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NEGATIVE PHILOSOPHY / REVERSE ADVOCACY

Acknowledging there are risks and limitations to drone missions, nevertheless in Yemen the benefits outweigh the risks

Dr. Seth Jones 2014. (PhD political science; director of the International Security and Defense Policy Center at the RAND Corporation, as well as an adjunct professor at Johns Hopkins University's School for Advanced International Studies (SAIS). He served as the representative for the commander, U.S. Special Operations Command, to the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations ) Testimony before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Subcommittee on Terrorism, Non-Proliferation, and Trade, 8 Apr 2014 <http://docs.house.gov/meetings/FA/FA18/20140408/102109/HHRG-113-FA18-Wstate-JonesS-20140408.pdf>

Still, there are risks with direct action and unconventional warfare. First, they can embolden the narrative of Salafi-jihadist groups, who will invariably attempt to portray the conflict as one between Islam and infidel countries. Direct U.S. participation will likely become public, despite efforts to keep it clandestine. Some in the United States may also balk at direct engagement in a foreign war. Second, there is a potential for blowback. In cases where Salafi-jihadist groups are not interested in targeting the U.S. homeland or its embassies, U.S. strikes against the group could cause a change in their behavior. After the 2009 U.S. killing of Tehreek-e-Taliban Pakistan (TTP) leader Baitullah Mehsud, for example, the TTP became increasingly interested in targeting the United States. In May 2010, Faisal Shahzad attempted to detonate a car bomb in Times Square, New York City, after being trained by TTP leaders in Pakistan. In addition, the United States has utilized drone strikes against some terrorist groups. But there are limitations to using armed drones for direct action missions. There is mixed evidence, at best, that drone strikes and broader decapitation strategies alone are effective. Groups can survive a strike when they establish – or shift to – a more decentralized leadership structure, possess an ideology that still has followers, or are able to appoint competent replacements for leaders that have been killed. In addition, successful counterterrorism and counterinsurgency campaigns generally require the local government to control territory using its security forces. But the benefits of direct action and unconventional warfare outweigh the risks in most cases where Salafi-jihadist groups are already plotting attacks against the U.S. homeland and its interests overseas (such as U.S. embassies), especially where the local government has minimal capabilities or little political will to counter the groups. One example is Yemen, where al Qa’ida in the Arabian Peninsula has been involved in multiple plots against the U.S. homeland and U.S. embassies, but whose government is relatively weak and embroiled in several domestic insurgencies and political unrest.

US engagement in Yemen has risks, but the failure of Yemen’s government to deal with Al Qaida means we should stay engaged. The risks to US homeland justify the risks of engagement.

Dr. Seth Jones 2014. (PhD political science; director of the International Security and Defense Policy Center at the RAND Corporation, as well as an adjunct professor at Johns Hopkins University's School for Advanced International Studies (SAIS). He served as the representative for the commander, U.S. Special Operations Command, to the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations ) Testimony before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Subcommittee on Terrorism, Non-Proliferation, and Trade, 8 Apr 2014 <http://docs.house.gov/meetings/FA/FA18/20140408/102109/HHRG-113-FA18-Wstate-JonesS-20140408.pdf>

Beginning in the summer of 2012, Yemeni President Abd Rabuh Mansur Hadi became increasingly cautious about conducting operations against al Qa’ida in the Arabian Peninsula to minimize government casualties. He avoided large-scale ground offensives in favor of airstrikes against al Qa’ida safe havens, including its stronghold in Mahfad District, Abyan governorate. In addition, the Yemeni military was fraught with problems. Many rank-and-file Yemeni soldiers did not receive their full pay because of endemic corruption in the military, undermining the military’s effectiveness in countering al Qa’ida. In these cases, a U.S. failure to directly engage special operations forces or intelligence units could severely jeopardize U.S. national security if a group were to strike the U.S. homeland or a U.S. embassy. The risks of not being engaged could be serious. Still, the possibility that direct U.S. engagement could inflame the local population suggests that U.S. policymakers should carefully weigh the type of engagement.

Terrorism threat justifies drone use. Canceling drones means forgetting the lessons of 9/11

Steven Groves 2013. (Senior Research Fellow [The Margaret Thatcher Center for Freedom](http://www.heritage.org/about/staff/departments/margaret-thatcher-center-for-freedom) The Davis Institute for National Security and Foreign Policy at The Heritage Foundation  law degree from Ohio Northern University's College of Law and a bachelor of arts degree in history from Florida State Univ) Drone Strikes: The Legality of U.S. Targeting Terrorists Abroad 10 Apr 2013 <http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2013/04/drone-strikes-the-legality-of-us-targeting-terrorists-abroad>

The debate within the international legal, academic, and human rights communities on the legality and propriety of drone strikes will likely continue unabated. To surrender to the demands of such critics would be equivalent to forgetting the lessons of September 11, when a small, non-state terrorist organization operating from a nation with which the United States was not at war planned and launched an attack that killed almost 3,000 Americans. The United States should preserve its ability to use all of the tools in its arsenal to ensure that the plots hatched by terrorist organizations do not become successful attacks on the U.S. homeland. Armed drones have proved to be one of the most effective and discriminating tools available to U.S. forces, and their lawful use should continue until such time as non-state, transnational terrorist organizations no longer present an imminent threat to the United States.

HARMS / SIGNIFICANCE

Status Quo is good: Current policies in Yemen are working, rolling back Al Qaeda, and should be continued

Daniel Benjamin 2014. (nonresident senior fellow in the [Center for 21st Century Security and Intelligence](http://www.brookings.edu/about/centers/security-and-intelligence) in the [Foreign Policy](http://www.brookings.edu/about/programs/foreign-policy) program at Brookings Institution; director of the John Sloan Dickey Center for International Understanding at Dartmouth College; former ambassador-at-large and coordinator for counterterrorism with the U.S. State Department) Terror Takes A Hit In Yemen 27 Apr 2014 (brackets added) <http://www.brookings.edu/research/opinions/2014/04/27-terror-takes-hit-yemen-benjamin>

As [former Yemen President] Saleh drew back from politics, the United States pressed for deeper engagement to train and equip Yemeni counterterrorism forces. It was pleasantly surprised to find in Vice President Abd Rabbuh Mansur Hadi, who replaced Saleh, a man dedicated to wiping out the terrorists who threatened his county. AQAP’s territorial gains were rolled back, and the cooperation between the United States and Yemen has deepened. The recent strikes show that joint effort is paying off. According to press reports, the action included a combination of US air power and Yemeni field operations. Yemen is a country where much territory is ungoverned, and the Yemeni piece of this involved a deployment into the dangerous Shabwa Governate. That already represents progress over what was possible in the very recent past. Yemen is a country where military appointments are often made on the basis of tribal and clan connections, so training is challenging. If these joint operations are found to have taken off the battlefield either AQAP [Al Qaeda of the Arabian Peninsula] leader Naser al-Wuhayshi or the master bomb maker, Ibrahim al-Asiri, who reportedly created the underwear bomb and even more diabolical devices, this will have been a big leap forward. It will also be a testament to the virtue of sticking with the program, however difficult. American engagement in Yemen began more than four years ago, and it will take many years until the country can comprehensively deal with the threats inside its borders.

Yemen is sticking with US counter-terrorism program because it works

Daniel Benjamin 2014. (nonresident senior fellow in the [Center for 21st Century Security and Intelligence](http://www.brookings.edu/about/centers/security-and-intelligence) in the [Foreign Policy](http://www.brookings.edu/about/programs/foreign-policy) program at Brookings Institution; director of the John Sloan Dickey Center for International Understanding at Dartmouth College; former ambassador-at-large and coordinator for counterterrorism with the U.S. State Department) Terror Takes A Hit In Yemen 27 Apr 2014 <http://www.brookings.edu/research/opinions/2014/04/27-terror-takes-hit-yemen-benjamin>

Since President Hadi took power, the United States has spent $250 million on humanitarian efforts, $100 million on economic development, and $40 million in support of the ambitious political transition that he is leading. That total is more than the US has spent on support for Yemeni counterterrorism efforts, and one crucial reason why the Yemenis are also sticking with a program that benefits everyone — except the terrorists.

Despite official ‘complaints’, Yemen’s government supports US drone strikes because they effectively combat Al Qaeda

Ariel Zirulnick 2014. (journalist) CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR String of US drone strikes in Yemen target Al Qaeda affiliate (+video) 22 Apr 2014 <http://www.csmonitor.com/World/Security-Watch/terrorism-security/2014/0422/String-of-US-drone-strikes-in-Yemen-target-Al-Qaeda-affiliate-video>

A series of drone strikes in Yemen in recent days have killed at least 40 alleged militants, highlighting the challenges facing the US and Yemen in directing a controversial anti-terrorism drone campaign that has proven effective in the past.  The Yemeni government has openly acknowledged a role in the strikes, despite the fact that it has made noise about decreasing the use of such airstrikes to combat Al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula (AQAP), a local Al Qaeda franchise.

Drone strikes are effective and meet the test of proportionality under the laws of war

Dr. James Jay Carafano 2011. (PhD ; graduate of West Point, Carafano holds a master's degree and a doctorate from Georgetown University as well as a master's degree in strategy from the U.S. Army War College; served as a visiting professor at National Defense University and Georgetown Univ; director of the Allison Center for Foreign Policy Studies at The Heritage Foundation ) Drones Save American Lives, 25 Sept 2011 <http://www.heritage.org/research/commentary/2011/09/drones-save-american-lives>

The efficacy of drone strikes is unquestionable. As an act of war, such strikes also meet the test of proportionality. That is: (1) they employ a level of force consonant with the goal of the operation; (2) the attacks are not indiscriminate; and (3) the operations take reasonable precautions to safeguard the lives of innocents.

“Civilian casualties” - Drone strikes are becoming more precise and discriminating

Peter Bergen and Jennifer Rowland 2012. Peter Bergen (CNN's national security analyst, is a director at the New America Foundation) and Jennifer Rowland (a program associate at the New America Foundation, a Washington-based think tank which seeks innovative solutions across the ideological spectrum), March 27, 2012. “CIA drone war in Pakistan in sharp decline,” CNN, <http://www.cnn.com/2012/03/27/opinion/bergen-drone-decline/index.html?hpt=hp_bn7>

“At the New America Foundation, we maintain an up-to-date database of every reported drone strike in Pakistan's tribal regions since 2004. We monitor reports about the strikes from the top Western and Pakistani news sources, such as The New York Times, Associated Press, CNN, Reuters, Express Tribune, Dawn, Geo TV and others. According to our data, 7% of the fatalities resulting from drone strikes in 2011 were civilians, up 2 percentage points from our figure in 2010. Over the life of the CIA drone program in Pakistan from 2004 to 2012, we found that the civilian casualty rate has been 17%. Clearly, as the years have progressed, the drone strikes have become more precise and discriminating.”

Drones have great precision for avoiding collateral deaths

Ken Dilanian 2011. (journalist) LOS ANGELES TIMES, “U.S. counter-terrorism strategy to rely on surgical strikes, unmanned drones” 29 June 2011 (brackets added) <http://articles.latimes.com/2011/jun/29/news/la-pn-al-qaeda-strategy-20110629>

In the peculiar dance that marks the administration’s discussions of this issue, Brennan did not explicitly mention the vast expansion of drone strikes the U.S. has undertaken in Pakistan since January 2009— 213 of them, according to the New America Foundation, which counts them through media reports. That is because the program technically is secret, even though it is widely discussed and openly acknowledged by U.S. and Pakistani officials in private. Later, when asked whether a policy of targeted killing was appropriate for the United States, [President Obama’s counter-terrorism advisor, John] Brennan responded that the U.S. is “exceptionally precise and surgical in terms of addressing the terrorist threat. And by that I mean, if there are terrorists who are within an area where there are women and children or others, you know, we do not take such action that might put those innocent men, women and children in danger.” He added that in the last year, “there hasn't been a single collateral death because of the exceptional proficiency, precision of the capabilities that we've been able to develop.”

US attacks comply with fundamental laws of war

Eric Holder 2012. (US attorney general) 5 Mar 2012 Attorney General Eric Holder Speaks at Northwestern University School of Law, <http://www.justice.gov/iso/opa/ag/speeches/2012/ag-speech-1203051.html>

Of course, any such use of lethal force by the United States will comply with the four fundamental law of war principles governing the use of force. The principle of necessity requires that the target have definite military value. The principle of distinction requires that only lawful targets – such as combatants, civilians directly participating in hostilities, and military objectives – may be targeted intentionally. Under the principle of proportionality, the anticipated collateral damage must not be excessive in relation to the anticipated military advantage. Finally, the principle of humanity requires us to use weapons that will not inflict unnecessary suffering.

Drones in Yemen comply with laws of war by minimizing civilian casualties

Steven Groves 2013. (Senior Research Fellow [The Margaret Thatcher Center for Freedom](http://www.heritage.org/about/staff/departments/margaret-thatcher-center-for-freedom) The Davis Institute for National Security and Foreign Policy at The Heritage Foundation  law degree from Ohio Northern University's College of Law and a bachelor of arts degree in history from Florida State Univ) Drone Strikes: The Legality of U.S. Targeting Terrorists Abroad 10 Apr 2013 <http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2013/04/drone-strikes-the-legality-of-us-targeting-terrorists-abroad>

Because the United States is currently engaged in an armed conflict with al-Qaeda and its associated forces, whose operatives continue to pose an imminent threat, U.S. armed forces may target them with lethal force wherever they may be found, whether on the “hot” battlefield of Afghanistan or operating from other nations, such as Pakistan and Yemen. American targeted drone strikes comply with international law, in particular that part of international law known as the law of war, which requires belligerents to distinguish combatants from civilians and minimize harm to the civilian population. Based on the information available to the public, it appears that the United States takes great care to adhere to these principles by targeting only combatants and by taking care to avoid civilian casualties. Indeed, the evidence indicates that armed drones are particularly well suited to carry out targeted strikes that meet the standards of the law of war.

Drones are better at preventing civilian casualties than the alternatives: invasion and bombing

Steven Groves 2013. (Senior Research Fellow [The Margaret Thatcher Center for Freedom](http://www.heritage.org/about/staff/departments/margaret-thatcher-center-for-freedom) The Davis Institute for National Security and Foreign Policy at The Heritage Foundation  law degree from Ohio Northern University's College of Law and a bachelor of arts degree in history from Florida State Univ) Drone Strikes: The Legality of U.S. Targeting Terrorists Abroad 10 Apr 2013 <http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2013/04/drone-strikes-the-legality-of-us-targeting-terrorists-abroad>

That said, by their nature, drone strikes are designed to be precise attacks on individual targets of military significance as opposed to indiscriminate attacks, such as carpet bombing a military installation situated alongside civilian buildings or an artillery barrage on an armored column travelling through an area known to be populated by civilians. That is not to say that drone strikes have not caused civilian casualties. They have. However, no evidence indicates that U.S. armed forces or CIA officers, in carrying out targeted strikes, have disregarded the principle of proportionality. While civilian deaths have reportedly resulted from drone strikes, there is no indication that U.S. personnel ordered such strikes without regard for civilian casualties or with foreknowledge that civilian casualties would greatly exceed the military advantage advanced by the strike. In sum, no evidence indicates that U.S. targeted drone strikes violate the law of war principles of necessity, distinction, or proportionality, much less in any intentional, systematic, or chronic manner. To the contrary, the use of drones, which can loiter over a target for hours waiting for the optimal moment to strike, is a particularly effective method of eliminating individual terrorist threats while adhering to the law of war. The publicly available evidence indicates that the U.S. government chooses its targets carefully and regularly reassesses the threats posed by those targets. While there is no guarantee that all civilian casualties can be eliminated, the use of drone strikes, as opposed to an armed invasion or use of large munitions, vastly minimizes the exposure of civilians.

Congress, Courts and Constitution all allow strikes against Al Qaeda outside Afghanistan

Eric Holder 2012. (US attorney general) 5 Mar 2012 Attorney General Eric Holder Speaks at Northwestern University School of Law, <http://www.justice.gov/iso/opa/ag/speeches/2012/ag-speech-1203051.html>

The Constitution empowers the President to protect the nation from any imminent threat of violent attack. And international law recognizes the inherent right of national self-defense. None of this is changed by the fact that we are not in a conventional war. Our legal authority is not limited to the battlefields in Afghanistan. Indeed, neither Congress nor our federal courts has limited the geographic scope of our ability to use force to the current conflict in Afghanistan. We are at war with a stateless enemy, prone to shifting operations from country to country. Over the last three years alone, al Qaeda and its associates have directed several attacks – fortunately, unsuccessful – against us from countries other than Afghanistan. Our government has both a responsibility and a right to protect this nation and its people from such threats.

Use of force in foreign territory is justified if they consent or if they can’t deal effectively with a threat to the US

Eric Holder 2012. (US attorney general) 5 Mar 2012 Attorney General Eric Holder Speaks at Northwestern University School of Law, <http://www.justice.gov/iso/opa/ag/speeches/2012/ag-speech-1203051.html>

This does not mean that we can use military force whenever or wherever we want. International legal principles, including respect for another nation’s sovereignty, constrain our ability to act unilaterally. But the use of force in foreign territory would be consistent with these international legal principles if conducted, for example, with the consent of the nation involved – or after a determination that the nation is unable or unwilling to deal effectively with a threat to the United States.

“Need to capture, not kill, terrorists” - Response: Not always feasible, sometimes drones are the only game in town

David Rittgers 2010. (law degree, U. of N. Carolina; legal policy analyst for Cato Institute; served in the United States Army as an Infantry and Special Forces officer, including three tours in Afghanistan; won two Bronze Stars) “Both Left and Right Are Wrong about Drones” 25 Feb 2010 <http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/both-left-right-are-wrong-about-drones>

Criticism from conservatives is largely based on the logic that a live and talking terrorist is worth more than a dead one. While this is true as a general matter, several factors make drone attacks a good alternative to capture. First, not all terrorists targeted in drone attacks can be feasibly taken alive. This is especially true of those who reside in the many areas dominated by local insurgent groups and therefore out of reach of national governments. For example, putting troops on the ground in the Pakistani tribal areas, where numerous drone attacks have been carried out, is both tactically and diplomatically problematic. Last May, CIA Director Leon Panetta called drones the "only game in town" when it comes to certain parts of Pakistan, and this will remain the case for the long term.

“Need to build Yemen government capacity to fight terrorism” – Response: Reliance on local government is risky

Dr. Seth Jones 2014. (PhD political science; director of the International Security and Defense Policy Center at the RAND Corporation, as well as an adjunct professor at Johns Hopkins University's School for Advanced International Studies (SAIS). He served as the representative for the commander, U.S. Special Operations Command, to the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations ) Testimony before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Subcommittee on Terrorism, Non-Proliferation, and Trade, 8 Apr 2014 <http://docs.house.gov/meetings/FA/FA18/20140408/102109/HHRG-113-FA18-Wstate-JonesS-20140408.pdf>

But there are risks with building partner capacity and foreign internal defense. First, local governments can be fickle and uncooperative. A government that is willing to target Salafi-jihadist groups at one point can change its assessment. Pakistan, for example, was more willing to target al Qa’ida operatives on its soil in the immediate aftermath of 9/11 than it is today. Governments can also collapse. Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak, whose regime effectively countered terrorist groups, was overthrown.

President of Yemen approves US drone strikes

Steven Groves 2013. (Senior Research Fellow [The Margaret Thatcher Center for Freedom](http://www.heritage.org/about/staff/departments/margaret-thatcher-center-for-freedom) The Davis Institute for National Security and Foreign Policy at The Heritage Foundation  law degree from Ohio Northern University's College of Law and a bachelor of arts degree in history from Florida State Univ) Drone Strikes: The Legality of U.S. Targeting Terrorists Abroad 10 Apr 2013 (brackets in original) <http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2013/04/drone-strikes-the-legality-of-us-targeting-terrorists-abroad>

There is no such ambiguity about U.S. drone strikes in Yemen. In a September 2012 interview described in The Washington Post, Yemeni President Abed Rabbo Mansour Hadi is quoted as saying in regard to U.S. targeted strikes against Al-Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula (AQAP) that “[e]very operation, before taking place, they take permission from the president.”

US has the right to attack Al Qaeda in Yemen under internationally recognized right of self-defense

Steven Groves 2013. (Senior Research Fellow [The Margaret Thatcher Center for Freedom](http://www.heritage.org/about/staff/departments/margaret-thatcher-center-for-freedom) The Davis Institute for National Security and Foreign Policy at The Heritage Foundation  law degree from Ohio Northern University's College of Law and a bachelor of arts degree in history from Florida State Univ) Drone Strikes: The Legality of U.S. Targeting Terrorists Abroad 10 Apr 2013 <http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2013/04/drone-strikes-the-legality-of-us-targeting-terrorists-abroad>

On the day after September 11, the U.N. Security Council unanimously condemned al-Qaeda’s terrorist attacks “in the strongest terms” and regarded “such acts, like any act of international terrorism, as a threat to international peace and security.” Security Council Resolution 1368 called on all nations “to work together urgently to bring to justice the perpetrators, organizers and sponsors of these terrorist attacks and stresses that those responsible for aiding, supporting or harbouring the perpetrators, organizers and sponsors of these acts will be held accountable.” Importantly, the Security Council reaffirmed and recognized “the inherent right of individual or collective self-defence in accordance with the Charter.”[[25]](http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2013/04/drone-strikes-the-legality-of-us-targeting-terrorists-abroad" \l "_ftn25) Yet critics contend that the U.S. may not invoke that very right, which is acknowledged by Article 51, against operatives in Pakistan or Yemen because those particular operatives either did not launch an “armed attack” against the United States or because the operatives do not pose an “imminent threat” to the United States. Such critics take an unreasonably narrow view of Article 51 and a nation’s right to self-defense.

DISADVANTAGES

1. Terrorism.

Link: Drones are effective at weakening Al Qaeda by killing key leaders

John Brennan 2011. Remarks of John O. Brennan, Assistant to the President for Homeland Security and Counterterrorism, on Ensuring al-Qa'ida's Demise -- As Prepared for Delivery, Paul H. Nitze School of Advanced International Studies 29 June 2011 <http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2011/06/29/remarks-john-o-brennan-assistant-president-homeland-security-and-counter>

All told, over the past two and half years, virtually every major al-Qa’ida affiliate has lost its key leader or operational commander, and more than half of al-Qa’ida’s top leadership has been eliminated. Yes, al-Qa’ida is adaptive and resilient and has sought to replace these leaders, but it has been forced to do so with less experienced individuals. That’s another reason why we and our partners have stepped up our efforts. Because if we hit al-Qa’ida hard enough and often enough, there will come a time when they simply can no longer replenish their ranks with the skilled leaders they need to sustain their operations. And that is the direction in which we’re headed today.

Link: AQAP (Al Qaida in the Arabian Peninsula) in Yemen is a high threat – they’re plotting attacks against the U.S.

Dr. Seth Jones 2014. (PhD political science; director of the International Security and Defense Policy Center at the RAND Corporation, as well as an adjunct professor at Johns Hopkins University's School for Advanced International Studies (SAIS). He served as the representative for the commander, U.S. Special Operations Command, to the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations ) Testimony before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Subcommittee on Terrorism, Non-Proliferation, and Trade, 8 Apr 2014 <http://docs.house.gov/meetings/FA/FA18/20140408/102109/HHRG-113-FA18-Wstate-JonesS-20140408.pdf>

As Table 1 illustrates, al Qa’ida and other Salafi-jihadist groups can be divided into three categories: those that pose a high threat because they are involved in active plotting against the U.S. homeland; those that pose a medium threat because they are involved in plotting attacks against U.S. structures (such as embassies) and U.S. citizens overseas; and those that pose a low threat because they are focused on targeting local regimes or other countries. The highest threat likely comes from al Qa’ida in the Arabian Peninsula, which retains a capability and desire to target the U.S. homeland and U.S. interest s overseas. Several Yemen-based operatives – such as leader Nasir al-Wuhayshi, senior military commander Qasim al-Rimi, and senior official Ibrahim al-Banna – continue to support attacks against the United States.

Impact: Reduced terrorism against US targets, and al Qaeda on the ropes

Dr. James Jay Carafano 2011. (PhD ; graduate of West Point, master's degree and doctorate from Georgetown Univ as well as a master's degree in strategy from the U.S. Army War College; former visiting professor at National Defense University and Georgetown Univ; director of the Allison Center for Foreign Policy Studies at The Heritage Foundation ) Drones Save American Lives, 25 Sept 2011 <http://www.heritage.org/research/commentary/2011/09/drones-save-american-lives>

No war can be won by defense alone. There is a reason White House counterterrorism chief John Brennan recently felt confident enough to declare that al-Qaida was “on the ropes.” Progress came from taking the offensive. A decade of strenuous effort to disrupt terrorist sanctuaries, take out leaders, pre-empt planning and operations, disaggregate networks, thwart terrorist travel and communications, and disrupt fundraising and recruiting is paying off. And, without question, the drone missile strikes in Pakistan’s tribal areas have helped put al-Qaida on the defensive. Similar operations conducted against an al-Qaida affiliate in Yemen have paid dividends as well. The results speak for themselves. Successful terrorist attacks on U.S. targets — both at home and overseas — have been on a continual rate of decline since 2005.

2. Micromanaging the War.

Link: Affirmative has Congress dictate tactics (“no drones in Yemen”) to the President for the war on Al Qaeda

Link & Impact: Congressional micro-management is bad. Presidential power is key to protecting us against foreign attacks

Prof. John Yoo 2007. (law professor at the [University of California, Berkeley](http://www.latimes.com/topic/education/colleges-universities/university-of-california-berkeley-OREDU00000197.topic) and a visiting scholar at the American Enterprise Institute. He served in the [Justice Department](http://www.latimes.com/topic/crime-law-justice/u.s.-department-of-justice-ORGOV0000160.topic) from 2001 to 2003, where he worked on constitutional issues involving war) Apr 2007 LOS ANGELES TIMES (brackets added) <http://www.latimes.com/news/opinion/la-op-dustup2apr02,0,3065343.story?page=2&coll=la-opinion-center>

[Alexander] Hamilton argued that the president should manage war because he could act with "decision, activity, secrecy, and dispatch." "Energy in the executive is a leading character in the definition of good government," he observed. "It is essential to the protection of the community against foreign attacks." You are right to quote Congress's power to declare war and to pass laws to govern and regulate the armed forces. But presidents and congresses have never believed they allow for control of tactics and strategy. Congress' real power is its power of the purse, not any right to dictate which units should fight where, or whether to surge troops into Baghdad. Congress is too fractured, slow, and inflexible to micromanage military decisions that depend on speed, secrecy, and force.

3. Civilian Casualties. Drones minimize civilian casualties compared to other military tactics

Andrew Callam 2010. (candidate for a masters degree in international affairs, George Washington Univ.) Winter 2010 INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS REVIEW Vol XVIII No. 3 “Drone Wars: Armed Unmanned Aerial Vehicles”<http://www.iar-gwu.org/node/144>

In counterinsurgency warfare, the main benefit of the armed drone is an increased ability to “find, fix and finish” enemy combatants, while minimizing civilian casualties. Traditionally, aerial surveillance vehicles would observe a suspected target and radio the coordinates to an operations center, where personnel would consult maps and senior officers in an attempt to identify civilian structures. Following the consultation, the operations center would relay instructions to an airborne craft. In Operation Desert Storm, this process (also know as the “kill chain” or “sensor-to shooter-cycle”) could take up to three days, by which time the targets could have left the target building or civilians could have entered it. When armed drones are used, the kill chain is only one link long and the process takes less than 5 minutes. Additionally, as P.W. Singer, author of Wired for War, notes, using an unmanned drone allows the pilot to take more risks with his craft, such as flying lower and loitering longer, thus leading to a more accurate strike. The drones therefore allow commanders to avoid killing noncombatants during their strikes, a crucial element in counterinsurgency warfare.

4. Yemen Government Collapse

Link: Drones are effective at fighting Al Qaeda in Yemen. See evidence above (DA 1 impact, Carafano card)

Link & Brink: Al Qaeda insurgency is putting big strain on Yemen’s limited military resources. Al Qaeda expansion is imminent

Alexis Knutsen & Katherine Zimmerman 2014. (Knutsen - Analyst for the American Enterprise Institute’s Critical Threats Project; research focuses on national security threats from Yemen, Horn of Africa, and the Gulf of Aden as well as the al Houthi movement; Univ of Kansas B.A. in Classical Languages. Zimmerman - research fellow at the American Enterprise Institute and the lead analyst on al Qaeda for AEI’s Critical Threats; has testified in front of Congress and briefed Members and congressional staff, as well as members of the defense community; Yale University B.A. in Political Science and Modern Middle East Studies) 14 Aug 2014 Warning: AQAP's Looming Threat in Yemen <http://www.criticalthreats.org/yemen/knutsen-zimmerman-warning-aqap-looming-threat-yemen-august-14-2014>

AQAP’s insurgency in Hadramawt puts an incredible strain on the Yemeni military and Yemen’s limited security resources. Effectively combating the insurgency requires the military to move fighting forces to Hadramawt, which could create openings for insurgents to extend control in other governorates. The growth of AQAP’s presence in Hadramawt corresponded to an increase in security forces in Abyan and Shabwah. Unless the Yemeni security forces are able to assert full control over the country’s territory, the army will continue to chase after AQAP’s fighters. The Yemeni military’s inability to confront AQAP is a challenge to America’s current counter-terrorism strategy and exposes the weakness of a policy that relies on unprepared local partners to confront our enemies. AQAP’s latest attacks should be a warning to policy makers that an expansion of al Qaeda’s deadliest affiliate looms on the horizon.

Brink & Impact: Yemen government is fragile, may collapse. If it does, US national security will be severely harmed

Katherine Zimmerman 2014. (research fellow at the American Enterprise Institute and the lead analyst on al Qaeda for AEI’s Critical Threats; has testified in front of Congress and briefed Members and congressional staff, as well as members of the defense community; Yale University B.A. in Political Science and Modern Middle East Studies) 12 Feb 2014 Yemen's Pivotal Moment <http://www.criticalthreats.org/yemen/zimmerman-yemens-pivotal-moment-february-12-2014>

Opposition groups, which have turned to violence in the past, may still seek to form independent states of their own, potentially collapsing the fragile Yemeni state structure entirely. American interests are bound up in this process by the fact that AQAP is among the most virulent al Qaeda affiliates that poses a direct threat to the U.S. homeland. Syria, Iran, and other foreign and domestic policy issues are distracting the United States and its regional partners from sustained engagement in Yemen. Without international support, the country is much less likely to ride this transition process smoothly and our security interests will be severely harmed.