I negate resolved:

To clarify, I offer the following definitions

(Merriam- Webster)

Due process- the regular administration of the law, according to which no citizen may be denied his or her legal rights and all laws must conform to fundamental, accepted legal principles, as the right of the accused to confront his or her accusers

(Dictionary.com)

The priority for this round is the well being and safety of all civilians and citizens who are part of this country, thus, the value for this round is **national security**. National security is the most immediate entity that is being threatened by terrorism therefore, it is required that we look at the preservation of the safety of all people within the US. Furthermore, the foremost duty of a government is to protect its citizens.

The most efficient way to achieve national security against the apparent continuous threat of terrorism is to **maximize public safety.** If we maximize public safety by minimizing threats and guaranteeing the safety of the general public, we best realize national security.

Contention 1: Conventional system’s standard of proof is too high to apply to terrorist safely

Morris states:

Madeline **Morris et. al, Professor of Law at Duke University, June 30th, 2009, “After Guantanamo: War, Crime, and Detention.” Harvard Law and Policy Review.** [**http://scholarship.law.duke.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2630&context=faculty\_scholarship&sei**](http://scholarship.law.duke.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2630&context=faculty_scholarship&sei)

The third problem (and the one most unpleasant to articulate) is the standard of proof. **Criminal conviction requires proof beyond a reasonable doubt. That standard should not be eroded. Nor, however, should it be applied to the prevention of high-magnitude terrorism.** **Is it really smart to release an individual shown by “clear and convincing evidence” (the standard of proof one step below “reasonable doubt”, often used in civil cases) to have attempted a nuclear attack or a release of smallpox virus**? If the answer is **no,** then **criminal law is not the right tool for preventing catastrophic terrorism.**

Extending the same due process protections to noncitizens who are suspects of terrorism within the US legal system, cannot be dealt with on reasonable grounds because there is too great a risk of error. Therefore, if we efficiently want to maximize public safety while preventing possible attacks from happening we cannot grant the same rights, specifically the right to the beyond a reasonable doubt standard of proof; instead we must deny them certain rights in order to ensure the protection of national security and maximize the safety of millions of people in the general public.