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1AC

Observation 1: Inherency

The US relies on drone technology in Afghanistan

Chelala, 6/9 [Cesar Chelala, winner of an Overseas Press Club of America award for an article on human rights, “Drones: Backfiring on U.S. Strategy,” The Globalist, 6/ 09/10, DA: 6/22/10, http://www.theglobalist.com/storyid.aspx?StoryId=8515.]

Predator drones are increasingly being used in Afghanistan and Pakistan, where they track and kill suspected insurgents, sometimes with their own missiles. César Chelala argues that if the use of these dangerous weapons becomes more frequent, so will adverse impacts on the safety of innocent civilians and violations of international humanitarian law.

Drones are a dominant component of US military presence in Afghanistan

Chelala, 6/10 [Cesar Chelala, winner of an Overseas Press Club of America award for an article on human rights, CommonDreams.org, 6/10/10, date accessed: 6/22/10, http://www.commondreams.org/view/2010/06/10-5.]

In a scathing report released on May 29, the American military blamed the "inaccurate and unprofessional reporting" by a team of Predator drone operators that led to the strikes. This episode illustrates the serious risks involved in the use of drones, which many law experts consider violate rules of war. Predator drones are extensively used in Afghanistan and Pakistan, where they track and kill suspected insurgents, sometimes with their own missiles. A report by the UN Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions, Philip Alston, makes a thorough assessment on the effect of drones, whose use has provoked significant controversy.

Advantage \_\_\_\_\_: Modeling

US use of drones in Afghanistan crushes international humanitarian law and eliminates international accountability for killing—Continued use will create devastating precedent that will inevitably be modeled

Alston, NYU law professor and the U.N.’s special rapporteur on extrajudicial killings, ’10

[Philip Alston, NYU law professor and the U.N.’s special rapporteur on extrajudicial killings,Human Rights Council: Fourteenth session, Agenda item 3, “Promotion and protection of all human rights, civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights, including the right to development, Report of the Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions” United Nations General Assembly Report, A/HRC/14/24/Add.6, 5/28/10, http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/hrcouncil/docs/14session/A.HRC.14.24.Add6.pdf]

1. A targeted killing is the intentional, premeditated and deliberate use of lethal force, by States or their agents acting under colour of law, or by an organized armed group in armed conflict, against a specific individual who is not in the physical custody of the perpetrator. In recent years, a few States have adopted policies, either openly or implicitly, of using targeted killings, including in the territories of other States. 2. Such policies have been justified both as a legitimate response to “terrorist” threats and as a necessary response to the challenges of “asymmetric warfare.” In the legitimate struggle against terrorism, too many criminal acts have been re-characterized so as to justify addressing them within the framework of the law of armed conflict. New technologies, and especially unarmed combat aerial vehicles or “drones”, have been added into this mix, by making it easier to kill targets, with fewer risks to the targeting State. 3. The result of this mix has been a highly problematic blurring and expansion of the boundaries of the applicable legal frameworks – human rights law, the laws of war, and the law applicable to the use of inter-state force. Even where the laws of war are clearly applicable, there has been a tendency to expand who may permissibly be targeted and under what conditions. Moreover, the States concerned have often failed to specify the legal justification for their policies, to disclose the safeguards in place to ensure that targeted killings are in fact legal and accurate, or to provide accountability mechanisms for violations. Most troublingly, they have refused to disclose who has been killed, for what reason, and with what collateral consequences. The result has been the displacement of clear legal standards with a vaguely defined licence to kill, and the creation of a major accountability vacuum. 4. In terms of the legal framework, many of these practices violate straightforward applicable legal rules. To the extent that customary law is invoked to justify a particular interpretation of an international norm, the starting point must be the policies and practice of the vast majority of States and not those of the handful which have conveniently sought to create their own personalized normative frameworks. It should be added that many of the justifications for targeted killings offered by one or other of the relevant States in particular current contexts would in all likelihood not gain their endorsement if they were to be asserted by other States in the future.

We isolate two impact scenarios to modeling

The first scenario is International Humanitarian Law—Drones crush IHL

Humanitarian international law is the driving force behind the humanization of all international law

Zeng, ‘9 [ZENG Lingliang, Faculty of Law, University of Macau, Macau, China, Humanizing tendency of contemporary international law, Front. Law China 2009, 4(1): 1–30]

(1) The fast humanizing tendency of international law has been resulted from external and internal factors of international law. Among various external factors, war and science & technology are two primary elements. It is the war or armed conflict that destroys or seriously harms the human life and property, thus urging the makers of international law increasingly to take into consideration of the human values. It is the continuous discovery and creation of science and technology that brings constant wealth to this world on the one hand and growing challenges to the human living environment and sustainable development on the other hand, thus making enactors of international law turn to more and more concerns to the latter. Judging from the internal factors (or international law itself), the humanitarian law and the law of human rights are the two “engines” of humanization-oriented trend of international law. It is humanitarian law that makes the start of humanizing process of international law. It is the fast development of human rights law that symbolizes humanization turning to be the main stream of international law. It has proved since the recent half a century or so that it is the continuous self-perfection of humanitarian law and human rights law, their mutual interactions and their putting-out effects on other areas of international law that have been promoting the growing humanization of international law as a whole.

Humanization of international law represents the end of absolute state power—it is ushering a new era of global justice, environmental protections and human rights

Zeng, ‘9 [ZENG Lingliang, Faculty of Law, University of Macau, Macau, China, Humanizing tendency of contemporary international law, Front. Law China 2009, 4(1): 1–30]

Humanization of international law has greatly enriched the contents of international law. Firstly, humanization has directly produced a series of new branches of international law, among which international human rights law, international environmental law and international criminal law are the most persuasive examples. Secondly, humanization has promoted some classic sectors of international law being continuously updated and adapted themselves to new conceptions, principles, rules and mechanism, such as various new elements in the law of sea, space law, law of diplomatic protection, humanitarian law, law of extradition, etc. In addition, humanization has urged international community to seek for dynamic links and appropriate coordination among certain sectors or areas of international law, such as the interactions between security, development, human rights and rule of law, the balance between economic development and environmental protection, the conciliation between intellectual property rights and public health, the connection between trade liberalization and core labor standards, etc. As a result of these horizontal and vertical development of humanizing international law, while sectors, areas or matters that are solely subject to domestic jurisdictions of States have been greatly decreasing, international law has been extending its scopes not only into various internal sectors of States, but also into all aspects of human life. In a word, humanizing international law symbolizes the end of absolute sovereignty and popularity of relative sovereignty both in theory and practice.

Humanized international law—far from being a western construct—is a tool of liberation of all peoples—International law key to stop extinction from nuclear war, ethnic violence, and environmental destruction

Raskin, ‘99

[Marcus, Co-founder of the Institute for Policy Studies and Professor of Public Policy at Georgetown, “Re-framing international law for the 21st century: The International Law of Reconstruction,” 9 Transnat'l L. & Contemp. Probs. 513, lexis]

Like law itself, international law has been a double-edged sword, organizing the power of status quo nations and forces as justification for naked power. Other times it seems that international law continues as an instrument for the violated and the wretched seeking moral, political and social recompense. Sometimes these forces are represented or present themselves directly in struggles that have no name. And sometimes they are recognized as a result of the profound shifts in consciousness which then guide law in new directions as, for example, in the discovery and application of human rights. Emphasis on human rights might transform the current dominant conflict/power/force paradigm of international relations to one of common cooperation where conflict is recognized but subsumed and transmuted. Other times, those precedents of reason and cooperation based on a pacific sentiment within humanity and international law are called upon and applied to new situations. The latter two notions mean the retiring of the Thucydides/Hobbes/Machiavelli (THM) framework 2 because it is not easily able to recognize anything but war and conflict as the fundament of civilization itself. The THM framework, as Francis Boyle has suggested, is one which retains dominance and has as its logical consequence the will to destroy and assert dominance. 3 It offers humanity nothing but a doomsday future in slow motion where, at best, practitioners of international law and international relations are consigned like Sisyphus either to forestall the inevitable or to engage in labors of questionable value. But the THM view represents the detritus from the past, which, in the light of present moral standards, is either suspect or rejected. Thus, take as an example George Kennan, one of the premier thinkers about American foreign policy, who promulgated the view that an elitist, virtually monarchial, system that was [\*515] authoritarian in nature was better than a democracy. 4 Kennan called for the "extensive restriction of suffrage in national affairs." 5 Those denied the vote would be women, considered frivolous by Kennan, blacks, considered wards of the state without need of the franchise, and immigrants, who were exercising more political power than "real" Americans. 6 The treatment of minorities as inferior and not part of civilization was accepted as "good and necessary" law through the Second World War. 7 Thus, whole groups, which at the beginning of the century were classified as beyond the ambit of concern and without rights, by the end of the century could no longer be denied even in international politics and law. 8However, the twentieth century has shown that such notions of power, racism and dominance need not endure in light of changed consciousness and international law once the project of human rights and inclusivity is clearly articulated as emancipation and reconstruction. This characterization of a reconstructed international law, linked to international and transnational relations, fits within the underlying patterns of modern history that have emerged since the French revolution. In fact, within American life, profound cultural changes have led to a transformation of understanding regarding world politics and historical markers. Today, there is a far greater awareness in the populace as a whole, such that ideas reflected by Kennan sixty years ago have been reduced to the marginal and dark recesses of the minds of segregationists and Colonel Blimps. 9 Demystification, which occurred through social movements finding their own voices and through new studies in tune with these movements, resulted in breaking the colonizing knowledge and power nexus. Not surprisingly, icons suffered. Christopher Columbus, once viewed uncritically (with the exception of Adam Smith) 10 and nearly universally as a symbol of [\*516] exploration and liberation, today can be seen as a harbinger of exploitation and genocide. School children in the West can recount the role of Columbus and the startling and awful role of the settlers in the destruction of native cultures. This destruction was no less furthered by the sanctimonious and sweet-talking missionaries whose crosses became swords stuck in the hearts of the indigenous. Today, school children learn that when a continent had to be cleared and Nature conquered, it was reprehensible for those such as Andrew Jackson, and Generals Sherman and Sheridan to relish in their tasks of the genocide of Indians. More proof of humane progress in this century can be seen among the colonized in the Congo, China or Brazil, indigenous people and tribes once captured to dig, mine and build for the West, who have since presented their own cases and found their own voices and representation. Yet, not much has changed in terms of the distribution of political power, the assumptions held by the powerful, and the institutional structures that reinforce very traditional and unpleasant views of the role that states have in the world--a world which is characterized by paranoia, fear and an inability to render solutions to world problems. However, the givens of international law changed with the idea that law should be undergirded by notions of humane progress. Law, humaneness and justice came to be conflated and, by the end of the century, democracy (because it meant inclusivity and choice) was also being invoked as a political rallying cry to promote justice, equality and dignity. Once whole groups, whether women, minorities or the indigenous, are recognized as having human rights as well as individual and group dignity, they are included in a social compact, which the law codifies in actions, rituals and symbols for political equality. In their continuing struggles, the formerly denied groups then use the law as their wedge for human rights. In this dialectical but complementary process, international law is no longer the passive justifier of the status quo and impenetrable state power. It becomes an instrument for continuing liberation among elites and popular movements alike. 11 Social and political developments such as these bear witness to the liberal thrust and consciousness that showed itself in the twentieth century. II. The Liberal Struggle Against THM The century began with the idea that progress was to have a material base. Correctly conceived, humankind would come to view itself through those forms of liberation which would allow people and governments to choose and pursue practical projects, ranging from installing sewage systems, to building schools, to providing for the general well-being of people. Such practical freedoms go hand-in-hand with those aspects of freedom that encourage choice and the amelioration of problems generated by human [\*517] material necessity. There was among many the Kantian belief that people should not be used as means, but rather that they were ends in themselves. Further, many believed that the light of education would shine in such a way throughout the world that two principles would emerge. These principles were adopted by many liberal-minded people in the United States as a means of understanding others and learning from them. The first of these principles was cultural relativism. Anthropologists such as Franz Boas, Margaret Mead, and Ruth Benedict, 12 as its proponents, intended to move all of humanity to a position of political equality. For American culture and politics, cultural relativism meant movement away from parochial narrowness. The second principle was that of universalism, in which "right" (in the sense of a moral right) was existent in all of us and could be teased out of us so that our institutions would reflect "right." This would be the type of justice and equality that all would accept and embrace, thereby overcoming the type of existential freedom for individuals and nations that made others their paranoid objects. Such hopes and sentiments represented a revolution when applied to international law, for that hoary subject began from the principle that there was the law of the conquerors who had mandates and trusteeships over the conquered. The conqueror, in his eyes, had a superior civilization (invariably white), with a triumphal spirit that would bring to the wretched the benefits of religion and technology, reinforced by military power. The wretched did not know the manifold character of this god. But they had their deities and their communal life stolen by missionaries who sanctified the private property of thee and thine, and set up the boundaries of land, resources, the mind, and the law of States and Corporations all in the name of religion. This smorgasbord of ideas, progressive and regressive as they were, contradictory and complementary, played an important ideological role in the development of American imperial triumphalism in the twentieth century. Leaders and policymakers in the United States saw the U.S. as the hope of the world, and by the end of the Second World War there were sufficient numbers of people in Europe who accepted this point of view so that American conceptions of international relations and international law, reinforced by military power, predominated. Yet, there were different voices that sought to break out of the harsh armor of European and white domination, and they did so through their own efforts. If they concerned themselves with international law it was to remind the colonizer of his words and concepts of fairness and justice. Leaders in the [\*518] third world hoped that international law would serve as a justifier and umbrella that would allow newly created nations to work through their own destinies of progress toward a somewhat undefined universal understanding of dignity and equality. For some international lawyers, such as the eminent Quincy Wright, international law was a continuing course of study in world ethics which would yield inclusivity and symmetry. 13 Humankind would live in, and then expand, the legal structure which would allow all peoples to be joined in world peace and brotherhood. International and domestic institutions, infused with universal right, recognized as such by all, would be held in common and all would be entitled to access. This, of course, was the "ought" version of international law which somehow would emerge from the nation-state structure with but a nod to non-state actors, such as political, social and economic movements. Quincy Wright's liberal interpretation of international law was intended to inhibit positivist realist law so that states could find common ground for cooperation that would yield a common law of international relations in the future. III. The UN: Straddling Old and New Frameworks The UN was to be the framework by which such cooperation would occur. The UN Security Council was configured according to the pyramidal system of power (especially military power), while the General Assembly was to realize new concepts and ideas of world participation. Realists, like Dean Acheson, former U.S. Secretary of State, had little interest in the UN because it seemed to limit individual state action. 14 Nevertheless, like other realpolitikers, he had grudging respect for the trope of idealism. The moral attraction of international law to Dean Acheson was its role in assuring Western domination and mediating differences between the powerful who held the same unexamined values regarding their privileged place in the world of states and, of course, in their own societies. 15 In pragmatic terms, the realist knew the power of the liberal sentiment, for it had served both in the First and Second World Wars as an amulet that gave men courage to fight and endure the most horrifying conditions. U.S. State Department officials like Dean Acheson, grounded in institutions as they were, held no interest in activities which were linked either to decolonization or to the creation of the United Nations as a body [\*519] separate from the dictates of the United States. 16 Their concern was to ensure that military and economic power guaranteed American preeminence and American views of beneficence. American policymakers believed that liberal notions of international law (in the sense of justice equally applied) were useful as rhetorical instruments but should not disrupt the world pyramid of power with the U.S. on the top. But the rhetoric of universalism has a tendency to become the action program of a future generation. Underneath the system in which justice belonged to the stronger, the system that defined American foreign policy during most of the Cold War, there was an emerging system of law that was set in motion by universalistic ideas, such as those found in the New Deal rhetoric and in Franklin Roosevelt's conceptions of international law. 17 These universalistic ideas revolved around the United Nations, which, while simultaneously justifying state power, became an open door for the hitherto unheard and unseen. There was to be, and continues to be, a fierce struggle for the role of the UN, its meaning, and the international laws for which it served as midwife. Although much energy was spent, for example, by the realist Hans Morgenthau, distinguishing himself from the idealists of international law, by the end of his life he saw the virtue of these ideals, especially in a nuclear age. 18 To the dominated, the primary public purpose of international law was to be justice. This necessarily required a very different measuring-stick than the kind featured by the colonizer. International law would thereafter move away, ever so slowly, from oppression and the diktat of the powerful. Eventually, it brought living, breathing and ordinary people into its ambit to the point at which it could be [\*520] said without drawing smirks and derision that the law of nations was really the laws of peoples within and beyond any particular states. The people were not the enemy "other." Indeed, they were to be actual operators in the international system. They were to become wild cards that ruling groups which ran states now had to confront, coopt and appease. Just as great states paid no heed to the sovereignty of others when it suited their interests, so too an attack came from another direction. The Lotus case, 19 which committed itself to sovereignty of states, was shattered by three words which conceptually had the effect of reshaping the political and legal geography of international law in line with the changed conditions that followed decolonization. The first three words of the United Nations Charter, "We the Peoples" 20 moved the subject of international law from a group of leaders in sovereign states to the lives of billions of people. Rhetorically, and through the law outlined at the Nuremberg trials, nations were on notice that they were in danger of committing crimes against humanity if they did not recognize the human rights of their own citizens. 21 It seemed that ordinary people would no longer be subject to the abuse of the state in which they lived. New words and concepts were to be given meaning and respect that made this point. Whether this claim applied to the permanent members of the Security Council, however, seemed dubious. They policed and were not to be policed. Although the International Court of Justice might rule against them in cases of high importance, such as nuclear testing, use of nuclear weapons, and covert actions in Nicaragua, the legal effect on the behavior of states was at best modest. Nevertheless, powerful changes were occurring. The idea of a legal conscience took its cues from a universal ethic which was not a single writ, but rather the recognition that norms had their own steps which accumulated over time to change the entire frame of reference. Changed circumstances through communications, war and technology made this argument one with a rational underpinning. Many without political power, and a few with such power, believed that conditions and situations which humanity confronted in the twentieth century demanded radically different approaches to social relations among people. The emergence of Gandhism and the non-violent struggles of Martin Luther King, Jr. portended very different uses of powerlessness and power, requiring protections in the law and support which identified with movements seeking an end to their felt oppression. Such movements forced lawyers and international lawyers to rethink their professions as they related to such [\*521] notions of international community. After all, whose community was it? Some argued that international law was more than a series of mechanical propositions between states taught in law schools. Without higher moral "values" international law is but a soulless contrivance: that, more or less, is the essential message of these new theories. By thrusting the concept of "international community" into the foreground, the concept was intended to increase the possibility of cooperation and move humanity to work out operationally how a greater unity overspanning ideological economic differences might occur. In practical political terms the concept of international community and international law were beginning to be understood as a means for the Third World to end its era of powerlessness and aspire to a new majority position within international organizations at the service of what it sees as a fight for justice. 22 The international community was to be understood as forging a "common good." Thus, concepts of equity and equality in the political and economic realm were to be included on the escutcheon of human rights. For all the fragility of the UN, its use as a plaything of the great powers, and its organizing of power primarily for the benefit of the powerful, it retains an overarching potential that sends chills down the spines of those who want to see the UN dismantled. It is important to remember that the UN as an organization was Franklin Roosevelt's ideal, having its roots in the League of Nations and in Kant's Perpetual Peace. 23 Those concerned with political power saw the UN as either a mistake or a rhetorical sideshow. Nevertheless, the UN opened doors to the hitherto excluded. Operationally, this meant that public interest lawyers, including international lawyers, could seek ways to open doors and allow new groups to walk in, legitimated by UN international conferences and General Assembly Resolutions. In themselves, these actions seemed to mean nothing. But taken together they constituted the decent opinion of humankind that served as the battering ram against the THM model of international politics. In this understanding of UN politics and international law, the UN charter makes the UN the primary forum in international politics and treaty law. Its framers, consciously or not, granted the UN overarching purposes with operational capacities to establish norms beyond specific treaty language. This power comes from its authority as the primary international instrument of the collective peoples of the world. In practice, a super-normative framework is created which aspires to the recognition of all people, both individually and collectively. [\*522] IV. The Legitimacy of States There is a profound risk to the reframing of international law away from nation-state relations per se, for if there is no means to sustain a new shape, catalyzed by international lawyers and by movements of protest and redefinition, emancipation can neither be sustained nor can its implications be secured in law and practice. The context will not change and the international social system that defines international politics will never be able to leave behind the crass features of national "interest," exemplified by the U.S. Senate's unwillingness to consent to a nuclear weapons test ban agreement in the puerile hope that it can develop a defensive shield around the U.S. and some allies. 24 The tendency for the powerful to use any argument and any highsounding ideal for themselves means that a very deeply embedded Orwellian cynicism will be sustained, wherein ideas mean their opposite, or where words of freedom apply only to the class which already has freedom. 25 If a practical project does not occur which leads to changes in behavior, we are left with the prattlings of a class of writers and auditors who sit comfortably at the seat of Western controlled governments, international corporations, and universities specializing in the mystifications of power, creating knowledges, technologies and laws that are in service of the largest multinational corporations and strongest military powers in the world. Such states may be understood as being inherently unstable. By this reading, states can only maintain their privilege in international law to the extent they are legitimate representatives of all those who live within the state. They may have no more legitimacy than a group of terrorists except that they may have access to the exchequer and the armed forces. Otherwise, they are merely representative of a ruling class, and therefore, the state itself has no basis of legitimacy--legitimacy stemming from a common ethical purpose. This Kantian idea, articulated by the philosopher Hermann Cohen, argues that the state itself can be an ethical consciousness only to the extent it includes all the people. 26 There is another effect of talking about "we the peoples" of the world. That is, it decenters international law and requires a relativist approach which takes into account the laws and mores of the world's peoples. As Francis Boyle has pointed out, this is hard for American international [\*523] lawyers to accept for they tend to think in terms of national interest and a Hobbesian state. 27 One would think that this pluralism would present us an insoluble difficulty. But on a linguistic level, that has not happened. Of course, words and concepts can go only so far in changing reality. In the meantime, "we the peoples" are required to find the means of dissolving updated versions of the traditional plagues of humankind, be they war, pestilence, nuclear war, famine or that quality of institutional parochialness and selfishness which now includes a runaway technology that can be used for purely sadomasochistic and criminal ends. Perhaps more dangerous are those technologies that intend to have a positive consequence, but which have dangerous and unintended consequences due to a lack of knowledge and understanding of the interactions of different sciences and technologies. V. Can International Law Stand With The Wretched? A suffering humanity is caught in cultural residues which are used by leadership to defend and aggress against the Other. Through the social categories we use to perceive the Other, they are turned into objects that become the Enemy Other. Surely that is one lesson of the Cold War and post-Cold War struggles. Realpolitiking teaches its adherents to see the enemy as blips on a screen, or as part of the racist detritus of prior times in which human beings were thought of as pigs, as dogs, or as slaves. As I have noted, world social categories and knowledge systems have changed so that they now see the colonized as human beings. The shifting in social categories, often by those who are the radicals and liberals of the privileged groups, created deep divisions between reality and its description. But this has not necessarily resulted in fundamental affirmative change. For those who were consigned to the role of slave, serf and oppressed by imperial Western nations, it may be disconcerting, but pleasantly surprising, that some leading international lawyers and intellectuals stand with those movements that take their strength from the dispossessed, wretched and exploited, whether in war or peace. Even though these idealists are educated in Western and imperial categories of social reality, they have, nonetheless, taken as their task the reconstruction and transformation of international law as it is understood in the United States. The skeptical are permitted their doubts, however. After all, what can those who represent the pain of others, and only indirectly their own, do to ameliorate the pain of misery sanctioned by imperial law? What do such a band of idealists dare to teach to those who suffer, especially when that suffering is often caused, directly or indirectly, by the choices made by the very class of which these Western intellectuals and lawyers are members? Why should the oppressed listen to those educated in a language and thought-pattern which, beneath the honeyed words, are the egocentric and ethnocentric doctrines of the [\*524] dominator? Certainly until decolonization, the abstract meaning of the words were employed as signifiers and killers of the culturally oppressed. The language of description and the mode of argument, the very words themselves, were instruments of the colonizer. Their very rules, laws, precedents and citations acted as a steel-belted noose to stifle the cries of the wretched. And yet, these were the very lessons the colonized needed to learn in order to stand up to the colonizer and survive. Not only did they survive, they pressed on to reform nineteenth and early twentieth century imperial law using the UN, and the International Court of Justice. Most importantly, they effected the consciousness of nations. Nevertheless, the wretched must wonder why, behind claims of universality and universal human rights, our actions and thoughts have an often indeterminate or contradictory effect. For Americans, the reason is a complex one. Americans seek identification with the victim in their dreams, but the reality for the American political and legal class is somewhere between carelessness and negligence of the oppressed worker, toleration for the destruction of other people's cultures for purposes of extraction and commodification, exploiter of their lands, and executioner in counter-revolutions which rain bombs of state and financial terror around the world. So even when some in the United States stand with the victim, they must always wonder, "Who are we that come forward with our notions that speak of human affirmation? Who are we to tell the colonized when independence is a drag on themselves and on others as well, possibly leading to war and internecine conflict?" And the wretched can go further and say, "You have recognized our struggle, taken away our language and substituted your words of understanding, but now what? How is freedom to be sustained? We, the formerly marginalized, the indigenous and the merely wretched, have come to recognize that what is presented by the West to humanity as conventional knowledge is a betrayal." In truth, it was a betrayal by intellectuals and all those who dared to suggest that the twentieth century could be a time of liberation and freedom. Education and knowledge as mediated through the colonizer's strainer has left humanity in worse shape than at the beginning of the twentieth century. For some, the god that really failed them was education/knowledge, which, through its institutions, set itself up as the emancipator. This failure, this sense of futility where knowledge is an instrument of domination for the few, demands recognition. The complaints of Rousseau about the enlightenment philosophies were not foolish. 28 Gandhi's similar fears and the claims of the anarchists about state power were also not wrong. 29 Kropotkin's claims [\*525] against prisons in whatever nation are as apposite now as they were at the beginning of the twentieth century. 30 At the turn of the century, where do the colonized turn for aid? Where do they turn to assuage their anger, frustration and grief at having their land eviscerated, their lives serrated into the sections of social roles which are not their own, and their language (and their concepts, sense of identity and ethical oughts) stolen or repressed? They turn to two places. One is to themselves, as they, the colonized, seek to remove the layers of dead ideological skin which cover their own. This process exposes their own identity, including their language and conceptions that need to be brought forward and reexamined in the light of the goal of changing the future for humanity as a whole. The second place to which they turn is that curious set of propositions and boundary limits that we call law. Here, before economists, anthropologists and philosophers, they turn to a hardy band of international lawyers. And so, before I go further in this essay, I want to acknowledge the several among us, who throughout their lives have sought the key to unlock the steel-belted noose, so that law and precedent would become a living aid to people whose suffering, whose yearning for peace and economic and social justice, whose struggles to stand straight, and whose desperate and plaintive wishes for decency could be legitimated and voiced through international law. The work of these activists creates a discord, as it forces a new harmony whose strands are being recognized in the common rooms, great assembly halls and even in the streets and villages of the dispossessed as the standard that will define international law and common decency for the twenty-first century. This hardy band, and I have in mind, Richard Falk, Burns Weston, Saul Mendlovitz, Peter Weiss, Francis Boyle, Anthony D'Amato, Cherif Bassiouni, the American University, the George Washington University international law groups, as well as the Center for Constitutional Rights, has searched for a language and a way of approaching the law which would protect and celebrate the defenseless, the tortured, the indigenous, and the environmentally robbed against all manner of prior inhuman incursions and likely future ones. They have sought to call on that democratic aspect of the American tradition that is universal in nature and caring in result. In the latter third of the twentieth century, it is primarily through the efforts of this hardy band that international law has come to recognize the person's rights of dignity, whether in economic and social rights, or in the right of peace, or against crimes occurring in war, such as rape, as well as the despoliation of the environment. Their task has been to reconfigure the law so that the subjectivities of the suffering would be translated into a voice and language that touched the colonizing class, causing it to reconsider its own assumptions and purposes. In their own way they insisted that within the colonizer's heart, beneath his social role, there was a moral sensibility that [\*526] could redefine the law of nations and individual states to standards of felt justice. They recognize in their work those aspects of caring and empathy, and the forbidden four letter word in law--love--as the basis of the future of humankind. Often the language and concepts were already present in documents, or what we would see as the inner spirit of those documents. Where necessary, these bold thinkers successfully invented new conceptions that addressed problems understood to be universal in nature, requiring global attention. In other words, for the reconstructor and emancipator, law and ideas became the means of liberating both the colonizer and the colonized. They found in the laws of the colonizer the seeds of emancipation which would support those with a surplus of pain and universal deficits requiring rational attention. And by so doing, they began the legal process (astonishing for those with a cynical cast of mind) that gave voice to the harassed and colonized. This was the role played by international lawyers in advising independence movements, securing new law, holding back nuclear war, and enforcing new limits and boundaries to secure freedom and dignity for people. Thus, they began the tortuous route of holding individuals liable for war crimes and crimes against humanity. But there was much more. Once they dared to use their intellectual tools, indeed, their lives, to stand with and liberate the colonizing class, the moralist international lawyers who brought the claims of the unrepresented and unheard to public relevance found that they were engaged in profound legal, moral and political acts. This band of reconstructors and emancipators are not utopians, although they do not shirk from the responsibility of putting forth paths and ideas that would serve as the foundation for a transnational world of cooperation. They saw a path inside the law of the status quo that could open new possibilities. They found that their code of social responsibility, linked to professional ethical responsibility and competence, could mean that the world of the status quo and the "is" did not have to be surrendered to the worst aspects of the "is." Ever so slowly, world consciousness has changed and may become codified into world law, as in the case of the protection of the environment. These activists sought to protect liberation and the will towards it by shifting the gaze, changing the language, filling old bottles with the concepts of new wine. They framed, ever so gently, a logic which pointed to obvious contradictions between the ideal, as reflected in UN documents and accepted international law, and the concrete, in which the colonizers protestations for political equality, personal freedom, and peace, not to mention their actual performance, did nothing more than reinforce the categories and actions of oppression. As Weston put it, Consider the possibility that if we can envisage a peaceful . . . world that is realistically attainable, as surely as we can and must, we can also devise ways in which to make that vision a reality. Great historical change is not the result of inexorable [\*527] predestined forces alone (if at all). Fundamental reforms come about also because some inspired people are able to perceive and act upon the need for change. 31Thus the emancipators engaged the colonizer with the logic of social invention, moral and legal symmetry and shame. Colonizers may enjoy irony. But they do not like to be shamed. And sometimes they are shamed by their own actions against their rhetoric. This is why Henry Kissinger did not want to be lectured about human rights by his ambassador to Chile after supporting Pinochet in his bloody coup. 32 Dean Acheson feared the instability which could occur if protest movements were able to rationalize their positions according to international law. His interest was in ensuring that there would be peace and stability among the signatory nations. This goal was achieved with NATO, a military alliance that was understood to be a force for the status quo in its various dealings and guises, especially as it related to the third and fourth world. Acheson defended the faith by burlesquing scholars of international law, praying that the "Good Lord, deliver us . . . from the United Nations Charter as distorted by professors of international law." 33 Acheson was defending white Rhodesia against the black African majority and the emerging hardy band of international lawyers who insisted on international law based in the spirit of morality. 34 Of course, Acheson patronized those such as the wise Quincy Wright, and even Grenville Clark and Louis Sohn, for he knew that if their ideas caught on, if their ideas jumped classes to reach and link to the ideas and struggles of the angry and dispossessed, and if the dispossessed were to escape the THM framework, law would become a threat to naked power. The United States and the West would have been inhibited in defining the world's social development. After all, what else are the curious phrase "nation-building" and the concept of globalization, other than materializations of an attempt to define the structure of national cultures without including one's own in the crucible of interaction, except as imperial guide? But abstract language and law are curious instruments of world historical development. In the hands, hearts and minds of people they can become quite unpredictable, especially when aided by new readings of the law which have a moral core. What must be surely irritating to the colonizers is that this hardy band used the rhetorical explanation and rationalization of realpolitik, as used by nation-states, as legal jiu jitsu for catalyzing autonomous groups to argue for human rights, freedom and even economic rights. Surely this is what [\*528] happened with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, 35 and what may become true of the covenants on political, economic and social rights. 36 This jiu jitsu was based on more than legal skill. It stemmed from those traditions which had roots in natural law, the Declaration of Independence, recognition of human dignity and pragmatic progress. The philosopher Richard McKeon's claim that cultural rights were fundamental to all other rights 37 helped to justify and give shape to the changing context for international law and politics, one which necessarily included different cultures beneath and beyond the nation-state. In the way arguments are now made in international law, the scholar-activists of whom I have spoken have forced the recognition of a transnational consciousness onto the agenda of nation-states. This consciousness, which manifests itself in new rules and codes of behavior that nation-states may have to accept as a result of popular and non-governmental pressures, could over time lead to a world civilization of plural cultures. Whether regarding the environment, nuclearism, war, or democracy, this network of international lawyers finds in the particularities of the desperate those social and political linkages which are covered by universal principles. These are not the "universal" principles of Western domination. Rather they are what the physicist Herbert Bernstein and I have termed "fluxioms"--that which can be believed, used until rebutted, borrowed from every culture and employed in the liberation of people from their colonized status, whether in the so-called third world, or in the so-called West. 38 The beginning of the next generation's consciousness does not mean that the unspeakable remains hidden as residue of the past. International lawyers after the Second World War gave us a name for such activities--genocide--and governments know that this is forbidden. Nevertheless, ruling classes want to protect their privilege of genocide, or they want to ensure that high government officials may mask their criminal activities behind sovereignty. There are too many current examples that suggest that the sheaf of parchment or law books that proscribe genocide are a transparent shield against the rapist and murderer. The Cambodia and Tutsi/Hutu mass slaughters and the war crimes trials in Geneva concerning individuals accused of war crimes in Bosnia are sobering statements about human [\*529] progress. All true, but without the parchment we have nothing and without the international lawyer moralist we have laws which defend the powerful against the powerful, rationalize violence against violence and we, especially in the United States, are led to accept the faux claims that international human rights is a matter of convenience. Propaganda and manipulation of the citizenry can then easily occur, where governments conveniently stir up their respective citizens to despise, dismiss, disdain or revile other nations and peoples. However, at particular moments in history when contradiction between the "is" and the professed "ought" is too great, we may expect momentous change, as was the case with the American civil rights movement of the 1960s and 1970s, which thrust forward the "ought" and changed the "is." What occurred in this case, as with other cases of humanitarian advances, was the vectoring of protest movements with those who became repelled by the social role they performed in the old reality of the "is," as when Saul, the tax collector, transformed into Paul, the disciple of Jesus. General concepts that seem to have no applicability to the behavior of people, such as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, 39 become a touchstone requiring obeisance. They are then made sharper so that the concepts are universalized and applied to all, not merely to a particular group.

Human rights legitimacy is critical to maintaining soft power

Nye, Professor and Former Dean Of Kennedy School of Government at Harvard, and Armitage, deputy secretary of state from 2001 to 2005, both are co-chairs of the CSIS Commission on Smart Power, 2007 [Joseph and Richard, “CSIS Reports – A Smarter, More Secure America”, http://www.csis.org/component/option,com\_csis\_pubs/task,view/id,4156/type,1/, 11/6]

Soft power is the ability to attract people to our side without coercion. Legitimacy is central to soft power. If a people or nation believes American objectives to be legitimate, we are more likely to persuade them to follow our lead without using threats and bribes. Legitimacy can also reduce opposition to—and the costs of—using hard power when the situation demands. Appealing to others’ values, interests, and preferences can, in certain circumstances, replace the dependence on carrots and sticks. Cooperation is always a matter of degree, and it is profoundly influenced by attraction. This is evident in the changing nature of conflict today, including in Iraq and against al Qaeda. In traditional conflict, once the enemy is vanquished militarily, he is likely to sue for peace. But many of the organizations against which we are fighting control no territory, hold few assets, and sprout new leaders for each one that is killed. Victory in the traditional sense is elusive. Militaries are well suited to defeating states, but they are often poor instruments to fight ideas. Today, victory depends on attracting foreign populations to our side and helping them to build capable, democratic states. Soft power is essential to winning the peace. It is easier to attract people to democracy than to coerce them to be democratic.

Soft power key to preventing warming, prolif and environmental destruction

Nye, ‘9 [Prof. Dr. Joseph S. Nye, Vorsitzender der Trilateralen Komission, 7/2/09, http://www.securityconference.de/Prof-Dr-Joseph-S-Nye.212.0.html.]

American leadership has been justifiably criticized in recent years, but it is difficult to see successful responses to global challenges without it. An American foreign policy that focuses on global public goods – things everyone can consume without diminishing their availability to others – will be essential to meeting the crisis of global governance. Such an approach could also help America reconcile its preponderant power with others’ interests. A small country can benefit from peace in its region, freedom of the seas, open trade, control of infectious diseases or stability in financial markets at the same time that the United States does without either diminishing the benefits to the U.S. or others. Of course, pure public goods are rare. Most public goods only partially approach the ideal case of clean air, where none can be excluded and all can benefit simultaneously. Global climate change – which I discuss further below -- is probably the most dramatic current case. According to the logic of collective action, if the largest beneficiary of a public good (like the U.S.) does not take the lead in providing disproportionate resources toward its provision, the smaller beneficiaries are unlikely to be able to produce it because of the difficulties of organizing collective action when large numbers are involved. While this responsibility of the largest often lets others become “free riders,” the alternative is that the collective bus does not move forward at all. In 2007, the Center for International and Strategic Studies sponsored a bipartisan “Smart Power Commission” that recommended such an approach. The terms and recommendations of the Smart Power Commission have begun to be accepted in Washington today. The United States could gain doubly, both from the public goods themselves, and from the way they legitimize preponderant power in the eyes of others. America can learn from the lesson of Great Britain in the 19th century, when it was also a preponderant power and took the lead in maintaining the balance of power among the major states in Europe; promoting an open international economic system; and maintaining freedom of the seas. All three issues translate relatively well to the current situation. Maintaining regional balances of power and dampening local incentives to use force to change borders provides a public good for many (but not all) countries. Similarly, maintaining open global markets is a necessary (though not sufficient) condition for alleviating poverty in poor countries even as it benefits the United States. To keep the system open, the United States must resist protectionism at home and support international economic institutions such as the World Trade Organization, the International Monetary Fund, and the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development that provide a framework of rules for the world economy. Like l9th century Britain, America has an interest keeping international commons, such the oceans, open to all. Today, however, the international commons include new issues such as global climate change, preservation of endangered species, and the uses of outer space, as well as the “virtual commons” of cyberspace. But on some issues, such as the global climate, the United States has failed to lead. The establishment of rules that preserves access for all remains as much a public good today as in the 19th century, even though some of the issues are more complex. These three classic global public goods enjoy a reasonable consensus in American public opinion. There are also three new dimensions of global public goods in today’s world. First, the United States should lead in helping to develop and maintain international regimes of laws and institutions to organize international actions to deal with not just trade and environment, but proliferation, peacekeeping, human rights and other concerns. The U.S. benefits from the order they provide, but so do others. Unilateralists complain that the United States is constrained by international regimes, but so are others.

Warming leads to extinction

Oliver Tickell, Climate Researcher, 8/11/2008, On a planet 4C hotter, all we can prepare for is extinction, The Guardian, pg. np

We need to get prepared for four degrees of global warming, Bob Watson told the Guardian last week. At first sight this looks like wise counsel from the climate science adviser to Defra. But the idea that we could adapt to a 4C rise is absurd and dangerous. Global warming on this scale would be a catastrophe that would mean, in the immortal words that Chief Seattle probably never spoke, "the end of living and the beginning of survival" for humankind. Or perhaps the beginning of our extinction. The collapse of the polar ice caps would become inevitable, bringing long-term sea level rises of 70-80 metres. All the world's coastal plains would be lost, complete with ports, cities, transport and industrial infrastructure, and much of the world's most productive farmland. The world's geography would be transformed much as it was at the end of the last ice age, when sea levels rose by about 120 metres to create the Channel, the North Sea and Cardigan Bay out of dry land. Weather would become extreme and unpredictable, with more frequent and severe droughts, floods and hurricanes. The Earth's carrying capacity would be hugely reduced. Billions would undoubtedly die. Watson's call was supported by the government's former chief scientific adviser, Sir David King, who warned that "if we get to a four-degree rise it is quite possible that we would begin to see a runaway increase". This is a remarkable understatement. The climate system is already experiencing significant feedbacks, notably the summer melting of the Arctic sea ice. The more the ice melts, the more sunshine is absorbed by the sea, and the more the Arctic warms. And as the Arctic warms, the release of billions of tonnes of methane – a greenhouse gas 70 times stronger than carbon dioxide over 20 years – captured under melting permafrost is already under way. To see how far this process could go, look 55.5m years to the Palaeocene-Eocene Thermal Maximum, when a global temperature increase of 6C coincided with the release of about 5,000 gigatonnes of carbon into the atmosphere, both as CO2 and as methane from bogs and seabed sediments. Lush subtropical forests grew in polar regions, and sea levels rose to 100m higher than today. It appears that an initial warming pulse triggered other warming processes. Many scientists warn that this historical event may be analogous to the present: the warming caused by human emissions could propel us towards a similar hothouse Earth.

Scenario two is future weapons

U.S. drone attacks will incite international, uncontrolled drone use and risks the spread of new weapons tech—

Savage ’10 [Charlie, columnist for the New York Times, New York Times, “U.N. Report Highly Critical of American Drone Attacks, Warning of Use by Others”, June 6th, 2010, http://www.nytimes.com/2010/06/03/world/ 03drones.html, Academic Search Premier]

A senior United Nations official said on Wednesday that the growing use of armed drones by the United States to kill terrorism suspects was undermining global constraints on the use of military force. He warned that the American example would lead to a chaotic world as the new weapons technology inevitably spread. In a 29-page report to the United Nations Human Rights Council, the official, Philip Alston, the United Nations special representative on extrajudicial executions, called on the United States to exercise greater restraint in its use of drones in places like Pakistan and Yemen, outside the war zones in Afghanistan and Iraq. The report -- the most extensive effort by the United Nations to grapple with the legal implications of armed drones -- also proposed a summit meeting of ''key military powers'' to clarify legal limits on such killings. In an interview, Mr. Alston said the United States appeared to think that it was ''facing a unique threat from transnational terrorist networks'' that justified its effort to put forward legal justifications that would make the rules ''as flexible as possible.'' But that example, he said, could quickly lead to a situation in which dozens of countries carry out ''competing drone attacks'' outside their borders against people ''labeled as terrorists by one group or another.'' ''I'm particularly concerned that the United States seems oblivious to this fact when it asserts an ever-expanding entitlement for itself to target individuals across the globe,'' Mr. Alston said in an accompanying statement. ''But this strongly asserted but ill-defined license to kill without accountability is not an entitlement which the United States or other states can have without doing grave damage to the rules designed to protect the right to life and prevent extrajudicial executions.''

Drone proliferation risks extinction

Engelhardt, ‘9 [Tom Engelhardt, co-founder of the American Empire Project, Drone Wars: Your Future has Arrived, 4/7/09, http://www.pacificfreepress.com/news/1/3990-drone-wars-your-future-has-arrived.html.]

If you want to read the single most chilling line yet uttered about drone warfare American-style, it comes at the end of Christopher Drew's piece. He quotes Brookings Institution analyst Peter Singer saying of our Predators and Reapers: "[T]hese systems today are very much Model T Fords. These things will only get more advanced." In other words, our drone wars are being fought with the airborne equivalent of cars with cranks, but the "race" to the horizon is already underway. By next year, some Reapers will have a far more sophisticated sensor system with 12 cameras capable of filming a two-and-a-half mile round area from 12 different angles. That program has been dubbed "Gorgon Stare", but it doesn't compare to the future 92-camera Argus program whose initial development is being funded by the Pentagon's blue-skies outfit, the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency. Soon enough, a single pilot may be capable of handling not one but perhaps three drones, and drone armaments will undoubtedly grow progressively more powerful and "precise." In the meantime, BAE Systems already has a drone four years into development, the Taranis, that should someday be "completely autonomous"; that is, it theoretically will do without human pilots. Initial trials of a prototype are scheduled for 2010. By 2020, so claim UAV enthusiasts, drones could be engaging in aerial battle and choosing their victims themselves. As Robert S. Boyd of McClatchy reported recently, "The Defense Department is financing studies of autonomous, or self-governing, armed robots that could find and destroy targets on their own. On-board computer programs, not flesh-and-blood people, would decide whether to fire their weapons." It's a particular sadness of our world that, in Washington, only the military can dream about the future in this way, and then fund the "arms race" of 2018 or 2035. Rest assured that no one with a governmental red cent is researching the health care system of 2018 or 2035, or the public education system of those years. In the meantime, the skies of our world are filling with round-the-clock assassins. They will only evolve and proliferate. Of course, when we check ourselves out in the movies, we like to identify with John Connor, the human resister, the good guy of this planet, against the evil machines. Elsewhere, however, as we fight our drone wars ever more openly, as we field mechanical techno-terminators with all-seeing eyes and loose our missiles from thousands of miles away ("Hasta la Vista, Baby!"), we undoubtedly look like something other than a nation of John Connors to those living under the Predators. It may not matter if the joysticks and consoles on those advanced machines are somewhat antiquated; to others, we are now the terminators of the planet, implacable machine assassins. True, we can't send our drones into the past to wipe out the young Ayman al-Zawahiri in Cairo or the teenage Osama bin Laden speeding down some Saudi road in his gray Mercedes sedan. True, the UAV enthusiasts, who are already imagining all-drone wars run by "ethical" machines, may never see anything like their fantasies come to pass. Still, the fact that without the help of a single advanced cyborg we are already in the process of creating a Terminator planet should give us pause for thought... or not.

Advantage \_\_\_\_\_\_: Terrorism

Drones attacks increase terrorist recruiting capabilities

Gerges ’10 [Fawaz A. Gerges, professor of middle-eastern politics and international relations at the University of London, May 30th, 2010, Newsweek, “The truth about Drones”, http://www.newsweek.com/2010/05/30/the-truth-about-drones.html]

In the first four months this year, the Predators fired nearly 60 missiles in Pakistan, about the same number as in Afghanistan, the recognized war theater. In Pakistan, the pace of drone strikes has increased to two or three a week, up roughly fourfold from the Bush years. Although drone strikes have killed more than a dozen Qaeda and Taliban leaders, they have incinerated hundreds of civilians, including women and children.

Predator strikes have inflamed anti-American rage among Afghans and Pakistanis, including first or second generation immigrants in the west, as well as elite members of the security services. The Pakistani Taliban and other militants are moving to exploit this anger, vowing to carry out suicide bombings in major U.S. cities. Drone attacks have become a rallying cry for Taliban militants, feeding the flow of volunteers into a small, loose network that is harder to trace even than shadowy Al Qaeda. Jeffrey Addicott, former legal adviser to Army Special Operations, says the strategy is “creating more enemies than we’re killing or capturing.” The Obama administration needs to at least acknowledge the dangers of military escalation and to welcome a real debate about the costs of the drone war. Because clearly, its fallout is reaching home.

Drones kill individuals with the information necessary to prevent terror attacks in the future—Interrogation of terrorists is the key internal link to preventing terrorism

Thiessen, 2/8 [Marc Thiessen, Foreign Policy, 2/8/10, http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2010/02/08/dead\_terrorists\_tell\_no\_tales?page=0,1]

President Barack Obama's escalation of drone strikes is one area in the counterterrorism fight where he has earned plaudits from even his most vocal critics on the right. Hold the applause. Obama's escalation of the "Predator War" comes at the very same time he has eliminated the CIA's capability to capture senior terrorist leaders alive and interrogate them for information on new attacks. The Predator has become for President Obama what the cruise missile was to President Bill Clinton -- an easy way to appear like he is taking tough action against terrorists, when he is really shying away from the hard decisions needed to protect the United States. To be sure, unmanned drones are critical in the struggle against al Qaeda. They allow the United States to reach terrorists hiding in remote regions where it would be difficult for special operations forces to reach them, or to act on perishable intelligence when the only choice is to kill a terrorist or lose him. Constantly hovering Predator (or Reaper) drones also have a psychological effect on the enemy, forcing al Qaeda leaders to live in fear and spend time focusing on self-preservation that would otherwise be used planning the next attack. All this is for the good. The problem is that Obama is increasingly using drone strikes as a substitute for operations to bring terrorist leaders in alive for questioning -- and that is putting the country at risk. As one high-ranking CIA official explained to me, in an interview for my book Courting Disaster, "In the wake of 9/11, [the CIA] put forward a program that had a lethal component to strike back at the people who did this. But the other component was to prevent this kind of catastrophe from happening again. And for that, killing people -- especially killing senior al Qaeda leaders -- is potentially counterproductive in that we can't know or learn of future attacks. You can't kill them all, and you don't want to kill them all from an intelligence standpoint. We needed to know what they knew." In the years after the 9/11 attacks, the CIA worked with Pakistani and other intelligence services to hunt down senior terrorist leaders and take them in for interrogation. Among those captured were men like Abu Zubaydah, Khalid Sheikh Mohammed, Ramzi bin al-Shibh, Ammar al-Baluchi, Walid bin Attash, Riduan Isamuddin (aka "Hambali"), Bashir bin Lap, Abd al-Rahim al-Nashiri, Abu Faraj al-Libbi, Abd al-Hadi al-Iraqi, and others. In all, about 100 terrorists were detained and questioned by the CIA. And the information they provided helped break up terrorist cells that were planning to blow up the U.S. Consulate in Karachi and the U.S. Marine camp in Djibouti; explode seven airplanes flying across the Atlantic from London to cities in North America; and fly hijacked airplanes into Heathrow Airport, London's financial district, and the Library Tower in Los Angeles. Today, the Obama administration is no longer attempting to capture men like these alive; it is simply killing them. This may be satisfying, but it comes at a price. With every drone strike that vaporizes a senior al Qaeda leader, actionable intelligence is vaporized along with him. Dead terrorists can't tell you their plans to strike America.

Focus on drones inevitably trades-off with other intelligence gathering efforts—Only banning drones ensures US ability to strike at the heart of the insurgency

Flynn et al, ’10 [Major General Michael T. Flynn, USA, Captain Matt Pottinger, USMC, Paul D. Batchelor, DIA, Published by the New American Security. The mission of the Center for a New American Security (CNAS) is to develop strong, pragmatic, and principled national security and defense policies that promote and protect American interests and values. Fixing Intel: A Blueprint for Making Intelligence Relevant in Afghanistan, Voices from the field, January 2010, http://www.cnas.org/files/documents/press/AfghanIntel\_Flynn\_Jan2010\_code507\_voices.pdf]

The tendency to overemphasize detailed information about the enemy at the expense of the political, economic, and cultural environment that supports it becomes even more pronounced at the brigade and regional command levels. Understandably galled by IED strikes that are killing soldiers, these intelligence shops react by devoting most of their resources to finding the people who emplace such devices. Analysts painstakingly diagram insurgent networks and recommend individuals who should be killed or captured. Aerial drones and other collection assets are tasked with scanning the countryside around the clock in the hope of spotting insurgents burying bombs or setting up ambushes. Again, these are fundamentally worthy objectives, but relying on them exclusively baits intelligence shops into reacting to enemy tactics at the expense of finding ways to strike at the very heart of the insurgency. These labor-intensive efforts, employed in isolation, fail to advance the war strategy and, as a result, expose more troops to danger over the long run. Overlooked amid these reactive intelligence efforts are two inescapable truths: 1) brigade and regional command analytic products, in their present form, tell ground units little they do not already know; and 2) lethal targeting alone will not help U.S. and allied forces win in Afghanistan.

The US can’t risk failing on counter-terrorism—A nuclear or biological terror attack against the US or an ally will happen in less than 3 years—A bioweapon attack would kill at least 40 million

Bohon, 6/15 [Dave Bohon, Government Panel Predicts WMD Attack by 2013, New American, 6/ 15/10, http://www.thenewamerican.com/index.php/usnews/politics/3788-government-panel-predicts-wmd-attack-by-2013]

The official report from a blue-ribbon panel warns that terrorists with weapons of massive destruction (WMD) are likely to attack somewhere in the world in the next three years, and the United States could be a prime target. According to the Commission on the Prevention of Weapons of Mass Destruction Proliferation and Terrorism, the likelihood is high that by 2013 terrorists will use WMDs in an attack somewhere in the world, and while several nations with terrorist ties are now in a race to produce nuclear weapons, the commission’s report says that an attack using biological weapons is the more likely scenario, with potentially devastating consequences. Among its recommendations, the commission said it believes that “the U.S. government needs to move more aggressively to limit the proliferation of biological weapons and reduce the prospect of a bio-terror attack.” The commission, co-chaired by former U.S. Senators Bob Graham (D-Fla.) and Jim Talent (R-Mo.), originally reported its findings in December 2008. During a June 10 press conference to announce legislation aimed at addressing dangers from terrorism, members of the commission joined with members of the House Homeland Security Committee to address the commission’s findings. “The consequences of a biological attack are almost beyond comprehension,” said former Senator Graham. “It would be 9/11 times ten or a hundred in terms of the number of people who would be killed.” Noting the millions of Americans who died as a result of the epidemic flu virus of 1918, Graham predicted that a lab-generated biological agent in the hands of terrorists could prove far worse. “Today it is still in the laboratory,” he said, “but if it should get out and into the hands of scientists who knew how to use it for a violent purpose, we could have multiple times the 40 million people who were killed 100 years ago.” In December 2008, at the same time the commission presented its findings, former Director of National Intelligence Mike McConnell offered a similar assessment of the likelihood of a biological attack, telling a Harvard University audience, “With weapons of mass destruction that could result in the death of many people — chemical, biological, nuclear — we assess biological as the more likely,” adding that “it’s better than an even chance in the next five years that an attack by one of those weapons systems will be conducted in some place on the globe.” While emphasizing the likely scenario of a biological attack, the commission also warned of the danger that exists of nuclear attacks, and cited efforts by both Iran and North Korea to produce a nuclear weapon. It also cited the specific danger that Pakistan poses to the United States, warning that while the country is officially an ally of the United States, “the next terrorist attack against the United States is likely to originate from within the Federally Administered Tribal Areas” of Pakistan, which has been identified as a haven for terrorists. “Were one to map terrorism and weapons of mass destruction today, all roads would intersect in Pakistan,” the report stated. Said Graham, “We think time is not our ally,” warning that the United States “needs to move with a sense of urgency.”

The US will retaliate to a terror attack, causing extinction

Speice 06 [Patrick F., Jr. "Negligence and nuclear nonproliferation: eliminating the current liability barrier to bilateral U.S.-Russian nonproliferation assistance programs." William and Mary Law Review 47.4 (Feb 2006): 1427(59). Expanded Academic ASAP]

The potential consequences of the unchecked spread of nuclear knowledge and material to terrorist groups that seek to cause mass destruction in the United States are truly horrifying. A terrorist attack with a nuclear weapon would be devastating in terms of immediate human and economic losses. (49) Moreover, there would be immense political pressure in the United States to discover the perpetrators and retaliate with nuclear weapons, massively increasing the number of casualties and potentially triggering a full-scale nuclear conflict. (50) In addition to the threat posed by terrorists, leakage of nuclear knowledge and material from Russia will reduce the barriers that states with nuclear ambitions face and may trigger widespread proliferation of nuclear weapons. (51) This proliferation will increase the risk of nuclear attacks against the United States or its allies by hostile states, (52) as well as increase the likelihood that regional conflicts will draw in the United States and escalate to the use of nuclear weapons. (53)

Advantage \_\_\_: Pakistan Stability

Drone Strikes in Afghanistan anger jihadist forces in Pakistan—They risk destabilizing the already fragile Pakistani government

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.

Pakistani collapse would cause an extremist takeover that would start a conflict with India

Ricks, 1 [Thomas Ricks. At Pentagon: Worries Over War's Costs, Consequences; Some Fear Regional Destabilization, Retribution Against U.S. Washington Post. 10/21/01.]

The prospect of Pakistan being taken over by Islamic extremists is especially worrisome because it possesses nuclear weapons. The betting among military strategists is that India, another nuclear power, would not stand idly by, if it appeared that the Pakistani nuclear arsenal were about to fall into the hands of extremists. A preemptive action by India to destroy Pakistan's nuclear stockpile could provoke a new war on the subcontinent. The U.S. military has conducted more than 25 war games involving a confrontation between a nuclear-armed India and Pakistan, and each has resulted in nuclear war, said retired Air Force Col. Sam Gardiner, an expert on strategic games.

A nuclear war with India causes extinction

Washington Times, 1 [The Most Dangerous Place. 7/8/01]

The foreign policy of the United States in South Asia should move from the lackadaisical and distant (with India crowned with a unilateral veto power) to aggressive involvement at the vortex. The most dangerous place on the planet is Kashmir, a disputed territory convulsed and illegally occupied for more than 53 years and sandwiched between nuclear-capable India and Pakistan. It has ignited two wars between the estranged South Asian rivals in 1948 and 1965, and a third could trigger nuclear volleys and a nuclear winter threatening the entire globe. The United States would enjoy no sanctuary.

INH: US Uses Drones

The US relies on drone attacks in Afghanistan

Alston, NYU law professor and the U.N.’s special rapporteur on extrajudicial killings, United Nations Report, ’10

[Philip Alston, NYU law professor and the U.N.’s special rapporteur on extrajudicial killings,Human Rights Council: Fourteenth session, Agenda item 3, “Promotion and protection of all human rights, civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights, including the right to development, Report of the Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions” United Nations General Assembly Report, A/HRC/14/24/Add.6, 5/28/10, http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/hrcouncil/docs/14session/A.HRC.14.24.Add6.pdf]

18. The United States has used drones and airstrikes for targeted killings in the armed conflicts in Afghanistan and Iraq, where the operations are conducted (to the extent publicly known) by the armed forces.27 The US also reportedly adopted a secret policy of targeted killings soon after the attacks of 11 September 2001,28 pursuant to which the Government has credibly been alleged to have engaged in targeted killings in the territory of other States.29 The secret targeted killing program is reportedly conducted by the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) using “Predator” or “Reaper” drones, although there have been reports of involvement by special operations forces, and of the assistance of civilian contractors with the implementation of the program.30 19. The first credibly reported CIA drone killing occurred on 3 November 2002, when a Predator drone fired a missile at a car in Yemen, killing Qaed Senyan al-Harithi, an al- Qaeda leader allegedly responsible for the USS Cole bombing.31 Since then, there have reportedly been over 120 drone strikes, although it is not possible to verify this number.32 The accuracy of drone strikes is heavily contested and also impossible for outsiders to verify. Reports of civilian casualties in Pakistan range from approximately 20 (according to anonymous US Government officials quoted in the media) to many hundreds.33 20. The CIA reportedly controls its fleet of drones from its headquarters in Langley, Virginia, in coordination with pilots near hidden airfields in Afghanistan and Pakistan who handle takeoffs and landings.34 The CIA’s fleet is reportedly flown by civilians, including both intelligence officers and private contractors (often retired military personnel).35 According to media accounts, the head of the CIA’s clandestine services, or his deputy, generally gives the final approval for a strike.36 There is reportedly a list of targets approved by senior Government personnel, although the criteria for inclusion and all other aspects of the program are unknown.37 The CIA is not required to identify its target by name; rather, targeting decisions may be based on surveillance and “pattern of life” assessments.38 21. The military also has a target list for Afghanistan. A Senate Foreign Relations Committee Report released on 10 August 2009 disclosed that the military’s list included drug lords suspected of giving money to help finance the Taliban.39 According to the report, “[t]he military places no restrictions on the use of force with these selected targets, which means they can be killed or captured on the battlefield . . . standards for getting on the list require two verifiable human sources and substantial additional evidence.”40

IHL I/L—US Use Crushes IHL

US expansion of international categories sends a signal to other states that they can indiscriminately kill—this crushes international humanitarian law and human rights frameworks

Alston, NYU law professor and the U.N.’s special rapporteur on extrajudicial killings, ’10

[Philip Alston, NYU law professor and the U.N.’s special rapporteur on extrajudicial killings,Human Rights Council: Fourteenth session, Agenda item 3, “Promotion and protection of all human rights, civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights, including the right to development, Report of the Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions” United Nations General Assembly Report, A/HRC/14/24/Add.6, 5/28/10, http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/hrcouncil/docs/14session/A.HRC.14.24.Add6.pdf]

55. With respect to the existence of a non-state group as a “party”, al-Qaeda and other alleged “associated” groups are often only loosely linked, if at all. Sometimes they appear to be not even groups, but a few individuals who take “inspiration” from al Qaeda. The idea that, instead, they are part of continuing hostilities that spread to new territories as new alliances form or are claimed may be superficially appealing but such “associates’ cannot constitute a “party” as required by IHL – although they can be criminals, if their conduct violates US law, or the law of the State in which they are located. 56. To ignore these minimum requirements, as well as the object and purpose of IHL, would be to undermine IHL safeguards against the use of violence against groups that are not the equivalent of an organized armed group capable of being a party to a conflict – whether because it lacks organization, the ability to engage in armed attacks, or because it does not have a connection or belligerent nexus to actual hostilities. It is also salutary to recognize that whatever rules the US seeks to invoke or apply to al Qaeda and any “affiliates” could be invoked by other States to apply to other non-state armed groups. To expand the notion of non-international armed conflict to groups that are essentially drug cartels, criminal gangs or other groups that should be dealt with under the law enforcement framework would be to do deep damage to the IHL and human rights frameworks.

Drones Hurt ILAW

Targeted attacks eviscerate international law, justifying states engaging in arbitrary killing

Alston, NYU law professor and the U.N.’s special rapporteur on extrajudicial killings, United Nations Report, ’10

[Philip Alston, NYU law professor and the U.N.’s special rapporteur on extrajudicial killings,Human Rights Council: Fourteenth session, Agenda item 3, “Promotion and protection of all human rights, civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights, including the right to development, Report of the Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions” United Nations General Assembly Report, A/HRC/14/24/Add.6, 5/28/10, http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/hrcouncil/docs/14session/A.HRC.14.24.Add6.pdf]

47. On the other hand, both the US and Israel have invoked the existence of an armed conflict against alleged terrorists (“non-state armed groups”).95 The appeal is obvious: the IHL applicable in armed conflict arguably has more permissive rules for killing than does human rights law or a State’s domestic law, and generally provides immunity to State armed forces.96 Because the law of armed conflict has fewer due process safeguards, States also see a benefit to avoiding compliance with the more onerous requirements for capture, arrest, detention or extradition of an alleged terrorist in another State. IHL is not, in fact, more permissive than human rights law because of the strict IHL requirement that lethal force be necessary. But labeling a situation as an armed conflict might also serve to expand executive power both as a matter of domestic law and in terms of public support. 48. Although the appeal of an armed conflict paradigm to address terrorism is obvious, so too is the significant potential for abuse. Internal unrest as a result of insurgency or other violence by non-state armed groups, and even terrorism, are common in many parts of the world. If States unilaterally extend the law of armed conflict to situations that are essentially matters of law enforcement that must, under international law, be dealt with under the framework of human rights, they are not only effectively declaring war against a particular group, but eviscerating key and necessary distinctions between international law frameworks that restricts States’ ability to kill arbitrarily.

US list of people targeted by drones violates IHL

Alston, NYU law professor and the U.N.’s special rapporteur on extrajudicial killings, United Nations Report, ’10

[Philip Alston, NYU law professor and the U.N.’s special rapporteur on extrajudicial killings,Human Rights Council: Fourteenth session, Agenda item 3, “Promotion and protection of all human rights, civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights, including the right to development, Report of the Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions” United Nations General Assembly Report, A/HRC/14/24/Add.6, 5/28/10, http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/hrcouncil/docs/14session/A.HRC.14.24.Add6.pdf]

68. The failure of States to disclose their criteria for DPH is deeply problematic because it gives no transparency or clarity about what conduct could subject a civilian to killing. It also leaves open the likelihood that States will unilaterally expand their concept of direct participation beyond permissible boundaries. Thus, although the US has not made public its definition of DPH, it is clear that it is more expansive than that set out by the ICRC; in Afghanistan, the US has said that drug traffickers on the “battlefield” who have links to the insurgency may be targeted and killed.120 This is not consistent with the traditionally understood concepts under IHL – drug trafficking is understood as criminal conduct, not an activity that would subject someone to a targeted killing. And generating profits that might be used to fund hostile actions does not constitute DPH.

Drones Hurt Ilaw

Claiming drones key for emergency scenarios crushes international law

Alston, NYU law professor and the U.N.’s special rapporteur on extrajudicial killings, United Nations Report, ’10

[Philip Alston, NYU law professor and the U.N.’s special rapporteur on extrajudicial killings, Human Rights Council: Fourteenth session, Agenda item 3, “Promotion and protection of all human rights, civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights, including the right to development, Report of the Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions” United Nations General Assembly Report, A/HRC/14/24/Add.6, 5/28/10, http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/hrcouncil/docs/14session/A.HRC.14.24.Add6.pdf]

86. Outside its own territory (or in territory over which it lacked control) and where the situation on the ground did not rise to the level of armed conflict in which IHL would apply, a State could theoretically seek to justify the use of drones by invoking the right to anticipatory self-defence against a non-state actor.147 It could also theoretically claim that human rights law’s requirement of first employing less-than-lethal means would not be possible if the State has no means of capturing or causing the other State to capture the target. As a practical matter, there are very few situations outside the context of active hostilities in which the test for anticipatory self-defence – necessity that is “instant, overwhelming, and leaving no choice of means, and no moment of deliberation”148 – would be met. This hypothetical presents the same danger as the “ticking-time bomb” scenario does in the context of the use of torture and coercion during interrogations: a thought experiment that posits a rare emergency exception to an absolute prohibition can effectively institutionalize that exception. Applying such a scenario to targeted killings threatens to eviscerate the human rights law prohibition against the arbitrary deprivation of life. In addition, drone killing of anyone other than the target (family members or others in the vicinity, for example) would be an arbitrary deprivation of life under human rights law and could result in State responsibility and individual criminal liability.

AT: Targeted Attacks Legally Justified

The US’s legal justification is insufficient to justify the continued use of targeted attacks

Alston, NYU law professor and the U.N.’s special rapporteur on extrajudicial killings, ’10

[Philip Alston, NYU law professor and the U.N.’s special rapporteur on extrajudicial killings,Human Rights Council: Fourteenth session, Agenda item 3, “Promotion and protection of all human rights, civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights, including the right to development, Report of the Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions” United Nations General Assembly Report, A/HRC/14/24/Add.6, 5/28/10, http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/hrcouncil/docs/14session/A.HRC.14.24.Add6.pdf]

22. The Legal Adviser to the Department of State recently outlined the Government’s legal justifications for targeted killings. They were said to be based on its asserted right to self-defence, as well as on IHL, on the basis that the US is “in an armed conflict with Al Qaeda, as well as the Taliban and associated forces.”41 While this statement is an important starting point, it does not address some of the most central legal issues including: the scope of the armed conflict in which the US asserts it is engaged, the criteria for individuals who may be targeted and killed, the existence of any substantive or procedural safeguards to ensure the legality and accuracy of killings, and the existence of accountability mechanisms.

AT: Targeted Attacks Legally Justified

Not legally justified—

A. It’s not an international armed conflict-- Ilaw doesn’t sanction war against non-state actors, like terror groups

Alston, NYU law professor and the U.N.’s special rapporteur on extrajudicial killings, United Nations Report, ’10 [Philip Alston, NYU law professor and the U.N.’s special rapporteur on extrajudicial killings, Human Rights Council: Fourteenth session, Agenda item 3, “Promotion and protection of all human rights, civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights, including the right to development, Report of the Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions” United Nations General Assembly Report, A/HRC/14/24/Add.6, 5/28/10, http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/hrcouncil/docs/14session/A.HRC.14.24.Add6.pdf]

51. The test for the existence of an international armed conflict is clear under IHL: “Any difference arising between two States and leading to the intervention of armed forces” qualifies as armed conflict, regardless of its intensity, duration or scale. 97 The IHL of international armed conflict applies also to “all cases of total or partial occupation of the territory of a High Contracting Party” to the Geneva Conventions.98 Following these criteria, an international armed conflict cannot exist between a State and a non-state group.99

B. It’s doesn’t fulfill the qualifications of a non-international armed conflict

Alston, NYU law professor and the U.N.’s special rapporteur on extrajudicial killings, United Nations Report, ’10 [Philip Alston, NYU law professor and the U.N.’s special rapporteur on extrajudicial killings,Human Rights Council: Fourteenth session, Agenda item 3, “Promotion and protection of all human rights, civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights, including the right to development, Report of the Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions” United Nations General Assembly Report, A/HRC/14/24/Add.6, 5/28/10, http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/hrcouncil/docs/14session/A.HRC.14.24.Add6.pdf]

52. The tests for the existence of a non-international armed conflict are not as categorical as those for international armed conflict. This recognizes the fact that there may be various types of non-international armed conflicts. The applicable test may also depend on whether a State is party to Additional Protocol II to the Geneva Conventions.100 Under treaty and customary international law, the elements which would point to the existence of a non-international armed conflict against a non-state armed group are: (i) The non-state armed group must be identifiable as such, based on criteria that are objective and verifiable. This is necessary for IHL to apply meaningfully, and so that States may comply with their obligation to distinguish between lawful targets and civilians.101 The criteria include:102 • Minimal level of organization of the group such that armed forces are able to identify an adversary (GC Art. 3; AP II). • Capability of the group to apply the Geneva Conventions (i.e., adequate command structure, and separation of military and political command) (GC Art. 3; AP II). • Engagement of the group in collective, armed, anti-government action (GC Art. 3). • For a conflict involving a State, the State uses its regular military forces against the group (GC Art. 3). • Admission of the conflict against the group to the agenda of the UN Security Council or the General Assembly (GC Art. 3). (ii) There must be a minimal threshold of intensity and duration. The threshold of violence is higher than required for the existence of an international armed conflict. To meet the minimum threshold, violence must be:103 • “Beyond the level of intensity of internal disturbances and tensions, such as riots, isolated and sporadic acts of violence and other acts of a similar nature” (AP II). • “[P]rotracted armed violence” among non-state armed groups or between a non-state armed group and a State;104 If an isolated incident, the incident itself should be of a high degree of intensity, with a high level of organization on the part of the non-state armed group; 105 (iii) The territorial confines can be: • Restricted to the territory of a State and between the State’s own armed forces and the non-state group (AP II); or • A transnational conflict, i.e., one that crosses State borders (GC Art. 3).106 This does not mean, however, that there is no territorial nexus requirement. 53. Taken cumulatively, these factors make it problematic for the US to show that – outside the context of the armed conflicts in Afghanistan or Iraq – it is in a transnational non-international armed conflict against “al Qaeda, the Taliban, and other associated forces”107 without further explanation of how those entities constitute a “party” under the IHL of non-international armed conflict, and whether and how any violence by any such group rises to the level necessary for an armed conflict to exist.

AT: Targeted Attacks Legally Justified

Also, drone attacks are even outlawed by US understandings of the laws of war

Fisher, 5/31 [William Fisher, US Drones Strikes Draw Int’l Scrutiny, IPS, 5/31/10, http://ipsnews.net/news.asp?idnews=51655]

The American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) charged last week that the Obama administration changed a new manual on military commissions rules to accommodate its illegal drone programme. Under the old rules, "murder in violation of the laws of war" was defined as killings by people who did not meet "the requirements for lawful combatancy", which would have suggested that CIA drone operators - who are not members of the military and do not wear a military uniform - could be charged with war crimes for killing individuals using drones. The ACLU is charging that "the U.S. programme of targeting and killing people, sometimes far from any battlefield, with little oversight or transparency, is illegal regardless of the military commissions rules". Constitutional scholar Chip Pitts, president of the Bill of Rights Defence Committee, agrees. He told IPS, "The manual's change to the definition of 'murder in violation of the laws of war' made in order to exempt drone killings by the CIA further reveals the double standards at play - a problem which has characterised these commissions since the outset, when normal rules of evidence, law, and humane treatment were declared inapplicable." He said, "I don't want to use the old cliché about 'lipstick on a pig'. But no matter how much you dress up these commissions, they're still used in circumstances where they shouldn't be used - i.e. for terrorist suspects and those not amenable to prosecution under the classic law of war - and they remain flawed tribunals under control of the executive, like the military courts used by dictators."

Drones Illegal—Not Transparent

US use of drones is not transparent—transparency key to upholding ilaw legitimacy

Alston, NYU law professor and the U.N.’s special rapporteur on extrajudicial killings, United Nations Report, ’10 [Philip Alston, NYU law professor and the U.N.’s special rapporteur on extrajudicial killings, Human Rights Council: Fourteenth session, Agenda item 3, “Promotion and protection of all human rights, civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights, including the right to development, Report of the Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions” United Nations General Assembly Report, A/HRC/14/24/Add.6, 5/28/10, http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/hrcouncil/docs/14session/A.HRC.14.24.Add6.pdf]

87. The failure of States to comply with their human rights law and IHL obligations to provide transparency and accountability for targeted killings is a matter of deep concern. To date, no State has disclosed the full legal basis for targeted killings, including its interpretation of the legal issues discussed above. Nor has any State disclosed the procedural and other safeguards in place to ensure that killings are lawful and justified, and the accountability mechanisms that ensure wrongful killings are investigated, prosecuted and punished. The refusal by States who conduct targeted killings to provide transparency about their policies violates the international legal framework that limits the unlawful use of lethal force against individuals.149 88. Transparency is required by both IHL150 and human rights law.151 A lack of disclosure gives States a virtual and impermissible license to kill. 89. Among the procedural safeguards States must take (and disclose) with respect to targeted killings in armed conflict are: • Ensure that forces and agents have access to reliable information to support the targeting decision.152 These include an appropriate command and control structure,153 as well as safeguards against faulty or unverifiable evidence. 154 • Ensure adequate intelligence on “the effects of the weapons that are to be used … the number of civilians that are likely to be present in the target area at the particular time; and whether they have any possibility to take cover before the attack takes place.”155 • The proportionality of an attack must be assessed for each individual strike.156 • Ensure that when an error is apparent, those conducting a targeted killing are able to abort or suspend the attack. 157 90. In order to ensure that accountability is meaningful, States must specifically disclose the measures in place to investigate alleged unlawful targeted killings and either to identify and prosecute perpetrators, or to extradite them to another State that has made out a prima facie case for the unlawfulness of a targeted killing.158 91. States have also refused to provide factual information about who has been targeted under their policies and with what outcome, including whether innocent civilians have been collaterally killed or injured. In some instances, targeted killings take place in easily accessible urban areas, and human rights monitors and civil society are able to document the outcome. In others, because of remoteness or security concerns, it has been impossible for independent observers and the international community to judge whether killings were lawful or not. 92. Transparency and accountability in the context of armed conflict or other situations that raise security concerns may not be easy. States may have tactical or security reasons not to disclose criteria for selecting specific targets (e.g. public release of intelligence source information could cause harm to the source). But without disclosure of the legal rationale as well as the bases for the selection of specific targets (consistent with genuine security needs), States are operating in an accountability vacuum. It is not possible for the international community to verify the legality of a killing, to confirm the authenticity or otherwise of intelligence relied upon, or to ensure that unlawful targeted killings do not result in impunity. The fact that there is no one-size-fits-all formula for such disclosure does not absolve States of the need to adopt explicit policies.

Drones Illegal—UN Charter

US use of drones risks collapse of the UN charter

New York Times, 6/2/10, http://www.nytimes.com/2010/06/03/world/03drones.html

It also said that a targeted killing outside of an armed conflict “is almost never likely to be legal.” In particular, it rejected “pre-emptive self-defense” as a justification for killing terrorism suspects far from combat zones. “This expansive and open-ended interpretation of the right to self-defense goes a long way towards destroying the prohibition on the use of armed force contained in the U.N. Charter,” Mr. Alston said. “If invoked by other states, in pursuit of those they deem to be terrorists and to have attacked them, it would cause chaos.”

US Key—Norm Building

State behaviors determine the norms of international law—in turn norms help dictate the policies of individual states.

Fisher, ‘7 [W. Jason Fisher, \* Judicial Clerk to the Honorable James O. Browning, United States District Court for the District of New Mexico, Targeted Killing, Norms, and International Law, 45 Colum. J. Transnat'l L. 711, Columbia Journal of Transnational Law, 2007]

International law and international norms are intimately related, and, as such, any consensus position that the international legal community takes on targeted killing should take account of the framework of international norms. n17 Norms, in this context, are "collective understandings about the proper behavior of actors;" they can have both "regulative effects," prescribing standards of proper behavior, and "constitutive effects," specifying what actions will cause recognition of a particular identity. n18 International norms are norms that command broad support within the international system of States, at the systemic level, and that shape States' interests and policies. n19 At a minimum, when norms "point in the same direction as legal rules, they make those rules more effective[, and w]hen they point in the opposite direction, they undercut legal rules" - thus, when prevailing norms are inconsistent with existing legal rules, the norms are more likely to govern actor behavior. n20 At an extreme, international law can be described as "an infrastructure of reinforcing sub-legal norms [which can be considered a] necessary condition for law's effective operation". n21 Whichever view of the relationship between law and norms is correct, it follows that the changes that affect international norms will affect international legal rules, and that "the forces that strengthen or undermine social norms will strengthen or undermine legal rules." n22 It can be said that international law, [\*716] whether customary or treaty, changes as State behavior changes. n23 Acts that initially violate existing legal rules can, with the sufficient support or emulation of States, lead to the reformulation or casting into desuetude of those rules. n24 State behavior, for that matter, changes as norms change. n25 Therefore, understanding how international norms evolve is crucial to understanding change and consistency in international law.

Disregard for international law spills over

Alston, NYU law professor and the U.N.’s special rapporteur on extrajudicial killings,’10

[Philip Alston, NYU law professor and the U.N.’s special rapporteur on extrajudicial killings,Human Rights Council: Fourteenth session, Agenda item 3, “Promotion and protection of all human rights, civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights, including the right to development, Report of the Special **Warming leads to extinction**

**Henderson 5**

**Hill. 3/16/5.** [**http://www.countercurrents.org/cc-henderson160305.htm**](http://www.countercurrents.org/cc-henderson160305.htm)**.**

**But these immediate effects of global warming pale before the possibility of runaway global warming where warming due to our greenhouse gas emissions causes greatly increased greenhouse gas production from normal terrestrial sources – the release of CO2 stored in tundra, for example - creating positive feedback loops which overwhelm regular biosphere regulation and lead to temperatures possibly hundreds of degrees warmer then present. Runaway global warming that could lead to an atmosphere like Venus. In September 2000, world-renowned physicist Stephen Hawking was widely quoted in the press as being very worried about runaway global warming: "I am afraid the atmosphere might get hotter and hotter until it will be like Venus with boiling sulfuric acid," said Hawking. "I am worried about the greenhouse effect." If we go over this cliff no more humanity; the extinction of almost every existing species except some bacteria; the end of life on Earth as we know it.**

Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions” United Nations General Assembly Report, A/HRC/14/24/Add.6, 5/28/10, http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/hrcouncil/docs/14session/A.HRC.14.24.Add6.pdf]

49. The IHL applicable to non-international armed conflict is not as well-developed as that applicable to international armed conflict. Since 11 September 2001, this fact has often been cited either to criticize IHL in general or as a justification for innovative interpretations which go well beyond generally accepted approaches. It is true that noninternational armed conflict rules would benefit from development, but the rules as they currently exist offer more than sufficient guidance to the existence and scope of an armed conflict. The key is for States to approach them with good faith intent to apply the rules as they exist and have been interpreted by international bodies, rather than to seek everexpanding flexibility.

Now Key—UAVs spreading

There is a growing trend toward spread of UAV tech—now key to checking prolif

Sherman, 5 [Jason, Writer on the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists (specifically on UAVs), The Drone Wars, Sep 1, 2005, Academic Search Premier]

Yet, the era when the United States enjoys an exclusive "asymmetric advantage" through UAVs may be brief. Many Pentagon strategists believe that future U.S. adversaries will most likely be subnational actors—such as the Iraqi resistance or Somali clans, and transnational actors, like Al Qaeda or organized criminals—rather than nation-states. Either way, the Pentagon could end up squaring off against an enemy armed with UAV forces. The number of countries worldwide capable of manufacturing UAVs keeps growing, as does the desire to push UAV capabilities. In May, Indian officials announced plans to begin producing UAVs domestically. A consortium of European companies has also agreed to begin developing an unmanned combat aerial vehicle. Russia recently announced that it had developed a UAV that didn't require a special launcher, but could be fired with an 800-kilogram rocket launched by a Smerch multiple-launch rocket system.

IHL Key to War-Fighting Rules

International humanitarian law is responsible for the humanization of international law—compliance with IHL key to war-fighting rules

Zeng, ‘9 [ZENG Lingliang, Faculty of Law, University of Macau, Macau, China, Humanizing tendency of contemporary international law, Front. Law China 2009, 4(1): 1–30]

Humanitarian law is undoubtedly the origin of humanizing modern international law.1 (Moeron, 2000) In traditional international law, humanitarian law had long been part of the Law of War, even being described as its supplementary rules and had not formed a relatively independent branch. Even many international lawyers take the view that the situation of humanitarian law is still the same as before, for it is closely linked to the Law of War or of armed conflict.2 What is more, traditional humanitarian norms were enacted to restrain the means in international wars, which had developed as so-called the “Hague Conventions System” or the “Hague Humanitarian Law”, or simply the “Hague Law”. On the basis of the “Hague Law”, modern humanitarian law has gradually been extended to protect the “victims” of hostilities, i.e., the wounded and sick in war fields, and shipwrecked at sea, prisoners of war, civilians and nonmilitary properties, which are generally called the “Geneva Conventions System” or simply the “Geneva Law”. At this time, humanitarian law as a relatively separate branch from the law of wars seemed to take the shape; and from then on, its application has no longer been limited to international war, but expanded to international armed conflict and even to domestic war or armed conflict. As a result, the most constant circumstances in which humanitarian law is applied nowadays are internal wars or internal armed conflicts since international wars or armed conflicts have been happening much less or less than internal ones. The further reason is that prohibition of use or threat to use armed forces between States is set up as a preemptory principle in modern international law.

IHL🡪 Humanization of all ILAW

Humanitarian international law is the driving force behind the humanization of all international law

Zeng, ‘9 [ZENG Lingliang, Faculty of Law, University of Macau, Macau, China, Humanizing tendency of contemporary international law, Front. Law China 2009, 4(1): 1–30]

(1) The fast humanizing tendency of international law has been resulted from external and internal factors of international law. Among various external factors, war and science & technology are two primary elements. It is the war or armed conflict that destroys or seriously harms the human life and property, thus urging the makers of international law increasingly to take into consideration of the human values. It is the continuous discovery and creation of science and technology that brings constant wealth to this world on the one hand and growing challenges to the human living environment and sustainable development on the other hand, thus making enactors of international law turn to more and more concerns to the latter. Judging from the internal factors (or international law itself), the humanitarian law and the law of human rights are the two “engines” of humanization-oriented trend of international law. It is humanitarian law that makes the start of humanizing process of international law. It is the fast development of human rights law that symbolizes humanization turning to be the main stream of international law. It has proved since the recent half a century or so that it is the continuous self-perfection of humanitarian law and human rights law, their mutual interactions and their putting-out effects on other areas of international law that have been promoting the growing humanization of international law as a whole.

International humanitarian law is the cause of humanization of international law

Zeng, ‘9

[ZENG Lingliang, Faculty of Law, University of Macau, Macau, China, Humanizing tendency of contemporary international law, Front. Law China 2009, 4(1): 1–30]

The reason for humanitarian law as the pioneer of humanizing international law lies in its own characteristics. Unlike other branches of international law, humanitarian law has direct binding force not only on States and their governments and armies, but also on battle fighters evolved in the wars or armed conflicts concern, although it is also formed and developed with treaties among international customary rules recognized by States. And more importantly, those treaties setting up humanitarian rules, at least those core rules therein, are legally binding on contracting parties as well as non-contracting parties involved in the related armed conflicts,4 the feature of which could hardly be shared by other treaties in general, with individual exceptions (such as the obligations upon non-member States in the UN Charter).

Empirically humanitarian law was the key force humanizing all branches of ilaw

Zeng, ‘9 [ZENG Lingliang, Faculty of Law, University of Macau, Macau, China, Humanizing tendency of contemporary international law, Front. Law China 2009, 4(1): 1–30]

It is worthy of mentioning that humanitarian law as the “Geneva Convention System” as its core has been continuing its extension in the direction of concluding treaties regulating specific matters. To name a few examples: The 1954 Hague Convention on Cultural Property (updated by the 1999 Second Hague Protocol on the same matter); the 1996 Amended Protocol II to the 1980 UN Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons, which prohibits or restricts the use on land of mines, booby-traps and other devices; the 1997 Ottawa Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines, etc. However, as Professor Cassese observed, these treaties agreed upon after 1949 applicable to both external and internal armed conflicts, unlike the four Geneva Conventions of 1949, “have not turned into customary law, or in some instances, only some of their most fundamental provisions have ripened into general law, while the bulk of each treaty exclusively govern the conduct of the contracting parties.” (Cassese, 2001) Therefore, humanitarian law once had long been the only symbol of humanizing factor in traditional international law, and has been turning into one of the most outstanding branches of modern international law in its humanizing process.

IHL Good—

Humanization of international law represents the end of absolute state power—it is ushering a new era of global justice, environmental protections and human rights

Zeng, ‘9 [ZENG Lingliang, Faculty of Law, University of Macau, Macau, China, Humanizing tendency of contemporary international law, Front. Law China 2009, 4(1): 1–30]

Humanization of international law has greatly enriched the contents of international law. Firstly, humanization has directly produced a series of new branches of international law, among which international human rights law, international environmental law and international criminal law are the most persuasive examples. Secondly, humanization has promoted some classic sectors of international law being continuously updated and adapted themselves to new conceptions, principles, rules and mechanism, such as various new elements in the law of sea, space law, law of diplomatic protection, humanitarian law, law of extradition, etc. In addition, humanization has urged international community to seek for dynamic links and appropriate coordination among certain sectors or areas of international law, such as the interactions between security, development, human rights and rule of law, the balance between economic development and environmental protection, the conciliation between intellectual property rights and public health, the connection between trade liberalization and core labor standards, etc. As a result of these horizontal and vertical development of humanizing international law, while sectors, areas or matters that are solely subject to domestic jurisdictions of States have been greatly decreasing, international law has been extending its scopes not only into various internal sectors of States, but also into all aspects of human life. In a word, humanizing international law symbolizes the end of absolute sovereignty and popularity of relative sovereignty both in theory and practice.

Continued humanizing of international law key to valuing all people—the aff is a prerequisite to the critique

Zeng, ‘9 [ZENG Lingliang, Faculty of Law, University of Macau, Macau, China, Humanizing tendency of contemporary international law, Front. Law China 2009, 4(1): 1–30]

(4) Humanization has been impacting the classic principle of reciprocity as the basis of rights and obligations in international law. Reciprocity is the primary manifestation of sovereign equality between States. As a result, Each State has a right or obligation in relation to other State only. In the same domain, once a State has infringed the sovereignty of another State, only the victim has the right to claim reparation and no other State can interfere on the victim’s behalf or on behalf of the international community to claim cessation of the wrong or reparation. (Cassese, 2001) Though it remains to be the foundation in perfecting international law, there have been growing principles, norms and regimes of international law departing the principle of reciprocity and bearing the character of obligations erga omnes 40 (De Hoogh, 1996; Ragazzi, 1977) or community obligations. (Cassese, 2001) The fundamental features of such new obligations could be summed up as follows: (a) They are obligations aiming at protecting the human fundamental values; (b) They are obligations towards all members of international community or the whole mankind (or all other contracting parties in the case of multilateral treaties); (c) They are obligations attended by a correlative rights that belong to any State or human being or each other contracting party; (d) This right may be exercised by any other State or any other contracting party, whether or not it has materially or morally injured by the violation; (e) The right is exercised on behalf of the whole international community (or the community of the contracting parties) to safeguard fundamental values of this community. (Cassese, 2001) Through the survey of obligations erga omnes, its is not difficult to find out that these obligations are not only originated from the rationale and value of humanizing international law, but also largely reflected in those sectors of international law where the humanization is mostly intensified.

ILAW Good--Terrorism

US respect for ILAW key to effective terror prevention

Little 6 [Laura E. Little\* Professor of Law and James E. Beasley Chair in Law, Beasley School of Law, 38 Geo. Wash. Int'l L. Rev. 1, Lexis]

Enhancing judicial professionalism, the reputation of U.S. legal culture, and global cooperation are all noble ends in themselves. Yet they also act as instruments to yet another end: defeating terrorism itself. The reasoning unfolds as follows: by skillfully tracking international and comparative examples, federal courts enhance the legitimacy of the United States. If our legitimacy is enhanced, then we are more likely to get cooperation from other countries in detecting nascent terrorist activity, capturing suspects, and prosecuting terrorists transnationally. When we lose legitimacy, we sacrifice the assistance of other countries. Our reduced legitimacy likely also galvanizes terrorist cells and facilitates their recruiting efforts. n119 Increased U.S. legitimacy presumably has the opposite effect. Yet another salutary effect emerges: improving cooperation among nations and increasing the prestige of transnational law renders law a more effective tool for fighting terrorism. We can trace the source of terrorism to failures of the rule of law in other countries. U.S. courts contribute to bringing rule of law to these countries by showing that we are part of the international enterprise of developing universal norms and by cooperating in cross-fertilization of legal cultures. Surely world governance by rule of law is strengthened when the world's "legal systems work together in harmony rather than at cross purposes." n120

International law solves war and terrorism

FDFA 10 [Swiss Federal Department of Foreign Affairs, International Law, http://www.eda.admin.ch/eda/en/home/topics/intla.html]

International law governs relations between states. It provides the basis for peace and stability and aims to protect and ensure the wellbeing of humankind. Globalisation has not only increased the importance of international law but also the complexity of international legal issues. Switzerland, which is not a major power politically or militarily, is committed to ensuring that international relations are governed by law and not by force. For this reason, it takes an active part in the development of international law. This is in fact one of the main objectives of Swiss foreign policy: to safeguard the country’s interests. International law encompasses the various fields, including: The prohibition of the use of force: States must resolve their differences by peaceful means. Human rights: Every individual can demand certain fundamental rights (the right to life, freedom from bodily harm, personal freedom, freedom of opinion and conscience, etc.). The protection of individuals during wars and armed conflicts: International humanitarian law defines the rules of war and especially those concerning the protection of civilians, the wounded and prisoners of war. The fight against terrorism and other serious crimes: Efforts to deal with such threats can only be effective if they are founded on international law.

ILAW Good--List

Upholding ILAW key to solving terrorism, warming, AIDS and human rights violations

Bellinger, Legal Advisor of the Dept of State, 2007 [John B III, Legal Advisor of the DoS “The United States and International Law” The DISAM Jornal, vol. 29 Issue 4. Dec. 2007. Proquest]

Today's world presents many challenges, from transnational terrorism to economic inter-dependence to global warming, AIDS, and possible future pandemics to the eternal quest for human dignity and liberty. The US believes that collective action and international law are essential in coordinating the international community's approach to these deep and difficult problems. Shortly after she was confirmed, Secretary Rice explained: "International law is critical to the proper function of international diplomacy." I hope I have also made it clear that the US role in the world makes international law more important to us, not less. We do not seek to impose constraints on others but shrink from them ourselves. Our careful approach to treaty negotiation and treaty acceptance reflects our respect for international law, not a desire to be free of it. When we assume international obligations, we take them seriously and seek to meet them, even when doing so is painful. And where international law applies, all branches of the US government including the judiciary, will enforce it.

ILAW Good—Norms Building

ILAW key to effective norms building

Racusin, JD Candidate @ University of Houston, 06 [Phillip D. Racusin, “Looking at the constitution through world-colored glasses: the Supreme Court’s use of transnational law in constitutional adjudication.” Houston Journal of International Law.Sept 22, 2006 – vol 28.3 p. 932]

Increasingly prevalent today is the Supreme Court's reliance, justification, and development of transnational law, both through the Court's opinions 129 and individual Justices' meetings with world leaders. 130 Through transnational legal development, the United States has become involved in a multilateral relationship of law-giving and taking -- engaging in a dialogue rather than as a one-sided conversationalist. 131 As law becomes increasingly transnational, multifaceted norms emerge. Critics, such as Justice Scalia, assert that the modern legal development's global nature provides no assurances that norms are actually evolving rather than developing 132, so perhaps they should not be used. Although judgment of such norms can be subjective, these norms can be helpful aids to an acceptable legal solution. When the law is viewed as a solution to a problem, whether legal, societal, or otherwise, the varying circumstances under which cultures attempt to solve a common problem will lead to varying solutions. These varying solutions, combined with transnational discourse and intelligent discussion, create a global marketplace of ideas from which the greatest ideas can rise to the top to be acknowledged, studied, or implemented. The Court must of course adhere to the Constitution, but it should not act as if the global marketplace does not exist.

ILAW Good—Democratic Globalization/Laundry List

Strong US support of democratic international law solves despair of globalization – the impact is nuclear war

Seita, Professor of Law, 97 [Alex, Globalization and the Convergence of Values, Cornell International Law Journal, Lexis]

Law has been important in managing economic globalization and may become as important with respect to political globalization.[[7]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_7)The ideology of globalization can be broadly divided into substantive and procedural components. The most important procedural element is the rule of law -- the idea that disputes will be settled and agreements negotiated through the observance of established principles rather than the use of force or the intimidation of power.[[8]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_8)In turn, the substantive principles, what the rule of law seeks to enforce, are those that nations have selected to settle disputes and negotiate agreements. The rule of law can be a way of resolving conflicts effectively, peacefully, and cooperatively. Furthermore, globalization enhances the perceived importance of distant international problems relative to local problems. Thus, protection of the environment beyond national borders has attracted strong international support, and the conflict between environment protection and economic development created the global issue of sustainable development.[[9]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_9)[page 430] On the downside, technology together with economic and political globalization can facilitate the movement of criminal and terrorist activities across national boundaries and help criminals and terrorists to operate like efficient international businesses.[[10]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_10) Most significantly for this Article, however, globalization is an important source of common economic and political values for humanity. Globalization is simultaneously a cause and a consequence of the convergence of basic economic and political systems among nations. As the activities of globalization help to converge economic and political systems, their existence reciprocally facilitates the expansion of globalization. Momentously, the convergence of these systems is leading to the convergence of fundamental values -- deeply held beliefs about what is right and wrong.[[11]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_11) There is a widespread, though not universal, acceptance among nations of the basic values of liberal democracy: a market economy (or free markets), a democratic government, and the protection of human rights. Although particular details may differ from country to country, the general nature of these values is the same. The convergence of basic economic and political values among nations is a pivotal event because it is a necessary, though not sufficient, condition for the eventual emergence of a consensus among human beings that there is but one human race.[[12]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_12) This Article argues that the United States and the other industrialized democracies (e.g., the members of the European Union, Japan, and Canada), collectively referred to as the "West,"[[13]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_13)should vigorously support and substantially guide the process of globalization. As it is currently emerging, globalization fosters desirable common national values by advancing general forms of market economies, democracy, and human rights.[[14]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_14)It is precisely those general characteristics of liberal democracy that constitute the foundational pillars and shared values of the United States and the other industrialized democracies.[[15]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_15) Because the exact form of globalization is not a fixed certainty, the United States and the other industrialized democracies should aggressively configure globalization to be consistent with and to promote the values of [page 431] liberal democracy. The industrialized democracies must also ensure that the path of globalization fairly balances the values of free market economics, democracy, and human rights, while accommodating such vital concerns as the protection of the environment, concerns that do not yet generate as strong a global consensus as the three convergent values.[[16]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_16) The mechanism for configuring globalization to conform to and to balance the values of liberal democracy consists of events and policies that, while difficult to achieve, are not unrealistic and have, to a degree, already been occurring.[[17]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_17)A particularly useful event might be a catharsis that would place the world into the next millennium without the baggage of the past. Perhaps by the year 2001, the representatives of oppressors, victims, victors, losers, and adversaries could assemble on a world stage in a therapeutic ceremony to put the past behind.[[18]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_18) Given their economic preeminence in the world, by acting in unison the industrialized democracies should be able to determine the specific content of globalization. Action from the industrialized democracies is needed because a humane globalization will increase human wealth and reduce human suffering.[[19]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_19)Morally, the promotion of liberal democratic values and the perspective of a single human race would serve to repay the historic debts that the industrialized countries have incurred over the past centuries.[[20]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_20) At the same time, the industrialized democracies must be careful to use their influence responsibly and sensitively, for the wisest ideas pursued for the best motives may be rejected when unilaterally imposed upon the rest of the world. Perceived economic and political "imperialism," though much less malevolent than military imperialism, will not be warmly greeted. The primary vehicle for the industrialized democracies should be the "rule of law" -- assuming that they have a substantial, if not commanding voice in determining its underlying principles. An enlightened globalization will not lead to the establishment of a world government. It could, however, create a new attitude among human beings and serve the interests of the United States.[[21]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_21)More profoundly, advancing globalization will facilitate an event barely begun that holds the great potential of constructing, in the distant future, the perspective that the human race matters more than its component divisions along race, religion, [page 432] or ethnicity.[[22]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_22)The vision of a common humanity is reason enough to embrace globalization. I. THE BACKGROUND OF GLOBALIZATION Today, more than ever, the events of foreign lands have important economic and political consequences for local inhabitants. To be sure, foreign events have had significant ramifications in the past. Centuries ago, seminal inventions in China revolutionized the culture, science, and warfare of Europeans; the opening of American borders to European immigrants from the 19th through the mid-20th centuries gave millions a new home; and the conflicts in Europe during WorldWarI eventually brought the United States onto the European battleground.[[23]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_23) But these events were of sporadic importance. For example, after World War I ended, the United States isolated itself in a number of respects from international politics and trade; America declined membership in the League of Nations and enacted the Smoot-Hawley tariffs in 1931 which drastically reduced imports.[[24]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_24)By contrast, transnational activities and affairs now have continuous importance, repeatedly affecting not just distant countries, but also the entire global community at times. The continuous importance of international events is a defining characteristic of globalization. Another feature of globalization with potentially profound implications is the convergence of basic economic and political values among nations towards the liberal democratic values of the industrialized democracies, the "West."[[25]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_25)For the West, the liberal, democratic values of market [page 433] economies, democracy, and human rights are fundamental.[[26]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_26)Given the arguably shallow roots of liberal democratic values in a number of countries and the absence of democracy and human rights in many others, this process may perhaps be too incomplete to be described as a convergence of [page 434] fundamental values. Nevertheless, today there are greater similarities between the economic and political systems of nations than at any other time in the short history of globalization.[[27]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_27)With careful and generous support from the West, this similarity of systems may evolve into a similarity of fundamental values. A. Globalization's Beginning Identifying the birth of globalization is an elusive task, but one possible date is the year 1945, when the United States led the Allied powers in creating the United Nations and its companion international organizations, the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (World Bank).[[28]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_28)Later in 1948, the United States and its democratic allies established the General Agreement on Tariffs [page 435] and Trade (GATT), another important economic institution for globalization along with the IMF and the World Bank.[[29]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_29)The motivations for creating these international institutions were at once noble and selfish. After the devastating experience of World War II, the victorious Allies were determined to prevent any reoccurrence of similar world wars. Their motivating hope was that a collegial body of nations would ensure the peaceful resolution of conflicts and provide a collective defense against wrongful aggression.[[30]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_30)Thus, the United Nations was the focus of political attempts to prevent future acts of aggression. Further, unlike the League of Nations, the United Nations made the promotion of human rights one of its basic purposes.[[31]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_31)Toward that end, the United Nations created various human rights institutions and generated human rights conventions and [page 436]declarations.[[32]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_32) At the same time, the Allies thought it critical to lay the foundations for the economic prosperity of the international community.[[33]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_33)Prosperous countries, it was thought, would be less inclined to wage wars. Thus, the Allies promoted activities that would raise the standard of living among peaceful countries. For example, the Allies established international economic institutions which were in part created to promote international monetary cooperation (the IMF), to foster economic development in less developed countries (the World Bank), and to increase international trade (the GATT).[[34]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_34)[page 437] The creation of the United Nations, the IMF, the World Bank, and the GATT were key moments in globalization. These institutions signaled the start of an era of cooperative behavior, however imperfect, among nations. While the number of nations involved was limited, their cooperation required the development and formal recognition of common interests. The GATT and the United Nations, in particular, were critical components in the genesis of globalization.[[35]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_35)In seeking to reduce barriers to trade of goods, the GATT contained free market principles that favored lower tariffs, banned quotas, and prohibited discrimination against foreign goods.[[36]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_36)The United Nations, at least on paper, championed the principles of human rights and democratic forms of government.[[37]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_37)As these principles [page 438] gained international acceptance, economic and political norms developed. That is, common values emerged. B. Economic Globalization In current usage, the term globalization refers primarily to economic globalization. As barriers to trade, investment, financial flows, and technology transfers have fallen, there has been an expansion of markets for goods, services, financial capital, and intellectual property to transnational, regional, and even global dimensions.[[38]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_38)There are several hallmarks of economic globalization. First, it increases opportunities for sellers as well as buyers. Second, economic globalization simultaneously creates new competition. Third, it develops interdependency among nations. Finally, economic globalization spreads the ideology of the free market economy model because the industrialized nations, the major promoters of globalization, advocate free market policies. The enlargement of markets beyond national boundaries means that both sellers and buyers have greater choices. More firms issue equity [page 439] securities in, or obtain financing from, international markets.[[39]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_39)They also find it profitable to sell their goods and services in, or buy their raw materials or components from, international markets. Worldwide trade now amounts to an astonishingly large figure, six trillion dollars in 1995, more than 80% the size of the gross domestic product of the United States, the world's largest economy.[[40]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_40) The existence of greater choice also extends to investment opportunities. Companies are investing in foreign countries, buying assets such as securities, businesses, facilities, and land, and have shifted production to [page 440] foreign factories.[[41]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_41)Concurrently, sellers of such domestic assets now have [page 441] more buyers to choose from. The liberalization of investment opportunities -- the removal of barriers -- contributes to the liberalization of trade, and vice versa.[[42]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_42) Expanding markets simultaneously generates more competition along with more opportunities;[[43]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_43)domestic firms must compete not only with domestic but also foreign rivals. While benefiting domestic consumers, foreign competition may threaten domestic businesses and employees.[[44]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_44)Whether the foreign competition comes from imports or the local subsidiaries of foreign corporations, employees of domestic firms may lose their jobs as these firms lay off surplus employees in order to become more competitive.[[45]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_45)Where local subsidiaries of foreign corporations provide competition, however, these subsidiaries will create new jobs that replace, in [page 442] part, jobs lost at domestic firms.[[46]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_46)One of the major consequences of increased foreign competition and the domestic drive for efficiency is that countries have become more willing to privatize and deregulate.[[47]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_47) By making foreign countries important sources of consumers, investors, and suppliers, globalization creates interdependence. When domestic businesses buy from and sell to foreign markets, their financial welfare becomes linked to those markets. More domestic companies have evolved into multinational corporations, firms that have economic interests in several countries. Businesses set up partnerships with foreign firms, to share technology and risk, in order to create new products.[[48]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_48)Because customers as well as suppliers are foreign, firms in one country become economically dependent upon firms in other countries. When foreign firms likewise become dependent upon domestic markets, interdependence is established as the economic prosperity of one nation becomes connected to that of other countries. For virtually all countries, transnational trade is important, if not vital, to their economic prosperity.[[49]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_49) As economic globalization integrates various national markets into regional or world-wide markets, it also promotes general free market principles, [page 443] such as the quintessential concept of the market mechanism to allocate resources,[[50]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_50)reduce protectionism in international trade,[[51]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_51)and [page 444] privatize and deregulate.[[52]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_52)Well before the collapse of the Soviet Union or even the end of the Cold War, the market economy (free market) paradigm of the West emerged as the decisive winner in the economic contest with the command (or planned) economy paradigm of the Soviet bloc.[[53]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_53)Since globalization is being led by the corporations and governments in the capitalist economies of the industrialized democracies, it naturally advocates the ideology of the winners rather than the losers. Thus, the rules underlying globalization seek to expand markets among market economy rather than command economy principles.[[54]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_54) For example, the WTO espouses the implementation of free-market ground rules to cover international trade and trade-related aspects of [page 445] investment and intellectual property.[[55]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_55)Its rules go further than those of the GATT, its predecessor in carrying out the free market principle of comparative advantage by stamping out protectionism among nations.[[56]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_56)When tools of protectionism -- such as tariffs, quotas, or domestic subsidies -- are reduced, foreign imports can better enter a domestic market, creating more competition for local firms. The presence of increased competition contributes to the development of more efficient local firms as only the fittest firms will survive in a competitive marketplace. The use of a market and consumer choice, rather than a bureaucracy, to determine the survival of firms and products is the essence of a free market.[[57]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_57)Not surprisingly, the various WTO agreements are expected to substantially [page 446] increase global income.[[58]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_58) C. Political Globalization As economic globalization expands, it has been accompanied by a somewhat lesser degree of political globalization in that there are now substantial numbers of elected governments.[[59]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_59)Also, the rhetoric of human rights has gained universal acceptance, and more nations than ever before have pledged to protect human rights.[[60]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_60)With political globalization, there is [page 447] more than just the existence of elected governments and the recognition of human rights by governments. Political globalization has also tended to cause a convergence in political values, with the genuine acceptance of democracy and human rights in a greater number of countries. Compared to the convergence in economic values, the convergence of political values has had a more difficult path. The growth of economic globalization was championed by countries that realized they would gain economically by increased foreign trade. Even the command-economy communist nations sought trade with the capitalist economies of the West.[[61]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_61)Well before the end of the Cold War, some communist nations even embraced capitalism to an extent. As events in China have clearly shown, dictatorship and a dismal human rights record have not been incompatible with free market policies.[[62]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_62) Unlike economic globalization, the support for political globalization historically has been weak, perhaps because its benefits were not as obvious or immediate. Despite their long history predating free market principles, the political values of democracy and human rights have been more dishonored by breach than honored by observance.[[63]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_63)Most countries did [page 448] not espouse them, and those that did applied these concepts selectively.[[64]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_64) For decades after the end of World WarII, the spread of humanitarian political values had to contend with severe obstacles.[[65]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_65)For much of the [page 449] existence of the United Nations, the most important international organization devoted to the promotion of democracy and human rights, many of its leading members either did not observe democratic values or human rights domestically, or subordinated these values to other priorities in foreign affairs.[[66]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_66)Despite initial obstacles, however, these political values slowly developed roots in non-western countries. Even before the end of the Cold War, the past two decades saw the emergence of a greater number of countries with democratic governments and protective of human rights.[[67]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_67)These countries offer political rights and [page 450] civil liberties that make them different in kind from past authoritarian regimes. With the end of the Cold War, many of the former Soviet-allied countries established popularly elected governments. Earlier, elected governments emerged from dictatorships in Latin America, Asia, and Africa.[[68]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_68)As the transformation of South Africa -- the former bastion of apartheid -- into a democratic country shows, the unbelievable can happen. The outlook today is promising for the values of democracy and, to a lesser extent, human rights. First, with the triumph of liberal democracy over communism in the Cold War,[[69]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_69)the United States and its allies can now more vigorously pursue humanitarian rather than security objectives. Second, the commonality of democracy and human rights in nations has provided more reason for these nations to cooperate among themselves in trade, humanitarian, and security matters, as well as in trying to nurture the qualities of democracy and human rights in authoritarian countries. The remaining authoritarian strongholds face pressures to democratize, and to recognize some level of human rights.[[70]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_70) Democracy has been easier to achieve than the protection of human rights, perhaps because the implementation of democracy is technically more easily accomplished (e.g., a popularly elected government), while there may be disagreement over which rights are basic human rights and how these basic rights are to be protected.[[71]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_71)Furthermore, elected governments need not necessarily protect human rights, especially in nascent [page 451] democracies which may have problems of illiteracy, corruption, authoritarian traditions, ethnic or religious conflicts, and a winner-takes-all political system.[[72]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_72) The value of democratic governments is that their actions reflect the desires of a majority of the people rather than the wishes of a tyrant or a select few. Democracy is arguably the most basic human right because it recognizes the sovereignty of the people in that a government pursues policies which the majority of the people support through their freely elected representatives. The preferences of at least a majority of its population, rather than the desires of a select few, influence democratic governments. Democratic governments are much more likely to respect human rights, at least those of the majority, than authoritarian regimes which are unaccountable to an electorate. Of course, democracy is not itself a sufficient condition for a humane society, since a majority may persecute or subjugate a minority in a democratic society.[[73]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_73)A practical benefit of mature democracies, those having democratic governments for a long period of time, is that they substantially protect a wide variety of human rights and are much less likely to use military force to resolve conflicts.[[74]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_74)[page 452] Despite disagreement over the extent to which human rights should be protected, some level of human rights protection exists for a substantial percentage, if not the majority, of the world's population.[[75]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_75)For an increasing number of countries, there seems to be a real, as opposed to a rhetorical, acceptance of some form of human rights. While inadequate and imperfect, this is an enormous improvement over the past. While outrageous examples of inhumanity still occur, such as in Rwanda, they are universally condemned.[[76]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_76) In an indirect way, the cultural impact of economic globalization stimulates political globalization. Economic globalization has long introduced aspects of foreign cultures -- especially American culture -- either directly by the sale of merchandise such as movies and musical recordings, or indirectly through exposure to foreigners.[[77]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_77)More than in the past, the opening of new markets through economic globalization has brought a flood of people and companies into foreign lands. Personal contact, always so important in understanding other human beings, has made foreigners less inscrutable. More business personnel are assigned to overseas offices, more consumers travel abroad as tourists, and more students study in foreign countries.[[78]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_78)Local residents are more likely than ever before to work for, do business with, or personally know foreigners. In some cases, this transnational encounter may lead to a personal [page 453] affinity with or an in-depth understanding of foreign cultures.[[79]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_79)[page 454] Further, economic globalization has generated an interest in learning foreign languages, primarily English. Perhaps irreversibly, English has become the international language of business and science, with a broader usage than any other language.[[80]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_80)At the same time, the ability to speak a foreign language other than English gives one a competitive advantage in doing business in nonEnglish-speaking countries.[[81]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_81) Doing business with foreigners, in their country or in one's own, requires that one communicate with them, cooperate with them, and be exposed to their political and business values.[[82]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_82)The political values of democracy and human rights, as well as aspects of foreign cultures, are often inseparable (though secondary) components of economic globalization. Thus, countries that seek to benefit from economic globalization must frequently tolerate political globalization and exposure to foreign cultures. As people know more about foreign cultures, some familiarity with foreign political values is bound to arise. II. TECHNOLOGY'S VITAL ROLE IN CONVERGING VALUES The advanced communication technology that links much of the world together continues to be crucial to the convergence of economic and political values. This technology is utilized primarily by business entities to facilitate economic globalization.[[83]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_83)Modern technology has also tended to promote democracy and human rights by making it easier and cheaper for [page 455] people to communicate without censorship across national boundaries. Communication technology not only exposes a national population to foreign ideas, but also concurrently exposes domestic conditions to a global audience. This has occurred because economic globalization involves communication technologies with multiple uses. The same technology that transmits a business proposal may also communicate politically embarrassing or other non-business information. These multiple uses of advanced technology cannot easily be separated from each other, making it difficult to restrict the technology to purely business purposes. A country that wishes to participate in international business cannot isolate itself from all uses of communication technologies unrelated to business dealings.[[84]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_84) The internet [[85]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_85)is a recent communication medium with tremendous potential for linking people across national boundaries, furthering mutual interests of the international community, and a myriad of other uses.[[86]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_86)The internet will become, or may already be, an important or even critical technological medium for business, as well as for scientific research and consumer enjoyment.[[87]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_87)The internet is the essential part of the "information [page 456] superhighway," a source of information that promises to change fundamentally human lives.[[88]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_88) E-mail and computer file transmission on the internet can potentially provide a more powerful (e.g., faster, cheaper, more convenient) business tool than such conventional devices as the postal service, telephones, and faxes. Internet users can transmit and download data, articles, images, movies, speeches, sound recordings, and other information.[[89]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_89)By providing a forum for the transfer of such information, the internet will help protect the freedoms of expression and choice for followers of any ideological persuasion.[[90]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_90)Unfortunately, however, it may shield criminal, obscene, [page 457] racist, and terrorist activities as well.[[91]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_91) A government might attempt to control the content of information transfers. It could screen large numbers of telephone calls, faxes, or computer data; it could restrict access to or intercept messages on the internet. Total censorship, however, would bring a halt to international business.[[92]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_92)Firms might object if government surveillance is too pervasive. For example, companies might not want government officials to be privy to proprietary information.[[93]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_93)A certain amount of freedom of communication is therefore assured if a country wishes to be part of a global economy: international firms will leave a nation if censorship prohibitively increases the cost of doing business. This will remain true even if governments attempt to censor communications using the most advanced and cost-effective surveillance technology available.[[94]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_94)[page 458] Communication technologies not essential to international business transactions also serve to bolster humanitarian political values. International news reporting utilizes communication technologies to broadcast major domestic events of all types on a worldwide screen. There are numerous journalists, broadcasters, and commentators whose professional livelihood depends upon bringing newsworthy stories to a foreign, if not international, audience. While most publicized stories may not involve political events, many do. The competitive members of the news media are unlikely to let stories of outrageous acts completely escape the attention of the international public. Furthermore, these news articles may be read by anyone in the world who has access to the internet.[[95]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_95) At the same time, news stories alone would not generate international repercussions against repressive governments if purely theoretical political values were involved. There must be influential constituencies that place high priority on the existence of democracy and human rights, that seek to spread those values, and that are galvanized into action upon news of deplorable political conditions. Neither value would flourish unless there were constituencies, either domestic or abroad, that strongly supported it. The presence of democratic governments and strong protections for human rights in the industrialized countries means that these values are expressed to some degree in their business transactions with other countries.[[96]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_96)Sizable populations in the industrialized countries also attempt to support democracy and human rights abroad through private means.[[97]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_97)Moreover, as the living standards of developing countries improve, the citizenry of these countries seem to expect more democratization (first) and [page 459] human rights (later).[[98]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_98) III. THE IMPORTANCE OF GLOBALIZATION Because globalization promotes common values across nations and can make foreign problems, conditions, issues, and debates as vivid and captivating as national, state, and local ones, it contributes to a sense of world community.[[99]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_99)It develops a feeling of empathy for the conditions of people abroad, enlarging the group of human beings that an individual will identify with. Globalization thus helps to bring alive persons in foreign lands, making them fellow human beings who simply live in different parts of the world rather than abstract statistics of deaths, poverty, and suffering. The convergence of basic political and economic values is thus fundamentally important because it helps to establish a common bond among people in different countries, facilitating understanding and encouraging cooperation. All other things being equal, the commonality among countries -- whether in the form of basic values, culture, or language -- enhances their attractiveness to each other.[[100]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_100)In addition, convergence increases [page 460] the possibility that a transformation of attitude will take place for those who participate in transnational activities. People will begin to regard foreigners in distant lands with the same concern that they have for their fellow citizens.[[101]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_101)They will endeavor to help these foreigners obtain basic political rights even though the status of political rights in other countries will have no tangible beneficial impact at home.[[102]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_102)Convergence does not mean that there is a single model of a market economy, a single type of democracy, or a single platform of human rights. They exist in different forms, and nations may have different combinations of these forms.[[103]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_103)[page 461] A. The Perspective of One Human Race The convergence of fundamental values through globalization has profound consequences because it increases the chance that a new perspective will develop, one which views membership in the human race as the most significant societal relationship, except for nationality.[[104]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_104)A person owes his or her strongest collective loyalties to the various societies with which he or she most intensely identifies. Today, this societal identification can be based on numerous factors, including nationality, race, religion, and ethnic group.[[105]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_105)While it is unlikely that nationality will be surpassed as the most significant societal relationship, globalization and the convergence of values may eventually convince people in different countries that the second most important social group is the human race, and not a person's racial, religious, or ethnic group.[[106]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_106) One of the first steps in the formation of a society is the recognition by prospective members that they have common interests and bonds. An essential commonality is that they share some fundamental values. A second is that they identify themselves as members belonging to the same community on the basis of a number of common ties, including shared fundamental values. A third commonality is the universality of rights -- the active application of the "golden rule" -- by which members expect that all must be entitled to the same rights as well as charged with the same responsibilities to ensure that these rights are protected. Globalization promotes these three types of commonalities. Globalization establishes common ground by facilitating the almost universal acceptance of market economies, the widespread emergence of democratic governments, and the extensive approval of human rights. The most visible example is economic. With the end of the Cold War, the free market economy has clearly triumphed over the command economy in the battle of the [page 462] economic paradigms. Because some variant of a market economy has taken root in virtually all countries, there has been a convergence of sorts in economic systems.[[107]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_107) Further, because it often requires exposure to and pervasive interaction with foreigners -- many of whom share the same fundamental values -- globalization can enlarge the group that one normally identifies with. Globalization makes many of its participants empathize with the conditions and problems of people who in earlier years would have been ignored as unknown residents of remote locations. This empathy often leads to sympathy and support when these people suffer unfairly. Finally, the combination of shared values and identification produce the third commonality, universality of rights.[[108]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_108)Citizens of one country will often expect, and work actively to achieve, the same basic values in other countries. They will treat nationals of other nations as they would wish to be treated. The effects of shared values, identification, and universality of rights in globalization could have a pivotal long-term effect -- the possibility that a majority of human beings will begin to believe that they are truly part of a single global society -- the human race. This is not to say that people disbelieve the idea that the human race encompasses all human beings. Of course, they realize that there is only one human species. Rather, the human race does not usually rank high on the hierarchy of societies for most people. Smaller societies, especially those based on nationality, race, religion, or ethnicity, command more loyalty.[[109]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_109)The idea of the human race, the broadest and all-inclusive category of the human species, is abstract and has little, if any, impact on the lives of human beings. To believe in the singular importance of the human race requires an attitudinal shift in which a person views the human race seriously. [page 463] This may occur because the convergence of values does not only mean that the people of different countries will share the same basic values. It may also lead to the greater promotion of these values for the people of other countries. Historically and certainly today, America and the other industrial democracies have attempted to foster democracy and human rights in other countries.[[110]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_110)While some part of this effort has been attributable to "self interest," it has also been due to the empathy that the industrialized democracies have had for other countries.[[111]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_111)The magnitude of these efforts in the future, as in the past, will depend not solely upon the available financial and human resources of the industrialized democracies. It will also depend upon their national will -- a factor undoubtedly influenced by the intensity with which the people of the industrialized democracies identify with people in foreign lands. The perspective that the human race matters more than its component divisions would accelerate cooperative efforts among nations to attack global problems that adversely affect human rights and the quality of human life.[[112]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_112)Obviously, there is no shortage of such problems. Great suffering still occurs in so many parts of the world, not just from internal armed conflicts,[[113]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_113)but also from conditions of poverty.[[114]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_114)There are severe health problems in much of the world which can be mitigated with relatively little cost.[[115]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_115)There are the lives lost to the AIDS epidemic, and [page 464] the deaths and disabilities caused by land mines.[[116]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_116)Russia, a nuclear superpower that could end life on this planet, has severe social, economic, and political problems.[[117]](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=6b13596222&view=att&th=1294268aee57a37d&attid=0.2&disp=vah&realattid=f_gailn2tf1&zw#0.2_117)Making the human race important would not just promote liberal democratic values but would also reduce human suffering and perhaps eliminate completely the risk of nuclear war.

Soft Power I/L

Drone strikes crush US credibility in the region

Bhatiya, ’10 [Neil Bhatiya, Century Foundation Policy Program Assistant and former Research Fellow for the Streit Council, Taking Note: Century Foundation, The Century Foundation is a nonprofit public policy research institution committed to the belief that a mix of effective government, open democracy, and free markets is the most effective solution to the major challenges facing the United States, 1/19/10, http://takingnote.tcf.org/2010/01/more-drones-in-afghanistan-not-a-path-to-a-winning-strategy-.html]

Flynn and his co-authors (Captain Matt Pottinger, a Marine, and Paul Batchelor, of the Defense Intelligence Agency), argue that U.S. intelligence efforts in Afghanistan are too focused on targeting insurgents, at the expense of generating local knowledge. In writing “Fixing Intel,” Flynn appears to be clearly delineating exactly what U.S. strategy should be over the next one and a half years: “lethal targeting alone will not help U.S. and allied force win in Afghanistan.” Andrew Exum, a CNAS Fellow and former adviser to McChrystal’s Spring 2009 strategy review, similarly writes that drone strikes in isolation and apart from a coherent counterinsurgency strategy hurt the U.S. credibility in the region. He also implicitly criticizes the CIA’s reliance on drones in Pakistan: “I fret drone strikes have become a way for a certain agency in the U.S. government to justify its budget share and relevance in the fight against al-Qaeda.”

Soft Power Solves Extinction

Soft power key to solving extinction from a host of global problems

Nye, ‘8 [Joseph Nye, Distinguished Professor at Harvard and Former Dean of the Kennedy School of Government, “Recovering American Leadership,” Survival, March 2008]

At first glance, the disparity between American power and that of the rest of the world looks overwhelming. The United States is the only country with both intercontinental nuclear weapons and large, state-of-the-art air, naval and ground forces capable of global deployment. The United States also leads the world in the information-based ‘revolution in military affairs’. With American spending constituting nearly half of world military expenditure, it would be very difficult for other nations to organise a traditional military challenge against the United States. In economic size, America’s roughly one-quarter share of world economic output (at official exchange rates) is equal to the next three countries combined. In terms of soft power and cultural prominence, the United States is far and away the world’s number-one film and television exporter. The country also attracts the most foreign students each year to its institutions of higher education. In terms of power resources, America is well ahead. But power measured in resources is not the same as power measured in terms of being able to produce the outcomes one wants. Some analysts describe this world as unipolar, others as multipolar, but both descriptions are wrong, because each is an oversimplification of the situation in a world where no one form of power is decisive. Unipolarity is misleading because it exaggerates the degree to which the United States is able to get the results it wants in some dimensions of world politics, while multipolarity is misleading because it implies several roughly equal counties. Power defined in behavioural terms – the ability to influence others to produce the outcomes one wants – always depends on context. Power today is distributed among countries in a pattern that resembles a complex, three-dimensional chess game. On the top board (representing the first context in which power resources may be analysed), military power is largely unipolar. But on the middle board, economic power among states is already multipolar, with the United States, Europe and Japan representing a majority of world economic output, and China’s dramatic growth rapidly making it the fourth major player. On this economic board, the United States is not a hegemon, and often must bargain as an equal. The bottom chessboard is the realm of transnational relations that involve actors crossing borders outside of government control. This realm includes players as diverse as bankers electronically transferring sums larger than most national budgets, terrorists transferring black-market weapons and hackers disrupting Internet operations. It also includes ecological threats, such as pandemics and global climate change, that can do damage on a scale equal or larger to that of major wars. (More people died in the 1918 flu pandemic, for example, than as a direct result of the First World War.) This adds a new dimension to questions of security and risk, and includes issues for which the military instruments that dominate the top board are clearly insufficient. On this bottom board, power is widely dispersed, and it makes no sense to speak of unipolarity, multipolarity or hegemony. And yet it is from this bottom board that many of the most important security challenges arise. Those who recommend a hegemonic American foreign policy based on traditional military power are relying on inadequate analysis, and like one-dimensional chess players in a three-dimensional game, they will eventually lose. Because of its leading edge in the information revolution and its past investment in traditional power resources, the United States will likely remain the world’s single most powerful country in military, economic and soft-power terms well into the twenty-first century. While potential coalitions to check American power could be created, countries like Russia, China and India have differing goals and priorities, and it is unlikely that they would become firm military allies unless the United States used its hard, coercive power in an overbearing, unilateral manner that undermined its soft or attractive power. Because soft power is particularly important in dealing with issues arising from the bottom chessboard of transnational relations, America’s resources in this area are increasingly important.

Modeling Add-On

US modeled—US targeted killings are modeled by others—Justifies other countries killing anyone

Lake 10 [Eli, a writer for the Washington times) U.S. drone strikes come under U.N. fire, http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2010/jun/2/us-drone-strikes-come-under-un-fire/?page=2 DA=June 2,2010]

To start, his report says there appears to be no geographic boundaries to U.S. drone strikes, creating what some have called the "law of 9/11," a reference to the authorization of military force by Congress on Sept. 14, 2001, three days after the terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon.That authorization allows the president "to use all necessary and appropriate force against those nations, organizations, or persons he determines planned, authorized, committed, or aided the terrorist attacks that occurred on September 11, 2001, or harbored such organizations or persons, in order to prevent any future acts of international terrorism against the United States by such nations, organizations or persons."Harold Koh, the State Department's legal adviser, said in a speech in March that the authorization allows the United States to use force throughout the world to target members of al Qaeda. He has justified the policy as a form of self-defense, based on the fact that al Qaeda and the United States are in armed conflict.However, Mr. Alston said this is not clear. He pointed out that a Senate Foreign Relations Committee report in 2009 found that some targets in Afghanistan included drug traffickers, who should not be considered the same as armed combatants.Part of the problem, Mr. Alston said, is that there is no overarching international law designed specifically for targeted killings. For example, international humanitarian law requires only that such targeted attacks do not target civilians disproportionately.Mr. Koh said in his speech in March that U.S. strikes also make sure the attacks are limited to military objectives.In his statement, Mr. Alston warned that the U.S. use of drones could encourage other countries to follow the American example."This strongly asserted but ill-defined license to kill without accountability is not an entitlement which the United States or other states can have without doing grave damage to the rules designed to protect the right to life and prevent extrajudicial executions," he said.Ben Wizner, an attorney with the American Civil Liberties Union, echoed this point in an interview."There are many countries in the world that define their enemies as illegitimate terrorists who would be eager to do this," Mr. Wizner said. "The danger of treating the entire world as a battlefield is that countries might do the same."A U.S. official familiar with the drone program said the approach, at least in Pakistan, a country whose tribal regions are thought to harbor al Qaeda's senior leadership, is the best option.

Prolif Snowballs

On the brink of widespread UAV prolif—

Engelhardt, ‘9 [Tom Engelhardt, co-founder of the American Empire Project, Drone Wars: Your Future has Arrived, 4/7/09, http://www.pacificfreepress.com/news/1/3990-drone-wars-your-future-has-arrived.html.]

This brings us back to arms races. They may be things of the past, but don't for a minute imagine that those hunter-killer skies won't someday fill with the drones of other nations. After all, one of the truths of our time is that no weapons system, no matter where first created, can be kept for long as private property. Today, we talk not of arms races, but of "proliferation," which is what you have once a global arms race of one takes hold. In drone-world, the Chinese, the Russians, the Israelis, the Pakistanis, the Georgians, and the Iranians, among others, already have drones. In the Lebanon War of 2006, Hezbollah flew drones over Israel. In fact, if you have the skills, you can create your own drone, more or less in your living room (as your basic DIY drone website indicates). Undoubtedly, the future holds unnerving possibilities for small groups intent on assassination from the air. Already the skies are growing more crowded. Three weeks ago, President Obama issued what Reuters termed "an unprecedented videotaped appeal to Iran... offering a 'new beginning' of diplomatic engagement to turn the page on decades of U.S. policy toward America's longtime foe." It was in the form of a Persian New Year's greeting. As the New York Times also reported, the U.S. military beat the president to the punch. They sent their own "greetings" to the Iranians a couple of days earlier. After considering what Times reporters Rod Nordland and Alissa J. Rubin term "the delicacy of the incident at a time when the United States is seeking a thaw in its relations with Iran," the U.S. military sent out Col. James Hutton to meet the press and "confirm" that "allied aircraft" had shot down an "Iranian unmanned aerial vehicle" over Iraq on February 25th, more than three weeks earlier. Between that day and mid-March, the relevant Iraqi military and civilian officials were, the Times tells us, not informed. The reason? That drone was intruding on our (borrowed) airspace, not theirs. You probably didn't know it, but according to an Iraqi Defense Ministry spokesman, "protection of Iraqi airspace remains an American responsibility for the next three years." And naturally enough, we don't want other countries' drones in "our" airspace, though that's hardly likely to stop them. The Iranians, for instance, have already announced the development of "a new generation of 'spy drones' that provide real-time surveillance over enemy terrain." Of course, when you openly control squads of assassination drones patrolling airspace over other countries, you've already made a mockery of whatever national sovereignty might once have meant. It's a precedent that may someday even make us distinctly uncomfortable. But not right now. If you doubt this, check out the stream of self-congratulatory comments being leaked by Washington officials about our drone assassins. These often lead off news pieces about America's "covert war" over Pakistan ("An intense, six-month campaign of Predator strikes in Pakistan has taken such a toll on Al Qaeda that militants have begun turning violently on one another out of confusion and distrust, U.S. intelligence and counter-terrorism officials say..."); but be sure to read to the end of such pieces. Somewhere in them, after the successes have been touted and toted up, you get the bad news: "In fact, the stepped-up strikes have coincided with a deterioration in the security situation in Pakistan." In Pakistan, a war of machine assassins is visibly provoking terror (and terrorism), as well as anger and hatred among people who are by no means fundamentalists. It is part of a larger destabilization of the country. To those who know their air power history, that shouldn't be so surprising. Air power has had a remarkably stellar record when it comes to causing death and destruction, but a remarkably poor one when it comes to breaking the will of nations, peoples, or even modest-sized organizations. Our drone wars are destructive, but they are unlikely to achieve Washington's goals.

Drones 🡪 Anti-Americanism

US drone attacks is the cause of terrorism

Hornberger ’09 [Jacob G. Hornberger, writer for the international newspaper *Revista Amauta*, October 22, 2009, *Revista Amauta*, “Drone Assassinations Are Only Making Things Worse”, http://revista-amauta.org/2009/10/drone-assassinations-are-only-making-things-worse-and-us-drone-strikes-may-break-international-law-un/, AZ)

Even worse, the drone attacks are killing family members, friends, and relatives of the suspects who are targeted for death. As New York Times columnist David Rohde, who was held captive in Afghanistan and Pakistan by the Taliban has been pointing out in a series on articles about his captivity, the drone attacks are producing enormously high levels of anger and rage against the United States.

Another justification for the drone attacks in Pakistan is that that country is serving as a sanctuary for insurgents in Afghanistan, who are opposing the 8-year occupation of that country by the U.S. government (which invaded without the constitutionally required congressional declaration of war).

U.S. officials says they have to continue occupying Afghanistan for the next several years, maybe decades, in order to prevent the Taliban from regaining power. The notion is that the Taliban would provide a sanctuary for al-Qaeda. But that’s a ludicrous rationale because it’s obvious that the occupation and, now, the expansion of killing into Pakistan are producing the very thing that the U.S. government fears most — terrorists. Moreover, at the risk of belaboring the obvious, terrorists don’t need a Taliban sanctuary in Afghanistan to plan attacks against the United States. All they need is a hotel room or a house somewhere. So, the principal rationale for continuing to occupy Afghanistan is ridiculous, especially given that the occupation is churning out new terrorists at an ever-increasing rate.

Civilians will retaliate against drone attacks.

Mayer ’09 [Jane, writer for the New Yorker on National Defense and author of the book The Dark Side, October 21, 2009, NPR, “Jane Mayer: The Risks Of A Remote-Controlled War”, http://www.npr.org/templates/transcript/transcript.php?storyId=113978637]

Well, I think it's - my personal sense is you can't really go around the globe killing people as the United States government without igniting some kind of retaliation. I think you - once you start killing people on the other side of the world, you are going to, first of all, kill some of the wrong people, which this program has done. They've killed a number of innocent people, and you know, women and children, and you then get members of their family wanting to avenge them, and you just basically also become morally insulated to a kind of a horrific thing that's going on, and eventually I think it's going to cause blowback, that basically that's been the experience historically.

Drone strikes are producing super terrorist cells—bringing together former enemies united in their hatred of the US

Mayer ’09 [Jane, writer for the New Yorker on National Defense and author of the book The Dark Side, October 21, 2009, NPR, “Jane Mayer: The Risks Of A Remote-Controlled War”, http://www.npr.org/templates/transcript/transcript.php?storyId=113978637, AZ]

Well, that's what certainly we would hope. I mean that by killing a few - yeah, they call it decapitating the leadership - maybe we can save American lives and Afghan and Pakistani lives - and avoid a larger war. But it's really unclear whether that's the effect of this program.

There's been an escalation of attacks in Pakistan by militant groups who didn't use to work together, who seemed to be kind of coalescing now against the Zardari government there, partly in anger at these drone attacks. So that the fear is that it may ignite some kind of backlash that will create worse problems. It remains to be seen, really. But it's an unsettling, disturbing form of warfare. It looks good on the surface. It doesn't look quite as good when you look closely.

Drones🡪 Anti-Americanism

Air power has ALWAYS turned populations against us—

Engelhardt, ‘9 [Tom Engelhardt, co-founder of the American Empire Project, Atlantic Free Press, 11/14/09, http://atlanticfreepress.com/news/1/12293-drone-race-to-a-known-future-why-military-dreams-fail-and-why-it-doesnt-matter.html.]

So why am I not excited -- other than the fact that the drones are also killing civilians in disputed but significant numbers in the Pakistani tribal borderlands, creating enemies and animosity wherever they strike, and turning us into a nation of 24/7 assassins beyond the law or accountability of any sort? Thought of another way, the drones put wings on the original Bush-era Guantanamo principle -- that Americans have the inalienable right to act as global judge, jury, and executioner, and in doing so are beyond the reach of any court or law.

And here's another factor that dulls my excitement just a tad -- if the history of air warfare has shown one thing, it's this: it never breaks populations. Rather, it only increases their sense of unity, as in London during the Blitz under Winston Churchill, in Germany under Adolf Hitler, Imperial Japan under Emperor Hirohito, North Korea under Kim Il Sung, North Vietnam under Ho Chi Minh, and of course (though we never put ourselves in such company, being the exceptions to all history), the United States after 9/11 under George W. Bush. Why should the peoples of rural Afghanistan and the Pakistani borderlands be any different?

Drone Strikes are increasing Al Qaeda’s recruitment’s and dooming the missions objectives

Bergen & Tiedemann, 09 [Writers for the New America Foundation, The Drone War, June 3, 2009, www.newamerica.net/publications/articles/2009/drone\_war\_13672 ]

The drone war against Al Qaeda's leaders--and, increasingly, their Pakistani-based Taliban allies--has been waged with little public discussion or congressional investigation of its legality or efficacy, even though the offensive is essentially a program of assassination that kills not only militant leaders, but also civilians in a country that is, at least nominally, a close ally of the United States. Nor has there been a substantive debate about whether the gains of winnowing the ranks of Al Qaeda's leadership outweigh the fact that the inevitable civilian casualties are a superb recruiting tool for the Pakistani Taliban. Indeed, the drone strikes have pushed militants deeper into Pakistan and given them an excuse to strike the heartland of the country, further destabilizing the already rickety government in Islamabad. All of which raises the question of whether the drone campaign, however useful in the short term, might fatally undermine U.S. efforts to stabilize the region and to win the long-term war against Al Qaeda and its allies.

Drones Crush Intel-Gathering

US intelligence efforts are in shambles from focus on drones

Flynn et al, ’10 [Major General Michael T. Flynn, USA, Captain Matt Pottinger, USMC, Paul D. Batchelor, DIA, Published by the New American Security. The mission of the Center for a New American Security (CNAS) is to develop strong, pragmatic, and principled national security and defense policies that promote and protect American interests and values. Fixing Intel: A Blueprint for Making Intelligence Relevant in Afghanistan, Voices from the field, January 2010, http://www.cnas.org/files/documents/press/AfghanIntel\_Flynn\_Jan2010\_code507\_voices.pdf]

The U.S. intelligence community has fallen into the trap of waging an anti-insurgency campaign rather than a counterinsurgency campaign. The difference is not academic. Capturing or killing key mid-level and high-level insurgents – anti-insurgency – is without question a necessary component of successful warfare, but far from sufficient for military success in Afghanistan. Anti-insurgent efforts are, in fact, a secondary task when compared to gaining and exploiting knowledge about the localized contexts of operation and the distinctions between the Taliban and the rest of the Afghan population. There are more than enough analysts in Afghanistan. Too many are simply in the wrong places and assigned to the wrong jobs. It is time to prioritize U.S. intelligence efforts and bring them in line with the war’s objectives.

Obama’s drone strikes sacrifice US ability to gather intelligence by killing the key info sources—this US is at greater risk of terror attacks than ever before

Thiessen, 2/8

[Marc Thiessen, Foreign Policy, 2/8/10, http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2010/02/08/dead\_terrorists\_tell\_no\_tales?page=0,1]

Obama's drone campaign is costing the United States vital intelligence, and it has also exposed him to the charge of hypocrisy. The president has claimed the moral high ground in eliminating the CIA's enhanced interrogation program, saying that he rejects the "the false choice between our security and our ideals." Yet when Obama orders a Predator or Reaper strike, he is often signing the death warrant for the women and children who will be killed alongside the target -- individuals whose only sin is that they are married to, or the children of, a terrorist. Is this not a choice between security and ideals? And why is it a morally superior choice? Is it really more in keeping with American ideals to kill a terrorist and the innocent people around him, when the United States might instead spare the innocent, capture the same terrorist alive, and get intelligence from him that could potentially save many other innocent lives as well? It is true that Obama's predecessor George W. Bush also reportedly increased the use of drone strikes against senior terrorist leaders toward the end of his term. But the Bush administration also maintained and exercised the CIA's capability to capture and interrogate such leaders. Obama has now dramatically escalated drone strikes while eliminating what is arguably the most important and successful intelligence programs in the war on terror. This is not a sign of Obama's seriousness. To the contrary, he is using drones as cover for his dangerous decision to eliminate the CIA's capability to take terrorist leaders in alive and question them effectively for actionable intelligence. That is nothing to praise. When Khalid Sheikh Mohammed was located in 2003, the United States did not send a Predator to kill him. It captured him alive and got him to give up the details of the plots he had set in motion. That decision saved thousands of lives. The fact that Obama's administration no longer does this when it locates senior terrorist leaders today means the president is voluntarily sacrificing intelligence that could protect the American people -- and that the U.S. homeland is at greater risk of a terrorist attack.

Intel I/L

Intelligence is the key factor in counter-terrorism efforts

Karmon, ‘1 [Dr. Ely Karmon, ICT Senior Researcher, The Role of Intelligence in Counter-Terrorism, This article is based on a paper presented at the Conference on “Intelligence in the 21st Century” (Castle of San Marino, Priverno, Italy 14 – 16 February 2001), to be published by the Center for Advanced Studies of Terrorism and Political Violence (CEAS - Italy) in a book on the conference’s proceedings, 2/26/01, http://212.150.54.123/articles/articledet.cfm?articleid=152.]

Intelligence is essential in countering terrorism, in diminishing its tactical effects and strategic importance. The U.S. Congress Report of the National Commission on Terrorism stressed that “good intelligence is the best weapon against international terrorism.”(3) But without a comprehensive, intelligent and firm policy of the all the governments and political leaders involved, terrorism will continue to present a genuine threat to future generations.

AT: Terrorist Don’t Have WMD

Since 9/11 terrorists have increased destructive capability—access to WMD likely

Toukan and Cordesman, ‘ 9 [Abdullah Toukan (Senior Associate at CSIS) & Anthony H. Cordesman (Arleigh A. Burke Chair in Strategy at CSIS), Terrorism and WMDThe Link with the War in Afghanistan, Center for Strategic and International Studies, 11/9/09, http://csis.org/files/publication/091109\_Terrorism\_WMD.pdf]

It is generally understood that when we talk about Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) we imply nuclear, biological, and chemical (NBC) weapons. More recently, other means of mass destruction or mass disruption effects entered the lexicon. Radiological weapons, often called radiological dispersal devices (RDD), add to a grouping of weapon capabilities as chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear (CBRN). High yield explosives can be considered, in some cases, a weapon of mass destruction. This characteristic is incorporated in a contemporary acronym of CBRNE. Cyber Terrorism can in part cause severe disruption and physical damages, one example could be a cyber attack on nations air traffic control system.

•The devastating impacts of WMD include chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear, and enhanced high explosive weapons as well cyber attacks. WMD may, at times, rely more on disruptive impacts than on destructive effects.

•The devastation of 9/11 raised the bar in terms of the kind of carnage that a future terrorist act must produce to capture similar news coverage. That, in turn, induces the terrorists to innovate in order to find a new means to cause greater destruction.•Terrorist groups that acquire WMD pose a critical danger. Terrorists armed with these weapons can gain leverage for their demands by threatening use of WMD to influence political or military actions, or to achieve a specific economic or financial objective. Likewise, some groups simply want to employ WMD to create large numbers of casualties, both military and civilian, and capitalize on the effects of these events.

•One important aim of the U.S. invasion of Afghanistan was to destroy and eliminate the main bases of al-Qaida and its central command structure. The 9/11 attacks demonstrated that transnational terrorism is becoming more lethal, and that it can produce a fundamental political and strategic impact. The threat of terrorist use of WMD is still possible and perhaps inevitable given the goals of al-Qaida.

•The threat of terrorist use of weapons of mass destruction (WMD), is a real one that represents a very serious threat to the U.S. and other nations that are potential targets of sub-national terrorist groups or networks. Transnational terrorism and the potential acquisition by terrorists of weapons of mass destruction are part of the ‘asymmetric’ dynamics of the new threats that have emerged and have thrust the international community into a new era of warfare.

•As far as is presently known, terrorist groups do not have in their possession nuclear weapons. However they could have the capability sometime soon given that knowledge about these kinds of weapons are available worldwide. Recent terrorist attacks have shown a rise in the tendency towards the use of mass-causality weapons for which WMD could be very well suited.

•The attempted terrorist attacks to simultaneously bomb locations in Jordan, in April 2004, using conventional explosives to disperse toxic chemical material, clearly demonstrates the deliberate planning for use of toxic chemical material in terrorism. Jordanian security forces foiled the attack on Jordanian and U.S. targets with a preemptive raid on the facilities used by the terrorists. Reports estimate that approximately 20 tons of chemicals were confiscated, which could have caused tens of thousands of casualties. The intent for the indiscriminate nature of the terrorist attacks was clear and projected how fast and how large a future attack using mass destruction bombs would occur.

•For radiological attacks a study was conducted by the Federation of American Scientists in which the destructive effects of various types of radiological bombs were analyzed. The case studies consisted of Cobalt, Cesium and Americium bombs. The conclusion was that “While radiological attacks would result in some deaths, they would not result in the hundreds of thousands of fatalities that could be caused by a crude nuclear weapon. Attacks could contaminate large urban areas with radiation levels that exceed the Environment Protection Agency (EPA) health and toxic material guidelines”.

AT: Terrorist Don’t Have WMD

Now is the key time to act—Al-Qaeda is intent on acquiring WMD, but is not yet successful. If they do mass destruction is inevitable

Toukan and Cordesman, ‘ 9 [Abdullah Toukan (Senior Associate at CSIS) & Anthony H. Cordesman (Arleigh A. Burke Chair in Strategy at CSIS), Terrorism and WMDThe Link with the War in Afghanistan, Center for Strategic and International Studies, 11/9/09, http://csis.org/files/publication/091109\_Terrorism\_WMD.pdf]

•We can safely assume that al-Qaida and other terrorist groups have the capability and intent to develop and employ a radiological dispersal device, as well as obtaining biological agents such as anthrax, and chemical weapons such as Sarin. Presently, it is doubtful that al-Qaida has the capability to produce or even possesses nuclear weapons, although acquisition remains a goal.

•Terrorists will seek to acquire and use weapons of mass destruction for spectacular attacks with catastrophic disruption, damage, or destruction. In addition to mass casualties and panic, the terrorist will seek a U.S. Government response perceived to be advantageous to the terrorist’s objectives. Therefore, there should be an ample cause of concern for a WMD terrorist attack on the United States or on a European country.

•The terrorist threat and intended use of WMD is real. If this type of attack occurs, warning times will be very short, and the number of people involved can be comparatively small.

Terrorists can get WMD and are motivated enough to use them

Intriligator and Toukan 06 (Michael Intriligator, Professor of Economics, Political Science, and Public Policy at UCLA and Abdullah Toukan, PhD from MIT in Theoretical Nuclear Physics and former Science Advisor to King Hussein of Jordan, Countering Terrorism and WMD: Creating a Global Counter-Terrorism Network, Ed. Peter Kotana, Michael Intriligator, and John P. Sullivan, 2006, pg. 74-5)

Overall, while there has been remarkably little historical use of WMD by terrorists and very few fatalities resulting from their use, one cannot rule out terrorist groups gaining such weapons and using them in the future. Sooner or later they could be available to terrorists. As former Secretary of Defense William Cohen stated concerning WMD terrorism: “The question is no longer if this will happen, but when.” In addition, other groups have sought to gain access and use nuclear weapons and other WMD, which compounds the problem as new nations and subnational groups seek these weapons. Some terrorist groups may feel that, in order to attract worldwide attention, they should escalate from conventional to biological or nuclear weapons. The likely users of these and other WMD are probably fundamentalist terrorist groups, given both their motivation and their access to funding and expertise. 9 It should be noted that nuclear weapons are “self-protecting”—they are difficult to acquire, to use and to take care of properly. This has the effect of keeping such weapons out of the reach of most national and subnational groups, including terrorists, and Table 4.3 summarizes some of the technical hurdles for nuclear, biological and chemical weapons programs. Neverthe-less, a well-financed terrorist group could have the resources need to hire the experts who could build and take care of such weapons, as was the case with Aum Shinrikyo. The CIA had predicted copycat phenomena in that case, but they did not in fact materialize, probably due to the difficulties of building and maintaining such a weapon. Also, each weapon is different and, while there are some weapons that can be developed easily, such as ricin, others are extremely difficult to build, including nuclear weapons. Nevertheless, with demand rising and marginal cost falling, as is also the case with other WMD technologies, it is only a matter of time before such weapons, including nuclear weapons, become available to terrorist groups.

AT: Terrorists Can’t Build Bomb

Easy for terrorists to build nuclear weapons- it’s easy and they have experts

Montgomery 09 (Evan Braden Montgomery, Research Fellow at the Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments, Nuclear Terrorism: Assessing the Threat, Developing a Response, http://www.csbaonline.org/4Publications/PubLibrary/R.20090422.Nuclear\_Terrorism/R.20090422.Nuclear\_ Terrorism.pdf)

By comparison, if terrorists acquired an adequate amount of HEU to build a guntype weapon, their task would be considerably easier; as Charles Ferguson, William Potter, and their coauthors note, “Because of the inherent simplicity of a gun-type device, designing and constructing it would be relatively straightforward.” In fact, this design was not even tested before being used for the first time over Hiroshima in 1945, due in large part to the confidence its designers had that it would function properly. 184 According to one recent estimate, a gun-type device could potentially be built in as little as two months, while an implosion device would take closer to a year to complete.185 Another, more detailed analysis concludes that constructing a gun-type device would take approximately one year, cost roughly two million dollars (not including the cost of acquiring HEU on the black market), and would produce a weapon that could fit inside a van or a small truck.186 The relative ease of building this type of device is a particular concern given the types of individuals that al Qaeda has managed to recruit in the past. According to Peter Bergen, “The terrorists who have succeeded in carrying out spectacular attacks against Western targets in the past have been college-educated, technically proficient men who are capable of manufacturing and deploying chemical, radiological, and biological weapons. At some point they could also assemble a crude ‘gun-type’ nuclear device and detonate it in a European city.” In short, “Al Qaeda attracts the kind of highly educated men who one day might be able to pull off such an attack.”187

Terrorists could easily build a bomb

Washington Post 07 (Nuclear Terrorism FAQ, Sept. 26, 2007, http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/09/24/AR2007092401154.html?sid=ST2007092501877)

How much expertise is needed to make a nuclear bomb? Would a large operation be required? Unfortunately, government studies have concluded that once a terrorist organization had the needed nuclear material, a handful of skilled individuals might be able to make a crude nuclear bomb using commercially available tools and equipment, without any large fixed facilities that might draw attention, and without access to classified nuclear weapons information. Getting nuclear material and making a crude nuclear bomb would be the most complex operation terrorists have ever carried out ¿ but the risk that a sophisticated group could pull it off is very real. Roughly 90 percent of the effort in the Manhattan Project was focused on making nuclear bomb material; getting stolen nuclear material would allow terrorists to skip the hardest part of making a nuclear bomb.

Terrorism Impact—WMD

WMD terrorism causes extinction

Alexander 03 (Yonah Alexander, professor and director of Inter-University for Terrorism Studies, Aug. 28, 2003, Washington Times)

Last week's brutal suicide bombings in Baghdad and Jerusalem have once again illustrated dramatically that the international community failed, thus far at least, to understand the magnitude and implications of the terrorist threats to the very survival of civilization itself. Even the United States and Israel have for decades tended to regard terrorism as a mere tactical nuisance or irritant rather than a critical strategic challenge to their national security concerns. It is not surprising, therefore, that on September 11, 2001, Americans were stunned by the unprecedented tragedy of 19 al Qaeda terrorists striking a devastating blow at the center of the nation's commercial and military powers. Likewise, Israel and its citizens, despite the collapse of the Oslo Agreements of 1993 and numerous acts of terrorism triggered by the second intifada that began almost three years ago, are still "shocked" by each suicide attack at a time of intensive diplomatic efforts to revive the moribund peace process through the now revoked cease-fire arrangements [hudna]. Why are the United States and Israel, as well as scores of other countries affected by the universal nightmare of modern terrorism surprised by new terrorist "surprises"? There are many reasons, including misunderstanding of the manifold specific factors that contribute to terrorism's expansion, such as lack of a universal definition of terrorism, the religionization of politics, double standards of morality, weak punishment of terrorists, and the exploitation of the media by terrorist propaganda and psychological warfare. Unlike their historical counterparts, contemporary terrorists have introduced a new scale of violence in terms of conventional and unconventional threats and impact. The internationalization and brutalization of current and future terrorism make it clear we have entered an Age of Super Terrorism [e.g. biological, chemical, radiological, nuclear and cyber] with its serious implications concerning national, regional and global security concerns.

Nuclear terrorism causes extinction

Sid-Ahmed 04 (Mohamed Sid-Ahmed, Al-Ahram Weekly Online, Extinction!, August 26- September 1, 2004, <http://weekly.ahram.org.eg/2004/705/op5.htm>)

What would be the consequences of a nuclear attack by terrorists? Even if it fails, it would further exacerbate the negative features of the new and frightening world in which we are now living. Societies would close in on themselves, police measures would be stepped up at the expense of human rights, tensions between civilisations and religions would rise and ethnic conflicts would proliferate. It would also speed up the arms race and develop the awareness that a different type of world order is imperative if humankind is to survive. But the still more critical scenario is if the attack succeeds. This could lead to a third world war, from which no one will emerge victorious. Unlike a conventional war which ends when one side triumphs over another, this war will be without winners and losers. When nuclear pollution infects the whole planet, we will all be losers.

Terrorism Impact—Global Nuclear War

Retaliation from the U.S. after a terrorist attack would cause global nuclear war

Easterbrook 01 (Greg Easterbrook, senior editor of the New Republic, Nov 11 2001 CNN show: Greenfield At Large, LN)

Easterbrook: Well, what held through the Cold War, when the United States and Russia had thousands of nuclear weapons pointed at each other, what held each side back was the fact that fundamentally they were rational.

They knew that if they struck, they would be struck in turn. Terrorists may not be held by this, especially suicidal terrorists, of the kind that al Qaeda is attempting to cultivate. But I think, if I could leave you with one message, it would be this: that the search for terrorist atomic weapons would be of great benefit to the Muslim peoples of the world in addition to members, to people of the United States and Western Europe, because if an atomic warhead goes off in Washington, say, in the current environment or anything like it, in the 24 hours that followed, a hundred million Muslims would die as U.S. nuclear bombs rained down on every conceivable military target in a dozen Muslim countries.

Terrorism Impact—Economy

Terrorists will attack economic centers

Toukan and Cordesman, ‘ 9

[Abdullah Toukan (Senior Associate at CSIS) & Anthony H. Cordesman (Arleigh A. Burke Chair in Strategy at CSIS), Terrorism and WMDThe Link with the War in Afghanistan, Center for Strategic and International Studies, 11/9/09, http://csis.org/files/publication/091109\_Terrorism\_WMD.pdf]

The United States Government assesses that al-Qaida and its affiliated network of transnational terrorists is the most serious international threat to it. Economic targets such as commercial aviation, energy sector, or mass transportation and other “soft” targets such as public gatherings will most probably continue to be the focus as the main targets.

Next terror attack will collapse econ

Wollstein 05 (Jarrett, “Towards Liberty” http://www.isil.org/towards-liberty/attack-could-sink.html)

**The next major terrorist attack on the U.S. could plunge our economy into deep recession** from which it may take years to recover. That's the disturbing, but all too believable conclusion of Robert D. Hormats, Managing Director of Goldman, Sachs. Hormats argues that in 2005, **the U.S. economy is much more vulnerable to disruption from a terrorist attack than it was before 9/11. In 2001, the federal budget was running a large surplus. Today it is running a huge deficit. In addition, the U.S. is spending large amounts of money on war in Afghanistan and Iraq, homeland defense, and other security-related activities.** As Hormats explains: "Three years of big government deficits and growing debt provide less room in the budget to respond to a new disaster. And U.S. dependence on foreign capital has grown to record levels. "Overseas investors supply the U.S. with hundreds of billions of dollars annually; in 2004 the federal government relied on foreign central banks and investors to finance over half of its enormous deficit – and they now hold over 43 percent of all Treasury bonds. Many foreigners are becoming skittish about buying more dollar securities – and could become much more so after a new terrorist strike." “And far greater sums could be required to respond to the next attack. Osama Bin Laden has made no secret of his desire to undermine the U.S. economy? He has proclaimed the goal of bleeding America to the point of bankruptcy?” **“A radiological attack** would have an impact measured in years. In an age of thin inventories and just-in-time deliveries of components and raw materials, such disruptions? **would cause massive and prolonged dislocations throughout the entire U.S. supply chain**. Regions dependant on fuel passing through the affected facility would be left with critical shortages.”

Economic collapse causes extinction

Kerpen 08 (Phil, National Review Online, October 29, , Don't Turn Panic Into Depression, http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2008/10/29/opinion/main4555821.shtml)

It’s important that we avoid all these policy errors - not just for the sake of our prosperity, but for our survival. The Great Depression, after all, didn’t end until the advent of World War II, the most destructive war in the history of the planet. In a world of nuclear and biological weapons and non-state terrorist organizations that breed on poverty and despair, another global economic breakdown of such extended duration would risk armed conflicts on an even greater scale. To be sure, Washington already has stoked the flames of the financial panic. The president and the Treasury secretary did the policy equivalent of yelling fire in a crowded theater when they insisted that Congress immediately pass a bad bailout bill or face financial Armageddon. Members of Congress splintered and voted against the bill before voting for it several days later, showing a lack of conviction that did nothing to reassure markets. Even Alan Greenspan is questioning free markets today, placing our policy fundamentals in even greater jeopardy. But after the elections, all eyes will turn to the new president and Congress in search of reassurance that the fundamentals of our free economy will be supported. That will require the shelving of any talk of trade protectionism, higher taxes, and more restrictive labor markets. The stakes couldn’t be any higher.

Terrorism Impact—Democracy

Next terror attack will tank democracy

Ignatieff 04 (Michael, “Lesser Evils,” The New York Times)

**Consider the consequences of a second major attack on the mainland United States -- the detonation of a radiological or dirty bomb, perhaps, or a low-yield nuclear device or a chemical strike in a subway. Any of these events could cause death, devastation and panic on a scale that would make 9/11 seem like a pale prelude**. After such an attack, a pall of mourning, melancholy, anger and fear would hang over our public life for a generation. **An attack of this sort is already in the realm of possibility. The recipes for making ultimate weapons are on the Internet, and the materiel required is available for the right price. Democracies live by free markets, but a free market in everything -- enriched uranium, ricin, anthrax -- will mean the death of democracy**. Armageddon is being privatized, and unless we shut down these markets, doomsday will be for sale. Sept. 11, for all its horror, was a conventional attack. We have the best of reasons to fear the fire next time. **A democracy can allow its leaders one fatal mistake -- and that's what 9/11 looks like to many observers -- but Americans will not forgive a second one. A succession of large-scale attacks would pull at the already-fragile tissue of trust that binds us to our leadership and destroy the trust we have in one another**. Once the zones of devastation were cordoned off and the bodies buried, we might find ourselves, in short order, living in a national-security state on continuous alert, **with sealed borders, constant identity checks and permanent detention camps for dissidents and aliens. Our constitutional rights might disappear from our courts, while torture might reappear in our interrogation cells. The worst of it is that government would not have to impose tyranny on a cowed populace. We would demand it for our own protection. And if the institutions of our democracy were unable to protect us from our enemies, we might go even further, taking the law into our own hands**. We have a history of lynching in this country, and by the time fear and paranoia settled deep in our bones, we might repeat the worst episodes from our past, killing our former neighbors, our onetime friends.

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.

Bioweapons Impact—Extinction

Bioweapons lead to extinction

Ochs 02 (Richard, June 9, pg. <http://www.freefromterror.net/other_articles/abolish.html>)

Of all the weapons of mass destruction, the genetically engineered biological weapons, many without a known cure or vaccine, are an extreme danger to the continued survival of life on earth. Any perceived military value or deterrence pales in comparison to the great risk these weapons pose just sitting in vials in laboratories. While a "nuclear winter," resulting from a massive exchange of nuclear weapons, could also kill off most of life on earth and severely compromise the health of future generations, they are easier to control. Biological weapons, on the other hand, can get out of control very easily, as the recent anthrax attacks has demonstrated. There is no way to guarantee the security of these doomsday weapons because very tiny amounts can be stolen or accidentally released and then grow or be grown to horrendous proportions. The Black Death of the Middle Ages would be small in comparison to the potential damage bioweapons could cause. Abolition of chemical weapons is less of a priority because, while they can also kill millions of people outright, their persistence in the environment would be less than nuclear or biological agents or more localized. Hence, chemical weapons would have a lesser effect on future generations of innocent people and the natural environment. Like the Holocaust, once a localized chemical extermination is over, it is over. With nuclear and biological weapons, the killing will probably never end. Radioactive elements last tens of thousands of years and will keep causing cancers virtually forever. Potentially worse than that, bio-engineered agents by the hundreds with no known cure could wreck even greater calamity on the human race than could persistent radiation. AIDS and ebola viruses are just a small example of recently emerging plagues with no known cure or vaccine. Can we imagine hundreds of such plagues? HUMAN EXTINCTION IS NOW POSSIBLE.

Pak Stability Adv. Ext.

US drone attacks enflame Anti-American sentiments in 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]

Missile strikes alienate thousands of clans, sub-clans and extended families within a tribal society that places high social value on honor and revenge. To the Pashtun tribes straddling the Afghanistan-Pakistan border, personal and collective vendettas have been known to last for generations, and are invoked irrespective of time and cost involved. Successive waves of Persian, Greek, Arab, Turk, Mughal, British and Soviet invaders have never successfully subdued this thin slice of rugged terrain. On August 12, the US special envoy for the region, Richard Holbrooke, told an audience at the Center for American Progress that the porous border and its surrounding areas served as a fertile recruiting ground for Al-Qaeda. One US military official, speaking on the condition of anonymity, called drone operations "a recruiting windfall for the Pakistani Taliban."

Military strikes appear to be the only viable recourse against the tribal region's shadowy insurgents, with US officials pointing to the successful killing of high-value Al-Qaeda militants like Abu Laith al-Libi in January 2008 and chemical weapons expert Abu Khabab al-Masri in July 2008. However, even if tomorrow Osama bin Laden were killed by a UAV, the jihadist insurgency would not melt away. The ability to keep militant groups off balance must be weighed against the cost of facilitating the rise of more insurgents.

Citizens living outside the ungoverned tribal areas also detest drones. "Anti-US sentiment has already been increasing in Pakistan … especially in regard to cross-border and reported drone strikes, which Pakistanis perceive to cause unacceptable civilian casualties," conceded US Central Command chief General David Petraeus in a declassified statement written on May 27, 2009.

Attempts to stabilize Afghanistan through drone strikes destabilize Pakistan—The strikes function as a recruiting tool for the Pakistani Taliban

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]

Drone strikes also contribute to the widening trust deficit between Pakistanis and the US. A recent poll conducted by Gallup Pakistan for Al-Jazeera found that 59 percent believed the US was the greatest threat to Pakistan. Most Pakistanis oppose extremism; they simply disagree with American tactics.

America's interests lie in ensuring the virus of anti-American radicalism does not infect the rest of the region. Yet Washington's attempts to stabilize Afghanistan help destabilize Pakistan, because its actions serve as a recruiting tool for Pakistani Taliban militants. Just as one would not kill a fly with a sledgehammer, using overwhelming firepower to kill a single insurgent creates collateral damage that can recruit 50 more. Military force against insurgents must be applied precisely and discriminately. On the ground, Pakistani security forces lack training, equipment, and communication gear to carry out a low-intensity counterinsurgency. But drones provide a poor substitute if the goal is to engage rather than alienate the other side. A better strategy in Afghanistan and Pakistan is for the United States to focus on limiting cross-border movement by supporting local Pakistani security forces with a small number of US Special Forces personnel. To improve fighting capabilities and enhance cooperation, Washington and Islamabad must increase the number of military-to-military training programs to help hone Pakistan's counterterrorism capabilities and serve as a confidence-building measure to lessen the Pakistan Army's tilt toward radicalism. Ending drone strikes is no panacea for Pakistan's array of problems. But continuing those strikes will certainly deepen the multiple challenges the country faces. Most Pakistanis do not passively accept American actions, and officials in Islamabad cannot afford to be perceived as putting Washington's interests above those of their own people. Long-term success in both Afghanistan and Pakistan depends on the people's repudiation of extremism. Continued US actions add more fuel to violent religious radicalism; it is time to reassess both US tactics and objectives in the region.

Pak Stability Adv. Ext.

Afghanistan drone attacks anger entire Pakistani population.

Reid ’10 (Robert, writer with the Associated Press, May 30th, 2010, TH Online, “U.S. drone crew blamed for civilian deaths”, http://www.thonline.com/article.cfm?id=284460, AZ)

KABUL, Afghanistan -- U.S. military investigators found that "inaccurate and unprofessional" reporting by U.S. operators of a Predator drone was responsible for a missile strike that killed 23 Afghan civilians in February, according to a report released Saturday. Release of the scathing report is part of a U.S. effort to counter rising public anger over civilian deaths, which threatens to undermine the campaign against the Taliban at a critical juncture in the nearly nine-year war. Twelve other civilians including a woman and three children were wounded In the missile strike, the report said. Four American officers -- two described as senior -- received career-damaging reprimands, the U.S. command said in a statement. The top U.S. and NATO commander in Afghanistan, Gen. Stanley McChrystal, called on the Air Force to investigate the actions of the Predator crew. "Our most important mission here is to protect the Afghan people," said McChrystal, who had apologized to President Hamid Karzai shortly after the attack. "Inadvertently killing or injuring civilians is heartbreaking and undermines their trust and confidence in our mission. We will do all we can to regain that trust." The attack also underscores the risks of using unmanned aircraft to fire on insurgents, not only in Afghanistan but also in neighboring Pakistan. Drone strikes against insurgent sanctuaries in border areas of Pakistan have fueled anti-Americanism among the 175 million Pakistanis.

Militant Groups 🡪 Pakistan Coup

The TTP forces in Pakistan seek to destabilize and topple the government of Pakistan

The Investigative Project on Terrorism,’10 [Internationalizing the Jihadist Threat from Pakistan-Afghanistan American terror arrests show reach of al Qaeda-affiliated jihadi groups along Pakistan-Afghanistan border. 1/25/2010, http://www.investigativeproject.org/1749/internationalizing-the-jihadist-threat-from]

A troubling development has been the uniting of several disparate militant groups that include members from both the Pashtun tribal groups and the Punjabi Taliban network. Sipah-i-Sahaba Pakistan (SSP), Lashkar-i-Jhangvi, and Jaish-e-Mohammed joined forces under the common banner of Tehrik-e-Taliban Pakistan (TTP). The TTP was led by a top Taliban commander from South Waziristan, Baitullah Mehsud, until his death in a U.S. missile strike in August 2009. He was replaced by his cousin and deputy, Hakimullah Mehsud. The coalition has a wide representation and includes groups from both the Federally Administered Tribal Areas (FATA) and the North West Frontier Province. Pakistani authorities blame former TTP leader Baitullah Mehsud to be behind the December 2007 assassination of former Pakistani prime minister and leader of Pakistan's People's Party (PPP) Benazir Bhutto. Prior to the TTP's creation in December 2007, the Pashtun and Punjabi groups had pursued different agendas: The Pashtun organizations fought for local autonomy, while the Punjabis pursued narrow religious and sectarian goals, and the Kashmiri groups waged jihad against India. But the formation of the TTP has led to a blurring of agendas, as disparate groups began to pursue a common goal of "defensive jihad" against the Pakistani state, including attacking American and other Western targets, Army headquarters and police facilities and fighting U.S.-led coalition forces in Afghanistan. Soon after its creation, the TTP's spokesman Maulvi Omar declared: "Our main aim is to target the US allies in Afghanistan but the government of Pakistan's ill-strategy has made us to launch a defensive Jihad in Pakistan....The government of Pakistan would be paid in the same coin now."Since then, the TTP has targeted key cities in Pakistan's Punjabi heartland, including Islamabad, Rawalpindi, and Lahore.

Distance Adv.

Drone technology creates distance between the tech operates and those being targeted

Evans and Taylor 10 (Rob and Richard, writers for the Guardian) RAF 'relying' on drones in Afghanistan, http://www.guardian.co.uk/uk/2010/feb/07/raf-drones-afghanistan 2/7/2010

Army commanders want more and more unmanned aerial vehicles – UAVs, or drones as they are commonly known – because they give round-the-clock surveillance and can attack targets without needing to use troops. However, their use, as they are set to be deployed more and more, raises questions. Their "pilots" sit in front of computer screens thousands of miles away. Despite technology, drones cannot be subjected to the same decision-making as can an aircraft. A real pilot can make a split-second decision to divert a bomb or missile after it is fired. It is more difficult for UAV pilots to do this.UAVs also suffer failures. Their use as weapons raises questions about rules of engagement, in turn raising legal and even ethical issues. And though unmanned, it takes about 100 personnel to ensure they function properly, including flying the routes they have been programmed to do.

Anti-Imperialism Kritik Adv.

Obama’s justification for drone attacks is based on flawed epistemology—Claims that lack of US presence causes a domino effect of escalating wars and terrorist attacks are simply wrong—Obama is using them as a tool to expand US imperialism

Cole ‘9 [Juan Cole teaches Middle Eastern and South Asian history at the University of Michigan. His weblog on thecontemporary Middle East is Informed Comment, ZNet, Obama's Domino Theory, 4/4/09]

-- President Barack Obama may or may not be doing the right thing in Afghanistan, but the rationale he gave for it on Friday is almost certainly wrong. Obama has presented us with a 21st century version of the domino theory. The U.S. is not, contrary to what the president said, mainly fighting "al-Qaida" in Afghanistan. In blaming everything on al-Qaida, Obama broke with his pledge of straight talk to the public and fell back on Bush-style boogeymen and implausible conspiracy theories. Obama realizes that after seven years, Afghanistan war fatigue has begun to set in with the American people. Some 51 percent of Americans now oppose the Afghanistan war, and 64 percent of Democrats do. The president is therefore escalating in the teeth of substantial domestic opposition, especially from his own party, as voters worry about spending billions more dollars abroad while the U.S. economy is in serious trouble. He acknowledged that we deserve a "straightforward answer" as to why the U.S. and NATO are still fighting there. "So let me be clear," he said, "Al-Qaida and its allies -- the terrorists who planned and supported the 9/11 attacks -- are in Pakistan and Afghanistan." But his characterization of what is going on now in Afghanistan, almost eight years after 9/11, was simply not true, and was, indeed, positively misleading. "And if the Afghan government falls to the Taliban," he said, "or allows al-Qaida to go unchallenged -- that country will again be a base for terrorists who want to kill as many of our people as they possibly can." Obama described the same sort of domino effect that Washington elites used to ascribe to international communism. In the updated, al-Qaida version, the Taliban might take Kunar Province, and then all of Afghanistan, and might again host al-Qaida, and might then threaten the shores of the United States. He even managed to add an analog to Cambodia to the scenario, saying, "The future of Afghanistan is inextricably linked to the future of its neighbor, Pakistan," and warned, "Make no mistake: Al-Qaida and its extremist allies are a cancer that risks killing Pakistan from within." This latter-day domino theory of al-Qaida takeovers in South Asia is just as implausible as its earlier iteration in Southeast Asia (ask Thailand or the Philippines). Most of the allegations are not true or are vastly exaggerated. There are very few al-Qaida fighters based in Afghanistan proper. What is being called the "Taliban" is mostly not Taliban at all (in the sense of seminary graduates loyal to Mullah Omar). The groups being branded "Taliban" only have substantial influence in 8 to 10 percent of Afghanistan, and only 4 percent of Afghans say they support them. Some 58 percent of Afghans say that a return of the Taliban is the biggest threat to their country, but almost no one expects it to happen. Moreover, with regard to Pakistan, there is no danger of militants based in the remote Federally Administered Tribal Areas (FATA) taking over that country or "killing" it. The Kabul government is not on the verge of falling to the Taliban. The Afghan government has 80,000 troops, who benefit from close U.S. air support, and the total number of Taliban fighters in the Pashtun provinces is estimated at 10,000 to 15,000. Kabul is in danger of losing control of some villages in the provinces to dissident Pashtun warlords styled "Taliban," though it is not clear why the new Afghan army could not expel them if they did so. A smaller, poorly equipped Northern Alliance army defeated 60,000 Taliban with U.S. air support in 2001. And there is no prospect of "al-Qaida" reestablishing bases in Afghanistan from which it could attack the United States. If al-Qaida did come back to Afghanistan, it could simply be bombed and would be attacked by the new Afghan army. While the emergence of "Pakistani Taliban" in the Federally Administered Tribal Areas is a blow to Pakistan's security, they have just been defeated in one of the seven major tribal agencies, Bajaur, by a concerted and months-long campaign of the highly professional and well-equipped Pakistani army.

Cole ‘9 cont.

United States Secretary of Defense Robert Gates replied last summer to the idea that al-Qaida is regrouping in Pakistan and forms a new and vital threat to the West: "Actually, I don't agree with that assessment, because when al-Qaida was in Afghanistan, they had the partnership of a government. They had ready access to international communications, ready access to travel, and so on. Their circumstances in the FATA (Federally Administered Tribal Areas) and on the Pakistani side of the border are much more primitive. And it's much more difficult for them to move around, much more difficult for them to communicate." As for a threat to Pakistan, the FATA areas are smaller than Connecticut, with a total population of a little over 3 million, while Pakistan itself is bigger than Texas, with a population more than half that of the entire United States. A few thousand Pashtun tribesmen cannot take over Pakistan, nor can they "kill" it. The Pakistani public just forced a military dictator out of office and forced the reinstatement of the Supreme Court, which oversees secular law. Over three-quarters of Pakistanis said in a poll last summer that they had an unfavorable view of the Taliban, and a recent poll found that 90 percent of them worried about terrorism. To be sure, Pakistanis are on the whole highly opposed to the U.S. military presence in the region, and most outside the tribal areas object to U.S. Predator drone strikes on Pakistani territory. The danger is that the U.S. strikes may make the radicals seem victims of Western imperialism and so sympathetic to the Pakistani public. Obama's dark vision of the overthrow of the Afghanistan government by al-Qaida-linked Taliban or the "killing" of Pakistan by small tribal groups differs little from the equally apocalyptic and implausible warnings issued by John McCain and Dick Cheney about an "al-Qaida" victory in Iraq. Ominously, the president's views are contradicted by those of his own secretary of defense. Pashtun tribes in northwestern Pakistan and southern Afghanistan have a long history of dissidence, feuding and rebellion, which is now being branded Talibanism and configured as a dire menace to the Western way of life. Obama has added yet another domino theory to the history of Washington's justifications for massive military interventions in Asia. When a policymaker gets the rationale for action wrong, he is at particular risk of falling into mission creep and stubborn commitment to a doomed and unnecessary enterprise.

AT: No solvency--Drones Based in Pakistan

All US drones BASED in Pakistan are jointly controlled by Pakistan government—the Pakistani government denies US requests to use them

Schachtman, ‘9 [Noah Shachtman, Pentagon Joins CIA’s Drone War on Pakistan, Wired, 5/13/09, http://www.wired.com/dangerroom/2009/05/pentagon-joins-pakistan-drone-war-gives-islamabad-robo-control/]

Under a new partnership with Pakistani Government, the Times’ Julian Barnes and Greg Miller write, this “separate fleet of U.S. drones operated by the Defense Department will be free for the first time to venture beyond the Afghan border under the direction of Pakistani military officials, who are working alongside American counterparts at a command center in Jalalabad, Afghanistan.” Pakistani officers previously have been able to see footage from the Predators’ high-powered cameras. Now the military men are being given “significant control over routes, targets and decisions to fire weapons.” The CIA drones will continue to “focus on the United States’ principal target, Al Qaeda. The military drones, however, are intended to undermine the militant networks that have moved closer to Islamabad, the capital, in recent weeks.” The underscores an expansion of the Obama administration’s military aims in the region. No longer is this fight solely about “defeat[ing] Al Qaeda in Pakistan and Afghanistan,” as the President said two months ago. The war’s goals now include keeping Islamabad from being overrun by a distinct, but related, group of homegrown extremists. The Air Force drones now being employed against those militants are now presumably subject to the oversight of the lawyers, intelligence analysts, and targeting specialists at the U.S. military’s Combined Air and Space Operations Center (CAOC). Such reviews could cut down on the unmanned strikes’ civilian casualties — as well as the popular and political resistance to the attacks. But the greater hesitancy to use the drones’ arrays of Hellfire missiles and laser-guided bombs may allow militant targets to get away, unscathed. Already, “some U.S. officials have expressed frustration that the Pakistanis have not used the Predator capabilities more aggressively. Officials said Pakistan was given the authority to order strikes on the jointly operated flights as long as there was U.S. agreement on the targets,” the Times says. Pakistan also “declined an offer to use the drones for its recent military offensives in the Swat Valley and Buner areas, and poor weather has caused other sorties to be scrapped.”

Drones are based in Afghanistan—plan would prevent attacks in Pakistan too

Mir, ‘9 [Amir Mir, 60 drone hits kill 14 al-Qaeda men, 687 civilians Friday, Jot Mid East, 4/10/09, http://www.jotmideast.com/2010/04/afghanistan-based-drones-civilian.html]

LAHORE: Of the 60 cross-border predator strikes carried out by the Afghanistan-based American drones in Pakistan between January 14, 2006 and April 8, 2009, only 10 were able to hit their actual targets, killing 14 wanted al-Qaeda leaders, besides perishing 687 innocent Pakistani civilians. The success percentage of the US predator strikes thus comes to not more than six per cent. Figures compiled by the Pakistani authorities show that a total of 701 people, including 14 al-Qaeda leaders, have been killed since January 2006 in 60 American predator attacks targeting the tribal areas of Pakistan. Two strikes carried out in 2006 had killed 98 civilians while three attacks conducted in 2007 had slain 66 Pakistanis, yet none of the wanted al-Qaeda or Taliban leaders could be hit by the Americans right on target. However, of the 50 drone attacks carried out between January 29, 2008 and April 8, 2009, 10 hit their targets and killed 14 wanted al-Qaeda operatives. Most of these attacks were carried out on the basis of intelligence believed to have been provided by the Pakistani and Afghan tribesmen who had been spying for the US-led allied forces stationed in Afghanistan. The remaining 50 drone attacks went wrong due to faulty intelligence information, killing hundreds of innocent civilians, including women and children. The number of the Pakistani civilians killed in those 50 attacks stood at 537, in which 385 people lost their lives in 2008 and 152 people were slain in the first 99 days of 2009 (between January 1 and April 8).

AT: Pakistan Alt Cause

There is ZERO risk of Pakistan Collapse

Cole ‘9 [Juan Cole teaches Middle Eastern and South Asian history at the University of Michigan. His weblog on thecontemporary Middle East is Informed Comment, ZNet, Obama's Domino Theory, 4/4/09]

Moreover, with regard to Pakistan, there is no danger of militants based in the remote Federally Administered Tribal Areas (FATA) taking over that country or "killing" it. The Kabul government is not on the verge of falling to the Taliban. The Afghan government has 80,000 troops, who benefit from close U.S. air support, and the total number of Taliban fighters in the Pashtun provinces is estimated at 10,000 to 15,000. Kabul is in danger of losing control of some villages in the provinces to dissident Pashtun warlords styled "Taliban," though it is not clear why the new Afghan army could not expel them if they did so. A smaller, poorly equipped Northern Alliance army defeated 60,000 Taliban with U.S. air support in 2001. And there is no prospect of "al-Qaida" reestablishing bases in Afghanistan from which it could attack the United States. If al-Qaida did come back to Afghanistan, it could simply be bombed and would be attacked by the new Afghan army. While the emergence of "Pakistani Taliban" in the Federally Administered Tribal Areas is a blow to Pakistan's security, they have just been defeated in one of the seven major tribal agencies, Bajaur, by a concerted and months-long campaign of the highly professional and well-equipped Pakistani army.

United States Secretary of Defense Robert Gates replied last summer to the idea that al-Qaida is regrouping in Pakistan and forms a new and vital threat to the West: "Actually, I don't agree with that assessment, because when al-Qaida was in Afghanistan, they had the partnership of a government. They had ready access to international communications, ready access to travel, and so on. Their circumstances in the FATA (Federally Administered Tribal Areas) and on the Pakistani side of the border are much more primitive. And it's much more difficult for them to move around, much more difficult for them to communicate." As for a threat to Pakistan, the FATA areas are smaller than Connecticut, with a total population of a little over 3 million, while Pakistan itself is bigger than Texas, with a population more than half that of the entire United States. A few thousand Pashtun tribesmen cannot take over Pakistan, nor can they "kill" it. The Pakistani public just forced a military dictator out of office and forced the reinstatement of the Supreme Court, which oversees secular law. Over three-quarters of Pakistanis said in a poll last summer that they had an unfavorable view of the Taliban, and a recent poll found that 90 percent of them worried about terrorism.

AT: Drones Save Lives/Key to Intel/Security

Ground troops are more effective than drones—Drones risk playstation mentality of killing

Alston, NYU law professor and the U.N.’s special rapporteur on extrajudicial killings, United Nations Report, ’10 [Philip Alston, NYU law professor and the U.N.’s special rapporteur on extrajudicial killings,Human Rights Council: Fourteenth session, Agenda item 3, “Promotion and protection of all human rights, civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights, including the right to development, Report of the Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions” United Nations General Assembly Report, A/HRC/14/24/Add.6, 5/28/10, http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/hrcouncil/docs/14session/A.HRC.14.24.Add6.pdf]

81. Drones’ proponents argue that since drones have greater surveillance capability and afford greater precision than other weapons, they can better prevent collateral civilian casualties and injuries. This may well be true to an extent, but it presents an incomplete picture. The precision, accuracy and legality of a drone strike depend on the human intelligence upon which the targeting decision is based. 82. Drones may provide the ability to conduct aerial surveillance and to gather “pattern of life” information that would allow their human operators to distinguish between peaceful civilians and those engaged in direct hostilities. Indeed, advanced surveillance capability enhances the ability of a State’s forces to undertake precautions in attack.144 But these optimal conditions may not exist in every case. More importantly, a drone operation team sitting thousands of miles away from the environment in which a potential target is located may well be at an even greater human intelligence gathering disadvantage than ground forces, who themselves are often unable to collect reliable intelligence. 83. It was clear during my mission to Afghanistan how hard it is even for forces on the ground to obtain accurate information. Testimony from witnesses and victims’ family members, showed that international forces were often too uninformed of local practices, or too credulous in interpreting information, to be able to arrive at a reliable understanding of a situation.145 International forces all too often based manned airstrikes and raids that resulted in killings on faulty intelligence. Multiple other examples show that the legality of a targeted killing operation is heavily dependent upon the reliability of the intelligence on which it is based.146 States must, therefore, ensure that they have in place the procedural safeguards necessary to ensure that intelligence on which targeting decisions are made is accurate and verifiable. 84. Furthermore, because operators are based thousands of miles away from the battlefield, and undertake operations entirely through computer screens and remote audiofeed, there is a risk of developing a “Playstation” mentality to killing. States must ensure that training programs for drone operators who have never been subjected to the risks and rigors of battle instill respect for IHL and adequate safeguards for compliance with it.

AT: Drones Effective

Killed 700 Civilians – Hit Rate of 2% - Creates Desire For Revenge

KILCULLEN ’10 [David, counterinsurgency adviser to Gen. David Petraeus from 2006 to 2008, The New York Times, “Death From Above, Outrage Down Below”, 05.16.2009, 1. (1/http://www.nytimes.com/2009/05/17/opinion/17exum.html?pagewanted=1&\_r=1//jdi-btw)]

Press reports suggest that over the last three years drone strikes have killed about 14 terrorist leaders. But, according to Pakistani sources, they have also killed some 700 civilians. This is 50 civilians for every militant killed, a hit rate of 2 percent — hardly “precision.” American officials vehemently dispute these figures, and it is likely that more militants and fewer civilians have been killed than is reported by the press in Pakistan. Nevertheless, every one of these dead noncombatants represents an alienated family, a new desire for revenge, and more recruits for a militant movement that has grown exponentially even as drone strikes have increased.

Predator drones are prone to mechanical failure and many environmental factors.

Scotland Herald, ‘2 [“Attack of killer drones will head war plan” 11.7.2002 Nexis]

The unmanned aircraft have been quietly operating over southern Iraq as part of the "no fly" zone for the past month as part of a dress rehearsal for war. United States air force officials admitted yesterday that they have so far fired "three or four missiles" at Iraqi targets, including some radar installations. Each Predator carries two Hellfire, laser-guided missiles. Their 18lb high -explosive warheads can destroy a tank five miles away. The killer drones earned their spurs over Afghanistan last year, used in action for the first time by the CIA's shadowy special operations division to kill a number of al Qaeda and Taliban commanders. Before that, the unarmed reconnaissance version of the aircraft made its debut in combat over Bosnia in 1995, and was used to spot the Serb gun positions for fighter-bomber strikes. **The US air force has about 50 Predators available and the CIA operates others, but it refuses to disclose how many. An updated (pounds) 3m-a-time version is rolling off production lines in San Diego in California at the rate of two a month. The US military has lost nine of the aircraft to mechanical malfunction, weather or enemy action in Afghanistan and Iraq in the last year, and the CIA is also believed to have lost one. Despite its impressive performance, the 80mph, propeller-driven** drone **is** vulnerable **to icing in cold conditions and has a low tolerance to high winds.**

AT: Plan 🡪 Troop Increase

Turn—drone strikes trade off with rebuilding efforts—continued use of drones limits our longterm ability to fight the insurgency

Bhatiya, ’10 [Neil Bhatiya, Century Foundation Policy Program Assistant and former Research Fellow for the Streit Council, Taking Note: Century Foundation, The Century Foundation is a nonprofit public policy research institution committed to the belief that a mix of effective government, open democracy, and free markets is the most effective solution to the major challenges facing the United States, 1/19/10, http://takingnote.tcf.org/2010/01/more-drones-in-afghanistan-not-a-path-to-a-winning-strategy-.html]

Yet the increase in drone attacks comes with a corresponding cost. Coalition forces need to focus more attention and resources on building Afghan capacity. When McChrystal took command in 2009, he issued a tactical directive which curtailed the use of air strikes. The UN mission in Afghanistan credits that policy with a reduction in the total number of civilian deaths due to coalition aerial attacks (from 552 in 2008 down to 359 in 2009). He repeated his thinking in an interview with Der Spiegel, saying that killing the enemy should not be the principal objective of U.S. operations. Rather, training Afghan security forces and improving governance need to be emphasized. Last week, his intelligence chief, Major General Michael T. Flynn, published his assessment of U.S. intelligence gathering abilities as a working paper for the Center for a New American Security. In that report, Flynn expressed profound resistance to the idea that killing insurgents deserves such a disproportionate share of limited U.S. and NATO resources. About the use of drones to kill al-Qaeda and Taliban operatives he wrote:

“Aerial drones and other collection assets are tasked with scanning the countryside around the clock in the hope of spotting insurgents burying bombs or setting up ambushes. Again, these are fundamentally worthy objectives, but relying on them exclusively baits intelligence shops into reacting to enemy tactics at the expense of finding ways to strike at the very heart of the insurgency.”

Drones hurt US interests in Afghanistan—rebuilding is a critical first step to ending the insurgency

Bhatiya, ’10 [Neil Bhatiya, Century Foundation Policy Program Assistant and former Research Fellow for the Streit Council, Taking Note: Century Foundation, The Century Foundation is a nonprofit public policy research institution committed to the belief that a mix of effective government, open democracy, and free markets is the most effective solution to the major challenges facing the United States, 1/19/10, http://takingnote.tcf.org/2010/01/more-drones-in-afghanistan-not-a-path-to-a-winning-strategy-.html]

What Flynn’s report tries to make clear is that, in the long run, expanded drone strikes and other “lethal targeting” might do more damage to U.S. interests in the region, regardless of their immediate tactical benefit and their popularity in Washington. He is correct to argue that there is little gain in being successful at killing insurgents if coalition forces are unsuccessful at building capabilities among Afghans to provide for their own security. This kind of reactive lethality feeds into the widespread belief that the U.S. military principally concerns itself with destroying rather than building. Instead, U.S. forces should de-emphasize their lethal action programs and make the necessary intelligence reforms highlighted by General Flynn in order to aid U.S. operations. They should focus their time and effort on the training of competent and capable Afghan security and police forces, providing the kind of infrastructure to respond to attacks like this past weekend’s Taliban assault on Kabul. The news that NATO will appoint a senior-level civilian leader for its operations is thus welcome news. The U.S. and its allies should also encourage protean efforts at political reintegration and reconciliation, with an eye to drawing both fighters and senior leadership away from the struggle. The death of individual insurgent leaders, though admittedly satisfying, will not end an insurgency absent changes in Afghanistan’s political and social fabric.

AT: Modernizing Now (Solves the aff)

Improved drones not possible for decades

Brannen ’10 (Kate, writer for Defense News, March 10th, 2010, DefenseNews.com, “U.S. Army Plan Takes Fire From Congress, DoD, GAO”, http://www.defensenews.com/story.php?i=4534072&amp;c=AIR &amp;s=TOP, AZ)

Lt. Gen. William Phillips, military deputy to the Army acquisition executive, cited the Class I's hover and stare and vertical takeoff abilities as increased capability over today's systems. But he did note the system's noise level, saying the system does have issues.

The hover ability doesn't do you much good if it's very loud, said Smith, who said he's concerned that fixing these systems will not just require little tweaks, but that they are "way off" from meeting capabilities.

AT: Topicality—Military Presence

Longtime historical presence used by many militaries

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.

UAVs key part of Washington war-strategy discussions

Mayer, ‘9 [Jane Mayer, The New Yorker, 10/26/09, http://www.newyorker.com/reporting/2009/10/26/091026fa\_fact\_mayer]

With public disenchantment mounting over the U.S. troop deployment in Afghanistan, and the Obama Administration divided over whether to escalate the American military presence there, many in Washington support an even greater reliance on Predator strikes. In this view, the U.S., rather than trying to stabilize Afghanistan by waging a counter-insurgency operation against Taliban forces, should focus purely on counterterrorism, and use the latest technology to surgically eliminate Al Qaeda leaders and their allies.

Drones referenced in contextual evidence

Cole ‘9 [Juan Cole teaches Middle Eastern and South Asian history at the University of Michigan. His weblog on thecontemporary Middle East is Informed Comment, ZNet, Obama's Domino Theory, 4/4/09]

Pakistanis are on the whole highly opposed to the U.S. military presence in the region, and most

outside the tribal areas object to U.S. Predator drone strikes on Pakistani territory. The danger is that the U.S strikes may make the radicals seem victims of Western imperialism and so sympathetic to the Pakistani

public.

Drones require military personnel

Saletan, ‘9 [William Saletan, Slate, 2/ 20/09, http://www.slate.com/id/2211683.]

The drones aren't supposed to be a U.S. military presence in Pakistan. They're unmanned, and until now, they were thought to be flown exclusively from the Afghan border. The satellite images, backed by expert analysis, prove otherwise. The drones are on Pakistani soil. And if the drones are there, so are the U.S. personnel who physically manage them.

Contextual Evidence

Extraordinary Edition, 4/29/10, http://extraordinaryedition.blogspot.com/2010/04/monday-drone-strike-not-to-be-confused.html.

While we're at it, since the financial world back home is collapsing around us, we might as well ask how much it costs to run a CIA drone program in Pakistan. If the U.S. is hunting terrorists associated with attacks on New York City or a perpetrated Christmas attack in Detroit, the U.S. public across the spectrum will likely support financing of such a program. If the CIA drone program is stimulating anger toward U.S. military presence in the Middle East and drafting new terrorists by hundreds or thousands a month into the camps of organizations bent on the destruction of the enemies of radical Islam, that situation will realistically not be reported by Western media or entirely classified by the U.S. government based upon what we've seen so far.

AT: Topicality—Military Presence

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.

AT: Topicality—Military Presence

C. Used in combat to suppress enemy

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]

It is clear that the United States military sees drone warfare as the wave of the future. The Department of Defense continues to increase its budget for unmanned systems and will purchase 24 additional Reapers and 36 additional Sky Warriors in fiscal year 2010. The UAV fleet will also continue to modernize. By the end of 2010, the Air Force’s Boeing X-45 Unmanned Combat Aerial Vehicle (UCAV) will make its first flight and the Navy’s X-47 UCAV will soon follow. UCAVs differ from armed UAVs in that UCAVs can perform similar tasks as modern manned fighter aircraft, namely defending themselves against enemy aircraft and flying at fast enough speeds to avoid surface-to-air defenses. While weaponized UAVs are currently more suitable to low-intensity conflicts like those in Iraq and Afghanistan, UCAVs will be able to participate in high- and medium-intensity conflict and could be used to suppress enemy air defenses in advance of a ground mission. Unmanned blimps, bombers, attack helicopters and surveillance and detection UAVs that resemble grasshoppers, flies, bees and spiders are all in the military’s playbook. The Defense Department’s 2011 budget request plans to double the production of unmanned aircraft. As current trends demonstrate, weaponized UAVs will increase the capability to fight low-intensity and insurgency warfare. Armed UAVs provide troops fighting in counterinsurgency operations with several advantages. First, they provide both the surveillance and attack capabilities to carry out precise counterterrorism missions without actually deploying troops to the specific area. Removing a pilot’s life from the equation also allows UAVs to provide more accurate intelligence in pursuit of avoiding civilian casualties. Armed UAVs also shorten the kill chain to just one link, allowing ground commanders to make snap decisions and exert more control over the battle space.

AT: Topicality—Substantially

Drones are a substantial part of US military strategy

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.

AT: Topicality—Substantially

Drones are a substantial portion of US military strategy in Afghanistan

Breaking News, 2/3/10, http://breakingnews.gaeatimes.com/2010/02/03/us-set-to-enhance-drone-strikes-in-pak-by-over-75-percent-despite-local-outrage-8258/.

WASHINGTON - The United States is planning to increase the use of unmanned drones significantly in its war against terror, as the American defence budget for 2011 seeks more funds to enhance drone operations by 75 per cent. Excited by the success rate of the missile strikes in the tribal region along the Pakistan, Afghanistan border, the Obama administration is mulling increasing the number of Predator and Reaper aircrafts from 37 to 65. “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,” US Joint Chiefs of Staff Chairman Admiral Mike Mullen said. “As we’ve seen firsthand through eight years of war, intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance assets are absolutely critical enablers for the war-fighter,” he added. Mullen’s statement came just hours before a series of drone strikes killed at least 16 Taliban operatives in terror hot bed North Waziristan. The latest attack is believed to be the deadliest of such strikes in the region so far, as up to eight drones carried out the attacks simultaneously. Talking to reporters about reports regarding the substantial increase in drone operations, Defence Secretary Robert Gates said the new drones would be added to the American military’s arsenal in a couple of years, and added that these would be the ‘most advanced UAVs’, The Dawn reports. Earlier this week, the Pentagon sent a 708 billion dollar defence budget proposal to the Congress, reflecting a major shift in the US military strategy from conventional wars to counter-insurgency operations.

AT: CMR

General Petraeus agrees with Obama’s withdrawal strategies.

Mataconis 2010[Doug, lawyer and staff writer, Outside the Beltway, “Petraeus Backs July 2011 Withdrawal Timetable.” 6.24.2010. http://www.outsidethebeltway.com/petraeus-backs-july-2011-afghanistan-withdrawal-timetable/ //jdi.tjc]

Gen. David **Petraeus** told CNN on Thursday that he **supports** President Barack Obama’s July 2011 deadline to start **withdrawing** U.S. troops **from Afghanistan,** a key point of contention between the president and many of his Republican critics in Congress. Petraeus — tapped to replace Gen. Stanley McChrystal as the U.S. commander in Afghanistan — also expressed his respect and appreciation for McChrystal’s work and said the circumstances surrounding the change in command are “sad.” Obama relieved McChrystal of his duties Wednesday after the general and his staff made comments in a Rolling Stone magazine article that appear to mock top administration officials. (…) Petraeus’ remarks to CNN’s Dana Bash and Ted Barrett were his first public comments since being chosen as the new U.S. military chief for the Afghan conflict**.** The Senate Armed Services Committee is set to begin his confirmation hearings Tuesday morning**. “I support the president’s policy, and I will also provide the best professional military advice as we conduct assessments,” Petraeus said**. The general said it’s a privilege to serve. “It’s obviously a hugely important mission,” he said.

AT: Karzai Cred

Non-unique—Karzai credibility couldn’t be lower—elections, Taliban, and insurgency

AFP ’10 [AFP Asian Edition, “Afghan Support for Karzai Gov’t Low, Says Pentagon”, 04.29.2010. 1. (1/ http://news.webcastr.com/articles-ID-96171-title-afghan-support-for-karzai-govt-low-says-pentagon.html/

The establishment of effective governance is a critical enabler for improving development and security."

Karzai has gone from a darling of the international powers who placed him at the head of the Afghan state in 2001 to facing accusations from the United States and other nations that he has allowed unchecked corruption. Popular anger at Karzai's government, which is widely seen as corrupt and inefficient, has allowed the Taliban to "perceive 2009 as their most successful year," the Pentagon report said. "Expanded violence is viewed as an insurgent victory, and insurgents perceive low voter turnout and reports of fraud during the past presidential election (in August 2009) as further signs of their success," the 150-page report said. According to the Pentagon, "violence is sharply above the seasonal average for the previous year -- an 87 percent increase from February 2009 to March 2010.

Link turn—Ending strikes is a win for Karzai

Macaskill 09, (Ewen, a writer for the Guardian.co.uk) Up to 100 civilians feared killed in US air raids in Afghanistan, http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2009/may/06/100-feared-dead-afghanistan-raids, 5/6/2009

**Karzai has criticised US bombing raids as counter-productive**, and yesterday again called on the US for restraint in bombing areas where civilians might be at risk. Speaking in Washington, he said Obama's strategy will only work if he ensures Afghan civilians are protected. "This war against terrorism will succeed only if we fight it from a higher platform of morality," he said.

Despite jirga, Karzai’s credibility still low now

Kern 6/6 [William Kern, Karzai Peace Jirga Called A Futile Illegitimate Exercise, The Moderate Voice, 6/6/10, http://themoderatevoice.com/75377/karzai-peace-jirga-called-a-futile-illegitimate-exercise-daily-outlook-afghanistan/]

Judging from this article from Afghanistan’s Outlook Afghanistan newspaper, the Peace Jirga held last Wednesday, Thursday and Friday by President Hamid Karzai did little it improve his government’s credibility among average Afghans, or persuade the militants to reenter what in Afghanistan qualifies as the ‘mainstream.’

AT: Politics—Plan Popular

Drones increasingly unpopular

Theissman 6/8 (marc a. post-graduate studies at the Naval War College. In CIA's drone mission, who will protect the CIA? [http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp 6.8.10](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp%206.8.10) dyn/content/article/2010/06/07/AR2010060701986.html)

After Sept. 11, few objected to the CIA interrogation program -- until the threat appeared to dissipate and the political winds shifted. Today, the breezes are beginning to shift on the Predator program -- a telltale sign of the gale to come. In a few years, when the situation in the war against terrorism has stabilized, will there be calls for the disbarment of the Obama lawyers who authorized these strikes and criminal investigations of the CIA officers who carried them out? Will Harold Koh join John Yoo and other Bush lawyers in the left's hall of infamy? As Panetta made clear in his visit with staff last year, he can provide a guarantee that lasts only one election cycle -- after that, the CIA is on its own.

Afghanistan war and drone attacks unpopular

Meek, 6/14 [James Gordon Meek, New York Daily News, 6/14/10, http://www.nydailynews.com/blogs/dc/2010/06/us-mining-good-news-out-of-afg.html]

President Karzai won reelection, despite the Obama administration’s opposition; suicide bombings have been shaking Kabul; rockets targeted Karzai’s “peace jirga;” Karzai has threatened to cut a deal with the Taliban; a report showed the slaughter of 27 people in a convoy targeted by a drone; and, most recently, there was questionable success in pacifying the Helmand River Valley and town of Marjah. The Afghan war’s sinking popularity also has undoubtedly caused Team Obama to worry, particularly among Democrats who had argued that Iraq was a distraction when “the real war” was being lost against those who attacked us on 9/11. All of this is set against the backdrop of a war that has escalated each year with no end in sight. Obama “surged” 30,000 more troops into the fight — there are now almost 100,000 American troops on the ground plus thousands more from other NATO countries and thousands more military contractors. The more troops, the more combat and more casualties. Can he still get 30,000 out a year from now? What do you think? If the summer months each resulted in as many KIAs as there were in May — 34 Americans fell last month — there would be 102 killed between June 1 and Labor Day. It’s a safe bet, however, that estimate will be on the low end of the actual fatalities and that the deaths this summer will be a much higher number. So far this month, 25 Americans and 13 other NATO troops have fallen. Groups of G.I.s have been killed recently in suicide bombings, roadside bombings and in a helicopter that was shot down last week. Occasionally, the Taliban kill a coalition trooper in a straight-up firefight but it’s rare. After Helmand, the plan was to use over 20,000 troops to quell the insurgency in Kandahar — birthplace of the Taliban sired by Pakistani intelligence. To simplify the task, Obama ordered U.S. forces to do less nation-building and focus on lethal operations. But narrowing the mission is unlikely to be enough. “There has never been any single person who has ever come up with a reasonable plan for ‘victory’ in Afghanistan,” says veteran Afghan war reporter Robert Young Pelton. To the east, on the unmarked Afghan-Pakistan border, success has been measured as much on rule of law as combat: several murder and corruption trials in Kunar province were “encouraging” milestones, said one top commander, Army Maj. Gen. Curtis Scaparrotti. But Scaparrotti — leader of the storied 82nd Airborne Division, which is turning over the eastern border fight to the 101st Airborne Division — also said only one potential area, in Nangarhar province, is pacified enough to hand off to Afghan forces, who experts consider weak. “Obama’s team is simply using the playbook from Iraq and focusing on the real war — which is being conducted in Pakistan, Yemen and Somalia,” Pelton said.

AT: Politics—Plan Popular

Obama’s hawkish policies alienate liberal dem base—Plan key to agenda

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.

Obama can spin plan as a win—Afghanistan is seen as unwinnable and new strategy is key

Stoddard, 6/25 [A.B. Stoddard, What the scandal reveals, The Hill, 6/25/10, http://thehill.com/blogs/pundits-blog/the-military/105603-what-the-scandal-reveals]

Perhaps it is an exercise in face-saving for Obama, who knows the war in Afghanistan is foundering, the American public opposes it and there is no hope of a successful strategy emerging from current conditions and concluding next July. Though Obama made the best possible choice in replacing McChrystal with Petraeus, the McChrystal episode weakened him, and it made him appear alone. As I wrote in my column this week, Obama is becoming increasingly isolated from his own party, the American people and even the rest of the world. As he heads to the G-20 meeting in Toronto this weekend, he is urging more stimulus from countries embarking instead on cuts. The deficit and debt woes our allies are feeling mirror those of Obama's own party members in Congress, where the Senate has all but given up on attempting to extend unemployment benefits and state aid aimed at mitigating enormous public-sector layoffs since the packages would increase the deficit. A new NBC News/Wall Street Journal poll this week showed Obama is now earning his lowest-ever job approval since taking office. With the spotlight back on the unpopular war in Afghanistan, Obama will have to find a way to connect with the military brass executing the strategy, with Democrats who no longer want to fund it, allied nations who no longer want to fight it and an American public that increasingly favors withdrawal.

Public outraged over civilian drone deaths

Kilcullen, ‘9 David, counterinsurgency adviser to Gen. David Petraeus, The New York Times, “Death From Above, Outrage Down Below”, 05.16.2009, (http://www.nytimes.com/2009/05/17/opinion/17exum.html?pagewanted=1&\_r=1]

Second, public outrage at the strikes is hardly limited to the region in which they take place — areas of northwestern Pakistan where ethnic Pashtuns predominate. Rather, the strikes are now exciting visceral opposition across a broad spectrum of Pakistani opinion in Punjab and Sindh, the nation’s two most populous provinces. Covered extensively by the news media, drone attacks are popularly believed to have caused even more civilian casualties than is actually the case. The persistence of these attacks on Pakistani territory offends people’s deepest sensibilities, alienates them from their government, and contributes to Pakistan’s instability.

AT: Midterms

Plan key to liberal democratic turn-out--

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.

AT: Modernize CP--Prolif

Attempts to modernize drone technology ensures the development of dangerous robot warriors and justifies drone use by rogue nations

Engelhardt, ‘9 [Tom Engelhardt, co-founder of the American Empire Project, Atlantic Free Press, 11/14/09, http://atlanticfreepress.com/news/1/12293-drone-race-to-a-known-future-why-military-dreams-fail-and-why-it-doesnt-matter.html.]

This, then, is the future that you can see just as well as I can. When the Obama administration decides to up the ante on drone use in Pakistan and Afghanistan, as it's soon likely to do, it will be ensuring not the end of al-Qaeda or the Taliban, but the long life of robot war within our ever more militarized society. And by the time this set of robotic dreams fails to pan out, it won't matter. Yet another mini-sector of the military-industrial complex will be etched into the American grain. Whatever the short-term gains from introducing drone warfare in these last years, we are now locked into the 24/7 assassination trade -- with our own set of non-suicide bombers on the job into eternity. This may pass for sanity in Washington, but it's surely helping to pave the road to hell. Haven't any of these folks ever seen a sci-fi film? Are none of them Terminator fans? Are they sure they want to open the way to unlimited robot war, keeping in mind that, if this is the latest game in town, it won't remain mainly an American one for long. And just wait until the first Iranian drone takes out the first Baluchi guerrilla supported by American funds somewhere in Pakistan. Then let's see just what we think about the right of any nation to summarily execute its enemies -- and anyone else in the vicinity -- by drone. Is this actually what we Americans want to be known for? And if we let this happen, and General Atomics is working double or triple shifts to turn out ever more, ever newer generations of robot warriors, while the nation suffers 10.2% unemployment, who exactly will think about shutting them down?

AT: Modernize CP—War

Technology cannot solve—All historical examples prove technology produces worse results than it attempts to solve

Engelbardt, ‘9 [Tom Engelhardt, co-founder of the American Empire Project, Atlantic Free Press, 11/14/09, http://atlanticfreepress.com/news/1/12293-drone-race-to-a-known-future-why-military-dreams-fail-and-why-it-doesnt-matter.html.]

Oh, and there's just one more reason that comes to mind: it so happens that I can see the future when it comes to drones, and it's dismal. I'm no prophet -- it's only that I've already lived through so much of that future. In fact, we all have. Militarily speaking, we might as well be in the film Groundhog Day in which Bill Murray and Andie MacDowell are forced to live out the same 24 hours again and again -- with all the grimness of that idea and none of the charm of those actors. In my lifetime, I've repeatedly seen advanced weapons systems or mind-boggling technologies of war hailed as near-utopian paths to victory and future peace (just as the atomic bomb was soon after my birth). In the Vietnam War, the glories of "the electronic battlefield" were limned as an antidote to brute and ineffective American air power. That high-tech, advanced battlefield of invisible sensors was to bring an end to the impunity of guerrillas and infiltrating enemy armies. No longer capable of going anywhere undetected, they would have nowhere to hide. In the 1980s, it was President Ronald Reagan's Strategic Defense Initiative, quickly dubbed "Star Wars" by its critics, a label that he accepted with amusement. ("If you will pardon my stealing a film line -- the Force is with us," he said in his usual genial way.) His dream, as he told the American people, was to create an "impermeable" anti-missile shield over the United States -- "like a roof protects a family from rain" -- that would end the possibility of nuclear attack from the Soviet Union and so create peace in our time (or, if you were of a more cynical turn of mind, the possibility of a freebie nuclear assault on the Soviets). In the Gulf War, "smart bombs" and smart missiles were praised as the military saviors of the moment. They were to give war the kind of precision that would lower civilian deaths to the vanishing point and, as the neocons of the Bush administration would claim in the next decade, free the U.S. military to "decapitate" any regime we loathed. All this would be possible without so much as touching the civilian population (which would, of course, then welcome us as liberators). And later, there was "netcentric warfare," that Rumsfeldian high-tech favorite. Its promise was that advanced information-sharing technology would turn a Military Lite into an uplinked force so savvy about changing battlefield realities and so crushing that a mere demo or two would cow any "rogue" nation or insurgency into submission. Of course, you know the results of this sort of magical thinking about wonder weapons (or technologies) and their properties just as well as I do. The atomic bomb ended nothing, but led to an almost half-century-long nuclear superpower standoff/nightmare, to nuclear proliferation, and so to the possibility that, someday, even terrorists might possess such weapons. The electronic battlefield was incapable of staving off defeat in Vietnam. That impermeable anti-missile shield never came even faintly close to making it into our skies. Those "smart bombs" of the Gulf War proved remarkably dumb, while the 50 "decapitation" strikes the Bush administration launched against Saddam Hussein's regime on the first day of the 2003 invasion of Iraq took out not a single Iraqi leader, but "dozens" of civilians. And the history of the netcentric military in Iraq is well known. Its "success" sent Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld into retirement and ignominy. In the same way, robot drones as assassination weapons will prove to be just another weapons system rather than a panacea for American warriors. To date, in fact, there is at least as much evidence in Pakistan and Afghanistan that the drones are helping to spread war as that they are staunching it. Yet, the above summary is, at best, only half the story. None of these wonder weapons or technologies succeeded in their moment, or as advertised, but that fact stopped none of them from embedding themselves in our American world. From the atomic bomb came a whole nuclear landscape that included the Strategic Air Command, weapons labs, production plants, missile silos, corporate interests, and an enormous world-destroying arsenal (as well as proliferating versions of the same, large and small, across the planet). Nor did the electronic battlefield go away. Quite the opposite -- it came home and entered our everyday world in the form of sensors, cameras, surveillance equipment and the like, now implanted from our borders to our cities.

AT: Modernize CP—Solvency Deficits

Modernization doesn’t solve the aff—

A. Too Longterm—new tech not available until 2022

Reed ’10(John, writer with Defense News, April 27th, 2010, DefenseNews.com, “USAF Broadens Plans for Next-Generation UAV”, http://www.defensenews.com/story.php?i=4601474&amp;c=AIR &amp;s=TOP, AZ)

The Air Force's chief intelligence officer, Lt. Gen. David Deptula, said this probably won't have a serious impact on the service's plans to field the plane - which he described as "an order of magnitude" more advanced than the MQ-9 - close to 2020 to 2022.

B. Too many errors to overcome

Brannen, ’10 [Kate, Writer for Defense News, Defense News.com, 3/10/10/, http://www.defensenews.com/story.php?i=4534072&amp;c=AIR &amp;s=TOP]

"In the first major acquisition decision for the Army's post-[Future Combat Systems] initiatives, DoD and the Army - because they want to support the war fighter quickly - are proceeding with low-rate initial production of Increment 1 systems despite having acknowledged that systems are immature, are unreliable, and cannot perform as required," GAO officials said in written testimony.

Originally developed under the FCS program, Increment 1 includes the Non-Line-of-Sight Launch System, Tactical and Urban Unattended Ground Sensors, the Class 1 Unmanned Aircraft System, the Small Unmanned Ground Vehicle and the Network Integration Kit.

"It will be a major challenge to correct all of the deficiencies," said J. Michael Gilmore, director of operational test and evaluation in the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

AT: Modernize CP—Links to Anti-Americanism

Aerial drone attacks have and always will fail on the whole.

Rall, ‘6 [Ted Rall, Common Dreams.org, “US Drone Plane have a nearly perfect record of failure,”http://www.commondreams.org/views06/0118-32.htm]

Mishaps are unavoidable due to the Predator's design limitations. Image resolution is too fuzzy to make out much of anything at 10,000 feet up. Fly the drone lower than that and it becomes vulnerable to anti-aircraft fire. Assassinations by unmanned aircraft seem doomed to failure--out of thousands of sorties, the Defense Department can only point to a single success, the alleged Hellfire killing of Al Qaeda's supposed "number five guy" in Pakistan last year. But it's not just drone planes. Attempted assassination bombings attempted by flesh-and-blood pilots haven't fared better.

Ronald Reagan ordered an airstrike on Libyan leader Moammar Khadafi's home in Tripoli. Khadafi survived, but his baby daughter and 37 others were killed. In 1998 Bill Clinton ordered Tomahawk cruise missiles fired at Osama bin Laden's training camp in Afghanistan and a pharmaceutical plant in Sudan. Bin Laden wasn't there, but dozens of others died; the Sudanese facility turned out to be an innocuous aspirin factory. At the start of the 2003 invasion of Iraq George W. Bush ordered 40 cruise missiles fired at a Baghdad restaurant where Saddam Hussein was reported to be eating dinner. He wasn't. No Baathist officials died. Fourteen members of two Christian families, mostly women and children, did.

Incompetence and poor intelligence are not exclusive to us. Though brutal, the 9/11 attacks fell far short of their planners' immediate goals. Tens of thousands would have died at the World Trade Center had the hijackers known that New Yorkers start work at nine. And even if one of the two Washington-bound planes had struck the White House, Bush was in Florida at the time.

Targeted killing by aerial bombardment, whether it's carried out by pilots, hijackers or computer-guided drones, is an inherently flawed concept--too easy to contemplate, too hard to carry out, and too ham-fisted to execute without also killing civilians. Intelligence is faulty, guidance systems fail, imagery is fuzzy. When the target of an assassination is present, small bombs can't ensure success and big bombs invariably result in "collateral damage." Technology hasn't changed everything. You can't know what's going on on the ground from the air.

Civilized nations should band together to renounce and outlaw these sloppy and obscene aerial assassination attempts, which send the terrifying message that killing civilians is acceptable in the pursuit of justice. But if the international community can't go that far, they can at least ban the use of unmanned vehicles like the Predator. Murder by mistake is bad enough when a human being can be held accountable.

AT: Modernize CP—Unpop

CP unpopular with congress and GAO

Brannen, ’10 [Kate, Writer for Defense News, Defense News.com, 3/10/10/, http://www.defensenews.com/story.php?i=4534072&amp;c=AIR &amp;s=TOP]

Why is the U.S. Army buying equipment that fared poorly in tests? That's the question the chairman of the House Armed Services air and land subcommittee asked senior Army officials at a March 10 hearing.

Lawmakers and U.S. Army officials on March 10 discussed whether the Class I UAV is better than the Raven it is intended to replace. (ARMY)

"It does not seem like these things are going to be ready anytime soon," Rep. Adam Smith (D-Wash.) said after listening to Pentagon testing office officials, who outlined the problems demonstrated in last year's testing of the first increment of the Army's brigade combat team modernization program. "Why is there a budget request for procurement of this stuff in there? ...Why not just delay it for a year?"

The Government Accountability Office agrees.

AT: Imperialism/Whitewashing

Obama’s troop surge is just a tool of imperialism meant to increase US’s economic power—only a reduction in troops checks US imperialism

Bill Van Auken, World Socialist Website, What are US troops dying for in Afghanistan?, 10/29/2009, http://www.wsws.org/articles/2009/oct2009/pers-o29.shtml

The American military is fighting in Afghanistan as part of a 21st century version of the “Great Game,” in which US imperialism is seeking to dominate Central Asia and its energy resources at the expense of its strategic rivals. There is no doubt that the Obama administration will continue to pursue these aims through an escalation of the Afghan war. The costs of this war, now pegged at $3.6 billion a month, will rise even higher with the deployment of more troops, and will be paid by working people in the US through attacks on their living standards and basic social benefits. The death and maiming of American soldiers and Marines will escalate, along with the slaughter of both Afghan and Pakistani civilians. The interests of the working class in the US and internationally stand opposed to those being pursued through the killing and dying in the so-called AfPak war. Working people must demand the immediate and unconditional withdrawal ofall American and foreign troops from the region and an end to the drive for imperialist domination in Central Asia.