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#### First, their criticism of Obama fuels anti-state libertarian racism.

Carrington in 2009

(Ben, teaches sociology at the University of Texas at Austin, and is a Carnegie Visiting Research Fellow at Leeds Metropolitan University, “Fear of a black president: in the US a barely concealed racist backlash is helping to undermine fragile moves towards progress”, Soundings, 43, p. 114, rcheek)

It was often said during the election campaign that Obama's greatest skill was to allow people to project their hopes and desires onto him. He then reflected back and amplified progressive yearnings for a better today and a more just tomorrow. Obama's rhetorical move in his speeches would be to suggest that Change did not come with himself but with 'the people' themselves - 'you'- in the audience. Obama became the great interpellator. People left his rallies feeling empowered as historical agents of change. Yes we can.¶ But if this was the case then Obama has also become an amplifier for the fear that the Republicans produced during the campaign. Just as millions celebrated The Age of Obama as signaling the chance and possibility for a more socially progressive, economically egalitarian and internationally engaged America, so did almost equal numbers see his election as the end of America itself. That fear did not dissipate with Obama's inauguration. It had to go somewhere. And it has gone, in part, into producing record gun sales across the US, driven by the belief that Obama is coming to take away gun-owners' semi-automatic weapons, rifles and handguns. Ammunition at gun shows and gun stores has run out in many States. In the midst of a recession, the trade in guns has become one of America's most profitable industries.¶ Anti-Obama meetings have sprung up across America. These so-called 'town hall meetings' have been organised and funded, in large part, by a fragile coalition of anti-state libertarians and pro-market Republican groups, mixed with elements from the anti-immigrant far-right and the Christian conservatives. Their discourse is driven by a fervent belief that Obama is a fascist, Muslim and/or socialist/Marxist, who is destroying America and turning the country into a communist state through his taxation and spending policies. The Obama administration is variously accused of 'taking over' the banking sector, car industry and health care system, while over-taxing 'the people' to pay for unwanted government subsidies to big business and handouts to the undeserving poor. The charges against Obama floated by McCain, and particularly by Palin, during the election - that Obama was a socialist, a terrorist sympathiser and a threat to America itself - have morphed into a pro-gun, anti-abortion, libertarian racism that has fuelled the revival of the anti-government militia organisations that once thrived during Clinton's administration, and found their terrible expression in the bombings of Oklahoma City in 1995 and Atlanta the following year.¶ While American politics has, historically speaking, always included a sizeable proportion of disaffected citizens, driven by populist forms of racism and anti-government rhetoric that often includes accusations of 'treason' and worse, what is significant about the current conjuncture is the level of influence it has within the mainstream of the Republican Party, and the public legitimation it is receiving from elements of the mass media, particularly Talk Radio and the Fox News Network. Talk of Obama as a black supremacist who has desires to enslave and intern white people as part of a secret Jihadist/communist plot is no longer restricted to fringe groups on the internet; it is allowed airtime within mainstream media outlets, and sometimes is actively encouraged and promoted by media pundits themselves. The Fox News host Glenn Beck has gone on record as stating that he believes Obama has a deep-seated hatred of white people and white culture, while leading Republican politicians openly talk about the American people being in a state of 'rebellion'. Right-wing protesters have been turning up at rallies and town hall meetings carrying loaded guns. Others have brought pictures of Obama depicted as Hitler, or sometimes as an African witch doctor, and carry signs calling him a traitor.¶ By the end of the summer of 2009, as right-wing protests against Obama's health care reforms descended into a more generalized anti-government frenzy, mainstream political commentators were beginning to openly discuss what many in the black community had talked about from the day he announced his candidacy, namely the possibility of Obama's assignation. In September 2009, Speaker of the House of Representatives, Nancy Pelosi, said during a news conference: 'I have concerns about some of the language that is being used because ... I saw this myself in the late '70s in San Francisco. This kind of rhetoric is ... really frightening and it created a climate in which ... violence took place and ... I wish that we would all, again, curb our enthusiasm in some of the statements that are made'. Following on from Pelosi's comments, New York Times columnist Thomas Friedman noted the parallels between contemporary American politics and the 'poisonous political environment' that existed in Israel in 1995 just before Yitzhak Rabin was assassinated: 'I have no problem with any of the substantive criticism of President Obama from the right or left. But something very dangerous is happening. Criticism from the far right has begun tipping over into delegitimation and creating the same kind of climate here that existed in Israel on the eve of the Rabin assassination'. (5) Many on the right responded by rejecting this analysis, and instead upping their rhetoric to charge that Obama was now stifling free speech, just as the fascists had done in the past.

#### And, for a country that once took whiteness as the foundation of citizenship, the election of a black president is a victory we should celebrate. Criticisms of Obama’s presidency are mired in white supremacy.

Coates in 2012

(Ta-Nehisi, senior editor at The Atlantic, “Fear of a Black President”, The Atlantic, September 2012, <http://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2012/09/fear-of-a-black-president/309064/>, rcheek)

The idea that blacks should hold no place of consequence in the American political future has affected every sector of American society, transforming whiteness itself into a monopoly on American possibilities. White people like Byrd and Buckley were raised in a time when, by law, they were assured of never having to compete with black people for the best of anything. Blacks used in­ferior public pools and inferior washrooms, attended inferior schools. The nicest restaurants turned them away. In large swaths of the country, blacks paid taxes but could neither attend the best universities nor exercise the right to vote. The best jobs, the richest neighborhoods, were giant set-asides for whites—universal affirmative action, with no pretense of restitution.¶ Slavery, Jim Crow, segregation: these bonded white people into a broad aristocracy united by the salient fact of unblackness. What Byrd saw in an integrated military was the crumbling of the ideal of whiteness, and thus the crumbling of an entire society built around it. Whatever the saintly nonviolent rhetoric used to herald it, racial integration was a brutal assault on whiteness. The American presidency, an unbroken streak of nonblack men, was, until 2008, the greatest symbol of that old order.¶ Watching Obama rack up victories in states like Virginia, New Mexico, Ohio, and North Carolina on Election Night in 2008, anyone could easily conclude that racism, as a national force, had been defeated. The thought should not be easily dismissed: Obama’s victory demonstrates the incredible distance this country has traveled. (Indeed, William F. Buckley Jr. later revised his early positions on race; Robert Byrd spent decades in Congress atoning for his.) That a country that once took whiteness as the foundation of citizenship would elect a black president is a victory. But to view this victory as racism’s defeat is to forget the precise terms on which it was secured, and to ignore the quaking ground beneath Obama’s feet.¶ During the 2008 primary, The New Yorker’s George Packer journeyed to Kentucky and was shocked by the brazen declarations of white identity. “I think he would put too many minorities in positions over the white race,” one voter told Packer. “That’s my opinion.” That voter was hardly alone. In 2010, Michael Tesler, a political scientist at Brown University, and David Sears, a professor of psychology and political science at UCLA, were able to assess the impact of race in the 2008 primary by comparing data from two 2008 campaign and election studies with previous surveys of racial resentment and voter choice. As they wrote in Obama’s Race: The 2008 Election and the Dream of a Post-Racial America:¶ No other factor, in fact, came close to dividing the Democratic primary electorate as powerfully as their feelings about African Americans. The impact of racial attitudes on individual vote decisions … was so strong that it appears to have even outstripped the substantive impact of racial attitudes on Jesse Jackson’s more racially charged campaign for the nomination in 1988.¶ Seth Stephens-Davidowitz, a doctoral candidate in economics at Harvard, is studying how racial animus may have cost Obama votes in 2008. First, Stephens-­Davidowitz ranked areas of the country according to how often people there typed racist search terms into Google. (The areas with the highest rates of racially charged search terms were West Virginia, western Pennsylvania, eastern Ohio, upstate New York, and southern Mississippi.) Then he compared Obama’s voting results in those areas with John Kerry’s four years earlier. So, for instance, in 2004 Kerry received 50 percent of the vote in the media markets of both Denver and Wheeling (which straddles the Ohio–West Virginia border). Based on the Democratic groundswell in 2008, Obama should have received about 57 percent of the popular vote in both regions. But that’s not what happened. In the Denver area, which had one of the nation’s lowest rates of racially charged Google searching, Obama received the predicted 57 percent. But in Wheeling, which had a high rate of racially charged Google searching, Obama’s share of the popular vote was only 48 percent. Of course, Obama also picked up some votes because he is black. But, aggregating his findings nationally, Stephens-Davidowitz has concluded that Obama lost between 3 and 5 percentage points of the popular vote to racism.¶ After Obama won, the longed-for post-­racial moment did not arrive; on the contrary, racism intensified. At rallies for the nascent Tea Party, people held signs saying things like Obama Plans White Slavery. Steve King, an Iowa congressman and Tea Party favorite, complained that Obama “favors the black person.” In 2009, Rush Limbaugh, bard of white decline, called Obama’s presidency a time when “the white kids now get beat up, with the black kids cheering ‘Yeah, right on, right on, right on.’ And of course everybody says the white kid deserved it—he was born a racist, he’s white.” On Fox & Friends, Glenn Beck asserted that Obama had exposed himself as a guy “who has a deep-seated hatred for white people or the white culture … This guy is, I believe, a racist.” Beck later said he was wrong to call Obama a racist. That same week he also called the president’s health-care plan “reparations.”¶ One possible retort to this pattern of racial paranoia is to cite the Clinton years, when an ideological fever drove the right wing to derangement, inspiring militia movements and accusations that the president had conspired to murder his own lawyer, Vince Foster. The upshot, by this logic, is that Obama is experiencing run-of-the-mill political opposition in which race is but a minor factor among much larger ones, such as party affiliation. But the argument assumes that party affiliation itself is unconnected to race. It pretends that only Toni Morrison took note of Clinton’s particular appeal to black voters. It forgets that Clinton felt compelled to attack Sister Souljah. It forgets that whatever ignoble labels the right wing pinned on Clinton’s health-care plan, “reparations” did not rank among them.¶ Michael Tesler, following up on his research with David Sears on the role of race in the 2008 campaign, recently published a study assessing the impact of race on opposition to and support for health-care reform. The findings are bracing. Obama’s election effectively racialized white Americans’ views, even of health-care policy. As Tesler writes in a paper published in July in The American Journal of Political Science, “Racial attitudes had a significantly greater impact on health care opinions when framed as part of President Obama’s plan than they had when the exact same policies were attributed to President Clinton’s 1993 health care initiative.”¶ While Beck and Limbaugh have chosen direct racial assault, others choose simply to deny that a black president actually exists. One in four Americans (and more than half of all Republicans) believe Obama was not born in this country, and thus is an illegitimate president. More than a dozen state legislatures have introduced “birther bills” demanding proof of Obama’s citizenship as a condition for putting him on the 2012 ballot. Eighteen percent of Republicans believe Obama to be a Muslim. The goal of all this is to delegitimize Obama’s presidency. If Obama is not truly American, then America has still never had a black president.¶ White resentment has not cooled as the Obama presidency has proceeded. Indeed, the GOP presidential-primary race featured candidates asserting that the black family was better off under slavery (Michele Bachmann, Rick Santorum); claiming that Obama, as a black man, should oppose abortion (Santorum again); or denouncing Obama as a “food-stamp president” (Newt Ging­rich).¶ The resentment is not confined to Republicans. Earlier this year, West Virginia gave 41 percent of the popular vote during the Democratic primary to Keith Judd, a white incarcerated felon (Judd actually defeated Obama in 10 counties). Joe Manchin, one of West Virginia’s senators, and Earl Ray Tomblin, its governor, are declining to attend this year’s Democratic convention, and will not commit to voting for Obama.¶ It is often claimed that Obama’s unpopularity in coal-­dependent West Virginia stems from his environmental policies. But recall that no state ranked higher on Seth Stephens-­Davidowitz’s racism scale than West Virginia. Moreover, Obama was unpopular in West Virginia before he became president: even at the tail end of the Democratic primaries in 2008, Hillary Clinton walloped Obama by 41 points. A fifth of West Virginia Democrats openly professed that race played a role in their vote.¶ What we are now witnessing is not some new and complicated expression of white racism—rather, it’s the dying embers of the same old racism that once rendered the best pickings of America the exclusive province of unblackness. Confronted by the thoroughly racialized backlash to Obama’s presidency, a stranger to American politics might conclude that Obama provoked the response by relentlessly pushing an agenda of radical racial reform. Hardly. Daniel Gillion, a political scientist at the University of Pennsylvania who studies race and politics, examined the Public Papers of the Presidents, a compilation of nearly all public presidential utterances—­proclamations, news-conference remarks, executive orders—and found that in his first two years as president, Obama talked less about race than any other Democratic president since 1961. Obama’s racial strategy has been, if anything, the opposite of radical: he declines to use his bully pulpit to address racism, using it instead to engage in the time-honored tradition of black self-hectoring, railing against the perceived failings of black culture.¶ His approach is not new. It is the approach of Booker T. Washington, who, amid a sea of white terrorists during the era of Jim Crow, endorsed segregation and proclaimed the South to be a land of black opportunity. It is the approach of L. Douglas Wilder, who, in 1986, not long before he became Virginia’s first black governor, kept his distance from Jesse Jackson and told an NAACP audience: “Yes, dear Brutus, the fault is not in our stars, but in ourselves … Some blacks don’t particularly care for me to say these things, to speak to values … Somebody’s got to. We’ve been too excusing.” It was even, at times, the approach of Jesse Jackson himself, who railed against “the rising use of drugs, and babies making babies, and violence … cutting away our opportunity.”¶ The strategy can work. Booker T.’s Tuskegee University still stands. Wilder became the first black governor in America since Reconstruction. Jackson’s campaign moved the Democratic nominating process toward proportional allocation of delegates, a shift that Obama exploited in the 2008 Democratic primaries by staying competitive enough in big states to rack up delegates even where he was losing, and rolling up huge vote margins (and delegate-count victories) in smaller ones.¶ And yet what are we to make of an integration premised, first, on the entire black community’s emulating the Huxt­ables? An equality that requires blacks to be twice as good is not equality—it’s a double standard. That double standard haunts and constrains the Obama presidency, warning him away from candor about America’s sordid birthmark.

#### The alternative is to wage war on white supremacy.

#### We have a moral obligation to reject white supremacy in all of its manifestations. This violent ideology is responsible for killing masses of people physically and mentally. All of humanity depends on our collective commitment to end it before it puts an end to us all.

Comissiong in 13

(Solomon, educator, community activist, author, host of the Your World News media collective and founding member of the Pan-African collective for Advocacy & Action, “The War on White Supremacy”, Black Agenda Report, <http://blackagendareport.com/content/war-white-supremacy>, rcheek)

The struggle to end White Supremacy is one that must continue and grow even stronger – countless youth of color simply depend on it. Resistance to white supremacist ideology is paramount. If you believe in humanity (regardless of the color of your skin) you must join in this resistance. White Supremacy is a most deadly social malady. It has given birth to Apartheid, Jim Crow, mass murder, chattel slavery – the list literally goes on and on.¶ People of color must resist White Supremacy in every way they can. We must organize ourselves to combat it – teaching our youth to recognize it is an important first step. People of color must collectively resist White Supremacy, and good intentioned white people must play their own critical roles within this struggle. It is the obligation of any good intentioned white person to go in to white communities and organize an end to the social disease there. After all, White Supremacy emanates from white communities. It is frequently birthed from ignorance and hatred, among several social maladies and complexes.¶ White people, it is your responsibility to put an end to White Supremacy in your communities just as it is the responsibility of men to bury Male Supremacy and sexual/physical abuse of women. White Supremacy is killing masses of people (physically and mentally). When will we all decide to wage a war on this pervasive social illness/ideology, and put and end to it? Humanity depends on our collective
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#### Terror attack likely now.

Zimmerman 9/25 (Katherine, senior analyst for the American Enterprise Institute’s Critical Threats Project., “Al-Qaeda’s African Surge Threatens the U.S.” AEI, <http://www.criticalthreats.org/somalia/zimmerman-al-qaedas-african-surge-threatens-us-september-25-2013> -Veeder)

U.S. intelligence officials fear that the score or so of American passport holders believed to be members of al Shabaab might return to the U.S. to commit terrorism. Al Shabaab's leadership has not espoused attacks on America, but security experts fear that recruitment targeting Americans increases the probability of an attack. Last month, al Shabaab released a video featuring what it called its "Minnesota Martyrs." Minnesota is home to the largest U.S. population of Somalis. The 40-minute video, the first in a promised series, featured three Americans. The video glorified the three young men, saying they had given their lives on what is now a global battlefield. Although some within the group may see Africa as their battleground, those who have cemented the relationship with al Qaeda understand that jihad stretches from Morocco to the Philippines, from Tanzania to Iraq. And as al Qaeda leader Ayman Zawahiri has made clear, to the United States. If reports now surfacing regarding Americans involved in the Nairobi attack—al Shabaab's response to the Kenyan military presence in Somalia—are confirmed, it will be difficult for the Obama administration to continue claiming that al Shabaab is purely local. The terror group has the means for a major attack, and al Qaeda's focus on the U.S. provides the motive. From the triumphalism after Osama bin Laden's death to the president's most recent speeches trumpeting an end to the war on terror, the Obama administration continues to proclaim al Qaeda's demise. Implicit in this claim is that the Obama counterterrorism strategy is succeeding and "the tide of war is receding," which in turn underpin substantial cuts to security spending and retreat from foreign entanglements. Alas, reciting a mantra does not make it true. Far from defeated, al Qaeda is stronger now than ever.

#### Court oversight prevents drones from effectively operating.

Boot, Max. The Jeane J. Kirkpatrick Senior Fellow in National Security Studies at the Council on Foreign Relations in New York Feburary 11th, 2013. “A Drone court is a terrible idea.” Commentary Magazine. http://www.commentarymagazine.com/2013/02/11/a-drone-court-is-a-terrible-idea-fisa-terroris/ --Veeder

There is no doubt that putting judicial imprimatur on such strikes would help to dissipate growing opposition to the use of drones and could help to rein in capricious decision-making by this administration or a future administration. This proposal is sure to gain traction on both the antiwar left and the anti-government right—as well as among many in the general public who have a certain unease about the idea of presidentially ordered “assassinations” a la fictional characters like Jason Bourne.¶ Nevertheless creating such a court would be a very bad idea because it would constitute a dangerous infringement on the president’s authority as commander-in-chief.¶ To be sure, there are few cases of drone strikes involving American citizens such as Anwar al-Awlaki and it would probably not be any great burden in the war on terror to have those instances reviewed by a court. The danger is that this would be the establishment of a dangerous precedent, with judges soon being called upon to approve all drone strikes, whether the targets are American citizens or not. There is already a fair amount of bureaucracy to vet such strikes and minimize collateral damage, which sometimes results in the suspects making an escape before approval to fire a Hellfire missile can be obtained. Introducing judges into the mix would make such operations intolerably slow and unwieldy.¶ If judges were given power to review military or CIA strikes taking place outside the country, where would this trend end? With troops having to read detainees on a foreign battlefield their Miranda rights? With judges having to approve in advance all military plans—including armored offensives and artillery barrages—to make sure they don’t infringe on someone’s civil rights?¶ Such scenarios are not as crazy as they sound. Civil liberties lawyers have already been trying to get the U.S. courts to assume oversight of detainees held in Afghanistan—one federal judge even ruled that these detainees had a right to a hearing before being overruled by the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia.¶ Constitutional guarantees of rights are the bedrock of our democracy—but they don’t apply to foreign combatants. Not even if they happen to be citizens—as the entire Confederate Army was during the Civil War. The FISA court is well and good but it only operates on our soil. It doesn’t limit the National Security Agency from carrying out wiretaps abroad. So, too, no “drone court” should be established to judicially regulate the use of lethal force abroad by the military or covert forces of the United States government.

#### Drones have been integral for providing continual pressure that prevents terrorist groups from re-establishing safe havens.

Johnston, Patrick B. Ph.D. in political science, Northwestern. 2012. “Drone Strikes Keep Pressure on al-Qaida.” The RAND Blog. August 22, 2012. --Veeder

Yet many insurgents and terrorists have been taken off the battlefield by U.S. drones and special-operations forces. Besides Mehsud, the list includes Anwar al-Awlaki of al-Qaida in the Arabian Peninsula; al-Qaida deputy leader Abu Yahya al-Li-bi; and, of course, al-Qaida leader Osama bin Laden. Given that list, it is possible that the drone program has prevented numerous attacks by their potential followers, like Shazad. ¶ What does the removal of al-Qaida leadership mean for U.S. national security? Though many in al-Qaida's senior leadership cadre remain, the historical record suggests that "decapitation" will likely weaken the organization and could cripple its ability to conduct major attacks on the U.S. homeland. ¶ Killing terrorist leaders is not necessarily a knockout blow, but can make it harder for terrorists to attack the U.S. Members of al-Qaida's central leadership, once safely amassed in northwestern Pakistan while America shifted its focus to Iraq, have been killed, captured, forced underground or scattered to various locations with little ability to communicate or move securely. ¶ Recently declassified correspondence seized in the bin Laden raid shows that the relentless pressure from the drone campaign on al-Qaida in Pakistan led bin Laden to advise al-Qaida operatives to leave Pakistan's Tribal Areas as no longer safe. Bin Laden's letters show that U.S. counterterrorism actions, which had forced him into self-imposed exile, had made running the organization not only more risky, but also more difficult. ¶ As al-Qaida members trickle out of Pakistan and seek sanctuary elsewhere, the U.S. military is ramping up its counterterrorism operations in Somalia and Yemen, while continuing its drone campaign in Pakistan. Despite its controversial nature, the U.S. counter-terrorism strategy has demonstrated a degree of effectiveness. ¶ The Obama administration is committed to reducing the size of the U.S. military's footprint overseas by relying on drones, special operations forces, and other intelligence capabilities. These methods have made it more difficult for al-Qaida remnants to reconstitute a new safe haven, as Osama bin Laden did in Afghanistan in 1996, after his ouster from Sudan.
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#### CP Text: The United States Executive Branch should disclose the procedures and safeguards used determining targets for UAV strikes.

#### Solve IHL, checks executive power, and helps Obama cred.

Kramer 2011 (Cheri Kramer 1-1-2011, The Legality of Targeted Drone Attacks as U.S.¶ Policy, Santa Clara Journal of International Law¶ Volume 9 | Issue 2 Article 4, http://digitalcommons.law.scu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1105&context=scujil, bs)

The heart of the debate over the legality of targeted drone attacks concerns policy considerations. Under both domestic and international law, the use of targeted killing of legal¶ targets is permissible. However, is it good policy?89 And, more urgently, do the targeted killings carried out by the U.S. actually qualify as legal killings?¶ The answer to both questions is a disappointingly vague "maybe." The definition of good¶ policy is inherently a fact-driven and opinion-based determination. As to the second question, like the notorious three monkeys, the U.S. government seems to have engaged in a¶ "see no evil, hear no evil, speak no evil" policy strategy regarding the use of drones. This is¶ particularly true of its Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), which, until recently, did not officially recognize its drone program, yet employs it extensively to eliminate terrorist targets¶ in northern Pakistan.90¶ It is no secret that the U.S. relies on drones in its war strategy against the insurgency inAfghanistan.91 Yet the administration repeatedly refuses to produce publicly any guidelines¶ that would set forth the procedures and safeguards used by U.S. forces in determining the¶ legality of a target.92 Given the importance of transparency in international rule of law, and¶ its role as a check on executive power, as well as the political legitimacy to be gained by¶ identifying the procedures used in targeting, President Obama's administration has much¶ to gain by being more forthcoming with the procedures engaged to ensure compliance.
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#### First, policymaking methods are structured by the assumptions of white, male elites. Their analysis is predicated on an instrumental rationality that glosses over gender, race, class and sexuality as being tied to the prevailing relations of power and systemic oppression

Shaw in 2004

(Kathleen M., “Using Feminist Critical Policy Analysis in the Realm of Higher Education: The Case of Welfare Reform as Gendered Educational Policy”, Journal of Higher Education, Vol. 75, Issue 1, rcheek)

Feminist critical policy analysis has been most clearly articulated in the work of Catherine Marshall, whose two edited volumes both lay out the theoretical and methodological underpinnings of this approach to policy research and also provide examples of the ways in which it can be used to examine both secondary and postsecondary education (Marshall, 1997a, 1997b). Feminist critical policy analysis melds critical theory and feminism in a way that is designed to challenge the traditional, mainstream approaches to policy analysis that have dominated policy research for the last fifty years (Marshall, 1997a). The methods and theoretical frameworks that dominate current policy analysis have been developed and implemented by those in power who, particularly in the world of policy formation and analysis, are overwhelmingly white, male, and well educated. Thus, traditional policy research has, according to Marshall, reflected the assumptions, worldview, and values of this group.¶ As is the case with much mainstream research in the social sciences, traditional policy analysis can be characterized by the following elements. Among the most important are a belief in a single concept of truth (truth with a capital "T"); the assumption that objectivity on the part of the researcher is both achievable and desirable; the assumption that all research subjects share the same relationship to their social environment, thereby rendering such particularities as gender, race, social class, and sexuality unimportant; and the practice of evaluating women on the basis of male norms (Bensimon & Marshall, 1997, p. 7-8). Since this positivist paradigm is so widely accepted in the policy world, it allows policy analysts to assume a dispassionate, objective stance and at the same time encourages the broader policy community to perceive the research enterprise in this way. Thus, traditional policy analysis will-fully ignores the inherently political nature of all research, and policy research in particular. As Marshall states, "Traditional policy analysis is grounded in a narrow, falsely objective, overly instrumental view of rationality that masks its latent biases and allows policy elites and technocrats to present analyses and plans as neutral and objective when they are actually tied to prevailing relations of power" (1997a, p. 3).

#### And, roleplaying a state policymaker colludes with an imperialist agenda that maintains status quo power, privilege, and oppression by distancing debaters from real world participation in the political contexts we debate about.

Reid-Brinkley in 2008

(Dr. Shanara Reid-Brinkley, University of Pittsburgh Department of Communications, “THE HARSH REALITIES OF “ACTING BLACK”: HOW AFRICAN-AMERICAN POLICY DEBATERS NEGOTIATE REPRESENTATION THROUGH RACIAL PERFORMANCE AND STYLE” 2008)

Mitchell observes that the stance of the policymaker in debate comes with a “sense of detachment associated with the spectator posture.”115 In other words, its participants are able to engage in debates where they are able to distance themselves from the events that are the subjects of debates. Debaters can throw around terms like torture, terrorism, genocide and nuclear war without blinking. Debate simulations can only serve to distance the debaters from real world participation in the political contexts they debate about. As William Shanahan remarks: …the topic established a relationship through interpellation that inhered irrespective of what the particular political affinities of the debaters were. The relationship was both political and ethical, and needed to be debated as such. When we blithely call for United States Federal Government policymaking, we are not immune to the colonialist legacy that establishes our place on this continent. We cannot wish away the horrific atrocities perpetrated everyday in our name simply by refusing to acknowledge these implications” (emphasis in original).116 118 The “objective” stance of the policymaker is an impersonal or imperialist persona. The policymaker relies upon “acceptable” forms of evidence, engaging in logical discussion, producing rational thoughts. As Shanahan, and the Louisville debaters’ note, such a stance is integrally linked to the normative, historical and contemporary practices of power that produce and maintain varying networks of oppression. In other words, the discursive practices of policy-oriented debate are developed within, through and from systems of power and privilege. Thus, these practices are critically implicated in the maintenance of hegemony. So, rather than seeing themselves as government or state actors, Jones and Green choose to perform themselves in debate, violating the more “objective” stance of the “policymaker” and require their opponents to do the same.

#### The alternative is to reject policymaking.

#### Their method reproduces exceptionalist violence and oppression. Vote negative to join a revolution in debate capable of instigating the critical consciousness necessary to avert immanent global disaster.

Spanos in 2004

(William V., professor @ Binghamton, printed in Joe Millers’ book “Cross-X” (pg. 467) 2004 and on edebate)

Dear Joe MIller, Yes, the statement about the American debate circuit you refer to was made by me, though some years ago. I strongly believed then --and still do, even though a certain uneasiness about "objectivity" has crept into the "philosophy of debate" -- that debate in both the high schools and colleges in this country is assumed to take place nowhere, even though the issues that are debated are profoundly historical, which means that positions are always represented from the perspective of power, and a matter of life and death. I find it grotesque that in the debate world, it doesn't matter which position you take on an issue -- say, the United States' unilateral wars of preemption -- as long as you "score points". The world we live in is a world entirely dominated by an "exceptionalist" America which has perennially claimed that it has been chosen by God or History to fulfill his/its "errand in the wilderness." That claim is powerful because American economic and military power lies behind it. And any alternative position in such a world is virtually powerless. Given this inexorable historical reality, to assume, as the protocols of debate do, that all positions are equal is to efface the imbalances of power that are the fundamental condition of history and to annul the Moral authority inhering in the position of the oppressed. This is why I have said that the appropriation of my interested work on education and empire to this transcendental debate world constitute a travesty of my intentions. My scholarship is not "disinterested." It is militant and intended to ameliorate as much as possible the pain and suffering of those who have been oppressed by the "democratic" institutions that have power precisely by way of showing that their language if "truth," far from being "disinterested" or "objective" as it is always claimed, is informed by the will to power over all manner of "others." This is also why I told my interlocutor that he and those in the debate world who felt like him should call into question the traditional "objective" debate protocols and the instrumentalist language they privilege in favor of a concept of debate and of language in which life and death mattered. I am very much aware that the arrogant neocons who now saturate the government of the Bush administration -- judges, pentagon planners, state department officials, etc. learned their "disinterested" argumentative skills in the high school and college debate societies and that, accordingly, they have become masters at disarming the just causes of the oppressed. This kind leadership will reproduce itself (along with the invisible oppression it perpetrates) as long as the training ground and the debate protocols from which it emerges remains in tact. A revolution in the debate world must occur. It must force that unworldly world down into the historical arena where positions make a difference. To invoke the late Edward Said, only such a revolution will be capable of "deterring democracy" (in Noam Chomsky's ironic phrase), of instigating the secular critical consciousness that is, in my mind, the sine qua non for avoiding the immanent global disaster towards which the blind arrogance of Bush Administration and his neocon policy makers is leading.

# Norms

#### 1. China won’t use drones to resolve territorial disputes – fears international backlash and creating a precedent for U.S. strikes in the area

Erickson, associate professor at the Naval War College and Associate in Research at Harvard University's Fairbank Centre, and Strange, researcher at the Naval War College's China Maritime Studies Institute and graduate student at Zhejiang University, 5-29-13 (Andrew and Austin, China has drones. Now how will it use them? Foreign Affairs, McClatchy-Tribune, 29 May 2013, http://www.nationmultimedia.com/opinion/China-has-drones-Now-how-will-it-use-them-30207095.html, da 8-3-13) PC

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.

#### 2. Restricting the use of drones is impossible – unrestrained use is inevitable.

Steigerwald ‘13 (Lucy, “The Inevitability of Drones in the US and Abroad”, Anti War, 4-29-13, <http://antiwar.com/blog/2013/04/29/the-inevitability-of-drones-in-the-u-s-and-abroad/>, RSR)

The proliferation of drones will not long be an American issue alone. “The number of countries that have acquired or developed drones expanded to more than 75, up from about 40 in 2005, according to the Government Accountability Office, the investigative arm of Congress,” USA Today reported in January.¶ In spite of some heartening legislative attempts to rein in drones here at home, as well as protests over their international use, they cannot be fully put back into the box. That’s why endlessly rehashing the concerns that are fundamentally tied in with this technology is a good thing to do, even if it brings up a sense of Deja Vu for anyone even halfway paying attention. The RCP article contains no breaking news about drones, but the moment that such articles disappear, we’re in real trouble. That’s when drones have been fully accepted as the most efficient killing machines abroad, and the ideal mechanisms for surveillance at home.

#### 3. No Asian conflict- empirically denied, economic interdependence checks, and China avoids nationalism.

Carlson ’13(Allen Carlson is an Associate Professor in Cornell University’s Government Department. He was granted his PhD from Yale University’s Political Science Department. His undergraduate degree is from Colby College. In 2005 his Unifying China, Integrating with the World: Securing Chinese Sovereignty in the Reform Era was published by Stanford University Press. He has also written articles that appeared in the Journal of Contemporary China, Pacific Affairs, Asia Policy, and Nations and Nationalism. In addition, he has published monographs for the National Committee on U.S.-China Relations and the East-West Center Washington. Carlson was a Fulbright-Hays scholar at Peking University during the 2004-2005 academic year. In 2005 he was chosen to participate in the National Committee’s Public Intellectuals Program, and he currently serves as an adviser to Cornell’s China Asia Pacific Studies program and its East Asia Program. Carlson is currently working on a project exploring the issue of nontraditional security in China’s emerging relationship with the rest of the international system. His most recent publications are the co-edited Contemporary Chinese Politics: New Sources, Methods and Field Strategies (Cambridge University Press, 2010) and New Frontiers in China’s Foreign Relations (Lexington, 2011). China Keeps the Peace at Sea China Keeps the Peace at Sea Why the Dragon Doesn't Want War Allen Carlson February 21, 2013

At times in the past few months, China and Japan have appeared almost ready to do battle over the **Senkaku** (Diaoyu) Islands --which are administered by Tokyo but claimed by both countries -- and to ignite a war that could be bigger than any since World War II. Although Tokyo and Beijing have been shadowboxing over the territory for years, the standoff reached a new low in the fall, when the Japanese government nationalized some of the islands by purchasing them from a private owner. The decision set off a wave of violent anti-Japanese demonstrations across China. In the wake of these events, the conflict quickly reached what political scientists call a state of equivalent retaliation -- a situation in which both countries believe that it is imperative to respond in kind to any and all perceived slights. As a result, it may have seemed that armed engagement was imminent. **Yet,** months later,nothing has happened. And **despite** their **aggressive posturing** in the disputed territory, **both** sides **now show** glimmers of willingness to dial down hostilities and to reestablish stability**.** Some analysts have cited North Korea's recent nuclear test as a factor in the countries' reluctance to engage in military conflict. They argue that the detonation, and Kim Jong Un's belligerence, brought China and Japan together, unsettling them and placing their differences in a scarier context. Rory Medcalf, a senior fellow at the Brookings Institution, explained that "the nuclear test gives the leadership in both Beijing and Tokyo a chance to focus on a foreign and security policy challenge where their interests are not diametrically at odds." The nuclear test, though, is a red herring in terms of the conflict over the disputed islands. In truth, the roots of the conflict -- and the reasons it has not yet exploded -- are much deeper. Put simply, **China** cannot afford military conflict **with** any of its **Asian neighbors.** It is not that China believes it would lose such a spat; the country increasingly enjoys strategic superiority over the entire region, and it is difficult to imagine that its forces would be beaten in a direct engagement over the islands, in the South China Sea or in the disputed regions along the Sino-Indian border. However**, Chinese officials see** thateven the most pronounced victory would be outweighed by the collateral damagethat such a use of force would cause **to Beijing's** two most fundamental national interests **--** economic **growth and preventing the escalation of** radical **nationalist sentiment at home.** These constraints, rather than any external deterrent**, will keep** Xi Jinping, **China's new leader, from** authorizing the use of deadly **force** in the Diaoyu Islands theater. For over three decades, **Beijing has promoted** peace and stability **in Asia** to facilitate conditions amenable to **China's** **economic** **development**. The origins of the policy can be traced back to the late 1970s, when Deng Xiaoping repeatedly contended that to move beyond the economically debilitating Maoist period, China would have to seek a common ground with its neighbors. Promoting cooperation in the region would allow China to spend less on military preparedness, focus on making the country a more welcoming destination for foreign investment, and foster better trade relations. All of this would strengthen the Chinese economy. Deng was right. Today, China's economy is second only to that of the United States. The fundamentals of Deng's grand economic strategy are still revered in Beijing. But any war in the region would erode the hard-won, and precariously held, political capital that China has gained in the last several decades. It would also disrupt trade relations, complicate efforts to promote the yuan as an international currency, and send shock waves through the country's economic system at a time when it can ill afford them. There is thus little reason to think that China is readying for war with Japan. At the same time, the specter of rising Chinese nationalism, **although** often seen as **a promoter of conflict**, further limits the prospects for armed engagement. This is because Beijing will try to discourage nationalism if it fears it may lose control or be forced by popular sentiment to take an action it deems unwise. **Ever since** the **Tiananmen Square** massacre put questions about the Chinese Communist Party's right to govern before the population, **successive generations of Chinese leaders have carefully negotiated a balance** between promoting nationalist sentiment and preventing it from boiling over. In the process, they cemented the legitimacy of their rule. A war with Japan could easily upset that balance by inflaming nationalism that could blow back against China's leaders. Consider a hypothetical scenario in which a uniformed Chinese military member is killed during a firefight with Japanese soldiers. Regardless of the specific circumstances, the casualty would create a new martyr in China and, almost as quickly, catalyze popular protests against Japan. Demonstrators would call for blood, and if the government (fearing economic instability) did not extract enough, citizens would agitate against Beijing itself. Those in Zhongnanhai, the Chinese leadership compound in Beijing, would find themselves between a rock and a hard place. It is possible that Xi lost track of these basic facts during the fanfare of his rise to power and in the face of renewed Japanese assertiveness. It is also possible that the Chinese state is more rotten at the core than is understood. That is, party elites believe that a diversionary war is the only way to hold on to power -- damn the economic and social consequences. But Xi does not seem blind to the principles that have served Beijing so well over the last few decades. Indeed, although he recently warned unnamed others about infringing upon China's "national core interests" during a foreign policy speech to members of the Politburo, he also underscored China's commitment to "never pursue development at the cost of sacrificing other country's interests" and to never "benefit ourselves at others' expense or do harm to any neighbor." Of course, wars do happen -- and still could in the East China Sea. Should either side draw first blood through accident or an unexpected move, Sino-Japanese relations would be pushed into terrain that has not been charted since the middle of the last century. However, understanding that war would be a no-win situation, China has avoided rushing over the brink. This relative restraint seems to have surprised everyone. But it shouldn't. Beijing will continue to disagree with Tokyo over the sovereign status of the islands, and will not budge in its negotiating position over disputed territory. However, it cannot take the risk of going to war over a few rocks in the sea. On the contrary, in the **coming months it will quietly** seek a way to **shelve the dispute in return for** securing **regional stability**, facilitating economic development, and keeping a lid on the Pandora's box of rising nationalist sentiment. The ensuing peace, while unlikely to be deep, or especially conducive to improving Sino-Japanese relations, will be enduring.

#### 4. China can’t challenge the US—the war will be quick

Reed 11 [John Reed= news correspondent, “PLA: Chinese Military Doesn’t Compare to U.S. Military”, May 19, 2011, http://defensetech.org/2011/05/19/pla-chinese-military-doesnt-compare-to-u-s-military/]

This is interesting. The PLA’s top officer, **Gen**. Chen **Bingde, announced during his recent visit to Washington that China’s is no where close to matching the United States’ in terms of military capability**. Yes, we’re fretting over China’s rise as an economic power, but according to the general, his nation has a long way to go before it catches the U.S. militarily. From Fox News: “Through my visit over the past couple of days in the United States, **I am surprised by the sophistication of the U.S. military, including its weapons and equipment and doctrines and so on,”** People’s Liberation Army leader General Chen Bingde said. “**I can tell you that China does not have the capability to challenge the United States**. As a matter of fact, the reconnaissance activities along China’s coast by U.S. military aircraft and vessels are seen in China as deterrents.” For emphasis, the general added, “What I’m trying to say is that we do not have the capability to challenge the United States.” He even went so far as to try to answer the question that’s long been on U.S. defense officials minds: What do Chinese officials mean when they says they want to ‘defend what is theirs’ with their new military might? “As it is known to all, the United States is a super-power in the world today; how can China easily have the ability to challenge it? That is simply not part of Chinese culture and we do not have that capability. We would strive for world peace, civility and development and well being of the whole humankind…**The United States has far more advanced weapons and equipment**.” Chen took some exception to the accusation, insisting the routine test flight was not targeted at Gates’ visit, and questioned why similar issues were frequently raised to China but not the United States. The general insisted, “After 30 years of reform and opening up, China’s economy has made tremendous progress and we are now the world’s second-largest economy…**Our efforts to grow our economy is to ensure that the 1.3 billion people are better off. We do not want to use the money to buy equipment or advanced weapons systems to challenge the United States**.” From the general’s answer, it sounds like China has no intention of getting into Cold War II with the United States. **Arms races can be notoriously expensive and distracting from the buildup of other sectors needed to support a healthy economy; something China is strongly focused on**. For now, it seems like **China wants to be the big military power in the region while focusing more on the long-term growth of its economy**. This reminds me of how the U.S. overtook Britain as the world’s most powerful economy decades before it overtook the empire in terms of military and global political might. However, once China overtakes the U.S. as the world’s largest economy (predicted to happen sometime in the next 20 years if current trends hold) who knows what kind of military investments it will make?

#### 5. No risk of escalation- China will only retaliate if US strikes first

Tilford, 12– Wichita Military Affairs Examiner (Robert, “Chinese General warns US ‘we will not attack - unless we are attacked’!”, The Examiner, June 5, http://www.examiner.com/article/chinese-general-warns-us-we-will-not-attack-unless-we-are-attacked)//VP

"**We will** also **improve our military strategy**, our national defense and the PLA's fighting ability. We will not attack unless we are attacked," the General told reporters. "**We have the measures to strike back when fundamental national interests are under threat,**" he said. "We still face a very complex, sometimes severe, situation. **We will be prepared for all complexities.** There's a saying: work for the best and prepare for the worst," said Lt. General Haiquan. These comments are seen as a warning to certain members of Congress and the entire US military industrial establishment - "don't mess with us in China." In the China Daily report, Chinese officials indicated **it would "improve" the capability of its forces** and has the capacity to "strike back" **when its "fundamental interests" are under threat.**

#### . No South China Sea War

Logan 2013 (By Justin Logan, director of Foreign Policy Studies, Cato Institute , February 20, 2013. War over the Senkaku/Diaoyu Islands¶ <http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/war-over-senkakudiaoyu-islands?utm_source=feedburnerandutm_medium=feedandutm_campaign=Feed%3A+CatoRecentOpeds+(Cato+Recent+Op-eds)>, bs)

It is simple to understand why Beijing and Tokyo are so exercised about the uninhabited islands. If sovereignty over the islands were settled, the victor would gain not just the fishing and (potential) energy resources that lay in the surrounding waters, but recognized territorial waters that implicate naval rights. Further, a virulent and irrational nationalism has captured both countries’ citizens, constraining policymakers’ room for negotiation.¶ What’s harder to understand is what Washington has at stake in this fight. State Department spokeswoman Victoria Nuland was visibly uncomfortable trying to explain the U.S. position on the sovereignty of the islands last summer, repeating the U.S. position that Washington does not take sides in the dispute over their sovereignty, but views them as covered by the U.S. security guarantee to Japan, since they have been under the administration of Japan.¶ “¶ Despite the ample early warning signs of trouble in East Asia, Washington does not look to be reevaluating policy.”¶ But would the United States really engage in a shooting war with China over the islands?¶ There’s good reason to wonder.¶ The biggest reason to doubt it is the stakes involved. Even if China acted aggressively, as it did when it apparently engaged a Japanese vessel and locked fire-control radar on it, the stakes are almost certainly lower than the costs of a war. America has littered the globe with a variety of security guarantees and promises, banking on the assumption that they will never be challenged but can depress security competition in peacetime.¶ This reality can be seen in a 2007 statement from then-presidential candidate Hillary Clinton. In a conversation with a U.S. Asia scholar, Clinton remarked that it is absurd to think that Americans would support a war with China over Taiwan—a much more important strategic asset than the Senkakus/Diaoyus. (Apparently there was some miscommunication about who was on the record when, because the video containing the discussion was swiftly edited to remove the Taiwan comment.)¶ Clinton’s remark about Taiwan points to a truth that is even greater in the case of the Senkaku/Diaoyu Islands: the game just isn’t worth the candle. Even if Washington dealt China a swift and decisive defeat, the consequences would be extremely costly in both economic terms and in terms of making a permanent enemy out of China without doing anything to moderate its future ambitions or capabilities.

# Pakistan

#### 1. Drones irrelevant to Pakistan stability- multiple alternatives cause.

Javaid ’11 (Umbreen, Director Center of Asian Studies & Chairperson Department of political science University of Punjab, “Thriving Fundamentalism and Militancy in Pakistan An Analytical Overview of their Impact on the Society,” South Asian Studies, Vol. 26 No. 1. Pg. 16-17)  
 ‘The recent increase of violence by jihadi groups, including suicide bombing of ¶ innocent bystanders as well attacks on the police and military, has perhaps brought ¶ more Pakistanis to consider how to strike a new balance between Islam and ¶ politics’ (Oldenburg, 2010: 158). ‘The Pakistani people also need to change their ¶ attitude, especially their outlook on religion. Suffered with anti-Americanism and ¶ religious fervor, Pakistanis are filtering their worldview through the prism of ¶ religion and the tensions between Islam and the West, making them to the radical ¶ propaganda and paralyzing their will to act against forces of extremism’ (Hussain, ¶ 2009: 11). mbreen Javaid Thriving Fundamentalism and ¶ 17¶ It is not only the task of the government to control this growing ¶ fundamentalism but the whole society needs to completely shun off these ¶ extremists. The political parties, intellectuals, sectarian and religious parties and ¶ the masses all have to openly condemn the extremists, so that they do not find any ¶ space to flourish. ‘Much still needs to be done on the home front curb religious ¶ zealotry and sectarianism, policies towards minorities, revision of school curricula, ¶ reconstructing ‘official’ history, promotion of universal education, and ¶ overhauling of the madrassah system’ (Niaz, 2011: 181). The best way to curtail the thriving fundamentalism in Pakistan is to look ¶ deeply into its causes. The whole society and especially the government needs to ¶ put in serious efforts in controlling on checking the causes if not diminishing ¶ them. It should also be understand that the issue of fundamentalism is very ¶ complex which entails number of factors which are playing their part. These ¶ include economic disparity, lack of education, religious ignorance, unemployment, ¶ extremism, judicial system, poor governance, ethnicity and sectarianism, ¶ corruption and alignment with United States, each of these have played their role ¶ separately and also a combined mix of all in flourishing militant fundamentalism ¶ in Pakistan. To control fundamentalism is not an easy task especially when it is ¶ now combined with militancy. Another major challenge for the government is that ¶ earlier the various militant extremist groups were operating separately and had ¶ divergent aims and objectives from each other but lately various local groups, AlQaeda and Taliban have all joined hands and helping each other irrespective of ¶ their particular objectives. These alignments have made these militant groups more ¶ lethal, thus making things more difficult for the government. ¶ Militant fundamentalism not only has the ability to destabilize Pakistan but it ¶ can, if not controlled, bring about serious security concerns for the region and also ¶ towards the global security and peace.

#### 2. Crackdowns prevent serious instability.

Bandow 09– Senior Fellow at the Cato Institute (Doug, “Recognizing the Limits of American Power in Afghanistan,” Huffington Post, 11/31/09, <http://www.cato.org/pub_display.php?pub_id=10924>, MMarcus)

From Pakistan's perspective, limiting the war on almost any terms would be better than prosecuting it for years, even to "victory," whatever that would mean. In fact, the least likely outcome is a takeover by widely unpopular Pakistani militants. The Pakistan military is the nation's strongest institution; while the army might not be able to rule alone, it can prevent any other force from ruling. Indeed, Bennett Ramberg made the important point: "Pakistan, Iran and the former Soviet republics to the north have demonstrated a brutal capacity to suppress political violence to ensure survival. This suggests that even were Afghanistan to become a terrorist haven, the neighborhood can adapt and resist." The results might not be pretty, but the region would not descend into chaos. In contrast, warned Bacevich: "To risk the stability of that nuclear-armed state in the vain hope of salvaging Afghanistan would be a terrible mistake."

#### 3. Won’t escalate -- Paki loose nukes aren’t a threat.

Innocent 10 - foreign policy analyst at the Cato Institute (Malou, “Away from McChrystal and Back to the Basics,” Huffington Post, 6/28/10, <http://www.cato.org/pub_display.php?pub_id=11934>, MMarcus)

Pakistan has an elaborate command and control system in place that complies with strict Western standards, and the country's warheads, detonators, and missiles are not stored fully-assembled, but are scattered and physically separated throughout the country. In short, the danger of militants seizing Pakistan's nuclear weapons in some Rambo-like scenario remains highly unlikely.

#### 4. Low US-Pakistan Relations inevitable

Qazi 2012 (Shehzad H. Qazi, World Affairs Journal, MAY/JUNE 2012, US-Pakistan Relations: Common and Clashing Interests, <http://www.worldaffairsjournal.org/article/us-pakistan-relations-common-and-clashing-interests>, bs)

There are two fundamental problems undergirding US-Pakistan troubles. First, instead of a broad partnership that includes trade and cultural linkages, the two countries have a one-dimensional transactional relationship centered along security concerns, i.e., the war against the Taliban and al-Qaeda. In a way, General Jehangir Karamat, Pakistan’s retired Army chief and ambassador to the US, underscored this point, saying that, in his assessment, “US-Pakistan relations were at their worst because relations between the Pentagon and the Pakistan Army were unstable.” US-Pakistan relations are further complicated because of clashing security interests, especially vis-à-vis the Afghan Taliban. These two problems will not yield to quick diplomatic fixes. Barring a fundamental re-thinking, Washington and Islamabad should get used to making the best of an ambiguous alliance, and one that, going forward, will be limited, transactional, and security-centered, featuring competition over the endgame in Afghanistan, cooperation in the fight against al-Qaeda, and a trimmed-down and conditional aid structure.

#### 5. No indo-pak war

Wright 13 (January 16, 2013, 11:59 AM Don’t Expect Worsening of India, Pakistan Ties By TOM WRIGHT WSJ Asia Economics Editor.http://blogs.wsj.com/indiarealtime/2013/01/16/dont-expect-worsening-of-india-pakistan-ties/)

There’s no end for now to the hostile rhetoric between India and Pakistan. But that doesn’t necessarily presage anything more drastic. Pakistan claims another of its soldiers died Tuesday night in firing across the Line of Control in Kashmir, the divided Himalayan region claimed by both nations.Indian army chief, Gen. Bikram Singh, on Wednesday, said Pakistan had opened fire and India retaliated.“If any of their people have died, it would have been in retaliation to their firing,” Gen. Singh said. ”When they fire, we also fire.”It was the latest in tit-for-tat recriminations over deaths in Kashmir that began last week. Pakistan claimed one of its soldiers died on Jan. 6. Two days later, India said Pakistani forces killed two of its soldiers and mutilated the bodies.Tuesday night, Indian Prime Minister Manmohan Singh said the mutilations meant it could not be “business as usual” between the countries. That has worried some that peace talks, which have been in train for two years, could be about to break down.Mr. Singh’s comments built on a drumbeat of anger from India. Gen. Singh, Monday called the mutilations “unpardonable” and said India withheld the right to retaliate to Pakistan aggression when and where it chooses.Pakistan Foreign Minister Hina Rabbani Khar, who is in the U.S., Tuesday termed the Indian army chief’s comments as “very hostile.”There are some other worrying signs. India said Tuesday it was delaying the start of a visa-on-arrival program meant to make it easier for some Indians and Pakistanis to visit each other’s countries.The visa program, like talks on opening up bilateral trade, is supposed to pave the way toward broader peace talks that would encompass thornier issues, like how to solve the Kashmir problem.Also Tuesday, nine Pakistani hockey players who had come to participate in a tournament in India were sent home due to fears of protests and violence against them.Still, there’s little benefit for either side to escalate what is now still sporadic firing over the Line of Control, the de facto border in Kashmir. Pakistan is embroiled in its own political meltdown sparked by the Supreme Court’s decision Tuesday to order the arrest of Prime Minister Raja Pervez Ashraf on allegations of corruption. Tens of thousands of protesters Tuesday took to the streets in Islamabad, and remain there today, demanding immediate elections and a greater role for the army and Supreme Court in politics. Pakistan’s military continues to play an important political role, dominating defense and foreign policy. But it has so far shown little sign of mounting a full-blown coup despite persistent rumors of military intervention. Pakistan’s government must hold national elections by May, meaning the next few months are likely to be choppy ones in Pakistan politics. In such an environment, the military is unlikely to want to dial up tensions with India. On the Indian side, despite Mr. Singh’s unusually strident tone Tuesday, there also will be pause before taking matters to the next level. Mr. Singh has put immense personal political capital into trying to improve ties with Pakistan since he came to power in 2004. Last year, he hosted Pakistan President Asif Ali Zardari in New Delhi and promised a return visit. Such a trip is clearly off the table for now. But India still has put too much into peace talks to throw away the progress made so far on visas, trade and other issues. Even Gen. Singh, India’s army chief, Monday said he did not believe the latest flare-up would lead to a broader escalation in violence and an official end to a 2003 ceasefire agreement in Kashmir. The clashes so far, he noted, have been limited to specific areas of the Line of Control.

#### 6. A long history of Indo-Pak tension and attacks prove no risk of escalation

Thakur 11 (Chandra, Distinguished Fellow, Centre for International Governance Innovation and Professor of Political Science, University of Waterloo, Glendon School of Public and International Affairs, Global Brief February 18th 2011, www98.griffith.edu.au/dspace/handle/10072/51641, page 2)

Islamabad’s record of double-dealing, deceit and denial of Pakistan-based attacks, in Afghanistan and India alike, has been based on four degrees of separation – between the government, the army, the ISI and terrorists – the plausibility of which is fading as it is exploited as a convenient alibi to escape accountability. That Pakistanis in general might harbour goodwill and friendships toward India is irrelevant if they have little say in making policy. Indian Prime Minister Manmohan Singh – by instinct circumspect – has said that, “given the sophistication and military precision,” the Mumbai attacks “must have had the support of some official agencies in Pakistan.” The combination of training, selection and advance reconnaissance of targets, diversionary tactics, discipline, munitions, cryptographic communications, false IDs, and damage inflicted is more typically associated with special forces units than with terrorists.

# Solvency

#### Drone courts take too long, won’t relieve criticism of drone strikes and unconstitutional.

Groves 2013 (Steven, Bernard and Barbara Lomas Senior Research Fellow, Drone Strikes:

The Legality of U.S. Targeting Terrorists Abroad

No. 2788 | April 9, 2013 <http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2013/04/drone-strikes-the-legality-of-us-targeting-terrorists-abroad> bs)

Certain former Obama Administration officials, the editorial board of The ¶ New York Times, and at least one U.S. Senator have called for the establishment of a special oversight panel or court to review the Administration’s targeting determinations, particularly in instances in which a U.S. citizen is targeted.49 Essentially, such a court would scrutinize the Administration’s targeting decisions, presumably including its decisions to place individuals on the “disposition matrix.” The court would apparently have the authority to ¶ overrule and nullify targeting decisions. The creation of such a court is ill advised and of doubtful constitutionality.¶ The proponents of a drone court apparently do ¶ not appreciate the potential unintended consequences of establishing such an authority. The idea ¶ is wrongheaded and raises more questions than it ¶ answers. For instance, could the drone court decide ¶ as a matter of law that a targeted strike is not justified because the United States is not engaged in an armed conflict with al-Qaeda? Could the drone ¶ court rule that members of a force associated with ¶ al-Qaeda (e.g., AQAp) may not be targeted because ¶ AQAp was not directly involved in the September ¶ 11 attacks and therefore the strike is not authorized ¶ under the AUMF? The proposed drone court cannot ¶ avoid these fundamental questions since the justification for the targeted strikes is dependent on the ¶ answers to these questions.¶ Even if the proposed drone court attempts to eschew intervention into foundational questions such as the existence of an armed conflict, it still would not be in a position to rule on the “easy” questions involved in each and every drone strike. Does ¶ the target constitute an “imminent threat” to the ¶ United States? When civilian casualties may occur ¶ as a result of the strike, does the drone court have the ¶ authority to overrule the targeting decision as a violation of the principle of proportionality? is the target an innocent civilian or a civilian “directly participating in hostilities”? Should U.S. forces attempt to ¶ capture the target before resorting to a drone strike? ¶ is capture feasible? Any drone court, even if constituted with former military and intelligence officials, is ill suited to weigh all of the competing factors that go into a decision to target an al-Qaeda operative and make a timely decision, particularly when there is often only a short window of time to order a strike. regardless, creating a judicial or quasi-judicial review process will not ameliorate, much less resolve, objections to U.S. targeted killing practices. Critics will continue to demand more judicial process, including appeals from the proposed drone court, and additional transparency no matter what kind of forum is established to oversee targeting decisions.

#### Drone Courts won’t improve accountability, they’d operate in secret.

Mulrine 2013 ( Anna Mulrine, Staff writer , Would a US 'drone court' to authorize drone strikes be a good idea? / May 24, 2013<http://www.csmonitor.com/USA/DC-Decoder/2013/0524/Would-a-US-drone-court-to-authorize-drone-strikes-be-a-good-idea-video> bs)

Critics of the drone program, however, are generally not reassured by the notion of oversight from a special drone court. They note that the FISA courts, on which the drone courts would be modeled, operate largely in secret, doing little to improve accountability to the public. ¶ What’s more, they say, national and international laws are already in place governing when drone strikes are legal. Those laws, they add, offer greater transparency than would a secret court. ¶ “I’m not big on this,” Sarah Holewinski, executive director of the Center for Civilians in Conflict, says of the drone courts. “The fact is, we have international laws. We have domestic laws. I would focus on those and say, ‘Look, here’s the due diligence you need to do in targeting a combatant. Here’s what you need to do in order to avoid civilians. Here’s what proportionality looks like.’ ”¶ Zeke Johnson, director of Amnesty International’s Security and Human Rights Campaign, argues that drone courts would do little to change critics' fundamental concerns about drone strikes.¶ “What’s needed on drones is not a ‘kill court,’ but a rejection of the radical redefinition of ‘imminence’ used to expand who can be killed – as well as independent investigations of alleged extrajudicial executions and remedy for victims,” he says.¶ Congress will carefully consider any drone-court proposal, Sen. Ron Wyden (D) of Oregon told National Public Radio on Thursday. Senator Wyden has demanded access to secret documents about the lethal drone attacks on Anwar al-Awlaki, an American cleric living in Yemen who was killed in 2011. ¶ For his part, Wyden expressed reservations “about this idea of just setting up more special courts.” ¶ “I mean, it’s not as if we’ve struck the right balance with respect to the FISA court at this point in terms of protecting the American people. I’ve been trying to get a number of these opinions declassified for years now,” he added, “and I haven’t been able to do it.”