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### Bioterror AO

#### AQAP will use bioweapons

CSARN 11, City Security and Resilience Networks group, a not-for-profit membership group of business and public sector security and emergency planning leaders, 9/2/11, “AQAP / Black Banners analysis,” http://worldreports.csarn.org/2011/09/aqap-black-banners-analysis-.html

On 12 August the New York Times reported leaked US intelligence assessments (which were likely provided by Saudi Arabia) suggesting that al-Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula (AQAP) is experimenting with the use of the biological toxin ricin. We believe this to be credible as AQAP called for chemists and microbiologists to volunteer in its English language publication, Inspire, last year. Furthermore, at least one of its senior bomb-makers trained with al-Qaeda in Afghanistan before 9/11 – when the movement is known to have experimented with chemical and biological weapons. AQAP also has a reputation as the movement’s most innovative element.

#### Extinction

Matheny 7 Jason G. Matheny, research associate with the Future of Humanity Institute at Oxford University, 2007, “Reducing the Risk of Human Extinction,” http://www.upmc-biosecurity.org/website/resources/publications/2007/2007-10-15-reducingrisk.html

Of current extinction risks, the most severe may be bioterrorism. The knowledge needed to engineer a virus is modest compared to that needed to build a nuclear weapon; the necessary equipment and materials are increasingly accessible and because biological agents are self-replicating, a weapon can have an exponential effect on a population (Warrick, 2006; Williams, 2006).5 Current U.S. biodefense efforts are funded at $5 billion per year to develop and stockpile new drugs and vaccines, monitor biological agents and emerging diseases, and strengthen the capacities of local health systems to respond to pandemics (Lam, Franco, & Shuler, 2006).

### CA AO

#### That causes Central Asian instability

Alexander Cooley 12, Prof of Poli Sci at Barnett College, PhD in Poli Sci from Columbia University, “Great Games, Local Rules: The New Power Contest in Central Asia,” p 48-49, google books

The increase in U.S. forces in Afghanistan in 2010 under the United States’ surge strategy also increased the importance of NDN and all of the Central Asian logistical partnerships cultivated by the U.S. military.81 But growing dependency on the network also appears to be empowering Central Asian elites to drive harder bargains and ratchet up political and economic demands. Politically, the Uzbek governments has been using its critical role in the NDN to push back against criticism of its human rights record. In a leaked cable from March 2009, U.S. Ambassador Richard Norland described how President Karimov gave him a “tongue-lashing” when broaching the topic of human rights and then implicitly threatened to suspend cooperation on NDN transit.82 Economically, the Uzbek government twice increased transit fees for goods bound for Afghanistan in 2010, while in February 2011 Tashkent announced a “significant” hike in NDN tariffs.83¶ On September 22, 2011, the U.S. Senate Committee on Appropriations approved a waiver to lift restrictions, in place since 2004, on providing U.S. military assistance to Uzbekistan. The DOD and diplomats engaged in NDN negotations had long sought for the waiver, which appeared to be yet another concession made to Tashkent to obtain its cooperation on security matters. Tellingly, the Senate made the waiver contingent on the DOD providing reports on how Pentagon funds were being spent on NDN contracts, though these reports will be classified.84 The Senate report on the foreign aid bill included the statement, “The committee is concerned with reports of pervasive corruption [in] Uzbekistan and therefore expects to be informed of public and private entities that receive support, directly or indirectly, from United States Government funds used to pay the costs of Northern Distribution Network supply routes through that country.”¶ The rent seeking, hard bargaining, and allegations of corruption that have accompanied NDN expansion have created some inescapable paradoxes about U.S. policy in Central Asia that conflict with the U.S. mission in neighboring Afghanistan. On the one hand, most U.S. planners acknowledge that the greatest obstacle to building an effective and legitimate state in Afghanistan is the problem of corruption that continues to erode the legitimacy of the Karzai government and its political allies. At the same time, behind the scenes in neighboring Central Asia, the deals established by the NDN seem to be doling out private economic benefits and lucrative contracts to the Central Asian regimes to maintain their cooperation. Just as the United States has had to juggle its strategic interests and values agenda with respect to Central Asia’s promotion of democracy and human rights, it seems that maintaining U.S. operations in Afghanistan necessitates tolerating and actively contributing to Central Asia’s corruption and governance problems.

#### Nuke war

M. Ehsan Ahrari 1, Professor of National Security and Strategy of the Joint and Combined Warfighting School at the Armed Forces Staff College, August 2001 , “Jihadi Groups, Nuclear Pakistan and the New Great Game,”

South and Central Asia constitute a part of the world where a well-designed American strategy might well help avoid crises or catastrophe. The U.S. military would provide only one component of such a strategy, and a secondary one at that, but has an important role to play through engagement activities and regional confidence building. Insecurity has led the states of the region to seek weapons of mass destruction, missiles and conventional arms. It has also led them toward policies which undercut the security of their neighbors. If such activities continue, the result could be increased terrorism, humanitarian disasters, continued low-level conflict and potentially even major regional war or a thermonuclear exchange. A shift away from this pattern could allow the states of the region to become solid economic and political partners for the United States, thus representing a gain for all concerned.

### 2AC Supreme Court CP

#### Courts alone don’t solve

Taylor 13 [Paul Taylor, Senior Fellow at the Center for Policy & Research, JD from Seton Hall Law School, “A FISC for Drones?” Feb 9 2013, http://transparentpolicy.org/2013/02/a-fisc-for-drones/]

Judges would likely be much more comfortable with ex post review. Ex post review would free them from any implication that they are issuing a “death warrant” and would place them in a position that they are much more comfortable with: reviewing executive uses of force after the fact. While there are clearly parallels that could be drawn between the ex ante review proposed here and the search and seizure warrants that judges routinely deal with, there are also important differences. First and foremost is that this implicates not the executive’s law enforcement responsibility but its war-making and foreign relations responsibilities, with which courts are loath to interfere, but are sometimes willing to review for abuse.¶ Additionally, in search and seizure warranting, there an ex post review will eventually be available. That will likely not be the case in drone strikes and other targeted killings unless such a process is specifically created. There are simply too many hurdles to judicial review (including state secrets, political questions, discovery problems, etc) for the courts to create such an opportunity without congressional action.

#### Links to politics

**Samuel 9** (Terence Samuel, Deputy Editor – The Root and Senior Correspondent - Prospect, “Obama's Honeymoon Nears Its End”, American Prospect, 5/29, http://www.prospect.org/cs/articles?article=obamas\_honeymoon\_nears\_its\_end**)**

This week, Barack Obama named his first nominee to the Supreme Court, then headed west to Las Vegas and Los Angeles to raise money for Democrats in the 2010 midterms. Taken together, these two seemingly disparate acts mark the end of a certain period of innocence in the Obama administration: The "blame Bush" phase of the Obama administration is over, and the prolonged honeymoon that the president has enjoyed with the country and the media will soon come to an end as well. Obama is no longer just the inheritor of Bush's mess. This is now his presidency in his own right. The chance to choose a Supreme Court justice is such a sui generis exercise of executive power -- it so powerfully underscores the vast and unique powers of a president -- that blame-shifting has become a less effective political strategy, and less becoming as well. Obama's political maturation will be hastened by the impending ideological fight that is now virtually a guarantee for Supreme Court nominations. Old wounds will be opened, and old animosities will be triggered as the process moves along. Already we see the effect in the polls. While Obama himself remains incredibly popular, only 47 percent of Americans think his choice of Judge Sonia Sotomayor is an excellent or good choice for the Court, according to the latest Gallup poll. The stimulus package scored better than that. The prospect of a new justice really seems to force people to reconsider their culture warrior allegiances in the context of the party in power. This month, after news of Justice David Souter's retirement, a Gallup poll showed that more Americans considered themselves against abortion rights than in favor: 51 percent to 42 percent. Those number were almost exactly reversed a year ago when Bush was in office and Obama was on the verge of wrapping up the Democratic nomination. "This is the first time a majority of U.S. adults have identified themselves as pro-life since Gallup began asking this question in 1995," according to the polling organization. Is this the same country that elected Obama? Yes, but with his overwhelmingly Democratic Senate, the public may be sending preemptory signals that they are not interested in a huge swing on some of these cultural issues that tend to explode during nomination hearings. Even though Obama will win the Sotomayor fight, her confirmation is likely to leave him less popular in the end because it will involve contentious issues -- questions of race and gender politics like affirmative action and abortion -- that he managed to avoid or at least finesse through his campaign and during his presidency so far.

#### Perm do both---shields the link

Perine, 6/12/2008 (Katherine – staff at CQ politics, Congress unlikely to try to counter Supreme Court detainee ruling, CQ Politics, p. http://www.cqpolitics.com/wmspage.cfm?docID=news-000002896528&cpage=2)

Thursday’s decision, from a Supreme Court dominated by Republican appointees, gives Democrats further cover against GOP sniping. “This is something that the court has decided, and very often the court gives political cover to Congress,” said Ross K. Baker, a Rutgers University political science professor. “You can simply point to a Supreme Court decision and say, ‘The devil made me do it.’ ”

#### No grounds, and only Congress can create them

Richard D. Rosend 11, Professor of Law and Director of the Center for Military Law & Policy at Texas School of Law, “Drones and the U.S. Courts,” W. Mitchell L. Rev. Vol. 37:5, pp. 5280-5293, http://repository.law.ttu.edu/bitstream/handle/10601/1918/Drones%20and%20the%20U.S.%20Courts.pdf?sequence=1

Second, some have suggested the possibility of Bivens actions76 for the victims of drone attacks; that is, a damages claim against federal officials for violating constitutional rights.77 Constitutional tort claims are specifically excepted from the Westfall Act;78 nevertheless, these lawsuits face several barriers. As an initial matter, noncitizen victims of overseas drone strikes have no constitutional rights.79 While the Supreme Court in Boumediene v. Bush80 held that the Suspension Clause reaches alien detainees confined at Guantanamo Bay, a territory over which the United States exercises de facto sovereignty,81 its decision was carefully circumscribed and neither extended the reach of habeas corpus beyond Guantanamo82 nor recognized that aliens outside the United States (including Guantanamo) enjoy substantive constitutional protections.83 Nor did the Court “disturb existing law governing the extraterritorial reach of any constitutional provisions, other than the Suspension Clause.”84¶ Even if the Constitution has universal extraterritorial application, a Bivens remedy for constitutional violations connected with the use of drones would still be unavailable. In Bivens, the Court recognized limits on the remedy, most notably the existence of special factors that may counsel hesitation against such a remedy in the absence of affirmative action by Congress.85 The lower courts have found special factors to exist in Bivens lawsuits against “military and foreign policy officials for allegedly unconstitutional treatment of foreign subjects causing injury abroad.”86 Given the Supreme Court’s “reluctan[ce] to extend Bivens liability ‘to any new context or new category of defendants,”’87 it is highly unlikely that the Court will recognize constitutional tort claims by foreign nationals who are victims of drone strikes in the nation’s war with al Qaeda and the Taliban.88

#### That means no precedent

Martha J. Dragich, Associate Professor of Law at Missouri-Columbia, 2-1995 44 Am. U.L. Rev. 757

Perhaps the most troublesome manner in which selective publication, summary dispositions, and vacatur weaken the development of the law is their failure to provide guidance for future conduct and for resolving future disputes. That is, even if a relevant decision can be located, and its precedential value ascertained, it may provide insufficient information about the facts of the case, the relevant rules, and the reasoning behind the rules' application. 260 Judges, no less than attorneys, must be able to evaluate prior decisions based upon a sophisticated understanding of what the court actually decided. Failing to provide sufficient guidance for future decisions jeopardizes the courts' ability to decide cases consistently and according to the law. 261 [\*798] Two examples illustrate the practical difficulties judges face in applying summary dispositions and unpublished opinions. In Burgin v. Henderson, 262 a district judge dismissed the complaint, relying on a previous, unreported decision that had been orally affirmed by the Second Circuit. 263 On appeal, the Second Circuit remanded Burgin for a factual hearing. 264 The appellate court stated that the question was still open because its affirmance of the district judge's earlier opinion was of no precedential value. 265 Thus, even though affirmance indicates that the lower court reached the correct result in the earlier case, it is impossible to know whether the lower court's analysis was sound. In future cases the trial judge cannot rely with confidence on the rationale previously employed.

#### State secrets blocks

Richard D. Rosend 11, Professor of Law and Director of the Center for Military Law & Policy at Texas School of Law, “Drones and the U.S. Courts,” W. Mitchell L. Rev. Vol. 37:5, pp. 5280-5293, http://repository.law.ttu.edu/bitstream/handle/10601/1918/Drones%20and%20the%20U.S.%20Courts.pdf?sequence=1

Assuming a complaint survives the jurisdictional, justiciability, immunity, and other hurdles to lawsuits challenging U.S. drone policy, the state secrets doctrine is likely to bring the suit to a quick end.9 Under the doctrine, the United States may prevent the disclosure of information in judicial proceedings if there is a reasonable danger of revealing military or state secrets.94 Once the privilege is properly invoked and a court is satisfied that release would pose a reasonable danger to secrets of state, "even the most compelling necessity cannot overcome the claim of privilege."¶ Not only will the state secrets doctrine thwart plaintiffs from 96 acquiring or introducing evidence vital to their case, it could result in dismissal of the cases themselves. Under the doctrine, the courts will dismiss a case either because the very subject of the case 97\* involves state secrets, or a case cannot proceed without the privileged evidence or presents an unnecessary risk of revealing protected secrets.98 Employing drones as a weapons platform against terrorists and insurgents in an ongoing armed conflict implicates both the nation's military tactics and strategy as well as its delicate relations with friendly nations.9 As such, lawsuits challenging the policy cannot be tried without access to and the possible disclosure of highly classified information relating to the means, methods, and circumstances under which drones are employed.

### 2AC Prez Powers DA

#### Unitary executive weakens the presidency

John W. Dean 9, former Counsel to the President, Chief Minority Counsel to the Judiciary Committee of the United States House of Representatives, the Associate Director of a law reform commission, and Associate Deputy Attorney General of the United States, graduate fellowship from American University to study government and the presidency, before entering Georgetown University Law Center, 1/9/09, <http://writ.news.findlaw.com/dean/20090109.html>

During the past eight years, President Bush has asserted presidential power in a singular fashion, drawing on the concept of a “unitary executive” who has unquestioned authority in times of war and is not beholden to international laws or treaties. This unusually broad interpretation of the Constitution provided the rationale for actions after the Sept. 11 terrorist attacks, including the establishment of military tribunals to try enemy combatants, the authorization of warrantless electronic surveillance of Americans and the assertion that the president may use any interrogation technique he deems necessary to protect national security. There is a widespread perception that Bush’s actions have collectively strengthened the presidency and fundamentally altered the balance of power between the executive and legislative branches. Bush, in many ways, embodies the concept of an “imperial presidency” as sketched by historian Arthur M. Schlesinger Jr. in the 1970s to describe chief executives who push their power to the absolute limit. But many experts believe Bush’s assertions of power have left the presidency fundamentally weaker, both for legal and political reasons. His boldest step, the order to convene military tribunals, was declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court in 2006. The warrantless surveillance program triggered a host of as-yet-unresolved legal challenges and antagonized Congress, making it unlikely that Obama, for pragmatic reasons, would risk a similarly daring policy without sensitivity to legal precedents or clear-cut authorization by the legislative branch. In general, the experts predict, Obama will derive more clout and influence by dialing back Bush’s conception of executive power and taking a more circumscribed view of the presidency. Bush’s actions “made the institution of the presidency more suspect in the eyes of Congress,” said Stephen J. Wayne, a presidential scholar at Georgetown University. “I think it’s generated a lot of resentment that will result in Congress demanding more collaboration from the president. Obama knows how the Senate works and understands the needs of members. His thinking is based on bringing groups together and unity, and that means give and take, not just pronouncing.”

#### Restrictions inevitable---the aff prevents haphazard ones which are worse

Benjamin Wittes 9, senior fellow and research director in public law at the Brookings Institution, is the author of Law and the Long War: The Future of Justice in the Age of Terror and is also a member of the Hoover Institution's Task Force on National Security and Law, “Legislating the War on Terror: An Agenda for Reform”, November 3, Book, p. 17

A new administration now confronts the same hard problems that plagued its ideologically opposite predecessor, and its very efforts to turn the page on the past make acute the problems of institutionalization. For while the new administration can promise to close the detention facility at Guantanamo Bay and can talk about its desire to prosecute suspects criminally, for example, it cannot so easily forswear noncriminal detention. While it can eschew the term "global war on terror," it cannot forswear those uses of force—Predator strikes, for example—that law enforcement powers would never countenance. Nor is it hastening to give back the surveillance powers that Congress finally gave the Bush administration. In other words, its very efforts to avoid the Bush administrations vocabulary have only emphasized the conflicts hybrid nature—indeed- emphasized that the United States is building something new here, not merely applying something old.¶ That point should not provoke controversy. The evidence that the United States is fumbling toward the creation of hybrid institutions to handle terrorism cases is everywhere around us. U.S. law, for example, now contemplates extensive- probing judicial review of detentions under the laws of war—a naked marriage of criminal justice and wartime traditions. It also contemplates warrantless wiretapping with judicial oversight of surveillance targeting procedures—thereby mingling the traditional judicial role in reviewing domestic surveillance with the vacuum cleaner-type acquisition of intelligence typical of overseas intelligence gathering. Slowly but surely, through an unpredictable combination of litigation, legislation, and evolutionary developments within executive branch policy, the nation is creating novel institutional arrangements to authorize and regulate the war on terror. The real question is not whether institutionalization will take place but whether it will take place deliberately or haphazardly, whether the United States will create through legislation the institutions with which it wishes to govern itself or whether it will allow an endless sequence of common law adjudications to shape them.¶ The authors of the chapters in this book disagree about a great many things. They span a considerable swath of the U.S. political spectrum, and they would no doubt object to some of one another's policy prescriptions. Indeed, some of the proposals are arguably inconsistent with one another, and it will be the very rare reader who reads this entire volume and wishes to see all of its ideas implemented in legislation. What binds these authors together is not the programmatic aspects of their policy prescriptions but the belief in the value of legislative action to help shape the contours of the continuing U.S. confrontation with terrorism. That is, the authors all believe that Congress has a significant role to play in the process of institutionalization—and they have all attempted to describe that role with reference to one of the policy areas over which Americans have sparred these past several years and will likely continue sparring over the next several years.

#### No impact---power is self-defeating

Tom Engelhardt 5, created and runs the Tomdispatch.com website, a project of The Nation Institute where he is a Fellow. Each spring he is a Teaching Fellow at the Graduate School of Journalism at the University of California, Berkeley. <http://www.tomdispatch.com/post/32668/>

Here it is worth reviewing the positions Yoo advocated while in the executive branch and since, and their consequences in the "war on terror." At every turn, Yoo has sought to exploit the "flexibility" he finds in the Constitution to advocate an approach to the "war on terror" in which legal limits are either interpreted away or rejected outright. Just two weeks after the September 11 attacks, Yoo sent an extensive memo to Tim Flanigan, deputy White House counsel, arguing that the President had unilateral authority to use military force not only against the terrorists responsible for the September 11 attacks but against terrorists anywhere on the globe, with or without congressional authorization.¶ Yoo followed that opinion with a series of memos in January 2002 maintaining, against the strong objections of the State Department, that the Geneva Conventions should not be applied to any detainees captured in the conflict in Afghanistan. Yoo argued that the president could unilaterally suspend the conventions; that al-Qaeda was not party to the treaty; that Afghanistan was a "failed state" and therefore the president could ignore the fact that it had signed the conventions; and that the Taliban had failed to adhere to the requirements of the Geneva Conventions regarding the conduct of war and therefore deserved no protection. Nor, he argued, was the president bound by customary international law, which insists on humane treatment for all wartime detainees. Relying on Yoo's reasoning, the Bush administration claimed that it could capture and detain any person who the president said was a member or supporter of al-Qaeda or the Taliban, and could categorically deny all detainees the protections of the Geneva Conventions, including a hearing to permit them to challenge their status and restrictions on inhumane interrogation practices.¶ Echoing Yoo, Alberto Gonzales, then White House counsel, argued at the time that one of the principal reasons for denying detainees protection under the Geneva Conventions was to "preserve flexibility" and make it easier to "quickly obtain information from captured terrorists and their sponsors." When CIA officials reportedly raised concerns that the methods they were using to interrogate high-level al-Qaeda detainees -- such as waterboarding -- might subject them to criminal liability, Yoo was again consulted. In response, he drafted the August 1, 2002, torture memo, signed by his superior, Jay Bybee, and delivered to Gonzales. In that memo, Yoo "interpreted" the criminal and international law bans on torture in as narrow and legalistic a way as possible; his evident purpose was to allow government officials to use as much coercion as possible in interrogations.¶ Yoo wrote that threats of death are permissible if they do not threaten "imminent death," and that drugs designed to disrupt the personality may be administered so long as they do not "penetrate to the core of an individual's ability to perceive the world around him." He said that the law prohibiting torture did not prevent interrogators from inflicting mental harm so long as it was not "prolonged." Physical pain could be inflicted so long as it was less severe than the pain associated with "serious physical injury, such as organ failure, impairment of bodily function, or even death."¶ Even this interpretation did not preserve enough executive "flexibility" for Yoo. In a separate section of the memo, he argued that if these loopholes were not sufficient, the president was free to order outright torture. Any law limiting the president's authority to order torture during wartime, the memo claimed, would "violate the Constitution's sole vesting of the Commander-in-Chief authority in the President."¶ Since leaving the Justice Department, Yoo has also defended the practice of "extraordinary renditions," in which the United States has kidnapped numerous "suspects" in the war on terror and "rendered" them to third countries with records of torturing detainees. He has argued that the federal courts have no right to review actions by the president that are said to violate the War Powers Clause. And he has defended the practice of targeted assassinations, otherwise known as "summary executions."¶ In short, the flexibility Yoo advocates allows the administration to lock up human beings indefinitely without charges or hearings, to subject them to brutally coercive interrogation tactics, to send them to other countries with a record of doing worse, to assassinate persons it describes as the enemy without trial, and to keep the courts from interfering with all such actions.¶ Has such flexibility actually aided the U.S. in dealing with terrorism? In all likelihood, the policies and attitudes Yoo has advanced have made the country less secure. The abuses at Guantánamo and Abu Ghraib have become international embarrassments for the United States, and by many accounts have helped to recruit young people to join al-Qaeda. The U.S. has squandered the sympathy it had on September 12, 2001, and we now find ourselves in a world perhaps more hostile than ever before.¶ With respect to detainees, thanks to Yoo, the U.S. is now in an untenable bind: on the one hand, it has become increasingly unacceptable for the U.S. to hold hundreds of prisoners indefinitely without trying them; on the other hand our coercive and inhumane interrogation tactics have effectively granted many of the prisoners immunity from trial. Because the evidence we might use against them is tainted by their mistreatment, trials would likely turn into occasions for exposing the United States' brutal interrogation tactics. This predicament was entirely avoidable. Had we given alleged al-Qaeda detainees the fair hearings required by the Geneva Conventions at the outset, and had we conducted humane interrogations at Guantánamo, Abu Ghraib, Camp Mercury, and elsewhere, few would have objected to the U.S. holding some detainees for the duration of the military conflict, and we could have tried those responsible for war crimes. What has been so objectionable to many in the U.S. and abroad is the government's refusal to accept even the limited constraints of the laws of war.¶ The consequences of Yoo's vaunted "flexibility" have been self-destructive for the U.S. -- we have turned a world in which international law was on our side into one in which we see it as our enemy. The Pentagon's National Defense Strategy, issued in March 2005, states,¶ "Our strength as a nation state will continue to be challenged by those who employ a strategy of the weak, using international fora, judicial processes, and terrorism."¶ The proposition that judicial processes -- the very essence of the rule of law -- are to be dismissed as a strategy of the weak, akin to terrorism, suggests the continuing strength of Yoo's influence. When the rule of law is seen simply as a device used by terrorists, something has gone perilously wrong. Michael Ignatieff has written that "it is the very nature of a democracy that it not only does, but should, fight with one hand tied behind its back. It is also in the nature of democracy that it prevails against its enemies precisely because it does." Yoo persuaded the Bush administration to untie its hand and abandon the constraints of the rule of law. Perhaps that is why we are not prevailing.

### Plan Key to Flex/Resolve

#### Stronger statutory checks on Presidential war powers increase America’s resolve

Matthew C. Waxman 13, Professor of Law at Columbia Law School; Adjunct Senior Fellow for Law and Foreign Policy, Council on Foreign Relations, “The Constitutional Power to Threaten War”, Forthcoming in Yale Law Journal, vol. 123 (2014), 8/25/2013, PDF

A second argument, this one advanced by some congressionalists, is that stronger legislative checks on presidential uses of force would improve deterrent and coercive strategies by making them more selective and credible. The most credible U.S. threats, this argument holds, are those that carry formal approval by Congress, which reflects strong public support and willingness to bear the costs of war; requiring express legislative backing to make good on threats might therefore be thought to enhance the potency of threats by encouraging the President to seek congressional authorization before acting.181 A frequently cited instance is President Eisenhower’s request (soon granted) for standing congressional authorization to use force in the Taiwan Straits crises of the mid- and late-1950s – an authorization he claimed at the time was important to bolstering the credibility of U.S. threats to protect Formosa from Chinese aggression.182 (Eisenhower did not go so far as to suggest that congressional authorization ought to be legally required, however.) “It was [Eisenhower’s] seasoned judgment … that a commitment the United States would have much greater impact on allies and enemies alike because it would represent the collective judgment of the President and Congress,” concludes Louis Fisher. “Single-handed actions taken by a President, without the support of Congress and the people, can threaten national prestige and undermine the presidency. Eisenhower’s position was sound then. It is sound now.”183 A critical assumption here is that legal requirements of congressional participation in decisions to use force filters out unpopular uses of force, the threats of which are unlikely to be credible and which, if unsuccessful, undermine the credibility of future U.S. threats.¶ A third view is that legal clarity is important to U.S. coercive and deterrent strategies; that ambiguity as to the President’s powers to use force undermines the credibility of threats. Michael Reisman observed, for example, in 1989: “Lack of clarity in the allocation of competence and the uncertain congressional role will sow uncertainty among those who depend on U.S. effectiveness for security and the maintenance of world order. Some reduction in U.S. credibility and diplomatic effectiveness may result.”184 Such stress on legal clarity is common among lawyers, who usually regard it as important to planning, whereas strategists tend to see possible value in “constructive ambiguity”, or deliberate fudging of drawn lines as a negotiating tactic or for domestic political purposes.185 A critical assumption here is that clarity of constitutional or statutory design with respect to decisions about force exerts significant effects on foreign perceptions of U.S. resolve to make good on threats, if not by affecting the substance of U.S. policy commitments with regard to force then by pointing foreign actors to the appropriate institution or process for reading them.

### 2AC Piracy DA

#### Pilot shortage thumps

RT 13 RT Network, “US drone pilot demand outstrips supply”, 8/13, <http://rt.com/usa/us-running-out-drone-pilots-765/>

The US Air Force is now facing a shortage in the number of pilots able to operate the military’s quickly expanding drone fleet, according to a new report published by a top Washington, DC, think tank. According to Air Force Colonel Bradley Hoagland, who contributed to a recent report on the Air Force’s drone program prepared by the Brookings Institution, it is quickly hitting a wall in the number of operators for its 159 Predators, 96 Reapers and 23 Global Hawks. Although the US military aimed to train 1,120 ‘traditional’ pilots along with 150 specialized drone pilots in 2012, it proved unable to meet the latter, owing to a lack of RPA (or remotely piloted aircraft) volunteers. A recent report by AFP placed the Air Force’s current drone pilot wing at 1,300, about 8.5 percent of the air corps’ pilots. Still, an increasing number of uses for America’s drone fleet, including recently-revealed plans by the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) for drones able to operate from naval vessels, have quickly exceeded the Air Force’s ability to train personnel to train and pilot unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs).

### AT: Africa Piracy Impact

#### No piracy impact

Patch 8 John Patch, Professor of strategic intelligence at the U.S. Army War College Retired US Navy Commander, directed the National Maritime Intelligence Watch at the Office of Naval Intelligence "The Overstated Threat" Proceedings Magazine - December 2008 Vol. 134/12/1,270 www.usni.org/magazines/proceedings/2008-12/overstated-threat

It is too easy to confuse piracy with water-borne terrorist acts. Don't believe the hype and consider the source.¶ Modern pirates bear little resemblance to popular romantic Hollywood characters. Increasingly violent and greedy, their actions seem an affront to the very ideals of Western civilization. Armchair admirals and politicians are quick to shake their fists, avowing, "Something must be done." Maritime industry is quick to follow, with unsettling incident accounts and dire financial projections. Yet, more informed analysis of piracy reveals that the impact in blood and treasure is altogether minimal.¶ Indeed, common misperceptions abound. While maritime piracy incidents capture media attention and generate international calls for action, the piracy threat is in fact overstated. It is nothing more than high-seas criminal activity, better addressed by law enforcement agencies than warships. As a localized nuisance, it should not serve to shape maritime force structure or strategy.¶ The distinction between piracy and terrorism is neither semantic nor academic. If piracy, the responsibility lies with local law enforcement officials, not the military. But maritime terrorism means scrambling the Navy.¶ No Link, No Evidence¶ A critical contemporary myth to debunk is the alleged nexus between piracy and international terrorism. Serious scholars and analysts view with circumspection any assertions of this linkage. For instance, a recent International Institute of Strategic Studies (IISS) forum revealed that there is "no evidence terrorists are gaining any benefit from piracy"—the real threat being organized criminal activity, not terrorism.1 The institute cites a study emphasizing the importance of not exaggerating the extent of either threat. Piracy, it maintains, is essentially a localized problem: "It is a nasty headache where it occurs, but its real effects on world trade and the movement of people are negligible." The study concludes there is no great risk of terrorists posing as pirates or adopting their methods either to seize a ship for hostages or to use the vessel itself as a weapon by igniting volatile cargo. To be sure, maritime terrorism is clearly a proven method of al Qaeda and other terrorist groups, but piracy cannot be plausibly conflated with it.¶ A 2008 RAND study reached similar conclusions. It detailed the causes for piracy in the last decade: local corruption, increased maritime traffic, small arms proliferation, lax coastal/port security, increasingly difficult maritime surveillance, lingering effects of the Asian financial crisis, and the denser traffic through congested choke points. RAND did not list terrorism, because "the presumed convergence between maritime terrorism and piracy remains highly questionable. . . . To date, there has been no credible evidence to support speculation about such a nexus emerging."2 RAND further assessed that the objectives of the two actors remained entirely distinct. A recent piracy incident seems to support this: during the September 2008 hijacking of a Ukrainian freighter—the Faina—off Somalia, the pirate leader admitted via phone to a New York Times reporter that the group wanted "just money."3

### 2AC CMR DA

#### CMR crisis inevitable---values and outlooks are drifting apart

Yoo 9 – John Yoo, Fletcher Jones Distinguished Visiting Professor of Law, Chapman University School of Law; Professor of Law, School of Law, University of California, Berkeley; Visiting Scholar, American Enterprise Institute, May 2009, “THIRTY-NINTH ANNUAL ADMINISTRATIVE LAW ISSUE: ADMINISTRATIVE LAW UNDER THE GEORGE W. BUSH ADMINISTRATION: LOOKING BACK AND LOOKING FORWARD: ARTICLE: ADMINISTRATION OF WAR,” Duke Law Journal, 58 Duke L.J. 2277, p. lexis

As the Obama administration takes office, this approach suggests that problems in civilian-military relations will not disappear, but in fact might grow worse. As I have noted, the growing gap between military and civilian outlooks and values sets the environment for differences on individual policy preferences. In light of this gap, the Obama administration might have problems similar to those experienced by the Clinton and Bush administration. If that is the case, then the new administration will need to devote even more attention to the question of civilian control of the military than did the last.

#### Policy disagreements don’t spill over --- no turns case

Hansen 9 – Victor Hansen, Associate Professor of Law, New England Law School, Summer 2009, “SYMPOSIUM: LAW, ETHICS, AND THE WAR ON TERROR: ARTICLE: UNDERSTANDING THE ROLE OF MILITARY LAWYERS IN THE WAR ON TERROR: A RESPONSE TO THE PERCEIVED CRISIS IN CIVIL-MILITARY RELATIONS,” South Texas Law Review, 50 S. Tex. L. Rev. 617, p. lexis

According to Sulmasy and Yoo, these conflicts between the military and the Bush Administration are the latest examples of a [\*624] crisis in civilian-military relations. n32 The authors suggest the principle of civilian control of the military must be measured and is potentially violated whenever the military is able to impose its preferred policy outcomes against the wishes of the civilian leaders. n33 They further assert that it is the attitude of at least some members of the military that civilian leaders are temporary office holders to be outlasted and outmaneuvered. n34 If the examples cited by the authors do in fact suggest efforts by members of the military to undermine civilian control over the military, then civilian-military relations may have indeed reached a crisis. Before such a conclusion can be reached, however, a more careful analysis is warranted. We cannot accept at face value the authors' broad assertions that any time a member of the military, whether on active duty or retired, disagrees with the views of a civilian member of the Department of Defense or other member of the executive branch, including the President, that such disagreement or difference of opinion equates to either a tension or a crisis in civil-military relations. Sulmasy and Yoo claim there is heightened tension or perhaps even a crisis in civil-military relations, yet they fail to define what is meant by the principle of civilian control over the military. Instead, the authors make general and rather vague statements suggesting any policy disagreements between members of the military and officials in the executive branch must equate to a challenge by the military against civilian control. n35 However, until we have a clear understanding of the principle of civilian control of the military, we cannot accurately determine whether a crisis in civil-military relations exists. It is to this question that we now turn.

#### No impact – empirics prove

Feaver and Kohn 5 - Peter Feaver, professor of Political Science and Public Policy and the director of the Triangle Institute for Security Studies at Duke University, and Richard H. Kohn, Professor of History at the University of North Carolina, 2005, “The Gap: Soldiers, Civilians, and Their Mutual Misunderstanding,” in American Defense Policy, 2005 edition, ed. Paul J. Bolt, Damon V. Coletta, Collins G. Shackelford, p. 339

Concerns about a troublesome divide between the armed forces and the society they serve are hardly new and in fact go back to the beginning of the Republic. Writing in the 1950s, Samuel Huntington argued that the divide could best be bridged by civilian society tolerating, if not embracing, the conservative values that animate military culture. Huntington also suggested that politicians allow the armed forces a substantial degree of cultural autonomy. Countering this argument, the sociologist Morris Janowitz argued that in a democracy, military culture necessarily adapts to changes in civilian society, adjusting to the needs and dictates of its civilian masters.2 The end of the Cold War and the extraordinary changes in American foreign and defense policy that resulted have revived the debate. The contemporary heirs of Janowitz see the all volunteer military as drifting too far away from the norms of American society, thereby posing problems for civilian control. They make tour principal assertions. First, the military has grown out of step ideologically with the public, showing itself to be inordinately right-wing politically, and much more religious (and fundamentalist) than America as a whole, having a strong and almost exclusive identification with the Republican Party. Second, the military has become increasingly alienated from, disgusted with, and sometimes even explicitly hostile to, civilian culture. Third, the armed forces have resisted change, particularly the integration of women and homosexuals into their ranks, and have generally proved reluctant to carry out constabulary missions. Fourth, civilian control and military effectiveness will both suffer as the military—seeking ways to operate without effective civilian oversight and alienated from the society around it—loses the respect and support of that society. By contrast, the heirs of Huntington argue that a degenerate civilian culture has strayed so far from traditional values that it intends to eradicate healthy and functional civil-military differences, particularly in the areas of gender, sexual orientation, and discipline. This camp, too, makes four key claims. First, its members assert that the military is divorced in values from a political and cultural elite that is itself alienated from the general public. Second, it believes this civilian elite to be ignorant of, and even hostile to, the armed forces—eager to employ the military as a laboratory for social change, even at the cost of crippling its warfighting capacity. Third, it discounts the specter of eroding civilian control because it sees a military so thoroughly inculcated with an ethos of subordination that there is now too much civilian control, the effect of which has been to stifle the military's ability to function effectively Fourth, because support for the military among the general public remains sturdy, any gap in values is inconsequential. The problem, if anything, is with the civilian elite. The debate has been lively (and inside the Beltway, sometimes quite vicious), but it has rested on very thin evidence—(tunneling anecdotes and claims and counterclaims about the nature of civilian and military attitudes. Absent has been a body of systematic data exploring opinions, values, perspectives, and attitudes inside the military compared with those held by civilian elites and the general public. Our project provides some answers.

### 2AC Debt Ceiling DA

#### McConnell primary challenge will prevent a deal

Stephanie Kirchgaessner 9/20, Financial Times, “Challenge to McConnell stymies deal on budget,” http://www.ft.com/cms/s/0/d2bb4f8c-21fd-11e3-9b55-00144feab7de.html#axzz2fUCcoopO

More significantly for the US economy and global markets, Mr McConnell’s political problems will make it more difficult for the White House to reach a deal to extend the nation’s debt limit. If no deal is reached by mid to late-October, it could lead to the first US debt default.¶ The high stakes were made clear on Friday when the Republican majority in the House of Representatives passed 230-189 a spending bill that would keep the government running until mid-December with one caveat: it would defund portions of the health reform law known as “Obamacare”.¶ The vote creates an impasse with no clear sign of a resolution given Democratic opposition to the defunding effort. Without a deal, the government will shut down on October 1.¶ The House proposal will be taken up next week by Democrats in the Senate, who are expected to send it back to the lower chamber after stripping out the defunding language. What happens next is unknown, and the uncertainty bodes badly for a separate fight over the debt ceiling increase. Conservative Republicans have said they will pass an increase only if it contains a one-year delay in a key provision of Obamacare. President Barack Obama has said he will not negotiate over the debt ceiling.¶ It is just the kind of quagmire that Mr McConnell has helped to defuse in the past.¶ The senator has never been an ally of Mr Obama. But his ultimately pragmatic nature, which reflects nearly three decades in the upper chamber of Congress, has made him an invaluable negotiating partner over the years.¶ It was Mr McConnell who clinched the deal with vice-president Joe Biden at the end of 2012 to avert the “fiscal cliff”. A year earlier, he was the senator who proposed the use of an arcane procedural mechanism to increase the debt ceiling without forcing Republicans to vote for it.¶ However, even as the lawmaker has touted his role in those deals and emphasised the important concessions he won on taxes and spending limits, he is nevertheless seen by conservative activists as a sellout.¶ “There is a conflict between his rhetoric and reality. He wants people to re-elect him because he has this power and the title, but he is not using it in a way that benefits them. These deals are very unpopular,” said Matt Hoskins, executive director of the Senate Conservatives Fund.¶ Now that the Kentucky lawmaker is engaged in a primary race against the largely unknown Matt Bevin – in which any co-operation with the White House will count against him among voters – it has put him “on the bench” for this round of fiscal fight.¶ “There was always a sense with McConnell of averting disaster. But you know now his focus is in Kentucky, not necessarily in pulling the Congress back from the brink the way he has in the last two big fights,” said Chris Krueger, an analyst at Guggenheim Securities.¶ Jennifer Duffy, of the Cook Political Report, added: “While McConnell may be inclined to be a dealmaker, I think getting a challenge from the right doessn’t give him a lot of incentive to be the dealmaker.”

#### Won’t pass---and Obama rhetoric makes the impact inevitable

Damian Paletta 9/18, WSJ reporter, “White House Shifts Debt-Ceiling Tone, Warning of Fiasco,” http://blogs.wsj.com/washwire/2013/09/18/white-house-shifts-debt-ceiling-tone-warning-of-fiasco/

In 2011, then-Treasury Secretary Timothy Geithner repeatedly brushed off questions about whether Congress would raise the debt ceiling. He wasn’t worried, he would tell audiences. Congress would raise it sooner or later.¶ This time, the White House and its allies are openly telling people they are worried.¶ On Tuesday morning, Treasury Secretary Jacob Lew told an audience in Washington that Congress’s lack of urgency on fiscal problems was making him “nervous” and “anxious.”¶ Mr. Lew has warned that if Congress doesn’t raise the debt ceiling by mid-October, the government would soon run out of cash to pay all of its bills. The government faced the same deadline pressure in August 2011 and narrowly averted blowing through the deadline.¶ Back then, Treasury was (publicly) denying at every opportunity that Congress wouldn’t raise the debt ceiling. Now, not so much.¶ Their strategy has shifted: instead of saying the government won’t pay its bills, they are saying if the government doesn’t pay its bills it will be the Republicans’ fault. (Republicans disagree, and say the White House needs to negotiate).¶ David Plouffe, a former top White House official who remains a close adviser to President Barack Obama, doubled down on the political messaging Tuesday night.¶ “Odds of shutdown and default rising as House GOP cowers to Team Cruz,” he tweeted, referring to Sen. Ted Cruz (R., Texas), who is pushing Republicans to band together and force the government to cut the funding of Mr. Obama’s health-care law. “Tanking the economy preferable to standing up to delusion. SOS.”¶ The White House, by playing offense, faces some immediate risks. By talking up the prospects of a Washington fiscal crisis, it could spook investors and lead to all sorts of volatility. But it’s clear the White House has thrown out the 2011 playbook and are trying something new.

#### PC low and fails for fiscal fights

Greg Sargent 9-12, September 12th, 2013, "The Morning Plum: Senate conservatives stick the knife in House GOP leaders," Washington Post, factiva

All of this underscores a basic fact about this fall's fiscal fights: Far and away the dominant factor shaping how they play out will be the divisions among Republicans. There's a great deal of chatter (see Senator Bob Corker for one of the most absurd examples yet) to the effect that Obama's mishandling of Syria has diminished his standing on Capitol Hill and will weaken him in coming fights. But those battles at bottom will be about whether the Republican Party can resolve its internal differences. Obama's "standing" with Republicans -- if it even could sink any lower -- is utterly irrelevant to that question.¶ The bottom line is that, when it comes to how aggressively to prosecute the war against Obamacare, internal GOP differences may be unbridgeable. Conservatives have adopted a deliberate strategy of deceiving untold numbers of base voters into believing Obamacare will be stopped outside normal electoral channels. Central to maintaining this fantasy is the idea that any Republican leader who breaks with this sacred mission can only be doing so because he or she is too weak and cowardly to endure the slings and arrows that persevering against the law must entail. GOP leaders, having themselves spent years feeding the base all sorts of lies and distortions about the law, are now desperately trying to inject a does of reality into the debate by pointing out that the defund-Obamacare crusade is, in political and practical terms alike, insane. But it may be too late. The time for injecting reality into the debate has long since passed.

#### Plan’s bipartisan---Congress looking for TK limitations

AP 13, "Congress looks to limit drone strikes", February 5, www.cbsnews.com/8301-250\_162-57567793/congress-looks-to-limit-drone-strikes/

Uncomfortable with the Obama administration's use of deadly drones, a growing number in Congress is looking to limit America's authority to kill suspected terrorists, even U.S. citizens. The Democratic-led outcry was emboldened by the revelation in a newly surfaced Justice Department memo that shows drones can strike against a wider range of threats, with less evidence, than previously believed.¶ The drone program, which has been used from Pakistan across the Middle East and into North Africa to find and kill an unknown number of suspected terrorists, is expected to be a top topic of debate when the Senate Intelligence Committee grills John Brennan, the White House's pick for CIA chief, at a hearing Thursday.¶ The White House on Tuesday defended its lethal drone program by citing the very laws that some in Congress once believed were appropriate in the years immediately after the Sept. 11 attacks but now think may be too broad.¶ It has to be in the agenda of this Congress to reconsider the scope of action of drones and use of deadly force by the United States around the world because the original authorization of use of force, I think, is being strained to its limits," Sen. Chris Coons, D-Del., said in a recent interview.¶ Rep. Steny Hoyer of Maryland, the No. 2 Democrat in the House, said Tuesday that "it deserves a serious look at how we make the decisions in government to take out, kill, eliminate, whatever word you want to use, not just American citizens but other citizens as well."¶ Hoyer added: "We ought to carefully review our policies as a country."¶ The Senate Foreign Relations Committee likely will hold hearings on U.S. drone policy, an aide said Tuesday, and Chairman Robert Menendez, D-N.J., and the panel's top Republican, Sen. Bob Corker of Tennessee, both have quietly expressed concerns about the deadly operations. And earlier this week, a group of 11 Democratic and Republican senators urged President Barack Obama to release a classified Justice Department legal opinion justifying when U.S. counterterror missions, including drone strikes, can be used to kill American citizens abroad.

#### No PC -- divided Dems backlashing – laundry list

Bloomberg 9/17 -- Mike Dorning and Kathleen Hunter, 2013, Obama Rifts with Allies on Summers-Syria Limit Debt Dealing, www.bloomberg.com/news/2013-09-17/obama-s-summers-syria-rifts-with-allies-limit-room-on-debt-

The backlash President Barack Obama faced from Democrats on both Syria and the prospect of Lawrence Summers leading the Federal Reserve underscore intraparty rifts that threaten to limit his room to strike budget and debt deals.¶ “There’s a large and growing portion of the Democratic Party that’s not in a compromising mood,” said William Galston, a former domestic policy adviser to President Bill Clinton.¶ Summers, one of Obama’s top economic advisers during the first two years of his presidency, withdrew from consideration for Fed chairman after a campaign against him led by Democratic senators who criticized his role in deregulating the financial industry during the 1990s.¶ That came just days after the Senate postponed deliberation on a request by Obama to authorize U.S. force in Syria, amid opposition from Democratic and Republican lawmakers wary of a new military action in the Middle East.¶ The two controversies raised “central issues” that divide Democrats at a time when the president needs unity to confront Republicans, Galston said. “The White House better make sure it and congressional Democrats are on the same page” as lawmakers face deadlines on government spending and raising the debt limit, he said.¶ Party Divisions¶ Senator Richard Durbin of Illinois, the chamber’s second-ranking Democrat, said today that Democrats are united with Obama on the need for a “clean” debt-ceiling increase. The anti-Summers movement reflected “strong feelings that many of us have” about making the Fed more responsive on issues such as income inequality, he said.¶ Republican leaders are dealing with their own divisions. House Speaker John Boehner, an Ohio Republican, had to pull back a vote last week on a plan to avoid a partial government shutdown in October after it became clear it couldn’t win enough support from members of his own party.¶ Congress and the Obama administration are facing fiscal decisions that include funding the government by Sept. 30 to avoid a federal shutdown and raising the nation’s $16.7 trillion debt ceiling. Boehner said in July that his party wouldn’t increase the borrowing limit “without real cuts in spending” that would further reduce the deficit. The administration insists it won’t negotiate on the debt ceiling.¶ Building Dissent¶ For Obama, the dissent on the left was already brewing before the Syria and Summers debates.¶ Congressional Democrats and union leaders accused him of being too eager to compromise with Republican demands to cut entitlement spending after he released a budget proposal that called for lower annual Social Security cost-of-living adjustments.¶ Some early Obama supporters also were disappointed that the president, who has relied on drone strikes to kill suspected terrorists and failed to close the detention center at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, hadn’t moved far enough from George W. Bush’s policies on civil liberties and national security. The complaints grew louder after the disclosure of National Security Agency surveillance practices this year.¶ Obama, who earlier this year watched his gun-control legislation fail in the Senate partly because of defections by Democrats from Republican-leaning states, also is limited in his capacity to enlist public support to win over lawmakers.

#### EPA regs cause firestorm against Obama

WT 9/20 -- Washington Times, EPA coal rules tighter than expected, will fuel backlash in Congress, 2013, Ben Wolfgang, www.washingtontimes.com/news/2013/sep/20/epa-coal-rules-tighter-expected-will-fuel-backlash/

The Environmental Protection Agency’s dramatic new power plant emissions standards already have touched off a firestorm within the coal industry and on Capitol Hill, with top Republicans promising to fight tooth-and-nail against President Obama’s climate-change agenda.¶ The EPA, the leading actor in the White House’s ambitious global-warming initiative, released the limits on Friday. Hopes that they’d be much less stringent than previous proposals proved to be misplaced.¶ Coal-state lawmakers from both parties are promising to push back.¶ “The president is leading a war on coal and what that really means for Kentucky families is a war on jobs. And the announcement by the EPA is another back door attempt by President Obama to fulfill his long-term commitment to shut down our nation’s coal mines,” said Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell, Kentucky Republican.

#### DOD shift triggers the link

Carlo Munoz 13, 4/9/13, staff writer for defense and national security for the Hill, “Turf battle builds quietly in Congress over control of armed drone program,” http://thehill.com/homenews/administration/292501-turf-battle-builds-quietly-over-control-of-armed-drone-program-

A turf war is quietly building between congressional defense and intelligence committees over who will oversee the Obama administration’s controversial armed drone program. ¶ Lawmakers are scrambling to make their case for or against a White House proposal that would hand control of the drones to the Pentagon. ¶ Gordon Adams, a senior defense analyst at the Stimson Center, called the looming battle a “turf fight in the [disguise] of a policy debate.”¶ The Pentagon and CIA operate their own armed drone programs, which are both geared toward eliminating senior al Qaeda leaders and other high-level terror targets around the world. Under the Obama administration’s proposal, the CIA would continue to supply intelligence on possible targets, but actual control over the drone strikes would fall to the Pentagon. ¶ Senate Intelligence Committee Chairwoman Dianne Feinstein (D-Calif.) publicly questioned whether the Defense Department (DOD) would be able to shoulder the program alone. ¶ “We’ve watched the intelligence aspect of the drone program, how they function, the quality of the intelligence, watching the agency exercise patience and discretion,” Feinstein told reporters in March. “The military [armed drone] program has not done that nearly as well.” ¶ Sen. John McCain and other defense lawmakers say the drone program would be better off being run by the Pentagon. ¶ “It’s not the job of the Central Intelligence Agency. ... It’s the military’s job,” the Arizona Republican said in March. ¶ The fight is a typical battle over who on Capitol Hill will retain power over the program, according to several analysts, who described it as predictable. ¶ “There is always going to be a turf battle” when dealing with congressional oversight, said Lawrence Korb, a former DOD official and defense analyst at the liberal-leaning Center for American Progress. ¶ But that battle could become particularly heated, given the high-profile nature of the drone program, which since the Sept. 11, 2001, attacks has become a huge factor in shaping counterterrorism policy, given its success, Korb said.

### AT: Econ Impact

#### No debt ceiling econ impact – proven since their card is pre 2011 downgrade

Tom Raum 11, AP, “Record $14 trillion-plus debt weighs on Congress”, Jan 15, <http://www.mercurynews.com/news/ci_17108333?source=rss&nclick_check=1>

Democrats have use doomsday rhetoric about a looming government shutdown and comparing the U.S. plight to financial crises in Greece and Portugal. It's all a bit of a stretch. "We can't do as the Gingrich crowd did a few years ago, close the government," said Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-Nev.), referring to government shutdowns in 1995 when Georgia Republican Newt Gingrich was House speaker. But those shutdowns had nothing to do with the debt limit. They were caused by failure of Congress to appropriate funds to keep federal agencies running. And there are many temporary ways around the debt limit. Hitting it does not automatically mean a default on existing debt. It only stops the government from new borrowing, forcing it to rely on other ways to finance its activities. In a 1995 debt-limit crisis, Treasury Secretary Robert Rubin borrowed $60 billion from federal pension funds to keep the government going. It wasn't popular, but it helped get the job done. A decade earlier, James Baker, President Ronald Reagan's treasury secretary, delayed payments to the Civil Service and Social Security trust funds and used other bookkeeping tricks to keep money in the federal till. Baker and Rubin "found money in pockets no one knew existed before," said former congressional budget analyst Stanley Collender. Collender, author of "Guide to the Federal Budget," cites a slew of other things the government can do to delay a crisis. They include leasing out government-owned properties, "the federal equivalent of renting out a room in your home," or slowing down payments to government contractors. Now partner-director of Qorvis Communications, a Washington consulting firm, Collender said such stopgap measures buy the White House time to resist GOP pressure for concessions. "My guess is they can go months after the debt ceiling is not raised and still be able to come up with the cash they need. But at some point, it will catch up," and raising the debt limit will become an imperative, he suggested.

#### AQAP rise collapses the economy

Nathaniel Sheppard 11, correspondent for the Chicago Tribune and NYT, June 7 2011, “Why pint-sized Yemen has become a world player,” http://www.alarabiya.net/articles/2011/06/07/152204.html

That Yemen could fall into the abyss is of great geopolitical significance that has put the bean-size nation at center stage. About 11 percent of the world’s seaborne petroleum passes through the Gulf of Aden en route to the Suez Canal, regional refineries and points west. ¶ It is not the largest shipment by far but enough that disruptions in transit could spook world markets and set off a new spiral of inflation as the world tries to recover from four years of economic distress.¶ Yemen occupies the southwestern and southern end of the Arabian Peninsula. It is bordered by Saudi Arabia to the north, the Red Sea to the west and Oman to the east. ¶ West bound oil must transit the Gulf of Aden and Bab el Mandab, a narrow strait that passes between Yemen and Djibouti then past the pirates’ paradise, Somalia before reaching open water. It is one of seven strategic world oil shipping chokepoints. ¶ Moreover, the area may contain significant untapped oil reserves, more reason for US concern since Saudi reserves may be diminishing and America is doing little to wean itself from fossil fuel.¶ Should Yemen polity fall apart, the country would be up for grabs. One of the grabbing hands would be that of Al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula, one of the most notorious of Al Qaeda offshoots. Even before Osama Bin Laden was killed and his body dumped into the sea at the beginning of May, the Al Qaeda leader and best known symbol of world terror had lost control of Yemen’s Al Qaeda warriors. They marched to their own drum.¶ Able to operate freely in this poorest of poor, barely managed country with rugged, unforgiving terrain, Yemen’s Al Qaeda has been able to mount several attacks on the US from here. First there was the suicide bombing of the naval destroyer USS Cole while it refueled at the Yemeni port of Aden. Seventeen seamen were killed¶ Subsequent attacks launched from here included the failed Christmas Day bomb plot in 2009 and the parcel bomb plot of 2010, which also failed. ¶ In 2009, Nasir Al Wuhayshi, an Al Qaeda commander who trained under Bin Laden in Afghanistan and served as his secretary, announced the consolidation of Al Qaeda forces in the region as Al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula, under his command.¶ The US went after Al Qaeda elements in the region that same year but in lawless Somalia with disastrous consequences.¶ Commander Wuhayshi pledged to take jihad from the Arabian Peninsula to Israel, striking at Muslim leaders he decreed “criminal tyrants,” along the way, such as the Saudi royal, family, Yemen’s President Ali Abdullah Saleh and recently deposed Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak. ¶ Once in Israel he would “liberate” Gaza and Muslim holy sites such as Haram Ash-Sharif, known by Jews as Temple Mount, the holiest of sites in the Old City of Jerusalem. It was here that God chose the Divine Presence to rest; from which the world we know expanded; and that God gathered the dust to make man.¶ US Navy SEALs would love to meet Mr. Wuhayshi to discuss diabolical ambitions for any serious attempt to carry out his apocalyptic quest most certainly would plunge the world into war of world proportions. His agenda and the passion and persistence with which he and his followers pursue it are a reason for stepped up US engagement in Yemen.¶ Before the current uptick in violence as disparate forces seek to send President Saleh packing for good, the long reigning strongman had begun to cooperate with the US counter terrorism efforts in the region, obliging with a series of air strikes and ground assaults on suspected Al Qaeda targets in Yemen. That cooperation may now be in tatters and Mr. Wuhayshi stands to gain ground.¶ The US’ waltz with the strongman was not by choice. While Mr. Saleh’s cooperation was probably more to save his utterly corrupt regime, he was viewed by the US as the lesser of evils in Yemen. The attitude toward President Saleh was the same as toward Panamanian strongman Gen. Manuel Noriega, another US criminal client: “He may be an SOB but he’s our SOB.’’ ¶ With a bigger footprint and wider control in Yemen in the absence of a strong central authority, outright land grabs and possible alliances with Somalia warlords, it would be as if Al Qaeda had found its Holy Grail, a potential for disrupting the flow of oil to the west, and what it views as the devil incarnate, the US. ¶ Ships transiting the area already find the waters treacherous. Now it stands to get worse. They are frequently targeted by pirates from Somalia who kill or demand large ransoms if they are able to successfully board cargo-carrying vessels. Oil tankers are like crown jewels.¶ International forces, including the US, have treated the Somali pirates like flies at a picnic, swatting them away unscathed most of the time and sometimes killing them, but not enough times to make their confederates think about new careers. ¶ Hijacking or blowing up oil tankers and messing with the oil that powers the world is a different matter altogether. There is too much at stake to leave it to Yemen to handle its own affairs but overt meddling from the West would be unwelcome in the region.¶ No Western or Asian oil dependent nation would relish the idea of invading a Muslim nation at a time of such tensions with Muslims. The US is particularly reluctant, having already done so twice in Iraq and Afghanistan.¶ Oil is oil however. While it might not matter to Muslim fundamentalists who want to turn the hands of time back to the 17th century, oil dependent nations would not sit by idly while an already fractured world economy worsened. The situation would get ugly.¶ Thus the tail wags the dog, the pint-sized nation that offers so little has forced the powerful behemoths to consider so much, like their limited options for doing anything about frightening events unfolding before their eyes.

### AT: Econ = War

#### No econ impact

Daniel W. Drezner 12, Professor, The Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University, October 2012, “The Irony of Global Economic Governance: The System Worked,” <http://www.globaleconomicgovernance.org/wp-content/uploads/IR-Colloquium-MT12-Week-5_The-Irony-of-Global-Economic-Governance.pdf>

The final outcome addresses a dog that hasn’t barked: the effect of the Great Recession on cross-border conflict and violence. During the initial stages of the crisis, multiple analysts asserted that the financial crisis would lead states to increase their use of force as a tool for staying in power.37 Whether through greater internal repression, diversionary wars, arms races, or a ratcheting up of great power conflict, there were genuine concerns that the global economic downturn would lead to an increase in conflict. Violence in the Middle East, border disputes in the South China Sea, and even the disruptions of the Occupy movement fuel impressions of surge in global public disorder. ¶ The aggregate data suggests otherwise,

however. The Institute for Economics and Peace has constructed a “Global Peace Index” annually since 2007. A key conclusion they draw from the 2012 report is that “The average level of peacefulness in 2012 is approximately the same as it was in 2007.”38 Interstate violence in particular has declined since the start of the financial crisis – as have military expenditures in most sampled countries. Other studies confirm that the Great Recession has not triggered any increase in violent conflict; the secular decline in violence that started with the end of the Cold War has not been reversed.39 Rogers Brubaker concludes, “the crisis has not to date generated the surge in protectionist nationalism or ethnic exclusion that might have been expected.”40¶ None of these data suggest that the global economy is operating swimmingly. Growth remains unbalanced and fragile, and has clearly slowed in 2012. Transnational capital flows remain depressed compared to pre-crisis levels, primarily due to a drying up of cross-border interbank lending in Europe. Currency volatility remains an ongoing concern. Compared to the aftermath of other postwar recessions, growth in output, investment, and employment in the developed world have all lagged behind. But the Great Recession is not like other postwar recessions in either scope or kind; expecting a standard “V”-shaped recovery was unreasonable. One financial analyst characterized the post-2008 global economy as in a state of “contained depression.”41 The key word is “contained,” however. Given the severity, reach and depth of the 2008 financial crisis, the proper comparison is with Great Depression. And by that standard, the outcome variables look impressive. As Carmen Reinhart and Kenneth Rogoff concluded in This Time is Different: “that its macroeconomic outcome has been only the most severe global recession since World War II – and not even worse – must be regarded as fortunate.”42

# 1AR

### Impact

#### No impact to biodiversity

Sagoff 97  Mark, Senior Research Scholar – Institute for Philosophy and Public policy in School of Public Affairs – U. Maryland, William and Mary Law Review, “INSTITUTE OF BILL OF RIGHTS LAW SYMPOSIUM DEFINING TAKINGS: PRIVATE PROPERTY AND THE FUTURE OF GOVERNMENT REGULATION: MUDDLE OR MUDDLE THROUGH? TAKINGS JURISPRUDENCE MEETS THE ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT”, 38 Wm and Mary L. Rev. 825, March, L/N

Note – Colin Tudge - Research Fellow at the Centre for Philosophy at the London School of Economics. Frmr Zoological Society of London: Scientific Fellow and tons of other positions. PhD. Read zoology at Cambridge.

Simon Levin = Moffet Professor of Biology, Princeton. 2007 American Institute of Biological Sciences Distinguished Scientist Award 2008 Istituto Veneto di Scienze Lettere ed Arti 2009 Honorary Doctorate of Science, Michigan State University 2010 Eminent Ecologist Award, Ecological Society of America 2010 Margalef Prize in Ecology, etc… PhD

Although one may agree with ecologists such as Ehrlich and Raven that the earth stands on **the brink of** an episode of **massive extinction, it may not follow** from this grim fact **that human** being**s will suffer** as a result. On the contrary, skeptics such as science writer Colin Tudge have challenged biologists to explain **why we need more than a tenth of the 10 to 100 million species that grace the earth**. Noting that "cultivated systems often out-produce wild systems by 100-fold or more," Tudge declared that "the argument that humans need the variety of other species is, when you think about it, a theological one." n343 Tudge observed that "the elimination of all but a tiny minority **of our fellow creatures does not affect the material well-being of humans** one iota."n344 This skeptic challenged ecologists to list more than 10,000 species (other than unthreatened microbes) that are essential to ecosystem productivity or functioning. n345 "**The human species could survive just as well** if 99.9% of our fellow creatures went extinct, provided only that we retained the appropriate 0.1% that we need." n346   [\*906]   The monumental Global Biodiversity Assessment ("the Assessment") identified two positions with respect to redundancy of species. "At one extreme is the idea that each species is unique and important, such that its removal or loss will have demonstrable consequences to the functioning of the community or ecosystem." n347 The authors of the Assessment, a panel of eminent ecologists, endorsed this position, saying it is "unlikely that there is much, if any, ecological redundancy in communities over time scales of decades to centuries, the time period over which environmental policy should operate." n348 These eminent ecologists rejected the opposing view, "the notion that species overlap in function to a sufficient degree that removal or loss of a species will be compensated by others, with negligible overall consequences to the community or ecosystem." n349  Other biologists believe, however, that species are so fabulously redundant in the ecological functions they perform that the life-support systems and processes of the planet and ecological processes in general will function perfectly well with fewer of them, certainly fewer than the millions and millions we can expect to remain **even if** **every threatened organism becomes extinct**. n350 Even the kind of sparse and miserable world depicted in the movie Blade Runner could provide a "sustainable" context for the human economy as long as people forgot their aesthetic and moral commitment to the glory and beauty of the natural world. n351 The Assessment makes this point. "Although any ecosystem contains hundreds to thousands of species interacting among themselves and their physical environment, the emerging consensus is that the system is driven by a small number of . . . biotic variables on whose interactions the balance of species are, in a sense, carried along." n352   [\*907]   To make up your mind on the question of the functional redundancy of species, consider an endangered species of bird, plant, or insect and ask how the ecosystem would fare in its absence. The fact that the creature is endangered suggests an answer: it is already in limbo as far as ecosystem processes are concerned. What crucial ecological services does the black-capped vireo, for example, serve? Are any of the species threatened with extinction necessary to the provision of any ecosystem service on which humans depend? If so, which ones are they?  Ecosystems and the species that compose them have changed, dramatically, continually, and totally in virtually every part of the United States. There is little ecological similarity, for example, between New England today and the land where the Pilgrims died. n353 In view of the constant reconfiguration of the biota, **one may wonder why Americans have not suffered more as a result of ecological catastrophes**. The cast of species in nearly every environment changes constantly-local extinction is commonplace in nature-but the crops still grow. Somehow, it seems, property values keep going up on Martha's Vineyard in spite of the tragic disappearance of the heath hen.  One might argue that the sheer number and variety of creatures available to any ecosystem buffers that system against stress. Accordingly, we should be concerned if the "library" of creatures ready, willing, and able to colonize ecosystems gets too small. (Advances in genetic engineering may well permit us to write a large number of additions to that "library.") In the United States as in many other parts of the world, however, the number of species has been increasing dramatically, not decreasing, as a result of human activity. This is because the hordes of exotic species coming into ecosystems in the United States far exceed the number of species that are becoming extinct. Indeed, introductions may outnumber extinctions by more than ten to one, so that the United States is becoming more and more species-rich all the time largely as a result of human action. n354 [\*908] Peter Vitousek and colleagues estimate that over 1000 non-native plants grow in California alone; in Hawaii there are 861; in Florida, 1210. n355 In Florida more than 1000 non-native insects, 23 species of mammals, and about 11 exotic birds have established themselves. n356 Anyone who waters a lawn or hoes a garden knows how many weeds desire to grow there, how many birds and bugs visit the yard, and how many fungi, creepy-crawlies, and other odd life forms show forth when it rains. All belong to nature, from wherever they might hail, but not many homeowners would claim that there are too few of them. Now, not all exotic species provide ecosystem services; indeed, some may be disruptive or have no instrumental value. n357 This also may be true, of course, of native species as well, especially because all exotics are native somewhere. Certain exotic species, however, such as Kentucky blue grass, establish an area's sense of identity and place; others, such as the green crabs showing up around Martha's Vineyard, are nuisances. n358 Consider an analogy [\*909] with human migration. Everyone knows that after a generation or two, immigrants to this country are hard to distinguish from everyone else. The vast majority of Americans did not evolve here, as it were, from hominids; most of us "came over" at one time or another. This is true of many of our fellow species as well, and they may fit in here just as well as we do. It is possible to distinguish exotic species from native ones for a period of time, just as we can distinguish immigrants from native-born Americans, but as the centuries roll by, species, like people, fit into the landscape or the society, changing and often enriching it. Shall we have a rule that a species had to come over on the Mayflower, as so many did, to count as "truly" American? Plainly not. When, then, is the cutoff date? Insofar as we are concerned with the absolute numbers of "rivets" holding ecosystems together, extinction seems not to pose a general problem because a far greater number of kinds of mammals, insects, fish, plants, and other creatures thrive on land and in water in America today than in prelapsarian times. n359 The Ecological Society of America has urged managers to maintain biological diversity as a critical component in strengthening ecosystems against disturbance. n360 Yet as Simon Levin observed, "much of the detail about species composition will be irrelevant in terms of influences on ecosystem properties." n361 [\*910] He added: "For net primary productivity, as is likely to be the case for any system property, **biodiversity matters only up to a point**; above a certain level, increasing biodiversity is likely to make **little difference**." n362 What about the use of plants and animals in agriculture? There is no scarcity foreseeable. "Of an estimated 80,000 types of plants [we] know to be edible," a U.S. Department of the Interior document says, "only about 150 are extensively cultivated." n363 About twenty species, not one of which is endangered, provide ninety percent of the food the world takes from plants. n364 Any new food has to take "shelf space" or "market share" from one that is now produced. Corporations also find it difficult to create demand for a new product; for example, people are not inclined to eat paw-paws, even though they are delicious. It is hard enough to get people to eat their broccoli and lima beans. It is harder still to develop consumer demand for new foods. This may be the reason the Kraft Corporation does not prospect in remote places for rare and unusual plants and animals to add to the world's diet. Of the roughly 235,000 flowering plants and 325,000 nonflowering plants (including mosses, lichens, and seaweeds) available, farmers ignore virtually all of them in favor of a very few that are profitable. n365 To be sure, any of the more than 600,000 species of plants could have an application in agriculture, but would they be preferable to the species that are now dominant? Has anyone found any consumer demand for any of these half-million or more plants to replace rice or wheat in the human diet? There are reasons that farmers cultivate rice, wheat, and corn rather than, say, Furbish's lousewort. There are many kinds of louseworts, so named because these weeds were thought to cause lice in sheep. How many does agriculture really require? [\*911] The species on which agriculture relies are domesticated, not naturally occurring; they are developed by artificial not natural selection; they might not be able to survive in the wild. n366 This argument is not intended to deny the religious, aesthetic, cultural, and moral reasons that command us to respect and protect the natural world. These spiritual and ethical values should evoke action, of course, but we should also recognize that they are spiritual and ethical values. We should recognize that ecosystems and all that dwell therein compel our moral respect, our aesthetic appreciation, and our spiritual veneration; we should clearly seek to achieve the goals of the ESA. There is no reason to assume, however, that these goals have anything to do with human well-being or welfare as economists understand that term. These are ethical goals, in other words, not economic ones. Protecting the marsh may be the right thing to do for moral, cultural, and spiritual reasons. We should do it-but someone will have to pay the costs. In the narrow sense of promoting human welfare, protecting nature often represents a net "cost," not a net "benefit." It is largely for moral, not economic, reasons-ethical, not prudential, reasons- that we care about all our fellow creatures. They are valuable as objects of love not as objects of use. What is good for   [\*912]  the marsh may be good in itself even if it is not, in the economic sense, good for mankind. The most valuable things are quite useless.

### S DEFICIT

#### Congress is vital---statute is necessary to prevent manipulation of norms

Mark David Maxwell 12, Colonel and Judge Advocate, U.S. Army, 1st Quarter 2012, “TARGETED KILLING, THE LAW, AND TERRORISTS: FEELING SAFE?,” Joint Force Quarterly, p. 123-130

The weakness of this theory is that it is not codified in U.S. law; it is merely the extrapolation of international theorists and organizations. The only entity under the Constitution that can frame and settle Presidential power regarding the enforcement of international norms is Congress. As the check on executive power, Congress must amend the AUMF to give the executive a statutory roadmap that articulates when force is appropriate and under what circumstances the President can use targeted killing. This would be the needed endorsement from Congress, the other political branch of government, to clarify the U.S. position on its use of force regarding targeted killing. For example, it would spell out the limits of American lethality once an individual takes the status of being a member of an organized group. Additionally, statutory clarification will give other states a roadmap for the contours of what constitutes anticipatory self-defense and the proper conduct of the military under the law of war.¶ Congress should also require that the President brief it on the decision matrix of articulated guidelines before a targeted killing mission is ordered. As Kenneth Anderson notes, “[t]he point about briefings to Congress is partly to allow it to exercise its democratic role as the people’s representative.”74¶ The desire to feel safe is understandable. The consumers who buy SUVs are not buying them to be less safe. Likewise, the champions of targeted killings want the feeling of safety achieved by the elimination of those who would do the United States harm. But allowing the President to order targeted killing without congressional limits means the President can manipulate force in the name of national security without tethering it to the law advanced by international norms. The potential consequence of such unilateral executive action is that it gives other states, such as North Korea and Iran, the customary precedent to do the same. Targeted killing might be required in certain circumstances, but if the guidelines are debated and understood, the decision can be executed with the full faith of the people’s representative, Congress. When the decision is made without Congress, the result might make the United States feel safer, but the process eschews what gives a state its greatest safety: the rule of law.

### CP Links

#### Obama receives blame for controversial court decisions---Kagan and Sotomayor

Mr. Mirengoff 10 is an attorney in Washington, D.C. A.B., Dartmouth College J.D., Stanford Law School, June 23 The Federalist Society Online Debate Series, http://www.fed-soc.org/debates/dbtid.41/default.asp

The other thing I found interesting was the degree to which Democrats used the hearings to attack the "Roberts Court." I don't recall either party going this much on the offensive in this respect during the last three sets of hearings. What explains this development? My view is that liberal Democratic politicians (and members of their base) think they lost the argument during the last three confirmation battles. John Roberts and Samuel Alito "played" well, and Sonia Sotomayor sounded like a conservative. The resulting frustration probably induced the Democrats to be more aggressive in general and, in particular, to try to discredit Roberts and Alito by claiming they are not the jurists they appeared to be when they made such a good impression on the public. I'm pretty sure the strategy didn't work. First, as I said, these hearings seem not to have attracted much attention. Second, Senate Democrats are unpopular right now, so their attacks on members of a more popular institution are not likely to resonate. Third, those who watched until the bitter end saw Ed Whelan, Robert Alt and others persuasively counter the alleged examples of "judicial activism" by the Roberts Court relied upon by the Democrats -- e.g., the Ledbetter case, which the Democrats continue grossly to mischaracterize. There's a chance that the Democrats' latest **partisan innovation** will **come back to haunt them**. Justice Sotomayor and soon-to-be Justice Kagan are on record having articulated a **traditional, fairly minimalist view of the role of judges**. If a liberal majority were to emerge -- or even **if the liberals prevail in a few high profile cases** -- the charge of "deceptive testimony" could be turned against them. And if Barack **Obama** is still president at that time, he likely **will receive** some of **the blame**.

### Perm Solves Link

#### Blame-shifting empirically works

Lubbock Avalanche-Journal, 4-16-2012, “Obama Scapegoats Others,” http://lubbockonline.com/interact/blog-post/may/2012-04-16/obama-scapegoats-others#.UVD0bBzFXzw

Rather than behaving like a leader and taking full responsibility for his own actions, President Barack Obama blames others. If the problem has been created by Radical Islam, Democrats, or other Socialists, Obama deflects the blame to others. For every problem, and for everything he wants to Socialize, Barack Obama picks a scapegoat, isolates them, and places all blame on them for the problem. Obama’s approach is to create hatred between groups of people, to divide, and to conquer. President George W. Bush has been Obama’s primary target. Obama blamed President Bush for liberating Iraq from Saddam Hussein, for the luxurious prison accommodations for terrorists at Guantanamo Bay, and for the housing bubble enabled by the Democrats and created by incompetent and corrupt management at Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. Obama blames Jews and other rich persons for not paying enough taxes as the reason for the trillions of dollars of debt the Obama Administration has created. Obama does not take any blame for wasting taxpayer money on his $1 trillion Stimulus Plan, also known as The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009. Obama did not accept any blame for the billions of dollars of bad investments our Federal Government made in Solyndra and other failing Green Energy Companies. Obama instead blamed bankers and the rich people on Wall Street. Health care costs were not the fault of government, according to Obama. He blamed insurance companies and massively cut payments to physicians and hospitals. ObamaCare is simply massive amounts of additional government health care bureaucracy that is despised by a majority of the American people, most of who realize it is unconstitutional. After the Supreme Court heard the case against ObamaCare, Obama singled out the Supreme Court Justices and told them that they must support ObamaCare or the failure of health care would be their fault.

#### The perm lets Obama claim his hands were tied to shift blame – even for lower courts

Andrew C. McCarthy, 5-12-2009, “Poison Photo-Drop,” National Review, ln

The administration claims its hands are tied because of a ruling last September by the Second Circuit Court of Appeals in New York. That is untrue. The Second Circuit decision rejected the Defense Department's argument that disclosure was foreclosed by an exemption from the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) for "law enforcement records" that "could reasonably be expected to endanger the life or physical safety of any individual." The three-judge panel reasoned that while the term "any individual" could be broadly construed, it should not cover a class of millions of people, such as all the members of our armed forces who might be jeopardized. To do so, the panel said, would nullify what it took to be the higher purpose of FOIA: to let Americans "know what their government is up to." This conclusion was far from indisputable. The country, after all, is currently involved in a defensive war authorized by Congress -- an imperative one might have thought took precedence over other legislative goals, such as those of the Freedom of Information Act. Given the stakes, the Bush administration sought a rehearing in the case before the full Second Circuit. By the time the court denied that application on March 12, however, the Obama administration had taken over. With Attorney General Eric Holder now at the helm, the Justice Department decided not to appeal the ruling to the Supreme Court. As a Pentagon spokesman told Stars and Stripes, "A decision was made by the Justice Department, in collaboration with us, that we should comply with the lower court's ruling." Obviously, that was a bad call. An administration that made its top priority the protection of our armed forces and the American people would have taken this case as far as it could -- which would very likely have pushed a final ruling well into next year. This administration's failure to do so underscores its anti-war predisposition -- as well as the deeply conflicted posture of the Holder Justice Department, many of whose top officials (including the attorney general himself) come from firms that have spent the last several years representing America's enemies in court. But contrary to what the administration would have Americans believe, the Second Circuit ruling is not the end of the story. FOIA also contains an exemption from disclosure for matters that are "specifically authorized under criteria established by an executive order to be kept secret in the interest of national defense or foreign policy." That exemption was not at issue in the Second Circuit case. Thus, if President Obama wanted to keep these photos from being exploited by America's enemies, all he would need to do is issue an executive order sealing them, based on a finding (which could be drawn from public statements he has already made) that their release would imperil the national defense -- as well as frustrate ongoing American foreign-policy efforts in Pakistan, Afghanistan, Iraq, the Palestinian territories, and elsewhere in the Muslim Middle East. Some will say that the president won't do that because he does not want to anger the anti-war Left, a significant part of his base. In truth, the president is the anti-war Left. He won't issue an executive order of this kind because he wants the photos revealed. It is important to understand that disclosure here is not an inevitable outcome. It is a choice. It doesn't have to happen unless Obama wants it to happen. The same can be said of the Democratic Congress. The Second Circuit ruling that Holder chose not to appeal did not say the Constitution mandated public dissemination of photos that will imperil Americans. It said FOIA required it. FOIA is just a statute. Congress writes the statutes and it can amend the statutes. Democrats control both houses, as well as the White House. If they wanted to bar disclosure of the photos, they could do that tomorrow. And with the overwhelming support they'd get from Republicans, they could do it with veto-proof margins. But legislative override would likely be irrelevant: Obama wouldn't dare veto a non-disclosure bill -- he wants disclosure, but only if he can snooker people into believing it wasn't his choice.

#### Perm lets Obama shift blame to the court

Jonah Goldberg, 5-15-2009, “Photos or No Photos, It's Hard to Picture Obama Winning Over U.S. Enemies,” National Review, ln

But I'm taking a wait-and-see approach. Obama himself admits that he's merely hoping to delay the release of the photos. Meanwhile, Andrew McCarthy, a fellow at the National Review Institute and terrorism expert, makes a compelling case that Obama is trying to vote "present" once again. After all, if Obama truly wanted to block the release of these photos in order to protect American troops, he could issue an executive order taking them beyond the reach of the courts and the Freedom of Information Act. Instead, Obama's heading back to the courtroom to relitigate the matter. This way, if the courts reaffirm that the photos must be released, Obama can say, "My hands are tied." Even the Associated Press sees Obama's maneuver as a way to "pass the buck to the courts." We'll see what happens.

### 1AR PC Not Key

#### PC not key and passage inevitable

Jason Easley 9-15, September 15th, 2013, "Obama Humiliates John Boehner By Laughing At His Debt Ceiling Threat," www.politicususa.com/2013/09/15/obama-humiliates-john-boehner-laughing-debt-ceiling-threat.html

Republicans might want to rethink this whole scare Obama into spending cuts with a threat not to raise the debt ceiling plan, because the president isn’t looking scared. The only person who should be scared here is Speaker John Boehner, because Obama clearly has the upper hand.¶ The president has been around the block more than a few times with Boehner and his House Republicans. He knows how this drama plays out. Despite all of their huffy warnings of doom, everyone knows that the wealthy billionaires who fund many Republican campaigns do not want their party to crash the economy (again).¶ President Obama was burned by Boehner the first time that he tried to negotiate, and he learned a valuable lesson. Unless Obama will negotiate with them, all Republicans have are empty threats. When Obama waits the House Republicans out, he wins. The president has nothing to lose. The pressure is all on the House Republicans. They are up for reelection next year. Paying the nation’s bills is their constitutional duty. House Republicans will feel the wrath of the voters if they hurt the economy.¶ The president knows that Boehner’s threats are meaningless. He can laugh them off because they are nothing more than hot air from an empty suit. House Republicans keep trying the same crisis creating tactics and failing. President Obama already knows how the debt ceiling issue is going to end, and whether they’ll admit it or not, Republicans do too.

### Pounders

#### No PC --- fopo weakness specific

BBC 9/18 -- Obama Presidency: Decline in the fall?, Mark Mardell, North America editor, 2013, [www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-us-canada-24155464](http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-us-canada-24155464)

As the chill creeps into Washington's nights and leaves start to tumble on to the White House lawn, President Barack Obama's fall will, some predict, prove his decline.¶ A recent slew of articles are declaring it so, and they are not all from the usual suspects on the right.¶ The case for it is based first on his foreign policy.¶ He dithered over Syria, vacillated over the Arab revolutions, and has been tricked by the Russian president into not firing even a pinprick of American power. Even the president of Brazil has cancelled a visit.¶ Carl Meacham, director of the Americas Programme at the Center for Strategic and International Studies, a foreign policy think thank, writes that until this moment "no world leader has cancelled a planned state visit to the United States.¶ "For the first time since the end of the Cold War, our influence in the world is being seriously questioned," he adds.¶ Perfect storm?¶ At home, Mr Obama has failed to get the man he wants at the Fed, even though he once described the choice as the most important economic decision of his second term.¶ “¶ Start Quote¶ If many Democrats are no longer playing ball, it may have something to do with disappointment, but more to do with 2016”¶ As one commentator has rightly pointed out, both Syria and Larry Summers' exit from the Fed line-up were dictated by restless Democrats.¶ It is worse than that. In his second-term inauguration speech he startled some by promising a radical agenda, dealing with gun control, immigration and the environment.¶ He hasn't even tried to start on the environment. And the other two measures are languishing in that legislative equivalent of the horse latitudes, Congress. Like the horses, the bills are likely to be pitched overboard.¶ The Republican threat to shut the government down at the end of this month unless "Obamacare" is gutted would once have seemed dramatic. Now it is just another of Mr Obama's woes.¶ But this is not yet a perfect storm - more the appearance of thunder clouds on the horizon.¶ Mr Obama's foreign policy looks clumsy, as he feels his way towards a different role for America in the world, which accepts "the rise of the rest".¶ It is so alien to many of the political class in the West that they are left feeling insecure and scorn his weakness.¶ The US president now so disdains the 24-hour news cycle, that he has made a mistake of ignoring the narrative completely.¶ He has fumbled his way out of a crisis, and at least for now looks like he may have got what he wants - no military action and Syria promising to do away with chemical weapons.¶ His domestic problem is almost entirely different.¶ If many Democrats are no longer playing ball, it may have something to do with disappointment, but more to do with 2016.

#### PC tanked by Fed fumbling – new nominee will fuel flames

Kevin Rafferty 9/20, professor at the Institute for Academic Initiatives, Osaka University, South China Morning Post, 2013, www.scmp.com/comment/insight-opinion/article/1313981/lack-leadership-fed-chairman-syria-show-obama-has-lost-his

US President Barack Obama, who came to office on a wave of enthusiasm and energy - promising a 21st-century vision of a rapidly changing world - has hit the hard brick wall of realpolitik and his own limitations.¶ He behaves as if he is lost: not merely has his vision disappeared in the fog of war, but he has little clue where he is going, and neither the American system nor his fellow Americans are helping him.¶ This was seen this week as Professor Larry Summers, Obama's candidate to take over from Ben Bernanke as chairman of the Federal Reserve, was ignominiously forced to withdraw, and Obama clearly reluctantly accepted that decision.¶ Opposition to Summers had been brewing for months in Obama's own Democratic Party and among left-wing critics hostile to Summers for his closeness to Wall Street and the so-called big "banksters".¶ The president has had months to think about the job and yet pointedly refused to make a choice when he might have guided the debate and pre-empted criticism. It was only after newspaper reports that Obama was about to nominate Summers - which provoked a hostile reaction in the markets - that Summers withdrew.¶ Obama displayed not only a lack of leadership but tin ears to what people are saying openly about his policies, and lack of them. But he compounded even this failure by saying he will wait longer before deciding who to nominate for the Fed.¶ Rumours are that another former treasury secretary, Timothy Geithner, may be in Obama's sights, even though Geithner has said he does not want the job. Geithner would attract the hostility of the same critics, who regard him as a "Summers lite". He is also seen as part of the gang of Robert Rubin who moved from being co-chairman of Goldman Sachs into Bill Clinton's White House, then to treasury secretary and out to be a director of Citigroup.¶ Whispers from the White House are that Obama does not want to be railroaded into choosing Janet Yellen, currently Bernanke's deputy, or that he wants someone with whom he feels comfortable, and he does not know Yellen.¶ The Fed chief should be independent of politics with a term that extends beyond the president's. It should not be a matter for the president's comfort, but who is best for the country, and it is inexcusable that Obama has not made it his business to get to know Yellen.¶ Obama's failure to articulate a vision for the future of the US and a road map to get there is one of the distressing features of his presidency. It has also got him into a fight with Congress over spending, which is likely to flare up again soon with renewed confrontation over the US debt ceiling and the budget.

### No Econ Impact

#### We control empirics

Michael Tanner 11, National Review, “No Surrender on Debt Ceiling”, Jan 19, <http://www.nationalreview.com/articles/257433/no-surrender-debt-ceiling-michael-tanner>

Of course the Obama administration is already warning of Armageddon if Congress doesn’t raise the debt ceiling. Certainly it would be a shock to the economic system. The bond market could crash. The impact would be felt at home and abroad. But would it necessarily be worse than the alternative? While Congress has never before refused to raise the debt ceiling, it has in fact frequently taken its time about doing so. In 1985, for example, Congress waited nearly three months after the debt limit was reached before it authorized a permanent increase. In 1995, four and a half months passed between the time that the government hit its statutory limit and the time Congress acted. And in 2002, Congress delayed raising the debt ceiling for three months. It took three months to raise the debt limit back in 1985 as well. In none of those cases did the world end. More important, what will be the consequences if the U.S. government fails to reduce government spending? What happens if we raise the debt ceiling then continue merrily on our way spending more and running up ever more debt? Already Moody’s and Standard & Poor’s have warned that our credit rating might be reduced unless we get a handle on our national debt. We’ve heard a lot recently about the European debt crisis, but, as one senior Chinese banking official recently noted, in some ways the U.S. financial position is more perilous than Europe’s. “We should be clear in our minds that the fiscal situation in the United States is much worse than in Europe,” he recently told reporters. “In one or two years, when the European debt situation stabilizes, [the] attention of financial markets will definitely shift to the United States. At that time, U.S. Treasury bonds and the dollar will experience considerable declines.” Moreover, unless we do something, federal spending is on course to consume 43 percent of GDP by the middle of the century. Throw in state and local spending, and government at all levels will take 60 cents out of every dollar produced in this country. Our economy will not long survive government spending at those levels.

#### No default impact

Daniel J. Mitchell 9-18, senior fellow at CATO, The Economic Costs of Debt-Ceiling Brinkmanship, <http://www.cato.org/publications/testimony/economic-costs-debt-ceiling-brinkmanship>

Let’s now deal directly with the debt ceiling. My fourth point is that an increase in the debt ceiling is not needed to avert a default. Simply stated, the federal government is collecting far more in revenue than what’s needed to pay interest on that debt.¶ To put some numbers on the table, interest payments are about $230 billion per year while federal tax revenues are approaching $3 trillion per year. There’s no need to fret about a default.¶ But don’t believe me. Let’s look at the views of some folks that disagree with me on many fiscal issues, but nonetheless are not prone to false demagoguery.¶ Donald Marron, head of the Urban-Brookings Tax Policy Center and former Director of the Congressional Budget Office, explained what actually would happen in an article for CNN Money.¶ If we hit the debt limit… that does not mean that we will default on the public debt. …[The Treasury Secretary] would undoubtedly keep making payments on the public debt, rolling over the outstanding principal and paying interest. Interest payments are relatively small, averaging about $20 billion per month.¶ And here is the analysis of Stan Collender, one of Washington’s best-known commentators on budget issues.¶ There is so much misinformation and grossly misleading talk about what will happen if the federal debt ceiling isn’t increased…it’s worth taking a few steps back from the edge. …if a standoff on raising the debt ceiling lasts for a significant amount of time… a default wouldn’t be automatic because payments to existing bondholders could be made the priority while payments to others could be delayed for months.¶ Or what about the Economist magazine, which made this sage observation.¶ Even with no increase in the ceiling, the Treasury can easily service its existing debt; it is free to roll over maturing issues, and tax revenue covers monthly interest payments by a large multiple.¶ Let me add one caveat to all this analysis. I suppose it’s possible that a default might occur, but only if the Secretary of the Treasury deliberately chose not to pay interest in the debt. But that won’t happen. Not only because the Obama Administration wouldn’t want to needlessly roil financial markets, but also since research by Administration lawyers in the 1960s concluded that the Secretary of the Treasury might be personally liable in the event of a default. Mr. Lew has more than one reason to make sure the government pays interest on the debt.

#### Credit ratings have no effect on economy or investment

Neil Irwin 13, is a Washington Post columnist and economics editor, June 10th, 2013, "S&P upgrades U.S. credit, proves continuing irrelevance," [www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/wonkblog/wp/2013/06/10/sp-upgrades-u-s-credit-rating-proves-continuing-irrelevance/](http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/wonkblog/wp/2013/06/10/sp-upgrades-u-s-credit-rating-proves-continuing-irrelevance/)

In the summer of 2011, after a debt ceiling showdown in which some Congressional Republicans threatened to allow the government to default, the credit rating firm Standard & Poor's roiled world markets further by downgrading the U.S. government's credit. S&P concluded that the debts of the United States did not in fact warrant a AAA rating but rather a mere AA+. The firm said its outlook for U.S. government debt was negative, seeing risk of further downgrades.¶ Well, good news, America! S&P on Monday revised its outlook to "stable" instead of "negative." So you're still not AAA in their book, but at least things don't appear set to get worse.¶ There is some logic behind the change; in the past two years, the U.S. budget deficit has come down quite a bit, and, importantly, House Republicans have backed away from the practice of threatening default over the debt ceiling to get their way.¶ At the same time, the shift shows the absurdity of sovereign credit ratings.¶ Think of it this way: When S&P (or its competitors, Moody's or Fitch) rates a corporate bond, it is providing useful information about the probability that the company will default on its debt. It can kick the tires, examine the quality of the company's balance sheet, the integrity of its managers, the stability of its revenues. Life is then simpler for investors buying corporate bonds.¶ But sovereign debt is different. It forms the bedrock of the financial system. It is backed not by a company that can easily fail and go bankrupt but by the full faith and credit of the government, with a central bank capable of printing money if there is a short-term liquidity squeeze. And the ratings firms don't bring any special analytical capability to the party; everything you might want to know about the creditworthiness of the U.S. government is in plain sight, from the future path of Federal Reserve policy to the relative dysfunction of Congress to the nation's economic prospects. S&P and Moody's and Fitch might have useful analysis to offer on how creditworthy a manufacturing firm might be, but on U.S. government debt they're just one more group of guys with opinions.¶ Don't believe me? Believe the markets. It's true that the downgrade of the U.S. credit rating in August 2011 caused palpitations on the exchanges -- but that greater uncertainty stirred investors to plow money into Treasury bonds, the very securities that had been downgraded. And today, with news of the upgrade in S&P's outlook for U.S. government debt, Treasury bond yields actually climbed as bond prices fell a bit, fitting the tenor of the better economic news over the last few months.¶ If you assign credit ratings, and the issuer's bonds rise in value after a downgrade and fall in value after an upgrade, you might start to ask yourself whether your ratings are actually telling people anything very useful.

### AT: Econ = War

#### Finishing Drezner

however. The Institute for Economics and Peace has constructed a “Global Peace Index” annually since 2007. A key conclusion they draw from the 2012 report is that “The average level of peacefulness in 2012 is approximately the same as it was in 2007.”38 Interstate violence in particular has declined since the start of the financial crisis – as have military expenditures in most sampled countries. Other studies confirm that the Great Recession has not triggered any increase in violent conflict; the secular decline in violence that started with the end of the Cold War has not been reversed.39 Rogers Brubaker concludes, “the crisis has not to date generated the surge in protectionist nationalism or ethnic exclusion that might have been expected.”40¶ None of these data suggest that the global economy is operating swimmingly. Growth remains unbalanced and fragile, and has clearly slowed in 2012. Transnational capital flows remain depressed compared to pre-crisis levels, primarily due to a drying up of cross-border interbank lending in Europe. Currency volatility remains an ongoing concern. Compared to the aftermath of other postwar recessions, growth in output, investment, and employment in the developed world have all lagged behind. But the Great Recession is not like other postwar recessions in either scope or kind; expecting a standard “V”-shaped recovery was unreasonable. One financial analyst characterized the post-2008 global economy as in a state of “contained depression.”41 The key word is “contained,” however. Given the severity, reach and depth of the 2008 financial crisis, the proper comparison is with Great Depression. And by that standard, the outcome variables look impressive. As Carmen Reinhart and Kenneth Rogoff concluded in This Time is Different: “that its macroeconomic outcome has been only the most severe global recession since World War II – and not even worse – must be regarded as fortunate.”42

#### No impact

Robert Jervis 11, Professor in the Department of Political Science and School of International and Public Affairs at Columbia University, December 2011, “Force in Our Times,” Survival, Vol. 25, No. 4, p. 403-425

Even if war is still seen as evil, the security community could be dissolved if severe conflicts of interest were to arise. Could the more peaceful world generate new interests that would bring the members of the community into sharp disputes? 45 A zero-sum sense of status would be one example, perhaps linked to a steep rise in nationalism. More likely would be a worsening of the current economic difficulties, which could itself produce greater nationalism, undermine democracy and bring back old-fashioned beggar-my-neighbor economic policies. While these dangers are real, it is hard to believe that the conflicts could be great enough to lead the members of the community to contemplate fighting each other. It is not so much that economic interdependence has proceeded to the point where it could not be reversed – states that were more internally interdependent than anything seen internationally have fought bloody civil wars. Rather it is that even if the more extreme versions of free trade and economic liberalism become discredited, it is hard to see how without building on a preexisting high level of political conflict leaders and mass opinion would come to believe that their countries could prosper by impoverishing or even attacking others. Is it possible that problems will not only become severe, but that people will entertain the thought that they have to be solved by war? While a pessimist could note that this argument does not appear as outlandish as it did before the financial crisis, an optimist could reply (correctly, in my view) that the very fact that we have seen such a sharp economic down-turn without anyone suggesting that force of arms is the solution shows that even if bad times bring about greater economic conflict, it will not make war thinkable.