### Casualties

#### Their ev is biased and based on unreliable data

Boyle 13

(Michael, International Affairs, “The costs and consequences of drone warfare,” 2013, <http://www.chathamhouse.org/sites/default/files/public/International%20Affairs/2013/89_1/89_1Boyle.pdf>) /wyo-mm

First, the claim that drones are effective at killing terrorist operatives without causing civilian casualties is based on data of questionable reliability and validity. The US government has classified almost all the details of the drones programmes and has never provided definitive tallies of the number of strikes or the casualties from these strikes.18 No one—among either advocates or critics—really knows the number of deaths caused by drones in these distant, sometimes ungoverned, lands. In the absence of official government statistics, a number of independent organizations have produced data on drone strikes based largely on newspaper reports and intelligence sources. There is substantial variation in the total deaths claimed for drone strikes across these databases. According to widely cited data collected by the New America Foundation, 334 drone strikes were conducted in Pakistan between June 2004 and October 2012.19 President Obama is responsible for a vast increase in the number of drone strikes, with 288 strikes (86 per cent of the total) conducted in Pakistan alone between January 2009 and October 2012. No precise casualty figures are available for each strike, only estimates based on often conflicting news reports. The casualty range is between 1,886 and 3,191 deaths for the period 2004–2012, which suggests an average of 5.6 to 9.5 people killed per strike. The Bureau of Investigative Journalism (TBIJ) has compiled its own data on strikes in Pakistan and found that 346 drone strikes were conducted between June 2004 and October 2012. They have arrived at a death toll of 2,570–3,337 deaths, which indicated an average of 7.4 to 9.6 people killed per strike.20 TBIJ also reported that between 1,232 and 1,366 Pakistanis have been injured in drone strikes during this eight-year period. In Yemen, TBIJ reports 40–50 confirmed US drone strikes from 2002 to September 2012, with a total death toll of between 357 and 1,026.21 In Somalia, there have been between three and nine drone strikes, with a total death toll between 58 and 170.

### 2AC – AT – Politics DA

#### Negotiations will fall through – neither side compromising, Obamacare

Healey 9/10

Jon, “House GOP playing with fire by tying debt ceiling to Obamacare,” <http://www.latimes.com/opinion/opinion-la/la-ol-gop-defunding-obamacare-plan-shifts-toward-delaying-it-20130910,0,4825515.story>, MCR

Having said that, Cantor's proposal still amounts to playing a game of chicken with the Senate and Obama over the debt limit. We watched this movie before, when the new House GOP majority held the debt ceiling hostage in 2011. Obama played along that time, trying to reach a "grand bargain" with Republicans that would reduce deficits by cutting spending, paring entitlements and raising taxes. Those negotiations fell through, however, and the long stalemate spooked Standard & Poor's enough for the agency to downgrade the federal government's credit. Oh, and yes, the stock market plummeted by almost 16% and the economy sputtered. Democrats successfully blamed the whole affair on Republican brinkmanship, helping Obama retain the White House and his party hold onto the Senate.¶ This go-round, Obama insists that he won't negotiate over the debt ceiling. He wants a clean bill that raises the limit, no matter how unpalatable that may be for Republicans. Meanwhile, House Speaker John A. Boehner (R-Ohio) continues to demand that any debt limit bill include measures to reduce the deficit, just as Congress did last time.¶ The two sides are so far apart -- again -- on the debt ceiling that even the informal talks the White House was holding with selected Senate Republicans have fallen through for lack of common ground. By seeking to throw Obamacare into the mix, Cantor may help Congress get past its first fiscal hurdle. But he only makes the second one harder to overcome.

#### 1st, Debates on drone courts now—legislation being written and proposed—thumps the disad

Wolverton, 3-12-13

[Joe, professor of American Government at Chattanooga State and was a practicing attorney until 2009, Federal Courts Rubber Stamp Federal Spying, http://tenthamendmentcenter.com/2013/05/12/federal-courts-rubber-stamp-federal-spying/comment-page-1/#.UfqaW2T70bh] /Wyo-MB

Although certainly not one to recognize checks on the executive, the White House indicated several months ago that it would entertain any legislative proposal for the establishment of such a tribunal. An Obama administration official told Reuters early this year, “The White House has been discussing various ways there could be independent review of counterterrorism actions for more than a year.”¶ In a press release issued in February, Senator King announced that he had sent a letter to Senators Feinstein and Saxby Chambliss (R-Ga.), chairwoman and vice-chairman of the Intelligence Committee, to consider a bill creating the new court.¶ King wrote, “As the Committee begins preparing the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, I ask that you work with me to contemplate legislative solutions, such as the creation of an outside judicial process similar to the FISA court, that might provide an independent perspective in the distinctive case of a U.S. citizen who is a senior operational leader of al Qaeda.”¶ According to comments made by “congressional aides” cited in Reuters, “discussions are at a preliminary stage.” They also reportedly said that several similar proposals made by legal experts were being kicked around on Capitol Hill.¶

#### 2nd, Link turn drone courts popular in congress—particularly with Feinstein and King

Hosenball, 2-8-2013

[Mark, Reuters news service, Support grows for U.S. "drone court" to review lethal strikes, http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/02/09/us-usa-drones-idUSBRE91800B20130209] /Wyo-MB

During a fresh round of debate this week over President Barack Obama's claim that he can unilaterally order lethal strikes by unmanned aircraft against U.S. citizens, some lawmakers proposed a middle ground: a special federal "drone court" that would approve suspected militants for targeting.¶ While the idea of a judicial review of such operations may be gaining political currency, multiple U.S. officials said on Friday that imminent action by the U.S. Congress or the White House to create one is unlikely. The idea is being actively considered, however, according to a White House official.¶ At Thursday's confirmation hearing for CIA director nominee John Brennan, senators discussed establishing a secret court or tribunal to rule on the validity of cases that U.S. intelligence agencies draw up for killing suspected militants using drones.¶ The court could be modeled on an existing court which examines applications for electronic eavesdropping on suspected spies or terrorists.¶ Senator Dianne Feinstein, Democratic chairwoman of the Senate Intelligence Committee, said Thursday that she planned to "review proposals for ... legislation to ensure that drone strikes are carried out in a manner consistent with our values, and the proposal to create an analogue of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court to review the conduct of such strikes."¶ Senator Angus King, a Maine independent, said during the hearing that he envisioned a scenario in which executive branch officials would go before a drone court "in a confidential and top-secret way, make the case that this American citizen is an enemy combatant, and at least that would be ... some check on the activities of the executive."

#### Feinstein key to agenda- can wrangle in both parties

Tate 13

(Curits, Mcclatchy Newspapers, “Sen. Dianne Feinstein presses her decades-long crusade on guns,” March 10, 2013, <http://www.mcclatchydc.com/2013/03/10/185261/sen-dianne-feinstein-presses-her.html#.Uhp4YpKThSQ>) /wyo-mm

Feinstein is a veteran lawmaker who knows how to work behind the scenes and across the aisle, which is how much of the real business of Capitol Hill gets done. “She’s developed a chain of colleagues she can call on,” Kennedy said. “She knows very well how to use her position on other committees.” Feinstein is an influential member. She ranks 14th in Senate seniority. Besides her seat on the Judiciary Committee, she serves on the powerful Appropriations Committee and chairs the Intelligence Committee. Her political roots took hold at a time before bitter partisanship began to color every debate, and even relationships on Capitol Hill. One of her closest friends has been Kay Bailey Hutchison, a Texas Republican who left the Senate in January. And Feinstein has warm relations with many more lawmakers, in an era fraught with political polarization. Sen. Jeff Sessions, R-Ala., a staunch conservative who serves alongside the liberal-leaning Feinstein on the Judiciary Committee, said that while they disagreed on many issues, including the assault weapons ban, he admired her ability to forge compromise. “I’d say on the 16 years I’ve been on it, she’s been one of the more effective Democratic senators at reaching across the aisle on key issues,” he said. “She battles for what she believes in, but she’s also very able at finding common ground and solving problems.”

#### 3rd, Link turn – plan popular in congress

Jakes 13

(Laura Jakes, writer for the Associate Press. “Congress Considers Putting Limits on Drone Strikes” 2-6-13 http://www.military.com/daily-news/2013/02/06/congress-considers-putting-limits-on-drone-strikes.html//wyoccd)

WASHINGTON -- Uncomfortable with the Obama administration's use of deadly drones, a growing number in Congress is looking to limit America's authority to kill suspected terrorists, even U.S. citizens. The Democratic-led outcry was emboldened by the revelation in a newly surfaced Justice Department memo that shows drones can strike against a wider range of threats, with less evidence, than previously believed.¶ The drone program, which has been used from Pakistan across the Middle East and into North Africa to find and kill an unknown number of suspected terrorists, is expected to be a top topic of debate when the Senate Intelligence Committee grills John Brennan, the White House's pick for CIA chief, at a hearing Thursday.¶ The White House on Tuesday defended its lethal drone program by citing the very laws that some in Congress once believed were appropriate in the years immediately after the Sept. 11 attacks but now think may be too broad.¶ "It has to be in the agenda of this Congress to reconsider the scope of action of drones and use of deadly force by the United States around the world because the original authorization of use of force, I think, is being strained to its limits," Sen. Chris Coons, D-Del., said in a recent interview.¶ Rep. Steny Hoyer of Maryland, the No. 2 Democrat in the House, said Tuesday that "it deserves a serious look at how we make the decisions in government to take out, kill, eliminate, whatever word you want to use, not just American citizens but other citizens as well."¶ Hoyer added: "We ought to carefully review our policies as a country."¶ The Senate Foreign Relations Committee likely will hold hearings on U.S. drone policy, an aide said Tuesday, and Chairman Robert Menendez, D-N.J., and the panel's top Republican, Sen. Bob Corker of Tennessee, both have quietly expressed concerns about the deadly operations. And earlier this week, a group of 11 Democratic and Republican senators urged President Barack Obama to release a classified Justice Department legal opinion justifying when U.S. counterterror missions, including drone strikes, can be used to kill American citizens abroad.¶ Without those documents, it's impossible for Congress and the public to decide "whether this authority has been properly defined, and whether the president's power to deliberately kill Americans is subject to appropriate limitations and safeguards," the senators wrote.

#### 4th, Political capital theory not true—and if the plan causes a fight it means Obama will get to pass more legislation—winning wins

Hirsh, 2013

[Michael, national journal chief correspondent, There’s No Such Thing as Political Capital, 3-30-13, http://www.nationaljournal.com/magazine/there-s-no-such-thing-as-political-capital-20130207] /Wyo-MB

But the abrupt emergence of the immigration and gun-control issues illustrates how suddenly shifts in mood can occur and how political interests can align in new ways just as suddenly. Indeed, the pseudo-concept of political capital masks a larger truth about Washington that is kindergarten simple: You just don’t know what you can do until you try. Or as Ornstein himself once wrote years ago, “Winning wins.” In theory, and in practice, depending on Obama’s handling of any particular issue, even in a polarized time, he could still deliver on a lot of his second-term goals, depending on his skill and the breaks. Unforeseen catalysts can appear, like Newtown. Epiphanies can dawn, such as when many Republican Party leaders suddenly woke up in panic to the huge disparity in the Hispanic vote.¶ Some political scientists who study the elusive calculus of how to pass legislation and run successful presidencies say that political capital is, at best, an empty concept, and that almost nothing in the academic literature successfully quantifies or even defines it. “It can refer to a very abstract thing, like a president’s popularity, but there’s no mechanism there. That makes it kind of useless,” says Richard Bensel, a government professor at Cornell University. Even Ornstein concedes that the calculus is far more complex than the term suggests. Winning on one issue often changes the calculation for the next issue; there is never any known amount of capital. “The idea here is, if an issue comes up where the conventional wisdom is that president is not going to get what he wants, and he gets it, then each time that happens, it changes the calculus of the other actors” Ornstein says. “If they think he’s going to win, they may change positions to get on the winning side. It’s a bandwagon effect.”

#### Syria guarantees PC is on a downward spiral – tanks the entire agenda – also proves PC is ineffective

Hughes 9/11

Brian, “Syria push imperils Obama's fall agenda”, <http://washingtonexaminer.com/syria-push-imperils-obamas-fall-agenda/article/2535611>, MCR

President Obama may have avoided an embarrassing legislative defeat over Syria, but the debate left him weakened at a critical point in his second term, according to GOP and Democratic insiders on Capitol Hill.¶ In a whirlwind period for both the White House and Congress, Obama pressed for an immediate military attack against Syria before eventually asking lawmakers to delay a vote authorizing the use of force to pursue a Russian-backed diplomatic solution.¶ Obama’s push to punish Syrian leader Bashar Assad for using chemical weapons faced stiff opposition from both lawmakers and the public and cost him in the polls.¶ Many on Capitol Hill say Obama squandered momentum that could have been better served on key challenges ahead.¶ Obama faces crucial fights over funding the federal government, raising the nation’s debt limit, turning off the next round of sequester cuts, rolling out his healthcare reforms and overhauling the nation’s immigration laws.¶ Sign Up for the Politics Today newsletter!¶ “It’s certainly true that [Obama] used up a lot of political capital, apparently for nothing, on the authorization push,” a senior House GOP leadership aide told the Washington Examiner.¶ The aide added that the Syrian standoff could still cost the president further leverage.¶ § Marked 08:07 § Secretary of State John Kerry is to begin talks with his Russian counterpart Wednesday on a plan to have Damascus turn over its chemical weapons to international inspectors, but the prospects for a deal are uncertain.¶ White House press secretary Jay Carney on Wednesday declined to lay out a timeline for talks, saying only that it would “take some time.”¶ "I think the bigger effect is still not known,” said the GOP aide. “If somehow the Russians do help get rid of the [Syrian] regime’s chemical weapons, the president will come out fine. But if Putin and Assad just toy with him for the next month, there’s no doubt he will have an exceedingly weakened presidency and ability to make demands of anyone.”¶ National security analysts say it would be virtually impossible to ensure Assad turns over his chemical weapons amid the country’s brutal civil war. And even some White House officials have privately questioned whether they are being played by Russian President Vladimir Putin’s offer to help facilitate the destruction of Syria’s chemical arsenal.¶ An adviser to a high-ranking Democratic senator with close ties to Obama conceded that Syria could remain a distraction as the president turns his attention to his domestic agenda.¶ “It doesn’t make the president’s job this fall any easier,” the aide said. “There’s not a whole lot for us to rally around at this point. Obviously, it’s not the boost the White House had hoped for.”¶ “Do I fear a carryover effect?” the source added. “I do.”¶ The Syria debate highlighted tensions between the president and Democratic lawmakers, with many of his party’s most liberal members failing to rally behind him in the foreign policy debate.¶ Even many from both parties who backed him on Syria suggested the president had poorly managed the effort to sway congressional support.¶ Rep. Adam Kinzinger, R-Ill., said he had offered to help the White House rally support on Syria and never heard back.¶ Many on both sides of the aisle now wonder how Obama will refine his effort to reach out to lawmakers in the domestic fights ahead.¶ White House officials have long scoffed at the notion that Obama could enhance his political clout by fostering better personal relationships with lawmakers. They say that a round of golf, dinner diplomacy or extensive presidential backslapping will do little to help push the president’s agenda in the GOP-controlled House.¶ But if Obama’s muddled Syria message proved anything, it’s that that he still doesn’t have the level of pull needed on Capitol Hill to force skittish Democrats to get in line or reachable Republicans to buck their party base.¶ Carney on Wednesday sidestepped questions about whether the Syria debate had weakened Obama’s standing.¶ “I'm not going to make a political assessment," he said.¶ Time is working against White House efforts to regain any leverage, though.

#### 5th, Obama wont spend PC and he won’t be effective if he does

Jay Cost, staff writer, 2-11-2013, “Obama the Bargainer,” The Weekly Standard, http://www.weeklystandard.com/articles/obama-bargainer\_699205.html?page=1

Thus, with the festivities finished and the glow of the inauguration fading, it is fair to ask: Just how powerful will President Obama be in his second term? In other words, how successful will he be at persuading the diverse agents of our government to do what he wants them to do? If the lessons of his first term guide our expectations for the second, then the most likely answer is: not very. At first blush, this assertion might sound absurd. A weak President Obama? Proof of the contrary is in the pudding: The massive stimulus, the health care bill, and financial reform were all epic in their scope and ambition. Surely both left and right agree—whether they celebrate or bemoan the fact—that Obama is a very strong, liberal president. But presidential power—the ability to persuade—has many sources, some external, some internal. The external sources are all reducible to “the political context.” How many seats does the president’s party control in Congress? What is the status of the opposition party? What was the relative strength of the president and his party in the last election? What is his job approval rating? And so on. All of these factors set the boundaries for how easily the president can persuade others. In 2009 and 2010, President Obama enjoyed a very favorable political context. Today, the political context is more favorable to him than it was in 2011, but markedly diminished from the heady days of 2009. So, for instance, President Obama can call for action on “climate change” until he is blue (or, perhaps, green) in the face, but the political environment—including arguably the most conservative House of Representatives since the 1920s—means he lacks the power to make it happen. The internal sources of strength are the president’s political skills, which he deploys in particular circumstances. So the question becomes: How good is he at persuading others, given the political context? If political context is the science of presidential power, quantifiable in electoral results and congressional voting scores, persuasive skill is the art. Here, we must put down the American Political Science Review and pick up Machiavelli’s Prince. As for President Obama’s first term, no other incoming president in recent history had such a surplus of political capital and misused it so terribly. The reason? He lacks important skills that are integral in the exercise of presidential power. All presidents are unique, each possessing or lacking skills useful to a chief executive. Obama is notable in that he has mastered some vital skills better than any recent predecessor, but he exhibits virtually no facility with others. His strengths have been enumerated extensively by a fawning press corps. His favorable coverage is due not only to the media’s ideological commitment to his policy goals, but also to his natural gifts. He awes the press, and many other groups in society, by his very presence. Moreover, he knows he has this power over them. This ability, more than any other, made him president and remains his single greatest source of power. Yet though he affects some people intensely, he himself seems largely unaffected by others. This helps explain why he has used his speaking ability so unevenly: He is wont to misread people, and therefore situations. His Tucson speech, for instance, after the shooting of Rep. Gabrielle Giffords, was a political stroke of genius. He intuited what the moment called for and delivered it perfectly. By contrast, his 2009 speech to the International Olympic Committee pitching Chicago was a waste of time and made him look small. Similarly, he has time and again left business leaders feeling nonplussed, inviting them to the White House mainly to serve as window dressing for another teleprompter performance. It is on Capitol Hill that Obama seems most out of touch with his audience. In particular, he does not understand what the key players in Congress expect, yet he is convinced he knows them better than they know themselves. What’s more, he gives little and inconsistent guidance as to what he expects from them. That goes for both Republicans and Democrats. For Republicans, the warning signs appeared early, on the stimulus bill passed in the president’s first month in office. Obama and his team were supremely confident that they could get a $900 billion package through Congress with solid Republican support, so much so that when House minority whip Eric Cantor warned that they would receive no backing from House Republicans, they told him not to embarrass himself with such an absurd prediction. Team Obama failed to anticipate how turned off the congressional GOP would be by the spending side of the package: Democratic appropriators were unloading a wish list that had accumulated during more than a decade of Republican governance. The White House also thought the Republicans would be attracted to the tax cuts that constituted roughly one-third of the package. But the White House did not understand how Republicans view taxes—specifically, the difference between tax credits, which the stimulus favored heavily, and rate cuts, which Republicans prefer. None of this should have come as a surprise to anyone who had done any homework on the congressional GOP. After all, Republicans killed a 1993 stimulus bill that was qualitatively similar, but less than a tenth the size of the 2009 package. What did Team Obama surmise when its predictions fell flat? It certainly did not take time to gauge the congressional GOP more carefully, to build a more nuanced picture of Republicans’ motives and expectations. Instead, it adopted the cartoonish caricature one finds in a Paul Krugman column: Republicans are contemptible knaves, willing to let the economy go down the drain to embarrass the president. The stimulus also featured another theme of presidential-congressional relations under Obama: mixed messages from the White House. Early in the negotiations over the bill, President Obama told House minority leader John Boehner and Cantor that he was interested in their ideas. He did not want to play partisan games; he just wanted to jump-start the economy. Yet when Cantor presented the president a list of suggestions, Obama brought the dialogue to an icy conclusion by infamously declaring, “I won, so I think I trump you on that.” During the deliberations on the bill, the president’s chief of staff, Rahm Emanuel, was known to respond to other GOP suggestions by shouting, “We have the votes. F— ’em!” For the first two years of Obama’s tenure, congressional Republicans did not register with the White House at all. Contact was so sparse that when the GOP took control of the House of Representatives, the White House did not even have Boehner’s cell phone number so the president could place a congratulatory call. The case of Michigan Republican Dave Camp is illustrative. According to Bob Woodward in The Price of Politics, The administration’s approach to Congress was different from what he was used to. He had first come to Washington as a congressional staffer during the Reagan administration. Reagan had deployed administration liaisons all over Congress. Camp could remember Reagan getting on the phone with a lowly freshman congressman to discuss legislation. .  .  . During Obama’s first two years in office, Camp was the ranking Republican on the Democrat-controlled Ways and Means Committee. He was one of the more politically moderate House Republicans. Yet the administration’s Hill staff didn’t even seem to know who he was. He never saw them. During the debt ceiling battle of 2011, the president again exhibited cluelessness about the motivations of congressional Republicans. Precious time during the month of July was wasted as Obama insisted again and again on decoupling the Bush-era tax cuts, making permanent the cuts for those making under $250,000, and letting the cuts in the high-end rates expire. His argument was that the congressional GOP could avoid the wrath of Grover Norquist because it would not actually have to vote to increase taxes. It seemed never to cross his mind that tax rate increases such as he was proposing were anathema to congressional Republicans. The bigger problem during the debt ceiling fight, and probably the biggest contributor to the near-default of the country that summer, was Obama’s failure to heed Boehner’s warning that $800 billion in additional tax revenue was his “red line,” above which he could not go. The justification for that figure was that it was all that could be squeezed out of tax reform (and even that was optimistic according to many analysts); beyond that, tax rates would have to be raised in order to bring in more revenue. In late July, after Boehner had made a “grand bargain” offer that included $800 billion in new revenue, Obama asked for another $400 billion. Memories diverge on exactly who said what—Boehner is convinced Obama said he had to have the extra money, while Obama believes he only suggested it. This ambiguity might have been avoided if Obama had not made the rookie mistake of making such a big request over the phone instead of in person. And, anyway, he should have known not to ask, given Boehner’s previous warnings about his red line. Unsurprisingly, the deal blew up shortly afterwards. It boils down to the difference between listening and waiting to talk. With congressional Republicans, Obama always seems to do the latter. So, once again, he was left disappointed, and once again he assumed the worst of his negotiating partners. He surmised that there were simply too many extreme Tea Party Republicans who were prepared to breach the debt ceiling, and that Boehner lacked control of his caucus. Again, a basic understanding of Republican history would have corrected this notion. Like Newt Gingrich and Denny Hastert before him, Boehner is responsible to a majority of the Republican caucus, which for generations has opposed the kinds of rate increases that $1.2 trillion in new revenue would have required. Not only did Obama fail to listen during the debt ceiling struggle, he consistently sent the other side mixed messages. A case in point: Obama’s demagogic April 2011 speech blasted Paul Ryan’s budget as “leaving seniors at the mercy of the insurance industry” and abandoning “the fundamental commitment this country has kept for generations.” In private, however, Obama had praised Ryan for offering a serious proposal and emphasized that both sides had to avoid scaring the elderly for political points. Worse, he had held a bipartisan summit that very day to encourage the two sides to come together on a plan. Obama’s problems communicating with Congress are not limited to the right side of the aisle. Although Democrats need not worry about White House demagoguery or fret that Obama fails to understand their concerns, he has nevertheless done a poor job of engaging them in dialogue. In particular, the White House has often cut congressional Democrats out of the loop, inhibiting interbranch coordination and angering leaders by what they feel is trampling on their institutional rights. Indeed, the president’s signature achievement—Obamacare—almost did not happen because of this. The process by which the health care bill was written was chaotic, to say the least. At one point five bills were circulating on Capitol Hill, three in the House and two in the Senate. Each differed, sometimes dramatically, in how to expand coverage and how to pay for it. And yet the White House did virtually nothing in 2009 to coordinate these efforts. In fact, White House aides privately thought the final House bill was a liberal fantasy, and they had worked out a deal with medical providers that did not include the so-called public option. Yet the president never came out against that proposal, or any other, for that matter. After multiple calls over the summer of 2009 for President Obama to set some ground rules on what he expected, he gave a speech in early September that, though his aides promised specificity, was once again vague. Finally, in early January, when the two chambers had passed their bills and it came time to work out the finer points, President Obama actually stormed out of a meeting after Nancy Pelosi tartly expressed her frustration with his lack of leadership. It was left to Emanuel to finish the negotiations. Worse, the needless delays due to the lack of presidential leadership sapped public support for the reform effort, led to Scott Brown’s victory in the Senate race in Massachusetts that January, and eventually forced Democrats to pass a gratuitously slipshod and ill-conceived bill that otherwise never would have become law. After the 2010 midterms, House Democrats lost their majority, but not all of their clout. It would have been virtually impossible for Boehner to pass a compromise debt ceiling plan through the House in 2011 without at least some Democratic support, so it was appropriate for Pelosi and her leadership team to be kept in the loop. For a while, they were, but as Boehner and Obama approached a grand bargain, House Democrats were excluded. Amazingly, so was Harry Reid. Any deal would obviously have to bear the imprimatur of the Senate majority leader, yet he was cut out of the final talks. It was only after the New York Times scooped the Boehner-Obama grand bargain that the White House brought Senate Democrats into the loop. Unsurprisingly, they were apoplectic, believing that the deal extracted too little from the congressional GOP, and feeling that they had been ignored. In fact, it was the outrage of the Senate Democrats that prompted the White House to go back to Boehner at the last minute to ask for more tax revenue, scuttling the big deal once and for all. All of these stories point in the same direction: This president does not have a solid congressional outreach program, does not have a steady grasp of the expectations of legislators in either party, and does a notably poor job of communicating to them what he expects. Thus, a drifting and listless policy process, finally given direction by some power player outside the White House, often acting to avert imminent disaster, has marked almost every major deal during his tenure. There is little reason to expect anything different in the next four years. In the end, President Obama simply does not spend enough time talking to members of Congress. He is too aloof, and most accounts suggest he dislikes the seemingly petty, parochial nature of Capitol Hill. In an interview with journalist Ron Suskind, President Obama articulated what he believes to be the core of a president’s job, and what he learned from the troubles of his first term: The reason people put me in this office is people felt that I had connected our current predicaments with the broader arc of American history and where we might go as a diverse and forward-looking nation. And that narrative thread we just lost, in the day-to-day problem solving that was going on. .  .  . What the president can do, that nobody else can do, is tell a story to the American people about where we are and where we need to go. While this statement would surely make the republicans of the founding generation turn over in their graves, it does encapsulate the job of the modern president, but only in part. Yes, he is to stand, almost godlike, above the political process and tell a story, but the modern presidential deity is not in line with the watchmaker God of the 18th-century rationalists. It is not enough to put the pieces in motion, then stand back. Instead, a president must be more like the God of the Old and New Testaments, above the world and sovereign over it, but also intimately involved in it, guiding, encouraging, cajoling, and threatening people to make the right choices. The ideal modern president, to borrow a phrase from Theodore Roosevelt, is one “actually in the arena, whose face is marred by dust and sweat and blood.” President Obama does not much care for the arena, and his successes came despite this distaste, not because of it. In fact, Nancy Pelosi probably deserves most of the credit for the legislative victories of 2009-2010. She functioned as a de facto prime minister, with her eyes always on big, national projects while she dealt with the provincial concerns of this committee chair or that subcommittee member. She, not Obama, was the one “in the arena.” What this means is that major breakthroughs on legislation in the next four years are likely to depend on political actors outside the White House. Pelosi’s power is only a fraction of what it was, but policy success will still depend on congressional entrepreneurs as long as the White House remains disengaged. Thus, a whole host of issues will likely go unaddressed, above all, the looming entitlement crisis. One issue that could see movement is immigration reform, a topic of discussion where there is overlap between the parties and there are potential leaders in Congress, like Marco Rubio, who could help in whipping his party and negotiating a compromise with the other side.

### Terror

#### And, Terror threat high and getting stronger

Boerma, 8-11-13

[Lindsay, CBS news, U.S. still on terror alert as embassies reopen, http://www.cbsnews.com/8301-3460\_162-57598021/u.s-still-on-terror-alert-as-embassies-reopen/] /Wyo-MB

The U.S. government was "absolutely not" overreacting by closing 19 embassies and consulates last week amid signs of an al Qaeda plot against U.S. diplomatic posts in the Middle East and other Muslim countries, lawmakers on the House Intelligence Committee argued Sunday on "Face the Nation."¶ "We can't be critical of Benghazi because there was not enough protection and now be critical because there's too much," Rep. Peter King, R-N.Y., said. "It's best to opt to secure American lives, especially in this situation. This was really out of the ordinary. In an extraordinary world, this was the most extraordinary I've seen in at least the last seven years."¶ Rep. Dutch Ruppersberger, D-Md., the top Democrat on the House Intelligence Committee, agreed there was "strong" information, "especially in Yemen," picked up by U.S. intelligence last weekend. The threat emanated from Al Qaeda of the Arabian Peninsula (AQAP) - one of the most active terrorist groups within the al Qaeda network - which Ruppersberger observed is "getting stronger, and their focus has been the United States."¶ "Any time an American is put at risk in the world or in our homeland, we have to deal with it; we have to be cautious," he said. "It wasn't just one incident - there's corroboration that's occurring." King agreed: "This was not a case of connecting the dots - this was clear, explicit intelligence and evidence."

#### And, the turns outweigh the links—only the plan creates an effective targeted killing framework that is essential to counterterrorism

Guiora, 2012

[Amos, Professor of Law, S.J. Quinney College of Law, University of Utah, Targeted killing: when proportionality gets all out of proportion, Case Western Reserve Journal of International Law. 45.1-2 (Fall 2012): p235., Academic onefile] /Wyo-MB

Targeted killing sits at the intersection of law, morality, strategy, and policy. For the very reasons that lawful and effective targeted killing enables the state to engage in its core function of self-defense and defense of its nationals, I am a proponent of targeted killing. However, my support for targeted killing is conditioned upon it being subject to rigorous standards, criteria, and guidelines. My advocacy of both targeted killing and criteria-based decision-making rests largely on my twenty years of experience with a "seat at the table" of operational counterterrorism. The dangers inherent in the use of state power are enormous. On the opposite side of the equation, however, is the terrible cost of terrorism because terrorists, in deliberately targeting innocent civilians, disregard both legality and morality.¶ At present, new conceptions of threat and new technological capabilities are drastically affecting the implementation of targeted killing and the application of core legal and moral principles. High-level decision makers have begun to seemingly place a disproportionate level of importance on tactical and strategic gain over respect for a narrow definition of criteria-based legal and moral framework. (1) Given the realities of collateral damage and other inevitable consequences, such an emphasis on tactical and strategic gain is troublesome. Nonetheless, an effective targeted killing provides the nation state with significant advantages in the context of counterterrorism.

### 2AC – Generic CPs

#### Perm do both—Shields the Link to politics—Congress purposefully doesn’t act on legislation or waits for executive action so that they can blame the president

Buchanan 2013

[Neil Buchanan, Law Professor, February 21, 2013, Spending Priorities, the Separation of Powers, and the Rule of Law, http://www.dorfonlaw.org/2013/02/spending-priorities-separation-of.html, uwyo//amp]

The debt ceiling is keeping us busy, here at Dorf on Law. Later today, both Professor Dorf and I will be speaking at Columbia Law School, at the invitation of the Law Review editors who worked on our two articles in 2012. Over the weekend, we also finalized a new article, which Professor Dorf briefly described here yesterday. In it, we extend our ongoing analysis of the constitutional issues surrounding the debt ceiling. The short-hand versions of the two main sections of the article are: (1) Yes, there really is a trilemma, and (2) No, the debt ceiling is still not binding, even if everyone knows that they are creating a trilemma when they pass the spending and taxing laws. The latter point is important because already-existing trilemmas (such as the one that Congress and the President faced last month, before the Republicans capitulated by passing their "Debt Ceiling Amnesia Act") do not exist when there are no appropriated funds for the President to spend. (Strictly speaking, there would be a trilemma if even the minimal level of emergency spending required by law during a government shutdown could only be financed by borrowing in excess of the debt ceiling. But given that most of the tax code is enacted on a continuing basis -- that is, unlike spending, tax provisions generally do not expire on a particular date -- there will generally be enough money coming in to finance emergency operations without having to borrow.) Every spending/taxing agreement, therefore, potentially necessitates issuing enough net new debt to require an increase in the debt ceiling. When that happens, one could invoke something like the "last in time" rule, but we conclude that the problem should not be resolved by relying upon a legal canon that is generally used for rationalizing inconsistent laws. Rather, the more fundamental question is how to preserve the separation of powers. As we point out, Congress might actually want to give away its legislative powers, thus putting the political blame on the President for unpopular cuts (a point that Professor Scott Bauries at the University of Kentucky College of Law calls "learned legislative helplessness") -- but their desire to pass the buck is actually all the more reason not to let them do so. With great power comes great responsibility.

#### CIA control fails- lacks transparency necessary to solve modeling

Zenko 13

(Micah, Douglas Dillon Fellow, Council on Foreign Relations, “Transferring CIA Drone Strikes to the Pentagon,” April 2013, <http://www.cfr.org/drones/transferring-cia-drone-strikes-pentagon/p30434>) /wyo-mm

In an interview, President Obama revealed, "I think creating a legal structure, processes, with oversight checks on how we use unmanned weapons is going to be a challenge for me and for my successors for some time to come—partly because technology may evolve fairly rapidly for other countries as well." The Obama administration has two central objectives for its targeted killing reforms: preventing constraints on its ability to conduct lethal operations and setting precedents for the use of armed drones by other states. By law, institutional culture, and customary practice, drone strikes conducted by the CIA cannot reach the minimum thresholds of transparency and accountability required to achieve either objective. JSOC is also a highly secretive organization, but the United States could provide a much clearer and more detailed explanation of the outstanding issues regarding targeted killing without compromising the military's sources and methods—should the president prioritize such change. Moreover, according to a February 2013 poll, U.S. public support for military drone strikes (75 percent) was higher than for those conducted by the CIA (65 percent). Without ending CIA targeted killings, the Obama administration cannot undertake any of the reforms that it has stated are necessary both to ensure drone strikes do not go the way of third-country renditions and enhanced interrogation techniques, but also to establish the precedents of greater openness in how such operations are conducted by others.

#### 1. Drone Courts key – Congress should establish Judicial Review, it is the best check on the president, all other mechanisms insufficient

Bazzle 12

(Timothy, George Mason University Civil Rights Law Journal, “Shutting the courthouse doors: invoking the state secrets privilege to thwart judicial review in the age of terror,” 2012, Hein Library Online) /wyo-mm

By design, courts serve as a bulwark against the excesses of the political branches. The challenge courts face when confronted with a claim of state secrets is reconciling their Article III duties with the Executive’s potentially competing Article II duties.212 While the temptation for the Executive to concentrate its power is understandable, a robust state secrets privilege insulates an overreaching Executive from meaningful oversight. To the extent courts are able to fashion judicial devices for determining when and how the states privilege applies, they may represent the most important method of controlling Executive Branch activity.213 Given the inability of Congress to enact legislation to constrain the application of the privilege,214 courts are perhaps also the best equipped to block the Executive Branch from self-interestedly invoking the privilege to protect itself from embarrassment and potential civil and criminal liability.215 Academic arguments claiming that courts should automatically defer to the Executive’s expertise in national security and foreign affairs matters216 ignore the potentially more serious—and structural—conflict of interest problem that occurs when an Executive, accused of wrongdoing, can self-servingly invoke the state secretes privilege to conceal its action from public view.217 Reinforcing judicial review of state secrets claim represents an important check on the potential for Executive Branch abuse of the privilege.

#### Judicial review is essential to judicial independence

Gerber, 2007

[Scott D. Gerber is an associate professor at Ohio Northern University College of Law and a senior research scholar in law and politics at the Social Philosophy and Policy Center, The Political Theory of an Independent Judiciary, 116 YALE L.J. POCKET PART 223 (2007), http://thepocketpart.org/2007/01/09/gerber.html] /Wyo-MB

Judicial review fits into the political theory of an independent judiciary in at least two ways. First, judicial review is a core component of the Constitution’s system of checks and balances, a system in which each branch of the federal government is endowed with, in the words of The Federalist No. 48, “a constitutional control over the others.” The President has, among other checks, a veto over congressional bills and the power to nominate federal judges. Congress has, among other checks, the power to override presidential vetoes and to control the size and jurisdiction of the federal courts, as well as the power to impeach all federal officials. Without the power of judicial review, what check—what “constitutional control”—would the federal judiciary have on the President or Congress? The answer is none. As a consequence, judicial review is an inevitable component of the Constitution’s commitment to checks and balances.¶ Judicial review also fits into the political theory of an independent judiciary in another, equally straightforward, fashion: judicial review is the ultimate expression of judicial independence, because without judicial independence no court could safely void an act of a coordinate political branch. Bluntly stated, the risk to a judge who exercises judicial review when he or she is not independent of the executive and the legislature is either removal from the bench or a reduction in salary. John Adams knew this, and so did the Framers who met in Philadelphia during the summer of 1787 when they wrote Adams’s theory of judicial independence into Article III of the Constitution.

#### Judicial independence is critical to democratic consolidation

Herron and Randazzo, 2003

[Erik, University of Kansas and Kirk, University of Kentucky, The Relationship Between Independence and Judicial Review in Post-Communist Courts, THE JOURNAL OF POLITICS, Vol. 65, No. 2, May 2003, Pp. 422–438, http://people.cas.sc.edu/randazzo/herron\_randazzo\_2003\_jop.pdf] /Wyo-MB

Although independent judiciaries are important actors in democratic consolidation, how expressions of judicial independence evolve in transitional societies¶ remains unclear. Ideally, courts review legislation and government decisions¶ under the rubric of constitutionality. That is, the judiciary is able to declare laws¶ and actions unconstitutional and serve as a check against excesses by other¶ branches of government. A strong judiciary in newly independent countries helps¶ the state break with its authoritarian past and develop a constitutional culture that¶ teaches state actors that the legal system cannot be transgressed for political gain¶ (Brewer-Carias 1989; Larkins 1996). However, the development of an independent judiciary can be constrained by a weak institutional legacy, limited training¶ and support for judges, and the strength of other political actors. If the judiciary¶ does not have the authority to make independent decisions, democratic progress may falter, potentially returning the country to “the darkness and chaos of a totalitarian and dictatorial regime” (Mohan 1982, 110).1

#### Solves global wars,

Epstien et al, 2007

[Susan B. Epstein, Nina M. Serafino, and Francis T. Miko Specialists in Foreign Policy Foreign Affairs, Defense, and Trade Division Congressional research service, Democracy Promotion: Cornerstone of U.S. Foreign Policy?, 12-26-7, http://www.au.af.mil/au/awc/awcgate/crs/rl34296.pdf] /Wyo-MB

A common rationale offered by proponents of democracy promotion, including¶ former Secretary of State Madeleine Albright and current Secretary of State¶ Condoleezza Rice, is that democracies do not go to war with one another. This is¶ sometimes referred to as the democratic peace theory. Experts point to European¶ countries, the United States, Canada, and Mexico as present-day examples.¶ According to President Clinton’s National Security Strategy of Engagement and¶ Enlargement: “Democracies create free markets that offer economic opportunity,¶ make for more reliable trading partners, and are far less likely to wage war on one¶ another.”22¶ Some have refined this democracy peace theory by distinguishing between¶ mature democracies and those in transition, suggesting that mature democracies do¶ not fight wars with each other, but that countries transitioning toward democracy are¶ more prone to being attacked (because of weak governmental institutions) or being¶ aggressive toward others. States that made transitions from an autocracy toward¶ early stages of democracy and were involved in hostilities soon after include France¶ in the mid-1800s under Napoleon III, Prussia/Germany under Bismarck (1870-1890),¶ Chile shortly before the War of the Pacific in 1879, Serbia’s multiparty constitutional¶ monarchy before the Balkan Wars of the late 20th Century, and Pakistan’s military guided pseudo-democracy before its wars with India in 1965 and 1971.23¶ The George W. Bush Administration asserts that democracy promotion is a¶ long-term antidote to terrorism. The Administration’s Strategy for Winning the War¶ on Terror asserts that inequality in political participation and access to wealth¶ resources in a country, lack of freedom of speech, and poor education all breed¶ volatility. By promoting basic human rights, freedoms of speech, religion, assembly,¶ association and press, and by maintaining order within their borders and providing¶ an independent justice system, effective democracies can defeat terrorism in the long¶ run, according to the Bush White House.24¶ Another reason given to encourage democracies (although debated by some¶ experts) is the belief that democracies promote economic prosperity. From this¶ perspective, as the rule of law leads to a more stable society and as equal economic¶ opportunity for all helps to spur economic activity, economic growth, particularly of¶ per capita income, is likely to follow. In addition, a democracy under this scenario¶ may be more likely to be viewed by other countries as a good trading partner and by¶ outside investors as a more stable environment for investment, according to some¶ experts. Moreover, countries that have developed as stable democracies are viewed¶ as being more likely to honor treaties, according to some experts.25

#### Second, Links to politics- causes massive controversy

Goldsmith 13

(Jack, Lawfare, “More on Drone Shift from CIA to DOD,” March 21, 2013, <http://www.lawfareblog.com/2013/03/more-on-drone-shift-from-dod-to-cia/>) /wyo-mm

Following up on Wells’ post, I increasingly think that the shift in drone authorities from CIA to DOD first reported by Dan Klaidman might not amount to much in substance, and that any proposed changes face many hurdles in any event. In addition to the suggestions to this effect in the NYT story that Wells discusses, the WSJ reports that any CIA wind down in Yemen and especially Pakistan will be slow at best. It also notes that the possible shift from CIA to DOD “remains controversial on Capitol Hill, within the CIA and in some military circles among people who think the program is more effective under the agency’s control.” And it describes disagreements about the shift between Senator McCain, who is on the Arms Services Committee and who (unsurprisingly) favors the shift, and Senator Feinstein, who is on the Intelligence Committee and who (unsurprisingly) opposes it. This congressional jurisdictional battle (more details here) could have large consequences for the success of any shift.

#### 3rd, counterplan links to politics

Schier 9

[Steven, Professor of Poliitcal Science at Carleton,"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.

### Sig Strikes CP

#### plan functionally erases signature strikes

Cohen 13

(Adam, Program assistant, Friends Committee on National Legislation, Huffington Post, “One Step Closer to Meaningful Oversight of International Targeted Killing,” March 30, 2013, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/adam-cohen/drone-killings-hearing_b_3180495.html>) /wyo-mm

We also learned from this hearing that there is near-unanimous consent for a constructive review of these policies. From Rosa Brooks, law professor at Georgetown University, fellow at the New America Foundation and former Counselor to the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy, to Colonel Martha McSally of the U.S. Air Force, all of the witnesses highlighted their willingness to examine the legal and procedural rules surrounding targeted killing. All of them highlighted their belief that it is critical to increase oversight, to thoroughly vet those being targeted, and to reduce civilian casualties as much as possible. Even those witnesses who supported and spoke to the virtues of drones favored the codification of a better review process, a larger oversight role for Congress and a court for reviewing the legality of conducted attacks and for appropriately compensating the families of victims. While these measures would not end U.S. targeted killings abroad altogether, they could rein in some of the program's worst offenses, more accurately define and protect civilians, and reduce the total number of strikes -- particularly signature strikes based on observed behavior rather than intelligence reviews. This groundbreaking hearing could be the first step in maturing the national dialogue on drones. In recent months, members of Congress have made public statements, held hearings, introduced and sponsored legislation and written letters to the administration challenging the federal government's right to deploy drones to infringe upon the rights of U.S. citizens at home or abroad. Finally, the scrutiny is shifting to the administration's opaque counterterrorism policies across the world. Congress should use this eye-opening discussion as the starting point to further question the drones program: hold another hearing; introduce legislation; and let the administration (whose decisions to neither provide a witness at the hearing nor make public the remaining Department of Justice memos was well noted) know that it is just as concerned about the ethical and strategic implications of targeted killing. With this hearing we are one step closer to meaningful transparency and accountability. We must move quickly to take the next.

#### Fifth, Signature strikes are good and don’t risk civilian casualties when intelligence is effectively used strikes can kill high value targets

Greg Miller, Washington Post, “CIA seeks new authority to expand Yemen drone campaign,” April 18, 2012.

Proponents of the plan said improvements in U.S. intelligence collection in Yemen have made it possible to expand the drone campaign — and use signature strikes — while minimizing the risk of civilian casualties. They also pointed to the CIA’s experience in Pakistan. U.S. officials said the agency killed more senior al-Qaeda operatives there with signature strikes than with those in which it had identified and located someone on its kill list. In Pakistan, the CIA “killed most of their ‘list people’ when they didn’t know they were there,” said a former senior U.S. military official familiar with drone operations. The agency has cited the Pakistan experience to administration officials in arguing, perhaps counterintuitively, that it can be more effective against al-Qaeda’s Yemen affiliate if it doesn’t have to identify its targets before an attack. Obama, however, ruled out a similar push for such authority more than a year ago. Increasing focus on Yemen The CIA, the National Security Agency and other spy services have deployed more officers and resources to Yemen over the past several years to augment counterterrorism operations that were previously handled almost exclusively by the U.S. Joint Special Operations Command. The CIA began flying armed drones over Yemen last year after opening a secret base on the Arabian Peninsula. The agency also has worked with the Saudi and Yemeni intelligence services to build networks of informants — much the way it did in Pakistan before ramping up drone strikes there. The agency’s strategy in Pakistan was centered on mounting a drone campaign so relentless that it allowed no time between attacks for al-Qaeda operatives to regroup. The use of signature strikes came to be seen as critical to achieving that pace. The approach involved assembling threads of intelligence from multiple sources to develop telltale “signatures” of al-Qaeda activity based on operatives’ vehicles, facilities, communications equipment and patterns of behavior. A former senior U.S. intelligence official said the CIA became so adept at this that it could tell what was happening inside an al-Qaeda compound — whether a leader was visiting or explosives were being assembled, for example — based on the location and number of security operatives surrounding the site.