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**Restrictions are prohibitions on action**

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

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

**Voting issue**

**Limits – they blow the lid off the topic – it’s a whole topic of its own**

**Ground – they jack links to core DAs like deference and credibility – makes being neg impossible**
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**The President of the United States should issue an executive order transferring lead executive authority for non-battlefield targeted killing from the Central Intelligence Agency to the Joint Special Operations Command.**

**Transferring authority boosts transparency and intel without restricting strikes – solves the aff**

**Zenko 13**¸ Micah, Douglas Dillon fellow with the Center for Preventive Action at the Council on Foreign Relations, “Clip the Agency's Wings: Why Obama needs to take the drones away from the CIA,” April 16th, http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2013/04/16/clip\_the\_agencys\_wings\_cia\_drones?utm\_source=feedly

Last month, Daniel Klaidman reported that three senior officials had told him that President Obama would gradually transfer targeted killings to the Pentagon during his second term. Other journalists report that this is not a certainty or that "it would most likely leave drone operations in Pakistan under the CIA," making any transition meaningless since over 80 percent of all U.S. targeted killings have occurred in Pakistan. But if Obama is serious about reforming targeted killing policies, as he has stated, then he needs to **sign an executive order transferring lead executive authority for non-battlefield targeted killings from the CIA to the Defense Department**. Doing this has three significant benefits for U.S. foreign policy. First, it would increase the transparency of targeted killings, including what methods are used to prevent civilian harm. Strikes by the CIA are classified as Title 50 "covert action," which under law are "activities of the United States Government...where it is intended that the role of the United States Government will not be apparent or acknowledged publicly, but does not include traditional...military activities." CIA operations purportedly allow for deniability about the U.S. role, though this rationale no longer applies to the highly-publicized drone campaign in Pakistan, which Obama personally acknowledged in January 2012. Beyond adjectives in public speeches ("methodical," "deliberate," "not willy-nilly"), the government does not, and cannot, describe the procedures and rules for CIA targeted killings. JSOC operations in Somalia and Yemen, on the other hand, fall under the Title 10 "armed forces" section of U.S. law, which the White House reports as "direct action" to Congress. The United States has also acknowledged clandestine military operations to the United Nations "against al-Qaida terrorist targets in Somalia in response to on-going threats to the United States." Moreover, JSOC operations are guided by military doctrine, available to the public in Joint Publication 3-60 (JP 3-60): Joint Targeting. (While the complete 2007 edition can be found online, only the executive summary of the most-recent version, released on January 31, is available. If the Joint Staff's J-7 Directorate for Joint Force Development posted this updated edition in its entirety -- or fulfilled my FOIA request [case number 13-F-0514] -- that would be appreciated.) JP 3-60 matters because it details each step in the targeting cycle, including the fundamentals, processes, responsibilities, legal considerations, and methods to reduce civilian casualties. This degree of transparency is impossible for CIA covert actions. Second, it would focus the finite resources and bandwidth of the CIA on its primary responsibilities of intelligence collection, analysis, and early warning. Last year, the President's Intelligence Advisory Board -- a semi-independent executive branch body, the findings of which rarely leak -- reportedly told Obama that "U.S. spy agencies were paying inadequate attention to China, the Middle East and other national security flash points because they had become too focused on military operations and drone strikes." This is not a new charge, since every few years an independent group or congressional report determines that "the CIA has been ignoring its core mission activities." But, as Mark Mazzetti shows in his indispensable CIA history, the agency has evolved from an organization once deeply divided at senior levels about using armed drones, to one that is a fully functioning paramilitary army. As former senior CIA official Ross Newland warns, the agency's armed drones program "ends up hurting the CIA. This just is not an intelligence mission." There is no longer any justification for the CIA to have its own redundant fleet of 30 to 35 armed drones. During White House debates of CIA requests in 2009, Gen. James Cartwright, the vice chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, repeatedly asked: "Can you tell me why we are building a second Air Force?" Obama eventually granted every single request made by then-Director of Central Intelligence Leon Panetta, adding: "The CIA gets what it wants." With this year's proposed National Intelligence Program budget scheduled to fall by 8 percent, an open checkbook for Langley is not sustainable or strategically wise.
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The affs restriction backfires – it normalizes and sanitizes paranoid imperial violence

Cooper, 11 -- University of Bradford International Relations and Security Studies Senior Lecturer [Neil, PhD from University of Kent at Canterbury, University of Bradford Associate Dean for Research for the School of Social and International Studies, "Humanitarian Arms Control and Processes of Securitization: Moving Weapons along the Security Continuum," Contemporary Security Policy, Vol 32, Issue 1, 2011, tandfonline, accessed 9-5-13, mss]

In this account of contemporary HAC, powerful actors who aim to uphold the status quo principally have a role as agents of resistance to control agendas, not as actors in the production of control regimes. This certainly reﬂects important aspects of contemporary campaigns to regulate pariah weapons but, as I suggest below, it offers a rather incomplete account. Moreover, if such accounts did indeed provide a complete understanding of the dynamics underpinning these control agendas it would certainly represent a novel development, not least because the long history of pariah weapons regulation illustrates the way that weapons taboos frequently reﬂect the interests of the powerful. For example, one factor in the virtual eradication of the gun in 17th and 18th century Japan was that it represented a threat to the warrior class when in the hands of the lower classes.48 The same was true of the rather less successful attempt of the Second Lateran Council to ban the crossbow – a ban partly motivated by the fact that crossbows could pierce the armour of the knight – and a ban that was notably not extended to use against non-Christians.49Similarly, whilst the restrictions on the slave, arms, and liquor trade to Africa embodied in the 1890 Brussels Act were certainly grounded in an ethical discourse, the restrictions imposed on the trade in ﬁrearms were primarily rooted in concerns about the impact of the trade on colonial order. As one British colonial ofﬁcial noted at the time, the restrictions on the small arms trade to Africa reﬂected imperial concern to ‘avoid the development and paciﬁcation of this great continent ... [being] carried out in the face of an enormous population, the majority of whom will probably be armed with ﬁrst-class breechloading riﬂes’.50 The history of pariah weapons regulation would therefore appear to demonstrate a persistent link between the material and political interests of states and / or powerful elites and the emergence of pariah weapons regulation. To be sure, the material and political interests of the same, or other, powerful actors also provide countervailing pressures – the immediate interests of nobles in winnings wars with crossbows mostly won out over their broader class interests,51 whilst colonial competition to secure arms proﬁts and local allies mitigated the impact of the various restrictions on the ﬁrearms trade in the late 19th century.52 But the point is that whilst the genesis of earlier attempts at pariah regulation may, in part, be explained by reference to particular securitizing moments of intervention, the impact of such interventions can only be understood by locating them in particular political economies of power. What is surprising therefore about accounts of post-Cold War humanitarian arms control is that this long history has largely failed to prompt consideration of the way in which contemporary regulation might also reﬂect the interests of powerful states and other actors, albeit in ways that are subject to similar countervailing pressures – an issue that will be taken up below. Pariah Weapons, Heroic Weapons, and Legitimized Military Technology A further recurring theme in the history of pariah regulation is the way in which **restrictions on pariah weapons are** often **related** in some way **to the construction of a** broad arena **of legitimized military tech**nology**.** A particularly extreme example of this is the way in which pariah weapons are sometimes constructed as the antithesis of the ‘heroic weapon’ – a weapon deemed to embody positive values such as honour and / or which is deemed central to national defence. Thus, the series of relatively successful Acts implemented in England between 1508 and 1542 banning crossbows were largely rooted in a concern to preserve the use of the heroic longbow, deemed central to a long line of English military successes.53 The Japanese ban on the gun was similarly connected to the romanticization of the heroic samurai sword as the visible form of one’s honour, as associated with grace of movement in battle and even its status as a work of art.54 In effect both the crossbow in 16th century England and the gun in 17th and 18th century Japan became the ‘other’ which deﬁned legitimized military technologies and militarism. Redford makes much the same point about English attitudes to the submarine, which was constructed as an ‘other’ partly because of the British romanticization of the battleship (‘the upper class or aristocracy of warships’)55 as central to British security and linked to British notions of valour and honour in the conduct of war. This highlights the ways in which the security meaning associated with particular sets of weapons technology are not just a function of the framings speciﬁc to that technology but are also relational, with the representation of one weapon playing an important role in constituting the meaning of another (albeit in sometimes unexpected ways), and vice versa. Not surprisingly perhaps, similar themes also help explain the contemporary taboos constructed around particular sets of military technology such as cluster munitions. Cluster Munitions What is particularly striking about the campaign against cluster munitions is not its success in banning an inhumane weapon but the fact that this success was achieved at a moment in history when, in absolute terms at least, cluster munitions use had fallen from the peak years of use during the Vietnam era (see Table 2). In the latter period cluster bombs such as the CBU-24 represented a ‘major increase in battleﬁeld lethality’ yet its development and deployment was ‘accomplished with no public debate and relatively little subsequent protest’.56 Indeed, for the American military, ‘CBUs were categorised as a standard weapon, to be taken off the shelf – “conventional ironmongery”.57 This is not to suggest that American use of cluster munitions in this period went unremarked. There were certainly some critics at the time who argued that such weapons were inhumane.58 There were also attempts, sponsored by the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) and Sweden in particular, to promote restrictions on cluster munitions in negotiations in the 1970s on the Additional Protocols to the 1949 Geneva Conventions.59 The point is however, that these efforts never achieved traction either with diplomats or with a wider public in the way that the issue would 30 years later. The labels attached to cluster munitions and also landmines only changed dramatically as the move into the post-Cold War era occurred when they moved from being treated as unproblematic elements in global military arsenals to a form of ‘technology non grata’ – weaponry deemed immoral, inhumane, and indiscriminate. Crucially, such a successful process of stigmatization was only made feasible in the context of a post-Cold War widening of the security label to incorporate the notion of human security as a referent object; by the turn to casting security interventions in humanitarian terms; and the representation of modern weaponry as humane because of its perceived capacity to better discriminate between civilians and combatants. The widening and deepening of the security label created the permissive environment necessary for activists to reframe cluster munitions (and APMs) as threats to the human. At the same time, the discussion of intervention in humanitarian terms60 and of precision weapons as instruments of humane warfare61 created a legitimized discursive space into which campaigners could insert a re-representation of landmines and cluster munitions technology as inhumane. Indeed, such a re-representation only exerted a powerful appeal because it was consonant with both the predominant framing of security threats in a postCold War world and a new divide between good and odious military technology. This is not to suggest that such developments reﬂected some teleology in which security and arms control practice progressively evolved to be more humane. As Krause and Latham have noted, for example, whilst the post-Cold War era concern with the impact of ‘inhumane weapons’ represents a notable shift compared with the Cold War arms control agenda, it does have similarities with the late 19th century when a Western discourse of civilized warfare was also prominent. One corollary of this – then as now – was a concern to specify what constituted an ‘inhumane weapon’62 manifest, for example, in the negotiations in the Hague conferences over problem technologies such as the dum dum bullet. As Michael Howard has suggested though, whilst initiatives such as the Hague conferences achieved notable successes, they also reﬂected the fact that liberal internationalists had ‘abandoned their original objects of preventing war and building peace in favour of making war more humane for those actually ﬁghting it’.63 The prohibitions on cluster munitions and also APMs can be understood as similarly ambiguous developments. On the one hand, the legitimizing discourse of Western militaries and arms ﬁrms was turned against them in order to generate powerful taboos against particular categories of weapons – even in the face of opposition from these militaries. The language of state security was coopted to promote human security, to preserve life, and prevent threats to its existence. On the other hand, the same prohibitions can ultimately be understood less as progressive initiatives imposed on foot-dragging states by the bottom-up power of global civil society and more as performative acts that simultaneously function to codify aspects of a new set of criteria for judging international respectability in a post-Cold War era, to reinforce the security framings of the era and to legitimize those categories of weapons successfully constructed as precise, discriminate, and thus humane. Indeed, **to the extent** that states such as **the U**nited **S**tates have been able to **circumscribe their commitments** on landmines etc. **they** have been able to **beneﬁt** **from the** broader legitimizing effects **of** speciﬁc **weapons taboos** without being unduly constrained **by** the **speciﬁc regulatory requirements** they have given rise to. Moreover, as already noted, the presence of pariah weapons regulation is not necessarily a sign of a more general shift to the tighter regulation of the arms trade – quite the reverse in some cases. Thus, any evaluation of the overall impact of such regulation on global and local security also has to take into account the broader system of arms regulation in which it is located, and the relationship that exists between pariah regulation and this broader system. The next two sections will offer some observations on these issues. Models of Economy and Models of Arms Trade Regulation The approach adopted to the regulation of the arms trade in general does not only reﬂect the security labels attached to particular kinds of technology or the direct interests powerful actors may have in constraining such technology. Regulatory approaches to the arms trade are also a function of the particular paradigms of political economy that dominate in speciﬁc era. In part this is because they link into particular understandings of what constitutes economic security. But the link between regulation and the paradigms of political economy go beyond this, reﬂecting a much more fundamental common sense about economy and trade. For example, the rise of mercantilism from about the 1600s meant the previous dominance of private arms traders was replaced by that of government arsenals64 and the emphasis on autarky encouraged a more restrictive approach to the regulation of arms transfers.65 In England for example, Queen Elizabeth I issued an order in 1574 restricting the number of guns to be cast in England to those ‘for the only use of the Realm’66 and further Ordnances restricting the export of arms were passed in 1610 and 1614.67 In contrast, the shift in economic ideology from mercantilism to capitalism led to the more laissez-faire approach to the regulation of arms transfers in the late 19th century already described above. Britain moved to a more laissez-faire basis from 1862 onwards, France passed legislation in 1885 reinstituting the private manufacture of arms and also repealed the law prohibiting exports.68 Indeed, this was an era in which the Prussian government did not even feel able to compel Krupp to abjure exports to Austria on the eve of war with that country in 1866.69 Economic philosophy also shaped both discourse and practice on the regulation of the arms trade in the aftermath of World War I. Against the background of what Buzan and Waever have described as a broader attempt to ‘construct war as a threat to civilisation’ after World War I70 private arms manufacturers were particularly castigated for the role they had supposedly played in fomenting war fever to promote sales, a role facilitated by their alleged control over the press in many countries.71 This partly explained the attempts in 1919 and 1925 to develop international agreements on the regulation of the arms trade, although in reality a broader set of international order and security concerns were also at work (see below). However, the 1919 and 1925 agreements never received the necessary ratiﬁcations to come into force (although they did have important legacy effects) and the laissez faire approach to the arms trade still predominated throughout the 1920s. It was only in the 1930s that concern about the activities of the arms manufacturers gained particular salience in both the media and policy circles. In part this may have been a function of the deteriorating international situation, but as Harkavy has argued, it was also a function of the fact that the Great Depression had prompted widespread doubts about the general viability of the capitalist system.72Consequently, nationalization and greater government oversight of the arms industry was presented by campaigners and, indeed, some governments, as a vehicle to ensure arms proﬁts were not pursued at the expense of either state interests or world peace. Although nationalization was, with the exception of France73 mostly avoided, by the mid-1930s most of the major arms producing states had begun to develop formal defence export licensing systems.74 In other words, this was the moment when the institutions and processes were established that would produce the many thousands of ordinary extraordinary export licensing decisions that now occur on a weekly basis, the point of genesis for a particular habitus of a particular set of security professionals. This shift was not solely a function of debates about the role of arms merchants in World War I, nor was it purely a consequence of the doubts about unmanaged capitalism sowed by the Great Depression. Issues of power and security as well as the moments of intervention represented by successive attempts to agree international arms regulation all played their role in this shift (see below). Nevertheless, attitudes to economy were an important part of the mix. In the Cold War, the regulation of arms transfers was structured so that it was simultaneously permissive vis-a`-vis transfers to allies and highly restrictive vis-a`-vis allies of the Soviet Union. In the West at least, these security rationales overlapped with the dominance of Keynesian approaches to the economy in which the preservation of defence production emerged not only as a strategic imperative but as a form of welfare militarism – aimed at maintaining jobs, stimulating economies in times of recession, and preserving key technology sectors. This implied the further extension of government oversight of arms sales (albeit principally on a national basis rather than through international negotiation) and government’s role in the promotion of arms sales. It also meant that arms sales were pursued primarily (if not exclusively) for political rather than economic reasons. This contrasted sharply with the late 19th century and even inter-war years when private industry and the search for arms proﬁts were the principle factors driving supply. However, the end of the Cold War coincided with (and reinforced) underlying shifts in conceptions of economy and security that inﬂuenced the debate on arms transfer control. In terms of economy, the neoliberal agenda had already been thoroughly mainstreamed in the policy discourse of governments. Greed was good, proﬁt was better and market principles were the order of the day. In terms of domestic defence procurement policies this was reﬂected in a shift to the much wider application of competition policy, particularly in the United States and the United Kingdom.75 In terms of the approach to major arms transfers it underpinned the shift to a more commercial attitude that had been gradually evolving from the 1960s onwards. Already by 1988 one analyst could note that ‘the political factors that dominated the arms trade in the recent past are yielding to market forces... the arms trade is returning to its patterns prior to World War II, when the trade in military equipment was not dramatically different from the trade in many other industrial products’.76The comparison with the pre-World War II era is perhaps exaggerated – not least because the frameworks of national oversight and national export promotion are far more extensive, as are the frameworks of international regulation. Nevertheless, whilst one feature of the post-Cold War era has been the proliferation of international or regional initiatives to ostensibly restrain arms proliferation, an equally notable feature has been the relaxation of restrictions on arms supplies, particularly to allies. Both the Clinton and George W. Bush administrations in the United States have attempted to ease restrictions on exports to key allies, most notably in the form of defence trade cooperation treaties with Australia and the United Kingdom announced in 2007, although these have yet to be ratiﬁed by the Senate.77 The effect of these agreements will be to permit the licence-free transfer of defence goods between the United States and each of the signatories.78 The Obama administration has, in addition, committed itself to a radical overhaul of the American export control system to make it easier to export weapons to American allies and to emerging markets such as China. For example, the administration has claimed that in the case of items related to tanks and military vehicles, the new rules would remove 74 per cent of the items currently on the US Munitions List.79 In other words, the export of brake pads for tanks may no longer be subject to a regime of extraordinary measures. Similar processes have been at work in other countries. For example, in 2002 the United Kingdom announced changes to its methodology for assessing licence applications for components to be incorporated into military equipment for onward export, a reform generally interpreted as opening ‘a signiﬁcant export licensing loophole’,80 whilst in 2007 the French government announced it would ease restrictions on products moving within the European Union.81 At the same time as this occurred NGOs became more focussed on the security outcomes stemming from the trade in small arms and landmines. To the extent that NGOs and academics have engaged with the issue of major conventional arms transfers, they have tended to follow the lead set by government and industry by engaging with the economic rationale for defence exports – albeit in an attempt to debunk them.82The combined effect of this has been to give a more central place to a technocratic discourse on major weapons transfers focussed on their economic costs and beneﬁts to suppliers. This is not to suggest that strategic rationales for arms transfers have disappeared completely – they still remain important factors in speciﬁc cases, particularly post-9/11. Nevertheless, as Hartung has noted, with the end of the Cold War, the economic rationales for arms sales ‘moved to the forefront’.83One corollary of this greater emphasis on the economics of arms sales has been the post-Cold War deproblematization of major arms transfers84 at least in terms of debates about their security outcomes. Today, such sales are primarily discussed (by exporters at least, if not by recipients and their neighbours) in the language of the technocrat and the banker - the language of jobs, ﬁnancing terms, market share, and performance evaluation. Indeed, both government and NGO security concerns about the negative effects of the arms trade have bifurcated – with concern focussed either on the problem of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) (problematized primarily in terms of their potential acquisition by rogues) or, at the other end of the scale, on issues such as small arms (primarily problematized in terms of the illicit rather than the legal trade in such weapons). Arms Trade Regulation and the Security Problematique If neoliberalism has facilitated a more permissive approach to arms transfer regulation then this raises the question of why any limits have been introduced at all? As already noted above, one part of the answer is rooted in the relationship between legitimized and heroic weapons and those military technologies that lie outside the boundaries of the heroic and the legitimized. Being the ‘other’ of legitimized military technology facilitates successful problematization and indeed ‘extra-securitisation’. Additionally however, the architecture of global arms trade regulation has been transformed in the post-Cold War era along with the transformation in the objects of security that accompanied the end of the Cold War. During the Cold War, the global architecture of conventional arms trade regulation, like arms control more generally, was principally focussed on managing East –West tensions. One consequence was a substantial extension of the range of dual-use goods invested with security labels in relation to trade with Eastern Europe, most manifest in debates in the early 1950s between the United States and European states over the operation of CoCoM (Coordinating Committee for Multilateral Export Controls).85 In contrast, the developing world was merely an object of security competition between the superpowers and therefore a site for the supply of arms to allies. With the dissolution of the Soviet threat the focus has turned more to the management of North–South relations as the developing world has been reconstructed as the source of diverse security threats86 and as humanitarian intervention has resurrected similar concerns with the maintenance of order in the developing world that animated the arms restrictions in the Brussels Act. One manifestation of this has been in the reframing of small arms as instruments of disorder rather than the means to shore up Cold War allies. A further example is the replacement of the CoCom regime with the Wasennaar Arrangement, focussed particularly on restricting transfers to pariah regimes in the global South. This shift in focus is also manifest in the signiﬁcant rise in the use of arms embargoes in the post-Cold War era. For example, between 1945 and 1990 only two mandatory embargoes were imposed globally, on Rhodesia and Africa, respectively. Since the 1990s there have been two voluntary and 27 mandatory cases of sanctions, the vast majority of which have been aimed at actors in Africa.87 Sanctions, just like the efforts to control arms to Africa in the late 19th century have not been hugely successful in reducing the supply of weapons to combatants. Nevertheless, they can be understood as animated by much the same desire to maintain order in the peripheries of the world, particularly in a context where Western powers have once again taken on a greater responsibility for policing and managing instability in the developing world. Thus, the post-Cold War regulation of the conventional arms trade is simultaneously characterized by a relatively more permissive approach to arms transfers in general but also a redirection of controls away from the governance of East – West relations and towards the governance of North –South relations and particularly the disciplining of those actors framed as rogue or pariah in the security narratives of dominant actors. The campaign to promote an arms trade treaty may yet produce a more meaningful architecture of arms transfer control – the jury is out. However the framing of the Arms Trade Treaty to the defence industry is perhaps instructive. For example, the UK’s Ambassador for Multilateral Arms Control has noted, the ATT ‘... is about ... export controls that will stop weapons ending up in the hands of terrorists, insurgents, violent criminal gangs, or in the hands of dictators’.88 It should also be noted that current efforts to develop a global agreement on the arms trade echo late 19thth and early 20thth century initiatives to govern the international arms trade, most notably: the Brussels Act, the 1919 St Germain Convention for the Control of the Trade in Arms and Ammunition, and the 1925 Arms Trafﬁc Convention. Although the latter two never received the necessary ratiﬁcations to come into force both were animated by the same imperial concern to prevent disorder in the colonies that had underpinned the Brussels Act. As Stone has noted with regards to the St Germain convention for example, ‘there was little doubt among representatives in Paris [where the Convention was signed] that keeping arms out of African and Asian hands was St Germain’s chief task’.89Accordingly, the convention imposed far stricter restrictions on sales to these areas as well as a ban on arms shipments to ‘any country which refuses to accept the tutelage under which it has been placed’.90 Indeed, although the convention never came into being, European powers nevertheless agreed informally to carry out its provisions in Africa and the Middle East.91 The 1925 convention similarly imposed more severe restrictions on exports to special zones that covered most of Africa and parts of what had been the Ottoman Empire.92 Thus, viewed against this broader history of arms regulation, negotiations on a putative Arms Trade Treaty (rather like action on APMs or cluster munitions) do not represent a novel post-Cold War development that symbolizes progress on an emancipatory human security agenda consonant with the promotion of local and global peace. Instead, it reﬂects the emergence of particular sets of relationships between power, interest, economy, security, and legitimized military technologies that in turn create the conditions of emergence for historically contingent architectures of global regulation. Conclusion The preceding analysis has a number of implications for campaigners, but also speaks to the debates about the utility of the securitization framework outlined at the start of this article. First, it provides support for Abrahamson’s notion of the security spectrum. Viewed in a more historical perspective, what is notable about the post-Cold War emergence of a humanitarian arms control agenda is the way in which action on landmines, cluster munitions, and even small arms have been made possible by a quite dramatic transformation in the way such technology is represented. They have, in Abrahamson’s formulation, been moved along the ‘spectrum of security’ from normal, run-of-the mill, unproblematic technologies of killing, to ones of extra special concern. Conversely, one of the features of the post-Cold War era is the way in which the security labels attached to major weapons transfers have, in general, actually moved in the other direction. Whilst such transfers still remain clearly within the domain of security it is, nevertheless, possible to conceive the post-Cold War trade in major weapons as having been relatively desecuritized. Second, the analysis highlights the relational elements that can be involved in processes of securitization and desecuritization. In the case of the landmines ban this manifested itself in the way campaigners engaged in simultaneous processes of securitization of APMs (with respect to the human as referent object) and (relative) desecuritization (with respect to the state as referent object) that worked to mutually reinforce the case for a ban. In the case of pariah weapons generally, whilst there are a number of factors that explain their stigmatization, one factor can be the way their particular qualities are depicted as the antithesis of those possessed by legitimized and particularly heroic weapons. Conversely, the stigmatization of pariah weapons works to delineate other weapons as normal and legitimate. There is therefore a process of mutual constitution that is at work in the way different sets of weapons technology are framed and understood. Third, the preceding analysis illustrates the relevance of Floyd’s argument that processes of securitization or desecuritization can be positive and negative, particularly when considered in terms of their emancipatory effects. As noted above, in the case of landmines a process of relative desecuritization vis-a`-vis the state combined with a process of extra-securitization vis-a`-vis the human to bring about the production of a ban widely considered to have produced positive security outcomes for individuals, communities, and the human as a collective. In contrast, the relative desecuritization of major weapons transfers represents a much more ambiguous development. It could, of course, be argued that such a change in the security labels attached to the weapons holdings of neighbouring states would not only reﬂect but reinforce a move to more peaceable relations. In addition, the relative deproblematization of defence transfers might be conceived as a positive development, particularly for states that possess minimal domestic defence industrial capacity, and are threatened by hostile neighbours. At the same time however, such a shift along the spectrum of security arguably represents a quite regressive development when applied to the issue of arms transfers. This is particularly the case given that, irrespective of the powerful ways in which the security labels attached to major weapons are shaped by discourse and other forms of representation, they still possess a residual materiality, however thin, that is characterized by their capacity to facilitate the organized prosecution of violence. More generally, the transfer of such technologies can also be viewed as symptomatic of a world characterized by deeply problematic higher order paradigms of security and economy. At the very least then, the relative (if not complete) desecuritization of major arms transfers would appear to raise further questions about the Copenhagen School’s normative commitment to desecuritization. Although more accurately, it highlights the effects that come from ratcheting down the security labels attached to ‘normal’ arms transfers and subjecting them to the kind of standard bureaucratic routines highlighted by Bigo, albeit the routines of the export licencing process in this case. One consequence, is that the many thousands of export licences granted for the transfer of weapons other than landmines, cluster munitions, and small arms are far less likely to become the object of public scrutiny or become subject to intense public and political contestation about the security effects of such exports. In this sense at least, the switch from a Cold War arms transfer system where security motivations for exports often predominated to one where economic motivations are more to the fore, has also been accompanied by a corresponding depoliticization of contemporary transfers, a phenomenon that highlights the problematic nature of the neat division between politicized and securitized issues outlined in the CS conception of securitization and one that highlights the downside of even partial moves towards the desecuritization end of the security spectrum. Fourth, the success of campaigns on landmines and cluster munitions demonstrates how ‘moments of intervention’ undertaken on behalf of the voiceless by supposedly weak securitizing actors such as NGOs can, nevertheless, produce quite effective securitizations – in this case, the hyper-securitization of particular weapons technologies. Both campaigns also highlighted the ways in which actors can utilize media images and, through survivor activism that extended to the conference room, provide a context for the body to speak security. Moreover, the success of these campaigns highlights the ways in which the language of threat, survival, and security can be deployed to achieve positive security outcomes. At the same time however, the success of the humanitarian arms control agenda around landmines and cluster munitions in particular was only achieved because NGOs adopted exactly the same discourse around humanitarianism, human security and weapons precision that has been deployed to legitimize post-Cold War liberal peace interventionism and in the marketing of new weapons developments. On one reading, this might point to the potential for actors to deploy dominant forms of security speech in order to achieve progressive ends. On a more pessimistic reading however, it also highlights the profound limits involved in such approaches. To the extent that the extra-securitization of pariah technologies such as landmines has facilitated the relative desecuritization of major conventional weapons transfers it has also made the current framework of control look like an example of ethical advance at the same time as creating space for the deproblematization of arms transfers in general. Ultimately then, the moments of intervention represented by the campaigns on landmines and cluster munitions were successful because they did not threaten, and in many ways were quite consistent with, the dominant security paradigm and security narratives of the post-Cold War era. Equally, whilst the regularized routines and working practices of the security professionals of the export licensing process are certainly important in understanding the treatment of defence transfers, this body of professionals were themselves, brought into being as a result of historical changes in the fundamental assumptions about security and economy. Moreover, their very working practices and modes of behaviour are currently being altered as a result of similar fundamental shifts in the paradigms of security and economy which, in turn, are a function of particular combinations of power and interest. Although these shifts certainly predated the post-Cold War era, they have become particularly concretized in this era. One consequence of all this is that a loud ethical discourse around the restriction of landmines, cluster munitions, and small arms has gone hand in hand with recent rises in both global military expenditure and arms transfers. For example, overall, world defence expenditure in 2008 was estimated to be $1,464 billion (of which NATO countries accounted for 60 per cent and OECD countries 72 per cent) representing a 45 per cent increase in real terms since 1999,93whilst global arms sales were 22 per cent higher in real terms for the period 2005– 2009 than for the preceding period 2000– 2004.94 Moreover, largely because of the dominance of American and European defence spending, the defence trade is increasingly concentrated in the hands of the United States and to a lesser extent, European companies. For example, in 2006 American and European companies accounted for an estimated 92.7 per cent of the arms sales of the world’s 100 largest defence companies.95 Most arms trade NGOs have largely neglected issues such as the rises in defence expenditure in major weapons states such as the United States, intra-northern trade in arms, and the dominant role played by Western companies in the arms trade, in favour of an agenda that conceives the South – and in particular pariah actors in sub-Saharan Africa – as the primary object of conventional arms trade regulation.96With regard to transfers of small arms and major conventional weapons it might be argued that this, at least, also requires impressive self-abnegation from arms trade proﬁts on the part of powerful states in the international system. In practice however, international initiatives such as the EU Code or the Wassennaar Arrangement, national export regulations of the major weapons states and the local initiatives of client states mostly combine to produce a cartography of prohibition that corresponds more closely with the disciplinary geographies advocated by the powerful rather than any global map of militarism and injustice. One illustration of this is the way in which a recent review of British defence export legislation downgraded long-range missiles and the ‘heroic’ Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (UAV – the Maxim gun of modern imperial wars) from a category A classiﬁcation (goods such as cluster munitions whose supply is prohibited) to the less restrictive category B,97 whilst in 2010, the Afghan government proscribed the import, use, and sale of Ammonium Nitrate Fertilizer because it is one of the elements used in the making of IEDs.98 More generally, as one recent econometric analysis of major weapons transfers from the Britain, France, Germany, and the United States concluded, despite much rhetoric about the need for a more ethical approach to arms sales from governments in all these countries: Neither human rights abuses nor autocratic polity would appear to reduce the likelihood of countries receiving Western arms, or reduce the relative share of a particular exporter’s weapons they receive. In fact, human rights abusing countries are actually more likely to receive weapons from the US, while autocratic regimes emerge as more likely recipients of weaponry from France and the UK.99 Of course, arms trade NGOs have often been the ﬁrst to highlight such hypocrisies and the work of most organizations include, to a greater or lesser extent, elements of critique or advocacy that might be considered transformational. However, one of the principle features of arms trade activism in the post-Cold War era is the extent to which many NGOs have downgraded radical critique in exchange for insider inﬂuence and government funding.100 Instead, activism has largely been aimed at promoting tactical reform within an overarching economic and security paradigm that justiﬁes intervention, regulation, and transformation of the South whilst (with the exception of token action on landmines, etc.) leaving the vast accumulation of Western armaments largely unproblematized. The logic of this analysis then, is that there needs to be a far greater problematization of military expenditure by the major powers, of the so-called ‘legitimate’ trade in defence goods, including intraNorthern trade, and a problematization of the predominance of Western defence companies in global arms markets. In short, campaigners needs to return to a strategic contestation of global militarism rather than searching for tactical campaign victories dependent on accommodation with the language and economic and security paradigms of contemporary military humanism.

**That causes endless warfare**

Bacevich, 5 -- Boston University international relations professor [A. J., retired career officer in the United States Army, former director of Boston University's Center for International Relations (from 1998 to 2005), *The New American Militarism: How Americans Are Seduced by Wa*r, 2005 accessed 9-4-13, mss]

Today as never before in their history Americans are enthralled with military power. The global military supremacy that the United States presently enjoys--and is bent on perpetuating-has become central to our national identity. More than America's matchless material abundance or even the effusions of its pop culture, the nation's arsenal of high-tech weaponry and the soldiers who employ that arsenal have come to signify who we are and what we stand for. When it comes to war, Americans have persuaded themselves that the United States possesses a peculiar genius. Writing in the spring of 2003, the journalist Gregg Easterbrook observed that "the extent of American military superiority has become almost impossible to overstate." During Operation Iraqi Freedom, U.S. forces had shown beyond the shadow of a doubt that they were "the strongest the world has ever known, . . . stronger than the Wehrmacht in r94o, stronger than the legions at the height of Roman power." Other nations trailed "so far behind they have no chance of catching up. ""˜ The commentator Max Boot scoffed at comparisons with the German army of World War II, hitherto "the gold standard of operational excellence." In Iraq, American military performance had been such as to make "fabled generals such as Erwin Rommel and Heinz Guderian seem positively incompetent by comparison." Easterbrook and Booz concurred on the central point: on the modern battlefield Americans had located an arena of human endeavor in which their flair for organizing and deploying technology offered an apparently decisive edge. As a consequence, the United States had (as many Americans have come to believe) become masters of all things military. Further, American political leaders have demonstrated their intention of tapping that mastery to reshape the world in accordance with American interests and American values. That the two are so closely intertwined as to be indistinguishable is, of course, a proposition to which the vast majority of Americans subscribe. Uniquely among the great powers in all of world history, ours (we insist) is an inherently values-based approach to policy. Furthermore, we have it on good authority that the ideals we espouse represent universal truths, valid for all times. American statesmen past and present have regularly affirmed that judgment. In doing so, they validate it and render it all but impervious to doubt. Whatever momentary setbacks the United States might encounter, whether a generation ago in Vietnam or more recently in Iraq, this certainty that American values are destined to prevail imbues U.S. policy with a distinctive grandeur. The preferred language of American statecraft is bold, ambitious, and confident. Reflecting such convictions, policymakers in Washington nurse (and the majority of citizens tacitly endorse) ever more grandiose expectations for how armed might can facilitate the inevitable triumph of those values. In that regard, George W. Bush's vow that the United States will "rid the world of evil" both echoes and amplifies the large claims of his predecessors going at least as far back as Woodrow Wilson. Coming from Bush the war- rior-president, the promise to make an end to evil is a promise to destroy, to demolish, and to obliterate it. One result of this belief that the fulfillment of America's historic mission begins with America's destruction of the old order has been to revive a phenomenon that C. Wright Mills in the early days of the Cold War described as a "military metaphysics**"-a tendency to see international problems as military problems and to** discountthe likelihood of findinga solution except through military means.To state the matter bluntly, Americans in our own time have fallen prey to militarism, manifesting itself in a romanticized view of soldiers, a tendency to see military power as the truest measure of national greatness, and outsized expectations regarding the efficacy of force. To a degree without precedent in U.S. history, Americans have come to define the nation's strength and well-being in terms of military preparedness, military action, and the fostering of (or nostalgia for) military ideals? Already in the 19905 America's marriage of a militaristic cast of mind with utopian ends had established itself as the distinguishing element of contemporary U.S. policy. The Bush administrations response to the hor- rors of 9/11 served to reaffirm that marriage, as it committed the United States to waging an open-ended war on a global scale. Events since, notably the alarms, excursions, and full-fledged campaigns comprising the Global War on Terror, have fortified and perhaps even sanctified this marriage. Regrettably, those events, in particular the successive invasions of Afghanistan and Iraq, advertised as important milestones along the road to ultimate victory have further dulled the average Americans ability to grasp the significance of this union, which does not serve our interests and may yet prove our undoing. The New American Militarism examines the origins and implications of this union and proposes its annulment. Although by no means the first book to undertake such an examination, The New American Militarism does so from a distinctive perspective. The bellicose character of U.S. policy after 9/11, culminating with the American-led invasion of Iraq in March 2003, has, in fact, evoked charges of militarism from across the political spectrum. Prominent among the accounts advancing that charge are books such as The Sorrows of Empire: Militarism, Secrecy, and the End of the Republic, by Chalmers Johnson; Hegemony or Survival: Americas Quest for Global Dominance, by Noam Chomsky; Masters of War; Militarism and Blowback in the Era of American Empire, edited by Carl Boggs; Rogue Nation: American Unilateralism and the Failure of Good Intentions, by Clyde Prestowitz; and Incoherent Empire, by Michael Mann, with its concluding chapter called "The New Militarism." Each of these books appeared in 2003 or 2004. Each was not only writ- ten in the aftermath of 9/11 but responded specifically to the policies of the Bush administration, above all to its determined efforts to promote and justify a war to overthrow Saddam Hussein. As the titles alone suggest and the contents amply demonstrate, they are for the most part angry books. They indict more than explain, and what- ever explanations they offer tend to be ad hominem. The authors of these books unite in heaping abuse on the head of George W Bush, said to combine in a single individual intractable provincialism, religious zealotry, and the reckless temperament of a gunslinger. Or if not Bush himself, they fin- ger his lieutenants, the cabal of warmongers, led by Vice President Dick Cheney and senior Defense Department officials, who whispered persua- sively in the president's ear and used him to do their bidding. Thus, accord- ing to Chalmers Johnson, ever since the Persian Gulf War of 1990-1991, Cheney and other key figures from that war had "Wanted to go back and finish what they started." Having lobbied unsuccessfully throughout the Clinton era "for aggression against Iraq and the remaking of the Middle East," they had returned to power on Bush's coattails. After they had "bided their time for nine months," they had seized upon the crisis of 9/1 1 "to put their theories and plans into action," pressing Bush to make Saddam Hussein number one on his hit list." By implication, militarism becomes something of a conspiracy foisted on a malleable president and an unsuspecting people by a handful of wild-eyed ideologues. By further implication, the remedy for American militarism is self-evi- dent: "Throw the new militarists out of office," as Michael Mann urges, and a more balanced attitude toward military power will presumably reassert itself? As a contribution to the ongoing debate about U.S. policy, The New American Militarism rejects such notions as simplistic. It refuses to lay the responsibility for American militarism at the feet of a particular president or a particular set of advisers and argues that no particular presidential election holds the promise of radically changing it. Charging George W. Bush with responsibility for the militaristic tendencies of present-day U.S. for- eign policy makes as much sense as holding Herbert Hoover culpable for the Great Depression: Whatever its psychic satisfactions, it is an exercise in scapegoating that lets too many others off the hook and allows society at large to abdicate responsibility for what has come to pass. The point is not to deprive George W. Bush or his advisers of whatever credit or blame they may deserve for conjuring up the several large-scale campaigns and myriad lesser military actions comprising their war on ter- ror. They have certainly taken up the mantle of this militarism with a verve not seen in years. Rather it is to suggest that well before September 11, 2001 , and before the younger Bush's ascent to the presidency a militaristic predisposition was already in place both in official circles and among Americans more generally. In this regard, 9/11 deserves to be seen as an event that gave added impetus to already existing tendencies rather than as a turning point. For his part, President Bush himself ought to be seen as a player reciting his lines rather than as a playwright drafting an entirely new script. In short, the argument offered here asserts that present-day **American militarism** has deep roots in the American past. It **represents a bipartisan project.** As a result, it is unlikely to disappear anytime soon, a point obscured by the myopia and personal animus tainting most accounts of how we have arrived at this point. The New American Militarism was conceived not only as a corrective to what has become the conventional critique of U.S. policies since 9/11 but as a challenge to the orthodox historical context employed to justify those policies. In this regard, although by no means comparable in scope and in richness of detail, it continues the story begun in Michael Sherry's masterful 1995 hook, In the Shadow of War an interpretive history of the United States in our times. In a narrative that begins with the Great Depression and spans six decades, Sherry reveals a pervasive American sense of anxiety and vulnerability. In an age during which War, actual as well as metaphorical, was a constant, either as ongoing reality or frightening prospect, national security became the axis around which the American enterprise turned. As a consequence, a relentless process of militarization "reshaped every realm of American life-politics and foreign policy, economics and technology, culture and social relations-making America a profoundly different nation." Yet Sherry concludes his account on a hopeful note. Surveying conditions midway through the post-Cold War era's first decade, he suggests in a chapter entitled "A Farewell to Militarization?" that America's preoccupation with War and military matters might at long last be waning. In the mid- 1995, a return to something resembling pre-1930s military normalcy, involving at least a partial liquidation of the national security state, appeared to be at hand. Events since In the Shadow of War appear to have swept away these expectations. The New American Militarism tries to explain why and by extension offers a different interpretation of America's immediate past. The upshot of that interpretation is that far from bidding farewell to militariza- tion, the United States has nestled more deeply into its embrace. f ~ Briefly told, the story that follows goes like this. The new American militarism made its appearance in reaction to the I96os and especially to Vietnam. It evolved over a period of decades, rather than being sponta- neously induced by a particular event such as the terrorist attack of Septem- ber 11, 2001. Nor, as mentioned above, is present-day American militarism the product of a conspiracy hatched by a small group of fanatics when the American people were distracted or otherwise engaged. Rather, it devel- oped in full view and with considerable popular approval. The new American militarism is the handiwork of several disparate groups that shared little in common apart from being intent on undoing the purportedly nefarious effects of the I96OS. Military officers intent on reha- bilitating their profession; intellectuals fearing that the loss of confidence at home was paving the way for the triumph of totalitarianism abroad; reli- gious leaders dismayed by the collapse of traditional moral standards; strategists wrestling with the implications of a humiliating defeat that had undermined their credibility; politicians on the make; purveyors of pop cul- turc looking to make a buck: as early as 1980, each saw military power as the apparent answer to any number of problems. The process giving rise to the new American militarism was not a neat one. Where collaboration made sense, the forces of reaction found the means to cooperate. But on many occasions-for example, on questions relating to women or to grand strategy-nominally "pro-military" groups worked at cross purposes. Confronting the thicket of unexpected developments that marked the decades after Vietnam, each tended to chart its own course. In many respects, the forces of reaction failed to achieve the specific objectives that first roused them to act. To the extent that the 19603 upended long-standing conventions relating to race, gender, and sexuality, efforts to mount a cultural counterrevolution failed miserably. Where the forces of reaction did achieve a modicum of success, moreover, their achievements often proved empty or gave rise to unintended and unwelcome conse- quences. Thus, as we shall see, military professionals did regain something approximating the standing that they had enjoyed in American society prior to Vietnam. But their efforts to reassert the autonomy of that profession backfired and left the military in the present century bereft of meaningful influence on basic questions relating to the uses of U.S. military power. Yet the reaction against the 1960s did give rise to one important by-prod: uct, namely, the militaristic tendencies that have of late come into full flower. In short, the story that follows consists of several narrative threads. No single thread can account for our current outsized ambitions and infatua- tion with military power. Together, however, they created conditions per- mitting a peculiarly American variant of militarism to emerge. As an antidote, the story concludes by offering specific remedies aimed at restor- ing a sense of realism and a sense of proportion to U.S. policy. It proposes thereby to bring American purposes and American methods-especially with regard to the role of military power-into closer harmony with the nation's founding ideals. The marriage of military metaphysics with eschatological ambition is a misbegotten one, contrary to the long-term interests of either the American people or the world beyond our borders. It invites endless war and the ever-deepening militarization of U.S. policy. As it subordinates concern for the common good to the paramount value of military effectiveness, it promises not to perfect but to distort American ideals. As it concentrates ever more authority in the hands of a few more concerned with order abroad rather than with justice at home, it will accelerate the hollowing out of American democracy. As it alienates peoples and nations around the world, it will leave the United States increasingly isolated. If history is any guide, it will end in bankruptcy, moral as well as economic, and in abject failure. "Of all the enemies of public liberty," wrote James Madison in 1795, "war is perhaps the most to be dreaded, because it comprises and develops the germ of every other. War is the parent of armies. From these proceed debts and taxes. And armies, debts and taxes are the known instruments for bringing the many under the domination of the few .... No nation could preserve its freedom in the midst of continual Warfare." The purpose of this book is to invite Americans to consider the continued relevance of Madison's warning to our own time and circumstances.

**Our alternative is to reject the affs obsession with sovereign power in favor of questioning the sovereign’s ability to dictate the limits of acceptable violence – only a shift from homo sacer to whatever being solves**

Caldwell 2004 [Anne, is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Political Science at the University of Louisville.] Bio-Sovereignty and the Emergence of Humanity Theory and Event 7:2. 48-53 <http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/theory_and_event/v007/7.2caldwell.html>]

Can we imagine another form of humanity, and another form of power? The bio-sovereignty described by Agamben is so fluid as to appear irresistible. Yet Agamben never suggests this order is necessary. Bio-sovereignty results from a particular and contingent history, and it requires certain conditions. Sovereign power, as Agamben describes it, finds its grounds in specific coordinates of life, which it then places in a relation of indeterminacy. What defies sovereign power is a life that cannot be reduced to those determinations: a life “that can never be separated from its form, a life in which it is never possible to isolate something such as naked life. “ (2.3). In his earlier Coming Community, Agamben describes this alternative life as “whatever being.”More recently he has used the term “forms-of-life.” These concepts come from the figure Benjamin proposed as a counter to homo sacer: the “total condition that is ‘man’.” For Benjamin and Agamben, mere life is the life which unites law and life. That tie permits law, in its endless cycle of violence, to reduce life an instrument of its own power. The total condition that is [hu]man refers to an alternative life incapable of serving as the ground of law. Such a life would exist outside sovereignty. Agamben’s own concept of whatever being is extraordinarily dense. It is made up of varied concepts, including language and potentiality; it is also shaped by several particular dense thinkers, including Benjamin and Heidegger. What follows is only a brief consideration of whatever being, in its relation to sovereign power. “Whatever being,” as described by Agamben,lacks the features permitting the sovereign capture and regulation of life in our tradition. Sovereignty’s capture of life has been conditional upon the separation of natural and political life. That separation has permitted the emergence of a sovereign power grounded in this distinction, and empowered to decide on the value, and non-value of life (1998: 142). Since then, every further politicization of life, in turn, calls for “a new decision concerning the threshold beyond which life ceases to be politically relevant, becomes only ‘sacred life,’ and can as such be eliminated without punishment” (p. 139). This expansion of the range of life meriting protection does not limit sovereignty, but provides sites for its expansion. In recent decades, factors that once might have been indifferent to sovereignty become a field for its exercise. Attributes such as national status, economic status, color, race, sex, religion, geo-political position have become the subjects of rights declarations. From a liberal or cosmopolitan perspective, such enumerations expand the range of life protected from and serving as a limit upon sovereignty. Agamben’s analysis suggests the contrary. If indeed sovereignty is bio-political before it is juridical, then juridical rights come into being only where life is incorporated within the field of bio-sovereignty. The language of rights, in other words, calls up and depends upon the life caught within sovereignty: homo sacer. Agamben’s alternative is therefore radical. He does not contest particular aspects of the tradition. He does not suggest we expand the range of rights available to life. He does not call us to deconstruct a tradition whose power lies in its indeterminate status.21 Instead, he suggests we take leave of the tradition and all its terms. Whatever being is a life that defies the classifications of the tradition, and its reduction of all forms of life to homo sacer. Whatever being therefore has no common ground, no presuppositions, and no particular attributes. It cannot be broken into discrete parts; it has no essence to be separated from its attributes; and it has no common substrate of existence defining its relation to others. Whatever being cannot then be broken down into some common element of life to which additive series of rights would then be attached. Whatever being retains all its properties, without any of them constituting a different valuation of life (1993: 18.9).As a result, whatever being is “reclaimed from its having this or that property, which identifies it as belonging to this or that set, to this or that class (the reds, the French, the Muslims) – and it is reclaimed not for another class nor for the simple generic absence of any belonging, but for its being-such, for belonging itself.” (0.1-1.2).Indifferent to any distinction between a ground and added determinations of its essence, whatever being cannot be grasped by a power built upon the separation of a common natural life, and its political specification. Whatever being dissolves the material ground of the sovereign exception and cancels its terms. This form of life is less post-metaphysical or anti-sovereign, than a-metaphysical and a-sovereign. Whatever is indifferent not because its status does not matter, but because it has no particular attribute which gives it more value than another whatever being. As Agamben suggests, whatever being is akin to Heidegger’s Dasein. Dasein, as Heidegger describes it, is that life which always has its own being as its concern – regardless of the way any other power might determine its status. Whatever being, in the manner of Dasein, takes the form of an “indissoluble cohesion in which it is impossible to isolate something like a bare life. In the state of exception become the rule, the life of homo sacer, which was the correlate of sovereign power, turns into existence over which power no longer seems to have any hold” (Agamben 1998: 153).We should pay attention to this comparison. For what Agamben suggests is that whatever being is not any abstract, inaccessible life, perhaps promised to us in the future. Whatever being, should we care to see it, is all around us, wherever we reject the criteria sovereign power would use to classify and value life. “In the final instance the State can recognize any claim for identity – even that of a State identity within the State . . . What the State cannot tolerate in any way, however, is that the singularities form a community without affirming an identity, that humans co-belong without a representable condition of belonging” (Agamben 1993:85.6). At every point where we refuse the distinctions sovereignty and the state would demand of us, the possibility of a non-state world, made up of whatever life, appears.

# Solvency

**Obama will circumvent the plan**

**Lohmann 13** [Julia, director of the Harvard Law National Security Research Committee, BA in political science from the University of California, Berkeley, “Distinguishing CIA-Led from Military-Led Targeted Killings,” 1/28, <http://www.lawfareblog.com/wiki/the-lawfare-wiki-document-library/targeted-killing/effects-of-particular-tactic-on-issues-related-to-targeted-killings/>]

The U.S. military—in particular, the Special Operations Command (SOCOM), and its subsidiary entity, the Joint Special Operations Command (JSOC)—is responsible for carrying out military-led targeted killings.¶ Military-led targeted killings are subject to various legal restrictions, including a complex web of statutes and executive orders. For example, because the Covert Action Statute does not distinguish among institutions undertaking covert actions, targeted killings conducted by the military that fall within the definition of “covert action” set forth in 50 U.S.C. § 413(b) are subject to the same statutory constraints as are CIA covert actions. 50 U.S.C. § 413b(e). However, as Robert Chesney explains, many military-led targeted killings may fall into one of the CAS exceptions—for instance, that for traditional military activities—so that the statute’s requirements will not always apply to military-led targetings. Such activities are exempted from the CAS’s presidential finding and authorization requirements, as well as its congressional reporting rules.¶ Because such unacknowledged military operations are, in many respects, indistinguishable from traditional covert actions conducted by the CIA, this exception may provide a “loophole” allowing the President to circumvent existing oversight mechanisms without substantively changing his operational decisions. However, at least some military-led targetings do not fall within the CAS exceptions, and are thus subject to that statute’s oversight requirements. For instance, Chesney and Kenneth Anderson explain, some believe that the traditional military activities exception to the CAS only applies in the context of overt hostilities, yet it is not clear that the world’s tacit awareness that targeted killing operations are conducted (albeit not officially acknowledged) by the U.S. military, such as the drone program in Pakistan, makes those operations sufficiently overt to place them within the traditional military activities exception, and thus outside the constraints of the CAS.¶ Chesney asserts, however, that despite the gaps in the CAS’s applicability to military-led targeted killings, those targetings are nevertheless subject to a web of oversight created by executive orders that, taken together, largely mirrors the presidential authorization requirements of the CAS. But, this process is not enshrined in statute or regulation and arguably could be changed or revoked by the President at any time. Moreover, this internal Executive Branch process does not involve Congress or the Judiciary in either ex ante or ex post oversight of military-led targeted killings, and thus, Philip Alston asserts, it may be insufficient to provide a meaningful check against arbitrary and overzealous Executive actions.

# Drone prolif

**Drone prolif inevitable**

**Etzioni ‘13** [Amitai, professor of international relations at George Washington University, “The Great Drone Debate,” March-April, <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 hardto-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.

**Surveillance drones mean the aff can’t solve – makes their impact inevitable**

**No modeling- US signals are dismissed, social science proves**

Zenko ‘13 [Micah, Council on Foreign Relations Center for Preventive Action Douglas Dillon fellow, "The Signal and the Noise," Foreign Policy, 2-2-13, www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2013/02/20/the\_signal\_and\_the\_noise, accessed 6-12-13, mss]

Later, Gen. Austin observed of cutting forces from the Middle East: "Once you reduce the presence in the region, you could very well signal the wrong things to our adversaries." Sen. Kelly Ayotte echoed his observation, claiming that President Obama's plan to withdraw 34,000 thousand U.S. troops from Afghanistan within one year "leaves us dangerously low on military personnel...it's going to send a clear signal that America's commitment to Afghanistan is going wobbly." Similarly, during a separate House Armed Services Committee hearing, Deputy Secretary of Defense Ashton Carter ominously warned of the possibility of sequestration: "Perhaps most important, the world is watching. Our friends and allies are watching, potential foes -- all over the world." These routine and unchallenged assertions highlight what is perhaps the most widely agreed-upon conventional wisdom in U.S. foreign and national security policymaking: the inherent power of signaling. This psychological capability rests on two core assumptions: All relevant international audiences can or will accurately interpret the signals conveyed, and upon correctly comprehending this signal, these audiences will act as intended by U.S. policymakers. Many policymakers and pundits fundamentally believe that the Pentagon is an omni-directional radar that uniformly transmits signals via presidential declarations, defense spending levels, visits with defense ministers, or troop deployments to receptive antennas. A bit of digging, however, exposes cracks in the premises underlying signaling theories. There is a half-century of social science research demonstrating the cultural and cognitive biases that make communication difficult between two humans. Why would this be any different between two states, or between a state and non-state actor? Unlike foreign policy signaling in the context of disputes or escalating crises -- of which there is an extensive body of research into types and effectiveness -- policymakers' claims about signaling are merely made in a peacetime vacuum. These signals are never articulated with a precision that could be tested or falsified, and thus policymakers cannot be judged misleading or wrong. Paired with the faith in signaling is the assumption that policymakers can read the minds of potential or actual friends and adversaries. During the cycle of congressional hearings this spring, you can rest assured that elected representatives and expert witnesses will claim to know what the Iranian supreme leader thinks, how "the Taliban" perceives White House pronouncements about Afghanistan, or how allies in East Asia will react to sequestration. This self-assuredness is referred to as the illusion of transparency by psychologists, or how "people overestimate others' ability to know them, and...also overestimate their ability to know others." Policymakers also conceive of signaling as a one-way transmission: something that the United States does and others absorb. You rarely read or hear critical thinking from U.S. policymakers about how to interpret the signals from others states. Moreover, since U.S. officials correctly downplay the attention-seeking actions of adversaries -- such as Iran's near-weekly pronouncement of inventing a new drone or missile -- wouldn't it be safer to assume that **the majority of U.S. signals are** similarly **dismissed**? During my encounters with foreign officials, few take U.S. government pronouncements seriously, and instead assume they are made to appease domestic audiences.

**Drone prolif doesn’t escalate**

**Singh ’12** [Joseph Singh is a researcher at the Center for a New American Security, an independent and non-partisan organization that focuses on researching and analyzing national security and defense policies, also a research assistant at the Institute for Near East and Gulf Military Analysis (INEGMA) North America, is a War and Peace Fellow at the Dickey Center, a global research organization, “Betting Against a Drone Arms Race,” 8-13-12, <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.

**No specific scenario in the 1ac – they need to read specific scenarios for escalation – we’ll read impact d to all of them**

**Their cards mention china – they won’t use drones aggressively**

**Erickson and Strange 13** [Andrew Erickson is an associate professor at the Naval War College and an Associate in Research at Harvard University's Fairbank Centre, Austin Strange is a researcher at the Naval War College's China Maritime Studies Institute, “China has drones. Now how will it use them?” 5-29, <http://www.nationmultimedia.com/opinion/China-has-drones-Now-how-will-it-use-them-30207095.html>]

Drones, able to dispatch death remotely, without human eyes on their targets or a pilot's life at stake, make people uncomfortable - even when they belong to democratic governments that presumably have some limits on using them for ill. (On May 23, in a major speech, US President Barack Obama laid out what some of those limits are.) An even more alarming prospect is that unmanned aircraft will be acquired and deployed by authoritarian regimes, with fewer checks on their use of lethal force.¶ Those worried about exactly that tend to point their fingers at China. In March, after details emerged that China had considered taking out a drug trafficker in Myanmar with a drone strike, a CNN blog post warned, "Today, it's Myanmar. Tomorrow, it could very well be some other place in Asia or beyond." Around the same time, a National Journal article entitled "When the Whole World Has Drones" teased out some of the consequences of Beijing's drone programme, asking, "What happens if China arms one of its remote-piloted planes and strikes Philippine or Indian trawlers in the South China Sea?"¶ 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 behaviour 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 programme, but according to Ian Easton, an analyst at the Project 2049 Institute, an American think-tank devoted to Asia-Pacific security matters, 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 Myanmar drug trafficker, Naw Kham, makes clear that it would not be out of the question for China to launch a drone strike in a security operation against a non-state actor. Meanwhile, as China's territorial disputes with its neighbours 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.

**No Russian War**

Weitz ‘11 (Richard, senior fellow at the Hudson Institute and a World Politics Review senior editor, “Global Insights: Putin not a Game-Changer for U.S.-Russia Ties,” <http://www.scribd.com/doc/66579517/Global-Insights-Putin-not-a-Game-Changer-for-U-S-Russia-Ties>, September 27, 2011)

Fifth, there will inevitably be areas of conflict between Russia and the United States regardless of who is in the Kremlin. Putin and his entourage can never be happy with having NATO be Europe's most powerful security institution, since Moscow is not a member and cannot become one. Similarly, the Russians will always object to NATO's missile defense efforts since they can neither match them nor join them in any meaningful way. In the case of Iran, Russian officials genuinely perceive less of a threat from Tehran than do most Americans, and Russia has more to lose from a cessation of economic ties with Iran -- as well as from an Iranian-Western reconciliation. On the other hand, these conflicts can be managed, since they will likely remain limited and compartmentalized. Russia and the West do not have fundamentally conflicting vital interests of the kind countries would go to war over. And as the Cold War demonstrated, nuclear weapons are a great pacifier under such conditions. Another novel development is that Russia is much more integrated into the international economy and global society than the Soviet Union was, and Putin's popularity depends heavily on his economic track record. Beyond that, there are objective criteria, such as the smaller size of the Russian population and economy as well as the difficulty of controlling modern means of social communication, that will constrain whoever is in charge of Russia.

# Europe

**Alt cause – detention**

**No impact to relations**

Leonard ‘12 (Mark Leonard is co-founder and director of the European Council on Foreign Relations, the first pan-European think tank., 7/24/2012, "The End of the Affair", www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/07/24/the\_end\_of\_the\_affair)

But Obama's stellar personal ratings in Europe hide the fact that the Western alliance has never loomed smaller in the imagination of policymakers on either side of the Atlantic. Seen from Washington, there is not a single problem in the world to be looked at primarily through a transatlantic prism. Although the administration looks first to Europeans as partners in any of its global endeavors -- from dealing with Iran's nuclear program to stopping genocide in Syria -- it no longer sees the European theater as its core problem or seeks a partnership of equals with Europeans. It was not until the eurozone looked like it might collapse -- threatening to bring down the global economy and with it Obama's chances of reelection -- that the president became truly interested in Europe. Conversely, Europeans have never cared less about what the United States thinks. Germany, traditionally among the most Atlanticist of European countries, has led the pack. Many German foreign-policy makers think it was simply a tactical error for Berlin to line up with Moscow and Beijing against Washington on Libya. But there is nothing accidental about the way Berlin has systematically refused even to engage with American concerns over German policy on the euro. During the Bush years, Europeans who were unable to influence the strategy of the White House would give a running commentary on American actions in lieu of a substantive policy. They had no influence in Washington, so they complained. But now, the tables are turned, with Obama passing continual judgment on German policy while Chancellor Angela Merkel stoically refuses to heed his advice. Europeans who for many years were infantilized by the transatlantic alliance, either using sycophancy and self-delusion about a "special relationship" to advance their goals or, in the case of Jacques Chirac's France, pursuing the even more futile goal of balancing American power, have finally come to realize that they can no longer outsource their security or their prosperity to Uncle Sam. On both sides of the Atlantic, the ties that held the alliance together are weakening. On the American side, Obama's biography links him to the Pacific and Africa but not to the old continent. His personal story echoes the demographic changes in the United States that have reduced the influence of Americans of European origin. Meanwhile, on the European side, the depth of the euro crisis has crowded out almost all foreign policy from the agenda of Europe's top decision-makers. The end of the Cold War means that Europeans no longer need American protection, and the U.S. financial crisis has led to a fall in American demand for European products (although U.S. exports to Europe are at an all-time high). What's more, Obama's lack of warmth has precluded him from establishing the sorts of human relationships with European leaders that animate alliances. When asked to name his closest allies, Obama mentions non-European leaders such as Recep Tayyip Erdogan of Turkey and Lee Myung-bak of South Korea. And his transactional nature has led to a neglect of countries that he feels will not contribute more to the relationship -- within a year of being elected, Obama had managed to alienate the leaders of most of Europe's big states, from Gordon Brown to Nicolas Sarkozy to Jose Luis Rodriguez Zapatero. Americans hardly remember, but Europe's collective nose was put out of joint by Obama's refusal to make the trip to Europe for the 2010 EU-U.S. summit. More recently, Obama has reached out to allies to counteract the impression that the only way to get a friendly reception in Washington is to be a problem nation -- but far too late to erase the sense that Europe matters little to this American president. Underlying these superficial issues is a more fundamental divergence in the way Europe and the United States are coping with their respective declines. As the EU's role shrinks in the world, Europeans have sought to help build a multilateral, rule-based world. That is why it is they, rather than the Chinese or the Americans, that have pushed for the creation of institutionalized global responses to climate change, genocide, or various trade disputes. To the extent that today's world has not collapsed into the deadlocked chaos of a "G-zero," it is often due to European efforts to create a functioning institutional order. To Washington's eternal frustration, however, Europeans have not put their energies into becoming a full partner on global issues. For all the existential angst of the euro crisis, Europe is not as weak as people think it is. It still has the world's largest market and represents 17 percent of world trade, compared with 12 percent for the United States. Even in military terms, the EU is the world's No. 2 military power, with 21 percent of the world's military spending, versus 5 percent for China, 3 percent for Russia, 2 percent for India, and 1.5 percent for Brazil, according to Harvard scholar Joseph Nye. But, ironically for a people who have embraced multilateralism more than any other on Earth, Europeans have not pooled their impressive economic, political, and military resources. And with the eurozone's need to resolve the euro crisis, the EU may split into two or more tiers -- making concerted action even more difficult. As a result, European power is too diffuse to be much of a help or a hindrance on many issues. On the other hand, Obama's United States -- although equally committed to liberal values -- thinks that the best way to safeguard American interests and values is to craft a multipartner world. On the one hand, Obama continues to believe that he can transform rising powers by integrating them into existing institutions (despite much evidence to the contrary). On the other, he thinks that Europe's overrepresentation in existing institutions like the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund is a threat to the consolidation of that order. This is leading a declining America to increasingly turn against Europe on issues ranging from climate change to currencies. The most striking example came at the 2009 G-20 in Pittsburgh, when Obama worked together with the emerging powers to pressure Europeans to give up their voting power at the IMF. As Walter Russell Mead, the U.S. international relations scholar, has written, "[I]ncreasingly it will be in the American interest to help Asian powers rebalance the world power structure in ways that redistribute power from the former great powers of Europe to the rising great powers of Asia today." But the long-term consequence of the cooling of this unique alliance could be the hollowing out of the world order that the Atlantic powers have made. The big unwritten story of the last few decades is the way that a European-inspired liberal economic and political order has been crafted in the shell of the American security order. It is an order that limits the powers of states and markets and puts the protection of individuals at its core. If the United States was the sheriff of this order, the EU was its constitutional court. And now it is being challenged by the emerging powers. Countries like Brazil, China, and India are all relatively new states forged by movements of national liberation whose experience of globalization has been bound up with their new sense of nationhood. While globalization is destroying sovereignty for the West, these former colonies are enjoying it on a scale never experienced before. As a result, they are not about to invite their former colonial masters to interfere in their internal affairs. Just look at the dynamics of the United Nations Security Council on issues from Sudan to Syria. Even in the General Assembly, the balance of power is shifting: 10 years ago, China won 43 percent of the votes on human rights in the United Nations, far behind Europe's 78 percent. But in 2010-11, the EU won less than 50 percent to China's nearly 60 percent, according to research by the European Council on Foreign Relations. Rather than being transformed by global institutions, China's sophisticated multilateral diplomacy is changing the global order itself. As relative power flows Eastward, it is perhaps inevitable that the Western alliance that kept liberty's flame alight during the Cold War and then sought to construct a liberal order in its aftermath is fading fast. It was perhaps inevitable that both Europeans and Americans should fail to live up to each other's expectations of their respective roles in a post-Cold War world. After all, America is still too powerful to happily commit to a multilateral world order (as evidenced by Congress's reluctance to ratify treaties). And Europe is too physically safe to be willing to match U.S. defense spending or pool its resources. What is surprising is that the passing of this alliance has not been mourned by many on either side. The legacy of Barack Obama is that the transatlantic relationship is at its most harmonious and yet least relevant in 50 years. Ironically, it may take the election of someone who is less naturally popular on the European stage for both sides to wake up and realize just what is at stake.

**Their internal link card says squo counterterror coop is sufficient to solve – “there has most assuredly been a deeper level of communication and cooperation. This is linked in part to other issues such as cybersecurity and data protection”**

**no impact**

**Alden 12**, Edward, Bernard L. Schwartz senior fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR), specializing in U.S. economic competitiveness “What Exactly Is a “Trade War”? Time to Abolish a Silly Notion,” 10/23, http://blogs.cfr.org/renewing-america/2012/10/23/what-exactly-is-a-trade-war-time-to-abolish-a-silly-notion/

I have a suggestion for everyone who writes about international trade: it is time to bury, once and for all, the concept of a “trade war.” The phrase is so ubiquitous that it will be awfully hard to abolish; I have probably been guilty myself from time to time. Indeed, it is almost a reflex that every time the United States or some other nation takes any action that restricts imports in any fashion, reporters and editorial writers jump to their keyboards to warn that a trade war is looming. But it is a canard that makes it far harder to have a sensible discussion about U.S. trade policy. No sooner had President Obama and Mitt Romney finished their latest round of “who’s tougher on trade with China?” in their final debate Monday night than the New York Times – to take one of many possible examples – warned that “formally citing Beijing as a currency manipulator may backfire, economic and foreign-policy experts have said. In the worst case, it could set off a trade war, leading to falling American exports to China and more expensive Chinese imports.” But what exactly is a “trade war”? To take the U.S.-China example, the notion seems to be that, if the United States restricts Chinese imports, China will respond by restricting imports of U.S. goods, in turn leading to further U.S. restrictions and so on and so on until trade between the two countries plummets. The closest historical example is the reaction to the infamous Smoot-Hawley tariff act of 1930, which raised the average U.S. tariff on imports to historically high levels. As trade historian Douglas Irwin of Dartmouth has show persuasively, Smoot-Hawley did not cause the Great Depression, and probably did not even exacerbate it very much since trade was a tiny part of the U.S. economy. But Smoot-Hawley did result in Great Britain, Canada and other U.S. trading partners raising their own tariffs in response. Irwin suggests that the higher tariffs were probably responsible for about a third of the 40 percent drop in imports between 1929 and 1932, and perhaps a slightly higher percentage of export losses. And the new trade barriers put in place took many decades to dismantle. With imports and exports today comprising roughly a third of the U.S. economy, and the few remaining tariffs mostly in the single digits, the consequences of similar tit-for-tat tariff increases today would be far more severe. But what are the chances of such a “trade war” actually occurring? Pretty close to zero, for two big reasons. First, in 1930, there was no World Trade Organization, no North American Free Trade Agreement, no European Community/Union – in short, no rules to prevent countries from jacking up tariffs or imposing quotas whenever governments felt domestic political pressure to do so. Today, such unilateral action is largely forbidden. Indeed, the tit-for-tat measures we have seen in the U.S.-China trade relationship have all been taken within the framework of WTO rules. When the Obama administration curbed purchases of Chinese steel in 2009 under the “Buy America” provisions of the stimulus, for example, China responded with an “anti-dumping” case which led to tariffs on imports of U.S. steel. But the United States challenged that action in the WTO, and just last week the WTO ordered China to lift the duties. No trade war – instead the phrase “see you in court” comes to mind. Secondly, almost every nation in the world seems fully aware of the dangers of aggressive protectionism. One of the striking things about the Great Recession– which resulted in global trade volumes plunging by more than 12 percent in 2009, the biggest drop since World War II – is how little of the protectionism that is permitted under WTO rules actually occurred. Chad Bown of the World Bank has documented the surprising low level of new trade barriers imposed during the recession and its aftermath. The danger of competitive currency devaluations – which are not clearly covered under WTO rules – is a greater threat than tariffs. This is one of the reasons that Romney’s pledge to label China a currency manipulator could be playing with fire, particularly after more than seven years in which the value of the renminbi has been creeping up steadily against the dollar. And his suggestion that the United States would impose tariffs in response is just silly – it would be a blatant violation of WTO rules and would quickly be slapped down as such. Again, however, no trade war – just an unfavorable WTO decision with which a Romney administration would quickly comply.

**No china impact**

**Kania 13** – The Harvard Political Review is a journal of politics and public policy published by the Institute of Politics, cites Andrew Ring, a former Weatherhead Center for International Affairs Fellow, and Peter Dutton, Director of the China Maritime Studies Institute at the U.S. Naval War College (Elsa, 01/11, “The South China Sea: Flashpoints and the U.S. Pivot,” http://harvardpolitics.com/world/the-south-china-sea-flashpoints-and-the-u-s-pivot/)

Equilibrium and Interdependence? One paradox at the heart of the South China Sea is the uneasy equilibrium that has largely been maintained. **Despite** the occasional confrontation and **frequent** diplomatic **squabbling, the situation has never escalated into full-blown physical conflict**. The main stabilizing factor has been that the countries involved have too much to lose from turmoil, and so much to gain from tranquility. Andrew Ring—former Weatherhead Center for International Affairs Fellow—emphasized that “With respect to the South China Sea, we all have the same goals” in terms of regional stability and development. With regional **trade flows and interdependence** critical to the region’s growing economies, conflict could be devastating. Even for China—the actor with by far the most to gain from such a dispute—taking unilateral action would **irreparably tarnish its image** in the eyes of the international community. With the predominant narrative of a “rising” and “assertive China”—referred to as a potential adversary by President Obama in the third presidential debate—China’s behavior in the South China Sea may be sometimes **exaggerated or sensationalized**. Dr. Auer, former Naval officer and currently Director of the Center for U.S.-Japan Studies and Cooperation at the Vanderbilt Institute for Public Policy Studies, told the HPR that “China has not indicated any willingness to negotiate multilaterally” and remains “very uncooperative.” Across its maritime territorial disputes—particularly through recent tensions with Japan in the East China Sea—Auer sees China as having taken a very aggressive stance, and he claims that “Chinese behavior is not understandable or clear.” Nonetheless, in recent incidents, such as a standoff between China and the Philippines over the Scarborough Shoal this past April, as Bonnie Glaser, Senior Adviser for Asia at the Center for Strategic and International Studies, emphasized, “this is not an either or.” Multiple parties are responsible for the tensions, yet the cycle of action and reaction is **often obscured**. Nonetheless, Glaser believes that “The Chinese have in every one of these cases overreacted—they have sought to take advantage of the missteps of other countries,” responding with disproportionate coercion. In addition, China has begun to use methods of “economic coercion” to assert its interests against trade partners. A Tipping Point? Has the dynamic in the South China Sea shifted recently? Perhaps not in a fundamental sense. But with the regional military buildup, governments have developed a greater capacity to pursue longstanding objectives. According to Peter Dutton, Director of the China Maritime Studies Institute at the U.S. Naval War College, “China’s recent behavior in the East China Sea and assertive policy in the South China Sea” is “a serious concern.” He believes that China’s willingness to resort to force in defense of its territorial claims has been increasing over time, partially as a consequence of its rising power. As such, Dutton sees the situation as reaching a “tipping point in which China is…no longer satisfied with shelving the dispute.” Is confrontation or resolution imminent? Worryingly, Dutton observes, “the international dynamic in the region is motivated largely by fear and anger.” However, **the use of unilateral military force would be a lose-lose for China**,” particularly in terms of its credibility, both among its neighbors and in the international community. The Pivot in the South China Sea From a U.S. perspective, a sustained American presence in the region has long been the underpinning of peace and stability. However, excessive U.S. intervention could disrupt the delicate balance that has been established. Although the U.S. has always sought to maintain a position of neutrality in territorial disputes, remarks by Secretary of State Hillary Clinton that referred to the South China Sea as the “West Philippine Sea” led China to challenge U.S. impartiality. If the U.S. engages with its regional allies without seeking enhanced engagement with China, then U.S. actions in the region may be perceived by China as efforts at containment. Moreover, as the U.S. strengthens ties to partners in the region, there is risk of entanglement if conflict were to break out. There has long been an undercurrent of tension between the Philippines and China—most recently displayed in the standoff over the Scarborough Shoal in May 2012. Shortly thereafter, in a visit to Washington D.C., President Aquino sought U.S. commitment to military support of the Philippines in the event of conflict with China on the basis of the 1952 Mutual Defense Treaty. However, despite providing further military and naval support, the U.S. has refrained from making concrete commitments. Although the U.S. would not necessarily be dragged into a dispute, if a confrontation did break out, it might feel compelled to respond militarily to maintain the credibility of commitments to allies and partners in the region. Strong ties to the U.S. and enhanced military capacity could also provoke more confrontational behavior from U.S. partners. Yet, Ring emphasizes that the U.S. navy and military are also unique in the “ability to facilitate military cooperation and communication among all of the claimants” and particularly to “be that bridge…uniquely situated to build some flows of communication” **that could facilitate a peaceful resolution to future incidents.**

# 2nc circumvention run

**Obama will circumvent the plan – that’s lohmann – he’ll create loopholes to avoid oversight**

**The executive will redefine the law to violate and ignore the plan**

Pollack, 13 -- MSU Guggenheim Fellow and professor of history emeritus [Norman, "Drones, Israel, and the Eclipse of Democracy," Counterpunch, 2-5-13, www.counterpunch.org/2013/02/05/drones-israel-and-the-eclipse-of-democracy/, accessed 9-1-13, mss]

Bisharat first addresses the transmogrification of international law by Israel’s military lawyers. We might call this damage control, were it not more serious. When the Palestinians first sought to join the I.C.C., and then, to receive the UN’s conferral of nonmember status on them, Israel raised fierce opposition. Why? He writes: “Israel’s frantic opposition to the elevation of Palestine’s status at the United Nations was motivated precisely by the fear that it would soon lead to I.C.C. jurisdiction over Palestinian claims of war crimes. Israeli leaders are unnerved for good reason. The I.C.C. could prosecute major international crimes committed on Palestinian soil anytime after the court’s founding on July 1, 2002.” In response to the threat, we see the deliberate reshaping of the law: Since 2000, “the Israel Defense Forces, guided by its military lawyers, have attempted to **remake the laws** of war by consciously violating them and then **creating new legal concepts to provide juridical cover** for their misdeeds.” (Italics, mine) In other words, habituate the law to the existence of atrocities; in the US‘s case, targeted assassination, repeated often enough, seems permissible, indeed clever and wise, as pressure is steadily applied to the laws of war. Even then, “collateral damage” is seen as unintentional, regrettable, but hardly prosecutable, and in the current atmosphere of complicity and desensitization, never a war crime. (**Obama is hardly a novice at** this game of **stretching the law to suit the convenience of**, shall we say, the **national interest**? In order to ensure the distortion in counting civilian casualties, which would bring the number down, as Brennan with a straight face claimed, was “zero,” the Big Lie if ever there was one, placing him in distinguished European company, Obama **redefined the meaning** of “combatant” status to be any male of military age throughout the area (which we) declared a combat zone, which noticeably led to a higher incidence of sadism, because it allowed for “second strikes” on funerals—the assumption that anyone attending must be a terrorist—and first responders, those who went to the aid of the wounded and dying, themselves also certainly terrorists because of their rescue attempts.) These guys play hardball, perhaps no more than in using—by report—the proverbial baseball cards to designate who would be next on the kill list. But funerals and first responders—verified by accredited witnesses–seems overly much, and not a murmur from an adoring public.

**“zones of active hostilities” is a legal fiction**

Corn, 13 -- South Texas College of Law Presidential Research Professor of Law

[Geoffrey, former JAG officer and chief of the law of war branch of the international law division of the US Army, Lieutenant Colonel, U.S. Army (Retired), Senate Armed Services Committee Hearing, "The law of armed conflict, the use of military force, and the 2001 Authorization for Use of Military Force," Congressional Documents and Publications, 6-16-13, l/n, accessed 8-23-13, mss]

I believe much of the momentum for asserting some arbitrary geographic limitation on the scope of operations conducted to disrupt or disable al Qaeda belligerent capabilities is the result of the commonly used term "hot battlefield." This notion of a "hot" battlefield is, in my opinion, **an**operational and legal fiction. Nothing in the law of armed conflict or military doctrine defines the meaning of "battlefield."Contrary to the erroneous assertions that the use of combat power is restricted to defined geographic locations such as Afghanistan (and previously Iraq), the geographic scope of armed conflict must be dictated by a totality assessment of a variety of factors, ultimately driven by the strategic end state the nation seeks to achieve. The nature and dynamics of the threat -including key vulnerabilities - is a vital factor in this analysis. These threat dynamics properly influence the assessment of enemy capabilities and vulnerabilities, which in turn drive the formulation of national strategy, which includes determining when, where, and how to leverage national power (including military power) to achieve desired operational effects. Thus, threat dynamics, and not some geographic "box", have historically driven and must continue to drive the scope of armed hostilities. The logic of this premise is validated by (in my opinion) the inability to identify an armed conflict in modern history where the scope of operations was legally restricted by a conception of a "hot" battlefield. Instead, threat dynamics coupled with policy, diplomatic considerations and, in certain armed conflicts the international law of neutrality, dictate such scope. Ultimately, battlefields become "hot" when persons, places, or things assessed as lawful military objectives pursuant to the law of armed conflict are subjected to attack.

**Even if there aren’t loopholes, Obama will ignore the aff**

**Kumar 13** [Anita, White House correspondent for McClatchy Newspapers, former writer for The Washington Post, covering Virginia politics and government, and spent a decade at the St. Petersburg Times, writing about local, state and federal government both in Florida and Washington, “Obama turning to executive power to get what he wants,” 3/19 <http://www.mcclatchydc.com/2013/03/19/186309/obama-turning-to-executive-power.html#.Ue18CdK1FSE>]

“The expectation is that they all do this,” said Ken Mayer, a political science professor at the University of Wisconsin-Madison who wrote “With the Stroke of a Pen: Executive Orders and Presidential Power.” “That is the typical way of doing things.”¶ But, experts say, Obama’s actions are more noticeable because as a candidate he was critical of Bush’s use of power. In particular, he singled out his predecessor’s use of signing statements, documents issued when a president signs a bill that clarifies his understanding of the law.¶ “These last few years we’ve seen an unacceptable abuse of power at home,” Obama said in an October 2007 speech.. “We’ve paid a heavy price for having a president whose priority is expanding his own power.”¶ Yet Obama’s use of power echoes that of his predecessors. For example, he signed 145 executive orders in his first term, putting him on track to issue as many as the 291 that Bush did in two terms.¶ John Yoo, who wrote the legal opinions that supported an expansion of presidential power after the 2001 terrorist attacks, including harsh interrogation methods that some called torture, said he thought that executive orders were sometimes appropriate – when conducting internal management and implementing power given to the president by Congress or the Constitution – but he thinks that Obama has gone too far.¶ “I think President Obama has been as equally aggressive as President Bush, and in fact he has sometimes used the very same language to suggest that he would not obey congressional laws that intrude on his commander-in-chief power,” said Yoo, who’s now a law professor at the University of California at Berkeley. “This is utterly hypocritical, both when compared to his campaign stances and the position of his supporters in Congress, who have suddenly discovered the virtues of silence.”¶ Most of Obama’s actions are written statements aimed at federal agencies that are published everywhere from the White House website to the Federal Register. Some are classified and hidden from public view.¶ “It seems to be more calculated to prod Congress,” said Phillip J. Cooper, the author of “By Order of the President: The Use and Abuse of Executive Direct Action.” “I can’t remember a president being that consistent, direct and public.”¶ Bush was criticized for many of his actions on surveillance and interrogation techniques, but attention has focused on Obama’s use of actions mostly about domestic issues.¶ In his first two years in the White House, when fellow Democrats controlled Capitol Hill, Obama largely worked through the regular legislative process to try to achieve his domestic agenda. His biggest achievements – including a federal health care overhaul and a stimulus package designed to boost the economy –came about with little or no Republican support.¶ But Republicans took control of the House of Representatives in 2010, making the task of passing legislation all the more difficult for a man with a detached personality who doesn’t relish schmoozing with lawmakers. By the next year, Obama wasn’t shy about his reasons for flexing his presidential power.¶ In fall 2011, he launched the “We Can’t Wait” campaign, unveiling dozens of policies through executive orders – creating jobs for veterans, adopting fuel efficiency standards and stopping drug shortages – that came straight from his jobs bills that faltered in Congress.¶ “We’re not waiting for Congress,” Obama said in Denver that year when he announced a plan to reduce college costs. “I intend to do everything in my power right now to act on behalf of the American people, with or without Congress. We can’t wait for Congress to do its job. So where they won’t act, I will.”¶ When Congress killed legislation aimed at curbing the emissions that cause global warming, Obama directed the Environmental Protection Agency to write regulations on its own incorporating some parts of the bill.¶ When Congress defeated pro-union legislation, he had the National Labor Relations Board and the Labor Department issue rules incorporating some parts of the bill.¶ “The president looks more and more like a king that the Constitution was designed to replace,” Sen. Charles Grassley, R-Iowa, said on the Senate floor last year.¶ While Republicans complain that Obama’s actions cross a line, experts say some of them are less aggressive than they appear.¶ After the mass shooting in Newtown, Conn., in December, the White House boasted of implementing 23 executive actions to curb gun control. In reality, Obama issued a trio of modest directives that instructed federal agencies to trace guns and send information for background checks to a database.¶ In his State of the Union address last month, Obama instructed businesses to improve the security of computers to help prevent hacking. But he doesn’t have the legal authority to force private companies to act.¶ “The executive order can be a useful tool but there are only certain things he can do,” said Melanie Teplinsky, an American University law professor who’s spoken extensively on cyber-law.¶ Executive actions often are fleeting. They generally don’t settle a political debate, and the next president, Congress or a court may overturn them.¶ Consider the so-called Mexico City policy. With it, Reagan banned federal money from going to international family-planning groups that provide abortions. Clinton rescinded the policy. George W. Bush reinstated it, and Obama reversed course again.¶ But congressional and legal action are rare. In 1952, the Supreme Court threw out Harry Truman’s order authorizing the seizure of steel mills during a series of strikes. In 1996, the District of Columbia Court of Appeals dismissed an order by Clinton that banned the government from contracting with companies that hire workers despite an ongoing strike.¶ Obama has seen some pushback.¶ Congress prohibited him from spending money to move inmates from the Guantanamo Bay U.S. naval base in Cuba after he signed an order that said it would close. A Chinese company sued Obama for killing its wind farm projects by executive order after he said they were too close to a military training site. A federal appeals court recently ruled that he’d exceeded his constitutional powers when he named several people to the National Labor Relations Board while the Senate was in recess.¶ But Obama appears to be undaunted.¶ “If Congress won’t act soon to protect future generations,” he told Congress last month, “I will.”

**Plan can’t solve future president rollback**

**Fournier 13** [Ron Fournier is the Editorial Director of National Journal. Prior to joining National Journal, he worked at the Associated Press for 20 years, most recently as Washington Bureau Chief. Starting with a Little Rock posting, covering Bill Clinton's second term as governor, Fournier moved to Washington to report on the Clinton White House. He has won numerous awards for his work, including the Society of Professional Journalists' Sigma Delta Chi Award for coverage of the 2000 elections and a four-time winner of the prestigious White House Correspondents' Association Merriman Smith Memorial Award. His 2012 piece on the decline of U.S. institutions, "In Nothing We Trust," was awarded an honorable mention in David Brook’s essay contest, the Sidney Awards, “What If the Next President Is Even Worse?” 5-28 <http://www.nationaljournal.com/politics/what-if-the-next-president-is-even-worse-20130528>]

George W. Bush in 2001 declared war on a tactic (terrorism), and empowered Big Brother to tap phones, launch drones, and indefinitely imprison people without due process.¶ Barack Obama in 2008 declared those Bush policies an overreach, and pledged to curb drone strikes, protect media freedoms, and close the prison at Guantanamo Bay. Instead, he escalated drone strikes and spied on the media. Gitmo is still open for its grim business.¶ These are facts. And yet, they are distorted by extreme and narrow-minded partisans, supporters of both Bush and Obama.¶ Conservatives contend that Bush single-handedly prevented a major terrorist strike after Sept. 11, 2001. They demagogue efforts to shift the pendulum back toward civil liberties. Last week, when Obama finally proposed a modest reassessment of the Bush doctrine, Sen. Saxby Chambliss, R-Ga., claimed the efforts "will be viewed by terrorists as a victory."¶ Liberals hypocritically gave Obama a pass for furthering the same policies they condemned in 2008. Criticism from the left was half-hearted and muted, compared with their Bush-era indignation. On Gitmo, left-wingers rightly blamed the GOP for blocking closure but didn't shame Obama into using his executive authority to shutter the pit.¶ Some progressives even tried to justify the Obama administration's efforts to criminalize the work of a Fox News reporter. Would they be so blase about a White House targeting MSNBC?¶ As Leonard Downie Jr. wrote in Sunday's Washington Post, "Hardly anything seems immune from constitutionally dangerous politicking in a polarized Washington."¶ But that's no excuse for missing the big picture, which is this: Bush and Obama shouldn't worry you nearly as much as the next president.¶ Or the one after that.¶ Think about it, liberals. What if there is a president in your lifetime who is more conservative than Bush? What if that commander in chief is empowered, as were Bush and Obama, by a national tragedy and a compliant Congress?¶ Your guy Obama has armed a president-turned-zealot with dangerous powers and precedents.¶ Think about it, conservatives. It may be maddening to listen to Obama tie himself into knots over the balance between liberty and freedom, but what if the next Democratic president sees no limit on a commander in chief's powers? What if he or she doesn't give a whit about offending the mainstream media? The IRS targeting conservatives is a scandal, but there is no evidence that it was directed by the White House. What if the next Democratic president publicly declared his or her political opponents a direct threat to national security, and openly deployed federal agents against them?¶ Before your eyes roll out of your heads, it is not unthinkable that a future president could make Bush and Obama look downright libertarian. We live in an age of rapid connectivity and hyper-celebrity, forces that create, destroy, and often resurrect public figures within the lifespan of a cicada. Does the name Justin Bieber ring a bell?¶ How about Sarah Palin? Our culture of celebrity coupled with the public's disaffection with Washington, could lead to the election of a true demagogue or reactionary. Put it this way: What if Huey Long had had access to the Internet? Or even Pat Buchanan? Don't be blinded by partisanship.

# a/t: Brown

**Brown says Obama wants to limit part of the AUMF- not all of it- talks about how Obama wants to make sure the AUMF is not expanded- none of their evidence talks about the aff.**

**Only ev specific to the aff- Obama wants to strike terrorists wherever he can**

Xinhua, 9 ["U.S. targets terrorists "wherever they take root": Obama," news.xinhuanet.com/english/2009-10/07/content\_12189089.htm, accessed 9-22-13, mss]

The U.S. anti-terror efforts are not restricted in Afghanistan and Pakistan, and terrorists will be targeted "wherever they take root," U.S. President Barack Obama said Tuesday. "The United States and our partners have sent an unmistakable message: We will target al-Qaida wherever they take root," he said during a tour of the National Counterterrorism Center in McLean, Virginia, near Washington D.C.. "It should now be clear," he added. The president noted that terror threats to the United States not only come from Afghanistan and Pakistan, but from places around the world, including East Africa, Southeast Asia, Europe and the Persian Gulf. He said the United States is determined to fight terrorism "relentlessly." "We will not yield in our pursuit; and we are developing the capacity and the cooperation to deny a safe haven to any who threaten America and its allies."

# a/t: congress = compliance

**congress won’t enforce the plan**

**Vlahos 13**, Kelly B, Editor for the American Conservative Magazine, “Beware Lawyers Bearing AUMF Fix,” 4/10, http://original.antiwar.com/vlahos/2013/04/09/beware-lawyers-bearing-aumf-fix/

For those of us who have been dutifully following the mission creep catastrophe we call the GWOT, there are two fire engine red flags flapping in the winds of this AUMF “reform” effort. One, the CGWW recommendation suggests that in order to get on “the list,” a group must show “sufficient capability and planning that it presents an imminent threat to the United States.” They go on to insist the criteria for this listing process should be “as specific as possible,” with congress making it “clear precisely what it means by key terms such as ‘imminent’ and ‘belligerent act.’” The process, in addition, would be “robust to ensure careful deliberation and strong accountability,” with auditing and reporting and transparency throughout. This all sounds quite positive. It also sounds too good to be true. **Every inch of the way**, Congressional oversight of our national security policy has been a shame and a disaster. Our elected officials have not proven themselves worthy of this task. Until the February filibuster by Sen. Rand Paul, who demanded clear distinctions in regards to the White House drone program (and even then, the administration has left many questions unanswered, like how does it define ‘imminent danger’?), congress has **never exercised its full watchdog authority** when it comes to military and CIA operations abroad. All we know now about the Executive Branch’s targeting killing has been leaked, like the secret DOJ “white paper” which offered a (lame) legal defense for the killing of Americans on foreign soil, and not offered freely. “The search for meaningful constraints on power is indeed the central challenge of our constitutional system. But Congress has an **abysmal track record** of successfully reining in presidential uses of force overseas. And there is little cause for hope it will succeed here,” wrote Slate’s Deborah Pearlstein on the AUMF debate, in March. Who’s going to trust the White House to get it right either? “For one thing, it was some of the best legal minds in the Obama administration that managed to produce the 2011 DOJ white paper on targeted killings of U.S. citizens, and that was a piece of legalistic garbage that enraged liberals and conservatives alike. Why imagine that administration input into a new AUMF would be any better than that DOJ white paper?” charged Brooks. Nevertheless, Republican lawmakers like Sen. Corker seem to think it is their duty to create a new AUMF, as though it would be used to “constrain” the president’s overreaching powers of the last decade. Be sure to keep your ears open for this approach: “For far too long, Congress has failed to fully exercise its constitutional responsibility to authorize the use of military force, including in the current struggle against al Qaeda, so I urge the committee to consider updating current antiterrorism authorities to adapt to threats that did not exist in 2001 and to better protect our nation while upholding our morals and values,” Corker said in his March statement. But (Ret.) Maj. Todd Pierce, who served as an Army judge advocate general (JAG) in the Office of Chief Defense Counsel for the U.S Military Commissions, balks at such a suggestion. “Congress has no ‘constitutional responsibility’ to place the U.S in what amounts to a state of permanent war on the pretext that the mere threat of terrorism is the equivalent of a state of war.” A permanent war state, fed and shielded by bureaucracy, sustained domestically by the politics of fear, seems to be what we are talking about here, not restraint nor constitutional awareness. Remember, at the same time this is going on, there is a major push to replace our withdrawing conventional soldiers from the war zone with Special Forces in Afghanistan, across Africa, the Middle East and beyond (forces which are already operating in 75 countries – that we know about — today).

**The drone lobby controls Congress – LOL @ oversight**

**Michaels 13** (Martin, The Human Side of Drones: Congress fails in oversight", http://www.mintpressnews.com/the-human-side-of-drones-congress-fails-in-oversight/158722/)

Standing in the way of proper congressional oversight has been the burgeoning drone lobby, an emerging force contributing to Congressional campaigns. “This is all about money when it comes down to it. The fact that there is an unmanned Aerial Systems Caucus in Congress says it all. It’s shameful when you look at the millions of dollars the industry spends on both lobbying and contributing to Congressional candidates,” Benjamin said “You see the collusion between our elected officials and the drone industry,” Benjamin said. Drones represent big money for manufacturers and local communities promised thousands of manufacturing jobs. A recent study by the Teal Group, an aviation and defense consulting firm, estimated that global spending on unmanned aircraft will almost double over the next decade, from $5.9 billion annually to $11.3 billion. Most of that growth will be in the United States. The same study estimated that the drone industry would create 23,000 new jobs in the U.S. by 2025. Political action committees affiliated with drone manufacturers donated a total of $2.3 million to the nearly 60 members of the bipartisan House Unmanned Systems Caucus, according to First Street Research. Seventy-seven percent of these donations went to Republicans.

**Congress can’t exercise oversight – too incompetent**

**Druck ‘12** [Judah A. Druck, law associate at Sullivan & Cromwell LLP, Cornell Law School graduate, magna cum laude graduate from Brandeis University, “Droning On: The War Powers Resolution and the Numbing Effect of Technology-Driven Warfare,” <http://www.lawschool.cornell.edu/research/cornell-law-review/upload/Druck-final.pdf>]

Of course, despite these various suits, Congress has received¶ much of the blame for the WPR’s treatment and failures. For example, Congress has been criticized for doing little to enforce the WPR¶ in using other Article I tools, such as the “power of the purse,”76 or by¶ closing the loopholes frequently used by presidents to avoid the WPR in the first place.77 Furthermore, in those situations where Congress¶ has decided to act, it has done so in such a disjointed manner as to¶ render any possible check on the President useless. For example, during President Reagan’s invasion of Grenada, Congress failed to reach¶ an agreement to declare the WPR’s sixty-day clock operative,78 and¶ later faced similar “deadlock” in deciding how best to respond to President Reagan’s actions in the Persian Gulf, eventually settling for a bill¶ that reflected congressional “ambivalence.”79 Thus, between the **lack**¶ **of a “backbone**” to check rogue presidential action and **general ineptitude** when it actually decides to act, Congress has demonstrated its¶ inability to remedy WPR violations.¶ Worse yet, much of Congress’s interest in the WPR is politically¶ motivated, leading to inconsistent review of presidential military decisions filled with post-hoc rationalizations. Given the political risk associated with wartime decisions,81 Congress **lacks any incentive to act**¶ unless and until it can gauge public reaction—a process that often¶ occurs after the fact.82 As a result, missions deemed successful by the¶ public will rarely provoke “serious congressional concern” about presidential compliance with the WPR, while failures will draw scrutiny.83¶ For example, in the case of the Mayaguez, “liberals in the Congress¶ generally praised [President Gerald Ford’s] performance” despite the¶ constitutional questions surrounding the conflict, simply because the public deemed it a success.84 Thus, even if Congress was effective at¶ checking potentially unconstitutional presidential action, it would only act when politically safe to do so. This result should be unsurprising: making a wartime decision provides little advantage for politicians, especially if the resulting action succeeds.85 Consequently,¶ Congress itself has taken a role in the continued disregard for WPR¶ enforcement.¶ The current WPR framework is broken: presidents avoid it, courts¶ will not rule on it, and Congress will not enforce it. This cycle has¶ culminated in President Obama’s recent use of force in Libya, which¶ created little, if any, controversy,86 and it provides a clear pass to future presidents, judges, and congresspersons looking to continue the¶ system of passivity and deferment.

# 2nc inevitable

**Drone prolif’s inevitable**

**Strategic considerations**

**Williams 13**, Carol J, foreign correspondent for the la times, “U.S. drone use could set dangerous example for rogue powers,” February 7th, http://articles.latimes.com/2013/feb/07/world/la-fg-wn-us-drones-global-precedent-20130206

Drone use was a rare and almost exclusively U.S. military capability a decade ago, Zegart said, yet today at least 70 countries have unmanned aerial vehicles, or UAVs, as drones are called in security parlance. Although most of that use is aimed at reducing the costs and risks of intelligence-gathering and search-and-rescue missions, the increasingly affordable and versatile aircraft can be programmed for combat as easily as for peaceful civilian uses. Despite a credible threat of spreading drone warfare, there is little interest among the nations employing the devices to yield to any agreed rules of engagement, Zegart said. “The question is, can the United States lead by example? Can we realistically put forward policies and ideas” that would establish permissible uses and prevent a perilous free-for-all, she said, intimating that such **self-imposed restraint is unlikely**. Avner Cohen, a professor of nonproliferation policy at the Monterey Institute of International Studies, agrees there is little incentive for countries making the most aggressive use of drones -- the United States and Israel first among them -- to impose restrictions on themselves. He points to what he sees as “seductive” elements of drone use as a danger for both international security and thoughtful decision-making. Israeli drone surveillance pinpointed Hamas militia leader Ahmed Jabari in the Gaza Strip in November, encouraging the Israeli leadership to order a targeted killing in a likely streamlined analysis of potential consequences, Cohen recalled. Jabari’s death set off eight days of fighting between Israel and the Palestinian enclave that ended with a cease-fire seen as having strengthened Hamas and Palestinian cohesion. “The temptation to use it is so high that it can obscure and overpower all kinds of other considerations,” Cohen said of drones’ offensive capabilities.

**Surveillance drones**

**Boyle ‘13** [Michael J. Boyle, PhD, is an Assistant Professor of Political Science at La Salle University in Philadelphia. He was previously a Lecturer in International Relations and Research Fellow at the Centre for the Study of Terrorism and Political Violence at the University of St. Andrews. He is also an alumnus of the Political Science Department at La Salle, research interests are on terrorism and political violence, with particular reference to the strategic use of violence in insurgencies and civil wars, “The costs and consequences of drone warfare,” International Affairs 89: 1 (2013) 1–29, <http://www.chathamhouse.org/sites/default/files/public/International%20Affairs/2013/89_1/89_1Boyle.pdf>, 2013]

A second consequence of the spread of drones is that many of the traditional concepts which have underwritten stability in the international system will be radically reshaped by drone technology. For example, much of the stability among the Great Powers in the international system is driven by deterrence, specifically nuclear deterrence.135 Deterrence operates with informal rules of the game and tacit bargains that govern what states, particularly those holding nuclear weapons, may and may not do to one another.136 While it is widely understood that nuclear-capable states will conduct aerial surveillance and spy on one another, overt military confrontations between nuclear powers are rare because they are assumed to be costly and prone to escalation. One open question is whether these states will exercise the same level of restraint with drone surveillance, which is unmanned, low cost, and possibly deniable. States may be more willing to engage in drone overflights which test the resolve of their rivals, or engage in ‘salami tactics’ to see what kind of drone-led incursion, if any, will motivate a response.137 This may have been Hezbollah’s logic in sending a drone into Israeli airspace in October 2012, possibly to relay information on Israel’s nuclear capabilities.138 After the incursion, both Hezbollah and Iran boasted that the drone incident demonstrated their military capabilities.139 One could imagine two rival states—for example, India and Pakistan—deploying drones to test each other’s capability and resolve, with untold consequences if such a probe were misinterpreted by the other as an attack. As drones get physically smaller and more precise, and as they develop a greater flying range, the temptation to use them to spy on a rival’s nuclear programme or military installations might prove too strong to resist. If this were to happen, drones might gradually erode the deterrent relationships that exist between nuclear powers, thus magnifying the risks of a spiral of conflict between them.

**No reverse modeling- norms can’t solve**

**Saunders 13** [Paul J. Saunders is executive director of The Center for the National Interest and associate publisher of The National Interest. He served in the State Department from 2003 to 2005, “We Won't Always Drone Alone,” 5-4, <http://nationalinterest.org/commentary/we-wont-always-drone-alone-8177>]

A broader and deeper challenge is how others—outside the United States—will use drones, whether armed or unarmed, and what lessons they will draw from Washington’s approach. Thus far, the principal lesson may well be that drones can be extremely effective in killing your opponents, wherever they are, without risking your own troops and without sending soldiers or law enforcement personnel across another country’s borders. It seems less likely that others will adopt U.S.-style legal standards and oversight procedures, or that they will always ask other governments before sending drones into their airspace.¶ Based on their actions, it is almost as if Obama administration officials believe that the United States and its allies will have a long-term monopoly on drones. How else can one explain their exuberant confidence in launching drone attacks? However, the administration’s dramatic expansion in drone strikes—and their apparent effectiveness—will only further shorten Washington’s reign as the drone capital of the world by increasing the incentives to others eager to develop, refine or buy the technology.¶ Have Obama administration officials given any thought to what the world might look like when armed drones are more widespread and when Americans or U.S. allies and partners could become targets? To an outsider, there is little evidence of this kind of thinking in the administration’s use of drones.¶ This is a serious problem. According to an unclassified July 2012 report by the Government Accountability Office, at least 76 countries already have acquired unmanned aerial vehicles, known as UAVs or drones; the report also states that “countries of concern” are attempting to acquire advanced UAVs from foreign suppliers as well as seeking illegal access to U.S. technology. And a 2012 special report by the United Kingdom’s Guardian newspaper indicated that China has 10 or more models, though not all are armed. Other sources identify additional varieties in China. At least 50 countries are trying to build 900 different types of drones, the GAO writes.¶ More generally, the administration’s expanding use of drones is a powerful endorsement of not only the technology, but of the practice of targeted killing as an instrument of foreign and security policy. Having provided this powerful impetus, the United States should not be surprised if others—with differing legal standards and more creative efforts at self-justification—seize upon it once they have the necessary capabilities. According to the GAO, this is already happening—in government-speak, “while only a limited number of countries have fielded lethal or weaponized UAVs, this threat is anticipated to grow.” From this perspective, it is ironic that a president so critical of his predecessor’s unilateralism would practice it himself—particularly in a manner that other governments will find much easier to emulate than the Bush administration’s larger-scale use of force. How does the Obama administration plan to respond if and when China or Russia uses armed UAVs to attack groups they define as terrorists?

**Restrictions won’t be modeled- precedent already set**

**Jacobson 13** [Mark R. Jacobson is a senior transatlantic fellow at the German Marshall Fund of the United States. From 2009 to 2011, he served with NATO’s International Security Assistance Force in Afghanistan, “Column: Key Assumptions About Drones Are Based on Misconceptions,” 2-12, <http://www.vnews.com/opinion/4393278-95/drones-drone-armed-civilian>]

Armed drones are neither as simple as model airplanes nor as complex as high-performance fighter jets. Of course, a remote-controlled helicopter that you can build in your garage is certainly not as capable as the $26.8 million MQ-9 Reaper, the primary U.S. hunter-killer drone. But drones are much less expensive than fighter aircraft, and in an age of increasing austerity, it is tempting for nations to consider replacing jets with drones. More than 50 countries operate surveillance drones, and armed drones will quickly become standard in military arsenals. The challenge is to consider what international rules, if any, should govern the use of armed drones. The United States is setting the precedent; our approach may define the global rules of engagement. Of course, we cannot expect other nations to adopt the oversight and restrictions we have. What doors are we opening for other nations’ use of drones? What happens when terrorist groups acquire them? The United States must prepare for being the prey, not just the predator.

# A2 Econ Defense

#### Statistics prove diversionary war theory

Royal ‘10 (Director of CTR Jedediah, Director of Cooperative Threat Reduction – U.S. Department of Defense, “Economic Integration, Economic Signaling and the Problem of Economic Crises”, Economics of War and Peace: Economic, Legal and Political Perspectives, Ed. Goldsmith and Brauer, p. 213-215)

Less intuitive is how periods of economic decline may increase the likelihood of external conflict. Political science literature has contributed a moderate degree of attention to the impact of economic decline and the security and defence behaviour of interdependent states. Research in this vein has been considered at systemic, dyadic and national levels. Several notable contributions follow. First, on the systemic level, Pollins (2008) advances Modelski and Thompson's (1996) work on leadership cycle theory, finding that rhythms in the global economy are associated with the rise and fall of a pre-eminent power and the often bloody transition from one pre-eminent leader to the next. As such, exogenous shocks such as economic crises could usher in a redistribution of relative power (see also Gilpin. 1981) that leads to uncertainty about power balances, increasing the risk of miscalculation (Feaver, 1995). Alternatively, even a relatively certain redistribution of power could lead to a permissive environment for conflict as a rising power may seek to challenge a declining power (Werner. 1999). Separately, Pollins (1996) also shows that global economic cycles combined with parallel leadership cycles impact the likelihood of conflict among major, medium and small powers, although he suggests that the causes and connections between global economic conditions and security conditions remain unknown. Second, on a dyadic level, Copeland's (1996, 2000) theory of trade expectations suggests that 'future expectation of trade' is a significant variable in understanding economic conditions and security behaviour of states. He argues that interdependent states are likely to gain pacific benefits from trade so long as they have an optimistic view of future trade relations. However, if the expectations of future trade decline, particularly for difficult to replace items such as energy resources, the likelihood for conflict increases, as states will be inclined to use force to gain access to those resources. Crises could potentially be the trigger for decreased trade expectations either on its own or because it triggers protectionist moves by interdependent states.4 Third, others have considered the link between economic decline and external armed conflict at a national level. Blomberg and Hess (2002) find a strong correlation between internal conflict and external conflict, particularly during periods of economic downturn. They write: The linkages between internal and external conflict and prosperity are strong and mutually reinforcing. Economic conflict tends to spawn internal conflict, which in turn returns the favour. Moreover, the presence of a recession tends to amplify the extent to which international and external conflicts self-reinforce each other. (Blomberg & Hess, 2002. p. 89) Economic decline has also been linked with an increase in the likelihood of terrorism (Blomberg, Hess, & Weerapana, 2004), which has the capacity to spill across borders and lead to external tensions. Furthermore, crises generally reduce the popularity of a sitting government. "Diversionary theory" suggests that, when facing unpopularity arising from economic decline, sitting governments have increased incentives to fabricate external military conflicts to create a 'rally around the flag' effect. Wang (1996), DeRouen (1995). and Blomberg, Hess, and Thacker (2006) find supporting evidence showing that economic decline and use of force are at least indirectly correlated. Gelpi (1997), Miller (1999), and Kisangani and Pickering (2009) suggest that the tendency towards diversionary tactics are greater for democratic states than autocratic states, due to the fact that democratic leaders are generally more susceptible to being removed from office due to lack of domestic support. DeRouen (2000) has provided evidence showing that periods of weak economic performance in the United States, and thus weak Presidential popularity, are statistically linked to an increase in the use of force. In summary, recent economic scholarship positively correlates economic integration with an increase in the frequency of economic crises, whereas political science scholarship links economic decline with external conflict at systemic, dyadic and national levels.5 This implied connection between integration, crises and armed conflict has not featured prominently in the economic-security debate and deserves more attention.

# A2 US Not Key

**Economy is improving now and key to the global econ**

**LaGarde 9/19 -** Managing Director, International Monetary Fund

U.S. Chamber of Commerce <Christine. “The Interconnected Global Economy:

Challenges and Opportunities for the United States—and the World” September 19, 2013. http://www.imf.org/external/np/speeches/2013/091913.htm>

This brings me to my second main theme: the critical role of the United States, and American business in particular, in our increasingly interconnected world.¶ The recovery gaining strength here is good news for America—and good news for the world. Admittedly, U.S. growth will be more modest this year than we would want—still well below 2 percent. Even so, it should accelerate significantly next year, by about one percentage point.¶ Indeed, the fundamentals of the U.S. economy have been improving gradually. Households are in better shape—they have lowered their debt and benefited from the recovery in house prices and the strong performance of the stock market. The housing sector is looking brighter, with ample potential for construction activity to pick up further. The private sector is yet again proving to be the primary engine of growth and job creation—and the main reason for weak growth this year is the very large ongoing fiscal adjustment, a theme I will return to shortly.¶ Job creation is the key ingredient of any economic recovery, domestic or global. The latest U.S. jobs data present a mixed picture. The unemployment rate has declined to 7.3 percent in August, but the participation rate has continued to decline, and employment remains well below pre-crisis levels. So the issue of jobs remains paramount.¶ Jobs and growth is an increasingly important component of the IMF’s policy advice. I know that it is very much on your minds here at the Chamber too.¶ Business—including the people in this room—have a key role to play. At the same time, policymakers also have an important responsibility to help shape the environment in which businesses and citizens can thrive—and jobs can be created.¶ So what should U.S. policymakers do? Here are a few points from our most recent assessment of the U.S. economy in July:¶ First, fix public finances. I have characterized this as a case of “slow down, but hurry up.” While we think it would have been more advisable to have a slower pace of fiscal consolidation in the short run—without using the blunt instrument of sequester—more action is needed to reduce long-run pressure on the budget. This includes addressing entitlement spending and higher revenues. In addition, the ongoing political uncertainty over the budget and the debt ceiling does not help. It is essential to resolve this—and the earlier the better—for confidence, for markets, and for the real economy.¶ Second, appropriately calibrated monetary policy, our advice is that exit from unconventional monetary policies should be gradual, linked to progress in the recovery and employment, and that it should be clearly communicated and in a dialogue.¶ Third, finish reforming the financial sector. There has been progress on this agenda— for example, the new capital and liquidity requirements for banks under Basle III—but the system is still not safe enough. Policymakers need to turn their attention to the outstanding danger zones, especially derivatives and shadow banking. The ultimate goal is clear: to have a financial system that is less prone to instability and better able to serve the real economy.¶ Financial sector reform, of course, is not the sole responsibility of the United States. It needs to be tackled in many countries and regions, ideally in a coordinated and consistent way to ensure the healthy function of the entire global financial system. I am thinking here for instance of the resolution of international financial institutions.¶ This brings me back to the point of global connections.¶ The United States plays a unique role in the global economy. I am thinking, for instance, of global trade—of which the U.S. accounts for 11 percent. The U.S. also represents 20 percent of global manufacturing value-added. I know that you recognize the potential of an even bigger market. Tom and others at the Chamber have often referred to 95 percent of your potential customers living “outside the U.S.”¶ America’s global financial ties are even deeper. Foreign banks hold about $5½ trillion of U.S. assets, while American banks hold about $3 trillion of foreign claims. Meanwhile, close to half of the S&P500’s sales originate from foreign operations.¶ These interconnections have great benefits for the United States. But they are not without risks—two-way risks—and we saw some of these play out during this crisis.¶ We all remember, five years ago, how the collapse of one U.S. bank ushered in a harsh new reality across sectors, across countries, and across the world. As those tensions traveled across the Atlantic, for example, they exposed tensions in Europe.¶ Considering that 20 percent of U.S. exports are destined for Europe, and that more than half of U.S. overseas assets are held in Europe, you clearly have a large stake in the recovery there.¶ And yet, despite the risks, I know that you are also deeply aware of how much can be gained from engaging with the rest of the world.¶ President Taft, who helped establish the Chamber, captured this when he said: “I am in favor of helping the prosperity of all countries because, when we are all prosperous, the trade with each becomes more valuable to the other.”¶ What was true in President Taft’s day is even more true in today’s interconnected world: a strong U.S. economy and a strong global economy are two sides of the same coin.

#### US growth spills over globally

Caploe ‘9 (David Caploe is CEO of the Singapore-incorporated American Centre for Applied Liberal Arts and Humanities in Asia., “Focus still on America to lead global recovery”, April 7, The Strait Times, lexis)

IN THE aftermath of the G-20 summit, most observers seem to have missed perhaps the most crucial statement of the entire event, made by United States President Barack Obama at his pre-conference meeting with British Prime Minister Gordon Brown: 'The world has become accustomed to the US being a voracious consumer market, the engine that drives a lot of economic growth worldwide,' he said. 'If there is going to be renewed growth, it just can't be the US as the engine.' While superficially sensible, this view is deeply problematic. To begin with, it ignores the fact that the global economy has in fact been 'America-centred' for more than 60 years. Countries - China, Japan, Canada, Brazil, Korea, Mexico and so on - either sell to the US or they sell to countries that sell to the US. This system has generally been advantageous for all concerned. America gained certain historically unprecedented benefits, but the system also enabled participating countries - first in Western Europe and Japan, and later, many in the Third World - to achieve undreamt-of prosperity. At the same time, this deep inter-connection between the US and the rest of the world also explains how the collapse of a relatively small sector of the US economy - 'sub-prime' housing, logarithmically exponentialised by Wall Street's ingenious chicanery - has cascaded into the worst global economic crisis since the Great Depression. To put it simply, Mr Obama doesn't seem to understand that there is no other engine for the world economy - and hasn't been for the last six decades. If the US does not drive global economic growth, growth is not going to happen. Thus, US policies to deal with the current crisis are critical not just domestically, but also to the entire world. Consequently, it is a matter of global concern that the Obama administration seems to be following Japan's 'model' from the 1990s: allowing major banks to avoid declaring massive losses openly and transparently, and so perpetuating 'zombie' banks - technically alive but in reality dead. As analysts like Nobel laureates Joseph Stiglitz and Paul Krugman have pointed out, the administration's unwillingness to confront US banks is the main reason why they are continuing their increasingly inexplicable credit freeze, thus ravaging the American and global economies.

# Econ – I/Ls

#### Failure to raise the debt ceiling has economic ripple effects – investor uncertainty

Masters 13 (Jonathan, Deputy Editor at the Council on Foreign Relations, Backgrounder, jan 2 2013"US Debt Ceiling. Costs and Consequences")

Most economists, including those in the White House and from former administrations, agree that the impact of an outright government default would be severe. Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke has said a U.S. default could be a ["recovery-ending event"](http://blogs.wsj.com/economics/2011/03/01/bernanke-warns-on-debt-limit-chaos/) that would likely spark another financial crisis. Short of default, officials warn that legislative delays in raising the debt ceiling could also inflict significant harm on the economy.¶ Many analysts say congressional gridlock over the debt limit will likely sow significant uncertainty in the bond markets and place upward pressure on interest rates. Rate increases would not only hike future borrowing costs of the federal government, but would also raise capital costs for struggling U.S. businesses and cash-strapped homebuyers. In addition, rising rates could divert future taxpayer money away from much-needed federal investments in such areas as infrastructure, education, and health care.¶ The protracted and politically acrimonious debt limit showdown in the summer 2011 prompted Standard and Poor's to take the unprecedented step of downgrading the U.S. credit rating from its triple-A status, and analysts fear such brinksmanship in early 2013 could bring about similar moves from other rating agencies.¶ A 2012 study by the non-partisan Government Accountability Office estimated that [delays in raising the debt ceiling](http://www.gao.gov/products/GAO-12-701) in 2011 cost taxpayers approximately $1.3 billion for FY 2011. BPC estimated the ten-year costs of the prolonged fight at roughly $19 billion.¶ The stock market also was thrown into frenzy in the lead-up to and aftermath of the 2011 debt limit debate, with the [Dow Jones Industrial Average](http://www.bizjournals.com/nashville/news/2011/08/08/slideshow-dows-10-worst-days-ever.html) plunging roughly 2,000 points from the final days of July through the first days of August. Indeed, the Dow recorded one of its worst single-day drops in history on August 8, the day after the S&P downgrade, tumbling 635 points.¶ Speaking to the [Economic Club of New York](http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/11/20/idUSW1E8KA00A20121120) in November 2012, Fed Chairman Ben Bernanke warned that congressional inaction with regard to the fiscal cliff, the raising of the debt ceiling, and the longer-term budget situation was creating uncertainty that "appears already to be affecting private spending and investment decisions and may be contributing to an increased sense of caution in financial markets, with adverse effects on the economy."

# Will Pass – 2NC Wall

#### -- Insiders vote neg

Bolton 9/14/13 (Alexander, Writer for the Hill, "Confident Democrats Want Separate Showdowns on Shutdown and Debt Limit")

¶ Senate Democrats want to have separate fights with the House GOP over a potential government shutdown and raising the nation’s debt limit, confident they will win showdowns on both issues. [[WATCH VIDEO](http://thehill.com/video/senate/322259-house-gop-prepares-for-last-fight-against-obamacare)]  Some House Republicans want to bundle the question of setting federal funding levels and raising the debt limit into one vote but a senior Senate Democrat has rejected that possibility. ¶ Senate Democratic Whip Dick Durbin (D-Ill.) said repeatedly raising the debt limit in small increments wreaks havoc on government operations.¶ “The longer you extend the debt limit, the more thoughtless it is,” he said.¶ Durbin predicted Congress would tackle the debt limit question in mid October instead of pushing the debate until shortly before Christmas.¶ “October 15, mark your calendar,” he said. “I’m told that come October 15 we better start getting serious about it.”¶ Durbin said he wants extend the nation’s borrowing limit for as long as possible in one increment. He cited a year as a reasonable extension.¶ “We’re not going to be in the situation where you’re lurching from crisis to crisis and putting the full faith and credit [of the government] at the hands of a Republican caucus that can’t get it’s act together,” said a senior Senate Democratic aide. “Doing a longer term clean debt-limit extension will prevent that from happening.” Some House Republicans want to maximize their leverage by bundling the debt limit and stopgap measure funding government. They could accomplish this by extending government funding until mid-December and bumping up the debt limit just enough to delay a medium-term solution until year’s end.¶ Democrats, however, want to force the GOP to debate these issues successively.¶ “We’re not negotiating on the debt ceiling. We think we have the high ground in both of those fights,” said a senior Senate Democratic aide.¶ The Senate Democratic strategy over the next several weeks will be to stand pat and refuse to make any significant concessions in exchange for funding the government or raising the debt ceiling.  “If push comes to shove on debt ceiling, I’m virtually certain they’ll blink,” said Sen. Charles Schumer (N.Y.), the third-ranking member of the Senate Democratic leadership. “They know they shouldn’t be playing havoc with the markets.”¶

#### The GOP will cave

The Wall street journal 9/19/13 ("Boehener: GOP Has 'No Interest' In Letting US Default on DEbt")

Republicans have “no interest” in allowing the U.S. government to default on its debt, House Speaker [John Boehner](http://topics.wsj.com/person/B/john%2C-boehner/6252) (R., Ohio) told reporters Thursday.¶ The top Republican in the House said GOP lawmakers will meet Friday morning to discuss their next steps in the emerging fiscal showdown.¶ “Let me be very clear: Republicans have no interest in defaulting on our debt — none,” Mr. Boehner told reporters. “But we want to find a way to pay it off.”¶ The Treasury Department has told Congress that the federal government will exhaust its ability to continue borrowing money in mid-October. Lawmakers must raise the borrowing limit, known as the debt ceiling, in order for the country to continue paying its bills.

#### -- Obama push overcomes opposition

Feldmann 9/18/13 (Linda, Christian Science Monitor, "Government shutdown coming? Boehner raises stakes on defunding Obamacare")

As for Obama, even before Boehner’s capitulation to the tea party wing of his caucus, efforts to woo the Republicans into a budget deal have born no fruit, and so he has opted for verbal slaps. On Monday, the president took to a [White House](http://www.csmonitor.com/tags/topic/The%2BWhite%2BHouse) stage to mark the five-year anniversary of the 2008 financial crisis, and he spewed vitriol at his most ardent opponents – even though a mass shooting had just taken place a few miles from the White House.¶ "I cannot remember a time when one faction of one party promises economic chaos if it doesn't get 100 percent of what it wants," Obama said.¶ At Wednesday’s briefing, White House press secretary [Jay Carney](http://www.csmonitor.com/tags/topic/Jay%2BCarney) suggested that the president’s past charm offensive with Republicans – including taking some out to dinner at an expensive restaurant (on his dime) – hadn’t completely failed.¶ “What we discovered is that there is a sincere desire by Republican lawmakers, some of them, anyway ... to make budget policy that ... reduces the deficit responsibly, but invests responsibly as well,” Mr. Carney said.¶ And, he said, the president will still try “all manner of ways to get to yes with Republican leaders.”

# 2NC – TOD

#### Budget issues are at the top of the docket – Obama is pushing

Pace 9/12/13 (Julie, AP White House Correspondent, "Syria Debate On Hold, Obama Refocuses on Agenda")

With a military strike against Syria on hold, President Barack Obama tried Thursday to reignite momentum for his second-term domestic agenda. But his progress could hinge on the strength of his standing on Capitol Hill after what even allies acknowledge were missteps in the latest foreign crisis.¶ "It is still important to recognize that we have a lot of things left to do here in this government," Obama told his Cabinet, starting a sustained White House push to refocus the nation on matters at home as key benchmarks on the budget and health care rapidly approach.¶ "The American people are still interested in making sure that our kids are getting the kind of education they deserve, that we are putting people back to work," Obama said.¶ The White House plans to use next week's five-year anniversary of the 2008 financial collapse to warn Republicans that shutting down the government or failing to raise the debt limit could drag down the still-fragile economy. With Hispanic Heritage Month to begin Monday, Obama expects to press for a stalled immigration overhaul and urge minorities to sign up for health care exchanges beginning Oct. 1.¶ Two major factors are driving Obama's push to get back on track with domestic issues after three weeks of Syria dominating the political debate. Polls show the economy, jobs and health care remain Americans' top concerns. And Obama has a limited window to make progress on those matters in a second term, when lame-duck status can quickly creep up on presidents, particularly if they start losing public support.

**pressure gets vote counts**

**Lillis and Wasson 9/7**, Mike, the Hill writer, Erik, the Hill writer, “Fears of wounding Obama weigh heavily on Democrats ahead of vote,” 9/7, http://thehill.com/homenews/house/320829-fears-of-wounding-obama-weigh-heavily-on-democrats#ixzz2fOPUfPNr

The prospect of wounding President Obama is weighing heavily on Democratic lawmakers as they decide their votes on Syria. **Obama needs** all the political capital he can muster **heading into bruising battles with the GOP over fiscal spending and the debt ceiling**. Democrats want Obama to use his popularity to reverse automatic spending cuts already in effect and pay for new economic stimulus measures through higher taxes on the wealthy and on multinational companies. But if the request for authorization for Syria military strikes is rebuffed, some fear it could limit Obama's power in those high-stakes fights. That has left Democrats with an agonizing decision: vote "no" on Syria and possibly encourage more chemical attacks while weakening their president, or vote "yes" and risk another war in the Middle East. “I’m sure a lot of people are focused on the political ramifications,” a House Democratic aide said. Rep. Jim Moran (D-Va.), a veteran appropriator, said the failure of the Syria resolution would diminish Obama's leverage in the fiscal battles. "It doesn't help him," Moran said Friday by phone. "**We need a** maximally strong president **to get us through this fiscal thicket. These are going to be very difficult votes."**

# PC High – AT: Approval Ratings

#### Obama is still doing better than Congress

The Globe and Mail 9/16/13 (Paul Koring, The Globe and Mail, "Obama Faces Fall Showdown With Congress")

But even as Mr. Obama’s approval ratings have dropped sharply, they still remain well above the abysmal levels recorded by Congress.¶ Karlyn Bowman, a senior fellow at the American Enterprise Institute, said Mr. Obama added to the public disaffection with Washington with his handling of Syria. “Nobody in Washington,” she added, “looks very good these days.”

# 2NC Losers Lose

#### Obama winning on the debt ceiling now

Easley 9/18/13 (Jason, "Obama's Genius Labeling of GOP Demands Extortion Has Already Won the Debt Ceiling Fight")

President Obama effectively ended any Republican hopes of getting a political victory on the debt ceiling when he called their demands extortion. Nobody likes being extorted. The American people don’t like feeling like they are being shaken down. The White House knows this, which is why they are using such strong language to criticize the Republicans. Obama is doing the same thing to House Republicans that he has been doing to the entire party for the last few years. The president is defining them before they can define themselves.¶ Obama is taking the same tactics that he used to define Mitt Romney in the summer of 2012 and applying them to John Boehner and his House Republicans. While Republicans are fighting among themselves and gearing up for another pointless run at defunding Obamacare, the president is already winning the political battle over the debt ceiling. His comments today were a masterstroke of strategy that will pay political dividends now and in the future. If the president is successful anytime a Republican talks about defunding Obamacare, the American people will think extortion. Republicans keep insisting on unconstitutional plots to kill Obamacare, and the [president is calling them out on it.](http://www.politicususa.com/2013/09/15/obama-turns-tables-tells-republicans-debt-ceiling-demands-unconstitutional.html) Republicans haven’t realized it yet, but while they are chasing the fool’s gold of defunding Obamacare they have already lost on the debt ceiling. By caving to the lunatic fringe in his party, John Boehner may have [handed control of the House of Representatives back to Democrats on a silver platter.](http://www.politicususa.com/2013/09/17/wall-street-journal-warns-gop-government-shutdown-give-democrats-house.html) While Republicans posture on Obamacare, Obama is routing them on the debt ceiling.

#### Congressional backlash against presidential military powers drains political capital- empirically proven

Kriner, 10 -- Boston University political science professor [Douglas, Ph.D. in Government from Harvard University, After the Rubicon: Congress, Presidents, and the Politics of Waging War, 67-69, google books, accessed 6-7-13, mss]

¶ Shaping both real and anticipated public opinion are two important ways in which Congress can raise or lower the political costs of a military action for the president. However, focusing exclusively on opinion dynamics threatens to obscure the much broader political consequences of domestic reaction-particularly congressional opposition-to presidential foreign policies. At least since Richard Neustadt's seminal work Presidential Power, presidency scholars have warned that costly political battles in one policy arena frequently have significant ramifications for presidential power in other realms. Indeed, two of Neustadt's three "cases of command"-Truman's seizure of the steel mills and firing of General Douglas MacArthur-explicitly discussed the broader political consequences of stiff domestic resistance to presidential assertions of commander-in-chief powers. In both cases, Truman emerged victorious in the case at hand-yet, Neustadt argues, each victory cost Truman dearly in terms of his future power prospects and leeway in other policy areas, many of which were more important to the president than achieving unconditional victory over North Korea." 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 pros- pects, as well as indirect consequences for congressional races." Indeed, Democratic efforts to tie congressional Republican incumbents to Presi- dent 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."" **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 both 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 priorities, 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."¶ When making their cost-benefit calculations, presidents surely con- sider 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.

# 2NC PolCap

Obama not engaging now but revising the AUMF saps capital – AUMF will capitalize on WOT

Munoz 5/23/13 (Carlo, Staff Writer at the The Hill specializing in Defense and National Security , "Obama Seeks to Ramp Down 9/11-Era Rules for War on Terror")

Some Republicans argued Obama was weakening the U.S. war on terror with his proposals.¶ “I believe we are still in a long, drawn-out conflict with al Qaeda. To somehow argue that al Qaeda is ‘on the run,’ comes from a degree of un-reality to me that is really incredible,” said Sen. John McCain (R-Ariz.).¶ Violent al Qaeda affiliates in Yemen, West Africa, Libya and elsewhere that continue to plot attacks against the United States are proof positive the rules of engagement must remain intact, he said.¶ "To somehow think we can bring the [AUMF] to a complete closure contradicts the reality of the facts on the ground," McCain said. "Al Qaeda will be with us for a long time."¶ A former CIA officer argued the White House simply does not have the political capital to burn in order to get the counterterrorism rules changed.¶ "Congress is not going to allow [Obama] to move" on the rules changes or any of the other initiatives laid out by the president during Thursday's speech, Frederick Fleitz, a former CIA official, told The Hill on Thursday.¶ "I do not think the president is going to spend a lot of political capital on this," said Fleitz, who described Thursday's speech as being geared more toward preserving Obama's foreign policy legacy than actual changes in counterterrorism strategy.¶ Obama's effort to change nearly a decade of battle-tested counterterrorism tactics could have a chilling effect on the military and intelligence community, Fleitz said.

Republicans will use constraining the WOT as a rallying point – saps capital

Dyer 8/7/13 (George, Financial Times, Obama Looks For Escape From Toxic Politics of Terrorism")

Yet, the impression the administration has created is of a resurgent al-Qaeda which still has the capacity to organise attacks on US interests. Analysts point out that the political turmoil in the Middle East is providing the sort of ungoverned spaces that al-Qaeda thrives on. The shutdowns have also provided an easy target for Republican critics who accuse the administration of underplaying the threat from the terror network to boost Mr Obama’s re-election chances.¶ If Mr Obama had wanted to unwind parts of the war on terror apparatus, he might also have taken the lead in letting in some light on the surveillance programmes the US has created. Instead, he has been buffeted by the Edward Snowden disclosures and has been forced to lobby members of Congress to maintain some of the most controversial features.¶ It is possible that NSA intercepts played a key role in detecting the new al-Qaeda plot, which could win the administration some breathing space. But the political price is to rely on many of the same Republicans who lambast the president as weak on terrorism to make the case for the administration’s electronic eavesdropping.¶ In his May speech, Mr Obama said he wanted to start a conversation about a pragmatic approach towards terrorism. With the far right and left denouncing the US surveillance state and parts of the intelligence community and neoconservative Republicans warning of a revived al-Qaeda, that debate is taking place. It is just that the president is following, not leading the discussion.

# A2 Polcap not real

#### Political capital is finite and drives decisionmaking

**Schier 9**, Professor of Poliitcal Science at Carleton, (Steven, "Understanding the Obama Presidency," The Forum: Vol. 7: Iss. 1, Berkely Electronic Press, <http://www.bepress.com/forum/vol7/iss1/art10>)

 In additional to formal powers, a president’s informal power is situationally derived and highly variable. Informal power is a function of the “political capital” presidents amass and deplete as they operate in office. Paul Light defines several components of political capital: party support of the president in Congress, public approval of the presidential conduct of his job, the President’s electoral margin and patronage appointments (Light 1983, 15). Richard Neustadt’s concept of a president’s “professional reputation” likewise figures into his political capital. Neustadt defines this as the “impressions in the Washington community about the skill and will with which he puts [his formal powers] to use” (Neustadt 1990, 185). In the wake of 9/11, George W. Bush’s political capital surged, and both the public and Washington elites granted him a broad ability to prosecute the war on terror. By the later stages of Bush’s troubled second term, beset by a lengthy and unpopular occupation of Iraq and an aggressive Democratic Congress, he found that his political capital had shrunk. Obama’s informal powers will prove variable, not stable, as is always the case for presidents. Nevertheless, he entered office with a formidable store of political capital. His solid electoral victory means he initially will receive high public support and strong backing from fellow Congressional partisans, a combination that will allow him much leeway in his presidential appointments and with his policy agenda. Obama probably enjoys the prospect of a happier honeymoon during his first year than did George W. Bush, who entered office amidst continuing controversy over the 2000 election outcome. Presidents usually employ power to disrupt the political order they inherit in order to reshape it according to their own agendas. Stephen Skowronek argues that “presidents disrupt systems, reshape political landscapes, and pass to successors leadership challenges that are different from the ones just faced” (Skowronek 1997, 6). Given their limited time in office and the hostile political alignments often present in Washington policymaking networks and among the electorate, presidents must force political change if they are to enact their agendas. In recent decades, Washington power structures have become more entrenched and elaborate (Drucker 1995) while presidential powers – through increased use of executive orders and legislative delegation (Howell 2003) –have also grown. The presidency has more powers in the early 21st century but also faces more entrenched coalitions of interests, lawmakers, and bureaucrats whose agendas often differ from that of the president. This is an invitation for an energetic president – and that seems to describe Barack Obama – to engage in major ongoing battles to impose his preferences.

**Presidents think capital’s real – our link’s true in practice**

**Marshall et al 11**, Bryan W, Miami University BRANDON C. PRINS University of Tennessee & Howard H. Baker, Jr. Center for Public Policy Power or Posturing? Policy Availability and Congressional Influence on U.S. Presidential Decisions to Use Force Presidential Studies Quarterly 41, no. 3 (September)

We argue that the more important effect of Congress occurs because presidents anticipate how the use of force may affect the larger congressional environment in which they inevitably have to operate (Brulé, Marshall, and Prins 2010). It may be true that presidents consider the chances that Congress will react to a specific use of force with countervailing tools, but even more importantly they anticipate the likelihood that a foreign conflict may damage (or advantage) their political fortunes elsewhere—in essence, the presidential calculus to use force factors in how such actions might shape their ability to achieve legislative priorities. To be clear, presidents can and do choose to use force and press for legislative initiatives in Congress. Taking unilateral actions in foreign policy does not preclude the president from working the legislative process on Capitol Hill. However, **political capital is finite so spending resources in one area lessens what the president can bring to bear in other areas.** That is, presidents consider the congressional environment in their decision to use force because their success at promoting policy change in either foreign or domestic affairs is largely determined by their relationship with Congress. Presidents do not make such decisions devoid of calculations regarding congressional preferences and behavior or how such decisions may influence their ability to achieve legislative objectives. This is true in large part because presidential behavior is motivated by multiple goals that are intimately tied to Congress. Presidents place a premium on passing legislative initiatives. The passage of policy is integral to their goals of reelection and enhancing their place in history (Canes-Wrone 2001; Moe 1985). Therefore, presidents seek to build and protect their relationship with Congress.

# 2NC Cyber

#### It causes cyberattacks

**Sideman**, 2-23-**2011** [Alysha, Federal Computer Week Contributor, “Agencies must determine computer security teams in face of potential federal shutdown” http://fcw.com/Articles/2011/02/23/Agencies-must-determine-computer-security-teams-in-face-of-shutdown.aspx?Page=1]

With the WikiLeaks hacks and other threats to cybersecurity present, guarding against cyberattacks has become a significant part of governing -- especially because most government agencies have moved to online systems. As a potential government shutdown comes closer, agencies must face new questions about defining “essential” computer personnel. Cyber threats weren’t as significant during the 1995 furlough as they are today, reports NextGov. The publication adds that agencies need to buck up and be organized. In late January, government officials, NATO and the European Union banded together in Brussels to formulate a plan to battle cyber bandits, according to Defense Systems. Leaders there agreed that existing cybersecurity measures were incomplete and decided to fast-track a new plan for cyber incident response. Meanwhile, observers are wondering whether the U.S. government has a plan to deal with cyberattacks in the case of a shutdown. The lists of essential computer security personnel drawn up 15 years ago are irrelevant today, computer specialists told NextGov. In 1995, the only agencies concerned about cybersecurity were entities such as the FBI and CIA. Today, before any potential government shutdown happens, a plan of essential IT personnel should be determined, the specialists add. Agencies should be figuring out which systems will need daily surveillance and strategic defense, as well as evaluating the job descriptions of the people operating in those systems, former federal executives told NextGov. Hord Tipton, a former Interior Department CIO, agrees. “If they haven’t done it, there’s going to be a mad scramble, and there’s going to be a hole in the system,” he told the site. All government departments are supposed to have contingency plans on deck that spell out essential systems and the employees associated with them, according to federal rules. Meanwhile, some experts say determining which IT workers are essential depends more on the length of the shutdown. Jeffrey Wheatman, a security and privacy analyst with the Gartner research group, tells NextGov that a shutdown lasting a couple of weeks “would require incident response personnel, network administrators and staff who monitor firewall logs for potential intrusions.” If a shutdown lasted a month or longer, more employees would need to report, he said, adding: “New threats could emerge during that time frame, which demands people with strategy-oriented job functions to devise new lines of defense.” Employees who are deemed “essential” are critical to national security. Cyber warfare or holes in cybersecurity can threaten a nation’s infrastructure. In particular, the electric grid, the nation’s military assets, financial sector and telecommunications networks can be vulnerable in the face of an attack, reports Federal Computer Week.

#### Great power escalation.

**Fritz, 2009** [Jason, researcher for International Commission on Nuclear Nonproliferation and Disarmament, former Army officer and consultant, and has a master of international relations at Bond University, “Hacking Nuclear Command and Control,” July, http://www.icnnd.org/latest/research/Jason\_Fritz\_Hacking\_NC2.pdf]

This paper will analyse the threat of cyber terrorism in regard to nuclear weapons. Specifically, this research will use open source knowledge to identify the structure of nuclear command and control centres, how those structures might be compromised through computer network operations, and how doing so would fit within established cyber terrorists’ capabilities, strategies, and tactics. If access to command and control centres is obtained, terrorists could fake or actually cause one nuclear-armed state to attack another, thus provoking a nuclear response from another nuclear power. This may be an easier alternative for terrorist groups than building or acquiring a nuclear weapon or dirty bomb themselves. This would also act as a force equaliser, and provide terrorists with the asymmetric benefits of high speed, removal of geographical distance, and a relatively low cost. Continuing difficulties in developing computer tracking technologies which could trace the identity of intruders, and difficulties in establishing an internationally agreed upon legal framework to guide responses to computer network operations, point towards an inherent weakness in using computer networks to manage nuclear weaponry. This is particularly relevant to reducing the hair trigger posture of existing nuclear arsenals. All computers which are connected to the internet are susceptible to infiltration and remote control. Computers which operate on a closed network may also be compromised by various hacker methods, such as privilege escalation, roaming notebooks, wireless access points, embedded exploits in software and hardware, and maintenance entry points. For example, e-mail spoofing targeted at individuals who have access to a closed network, could lead to the installation of a virus on an open network. This virus could then be carelessly transported on removable data storage between the open and closed network. Information found on the internet may also reveal how to access these closed networks directly. Efforts by militaries to place increasing reliance on computer networks, including experimental technology such as autonomous systems, and their desire to have multiple launch options, such as nuclear triad capability, enables multiple entry points for terrorists. For example, if a terrestrial command centre is impenetrable, perhaps isolating one nuclear armed submarine would prove an easier task. There is evidence to suggest multiple attempts have been made by hackers to compromise the extremely low radio frequency once used by the US Navy to send nuclear launch approval to submerged submarines. Additionally, the alleged Soviet system known as Perimetr was designed to automatically launch nuclear weapons if it was unable to establish communications with Soviet leadership. This was intended as a retaliatory response in the event that nuclear weapons had decapitated Soviet leadership; however it did not account for the possibility of cyber terrorists blocking communications through computer network operations in an attempt to engage the system. Should a warhead be launched, damage could be further enhanced through additional computer network operations. By using proxies, multi-layered attacks could be engineered. Terrorists could remotely commandeer computers in China and use them to launch a US nuclear attack against Russia. Thus Russia would believe it was under attack from the US and the US would believe China was responsible. Further, emergency response communications could be disrupted, transportation could be shut down, and disinformation, such as misdirection, could be planted, thereby hindering the disaster relief effort and maximizing destruction. Disruptions in communication and the use of disinformation could also be used to provoke uninformed responses. For example, a nuclear strike between India and Pakistan could be coordinated with Distributed Denial of Service attacks against key networks, so they would have further difficulty in identifying what happened and be forced to respond quickly. Terrorists could also knock out communications between these states so they cannot discuss the situation. Alternatively, amidst the confusion of a traditional large-scale terrorist attack, claims of responsibility and declarations of war could be falsified in an attempt to instigate a hasty military response. These false claims could be posted directly on Presidential, military, and government websites. E-mails could also be sent to the media and foreign governments using the IP addresses and e-mail accounts of government officials. A sophisticated and all encompassing combination of traditional terrorism and cyber terrorism could be enough to launch nuclear weapons on its own, without the need for compromising command and control centres directly.

# 2nr Summers

#### Summers’ withdrawal solves –

Market Watch 9/18/13 ("Failure of Summers Nomination Reflects weakened White House")

Could the president have gotten Summers through? Probably. Presidents almost always get their way on major nominations and their choices are rarely denied, especially by members of the same party. The Senate, for example, has only blocked three presidential cabinet appointments in the past century, the last rejection occurring in 1989. In each case the opposition party was in control.¶ Obama might have been able to persuade liberals that a highly publicized vote against Summers could severely harm his presidency and undermine the cause of Democrats on other major issues. Yet he would have had to expend precious political capital to get his way.

**Summers didn’t cost capital**

**Lowrey 9/16**, Annie, reporter in the Washington bureau of The New York Times, “Summers Seen as Costly in Political Terms,” 9/16, http://www.nytimes.com/2013/09/17/business/democrats-saw-summerss-fed-nomination-as-too-costly-in-political-capital.html?pagewanted=all

That spotty phone call — reflecting the revolt of a number of prominent Democrats, many of them from the liberal wing of the party, but not limited to it — helped to seal Mr. Summers’s fate. Not even an official nominee yet, Mr. Summers, a former Treasury secretary under President Bill Clinton and a key architect of Mr. Obama’s economic stimulus program, faced long odds in winning Senate confirmation. On Sunday, Mr. Summers pulled out of contention, citing a potentially “acrimonious” battle that could harm the economy and Mr. Obama’s presidency. Senate Democrats did not “want the fight,” said one Congressional aide, speaking on condition of anonymity. “They don’t want another fight that divides Democrats, and brings back to the forefront a bunch of the issues we dealt with during the crisis and the bailout.” The aide continued: “And they don’t want to spend the political capital to get this guy through.” Ultimately, they got their way.

# Winwin

**Even if a confrontational strategy is key, that doesn’t mean the plan’s singular win spills-over—it’s more likely to undermine Obama’s careful strategy**

Ryan Lizza, 1/7/13, Will Hagel Spike the G.O.P.’s Fever?, www.newyorker.com/online/blogs/newsdesk/2013/01/how-much-will-the-nomination-of-chuck-hagel-hurt-obamas-second-term-agenda.html

But Obama’s victory has made almost no difference in changing the psychology or incentives of the members of the G.O.P. who matter most: the House Republicans. The idea that a bloc of conservative, mostly Southern, Republicans would start to coöperate with the President on issues like tax policy and immigration may have rested on a faulty assumption.

The past few weeks of fiscal-cliff drama have taught us that “breaking the fever” was the wrong metaphor. There is no one event—even the election of a President—that can change a political party overnight. Congress is a co-equal branch of government, and House Republicans feel that they have as much of a mandate for their policies as Obama does for his. Shouldn’t House Republicans care that their views on Obama’s priorities, like tax cuts for the rich and immigration, helped cost Romney the White House and will make it difficult for their party’s nominee to win in 2016? In the abstract, many do, but that’s not enough to change the voting behavior of the average House Republican, who represents a gerrymandered and very conservative district.

A better metaphor for the coming battles with Congress may be what Woody Hayes, the college-football coach, famously called “three yards and a cloud of dust”: a series of grinding plays where small victories are earned only after lots of intense combat. While the fiscal-cliff showdown demonstrated that there’s potential for bipartisan deal-making in the Senate, passing any Obama priority through the House of Representatives is nearly impossible unless the political pressure is extremely intense.

The fiscal-cliff bill passed the House only when Speaker John Boehner’s members realized that their only alternative was blowing up the settlement negotiated by Joe Biden and Mitch McConnell—and accepting all the blame and consequences.

That episode offers the White House a general template for the coming fights over spending, immigration, and gun control—three issues where there is very little consensus between Obama and most House Republicans. Deals will have to be negotiated in the Senate and gain the imprimatur of some high-profile Republicans. Then a pressure campaign will have to be mounted to convince Boehner to move the legislation to the floor of the House under rules that allow it to pass with mostly Democratic votes. It’s easier to see how this could happen with the coming budgetary issues, which have deadlines that force action, than for the rest of Obama’s agenda, which is more likely than not to simply die in the House.