### 1st Off

####  The Executive Branch of the United States should cease using the President’s war powers authority for targeted killing as a first resort outside zones of active hostilities. The President of the United States should publicly announce and adhere to this policy.

#### The United States Congress should enact a resolution and issue a white paper stating that it has reviewed the aforementioned Executive Branch policy revisions with respect to targeted killing operations and determined that the United States government is conducting such operations in full compliance with relevant laws.

#### Congressional defense of the process solves the signal of legitimacy

Gregory McNeal 13, Associate Professor of Law, Pepperdine University, 3/5/13, “Targeted Killing and Accountability,” <http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1819583>

Perhaps the most obvious way to add accountability to the targeted killing process is for someone in government to describe the process the way this article has, and from there, defend the process. The task of describing the government’s policies in detail should not fall to anonymous sources, confidential interviews, and selective leaks. Government’s failure to defend policies is not a phenomenon that is unique to post 9/11 targeted killings. In fact, James Baker once noted "In my experience, the United States does a better job at incorporating intelligence into its targeting decisions than it does in using intelligence to explain those decisions after the fact. This in part reflects the inherent difficulty in articulating a basis for targets derived from ongoing intelligence sources and methods. Moreover, it is hard to pause during ongoing operations to work through issues of disclosure…But articulation is an important part of the targeting process that must be incorporated into the decision cycle for that subset of targets raising the hardest issues…"519 Publicly defending the process is a natural fit for public accountability mechanisms. It provides information to voters and other external actors who can choose to exercise a degree of control over the process. However, a detailed public defense of the process also bolsters bureaucratic and professional accountability by demonstrating to those within government that they are involved in activities that their government is willing to publicly describe and defend (subject to the limits of necessary national security secrecy). However, the Executive branch, while wanting to reveal information to defend the process, similarly recognizes that by revealing too much information they may face legal accountability mechanisms that they may be unable to control, thus their caution is understandable (albeit self-serving).520 It’s not just the Executive branch that can benefit from a healthier defense of the process. Congress too can bolster the legitimacy of the program by specifying how they have conducted their oversight activities. The best mechanism by which they can do this is through a white paper. That paper could include: A statement about why the committees believe the U.S. government's use of force is lawful. If the U.S. government is employing armed force it's likely that it is only doing so pursuant to the AUMF, a covert action finding, or relying on the President's inherent powers under the Constitution. Congress could clear up a substantial amount of ambiguity by specifying that in the conduct of its oversight it has reviewed past and ongoing targeted killing operations and is satisfied that in the conduct of its operations the U.S. government is acting consistent with those sources of law. Moreover, Congress could also specify certain legal red lines that if crossed would cause members to cease believing the program was lawful. For example, if members do not believe the President may engage in targeted killings acting only pursuant to his Article II powers, they could say so in this white paper, and also articulate what the consequences of crossing that red line might be. To bolster their credibility, Congress could specifically articulate their powers and how they would exercise them if they believed the program was being conducted in an unlawful manner. Perhaps stating: "The undersigned members affirm that if the President were to conduct operations not authorized by the AUMF or a covert action finding, we would consider that action to be unlawful and would publicly withdraw our support for the program, and terminate funding for it." A statement detailing the breadth and depth of Congressional oversight activities. When Senator Feinstein released her statement regarding the nature and degree of Senate Intelligence Committee oversight of targeted killing operations it went a long way toward bolstering the argument that the program was being conducted in a responsible and lawful manner. An oversight white paper could add more details about the oversight being conducted by the intelligence and armed services committees, explaining in as much detail as possible the formal and informal activities that have been conducted by the relevant committees. How many briefings have members attended? Have members reviewed targeting criteria? Have members had an opportunity to question the robustness of the internal kill-list creation process and target vetting and validation processes? Have members been briefed on and had an opportunity to question how civilian casualties are counted and how battle damage assessments are conducted? Have members been informed of the internal disciplinary procedures for the DoD and CIA in the event a strike goes awry, and have they been informed of whether any individuals have been disciplined for improper targeting? Are the members satisfied that internal disciplinary procedures are adequate? 3) Congressional assessment of the foreign relations implications of the program. The Constitution divides some foreign policy powers between the President and Congress, and the oversight white paper should articulate whether members have assessed the diplomatic and foreign relations implications of the targeted killing program. While the white paper would likely not be able to address sensitive diplomatic matters such as whether Pakistan has privately consented to the use of force in their territory, the white paper could set forth the red lines that would cause Congress to withdraw support for the program. The white paper could specifically address whether the members have considered potential blow-back, whether the program has jeopardized alliances, whether it is creating more terrorists than it kills, etc. In specifying each of these and other factors, Congress could note the types of developments, that if witnessed would cause them to withdraw support for the program. For example, Congress could state "In the countries where strikes are conducted, we have not seen the types of formal objections to the activities that would normally be associated with a violation of state's sovereignty. Specifically, no nation has formally asked that the issue of strikes in their territory be added to the Security Council's agenda for resolution. No nation has shot down or threatened to shoot down our aircraft, severed diplomatic relations, expelled our personnel from their country, or refused foreign aid. If we were to witness such actions it would cause us to question the wisdom and perhaps even the legality of the program."

#### De Facto and De Jure self-binding create accountability from the courts and risk political alienation for going back on promises

Posner and Vermeule 2010 **[Eric A. ,** Professor of Law at the University of Chicago Law School and Editor of The Journal of Legal Studies; **Adrian , Harvard Law Professor, The Executive Unbound: After the Madisonian Republic, Oxford Press, p. 138-139//wyo-sc]**

Many of our mechanisms are unproblematic from a legal perspective, as they involve presidential actions that are clearly lawful. But a few raise legal questions; in particular, those that involve self-binding.59 Can a president bind himself to respect particular first-order policies? With qualifications, the answer is "yes, at least to the same extent that a legislature can." Formally, a duly promulgated executive rule or order binds even the executive unless and until it is validly abrogated, thereby establishing a new legal status quo.60 The legal authority to establish a new status quo allows a president to create inertia or political constraints that will affect his own future choices. In a practical sense, presidents, like legislatures, have great de facto power to adopt policies that shape the legal landscape for the future. A president might commit himself to a long-term project of defense procurement or infrastructure or foreign policy, narrowing his own future choices and generating new political coalitions that will act to defend the new rules or policies. More schematically, we may speak of formal and informal means of selfbinding: 1. The president might use formal means to bind himself. This is possible in the sense that an executive order, if otherwise valid, legally binds the president while it is in effect and may be enforced by the courts. It is not possible in the sense that the president can always repeal the executive order if he can bear the political and reputational costs of doing so. 2. The president might use informal means to bind himself. This is not only possible but frequent and important. Issuing an executive rule providing for the appointment of special prosecutors, as Nixon did, is not a formal self-binding.61 However, there may be political costs to repealing the order. This effect does not depend on the courts' willingness to enforce the order, even against Nixon himself. Court enforcement makes the order legally binding while it is in place, but only political and reputational enforcement can protect it from repeal. Just as a dessert addict might announce to his friends that he is going on a no-dessert diet in order to raise the reputational costs of backsliding and thus commit himself, so too the repeal of an executive order may be seen as a breach of faith even if no other institution ever enforces it. In what follows, we will invoke both formal and informal mechanisms. For our purposes, the distinction between the authority to engage in de jure self-binding (legally limited and well-defined) and the power to engage in de facto self-binding (broad and amorphous) is secondary. So long as policies are deliberately chosen with a view to generating credibility, and do so by constraining the president’s own future choices in ways that impose greater costs on ill-motivated presidents than on well-motivated ones, it does not matter whether the constraint is formal or informal.

### 2nd Off

#### Geographic limits undermine the effectiveness of US counter-terror ops

Corn 13 (Geoffrey, South Texas College of Law Presidential Research Professor of Law, former JAG officer and chief of the law of war branch of the international law division of the US Army, Lieutenant Colonel, U.S. Army (Retired), Senate Armed Services Committee Hearing, "The law of armed conflict, the use of military force, and the 2001 Authorization for Use of Military Force," Congressional Documents and Publications, 6-16-13, lexis)

In my opinion, there is no need to amend the AUMF to define the geographic scope of military operations it authorizes. On the contrary, I believe doing so would fundamentally undermine the efficacy of U.S. counter-terror military operations by overtly signaling to the enemy exactly where to pursue safe-haven and de facto immunity from the reach of U.S. power. This concern is similar to that associated with explicitly defining co-belligerents subject to the AUMF, although I believe it is substantially more significant. It is an operational and tactical axiom that insurgent and non-state threats rarely seek the proverbial "toe to toe" confrontation with clearly superior military forces. Al Qaeda is no different. Indeed, their attempts to engage in such tactics in the initial phases of Operation Enduring Freedom proved disastrous, and ostensibly caused the dispersion of operational capabilities that then necessitated the co-belligerent assessment. Imposing an arbitrary geographic limitation of the scope of military operations against this threat would therefore be inconsistent with the strategic objective of preventing future terrorist attacks against the United States. I believe much of the momentum for asserting some arbitrary geographic limitation on the scope of operations conducted to disrupt or disable al Qaeda belligerent capabilities is the result of the commonly used term "hot battlefield." This notion of a "hot" battlefield is, in my opinion, an operational and legal fiction. Nothing in the law of armed conflict or military doctrine defines the meaning of "battlefield." Contrary to the erroneous assertions that the use of combat power is restricted to defined geographic locations such as Afghanistan (and previously Iraq), the geographic scope of armed conflict must be dictated by a totality assessment of a variety of factors, ultimately driven by the strategic end state the nation seeks to achieve. The nature and dynamics of the threat -including key vulnerabilities - is a vital factor in this analysis. These threat dynamics properly influence the assessment of enemy capabilities and vulnerabilities, which in turn drive the formulation of national strategy, which includes determining when, where, and how to leverage national power (including military power) to achieve desired operational effects. Thus, threat dynamics, and not some geographic "box", have historically driven and must continue to drive the scope of armed hostilities. The logic of this premise is validated by (in my opinion) the inability to identify an armed conflict in modern history where the scope of operations was legally restricted by a conception of a "hot" battlefield. Instead, threat dynamics coupled with policy, diplomatic considerations and, in certain armed conflicts the international law of neutrality, dictate such scope. Ultimately, battlefields become "hot" when persons, places, or things assessed as lawful military objectives pursuant to the law of armed conflict are subjected to attack. I do not, however, intend to suggest that it is proper to view the entire globe as a battlefield in the military component of our struggle against al Qaeda, or that threat dynamics are the only considerations in assessing the scope of military operations. Instead, complex considerations of policy and diplomacy have and must continue to influence this assessment. However, suggesting that the proper scope of combat operations is dictated by a legal conception of "hot" battlefield is operationally irrational and legally unsound. Accordingly, placing policy limits on the scope of combat operations conducted pursuant to the legal authority provided by the AUMF is both logical and appropriate, and in my view has been a cornerstone of U.S. use of force policy since the enactment of the AUMF. In contrast, interpreting the law of armed conflict to place legal limits on the scope of such operations to "hot" battlefields, or imposing such a legal limitation in the terms of the AUMF, creates a perverse incentive for the belligerent enemy by allowing [them]~~him~~ to dictate when and where [they]~~he~~ will be subject to lawful attack.

#### Extinction

Hellman 8 (Martin E. Hellman, emeritus prof of engineering @ Stanford, “Risk Analysis of Nuclear Deterrence” SPRING 2008 THE BENT OF TAU BETA PI, <http://www.nuclearrisk.org/paper.pdf>)

The threat of nuclear terrorism looms much larger in the public’s mind than the threat of a full-scale nuclear war, yet this article focuses primarily on the latter. An explanation is therefore in order before proceeding. A terrorist attack involving a nuclear weapon would be a catastrophe of immense proportions: “A 10-kiloton bomb detonated at Grand Central Station on a typical work day would likely kill some half a million people, and inflict over a trillion dollars in direct economic damage. America and its way of life would be changed forever.” [Bunn 2003, pages viii-ix]. The likelihood of such an attack is also significant. Former Secretary of Defense William Perry has estimated the chance of a nuclear terrorist incident within the next decade to be roughly 50 percent [Bunn 2007, page 15]. David Albright, a former weapons inspector in Iraq, estimates those odds at less than one percent, but notes, “We would never accept a situation where the chance of a major nuclear accident like Chernobyl would be anywhere near 1% .... A nuclear terrorism attack is a low-probability event, but we can’t live in a world where it’s anything but extremely low-probability.” [Hegland 2005]. In a survey of 85 national security experts, Senator Richard Lugar found a median estimate of 20 percent for the “probability of an attack involving a nuclear explosion occurring somewhere in the world in the next 10 years,” with 79 percent of the respondents believing “it more likely to be carried out by terrorists” than by a government [Lugar 2005, pp. 14-15]. I support increased efforts to reduce the threat of nuclear terrorism, but that is not inconsistent with the approach of this article. Because terrorism is one of the potential trigger mechanisms for a full-scale nuclear war, the risk analyses proposed herein will include estimating the risk of nuclear terrorism as one component of the overall risk. If that risk, the overall risk, or both are found to be unacceptable, then the proposed remedies would be directed to reduce which- ever risk(s) warrant attention. Similar remarks apply to a number of other threats (e.g., nuclear war between the U.S. and China over Taiwan). his article would be incomplete if it only dealt with the threat of nuclear terrorism and neglected the threat of full- scale nuclear war. If both risks are unacceptable, an effort to reduce only the terrorist component would leave humanity in great peril. In fact, society’s almost total neglect of the threat of full-scale nuclear war makes studying that risk all the more important. The cosT of World War iii The danger associated with nuclear deterrence depends on both the cost of a failure and the failure rate.3 This section explores the cost of a failure of nuclear deterrence, and the next section is concerned with the failure rate. While other definitions are possible, this article defines a failure of deterrence to mean a full-scale exchange of all nuclear weapons available to the U.S. and Russia, an event that will be termed World War III. Approximately 20 million people died as a result of the first World War. World War II’s fatalities were double or triple that number—chaos prevented a more precise deter- mination. In both cases humanity recovered, and the world today bears few scars that attest to the horror of those two wars. Many people therefore implicitly believe that a third World War would be horrible but survivable, an extrapola- tion of the effects of the first two global wars. In that view, World War III, while horrible, is something that humanity may just have to face and from which it will then have to recover. In contrast, some of those most qualified to assess the situation hold a very different view. In a 1961 speech to a joint session of the Philippine Con- gress, General Douglas MacArthur, stated, “Global war has become a Frankenstein to destroy both sides. … If you lose, you are annihilated. If you win, you stand only to lose. No longer does it possess even the chance of the winner of a duel. It contains now only the germs of double suicide.” Former Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara ex- pressed a similar view: “If deterrence fails and conflict develops, the present U.S. and NATO strategy carries with it a high risk that Western civilization will be destroyed” [McNamara 1986, page 6]. More recently, George Shultz, William Perry, Henry Kissinger, and Sam Nunn4 echoed those concerns when they quoted President Reagan’s belief that nuclear weapons were “totally irrational, totally inhu- mane, good for nothing but killing, possibly destructive of life on earth and civilization.” [Shultz 2007] Official studies, while couched in less emotional terms, still convey the horrendous toll that World War III would exact: “The resulting deaths would be far beyond any precedent. Executive branch calculations show a range of U.S. deaths from 35 to 77 percent (i.e., 79-160 million dead) … a change in targeting could kill somewhere between 20 million and 30 million additional people on each side .... These calculations reflect only deaths during the first 30 days. Additional millions would be injured, and many would eventually die from lack of adequate medical care … millions of people might starve or freeze during the follow- ing winter, but it is not possible to estimate how many. … further millions … might eventually die of latent radiation effects.” [OTA 1979, page 8] This OTA report also noted the possibility of serious ecological damage [OTA 1979, page 9], a concern that as- sumed a new potentiality when the TTAPS report [TTAPS 1983] proposed that the ash and dust from so many nearly simultaneous nuclear explosions and their resultant fire- storms could usher in a nuclear winter that might erase homo sapiens from the face of the earth, much as many scientists now believe the K-T Extinction that wiped out the dinosaurs resulted from an impact winter caused by ash and dust from a large asteroid or comet striking Earth. The TTAPS report produced a heated debate, and there is still no scientific consensus on whether a nuclear winter would follow a full-scale nuclear war. Recent work [Robock 2007, Toon 2007] suggests that even a limited nuclear exchange or one between newer nuclear-weapon states, such as India and Pakistan, could have devastating long-lasting climatic consequences due to the large volumes of smoke that would be generated by fires in modern megacities. While it is uncertain how destructive World War III would be, prudence dictates that we apply the same engi- neering conservatism that saved the Golden Gate Bridge from collapsing on its 50th anniversary and assume that preventing World War III is a necessity—not an option.

### 3rd Off

#### Obama has successfully fended off sanctions, FOR NOW, any lags create an aggressive push that will be veto proof

Rubin 2-7

(Jennifer, Washington Post. “Menendez’s blasts Obama’s Iran policy” 2-7-14 http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/right-turn/wp/2014/02/07/menendezs-blasts-obamas-iran-policy///wyoccd)

The administration has a big problem on Iran. It has for now successfully fended off sanctions, but in doing so it helped forge consensus about the flaws in its approach and set the scene for a major showdown with Congress when, as everyone but Secretary of State John Kerry expects, Iran refuses to agree to even minimal steps to dismantle its nuclear weapons program. In other words, it has set itself up for failure with no back-up plan.Thursday, Sen. Robert Menendez (D-N.J.), denied by his majority leader a vote on a sanctions bill that would pass with more than 70 votes, explained in detail the administration’s gross mishandling of negotiations. It is worth reading in full, but some portions deserve emphasis. After describing in detail the requirements the administration, the United Nations and former administration official Dennis Ross have confirmed are needed to prevent a nuclear-capable Iran, the New Jersey Democrat summed up the flaws in the interim deal:¶ Iran is insisting on keeping core elements of its programs – enrichment, the Arak heavy-water reactor, the underground Fordow facility, and the Parchin military complex. And, while they may be subject to safeguards — so they can satisfy the international community in the short-run – if they are allowed to retain their core infrastructure, they could quickly revive their program sometime in the future. At the same time, Iran is seeking to reverse the harsh international sanctions regimes against them. Bottom line: They dismantle nothing. We gut the sanctions.¶ Directly contradicting Kerry’s assurances, Menendez states:¶ Since the interim deal was signed there was an immediate effort by many nations – including many European nations — to revive trade and resume business with Iran. There have been recent headlines that the Russians may be seeking a barter deal that could increase Iran’s oil exports by 50 percent. That Iran and Russia are negotiating an oil-for-goods deal worth $1.5 billion a month — $18 billion a year – which would significantly boost Iran’s oil exports by 500,000 barrels a day in exchange for Russian goods . . . Iran’s economy is recovering. . . . Sanctions relief — combined with the “open for business sign” that Iran is posting — is paying returns.¶ And as for the potential for sanctions at the end of the six months, Menendez states definitively that this would be too late. It is quite an extraordinary assertion — in essence, that barring a miraculous negotiated solution, we’re now in the mode of “containment,” precisely what the president swore up and down he’d never allow:¶ My legislation – cosponsored by 59 Senators – would simply require that Iran act in good faith, adhering to the implementing agreement, not engage in new acts of terror against American citizens or U.S, property — and not conduct new ballistic missile tests with a range beyond 500 kilometers.¶ The legislation is not the problem. Congress is not the problem. Iran is the problem. We need to worry about Iran, not the Congress. We need to focus on Iran’s long history of deception surrounding its nuclear program and how this should inform our approach to reaching a comprehensive deal. . . .New sanctions are not a spigot that can be turned off-and-on as has been suggested.¶ Even if Congress were to take-up and pass new sanctions at the moment of Iran’s first breach of the Joint Plan of Action, there is a lag time of at least 6 months to bring those sanctions on line — and at least a year for the real impact to be felt.¶ This would bring us beyond the very short-time Iran would need to build a nuclear bomb, especially since the interim agreement does not require them neither to dismantle anything, and freezes their capability as it stands today.¶ So let everyone understand — if there is no deal we won’t have time to impose new sanctions before Iran could produce a nuclear weapon. . . .¶ The simple and deeply troubling fact is — Iran is literally weeks to months away from breakout, and the parameters of the final agreement — laid out in the Joint Plan of Action — do not appear to set Iran’s development-capacity back by more than a few weeks. [Emphasis added.]¶ He concludes, “The concerns I have raised here are legitimate. They are not — as the President’s press secretary has said – ‘war-mongering.’ . . . Iran says it won’t negotiate with a gun to its head. Well, I would suggest it is Iran that has put a nuclear gun to the world’s head. So, at the end of the day, name-calling is not an argument, nor is it sound policy. It is a false choice to say a vote for sanctions is equivalent to war-mongering. . . . The ball is in the Administration’s court, not in Congress’.”¶ So then, in the estimation of the Senate’s Democratic foreign affairs chairman the interim deal is fatally flawed, a final deal must achieve things Iran has no intention of giving us and it will be too late to pass sanctions in six months. He has in essence accused the president of setting us on a road to containment since the president and Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid will not permit a sanctions vote that is the last hope to bring Iran to heel.¶ I wonder what the point of the speech really was. Does he think Reid will bend? Does he have more Democrats on board to force a vote? Does he think sanctions proponents will say, ‘What a nice speech. He’ll be on the ball when the talks fail“? (But Menendez’s entire point was when the talks fail, it will be too late.)¶ In six-months, when the talks fail and/or another six-months are declared necessary for a deal, Congress then can try to restart sanctions, I suppose. But Menendez says that won’t be effective. The alternative is accepting a nuclear-capable Iran or an Israeli military strike. The latter is becoming the most likely scenario if Menendez’s assessment of the timeline is correct. Obama will therefore have brought about the one thing he was desperate to avoid — a Middle East war.

#### Fighting to defend his war power will sap Obama’s capital- trades off with agenda

**Kriner, 10** --- assistant professor of political science at Boston University

(Douglas L. Kriner, “After the Rubicon: Congress, Presidents, and the Politics of Waging War”, University of Chicago Press, Dec 1, 2010, page 68-69)

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

#### Loss of political capital causes Democrats flop and support sanctions

Kraushaar 1-22

(Josh Kraushaar, staff writer at the National Journal. “The Iran Deal Puts Pro-Israel Democrats in a Bind” 1-22-14 http://www.nationaljournal.com/magazine/the-iran-deal-puts-pro-israel-democrats-in-a-bind-20131122//wyoccd)

All of this puts Democrats, who routinely win overwhelming support from Jewish Americans on Election Day, in an awkward position. Do they stand with the president on politically sensitive foreign policy issues, or stake their own course? That difficult dynamic is currently playing out in Congress, where the Obama administration is resisting a Senate push to maintain tough sanctions against Iran. This week, Obama met with leading senators on the Banking and Foreign Relations committees to dissuade them from their efforts while diplomacy is underway. "There's a fundamental disagreement between the vast majority of Congress and the president when it comes to increasing Iran sanctions right now," said one Democratic operative involved in the advocacy efforts. "Pro-Israel groups, like AIPAC, try to do things in a bipartisan way; they don't like open confrontation. But in this instance, it's hard." That awkwardness has been evident in the lukewarm reaction from many of Obama's Senate Democratic allies to the administration's outreach to Iran. Senate Foreign Relations Committee Chairman Robert Menendez of New Jersey said last week he was concerned that the administration seems "to want the deal almost more than the Iranians." Normally outspoken Sen. Chuck Schumer of New York, a reliable ally of Israel, has been conspicuously quiet about his views on the negotiations. In a CNN interview this month, Democratic Rep. Debbie Wasserman Schultz of Florida, whose job as chairwoman of the Democratic National Committee is to defend the president, notably declined to endorse the administration's approach, focusing instead on Obama's past support of sanctions. This, despite the full-court press from Secretary of State John Kerry, a former congressional colleague. On Tuesday, after meeting with Obama, Menendez and Schumer signed a bipartisan letter to Kerry warning the administration about accepting a deal that would allow Iran to continue its nuclear program. The letter was also signed by Sens. John McCain, R-Ariz., Lindsey Graham, R-S.C., Susan Collins, R-Maine, and Robert Casey, D-Pa. Democrats, of course, realize that the president plays an outsized role in the policy direction of his party. Just as George W. Bush moved the Republican Party in a more hawkish direction during his war-riven presidency, Obama is nudging Democrats away from their traditionally instinctive support for the Jewish state. "I can't remember the last time the differences [between the U.S. and Israel] were this stark," said one former Democratic White House official with ties to the Jewish community. "There's now a little more freedom [for progressive Democrats] to say what they want to say, without fear of getting their tuchus kicked by the organized Jewish community." A Gallup survey conducted this year showed 55 percent of Democrats sympathizing with the Israelis over the Palestinians, compared with 78 percent of Republicans and 63 percent of independents who do so. A landmark Pew poll of American Jews, released in October, showed that 35 percent of Jewish Democrats said they had little or no attachment to Israel, more than double the 15 percent of Jewish Republicans who answered similarly. At the 2012 Democratic National Convention, many delegates booed a platform proposal supporting the move of the U.S. Embassy in Israel from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem. In 2011, Democrats lost Anthony Weiner's heavily Jewish, solidly Democratic Brooklyn House seat because enough Jewish voters wanted to rebuke the president's perceived hostility toward Israel. Pro-Israel advocacy groups rely on the mantra that support for Israel carries overwhelming bipartisan support, a maxim that has held true for decades in Congress. But most also reluctantly acknowledge the growing influence of a faction within the Democratic Party that is more critical of the two countries' close relationship. Within the Jewish community, that faction is represented by J Street, which positions itself as the home for "pro-Israel, pro-peace Americans" and supports the Iran negotiations. "Organizations that claim to represent the American Jewish community are undermining [Obama's] approach by pushing for new and harsher penalties against Iran," the group wrote in an action alert to its members. Some supporters of Israel view J Street with concern. "There's a small cadre of people that comes from the progressive side of the party that are in the business of blaming Israel first. There's a chorus of these guys," said a former Clinton administration foreign policy official. "But that doesn't make them the dominant folks in the policy space of the party, or the Hill." Pro-Israel activists worry that one of the ironies of Obama's situation is that as his poll numbers sink, his interest in striking a deal with Iran will grow because he'll be looking for any bit of positive news that can draw attention away from the health care law's problems. Thus far, Obama's diminished political fortunes aren't deterring Democrats from protecting the administration's prerogatives. Congressional sources expect the Senate Banking Committee, chaired by South Dakota Democrat Tim Johnson, to hold off on any sanctions legislation until there's a resolution to the Iranian negotiations. But if Obama's standing continues to drop, and if Israel doesn't like the deal, don't be surprised to see Democrats become less hesitant about going their own way.

#### Tanks Geneva and causes Israel strikes

**Leubsdorf, 1/22/14 –** former Washington Bureau chief of The Dallas Morning News (Carl, Dallas Morning News, “Hard-liners’ mischief-making threatens Iran nuke talks” <http://www.dallasnews.com/opinion/columnists/carl-p-leubsdorf/20140122-carl-leubsdorf-hard-liners-mischief-making-threatens-iran-nuke-talks.ece>)

The measure’s most dangerous provision, according to various published reports, reads as follows:¶ “If the government of Israel is compelled to take military action in legitimate self-defense against Iran’s nuclear weapon program, the United States should stand with Israel and provide in accordance with the law of the United States and the constitutional responsibility of Congress to authorize the use of military force, diplomatic and economic support to the Government of Israel in the defense of its territory, people and existence.”¶ While not requiring U.S. action, critics note the language suggests the mere existence of an Iranian “nuclear weapon program” would be sufficient to compel Israel to attack “in legitimate self-defense.” And it says the U.S. “should” provide such an Israeli attack with “military, diplomatic and economic support” according to U.S. laws and congressional constitutional responsibility.¶ In effect, that could enable the hard-liners who control the Israeli government to kill the talks or try to drag the United States into a war against Iran if they decide that Iranian compliance with the current agreement is insufficient to protect Israel.¶ The measure would also enable Congress to kill any agreement the West reaches with Iran by overriding Obama’s decision to waive existing sanctions.

#### Global war

-Strikes fail: intel gap and buried

-Iran second strike = nuclear

-Economy: stops oil

-Hegemony: Balancers

-Miscalc/Escalation: Forces on nuclear alter

**Reuveny, 10** – professor in the School of Public and Environmental Affairs at Indiana University (Rafael, “Unilateral strike could trigger World War III, global depression” Gazette Xtra, 8/7, - See more at: <http://gazettextra.com/news/2010/aug/07/con-unilateral-strike-could-trigger-world-war-iii-/#sthash.ec4zqu8o.dpuf>)

A unilateral Israeli strike on Iran’s nuclear facilities would likely have dire consequences, including a regional war, global economic collapse and a major power clash.¶ For an Israeli campaign to succeed, it must be quick and decisive. This requires an attack that would be so overwhelming that Iran would not dare to respond in full force.¶ Such an outcome is extremely unlikely since the locations of some of Iran’s nuclear facilities are not fully known and known facilities are buried deep underground.¶ All of these widely spread facilities are shielded by elaborate air defense systems constructed not only by the Iranians but also the Chinese and, likely, the Russians as well.¶ By now, Iran has also built redundant command and control systems and nuclear facilities, devloped early warning systems, acquired ballistic and cruise missiles and upgraded and enlarged its armed forces.¶ Because Iran is well-prepared, a single, conventional Israeli strike—or even numerous strikes—could not destroy all of its capabilities, giving Iran time to respond.¶ Unlike Iraq, whose nuclear program Israel destroyed in 1981, Iran has a second-strike capability comprised of a coalition of Iranian, Syrian, Lebanese, Hezbollah, Hamas, and, perhaps, Turkish forces. Internal pressure might compel Jordan, Egypt and the Palestinian Authority to join the assault, turning a bad situation into a regional war.¶ During the 1973 Arab-Israeli War, at the apex of its power, Israel was saved from defeat by President Nixon’s shipment of weapons and planes. Today, Israel’s numerical inferiority is greater, and it faces more determined and better-equipped opponents. After years of futilely fighting Palestinian irregular armies, Israel has lost some of its perceived superiority—bolstering its enemies’ resolve.¶ Despite Israel’s touted defense systems, Iranian coalition missiles, armed forces, and terrorist attacks would likely wreak havoc on its enemy, leading to a prolonged tit-for-tat.¶ In the absence of massive U.S. assistance, Israel’s military resources may quickly dwindle, forcing it to use its alleged nuclear weapons, as it had reportedly almost done in 1973.¶ An Israeli nuclear attack would likely destroy most of Iran’s capabilities, but a crippled Iran and its coalition could still attack neighboring oil facilities, unleash global terrorism, plant mines in the Persian Gulf and impair maritime trade in the Mediterranean, Red Sea and Indian Ocean.¶ Middle Eastern oil shipments would likely slow to a trickle as production declines due to the war and insurance companies decide to drop their risky Middle Eastern clients. Iran and Venezuela would likely stop selling oil to the United States and Europe.¶ From there, things could deteriorate as they did in the 1930s. The world economy would head into a tailspin; international acrimony would rise; and Iraqi and Afghani citizens might fully turn on the United States, immediately requiring the deployment of more American troops.¶ Russia, China, Venezuela, and maybe Brazil and Turkey—all of which essentially support Iran—could be tempted to form an alliance and openly challenge the U.S. hegemony.¶ Russia and China might rearm their injured Iranian protege overnight, just as Nixon rearmed Israel, and threaten to intervene, just as the U.S.S.R. threatened to join Egypt and Syria in 1973. President Obama’s response would likely put U.S. forces on nuclear alert, replaying Nixon’s nightmarish scenario.¶ Iran may well feel duty-bound to respond to a unilateral attack by its Israeli archenemy, but it knows that it could not take on the United States head-to-head. In contrast, if the United States leads the attack, Iran’s response would likely be muted.¶ If Iran chooses to absorb an American-led strike, its allies would likely protest and send weapons but would probably not risk using force.¶ While no one has a crystal ball, leaders should be risk-averse when choosing war as a foreign policy tool. If attacking Iran is deemed necessary, Israel must wait for an American green light. A unilateral Israeli strike could ultimately spark World War III.

### 4th Off

#### Egalitarian politics is not real and not possible within the confines of the nation state- the state demands that woman give up her sexual difference to become a citizen, to become “neuter”, and to become incorporated into the masculine universal- women cannot participate in the law or judicial circuits because they have no language

Fermon 98

[Nicole Ferman, 1998, Women on the Global Market: Irigaray and the Democratic State, Diacritics, Vol. 28, No. 1, Irigaray and the Political Future of Sexual Difference¶ (Spring, 1998), pp. 120-137¶ uwyo//amp]

Best known for her subtle interrogation of philosophy and psychoanalysis, Luce Irigaray ¶ clearly also conducts a dialogue with the political, proposing that women's erasure from ¶ culture and society invalidates all economies, sexual or political. Because woman has ¶ disappeared both figuratively and literally from society [see Sen, "More Than 100 Million ¶ Women Are Missing"], Irigaray conceives the contemporary ethical project as a recall to ¶ difference rather than equality, to difference between women and men-that is, sexual ¶ difference. She characterizes relations between men and women as market relations in ¶ which women are commodities, objects, but never subjects of exchange, objects to men ¶ but not to themselves: women do not belong to themselves but exist "to keep relationships ¶ among men running smoothly" [TS 192]. Women under these conditions require imagi- ¶ native ways to reconfigure the self, to subvert the melancholy and regression of ¶ masculinist economies and envisage a future in which women would not be ashamed of ¶ the feminine, would experience it as a positivity worth emulating. ¶ Irigaray contends that after the gains of egalitarian politics are carefully examined, ¶ the inclusion of women in the political arena has failed to take into account women's ¶ distinct and different position from men, and from each other, as well as perpetuating the ¶ fiction of the "neutral" citizen, the ahistorical individual citizen of the nation-state. It is ¶ that fiction Irigaray dispels in her critique of liberal democratic politics and its creation, ¶ "citizens who are neuter in regard to familial singularity, its laws, and necessary sexual ¶ difference" [SG 112] in order to benefit the State and its laws. The subject is male; the ¶ citizen is neuter. Who is the female citizen in contemporary society? What is the ethical ¶ elaboration of the contractual relations between women and men, and between sexed ¶ individuals and the community? How do women imagine a distinct set of rights and ¶ responsibilities based on self-definition and autonomy, given the particular strictures of ¶ contemporary politics-that is, the market-driven, antidemocratic nature of the current ¶ economic national and global forces? Irigaray suggests that "the return of women to ¶ collective work, to public places, to social relations, demands linguistic mutations" and ¶ profound transformations, an embodied imagination with force and agency in civil life ¶ [TD 65]. ¶ Irigaray warns that if civil and political participation is construed in overly narrow ¶ terms, if focus is on economic or judicial "circuits" alone, we overlook the symbolic ¶ organization of power-women risk losing "everything without even being acknowl- ¶ edged" [TD 56]. Instead an interval of recognition can expand the political to include the ¶ concerns and activities of real women, lest silence imply consent to sexual neutrality, or ¶ more likely, to women's obliteration under men's interests and concerns. Women's ¶ insistence on self-definition and wage labor, on love and justly remunerated work, ¶ testifies to the obduracy of women's difference, one that is not likely to disappear. The ¶ patriarchal family is still the legal norm, even when certain exceptions are made, while ¶ enduring questions regarding women's health and children's physical welfare as priori- ¶ ties beyond market considerations are consigned to legislative obfuscation, still a political ¶ afterthought. Instead, in the US the liberal state removes the slender welfare net specific ¶ to women and children, Aid to Families with Dependent Children, and fails to provide ¶ medical coverage to those who are among the most vulnerable of its citizens. Women ¶ without access to the legal protection of sex-neutral citizenship, poor working women ¶ without language (the money for an effective "mouthpiece" to represent their distress in ¶ a court of law), are further disempowered by liberal politics' insistence on sexual ¶ neutrality-that is, on repression or amnesia regarding the lived experiences of women. ¶ Sexual difference is key to any project of self-definition by women. Irigaray insists ¶ on the sexual nature of this self-definition, not solely for its obvious procreative necessity, ¶ but because the natural world is a source of renewal and fecundity which requires attentive ¶ interrogation and respect [SG 15]. This rebirth seems alien to the structure of male politics, ¶ which instead seem to provoke disasters (Bhopal, Chernobyl, or the current runaway ¶ jungle fires of Indonesia, courtesy of commercial logging, spreading thick pollution to ¶ neighboring countries) and untimely death.' We talk about social justice and forget its ¶ origins in nature and not merely as an engagement between men in abstraction. Irigaray ¶ believes that recognition and respect of difference between the sexes is prior to productive ¶ and generative relations between women, between men, and between men and women. ¶ Sexual difference is universal and allows us to participate in "an immediate natural given, ¶ and it is a real and irreducible component of the universal" [ILTY 47]. It is this prior ¶ recognition of two, rather than the One that has dominated world politics and thought, ¶ which must be acknowledged, along with the possibility of a political economy of ¶ abundance, not only that of man-made scarcity then attributed to nature. This melancholic ¶ (male) script pays romantic tribute to motherhood in the abstract without due recognition ¶ of the relations between real mothers and children, thus failing to properly acknowledge ¶ and protect mother or child. Our ability to address the specifics of race, ethnicity, and ¶ religious and other differences with respect hinges on our ability to acknowledge and ¶ respect the feminine, to see it as a source of invention and possibilities. To do so would ¶ of course affect relations between the sexes, "men and women perhaps... communicat[ing] ¶ for the first time if two different genders are affirmed," it would allow a new configuration ¶ rather than continuing the present regime: "the globalization and universalization of ¶ culture ... ungovernable and beyond our control" [SG 120; ILTY 129].

#### Splitting of the atom is a symptom of man’s persistence in his refusal to reunite with and affirm his body and the female body-only through this affirmation does the destruction of humynkind become unthinkable

Irigaray 85

[Luce Irigaray, 1985, “An Ethics of Sexual Difference”, uwyo//amp]

To forget being is to forget the air, this first fluid given us gratis and free of interest in the mother's blood, given us again when we are born, like a natural profusion that raises a cry of pain: the pain of a being who comes into the world and is abandoned, forced henceforth to live without the immediate assistance of another body. Unmitigated mourning for the intrauterine nest, elemental homesickness that man will seek to assuage through his work as builder of worlds, and notably of the dwelling which seems to form the essence of his maleness: language. In all his creations, all his works, man always seems to neglect thinking of himself as flesh, as one who has received his body as that primary home (that Gestell, as Heidegger would say, when, in "Logos," the seminar on Heraclitus, he recognizes that what metaphysics has not begun to address is the issue of the body) which determines the possibility of his coming into the world and the potential opening of a horizon of thought, of poetry, of celebration, that also includes the god or gods. The fundamental dereliction in our time may be interpreted as our failure to remember or prize the element that is indispensable to life in all its manifestations: from the lowliest plant and animal forms to the highest. Science and technology are reminding men of their careless neglect by forcing them to consider the most frightening question possible, the question of a radical polemic: the destruction of the universe and of the human race through the splitting of the atom and its exploitation to achieve goals that are beyond our capacities as mortals.

#### The alternative is to reject the affirmative’s masculine, universal silence and instead affirm a radical ethics of sexual difference that comes to grips with the sexual violence of the 1AC.

Irigaray 85

[Luce Irigaray, 1985, “An Ethics of Sexual Difference”, uwyo//amp]

Sexual difference is one of the major philosophical issues, if not the issue, of our age. According to Heidegger, each age has one issue to think through, and one only. Sexual difference is prQbably the issue in our time which could be our "salvation" if we thought it through. But, whether I turn to philosophy, to science, or to religion, I find this underlying issue still cries out in vain for our attention. Think of it as an approach that would allow us to check the many forms that destruction takes in our world, to counteract a nihilism that merely affirms the reversal or the repetitive proliferation of status quo values-whether you call them the consumer society, the circularity of discourse, the more or less cancerous diseases of our age, the unreliability of words, the end of philosophy, religious despair or regression to religiosity, scientis tic or technical imperialism that fails to consider the living subject. Sexual difference would constitute the horizon of worlds more fecund than any known to date-at least in the West-and without reducing fecundity to the reproduction of bodies and flesh. For loving partners this would be a fecundity of birth and regeneration, but also the production of a new age of thought, art, poetry, and language: the creation of a new poetics. Both in theory and in practice, everything resists the discovery and affirmation of such an advent or event. In theory, philosophy wants to be literature or rhetoric, wishing either to break with ontology or to regress to the ontological. Using the same ground and the same framework as "first philosophy," working toward its disintegration but without proposing any other goals that might assure new foundations and new works. In politics, some overtures have been made to the world of women. But these overtures remain partial and local: some concessions have been made by those in power, but no new values have been established. Rarely have these measures been thought through and affirmed by women themselves, who consequently remain at the level of critical demands. Has a worldwide erosion of the gains won in women's struggles occurred because of the failure to lay foundations different from those on which the world of men is constructed? Psychoanalytic theory and therapy, the scenes of sexuality as such, are a long way from having effected their revolution. And with a few exceptions, sexual practice today is often divided between two parallel worlds: the world of men and the world of women. A nontraditional, fecund encounter between the sexes barely exists. It does not voice its demands publicly, except through certain kinds of silence and polemics. A revolution in thought and ethics is needed if the work of sexual difference is to take place. We need to reinterpret everything concerning the relations between the subject and discourse, the subject and the world, the subject and the cosmic,' the microcosmic and the macrocosmic. Everything, beginning with the way in which the subject has always been written in the masculine form, as man, even when it claimed to be universal or neutral. Despite the fact that man-at least in French-rather than being neutral, is sexed.

## Case

### Solvency

#### Prez will circumvent-

#### [1.] invokes state secrets to avoid oversight

Posner and Vermeule 2010 [Eric A. , Professor of Law at the University of Chicago Law School and Editor of The Journal of Legal Studies; Adrian , Harvard Law Professor, The Executive Unbound: After the Madisonian Republic, Oxford Press, p. 24//wyo-sc]

Monitoring the executive requires expertise in the area being monitored. In many cases, Congress lacks the information necessary to monitor discretionary policy choices by the executive. Although the committee system has the effect, among others, of generating legislative information and expertise,18 and although Congress has a large internal staff, there are domains in which no amount of legislative expertise suffices for effective oversight. Prime among these are areas of foreign policy and national security. Here the relative lack of legislative expertise is only part of the problem; what makes it worse is that the legislature lacks the raw information that experts need to make assessments. The problem would disappear if legislators could cheaply acquire information from the president, but they cannot. One obstacle is a suite of legal doctrines protecting executive secrecy and creating deliberative privileges— doctrines that may or may not be justified from some higher-order systemic point of view as means for producing optimal deliberation within the executive branch. Although such privileges are waivable, the executive often fears to set a bad institutional precedent. Another obstacle is the standard executive claim that Congress leaks like a sieve, so that sharing secret information with legislators will result in public disclosure. The problem becomes most acute when, as in the recent controversy over surveillance by the National Security Agency, the executive claims that the very scope or rationale of a program cannot be discussed with Congress, because to do so would vitiate the very secrecy that makes the program possible and beneficial. In any particular case the claim might be right or wrong; legislators have no real way to judge, and they know that the claim might be made either by a wellmotivated executive or by an ill-motivated executive, albeit for very different reasons.

#### [3.] Empirics on presidents ignoring WPR prove the trend

Isaacs 2011

[John Isaacs, 2011, executive director of Council for a Livable World, War Powers Resolution consistently ignored, <http://thehill.com/blogs/congress-blog/foreign-policy/172803-war-powers-resolution-consistently-ignored>, uwyo//amp]

President Harry F. Truman ignored Congress when in 1950 he sent troops to Korea to stave off a North Korean advance into the South. Almost 1.8 million Americans fought in Korea, with some 33,600 American deaths. But there never was a congressional authorization, and Congress continued to appropriate funds to prosecute the war. The War Powers Resolution also appeared to be a check against Nixon’s power, a President recently overwhelmingly re-elected who was becoming more and more enmeshed in the Watergate scandal. Indeed, I played only a bit role, helping to convince some liberals such as Representatives Bella Abzug (D-NY) and Robert Drinan (D-Mass.) that Congress was not ceding additional power to the President by giving him or her 60 or 90 days to conduct war without approval of Congress. Fast forward to today. Every President since 1973, including Barack Obama, has decided to ignore the law as an unconstitutional assertion of power.

#### [4.] Cancels testimony, Justice Department ignores oversight requests

Victor ‘03

[Kirk Victor, writer for government executive.com, 2003, Congress in eclipse as power shifts to executive branch, <http://www.govexec.com/management/2003/04/congress-in-eclipse-as-power-shifts-to-executive-branch/13800/>, uwyo//amp]

Senate Finance Committee Chairman Charles Grassley, R-Iowa, agreed in an interview that "getting information from the Justice Department under Ashcroft is like pulling teeth." But Grassley sees it as an institutional problem, and said it had also been difficult to get responses when Janet Reno led the department. Grassley said he has had no problem in asserting his oversight powers with the executive branch. As for his colleagues who worry about presidential usurpation of Congress's powers, Grassley added, "It doesn't matter to me what the president thinks, unless I want to take it into consideration. He didn't elect me-the people of Iowa elected me. I am a trustee of the people, not a messenger boy for the president." But Leahy had a far more negative, withering take on the Bush administration's actions to avoid oversight. He and some other Senate Judiciary Committee members have sent the Justice Department 28 requests for oversight information, dating back to July 2001. The department has not responded to any of them. Ashcroft "basically ignores most of the requests, but at least I give him credit for being bipartisan-he ignores Republican requests, too," Leahy said in the interview. "And this is the man who [when he was a senator] thought he should hold up judicial nominations and everything else when the attorney general didn't give us what we wanted." Several members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee also reacted angrily when the administration canceled, at the last minute, testimony by the top official in charge of reconstruction and humanitarian assistance in Iraq, who was to appear at a March 11 hearing. They also were surprised to learn from that day's newspapers that the administration was seeking bids from U.S. corporations on reconstruction contracts for Iraq.

### Norms

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

Etzioni 13, Professor of International Relations @ George Washington University

(Aimtai Etzioni, adviser to the Carter administration, “The Great Drone Debate”, Military Review, 4/2013, http://usacac.army.mil/CAC2/MilitaryReview/Archives/English/MilitaryReview\_20130430\_art004.pdf)

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

#### No US precedent---not causal

Kenneth Anderson 11, Professor of International Law at American University, 10/9/11, “What Kind of Drones Arms Race Is Coming?,” <http://www.volokh.com/2011/10/09/what-kind-of-drones-arms-race-is-coming/#more-51516>

New York Times national security correspondent Scott Shane has an opinion piece in today’s Sunday Times predicting an “arms race” in military drones. The methodology essentially looks at the US as the leader, followed by Israel – countries that have built, deployed and used drones in both surveillance and as weapons platforms. It then looks at the list of other countries that are following fast in US footsteps to both build and deploy, as well as purchase or sell the technology – noting, correctly, that the list is a long one, starting with China. The predicament is put this way:

Eventually, the United States will face a military adversary or terrorist group armed with drones, military analysts say. But what the short-run hazard experts foresee is not an attack on the United States, which faces no enemies with significant combat drone capabilities, but the political and legal challenges posed when another country follows the American example. The Bush administration, and even more aggressively the Obama administration, embraced an extraordinary principle: that the United States can send this robotic weapon over borders to kill perceived enemies, even American citizens, who are viewed as a threat.

“Is this the world we want to live in?” asks Micah Zenko, a fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations. “Because we’re creating it.”

By asserting that “we’re” creating it, this is a claim that there is an arms race among states over military drones, and that it is a consequence of the US creating the technology and deploying it – and then, beyond the technology, changing the normative legal and moral rules in the international community about using it across borders. In effect, the combination of those two, technological and normative, forces other countries in strategic competition with the US to follow suit. (The other unstated premise underlying the whole opinion piece is a studiously neutral moral relativism signaled by that otherwise unexamined phrase “perceived enemies.” Does it matter if they are not merely our “perceived” but are our actual enemies? Irrespective of what one might be entitled to do to them, is it so very difficult to conclude, even in the New York Times, that Anwar al-Awlaki was, in objective terms, our enemy?)

It sounds like it must be true. But is it? There are a number of reasons to doubt that moves by other countries are an arms race in the sense that the US “created” it or could have stopped it, or that something different would have happened had the US not pursued the technology or not used it in the ways it has against non-state terrorist actors. Here are a couple of quick reasons why I don’t find this thesis very persuasive, and what I think the real “arms race” surrounding drones will be.

Unmanned aerial vehicles have clearly got a big push from the US military in the way of research, development, and deployment. But the reality today is that the technology will transform civil aviation, in many of the same ways and for the same reasons that another robotic technology, driverless cars (which Google is busily plying up and down the streets of San Francisco, but which started as a DARPA project). UAVs will eventually move into many roles in ordinary aviation, because it is cheaper, relatively safer, more reliable – and it will eventually include cargo planes, crop dusting, border patrol, forest fire patrols, and many other tasks. There is a reason for this – the avionics involved are simply not so complicated as to be beyond the abilities of many, many states. Military applications will carry drones many different directions, from next-generation unmanned fighter aircraft able to operate against other craft at much higher G stresses to tiny surveillance drones. But the flying-around technology for aircraft that are generally sizes flown today is not that difficult, and any substantial state that feels like developing them will be able to do so.

But the point is that this was happening anyway, and the technology was already available. T he US might have been first, but it hasn’t sparked an arms race in any sense that absent the US push, no one would have done this. That’s just a fantasy reading of where the technology in general aviation was already going; Zenko’s ‘original sin’ attribution of this to the US opening Pandora’s box is not a credible understanding of the development and applications of the technology. Had the US not moved on this, the result would have been a US playing catch-up to someone else. For that matter, the off-the-shelf technology for small, hobbyist UAVs is simple enough and available enough that terrorists will eventually try to do their own amateur version, putting some kind of bomb on it.

Moving on from the avionics, weaponizing the craft is also not difficult. The US stuck an anti-tank missile on a Predator; this is also not rocket science. Many states can build drones, many states can operate them, and crudely weaponizing them is also not rocket science. The US didn’t spark an arms race; this would occur to any state with a drone. To the extent that there is real development here, it lies in the development of specialized weapons that enable vastly more discriminating targeting. The details are sketchy, but there are indications from DangerRoom and other observers (including some comments from military officials off the record) that US military budgets include amounts for much smaller missiles designed not as anti-tank weapons, but to penetrate and kill persons inside a car without blowing it to bits, for example. This is genuinely harder to do – but still not all that difficult for a major state, whether leading NATO states, China, Russia, or India. The question is whether it would be a bad thing to have states competing to come up with weapons technologies that are … more discriminating.

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

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

Drones, able to dispatch death remotely, without human eyes on their targets or a pilot's life at stake, make people uncomfortable - even when they belong to democratic governments that presumably have some limits on using them for ill. (On May 23, in a major speech, US President Barack Obama laid out what some of those limits are.) An even more alarming prospect is that unmanned aircraft will be acquired and deployed by authoritarian regimes, with fewer checks on their use of lethal force.¶ Those worried about exactly that tend to point their fingers at China. In March, after details emerged that China had considered taking out a drug trafficker in Myanmar with a drone strike, a CNN blog post warned, "Today, it's Myanmar. Tomorrow, it could very well be some other place in Asia or beyond." Around the same time, a National Journal article entitled "When the Whole World Has Drones" teased out some of the consequences of Beijing's drone programme, asking, "What happens if China arms one of its remote-piloted planes and strikes Philippine or Indian trawlers in the South China Sea?"¶ Indeed, the time to fret about when China and other authoritarian countries will acquire drones is over: they have them. The question now is when and how they will use them. But as with its other, less exotic military capabilities, Beijing has cleared only a technological hurdle - and its behaviour will continue to be constrained by politics.¶ China has been developing a drone capacity for over half a century, starting with its reverse engineering of Soviet Lavochkin La-17C target drones that it had received from Moscow in the late 1950s. Today, Beijing's opacity makes it difficult to gauge the exact scale of the programme, but according to Ian Easton, an analyst at the Project 2049 Institute, an American think-tank devoted to Asia-Pacific security matters, by 2011 China's air force alone had over 280 combat drones. In other words, its fleet of unmanned aerial vehicles is already bigger and more sophisticated than all but the United States'; in this relatively new field Beijing is less of a newcomer and more of a fast follower. And the force will only become more effective: the Lijian ("sharp sword" in Chinese), a combat drone in the final stages of development, will make China one of the very few states that have or are building a stealth drone capacity.¶ This impressive arsenal may tempt China to pull the trigger. The fact that a Chinese official acknowledged that Beijing had considered using drones to eliminate the Myanmar drug trafficker, Naw Kham, makes clear that it would not be out of the question for China to launch a drone strike in a security operation against a non-state actor. Meanwhile, as China's territorial disputes with its neighbours have escalated, there is a chance that Beijing would introduce unmanned aircraft, especially since India, the Philippines and Vietnam distantly trail China in drone funding and capacity, and would find it difficult to compete. Beijing is already using drones to photograph the Senkaku/Diaoyu islands it disputes with Japan, as the retired Chinese major-general Peng Guangqian revealed earlier this year, and to keep an eye on movements near the North Korean border.¶ Beijing, however, is unlikely to use its drones lightly. It already faces tremendous criticism from much of the international community for its perceived brazenness in continental and maritime sovereignty disputes. With its leaders attempting to allay notions that China's rise poses a threat to the region, injecting drones conspicuously into these disputes would prove counterproductive. China also fears setting a precedent for the use of drones in East Asian hotspots that the United States could eventually exploit. For now, Beijing is showing that it understands these risks, and to date it has limited its use of drones in these areas to surveillance, according to recent public statements from China's Defence Ministry.

**No Senkaku impact – multiple reasons**

Park International Affairs Review ’12 (Suntag, “Limits of the China-Japan Tension Over the Senkaku/Diaoyu Islands,” <http://www.iar-gwu.org/node/434>, Mike)

While many are growing increasingly nervous about a China-Japan confrontation, conflict is unlikely for a number of reasons. There is a growing fear among many Asia observers and pundits that the on-going territorial dispute could become a spark for a destructive, general war in Asia. The reality, however, is that there are several economic, political, as well as logistical (in military terms) constraints that make a warhighly unlikely. In economic terms, trade between the two countries is at historic high levels. A war would have devastating human as well as material costs. While economic interests and interdependence do not necessarily lead to peace, as history has proven with World War I, the current situation is different. Both political and military leaders before World War I believed that a war would be quick with small costs. Each side also believed that it would win. Leaders of both China and Japan today understand that the costs of a war would be astronomical and understand that victory is no certainty. The CCP (the Chinese Communist Party) has a strong interest in making sure that the conflict does not turn into a war. One of the key pillars of the CCP’s legitimacy is economic growth. The Chinese economy is already slowing. A war would certainly put a halt to the so-called Chinese miracle. In the beginning of the dispute this year, Beijing actually discreetly encouraged protests in hope that they would divert the Chinese people’s attention away from China’s slowing economic growth and deteriorating socioeconomic conditions. As of now, however, Beijing is attempting to restrain the protests, fearing that they could pressure the government into an actual war. Despite constitutional constraints, Japan's military has continued to evolve over the past half century, but the pacifist sentiment among the Japanese public still remains very strong. The Japanese who are inflaming the tension between the two countries do not represent the majority. At the official level, Japan’s decision to purchase the disputed islands is in fact a way for the Japanese government to be able to exercise more control and restraint over the entire situation by taking the islands out of private hands. There are also logistical reasons why a war over the Senkaku/Diaoyu Islands is unlikely. It is generally believed that neither China nor Japan at the moment has the military capability to wage a full-scale conventional war against the other. If China and Japan were to fight a war, the initial fighting would take place on water. The Chinese navy is mainly oriented towards coastal defense and does not have effective naval capabilities to project its power beyond the so-called “first island chain.” The Senkaku/Diaoyu Islands are part of the first island chain, but the Chinese military would have to stretch its naval capability to the limit in order to fight a war at that point.Even China’s on-going naval modernization is primarily for defensive purposes. The Japanese navy, on the other hand, does have some capability to project its power, but it is very limited. The Japanese military also does not have adequate ground forces to conduct fighting on the Chinese mainland. **Even if**violence breaks out, such a conflict would be very**limited in scope**and is highly unlikely that it would turn into a general war or escalate to a nuclear conflict. A more uncertain factor that must be considered is that the security treaty between the United States and Japan extends to the Senkaku/Diaoyu Islands. The treaty makes it possible for the United States to become involved in a military conflict. So far, Washington has taken a neutral stance between China and Japan .The United States is opposed to any violent solution and shares concerns, particularly economic, with both China and Japan about the consequences of a general war. Any major conflict between China and Japan would kill the prospects of global economic recovery. Furthermore, because any conflict between China and Japan would be limited at best, any U.S. involvement due to its security obligation would most likely be limited as well. § Marked 16:05 § In examining the potential for the use of military force, one must consider both intent and capability. Neither China nor Japan has the intent or the capability to fight a war over the Senkaku/Diaoyu Islands. While the rhetoric between the two countries may be fierce, it remains subject to reality.

**China is de-escalating South China Sea tensions – promoting peaceful negotiations now**

**Ponnudurai ‘12 –** Parameswaran Ponnudurai, September 26th, 2012, "China Seeks To Mend Fences In Sea Dispute – Analysis" www.eurasiareview.com/26092012-china-seeks-to-mend-fences-in-sea-dispute-analysis/

As Beijingflexes its muscles over its territorial dispute with Japan in the East China Sea, it **is mending fences with Southeast Asian nations** after a spate of tensions in the contested South China Sea.¶ Following much prodding and diplomacy, **China appears to be showing some flexibility in its approach towards drawing up a code of conduct with the Southeast Asian nations** aimed at avoiding clashes over competing territorial claims in the vast sea, diplomats in the region told RFA.¶ Although they are skeptical of any early breakthrough for a legally binding document between China and the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) to guide behavior in the sea, there is optimism that negotiations will occur on a sustained basis.¶“We see some flexibility to discuss the COC with ASEAN,” one Southeast Asian diplomat said, referring to the elusive Code of Conduct or COC which ASEAN—comprising Brunei, Burma, Cambodia, Indonesia, Laos, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore, Thailand and Vietnam—has been striving to devise with Beijing for a decade.¶**In an initial display of seriousness that it is prepared to come to the table, China sent its senior officials to Cambodia last week to informally discuss with their counterparts from ASEAN the prospects for drawing up a code**, officials said.¶This is the first meeting between the two sides specifically on the maritime dispute since ASEAN plunged into a crisis two months ago when foreign ministers of the 10-member bloc failed to issue their customary joint statement at the conclusion of their annual meeting hosted by Cambodia, China’s top ally in Southeast Asia.¶ Some ASEAN diplomats had charged that Cambodia had been influenced by China not to incorporate in the statement the views of ASEAN member states the Philippines and Vietnam, which had tiffs earlier this year with Beijing over islands and reefs in the South China Sea, causing an impasse at the meeting.¶ China claims to South China Sea¶ China claims to South China Sea¶ The ASEAN-China Senior Officials’ Informal Consultations on the Code of Conduct (COC) in the South China Sea, as last week’s meeting in Phnom Penh was officially called, was among a series of discussions in preparation for the ASEAN summit and the East Asia Summit in November.¶ “**Compared to two months ago, when there was complete reluctance to come to the table, China appears willing to sit down and talk,” said one Southeast Asian official, who was briefed on the talks but spoke on condition of anonymity**.¶ “Indirectly, they may be feeling the heat from the mounting criticism over what happened at the meeting in July which was a big blow to ASEAN,” the official said.¶ “But China has also asked the ASEAN states to do their part by reducing tensions and not conducting border incursions and creating a conducive environment for any future talks. **They don’t want us to bring in third parties [the United States] over the conflict and want us to stick to the 2002 declaration**,” the diplomat said.¶ Under a 2002 agreement for managing their overlapping territorial claims, ASEAN and China adopted a Declaration on the Conduct of Parties in the South China Sea, called DOC as a first step towards a binding code of conduct.¶ But in a reflection of the sensitivity over the issue, it was only last year—after 10 years—that they agreed on a set of guidelines to implement the declaration that was aimed at laying the groundwork for discussions on the regional code of conduct.¶ Ray of hope¶ The new ray of hope for achieving a COC comes after extensive diplomacy, including U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton’s trip to Southeast Asia and China, with a meeting with Chinese President Hu Jintao.¶Chinese leaders told Clinton—who has often emphasized that freedom of navigation in the South China Sea is a U.S. “national interest”—that they want to pursue the COC, U.S. Ambassador to China Gary Locke told a forum in Washington last week, saying the talks between the two sides were “very good.”¶“I’ve also heard from many prominent Chinese academics that **China would like somehow to return to the status quo**, that **they would like to lower the temperature**,” Locke said.¶ Chinese Foreign Minister Yang Yechi had also visited Indonesia as well as Malaysia and Brunei, giving reassurances that diplomacy was still on track.¶ Cambodian Prime Minister Hun Sen, embarrassed by the failure by his country as 2012 ASEAN chairman to forge an agreement on the foreign ministers’ joint statement, also made a trip to China this month, meeting Prime Minister Wen Jiabao.¶ Hun Sen won assurances from Wen that Beijing will “closely work” to make the upcoming East Asia Summit which Cambodia will host a success,” Chinese media reported.¶ Southeast Asian diplomats said a key objective is to get an initial ASEAN-China accord on the COC before the November East Asia Summit, to be attended by leaders of ASEAN as well as China, Japan, South Korea, India, Australia, New Zealand, Russia and the United States.¶**Key elements of the COC have been agreed upon by ASEAN member states whose foreign ministers will meet to consider a full draft document on the sidelines of the U.N. General Assembly in New York this coming week**, the diplomats said.¶ “We are now in the process of spelling out the draft [of the code] and we hope to be able to share it with my ASEAN foreign minister colleagues when I meet them in New York,” Indonesian Foreign Minister Marty Natalegawa said, according to the Jakarta Globe newspaper.¶ “The development of the South China Sea [issues] reminds us how we desperately need the code of conduct, [so] I’m trying to use the momentum,” Marty said, as Indonesia asserts a leadership role in ASEAN to deal with the South China Sea issue, Asia’s biggest potential military flashpoint.¶ Cambodia or Thailand, which is the ASEAN coordinator for China issues, could host another round of informal talks between senior officials from ASEAN and China on the COC before the East Asia Summit.¶ “Both sides might also issue a joint statement to commemorate the 10th anniversary of the DOC at Summit,” an official involved in the planning of the summit told RFA, referring to the declaration adopted in 2002 in Cambodia to set the stage for the regional code of conduct.¶**Beijing has maintained all this while that it wants to resolve the South China Sea territorial conflicts on a bilateral basis with ASEAN members Brunei, Malaysia, the Philippines and Vietnam, which have competing claims with China**.

#### No Middle East war

Salem 11—Director of the Carnegie Middle East Center. PhD from Harvard (Paul, 'Arab Spring' Has Yet to Alter Region's Strategic Balance, carnegie-mec.org/publications/?fa=43907)

Despite their sweeping repercussions for both domestic and international players, the Arab uprisings have not led to a dramatically new regional order or a new balance of power. This could change, particularly if developments in Syria continue to escalate. While Iran has welcomed uprisings against Western-backed regimes in Egypt and Tunisia, it dealt harshly with its own protesters and has been worried about recent events in Syria. Moreover, countries that threw out pro-Western dictators are not moving closer to Iran. Egypt's and Tunisia’s future foreign policies are more likely to resemble Turkey's in becoming more independent while remaining allied with the West. And Iran's soft power has decreased as its regime looks increasingly repressive and new models of revolutionary success have emerged in Tunisia, Egypt, and other parts of the Arab world. Turkey, for its part, bungled the opportunity to take advantage of this historic shift to bolster its influence in the Arab world. The Arab uprisings are effectively calling for the Arab world to be more like Turkey: democratic, with a vibrant civil society, political pluralism, secularism alongside Islam, and a productive and fairly balanced economy. However, after expressing clear support for Egyptian protesters, Turkey has hedged its bets in Libya and Syria. Turkey has over $15 billion in business contracts with Moammar Kadafi's Libya and has built a close relationship with Syrian President Bashar Assad. Turkey's foreign policy of "zero problems" with neighbors is becoming harder to implement as peoples and governments in the neighborhood are increasingly on opposite sides. Although Arab public opinion has held Turkey in very high esteem in past years, recent events have tarnished that image. This could have been Turkey's moment in the Middle East; the moment was lost. Saudi Arabia has been taken aback by the loss of old allies and remains worried about increased Iranian influence, but has maintained its sphere of influence. Its military intervention in Bahrain shows that Riyadh is extremely worried not only about Iranian influence but about the wave of democratic change, and still has not figured out a way to achieve a balance between addressing growing demands by citizens for better governance and social justice, while keeping Iranian influence out of the Gulf Cooperation Council. Although the United States has generally suffered setbacks from the events of the past months, it is adjusting quickly to the new realities and § Marked 16:06 § stands to remain a key player in the coming period. It has not lost its leverage despite the demise of its main Egyptian and Tunisian allies, and has expressed support for protests after realizing they were not dominated by radical groups and that they echoed Western values. Emerging global powers such as Russia, China, India and Brazil have had mixed reactions to the "Arab Spring." All were reluctant to approve Western-led military intervention in Libya, expressing concerns ranging from the risk of higher oil prices to a potential spillover effect on their shores. As for Israel, even though its peace treaty with Egypt will remain in place, it no longer has any friends in the region after the departure of Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak, its declining relations with Turkey and growing unrest in Jordan. The recent Fatah-Hamas accord underlines Israel's predicament. Two difficult challenges lie ahead: The Palestinian Authority's unilateral move to declare Palestinian statehood by the end of the year and a potential Palestinian popular uprising encouraged by the success of neighboring populations. Although the Arab Spring has been largely about internal democracy and reform, it has affected all of the major regional and international actors. However, so far there has been no major shift in the balance of power or the basic pattern of regional relations.

#### No war – deterrence checks escalation

Ganguly, 8

[Sumit Ganguly is a professor of political science and holds the Rabindranath Tagore Chair at Indiana University, Bloomington. “Nuclear Stability in South Asia,” International Security, Vol. 33, No. 2 (Fall 2008), pp. 45–70]

As the outcomes of the 1999 and 2001–02 crises show, nuclear deterrence is robust in South Asia. Both crises were contained at levels considerably short of full-scale war. That said, as Paul Kapur has argued, Pakistan’s acquisition of a nuclear weapons capability may well have emboldened its leadership, secure in the belief that India had no good options to respond. India, in turn, has been grappling with an effort to forge a new military doctrine and strategy to enable it to respond to Pakistani needling while containing the possibilities of conflict escalation, especially to the nuclear level.78 Whether Indian military planners can fashion such a calibrated strategy to cope with Pakistani probes remains an open question. This article’s analysis of the 1999 and 2001–02 crises does suggest, however, that nuclear deterrence in South Asia is far from parlous, contrary to what the critics have suggested. Three specific forms of evidence can be adduced to argue the case for the strength of nuclear deterrence. First, there is a serious problem of conflation in the arguments of both Hoyt and Kapur. Undeniably, Pakistan’s willingness to provoke India has increased commensurate with its steady acquisition of a nuclear arsenal. This period from the late 1980s to the late 1990s, however, also coincided with two parallel developments that equipped Pakistan with the motives, opportunities, and means to meddle in India’s internal affairs—particularly in Jammu and Kashmir. The most important change that occurred was the end of the conflict with the Soviet Union, which freed up military resources for use in a new jihad in Kashmir. This jihad, in turn, was made possible by the emergence of an indigenous uprising within the state as a result of Indian political malfeasance.79 Once the jihadis were organized, trained, armed, and unleashed, it is far from clear whether Pakistan could control the behavior and actions of every resulting jihadist organization.80 Consequently, although the number of attacks on India did multiply during the 1990s, it is difficult to establish a firm causal connection between the growth of Pakistani boldness and its gradual acquisition of a full-fledged nuclear weapons capability. Second, India did respond with considerable force once its military planners realized the full scope and extent of the intrusions across the Line of Control. Despite the vigor of this response, India did exhibit restraint. For example, Indian pilots were under strict instructions not to cross the Line of Control in pursuit of their bombing objectives.81 They adhered to these guidelines even though they left them more vulnerable to Pakistani ground ªre.82 The Indian military exercised such restraint to avoid provoking Pakistani fears of a wider attack into Pakistan-controlled Kashmir and then into Pakistan itself. Indian restraint was also evident at another level. During the last war in Kashmir in 1965, within a week of its onset, the Indian Army horizontally escalated with an attack into Pakistani Punjab. In fact, in the Punjab, Indian forces successfully breached the international border and reached the outskirts of the regional capital, Lahore. The Indian military resorted to this strategy under conditions that were not especially propitious for the country. Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru, India’s first prime minister, had died in late 1964. His successor, Lal Bahadur Shastri, was a relatively unknown politician of uncertain stature and standing, and the Indian military was still recovering from the trauma of the 1962 border war with the People’s Republic of China.83 Finally, because of its role in the Cold War, the Pakistani military was armed with more sophisticated, U.S.-supplied weaponry, including the F-86 Sabre and the F-104 Starfighter aircraft. India, on the other hand, had few supersonic aircraft in its inventory, barring a small number of Soviet-supplied MiG-21s and the indigenously built HF-24.84 Furthermore, the Indian military remained concerned that China might open a second front along the Himalayan border. Such concerns were not entirely chimerical, because a Sino-Pakistani entente was under way. Despite these limitations, the Indian political leadership responded to Pakistani aggression with vigor and granted the Indian military the necessary authority to expand the scope of the war. In marked contrast to the politico-military context of 1965, in 1999 India had a self-confident (if belligerent) political leadership and a substantially more powerful military apparatus. Moreover, the country had overcome most of its Nehruvian inhibitions about the use of force to resolve disputes.85 Furthermore, unlike in 1965, India had at least two reserve strike corps in the Punjab in a state of military readiness and poised to attack across the border if given the political nod.86 Despite these significant differences and advantages, the Indian political leadership chose to scrupulously limit the scope of the conflict to the Kargil region. As K. Subrahmanyam, a prominent Indian defense analyst and political commentator, wrote in 1993:. The awareness on both sides of a nuclear capability that can enable either country to assemble nuclear weapons at short notice induces mutual caution. This caution is already evident on the part of India. In 1965, when Pakistan carried out its “Operation Gibraltar” and sent in infiltrators, India sent its army across the cease-fire line to destroy the assembly points of the infiltrators. That escalated into a full-scale war. In 1990, when Pakistan once again carried out a massive infiltration of terrorists trained in Pakistan, India tried to deal with the problem on Indian territory and did not send its army into Pakistan-occupied Kashmir.87

### Allies

#### Individual policies can’t undermine relations – Mutual interests overwhelm.

Ayoob and Zierler 05 Mohammed Ayoob is a University Distinguished Professor of International Relations, and Matthew Zierler is a visiting Assistant Professor of International Relations at James Madison College, World Policy Journal, Spring, Volume 22, “The Unipolar Concert: The North-South Divide Trumps Transatlantic Differences”

Second, **disagreements within the concert are often over policy choices, as opposed to fundamental rules of the system or basic objectives. Deterring and punishing “rogue” states** and denying unconventional capabilities to those outside the club **are shared objectives from which no member of the concert dissents**. This was very clear in the runup to the invasion of Iraq in 2003. A **reading of the U.N. Security Council debates on Iraq** from 1991 to 2003 **makes it obvious that there were hardly any differences among the club of powerful states on taking steps that would severely derogate Iraq’s sovereignty and eventually bring about a regime change**. The imposition of no-flight zones and invasive inspections under U.N. auspices between 1991 and 2003 clearly demonstrated this unity of purpose. **The differences were over the tactics to achieve these ends.** The same applies to the concert’s objectives regarding Iran. The shared objective is to deny Iran nuclear weapons capabilities and to curb its regional influence; the debate is about how best to attain these goals. A similar situation prevails in the economic arena. **While there may be differences over details and even intra-concert bickering about certain issues**, for example, the American attempt to impose tariffs on European steel, **there is a basic consensus about prying open world markets under the guise of free trade** and liberal investment policies, thus making it easier for developed countries to market their high-value-added products and to invest in profitable ventures abroad. **This is accompanied by imposing conditionalities, or structural adjustments, on Third World economies that would ostensibly help to reduce their fiscal deficits. It is clear that this can only be achieved through multilateral mechanisms, such as the World Bank, the IMF**, and the World Trade Organization. **The concert of industrialized states**, working through the G-7 in particular, **harmonizes its economic policy** in such a fashion **that it can effectively use these multilateral forums to promote its neoliberal agenda**. We do not mean to suggest that the current multilateral arrangements and initiatives are set in stone. However, **it is unlikely that the instrument will be jettisoned, if only because of the deep commitment on the part of the concert to maintain it. Moreover, multilateral institutions in the North are being strengthened as the states from Eastern Europe seek membership in the European Union and NATO. The deepening and broadening of multilateral institutions in the North have had the added effect of reinforcing the divide between those in the concert and those outside**. In short, multilateralism has not proved to be antithetical to unipolarity. In fact, the two have worked in tandem to promote the interests of the North in both the economic and security spheres.

#### 3. U.S./E.U. fights are inevitable – And there’s no impact.

Ahearn, Archick, Belkin 07 Foreign Affairs, Defense, and Trade Division [Raymond Ahearn, Kristin Archick, Paul Belkin “U.S.-European Union Relations and the 2007 Summit” may 14, 2007 http://ftp.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/RS22645.pdf/]

The U.S. Congress and successive U.S. administrations have supported the EU project since its inception as a way to foster a stable Europe, democratic states, and strong trading partners. The United States has welcomed EU efforts since the end of the Cold War to expand the political and economic benefits of membership to central and eastern Europe, and supports the EU aspirations of Turkey and the western Balkan states. The United States and the EU share a huge and mutually beneficial economic relationship. Two-way flows of goods, services, and foreign investment now exceed $1.0 trillion on an annual basis, and the total stock of two-way direct investment is over $1.9 trillion. Nevertheless**, the U.S.-EU relationship has been challenged in recent years as numerous trade and foreign policy conflicts have emerged. The 2003 crisis over Iraq, which bitterly divided the EU and severely strained U.S.-EU relations, is most notable, but the list of disagreements has been wide and varied**. Although Europeans are not monolithic in their views, **many EU member states have objected to at least some elements of U.S. policy on issues ranging from the Israeli-Palestinian conflict to U.S. treatment of terrorist detainees to** climate change and **aircraft subsidies**. Since 2003, however, **both sides have made efforts to improve relations, and successive U.S.-EU summits have sought to emphasize areas of cooperation and partnership**. At the same time, **challenges and some tensions remain in the U.S.-EU relationship.**

#### No impact – we are already becoming independent of each other and cooperation is unnecessary.

**Daalder,** senior fellow in Foreign Policy Studies at Brookings, Summer 20**03** (Ivo H., Survival, vol. 45, no. 2, p.147)

The main consequence of these changes in US and European policy priorities is to make the transatlantic relationship less pivotal to the foreign policy of both actors. For America, Europe is a useful source of support for American actions – a place to seek complementary capabilities and to build ad hoc coalitions of the willing and somewhat able. But Washington views Europe as less central to its main interests and preoccupations than it was during the Cold War. For European countries, America’s protective role has become essentially superfluous with the disappearance of the Soviet threat, while its pacifying presence is no longer warranted, given the advance of European integration. The task of integrating all of Europe into the zone of peace now falls squarely on Europe’s shoulders, with the United States playing at most a supporting role. Even the stabilisation of Europe’s periphery – from the Balkans in the south to Turkey, the Caucuses, and Ukraine in the East – is one where Europeans will increasingly have to take the lead.

#### NATO is resilient

Kupchan5/10/12Charles,Whitney Shepardson Senior Fellow Council on Foreign Relations & Professor of International Relations Georgetown University, “NATO: Chicago and Beyond” http://www.foreign.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/Charles\_Kupchan\_Testimony1.pdf

NATO has demonstrated impressive resilience and solidarity since the Cold War’s end. Indeed, it has defied history; alliances usually disband when the collective threat that brought them into being disappears. Instead, NATO has not only survived, but markedly expanded its membership and undertaken major missions in the Balkans, Afghanistan, and Libya. As the Cold War came to a close, few observers could have predicted that NATO, twenty years later, would be in the midst of an extended operation in Afghanistan while simultaneously carrying out a successful air campaign to topple the Libyan government. The durability of NATO stems from the reality that the United States and Europe remain one another’s best partner. To be sure, differing perspectives and priorities regularly test transatlantic solidarity. But teamwork between the United States and Europe remains vital to addressing most international challenges. As President Obama affirmed prior to the 2010 NATO Summit in Lisbon, “our relationship with our European allies and partners is the cornerstone of our engagement with the world, and a catalyst for global cooperation. With no other region does the United States have such a close alignment of values,

interests, capabilities, and goals.”

#### No NATO impact

Kaplan & Kaplan 11 – Robert D., senior fellow at the Center for a New American Security in Washington and a member of the Pentagon’s Defense Policy Board, and Stephen S., former vice chairman of the National Intelligence Council as well as a longtime daily White House briefer and director of the president’s daily briefing, March/April 2011, “America Primed,” <http://nationalinterest.org/print/article/america-primed-4892>

OF COURSE even this set of assets is not enough to ensure American primacy—nor its sway over the West. And not all alliances are created equal. For example, Washington can less and less rely on NATO to serve as its linchpin in Europe. NATO is of limited help in Afghanistan, was irrelevant in Iraq and simply does not matter in the larger Middle East. The defense budgets of member states in Western Europe are generally below the NATO standard of 2 percent of GDP, even as these same countries now brace for the steepest cuts in military spending since the end of the Cold War. U.S. Defense Secretary Robert Gates, as prudent and low-key a public speaker as one can imagine, has publicly chided Europeans for being too reluctant to use military force. Nor does NATO, whatever the fine print of its documents, really guarantee the territorial integrity of its new member states in Eastern Europe against potential Russian aggression. The United States does that, and the Balts, Poles, Romanians and others know it. Plainly, the Poles and Romanians sent troops to Iraq and Afghanistan (and any number of various African countries where the United States has had military missions) not because they necessarily approved of these deployments or were enthusiastic about them, but as a quid pro quo for this implicit security guarantee.

#### NATO isn’t necessary – The US will always remain engaged with Europe.

Michael Gallagher 03, Assistant Secretary of Commerce, Winter 2003 Houston Journal of International Law

NATO’s supporters argue that ending NATO will destabilize Europe. Ending NATO, they claim, will destroy the transatlantic link between the United States and Europe, and isolate the United States from Europe. The ties of history, however, prevent this outcome. The § Marked 16:08 § United States has long enjoyed a “special relationship” with the United Kingdom. The United States also has strong relations with such nations as Italy, Turkey, Germany, the Netherlands, Denmark, and Norway. Some claim that NATO is the foremost expression of U.S. commitment to Europe. The United States, however, aided Europe in two world wars, and stood firmly by Europe’s side during the Cold War – this commitment surpasses diplomatic formalities. The United States will not isolate itself from Europe merely because NATO disbands. Additionally, European nations do not need a formal security link to the United States. Even with NATO gone, “there is still plenty of life in, and need for, [the United States-Europe security] partnership.”

#### Impact inevitable- Continued economic decline will crush NATO

Daniel Hamilton et al, Richard von Weizsäcker Professor and Director of the Center for Transatlantic Relations at the Paul H. Nitze School of Advanced International Studies (SAIS), Feb. 2009 (“Alliance Reborn: An Atlantic Compact for the 21st Century” http://foreign.senate.gov/testimony/2009/HamiltonTestimony090506p.pdf)

First, we must tackle immediate economic challenges while positioning our economies for the future. Few issues are likely to shape European-American relations over the next few years as the global economic crisis. This epochal event has erased any doubt about how interconnected the transatlantic economy has become. The deeper and more prolonged the economic recession of 2009, the greater the risks of inward, insular policies on both sides of the Atlantic. Our common challenge is to show our citizens and millions around the world that it is possible to reap globalization’s benefits while making its costs bearable to those most directly affected, without succumbing to protectionist temptations. This requires more than large dollops of fiscal and monetary stimuli. Bolder thinking and action are needed.
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### AT: Int’l Don’t Believe Prez

**Constraints through executive coordination solves signaling**

**POSNER & VERMEULE 2006** --- \*Prof of Law at U Chicago, AND \*\* Prof of Law at Harvard (9/19/2006, Eric A. Posner & Adrian Vermeule, “The Credible Executive,” <http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=931501)>)

IV. Executive Signaling: Law and Mechanisms

We suggest that the executive’s credibility problem can be solved by second-order mechanisms of executive signaling. In the general case, well-motivated executives send credible signals by taking actions that are more costly for ill-motivated actors than for well-motivated ones, thus distinguishing themselves from their ill-motivated mimics. Among the specific mechanisms we discuss, an important subset involve executive self-binding, whereby executives commit themselves to a course of action that would impose higher costs on ill-motivated actors. Commitments themselves have value as signals of benign motivations.

This departs from the usual approach in legal scholarship. Legal theory has often discussed self-binding by “government” or government officials. In constitutional theory, it is often suggested that constitutions represent an attempt by “the people” to bind “themselves” against their own future decisionmaking pathologies, or relatedly that constitutional prohibitions represent mechanisms by which governments commit themselves not to expropriate investments or to exploit their populations.71 Whether or not this picture is coherent,72 it is not the question we examine here, although some of the relevant considerations are similar.73 We are not concerned with binding the president so that he cannot abuse his powers, but with how he might bind himself or take other actions that enhance his credibility, so that he can generate support from the public and other members of the government.

Furthermore, our question is subconstitutional; it is whether a well-motivated executive, acting within an established set of constitutional and statutory rules, can use signaling to generate public trust. Accordingly we proceed by assuming that no constitutional amendments or new statutes will be enacted. Within these constraints, what can a well-motivated executive do to bootstrap himself to credibility? The problem for the well-motivated executive is to credibly signal his benign motivations; in general, the solution is to engage in actions that are less costly for good types than for bad types.

We begin with some relevant law; then examine a set of possible mechanisms, emphasizing both the conditions under which they might succeed and the conditions under which they might not; and then examine the costs of credibility.

A. A Preliminary Note on Law and Self-Binding

Many of our mechanisms are unproblematic from a legal perspective, as they involve presidential actions that are clearly lawful. But a few raise legal questions; in particular, those that involve self-binding.74 Can a president bind himself to respect particular first-order policies? With qualifications, the answer is “yes, at least to the same extent that a legislature can.” Formally, a duly promulgated executive rule or order binds even the executive unless and until it is validly abrogated, thereby establishing a new legal status quo.75 The legal authority to establish a new status quo allows a president to create inertia or political constraints that will affect his own future choices. In a practical sense, presidents, like legislatures, have great de facto power to adopt policies that shape the legal landscape for the future**.** A president might commit himself to a long-term project of defense procurement or infrastructure or foreign policy, narrowing his own future choices and generating new political coalitions that will act to defend the new rules or policies.

More schematically, we may speak of formal and informal means of self-binding:

(1) The president might use formal means to bind himself. This is possible in the sense that an executive order, if otherwise valid, legally binds the president while it is in effect and may be enforced by the courts. It is not possible in the sense that the president can always repeal the executive order if he can bear the political and reputational costs of doing so.

(2) The president might use informal means to bind himself. This is not only possible but frequent and important. Issuing an executive rule providing for the appointment of special prosecutors, as Nixon did, is not a formal self-binding.76 However, there may be large political costs to repealing the order. This effect does not depend on the courts’ willingness to enforce the order, even against Nixon himself. Court enforcement makes the order legally binding while it is in place, but only political and reputational enforcement can protect it from repeal. Just as a dessert addict might announce to his friends that he is going on a no-dessert diet in order to raise the reputational costs of backsliding and thus commit himself, so too the repeal of an executive order may be seen as a breach of faith even if no other institution ever enforces it.

In what follows, we will invoke both formal and informal mechanisms. For our purposes, the distinction between the authority to engage in de jure self-binding (legally limited and well-defined) and the power to engage in de facto self-binding (broad and amorphous) is secondary. So long as policies are deliberately chosen with a view to generating credibility, and do so by constraining the president’s own future choices in ways that impose greater costs on ill-motivated presidents than on well-motivated ones, it does not matter whether the constraint is formal or informal.

B. Mechanisms

What signaling mechanisms might a well-motivated executive adopt to credibly assure voters, legislators and judges that his policies rest on judgments about the public interest, rather than on power-maximization, partisanship or other nefarious motives? Intrabranch separation of powers. In an interesting treatment of related problems, Neal Katyal suggests that the failure of the Madisonian system counsels “internal separation of powers” within the executive branch.77 Abdication by Congress means that there are few effective checks on executive power; second-best substitutes are necessary. Katyal proposes some mechanisms that would be adopted by Congress, such as oversight hearings by the minority party, but his most creative proposals are for arrangements internal to the executive branch, such as redundancy and competition among agencies, stronger civil-service protections and internal adjudication of executive controversies by insulated “executive” decisionmakers who resemble judges in many ways.78Katyal’s argument is relevant because the mechanisms he discusses might be understood as signaling devices, but his overall approach is conceptually flawed, on two grounds. First, the assumption that second-best constraints on the executive should reproduce the Madisonian separation of powers within the executive branch is never defended. The idea seems to be that this is as close as we can get to the first-best, while holding constant everything else in our constitutional order. But the general theory of second-best states that approaching as closely as possible to the first-best will not necessarily be the preferred strategy;79 the best approach may be to adjust matters on other margins as well, in potentially unpredictable ways. If the Madisonian system has failed in the ways Katyal suggests, the best compensating adjustment might be, for all we know, to switch to a parliamentary system. (We assume that no large-scale changes of this sort are possible, whereas Katyal seemingly assumes that they are, or at least does not make clear his assumptions in this regard). Overall, Katyal’s view has a kind of fractal quality – each branch should reproduce within itself the very same separation of powers structure that also describes the whole system – but it is not explained why the constitutional order should be fractal.

Second, Katyal’s proposals for internal separation of powers are self-defeating: the motivations that Katyal ascribes to the executive are inconsistent with the executive adopting or respecting the prescriptions Katyal recommends.80 Katyal never quite says so explicitly, but he clearly envisions the executive as a power-maximizing actor, in the sense that the president seeks to remove all constraints on his current choices.81 Such an executive would not adopt or enforce the internal separation of powers to check himself. Executive signaling is not, even in principle, a solution to the lack of constraints on a power-maximizing executive in the sense Katyal implicitly intends. Although an illmotivated executive might bind himself to enhance his strategic credibility, as explained above, he would not do so in order to restore the balance of powers. Nor is it possible, given Katyal’s premise of legislative passivity or abdication, that Congress would force the internal separation of powers on the executive. In what follows, we limit ourselves to proposals that are consistent with the motivations, beliefs, and political opportunities that we ascribe to the well-motivated executive, to whom the proposals are addressed. This limitation ensures that the proposals are not self-defeating, whatever their costs.

The contrast here must not be drawn too simply. A well-motivated executive, in our sense, might well attempt to increase his power. The very point of demonstrating credibility is to encourage voters and legislators to increase the discretionary authority of the executive, where all will be made better off by doing so. Scholars such as Katyal who implicitly distrust the executive, however, do not subscribe to this picture of executive motivations. Rather, they see the executive as an unfaithful agent of the voters; the executive attempts to maximize his power even where fully-informed voters would prefer otherwise. An actor of that sort will have no incentive to adopt proposals intended to constrain that sort of actor.

Independent commissions. We now turn to some conceptually coherent mechanisms of executive signaling. Somewhat analogously to Katyal’s idea of the internal separation of powers, a well-motivated executive might establish independent commissions to review policy decisions, either before or after the fact. Presidents do this routinely, especially after a policy has had disastrous outcomes, but sometimes beforehand as well. Independent commissions are typically blue-ribbon and bipartisan.82

We add to this familiar process the idea that the President might gain credibility by publicly committing or binding himself to give the commission authority on some dimension. The president might publicly promise to follow the recommendations of such a commission, or to allow the commission to exercise de facto veto power over a policy decision before it is made, or might promise before the policy is chosen that the commission will be given power to review its success after the fact. To be sure, there will always be some wiggle room in the terms of the promise, but that is true of almost all commitments, which raise the costs of wiggling out even if they do not completely prevent it.

Consider whether George W. Bush’s credibility would have been enhanced had he appointed a blue-ribbon commission to examine the evidence for weapons of mass destruction in Iraq before the 2003 invasion, and publicly promised not to invade unless the commission found substantial evidence of their existence. Bush would have retained his preexisting legal authority to order the invasion even if the commission found the evidence inadequate, but the political costs of doing so would have been large. Knowing this, and knowing that Bush shared that knowledge, the public could have inferred that Bush’s professed motive – elimination of weapons of mass destruction – was also his real motive. Public promises that inflict reputational costs on badly motivated behavior help the well-motivated executive to credibly distinguish himself from the ill-motivated one.

The more common version of this tactic is to appoint commissions after the relevant event, as George W. Bush did to investigate the faulty reports by intelligence agencies that Iraq possessed weapons of mass destruction.83 If the president appoints after-the-fact commissions, the commissions can enhance his credibility for the next event—by showing that he will be willing, after that event, to subject his statements to scrutiny by public experts. Here, however, the demonstration of credibility is weaker, because there is no commitment to appoint any after-the-fact commissions in the future – merely a plausible inference that the president’s future behavior will track his past behavior.

Bipartisan appointments. In examples of the sort just mentioned, the signaling arises from public position-taking. The well-motivated executive might produce similar effects through appointments to office.84 A number of statutes require partisan balance on multimember commissions; although these statutes are outside the scope of our discussion, we note that presidents might approve them because they allow the president to commit to a policy that legislators favor, thus encouraging legislators to increase the scope of the delegation in the first place.85 For similar reasons, presidents may consent to restrictions on the removal of agency officials, because the restriction enables the president to commit to giving the agency some autonomy from the president’s preferences.86

Similar mechanisms can work even where no statutes are in the picture. As previously mentioned, during World War II, FDR appointed Republicans to important cabinet positions, making Stimson his Secretary of War. Clinton appointed William Cohen, a moderate Republican, as Secretary of Defense in order to shore up his credibility on security issues. Bipartisanship of this sort might improve the deliberation that precedes decisions, by impeding various forms of herding, cascades and groupthink;87 however, we focus on its credibility-generating effects. By (1) expanding the circle of those who share the president’s privileged access to information, (2) ensuring that policy is partly controlled by officials with preferences that differ from the president’s, and (3) inviting a potential whistleblower into the tent, bipartisanship helps to dispel the suspicion that policy decisions rest on partisan motives or extreme preferences, which in turn encourages broader delegations of discretion from the public and Congress.

A commitment to bipartisanship is only one way in which appointments can generate credibility. Presidents might simply appoint a person with a reputation for integrity, as when President Nixon appointed Archibald Cox as special prosecutor (although plausibly Nixon did so because he was forced to do so by political constraints, rather than as a tactic for generating credibility). A person with well-known preferences on a particular issue, even if not of the other party or widely respected for impartiality, can serve as a credible whistleblower on that issue. Thus presidents routinely award cabinet posts to leaders of subsets of the president’s own party, leaders whose preferences are known to diverge from the president’s on the subject; one point of this is to credibly assure the relevant interest groups that the president will not deviate (too far) from their preferences.

The Independent Counsel Statute institutionalized the special prosecutor and strengthened it. But the statute proved unpopular and was allowed to lapse in 1999.88 This experience raises two interesting questions. First, why have presidents confined themselves to appointing lawyers to investigate allegations of wrongdoing; why have they not appointed, say, independent policy experts to investigate allegations of policy failure? Second, why did the Independent Counsel Statute fail? Briefly, the statute failed because it was too difficult to control the behavior of the prosecutor, who was not given any incentive to keep his investigation within reasonable bounds.89 Not surprisingly, policy investigators would be even less constrained since they would not be confined by the law, and at the same time, without legal powers they would probably be ignored on partisan grounds. A commission composed of members with diverse viewpoints is harder to ignore, if the members agree with each other.

More generally, the decision by presidents to bring into their administrations members of other parties, or persons with a reputation for bipartisanship and integrity, illustrates the formation of domestic coalitions of the willing. Presidents can informally bargain around the formal separation of powers90 by employing subsets of Congress, or of the opposing party, to generate credibility while maintaining a measure of institutional control. FDR was willing to appoint Knox and Stimson, but not to give the Republicans in Congress a veto. Truman was willing to ally with Arthur Vandenbergh but not with all the Republicans; Clinton was willing to appoint William Cohen but not Newt Gingrich. George W. Bush likewise made a gesture towards credibility by briefing members of the Senate Intelligence Committee – including Democrats – on the administration’s secret surveillance program(s), which provided a useful talking point when the existence of the program(s) was revealed to the public.

Counter-partisanship. Related to bipartisanship is what might be called counterpartisanship: presidents have greater credibility when they choose policies that cut against the grain of their party’s platform or their own presumed preferences.91 Only Nixon could go to China, and only Clinton could engineer welfare reform. Voters and publics rationally employ a political heuristic: the relevant policy, which voters are incapable of directly assessing, must be highly beneficial if it is chosen by a president who is predisposed against it by convictions or partisan loyalty.92 Accordingly, those who wish to move U.S. terrorism policy towards greater security and less liberty might do well to support the election of a Democrat.93 By the same logic, George W. Bush is widely suspected of nefarious motives when he rounds up alleged enemy combatants, but not when he creates a massive prescription drug benefit.

Counter-partisanship can powerfully enhance the president’s credibility, but it depends heavily on a lucky alignment of political stars. A peace-loving president has credibility when he declares a military emergency but not when he appeases; a belligerent president has credibility when he offers peace but not when he advocates military solutions. A lucky nation has a well-motivated president with a belligerent reputation when international tensions diminish (Ronald Reagan) and a president with a pacific reputation when they grow (Abraham Lincoln, who opposed the Mexican War). But a nation is not always lucky.

Transparency. The well-motivated executive might commit to transparency, as a way to reduce the costs to outsiders of monitoring his actions.94 The FDR strategy of inviting potential whistleblowers from the opposite party into government is a special case of this; the implicit threat is that the whistleblower will make public any evidence of partisan motivations. The more ambitious case involves actually exposing the executive’s decisionmaking processes to observation. To the extent that an ill-motivated executive cannot publicly acknowledge his motivations or publicly instruct subordinates to take them into account in decisionmaking, transparency will exclude those motivations from the decisionmaking process. The public will know that only a well-motivated executive would promise transparency in the first place, and the public can therefore draw an inference to credibility.

Credibility is especially enhanced when transparency is effected through journalists with reputations for integrity or with political preferences opposite to those of the president. Thus George W. Bush gave Bob Woodward unprecedented access to White House decisionmaking, and perhaps even to classified intelligence,95 with the expectation that the material would be published. This sort of disclosure to journalists is not real-time transparency – no one expects meetings of the National Security Council to appear on CSPAN – but the anticipation of future disclosure can have a disciplining effect in the present. By inviting this disciplining effect, the administration engages in signaling in the present through (the threat of) future transparency.

There are complex tradeoffs here, because transparency can have a range of harmful effects. As far as process is concerned, decisionmakers under public scrutiny may posture for the audience, may freeze their views or positions prematurely, and may hesitate to offer proposals or reasons for which they can later be blamed if things go wrong.96 As for substance, transparency can frustrate the achievement of programmatic or policy goals themselves. Where security policy is at stake, secrecy is sometimes necessary to surprise enemies or to keep them guessing. Finally, one must take account of the incentives of the actors who expose the facts—especially journalists who might reward presidents who give them access by portraying their decisionmaking in a favorable light.97

We will take up the costs of credibility shortly.98 In general, however, the existence of costs does not mean that the credibility-generating mechanisms are useless. Quite the contrary: where the executive uses such mechanisms, voters and legislators can draw an inference that the executive is well-motivated, precisely because the existence of costs would have given an ill-motivated executive an excuse not to use those mechanisms.

#### Second, unilateralism key

Singer 13

[Singer, director – Center for 21st Century Security and Intelligence @ Brookings, and Wright, senior fellow – Brookings, 2/7/’13

(Peter W. and Thomas, "Obama, own your secret wars", www.nydailynews.com/opinion/obama-secret-wars-article-1.1265620])

It is time for a new approach. And **all that is required** of the President is to do the thing that he does perhaps best of all: to speak.

Obama has a unique opportunity — in fact, an urgent obligation — to create a new doctrine, unveiled in a major presidential speech, for the use and deployment of these new tools of war.

While the Republicans tried to paint the President as weak on security issues in the 2012 elections, history will record instead that his administration pushed into new frontiers of war, most especially in the new class of technologies that move the human role both geographically and chronologically further from the point of action on the battlefield.

The U.S. military’s unmanned systems, popularly known as “drones,” now number more than 8,000 in the air and 12,000 on the ground. And in a parallel development, the U.S. Cyber Command, which became operational in 2010, has added an array of new (and controversial) responsibilities — and is set to quintuple in size.

This is not just a military matter. American intelligence agencies are increasingly using these technologies as the tips of the spear in a series of so-called “shadow wars.” These include not only the more than 400 drone strikes that have taken place from Pakistan to Yemen, but also the deployment of the Stuxnet computer virus to sabotage Iranian nuclear development, the world’s first known use of a specially designed cyber weapon.

Throughout this period, the administration has tried to have it both ways — leaking out success stories of our growing use of these new technologies but not tying its hands with official statements and set policies.

This made great sense at first, when much of what was happening was ad hoc and being fleshed out as it went along.

But that position has become unsustainable. The less the U.S. government now says about our policies, the more that vacuum is becoming filled by others, in harmful ways.

By acting but barely explaining our actions, we’re creating precedents for other states to exploit. More than 75 countries now have military robotics programs, while another 20 have advanced cyber war capacities. Rest assured that nations like Iran, Russia and China will use these technologies in far more crude and indiscriminate ways — yet will do so while claiming to be merely following U.S. footsteps.

In turn, international organizations — the UN among them — are pushing ahead with special investigations into potential war crimes and proposing new treaties.

Our leaders, meanwhile, stay mum, which isolates the U.S. and drains its soft power.

The current policy also makes it harder to respond to growing concerns over civilian casualties. Indeed, Pew polling found 96% levels of opposition to U.S. drones in the key battleground state of Pakistan, a bellwether of the entire region. It is indisputable than many civilians have been harmed over the course of hundreds of strikes. And yet it is also indisputable that various groups have incentives to magnify such claims.

Yet so far, U.S. officials have painted themselves into a corner — either denying that any collateral losses have occurred, which no one believes, or reverting to the argument that we cannot confirm or deny our involvement, which no one believes, either.

Finally, the domestic support and legitimacy needed for the use of these weapons is in transition. Polling has found general public support for drone strikes, but only to a point, with growing numbers in the “not sure” category and growing worries around cases of targeting U.S. citizens abroad who are suspected of being terrorists.

The administration is so boxed in that, even when it recently won a court case to maintain the veil of semi-silence that surrounds the drone strike program, the judge described the current policy as having an “Alice in Wonderland” feel.

The White House seems to be finally starting to realize the problems caused by this disconnect of action but no explanation. After years of silence, occasional statements by senior aides are acknowledging the use of drones, while lesser-noticed working level documents have been created to formalize strike policies and even to explore what to do about the next, far more autonomous generation of weapons.

These efforts have been good starts, but they have been disjointed and partial. Most important, they are missing the **much-needed stamp of the President’s voice and authority**, which is essential to turn tentative first steps into established policy.

Much remains to be done — and said — out in the open.

This is why it’s time for Obama’s voice to ring loud and clear. Much as Presidents Harry Truman and Dwight Eisenhower were able keep secret aspects of the development of nuclear weapons, even as they articulated how and when we would use them, Obama should publicly lay out criteria by which the United States will develop, deploy and use these new weapons.

The President has a strong case to make — if only he would finally make it. After all, the new weapons have worked. They have offered new options for military action that are more accurate and proportionate and less risky than previously available methods.

But they have also posed many new complications. Explaining our position is about embracing both the good and the bad. It is about acknowledging the harms that come with war regardless of what technology is being used and making clear what structures of accountability are in place to respond.

It’s also about finally defining where America truly stands on some of the most controversial questions. These include the tactics of “signature” strikes, where the identity is not firmly identified, and “double tap” strikes, where rescuers aiding victims of a first attack are also brought under fire. These have been reported as occurring and yet seem to run counter to the principles under which the programs have been defended so far.

The role of the President is not to conduct some kind of retrospective of what we have done and why, but to lay out a course of the future. What are the key strategic goals and ethical guidelines that should drive the development and use of these new technologies? Is current U.S. and international law sufficient to cover them?

There are also crucial executive management questions, like where to draw the dividing line between military and civilian intelligence agency use of such technologies, and how to keep a growing range of covert actions from morphing into undeclared and undebated wars.

And, finally, the President must help resolve growing tensions between the executive branch and an increasingly restive Congress, including how to handle situations where we create the effect of war but no U.S. personnel are ever sent in harm’s way.

Given the sprawling complexity of these matters, only the President can deliver an official statement on where we stand. If only we somehow had a commander in chief who was simultaneously a law professor and Nobel Peace Prize winner!

The President’s voice on these issues won’t be a cure-all. But it will lay down a powerful marker, shaping not just the next four years but the actions of future administrations.

#### 1st- Presidential commitments are the gold standard-congress isn’t believed internationally because perceived as a circus

Marvin Kalb 13, Nonresident Senior Fellow at Foreign Policy, James Clark Welling Presidential Fellow, The George Washington University Edward R. Murrow Professor of Practice (Emeritus), Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University, 2013, "The Road to War," book,pg. 7-8, www.brookings.edu/~/media/press/books/2013/theroadtowar/theroadtowar\_samplechapter.pdf

As we learned in Vietnam and in the broader Middle East, a presidential commitment could lead to war, based on miscalculation, misjudgment, or mistrust. It could also lead to reconciliation. We live in a world of uncertainty, where even the word of a president is now questioned in wider circles of critical commentary. On domestic policy, Washington often resembles a political circus detached from reason and responsibility. But on foreign policy, when an international crisis erupts and some degree of global leadership is required, the word or commitment of an American president still represents the gold standard, even if the gold does not glitter as once it did.

#### 3rd International community is swayed by president as the “voice of america” even in the face of congressional opposition

Zbigniew Brzezinski, national security advisor under U.S. President Jimmy Carter, 12/3/12, Obama's Moment, www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/12/03/obamas\_moment

In foreign affairs, the central challenge now facing President Barack Obama is how to regain some of the ground lost in recent years in shaping U.S. national security policy. Historically and politically, in America's system of separation of powers, it is the president who has the greatest leeway for decisive action in foreign affairs. He is viewed by the country as responsible for Americans' safety in an increasingly turbulent world. He is seen as the ultimate definer of the goals that the United States should pursue through its diplomacy, economic leverage, and, if need be, military compulsion. And the world at large sees him -- for better or for worse -- as the authentic voice of America.

To be sure, he is not a dictator. Congress has a voice. So does the public. And so do vested interests and foreign-policy lobbies. The congressional role in declaring war is especially important not when the United States is the victim of an attack, but when the United States is planning to wage war abroad. Because America is a democracy, public support for presidential foreign-policy decisions is essential. But no one in the government or outside it can match the president's authoritative voice when he speaks and then decisively acts for America.

This is true even in the face of determined opposition. Even when some lobbies succeed in gaining congressional support for their particular foreign clients in defiance of the president, for instance, many congressional signatories still quietly convey to the White House their readiness to support the president if he stands firm for "the national interest." And a president who is willing to do so publicly, while skillfully cultivating friends and allies on Capitol Hill, can then establish such intimidating credibility that it is politically unwise to confront him. This is exactly what Obama needs to do now.

### AT: Object Fiat Theory

#### No link: Object of the resolution is “authority” not “war powers”--restricting authority requires reducing the permission to act, not the ability to act.

#### Taylor, 1996 (Ellen, 21 Del. J. Corp. L. 870 (1996), Hein Online)

The term authority is commonly thought of in the context of the law of agency, and the Restatement (Second) of Agency defines both power and authority.'89 Power refers to an agent's ability or capacity to produce a change in a legal relation (whether or not the principal approves of the change), and authority refers to the power given (permission granted) to the agent by the principal to affect the legal relations of the principal; the distinction is between what the agent can do and what the agent may do.

#### First, CP is executive action—obviously avoids Congressional fights

Fine 12

Jeffrey A. Fine, assistant professor of political science at Clemson University. He has published articles in the Journal of Politics, Political Research Quarterly, and Political Behavior. Adam L. Warber is an associate professor of political science at Clemson University. He is the author of Executive Orders and the Modern Presidency, Presidential Studies Quarterly, June 2012, " Circumventing Adversity: Executive Orders and Divided Government", Vol. 42, No. 2, Ebsco

We also should expect presidents to prioritize and be strategic in the types of executive orders that they create to maneuver around a hostile Congress. There are a variety of reasons that can drive a president’s decision. For example, presidents can use an executive order to move the status quo of a policy issue to a position that is closer to their ideal point. By doing so, presidents are able to pressure Congress to respond, perhaps by passing a new law that represents a compromise between the preferences of the president and Congress. Forcing Congress’s hand to enact legislation might be a preferred option for the president, if he perceives Congress to be unable or unwilling to pass meaningful legislation in the ﬁrst place. While it is possible that such unilateral actions might spur Congress to pass a law to modify or reverse a president’s order, such responses by Congress are rare (Howell 2003, 113-117; Warber 2006, 119). Enacting a major policy executive order allows the president to move the equilibrium toward his preferred outcome without having to spend time lining up votes or forming coalitions with legislators. As a result, and since reversal from Congress is unlikely, presidents have a greater incentive to issue major policy orders to overcome legislative hurdles.

# Case

S

### 2NC: Exec Circumvents Congress

#### [4.] Presidents circumvent or force the hand of Congress

Kinsley 2011

[Michael Kinsley, writer for LA Times, March 29, 2011,

Presidents can't declare war? Just watch them, <http://articles.latimes.com/2011/mar/29/opinion/la-oe-kinsley-column-war-powers-20110329>, uwyo//amp]

It really couldn't be clearer. "The Congress shall have power … to declare war." Yet these are probably the most egregiously ignored words in the Constitution. You would think that Republicans, especially, with their showy fondness for "originalism" and "plain meaning" in interpreting the Constitution, would have no problem interpreting the meaning of these words: If a president wants to go to war, he must get the approval of Congress. Presidents of both parties traditionally ignore the congressional war power when they feel like it. Or they wait until the troops are poised for battle — putting Congress in an impossible position — before asking permission.

# Norms

#### Zero chance that U.S. self-restraint causes any other country to give up their plans for drones

Max Boot 11, the Jeane J. Kirkpatrick Senior Fellow in National Security Studies at the Council on Foreign Relations, 10/9/11, “We Cannot Afford to Stop Drone Strikes,” Commentary Magazine, <http://www.commentarymagazine.com/2011/10/09/drone-arms-race/>

The New York Times engages in some scare-mongering today about a drone ams race. Scott Shane notes correctly other nations such as China are building their own drones and in the future U.S. forces could be attacked by them–our forces will not have a monopoly on their use forever. Fair enough, but he goes further, suggesting our current use of drones to target terrorists will backfire:

If China, for instance, sends killer drones into Kazakhstan to hunt minority Uighur Muslims it accuses of plotting terrorism, what will the United States say? What if India uses remotely controlled craft to hit terrorism suspects in Kashmir, or Russia sends drones after militants in the Caucasus? American officials who protest will likely find their own example thrown back at them.

“The problem is that we’re creating an international norm” — asserting the right to strike preemptively against those we suspect of planning attacks, argues Dennis M. Gormley, a senior research fellow at the University of Pittsburgh and author of Missile Contagion, who has called for tougher export controls on American drone technology. “The copycatting is what I worry about most.”

This is a familiar trope of liberal critics who are always claiming we should forego “X” weapons system or capability, otherwise our enemies will adopt it too. We have heard this with regard to ballistic missile defense, ballistic missiles, nuclear weapons, chemical and biological weapons, land mines, exploding bullets, and other fearsome weapons. Some have even suggested the U.S. should abjure the first use of nuclear weapons–and cut down our own arsenal–to encourage similar restraint from Iran.

The argument falls apart rather quickly because it is founded on a false premise: that other nations will follow our example. In point of fact, Iran is hell-bent on getting nuclear weapons no matter what we do; China is hell-bent on getting drones; and so forth. Whether and under what circumstances they will use those weapons remains an open question–but there is little reason to think self-restraint on our part will be matched by equal self-restraint on theirs. Is Pakistan avoiding nuking India because we haven’t used nuclear weapons since 1945? Hardly. The reason is that India has a powerful nuclear deterrent to use against Pakistan. If there is one lesson of history it is a strong deterrent is a better upholder of peace than is unilateral disarmament–which is what the New York Times implicitly suggests.

Imagine if we did refrain from drone strikes against al-Qaeda–what would be the consequence? If we were to stop the strikes, would China really decide to take a softer line on Uighurs or Russia on Chechen separatists? That seems unlikely given the viciousness those states already employ in their battles against ethnic separatists–which at least in Russia’s case already includes the suspected assassination of Chechen leaders abroad. What’s the difference between sending a hit team and sending a drone?

While a decision on our part to stop drone strikes would be unlikely to alter Russian or Chinese thinking, it would have one immediate consequence: al-Qaeda would be strengthened and could regenerate the ability to attack our homeland. Drone strikes are the only effective weapon we have to combat terrorist groups in places like Pakistan or Yemen where we don’t have a lot of boots on the ground or a lot of cooperation from local authorities. We cannot afford to give them up in the vain hope it will encourage disarmament on the part of dictatorial states.

# 1NR

#### We control time frame and magnitude – deal failure draws in global powers and goes nuclear within months

PressTV 11/13

Global nuclear conflict between US, Russia, China likely if Iran talks fail, 11/13/13,<http://www.presstv.ir/detail/2013/11/13/334544/global-nuclear-war-likely-if-iran-talks-fail/>

A global conflict between the US, Russia, and China is likely in the coming months should the world powers fail to reach a nuclear deal with Iran, an American analyst says.¶ “If the talks fail, if the agreements being pursued are not successfully carried forward and implemented, then there would be enormous international pressure to drive towards a conflict with Iran before [US President Barack] Obama leaves office and that’s a very great danger that no one can underestimate the importance of,” senior editor at the Executive Intelligence Review Jeff Steinberg told Press TV on Wednesday. ¶ “The United States could find itself on one side and Russia and China on the other and those are the kinds of conditions that can lead to miscalculation and general roar,” Steinberg said. ¶ “So the danger in this situation is that if these talks don’t go forward, we could be facing a global conflict in the coming months and years and that’s got to be avoided at all costs when you’ve got countries like the United States, Russia, and China with” their arsenals of “nuclear weapons,” he warned.

#### T’s M/E

The Iran Project, group of interested former officials of the US government and professionals in US national security, includes folks like Richard Armitage, Zbigniew Brezezinski, and Paul Volker, “Weighing the Benefits and Costs of Military Action Against Iran”, Wilson Center, 9/11/2012

III. Costs. In addition to the financial costs of conducting military attacks against Iran, which would be significant (particularly if the U.S. had to carry out thousands of sorties and if it had to return to the use of force periodically for years to come), there would likely be near-term costs associated with Iranian retaliation, through both direct and surrogate asymmetrical attacks. Serious costs to U.S. interests would also be felt over the longer term, we believe, with problematic consequences for global and regional stability, including economic stability. A dynamic of escalation, action, and counteraction could produce serious unintended consequences that would significantly increase all of these costs and lead, potentially, to all-out regional war.

#### draw in causes global nuclear conflict – draws in Russia and China AND leads to the detonation of CBW’s- T’s Specific Scenarios

Morgan 09

[Dennis Ray Morgan, Hankuk University of Foreign Studies- South Korea, 10 July 2009, World on fire: two scenarios of the destruction of human civilization and possible extinction of the human race, Futures 41 (2009) 683–693, uwyo//amp]

**Given the present day predicament regarding Iran’s attempt to become a nuclear power, particular attention should be given to one of Moore’s scenarios depicting nuclear war that begins through an attack on Iran’s supposed nuclear facilities**. According to Seymour Hersh [12] **the nuclear option against Iran has, in fact, been discussed** by sources in the Pentagon as a viable option. As Hersh reports, **according to a former intelligence officer, the lack of ‘‘reliable intelligence leaves military planners, given the goal of totally destroying the sites, little choice but to consider the use of tactical nuclear weapons. ‘Every other option, in the view of the nuclear weaponeers, would leave a gap,’** the former senior intelligence official said. ‘Decisive is the key word of the Air Force’s planning. **It’s a tough decision. But we made it in Japan**.’’ [12].10 The official continues to explain **how White House and Pentagon officials are considering the nuclear option for Iran, ‘‘Nuclear planners go through extensive training** and learn the technical details of damage and fallout - we’re talking about mushroom clouds, radiation, mass casualties, and contamination over years. This is not an underground nuclear test, where all you see is the earth raised a little bit. **These politicians don’t have a clue, and whenever anybody tries to get it out – remove the nuclear option – they’re shouted down’’** [12]. Understandably, some members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff were not comfortable about consideration of the nuclear option in a first strike, and some officers have even discussed resigning. Hersh quotes the former intelligence officer as saying, ‘‘Late this winter, the Joint Chiefs of Staff sought to remove the nuclear option from the evolving war plans for Iran - without success. The White House said, ‘Why are you challenging this? The option came from you’’’ [12]. **This scenario has gained even more plausibility since a January 2007 Sunday Times report [13] of an Israeli intelligence leak that Israel was considering a strike against Iran, using low-yield bunker busting nukes to destroy Iran’s supposedly secret underground nuclear facilities. In Moore’s scenario, non-nuclear neighboring countries would then respond with conventional rockets and chemical, biological and radiological weapons. Israel then would retaliate with nuclear strikes on several countries, including a pre-emptive strike against Pakistan, who then retaliates with an attack not only on Israel but pre-emptively striking India as well. Israel then initiates the ‘‘Samson option’’ with attacks on other Muslim countries, Russia, and possibly the ‘‘anti-Semitic’’ cities of Europe. At that point, all-out nuclear war ensues as the U.S. retaliates with nuclear attacks on Russia and possibly on China** as well.11 Out of the four interrelated factors that could precipitate a nuclear strike and subsequent escalation into nuclear war, probably the accidental factor is one that deserves particular attention since its likelihood is much greater than commonly perceived. In an article, ‘‘20 Mishaps that Might Have Started a Nuclear War,’’ Phillips [14] cites the historical record to illustrate how an accident, misinterpretation,or false alarm could ignite a nuclear war. Most of these incidents occurred during a time of intense tension between the U.S. and the Soviet Union in the Cuban Missile Crisis, but other mishaps occurred during other times, with the most recent one in 1995. Close inspection of each of these incidents reveals how likely it is that an ‘‘accident’’ or misinterpretation of phenomena or data (‘‘glitch’’) can lead to nuclear confrontation and war. In his overall analysis, Phillips writes: The probability of actual progression to nuclear war on any one of the occasions listed may have been small, due to planned ‘‘failsafe’’ features in the warning and launch systems, and to responsible action by those in the chain of command when the failsafe features had failed. However, the accumulation of small probabilities of disaster from a long sequence of risks adds up to serious danger. There is no way of telling what the actual level of risk was in these mishaps but if the chance of disaster in every one of the 20 incidents had been only 1 in 100, it is a mathematical fact that the chance of surviving all 20 would have been 82%, i.e. about the same as the chance of surviving a single pull of the trigger at Russian roulette played with a 6- shooter. With a similar series of mishaps on the Soviet side: another pull of the trigger. If the risk in some of the events had been as high as 1 in 10, then the chance of surviving just seven such events would have been less than 50:50. [14]12 **Aggression in the Middle East along with the willingness to use low-yield ‘‘bunker busting’’ nukes by the U.S. only increases the likelihood of nuclear war and catastrophe in the future. White House and Pentagon policy-makers are seriously considering the use of strategic nuclear weapons against Iran**. As Ryan McMaken explains, **someone at the Pentagon who had . . .not yet completed the transformation into a complete sociopath leaked the ‘Nuclear Posture Review’ which outlined plans for a nuclear ‘end game’ with Iraq, Iran, Libya, North Korea, and Syria, none of which possess nuclear weapons. The report also outlined plans to let the missiles fly on Russia and China** as well, even though virtually everyone on the face of the Earth thought we had actually normalized relations with them. **It turns out, much to the surprise of the Chinese and the Russians, that they are still potential enemies in a nuclear holocaust.**

#### T’s NATO

Engdahl`6

[F William,author of A Century of War: Anglo-American Oil Politics and the New World Order) “A high-risk game of nuclear chicken”, 31 January, http://www.sibernews.com/the-news/world-news/a-high%11risk-game-of-nuclear-chicken-200601313615/]

Bush, on the urging of Cheney, Rumsfeld and the neo-conservative hawks, decides to activate Conplan 8022, an air attack bombing of Iran's presumed nuclear sites, including, for the first time since 1945, with deployment of nuclear weapons. No ground troops are used and it is proclaimed a swift surgical "success" by the formidable Pentagon propaganda machine. Iran, prepared for such a possibility, launches a calculated counter-strike using techniques of guerrilla war or "asymmetrical warfare" against US and NATO targets around the world. The Iran response includes activating trained cells within Lebanon's Hezbollah; it includes activating considerable Iranian assets within Iraq, potentially in de facto alliance with the Sunni resistance there targeting the 135,000 remaining US troops and civilian personnel. Iran's asymmetrical response also includes stepping up informal ties to the powerful Hamas within Palestine to win them to a Holy War against the US-Israel "Great Satan" Alliance. Israel faces unprecedented terror and sabotage attacks from every side and from within its territory from sleeper cells of Arab Israelis. Iran activates trained sleeper terror cells in the Ras Tanura center of Saudi oil refining and shipping. The Eastern province of Saudi Arabia around Ras Tanura contains a disenfranchised Shi'ite minority, which has historically been denied the fruits of the immense Saudi oil wealth. There are some 2 million Shi'ite Muslims in Saudi Arabia. Shi'ites do most of the manual work in the Saudi oilfields, making up 40% of Aramco's workforce. Iran declares an immediate embargo of deliveries of its 4 million barrels of oil a day. It threatens to sink a large oil super-tanker in the narrows of the Strait of Hormuz, choking off 40% of all world oil flows, if the world does not join it against the US-Israeli action. The strait has two 1-mile-wide channels for marine traffic, separated by a 2-mile-wide buffer zone, and is the only sea passage to the open ocean for much of OPEC oil. It is Saudi Arabia's main export route. Iran is a vast, strategically central expanse of land, more than double the land area of France and Germany combined, with well over 70 million people and one of the fastest population growth rates in the world. It is well prepared for a new Holy War. Its mountainous terrain makes any thought of a US ground occupation inconceivable at a time the Pentagon is having problems retaining its present force to maintain the Iraq and Afghanistan occupations. World War III begins in a series of miscalculations and disruptions. The Pentagon's awesome war machine, "total spectrum dominance" is powerless against the growing "asymmetrical war" assaults around the globe.

### 2NC – No Iran Sanctions Wall

#### Obama has perceptually won the battle over sanctions—but it is close and pressure is mounting

Crittenden 2-5

(Michael, Wall Street Journal. “Congress Eases Standoff With White House Over Iran Sanctions” 2-5-14 https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/#inbox/1440308321fc2858//wyoccd)

WASHINGTON—The Obama administration appeared to be prevailing in its effort to persuade lawmakers to give U.S. diplomacy with Iran a chance, but faced continued skepticism from senators at a hearing Tuesday.¶ Senior aides said pressure on Senate leaders to allow a vote on new sanctions has eased in recent weeks, as lawmakers gauge the effectiveness of an interim deal reached in November between Iran and world powers.¶ But while many lawmakers said they were willing to give diplomacy time to work, Democrats and Republicans alike said the stakes were high if talks fail.¶ "If these negotiations fail, there are two grim alternatives, a nuclear Iran, or war, or perhaps both," said Sen. Richard Durbin (D., Ill.), a Senate Foreign Relations Committee member.¶ The White House and lawmakers have wrestled over the issue for months. Many in Congress support new sanctions, while the administration insists such a step would disrupt high-level negotiations with Tehran. A six-month deal provides Iran with relief from international sanctions in exchange for enhanced inspections and Tehran's agreement to halt or roll back parts of its nuclear program.¶ Sen. Robert Menendez (D., N.J.), chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, argued the agreement provides Iran with economic benefits that outpace what Western governments have received in return. He said he remained concerned Iran would never agree to fully put aside its nuclear ambitions.¶ "I am convinced that we should only relieve pressure on Iran in return for verifiable concessions that will fundamentally dismantle Iran's nuclear program," Mr. Menendez said.¶ A top State Department official argued that any move by the U.S. to impose new sanctions would risk unraveling the international talks. "It is crucial we give diplomacy a chance to succeed," Wendy Sherman, the State Department undersecretary of political affairs, told the Foreign Relations panel.¶ President Barack Obama and his administration have urged lawmakers to hold off on additional actions. Mr. Obama vowed in his State of the Union address to veto any bill "that threatens to derail these talks."¶ Lawmakers have bristled at some of the White House criticism, particularly the suggestion that those seeking more sanctions were in favor of war. Sen. Timothy Kaine (D., Va.), addressing those complaints Tuesday, said that those who support new sanctions "are not pro-war and those that oppose it are not soft on Iran or anti-Israel."¶ "We all want exactly the same thing…we all will prefer if we can get to that diplomatically," Mr. Kaine said.¶ Ms. Sherman, stepping back from the more strident administration language, agreed.¶ "I don't believe anyone prefers war," she said, calling the two sides' positions a difference over tactics.

#### White House push back has blocked sanctions—Pressure on Reid means no vote

Johnson 1/30

(Luke – Huffington Post, “Iran Sanctions Bill 'On Ice' As Momentum Fades In Senate “, 2014, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2014/01/30/iran-sanctions-bill\_n\_4696197.html)

Another Senate Democratic leadership aide **wouldn't go so far as to call the legislation dead**, but conceded, "Its forward momentum **has been stopped** and even reversed." Both aides requested anonymity in order to speak candidly. The bipartisan bill had been gaining steam over the past two months, picking up a whopping 58 cosponsors -- including 15 Democrats. The measure would boost sanctions on Iran unless it agrees to halt all of its uranium enrichment. But the **White House has been pushing back hard** against any congressional action on Iran sanctions, warning it could thwart a delicate deal in place between Iran and six world powers. Under that six-month deal, Iran would scale back its uranium enrichment in exchange for sanctions relief. Iranian leaders have already warned that any new sanctions would sink the deal, which would leave the U.S. with few options for resolving concerns with Iran apart from going to war. The White House **pressure has paid off**. Reid has refused to bring the bill up for a vote, and during Tuesday's State of the Union, Obama made it clear he would veto the measure if it even made it to his desk. Since then, at least three Democratic cosponsors of the bill have **walked back their support** for taking it up. Several senators acknowledged Thursday that the bill isn't going anywhere, at least not anytime soon. "We want to give the administration the time it needs to negotiate," said Sen. Michael Bennet (D-Colo.), a cosponsor of the bill and the chairman of the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee. Asked if his Democratic colleagues are prepared to hold off on pushing the bill amid international negotiations with Iran, he said, "That's my sense." "There's no time frame," said Sen. Ben Cardin (D-Md.), a cosponsor of the bill. "That's up to the majority leader, he's the one who schedules votes ... I've always been comfortable with the fact that our first preference is a negotiated agreement." "Do I think it's going to be brought up? No," said Sen. Carl Levin (D-Mich.). "And I hope it isn't brought up." Republican proponents of the bill conceded the White House has won this round, but said that's a bad thing. "The **pressure from the administration** has made people, **particularly Harry Reid, who's the key guy, back off of it**," said Sen. John McCain (R-Ariz.).

#### No votes coming now- Obama PC

Kaper 2-3

(Stacy, National Journal. “How Obama Won the War on Iran Sanctions” 2-3-14 http://www.defenseone.com/politics/2014/02/how-obama-won-war-iran-sanctions/78020//wyoccd)

The push for new sanctions on Iran has stalled. The Democrats who bucked President Obama to back the sanctions bill are backpedaling mightily—no longer even pretending they’re pushing Harry Reid to hold a vote on the measure. And while there’s still plenty of chest-pounding and posturing, the debate’s end result seems clear: The Senate will wait, at least so long as the negotiations move in the right direction.¶ That’s a full flip from just more than a month ago. Before the December recess, the Senate’s pro-sanctions faction was surging. Senators—including Democrats who are typically Obama loyalists—were agreeing with Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu’s claim that the nuclear negotiations with Iran bordered on capitulation.So how did Obama—a supposedly feckless president when it comes to handling Congress—turn the tide?¶ Obama’s in-person, all-hands-on-deck advocacy campaign with the Senate appears to have advanced his cause, but it’s not that simple.¶ The president combined tangible developments abroad with fervent support from the Left, and used it to win out over a fracturing Israel lobby. In the process, he won—at least for now—a foreign policy victory just as his critics were insisting Obama’s age of influence was over.¶ “It’s a combination of one side not doing that much and the other side doing a lot. The AIPAC guys have not been calling us and usually we would be hearing from them,” a Democratic Senate aide said. AIPAC is shorthand for the American Israel Public Affairs Committee, Washington’s best-known pro-Israel lobby group.¶ Obama started by reaching out to Congress in their house and his: He sent envoys, including Secretary of State John Kerry, to Capitol Hill, and he invited key players to a White House meeting to make a case that independent Sen. Angus King of Maine labeled “incredibly powerful.”

### 2NC Link Wall

#### [1.] Political capital link – Congressional criticism forces Obama to expend energy defending or changing his policy which forces a zero sum drop off of political capital necessary to accomplish his foreign policy goals – Kriner 10 – prefer our ev because cites historical example of Vietnam and political science theorists.

#### [2.] Losers lose link – plan is a perceived loss for Obama that saps his capital- answers your Plan increases cap

Loomis, 7 --- Department of Government at Georgetown

(3/2/2007, Dr. Andrew J. Loomis is a Visiting Fellow at the Center for a New American Security, “Leveraging legitimacy in the crafting of U.S. foreign policy,” pg 35-36, <http://citation.allacademic.com//meta/p_mla_apa_research_citation/1/7/9/4/8/pages179487/p179487-36.php>)

Declining political authority encourages defection. American political analyst Norman Ornstein writes of the domestic context, ¶ In a system where a President has limited formal power, perception matters. The reputation for success—the belief by other political actors that even when he looks down, a president will find a way to pull out a victory—is the most valuable resource a chief executive can have. Conversely, the widespread belief that the Oval Office occupant is on the defensive, on the wane or without the ability to win under adversity can lead to disaster, as individual lawmakers calculate who will be on the winning side and negotiate accordingly. In simple terms, winners win and losers lose more often than not. ¶ Failure begets failure. In short, a president experiencing declining amounts of political capital has diminished capacity to advance his goals. As a result, political allies perceive a decreasing benefit in publicly tying themselves to the president, and an increasing benefit in allying with rising centers of authority. A president’s incapacity and his record of success are interlocked and reinforce each other. Incapacity leads to political failure, which reinforces perceptions of incapacity. This feedback loop accelerates decay both in leadership capacity and defection by key allies. ¶ The central point of this review of the presidential literature is that the sources of presidential influence—and thus their prospects for enjoying success in pursuing preferred foreign policies—go beyond the structural factors imbued by the Constitution. Presidential authority is affected by ideational resources in the form of public perceptions of legitimacy. The public offers and rescinds its support in accordance with normative trends and historical patterns, non-material sources of power that affects the character of U.S. policy, foreign and domestic.¶ This brief review of the literature suggests how legitimacy norms enhance presidential influence in ways that structural powers cannot explain. Correspondingly, increased executive power improves the prospects for policy success. As a variety of cases indicate—from Woodrow Wilson’s failure to generate domestic support for the League of Nations to public pressure that is changing the current course of U.S. involvement in Iraq—the effective execution of foreign policy depends on public support. Public support turns on perceptions of policy legitimacy. As a result, policymakers—starting with the president—pay close attention to the receptivity that U.S. policy has with the domestic public. In this way, normative influences infiltrate policy-making processes and affect the character of policy decisions.¶ **Political capital is finite --- the plan would tradeoff with domestic economic priorities** ¶ **Moore, 9/10** --- Guardian's US finance and economics editor¶ (Heidi, 9/10/2013, “Syria: the great distraction; Obama is focused on a conflict abroad, but the fight he should be gearing up for is with Congress on America's economic security,” [http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2013/sep/10/obama-syria-what-about-sequester)](http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2013/sep/10/obama-syria-what-about-sequester%29))¶ Before President Obama speaks to the nation about Syria tonight, take a look at what this fall will look like inside America.¶ There are 49 million people in the country who suffered inadequate access to food in 2012, leaving the percentage of "food-insecure" Americans at about one-sixth of the US population. At the same time, Congress refused to pass food-stamp legislation this summer, pushing it off again and threatening draconian cuts.¶ **The country will crash into the debt ceiling in mid-October, which would be an economic disaster, especially with a government shutdown looming at the same time. These are deadlines that Congress already learned two years ago not to toy with, but memories appear to be preciously short.**¶ The Federal Reserve needs a new chief in three months, someone who will help the country confront its raging unemployment crisis that has left 12 million people without jobs. The president has promised to choose a warm body within the next three weeks, despite the fact that his top pick, Larry Summers, would likely spark an ugly confirmation battle – the "fight of the century," according to some – with a Congress already unwilling to do the President's bidding.¶ Congress was supposed to pass a farm bill this summer, but declined to do so even though the task is already two years late. As a result, the country has no farm bill, leaving agricultural subsidies up in the air, farmers uncertain about what their financial picture looks like, and a potential food crisis on the horizon.¶ The two main housing agencies, Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, have been in limbo for four years and are desperately in need of reform that should start this fall, but there is scant attention to the problem.¶ These are the problems going unattended by the Obama administration while his aides and cabinet members have been wasting the nation's time making the rounds on television and Capitol Hill stumping for a profoundly unpopular war. The fact that all this chest-beating was for naught, and an easy solution seems on the horizon, belies the single-minded intensity that the Obama White House brought to its insistence on bombing Syria.¶ More than one wag has suggested, with the utmost reason, that if Obama had brought this kind of passion to domestic initiatives, the country would be in better condition right now. As it is, public policy is embarrassingly in shambles at home while the administration throws all of its resources and political capital behind a widely hated plan to get involved in a civil war overseas.¶ The upshot for the president may be that it's easier to wage war with a foreign power than go head-to-head with the US Congress, even as America suffers from neglect.¶ This is the paradox that President Obama is facing this fall, as he appears to turn his back on a number of crucial and urgent domestic initiatives in order to spend all of his meager political capital on striking Syria.¶ Syria does present a significant humanitarian crisis, which has been true for the past two years that the Obama administration has completely ignored the atrocities of Bashar al-Assad.¶ Two years is also roughly the same amount of time that key domestic initiatives have also gone ignored as Obama and Congress engage in petty battles for dominance and leave the country to run itself on a starvation diet imposed by sequestration cuts. Leon Panetta tells the story of how he tried to lobby against sequestration only to be told:¶ Leon, you don't understand. The Congress is resigned to failure.¶ Similarly, those on Wall Street, the Federal Reserve, those working at government agencies, and voters themselves have become all too practiced at ignoring the determined incompetence of those in Washington.¶ **Political capital – the ability to horse-trade and win political favors from a receptive audience – is a finite resource in Washington. Pursuing misguided policies takes up time, but it also eats up credibility in asking for the next favor.** It's fair to say that **congressional Republicans**, particularly in the House, **have no love for Obama and are likely to oppose anything he supports. That's exactly the reason the White House should stop proposing policies as if it is scattering buckshot and focus with intensity on the domestic tasks it wants to accomplish, one at a time.**

#### [3.] Presidential flexibility link - Independent of the political capital debate plan undermines negotiations with Iran because it sends signal that congress is taking greater foreign policy authority - Obama’s perceived flexibility is key to ensure diplomatic success.

**Benen**, writer for MSNBC and producer of the Rachel Maddow show, **9/20**/2013

(Steve, “When crises become opportunities,” http://maddowblog.msnbc.com/\_news/2013/09/20/20599445-when-crises-become-opportunities?lite)

When it comes to the Middle East, progress has never moved in a straight line. There are fits and starts, ebbs and flows. There are heartening breakthroughs and crushing disappointments, occasionally at the same time.¶ That said, while the domestic political establishment's attention seems focused elsewhere, there's reason to believe new opportunities are materializing in the region in ways that were **hard to even imagine up until very recently**.¶ This morning, for example, the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW) announced that Syria has taken its first steps towards detailing its stockpiles. Michael Luhan, a spokesperson for the Hague-based chemical weapons regulator, said in a statement, "The OPCW has received an initial disclosure from the Syrian Government of its chemical weapons programme, which is now being examined by the Technical Secretariat of the Organisation."¶ Meanwhile, Iranian President Hasan Rouhani has a new op-ed in the Washington Post arguing that the United States and the rest of the world "must work together to end the unhealthy rivalries and interferences that fuel violence and drive us apart" through a policy of "constructive engagement."¶ The New York Times added that **Iranian leaders**, "**seizing on perceived flexibility** in a private letter **from** President **Obama**, **have decided to gamble on** forging **a swift agreement over their nuclear program with the goal of ending crippling sanctions**."¶ David Sanger summarized the bigger picture nicely.¶ Only two weeks after Washington and the nation were debating a unilateral military strike on Syria that was also intended as a forceful warning to Iran about its nuclear program, President Obama finds himself at the opening stages of two unexpected diplomatic initiatives with America's biggest adversaries in the Middle East, each fraught with opportunity and danger.¶ Without much warning, diplomacy is suddenly alive again after a decade of debilitating war in the region. After years of increasing tension with Iran, there is talk of finding a way for it to maintain a face-saving capacity to produce a very limited amount of nuclear fuel while allaying fears in the United States and Israel that it could race for a bomb.¶ The surprising progress has come so suddenly that a senior American diplomat described this week's developments as "head spinning."¶ So what happens next?¶ The consensus among many foreign policy observers is that developments in Syria and Iran are linked in ways that may or may not be helpful to the United States. Max Fisher explained well yesterday that President **Obama's pragmatism** "**has sent exactly the right signals to Iran**, particularly **at this** very **sensitive moment**."¶ Obama has been consistently clear, even if some members of his administration were not, that his big overriding goal is for Syrian leader Bashar al-Assad to stop using chemical weapons. First he was going to do that with strikes, meant to coerce Assad. Then, in response to the Russian proposal, Obama signaled he would back off the strikes if Assad gave up his chemical weapons, which is exactly what Obama has always said he wants. **He's been consistent as well as flexible**, **which gave Assad big incentives to cooperate** when he might have otherwise dug in his heels.¶ There are some awfully significant -- and promising -- parallels here with the U.S. standoff with Iran. Obama has been clear that he wants Iran to give up its rogue uranium-enrichment program and submit to the kind of rigorous inspections that would guarantee that its nuclear program is peaceful. **He's** also **been clear that the U**nited **S**tates is using severe economic sanctions to coerce Tehran to cooperate and that it **would use military force if necessary**. § Marked 16:50 § The implicit (and sometimes explicit) message to Iran has been: If you abandon your enrichment program, we'll make it worth your while by easing off.¶ Here's where the parallel with Syria is really important: Iranian leaders distrust the United States deeply and fear that Obama would betray them by not holding up his end of the bargain. That's been a major hurdle to any U.S.-Iran nuclear deal. But seeing Assad's deal with Obama work out (so far) sends the message to Iran that it can trust the United States. It also sends the message that making concessions to the United States can pay off. **Iran's supreme leader has been talking a lot lately about** flexibility and **diplomacy toward the West**. **So it's an ideal moment for Obama to be demonstrating flexibility** and diplomacy toward the Middle East.

### 2NC AT: Obama Doesn’t Fight Plan

#### [1.] Still links - even if Obama doesn’t fight the plan it forces him to spend time defending his previous foreign policy and answering those who the plan doesn’t appease.

#### [2.] Obama fights the plan – strongly supports war powers

Rana 11 (Aziz – Assistant Professor of Law, Cornell Law School, “TEN QUESTIONS: RESPONSES TO THE TEN QUESTIONS”, 2011, 37 Wm. Mitchell L. Rev. 5099, lexis)

Thus, for many legal critics of executive power, the election of Barack Obama as President appeared to herald a new approach to security concerns and even the possibility of a fundamental break from Bush-era policies. These hopes were immediately stoked by Obama's decision before taking office to close the Guantanamo Bay prison. n4 Over two years later, however, not only does Guantanamo remain open, but through a recent executive order Obama has formalized a system of indefinite detention for those held there and also has stated that new military commission trials will begin for Guantanamo detainees. n5 More important, in ways small and large, the new administration remains committed to core elements of the previous constitutional vision of national security. Just as their predecessors, Obama officials continue to defend expansive executive detention and war powers and to promote the centrality of state secrecy to national security.

### 2NC- Obama PC Key

#### [1.] Political capital is key and being spent on preventing Iran sanctions now – that’s Rubin and Krushaar

#### Obama’s using his pc to hold off strong democrat support for sanctions now and keep Reid from calling it to the floor – signals of weakness to Obama political capital cause democrats to turn their back on Obama, triggers a vote and sanctions.

#### [2.] PC key—forces dems to back off and strong arm repubs

Raju and Everett 2-6

(Manu and Burgess, Politico. “Bill Clinton urges delay on Iran sanctions” 2-6-14 http://www.politico.com/story/2014/02/bill-clinton-iran-sanctions-103219.html//wyoccd)

But Senate Republicans, and a number of hawkish Senate Democrats, have long been skeptical of the talks and are deeply distrustful of Iran, arguing that failing to impose stricter sanctions on the country will only aid its pursuit of nuclear weapons.¶ Led by Sens. Mark Kirk (R-Ill.) and Robert Menendez (D-N.J.), a large bipartisan group of senators is pushing legislation to drastically limit Iran’s ability to export petroleum if the Islamic Republic breaks the conditions of an interim agreement or abandons a permanent nuclear deal with global powers. It also would require a dramatic rollback of Iran’s nuclear program as a condition for further lifting existing sanctions.¶ But the White House is increasing pressure by urging Senate Democrats who back the bill to avoid acting until after the six-months of negotiations play out. After Obama made a similar case during his State of the Union address, several Democrats who back the sanctions bill — like Sen. Chris Coons of Delaware — privately urged party leaders to postpone a vote for now.¶ “I think most of us feel these negotiations should have a chance,” Senate Majority Whip Dick Durbin (D-Ill.) said Thursday. “The alternative to Iran negotiations are to a nuclear-armed Iran, which is unacceptable, or a war, equally unacceptable. We have to give these negotiations a chance.”¶ As Democrats toned down their rhetoric, Republicans have increasingly pushed Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-Nev.) to schedule a vote on the issue, including in a Thursday letter to the Nevada Democrat, which was signed by 42 GOP senators.¶ “Now we have come to a crossroads,” the Republicans wrote in the letter spearheaded by Kirk. “Will the Senate allow Iran to keep its illicit nuclear infrastructure in place, rebuild its teetering economy and ultimately develop nuclear weapons at some point in the future — or will the Senate stand firm on behalf of the American people and insist that any final agreement with Iran must dismantle the regime’s illicit nuclear infrastructure and preclude the world’s foremost state sponsor of terrorism from ever producing nuclear weapons?”¶ Reid lashed out at the Republicans when asked about the issue on Thursday.¶ “It’s not a partisan issue,” Reid said. “It’s a serious, serious situation. For me to receive a totally partisan letter, we should not make this a partisan issue, and that’s what 42 Republicans have done. And I think it’s wrong.”¶ Reid wouldn’t respond when asked if he would schedule the measure for a vote before the negotiations conclude.

### 2NC AT: Uniqueness overwhelms link

#### 1NC Rubin and Kraushaar answers this:

#### [1.] – there’s bipartisan support, continuing republican pressure, and serious pressure on democrats to pass the bill - balancing party support, commitment to Israel and the administration. Democratic senate leadership is holding off now.

#### [2.] Begs the question of political capital key – only avoiding a drop in Obama’s pc can prevent passage of the bill and it’s the credible overdrive effort of the administration preventing the bill from coming to vote. Without it democratic leadership will err on the side of Israel and congressional benefits rather than the administration.

#### [3.] New wave of Republican pressure will force a vote and sway people on the fence, consistent PC is key

Rogin 2-5

(Josh, Daily Beast. “GOP Will Force Reid to Save Obama’s Iran Policy—Over and Over Again” 2-5-14 http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2014/02/05/gop-will-force-reid-to-save-obama-s-iran-policy-over-and-over-again.html//wyoccd)

The Republican Senate caucus is planning to use every parliamentary trick in the book to push Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid to allow a floor vote on a new Iran sanctions bill that the Obama administration strenuously opposes.¶ The Obama White House has succeeded in keeping most Democrats in line against supporting quick passage of the “Nuclear Weapon Free Iran Act,” which currently has 59 co-sponsors, including 13 Democrats. Reid has faithfully shelved the bill, pending the outcome of negotiations between Iran and the world’s major powers—the so-called “P5+1.”¶ “But tomorrow, Republicans plan to respond by using an array of floor tactics—including bringing up the bill and forcing Reid to publicly oppose it—as a means of putting public pressure on Reid and Democrats who may be on the fence.¶ Now we have come to a crossroads. Will the Senate allow Iran to keep its illicit nuclear infrastructure in place, rebuild its teetering economy and ultimately develop nuclear weapons at some point in the future?” 42 GOP senators wrote in a letter sent to Reid late Wednesday and obtained by The Daily Beast. “The answer to this question will be determined by whether you allow a vote on S. 1881, the bipartisan Nuclear Weapon Free Iran Act, which is cosponsored by more than half of the Senate.”¶ The GOP letter calls on Reid to allow a vote on the bill during the current Senate work period—in other words, before the chamber’s next recess. Senate GOP aides said that until they get a vote, GOP senators are planning to use a number of procedural tools at their disposal to keep this issue front and center for Democrats. Since the legislation is already on the Senate’s legislative calendar, any senator can bring up the bill for a vote at any time and force Democrats to publicly object. ¶ Senators can also try attaching the bill as an amendment to future bills under consideration. Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell has been a harsh critic of Reid’s shelving of the bill, so he could demand a vote on it as a condition of moving any other legislation.¶ If those amendments are blocked by Reid, Senators can then go to the floor and make speech after speech calling out Reid for ignoring a bill supported by 59 senators—and calling on fence-sitting Democrats to declare their position on the bill.¶ “This letter is a final warning to Harry Reid that if Democrats want to block this bipartisan legislation, they will own the results of this foreign policy disaster,” one senior GOP senate aide said.¶ The Republican senators believe, based on recent polls, that the majority of Americans support moving forward with the Iran sanctions bill now. They also believe that if Reid did allow a vote, the bill would garner more than the 59 votes of its co-sponsors and that Democrats vulnerable in 2014 races would support it, pushing the vote total past a veto-proof two-thirds supermajority.¶ “I stand with the majority of Americans who want Iran’s illicit nuclear infrastructure dismantled before economic sanctions are lifted,” Sen. Mark Kirk, one of the bill’s sponsors, told The Daily Beast. “The American people deserve a vote on the bipartisan Nuclear Weapon Free Iran Act.”¶ Besides McConnell and Kirk, other senators prepared to lead the effort to demand a vote on the bill include Marco Rubio and Lindsey Graham.¶ The bill would do three things: reimpose existing sanctions suspended under the interim agreement if Iran cheats on its commitments; ensure that a final agreement must require Iran to dismantle its illicit nuclear infrastructure; and threaten to impose additional economic sanctions in the future should Iran cheat on its commitments or fail to agree to a final deal that dismantles its nuclear infrastructure.¶ Last week, Iranian President Hassan Rouhani told CNN’s Fareed Zakaria (Iranian President Hassan Rouhani told CNN’s Fareed Zakaria) that Iran would never dismantle centrifuges under any circumstances. Iran’s top nuclear negotiator said last month that interim steps Iran has taken to curtail its nuclear activities could be reversed within one day.¶ During his State of the Union address last month, President Obama pledged to veto the bill if it reached his desk. Speaking with CNN’s Jake Tapper Wednesday, Secretary of State John Kerry urged the senate not to pass the measure.¶ “I believe it’s a mistake now to break faith with a negotiating process when you’re in the middle of the process. The United States of America agreed, together with our P5+1 allies, with Russia, China, France, Great Britain, Germany, all of them agreed that during the time we’re negotiating, we would not increase sanctions,” said Kerry. “Now, our word has to mean something, too. If we’re going to negotiate, we don’t want to be responsible for now creating a dynamic where we destroy the negotiations… so they can blame us for not getting there.”

### Case

#### Impact inevitable- Continued economic decline will crush NATO

Daniel Hamilton et al, Richard von Weizsäcker Professor and Director of the Center for Transatlantic Relations at the Paul H. Nitze School of Advanced International Studies (SAIS), Feb. 2009 (“Alliance Reborn: An Atlantic Compact for the 21st Century” http://foreign.senate.gov/testimony/2009/HamiltonTestimony090506p.pdf)

First, we must tackle immediate economic challenges while positioning our economies for the future. Few issues are likely to shape European-American relations over the next few years as the global economic crisis. This epochal event has erased any doubt about how interconnected the transatlantic economy has become. The deeper and more prolonged the economic recession of 2009, the greater the risks of inward, insular policies on both sides of the Atlantic. Our common challenge is to show our citizens and millions around the world that it is possible to reap globalization’s benefits while making its costs bearable to those most directly affected, without succumbing to protectionist temptations. This requires more than large dollops of fiscal and monetary stimuli. Bolder thinking and action are needed.