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#### Restrictions on authority prohibit- the aff is a condition

William **Conner 78**,former federal judge for the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York United States District Court, S. D. New York, CORPORACION VENEZOLANA de FOMENTO v. VINTERO SALES, http://www.leagle.com/decision/19781560452FSupp1108\_11379

Plaintiff next contends that Merban was charged with notice of the restrictions on the authority of plaintiff's officers to execute the guarantees. **Properly interpreted,** **the "conditions" that had been imposed by plaintiff's** Board of Directors and by the Venezuelan Cabinet **were not "restrictions" or "limitations"** up**on** the **authority of** plaintiff's **agents but rather conditions precedent to the granting of authority**. Essentially, then, plaintiff's argument is that Merban should have known that plaintiff's officers were not authorized to act except upon the fulfillment of the specified conditions.

**Vote neg
limits and ground- anything can indirectly affect war powers--also makes the topic bidirectional because conditions can enhance executive power**

### Politics of Schmitt K

#### Politics is Schmittian – trying to fight the executive on their own battlefield is naïve – the aff is just a liberal knee-jerk reaction that swells executive power

Kinniburgh, 5/27 **–** (Colin, Dissent, 5-27, <http://www.dissentmagazine.org/blog/partial-readings-the-rule-of-law>)

Our thesis is that these modifications to liberal legalism fail. Either they do not go far enough to square with the facts, or they go so far as to effec­tively abandon the position they seek to defend. We live in a regime of executive-centered government, in an age after the separation of powers, and the legally constrained executive is now a historical curiosity. As against liberal constitutional theorists like Janies Madison, Bruce Acker­man,1 and Richard Epstein,2 and liberal theorists of the rule of law like ..Albert Venn Dicey3 and David Dyzenhaus,4 we argue that in the modern administrative state the executive governs, subject to legal constraints that are shaky in normal times and weak or nonexistent in times of crisis. Whereas Madison is an exemplar of liberal legalism, particularly in the domain of constitutional theory, we draw upon the thought of the Weimar legal theorist Carl Schmitt. We do not agree with all of Schmitt’s views, by any means. To the. extent Schmitt thought that democratic poli­tics do not constrain the executive, or thought that in the administrative state the executive is not only largely unconstrained by law but also uncon­strained tout court, we disagree. Indeed, to the extent that Schmitt thought this, he fell into a characteristic error of liberal legalism, which equates lack of legal constraint with unbounded power. But Schmitt’s critical arguments against liberal legalism seem to us basically correct, at least when demysti­fied and rendered into suitably pragmatic and institutional terms. A central theme in Schmitt s work, growing outof Weimar’s running economic and security crises in the 1920s and early 1930s, involves the relationship between the classical rule-of-law state, featuring legislative enactment of general rules enforced by courts, and the administrative state, featuring discretionary authority and ad hoc programs, administered by the executive, affecting particular individuals and firms. The nub of Schmitt s view is the idea that liberal lawmaking institutions frame, general norms that are essentially “oriented to the past,” whereas “the dictates of modern interventionist politics cry out for a legal system conducive to a present- and future-oriented ‘steering’ of complex, ever-changing eco­nomic scenarios.”3 Legislatures and courts, then, are continually behind the pace of events in the administrative state; they play an essentially reac­tive and marginal role, modifying and. occasionally blocking executive policy initiatives, but rarely taking the lead. And in crises, the executive governs nearly alone, at least so far as law is concerned. In our view, the major constraints on the executive, especially in crises, do not arise from law or from the separation-of-powers framework defended by liberal legalists, but from politics and public opinion. Law and politics are hard to separate and lie on a continuum—elections, for example, are a complicated mix: of legal rules and political norms—but the poles are clear enough for our purposes, and the main constraints on the executive arise from the political end of the continuum. A central fallacy of liberal legalism, we argue, is the equation of a constrained executive with an executive constrained by law. The pressures of the administrative state loosen legal constraints, causing liberal legalists to develop tyrannophobia, or unjustified fear of dictatorship. They overlook the de facto political con­straints that have grown up and, to some degree, substituted for legal constraints on the executive.6 As the bonds of law have loosened, the bonds of politics have tightened their grip. The executive, “unbound” from the standpoint of liberal legalism, is in some ways more constrained than ever before. We do not claim that these political constraints necessarily cause the executive to pursue the public interest, however defined, or that they pro­duce optimal executive decision-making. We do claim that politics and public opinion at least block the most lurid forms of executive abuse, that courts and Congress can do no better, that liberal legalism goes wrong by assuming that a legally unconstrained executive is unconstrained overall, and that in any event there is no pragmatically feasible alternative to exec­utive government under current conditions. The last point has normative implications, because of the maxim “Ought implies can.” Executive gov­ernment is best in the thin sense that there is no feasible way to improve upon it, under the conditions of the administrative state.

#### Legality feeds a new form of muscular liberalism where these illusions cannot see how much they sustain it which legitimizes wars for democracies and doctrines of pre-emption

Motha 8 \*Stewart, Senior Lecturer, Kent Law School, University of Kent, Canterbury, Kent, Journal of Law, Culture, and Humanities Forthcoming 2008, Liberal Cults, Suicide Bombers, and other Theological Dilemmas

A universalist liberal ideology has been re-asserted. It is not only neo-con hawks or Blairite opportunists that now legitimise wars for democracy. Alarmingly, it is a generation of political thinkers who opposed the Nixonian logic of war (wars to show that a country can ‘credibly’ fight a war to protect its interests1), and those humbled by the anticolonial struggles of liberation from previous incarnations of European superiority that are renewing spurious civilizational discourses. This ‘muscular liberalism’ has found its voice at the moment of a global political debate about the legality and effectiveness of ‘just wars’ – so called ‘wars for democracy’ or ‘humanitarian war’. The new political alignment of the liberal left emerged in the context of discussions about the ‘use of force’ irrespective of UN Security Council endorsement or the sovereign state’s territorial integrity, such as in Kosovo – but gained rapid momentum in response to attacks in New York City and Washington on September 11, 2001. Parts of the liberal left have now aligned themselves with neoconservative foreign policies, and have joined what they believe is a new anti-totalitarian global struggle – the ‘war on terror’ or the battle against Islamist fundamentalism. One task of this essay, then, is to identify this new formation of the liberal left. Much horror and suffering has been unleashed on the world in the name of the liberal society which must endure. However, when suicide bombing and state-terror are compared, the retort is that there is no moral equivalence between the two. Talal Asad in his evocative book, On Suicide Bombing, has probed the horror that is felt about suicide bombing in contrast to state violence and terror.2 What affective associations are formed in the reaction to suicide bombing? What does horror about suicide bombing tell us about the constitution of inter-subjective relations? In this essay I begin to probe these questions about the relation between death, subjectivity, and politics. I want to excavate below the surface oppositions of good deaths and bad, justifiable killing and barbarism, which have been so central to left liberal arguments. As so much is riding on the difference between ‘our good war’ and ‘their cult of death’, it seems apt to examine and undo the opposition. The muscular liberal left projects itself as embodying the values of the ‘West’, a geo-political convergence that is regularly opposed to the ‘East’, ‘Muslims’, or the ‘Islamic World’. I undo this opposition, arguing that thanatopolitics, a convergence of death, sacrifice, martyrdom and politics, is common to left liberal and Islamist political formations. How does death become political for left liberals and Islamist suicide bombers? In the case of the latter, what is most immediately apparent is how little is known about the politics and politicization of suicide bombers. Suicide bombers are represented as a near perfect contrast to the free, autonomous, self-legislating liberal subject – a person overdetermined by her backward culture, oppressive setting, and yet also empty of content, and whose death can have no temporal political purchase. The ‘suicide bomber’ tends to be treated by the liberal left as a trans-historical ‘figure’, usually represented as the ‘Islamo-fascist’ or the ‘irrational’ Muslim.3 The causes of suicide bombing are often implicitly placed on Islam itself – a religion that is represented as devoid of ‘scepticism, doubt, or rebellion’ and thus seen as a favourable setting for totalitarianism.4 The account of the suicide bomber as neo-fascist assassin supplements a lack – that is, that the association of suicide bombing with Islam explains very little. The suicide bomber is thus made completely familiar as totalitarian fascist, or wholly other as “[a] completely new kind of enemy, one for whom death is not death”.5 So much that is written about the suicide bomber glosses over the unknown with political subjectivities, figures, and paradigms (such as fascism) which are familiar enough to be vociferously opposed. By drawing the suicide bomber into a familiar moral register of ‘evil’, political and historical relations between victim and perpetrator are erased.6 In the place of ethnographically informed research the ‘theorist’ or ‘public intellectual’ erases the contingency of the suicide bomber and reduces her death to pure annihilation, or nothingness. The discussion concludes by undoing the notion of the ‘West’, the very ground that the liberal left assert they stand for. The ‘West’ is no longer a viable representation of a geo-political convergence, if it ever was. Liberal discourse has regarded itself as the projection of the ‘West’ and its enlightenment. But this ignores important continuities between Islam, Christianity, and contemporary secular formations. The current ‘clash of monotheisms’, I argue after J-L Nancy, reveals a crisis of sense, authority, and meaning which is inherent to the monotheistic form. An increasingly globalised world is made up of political communities and juridical orders that have been ‘emptied’ of authority and certainty. This crisis of sense conditions the horror felt by the supposedly rational liberal in the face of Islamist terrorism. Horror at terrorism is then the affective bond that sustains a grouping that otherwise suffers the loss of a political project with a definite end. The general objective of this essay is to challenge the unexamined assumptions about politics and death that circulate in liberal left denunciations of Islamic fascism. The horror and fascination with the figure of the suicide bomber reveals an unacknowledged affective bond that constitutes the muscular liberal left as a political formation. This relies on disavowing the sacrificial and theological underpinnings of political liberalism itself – and ignores the continuities between what is called the ‘West’ and the theologico-political enterprise of monotheism. Monotheism is not the preserve of something called the ‘West’, but rather an enterprise that is common to all three Religions of the Book. The article concludes by describing how the writings of Jean-Luc Nancy on monotheism offer liberal left thinkers insights for rethinking the crisis of value that resulted from the collapse of grand emancipatory enterprises as well as the fragmentation of politics resulting from a focus on political identification through difference. I opened with a reference to the ‘liberal left’. Of course the ‘liberal left’ signifies a vast and varied range of political thinking and activism – so I must clarify how I am deploying this term. In this essay the terms ‘liberal left’ or ‘muscular liberal’ are used interchangeably. Paul Berman and Nick Cohen, whose writing I will shortly refer to, are exemplars of the new political alignment who self-identify as ‘democrats and progressives’, but whose writings feature bellicose assertions about the superiority of western models of democracy, and universal human rights.7 Among this liberal left, democracy and freedom become hemispheric and come to stand for the West. More generally, now, the ‘liberal left’ can be distinguished from political movements and thinkers who draw inspiration from a Marxist tradition of thought with a socialist horizon. The liberal left I am referring to would view the Marxist tradition as undervaluing democratic freedoms and human rights. Left liberals also tend to dismiss the so called post-Marxist turn in European continental philosophy as ‘postmodern relativism’.8 PostMarxists confronted the problem of the ‘collective’ – addressing the problem of masses and classes as the universal category or agent of historical transformation. This was a necessary correction to all the disasters visited on the masses in the name of a universal working class. The liberal state exploited these divisions on the left. It is true that a left fragmented through identity politics or the politics of difference were reduced to group based claims on the state. However, liberal multiculturalism was critiqued by anti-racist and feminist thinkers as early as the 1970s for ignoring the structural problems of class or as yet another nation-building device. The new formation of the muscular liberal left have only just discovered the defects of multiculturalism. The dismissal of liberal multiculturalism is now code for ‘too much tolerance’ of ‘all that difference’. The liberal left, or muscular liberal, as I use these terms, should not be conflated with the way ‘liberal’ is generally used in North America to denote ‘progressive’, ‘pro-choice’, open to a multiplicity of forms of sexual expression, generally ‘tolerant’, or ‘left wing’ (meaning socialist). It might be objected that it is not the liberal left, but ‘right wing crazies’ driven by Christian evangelical zeal combined with neo-liberal economic strategies that have usurped a post-9/11 crime and security agenda to mount a global hegemonic enterprise in the name of a ‘war on terror’. It might also be said that this is nothing new – global expansionist enterprises such as 18th and 19th century colonialism mobilised religion, science, and theories of economic development to secure resources and justify extreme violence where necessary. Global domination, it might be argued, has always been a thanatopolitical enterprise. So what’s different now? What is crucial, now, is that the entire spectrum of liberalism, including the ‘rational centre’, is engaged in the kind of mindset whereby a destructive and deadly war is justified in the name of protecting or establishing democracy, the rule of law, and human rights. It might then be retorted that this ‘rational centre’ of liberalism have ‘always’ been oriented in this way. That is partly true, but it is worth recalling that the liberal left I have in mind is the generation that came of age with opposition to the war in Vietnam, other Indo-Chinese conflagrations, and the undoing of empire. This is a left that observed the Cold War conducted through various ‘hot wars’ in Africa, Central and Latin America, and South East Asia and thus at least hoped to build a ‘new world order’ of international law and multilateralism. This is a left that was resolved, by the 1970s, not to repeat the error of blindly following a scientific discourse that promised to produce a utopia – whether this was ‘actually existing socialism’ or the purity of ‘blood and soil’. But now, a deadly politics, a thanatopolitics, is drawn out of a liberal horror and struggle against a monolithically drawn enemy called Islamic fundamentalism. What is new is that Islam has replaced communism/fascism as the new ‘peril’ against which the full spectrum of liberalism is mobilized. Islamist terrorism and suicide bombers, a clash between an apparently Islamic ‘cult of death’ versus modern secular rationality has come to be a central preoccupation of the liberal left. In the process, as Talal Asad has eloquently pointed out, horror about terrorism has come to be revealed as one way in which liberal subjectivity and its relation to political community can be interrogated and understood.9 Moreover, the potential for liberal principles to be deployed in the service of legitimating a doctrine of pre-emption as the ‘new internationalism’ is significant. The first and second Gulf Wars, according to the liberal left, are then not wars to secure control over the supply of oil, or regional and global hegemony, as others on the left might argue, but anti-fascist, anti-totalitarian wars of liberation fought in the name of ‘democracy’. Backing ‘progressive wars’ for ‘freedom and democracy’, those who self-identify as a left which is reasserting liberal democratic principles start by asking questions such as: “Are western freedoms only for westerners?”.10 In the process, freedom becomes ‘western’, and its enemy an amorphous legion behind an unidentifiable line between ‘west’ and the rest (the ‘Muslim world’). The ‘war for democracy’ waged against ‘Islamist terrorism’ and Muslim fundamentalism is the crucible on which the new alignment of the liberal left is forged.

#### The alt is to reject the aff in favor of building a culture of resilience

Vermeule and Posner 11 Adrian Vermeule, prof of Law at Harvard University Law School, Eric A Posner., prof of Law at the University of Chicago Law School, *Executive Unbound: After the Madisonian Republic*, Oxford University Press 2011

We do not yet live under a plebiscitary presidency. In such a system, the president has unchecked legal powers except for the obligation to submit to periodic elections. In our system, Congress retains the formal power to make law. It has subjected presidential lawmaking to complex procedures and bureaucratic checks,1 and it has created independent agencies over which the president in theory has limited control. The fed­eral courts can expect the executive to submit to their orders, and the Supreme Court retains certain quasi-lawmaking powers, which it exercises by striking down statutes and blocking executive actions. The federal system is still in place. State legal institutions retain considerable power over their populations. But these legal checks on executive authority (aside from the electoral constraint) have eroded considerably over the last two hundred years. Congress has delegated extensive powers to the executive. For new initia­tives, the executive leads and Congress follows. Congress can certainly slow down policymaking, and block bills proposed by the executive; but it cannot set the agenda. It is hard to quantify the extent of congressional control over regulatory agencies, but it is fair to say that congressional intervention is episodic and limited, while presidential control over both the executive and independent agencies is strong and growing stronger. The states increasingly exercise authority at the sufferance of the national government and hence the president. The federal courts have not tried to stop the erosion of congressional power and state power. Some commentators argue that the federal courts have taken over Con­gress’s role as an institutional check. It is true that the Supreme Court has shown little compunction about striking down statutes (although usually state statutes), and that it rejected some of the legal theories that the Bush administration used to justify its counterterrorism policies. However, the Court remains a marginal player. The Court ducked any legal rulings on counterterror policies until the 2004 Hamdi decision, and even after the Boumediene decision in 2008, no detainee has been released by final judicial order, from Guantanamo or elsewhere, except in cases where the government chose not to appeal the order of a district judge. The vast majority of detainees have received merely another round of legal process. Some speculate that judicial threats to release detainees have caused the administration to release them preemptively. Yet the judges would incur large political costs for actual orders to release suspected terrorists, and the government knows this, so it is unclear that the government sees the judi­cial threats as credible or takes them very seriously. The government, of course, has many administrative and political reasons to release detainees, quite apart from anything the courts do. So the executive submits to judi­cial orders in part because the courts are careful not to give orders that the executive will resist. In general, judicial opposition to the Bush administration’s counterter­rorism policies took the form of incremental rulings handed down at a gla­cial pace, none of which actually stopped any of the major counterterrorism tactics of that administration, including the application of military power against Al Qaeda, the indefinite detention of members of Al Qaeda, tar­geted assassinations, the immigration sweeps, even coercive interrogation. The (limited) modifications of those tactics that have occurred resulted not from legal interventions but from policy adjustments driven by changed circumstances and public opinion, and by electoral victory of the Obama administration. However, the Obama administration has mostly confirmed and in some areas even expanded the counterterrorism policies of the Bush administration. Strong executive government is bipartisan. The 9/11 attack provided a reminder of just how extensive the presi­dent’s power is. The executive claimed the constitutional authority to, in effect, use emergency powers. Because Congress provided redundant stat­utory authority, and the Supreme Court has steadfastly refused to address the ultimate merits of the executives constitutional claims, these claims were never tested in a legal or public forum. But it is worth trying to ima­gine what would have happened if Congress had refused to pass the Autho­rization for Use of Military Force and the Supreme Court had ordered the executive to release detainees in a contested case. We think that the execu­tive, backed up as it was by popular opinion, would have refused to obey. And, indeed, for just that reason, Congress would, never have refused its imprimatur and the Supreme Court would never have stood in the execu­tive’s way. The major check on the executives power to declare an emer­gency and to use emergency powers is—political. The financial crisis of 2008-2009 also revealed the extent of executive power. Acting together, the Fed, the Treasury, and other executive agencies spent hundreds of billions of dollars, virtually nationalizing parts of the financial system. Congress put up a fuss, but it could not make policy and indeed hardly even influenced policy. Congress initially refused to supply a blank check, then in world-record time changed its mind and gave the blank check, then watched helplessly as the administration adopted pol­icies different from those for which it said the legislation would be needed. Courts played no role in the crisis except to ratify executive actions in tension with the law.2 What, then, prevents the executive from declaring spurious emergencies and using the occasion to consolidate its power—or for that matter, consolidating its power during real emergencies so that it retains that power even after normal times return? In many countries, notably in Latin America, presidents have done just that. Citing an economic crisis, or a military threat, or congressional gridlock, executives have shut down independent media, replaced judges with their cronies, suppressed political opposition, and ruled by dictate. Could this happen in the United States? The answer is, very probably, no. The political check on the executive is real. Declarations of emergency not justified by publicly visible events would be met with skepticism. Actions said, to be justified by emergency would not be approved if the justification were not plausible. Separation of powers may be suffering through an enfeebled old age, but electoral democracy is alive and well. We have suggested that the historical developments that have under­mined separation of powers have strengthened democracy. Consider, for example, the communications revolution, which has culminated (so far) in the Internet Age. As communication costs decrease, the size of markets expand, and hence the scale of regulatory activity must increase. Localities and states lose their ability to regulate markets, and the national govern­ment takes over. Meanwhile, reduced communication costs increase the relative value of administration (monitoring firms and ordering them to change their behavior) and reduce the relative value of legislation (issuing broad-gauged rules), favoring the executive over Congress. At the same time, reduced communication costs make it easier for the public to mon­itor the executive. Today, whistleblowers can easily find an audience on the Internet,; people can put together groups that focus on a tiny aspect of the government s behavior; gigabytes of government data are uploaded onto the Internet and downloaded by researchers who can subject them to rigorous statistical analysis. It need not have worked out this way. Govern­ments can also use technology to monitor citizens for the purpose of suppressing political opposition. But this has not, so far, happened in the United States. Nixon fell in part because his monitoring of political enemies caused an overwhelming political backlash, and although the Bush administration monitored suspected terrorists, no reputable critic suggested that it targeted domestic political opponents. Our main argument has been methodological and programmatic: researchers should no longer view American political life through the Madisonian prism, while normative theorists should cease bemoaning the decline of Madisonianism and instead make their peace with the new political order. The center of gravity has shifted to the executive, which both makes policy and administers it, subject to weak constraints imposed by Congress, the judiciary, and the states. It is pointless to bewail these developments, and futile to argue that Madisonian structures should be reinvigorated. Instead, attention should shift to the political constraints on the president and the institutions through, which those political con­straints operate—chief among them elections, parties, bureaucracy, and the media. As long as the public informs itself and maintains a skeptical attitude toward the motivations of government officials, the executive can operate effectively only by proving over and over that it deserves the public s trust. The irony of the new political order is that the executive, freed from the bonds of law, inspires more distrust than in the past, and thus must enter ad hoc partnerships with political rivals in order to persuade people that it means well. But the new system is more fluid, allowing the executive to form those partnerships when they are needed to advance its goals, and not otherwise. Certain types of partnership have become recurrent pat­terns—for example, inviting a member of the opposite party to join the president’s cabinet. Others are likely in the future. In the place of the clockwork mechanism bequeathed to us by the Enlightenment thinking of the founders, there has emerged a more organic system of power sharing and power constraint that depends on shifting political alliances, currents of public opinion, and the particular exigencies that demand government action. It might seem that such a system requires more attention from the public than can reasonably be expected, but the old system of checks and balances always depended on public opinion as well. The centuries-old British parliamentary system, which operated in. just this way, should provide reason, for optimism. The British record on executive abuses, although hardly perfect, is no worse than the American record and arguably better, despite the lack of a Madisonian separation of legislative and executive powers

### CIR DA

#### CIR will pass SOON Obama’s continued push is key

Matthews 10/16

Laura Matthews, MA Columbia, International Business Times “2013 Immigration Reform Bill: 'I'm Going To Push To Call A Vote,' Says Obama” October 16 2013 http://www.ibtimes.com/2013-immigration-reform-bill-im-going-push-call-vote-says-obama-1429220

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

#### Plan tanks capital and derails the agenda – empirics prove

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

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

#### CIR solves multiple internal links to the economy

Beadle 12/10 Amanda Peterson, Reporter/Blogger at ThinkProgress.org. She received her B.A. in journalism and Spanish from the University of Alabama, where she was editor-in-chief of the campus newspaper The Crimson White and graduated with honors. Before joining ThinkProgress, she worked as a legislative aide in the Maryland House of Delegates. “Top 10 Reasons Why The U.S. Needs Comprehensive Immigration Reform” http://thinkprogress.org/justice/2012/12/10/1307561/top-10-reasons-why-the-us-needs-comprehensive-immigration-reform-that-includes-a-path-to-citizenship/

The nation needs a comprehensive immigration plan, and it is clear from a recent poll that most Americans support reforming the U.S.’s immigration system. In a new poll, nearly two-thirds of people surveyed are in favor of a measure that allows undocumented immigrants to earn citizenship over several years, while only 35 percent oppose such a plan. And President Obama is expected to “begin an all-out drive for comprehensive immigration reform, including seeking a path to citizenship” in January.¶ Several top Republicans have softened their views on immigration reform following November’s election, but in the first push for reform, House Republicans advanced a bill last month that would add visas for highly skilled workers while reducing legal immigration overall. Providing a road map to citizenship for the millions of undocumented immigrants living in the U.S. would have sweeping benefits for the nation, especially the economy.¶ Here are the top 10 reasons why the U.S. needs comprehensive immigration reform:¶ 1. Legalizing the 11 million undocumented immigrants in the United States would boost the nation’s economy. It would add a cumulative $1.5 trillion to the U.S. gross domestic product—the largest measure of economic growth—over 10 years. That’s because immigration reform that puts all workers on a level playing field would create a virtuous cycle in which legal status and labor rights exert upward pressure on the wages of both American and immigrant workers. Higher wages and even better jobs would translate into increased consumer purchasing power, which would benefit the U.S. economy as a whole.¶ 2. Tax revenues would increase. The federal government would accrue $4.5 billion to $5.4 billion in additional net tax revenue over just three years if the 11 million undocumented immigrants were legalized. And states would benefit. Texas, for example, would see a $4.1 billion gain in tax revenue and the creation of 193,000 new jobs if its approximately 1.6 million undocumented immigrants were legalized.¶ 3. Harmful state immigration laws are damaging state economies. States that have passed stringent immigration measures in an effort to curb the number of undocumented immigrants living in the state have hurt some of their key industries, which are held back due to inadequate access to qualified workers. A farmer in Alabama, where the state legislature passed the anti-immigration law HB 56 in 2011, for example, estimated that he lost up to $300,000 in produce in 2011 because the undocumented farmworkers who had skillfully picked tomatoes from his vines in years prior had been forced to flee the state.¶ 4. A path to citizenship would help families access health care. About a quarter of families where at least one parent is an undocumented immigrant are uninsured, but undocumented immigrants do not qualify for coverage under the Affordable Care Act, leaving them dependent on so-called safety net hospitals that will see their funding reduced as health care reforms are implemented. Without being able to apply for legal status and gain health care coverage, the health care options for undocumented immigrants and their families will shrink.¶ 5. U.S. employers need a legalized workforce. Nearly half of agricultural workers, 17 percent of construction workers, and 12 percent of food preparation workers nationwide lacking legal immigration status. But business owners—from farmers to hotel chain owners—benefit from reliable and skilled laborers, and a legalization program would ensure that they have them.¶ 6. In 2011, immigrant entrepreneurs were responsible for more than one in four new U.S. businesses. Additionally, immigrant businesses employ one in every 10 people working for private companies. Immigrants and their children founded 40 percent of Fortune 500 companies, which collectively generated $4.2 trillion in revenue in 2010—more than the GDP of every country in the world except the United States, China, and Japan. Reforms that enhance legal immigration channels for high-skilled immigrants and entrepreneurs while protecting American workers and placing all high-skilled workers on a level playing field will promote economic growth, innovation, and workforce stability in the United States.¶ 7. Letting undocumented immigrants gain legal status would keep families together. More than 5,100 children whose parents are undocumented immigrants are in the U.S. foster care system, according to a 2011 report, because their parents have either been detained by immigration officials or deported and unable to reunite with their children. If undocumented immigrants continue to be deported without a path to citizenship enabling them to remain in the U.S. with their families, up to 15,000 children could be in the foster care system by 2016 because their parents were deported, and most child welfare departments do not have the resources to handle this increase.¶ 8. Young undocumented immigrants would add billions to the economy if they gained legal status. Passing the DREAM Act—legislation that proposes to create a roadmap to citizenship for immigrants who came to the United States as children—would put 2.1 million young people on a pathway to legal status, adding $329 billion to the American economy over the next two decades.¶ 9. And DREAMers would boost employment and wages. Legal status and the pursuit of higher education would create an aggregate 19 percent increase in earnings for young undocumented immigrants who would benefit from the DREAM Act by 2030. The ripple effects of these increased wages would create $181 billion in induced economic impact, 1.4 million new jobs, and $10 billion in increased federal revenue.¶ 10. Significant reform of the high-skilled immigration system would benefit certain industries that require high-skilled workers. Immigrants make up 23 percent of the labor force in high-tech manufacturing and information technology industries, and immigrants more highly educated, on average, than the native-born Americans working in these industries. For every immigrant who earns an advanced degree in one of these fields at a U.S. university, 2.62 American jobs are created.

#### Global economic crisis causes nuclear war

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

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

### ESR CP

#### The Executive Branch of the United States should create a national security court housed within the executive branch and “executive v. executive” divisions as per our Katyal evidence to promote internal separation of powers via separate and overlapping cabinet offices, mandatory review of government action by different agencies, civil-service protections for agency workers, reporting requirements to Congress, and an impartial decision-maker to resolve inter-agency conflicts.

#### Presidential veto power and executive deference mean external restraints fail – internal separation of powers constrains the president and leads to better decision making

Katyal ’6 Neal Katyal, Professor of Law @ Georgetown, The Yale Law Journal, “Internal Separation of Powers: Checking Today’s Most Dangerous Branch from Within” 115 Yale L.J. 2314, 2006

After all, Publius's view of separation of powers presumes three branches with equivalent ambitions of maximizing their powers, yet legislative abdication is the reigning modus operandi. It is often remarked that "9/11 changed everything"; 2 particularly so in the war on terror, in which Congress has been absent or content to pass vague, open-ended statutes. The result is an executive that subsumes much of the tripartite structure of government. Many commentators have bemoaned this state of affairs. This Essay will not pile on to those complaints. Rather, it begins where others have left off. If major decisions are going to be made by the President, then how might separation of powers be reflected within the executive branch? The first-best concept of "legislature v. executive" checks and balances must be updated to contemplate second-best "executive v. executive" divisions. And this Essay proposes doing so in perhaps the most controversial area: foreign policy. It is widely thought that the President's power is at its apogee in this arena. By explaining the virtues of internal divisions in the realm of foreign policy, this Essay sparks conversation on whether checks are necessary in other, domestic realms. That conversation desperately needs to center on how best to structure the ever-expanding modern executive branch. From 608,915 employees working in agencies in 1930, 3 to 2,649,319 individuals in 2004, 4 the growth of the executive has not generated a systematic focus on internal checks. We are all fond of analyzing checks on judicial activism in the post-Brown, post-Roe era. So too we think of checks on legislatures, from the filibuster to judicial review. But [\*2317] there is a paucity of thought regarding checks on the President beyond banal wishful thinking about congressional and judicial activity. This Essay aims to fill that gap. A critical mechanism to promote internal separation of powers is bureaucracy. Much maligned by both the political left and right, bureaucracy creates a civil service not beholden to any particular administration and a cadre of experts with a long-term institutional worldview. These benefits have been obscured by the now-dominant, caricatured view of agencies as simple anti-change agents. This Essay celebrates the potential of bureaucracy and explains how legal institutions can better tap its powers. A well-functioning bureaucracy contains agencies with differing missions and objectives that intentionally overlap to create friction. Just as the standard separation-of-powers paradigms (legislature v. courts, executive v. courts, legislature v. executive) overlap to produce friction, so too do their internal variants. When the State and Defense Departments have to convince each other of why their view is right, for example, better decision-making results. And when there is no neutral decision-maker within the government in cases of disagreement, the system risks breaking down. In short, the executive is the home of two different sorts of legitimacy: political (democratic will) and bureaucratic (expertise). A chief aim of this Essay's proposal is to allow each to function without undermining the other. This goal can be met without agency competition - overlapping jurisdiction is simply one catalyzing agent. Other ideas deserve consideration, alongside or independent of such competition, such as developing career protections for the civil service modeled more on the Foreign Service. Executives of all stripes offer the same rationale for forgoing bureaucracy-executive energy and dispatch. 5 Yet the Founders assumed that massive changes to the status quo required legislative enactments, not executive decrees. As that concept has broken down, the risks of unchecked executive power have grown to the point where dispatch has become a worn-out excuse for capricious activity. Such claims of executive power are not limited to the current administration, nor are they limited to politicians. Take, for example, Dean Elena Kagan's rich celebration of presidential administration. 6 Kagan, herself a former political appointee, lauded the President's ability to trump bureaucracy. Anticipating the claims of the current administration, Kagan argued that the [\*2318] President's ability to overrule bureaucrats "energizes regulatory policy" because only "the President has the ability to effect comprehensive, coherent change in administrative policymaking." 7 Yet it becomes clear that the Kagan thesis depends crucially on oversight by the coordinate legislative branch (typically controlled by a party in opposition to the President). Without that checking function, presidential administration can become an engine of concentrated power. This Essay therefore outlines a set of mechanisms that create checks and balances within the executive branch. The apparatuses are familiar - separate and overlapping cabinet offices, mandatory review of government action by different agencies, civil-service protections for agency workers, reporting requirements to Congress, and an impartial decision-maker to resolve inter-agency conflicts. But these restraints have been informally laid down and inconsistently applied, and in the wake of September 11 they have been decimated. 8 A general framework statute is needed to codify a set of practices. In many ways, the status quo is the worst of all worlds because it creates the facade of external and internal checks when both have withered. I. THE NEED FOR INTERNAL SEPARATION OF POWERS The treacherous attacks of September 11 gave Congress and the President a unique opportunity to work together. Within a week, both houses of Congress passed an Authorization for Use of Military Force (AUMF); 10 two months later they enacted the USA PATRIOT Act to further expand intelligence and law enforcement powers. 11 But Congress did no more. It passed no laws authorizing or regulating detentions for U.S. citizens. It did not affirm or regulate President Bush's decision to use military commissions to try unlawful belligerents. 12 It stood silent when President Bush accepted thinly reasoned legal views of the Geneva Conventions. 13 The administration was content to rely on vague legislation, and Congress was content to enact little else. 14 There is much to be said about the violation of separation of powers engendered by these executive decisions, but for purposes of this Essay, I want [\*2320] to concede the executive's claim - that the AUMF gave the President the raw authority to make these decisions. A democratic deficit still exists; the values of divided government and popular accountability are not being preserved. Even if the President did have the power to carry out the above acts, it would surely have been wiser if Congress had specifically authorized them. Congress's imprimatur would have ensured that the people's representatives concurred, would have aided the government's defense of these actions in courts, and would have signaled to the world a broader American commitment to these decisions than one man's pen stroke. Of course, Congress has not passed legislation to denounce these presidential actions either. And here we come to a subtle change in the legal landscape with broad ramifications: the demise of the congressional checking function. The story begins with the collapse of the nondelegation doctrine in the 1930s, which enabled broad areas of policymaking authority to be given to the President and to agencies under his control. That collapse, however, was tempered by the legislative veto; in practical terms, when Congress did not approve of a particular agency action, it could correct the problem. But after INS v. Chadha, 15 which declared the legislative veto unconstitutional, that checking function, too, disappeared. In most instances today, the only way for Congress to disapprove of a presidential decree, even one chock full of rampant lawmaking, is to pass a bill with a solid enough majority to override a presidential veto. The veto power thus becomes a tool to entrench presidential decrees, rather than one that blocks congressional misadventures. And because Congress ex ante appreciates the supermajority-override rule, its members do not even bother to try to check the President, knowing that a small cadre of loyalists in either House can block a bill. 16 For example, when some of the Senate's most powerful Republicans (John McCain, Lindsay Graham, and John Warner) tried to regulate detentions and trials at Guantanamo Bay, they were told that the President would veto any attempt to modify the AUMF. 17 The result is that once a court [\*2321] interprets a congressional act, such as the AUMF, to give the President broad powers, Congress often cannot reverse the interpretation, even if Congress never intended to give the President those powers in the first place. Senator McCain might persuade every one of the other ninety-nine Senators to vote for his bill, but that is of no moment without a supermajority in the House of Representatives as well. 18 At the same time, the executive branch has gained power from deference doctrines that induce courts to leave much conduct untouched - particularly in foreign affairs. 19 The combination of deference and the veto is especially insidious - it means that a President can interpret a vague statute to give himself additional powers, receive deference in that interpretation from courts, and then lock that decision into place by brandishing the veto. This ratchet-and-lock scheme makes it almost impossible to rein in executive power. All legislative action is therefore dangerous. Any bill, like Senator McCain's torture bill, can be derailed through compromise. A rational legislator, fearing this cascading cycle, is likely to do nothing at all. This expansion of presidential power is reinforced by the party system. When the political branches are controlled by the same party, loyalty, discipline, and self-interest generally preclude interbranch checking. That reluctance is exacerbated by a paucity of weapons that check the President. Post-Chadha, Congress only has weapons that cause extensive collateral damage. The fear of that damage becomes yet another reason why Congress is plagued with inertia. And the filibuster, the last big check in periods of single-party government, is useless against the host of problems caused by Presidents who take expansive views of their powers under existing laws (such as the AUMF). Instead of preserving bicameralism, Chadha has led to its subversion and "no-cameralism." A Congress that conducts little oversight provides a veneer of legitimacy to an adventurist President. The President can appeal to the historic sense of checks and balances, even if those checks are entirely compromised by modern political dynamics. With this system in place, it is no surprise that recent calls [\*2322] for legislative revitalization have failed. No successful action-forcing mechanisms have been developed; instead we are still in John Hart Ely's world of giving a "halftime pep-talk imploring that body to pull up its socks and reclaim its rightful authority." 20 It is time to consider second-best solutions to bring separation of powers into the executive. Bureaucracy can be reformed and celebrated (instead of purged and maligned), and neutral conflict-decision mechanisms can be introduced. Design choices such as these can help bring our government back in line with the principles envisioned by our Founders. 21

#### A “national security court” improve oversight, accountability, and congressional review of targeted killing – comparatively better than external restraints

Katyal ’13, Neal Katyal, Professor of Law @ Georgetown, NW Times “Who Will Mind the Drones?” February 20, 2013, <http://www.nytimes.com/2013/02/21/opinion/an-executive-branch-drone-court.html?_r=0>

In the wake of revelations about the Obama administration’s drone program politicians from both parties have taken up the idea of creating a “drone court” within the federal judiciary, which would review executive decisions to target and kill individuals. But the drone court idea is a mistake. It is hard to think of something less suitable for a federal judge to rule on than the fast-moving and protean nature of targeting decisions. Fortunately, a better solution exists: a “national security court” housed within the executive branch itself. Experts, not generalists, would rule; pressing concerns about classified information would be minimized; and speedy decisions would be easier to reach. There is, of course, a role for federal courts in national security. In 2006, I argued and won Hamdan v. Rumsfeld, a Supreme Court case that struck down President George W. Bush’s use of military tribunals at Guantánamo Bay. But military trials are a far cry from wartime targeting decisions. And the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court, which reviews administration requests to collect intelligence involving foreign agents inside the country and which some have advocated as a model for the drone court, is likewise appropriately housed within the judicial system — it rules on surveillance operations that raise questions much like those in Fourth Amendment “search and seizure” cases, a subject federal judges know well. But there is no true precedent for interposing courts into military decisions about who, what and when to strike militarily. Putting aside the serious constitutional implications of such a proposal, courts are simply not institutionally equipped to play such a role. There are many reasons a drone court composed of generalist federal judges will not work. They lack national security expertise, they are not accustomed to ruling on lightning-fast timetables, they are used to being in absolute control, their primary work is on domestic matters and they usually rule on matters after the fact, not beforehand. Even the questions placed before the FISA Court aren’t comparable to what a drone court would face; they involve more traditional constitutional issues — not rapidly developing questions about whether to target an individual for assassination by a drone strike. Imagine instead that the president had an internal court, staffed by expert lawyers to represent both sides. Those lawyers, like the Judge Advocate General’s Corps in the military, would switch sides every few years, to develop both expertise as repeat players and the ability to understand the other point of view. The adjudicator would be a panel of the president’s most senior national security advisers, who would issue decisions in writing if at all possible. Those decisions would later be given to the Congressional intelligence committees for review. Crucially, the president would be able to overrule this court, and take whatever action he thought appropriate, but would have to explain himself afterward to Congress. Such a court would embed accountability and expertise into the drone program. With a federal drone court, it would simply be too easy for a president or other executive-branch official to point his finger at a federal judge for the failure to act. With an internal court, it would be impossible to avoid blame. It’s true that a court housed within the executive branch might sound nefarious in today’s “Homeland” culture — if Alexander Hamilton celebrated the executive, in Federalist No. 70, for its “decision, activity, secrecy and dispatch,” some now look at those same qualities with skepticism, if not fear. In contrast, advocates of a drone court say it would bring independent, constitutional values of reasoned decision making to a process that is inherently murky. But simply placing a drone court in the judicial branch is not a guaranteed check. The FISA Court’s record is instructive: between 1979 and 2011 it rejected only 11 out of more than 32,000 requests — making the odds of getting a request rejected, around 1 in 3,000, approximately the same as those of being struck by lightning in one’s lifetime. What reason does the FISA Court give us to think that judges are better than specialists at keeping executive power in check? The written decisions of an internal national security court, in contrast, would be products of an adversarial system (unlike the FISA Court), and later reviewed by Congressional intelligence committees. If members of Congress saw troublesome trends developing, it could push legislation to constrain the executive. That is something a federal judge cannot do. One of our Constitution’s greatest virtues is that it looks to judges as a source of reasoned, practical, rights-minded decision making. But judges should be left to what they know. A national security court inside the executive branch may not be a perfect solution, but it is a better way to balance the demands of secrecy and speed with those of liberty and justice.

#### Doesn’t link to politics

Metzger ‘9, Gillian E. Metzger, Professor of Law @ Columbia Law School, “The Interdependent Relationship Between Internal and External Separation of Powers” 59 Emory L.J. 423, Emory Law Journal, 2009

Several bases exist for thinking that internal separation of powers mechanisms may have a comparative advantage. First, internal mechanisms [\*440] operate ex ante, at the time when the Executive Branch is formulating and implementing policy, rather than ex post. As a result, they avoid the delay in application that can hamper both judicial and congressional oversight. 76 Second, internal mechanisms often operate continuously, rather than being limited to issues that generate congressional attention or arise in the form of a justiciable challenge. 77 Third, internal mechanisms operate not just at the points at which policy proposals originate and are implemented but also at higher managerial levels, thus addressing policy and administration in both a granular and systemic fashion. In addition, policy recommendations generated through internal checks may face less resistance than those offered externally because the latter frequently arise after executive officials have already decided upon a policy course and are more likely to take an adversarial form. 78 Internal mechanisms may also gain credibility with Executive Branch officials to the extent they are perceived as contributing to more fully informed and expertise-based decisionmaking. 79

### Solvency

#### Executives will block information – preventing litigation. Courts will defer because of SSP and qualified immunity – only the most egregious cases will succeed

Murphy and Radsan 9 Richard Murphy is the AT&T Professor of Law, Texas Tech University School of Law. Afsheen John Radsan is a Professor, William Mitchell College of Law. Cardozo Law Review, 32 Cardozo L. Rev. 405

The state-secrets privilege poses another barrier to Bivens-style actions. This privilege allows the government to block the disclosure of information in court that would damage national security. 217 It could prevent a case from proceeding in any number of ways. For instance, the government could block plaintiffs from accessing or using information needed to determine whether a Predator attack had a sound basis through human or technical sources of intelligence. 218 By this trump card, the government could prevent litigation from seriously compromising intelligence sources and methods. 219 In addition, the doctrine of qualified immunity requires dismissal of actions against officials if a court determines they reasonably believed they were acting within the scope of their legal authority. 220 Defendants would satisfy this requirement so long as they reasonably [\*444] claimed they had authority under the laws of war (assuming their applicability). These standards are hazy, and a court applying them would tend to defer to the executive on matters of military judgment. 221 In view of so many practical and legal hurdles, some courts and commentators might be inclined to categorically reject all Bivens-style challenges to targeted killings. In essence, they might view lawsuits related to targeted killing as a political question left to the executive. 222 This view parallels Justice Thomas's that courts should not second-guess executive judgments as to who is an enemy combatant. 223 Contrary to Justice Thomas's view, the potency of the government's threshold defenses means that targeted-killing cases that make it to the merits would likely involve the most egregious conduct - for example, killing an unarmed Jose Padilla at O'Hare Airport on a shoot-to-kill order. For these egregious cases, a judicial check on executive authority is most necessary.

#### District courts empirically defer to the executive on targeted killings

Josh Gerstein 13, Political White House and Court Expert 13 (“Court: Feds can keep drone legal opinions secret” 1/2/13, <http://www.politico.com/blogs/under-the-radar/2013/01/court-feds-can-keep-drone-legal-opinions-secret-153169.html>) \*Colleen McMahon is a District Court Judge, judge

McMahon, a Clinton appointee, also said the law prohibited her from disputing executive branch officials' contention that many of the relevant documents were classified. "It is beyond the power of this Court to conclude that a document has been improperly classified," she wrote. While judges are usually extremely deferential to Executive Branch claims regarding national security concerns and classification, few have said explicitly that they have no power to reject a classification. Indeed, the text of FOIA indicates that they do, and in very rare cases they have done so. The Justice Department acknowledged in response to the litigation that an opinion from Justice's Office of Legal Counsel addresses the targeted killing issue. The CIA and Pentagon may have more legal opinions on the point, but they have refused to provide any details about the documents—an approach McMahon ruled was legally permissible. McMahon did hold out the possibility she might order the release of two Defense Department memoranda regarding the impact of U.S. citizenship on attempts to target enemy fighters. She said the Pentagon's explanation of why the records were part of an internal deliberative process was "wholly conclusory." A Justice Department spokesman said officials were reviewing the ruling. An attorney for the Times, David McCraw, said the newspaper plans to appeal. "Judge McMahon’s decision speaks eloquently and at length to the serious legal questions raised by the targeted-killing program and to why in a democracy the government should be addressing those questions openly and fully," McCraw said in statement. "We continue to believe that disclosure is required under FOIA." The ACLU also expressed disappointment in the decision. “This ruling denies the public access to crucial information about the government’s extrajudicial killing of U.S. citizens and also effectively green-lights its practice of making selective and self-serving disclosures,” ACLU deputy legal director Jameel Jaffer said in a statement. “As the judge acknowledges, the targeted killing program raises profound questions about the appropriate limits on government power in our constitutional democracy. The public has a right to know more about the circumstances in which the government believes it can lawfully kill people, including U.S. citizens, who are far from any battlefield and have never been charged with a crime.”

#### Plan leads to stripping

Rosen 13 Jeffrey, professor of law at The George Washington University and the legal affairs editor of The New Republic, "Courting disaster: A new idea to limit drones could actually legitimize them,” The New Republic, 2-11, http://www.newrepublic.com/article/112392/drone-courts-congress-should-exercise-oversight-instead#

Although the Supreme Court has been most sympathetic to bold claims about executive power when they’re supported by Congress and reviewed by independent judges, a congressionally created drone court would be open to a series of practical and constitutional objections. On the practical side, there’s the question of what, precisely, the court would be reviewing. The administration claims the power to order targeted assassinations when three conditions are met: 1) a high level U.S. officials decides the target is a “senior operational leader of Al-Qaida” who “poses an imminent threat of violent attack against the United States”; 2) “capture is infeasible”; and 3) the operation would be conducted according to the laws of war. But it’s infeasible for judges to make split second decisions about whether or not an attack is, in fact, imminent or capture is feasible. For that reason, the most likely focus of a drone court would be the administration’s decision to put a suspect on the targeted killing list in the first place. But, as Steve Vladek of American University has argued, it’s not clear that judges have the constitutional power to issue warrants that can’t be challenged by the targets in a future judicial proceeding. And there are also serious questions about whether or not Congress has the constitutional power to forbid the president from exercising his war powers without getting judicial approval in advance.

#### Stripping guts the case solvency and turns the case—all rights protections would go completely unenforced—trampling meaningful rights:

Barry W. Lynn, 2004 bachelor's degree at Dickinson College, theology degree from Boston University School of Theology, minister in the United Church of Christ, of the Washington, D.C. bar, law degree from Georgetown University Law Center, the Executive Director of Americans United for Separation of Church and State, 20**04**[“Congress and Court Stripping: Just Keep Your Shirts On” Church and State Magazine, May]

Another measure, the misnamed "Constitution Restoration Act of 2004," was written by former Alabama Supreme Court Chief Justice Roy Moore and his allies. It would ban all cases challenging state-sponsored acknowledgement of "God as the sovereign source of law, liberty, or government." For good measure, it would also retroactively overturn all existing rulings in this area and establish a mechanism for impeaching federal judges who dare to uphold church-state separation! One wonders if the legislators who wrote these bills slept through high school civics class. The separation of powers means that the U.S. government consists of three co-equal branches: the president, the Congress and the courts. Congress does not have the power, through simple legislation, to decimate the authority of the courts over issues dealing with the Bill of Rights. Such power would rapidly make the courts superfluous. Whenever a judge ruled in a manner that displeased a legislator, a court-stripping bill would be drawn up and passed. Pretty soon the courts would be nothing but a rubber-stamp **body for Congress**. Some members of Congress might want that, but it would be a disaster for American democracy. Courts exist to make hard decisions. When lawmakers overstep their bounds and infringe on constitutional rights, courts are there to pull them back. Without the judiciary to protect us, Americans would quickly be at the mercy of the momentary whims of the majority. Our rights would be trampled on.

#### Strict scrutiny is a joke during war-time- can’t solve judicial deference

Moshirnia 11 Andrew V. Moshirnia JD, May 2011, Harvard Law School; PhD--Informational Technology, May 2008, University of Kansas; Law Clerk to the Hon. Richard D. Cudahy, Senior Circuit Judge, United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit. Harvard National Security Journal 2013 Harvard National Security Journal 4 Harv. Nat'l Sec. J. 385 Valuing Speech and Open Source Intelligence in the Face of Judicial Deference

The most glaring case of deference, Korematsu v. United States, n196 deserves special attention. It provides a particularly embarrassing example n197 of how military deference n198 may override even the most exacting legal standard. The case concerned the constitutionality of Executive Order 9066, the internment order for persons of Japanese ancestry. The Court, in a 6-3 opinion, upheld the constitutionality of the Order in the face of strict scrutiny, largely relying on the claims of military necessity, n199 as in the earlier unanimously upheld Hirabayashi v. United States, n200 enforcing a night curfew on persons of Japanese ancestry in the [\*421] aftermath of the Pearl Harbor attacks. n201 The Court accepted on faith the government's claims that both of these exclusionary orders were the only method to safeguard the national interest. n202 While Korematsu clearly reflects racist undercurrents of the period, n203 close analysis of the opinion indicates that executive and congressional prerogative coupled with judicial deference was the main divide between the majority and the three dissents. n204 While [\*422] there is great political pressure to accede to the demands of the executive, Congress, and the military, especially in times of war, the notion of deference becomes harder to support when the Government's claims are simply not credible. n205 Though the Court often defers to the Government in military matters, n206 in the context of the First Amendment this deference cannot rightly be characterized as strict scrutiny. n207 One of the main purposes of strict scrutiny is rooted in the fact that restrictive laws may reflect possible illicit motivations on the part of the Government. If the Court simply defers to the Government as to whether the means actually further the ends in the least restrictive manner, the standard ceases to serve a function. After all, it was this very deference that led the Court to approve the internment of Japanese-Americans in Korematsu v. United States. The Court, to its credit, has not engaged in this sort of widespread deference to the Government during the war on terror. However, the HLP decision, with its reliance on deference even in the face of strict scrutiny perhaps signals that the Court's willingness to oppose the executive and congress in military matters is waning. It is unsurprising that the Court would feel pressure to affirm government actions during times of war. However, the deep embarrassment of the Court for such decisions, n208 including Korematsu, a member of the so-called "Anti-Canon," n209 could be considered a buffer. The war-speech cases [\*423] above were decided before the advent of strict scrutiny or its solidification (of course, Koreamatsu, a particularly odious case, announced strict scrutiny in the racial context). Even after the advent of strict scrutiny, there is little doubt that the Supreme Court has a long history of deference to the military when confronted with a justification of military necessity or other national security concerns. However, in 1971, the Pentagon Papers case n210 marked a rather shocking departure from this trajectory. The crux of the case was an injunction issued by the Second Circuit, preventing the New York Times and the Washington Post from publishing portions of classified Defense Department study on its policies in Vietnam. n211 The government argued that the publication would prolong the War by revealing sensitive information, though concededly not any future plans, that would embarrass the war effort. n212 In a per curiam decision with nine different opinions, the majority determined that the Government's justifications were insufficient to justify the prior restraint on speech. n213 With each of the nine justices writing separate opinions, the boundaries of the case are relatively unclear; n214 yet, the overall effect of the decision is clear. Following cases like Korematsu, and the war-time speech cases, the determination that a military necessity justification was insufficient is remarkable. Faced with the one-of-a-kind abrogation of a fundamental [\*424] constitutional guarantee, n215 the court seemed willing to challenge the Government's understanding of security threats: "The word 'security' is a broad, vague generality whose contours should not be invoked to abrogate the fundamental law embodied in the First Amendment. The guarding of military and diplomatic secrets at the expense of informed representative government provides no real security for our Republic." n216

#### The court will just use legal language to use strict scrutiny in name only

Moshirnia 11 Andrew V. Moshirnia JD, May 2011, Harvard Law School; PhD--Informational Technology, May 2008, University of Kansas; Law Clerk to the Hon. Richard D. Cudahy, Senior Circuit Judge, United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit. Harvard National Security Journal 2013 Harvard National Security Journal 4 Harv. Nat'l Sec. J. 385 Valuing Speech and Open Source Intelligence in the Face of Judicial Deference

In HLP the material support statute survived the Court's purported application of strict scrutiny. The survival of the statute should astound. Very few laws survive strict scrutiny in the speech context, though the standard is not always fatal. Professor Volokh takes the position that the standard is near-fatal, noting that, as of 1997, the Court had upheld three speech restrictions under strict scrutiny--Buckley v. Valeo, n227 Austin v. Michigan [\*426] Chamber of Commerce, n228 and Burson v. Freeman n229--all involving election speech. n230 However, these cases have been either criticized or overruled. For example, Austin v. Michigan Chamber of Commerce, n231 was overruled in Citizens United v. FEC. n232 While other commentators insist that strict scrutiny is not always fatal, it is "most fatal" in the context of speech restrictions. n233 Over a thirteen-year period, 1990-2003, the entirety of the federal courts applied strict scrutiny in the speech context 222 times, upholding the law only 22% of the time. n234 The reader is then left with a puzzling picture: the Court went out of its way to announce that it viewed the statute as content-based. n235 The Court then announced that it must, therefore, apply the most rigorous standard, strict scrutiny. n236 However, the Court then proceeded to apply none of the hallmarks of that standard. There is little discussion of the means to achieve a compelling goal. There is no examination of less intrusive means. In the face of this strict in-name-only scrutiny, the statute survives. It seems unlikely that § 2339B, even as interpreted by the Court, could have survived strict scrutiny. n237 The Court's attempts to address the clear overinclusive nature of the ban are unconvincing. In order to justify banning all aid, the Court must first accept that all aid, even political or [\*427] legal training, is inherently fungible. The dissent rightly points out the absurdity of this argument. The reinterpreted § 2339B now suffers from underinclusion. The majority surely realized that by stressing the danger of any aid to terrorist groups, the Court could be seen endorsing a speech ban on any thought critical of the war effort or supportive of terrorist goals. Indeed, any such speech might contribute to the legitimacy of a terrorist group, a specific concern of the majority. n238 Instead, the Court noted that § 2339B would not reach independent advocacy. n239 The statute would only reach those individuals whose speech was "coordinated" with terrorist groups. n240 But it should be obvious that independent advocacy would likely have a greater legitimating effect than coordinated speech. n241 It would seem, then, that the Court damaged established First Amendment doctrine in order to arrive at a possible military advantage. But this sacrifice of jurisprudential clarity for some imagined military necessity is counterproductive. The great irony of the majority's action is that by willfully deviating from strict scrutiny, the Court managed to protect a statute likely to chill OSINT and harm the war effort. The chilling of valuable OSINT will hamper intelligence efforts. Supporters of the HLP decision may claim that the Court's affirmance was compelled by Congress's finding that "foreign organizations that engage in terrorist activity are so tainted by their criminal conduct that any contribution to such an organization facilitates that conduct." n242 However, this defense is seriously undermined by the fact that Congress made a nearly identical finding regarding the Communist Party, yet the Court repeatedly struck down statutes criminalizing membership or participation with the Party. Under the Communist cases of the 1950s, n243 as [\*428] well as the "clear and present danger" test set out in Brandenburg v. Ohio, n244 mere advocacy of membership in or aid to an organization with both dangerous and peaceful goals is not subject to punishment under the First Amendment. n245

#### Can’t solve the aff- it has to be about the public challenging the executive

#### Doesn’t solve- judges will still defer to the executive- Korematsu proves

Mueller 10 Eric Mueller, 2010 (Dan K. Moore Distinguished Professor in Jurisprudence and Ethics, University of North Carolina School of Law. Hirabayashi and the Invasion of Evasion, North Carolina Law Review, Vol. 88)

Why did the Court adopt an extremely deferential posture and also fail to address squarely its earlier cases? The Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians ("CWRIC") has suggested that the Court refrained from "any careful review of the facts" and chose to "give great deference to the military judgment rather than looking closely at the record"because this "was the only plausible course for the court to follow if it were to conclude that exclusion was constitutionally permissible."" ' Indeed, the Court's contradictory language of heightened scrutiny and judicial deference might be best explained **not by analysis of legal doctrine** but by the quid pro quo involved in building a majority vote to uphold the government's actions."

#### No groupthink—Congress wouldn’t help

Posner and Vermeule, 7– \*Kirkland and Ellis Professor of Law at the University of Chicago Law School AND \*\*professor at Harvard Law School (Eric and Adrian, Terror in the Balance: Security, Liberty, and the Courts p. 46-47)

The idea that Congress will, on net, weed out bad policies rests on an institutional comparison. The president is elected by a national constituency on a winner-take-all basis (barring the remote chance that the Electoral College will matter), whereas Congress is a summation of local constituencies and thus affords more voice to political and racial minorities. At the level of political psychology, decisionmaking within the executive is prone to group polarization and other forms of groupthink or irrational panic,51 whereas the internal diversity of legislative deliberation checks these forces. At the level of political structure, Congress contains internal veto gates and chokepoints—consider the committee system and the fi libuster rule—that provide minorities an opportunity to block harmful policies, whereas executive decisionmaking is relatively centralized and unitary. The contrast is drawn too sharply, because in practice the executive is a they, not an it. Presidential oversight is incapable of fully unifying executive branch policies, which means that disagreement flourishes within the executive as well, dampening panic and groupthink and providing minorities with political redoubts.52 Where a national majority is internally divided, the structure of presidential politics creates chokepoints that can give racial or ideological minorities disproportionate influence, just as the legislative process does. Consider the influence of Arab Americans in Michigan, often a swing state in presidential elections. It is not obvious, then, that statutory authorization makes any difference at all. One possibility is that a large national majority dominates both Congress and the presidency and enacts panicky policies, oppresses minorities, or increases security in ways that have ratchet effects that are costly to reverse. If this is the case, a requirement of statutory authorization does not help. Another possibility is that there are internal institutional checks, within both the executive branch and Congress, on the adoption of panicky or oppressive policies and that democratic minorities have real infl uence in both arenas. If this is the case, then a requirement of authorization is not necessary and does no good. Authorization only makes a difference in the unlikely case where the executive is thoroughly panicky, or oppressively majoritarian, while Congress resists the stampede toward bad policies and safeguards the interests of oppressed minorities. Even if that condition obtains, however, the argument for authorization goes wrong by failing to consider both sides of the normative ledger. As for majoritarian oppression, the multiplicity of veto gates within Congress may allow minorities to block harmful discrimination, but it also allows minorities to block policies and laws which, although targeted, are nonetheless good. As for panic and irrationality, if Congress is more deliberative, one result will be to prevent groupthink and slow down stampedes toward bad policies, but another result will be to delay necessary emergency measures and slow down stampedes toward good policies. Proponents of the authorization requirement sometimes assume that quick action, even panicky action, always produces bad policies. But there is no necessary connection between these two things; expedited action is sometimes good, and panicky crowds can stampede either in the wrong direction or in the right direction. Slowing down the adoption of new policies through congressional oversight retards the adoption not only of bad policies, but also of good policies that need to be adopted quickly if they are to be effective.

### Norms

#### The plan wouldn’t solve drone prolif --- countries would perceive secrecy and hypocrisy as a rubber stamp

Rona 13 (Gabor Rona, international legal director at Human Rights First, “The Pro-Rule of Law Argument Against a ‘Drone Court,’” The Hill, February 27, 2013, http://thehill.com/blogs/congress-blog/judicial/285041-the-pro-rule-of-law-argument-against-a-drone-court)

A “drone court” would be unjust because the proposed target would be unable to appear and make the case for preserving his life. A secret judicial process in which the right to life is at stake but the owner of that life has no say is an affront both to American values and international legal principles. While doing much harm, a “drone court” would do little, if any, good. Supporters like the idea because it appears to provide some check on the President’s secretive exercise of this lethal unilateral power. But what judge would risk preventing the interception of a terrorist? What’s more likely is that the drone court would be a rubber stamp, creating only the appearance, not the reality, of justice. In wartime, the president may authorize killing of members of enemy armed forces or anyone else directly participating in hostilities. In an unconventional war such as this one, where the definition of the “enemy” and its “armed forces” isn’t always clear, the president needs to disclose how he defines that enemy and determines who is a member of its armed forces or otherwise participating in its fight against the United States, so that we can have some assurance he’s not killing the wrong people. A secret court would have no special expertise in making that determination. Outside an active armed conflict, the legal standards are different: a suspect can be targeted for death only if he poses an “imminent threat” to human life that cannot be thwarted by non-lethal means. Here a “drone court” would be especially useless. We wouldn’t want the military to have to jump through judicial hoops to thwart a truly imminent attack. If the threat is imminent, there is, by definition, no time to seek judicial review, and if there is time, the threat is, by definition, not imminent. But a “drone court” would be worse than ineffective: it would harm national security. Throughout the “war on terror,” policies that offend international law, including the broad scope of the government's claimed authority to kill, have inhibited allies from sharing essential intelligence with the United States and damaged the country’s reputation as a beacon on human rights. A secret court would only reinforce the perception that the United States concocts its own secret ruleswhileinsisting that other countriesfollow the international public ones**.**

#### Zenko evidence says we need direct cooperation to solve norms.

Zenko 13 (Micah Zenko is the Douglas Dillon fellow in the Center for Preventive Action (CPA) at the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR). Previously, he worked for five years at the Harvard Kennedy School and in Washington, DC, at the Brookings Institution, Congressional Research Service, and State Department's Office of Policy Planning, Council Special Report No. 65, January 2013, “U.S. Drone Strike Policies”, i.cfr.org/content/publications/attachments/Drones\_CSR65.pdf‎)

The United States should ■■ promote Track 1.5 or Track 2 discussions on armed drones, similar to dialogues with other countries on the principles and limits of weapons systems such as nuclear weapons or cyberwarfare; ■■ create an international association of drone manufacturers that includes broad participation with emerging drone powers that could be modeled on similar organizations like the Nuclear Suppliers Group; explicitly state which legal principles apply—and do not apply—to drone strikes and the procedural safeguards to ensure compliance to build broader international consensus; ■■ begin discussions with emerging drone powers for a code of conduct to develop common principles for how armed drones should be used outside a state’s territory, which would address issues such as sovereignty, proportionality, distinction, and appropriate legal framework; and ■■ host discussions in partnership with Israel to engage emerging drone makers on how to strengthen norms against selling weaponscapable systems.

#### Drone arms race inevitable

USA Today 13 (1/9, http://www.usatoday.com/story/news/world/2013/01/08/experts-drones-basis-for-new-global-arms-race/1819091/, “Experts: Drones basis for new global arms race”, AB)

The success of U.S. drones in Iraq and Afghanistan has triggered a global arms race, raising concerns the remotely piloted aircraft could fall into unfriendly hands, military experts say. The number of countries that have acquired or developed drones expanded to more than 75, up from about 40 in 2005, according to the Government Accountability Office, the investigative arm of Congress. Iran and China are among the countries that have fielded their own systems. "People have seen the successes we've had," said Lt. Gen. Larry James, the Air Force's deputy chief of staff for intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance. The U.S. military has used drones extensively in Afghanistan, primarily to watch over enemy targets. Armed drones have been used to target terrorist leaders with missiles that are fired from miles away.

#### [IF TIME] US tech sales and economic benefits make prolif inevitable

CRG 12 (The Centre for Research on Globalization (CRG) is an independent research and media organization based in Montreal, a registered non-profit organization in the province of Quebec, Canada, “Mapping Drone Proliferation: UAVs in 76 Countries,” September 18, <http://www.globalresearch.ca/mapping-drone-proliferation-uavs-in-76-countries>)

The report goes on: “Currently, there are over 50 countries developing more than 900 different UAV systems. This growth is attributed to countries seeing the success of the United States with UAVs in Iraq and Afghanistan and deciding to invest resources into UAV development to compete economically and militarily in this emerging area.”¶ While the report fails to highlight the danger of growing drone proliferation to global peace and security it does emphasize the danger of drone proliferation to “US interests”. The report states that “the use of UAVs by foreign parties to gather information on U.S. military activities has already taken place” and “the significant growth in the number of countries that have acquired UAVs, including key countries of concern, has increased the threat to the United States.”¶ Despite this, the report states “the U.S. government has determined that selected transfers of UAV technology support its national security interests”, thus highlighting the contradiction at the heart of current arms control measures. ‘Private sector representatives’ told the reports authors that “UAVs are one of the most important growth sectors in the defense industry and provide significant opportunities for economic benefits if U.S. companies can remain competitive in the global UAV market.”

#### No drone arms race – multiple checks

* Narrow application
* Diplomatic and political costs
* State defenses
* Deterrence checks

Singh 12 (Joseph Singh is a researcher at the Center for a New American Security. “Betting Against a Drone Arms Race,” http://nation.time.com/2012/08/13/betting-against-a-drone-arms-race/)

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

#### U.S. drone use doesn’t cause prolif – no international precedent.

Etzioni 13, Professor of International Relations @ George Washington University (Aimtai Etzioni, adviser to the Carter administration, “The Great Drone Debate”, Military Review, 4/2013, http://usacac.army.mil/CAC2/MilitaryReview/Archives/English/MilitaryReview\_20130430\_art004.pdf)

Other critics contend that by the United States ¶ using drones, it leads other countries into making and ¶ using them. For example, Medea Benjamin, the cofounder of the anti-war activist group CODEPINK ¶ and author of a book about drones argues that, “The ¶ proliferation of drones should evoke reﬂection on the ¶ precedent that the United States is setting by killing ¶ anyone it wants, anywhere it wants, on the basis of ¶ secret information. Other nations and non-state entities are watching—and are bound to start acting in ¶ a similar fashion.”60 Indeed scores of countries are ¶ now manufacturing or purchasing drones. There can ¶ be little doubt that the fact that drones have served ¶ the United States well has helped to popularize them. ¶ However, it does not follow that United States ¶ should not have employed drones in the hope that such a show of restraint would deter others. First ¶ of all, this would have meant that either the United ¶ States would have had to allow terrorists in hard-to-reach places, say North Waziristan, to either ¶ roam and rest freely—or it would have had to use ¶ bombs that would have caused much greater collateral damage. ¶ Further, the record shows that even when the ¶ United States did not develop a particular weapon, ¶ others did. Thus, China has taken the lead in the ¶ development of anti-ship missiles and seemingly ¶ cyber weapons as well. One must keep in mind ¶ that the international environment is a hostile ¶ one. Countries—and especially non-state actors—¶ most of the time do not play by some set of selfconstraining rules. Rather, they tend to employ ¶ whatever weapons they can obtain that will further ¶ their interests. The United States correctly does ¶ not assume that it can rely on some non-existent ¶ implicit gentleman’s agreements that call for the ¶ avoidance of new military technology by nation X ¶ or terrorist group Y—if the United States refrains ¶ from employing that technology. I am not arguing that there are no natural norms ¶ that restrain behavior. There are certainly some ¶ that exist, particularly in situations where all parties beneﬁt from the norms (e.g., the granting of ¶ diplomatic immunity) or where particularly horrifying weapons are involved (e.g., weapons of ¶ mass destruction). However drones are but one ¶ step—following bombers and missiles—in the ¶ development of distant battleﬁeld technologies. ¶ (Robotic soldiers—or future ﬁghting machines—¶ are next in line). In such circumstances, the role ¶ of norms is much more limited.

#### Even with the tech, China won’t use drones offensively

* Fear international backlash
* Don’t want to set precedent for US drone us in East Asia
* Domestic political constraints

Erickson and Strange 13 (Andrew Erickson, associate professor at the Naval War College, Associate in Research at Harvard University's Fairbank Centre, Austin Strange, researcher at the Naval War College's China Maritime Studies Institute, graduate student at Zhejiang University, “China Has Drones. Now How Will it Use Them?” Foreign Affairs, May 29, 2013, <http://www.nationmultimedia.com/opinion/China-has-drones-Now-how-will-it-use-them-30207095.html>)

Indeed, the time to fret about when China and other authoritarian countries will acquire drones is over: they have them. The question now is when and how they will use them. But as with its other, less exotic military capabilities, Beijing has cleared only a technological hurdle -- and its behavior will continue to be constrained by politics.¶ China has been developing a drone capacity for over half a century, starting with its reverse engineering of Soviet Lavochkin La-17C target drones that it had received from Moscow in the late 1950s. Today, Beijing’s opacity makes it difficult to gauge the exact scale of the program, but according to Ian Easton, an analyst at the Project 2049 Institute, by 2011 China’s air force alone had over 280 combat drones. In other words, its fleet of unmanned aerial vehicles is already bigger and more sophisticated than all but the United States’; in this relatively new field Beijing is less of a newcomer and more of a fast follower. And the force will only become more effective: the Lijian (“sharp sword” in Chinese), a combat drone in the final stages of development, will make China one of the very few states that have or are building a stealth drone capacity.¶ This impressive arsenal may tempt China to pull the trigger. The fact that a Chinese official acknowledged that Beijing had considered using drones to eliminate the Burmese drug trafficker, Naw Kham, made clear that it would not be out of the question for China to launch a drone strike in a security operation against a nonstate actor. Meanwhile, as China’s territorial disputes with its neighbors have escalated, there is a chance that Beijing would introduce unmanned aircraft, especially since India, the Philippines, and Vietnam distantly trail China in drone funding and capacity, and would find it difficult to compete. Beijing is already using drones to photograph the Senkaku/Diaoyu Islands it disputes with Japan, as the retired Chinese Major General Peng Guangqian revealed earlier this year, and to keep an eye on movements near the North Korean border.¶ Beijing, however, is unlikely to use its drones lightly. It already faces tremendous criticism from much of the international community for its perceived brazenness in continental and maritime sovereignty disputes. With its leaders attempting to allay notions that China's rise poses a threat to the region, injecting drones conspicuously into these disputes would prove counterproductive. China also fears setting a precedent for the use of drones in East Asian hotspots that the United States could eventually exploit. For now, Beijing is showing that it understands these risks, and to date it has limited its use of drones in these areas to surveillance, according to recent public statements from China's Defence Ministry. What about using drones outside of Chinese-claimed areas? That China did not, in fact, launch a drone strike on the Myanmar drug criminal underscores its caution. According to Liu Yuejin, the director of the anti-drug bureau in China's Ministry of Public Security, Beijing considered using a drone carrying a 20-kilogram TNT payload to bomb Kham's mountain redoubt in northeast Myanmar. Kham had already evaded capture three times, so a drone strike may have seemed to be the best option. The authorities apparently had at least two plans for capturing Kham. The method they ultimately chose was to send Chinese police forces to lead a transnational investigation that ended in April 2012 with Kham's capture near the Myanmar-Laos border. The ultimate decision to refrain from the strike may reflect both a fear of political reproach and a lack of confidence in untested drones, systems, and operators. The restrictive position that Beijing takes on sovereignty in international forums will further constrain its use of drones. China is not likely to publicly deploy drones for precision strikes or in other military assignments without first having been granted a credible mandate to do so. The gold standard of such an authorisation is a resolution passed by the UN Security Council, the stamp of approval that has permitted Chinese humanitarian interventions in Africa and anti-piracy operations in the Gulf of Aden. China might consider using drones abroad with some sort of regional authorisation, such as a country giving Beijing explicit permission to launch a drone strike within its territory. But even with the endorsement of the international community or specific states, China would have to weigh any benefits of a drone strike abroad against the potential for mishaps and perceptions that it was infringing on other countries' sovereignty - something Beijing regularly decries when others do it. The limitations on China's drone use are reflected in the country's academic literature on the topic. The bulk of Chinese drone research is dedicated to scientific and technological topics related to design and performance. The articles that do discuss potential applications primarily point to major combat scenarios -such as a conflagration with Taiwan or the need to attack a US aircraft carrier - which would presumably involve far more than just drones. Chinese researchers have thought a great deal about the utility of drones for domestic surveillance and law enforcement, as well as for non-combat-related tasks near China's contentious borders. Few scholars, however, have publicly considered the use of drone strikes overseas. Yet there is a reason why the United States has employed drones extensively despite domestic and international criticism: it is much easier and cheaper to kill terrorists from above than to try to root them out through long and expensive counterinsurgency campaigns. Some similar challenges loom on China's horizon. Within China, Beijing often considers protests and violence in the restive border regions, such as Xinjiang and Tibet, to constitute terrorism. It would presumably consider ordering precision strikes to suppress any future violence there. Even if such strikes are operationally prudent, China's leaders understand that they would damage the country's image abroad, but they prioritise internal stability above all else. Domestic surveillance by drones is a different issue; there should be few barriers to its application in what is already one of the world's most heavily policed societies. China might also be willing to use stealth drones in foreign airspace without authorisation if the risk of detection were low enough; it already deploys intelligence-gathering ships in the exclusive economic zones of Japan and the United States, as well as in the Indian Ocean. Still, although China enjoys a rapidly expanding and cutting-edge drone fleet, it is bound by the same rules of the game as the rest of the military's tools. Beyond surveillance, the other non-lethal military actions that China can take with its drones are to facilitate communications within the Chinese military, support electronic warfare by intercepting electronic communications and jamming enemy systems, and help identify targets for Chinese precision strike weapons, such as missiles. Beijing's overarching approach remains one of caution - something Washington must bear in mind with its own drone programme.

### Pakistan

#### Their ev says Pakistanis are fed up with the government – the plan doesn’t resolve that – here’s a card

Daniel Markey is senior fellow for India, Pakistan, and South Asia at the Council on Foreign Relations, 13 [“A New Drone Deal For Pakistan,” Foreign Affairs, July 16, http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/139584/daniel-markey/a-new-drone-deal-for-pakistan?page=show]

For all its successes, the U.S. drone program in Pakistan is unlikely to survive much longer in its current form. Less than a week after his election on May 11, Pakistan’s new prime minister, Nawaz Sharif, reportedly declared to his cabinet that “the policy of protesting against drone strikes for public consumption, while working behind the scenes to make them happen, is not on.” This fall, Pakistan’s national and provincial assemblies will elect a new president, likely a Sharif loyalist, and the prime minister will also select a new army chief. It is safe to say that these men are unlikely to follow their predecessors in offering tacit endorsements of the United States' expansive counterterrorism efforts. ¶ In other words, the United States is going to have to hammer out a new drone deal with Pakistan in the years ahead, one that is sensitive to Pakistan's own concerns and objectives. This will likely mean that Washington will face new constraints in its counterterrorism operations. But managed with care, a new agreement could put the targeted killing campaign against al Qaeda on firmer political footing without entirely eliminating its effectiveness.¶ Ever since its inception in 2004, the U.S. drone campaign in Pakistan has been stumbling along shaky legal and strategic ground. At various points in time, Washington and Islamabad constructed different fictions to enable the drone campaign. Before launching the first drone strike that killed Taliban leader Nek Muhammad in June 2004, Washington sought personal authorization from then President and army chief Pervez Musharraf. For several years thereafter, the Pakistani army claimed responsibility for all drone strikes, publicly denying (however implausibly) American intervention.¶ But the program’s remarkable success in killing al Qaeda and Taliban leaders, combined with the otherwise largely unaddressed problem of sanctuaries in Pakistan’s tribal areas, encouraged U.S. officials to expand their list of targets. As the program grew, and especially as Washington killed militants with suspected links to Pakistan’s own military and intelligence services, such as members of the Afghan Taliban–affiliated Haqqani Network, Pakistani officials shed the fiction that the strikes were their own. Islamabad instead bowed to what it perceived as a powerful domestic consensus against the drones and criticized the United States in increasingly shrill terms for violating Pakistan’s territorial sovereignty. Privately, however, Musharraf and his immediate successors -- including the civilian government led by the Pakistan People’s Party (PPP) and the army under General Kayani -- continued to greenlight the drone program.¶ As the drone strikes mounted, the hypocrisy of the official Pakistani position became ever more difficult to hide. Opposition politician and former cricket star Imran Khan made the criticism of drones a centerpiece of his Tehreek-e-Insaf (PTI) party’s election campaign in 2011 and 2012. And in early 2012, the Pakistani parliament unequivocally denounced the drone strikes and called for them to end. This unmistakable sovereign act called into question oft-repeated U.S. claims that Pakistan actually provides “tacit consent” for the drone campaign.¶ Pakistan's current and future leaders, starting with Nawaz Sharif, will have little reason to implicate themselves in the drone hypocrisy of their predecessors. Sharif is on sounder political footing than his predecessor, but -- as his top lieutenants are already signaling -- he cannot weather the political storm that is likely to result if the United States appears to blithely disregard his authority. Washington’s failure to shift its policy would lead Islamabad to escalate its diplomatic protests.¶ One step in this escalation has already happened, with Pakistan taking its case against drones to the international community by way of the United Nations. If Pakistani frustration mounts without yielding results, one can imagine Sharif’s new army chief threatening to shoot U.S. drones from the sky, just as past Pakistani leaders have threatened to take down helicopters that cross into the nation’s airspace. At that stage, Washington would likely pull the drones from normal operation rather than play a high-stakes game of chicken. (Indeed, Washington has a habit of taking extended breaks from drone strikes at sensitive periods: for instance, there were no strikes for over six weeks after the so-called Salala incident at the Afghan border.)¶ The question is whether Washington and Islamabad can find a deal that addresses Pakistani concerns without depriving the United States of a counterterrorism tool that has been more effective, at least in a tactical sense, than any other. Short of ending the drone program altogether, the only way that Pakistan’s leaders can credibly claim to assert their sovereign authority -- and thereby prove their nationalist credentials to political allies and adversaries alike -- is if Washington cedes to Islamabad a greater degree of control over the program, especially when it comes to target selection.¶ At one extreme, this would mean doing what a number of Pakistani leaders (including General Musharraf) have requested for years: placing the drones under Pakistani command. Of course, given the highly sensitive nature of drone technology, along with the fact that U.S. officials do not adequately trust their Pakistani counterparts to deploy the drones in ways that would effectively eliminate top terrorist leaders, this solution remains off the table in nearly any conceivable future.¶ Somewhat less pie-in-the-sky, if still unrealistic at this stage, would be the idea of disarming U.S. drones and leaving Pakistani forces to act as the “trigger pullers” whenever terrorist targets are identified. Strikes would then be launched by Pakistani Air Force jets, helicopters, or perhaps even artillery, and would use U.S. intelligence for target selection. This solution also has an assortment of practical problems, from the time lag between identifying targets and shooting at them to, once again, U.S. officials’ lack of faith in their Pakistani counterparts’ ability and desire to act on that intelligence in the first place.¶ Then there is the option of crafting a “dual-key” authority at the operational level, perhaps by informing Pakistani officers in real time as drone strikes are launched and by implementing a mutually acceptable mechanism through which Islamabad could veto a specific strike, or at least raise it up the chain of command in a timely manner. Versions of a dual-key approach have been tried in the past, with some success. But given the fraught terms of cooperation between Washington and Islamabad in recent years, it is hard to imagine U.S. officials accepting this sort of arrangement, at least not yet. The real-time nature of the decision process would limit the potential for unwanted leaks or tip-offs to targets, but U.S. officials would still be wary that Pakistani officials could acquire too much knowledge of the drone program and its capabilities. If political trust improves over time, however, this might be a useful model for cooperation.¶ A final option -- and the only realistic compromise at present -- would be for Washington to seek Islamabad’s pre-authorization for specific targets and zones for strikes. The United States would retain full operational control over drone missions, and unlike the earliest stage in the drone program, when Musharraf’s explicit approval was required to kill Nek Muhammad, this process could provide blanket authority for a much longer (mutually agreed, if not publicly disclosed) target list. In return, Pakistani leaders would acknowledge publicly the terms of the new arrangement. Accompanying this preauthorization regime, Washington and Islamabad could establish a mechanism for reviewing claims of civilian losses and providing appropriate compensation, as the United States has done in Afghanistan and Iraq. In bringing the program out of the shadows, U.S. operational authority for the drones would almost certainly have to shift from the CIA to the Pentagon, as the Obama administration has already said it plans to do in other countries.¶ Admittedly, this final compromise option would be painful for both Islamabad and Washington. Pakistani leaders would finally have to come clean to their people about authorizing drone strikes. That would eliminate even the thin veneer of deniability that past leaders have maintained to protect themselves from political fallout. It would also place Sharif’s party firmly on the blacklists of the Pakistani Taliban and other targeted groups, which to date have enjoyed slightly more ambiguous relationships.¶ For their part, U.S. counterterror officials would chafe at any preauthorization program. This would be especially true if the target list excluded individuals, such as senior Afghan Taliban commanders, with whom the Pakistanis would prefer to maintain ties. A preauthorization regime would also mean foregoing the controversial U.S. practice of signature strikes, in which drones have been used to attack individuals who fit the profile of terrorists -- for example, people who move about in armed convoys or visit known terrorist camps -- but whose identities are not yet known to U.S. officials.¶ The new drone deal would be premised on the assumption that the United States is prepared to accept less frequent drone strikes than it has become accustomed to. So one potentially insurmountable stumbling block to this compromise would be if Washington planned to use the drone campaign as a primary tool for shaping the battlefield in Afghanistan, for instance by intensifying strikes against the Haqqani Network in the FATA’s North Waziristan agency. Pakistani leaders would almost certainly reject this strategy**.** Under such conditions, however, it is hard to imagine anything other than a tense and conflict-prone relationship between Washington and Islamabad, whether or not any new drone deal has been negotiated.¶ But officials in Washington would be wise not to let relations with Pakistan deteriorate to that point. The United States faces potential challenges in Pakistan that are even more daunting than the war in Afghanistan or the fight against al Qaeda. Nuclear-armed and battling a hardened Islamist insurgency, Pakistan is on track to be the fourth most populous country in the world by midcentury. Pakistan, in short, is here to stay -- as is Nawaz Sharif, at least for the immediate future. Sharif may not be the man that the United States would choose to lead Pakistan, but he is one that Washington would be wise to learn how to bargain with.

#### Casualties are way down and drones are far more precise than alternatives---our ev uses the best data

Michael Cohen 13, Fellow at the Century Foundation, 5/23/13, “Give President Obama a chance: there is a role for drones,” The Guardian, http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2013/may/23/obama-drone-speech-use-justified

Drone critics have a much different take. They are passionate in their conviction that US drones are indiscriminately killing and terrorizing civilians. The Guardian's own Glenn Greenwald argued recently that no "minimally rational person" can defend "Obama's drone kills on the ground that they are killing The Terrorists or that civilian deaths are rare". Conor Friedersdorf, an editor at the Atlantic and a vocal drone critic, wrote last year that liberals should not vote for President Obama's re-election because of the drone campaign, which he claimed "kills hundreds of innocents, including children," "terrorizes innocent Pakistanis on an almost daily basis" and "makes their lives into a nightmare worthy of dystopian novels". ¶ I disagree. Increasingly it appears that arguments like Friedersdorf makes are no longer sustainable (and there's real question if they ever were). Not only have drone strikes decreased, but so too have the number of civilians killed – and dramatically so. ¶ This conclusion comes not from Obama administration apologists but rather, Chris Woods, whose research has served as the empirical basis for the harshest attacks on the Obama Administration's drone policy. ¶ Woods heads the covert war program for the Bureau of Investigative Journalism (TBIJ), which maintains one of three major databases tabulating civilian casualties from US drone strikes. The others are the Long War Journal and the New America Foundation (full disclosure: I used to be a fellow there). While LWJ and NAJ estimate that drone strikes in Pakistan have killed somewhere between 140 and 300 civilians, TBIJ utilizes a far broader classification for civilians killed, resulting in estimates of somewhere between 411-884 civilians killed by drones in Pakistan. The wide range of numbers here speaks to the extraordinary challenge in tabulating civilian death rates. ¶ There is little local reporting done on the ground in northwest Pakistan, which is the epicenter of the US drone program. As a result data collection is reliant on Pakistani news reporting, which is also dependent on Pakistani intelligence, which has a vested interest in playing up the negative consequences of US drones. ¶ When I spoke with Woods last month, he said that a fairly clear pattern has emerged over the past year – far fewer civilians are dying from drones. "For those who are opposed to drone strikes," says Woods there is historical merit to the charge of significant civilian deaths, "but from a contemporary standpoint the numbers just aren't there." ¶ While Woods makes clear that one has to be "cautious" on any estimates of casualties, it's not just a numeric decline that is being seen, but rather it's a "proportionate decline". In other words, the percentage of civilians dying in drone strikes is also falling, which suggests to Woods that US drone operators are showing far greater care in trying to limit collateral damage. ¶ Woods estimates are supported by the aforementioned databases. In Pakistan, New America Foundation claims there have been no civilian deaths this year and only five last year; Long War Journal reported four deaths in 2012 and 11 so far in 2013; and TBIJ reports a range of 7-42 in 2012 and 0-4 in 2013. In addition, the drop in casualty figures is occurring not just in Pakistan but also in Yemen. ¶ These numbers are broadly consistent with what has been an under-reported decline in drone use overall. According to TBIJ, the number of drone strikes went from 128 in 2010 to 48 in 2012 and only 12 have occurred this year. These statistics are broadly consistent with LWJ and NAF's reporting. In Yemen, while drone attacks picked up in 2012, they have slowed dramatically this year. And in Somalia there has been no strike reported for more than a year. ¶ Ironically, these numbers are in line with the public statements of CIA director Brennan, and even more so with Senator Dianne Feinstein of California, chairman of the Select Intelligence Committee, who claimed in February that the numbers she has received from the Obama administration suggest that the typical number of victims per year from drone attacks is in "the single digits".¶ Part of the reason for these low counts is that the Obama administration has sought to minimize the number of civilian casualties through what can best be described as "creative bookkeeping". The administration counts all military-age males as possible combatants unless they have information (posthumously provided) that proves them innocent. Few have taken the White House's side on this issue (and for good reason) though some outside researchers concur with the administration's estimates.¶ Christine Fair, a professor at Georgetown University has long maintained that civilian deaths from drones in Pakistan are dramatically overstated. She argues that considering the alternatives of sending in the Pakistani military or using manned aircraft to flush out jihadists, drone strikes are a far more humane method of war-fighting.

#### Alt causes - Drones not the greatest threat for the people of the FATA

Rogers 13 Christopher Rogers, Pakistan Field Fellow with the Campaign for Innocent Victims in Conflict (CIVIC). Program Officer, Regional Policy Initiative, Open Society Foundations, Congressional Progressive Caucus Peace and Security Taskforce: Ad Hoc Hearing on Drones, 5-8

Having spoken to many people from this region, I have seen that drones are by no means the only, or even the greatest threat faced by the people of FATA. FATA is under siege, and has for decades been economically, socially, and politically isolated. Average income is less than 250 dollars per year. Less than one in five are literate. There are no courts, no elected local government. Militancy has filled this vacuum and the ensuing conflict has displaced hundreds of thousands, led to the detention of thousands more, and caused an untold number of civilian deaths. People in FATA are caught between militants and the Pakistani military, dealing with the destruction of their traditional tribal structures, and an absentee government. It is against this backdrop that the United States is conducting drone strikes, which have killed two to three thousand people over the past several years, in communities that already feel abandoned and extremely vulnerable.

#### Even after relations declined - Pakistan protests but it still clears its airspace

Gray 13 Christine Gray, Professor of International Law, University of Cambridge. *Current Legal Problems*, Targeted Killings: Recent US Attempts to Create a Legal Framework (2013), pp. 1–32

According to newspaper reports, the USA followed the practice of notifying Pakistan of its intention to carry out a targeted killing.70 The CIA would send a fax to the ISI (the Pakistan intelligence service) once a month, outlining areas and targets for drone attacks. The ISI would acknowledge receipt of the fax, without saying anything express about consent, but Pakistan would clear the airspace. However, after relations between the USA and Pakistan deteriorated following a series of incidents in 2011 and 2012, the practice changed. Today the ISI apparently no longer acknowledges receipt of the CIA faxes. But the USA says that Pakistan still clears its airspace. There are newspaper reports of divisions in the US administration on this issue. US State Department Legal Adviser Harold Koh is said to have expressed some concerns about the adequacy of the consent.71 In private there may have been consent, or possibly just acquiescence, by the Pakistani government, but the public picture is different.

#### No escalation- crises will be resolved through negotiations

Alagappa 9, Distinguished Senior Fellow at the East-West Center, PhD in International Affairs from the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, 2009 (Muthiah, “Nuclear Weapons Reinforce Security and Stability in 21st Century Asia”, Vol 4 No 1)

The stabilizing effect of nuclear weapons may be better illustrated in India-Pakistan relations, as the crises between these two countries during the 1999–2002 period are often cited as demonstrating nuclear weapon-induced instability. Rather than simply attribute these crises to the possession of nuclear weapons, a more accurate and useful reading would ground them in Pakistan’s deliberate policy to alter the status quo through military means on the premise that the risk of escalation to nuclear war would deter India from responding with full-scale conventional retaliation; and in India’s response, employing compellence and coercive diplomacy strategies. In other words, particular goals and strategies rather than nuclear weapons per se precipitated the crises. Further, the outcomes of these two crises revealed the limited utility of nuclear weapons in bringing about even a minor change in the territorial status quo and highlighted the grave risks associated with offensive strategies. Recognition of these limits and the grave consequences in part contributed to the two countries’ subsequent efforts to engage in a comprehensive dialogue to settle the many disputes between them. The crises also led to bilateral understandings and measures to avoid unintended hostilities. Though it is too soon to take a long view, it is possible to argue that, like the Cuban missile crisis in 1962, the 1999 and 2001–02 crises between India and Pakistan mark a watershed in their strategic relations: the danger of nuclear war shifted their focus to avoiding a major war and to finding a negotiated settlement to bilateral problems. Large-scale military deployments along the common border, Pakistan-supported insurgent activities in India, and cross-border terrorism continue; and the two countries regularly conduct large-scale military exercises and test nuclear-capable missiles that have each other’s entire territory within range. Despite these activities, the situation has become relatively less tense; stability with the ability to absorb shocks even like that created by the November 26terrorist attack in Mumbai has begun to characterize the bilateral relationship.

## 2NC

### K

#### Second is national security utilitarianism – the public has been subdued into believing the government’s means-end rationality logic that seeks to control and dominate around the world which is pushing us on the brink of extinction – Syria is the most recent example

Instead of engaging in diplomacy which would have been the better option we were on the brink of initiating a nuclear war in the region

Williams 8 \*Daniel R, Associate Professor of Law, Northeastern University School of Law.

Penn State Law Review, Summer, 113 Penn St. L. Rev. 55

B. The Underbelly of the Enlightenment Heritage - the Weberian Nightmare What has heretofore given a patina of acceptability to this modern-day Foucauldian "political dream of the plague" is the narrative idea of a wounded and vulnerable nation gripped in an existential crisis, seeking to protect itself against human "missiles of destruction." The descriptive (a threatened wounded nation) produces in this story the normative (the adjudicative assembly line for enemy combatants). The Foucauldian "political dream of the plague" is the Weberian nightmare. In Dialectic of the Enlightenment, Frankfurt School theorists Horkheimer and Adorno identify the Weberian nightmare of obsessive instrumental rationality as the dominant cognitive orientation in Western culture. 147 Whereas most Americans see as features of this means-ends orientation the awesome feats of science (the amazing technological prosthetics that drives humanity closer to becoming a God, as Freud observed), critical theorists like Horkheimer and Adorno saw what Weber saw 148 - a cognitive orientation that feeds into and fuels our obsessive drive to dominate and control all that surrounds us. 149 The salient point in the Dialectic of the Enlightenment, for our purposes, is that the instrumentalist orientation has been unleashed to devour the very idea of the "sacred" in life. 150 September 11th and the war on terror has only hastened a movement along an already existing trajectory. What we experience in our alienated, gadget-filled, but spiritually vacant existence - what Max Weber termed our "disenchantment with the world" 151 - is a reflection of what Horkheimer and Adorno diagnosed, and of how badly our capacity for reason has been corrupted by a fetish for means-ends rationality. 152 That corruption, which is on [\*91] full display in the overt means-ends reasoning of Hamdi itself, has led to what philosopher Albert Borgmann calls a "crucial debility" in our culture, characterized by the "expatriate quality of public life" where we "live in self-imposed exile from communal conversation and action." 153 There is, then, a certain blowback effect, where a mode of thinking that was supposed to lead to humanity's flourishing has been whipsawed back upon us as a powerful corrupting, even imprisoning, force. Whereas the Enlightenment, as exemplified by Rousseau, Voltaire, and Kant, promised freedom from irrationality and darkness, it has instead denuded the public sphere and bequeathed to us a technocratic language that debilitates the ability to conceptualize our way out of a disastrous course (ecologically and otherwise) on which our technocratic means-ends orientation has put us. 154 The quest for domination and control immanent within Enlightenment's fetish for means-ends reasoning, which supposedly promised a world of flourishing human rights (though pursued through the blood of ancient cultures, such as the native peoples in the Americas), drained modernity of the very vitality that modernist thinkers insisted [\*92] was distinctive about Enlightenment society. 155 It has instead taken us to the brink of annihilation in a world where the disparities of wealth are grossly appalling and human behavior slides so easily into barbarism and violence, usually in the service of preserving or further deepening those disparities. Whereas the Enlightenment broke the bondage of atrophied tradition, it has wrought a world where little is sacred, and what little remains is rapidly dwindling, where "what holds us all together is a cold and impersonal design." 156 We slaughtered cultures within our own country - Native American cultures that we still do not fully appreciate and comprehend - with the quintessential Enlightenment slogan, Manifest Destiny, only to bring about an ennui and despair that produces a nostalgic yearning for the sacred upon which those slaughtered cultures built their now-defunct way of life.

#### All of our solvency arguments are *net offense*---legalism creates the façade that the executive is being constrained while allowing the government to do as it pleases under the guise of constraint---this swells executive power and turns the case

Osborn 8 Timothy Kaufman is the Baker Ferguson Professor of Politics and Leadership at Whitman College; from 2002-06 as president of the American Civil Liberties of Washington; and he recently completed a term on the Executive Council of the American Political Science Association. Theory & Event > Volume 11, Issue 2

The examples cited in this section suggest not the formation of an utterly lawless regime, but, rather, within an order that continues to understand itself in terms of the categories provided by liberal contractarianism, the more insidious creation, multiplication, and institutionalization of what David Dyzenhaus calls "grey holes." Such holes are "spaces in which there are some legal constraints on executive action...but the constraints are so insubstantial that they pretty well permit government to do as it pleases."40 As such, they are more harmful to the rule of law than are outright dictatorial usurpations, first, because the provision of limited procedural protections masks the absence of any real constraint on executive power; and, second, because location of the authority to create such spaces within the Constitution implies that, in the last analysis, they bear ex ante authorization by the people. When created, in other words, they may receive but they do not require ratification, whether by Congress or by those whom its members are said to represent. What this means in effect is that the second Bush administration has dispensed with Jefferson's stipulation that extra-constitutional executive acts (or, rather, acts that Jefferson deemed to be outside those constitutionally permitted) require ex post facto ratification; and, in addition, that it has dispensed with Locke's contention that, however unlikely, at least in principle, specific exercises of extra-legal prerogative power (or, rather, acts that Locke deemed to be outside those legally permitted) are properly subject to revolutionary rejection. What one finds in the second Bush administration, then, is a denial of both models of accountability, combined with an aggressive commitment to the constitution of a security state that is liberal only in name. As it extends its reach, perfection of that state renders the prospect of popular repudiation of prerogative power ever more chimerical, and, indeed, renders recognition of the problematic character of its exercise ever less likely.

#### alt key to come before the plan otherwise movements get sapped

Nagin 5 Tomiko Brown, Visiting Associate Professor, University of Virginia School of Law, “ELITES, SOCIAL MOVEMENTS, AND THE LAW: THE CASE OF AFFIRMATIVE ACTION,” Columbia Law Review, 105 Colum. L. Rev. 1436

Those seeking to have an impact on the political and legal orders should not root a mass movement in the courts;instead, affirmative litigation about constitutional rights should be anchored upon and preceded by a mass movement.Efforts to achieve fundamental change shouldbegin with the target constituency and be waged initially outside of the confines of institutionalized politics.Law should be understood as a tactic in an ongoing political struggle, where the struggle is the main event and favorable legal outcomes are its byproducts. There is a crucially important temporal component to this view. Legal claims can be tactically useful in a political strategy for achieving change - butonly after social movements lay the groundworkfor legal change. Social movements must first create political pressure that frames issues in a favorable manner, creates cultural norm shifts, and affects public opinion; these norm shifts then increase the likelihood that courts will reach outcomes favored by lawyers. [437](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=b1b76c3bff33e7c7527182cc42568c87&docnum=11&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVzz-zSkAl&_md5=b4841fe459fa752b47486b13d84385b6&focBudTerms=milliken%20w/150%20hispanic%20or%20latino&focBudSel=all#n437) Again, my claims find support in the history of the mid-twentieth-century civil rights movement. This narrative posits an intimate relationship between the sociopolitical dynamics within black client communities and the success (or failure) of civil rights lawyers' litigation campaigns for rights. The postwar civil rights movement confirms that the moral suasion of participatory democratic groups of nonlawyers, and typically nonelites, was integral to law's movement from a Jim Crow regime to a [\*1523] constitutional order in which formal equality was the norm. During the past three decades, historians who have analyzed social change have discovered that small groups of inexpert individuals can be the leading edge of a social movement, especially when they work in coalition with those who traditionally wield influence in society. [438](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=b1b76c3bff33e7c7527182cc42568c87&docnum=11&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVzz-zSkAl&_md5=b4841fe459fa752b47486b13d84385b6&focBudTerms=milliken%20w/150%20hispanic%20or%20latino&focBudSel=all#n438)Through their commitment to a social cause, ordinary people with no insider knowledge of the technical aspects of the broad issue on which they are mobilizing can create circumstances in which those with actual power (political, economic, and, ultimately, legal power) are persuaded to act in their favor.

#### they zero in on certain aspects of executive power which stop broader systemic criticisms and provides a cover to normalize the war on terror

Saas, 12 \*\*William O. Pf Department of Communication Arts and Sciences at the Pennsylvania State University. symploke > Volume 20, Numbers 1-2

How might one critique this massive network of violence that has become so enmeshed in our contemporary geo-socio-political reality? Is there any hope for reversing the expansion of executive violence in the current political climate, in which the President enjoys minimal resistance to his most egregious uses of violence? How does exceptional violence become routine? Answers to these broad and difficult questions, derived as they are from the disorientingly vast and hyper-accelerated retrenchment of our current political situation, are best won through the broad strokes of what Slavoj Žižek calls "systemic" critique. For Žižek, looking squarely at interpersonal or subjective violences (e.g., torture, drone strikes), drawn as we may be by their gruesome and immediate appeal, distorts the critic's broader field of vision. For a fuller picture, one must pull one's critical focus back several steps to reveal the deep, objective structures that undergird the spectacular manifestations of everyday, subjective violence (Žižek 2008, 1-2). Immediately, however, one confronts the limit question of Žižek's mandate: how does one productively draw the boundaries of a system without too severely dampening the force of objective critique? For practical purposes, this essay leaves off discussion of neoliberal economic domination, vital as it may be to a full accounting for the U.S.' latest and most desperate expressions of state solvency.

#### state is hijacked by elites who control the decision making that normalizes an authoritarian state that wages war on populations – the focus of debate should be how culture elements can create change to combat normalization of violence caused by the military-industrial-state

Giroux 13 Henry A. is a social critic and educator, and the author of many books. He currently holds the Global Television Network Chair in English and Cultural Studies at McMaster University, Ontario, Monthly Review, Volume 65, Issue 01 (May)

In addition, as the state is hijacked by the financial-military-industrial complex, the “most crucial decisions regarding national policy are not made by representatives, but by the financial and military elites.”53 Such massive inequality and the suffering and political corruption it produces point to the need for critical analysis in which the separation of power and politics can be understood. This means developing terms that clarify how power becomes global even as politics continues to function largely at the national level, with the effect of reducing the state primarily to custodial, policing, and punishing functions—at least for those populations considered disposable. The state exercises its slavish role in the form of lowering taxes for the rich, deregulating corporations, funding wars for the benefit of the defense industries, and devising other welfare services for the ultra-rich. There is no escaping the global politics of finance capital and the global network of violence it has produced. Resistance must be mobilized globally and politics restored to a level where it can make a difference in fulfilling the promises of a global democracy. But such a challenge can only take place if the political is made more pedagogical and matters of education take center stage in the struggle for desires, subjectivities, and social relations that refuse the normalizing of violence as a source of gratification, entertainment, identity, and honor. War in its expanded incarnation works in tandem with a state organized around the production of widespread violence. Such a state is necessarily divorced from public values and the formative cultures that make a democracy possible. The result is a weakened civic culture that allows violence and punishment to circulate as part of a culture of commodification, entertainment, distraction, and exclusion. In opposing the emergence of the United States as both a warfare and a punishing state, I am not appealing to a form of left moralism meant simply to mobilize outrage and condemnation. These are not unimportant registers, but they do not constitute an adequate form of resistance .What is needed are modes of analysis that do the hard work of uncovering the effects of the merging of institutions of capital, wealth, and power, and how this merger has extended the reach of a military-industrial-carceral and academic complex, especially since the 1980s. This complex of ideological and institutional elements designed for the production of violence must be addressed by making visible its vast national and global interests and militarized networks, as indicated by the fact that the United States has over 1,000 military bases abroad.54 Equally important is the need to highlight how this military-industrial-carceral and academic complex uses punishment as a structuring force to shape national policy and everyday life. Challenging the warfare state also has an important educational component. C. Wright Mills was right in arguing that it is impossible to separate the violence of an authoritarian social order from the cultural apparatuses that nourish it. As Mills put it, the major cultural apparatuses not only “guide experience, they also expropriate the very chance to have an experience rightly called ‘our own.’”55 This narrowing of experience shorn of public values locks people into private interests and the hyper-individualized orbits in which they live. Experience itself is now privatized, instrumentalized, commodified, and increasingly militarized. Social responsibility gives way to organized infantilization and a flight from responsibility. Crucial here is the need to develop new cultural and political vocabularies that can foster an engaged mode of citizenship capable of naming the corporate and academic interests that support the warfare state and its apparatuses of violence, while simultaneously mobilizing social movements to challenge and dismantle its vast networks of power. One central pedagogical and political task in dismantling the warfare state is, therefore, the challenge of creating the cultural conditions and public spheres that would enable the U.S. public to move from being spectators of war and everyday violence to being informed and engaged citizens.Unfortunately, major cultural apparatuses like public and higher education, which have been historically responsible for educating the public, are becoming little more than market-driven and militarized knowledge factories. In this particularly insidious role, educational institutions deprive students of the capacities that would enable them not only to assume public responsibilities, but also to actively participate in the process of governing. Without the public spheres for creating a formative culture equipped to challenge the educational, military, market, and religious fundamentalisms that dominate U.S. society, it will be virtually impossible to resist the normalization of war as a matter of domestic and foreign policy. Any viable notion of resistance to the current authoritarian order must also address the issue of what it means pedagogically to imagine a more democratically oriented notion of knowledge, subjectivity, and agency and what it might mean to bring such notions into the public sphere. This is more than what Bernard Harcourt calls “a new grammar of political disobedience.”56 It is a reconfiguring of the nature and substance of the political so that matters of pedagogy become central to the very definition of what constitutes the political and the practices that make it meaningful. Critical understanding motivates transformative action, and the affective investments it demands can only be brought about by breaking into the hardwired forms of common sense that give war and state-supported violence their legitimacy. War does not have to be a permanent social relation, nor the primary organizing principle of everyday life, society, and foreign policy. The war of all-against-all and the social Darwinian imperative to respond positively only to one’s own self-interest represent the death of politics, civic responsibility, and ethics, and set the stage for a dysfunctional democracy, if not an emergent authoritarianism. The existing neoliberal social order produces individuals who have no commitment, except to profit, disdain social responsibility, and loosen all ties to any viable notion of the public good. This regime of punishment and privatization is organized around the structuring forces of violence and militarization, which produce a surplus of fear, insecurity, and a weakened culture of civic engagement—one in which there is little room for reasoned debate, critical dialogue, and informed intellectual exchange. Patricia Clough and Craig Willse are right in arguing that we live in a society “in which the production and circulation of death functions as political and economic recovery.”57 The United States understood as a warfare state prompts a new urgency for a collective politics and a social movement capable of negating the current regimes of political and economic power, while imagining a different and more democratic social order. Until the ideological and structural foundations of violence that are pushing U.S. society over the abyss are addressed, the current warfare state will be transformed into a full-blown authoritarian state that will shut down any vestige of democratic values, social relations, and public spheres. At the very least, the U.S. public owes it to its children and future generations, if not the future of democracy itself, to make visible and dismantle this machinery of violence while also reclaiming the spirit of a future that works for life rather than death—the future of the current authoritarianism, however dressed up they appear in the spectacles of consumerism and celebrity culture. It is time for educators, unions, young people, liberals, religious organizations, and other groups to connect the dots, educate themselves, and develop powerful social movements that can restructure the fundamental values and social relations of democracy while establishing the institutions and formative cultures that make it possible. Stanley Aronowitz is right in arguing that: the system survives on the eclipse of the radical imagination, the absence of a viable political opposition with roots in the general population, and the conformity of its intellectuals who, to a large extent, are subjugated by their secure berths in the academy [and though] we can take some solace in 2011, the year of the protester…it would be premature to predict that decades of retreat, defeat and silence can be reversed overnight without a commitment to what may be termed “a long march” through the institutions, the workplaces and the streets of the capitalist metropoles.58 The current protests among young people, workers, the unemployed, students, and others are making clear that this is not—indeed, cannot be—only a short-term project for reform, but must constitute a political and social movement of sustained growth, accompanied by the reclaiming of public spaces, the progressive use of digital technologies, the development of democratic public spheres, new modes of education, and the safeguarding of places where democratic expression, new identities, and collective hope can be nurtured and mobilized. Without broad political and social movements standing behind and uniting the call on the part of young people for democratic transformations, any attempt at radical change will more than likely be cosmetic.

### CP Solves Norms

#### Legal norms fail and is not unique to congress – the War Powers resolution alone is proof. Executive compliance with international norms SETS A LEGAL PRECEDENT

Twomey 13, Trinity College Dublin, (Laura, Setting a Global Precedent: President Obama's Codification of Drone Warfare, Cambridge Journal of International and Comparative Law, 14 March 2013, http://www.cjicl.org.uk/index.php/cjicl-blog/setting-a-global-precedent-president-obamas-codification-of-drone-warfare, da 7-31-13) PC

It is clear that, as the first State to deploy remote targeting technology in a non international armed conflict, the legal framework forged by the US during President Obama's second term will set significant precedent for the future practice of the estimated 40 States developing their own drone technology. On 7 March 2013, members of the European Parliament expressed deep concern about the “unwelcome precedent” the programme sets, citing its “destabilising effect on the international legal framework” that “destroys ... our common legal heritage.” This 'destabilising effect' arises from the classified and seemingly amorphous substantive legal basis for the programme and the apparent lack of procedural standards in place. It remains to be seen if the classified 'rulebook' will be released for public scrutiny, and allay these concerns. Reliance on international law in world order is based on consent, consensus, good faith and, crucially in this instance, reciprocity. The US programme may harbour short term gains in the pursuit of al-Qaeda operatives, however, if the aforementioned substantive legal justifications continue to be invoked, it risks engendering long term disadvantages. Pursuing this policy encourages other States to adopt similar policies. Administration officials have cited particular concern about setting precedent for Russia, Iran and China, all of which are developing their own remote targeting technology. It is therefore suggested that the Administration should take this opportunity to codify the rules, clarify terms where ambiguity may currently allow for broader interpretations, and to bring its regulations in line with the existing framework of international law. This legal framework should then be made available to the public, with covert operational necessities redacted. This could set a valuable legal precedent, of particular importance at this turning point wherein international law must adapt to the 21st century model of warfare, a model which lacks a clear enemy and a demarcated battlefield.

### A2 Rollback

#### XOs are binding on future administrations and cause follow-on

Duncan, Associate Professor of Law at Florida A&M, Winter 2010

(John C., “A Critical Consideration of Executive Orders,” 35 Vt. L. Rev. 333, Lexis)

**Executive orders** can serve the purpose of allowing the President to generate favorable publicity, such as when President Clinton signed an executive order on ethics, n493 and when President George W. Bush signed the first of a series of executive orders to launch his Faith-Based and Community Initiatives. n494 While these orders pay off political debts and thus may seem trivial, they nevertheless **create both infrastructural and regulatory precedents for future administrations**. Hence, they create an avenue for key constituencies of each administration to influence the executive structure as a whole without necessarily permitting that influence to extend to arenas of reserved for Congress. That is, while the President can act more swiftly and precisely to satisfy political commitments, the impact of his action will fall considerably short of analogous congressional action. This in turn serves to satisfy selected constituencies without giving them undue power via the presidency.

Executive orders have even served to create presidential commissions to investigate and research problems, and have been instrumental in solving remedial issues. n495 **Commission reports** that result from such orders can in [\*398] turn **put pressure on Congress to** enact legislation to respond to those problems. President Franklin Roosevelt pursued this process when he issued a report of the Committee on Economic Security studying financial insecurity due to "unemployment, old age, disability, and health." n496 This report led to the Social Security Act. n497

### Case – Norms

#### New technology makes drone proliferation by state and non-state actors inevitable

Wood 12 (David, American Drones Ignite New Arms Race From Gaza To Iran To China, Huffington Post, 27 November 2012, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/11/27/american-drones\_n\_2199193.html, da 8-2-13) PC

Obama administration officials have said they are weighing various options to codify the use of armed U.S. drones, because the increased use of drones has been driven more by perceived necessity than by deliberative policy. But that effort is complicated by the wildfire spread of drone technology: how could the U.S. restrict its use of armed drones if others do not?¶ Already, the Pentagon is worried that China not only is engaged in an "alarming" effort to develop and field high-tech drones, but it intends to sell drone technology abroad, according to the Pentagon report.¶ Indeed, the momentum of the drone wars seems irresistible. "The increasing worldwide focus on unmanned systems highlights how U.S. military success has changed global strategic thinking and spurred a race for unmanned aircraft," the Pentagon study reported.¶ Modern drones were first perfected by Israel, but the U.S. Air Force took the first steps in 2001 to mount sophisticated drones with precision weapons. Today the U.S. fields some 8,000 drones and plans to invest $36.9 billion to boost its fleet by 35 percent over the next eight years.¶ Current research on next-generation drones seems certain to exacerbate the drone arms race. The U.S. and other countries are developing "nano" drones, tiny weapons designed to attack in swarms. Both the U.S. and China are working to incorporate "stealth" technology into micro drones. The Pentagon is fielding a new weapon called the Switchblade, a 5.5-pound precision-attack drone that can be carried and fired by one person -- a capability sure to be envied by terrorists.¶ "This is a robotics revolution, but it's not just an American revolution -- everyone's involved, from Hezbollah to paparazzi," Singer, the Brookings Institution expert, told The Huffington Post. "This is a revolution in which billions and trillions of dollars will be made. To stop it you'd have to first stop science, and then business, and then war."

#### Israel is the world’s largest exporter of drones

Allinson 12 Jamie, IR - University of Westminster, Necropolitics of the Cyborg Empire: Re-reading the Ethics of the Drone War, Millennium Annual Conference 2012, ‘Materialism and World Politics’ 10-20

Israel has thus been using drones for the best part of four decades, and remains the world’s largest exporter of drone technology, deployed and honed throughout the occupations of Gaza, South Lebanon and the West Bank . The US Predator drone, developed with the aid of Israeli expertise, was first used for reconnaissance over Bosnia in 1995 and in the NATO bombing campaign against Yugoslavia in 1999 . The drones remained at this point an instrument of surveillance rather than punishment. Drones were designed to provide the information used to launch air-strikes. It was not until the US invasion of Afghanistan in 2011 that the functions of killing and seeing were unified: on the 23rd of November, Mohammed Atef became the first person to be killed by a flying war-robot .

### 2NC No Reverse casual

#### Zero chance of precedent setting – other countries don’t act based on the United States policy

Wright 12 [Robert Wright, finalist for the Pulitzer Prize, former writer and editor at The Atlantic, “The Incoherence of a Drone-Strike Advocate” NOV 14 2012, <http://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2012/11/the-incoherence-of-a-drone-strike-advocate/265256/>]

Naureen Shah of Columbia Law School, a guest on the show, had raised the possibility that America is setting a dangerous precedent with drone strikes. If other people start doing what America does--fire drones into nations that house somebody they want dead--couldn't this come back to haunt us? And haunt the whole world? Shouldn't the U.S. be helping to establish a global norm against this sort of thing? Host Warren Olney asked Boot to respond.¶ Boot started out with this observation:¶ I think the precedent setting argument is overblown, because I don't think other countries act based necessarily on what we do and in fact we've seen lots of Americans be killed by acts of terrorism over the last several decades, none of them by drones but they've certainly been killed with car bombs and other means.¶ That's true--no deaths by terrorist drone strike so far. But I think a fairly undeniable premise of the question was that the arsenal of terrorists and other nations may change as time passes. So answering it by reference to their current arsenal isn't very illuminating. In 1945, if I had raised the possibility that the Soviet Union might one day have nuclear weapons, it wouldn't have made sense for you to dismiss that possibility by noting that none of the Soviet bombs dropped during World War II were nuclear, right?¶ As if he was reading my mind, Boot immediately went on to address the prospect of drone technology spreading. Here's what he said:¶ You know, drones are a pretty high tech instrument to employ and they're going to be outside the reach of most terrorist groups and even most countries. But whether we use them or not, the technology is propagating out there. We're seeing Hezbollah operate Iranian supplied drones over Israel, for example, and our giving up our use of drones is not going to prevent Iran or others from using drones on their own. So I wouldn't worry too much about the so called precedent it sets..."

### Case – Pakistan

#### T/ recruitment outside hostilities

Harman 13 Jane, former U.S. Representative for California's 36th congressional district, head of the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars. The Extrajudicial Use of Drones: The Need for a Post-9/11 Legal Framework, Holt Lecture: The University of Pennsylvania Law School, 4-2

Disparate tactics, with varied consequences, will not win us any friends (we’ve lost quite a few along the way)—and will not ultimately help reduce threats against the United States. In fact, if we continue to operate without a comprehensive legal framework around our actions, we may end up creating more enemies than we’re eliminating. “Why Are They the Enemy?” Consider what Gen. Stanley McChrystal, former commander of the International Security Assistance Force in Afghanistan (ISAF) and the Joint Special Operations Command, recently said about what he learned in Iraq and Afghanistan. In Iraq, he says, the first question he asked was, “Where is the enemy?'” As things evolved, the question became, “Who is the enemy?” Then “What’s the enemy doing or trying to do?'” and, finally, “Why are they the enemy?” This catechism is so revealing, but shouldn’t be surprising: the tactic of taking out bad guys may ultimately create more of them. I was recently on a panel at a security conference in Herzliya, Israel, where a thoughtful academic named Boaz Ganor discussed this so-called “boomerang effect.” The idea is that there is often a contradiction between dismantling the capability of terrorists and removing their motivation. Without a strategy and clear legal framework around our counterterrorism tactics, they can become inadvertent recruitment tools (think Gitmo). Moreover, playing whack-a-mole will not win the argument with the kid in rural Yemen deciding whether or not to strap on a suicide vest. Now that the American public is finally tuning in to the debate and insisting on clear limits on the tactics we use, Congress—the nation’s lawmakers—need to step back in. Change in Terror Threat Today, we face a horizontally organized threat. A confluence of multiple events – from reduction in al Qaeda Senior Leadership, to the rise of al Qaeda affiliates, to the new networks between Al Qaeda and among a range of extremist groups to the US drawdowns in Iraq and Afghanistan to the civil war in Syria – has changed the threat landscape tremendously. This constantly changing state of affairs – where the new “safehaven” is in many places, even hidden behind computer screens – means that the US will probably face an increase in smaller-scale attacks.

#### No public backlash in Pakistan or Yemen---just as many people love them as hate them

Max Boot 13, the Jeane J. Kirkpatrick Senior Fellow in National Security Studies at the Council on Foreign Relations, 2/6/13, “Obama Drone Memo is a Careful, Responsible Document,” http://www.commentarymagazine.com/2013/02/06/obama-drone-memo-is-a-careful-responsible-document/

Drone strikes are by no means risk free, the biggest risk being that by killing innocent civilians they will cause a backlash and thereby create more enemies for the U.S. than they eliminate. There is no doubt that some of these strikes have killed the wrong people–as the New York Times account highlights in one incident in Yemen. There is also little doubt, moreover, that drone strikes are no substitute for a comprehensive counterinsurgency and state-building policy designed to permanently safeguard vulnerable countries such as Pakistan, Yemen, Somalia, Libya, and Mali from the incursions of radical jihadists. But drone strikes have been effective in disrupting al-Qaeda operations and they have been conducted with less collateral damage and more precision than in the past.

It is hard to assess what impact they have had on public opinion in countries such as Yemen and Pakistan, but there is at least as much evidence that these strikes are applauded by locals who are terrorized by al-Qaeda thugs as there is evidence that the strikes are reviled for killing fellow clansmen. As the Times notes: “Although most Yemenis are reluctant to admit it publicly, there does appear to be widespread support for the American drone strikes that hit substantial Qaeda figures like Mr. Shihri, a Saudi and the affiliate’s deputy leader, who died in January of wounds received in a drone strike late last year.”

## 1NR

### HR Add-On

#### No causal analysis demonstrate soft power achieves foreign policy objectives

Goldsmith, Professor Gov University of Sidney, and Horiuchi, Professor Gov Dartmouth College, ’12 (Benjamin and Yusaku, July, “In Search of Soft Power: Does Foreign Public Opinion Matter for US Foreign Policy?” World Politics, Vol 64 No 3, p 555-585, ProjectMuse)

By stressing general factors that show limited variation over time, however, we feel that Nye fails to provide a theory for understanding when soft power affects international outcomes. Indeed, he writes, “[w]hether that attraction in turn produces desired policy outcomes has to be judged in particular cases.”15 But he does not specify how this is to be judged. This leaves the causal mechanisms of soft power, as well as their empirical implications, underspecified. Nor is there any indication of what the relative importance of each currency of soft power is for any given foreign policy outcome desired by the US. An example from Nye’s own writing is indicative: while “American music and films are more popular in Britain, France, and Germany than they were 20 years ago,” he finds that US policies received less support there than they did 20 years prior.16 Is this pattern consistent with the soft power thesis, or does it contradict it? In short, it is not readily apparent how the theory might be tested. We argue that it is the public views about current foreign policy— rather than underlying public affinity—that are directly relevant in shaping international outcomes. For the case of US soft power, foreign decision makers today care about their public’s potential reactions to specific foreign policy choices, such as signing a treaty or going to war, rather than the popularity of Nike goods, admiration for the US Bill of Rights, or opinions about the Vietnam War. Culture, values, institutions, and (past) policies—the four currencies of soft power—are important latent or underlying factors, public perceptions of which play a role in how views about current foreign policy are formed, but on their own are relatively indeterminate, as Nye himself suggests.17

### 2NC OV

#### US economic decline goes global

Mead 4 Walter Russell Mead is the Henry A. Kissinger senior fellow for U.S. foreign policy at the Council on Foreign Relations and one of the country's leading students of American foreign policy. October, 2004; From: America’s Sticky Power http://www.foreignpolicy.com/users/login.php?story\_id=2504&URL=http://www.foreignpolicy.com/story/cms.php?story\_id=2504&page=2

“Similarly, in the last 60 years, as foreigners have acquired a greater value in the United States-government and private bonds, direct and portfolio private investments-more and more of them have acquired an interest in maintaining the strength of the U.S.-led system. A collapse of the U.S. economy and the ruin of the dollar would do more than dent the prosperity of the United States. Without their best customer, countries including China and Japan would fall into depressions. The financial strength of every country would be severely shaken should the United States collapse. Under those circumstances, debt becomes a strength, not a weakness, and other countries fear to break with the United States because they need its market and own its securities. Of course, pressed too far, a large national debt can turn from a source of strength to a crippling liability, and the United States must continue to justify other countries' faith by maintaining its long-term record of meeting its financial obligations. But, like Samson in the temple of the Philistines, a collapsing U.S. economy would inflict enormous, unacceptable damage on the rest of the world.

#### Economic collapse turns Chinese relations and war –

Mead 9(Walter Russell, Henry A. Kissinger Senior Fellow in U.S. Foreign Policy – Council on Foreign Relations, “Only Makes You Stronger”, The New Republic, 2-4, http://www.tnr.com/politics/story.html?id=571cbbb9-2887-4d81-8542-92e83915f5f8&p=2)

The greatest danger both to U.S.-China relations and to American power itself is probably not that China will rise too far, too fast; it is that the current crisis might end China's growth miracle. In the worst-case scenario, the turmoil in the international economy will plunge China into a major economic downturn. The Chinese financial system will implode as loans to both state and private enterprises go bad. Millions or even tens of millions of Chinese will be unemployed in a country without an effective social safety net. The collapse of asset bubbles in the stock and property markets will wipe out the savings of a generation of the Chinese middle class. The political consequences could include dangerous unrest--and a bitter climate of anti-foreign feeling that blames others for China's woes. (Think of Weimar Germany, when both Nazi and communist politicians blamed the West for Germany's economic travails.) Worse, instability could lead to a vicious cycle, as nervous investors moved their money out of the country, further slowing growth and, in turn, fomenting ever-greater bitterness. Thanks to a generation of rapid economic growth, China has so far been able to manage the stresses and conflicts of modernization and change; nobody knows what will happen if the growth stops. India's future is also a question. Support for global integration is a fairly recent development in India, and many serious Indians remain skeptical of it. While India's 60-year-old democratic system has resisted many shocks, a deep economic recession in a country where mass poverty and even hunger are still major concerns could undermine political order, long-term growth, and India's attitude toward the United States and global economic integration. The violent Naxalite insurrection plaguing a significant swath of the country could get worse; religious extremism among both Hindus and Muslims could further polarize Indian politics; and India's economic miracle could be nipped in the bud. If current market turmoil seriously damaged the performance and prospects of India and China, the current crisis could join the Great Depression in the list of economic events that changed history, even if the recessions in the West are relatively short and mild. The United States should stand ready to assist Chinese and Indian financial authorities on an emergency basis--and work very hard to help both countries escape or at least weather any economic downturn. It may test the political will of the Obama administration, but the United States must avoid a protectionist response to the economic slowdown. U.S. moves to limit market access for Chinese and Indian producers could poison relations for years. For billions of people in nuclear-armed countries to emerge from this crisis believing either that the United States was indifferent to their well-being or that it had profited from their distress could damage U.S. foreign policy far more severely than any mistake made by George W. Bush. It's not just the great powers whose trajectories have been affected by the crash. Lesser powers like Saudi Arabia and Iran also face new constraints. The crisis has strengthened the U.S. position in the Middle East as falling oil prices reduce Iranian influence and increase the dependence of the oil sheikdoms on U.S. protection. Success in Iraq--however late, however undeserved, however limited--had already improved the Obama administration's prospects for addressing regional crises. Now, the collapse in oil prices has put the Iranian regime on the defensive. The annual inflation rate rose above 29 percent last September, up from about 17 percent in 2007, according to Iran's Bank Markazi. Economists forecast that Iran's real GDP growth will drop markedly in the coming months as stagnating oil revenues and the continued global economic downturn force the government to rein in its expansionary fiscal policy. All this has weakened Ahmadinejad at home and Iran abroad. Iranian officials must balance the relative merits of support for allies like Hamas, Hezbollah, and Syria against domestic needs, while international sanctions and other diplomatic sticks have been made more painful and Western carrots (like trade opportunities) have become more attractive. Meanwhile, Saudi Arabia and other oil states have become more dependent on the United States for protection against Iran, and they have fewer resources to fund religious extremism as they use diminished oil revenues to support basic domestic spending and development goals. None of this makes the Middle East an easy target for U.S. diplomacy, but thanks in part to the economic crisis, the incoming administration has the chance to try some new ideas and to enter negotiations with Iran (and Syria) from a position of enhanced strength. Every crisis is different, but there seem to be reasons why, over time, financial crises on balance reinforce rather than undermine the world position of the leading capitalist countries. Since capitalism first emerged in early modern Europe, the ability to exploit the advantages of rapid economic development has been a key factor in international competition. Countries that can encourage--or at least allow and sustain--the change, dislocation, upheaval, and pain that capitalism often involves, while providing their tumultuous market societies with appropriate regulatory and legal frameworks, grow swiftly. They produce cutting-edge technologies that translate into military and economic power. They are able to invest in education, making their workforces ever more productive. They typically develop liberal political institutions and cultural norms that value, or at least tolerate, dissent and that allow people of different political and religious viewpoints to collaborate on a vast social project of modernization--and to maintain political stability in the face of accelerating social and economic change. The vast productive capacity of leading capitalist powers gives them the ability to project influence around the world and, to some degree, to remake the world to suit their own interests and preferences. This is what the United Kingdom and the United States have done in past centuries, and what other capitalist powers like France, Germany, and Japan have done to a lesser extent. In these countries, the social forces that support the idea of a competitive market economy within an appropriately liberal legal and political framework are relatively strong. But, in many other countries where capitalism rubs people the wrong way, this is not the case. On either side of the Atlantic, for example, the Latin world is often drawn to anti-capitalist movements and rulers on both the right and the left. Russia, too, has never really taken to capitalism and liberal society--whether during the time of the czars, the commissars, or the post-cold war leaders who so signally failed to build a stable, open system of liberal democratic capitalism even as many former Warsaw Pact nations were making rapid transitions. Partly as a result of these internal cultural pressures, and partly because, in much of the world, capitalism has appeared as an unwelcome interloper, imposed by foreign forces and shaped to fit foreign rather than domestic interests and preferences, many countries are only half-heartedly capitalist. When crisis strikes, they are quick to decide that capitalism is a failure and look for alternatives. So far, such half-hearted experiments not only have failed to work; they have left the societies that have tried them in a progressively worse position, farther behind the front-runners as time goes by. Argentina has lost ground to Chile; Russian development has fallen farther behind that of the Baltic states and Central Europe. Frequently, the crisis has weakened the power of the merchants, industrialists, financiers, and professionals who want to develop a liberal capitalist society integrated into the world. Crisis can also strengthen the hand of religious extremists, populist radicals, or authoritarian traditionalists who are determined to resist liberal capitalist society for a variety of reasons. Meanwhile, the companies and banks based in these societies are often less established and more vulnerable to the consequences of a financial crisis than more established firms in wealthier societies. As a result, developing countries and countries where capitalism has relatively recent and shallow roots tend to suffer greater economic and political damage when crisis strikes--as, inevitably, it does. And, consequently, financial crises often reinforce rather than challenge the global distribution of power and wealth. This may be happening yet again. None of which means that we can just sit back and enjoy the recession. History may suggest that financial crises actually help capitalist great powers maintain their leads--but it has other, less reassuring messages as well. If financial crises have been a normal part of life during the 300-year rise of the liberal capitalist system under the Anglophone powers, so has war. The wars of the League of Augsburg and the Spanish Succession; the Seven Years War; the American Revolution; the Napoleonic Wars; the two World Wars; the cold war: The list of wars is almost as long as the list of financial crises. Bad economic times can breed wars. Europe was a pretty peaceful place in 1928, but the Depression poisoned German public opinion and helped bring Adolf Hitler to power. If the current crisis turns into a depression, what rough beasts might start slouching toward Moscow, Karachi, Beijing, or New Delhi to be born? The United States may not, yet, decline, but, if we can't get the world economy back on track, we may still have to fight.

#### Collapses power projection that would make drone norms enforceable and leads to nuclear war

Harris & Burrows 9 Mathew, PhD European History @ Cambridge, counselor of the U.S. National Intelligence Council (NIC) and Jennifer, member of the NIC’s Long Range Analysis Unit “Revisiting the Future: Geopolitical Effects of the Financial Crisis” http://www.ciaonet.org/journals/twq/v32i2/f\_0016178\_13952.pdf

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

#### Turns the Pakistan advantage –

#### Economic decline collapses Pakistan

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

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

#### Economic crisis turns Indo-Pak war

Kemp 10 Geoffrey Kemp, Director of Regional Strategic Programs at The Nixon Center, served in the White House under Ronald Reagan, special assistant to the president for national security affairs and senior director for Near East and South Asian affairs on the National Security Council Staff, Former Director, Middle East Arms Control Project at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 2010, The East Moves West: India, China, and Asia’s Growing Presence in the Middle East, p. 233-4

The second scenario, called Mayhem and Chaos, is the opposite of the first scenario; everything that can go wrong does go wrong. The world economic situation weakens rather than strengthens, **and** India, China, and Japan suffer a major reduction in their growth rates, further weakening the global economy. As a result, energy demand falls and the price of fossil fuels plummets, leading to a financial crisis for the energy-producing states, which are forced to cut back dramatically on expansion programs and social welfare. That in turn leads to political unrest: and nurtures different radical groups, including, but not limited to, Islamic extremists. The internal stability of some countries is challenged, and there are more “failed states.” Most serious is the collapse of the democratic government in Pakistan and its takeover by Muslim extremists, who then take possession of a large number of nuclear weapons. The danger of war between India and Pakistan increases significantly. Iran, always worried about an extremist Pakistan, expands and weaponizes its nuclear program. That further enhances nuclear proliferation in the Middle East, with Saudi Arabia, Turkey, and Egypt joining Israel and Iran as nuclear states. Under these circumstances, the potential for nuclear terrorism increases, and the possibility of a nuclear terrorist attack in either the Western world or in the oil-producing states may lead to a further devastating collapse of the world economic market, with a tsunami-like impact on stability. In this scenario, major disruptions can be expected, with dire consequences for two-thirds of the planet’s population.

### LINK

#### Obama will attempt to block any judicial limitations.

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

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

#### Court action causes Congress to backlash against Obama

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

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

#### Oversight sparks turf wars – Obama calls to rewrite the laws

Berger 8/12/13 (Judson, Fox, “Yemen drone strikes may revive war-powers battle between administration, Congress”, <http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2013/08/12/yemen-drone-strikes-could-revive-war-powers-battle-between-administration/>)

The escalation of drone strikes in Yemen, presumably in response to the ongoing Al Qaeda threat, and other technology-based military options could fuel calls to re-write laws that govern such actions to give Congress greater oversight over the administration's remote-controlled warfare. "Some of these campaigns by the administration clearly constitute an act of war," said Jonathan Turley, an attorney and professor at George Washington University Law School. To date, the administration has claimed broad latitude in its authority to launch limited military operations -- including drone strikes -- without congressional authorization. There's no indication this time will be any different. A total of nine suspected drone strikes reportedly have been recorded in Yemen since late July, taking out dozens of alleged Al Qaeda operatives and other militants. The most recent strike was on Saturday. The Washington Post reported last week that the strikes were authorized by the Obama administration in connection with the ongoing terror threat. If challenged on the strikes, the president is likely to argue that the operation is contained and does not require congressional authorization. He has in the past. This debate flared during the 2011 operation in Libya, when the administration launched a series of air and drone strikes in support of the campaign against Muammar Qaddafi.

#### The executive will fight a drone court

Ruppert 13 Madison, Editor of End the Lie, Support and opposition arises for FISA-style secret court to oversee drone assassinations, 2-9, http://EndtheLie.com/2013/02/09/support-and-opposition-arises-for-fisa-style-secret-court-to-oversee-drone-assassinations/#ixzz2TyHUp5Cv

While the Obama administration claimed they were going to release the contested legal memos to intelligence committees outlining the justification for the so-called targeted killing program carried out by drones in Yemen (via a base in Saudi Arabia) and elsewhere, these memos have not been released for scrutiny in the court system. The response to what the New York Times calls “the hidden bureaucracy directing lethal drone strikes” appears to be even more hidden bureaucracy in the style of the secret Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court (FISC), built upon the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA). While it is claimed that having a court approve the adding of names to a kill list, at least for American citizens, “is no longer beyond the realm of political possibility,” according to Robert Chesney, a law professor at the University of Texas, this proposal is still problematic. The idea has been promoted by legislators like Senator Dianne Feinstein, according to the Washington Post, and yet it faces significant obstacles like the “almost-certain opposition from the executive branch to a dilution of the president’s authority to protect the country against looming threats.” Other obstacles “include the difficulty of putting judges in a position to approve the killing of individuals — possibly including American citizens — even if they have not been convicted of a crime,” according to the Post.

### 2NC U WALL

Shutdown opened up a window – but it’s narrow – Obama push is key.

Mason, 10/20 (Analysis: Despite budget win, Obama has weak hand with Congress. Reuters. Web, Acc 10/20/13) http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/10/20/us-usa-fiscal-obama-shutdown-analysis-idUSBRE99J01120131020

Democrats believe, however, that Obama's bargaining hand may be strengthened by the thrashing Republicans took in opinion polls over their handling of the shutdown.¶ "This shutdown re-emphasized the overwhelming public demand for compromise and negotiation. And that may open up a window," said Ben LaBolt, Obama's 2012 campaign spokesman and a former White House aide.¶ "There's no doubt that some Republican members (of Congress) are going to oppose policies just because the president's for it. But the hand of those members was significantly weakened."¶ If he does have an upper hand, Obama is likely to apply it to immigration reform. The White House had hoped to have a bill concluded by the end of the summer. A Senate version passed with bipartisan support earlier this year but has languished in the Republican-controlled House.¶ "It will be hard to move anything forward, unless the Republicans find the political pain of obstructionism too much to bear," said Doug Hattaway, a Democratic strategist and an adviser to Hillary Clinton's 2008 presidential campaign.¶ "That may be the case with immigration - they'll face pressure from business and Latinos to advance immigration reform," he said.

#### Bipartisan support for CIR– Republicans want to improve their rep

NYT 10/18 (http://www.nytimes.com/2013/10/19/us/politics/democrats-aim-to-restore-immigration-to-agenda.html?\_r=0)

As the fiscal crisis subsided and the government went back to work this week, President Obama and other leading Democrats were quick to say that an immigration overhaul should be back on the agenda in Congress.¶ Related¶ Charles M. Blow: The President’s Pivot (October 19, 2013)¶ Mr. Obama raised the issue in his first comments after lawmakers reached a deal to reopen the government, and on the night the shutdown ended the three top Senate Democrats said they hoped to extend the bipartisan moment that produced the compromise by taking up immigration.¶ “Let’s move on,” said the Senate majority leader, Harry Reid of Nevada. He added that he hoped “the next venture is making sure we do immigration reform.”¶ But the possibilities for progress on the issue will be determined in the House of Representatives, where many conservative Republicans are fuming with frustration over their meager gains from the two-week shutdown and turning their ire against Mr. Obama, saying he failed to negotiate with them. It will be up to Speaker John A. Boehner of Ohio to discern whether relations with the White House are simply too raw for House Republicans to consider legislation on an issue the president has made a priority.¶ Many Democrats and some Republicans are arguing that passing a broad immigration bill could be a way for Republicans to come back from the bruising they took in the polls during the shutdown. “When the Republican polling numbers are at 20 percent, there’s a pretty strong argument to do something to get those poll numbers up, and immigration is a good way to do that,” said Senator Charles E. Schumer, Democrat of New York.¶ The effort to repair the immigration system has attracted support across the political spectrum, including from traditional Republican allies like business, agriculture and evangelical Christians. The Senate passed a sweeping bill in June on a bipartisan vote. But lawmakers on both sides agreed that the window for action on immigration is narrow, most likely limited to the remaining months of this year, before the next fiscal deadlines, or maybe to early next spring.¶ Mr. Boehner would like to make progress this year on immigration, a spokesman said Friday. “The speaker remains committed to a step-by-step process to fix our broken immigration system,” said the spokesman, Michael Steel.

#### Obama pushing CIR now– will pass but now is key

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

Obama, however, last week signaled that he is not surrendering on one of the issues he ran on when he was first elected president in 2008.¶ In an interview with Univision's Los Angeles affiliate, Obama indicated he will press forward on immigration reform immediately after the dust settles from the fiscal fight and demand that House Speaker John Boehner, R-Ohio, and other Republican leaders allow a vote on a Senate-passed comprehensive bill.¶ "And if I have to join with other advocates and continue to speak out on that, and keep pushing, I'm going to do so because I think it's really important for the country," Obama said. "And now is the time to do it."¶ Reform supporters have remained optimistic that the GOP-controlled House of Representatives will consider several immigration-related bills in November. Their hope is that the House will pass legislation that could lead to negotiations with the Democrat-controlled Senate. On June 27, the upper chamber passed a comprehensive bill that includes a massive investment in border security and a pathway to citizenship for many of the estimated 11 million undocumented immigrants who have settled in the United States. Most observers believe, as a practical matter, lawmakers have at most a few months to act on immigration reform before Congress is paralyzed by 2014 midterm election politics.

#### GOP caucus in disarray – there are enough votes in house to secure passage

Martosko 10/16

DAVID MARTOSKO, U.S. POLITICAL EDITOR, Daily Mail

http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2463149/Senate-passes-debt-fix-Cruz-goes-swinging-McConnell-carves-2-billion-pet-project.html

Rep. Devin Nunes, a California Republican, said Wednesday that 'all of the Democrats and a big chunk of the Republicans' would vote to support the Reid–McConnell bill. Nunes has been critical of GOP advocates who pushed for a government shutdown in late September, calling them 'lemmings with suicide vests.'¶ A senior House Republican aide told MailOnline that while the GOP caucus is in disarray, more than enough Republicans will support the Senate-crafted bill to assure its passage in the House.¶ 'Frankly, we're all just tired of this problem and everyone – well, almost everyone – is ready to move on,' the House staffer said.¶ That comment was a dig at tea party-affiliated Republicans who have held up the process and given the White House endless opportunities to bash the GOP.

#### Will pass – Obama will reverse on cooperation post – debt ceiling

Miller 10/17

Zeke Miller is a political reporter for TIME. He previously was the first White House correspondent at BuzzFeed and extensively covered the 2012 presidential campaign. Prior to that, he covered politics for Business Insider. A New York native, he graduated from Yale University where he was an editor and reporter at the Yale Daily News. http://swampland.time.com/2013/10/17/obama-pivots-to-reclaim-reputation-as-negotiator-in-chief/#ixzz2i1KQMgQBhttp://swampland.time.com/2013/10/17/obama-pivots-to-reclaim-reputation-as-negotiator-in-chief/

President Barack Obama has a new message for congressional Republicans today: let’s talk.¶ “I will look for willing partners wherever I can to get important work done,” the president said Thursday morning, announcing he intends to work with Congress to pass an annual budget, comprehensive immigration reform, and a farm bill.¶ Fresh off his victory over House Republicans in twin fiscal crises, the president is preparing an about-face after weeks of swearing off any negotiations with the GOP to fund the government and raise the debt limit. Not only that, but he is also setting the stage to criticize the opposition if they decline to put everything on the table.¶ It’s the completion of a months-long White House strategy on the debt limit that whittled away at the president’s preferred public image as moderate dealmaker. After getting rolled in 2011, Obama swore to his staff that he wouldn’t again get held hostage over the debt limit. Earlier this year, Obama laid down that no-negotiation promise in a statement on the New Year’s fiscal cliff deal, and he stood by it. There were no serious talks. No secret back-channel negotiations. No Joe Biden. Aides on both sides of Pennsylvania Ave. described meetings with congressional leaders last week as more to please the media than a reflection of any attempt to make progress.¶ Aides admit they were wary of the impact of Obama’s hardline position during the shutdown, especially as Republicans passed piecemeal bills to reopen slices of the federal government last week. Business leaders called on the president to throw Republicans a lifeline. Senate Democrats instinctively rushed to cut rogue deals. They fretted the rebuke from the “David Gergen caucus” of beltway pundits. But more than anything, it posed a danger to the Obama brand. He ran for office in 2008 insisting that he was open to negotiating with Iran without preconditions. He had pledged to change the way business is done in Washington and bridge the partisan divides.¶ As the afterglow of an end to the shutdown quickly faded, Obama turned his focus to the next crisis in a morning address at the White House, taking a swing at the tea party and extending an olive branch to moderate Republicans.

#### Reform has momentum but House must act soon – GOP needs acome back

Aguilar 10/17

Julián Aguilar, Texas Tribune, “After Shutdown, Immigration Reform Push Picks Up” October 17, 2013 http://www.texastribune.org/2013/10/17/advocates-immigration-reform-continue-push/

With the federal government fully operational and the debt ceiling debate on hold until next year, proponents of immigration reform resumed their campaign blitz and called on leaders to address the issue before the year ends.¶ The push came after President Obama on Thursday reasserted his belief that Congress can tackle immigration reform after taking on the budget.¶ “There's already a broad coalition across America that’s behind this effort of comprehensive immigration reform — from business leaders to faith leaders to law enforcement,” Obama said, according to an emailed transcript of the president’s remarks. ¶ The House calendar indicates Congress must act quickly to make immigration reform happen this year. There are fewer than 25 working days left on the regular calendar, according to the agenda posted on the website for House Majority Leader Eric Cantor of Virginia. House Republicans have yet to indicate whether they expect to take up immigration reform before the end of the year.¶ The president reiterated that the Senate has already passed a measure that would beef up border security and “modernize our legal immigration system; make sure everyone plays by the same rules, makes sure that folks who came here illegally have to pay a fine, pay back taxes, meet their responsibilities.”¶ He added that if that bill became law, the country would see a 5 percent climb in the economy over 20 years.¶ Advocates said the issue could provide the stage for a comeback for the GOP, whose image took a hit after the 16-day standoff that furloughed thousands of federal employees and shut down various nonessential services.

#### Immigration reform is TOA and will pass – GOP vulnerable, advocates mobilized, and Obama aggressively pushing

Salamanca 10/16

Jean-Paul Salamanca Latino Post “Immigration Reform 2013 News: President Obama Looks to Push for Vote on Immigration Bill Post-Fiscal Crisis”Oct 16, 2013 http://www.latinospost.com/articles/29856/20131016/immigration-reform-2013-news-president-obama-looks-push-vote-bill.htm

Even with the nation still gripped in a fiscal crisis with Congress still arguing over the debt ceiling, President Obama told the nation Tuesday that he would push for a vote on immigration reform.¶ In a sit-down interview with Spanish-language network Univision, President Obama said that the stalled issue of immigration reform, which currently remains frozen in the Republican-controlled U.S. House of Representatives, would become a top priority for him once Congress can agree on a deal regarding the debt limit.¶ "Once that's done, you know, the day after, I'm going to be pushing to say, call a vote on immigration reform," he told Univision, as noted by Reuters.¶ As the current political climate indicates, President Obama faces an intimidating battle to successfully pass immigration reform. While the issue gathered support from Democrats and even several top Republicans--the GOP looking to rebound after suffering stinging defeats at the polls in the November 2013 presidential election--the bill has encountered resistance as it passed to the House.¶ The Democrat-controlled Senate passed a bill in June from the bipartisan "Gang of Eight" Senate panel that would have created a pathway to citizenship for millions of undocumented immigrants living in the U.S. However, Republicans in the House, some of which are denouncing the bill as offering "amnesty" to immigrants who came into the country without authorization, have stalled the bill on the floor, refusing to put it to a vote.¶ President Obama laid the blame at the feet of House Speaker John Boehner for the bill's delay.¶ "We had a very strong Democratic and Republican vote in the Senate," he said. "The only thing right now that's holding it back is, again, Speaker Boehner not willing to call the bill on the floor of the House of Representatives."¶ Boehner has indicated that the House would not consider a dramatic immigration overhaul, and would pass immigration issues in smaller bills, including tighter border security measures. Immigration advocates, however, have opposed such a measure, as it means there would be little chance of legally giving undocumented immigrants a chance to become U.S. citizens via a "pathway," such as the one offered in the Senate proposal, which includes a decade-plus long waiting period along with the payment of back taxes and fines for time said immigrants have lived in the country unauthorized.¶ Several late year issues -- the crisis in Syria and now, the debt limit debacle -- have occupied much of Washington legislators' time. However, it appears the White House and Democrats on Capitol Hill may be ready to head back into the battle for immigration reform after the fiscal crisis is over.¶ Frank Sharry, executive director of the immigration reform group America's Voice, told Buzzfeed that with the GOP's public opinion numbers plummeting, it is possible that the Republicans could be open to discussing immigration reform more easily if Congress can work together to solve the fiscal crisis.¶ "It's at least possible with sinking poll numbers for the Republicans, with a [GOP] brand that is badly damaged as the party that can't govern responsibly and is reckless that they're going to say, 'Alright, what can we do that will be in our political interest and also do tough things?'" said Sharry. "That's where immigration could fill the bill."¶ A recent poll from the Public Religion Research Institute indicated that Hispanics in the U.S. are three times more likely to identify with Democrats than they would Republicans, with 50 percent of Latinos identifying with Democrats while only 15 percent of those Hispanics polled identify with the GOP.¶ Meanwhile, advocates for immigration reform appear to be gearing up for another fight on that front.¶ "We're talking about it. We want to be next up and we're going to position ourselves that way," Sharry said. "There are different people doing different things, and our movement will be increasingly confrontational with Republicans, including civil disobedience. A lot of people are going to say, 'we're not going to wait.'"

### PC is key and good

#### Obama has to Court Republicans

McMorris-Santoro 10/16

Evan McMorris-Santoro, BuzzFeed White House Reporter, “DREAMers Put Obama On Notice: New Immigration Push Better Not Be A Play For 2014 Votes”

http://www.buzzfeed.com/evanmcsan/dreamers-put-obama-on-notice-new-immigration-push-better-not

WASHINGTON — The children of undocumented immigrants, known in the capital as the DREAMers, warned President Obama Wednesday not to toy with them to score political points as he shifts the White House’s focus back to immigration following the end of the fiscal battle.¶ Cesar Vargas, executive director of the DREAM Action Coalition — a group known for high-profile actions featuring children of undocumented immigrants raised for most of their lives in the United States — said Wednesday he’s cautiously optimistic that House Republicans could be persuaded to take up immigration reform after seeing their poll numbers collapse through the government shutdown. But as Democrats and the White House geared up to take advantage of the situation, Vargas penned an open letter to Obama calling on him to focus on getting something done when it comes to immigration reform instead of spouting rhetoric designed to help his party’s chances in 2014.¶ “Dreamers and the American people, however, especially Latino voters, have heard the same empty words and broken promises before from candidate Barack Obama and President Obama,” he wrote. Even during the shutdown, Vargas wrote, immigration agents have been working, “bringing [Obama’s] Administration closer to the 2 million deportations milestone.”¶ “We will not be fooled by your rhetoric again,” Vargas wrote. If Obama wants to talk about immigration reform, Vargas said in an interview, he needs to get serious about working across the aisle, even if that means upsetting leaders of his own party. He called on the president to “make phone calls to the Speaker and Republican leadership on immigration” and “not follow” what Vargas sees as a Democratic House “strategy to just make immigration a partisan issue to win more seats the next election.”¶ Comprehensive immigration reform is an intensely personal issue for the DREAMers, and their plight has tugged at the nation’s heartstrings, leading to strong support in polling for legislation providing a pathway to citizenship for them. In perhaps the best example of how difficult it is to move immigration legislation through the House Republican caucus, the House GOP voted in June to end an Obama administration policy that seeks to limit the deportation of DREAM Act-eligible immigrants.¶ Nevertheless, many Republicans have expressed interest in DREAM Act-like legislation and Vargas said that if Obama wants to get serious on immigration reform in the coming weeks he’ll reach out to them as much as possible.

#### CIR will pass --- Obama needs to prevent extremist from tubing chances

McMorris-Santoro 10/16

Evan McMorris-Santoro, BuzzFeed White House Reporter, “DREAMers Put Obama On Notice: New Immigration Push Better Not Be A Play For 2014 Votes”

http://www.buzzfeed.com/evanmcsan/dreamers-put-obama-on-notice-new-immigration-push-better-not

Vargas actually shares the view of many immigration advocates and Democrats that the shutdown and it’s dramatic effect on the GOP’s standing could be a boon to immigration reform’s chances.¶ “Right now the Republican leadership looks very weak, and the fact that they want to be able to take initiative and actually look stronger, I think immigration is an opportunity [to do that]. It’s going to gain momentum not only by the Republican leadership’s stance, but by the fact that Senate Republicans and Democrats worked together to put something together,” he said. “What we know is that there are people on both sides of the aisle who really want to get it done, and the only thing that’s going to kill is the politics that Democratic leaders and Republicans extremists are going to play with.”¶ Vargas’ group is doing its best to spark bipartisan conversations on immigration reform. Next week, the DREAM Action Coalition is hosting an event in Washington featuring members of Congress on both sides of the aisle calling for DREAM legislation.¶ Now Obama needs to prove he’s out to do whatever it takes to get immigration reform accomplished, Vargas said.

#### PC key to passage

NBC Latino 10/16

Suzanne Gamboa “Conflicting views on approaching 2 million deportations” 10/16/2013

http://nbclatino.com/2013/10/16/conflicting-views-on-approaching-2-million-deportations/

The Obama administration is approaching two million deportations, a milestone that immigration advocates decry and enforcement hawks dismiss as a failing of the president’s immigration policies.¶ Exactly when the number will be reached is unknown, possibly by year’s end or more likely early in 2014.¶ But it’s close enough for immigration activists to invoke the number as they clamor for Congress to move on immigration reform legislation and press President Barack Obama to suspend deportations.¶ Enforcement hawks see the number as a statistics gimmick spun by the administration to appear it has been tougher on immigration enforcement than it actually has.¶ Immigration activists have been organizing around the coming two millionth deportation, having met in Phoenix last weekend for what they dubbed the “#Not1MoreDeportation” conference.¶ They’ve chained themselves to buses loaded with immigrants headed to deportation hearings, to fencing outside an Arizona immigration center and along the White House perimeter. They plan more protests.¶ It is not enough that Obama has championed immigration reform and in his second term, has put some political capital behind moving immigration legislation through Congress, said B. Loewe, a spokesman for the National Day Laborer Organizing Network, a group that has organized deportation protest activities.

## 2NR

### UQ – A2 Hastert

#### Boehner will violate Hastert if overwhelming support from House Dems coupled with some GOP

Gomez 10/17

Alan Gomez, USA TODAY, “Shutdown over, Democrats say immigration is next”

http://www.usatoday.com/story/news/politics/2013/10/17/government-shutdown-shift-immigration-reform/3000575/

Rep. Xavier Becerra, R-Calif., chairman of the House Democratic Caucus, looks to more recent examples for hope. He said Boehner has violated the so-called 'Hastert Rule' — requiring support from a majority of the majority party in the House before a bill can come to the floor — on several votes that were critical, including emergency relief for victims of Superstorm Sandy.¶ Becerra sees a similar situation developing on immigration, where the vast majority of Democrats and a small number of Republicans could pass a bill through the House.

#### Boehner will break Hastert rule – business interests election strategy

Fabian 10/16

Jordan Fabian, Political Analyst ABC, http://abcnews.go.com/ABC\_Univision/house-handle-immigration-reform-analysis/story?id=20587483&singlePage=true

Pro-immigration advocates have pointed out that Boehner has broken the Hastert Rule on at least three key votes this year. They argue that the Speaker may do it again, especially to pass a proposal that’s backed by business interests and party strategists who believe it’s necessary to start winning back Latino voters. Boehner may even violate it to end the current fiscal crisis.