#### 1st, No deference now--- lots of rulings

Flaherty 2011 (Martin Flaherty, Leitner Professor of International Law, Fordham Law School, “Judicial Foreign Relations Authority After 9/11,” NYLS Law Review, http://www.nylslawreview.com/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2011/08/Flaherty-56-1.pdf)

For a time the forces of judicial isolationism appeared to have gained traction and ¶ may yet carry the day. It is all the more surprising, then, that the Supreme Court ¶ reasserted the judiciary’s traditional foreign affairs role in the areas in which its ¶ opponents assert deference is most urgent—national security, terrorism, and war. Yet ¶ so far, in every major case arising out of 9/11, the Court has rejected the position ¶ staked out by the executive branch, even when supported by Congress. At critical ¶ points, moreover, each of these rejections involved the Court reclaiming its primacy ¶ in legal interpretation, an area in which advocates of judicial deference have appeared ¶ to make substantial progress. The Court nonetheless rejected deference in statutory ¶ construction in Rasul v. Bush.¶ 16 It took the same tack with regard to treaties in ¶ Hamdan v. Rumsfeld.¶ 17 It further rejected deference in constitutional interpretation in ¶ both Hamdi v. Rumsfeld18 and Boumediene v. Bush.¶ 19 Together, these cases represent a ¶ stunning reassertion of the judiciary’s proper role in foreign relations. Whether ¶ reassertion will mean restoration, however, still remains to be seen.

#### 1st, Pres powers low now—Syria decision undermined Obama’s presidential powers

Nather and Palmer, 9-1-13

[David and Anna, Politico, Bushies fear Obama weakening presidency, http://www.politico.com/story/2013/09/bushies-fear-obama-weakening-presidency-96143.html] /Wyo-MB

President Barack Obama just turned decades of debate over presidential war powers on its head.¶ Until Saturday, when Obama went to Congress to ask for permission to strike Syria, the power to launch military action had been strongly in the hands of the commander in chief. Even the 1973 War Powers Resolution allows bombs to start falling before the president has to ask Congress for long-term approval.¶ For three decades after Watergate, conservatives like Dick Cheney and those of his ilk sought to increase executive branch power that they felt had been eroded by liberal congressional reformers. George W. Bush’s legal team crafted controversial opinions that emboldened the White House on a wide range of national security areas, from interrogation to surveillance.¶ That makes the move by Obama to hand a piece of the messy situation in Syria to Congress a clear step in the other direction — an abdication of power to Congress at a moment when he has no good solutions.¶ And even if Obama ultimately balks at Congress if they vote down his ask, prominent conservatives who fueled the expansion of presidential power — especially Bush administration alums — are beside themselves, arguing that Obama has weakened the presidency.

#### 2nd, A multitude of other actors hamper presidential flexibility—thumps the disad

Rozell 12

(Mark Rozell, Professor of Public Policy, George Mason University, “From Idealism to Power: The Presidency in the Age of Obama” 2012, <http://www.libertylawsite.org/book-review/from-idealism-to-power-the-presidency-in-the-age-of-obama/>, KB)

A substantial portion of Goldsmith’s book presents in detail his case that various forces outside of government, and some within, are responsible for hamstringing the president in unprecedented fashion: Aggressive, often intrusive, journalism, that at times endangers national security; human rights and other advocacy groups, some domestic and other cross-national, teamed with big resources and talented, aggressive lawyers, using every legal category and technicality possible to complicate executive action; courts thrust into the mix, having to decide critical national security law controversies, even when the judges themselves have little direct knowledge or expertise on the topics brought before them; attorneys within the executive branch itself advising against actions based on often narrow legal interpretations and with little understanding of the broader implications of tying down the president with legalisms.

#### 3rd, Link Turn—extend 1ac Chebab evidence, Counterplan bolsters executive action—Obama power is vindicated when he has the backing and support of courts, plan results in more decisive executive actions.

#### And, the link turn outweighs the link—Judicial oversight serves to legitimize executive decisions

Kwoka 11

(Lindsay, University of Pennsylvania Law School, J.D, Journal of Constitutional Law, “Trial by Sniper: The Legality of Targeted Killing in the War on Terror,” 2011, Lexis) /wyo-mm

Providing an intra-executive process is not sufficient in the context of targeted killing of a U.S. citizen outside of a war zone.122 Murphy and Radsan argue that due process would be satisfied if, after a strike has already occurred, the executive branch launched an investigation of its legality.123 They argue that interference from the judicial branch would undermine the executive’s decisionmaking and compromise state secrets.124 On the contrary, judicial intervention would not undermine the executive’s decisionmaking, but rather would serve to legitimize the executive’s actions. Even during wartime, many are critical of actions taken by the executive to deprive individuals of rights without intervention by the judicial branch. For instance, many objected to the Military Commissions Act on the grounds that it did not afford the accused of an independent judiciary.125 Furthermore, as noted above, the concerns about minimizing the disclosure of state secrets would be alleviated by permitting only the decisionmaker to review the evidence. The hearing would be conducted privately and the information would be conveyed on a “need-to-know” basis only. Thus the confidentiality problems associated with affording suspected terrorists a full jury trial are not present in a process where the judge reviews the evidence in confidence. Not only would judicial intervention decrease public skepticism of the executive’s decisions, but would also promote accuracy and fairness.§ Marked 17:54 § 126 Because mistakes are possible and have happened regarding misclassification of terrorists, accuracy is better preserved by allowing the judiciary to check the actions of the executive.127 The process would likely be fairer because federal judges are appointed for life tenure, and thus are less likely to be subject to public pressure.128 Moreover, having a federal judge decide on whether targeted killing is permissible would alleviate executive branch pressure. If a member of the executive branch were to be the neutral decisionmaker, he would have incentive to permit the President to do whatever he deems necessary. A federal judge would not likely be subject so such influence.

#### 4th, Political power is not zero sum—no trade off

Read, 3-1-12

[James, College of Saint Benedict/Saint John's University, jread@csbsju.edu, Is Power Zero-Sum or Variable-Sum? Old Arguments and New Beginnings, Political Science Faculty Publications.Paper 4, http://digitalcommons.csbsju.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1004&context=polsci\_pubs] /Wyo-MB

The specific question with which this essay is concerned is whether power – and ¶ especially political power – should be regarded as inherently zero-sum, one‟s agent‟s gain ¶ entailing by definition an equivalent loss for another or others; or variable-sum, whereby it is ¶ possible to have mutual gains of power not offset by equivalent losses somewhere else (positivesum), and mutual losses of power not offset by equivalent gains somewhere else (negative-sum). ¶ This essay is part of a larger book-length project that will systematically examine zero-sum and ¶ variable-sum understandings of power; and argue that a variable-sum understanding of power is ¶ at least as fruitful in describing actual power relations – including relations characterized by ¶ significant conflict – as the zero-sum view (see Read 2009a; 2010).

#### No deal – Boehner can’t get house GOP in line

Alberta 9-26 (Tim Alberta, leadership reporter for the National Journal, Republicans Not Sold on Boehner's Debt-Ceiling Plan, National Journal, 26 September 2013, http://www.nationaljournal.com/congress/republicans-not-sold-on-boehner-s-debt-ceiling-plan-20130926, da 9-26-13) PC

Speaker John Boehner attempted Thursday morning to sell House Republicans on a debt-ceiling plan that would delay the implementation of Obamacare, jumpstart the Keystone Pipeline, and introduce other conservative reforms in hopes of uniting the GOP conference ahead of tough votes on the continuing resolution and debt-ceiling.¶ But reaction from members was mixed, at best.¶ "We shouldn't even be talking about the debt-ceiling until we get [the Senate] to vote on a good CR for America," fumed Rep. Louie Gohmert of Texas, who plans to vote against the debt-ceiling bill when it hits the floor, which could happen as soon as Friday.¶ Rep. Mo Brooks of Alabama said he was undecided on the debt-limit package, even though "it definitely has a lot of goodies in it." Brooks added: "It does not cut spending and does not solve the problem."¶ Asked if it could pass the House, Brooks replied, "In my judgment, no."¶ Others Republicans, though, were more optimistic. Rep. Tom Price of Georgia, who has been working with leadership to craft a comprehensive strategy to deal with the CR and debt-ceiling fights, said members seemed satisfied that Boehner's proposal meets the criteria they have long demanded for a debt-ceiling increase.¶ "It meets the Boehner Rule -- any increase is met by dollar-for-dollar decrease in spending as well as reforms," Price said. "It will delay Obamacare for a year. ... And it keeps the House moving in a direction where the Senate has to respond, which is important."¶ But does it have enough support to pass the House? "I think so, yeah," Price said.¶ Rep. Kevin Brady of Texas agreed, saying conservatives should rally behind the Boehner plan. "We should be unified in bringing this debt-ceiling proposal out of the House," said Brady, noting that the package includes "very strong, pro-growth policies that will help reduce the deficit."¶ Brady said of a potential floor vote Friday: "There should be more than 218."¶ The prospect of a quick floor vote, however, did not sit well with undecided Republicans like Rep. Jim Bridenstine of Oklahoma. "I'm looking forward to seeing what leadership puts on the table," he said. "I think there's a lot more to be discussed."¶ Rep. Randy Weber of Texas agreed: "I have decided not take a position as of yet," he said. "I want to hear more."¶ Meanwhile, conservative leaders wouldn't bite when asked whether the debt-ceiling proposal has the votes to pass.¶ "You must confuse me with the whip," said a smiling Rep. Jeb Hensarling of Texas. Pressed to analyze the support within his conference for Boehner's plan, Hensarling repeated three times: "I expect Republicans to be united."¶ Even Rep. Steve Scalise, chairman of the Republican Study Committee, seemed uncertain of whether Boehner's presentation had won over a sufficient number of conservatives. "We're going to find out," he said. "You'll have to ask the whip."

#### 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§ Marked 17:57 § ,” he said. “She battles for what she believes in, but she’s also very able at finding common ground and solving problems.”

#### 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.”

#### Prioritization solves default

Tamara Keith, “House GOP Leaders Gear Up For Debt Ceiling Battle,” NPR, 9/27/13. http://www.npr.org/2013/09/27/226716489/house-gop-leaders-gear-up-for-debt-ceiling-battle

KEITH: John Kline is a Minnesota Republican. He says, unlike a government shutdown, with the debt limit, there would be no immediate crisis.¶ KLINE: The government has the authority to spend money. It simply doesn't have enough. But the secretary of the Treasury has the ability to pay different parts of the obligation.¶ KEITH: This is a concept known as prioritization. Make interest payments on the national debt first, and there won't be a default. John Fleming is a Republican from Louisiana.¶ REPRESENTATIVE JOHN FLEMING: There's always enough revenue to make interest payments. There will never be a shortfall on that, so that default is impossible.

#### No impact – Obama will unilaterally lift

Greg Valliere, chief political strategic for Potomac Research group, “If all else fails, Obama will raise debt ceiling himself: analyst,” Market Watch, 9/25/13

If Congress fails to raise the debt limit by Oct. 17, could President Barack Obama step in and raise the ceiling by executive action? Greg Valliere, chief political strategist for Potomac Research Group, says Obama would do so, if faced with the prospect of a certain default on paying the nation’s creditors. “I am not flat out saying that [executive fiat] is the end game, but it has to be on the table if a default looks imminent,” Valliere said in an interview with MarketWatch. During the last debt ceiling showdown in the summer of 2011, there were scholars and senators who suggested Obama did have such a silver bullet — the 14th Amendment to the Constitution. None other than former President Bill Clinton agreed. In an interview with The New York Times in 2011, Clinton said Obama should invoke the 14th Amendment “without hesitation” to raise the debt ceiling and “force the courts to stop me.” The provision in question, Section 4 of the amendment, says that the validity of the public debt “shall not be questioned.” Laurence Tribe, a noted professor of constitutional law at Harvard, tried at the time to throw cold water on such arguments. In an op-ed in the Times, Tribe said that only Congress has the power to borrow money on the credit of the United States. Arguments that the president may do whatever is necessary to avoid default “has no logical stopping point,” Tribe noted. In addition, a legal cloud would hang over any newly issued bonds, Tribe said, because of the risk that the government might refuse to honor those debts as legitimate. Back in 2011, Obama and administration officials shied away from the suggestion he could act unilaterally. But Valliere noted that times have changed, with Obama now in his second term in office. “Obama has fewer constraints,” Valliere said.

#### Preventing extinction is the highest ethical priority – we should take action to prevent the Other from dying FIRST, only THEN can we consider questions of value to life

Paul Wapner, associate professor and director of the Global Environmental Policy Program at American University, Winter 2003, Dissent, online: http://www.dissentmagazine.org/menutest/archives/2003/wi03/wapner.htm

All attempts to listen to nature are social constructions-except one. Even the most radical postmodernist must acknowledge the distinction between physical existence and non-existence. As I have said, postmodernists accept that there is a physical substratum to the phenomenal world even if they argue about the different meanings we ascribe to it. This acknowledgment of physical existence is crucial. We can't ascribe meaning to that which doesn't appear. What doesn't exist can manifest no character. Put differently, yes, the postmodernist should rightly worry about interpreting nature's expressions. And all of us should be wary of those who claim to speak on nature's behalf (including environmentalists who do that). But we need not doubt the simple idea that a prerequisite of expression is existence. This in turn suggests that preserving the nonhuman world-in all its diverse embodiments-must be seen by eco-critics as a fundamental good. Eco-critics must be supporters, in some fashion, of environmental preservation. Postmodernists reject the idea of a universal good. They rightly acknowledge the difficulty of identifying a common value given the multiple contexts of our value-producing activity. In fact, if there is one thing they vehemently scorn, it is the idea that there can be a value that stands above the individual contexts of human experience. Such a value would present itself as a metanarrative and, as Jean-François Lyotard has explained, postmodernism is characterized fundamentally by its "incredulity toward meta-narratives." Nonetheless, I can't see how postmodern critics can do otherwise than accept the value of preserving the nonhuman world. The nonhuman is the extreme "other"; it stands in contradistinction to humans as a species. In understanding the constructed quality of human experience and the dangers of reification, postmodernism inherently advances an ethic of respecting the "other." At the very least, respect must involve ensuring that the "other" actually continues to exist. In our day and age, this requires us to take responsibility for protecting the actuality of the nonhuman. Instead, however, we are running roughshod over the earth's diversity of plants, animals, and ecosystems. Postmodern critics should find this particularly disturbing. If they don't, they deny their own intellectual insights and compromise their fundamental moral commitment.

#### Drones are inevitable

Henning, 2-20-12

[Job, NYT, Embracing the Drone, http://www.nytimes.com/2012/02/21/opinion/embracing-the-drone.html?pagewanted=all&\_r=0] /Wyo-MB

Drones — more formally armed Unmanned Aerial Vehicles, or UAVs — are “in.” Since a Predator strike in Yemen against Al Qaeda in November 2002 — the first known use of a drone attack outside a theater of war — the United States has made extensive use of drones. There were nearly four times as many drone strikes in Pakistan during the first two years of the Obama administration as there were during the entire Bush administration.¶ The United States is now conducting drone strikes in Somalia as well, and their use is expected to dramatically increase in Afghanistan over the next five years as NATO troops withdraw from there.¶ Armed drones are both inevitable, since they allow the fusing of a reconnaissance platform with a weapons system, and, in many respects, highly desirable. They can loiter, observe and strike, with a far more precise application of force. They eliminate risk to pilots and sharply reduce the financial costs of projecting power. Moreover, polls show that a vast majority of Americans support the use of drones.¶

#### Realism is inevitable—states will always seek to maximize power

John Mearsheimer, Professor, University of Chicago, THE TRAGEDY OF GREAT POWER POLITICS, 2001, p. 2.

The sad fact is that international politics has always been a ruthless and dangerous business, and it is likely to remain that way. Although the intensity of their competition waxes and wanes, great powers fear each other and always compete with each other for power. The overriding goal of each state is to maximize its share of world power, which means gaining power at the expense of other states. But great powers do not merely strive to be the strongest of all the great powers, although that is a welcome outcome. Their ultimate aim is to be the hegemon-that is, the only great power in the system.

Dershowitz 02

(Alan M., Why Terrorism Works: Understanding the Threat, Responding to the Challenge, Pgs. 24-26//wyo-mm)

The reason terrorism works—and will persist unless there are significant changes in the response to it—is precisely because its perpetrators believe that by murdering innocent civilians they will succeed in attracting the attention of the world to their perceived grievances and their demand that the world “understand them” and “eliminate their root causes.” To submit to this demand is to send the following counterproductive message to those with perceived grievances: if you resort to terrorism, we will try harder to understand your grievances and respond to them than we would have if you employed less violent methods. This is precisely the criterion for success established by the terrorist themselves. Listen to the words of Zehdi Labib Terzi, the Palestine Liberation Organization’s chief observer at the United Nations: “The first several hijackings aroused the consciousness of the world and awakened the media and the world opinion much more—and more effectively—than twenty years of pleading at the United Nations.” If this is true—and the Palestinians surely believe it is—then it should come as no surprise that hijackings and other forms of terrorism increased dramatically after the Palestinians were rewarded for their initial terrorism by increased world attention to its “root causes”—attention that quickly resulted in their leader being welcomed by the U.N. General Assembly, their organization being granted observer status at the United Nations, and their “government” being recognized by dozens of nations.9 We must take precisely the opposite approach to terrorism. We must commit ourselves never to try to understand or eliminate its alleged root causes, but rather to place it beyond the pale of dialogue and negotiation. Our message must be this: even if you have legitimate grievances, if you resort to terrorism as a means toward eliminating them we will simply not listen to you, we will not try to understand you, and we will certainly never change any of our policies toward you. Instead, we will hunt you down and destroy your capacity to engage in terror. Any other approach will encourage the use of terrorism as a means toward achieving ends—whether those ends are legitimate, illegitimate, or anything in between. Nor is there any single substantive root cause of all, or even most, terrorism. If there were—if poverty, for example, were the root cause of all terrorism—then by fixing that problem we could address the root cause of specific terrorist groups without encouraging others. But the reality is that the “root causes” of terrorism are as varied as human nature. Every single “root cause” associated with terrorism has existed for centuries, and the vast majority of groups with equivalent or more compelling causes—§ Marked 17:59 § and with far greater poverty and disadvantage—have never resorted to terrorism. The search for “root causes” smacks more of after-the-fact political justification than inductive scientific inquiry. The variables that distinguish aggrieved groups willing to target innocent civilians from equally situated groups unwilling to murder children have far less to do with the legitimacy of their causes or the suffering of their people than with religious, cultural, political, and ethical differences.10 They also relate to universalism versus parochialism and especially to the value placed on human life. To focus on such favors as poverty, illiteracy, disenfranchisement, and others all too common around our imperfect world is to fail to explain why so many groups with far greater grievances and disabilities have never resorted to terrorism.11 Instead, the focus must be on the reality that using an act of terrorism as the occasion for addressing the root causes of that act only encourages other groups to resort to terrorism in order to have their root causes advanced on the international agenda. Put another way, the “root cause” of terrorism that must be eliminated is its success.