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AT: T—Substantially Reduce

1. We meet—Plan restricts the use and presence of all drone technology in Afghanistan. The 1AC says drones are a major portion of US military presence in Afghanistan.

2. Counter-interpretation—

A. Substantially means considerably or in an ample way

Encarta, 09 (Encarta World English Dictionary, http://encarta.msn.com/encnet/features/dictionary/DictionaryResults.aspx?refid=1861716589)

sub·stan·tial·ly adverb  Definition:   1. considerably: in an extensive, substantial, or ample way

B. Substantially is always relative to context – their percentage def from a random court case is moot

Words and Phrases 95(Vol. 40, 1995, p. 458).

In State v. Rose the court held that “the term ‘substantially’ is relative and must be considered within the context of the particular fact situation; in essence, it means less than totally or the whole, but more than imaginary”

C. Reduce means to make smaller

Webster’s 93 (Webster’s Third New International Dictionary)

reduce   vb  -ED/-ING/-S **b (1)**  : to diminish in size, amount, extent, or number **:** make smaller**:** LESSEN, SHRINK

AT: T—Substantially Reduce

3. We meet the counter-interpretation—Drones represent a considerable portion of current US military presence in Afghanistan

Iqbal, 6/19 [Anwar Iqbal, Dawn.com, 6/19/10, http://www.dawn.com/wps/wcm/connect/dawn-content-library/dawn/the-newspaper/front-page/13+us-plans-75pc-increase-in-drone-operations-320-za-05.]

The US defence budget for 2011 seeks more funds to enhance drone operations by 75 per cent, citing its success in targeting militants in Afghanistan and Pakistan’s tribal belt. “With this funding, we will increase the unmanned Predator and Reaper orbits from 37 to 65, while enhancing our ability to process, exploit and disseminate information gathered by this game-changing technology,” said Chairman of the US Joint Chiefs of Staff Admiral Mike Mullen. “As we’ve seen firsthand through eight years of war, intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance assets are absolutely critical enablers for the war-fighter,” he said. US Defence Secretary Robert Gates, while briefing journalists on the 2011 budget, said the new drones would be added to the American military’s arsenal “in a couple of years” and these would be “the most advanced UAVs”. On Monday afternoon, the Pentagon sent a $708 billion defence budget proposal to Congress, reflecting a shift in the US military strategy from conventional wars to counter-insurgency. The three separate requests include the $548.9 billion fiscal 2011 base budget, $159.3 billion fiscal 2011 overseas contingency operations proposal and the $33 billion fiscal 2010 supplemental. The counter-insurgency budget funds US operations in Afghanistan, Pakistan and Iraq. The supplemental covers costs of implementing President Obama’s new strategy for Afghanistan and Pakistan. The budget also allocates funds for more helicopters in Afghanistan and for adding two more army combat aviation brigades. US special operations forces will also be increased with 2,800 more commandos. The budget “provides our troops what they’ll need to complete a responsible drawdown in Iraq and execute the president’s strategy in Afghanistan and Pakistan,” said Admiral Mullen. Secretary Gates noted that “achieving our objectives in Afghanistan and Iraq has moved to the top of the institutional military’s budgeting, policy and programme priorities”. “America’s ability to deal with threats for years to come will depend importantly on our success in the current conflicts,” he said. Although the $3.8 trillion budget President Obama announced on Monday is the third budget in a row with a deficit of more than $1 trillion, it boosts the defence outlay by 3.4 per cent over the 2010 enacted level. Failing states The Pentagon’s budget and strategy include a new emphasis on preparing to deal with failed or collapsing states by boosting security assistance, through weapons and training, with an additional $150 million. “In a world where, arguably, the most likely and lethal threats will emanate from failed or fractured states, building the security capacity of partners has emerged as a key capability for us,” said Mr Gates. The Pentagon also will continue to work overseas to try to halt the flow of weapons to dangerous regions and will add funds to US nuclear weapons and infrastructure to modernise an ageing arsenal needed to deter nuclear states. The fiscal 2011 budget requests additional steps to fill what Mr Gates called “persistent shortfalls that have plagued recent military efforts, especially in Afghanistan”. These include accelerated training of Afghan national security forces; $1 billion to complete a mine-resistant, ambush-protected programme, $3.4 billion to sustain protective programmes for US forces; and $1 billion for the Commander’s Emergency Response Funds. The Quadrennial Defence Review, also released on Monday, reflected the budget’s emphasis on counter-insurgency, lists China as one of America’s main “potentially hostile” nations, along with North Korea and Iran. The new strategy abandons the decades-long policy of maintaining large numbers of troops and weapons that could fight two major regional wars at the same time, for example in the Middle East and Asia. The immediate priority of US military strategy will be the “substantial” forces in Afghanistan and Iraq as Pentagon believes that the conflicts “will substantially determine the size and shape of major elements of US military forces for several years”. “In the mid- to long-term, we expect there to be enduring operational requirements in Afghanistan and elsewhere to defeat Al Qaeda and its allies,” the report said.

4. Reasons to prefer:

A. Contextual—Each topic country has a different type of military presence. Our interpretation recognizes that and forces affs to defend that the reduction in their plan is substantial for that particular country.

B. Predictable—Their interp is a random number selected by the neg. This is not predictable. Predictability key to research and education.

C. Aff ground—It is impossible to quantify certain aspects of our military presence—Military presence can includes troops, budget, equipment, technology, intelligence, etc. There is no way to quantify that.

5. Not a voting issue—Reasonability is a better way to judge a debate. The aff is at the heart of the topic.

1AR T—Substantially Ext.

One percent reductions can be "substantial" if the degree of reliance is extremely high

Lee 94 (Thomas, September, 72 N.C.L. Rev. 1633, lexis)

The Fourth Circuit easily concluded that the city had entered contracts with its employees upon enacting the Ordinance of Estimates, 31 and that the salary reductions constituted an impairment of these contracts. 32 Second, the court determined that the **nearly one-percent pay reduction was substantial** 33 because the level of compensation was a contractual inducement upon which the plaintiffs had especially relied. 34

Percentage tests obscures complexity of the terms

Leo 08(Kevin Leo\*\* J.D. Candidate, Spring 2008, Hastings College of the Law. Hastings Business Law Journal Spring, 2008 4 Hastings Bus. L.J. 297 LEXIS)

In contrast, **the court in Haswell v. United States** held that spending over sixteen percent of an organization's time on lobbying was substantial. n83 The court **found that applying a strict percentage test to determine whether activities are substantial would be inappropriate**, since [\*308] such a test "obscures the complexity of balancing the organization's activities in relation to its objectives and circumstances in the context of the totality of the organization." n84

AT: Topicality—Military Presence is Troops

1. We meet—Drones require military personnel and troops. Even though they fly without crews, they require crews for their operations.

2. Counter-interpretation

Military Presence is a class of activities for military and security objectives, including training forces, defending US interests, intelligence gathering and security efforts

Thomason et al. 2002 (James S. Thomason, Project Leader on Report for the Undersecretary of Defense, AND Senior Analyst of Strategy, Forces and Resources Division at the Institute for Defense Analyses.

Michael P. Fischerkeller, Kongdan Oh Hassig, Charles Hawkins, Gene Porter, Robert J. Atwell, Robert Bovey, William E. Cralley, James Delaney, “Transforming US Overseas Military Presence: Evidence and Options for DoD Volume I: Main Report” July 2002, http://www.bayan.ph/us%20war%20of%20terror/US%20BASES/US%20Mil%20Presence%20Overseas.pdf)

Overseas military presence activities are generally viewed as a subset of the overall class of activities that the US government uses in its efforts to promote important military/security objectives [Dismukes, 1994]. A variety of recurrent, overseas military activities are normally placed under the “umbrella” concept of military presence. These include but are not limited to US military efforts overseas to train foreign militaries; to improve inter-operability of US and friendly forces; to peacefully and visibly demonstrate US commitment and/or ability to defend US interests; to gain intelligence and familiarity with a locale; to conduct peacekeeping activities; and to position relevant, capable US military assets such that they are likely to be available sooner rather than later in case an evolving security operation or contingency should call for them.

3. We meet the counter interpretation—The purposes of UAVs prove they’re topical

A. Surveillance

FAS Intelligence Resource Program, 5/11/10, http://www.fas.org/irp/program/collect/uav.htm

Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (UAVs) are remotely piloted or self-piloted aircraft that can carry cameras, sensors, communications equipment or other payloads. They have been used in a reconnaissance and intelligence-gathering role since the 1950s, and more challenging roles are envisioned, including combat missions. Since 1964 the Defense Department has developed 11 different UAVs, though due to acquisition and development problems only 3 entered production. The US Navy has studyied the feasibility of operating VTOL UAVs since the early 1960s, the QH-50 Gyrodyne torpedo-delivery drone being an early example. However, high cost and technological immaturity have precluded acquiring and fielding operational VTOL UAV systems. By the early 1990s DOD sought UAVs to satisfy surveillance requirements in Close Range, Short Range or Endurance categories. Close Range was defined to be within 50 kilometers, Short Range was defined as within 200 kilometers and Endurance as anything beyond. By the late 1990s, the Close and Short Range categories were combined, and a separate Shipboard category emerged. The current classes of these vehicles are the Tactical UAV and the Endurance category. Pioneer: Procured beginning in 1985 as an interim UAV capability to provide imagery intelligence for tactical commanders on land and see at ranges out to 185 kilometers. No longer in the Army inventory (returned to the US Navy in 1995). Tactical UAV : Designed to support tactical commanders with near-real-time imagery intelligence at ranges up to 200 kilometers. Outrider Advanced Concept Technology Demonstration (ACTD) program terminated. Material solution for TUAV requirements is being pursued through a competive acquisition process with goal of contract award in DEC 99. Joint Tactical UAV (Hunter): Developed to provide ground and maritime forces with near-real-time imagery intelligence at ranges up to 200 kilometers; extensible to 300+ kilometers by using another Hunter UAV as an airborne relay. Training base located at Fort Huachuca, with additional baseline at Fort Polk to support JRTC rotations. Operational assets based at Fort Hood (currently supporting the KFOR in Kosovo). Medium Altitude Endurance UAV (Predator): Advanced Concept Technology Demonstration now transitioned to Low-Rate Initial Production (LRIP). Provides imagery intelligence to satisfy Joint Task Force and Theater Commanders at ranges out to 500 nautical miles. No longer in the Army inventory (transferred to the US Air Force in 1996). High Altitude Endurance UAV (Global Hawk): Intended for missions requiring long-range deployment and wide-area surveillance (EO/IR and SAR) or long sensor dwell over the target area. Directly deployable from CONUS to the theater of operations. Advanced Concept Technology Demonstration (ACTD) managed by the US Air Force. Tactical Control Station (TCS): The Tactical Control Station is the software and communications links required to control the TUAV, MAE-UAV, and other future tactical UAV's. It also provides connectivity to other C4I systems. Micro Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (MAV): DARPA program to explore the military relevance of Micro Air Vehicles for future military operations, and to develop and demonstrate flight enabling technologies for very small aircraft (less than 15cm/6in. in any dimension).

B. Support for daily military operation

Callam, ’10 [Andrew Callam, “Drone Wars: Armed Unmanned Aerial Vehicles,” International Affairs Review, Volume XIX, No. 1: Winter 2010, http://www.iar-gwu.org/node/144]

The operational use of weaponized UAVs can be divided into two broad categories; direct support of military operation and hunter-killer missions. As mentioned above, the military first utilized UAVs in the early operations of OEF and OIF as both a weapon and surveillance tool and they proved particularly useful in identifying, locating and eliminating targets. In describing the utility of UAVs in OEF, CENTCOM commander General Tommy Franks said: “The Predator is my most capable sensor in hunting down and killing al Qaeda and Taliban leadership and is proving critical to our fight.” By 2007, the military began utilizing drones in counterinsurgency operations in Iraq and demand for drones skyrocketed. Drones continue to serve in supporting operations to American forces in Afghanistan and Iraq.

4. Drones are military presence—use throughout history means they are topical

BML, ‘7 [Barnard Microsystems Limited, Introduction to Unmanned Airsystems, 2007, http://www.barnardmicrosystems.com/L3E\_introduction.htm]

In its simplest form, the Unmanned Air Vehicle (UAV) or Unmanned Air System (UAS), as it is starting to be called, is a pilotless plane. It is a small aircraft, with an on-board computer, or, microprocessor, together with control, sensor and communication electronics. Any aerial application, in which the payload weighs less than an average adult male (say 85 Kgs, although the US military allows a “worst case” soldier weight of 136 Kgs) could be performed less expensively and in a more environmentally friendly way, through the use of an Unmanned Air Vehicle. UAVs have an historical military presence, in the form of the German V1 flying bomb of Second World War vintage, followed by the modern turbine-powered cruise missile, such as the US Tomahawk cruisemissile shown below, made by Raytheon. There are also some differences between the V1, the cruise missile and the UAV: the UAV returns for reuse. The early civilian UAV was in essence a radio controlled aeroplane.

5. Reasons to prefer—

A. Limits—the neg definition is overlimiting. Over-limiting bad for education because it restricts what we learn about.

B. Aff ground—their interpretation crushes aff ground and limits aff flexibility. This is bad for debate.

C. Key to negative ground—Obama has already guaranteed to reduce troops from many of the topic countries. Our interpretation ensures uniqueness.

D. Predictability—Our definition is supported by the Department of Defense and it based in history. This is the core of the topic. Predictability is key to research which is key to good debates and education.

6. Topicality not a voter issue—reasonability is better than competing interpretations

Literature checks abuse

Vote for in-round abuse

AT: Topicality—Military presence is bases

1. We meet—Drones are stored on, launch from and land on military bases.

2. Counter-interpretation

Military Presence is a class of activities for military and security objectives, including training forces, defending US interests, intelligence gathering and security efforts

Thomason et al. 2002 (James S. Thomason, Project Leader on Report for the Undersecretary of Defense, AND Senior Analyst of Strategy, Forces and Resources Division at the Institute for Defense Analyses.

Michael P. Fischerkeller, Kongdan Oh Hassig, Charles Hawkins, Gene Porter, Robert J. Atwell, Robert Bovey, William E. Cralley, James Delaney, “Transforming US Overseas Military Presence: Evidence and Options for DoD Volume I: Main Report” July 2002, http://www.bayan.ph/us%20war%20of%20terror/US%20BASES/US%20Mil%20Presence%20Overseas.pdf)

Overseas military presence activities are generally viewed as a subset of the overall class of activities that the US government uses in its efforts to promote important military/security objectives [Dismukes, 1994]. A variety of recurrent, overseas military activities are normally placed under the “umbrella” concept of military presence. These include but are not limited to US military efforts overseas to train foreign militaries; to improve inter-operability of US and friendly forces; to peacefully and visibly demonstrate US commitment and/or ability to defend US interests; to gain intelligence and familiarity with a locale; to conduct peacekeeping activities; and to position relevant, capable US military assets such that they are likely to be available sooner rather than later in case an evolving security operation or contingency should call for them.

3. We meet the counter interpretation—The purposes of UAVs prove they’re topical

A. Surveillance

FAS Intelligence Resource Program, 5/11/10, http://www.fas.org/irp/program/collect/uav.htm

Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (UAVs) are remotely piloted or self-piloted aircraft that can carry cameras, sensors, communications equipment or other payloads. They have been used in a reconnaissance and intelligence-gathering role since the 1950s, and more challenging roles are envisioned, including combat missions. Since 1964 the Defense Department has developed 11 different UAVs, though due to acquisition and development problems only 3 entered production. The US Navy has studyied the feasibility of operating VTOL UAVs since the early 1960s, the QH-50 Gyrodyne torpedo-delivery drone being an early example. However, high cost and technological immaturity have precluded acquiring and fielding operational VTOL UAV systems. By the early 1990s DOD sought UAVs to satisfy surveillance requirements in Close Range, Short Range or Endurance categories. Close Range was defined to be within 50 kilometers, Short Range was defined as within 200 kilometers and Endurance as anything beyond. By the late 1990s, the Close and Short Range categories were combined, and a separate Shipboard category emerged. The current classes of these vehicles are the Tactical UAV and the Endurance category. Pioneer: Procured beginning in 1985 as an interim UAV capability to provide imagery intelligence for tactical commanders on land and see at ranges out to 185 kilometers. No longer in the Army inventory (returned to the US Navy in 1995). Tactical UAV : Designed to support tactical commanders with near-real-time imagery intelligence at ranges up to 200 kilometers. Outrider Advanced Concept Technology Demonstration (ACTD) program terminated. Material solution for TUAV requirements is being pursued through a competive acquisition process with goal of contract award in DEC 99. Joint Tactical UAV (Hunter): Developed to provide ground and maritime forces with near-real-time imagery intelligence at ranges up to 200 kilometers; extensible to 300+ kilometers by using another Hunter UAV as an airborne relay. Training base located at Fort Huachuca, with additional baseline at Fort Polk to support JRTC rotations. Operational assets based at Fort Hood (currently supporting the KFOR in Kosovo). Medium Altitude Endurance UAV (Predator): Advanced Concept Technology Demonstration now transitioned to Low-Rate Initial Production (LRIP). Provides imagery intelligence to satisfy Joint Task Force and Theater Commanders at ranges out to 500 nautical miles. No longer in the Army inventory (transferred to the US Air Force in 1996). High Altitude Endurance UAV (Global Hawk): Intended for missions requiring long-range deployment and wide-area surveillance (EO/IR and SAR) or long sensor dwell over the target area. Directly deployable from CONUS to the theater of operations. Advanced Concept Technology Demonstration (ACTD) managed by the US Air Force. Tactical Control Station (TCS): The Tactical Control Station is the software and communications links required to control the TUAV, MAE-UAV, and other future tactical UAV's. It also provides connectivity to other C4I systems. Micro Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (MAV): DARPA program to explore the military relevance of Micro Air Vehicles for future military operations, and to develop and demonstrate flight enabling technologies for very small aircraft (less than 15cm/6in. in any dimension).

B. Support for daily military operation

Callam, ’10 [Andrew Callam, “Drone Wars: Armed Unmanned Aerial Vehicles,” International Affairs Review, Volume XIX, No. 1: Winter 2010, http://www.iar-gwu.org/node/144]

The operational use of weaponized UAVs can be divided into two broad categories; direct support of military operation and hunter-killer missions. As mentioned above, the military first utilized UAVs in the early operations of OEF and OIF as both a weapon and surveillance tool and they proved particularly useful in identifying, locating and eliminating targets. In describing the utility of UAVs in OEF, CENTCOM commander General Tommy Franks said: “The Predator is my most capable sensor in hunting down and killing al Qaeda and Taliban leadership and is proving critical to our fight.” By 2007, the military began utilizing drones in counterinsurgency operations in Iraq and demand for drones skyrocketed. Drones continue to serve in supporting operations to American forces in Afghanistan and Iraq.

4. Drones are military presence—use throughout history means they are topical

BML, ‘7

[Barnard Microsystems Limited, Introduction to Unmanned Airsystems, 2007, http://www.barnardmicrosystems.com/L3E\_introduction.htm]

In its simplest form, the Unmanned Air Vehicle (UAV) or Unmanned Air System (UAS), as it is starting to be called, is a pilotless plane. It is a small aircraft, with an on-board computer, or, microprocessor, together with control, sensor and communication electronics. Any aerial application, in which the payload weighs less than an average adult male (say 85 Kgs, although the US military allows a “worst case” soldier weight of 136 Kgs) could be performed less expensively and in a more environmentally friendly way, through the use of an Unmanned Air Vehicle. UAVs have an historical military presence, in the form of the German V1 flying bomb of Second World War vintage, followed by the modern turbine-powered cruise missile, such as the US Tomahawk cruisemissile shown below, made by Raytheon. There are also some differences between the V1, the cruise missile and the UAV: the UAV returns for reuse. The early civilian UAV was in essence a radio controlled aeroplane.

5. Reasons to prefer—

A. Limits—the neg definition is overlimiting. Over-limiting bad for education because it restricts what we learn about.

B. Aff ground—their interpretation crushes aff ground and limits aff flexibility. This is bad for debate.

C. Key to negative ground—Obama has already guaranteed to reduce troops from many of the topic countries. Our interpretation ensures uniqueness.

D. Predictability—Our definition is supported by the Department of Defense and it based in history. This is the core of the topic. Predictability is key to research which is key to good debates and education.

6. Topicality not a voter issue—reasonability is better than competing interpretations

Literature checks abuse

Vote for in-round abuse

AT: CMR

1. Non-unique—CMR low now—McCrystal was just the beginning of the fight

Beforeitsnews.com, 6/27 June 27, 2010, Obama Just might have set himself up!, beforeitsnews.com/news/87/282/Obama\_Just\_might\_have\_set\_himself\_up.html

Yes, Obama had the right to fire McChrystal. And yes, McChrystal “spoke out of school.” But McChrystal is not the problem; he is only one of the symptoms of the problems.

It is too late for Obama to suddenly command respect. Obama has demonstrated his incompetence, not just with Afghanistan and other international blunders but domestically. After 17 months of proving to the world that he is nothing more than a leftist ideologue with no leadership qualities, he can’t very well put that cat back into its bag. And while everyone will now be speculating about divisions in the White House and the Pentagon about how the war is being conducted, the Obama administration is stalling the trial of Khalid Sheik Mohammad until after the November elections; budget director Peter Orszag is jumping ship in July; Rahm Emanuel may not be far behind; and Democrats are set to get creamed in the upcoming mid-term elections. (This will not be an “all politics is local” election; it will be a “how can we stop the Obama agenda?” election.).

2. Counter-insurgency Turn

A. Military angry that counter-insurgency fails--

Sherwell and Farmer, 6/26 [Philip Sherwell, US Editor, and Ben Farmer in Zhari, Telegragh (UK), 6/26/10, http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/asia/afghanistan/7856670/General-Petraeus-faces-battle-on-many-fronts-not-all-of-them-in-Afghanistan.html]

But what the commander-in-chief's quick action could not cover up were the rifts among his inner circle over how the US - and its Nato allies, most prominently Britain - should be fighting the war in Afghanistan. And it was those feuds that framed the backdrop to the ill-judged Team McChrystal exercise in derision and score-settling. Those disagreements have only deepened as the counter-insurgency strategy - championed by Gen Petraeus in Iraq and enthusiastically adapted by his protégé Gen McChrystal in Afghanistan - has suffered a series of recent setbacks on the ground. The new man will need all his much-vaunted political and diplomatic skills to steer through this toxic Washington mess. Some commentators are even raising the grim spectre that the US and its friends are losing in Afghanistan in a quagmire that resonates of Vietnam. And there is increasing speculation that the only long-term solution there will involve a negotiated settlement with some Taliban factions.

B. Ending drones improves CMR—Ending drone strikes improves intelligence gathering ability. Cross-apply Flynn from the Terrorism Advantage—Better intelligence gathering will strike at the heart of the insurgency and improve our counter-insurgent strategy.

3. Military hates drones—worried about hacking.

Dreazen, Cole and Gorman, ‘9 [Yoshi K. Dreazen, August Cole and Siobhan Gorman, Wall Street Journal, 12/18/09, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB126109611986796377.html]

The disclosure came after The Wall Street Journal reported insurgents in Iraq had intercepted video feeds from drones, downloading unencrypted communications from the unmanned planes.

**Members of the Pentagon's Joint Staff discussed the potential security shortfall of drone feeds** in 2004 and 2005, according to two officers with direct knowledge of the deliberations.

**Officers at the time weren't concerned about adversaries intercepting the signals in Iraq or Afghanistan because drones weren't yet common there and militants weren't thought to be technically sophisticated.**

Instead, some **officers worried that such potential U.S. adversaries as Russia or China could manipulate the drone video feeds to hide battlefield movements. "The main concern was that the video feeds were being intercepted, manipulated and then fed to the commanders in the field,"** one of the officers said. "The fear was a commander looking on a feed, seeing nothing, and then having an enemy tank brigade come roaring into your command post."

4. Petraeus will demand more troops and deny withdrawal timeline

Sherwell and Farmer, 6/26 [Philip Sherwell, US Editor, and Ben Farmer in Zhari, Telegragh (UK), 6/26/10, http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/asia/afghanistan/7856670/General-Petraeus-faces-battle-on-many-fronts-not-all-of-them-in-Afghanistan.html]

There is speculation that Gen Petraeus will use his status in Washington to press for extra troops - Gen McChrystal asked for a surge of 40,000 men but Mr Obama eventually decided to send only 30,000 - and effectively to push aside the July 2011 deadline set by the president for a withdrawal to begin.

5. Case solves the impact

A. Drones strikes in Afghanistan destabilize Pakistan

Innocent, ‘9 [Malou Innocent is a foreign policy analyst at the Cato Institute in Washington DC and recently returned from a fact-finding trip to Pakistan, CATO Institute, 8/25/09, http://www.cato.org/pub\_display.php?pub\_id=10479]

An American missile killed Pakistan's most wanted militant, Baitullah Mehsud, on August 5. The death of the radical Taliban commander was a success for Pakistan and the United States. However, the method used may well produce dangerous unintended consequences in how it might undermine one of the United States' primary interests. Chaos in Afghanistan could spill over and destabilize neighboring Pakistan. That's why the efficacy of missile strikes must be reassessed. The targeting of tribal safe havens by CIA-operated drone strikes strengthens the very jihadist forces that America seeks to defeat, by alienating hearts and minds in a fragile, nuclear-armed, Muslim-majority Pakistani state. During a recent visit to the frontier region, I spoke with several South Waziri tribesmen about the impact of US missile strikes. They recounted how militants exploit the popular resentment felt from the accidental killing of innocents from unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs), and defined themselves as a force against the injustice of a hostile foreign occupation. The ability to keep militant groups off balance must be weighed against the cost of facilitating the rise of more insurgents.

B. Soft power solves nuclear wars—Cross apply Nye—Soft power allows the US to keep peace around the globe.

C. Climate change—International law and soft power key to checking warming. Warming means Indo-Pak war inevitable in the world of resource depletion.

6. Case outweighs—

A. Timeframe—Terrorism will lead to extinction in three years. Cross apply the Bohon evidence from the Terrorism advantage.

B. Probability—Bohon assesses a high likelihood of terrorism if the US continues on the same course.

C. Magnitude—We have several extinction level impacts, including climate change, terrorism, and nuclear war from loss of US hegemony.

1AR CMR Extension-- AT: Petraeus will stick to SQ in Afghanistan

Petraeus will change Obama’s Afghanistan policy

Sherwell and Farmer, 6/26 [Philip Sherwell, US Editor, and Ben Farmer in Zhari, Telegragh (UK), 6/26/10, http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/asia/afghanistan/7856670/General-Petraeus-faces-battle-on-many-fronts-not-all-of-them-in-Afghanistan.html]

Mr Obama insisted that the change in personnel would not mean in a switch in strategy. But Gen Petraeus is expected to make some significant tweaks, most notably with a change to the rules of engagement to make it easier for US soldiers to engage in combat. That will ease restrictions imposed by his predecessor to minimise civilian casualties but which troops said were costing US lives. Indeed, while it was the drink-fuelled barbs that garnered the dramatic headlines from the Rolling Stone piece, just as powerful were the complaints of soldiers that their comrades had died because of these battlefield restrictions. Asked about the reports of troop dissatisfaction with the rules of engagement, a US officer in Zhari told The Sunday Telegraph: "When you read the COIN directive, it's open to interpretation. It might be interpreted differently in future." Under the so-called "courageous restraint" rules troops are not allowed to engage the enemy unless they positively identify someone actually firing at them - problematic given the well-hidden corners and niches used as Taliban firing points. Calling in air strikes is now also a complicated process and much rarer than before. British troops in Helmand expressed their frustration with the approach to The Sunday Telegraph in the wake of the McChrystal saga. "We aren't going to win this war with hearts and minds with the insurgents," said one. "Courageous restraint is like a health and safety notification. When we are being smashed there is nothing we can do about it so what's the point?'" Another soldier pointed out that Taliban fighters are well aware of the rules that govern how their enemies must fight. "They know we aren't allowed to fire back when they shoot at us unless we actually see them firing, which is difficult because they shoot from very well hidden 'murder holes'," he said. "And they know we can't shoot if there are civilians around, so in the middle of a fire fight you suddenly see a civilian or a child out in the open who has been placed there by insurgents."

AT: Politics—Climate Bill (1/3)

COMPROMISE BILL WON’T PASS

McFeatters 6/20 [Dale, Scripps Howard News Service, Korea Times, “Senate running out of energy,” http://www.koreatimes.co.kr/www/news/opinon/2010/06/137\_67938.html, accessed 6/26/10]

Even before Obama's specifics-free call for energy legislation, a comprehensive bill was probably dead in the Senate. The problem is that there aren't the 60 votes necessary to override the inevitable Republican filibuster of a bill containing cap-and-trade, a carbon tax or any kind of carbon-pricing mechanism. Even without the filibuster, passing a bill with a pricing plan would be a tight squeeze. The Senate is under some pressure to act because the House already has, passing a comprehensive bill that did include cap-and-trade. House members are irritated that, in their view, they have been going first on controversial legislation, like health-care reform, only to have the Senate dither. In any case, there's a sense that Congress is suffering from big-issue fatigue, that it doesn't want to take on any more heavy lifting than cleaning up the work it has to do, and then heading home to run for re-election. There is still a chance that the Senate might pass a less-ambitious, stripped-down energy bill with subsidies, incentives and standards for renewable energy, energy efficiency, nuclear power and natural gas. In the unlikely event senators could agree on a carbon cap, it might be applied only to utilities. Even then, there's a problem. Liberal Democrats are hinting they may vote against an energy bill that does not address climate change.

Obama spending PC on Start—Its TOA

O’Brien, 5/8 [Michael, The Hill, “Obama wants new START treaty ratified before the election,” http://thehill.com/blogs/blog-briefing-room/news/96807-obama-wants-

new-start-treaty-ratified-before-the-election, accessed 6/26/10]

President Barack Obama said this weekend that he wants a new nuclear arms reduction treaty with Russia ratified before November's elections. The president said he soon planned to submit to the Senate the language of the treaty he signed with Russian President Dmitry Medvedev in late March. "Well, I’d like to see it happen before the election," Obama told Channel Rossiya, a Russian television station, in an interview this week, a transcript of which was released on Saturday. But while the president said he hopes for swift Senate action, senators in both parties have said that it would be difficult to get through the treaty this year, and that the 67 votes necessary to ratify an agreement would be difficult. "Obviously it’s technical and I think it’s appropriate for the Senate to examine it, but we’re going to be putting forward the text of the treaty, the annexes, all the necessary materials before the Senate in short order," Obama said. That timeline also contrasts with a busy Senate calendar the rest of this year, with senators hoping to wrap up work on Wall Street reform legislation in the next week, and with an energy bill, immigration reform, and a Supreme Court nomination vote on the horizon. The president said he hoped for the Senate to work quickly on ratifying the treaty. "Our hope is, is that they will be able to review it quickly and recognize that this is an important step in the efforts of both the United States and Russia to meet our obligations under the Non-Proliferation Treaty to lower our stockpiles, at the same time as we work together to hold other countries accountable on obligations regarding the Non-Proliferation Treaty," he said.

OBAMA SPENT HIS POLITICAL CAPITAL ON OFFSHORE DRILLING INSTEAD OF CIR

Sunday Herald ‘10 [Sunday Herald, news organization, “Oil spill seeps into the heart of America,” 5-30-10, (http://www.lexisnexis.com/hottopics/lnacademic/ )]

However much of the bill his government eventually gets stuck with, Obama is expending time and political capital that could otherwise have been invested in comprehensive immigration reform. How he must regret opening up new areas to offshore drilling less than three weeks before the catastrophe. It turns out, by the way, that oil rigs today generally don t cause spills, he said at the time. They are technologically very advanced.

AT: Politics—Climate Bill (2/3)

Plan is popular

Walsh 6/24 [Kenneth T. Walsh, US News and World Report, 6/24/10,

http://politics.usnews.com/news/articles/2010/06/24/obamas-big-problems-oil-spill-afghanistan-and-unemployment.html]

President Obama spent last week focusing on the massive BP oil leak, but two other big issues are creeping up on him—Afghanistan and unemployment. Each one could easily have a greater impact on his long-term success or failure than the gusher in the Gulf of Mexico. By most accounts, the war in Afghanistan isn't going well. American and Afghan casualties are on the rise this spring, and the U.S. effort to subdue insurgents in the key region around Kandahar has run into severe difficulty. American military officials now say their original timetable for a relatively quick offensive there was too optimistic, and it will be a long, tough slog. The problem is the same one that critics of U.S. escalation have always cited: Afghanistan is known as the graveyard of empires. Suspicion of outsiders runs deep and the United States is widely seen as an occupying power, like Russia and Great Britain in the past. Each was eventually forced to withdraw. [See photos of U.S. troops in Afghanistan.]  The Afghan war is particularly unpopular among Democratic liberals who thought Obama was going to be a dovish president when they backed him in the 2008 primaries. Many liberals are so upset with Obama and majority Democrats in Congress that they may sit out the November elections, which would guarantee Republicans gains. "Afghanistan is pretty close to a deal breaker for many," says a prominent Democratic strategist.

PUBLIC SUPPORT FOR POLICY TRANSFERS INTO POLITICAL CAPITAL FOR THE PRESIDENT

Hershey 05 Marjorie Randon Hershey (Professor of Political Science at Indiana University) 2005, “Party Politics in America”

Popular support is a valuable resource for the chief executive in getting Congress to go along with his programs. Bush's public popularity after September 11 helped him to gain considerable success on the Hill, just as President Clinton's unpopularity in 1993 made it harder for him to steer health care reform through a Democratic Congress.

WINNING ON CONTROVERSIAL ISSUES IS KEY TO OBAMA’S AGENDA

Singer, 03/03/2009 Jonathan (JD candidate at Berkeley and editor of MyDD) http://www.mydd.com/story/2009/3/3/191825/0428

Peter Hart gets at a key point. Some believe that political capital is finite, that it can be used up. To an extent that's true. But it's important to note, too, that political capital can be regenerated -- and, specifically, that when a President expends a great deal of capital on a measure that was difficult to enact and then succeeds, he can build up more capital. Indeed, that appears to be what is happening with Barack Obama, who went to the mat to pass the stimulus package out of the gate, got it passed despite near-unanimous opposition of the Republicans on Capitol Hill, and is being rewarded by the American public as a result. Take a look at the numbers. President Obama now has a 68 percent favorable rating in the NBC-WSJ poll, his highest ever showing in the survey. Nearly half of those surveyed (47 percent) view him very positively. Obama's Democratic Party earns a respectable 49 percent favorable rating. The Republican Party, however, is in the toilet, with its worst ever showing in the history of the NBC-WSJ poll, 26 percent favorable. On the question of blame for the partisanship in Washington, 56 percent place the onus on the Bush administration and another 41 percent place it on Congressional Republicans. Yet just 24 percent blame Congressional Democrats, and a mere 11 percent blame the Obama administration. So at this point, with President Obama seemingly benefiting from his ambitious actions and the Republicans sinking further and further as a result of their knee-jerked opposition to that agenda, there appears to be no reason not to push forward on anything from universal healthcare to energy reform to ending the war in Iraq.

AT: Politics—Climate Bill (2/3)

CLIMATE BILL FAILS TO SOLVE CLIMATE

McMahon 6/8 Jeff Mcmahon, writer for true true slant, “lugar’s climate plan: more oil trilling and amnesty for coal plants”, accessed 6/25/10, 6/8/10

“The legislation contains no specific provisions to enhance outer-continental shelf oil production,” Lugar said. “The primary driver of increased OCS production will be increased oil prices.” Why would oil prices increase if the nation is reducing demand for oil through increased efficiency and development of alternative fuels? Nothing in his plan would restrict far greater expansion of offshore drilling or, for that matter, increased dependence on foreign oil. Nor would it restrict carbon pollution. Lugar claims the plan would “cut greenhouse gas emissions by 25 percent over business as usual” by 2030. If that achievement came to pass it would amount to only about half the short-term savings President Obama committed the U.S. to achieving during the Copenhagen Climate Talks–a 17 percent reduction by 2020 already criticized the world over as inadequate.

Case outweighs

a)probability—US Drone Policy is playing with a loaded gun, only a matter of time before terrorists attempt to use WMD, creates an incentive for terrorism that makes it more likely which escalates

b) Magnitude—Bioweapons get immediately released which prevents the possibility of adaptation, which is the biggest internal link to extinction!

c) timeframe--Bioterror happens in 3 years which means its now or never. Other issues could solve for warming in the future, so its better to wine and dine in the now.

d)case turns the DA—IHL is necessary to global cooperation which spills over to other issues like climate change which is necessary to solve for global warming

START Good DA 2AC (1/3)

START WON’T PASS- IT NEEDS 7 MORE GOP VOTES, AND REPUBLICANS DON’T SUPPORT IT.

Colwell 6/20 [Jack, Washington Columnist, South Bend Tribune, “Lugar: It's time for a new START,” 6/20/10,

http://www.southbendtribune.com/article/20100620/Opinion/6200467/-1/googleNews, accessed 6/23/10]

Now, Lugar views the New START Treaty with Russia negotiated by President Obama as a "modest step" but a vital one for further reduction of nuclear arsenals and also for better relations as Russia's help is sought in containing threats from Iran and North Korea. Modest step? Some of those same "groups on the far right" that Lugar cited oppose ratification of the treaty, suggesting that it is a dangerous step and promoting instead the old "Star Wars" fantasy of a missile defense shield to ward off even a barrage of missiles rather than reducing arsenals and providing for strict verification and what Lugar calls "boots on the ground" inspections. "Just madness," Lugar says of reliance on non- existent "Star Wars" technology to down thousands of missiles if they were again aimed at targets all around the United States. At a hearing of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, where Lugar is the top Republican, he recalled those bad old days of Cold War, telling of "the chilling experience" of inspecting a deactivated Soviet missile silo where he found posted pictures of 10 American cities once targeted by the 10 nuclear warheads in the horrible place. Lugar is all for development of a realistic shield that could perhaps down a missile fired by some rogue nation such as North Korea. And he says there is nothing in the treaty, not a word, that would prohibit this development, even though Russia continues to be suspicious about any shield deployment. He prefers a treaty to eliminate hundreds of nuclear warheads now rather than count on some future "Star Wars" to somehow render them harmless much later, if ever. The Foreign Relations Committee has held numerous hearings on the treaty, with testimony both in public and in private, from defense officials, treaty negotiators and top administration officials such as Secretary of State Hillary Clinton. Committee Chairman John Kerry, D-Mass., and Lugar are in bipartisan agreement on a vote on the treaty by the committee before the August congressional recess, with hope of ratification by the full Senate yet this year. Action is important, Lugar says, because the old START agreement expired last December and he wants to get back to those "boots on the ground" inspections. So far, Lugar is the only Republican to support ratification. And it takes a two-thirds vote, 67 votes, for ratification. Democrats and their two independent allies have 59 votes, so support from at least eight Republicans is needed. Part of the problem with Republican support, Lugar knows, is reluctance to support a treaty negotiated by Obama. Also, there are the questions raised by those "groups on the far right" that distrust both the Russians and Obama.

OBAMA SPENT HIS POLITICAL CAPITAL ON OFFSHORE DRILLING INSTEAD OF CIR

Sunday Herald, 5/30/10, lexis

However much of the bill his government eventually gets stuck with, Obama is expending time and political capital that could otherwise have been invested in comprehensive immigration reform. How he must regret opening up new areas to offshore drilling less than three weeks before the catastrophe. It turns out, by the way, that oil rigs today generally don t cause spills, he said at the time. They are technologically very advanced.

START Not Top of the Agenda—Colwell says it is going to happen after the midterms, which will be the make or break for PC

START Good 2AC (2/3)

Plan is popular

Walsh 6/24 [Kenneth T. Walsh, US News and World Report, 6/24/10,

http://politics.usnews.com/news/articles/2010/06/24/obamas-big-problems-oil-spill-afghanistan-and-unemployment.html]

President Obama spent last week focusing on the massive BP oil leak, but two other big issues are creeping up on him—Afghanistan and unemployment. Each one could easily have a greater impact on his long-term success or failure than the gusher in the Gulf of Mexico. By most accounts, the war in Afghanistan isn't going well. American and Afghan casualties are on the rise this spring, and the U.S. effort to subdue insurgents in the key region around Kandahar has run into severe difficulty. American military officials now say their original timetable for a relatively quick offensive there was too optimistic, and it will be a long, tough slog. The problem is the same one that critics of U.S. escalation have always cited: Afghanistan is known as the graveyard of empires. Suspicion of outsiders runs deep and the United States is widely seen as an occupying power, like Russia and Great Britain in the past. Each was eventually forced to withdraw. [See photos of U.S. troops in Afghanistan.]  The Afghan war is particularly unpopular among Democratic liberals who thought Obama was going to be a dovish president when they backed him in the 2008 primaries. Many liberals are so upset with Obama and majority Democrats in Congress that they may sit out the November elections, which would guarantee Republicans gains. "Afghanistan is pretty close to a deal breaker for many," says a prominent Democratic strategist.

PUBLIC SUPPORT FOR POLICY TRANSFERS INTO POLITICAL CAPITAL FOR THE PRESIDENT

Hershey 05 [Marjorie Randon Hershey (Professor of Political Science at Indiana University) 2005, “Party Politics in America” ]

Popular support is a valuable resource for the chief executive in getting Congress to go along with his programs. Bush's public popularity after September 11 helped him to gain considerable success on the Hill, just as President Clinton's unpopularity in 1993 made it harder for him to steer health care reform through a Democratic Congress.

WINNING ON CONTROVERSIAL ISSUES IS KEY TO OBAMA’S AGENDA

Singer, 03/03/2009 [Jonathan, Singer, JD candidate at Berkeley and editor of MyDD, http://www.mydd.com/story/2009/3/3/191825/0428 ]

Peter Hart gets at a key point. Some believe that political capital is finite, that it can be used up. To an extent that's true. But it's important to note, too, that political capital can be regenerated -- and, specifically, that when a President expends a great deal of capital on a measure that was difficult to enact and then succeeds, he can build up more capital. Indeed, that appears to be what is happening with Barack Obama, who went to the mat to pass the stimulus package out of the gate, got it passed despite near-unanimous opposition of the Republicans on Capitol Hill, and is being rewarded by the American public as a result. Take a look at the numbers. President Obama now has a 68 percent favorable rating in the NBC-WSJ poll, his highest ever showing in the survey. Nearly half of those surveyed (47 percent) view him very positively. Obama's Democratic Party earns a respectable 49 percent favorable rating. The Republican Party, however, is in the toilet, with its worst ever showing in the history of the NBC-WSJ poll, 26 percent favorable. On the question of blame for the partisanship in Washington, 56 percent place the onus on the Bush administration and another 41 percent place it on Congressional Republicans. Yet just 24 percent blame Congressional Democrats, and a mere 11 percent blame the Obama administration. So at this point, with President Obama seemingly benefiting from his ambitious actions and the Republicans sinking further and further as a result of their knee-jerked opposition to that agenda, there appears to be no reason not to push forward on anything from universal healthcare to energy reform to ending the war in Iraq.

START Good 2AC (3/3)

START doesn’t solve relations—wrong starting point

Kokesh 6/26 (Jessica Kokesh, columnist at infozine Kansas city, 6.26,10, “Concerns About New Arms Treaty Raised During Senate Hearing ” http://www.infozine.com/news/stories/op/storiesView/sid/41988/)

Although the goal of the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty is to "reset" the U.S.-Russian relationship, Robert Joseph, former undersecretary of state for arms control and international security, said the treaty is a Cold War tactic. "It once again treats nuclear weapons - the one category of arms on which Russia can compete with the United States - as the principal currency of the relationship," he said. Joseph testified during the 10th Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearing on the matter. Signed by President Barack Obama in April, START seeks to reduce by one-third the number of nuclear arms held by the United States and Russia. The hearing was held as Russian President Dmitry Medvedev was meeting with Obama in Washington to discuss non-security issues. Medvedev urged U.S. and Russian lawmakers to ratify the treaty during a meeting with Speaker of the House Nancy Pelosi, D-Calif., Thursday. Joseph said a better way to improve relationships with Russia would be to focus on common interests, such as nuclear energy development and combating terrorism. "I think working together in other areas will build confidence and trust in our relationship. But we can't establish a non-Cold War type relationship when we continue to practice Cold War arms control," he said. "I think we move in the wrong direction."

START WON’T SOLVE TRUE PROLIF PROBLEMS WITH THE NPT – OTHER WON’T FOLLOW

Xinhua 2/9 (Lin Zhi, 2/9/10, "US Senate Republicans could use START to derail Obama's disarmament agenda ...", http://news.xinhuanet.com/english2010/indepth/2010-02/10/c\_13170319.htm)

As the START talks drag on, some experts have expressed concern that it could make it harder for the U.S. to convince the rest of the world to strengthen the NPT at the upcoming review conference in May. "A failure to get a START agreement would be a very serious blow to any idea that there is a credible commitment to zero nuclear weapons," former U.S. Ambassador to Russia James Collins told Agence France-Presse. But besides gaining political leverage, says Graham, the U.S.'s success with Russia over an arms control deal will not directly affect the international nuclear disarmament agenda. "I hope I don't sound overly negative but I don't think this phase of START will have much effect on the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT)," he said. "It's a modest reduction and it really doesn't get at the real NPT issues, which is partly the test ban and really low levels of nuclear weapons down into the hundreds.

Case Outweighs

a) probability-- US Drone Policy is playing with a loaded gun, only a matter of time before terrorists attempt to use WMD, creates an incentive for terrorism that makes it more likely which escalates

b) timeframe—Bioweapons will lead to extinction in 3 years. It will take atleast 10 years for potential proliferants to develop the technology

c) magnitude—Warming destroys the ecosystem which means nothing can survive due to destruction of keystone species. US-Russia War wouldn’t envelop the globe which would ensure some survivors

d) Case turns the DA—IHL is key to spur international cooperation on issues like disarm, which is key to resolve Russian fears of the US. It also would galvanize support for I-law as a whole which would give strength to the NPT

START Bad 2AC (1/3)

ANALYSTS BELIEVE THAT THERE ARE 80 VOTES READY FOR START.

Global Security Newswire 6/24 [Think Tank of the National Journal Group, “Additional Hearings Planned on ‘New START’” http://www.globalsecuritynewswire.org/gsn/nw\_20100624\_3032.php, accessed 6/25/10]

Medvedev and Obama signed the "New START" pact in April. The treaty would obligate the nations to respectively cap their fielded strategic nuclear weapons to 1,550 warheads, down from the maximum of 2,200 allowed each country by 2012 under the 2002 Moscow Treaty. The deal would also limit U.S. and Russian deployed nuclear delivery vehicles to 700, with another 100 platforms allowed in reserve. The pact has been submitted for ratification by legislative bodies in Russia and the United States. Foreign Relations Committee Chairman John Kerry (D-Mass.) could schedule as many as three hearings on the deal beyond today's meetings before the committee votes on the pact. The Senate Armed Services Committee is carrying out separate hearings on the agreement. A full Senate vote on the deal is likely before the end of 2010, according to a spokesman for Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-Nev.). Many analysts believe the agreement will receive at least 80 votes, far more than the 67 required for ratification, USA Today reported

Russian Duma won't pass START treaty – contention over NMD

Shasha 3/16/10 [Deng Shasha, editor for Xinhua news, “Russian State Duma might block new START treaty: speaker,” http://news.xinhuanet.com/english2010/world/2010-03/16/c\_13213482.htm]

MOSCOW, March 16 (Xinhua) -- Russia's State Duma, or lower house of parliament, might block a new strategic arms treaty (START) with the United States, if it is not linked with missile defense, the Duma's speaker said Tuesday. "We will not ratify it, if it does not take into account the link between strategic offensive weapons and missile defense," Boris Gryzlov was quoted as saying by the Interfax news agency. Gryzlov told his Bulgarian counterpart, Tsetska Tsacheva, Tuesday U.S. plans to deploy elements of a missile defense shield in eastern Europe was "a particularly sensitive issue for Russia." He also asked her whether Bulgaria would join the planned deployment. Tsacheva replied the project "has not been discussed either in the government, or in parliament," adding "what is meant here is only NATO's ideas, voiced by U.S. officials through the mass media." Russia and the United States have been working on a new arms control deal since Russian president Dmitry Medvedev and U.S. president Barack Obama met in April last year, but they failed to reach a pact before START-1 expired in December. The U.S. missile defence plans have become a major sticking point in the nuclear disarmament negotiations. On Feb. 12, the U.S. ambassador to Bulgaria James B. Warlick said there had been informal discussions at different levels "in Sofia and in Washington" about basing parts of the American missile shield in Bulgaria. Bulgarian Prime Minister Boyko Borisov also said he supported plans for taking part in a new U.S. missile defense system in Europe. However, Bulgaria informed Russia on Feb. 19 there were no official negotiations with the U.S. about the planned missile defense system. Russian Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov reiterated on March 9 the new arms control deal would link strategic offensive and defensive weapons, which was agreed by Medvedev and Obama during their meeting last April. U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton is to meet Lavrov in Moscow on March 18-19, when both sides are expected to discuss the START treaty. The Kremlin said on Saturday that, during a telephone conversation, Medvedev and Obama agreed it was now possible to talk about specific dates for signing the new treaty. The Russian daily, Kommersant, meanwhile reported newly elected Ukrainian President Viktor Yanukovych suggested Kiev as the venue for the signing when he met Medvedev in Moscow on March 5 and Moscow had shown interest. Anna German, deputy head of the Ukrainian presidential administration, said Kiev's bid to host the signing ceremony was part of Yanukovych's efforts to serve as "the bridge between the East and the West."

Plan Unpopular--Bipart

Shane, 9[SCOTT SHANE, " C.I.A. to Expand Use of Drones in Pakistan " December 3, 2009, NYTimes,

http://www.nytimes.com/2009/12/04/world/asia/04drones.html]

Yet with few other tools to use against Al Qaeda, the drone program has enjoyed bipartisan support in Congress and was escalated by the Obama administration in January. More C.I.A. drone attacks have been conducted under President Obama than under President George W. Bush. The political consensus in support of the drone program, its antiseptic, high-tech appeal and its secrecy have obscured just how radical it is. For the first time in history, a civilian intelligence agency is using robots to carry out a military mission, selecting people for killing in a country where the United States is not officially at war.

START Bad (2/3)

FAILING TO LOOK STRONG ON FOREIGN POLICY WILL MAKE PROGRESSIVES AND OBAMA LOSE POLITICAL CAPITAL.

Cohen ‘10 [Michael A., PhD, Director of International Affairs at The New School, The New Republic, “The Left’s Silence on Afghanistan,” 6/11/10,

http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=127762829&ft=1&f=1057, accessed 6/22/10]

In fact, the lack of good alternatives for Afghanistan seems to be a major stumbling block for progressives. Many told me that it was difficult to criticize the president's strategy without a clear sense of what should be done differently. But for the left to argue that there are still no good alternatives on Afghanistan is an implicit indictment of their own failure to come up with one. Members of left-leaning, DC-based think tanks and and advocacy organizations like have either tacitly supported the Afghanistan strategy or offered tactical suggestions to improve a policy that some privately believe is irredeemable. These are the groups that should be providing the policy ammunition for liberals to speak more authoritatively on Afghanistan. The absence of critical discussion among these policy groups was painfully evident when the president convened his first review of Afghanistan in Spring 2009. His civilian national security advisers went along with the military's single-minded call for a counter-insurgency (COIN) strategy as did almost all of Obama's liberal supporters. But both groups — not well versed in what a fully resourced counter-insurgency would entail — clearly underestimated the implications of a significant U.S. commitment to a COIN strategy. "They were caught flat-footed in the face of the COIN public relations campaign, which came from the military, some civilians, and an echo chamber of think tank analysts and bloggers who played a cheerleading role rather than critically examining U.S. interests and policy options in Afghanistan," said Brian Katulis, Senior Fellow at the Center for American Progress. According to Lorelei Kelly, who runs the Afghanistan Congressional Communications Hub, many on the left fear that "they don't have the credibility to engage in this conversation." Instead, the progressive national security community has tended to focus on issues like arms control, human rights, economic development, and the environment. Moreover, there is a sense that liberals can't compete on military issues — either from a reputational standpoint or intellectually. Among those who have not served in the military the reluctance is even more profound. The liberals' reluctance to address national security issues more authoritatively could prove costly to both the Obama administration and the country. Politicians must rely, in some measure, on the policy ideas that their own backers can muster, as Republicans were able to do when they took back the White House in 1981 and 2001. But when he took office, President Obama wasn't able to look to the liberal media and think tanks either for help in figuring out what to do in Afghanistan or for political support in exploring approaches different from what the military was proposing. If the strategy he adopted for Afghanistan falters, Obama may once again find himself with limited options from his base of supporters on how to salvage the conflict. That's a dangerous prospect and it could affect more than just the war in Afghanistan: it could do real damage to Obama's presidency and the aspirations of his progressive supporters.

FOREIGN POLICY CAN ONLY DEPLETE AND NOT BUILD POLITICAL CAPITAL

Crabb, Antizzo, and Sarieddine in 2000 [Crabb, Cecil V. Jr., Antizzo, Glenn J., and Sarieddine, Leila E., Congress and the Foreign Policy Process, Louisiana State University Press, 2000, pg 162]

Moreover, as a rule, it is difficult for legislators to make political capital out of foreign policy issues. To the contrary, as often as not, the political future of legislators is likely to be damaged by taking an unpopular position on some external policy question. In recent experience, the political defeat in the 1992 national election of President George Bush, who had won unrivaled public approval because of his dynamic leadership in foreign affairs, provided graphic evidence of the general rule that national leaders can normally expect few political rewards from active involvement with foreign policy questions. Expressed differently, the congressional view of America's "national interest" in approaching any specific global problem or challenge is heavily conditioned by the legislative preoccupation with, and understanding of, domestic developments and concerns.

Wins Now

KRIEGER 6/26/10’ [HILARY LEILA, writer for the Jerusalem post, the Jerusalem post, “Obama welcomes Iran sanctions”, 6-26-10, http://www.jpost.com/ArtsAndCulture/Entertainment/Article.aspx?id=179558] WASHINGTON – The Obama administration welcomed Congressional approval of sweeping Iran sanctions Friday, after months of reservations and negotiations over the legislation.US Secretary of State Hillary Clinton pledged complete implementation of the measure, which was passed overwhelming by both chambers Thursday and now awaits only the president’s signature to become law.

START Bad (3/3)

No Japan nuclearization – multiple constraints

Chanlett-Avery and Nikitin, 9 [Emma (specialist in Asian affairs) and Mary Beth (analyist in nonproliferation). “Japan’s nuclear future: policy debate, prospects, and US interests.” Congressional Research Service. 2/19/9. Online. ]

This paper examines the prospects for Japan pursuing a nuclear weapons capability by assessing the existing technical infrastructure of its extensive civilian nuclear energy program. It explores the range of challenges that Japan would have to overcome to transform its current program into a military program. Presently, Japan appears to lack several of the prerequisites for a full-scale nuclear weapons deterrent: expertise on bomb design, reliable delivery vehicles, an intelligence program to protect and conceal assets, and sites for nuclear testing. In addition, a range of legal and political restraints on Japan’s development of nuclear weapons, including averse public and elite opinion, restrictive domestic laws and practices, and the negative diplomatic consequences of abandoning its traditional approach is analyzed.

South Korea won’t proliferate—public opposition

Yi 9 [Kiho, Dir. Nautilus Institute of Seoul and Prof. – Hanshin U., The Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, “The North Korean nuclear test: The South Korean reaction,” 6-5, http://www.thebulletin.org/web-edition/features/the-north-korean-nuclear-test-the-south-korean-reaction]

But back to the domestic response in South Korea. Like the South Korean public, other than the two hours immediately following the test, the South Korean stock market remained pretty much unaffected by Pyongyang's actions last week. The country's most important investors seemed to dismiss the idea of a war between the North and South as unlikely, despite the North's rhetoric. As for Seoul's intellectual elite, they have made many political statements this week, but none of them involve North Korea. Instead, these statements involve Lee Myung-bak, as many professors at the country's major universities want him to apologize for prosecuting Roh and to support the basic rights of expression that make the South a democracy. A few statements from domestic civil society organizations did request that North Korea stop its nuclear program, but that was about it in terms of public outcry. Politically, the response has been more heated. Some members of the South Korean Parliament have seriously raised the idea of Seoul pursuing its own nuclear capability. Others want to discuss what options the South Korean government should take if the country's leaders decide the U.S. nuclear umbrella isn't enough to keep Seoul safe. But again, the South Korean people seem opposed to such actions. According to a recent poll done by Mono Research, 67 percent of everyday South Koreans said that Seoul needs to find a peaceful way in which to solve the North Korean nuclear crisis; only 25 percent answered that South Korea should take a strong stand against North Korean military provocations. So I am hopeful that such popular support for peace will lead to a practical process of denuclearization and disarmament on the Korean Peninsula.

Case Outweighs

a) probability-- US Drone Policy is playing with a loaded gun, only a matter of time before terrorists attempt to use WMD, creates an incentive for terrorism that makes it more likely which escalates

b) timeframe—Bioweapons will lead to extinction in 3 years. It takes a long time to develop the technology and resources for potential proliferants, so assume a slow timeframe

c) magnitude—Warming destroys the ecosystem which means nothing can survive due to destruction of keystone species. Japan rearming would only be contained to East Asia, which guarantees survivors in the South.

Midterms 2AC (1/2)

Republicans will win midterms and their minds are already made up—plan won’t affect decisions

Shedlock 6/24 [Michael, June 24, 2010 “Midterm Disaster Looms for Democrats as Confidence in Obama Wanes” Accessed on June 25, 2010 from Lexis Academic]

Polls by Rasmussen and the Wall Street Journal show US citizens are increasingly angry about jobs, bailouts of banks, and the oil spill. The Wall Street Journal reports Confidence Waning in Obama, U.S. Outlook Americans are more pessimistic about the state of the country and less confident in President Barack Obama's leadership than at any point since Mr. Obama entered the White House, according to a new Wall Street Journal/NBC News poll. Sixty- two percent of adults in the survey feel the country is on the wrong track, the highest level since before the 2008 election. Just one-third think the economy will get better over the next year, a 7-point drop from a month ago and the low point of Mr. Obama's tenure. Amid anxiety over the nation's course, support for Mr. Obama and other incumbents is eroding. For the first time, more people disapprove of Mr. Obama's job performance than approve. And 57% of voters would prefer to elect a new per-son to Congress than re-elect their local representatives, the highest share in 18 years. The results show "a really ugly mood and an unhappy electorate," said Democratic pollster Peter Hart, who conducts the Journal/NBC poll with GOP pollster Bill McInturff. "The voters, I think, are just looking for change, and that means bad news for incumbents and in particular for the Democrats."Mr. McInturff said voters' feelings, typically set by June in any election year, are being hardened by frustration over the economy and the oil spill. "It would take an enormous and seismic event to change the drift of these powerful forces before November," he said. Direction of the Nation

Will Win—Statistical models prove

Kraske 6/17 [Steve Kraske, June 17, 2010. KC Star, “Can GOP Retake the House this November?” Accessed 6/25/10 from: http://primebuzz.kcstar.com/?q=node/22648 ]

But the Crystal Ball has always done House projections in two ways. The second method requires advanced statistical modeling of the sort Professor Alan Abramowitz provides in this week’s Crystal Ball. Prof. Abramowitz’s record has been superb in election prognostication, and his analysis shows a GOP gain of 39 House seats—precisely the number needed to take control. There is not much difference between 32 and 39 in a June forecast. Both methods will be tweaked as we enter late summer and early fall.

Turn—Dems are sitting home now because of Afghanistan policy—Plan makes Obama look like a Dove

Walsh 6/24 [Kenneth T. Walsh, US News and World Report, 6/24/10,

http://politics.usnews.com/news/articles/2010/06/24/obamas-big-problems-oil-spill-afghanistan-and-unemployment.html]

President Obama spent last week focusing on the massive BP oil leak, but two other big issues are creeping up on him—Afghanistan and unemployment. Each one could easily have a greater impact on his long-term success or failure than the gusher in the Gulf of Mexico. By most accounts, the war in Afghanistan isn't going well. American and Afghan casualties are on the rise this spring, and the U.S. effort to subdue insurgents in the key region around Kandahar has run into severe difficulty. American military officials now say their original timetable for a relatively quick offensive there was too optimistic, and it will be a long, tough slog. The problem is the same one that critics of U.S. escalation have always cited: Afghanistan is known as the graveyard of empires. Suspicion of outsiders runs deep and the United States is widely seen as an occupying power, like Russia and Great Britain in the past. Each was eventually forced to withdraw. [See photos of U.S. troops in Afghanistan.]  The Afghan war is particularly unpopular among Democratic liberals who thought Obama was going to be a dovish president when they backed him in the 2008 primaries. Many liberals are so upset with Obama and majority Democrats in Congress that they may sit out the November elections, which would guarantee Republicans gains. "Afghanistan is pretty close to a deal breaker for many," says a prominent Democratic strategist.

Midterms 2AC (2/2)

Turn—Passing Legislation is key to democratic victories

Washington Monthly 2/16/10 http://www.washingtonmonthly.com/

SUCCESS BEGETS SUCCESS.... It's not exactly a secret that congressional Democrats, predisposed to panic, are feeling an overwhelming sense of dread right now. But elections aren't decided in February, and it's not entirely fanciful to believe some key accomplishments over the next several months can prevent an electoral disaster. Senator Evan Bayh's abrupt announcement on Monday that he will retire at the end of his term has further united disparate voices within the Democratic Party behind the idea that legislative action is the only remedy to avoid future political calamity. In the wake of the Indiana Democrat's announcement, a host of figures -- from the progressive wing of the party to devout centrists -- have chimed in to warn that failure in jobs and health care legislation have sapped the party's momentum and fortunes. Markos Moulitsas, the founder of the blog Daily Kos, said that the best way for Democrats to salvage the fate of the party before the 2010 elections is clear: "Deliveron their campaign promises." For all the palpable anxiety in Democratic circles, there's still time. Sinking poll numbers are largely the result of inaction -- Americans want to see results, and they're not getting any. If Dems run for the hills, matters will only get worse.

AT:Econ Dec.-->War

Economic declines doesn’t cause war

Ferguson 6 [Niall, Professor of History @ Harvard, The Next War of the World, Foreign Affairs 85.5, Proquest]

There are many unsatisfactory explanations for why the twentieth century was so destructive. One is the assertion that the availability of more powerful weapons caused bloodier conflicts. But there is no correlation between the sophistication of military technology and the lethality of conflict. Some of the worst violence of the century -- the genocides in Cambodia in the 1970s and central Africa in the 1990s, for instance -- was perpetrated with the crudest of weapons: rifles, axes, machetes, and knives. Nor can economic crises explain the bloodshed. What may be the most familiar causal chain in modern historiography links the Great Depression to the rise of fascism and the outbreak of World War II. But that simple story leaves too much out. Nazi Germany started the war in Europe only after its economy had recovered. Not all the countries affected by the Great Depression were taken over by fascist regimes, nor did all such regimes start wars of aggression. In fact, no general relationship between economics and conflict is discernible for the century as a whole. Some wars came after periods of growth, others were the causes rather than the consequences of economic catastrophe, and some severe economic crises were not followed by wars.

AT: Apocalyptic Reps K (1/3)

1. Framework: Aff should defend the implementation of a topical plan action. The negative can defend the status quo or a competitive policy option.

Reasons to prefer:

A. Predictability—Forcing links and competition off of plan text key is the most predictable for both teams because the aff has to read a topical plan and the neg can only read things related to plan. Predictability key to fairness and education.

B. Topic specific education—Their interpretation produces stale, generic education. Only our interpretation guarantees we learn about the specifics of the topic.

C. Policy analysis should precede discourse – most effective way to challenge power

Taft-Kaufman, ’95 [Jill Taft-Kaufman, Speech prof @ CMU, 1995, Southern Comm. Journal, Spring, v. 60, Iss. 3, ―Other Ways‖, p pq]

The postmodern passwords of "polyvocality," "Otherness," and "difference," unsupported by substantial analysis of the concrete contexts of subjects, creates a solipsistic quagmire. The political sympathies of the new cultural critics, with their ostensible concern for the lack of power experienced by marginalized people, aligns them with the political left. Yet, despite their adversarial posture and talk of opposition, their discourses on intertextuality and inter-referentiality isolate them from and ignore the conditions that have produced leftist politics--conflict, racism, poverty, and injustice. In short, as Clarke (1991) asserts, postmodern emphasis on new subjects conceals the old subjects, those who have limited access to good jobs, food, housing, health care, and transportation, as well as to the media that depict them. Merod (1987) decries this situation as one which leaves no vision, will, or commitment to activism. He notes that academic lip service to the oppositional is underscored by the absence of focused collective or politically active intellectual communities. Provoked by the academic manifestations of this problem Di Leonardo (1990) echoes Merod and laments**:** Has there ever been a historical era characterized by as little radical analysis or activism and as much radical-chic writing as ours? Maundering on about Otherness:phallocentrism or Eurocentric tropes has become a lazy academic substitute for actual engagement withthe detailed histories and contemporary realitiesof Western racial minorities, white women, or any Third World population. (p. 530) Clarke's assessment of the postmodern elevation of language to the "sine qua non" of critical discussion is an even stronger indictment against the trend. Clarke examines Lyotard's (1984) The Postmodern Condition in which Lyotard maintains that virtually all social relations are linguistic, and, therefore, it is through the coercion that threatens speech that we enter the "realm of terror" and society falls apart. To this assertion, Clarke replies: I can think of few more striking indicators of the political and intellectual impoverishment of a view of society that can only recognize the discursive. If the worst terror we can envisage is the threat not to be allowed to speak, we are appallingly ignorant of terror in its elaborate contemporary forms. It may be the intellectual's conception of terror **(what else do we do but speak?),** but its projection onto the rest of the world would be calamitous**....(pp. 2-27)** The **realm of the** discursive is derived from the requisites for human life, which are in the physical world, rather than in a world of ideas or symbols.(4) Nutrition, shelter, and protection are basic human needs that require collective activity for their fulfillment. Postmodern emphasis on the discursive without an accompanying analysis of how the discursive emerges from material circumstances hides the complex task of envisioning and working towards concrete social goals(Merod, 1987). Although the material conditions that create the situation of marginality escape the purview of the postmodernist, the situation and its consequences are not overlooked by scholars from marginalized groups. Robinson (1990) for example, argues that "the justice that working people deserve is economic, not just textual" (p. 571). Lopez (1992) states that "the starting point for organizing the program content of education or political action must be the present existential, concrete situation" (p. 299). West (1988) asserts that borrowing French post-structuralist discourses about "Otherness" blinds us to realities of American difference going on in front of us (p. 170). Unlike postmodern "textual radicals" who Rabinow (1986) acknowledges are "fuzzy about power and the realities of socioeconomic constraints" (p. 255), most writers from marginalized groups are clear about how discourse interweaves with the concrete circumstances that create lived experience. People whose lives form the material for postmoderncounter-hegemonicdiscourse do not share the optimism over the new recognition of their discursive subjectivities**,** because such an acknowledgment does not address sufficiently their collective historical and current strugglesagainst racism, sexism, homophobia, and economic injustice**.** They do not appreciate being told they are living in a world in which there are no more real subjects. Ideas have consequences. Emphasizing the discursive self when a person is hungry and homeless represents both a cultural and humane failure**.** The need to look beyond textstothe perception and attainment of concrete social goals keeps writers from marginalized groups ever-mindful of the specifics of how power works through political agendas, institutions, agencies, and the budgets that fuel them.

AT: Apocalyptic Reps K (2/3)

2. Perm—Do plan and reject the apocalyptic imagery of the United States. We are only responsible for our plan text.

3. Perm—Do both.

4. Perm—Do plan and all non-mutually exclusive parts of the kritik.

5. Death imagery affirms life

Michael Allen Fox, Assoc. Prof Phil. @ Queens, 1985, ―Nuclear War: Philosophical Perspectives,‖ ed. Fox and

Groarke, p. 127

There remains but one choice: we must seek a reduction of world tensions, mutual trust, disarmament, and peace.35 Security is not the absence of fear and anxiety, but a degree of stress and uncertainty with which we can cope and remain mentally healthy. For security, understood in this way, to become a feature of our lives, we must admitour nuclear fear and anxiety and identify the mechanisms that dull or mask our emotional and other responses. It is necessary to realist that we cannot entrust security to ourselves, but, strange as it seems and however difficult to accept, must entrust it to our adversary Just as the safety and security of each of us, as individuals, depends upon the good will of every other, any one of whom could harm us at any moment, so the security of nations finally depends upon the good will of other nations, whether or not we willingly accept this fact. Thedisease for which we must find the cure also requiresthatwe continually come face to face with the unthinkable in image and thought and recoil from it.36 In this mannerwe can break its hold over us and free ourselves to begin new initiatives**.** As Robert J. Lifton points out, **―**confronting massive death helps us bring ourselves more in touch with what we care most about in life. We [will then] find ourselves in no way on a death trip, but rather responding to a call forpersonal and professional actions and commitments on behalf of that wondrous and fragile entity we know as human life.

6. Alternative Doesn’t Solve the aff—Pure Rejection is an endorsement of the status quo. The aff advantages are a DA to the alternative.

A. Terrorism—Rejection of the imagery of the aff doesn’t deny that drones are THE largest cause of anti-American sentiment in the Middle East or that anti-American sentiment triggers terrorists actions that escalate to extinction.

B. Their alt crushes international law, preventing states from working together to solve global injustices, inequality, environment, or racism. Cross-apply Zeng and Raskin.

7. Doesn’t disprove the aff—They can win that reps do influence policy, but that doesn’t disprove the aff. There is not a single piece of evidence in the 1NC that challenges the epistemological claims of the 1AC advantages. At most they win that we should be skeptical of big generate impacts, but you can prefer the specificity of our internal link chains,

8. No link and turn—they do not identify any part of the 1AC that uses this dangerous imagery. And the plan is a much larger step away from otherization than the questioning of our reps. We reject the US bombing people.

9. Floating pics are bad—They cannot claim to solve the aff. This is unpredictable and not tied to any text. This is bad for fairness because it is not reciprocal and makes the neg a moving target.

AT: Apocalytic Reps K (3/3)

10. THREATS ARE REAL AND COULD LITERALLY DESTROY AMERICA WITH WMDs

Newt Gingrich, Ph.D. and Prof. in History at the University of West Georgia, former Speaker of the US House of Reps, 2010, “Securing America and its Allies by Defeating America's Enemies,” ACC. 6-16-10, http://www.newt.org/securing-america-and-its-allies-defeating-americas-enemies, JT//JDI

Imagine the morning after an attack even more devastating than 9/11. It could happen. The threats are real and could literally destroy our country.

There are weapons of mass destruction, weapons of mass murder, and weapons of mass disruption—nuclear is first, biological and chemical is second, electromagnetic pulse (EMP) is third. All are real, and we are lulled into complacency by the fact that none is currently being used. But if any of them were used, the effect could be catastrophic.

\

11. REJECTION ALONE FAILS

Edward W. Said, Professor of English and Comparative Literature at Columbia Univ., ’98, “Islam Through Western Eyes,” The Nation, January 1, http://www.thenation.com/doc/19800426/19800426said, ACC. 6-10-10, JT//JDI

How fundamentally narrow and constricted is the semantic field of Islam was brought home to me after my book Orientalism appeared last year. Even though I took great pains in the book to show that current discussions of the Orient or of the Arabs and Islam are fundamentally premised upon a fiction, my book was often interpreted as a defense of the "real" Islam. Whereas what I was trying to show was that any talk about Islam was radically flawed, not only because an unwarranted assumption was being made that a large ideologically freighted generalization could cover all the rich and diverse particularity of Islamic life (a very different thing) but also because it would simply be repeating the errors of Orientalism to claim that the correct view of Islam was X or Y or Z. And still I would receive invitations from various institutions to give a lecture on the true meaning of an Islamic Republic or on the Islamic view of peace. Either one found oneself defending Islam--as if the religion needed that kind of defense--or, by keeping silent, seeming to be tacitly accepting Islam's defamation. **But rejection alone does not take one very far**, since if we are to claim, as we must, that as a religion and as a civilization Islam does have a meaning very much beyond either of the two currently given it**, we must first be able to provide something in the way of a space in which to speak** of Islam**. Those who wish either to rebut the** standard anti-Islamic and anti-Arab rhetoric that dominates the media and **liberal intellectual discourse**, or to avoid the idealization of Islam (to say nothing of its sentimentalization), **find themselves with scarcely a place to stand on, much less a place in which to move freely.** From at least the end of the eighteenth century until our own day, modern Occidental reactions to Islam have been dominated by a type of thinking that may still be called Orientalist. The general basis of Orientalist thought is an imaginative geography dividing the word into two unequal parts, the larger and "different" one called the Orient, the other, also known as our world, called the Occident or the West. Such divisions always take place when one society or culture thinks about another one, different from it, but it is interesting that even when the Orient has uniformly been considered an inferior part of the world, it has always been endowed both with far greater size and with a greater potential for power than the West. Insofar as Islam has always been seen as belonging to the Orient, its particular fate within the general structure of Orientalism has been to be looked at with a very special hostility and fear. There are, of course, many obvious religious, psychological and political reasons for this, but all of these reasons derive from a sense that so far as the West is concerned, Islam represents not only a formidable competitor but also a late-coming challenge to Christianity.

AT: Orientalism/Empire

1. Framework: Aff should defend the implementation of a topical plan action. The negative can defend the status quo or a competitive policy option.

Reasons to prefer:

A. Predictability—Forcing links and competition off of plan text key is the most predictable for both teams because the aff has to read a topical plan and the neg can only read things related to plan. Also, the USFG is the agent of the resolution. It is the only predictable actor. Predictability key to fairness and education.

B. Topic specific education—Their interpretation produces stale, generic education. Only our interpretation guarantees we learn about the specifics of the topic.

C. Policy analysis should precede discourse – most effective way to challenge power

Taft-Kaufman, ’95 [Jill **Taft-Kaufman**, Speech prof @ CMU, **1995**, Southern Comm. Journal, Spring, v. 60, Iss. 3, ―Other Ways‖, p pq]

The postmodern passwords of "polyvocality," "Otherness," and "difference," unsupported by substantial analysis of the concrete contexts of subjects, creates a solipsistic quagmire. The political sympathies of the new cultural critics, with their ostensible concern for the lack of power experienced by marginalized people, aligns them with the political left. Yet, despite their adversarial posture and talk of opposition, their discourses on intertextuality and inter-referentiality isolate them from and ignore the conditions that have produced leftist politics--conflict, racism, poverty, and injustice. In short, as Clarke (1991) asserts, postmodern emphasis on new subjects conceals the old subjects, those who have limited access to good jobs, food, housing, health care, and transportation, as well as to the media that depict them. Merod (1987) decries this situation as one which leaves no vision, will, or commitment to activism. He notes that academic lip service to the oppositional is underscored by the absence of focused collective or politically active intellectual communities. Provoked by the academic manifestations of this problem Di Leonardo (1990) echoes Merod and laments**:** Has there ever been a historical era characterized by as little radical analysis or activism and as much radical-chic writing as ours? Maundering on about Otherness:phallocentrism or Eurocentric tropes has become a lazy academic substitute for actual engagement withthe detailed histories and contemporary realitiesof Western racial minorities, white women, or any Third World population. (p. 530) Clarke's assessment of the postmodern elevation of language to the "sine qua non" of critical discussion is an even stronger indictment against the trend. Clarke examines Lyotard's (1984) The Postmodern Condition in which Lyotard maintains that virtually all social relations are linguistic, and, therefore, it is through the coercion that threatens speech that we enter the "realm of terror" and society falls apart. To this assertion, Clarke replies: I can think of few more striking indicators of the political and intellectual impoverishment of a view of society that can only recognize the discursive. If the worst terror we can envisage is the threat not to be allowed to speak, we are appallingly ignorant of terror in its elaborate contemporary forms. It may be the intellectual's conception of terror **(what else do we do but speak?),** but its projection onto the rest of the world would be calamitous**....(pp. 2-27)** The **realm of the** discursive is derived from the requisites for human life, which are in the physical world, rather than in a world of ideas or symbols.(4) Nutrition, shelter, and protection are basic human needs that require collective activity for their fulfillment. Postmodern emphasis on the discursive without an accompanying analysis of how the discursive emerges from material circumstances hides the complex task of envisioning and working towards concrete social goals(Merod, 1987). Although the material conditions that create the situation of marginality escape the purview of the postmodernist, the situation and its consequences are not overlooked by scholars from marginalized groups. Robinson (1990) for example, argues that "the justice that working people deserve is economic, not just textual" (p. 571). Lopez (1992) states that "the starting point for organizing the program content of education or political action must be the present existential, concrete situation" (p. 299). West (1988) asserts that borrowing French post-structuralist discourses about "Otherness" blinds us to realities of American difference going on in front of us (p. 170). Unlike postmodern "textual radicals" who Rabinow (1986) acknowledges are "fuzzy about power and the realities of socioeconomic constraints" (p. 255), most writers from marginalized groups are clear about how discourse interweaves with the concrete circumstances that create lived experience. People whose lives form the material for postmoderncounter-hegemonicdiscourse do not share the optimism over the new recognition of their discursive subjectivities**,** because such an acknowledgment does not address sufficiently their collective historical and current strugglesagainst racism, sexism, homophobia, and economic injustice**.** They do not appreciate being told they are living in a world in which there are no more real subjects. Ideas have consequences. Emphasizing the discursive self when a person is hungry and homeless represents both a cultural and humane failure**.** The need to look beyond textstothe perception and attainment of concrete social goals keeps writers from marginalized groups ever-mindful of the specifics of how power works through political agendas, institutions, agencies, and the budgets that fuel them.

AT: Orientalism/Empire (2/3)

2. Perm—Do plan and reject imperialist orientalist white supremacist epistemology to build genuine interactions with the oppressed.

3. Perm—Do both

4. Perm—Do plan and the non-mutually exclusive parts of the kritik.

5. No link—Plan is a negative action that removes the United States’ ability to use military drones in Afghanistan. Links to plan key.

6. REJECTION ALONE FAILS

Edward W. Said, Professor of English and Comparative Literature at Columbia Univ., ’98, “Islam Through Western Eyes,” The Nation, January 1, http://www.thenation.com/doc/19800426/19800426said, ACC. 6-10-10, JT//JDI

How fundamentally narrow and constricted is the semantic field of Islam was brought home to me after my book Orientalism appeared last year. Even though I took great pains in the book to show that current discussions of the Orient or of the Arabs and Islam are fundamentally premised upon a fiction, my book was often interpreted as a defense of the "real" Islam. Whereas what I was trying to show was that any talk about Islam was radically flawed, not only because an unwarranted assumption was being made that a large ideologically freighted generalization could cover all the rich and diverse particularity of Islamic life (a very different thing) but also because it would simply be repeating the errors of Orientalism to claim that the correct view of Islam was X or Y or Z. And still I would receive invitations from various institutions to give a lecture on the true meaning of an Islamic Republic or on the Islamic view of peace. Either one found oneself defending Islam--as if the religion needed that kind of defense--or, by keeping silent, seeming to be tacitly accepting Islam's defamation. **But rejection alone does not take one very far**, since if we are to claim, as we must, that as a religion and as a civilization Islam does have a meaning very much beyond either of the two currently given it**, we must first be able to provide something in the way of a space in which to speak** of Islam**. Those who wish either to rebut the** standard anti-Islamic and anti-Arab rhetoric that dominates the media and **liberal intellectual discourse**, or to avoid the idealization of Islam (to say nothing of its sentimentalization), **find themselves with scarcely a place to stand on, much less a place in which to move freely.** From at least the end of the eighteenth century until our own day, modern Occidental reactions to Islam have been dominated by a type of thinking that may still be called Orientalist. The general basis of Orientalist thought is an imaginative geography dividing the word into two unequal parts, the larger and "different" one called the Orient, the other, also known as our world, called the Occident or the West. Such divisions always take place when one society or culture thinks about another one, different from it, but it is interesting that even when the Orient has uniformly been considered an inferior part of the world, it has always been endowed both with far greater size and with a greater potential for power than the West. Insofar as Islam has always been seen as belonging to the Orient, its particular fate within the general structure of Orientalism has been to be looked at with a very special hostility and fear. There are, of course, many obvious religious, psychological and political reasons for this, but all of these reasons derive from a sense that so far as the West is concerned, Islam represents not only a formidable competitor but also a late-coming challenge to Christianity.

AT: Orientalism/Empire (3/3)

7. Privileging epistemology guarantees policy failure because of theoretical reductionism, and isn’t relevant to the truth value of our arguments.

Owen 2 (University of Southampton, David Owen, Reader of Political Theory at the Univ. of Southampton, Millennium Vol 31 No 3 2002 p. 655-7)

Commenting on the ‘philosophical turn’ in IR, Wæver remarks that ‘[a] frenzy for words like “epistemology” and “ontology” often signals this philosophical turn’, although he goes on to comment that these terms are often used loosely.4 However, loosely deployed or not, it is clear that debates concerning ontology and epistemology play a central role in the contemporary IR theory wars. In one respect, this is unsurprising since it is a characteristic feature of the social sciences that periods of disciplinary disorientation involve recourse to reflection on the philosophical commitments of different theoretical approaches, and there is no doubt that such reflection can play a valuable role in making explicit the commitments that characterise (and help individuate) diverse theoretical positions. Yet, such a philosophical turn is not without its dangers and I will briefly mention three before turning to consider a confusion that has, I will suggest, helped to promote the IR theory wars by motivating this philosophical turn. The first danger with the philosophical turn is that it has an inbuilt tendency to prioritise issues of ontology and epistemology over explanatory and/or interpretive power as if the latter two were merely a simple function of the former. But while the explanatory and/or interpretive power of a theoretical account is not wholly independent of its ontological and/or epistemological commitments (otherwise criticism of these features would not be a criticism that had any value), it is by no means clear that it is, in contrast, wholly dependent on these philosophical commitments. Thus, for example, one need not be sympathetic to rational choice theory to recognise that it can provide powerful accounts of certain kinds of problems, such as the tragedy of the commons in which dilemmas of collective action are foregrounded. It may, of course, be the case that the advocates of rational choice theory cannot give a good account of why this type of theory is powerful in accounting for this class of problems (i.e., how it is that the relevant actors come to exhibit features in these circumstances that approximate the assumptions of rational choice theory) and, if this is the case, it is a philosophical weakness—but this does not undermine the point that, for a certain class of problems, rational choice theory may provide the best account available to us. In other words, while the critical judgement of theoretical accounts in terms of their ontological and/or epistemological sophistication is one kind of critical judgement, it is not the only or even necessarily the most important kind. The second danger run by the philosophical turn is that because prioritisation of ontology and epistemology promotes theory-construction from philosophical first principles, it cultivates a theory-driven rather than problem-driven approach to IR. Paraphrasing Ian Shapiro, the point can be put like this: since it is the case that there is always a plurality of possible true descriptions of a given action, event or phenomenon, the challenge is to decide which is the most apt in terms of getting a perspicuous grip on the action, event or phenomenon in question given the purposes of the inquiry; yet, from this standpoint, ‘theory-driven work is part of a reductionist program’ in that it ‘dictates always opting for the description that calls for the explanation that flows from the preferred model or theory’.5 The justification offered for this strategy rests on the mistaken belief that it is necessary for social science because general explanations are required to characterise the classes of phenomena studied in similar terms. However, as Shapiro points out, this is to misunderstand the enterprise of science since ‘whether there are general explanations for classes of phenomena is a question for social-scientific inquiry, not to be prejudged before conducting that inquiry’.6 Moreover, this strategy easily slips into the promotion of the pursuit of generality over that of empirical validity. The third danger is that the preceding two combine to encourage the formation of a particular image of disciplinary debate in IR—what might be called (only slightly tongue in cheek) ‘the Highlander view’—namely, an image of warring theoretical approaches with each, despite occasional temporary tactical alliances, dedicated to the strategic achievement of sovereignty over the disciplinary field. It encourages this view because the turn to, and prioritisation of, ontology and epistemology stimulates the idea that there can only be one theoretical approach which gets things right, namely, the theoretical approach that gets its ontology and epistemology right. This image feeds back into IR exacerbating the first and second dangers, and so a potentially vicious circle arises.

8. Case Turns the K—The humanization of international law is critical to equality in the international sphere. Rejection of the aff ensures collapse of international law and the expansion of more dangerous hegemonic forms. Prefer the aff too.

XO 2AC (1/3)

1. Perm Do the CP—The Executive Order could be normal means – congress cannot interfere with presidential war planning

Prakash Herzog Research Professor of Law, University of San Diego 2008 Saikrishna William and Mary Law Review lexis accessed 6/24/10

Apart from claiming the power to initiate warfare, modern Commanders in Chief have also asserted that the Constitution bars Congress from enacting statutes that interfere with presidential direction of wars. These claims were voiced as early as the mid-1950s by President Truman. n123 Many scholars have endorsed the [\*1041] notion that the Commander in Chief has exclusive authority over certain operational matte**rs.** n124

2. Perm Do Both

3. Agent CPs are Bad—

a) Not Predictable==multiple possible actors like NGOs, other countries, random agencies, explodes the research burden for the aff because they can’t predict

b) Steals the entirety of the aff—means we can’t leverage the 1ac as offense, especially true because there isn’t a literature base that makes a distinction between congress and the executive

c) Err aff on theory—neg has higher win percentage, the negative block, and generic CPs and Ks that moot the benefit of speaking first and last

d) Voting issue for fairness and Education

4. CP links to politics--executive orders create a lightning rod on the whitehouse

Cooper 97 [Phillip, Prof of Public Administration @ Portland State, Nov 97, “Power tools for an effective and

responsible presidency” Administration and Society, Vol. 29, p. Proquest]

Interestingly enough, the effort to avoid opposition from Congress or agencies can have the effect of turning the White House itself into a lightning rod. When an administrative agency takes action under its statutory authority and responsibility, its opponents generally focus their conflicts as limited disputes aimed at the agency involved. Where the White House employs an executive order, for example, to shift critical elements of decision making from the agencies to the executive office of the president, the nature of conflict changes and the focus shifts to 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue or at least to the executive office buildings. The saga of the OIRA battle with Congress under regulatory review orders and the murky status of the Quayle Commission working in concert with OIRA provides a dramatic case in point.

5. No Solvency—Xos are overly complex and Next President will Rollback

Cooper 97 [Phillip, Prof of Public Administration @ Portland State, Nov 97, “Power tools for an effective and

responsible presidency” Administration and Society, Vol. 29, p. Proquest]

Even if one takes a purely utilitarian approach, dangers exist in the use of executive orders. Because their development is unsystematic and ad hoc, they can create burdensome duplicative or overlapping obligations that do not fit well with statutory and regulatory obligations. Where the effort was merely to block action, as was true with the regulatory review orders, those burdens seem to help the president, but if the chief executive wants something positive to happen, the orders can be needless burdens on the accomplishment of the president's wishes. Even if they serve temporary goals, executive orders can produce a significant amount of complexity and conflict and not yield a long-term benefit because the next president may dispose of predecessors' orders at a whim. It may be easier than moving a statute through Congress and faster than waiting for agencies to use their rule-making processes to accomplish policy ends, but executive orders may ultimately be a much weaker foundation on which to build a policy than the alternatives. And to the degree that agencies prepare and advocate executive orders to avoid the burdensome process of rule making, they are plainly subverting the very body of law that supports their authority and effectiveness.

XO 2AC (2/3)

6. Interbranch Conflict—

A. Executive Orders Cause them

Cooper 97 [Phillip, Prof of Public Administration @ Portland State, Nov 97, “Power tools for an effective and

responsible presidency” Administration and Society, Vol. 29, p. Proquest]

Despite the fact that executive orders are seemingly efficient and effective tools, they carry dangers as well as opportunities. The first problem is the temptation to do things in what appears to be the easy way. Second, the use of executive orders poses dangers of political tensions with Congress and within the executive branch. Third, the use ofthe orders poses threats to the system of administrative law. More than one president has used executive orders to circumvent what appeared to be a recalcitrant Congress. President Johnson did that in his order establishing affirmative action requirements in federal government contracting, which the Nixon administration later endorsed and issued as the Philadelphia Plan (E.O. 11246). Carter and Reagan followed suit in other policy arenas. On other occasions, presidents merely interpreted statutory authority in very broad terms to support actions they wanted to undertake without seeking more specific and immediate legislative approval. Nixon's wage/price freeze was upheld in Amalgamated Meat Cutters & Butcher Workmen of North America v. Connally, 1971 (see generally Friedelbaum,1974) and Carter's efforts to impose an oil import fee was struck down (Independent Gasoline Markets Council v. Duncan, 1980). Reagan's regulatory review orders clearly intended to slow the issuance of regulations called for by statute. Bush's rule-making moratorium not only accomplished that objective but sought, where possible, to roll back rules already issued as well. The dangers of engendering conflicts with Congress in such matters is clear. Indeed, the regulatory review battle eventually led to threats to the existence of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs (OIRA) in the OMB. When OIRA shifted its tactics to the use of the Paperwork Reduction Act to accomplish what Congress challenged under the executive orders, the battle ultimately led to a standoff in which the Congress refused to reauthorize the Paperwork Reduction Act after the White House reneged on a sidebar agreement between the OMB and the House Government Operations Committee (C. Boyden Gray, counsel to the president, to John Conyers, chairman, Committee on Government Operations, April 30,1990; and Carol T. Crawford, assistant attorney general, to Richard G. Darman, director, OMB, December 20, 1989). The actual agreement was titled "Administrative Agreement: Procedures Governing OIRA Review of Regulations Under Executive Order Nos. 12291 and 12498." Conflict with Congress can emerge from process concerns as well as from substance. Thus, the Reagan administration engendered a legislative challenge when it modified the Carter administration security classification order in drafting E.O. 12356. The Carter administration had used an open process with considerable consultation in something that almost appeared to be a kind of notice and comment process. The Reagan administration had a clear intention to modify the security classification system to be more protective and less open than its predecessor. The process used to produce the order mirrored the tone of the document itself. Many members of Congress were not pleased, and some speculated that the intention was to reduce the availability of information generally and to Congress in particular. The lesson seems to be that where it is appropriate and feasible to do so, a cooperative approach to the development of orders is not a bad idea.

B. Interbranch Conflict kills US Foreign Policy—Impact is multiple wars

Jamison, Deputy of Governmental Relations at CSIS, 1993 (Linda S., Executive-Legislative Relations after the Cold War, Washington Quarterly, Spring Vol. 16, No. 2; Page 189)

Indeed, there are very few domestic issues that do not have strong international implications, and likewise there are numerous transnational issues in which all nations have a stake. Environmental degradation, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, population control, migration, international narcotics trafficking, the spread of AIDS, and the deterioration of the human condition in the less developed world are circumstances affecting all corners of the globe. Neither political isolation nor policy bifurcation is an option for the United States. Global circumstances have drastically changed with the end of the Cold War and the political and policy conditions that sustained bipartisan consensus are not applicable to the post-war era. The formulation of a new foreign policy must be grounded in broad-based principles that reflect domestic economic, political, and social concerns while providing practical solutions to new situations. Toward a Cooperative U.S. Foreign Policy for the 1990s If the federal government is to meet the new international policy challenges of the post-cold war era, institutional dissension caused by partisan competition and executive-legislative friction must give way to a new way of business. Policy flexibility must be the watchword of the 1990s in the foreign policy domain if the United States is to have any hope of securing its interests in the uncertain years ahead. One former policymaker, noting the historical tendency of the United States to make fixed "attachments," has argued that a changing world dictates policy flexibility, where practical solutions can be developed on principles of broad-based foreign policy objectives (Fulbright 1979). Flexibility, however, will not be possible without interbranch cooperation. The end of the Cold War and the new single-party control of the White House and Congress provide a unique opportunity to reestablish foreign policy cooperation. Reconfiguring post-cold war objectives requires comprehension of the remarkable transformations in world affairs and demands an intense political dialogue that goes beyond the executive branch (Mann 1990, 28-29).

XO 2AC (3/3)

7. Presidential Power are Bad--

A. Pres Powers Undercuts Democracy, The Rule of Law and  Military Adventurism

Fisher 2010 The Law: When Wars Begin: Misleading Statements by Presidents; LOUIS FISHER, Presidential

Studies Quarterly; Volume 40, Issue 1, Pages 171-184, p.

The framers would not have been surprised that presidents and executive officials would deliberately mislead Congress and the American people about the need to go to war. They did not trust human nature, and they certainly did not trust executives and their capacity to initiate wars ruinous to their countries. Presidents are surrounded by aides who focus more on "mandates" from a winning campaign and less on constitutional and legal constraints. Although recent presidents (Truman, Johnson, Bush II) have been chewed up by failed military commitments, the aura remains that in order to be a great president, the occupant of the White House must be a war president. There is great temptation for presidents and executive officials to dissemble and distort. The drafters of the Constitution hoped that the capacity to abuse power would be checked by rival institutions. As Madison expressed it in Federalist No. 51, each department of government "should have a will of its own" (Wright 2002, 355). Each department had to possess "the necessary constitutional means and personal motives to resist encroachments of the others" (Wright 2002, 356). Over the last half century, Congress has frequently failed to honor that fundamental duty, choosing to defer to presidential decisions and Supreme Court rulings (Fisher 2010). Congressional committees need to call executive officials to testify, under oath, to defend their public statements about going to war. To do that effectively, lawmakers and their staffs must arm themselves in advance with information obtained from executive agencies and from experts outside of government. Going to war is the most consequential act of government. Congress cannot function in an independent and informed manner by conceding that the president possesses plenary and exclusive control over national security intelligence. The executive branch does not have, constitutionally or politically, a superior advantage in deciding military commitments. Leaning in that direction undercuts the hope for democracy and the rule of law.

B. Democracy key to prevent extinction

Diamond 95 [Larry Promoting Democracy in the 1990’s <http://wwics.si.edu/subsites/ccpdc/pubs/di/1.htm>]

This hardly exhausts the lists of threats to our security and well-being in the coming years and decades. In the former Yugoslavia nationalist aggression tears at the stability of Europe and could easily spread. The flow of illegal drugs intensifies through increasingly powerful international crime syndicates that have made common cause with authoritarian regimes and have utterly corrupted the institutions of tenuous, democratic ones. Nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons continue to proliferate. The very source of life on Earth, the global ecosystem, appears increasingly endangered. Most of these new and unconventional threats to security are associated with or aggravated by the weakness or absence of democracy, with its provisions for legality, accountability, popular sovereignty, and openness.

AT: Full Withdrawal CP

1. Perm—Do Plan and The United States federal government should withdrawal virtually all United States forces from Afghanistan over the next 18 months. The United States federal government will retain small numbers of CIA and Special Forces personnel in Afghanistan.

2. The case is a DA to the counterplan—The counterplan leaves drones in place.

A. Terrorism—The CP doesn’t solve any of our internal links. Drones will still cause anti-Americanism, hurt interrogation and trade-off with intel gathering. This ensures extinction from terrorism.

B. International Law—US use of drones violates international law. This prevents the humanization of international law which is key to ending violence and war. It also hurts US soft power which is key to preventing extinction. They also concede that the spread of future weapons leads to extinction.

3. Perm-Do both

AT: Drones Key to Solve Terror (On-Case)

Not true—even if they are right that drones can find a few terrorists, we’ll win that terrorism is better solved by banning drones

A. Drones produce more anti-Americanism than they can solve. Extend the Gerges evidence from the 1AC.

B. When drones find terrorists, they kill them—finding terrorists with ground forces is more productive because then we can interrogate for necessary information.

C. Intelligence trade-off—Drones are resource intensive. Requiring many analysts. Ground forces are just as effective when analysts can focus on their missions.

AT: Adv. Non-U—US uses drones elsewhere

1. Doesn’t matter—the plan solves an enormous risk of terrorist attack based in Afghanistan. We have very specific internal links.

2. International Law Advantage solves this—Adherence to international law in Afghanistan sets a global precedent banning all drone use internationally. Plan is the key first step.

AT: Adv. Non-U—Other Countries use drones

1. Other countries model the US—Ext Alston. Other countries proliferate because the US does. A US ban on drones will solve.

2. Soft power solves—An increase in US soft power gives the US the ability to bargain with other countries, persuading them not to develop and use drone technology. Also, soft power solves proliferation. Ext our Nye ev.

3. International law solves—the plan strengthens international law ensuring a global ban on drone technology. The prevents the development of future drone technology.

AT: Alt Causes to US Soft Power Decline

1. Plan solves the alt causes—US ban on drones ensures strengthening of international law, which means the US can no longer commit the things listed in their alt causes. Cross apply Zeng and Raskin.

2. Drones key—the 1AC evidence says that drones are the key. They are THE tool of the US war on terror now. Solving this will spill over to other issues.

3. SQ solved these—Obama is working to solve all of these in the SQuo.

4. Doesn’t take out the advantage. We have specific internal links to our aff that don’t rely on soft power.

AT: Drones key to Intelligence

1. Not true—Drone actually hurt intelligence.

A. Kill the sources of intelligence and prevent interrogation. Cross the second internal link from the 1AC.

B. They overload analysts—intel specialists are overwhelmed by the videofeed from drones. This trades off with better intell for on the ground counter-insurgency strategies.