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#### Substantially” means the plan must be across the board

Brian Anderson 5, Becky Collins, Barbara Van Haren & Nissan Bar-Lev, WCASS Research / Special Projects Committee\* Report on: A Conceptual Framework for Developing a 504 School District Policy, http://www.specialed.us/issues-504policy/504.htm

A substantial limitation is a significant restriction as to the condition, manner, or duration under which an individual can perform a particular major life activity as compared to the condition, manner, or duration under which the average person in the general population can perform that same major life activity.¶ The 504 regulation does not define substantial limitation, and the regulation gives discretion to schools to decide what substantial limitation is. The key here is to be consistent internally and to be consistent with pertinent court decisions.¶ The issue “Does it substantially limit the major life activity?” was clarified by the US Supreme Court decision on January 8th, 2002 , “Toyota v. Williams”. In this labor related case, the Supreme Court noted that to meet the “substantially limit” definition, the disability must occur across the board in multiple environments, not only in one environment or one setting. The implications for school related 504 eligibility decisions are clear: The disability in question must be manifested in all facets of the student’s life, not only in school.

Violation- plan only limits active zones of conflict

#### Best interp

#### Ground- Our interpretation employs a flexible and reasonable definition of substantially but still excludes tiny subsets of each of areas.

#### Education: Our interp ensures the entire category of targeted killings are explored, ensuring the best topic debates.

#### T is a voter for fairness and education.
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#### Targeted killing’s vital to counterterrorism---disrupts leadership and makes carrying out attacks impossible

Byman 2013

(Daniel L., Research Director of Saban Center for Middle East Policy, “Why Drones Work: The Case for Washington's Weapon of Choice”, Foreign Affairs, July/August 2013, <http://www.brookings.edu/research/articles/2013/06/17-drones-obama-weapon-choice-us-counterterrorism-byman>)

The Obama administration relies on drones for one simple reason: they work. According to data compiled by the New America Foundation, since Obama has been in the White House, U.S. drones have killed an estimated 3,300 al Qaeda, Taliban, and other jihadist operatives in Pakistan and Yemen. That number includes over 50 senior leaders of al Qaeda and the Taliban—top figures who are not easily replaced. In 2010, Osama bin Laden warned his chief aide, Atiyah Abd al-Rahman, who was later killed by a drone strike in the Waziristan region of Pakistan in 2011, that when experienced leaders are eliminated, the result is “the rise of lower leaders who are not as experienced as the former leaders” and who are prone to errors and miscalculations. And drones also hurt terrorist organizations when they eliminate operatives who are lower down on the food chain but who boast special skills: passport forgers, bomb makers, recruiters, and fundraisers.¶ Drones have also undercut terrorists’ ability to communicate and to train new recruits. In order to avoid attracting drones, al Qaeda and Taliban operatives try to avoid using electronic devices or gathering in large numbers. A tip sheet found among jihadists in Mali advised militants to “maintain complete silence of all wireless contacts” and “avoid gathering in open areas.” Leaders, however, cannot give orders when they are incommunicado, and training on a large scale is nearly impossible when a drone strike could wipe out an entire group of new recruits. Drones have turned al Qaeda’s command and training structures into a liability, forcing the group to choose between having no leaders and risking dead leaders.

#### Restricting targeted killing as a first resort outside active hostilities collapses counter-terrorism by signaling availability of safe havens and immunity from strikes

Corn 13

Geoffrey Corn 13, Professor of Law and Presidential Research Professor, South Texas College of Law, 5/16/13, Statement before the Senate Armed Services Committee, CQ Congressional Testimony, lexis

3. What is the geographic scope of the AUMF and under what circumstances may the United States attack belligerent targets in the territory of another country?¶ In my opinion, there is no need to amend the AUMF to define the geographic scope of military operations it authorizes. On the contrary, I believe doing so would fundamentally undermine the efficacy of U.S. counter-terror military operations by overtly signaling to the enemy exactly where to pursue safe-haven and de facto immunity from the reach of U.S. power. This concern is similar to that associated with explicitly defining co- belligerents subject to the AUMF, although I believe it is substantially more significant. It is an operational and tactical axiom that insurgent and non-state threats rarely seek the proverbial "toe to toe" confrontation with clearly superior military forces. Al Qaeda is no different. Indeed, their attempts to engage in such tactics in the initial phases of Operation Enduring Freedom proved disastrous, and ostensibly caused the dispersion of operational capabilities that then necessitated the co-belligerent assessment. Imposing an arbitrary geographic limitation of the scope of military operations against this threat would therefore be inconsistent with the strategic objective of preventing future terrorist attacks against the United States.¶ I believe much of the momentum for asserting some arbitrary geographic limitation on the scope of operations conducted to disrupt or disable al Qaeda belligerent capabilities is the result of the commonly used term "hot battlefield." This notion of a "hot" battlefield is, in my opinion, an operational and legal fiction. Nothing in the law of armed conflict or military doctrine defines the meaning of "battlefield." Contrary to the erroneous assertions that the use of combat power is restricted to defined geographic locations such as Afghanistan (and previously Iraq), the geographic scope of armed conflict must be dictated by a totality assessment of a variety of factors, ultimately driven by the strategic end state the nation seeks to achieve. The nature and dynamics of the threat -including key vulnerabilities - is a vital factor in this analysis. These threat dynamics properly influence the assessment of enemy capabilities and vulnerabilities, which in turn drive the formulation of national strategy, which includes determining when, where, and how to leverage national power (including military power) to achieve desired operational effects. Thus, threat dynamics, and not some geographic "box", have historically driven and must continue to drive the scope of armed hostilities. The logic of this premise is validated by (in my opinion) the inability to identify an armed conflict in modern history where the scope of operations was legally restricted by a conception of a "hot" battlefield. Instead, threat dynamics coupled with policy, diplomatic considerations and, in certain armed conflicts the international law of neutrality, dictate such scope. Ultimately, battlefields become "hot" when persons, places, or things assessed as lawful military objectives pursuant to the law of armed conflict are subjected to attack.¶ I do not, however, intend to suggest that it is proper to view the entire globe as a battlefield in the military component of our struggle against al Qaeda, or that threat dynamics are the only considerations in assessing the scope of military operations. Instead, complex considerations of policy and diplomacy have and must continue to influence this assessment. However, suggesting that the proper scope of combat operations is dictated by a legal conception of "hot" battlefield is operationally irrational and legally unsound. Accordingly, placing policy limits on the scope of combat operations conducted pursuant to the legal authority provided by the AUMF is both logical and appropriate, and in my view has been a cornerstone of U.S. use of force policy since the enactment of the AUMF. In contrast, interpreting the law of armed conflict to place legal limits on the scope of such operations to "hot" battlefields, or imposing such a legal limitation in the terms of the AUMF, creates a perverse incentive for the belligerent enemy by allowing him to dictate when and where he will be subject to lawful attack.¶ I believe this balance between legal authority and policy and diplomatic considerations is reflected in what is commonly termed the "unable or unwilling" test for assessing when attacking an enemy belligerent capability in the territory of another country is permissible. First, it should be noted that the legality of an attack against an enemy belligerent is determined exclusively by the law of armed conflict when the country where he is located provides consent for such action (is the target lawful within the meaning of the law and will attack of the target comply with the targeting principles of distinction, proportionality and precautions in the attack). In the unusual circumstance where a lawful object of attack associated with al Qaeda and therefore falling within the scope of the AUMF is identified in the territory of another country not providing consent for U.S. military action, policy and diplomacy play a decisive role in the attack decision-making process. Only when the U.S. concludes that the country is unable or unwilling to address the threat will attack be authorized, which presupposes that the nature of the target is determined to be sufficiently significant to warrant a non-consensual military action in that territory. I believe the Executive is best positioned to make these judgments, and that to date they have been made judiciously. I also believe that imposing a statutory scope limitation would vest terrorist belligerent operatives with the benefits of the sovereignty of the state they exploit for sanctuary. It strikes me as far more logical to continue to allow the President to address these sovereignty concerns through diplomacy, focused on the strategic interests of the nation.

#### Constraining targeted killing’s role in the war on terror causes extinction

Beres 11

Louis Rene Beres 11, Professor of Political Science and International Law at Purdue, 2011, “After Osama bin Laden: Assassination, Terrorism, War, and International Law,” Case Western Reserve Journal of International Law, 44 Case W. Res. J. Int'l L. 93

Even after the U.S. assassination of Osama bin Laden, we are still left with the problem of demonstrating that assassination can be construed, at least under certain very limited circumstances, as an appropriate instance of anticipatory self-defense. Arguably, the enhanced permissibility of anticipatory self-defense that follows generally from the growing destructiveness of current weapons technologies in rogue hands may be paralleled by the enhanced permissibility of assassination as a particular strategy of preemption. Indeed, where assassination as anticipatory self-defense may actually prevent a nuclear or other highly destructive form of warfare, reasonableness dictates that it could represent distinctly, even especially, law-enforcing behavior.

For this to be the case, a number of particular conditions would need to be satisfied. First, the assassination itself would have to be limited to the greatest extent possible to those authoritative persons in the prospective attacking state. Second, the assassination would have to conform to all of the settled rules of warfare as they concern discrimination, proportionality, and military necessity. Third, the assassination would need to follow intelligence assessments that point, beyond a reasonable doubt, to preparations for unconventional or other forms of highly destructive warfare within the intended victim's state. Fourth, the assassination would need to be founded upon carefully calculated judgments that it would, in fact, prevent the intended aggression, and that it would do so with substantially less harm [\*114] to civilian populations than would all of the alternative forms of anticipatory self-defense.

Such an argument may appear manipulative and dangerous; permitting states to engage in what is normally illegal behavior under the convenient pretext of anticipatory self-defense. Yet, any blanket prohibition of assassination under international law could produce even greater harm, compelling threatened states to resort to large-scale warfare that could otherwise be avoided. Although it would surely be the best of all possible worlds if international legal norms could always be upheld without resort to assassination as anticipatory self-defense, the persisting dynamics of a decentralized system of international law may sometimes still require extraordinary methods of law-enforcement. n71¶ Let us suppose, for example, that a particular state determines that another state is planning a nuclear or chemical surprise attack upon its population centers. We may suppose, also, that carefully constructed intelligence assessments reveal that the assassination of selected key figures (or, perhaps, just one leadership figure) could prevent such an attack altogether. Balancing the expected harms of the principal alternative courses of action (assassination/no surprise attack v. no assassination/surprise attack), the selection of preemptive assassination could prove reasonable, life-saving, and cost-effective.¶ What of another, more common form of anticipatory self-defense? Might a conventional military strike against the prospective attacker's nuclear, biological or chemical weapons launchers and/or storage sites prove even more reasonable and cost-effective? A persuasive answer inevitably depends upon the particular tactical and strategic circumstances of the moment, and on the precise way in which these particular circumstances are configured.¶ But it is entirely conceivable that conventional military forms of preemption would generate tangibly greater harms than assassination, and possibly with no greater defensive benefit. This suggests that assassination should not be dismissed out of hand in all circumstances as a permissible form of anticipatory self-defense under international law. [\*115] ¶ What of those circumstances in which the threat to particular states would not involve higher-order (WMD) n72 military attacks? Could assassination also represent a permissible form of anticipatory self-defense under these circumstances? Subject to the above-stated conditions, the answer might still be "yes." The threat of chemical, biological or nuclear attack may surely enhance the legality of assassination as preemption, but it is by no means an essential precondition. A conventional military attack might still, after all, be enormously, even existentially, destructive. n73 Moreover, it could be followed, in certain circumstances, by unconventional attacks.

#### Specifically, Special Forces conduct first-resort targeted killings outside of armed conflict zones

Bachmann 13

Sascha-Dominik Bachmann 13, Reader in International Law (University of Lincoln), 2013, “Targeted Killings: Contemporary Challenges, Risks and Opportunities,” Journal of Conflict and Security Law, doi: 10.1093/jcsl/krt007

Targeted killing has also been used by the USA in theatres of actual combat operations, such as Afghanistan and Iraq, as well as outside these theatres of war and as part of CIA and US military run covert operations in Pakistan. The USA is using drone strikes and Special Forces there to conduct pre-emptive as well as defensive targeted killing operations against Al-Qaeda and the Taliban. The argument is brought forward that such operations are necessary to protect US forces and its allies in Afghanistan and to disrupt the existent terrorist infrastructure. The focus of such operations is on the so-called ‘Tribal Areas’ of Pakistan, Waziristan, where the Taliban have effectively established an autonomous sphere of influence to the exclusion of the central government in Peshawar.32 Other such covert operations have seen CIA operated drone strikes in Yemen, Somalia as well Sudan, where a lack of cooperation and/or relative capabilities of the respective governments have created areas which are outside effective state control.33

#### Special Forces readiness is key to counter-prolif---solves nuclear war

Thomas 13

Jim Thomas 13, Vice President and Director of Studies at the Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments, and Chris Dougherty is a Research Fellow at the Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments, 2013, “BEYOND THE RAMPARTS THE FUTURE OF U.S. SPECIAL OPERATIONS FORCES,” <http://www.csbaonline.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/05/SOF-Report-CSBA-Final.pdf>

WMD do not represent new threats to U.S. security interests, but as nascent nuclear powers grow their arsenals and aspirants like Iran continue to pursue nuclear capabilities, the threat of nuclear proliferation, as well as the potential for the actual use of nuclear weapons, will increase. Upheaval in failing or outlaw states like Libya and Syria, which possess chemical weapons and a range of missiles, highlights the possibility that in future instances of state collapse or civil war, such weapons could be used by failing regimes in an act of desperation, fall into the hands of rebel forces, or be seized by parties hostile to the United States or its interests. SOF can contribute across the spectrum of counter-WMD efforts, from stopping the acquisition of WMD by hostile states or terrorist groups to preventing their use. The global CT network SOF have built over the last decade could be repurposed over the next decade to become a global counter-WMD network, applying the same logic that it takes a network to defeat a network. Increasing the reach and density of a global counter-WMD network will require expanding security cooperation activities focused on counter-proliferation. Finally, SOF may offer the most viable strategic option for deposing WMD-armed regimes through UW campaigns should the need arise.
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#### Restrictions on executive war powers DO NOTHING for the state of political legal exception we live in and only gives further justification for violent intervention on the basis of legality

Dyzenhaus 05

(David, is a professor of Law and Philosophy at the University of Toronto, and a Fellow of the Royal Society of Canada, “Schmitt v. Dicey: Are States of Emergency Inside or Outside the Legal Order?” Cardozo Law Review 27)

Rossiter had in mind Lincoln's actions during the Civil War, including the proclamation by which Lincoln, without the prior authority of Congress, suspended habeas corpus. n35 Lincoln, he said, subscribed to a theory that in a time of emergency, the President could assume whatever legislative, executive, and judicial powers he thought necessary to preserve the nation, and could in the process break the "fundamental laws of the nation, if such a step were unavoidable." n36 This power included one ratified by the Supreme Court: "an almost unrestrained power to act toward insurrectionary citizens as if they were enemies of the United States, and thus place them outside the protection of the Constitution." Rossiter's difficulties here illustrate rather than solve the tensions inherent in the idea of constitutional dictatorship. On the one hand, he wants to assert that emergency rule in a liberal democracy can be constitutional in nature. "Constitutional" implies restraints and limits in accordance not only with law, but with fundamental laws. These laws are not the constitution that is in place for ordinary times; rather, they are the laws that govern the management of exceptional times - the eleven criteria that he developed for constitutional dictatorship. The criteria are either put within the discretion of the dictator - they are judgments about necessity - or are couched as limits that should be enshrined either in the constitution or in legislation. However, Rossiter does not properly address the fact that judgments about necessity are for the dictator to make, which means that these criteria are not limits or constraints but merely factors about which the dictator will have to decide. Other criteria look more like genuine limits. Moreover, they are limits that could be constitutionally enshrined - for example, the second criterion, which requires that the person who makes the decision that there is an emergency should not be the person who assumes dictatorial powers. Yet, as we have seen, Rossiter's foremost example of the modern constitutional dictator, Lincoln, not only gave himself dictatorial powers but, Rossiter supposes, had no choice but to do this. Moreover, if these criteria are constitutionally enshrined, so that part of the constitution is devoted to the rules that govern the time when the rest of the constitution might be suspended, they still form part of the constitution. So, no less than the ordinary constitution, what we can think of as the exceptional or emergency constitution - the constitution that governs the state of emergency - is subject to suspension should the dictator deem this necessary. This explains why, on the other hand, Rossiter equated emergency rule with potentially unlimited dictatorship, with Locke's idea of prerogative. And Rossiter said, "whatever the theory, in moments of extreme national emergency the facts have always been with ... John Locke." So Rossiter at one and the same time sees constitutional dictatorship as unconstrained in nature and as constrainable by principles - his eleven criteria. The upshot is that "constitutional" turns out not to mean what we usually take it to mean; rather, it is a misleading name for the hope that the person who assumes dictatorial powers does so because of a good faith evaluation that this is really necessary and with the honest and steadfast intention to return to the ordinary way of doing things as soon as possible. Giorgio Agamben is thus right to remark that the bid by modern theorists of constitutional dictatorship to rely on the tradition of Roman dictatorship is misleading. n39 They rely on that tradition in an effort to show that dictatorship is constitutional or law-governed. But in fact they show that dictatorship is in principle absolute - the dictator is subject to whatever limits he deems necessary, which means to no limits at all. As H.L.A. Hart described the sovereign within the tradition of legal positivism, the dictator is an uncommanded commander. n40 He [\*2015] operates within a black hole, in Agamben's words, "an emptiness of law." n41 Agamben thus suggests that the real analogue to the contemporary state of emergency is not the Roman dictatorship but the institution of iustitium, in which the law is used to produce a "juridical void" - a total suspension of law. n42 And in coming to this conclusion, Agamben sides with Carl Schmitt, his principal interlocutor in his book. However, it is important to see that Schmitt's understanding of the state of exception is not quite a legal black hole, a juridically produced void. Rather, it is a space beyond law, a space which is revealed when law recedes, leaving the state, represented by the sovereign, to act. In substance, there might seem to be little difference between a legal black hole and space beyond law since neither is controlled by the rule of law. But there is a difference in that nearly all liberal legal theorists find the idea of a space beyond law antithetical, even if they suppose that law can be used to produce a legal void. This is so especially if such theorists want to claim for the sake of legitimacy that law is playing a role, even if it is the case that the role law plays is to suspend the rule of law. Schmitt would have regarded such claims as an attempt to cling to the wreckage of liberal conceptions of the rule of law brought about by any attempt to respond to emergencies through the law. They represent a vain effort to banish the exception from legal order. Because liberals cannot countenance the idea of politics uncontrolled by law, they place a veneer of legality on the political, which allows the executive to do what it wants while claiming the legitimacy of the rule of law. We have seen that Rossiter presents a prominent example which supports Schmitt's view, and as I will now show, it is a depressing fact that much recent post 9/11 work on emergencies is also supportive of Schmitt's view. II. Responding to 9/11 For example, Bruce Ackerman in his essay, The Emergency Constitution, n43 starts by claiming that we need "new constitutional concepts" in order to avoid the downward spiral in protection of civil liberties that occurs when politicians enact laws that become increasingly repressive with each new terrorist attack. n44 We need, he says, to rescue the concept of "emergency powers ... from fascist thinkers like Carl Schmitt, who used it as a battering ram against liberal [\*2016] democracy." n45 Because Ackerman does not think that judges are likely to do, or can do, better than they have in the past at containing the executive during an emergency, he proposes mainly the creative design of constitutional checks and balances to ensure, as did the Roman dictatorship, against the normalization of the state of emergency. Judges should not be regarded as "miraculous saviors of our threatened heritage of freedom." n46 Hence, it is better to rely on a system of political incentives and disincentives, a "political economy" that will prevent abuse of emergency powers. He calls his first device the "supramajoritarian escalator" n48 - basically the requirement that a declaration of a state of emergency requires legislative endorsement within a very short time, and thereafter has to be renewed at short intervals, with each renewal requiring the approval of a larger majority of legislators. The idea is that it will become increasingly easy with time for even a small minority of legislators to bring the emergency to an end, thus decreasing the opportunities for executive abuse of power. n49 The second device requires the executive to share security intelligence with legislative committees and that a majority of the seats on these committees belong to the opposition party. Ackerman does see some role for courts. They will have a macro role should the executive flout the constitutional devices. While he recognizes both that the executive might simply assert the necessity to suspend the emergency constitution and that this assertion might enjoy popular support, he supposes that if the courts declare that the executive is violating the constitution, this will give the public pause and thus will decrease incentives on the executive to evade the constitution. n51 In addition, the courts will have a micro role in supervising what he regards as the inevitable process of detaining suspects without trial for the period of the emergency. Suspects should be brought to court and some explanation should be given of the grounds of their detention, not so that they can contest it - a matter which Ackerman does not regard as practicable - but in order both to give the suspects a public identity so that they do not disappear and to provide a basis for compensation once the emergency is over in case the executive turns out to have fabricated [\*2017] its reasons. He also wishes to maintain a constitutional prohibition on torture, which he thinks can be enforced by requiring regular visits by lawyers. Not only is the judicial role limited, but it is clear that Ackerman does not see the courts as having much to do with preventing a period of "sheer lawlessness." n53 Even within the section on the judiciary, he says that the real restraint on the executive will be the knowledge that the supramajoritarian escalator might bring the emergency to an end, whereupon the detainees will be released if there is no hard evidence to justify detaining them. In sum, according to Ackerman, judges have at best a minimal role to play during a state of emergency. We cannot really escape from the fact that a state of emergency is a legally created black hole, a lawless void. It is subject to external constraints, controls on the executive located at the constitutional level and policed by the legislature. But internally, the rule of law does next to no work; all that we can reasonably hope for is decency. But once one has conceded that internally a state of emergency is more or less a legal black hole because the rule of law, as policed by judges, has no or little purchase, it becomes difficult to understand how external legal constraints, the constitutionally entrenched devices, can play the role Ackerman sets out. Recall that Ackerman accepts that the reason we should not give judges more than a minimal role is the history of judicial failure to uphold the rule of law during emergencies in the face of executive assertions of a necessity to operate outside of law's rule. For that reason, he constructs a political economy to constrain emergency powers. But that political economy still has to be located in law in order to be enforceable, which means that Ackerman cannot help but rely on judges. But why should we accept his claim that we can rely on judges when the executive asserts the necessity of suspending the exceptional constitution, the constitution for the state of emergency, when one of his premises is that we cannot so rely? Far from rescuing the concept of emergency powers from Schmitt, Ackerman's devices for an emergency constitution, an attempt to update Rossiter's model of constitutional dictatorship, fails for the same reasons that Rossiter's model fails. Even as they attempt to respond to Schmitt's challenge, they seem to prove the claim that Schmitt made in late Weimar that law cannot effectively enshrine a distinction between constitutional dictatorship and dictatorship. They appear to be vain attempts to find a role for law while at the same time conceding that law has no role. Of course, this last claim trades on an ambiguity in the idea of the rule of law between, on the one hand, the rule of law, understood as the rule of substantive principles, and, on the other, rule by law, where as long as there is a legal warrant for what government does, government will be considered to be in compliance with the rule of law. Only if one holds to a fairly substantive or thick conception of the rule of law will one think that there is a point on a continuum of legality where rule by law ceases to be in accordance with the rule of law. Ackerman's argument for rule by law, by the law of the emergency constitution, might not answer Schmitt's challenge. But at least it attempts to avoid dignifying the legal void with the title of rule of law, even as it tries to use law to govern what it deems ungovernable by law. The same cannot be said of those responses to 9/11 that seem to suggest that legal black holes are not in tension with the rule of law, as long as they are properly created. While it is relatively rare to find a position that articulates so stark a view, it is quite common to find positions that are comfortable with grey holes, as long as these are properly created. A grey hole is a legal space in which there are some legal constraints on executive action - it is not a lawless void - but the constraints are so insubstantial that they pretty well permit government to do as it pleases. And since such grey holes permit government to have its cake and eat it too, to seem to be governing not only by law but in accordance with the rule of law, they and their endorsement by judges and academics might be even more dangerous from the perspective of the substantive conception of the rule of law than true black holes.

#### Our alternative is to recognize the necessity of the opposition. Sovereignty necessarily functions in exception to the law. This exception is necessary to avoid the universal violence of the Law and the affirmative.

Rasch 2k

(William. "Conflict as a Vocation: Carl Schmitt and the Possibility of Politics." Theory Culture Society 17.1)

It is not difficult to see that the polemical elevation of sovereignty over the rule of law replicates a lively historical opposition, one that can be perhaps best evoked by that happy pair, Hobbes and Locke. Within the liberal tradition, the rule of law invokes reason and calculability in its battles against the arbitrary and potentially despotic whim of an unrestrained sovereign. The legitimacy of the sovereign is thus replaced by a legality that claims to provide its own immanent and unforced legitimacy. Predictable and universally accessible reason - the normative validity of an "uncorked consensus", to use the words of a prominent modern exponent - gently usurps, so it is claimed, the place that would otherwise be occupied by a cynical, pragmatic utilitarianism and the tyranny of a dark, incalculable will. The rule of law brings all the comforts of an uncontroversial, rule-based, normative security as if legality preceded by way of simple logical derivation, abolishing above all the necessity of decisions. Schmitt clearly will have none of this and in various writings attempts to expose what he considers to be the two-fold fallacy of the liberal position. As we have seen, if taken at its word, legality, or the rule of law, is seen by Schmitt to be impotent; it can neither legitimize nor effectively defend itself against determined enemies in times of crisis. Were law truly the opposite of force, it would cease to exist. But this self-description is deceptive, for if judged by its deeds, the same liberal regime that enunciates the self-evidence validity of universal norms strives to enact a universal consensus that is, indeed, far from uncorked. The rule of law inevitably reveals itself, precisely during moments of crisis, as the force of law, perhaps, not every bit as violent and "irrational" as the arbitrary tyrant, but nonetheless compelling and irresistible - indeed, necessarily so. Thus, Schmitt would argue the distinction between "decision", "force" and sovereignty", on the one hand, and the "rule of law", on the other, is based on a blithe and simple illusion. What agitates Schmitt is not the force, but the deception. More precisely, what agitates Schmitt is what he perceives to be the elimination of politics in the name of a higher legal or moral order. In its claim to a universal, normative, rule-bound validity, the liberal sleight-of-hand reveals itself to be not the opposite of force, but a force that outlaws opposition. In resurrecting the notion of sovereignty, therefore, Schmitt sees himself as one who rescues a legitimate notion of politics. Of course, this rescue attempt is itself political, a battle over the correct definition of politics. That is, we are not merely dealing with a logical problem, and not merely dealing with a desire to provide constitutional mechanisms that would prevent the self-dissolution of the constitution. Rather, we are dealing with a contest between a particularist notion of politics, in which individual conflicts can be resolved, but in which antagonism as a structure and reservoir of possible future conflicts is never destroyed, versus politics as the historical unfolding and pacific expansion of the universal morality. To evoke the long shadows of an ongoing contemporary debate, we are dealing with the difference between a politics of dissensus and a politics of consensus. Whereas the latter ideology entails an explicit or implicit belief in the "highest good" that can be rationally discerned and achieved, a "right regime", to use Leo Strauss's term, or the "just society" that hopes to actualize aspects of the City of God here on earth, the former stresses the necessity of determining a workable order where no single order bears the mantle of necessity, in fact, where all order is contingent, hence imperfect, and thus seeks to make the best of an inherently contradictory world by erecting structures that minimize self-inflicted damage. In Schmitt's eyes, the elements of such a structure must be the manifold of sovereign states. The liberal says there can only be one world-wide sovereign, the sovereignty of a universal moral and legal order. Schmitt counters with a plurality of equal sovereigns, for only in this way, he believes, can the economic and moral extinction of politics be prevented. Politics, on this view, is not the means by which the universally acknowledged good is actualized, but the mechanism that negotiates and limits disputes in the absence of any universally acknowledged good. Politics exists, in other words, because the just society does not.

#### This requires the unchecked authority of the executive to respond to the exception.

Nagan and Haddad 12

(Winston and Aitza, "Sovereignty in Theory and Practice." San Diego International Law Journal 13)

Although Schmitt was German, his ideas about sovereignty, and the political exception have had influence on the American theory and practice of sovereignty. Carl Schmitt was a philosophic theorist of sovereignty during the Third Reich. n375 His ideas about sovereignty and its above the law placement in the political culture of the State have important parallels in the developing discourse in the United States about the scope of presidential authority and power. His views have attracted the attention of American theorists. Schmitt developed his view of sovereignty on the concept described as "the exception". n376 This idea suggests that the sovereign or executive may invoke the idea of exceptional powers which are distinct from the general theory of the State. In Schmitt's view, the normal condition of the functions of the theory of a State, rides with the existence of the idea of the "exception." The exception is in effect intrinsic to the idea of a normal State. In his view, [\*487] the normal legal order of a State depends on the existence of an exception. n377 The exception is based on the continuing existence of an existential threat to the State and it is the sovereign that must decide on the exception. n378 In short, the political life of a State comprises allies and enemies. For the purpose of Statecraft, "an enemy exists only when at least potentially, one fighting collectivity of people confronts another similar collectivity." n379 In this sense, the political reality of the State always confronts the issue of the survival of the group. This reality is explained as follows. The political is the most intense and extreme antagonism, and every concrete antagonism becomes that much more political the closer it approaches the most extreme point, that of the friend-enemy grouping. \*\*\* As an ever present possibility [war] is the leading presupposition which determines in a characteristic way human action and thinking and hereby creates a specifically political behavior.\*\*\* A world in which the possibility of war is utterly eliminated, a completely pacified globe, would be a world without the distinction between friend and enemy and hence a world without politics. n380 Schmitt's view bases the supremacy of the exception on the supremacy of politics and power. n381 Thus, the exception, as rooted in the competence of the executive, is not dependent on law for its authority but on the conditions of power and conflict, which are implicitly pre-legal. n382 The central idea is that in an emergency, the power to decide based on the exception accepts its normal superiority over law on the basis that the suspension of the law is justified by the pre-legal right to self-preservation. n383 Schmitt's view is a powerful justification for the exercise of extraordinary powers, which he regards as ordinary, by executive authority. This is a tempting view for executive officers but it may not be an adequate explanation of the interplay of power, legitimacy, and the constitutional foundations of a rule of law State. In a later section, we draw on insights from the New Haven School, which deals empirically with the problem of power and the problem of constituting authority using the methods of contextual mapping. Nonetheless, Schmitt's view provides support for theorists who seek to enlarge executive power on the unitary presidency theory.

### 1NC

#### Text: The Executive branch of the United States should publically establish transparency standards outlining its legal rationale for its target killing policy, including the standards and procedures for target selection.

#### CP resolves drone legitimacy and resentment

Daskal 13

Jennifer Daskal, Fellow and Adjunct Professor, Georgetown Center on National Security and the Law, Georgetown University Law Center, April 2013, ARTICLE: THE GEOGRAPHY OF THE BATTLEFIELD: A FRAMEWORK FOR DETENTION AND TARGETING OUTSIDE THE "HOT" CONFLICT ZONE, 161 U. Pa. L. Rev. 1165

4. Procedural Requirements¶ Currently, officials in the executive branch carry out all such ex ante review of out-of-battlefield targeting and detention decisions, reportedly with the involvement of the President, but without any binding and publicly articulated standards governing the exercise of these authorities. n163 All ex post review of targeting is also done internally within the executive branch. There is no public accounting, or even acknowledgment, of most strikes, their success and error rates, or the extent of any collateral damage. Whereas the Department of Defense provides solatia or condolence payments to Afghan civilians who are killed or injured as a result of military actions in Afghanistan (and formerly did so in Iraq), there is no equivalent effort in areas outside the active conflict zone. n164¶ Meanwhile, the degree of ex post review of detention decisions depends on the location of detention as opposed to the location of capture. Thus, [\*1219] Guantanamo detainees are entitled to habeas review, but detainees held in Afghanistan are not, even if they were captured far away and brought to Afghanistan to be detained. n165¶ Enhanced ex ante and ex post procedural protections for both detention and targeting, coupled with transparency as to the standards and processes employed, serve several important functions: they can minimize error and abuse by creating time for advance reflection, correct erroneous deprivations of liberty, create endogenous incentives to avoid mistake or abuse, and increase the legitimacy of state action.¶ a. Ex Ante Procedures¶ Three key considerations should guide the development of ex ante procedures. First, any procedural requirements must reasonably respond to the need for secrecy in certain operations. Secrecy concerns cannot, for example, justify the lack of transparency as to the substantive targeting standards being employed. There is, however, a legitimate need for the state to protect its sources and methods and to maintain an element of surprise in an attack or capture operation. Second, contrary to oft-repeated rhetoric about the ticking time bomb, few, if any, capture or kill operations outside a zone of active conflict occur in situations of true exigency. n166 Rather, there is often the time and need for advance planning. In fact, advance planning is often necessary to minimize damage to one's own troops and nearby civilians. n167 Third, the procedures and standards employed must be transparent and sufficiently credible to achieve the desired legitimacy gains.¶ These considerations suggest the value of an independent, formalized, ex ante review system. Possible models include the Foreign Intelligence [\*1220] Surveillance Court (FISC), n168 or a FISC-like entity composed of military and intelligence officials and military lawyers, in the mode of an executive branch review board. n169¶ Created by the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA) in 1978, n170 the FISC grants ex parte orders for electronic surveillance and physical searches, among other actions, based on a finding that a "significant purpose" of the surveillance is to collect "foreign intelligence information." n171 The Attorney General can grant emergency authorizations without court approval, subject to a requirement that he notify the court of the emergency authorization and seek subsequent judicial authorization within seven days. n172 The FISC also approves procedures related to the use and dissemination of collected information. By statute, heightened restrictions apply to the use and dissemination of information concerning U.S. persons. n173 Notably, the process has been extraordinarily successful in protecting extremely sensitive sources and methods. To date, there has never been an unauthorized disclosure of an application to or order from the FISC court.¶ An ex parte review system for targeting and detention outside zones of active hostility could operate in a similar way. Judges or the review board would approve selected targets and general procedures and standards, while still giving operators wide rein to implement the orders according to the approved standards. Specifically, the court or review board would determine whether the targets meet the substantive requirements and would [\*1221] evaluate the overarching procedures for making least harmful means-determinations, but would leave target identification and time-sensitive decisionmaking to the operators. n174¶ Moreover, there should be a mechanism for emergency authorizations at the behest of the Secretary of Defense or the Director of National Intelligence. Such a mechanism already exists for electronic surveillance conducted pursuant to FISA. n175 These authorizations would respond to situations in which there is reason to believe that the targeted individual poses an imminent, specific threat, and in which there is insufficient time to seek and obtain approval by a court or review panel as will likely be the case in instances of true imminence justifying the targeting of persons who do not meet the standards applicable to operational leaders. As required under FISA, the reviewing court or executive branch review board should be notified that such an emergency authorization has been issued; it should be time-limited; and the operational decisionmakers should have to seek court or review board approval (or review, if the strike has already taken place) as soon as practicable but at most within seven days. n176¶ Finally, and critically, given the stakes in any application namely, the deprivation of life someone should be appointed to represent the potential target's interests and put together the most compelling case that the individual is not who he is assumed to be or does not meet the targeting criteria.¶ The objections to such a proposal are many. In the context of proposed courts to review the targeting of U.S. citizens, for example, some have argued that such review would serve merely to institutionalize, legitimize, and expand the use of targeted drone strikes. n177 But this ignores the reality of their continued use and expansion and imagines a world in which targeted [\*1222] killings of operational leaders of an enemy organization outside a zone of active conflict is categorically prohibited (an approach I reject n178). If states are going to use this extraordinary power (and they will), there ought to be a clear and transparent set of applicable standards and mechanisms in place to ensure thorough and careful review of targeted-killing decisions. The formalization of review procedures along with clear, binding standards will help to avoid ad hoc decisionmaking and will ensure consistency across administrations and time.¶ Some also condemn the ex parte nature of such reviews. n179 But again, this critique fails to consider the likely alternative: an equally secret process in which targeting decisions are made without any formalized or institutionalized review process and no clarity as to the standards being employed. Institutionalizing a court or review board will not solve the secrecy issue, but it will lead to enhanced scrutiny of decisionmaking, particularly if a quasi-adversarial model is adopted, in which an official is obligated to act as advocate for the potential target.¶ That said, there is a reasonable fear that any such court or review board will simply defer. In this vein, FISC's high approval rate is cited as evidence that reviewing courts or review boards will do little more than rubber-stamp the Executive's targeting decisions. n180 But the high approval rates only tell part of the story. In many cases, the mere requirement of justifying an application before a court or other independent review board can serve as an internal check, creating endogenous incentives to comply with the statutory requirements and limit the breadth of executive action. n181 Even if this system does little more than increase the attention paid to the stated requirements and expand the circle of persons reviewing the factual basis for the application, those features in and of themselves can lead to increased reflection and restraint.¶ Additional accountability mechanisms, such as civil or criminal sanctions in the event of material misrepresentations or omissions, the granting of far-reaching authority to the relevant Inspectors General, and meaningful ex post review by Article III courts, n182 are also needed to help further minimize abuse.¶ Conversely, some object to the use of courts or court-like review as stymying executive power in wartime, and interfering with the President's Article II powers. n183 According to this view, it is dangerous and potentially unconstitutional to require the President's wartime targeting decisions to be subject to additional reviews. These concerns, however, can be dealt with through emergency authorization mechanisms, the possibility of a presidential override, and design details that protect against ex ante review of operational decisionmaking. The adoption of an Article II review board, rather than an Article III-FISC model, further addresses some of the constitutional concerns.¶ Some also have warned that there may be no "case or controversy" for an Article III, FISC-like court to review, further suggesting a preference for an Article II review board. n184 That said, similar concerns have been raised with respect to FISA and rejected. n185 Drawing heavily on an analogy to courts' roles in issuing ordinary warrants, the Justice Department's Office of Legal Counsel concluded at the time of enactment that a case and controversy existed, even though the FISA applications are made ex parte. n186 [\*1224] Here, the judges would be issuing a warrant to kill rather than surveil. While this is significant, it should not fundamentally alter the legal analysis. n187 As the Supreme Court has ruled, killing is a type of seizure. n188 The judges would be issuing a warrant for the most extreme type of seizure. n189¶ It is also important to emphasize that a reviewing court or review board would not be "selecting" targets, but determining whether the targets chosen by executive branch officials met substantive requirements much as courts do all the time when applying the law to the facts. Press accounts indicate that the United States maintains lists of persons subject to capture or kill operations lists created in advance of specific targeting operations and reportedly subject to significant internal deliberation, including by the President himself. n190 A court or review board could be incorporated into the existing ex ante decisionmaking process in a manner that would avoid interference with the conduct of specific operations reviewing the target lists but leaving the operational details to the operators. As suggested above, emergency approval mechanisms could and should be available to deal with exceptional cases where ex ante approval is not possible.¶ Additional details will need to be addressed, including the temporal limits of the court's or review board's authorizations. For some high-level operatives, inclusion on a target list would presumably be valid for some set period of [\*1225] time, subject to specific renewal requirements. Authorizations based on a specific, imminent threat, by comparison, would need to be strictly time-limited, and tailored to the specifics of the threat, consistent with what courts regularly do when they issue warrants.¶ In the absence of such a system, the President ought to, at a minimum, issue an executive order establishing a transparent set of standards and procedures for identifying targets of lethal killing and detention operations outside a zone of active hostilities. n192 To enhance legitimacy, the procedures should include target list reviews and disposition plans by the top official in each of the agencies with a stake in the outcome the Secretary of Defense, the Director of the CIA, the Secretary of State, the Director of Homeland Security, and the Director of National Intelligence, with either the Secretary of Defense, Director of National Intelligence, or President himself, responsible for final sign-off. n193 In all cases, decisions should be unanimous, or, in the absence of consensus, elevated to the President of the United States. n194 Additional details will need to be worked out, including critical questions about the standard of proof that applies. Given the stakes, a clear and convincing evidentiary standard is warranted. n195¶ While this proposal is obviously geared toward the United States, the same principles should apply for all states engaged in targeting operations. n196 States would ideally subject such determinations to independent review or, alternatively, clearly articulate the standards and procedures for their decisionmaking, thus enhancing accountability.¶ b. Ex Post Review¶ For targeted-killing operations, ex post reviews serve only limited purposes. They obviously cannot restore the target's life. But retrospective review either by a FISC-like court or review board can serve to identify errors or overreaching and thereby help avoid future mistakes. This can, and ideally would, be supplemented by the adoption of an additional Article III damages mechanism. n197 At a minimum, the relevant Inspectors General should engage in regular and extensive reviews of targeted-killing operations. Such post hoc analysis helps to set standards and controls that then get incorporated into ex ante decisionmaking. In fact, post hoc review can often serve as a more meaningful and often more searching inquiry into the legitimacy of targeting decisions. Even the mere knowledge that an ex post review will occur can help to protect against rash ex ante decisionmaking, thereby providing a self-correcting mechanism.¶ Ex post review should also be accompanied by the establishment of a solatia and condolence payment system for activities that occur outside the active zone of hostilities. Extension of such a system beyond Afghanistan and Iraq would help mitigate resentment caused by civilian deaths or injuries and would promote better accounting of the civilian costs of targeting operations. n198

### EU

#### EU/US relations resilient

Joyner 11—editor of the Atlantic Council. PhD in pol sci (James, Death of Transatlantic Relationship Wildly Exaggerated, 14 June 2011, www.acus.org/new\_atlanticist/death-transatlantic-relationship-wildly-exaggerated)

The blistering farewell speech to NATO by U.S. defense secretary Robert Gates warning of a "dim, if not dismal" future for the Alliance drew the Western public's attention to a longstanding debate about the state of the transatlantic relationship. With prominent commenters voicing concern about much more than just a two-tiered defensive alliance, questioning whether the U.S.-Europe relationship itself is past its prime, doubts that the Western alliance that has dominated the post-Cold War world are reaching a new high.¶ But those **fears are overblown, and may be mistaking short-term bumps in the relationship for proof of a long-term decline that isn't there.** Gates' frustration with the fact that only five of the 28 NATO allies are living up to their commitment to devote 2 percent of GDP to defense, which has hindered their ability to take on even the likes of Muammar Qaddafi's puny force without American assistance is certainly legitimate and worrying.¶ Though the U.S.-Europe partnership may not be living up to its potential, it is not worthless, and that relationship continues to be one of the **strongest** and most important **in the world**. Gates is an Atlanticist whose speech was, as he put it, "in the spirit of solidarity and friendship, with the understanding that true friends occasionally must speak bluntly with one another for the sake of those greater interests and values that bind us together." He wants the Europeans, Germany in particular, to understand what a tragedy it would be if NATO were to go away.¶ Most Europeans don't see their security as being in jeopardy and political leaders are hard pressed to divert scarce resources away from social spending -- especially in the current economic climate -- a dynamic that has weakened NATO but**, despite fears to the contrary, not the greater Transatlantic partnership.¶** It would obviously have been a great relief to the U.S. if European governments had shouldered more of the burden in Afghanistan. This disparity, which has only increased as the war has dragged on and the European economies suffered, is driving both Gates' warning and broader fears about the declining relationship. But it was our fight, not theirs; they were there, in most cases against the strong wishes of the people who elected them to office, because we asked. We'd have fought it exactly the same way in their absence. In that light, every European and Canadian soldier was a bonus.¶ Libya, however, is a different story. The Obama administration clearly had limited interest in entering that fight - Gates himself warned against it -- and our involvement is due in part to coaxing by our French and British allies. The hope was to take the lead in the early days, providing "unique assets" at America's disposal, and then turn the fight over to the Europeans. But, as Gates' predecessor noted not long after the ill-fated 2003 invasion of Iraq, you go to war with the army you have, not the one you wish you had.¶ The diminished capabilities of European militaries, spent by nearly a decade in Afghanistan, should be of no surprise. NATO entered into Libya with no real plan for an end game beyond hoping the rebels would somehow win or that Qaddafi would somehow fall. That failure, to be fair, is a collective responsibility, not the fault of European militaries alone.¶ But the concern goes deeper than different defensive priorities. Many Europeans worry that the United States takes the relationship for granted, and that the Obama administration in particular puts a much higher priority on the Pacific and on the emerging BRICS (Brazil, Russia, India, China, and South Africa) economies.¶ New York Times columist Roger Cohen recently wrote that this is as it should be: "In so far as the United States is interested in Europe it is interested in what can be done together in the rest of the world." In Der Spiegel, Roland Nelles and Gregor Peter Schmitz lamented, "we live in a G-20 world instead of one led by a G-2."¶ It's certainly true that, if it ever existed, the Unipolar Moment that Charles Krauthammer and others saw in the aftermath of the Soviet collapse is over. But that multipolar dynamic actually makes transatlantic cooperation more, not less, important. A hegemon needs much less help than one of many great powers, even if it remains the biggest.¶ Take the G-20. Seven of the members are NATO Allies: the US, Canada, France, Germany, Italy, the UK, and Turkey. Toss in the EU, and you have 40 percent of the delegation. If they can form a united front at G-20 summits, they are much more powerful than if each stands alone. Add in four NATO Partner countries (Russia, Japan, Australia, and South Korea) and you're up to 60 percent of the delegation -- a comfortable majority for the U.S.-European partnership and its circle of closest allies.¶ Granted, it's unlikely that we'll achieve consensus among all 12 states on any one issue, let alone most issues. But constantly working together toward shared goals and values expands a sense of commonality.¶ And, like so many things, projects end. Indeed, that's generally the goal. The transatlantic military alliance that formed to defeat fascism remained intact after victory; indeed, it expanded to include its former German and Italian adversaries. NATO outlasted the demise of its raison d'être, the Soviet threat, and went on to fight together --along with many of its former adversaries -- in Bosnia, Kosovo, Afghanistan, and Libya. Is there seriously any doubt that other challenges will emerge in the future in which the Americans and its European allies might benefit from working together?

#### Allied terror coop is high now, despite frictions

Archick 9-4

Kristin Archick, European affairs specialist @ CRS, 9-4-2013, “U.S.-EU Cooperation Against Terrorism,” Congressional Research Service, <http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/RS22030.pdf>

As part of the EU’s efforts to combat terrorism since September 11, 2001, the EU made improving law enforcement and intelligence cooperation with the United States a top priority. The previous George W. Bush Administration and many Members of Congress largely welcomed this EU initiative in the hopes that it would help root out terrorist cells in Europe and beyond that could be planning other attacks against the United States or its interests. Such growing U.S.-EU cooperation was in line with the 9/11 Commission’s recommendations that the United States should develop a “comprehensive coalition strategy” against Islamist terrorism, “exchange terrorist information with trusted allies,” and improve border security through better international cooperation. Some measures in the resulting Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (P.L. 108-458) and in the Implementing Recommendations of the 9/11 Commission Act of 2007 (P.L. 110-53) mirrored these sentiments and were consistent with U.S.-EU counterterrorism efforts, especially those aimed at improving border controls and transport security. U.S.-EU cooperation against terrorism has led to a new dynamic in U.S.-EU relations by fostering dialogue on law enforcement and homeland security issues previously reserved for bilateral discussions. Despite some frictions, most U.S. policymakers and analysts view the developing partnership in these areas as positive. Like its predecessor, the Obama Administration has supported U.S. cooperation with the EU in the areas of counterterrorism, border controls, and transport security. At the November 2009 U.S.-EU Summit in Washington, DC, the two sides reaffirmed their commitment to work together to combat terrorism and enhance cooperation in the broader JHA field. In June 2010, the United States and the EU adopted a new “Declaration on Counterterrorism” aimed at deepening the already close U.S.-EU counterterrorism relationship and highlighting the commitment of both sides to combat terrorism within the rule of law. In June 2011, President Obama’s National Strategy for Counterterrorism asserted that in addition to working with European allies bilaterally, “the United States will continue to partner with the European Parliament and European Union to maintain and advance CT efforts that provide mutual security and protection to citizens of all nations while also upholding individual rights.”

#### Uniqueness overwhelems the internal link- their Stravichis evidence says the importance of cooperation on international issues overwhelm even major strains. Also, no terminal impact have been read to any of the issues so don’t give them an extinction claim

**Issues don’t spillover**

**EurActiv 7/9/13**

(EurActiv “Spying scandal will not threaten trade deal, says top US envoy” Updated: 09 July 2013 <http://www.euractiv.com/print/trade/spying-scandal-threaten-trade-de-news-529132>, TSW)

As EU, US negotiators meet today (8 July) for the first round of talks on an ambitious transatlantic trade agreement, outgoing US Ambassador to the EU William E. Kennard promised a ‘healthy debate’ between the two partners in the light of recent spying allegations.¶ “**We** **have such a deep and broad relationship that it would be unfortunate if we allowed one issue, as serious as it is, to paralyse us across a whole range of other issues we're working on**,” Kennard told EurActiv in an interview.¶ Europeans have reacted angrily to revelations that an American spy agency monitored phone calls and e-mails of EU institutions and some member states, with some politicians calling for a suspension of negotiations over a transatlantic trade agreement until further clarification is provided.¶ Despite differences in data protection regimes and perspectives, Kennard argued for finding the right balance, as the flow of data is not only essential for the functioning of the economy, but also indispensable for cooperation on law enforcement and counter-terrorism.¶ “**We have to work these issues through and the good news is we have**,” he added, taking examples like the Terrorist Finance Tracking programme (TFTP), the Passenger Name Record (PNR) and the SWIFT banking agreement.¶ “In each case we found a way to effectively converge our systems. The EU is concerned, under their privacy laws, about proportionality of data and in both PNR and TFTP. We put those issues on the table and we found a way to work through them,” Kennard said, stressing he was optimistic the two will find common ground.¶ **Two separate working groups have been set up to discuss the extent of US intelligence activities and questions of privacy and data protection.**¶ **These will move on parallel track to the trade talks, which are scheduled to begin on Monday [8 July] in Washington.** Both the European Commission and the European Parliament have agreed to move ahead on trade negotiations, despite calls from Greens and French Socialists to freeze negotiations until Washington explains whether it was spying on EU offices and European governments.

EU

**Collapse of security cooperation is inevitable but no impact**

**Brown ‘12**

Bernard, Professor Emeritus of Political Science at the CUNY Graduate School and Director of the Transatlantic Relations project of the National Committee on American Foreign Policy. He is the author, coauthor, or editor of more than a dozen books on comparative politics and political theory and numerous articles in professional journals. His most recent book is Tout ce que vous avez toujours voulu savoir sur les e´ lections ame´ ricaines (Paris, 2008), “NATO Goes Realistic,” American Foreign Policy Interests, 34:80–85, 2012

THE WEST AT BAY

The air is now filled with tough talk about NATO. Former NATO Secretary General Lord Robertson recently declared that we can no longer be satisfied with reassuring language enshrined after lengthy consultations and painful negotiations in periodic announcements of ‘‘strategic concepts’’ concerning such problems as missile defense, nuclear deterrence, relations with Russia, and global partnership. ‘‘I am not one to be mesmerized by fine words about underlying bonds of common values,’’ he declared. ‘‘They don’t provide helicopters and precision bombs.’’ The question is: What works and what does not work? Several different responses have been made to the present difficulties of the transatlantic relationship. Some observers are **deeply pessimistic.** Their arguments: Europe no longer matters. With the disappearance of the Soviet threat, Europeans do not have the **will or the means** to defend themselves, as shown by their reluctance to pay for their own defense. All their talk about creating a viable Common Foreign and Security Policy, comments Richard Haass, is just that—talk. Global power is shifting away from Europe toward Asia and other rising powers elsewhere, particularly the BRIC nations (Brazil, Russia, India, and, above all, China). **Inevitably** the United States will turn away from Europe and NATO and toward other parts of the world. Secretary of Defense Robert Gates contributed to this atmosphere of gloom and doom in his farewell appearance at NATO headquarters in June 2011 when he warned that the U.S. Congress would not be willing to pay for the defense of people who are not willing to defend themselves. There is a real possibility, he said, **of a ‘‘dim if not dismal future for the transatlantic alliance.**’’2 Others believe that American rather than European power is in decline. Among the frequently sounded themes: The United States is no longer the dominant superpower that it was in the past. Confidence in the quality of American leadership has been weakened, perhaps fatally, by the launching of a ‘‘war of choice’’ in Iraq. The rise of China and the other BRIC nations inevitably will create a multipolar world in which China may well become the dominant superpower. These structural trends will lead to the lessening importance and perhaps the disappearance of NATO. Many Europeans believe or hope that an increasingly united and selfconfident EU can fill the vacuum created by American decline. The EU in the past has always come out of crises stronger than before. Europeans are being urged to rise to the occasion and take steps to create true economic governance and an effective foreign and defense policy. Were this to happen, many hope the United States and the EU would then march ‘‘shoulder to shoulder’’ as equals within a revitalized transatlantic relationship and in NATO.

#### Intel sharing is permanent

Aldrich 09

Richard J. Aldrich is a Professor of International Security at the University of Warwick, British Journal of Politics and International Relations, February 2009, "US–European Intelligence Co-operation on Counter-Terrorism: Low Politics and Compulsion", Vol. 11, Issue 1, pgs. 122-139

Since 9/11, intelligence has been viewed as an integral part of a controversial ‘war on terror’. The acrimonious public arguments over subjects such as Iraqi WMD assessments, secret prisons and the interrogation of detainees suggest intense transatlantic discord. Yet improbably, some of those countries that have expressed strident disagreement in public are privately the closest intelligence partners. It is argued here that we can explain this seeming paradox by viewing intelligence co-operation as a rather specialist kind of ‘low politics’ that is focused on practical arrangements. Intelligence is also a fissiparous activity, allowing countries to work together in one area even while they disagree about something else. Meanwhile, the pressing need to deal with a range of increasingly elusive transnational opponents—including organised crime—compels intelligence agencies to work more closely together, despite their instinctive dislike of multilateral sharing. Therefore, transatlantic intelligence co-operation will continue to deepen, despite the complex problems that it entails.

**Poor US-Europe relations allows Europe to reset relations with Russia- key to regional stability**

**Shapiro and Witney, 9** [TOWARDS A POST-AMERICAN EUROPE: A POWER AUDIT OF EU-US RELATIONS, Jeremy Shapiro and Nick Witney, The European Council on Foreign Relations]

**Relations with Russia are of intrinsic and self-evident importance to all the states of Europe and, for sound historical reasons, the subject of a near obsession for some**. A schism has long been evident between the “old Europe” led by Germany, which is pursuing engagement (and gas), and the “new Europe” of ex-Communist member states which have an altogether tougher attitude towards Russia. But, in fact, things are even more complex than that schism suggests. History, geography, and culture have all played a part in generating a patchwork of views among the EU’s 27 member states. For example**, there is a discernible bond of sympathy between Russia and its Orthodox co-religionists in Bulgaria, Cyprus, and Greece.** On the other hand, a significant number of West European member states incline towards a “frosty pragmatism” in dealing with Russia, rather than any enthusiastic pursuit of partnership. However, as the Bush presidency faded away in 2008, **European attitudes began noticeably to converge.** A number of factors contributed. First, **as the dust settled on the Georgia crisis, the extent of Georgian President Mikhail Sakashvili’s contribution to the debacle became clearer,** while the effectiveness of French President Nicolas Sarkozy’s intervention on behalf of the EU encouraged a degree of European self-confidence. Second, **Russia had, like everyone else, been humbled by the financial crisis** – indeed, exceptional pride had gone before an unusually large fall. Third, **the gas crisis of early 2009 brought home to many Europeans that the problem is less energy dependency on Russia per se than the murky issues involved in transiting Ukraine**, and the lack of the right networks and markets to distribute gas effectively within Europe. Against this background, it became easier for “old” and “new” Europe to find common ground. With hindsight, German-French opposition to setting Ukraine and Georgia on the path to NATO membership at the Bucharest summit of 2008 seemed smart. Member states began to agree that the right way to protect European interests in the Eastern neighbourhood was through the EU (specifically, the new Eastern Partnership initiative), not NATO. Shortly before the 2009 NATO summit, the Polish foreign minister even endorsed the idea of Russia one day joining the alliance – exemplifying both a new conciliation towards Russia and a reluctance to use NATO as a weapon against it. Then, however, the Obama administration announced a “reset” of relations with Moscow. Although most Europeans welcomed the US move, **old anxieties about “condominium” – in other words, the idea that Europe could end up sandwiched between converging US and Russian interests** – also re-emerged. In the wake of the June 2009 US-Russia summit in Moscow, these anxieties found striking expression in the open letter signed by 22 leading Central and Eastern European figures that urged the US not to take the region for granted.37 The US was deeply irritated – its immediate reaction was, according to one Washington insider, “a very, very angry push-back”. The Obama administration had, after all, done its utmost to reassure the new EU member states that it was committed to their security and to ensure that Russia did not misinterpret “reset” as tacit permission to claim a new sphere of influence in the former Soviet space. The episode illustrates that nothing so confuses and divides Europeans as an active US policy, whether the president behind it is George W. Bush or Barack Obama. Our audit suggests that the key reason is that Eastern Europeans simply do not trust their European partners and allies, even through NATO, to guarantee their security against Russia. They look only to the US for that security. Neither EU solidarity nor NATO’s mutual security guarantees can compensate for the fear that they might be betrayed by the US. Although the historic roots of this view are clear, it would seem to be anachronistic. After all, the US effectively had no Russia policy during the last year of the Bush administration and did little when Russia invaded its neighbour. Meanwhile, **with the US effectively absent** **during the interregnum between the old and new administrations**, **Europe worked through the Georgia and gas crises with a quite untypical degree of cohesion** and self-confidence. This analysis suggests that **Europeans might have more success if they worry a little less about what the US is up to and a little more about defining and asserting their own common interests in relation to Russia**. Having launched their new Eastern Partnership initiative – albeit with German Chancellor Angela Merkel as the sole EU head of government in attendance – they now need to devote the necessary attention and resources to making it a success. They need to make it harder for the Russians to play on their divisions by presenting a more united front to Moscow, not just on issues such as energy but also on the wider economic relationship that is waiting to be developed to mutual benefit. **Europeans should also debate Moscow’s ideas on a “new security architecture” rather than just waiting to see what the US thinks about them**. Europe’s interests in relation to Russia are not identical with those of the US. Nor is it paranoid to believe that the Obama administration would like to see the Europeans taking rather more responsibility for themselves and indeed for the post-Soviet states covered by the Eastern Partnership. As a global power, **the US cannot afford to assign disproportionate time and attention to a region of the world that does not, or at least should not, need it**. The US wants the EU to be a more effective player on its own continent. From a European point of view, this would not only be a more effective way of dealing with Russia, but also would prevent Washington and Moscow doing deals over querulous European heads. From an American point of view, a Europe that acted in this way would be the sort of partner that it wants at the other end of an effective transatlantic relationship.

**Europe- Russian relations are key to stabilize Europe and prevent war.**

**Anderson ‘7**

Russian-EU relations: Leaders, Present Conflicts, and Future Policies, Brussels Research Project, Andrea, Fall

**This is a crucial time in EU-Russian relations because, not only is Putin up for reelection in a few months, but his predecessor will most likely be someone he approves oil Will Putin try to use his influence with the EU to promote economic stability in Russia? Or is socialism with a semi-dictatorship back on the table?** Even though anything is possible with elections just around the corner, **the EU must decide now if close ties with Russia will promote its agenda, as well as advance the EU’s and Russia’s reputation as global actor**s (“Agreement on Partnership and Cooperation"). Even though anything is possible with presidential elections just around the corner, this paper shows that because EU-Russian relations are still important. Thus, **it is in Russia’s best interests to stay tied politically and economically to the EU. The EU needs to stay on good terms and in a relationship with Russia during this Kosovo crisis so that Javier Solana,” who assists with the EU’s foreign policy matters, can influence Russia to put pressure on Serbia to not act violently while the international community attempts to help Serbia with Kosovo’s declaration of independence**. The EU must decide if close ties with **Russia will promote its agenda, as well as advance its reputation as a global acto**r (“EU, Russia signal closer ties at Portugal summit”). This is more likely because parting ways is not the best option for either of them right now. With yesterday’s signing of the Reform Treaty, the EU is rising on the global scene. As becoming a global actor i: also Russia’s intention, the two are going in the same direction just with a few kinks in their relationship. As far as human rights violations are concemed, the EU needs to start discussing these with Russia; human rights need to be back on the table if Russia wishes to be taken seriously. Most countries have domestic problems, but the (in some cases, mass) **displacement of citizens by authorities and unrepresentative voting arrangements make** **Russia’s problems more than just domestic conflicts that can be overlooked by the international community.**

### Drones

#### Drone prolif now AND US restrictions don’t solve

Anderson 10 (Kenneth Anderson is a law professor at Washington College of Law, American University, a research fellow of the Hoover Institution at Stanford University and a Non-Resident Visiting Fellow at the Brookings Institution, April 10th 2010, “Acquiring UAV Technology”, http://www.volokh.com/2010/04/09/acquiring-uav-technology/, AB)

I’ve noticed a number of posts and comments around the blogosphere on the spread of UAV technology. Which indeed is happening; many states are developing and deploying UAVs of various kinds. The WCL National Security Law Brief blog, for example, notes that India is now acquiring weaponized UAVs: India is reportedly preparing to have “killer” unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs) in response to possible threats from Pakistan and China. Until now India has denied the use of armed UAVs, but they did use UAVs that can detect incoming missile attacks or border incursions. The importance of obtaining armed UAVs grew enormously after the recent attack on paramilitary forces in Chhattisgarh that killed 75 security personnel. Sources reveal that the Indian Air Force (IAF) has been in contact with Israeli arms suppliers in New Delhi recently. The IAF is looking to operate Israeli Harop armed UAVs from 2011 onwards, and other units of the armed forces will follow. I’ve also read comments various places suggesting that increased use of drone technologies by the United States causes other countries to follow suit, or to develop or acquire similar technologies. In some cases, the dangling implication is that if the US would not get involved in such technologies, others would not follow suit. In some relatively rare cases of weapons technologies, the US refraining from undertaking the R&D, or stopping short of a deployable weapon, might induce others not to build the same weapon. Perhaps the best example is the US stopping its development of blinding laser antipersonnel weapons in the 1990s; if others, particularly the Chinese, have developed them to a deployable weapon, I’m not aware of it. The US stopped partly in relation to a developing international campaign, modeled on the landmines ban campaign, but mostly because of a strong sense of revulsion and pushback by US line officers. Moreover, there was a strong sense that such a weapon (somewhat like chemical weapons) would be not deeply useful on a battlefield – but would be tremendously threatening as a pure terrorism weapon against civilians. In any case, the technologies involved would be advanced for R&D, construction, maintenance, and deployment, at least for a while. The situation is altogether different in the case of UAVs. The biggest reason is that the flying-around part of UAVs – the avionics and control of a drone aircraft in flight – is not particularly high technology at all. It is in range of pretty much any functioning state military that flies anything at all. The same for the weaponry, if all you’re looking to do is fire a missile, such as an anti-tank missile like the Hellfire. It’s not high technology, it is well within the reach of pretty much any state military. Iran? Without thinking twice. Burma? Sure. Zimbabwe? If it really wanted to, probably. So it doesn’t make any substantial difference whether or not the US deploys UAVs, not in relation to a decision by other states to deploy their own. The US decision to use and deploy UAVs does not drive others’ decisions one way or the other. They make that decision in nearly all cases – Iran perhaps being an exception in wanting to be able to show that they can use them in or over the Iraqi border – in relation to their particular security perceptions. Many states have reasons to want to have UAVs, for surveillance as well as use of force. It is not as a counter or defense to the US use of UAVs. The real issue is not flying the plane or putting a missile on it. The question is the sensor technology (and related communication links) – for two reasons. One is the ability to identify the target; the other is to determine the level, acceptable or not, of collateral damage in relation to the target. That’s the technologically difficult part. And yet it is not something important to very many of the militaries that might want to use UAVs, because not that many are going to be worried about the use of UAVs for discrete, targeted killing. Not so discrete and not so targeted will be just fine – and that does not require super-advanced technology. China might decide that it wants an advanced assassination platform that would depend on such sensors, and in any case be interested in investing in such technology for many reasons – but that is not going to describe Iran or very many other places that are capable of deploying and using weaponized UAVs. Iran, for example, won’t have super advanced sensor technology (unless China sells it to them), but they will have UAVs. (The attached weaponry follows the same pattern. Most countries will find a Hellfire type missile just fine. The US will continue to develop smaller weapons finally capable of a single person hit. Few others will develop it, partly because they don’t care and partly because its effectiveness depends on advanced sensors that they are not likely to have.) Robots are broadly defined by three characteristics – computation, sensor inputs, and gross movement. Movement in the case of a weaponized robot includes both movement and the use of its weapon – meaning, flying the UAV and firing a weapon. The first of those, flying the UAV, is available widely; primitive weapons are available widely as well, and so is the fundamental computational power. Sensors are much, much more difficult – but only to the extent that a party cares about discretion in targeting. But it is not the case that they are making these decisions on account of US decisions about UAVs; UAVs are useful for many other reasons for many other parties, all on their own.

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

Erickson and Strange 5-29

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

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

#### No Senkaku or Asian conflict- empirically denied, economic interdependence checks, and China avoids nationalism.

Carlson ’13

(Allen Carlson is an Associate Professor in Cornell University’s Government Department. He was granted his PhD from Yale University’s Political Science Department. His undergraduate degree is from Colby College. In 2005 his Unifying China, Integrating with the World: Securing Chinese Sovereignty in the Reform Era was published by Stanford University Press. He has also written articles that appeared in the Journal of Contemporary China, Pacific Affairs, Asia Policy, and Nations and Nationalism. In addition, he has published monographs for the National Committee on U.S.-China Relations and the East-West Center Washington. Carlson was a Fulbright-Hays scholar at Peking University during the 2004-2005 academic year. In 2005 he was chosen to participate in the National Committee’s Public Intellectuals Program, and he currently serves as an adviser to Cornell’s China Asia Pacific Studies program and its East Asia Program. Carlson is currently working on a project exploring the issue of nontraditional security in China’s emerging relationship with the rest of the international system. His most recent publications are the co-edited Contemporary Chinese Politics: New Sources, Methods and Field Strategies (Cambridge University Press, 2010) and New Frontiers in China’s Foreign Relations (Lexington, 2011). China Keeps the Peace at Sea China Keeps the Peace at Sea Why the Dragon Doesn't Want War Allen Carlson February 21, 2013

At times in the past few months, China and Japan have appeared almost ready to do battle over the **Senkaku** (Diaoyu) Islands --which are administered by Tokyo but claimed by both countries -- and to ignite a war that could be bigger than any since World War II. Although Tokyo and Beijing have been shadowboxing over the territory for years, the standoff reached a new low in the fall, when the Japanese government nationalized some of the islands by purchasing them from a private owner. The decision set off a wave of violent anti-Japanese demonstrations across China. In the wake of these events, the conflict quickly reached what political scientists call a state of equivalent retaliation -- a situation in which both countries believe that it is imperative to respond in kind to any and all perceived slights. As a result, it may have seemed that armed engagement was imminent. **Yet,** months later,nothing has happened. And **despite** their **aggressive posturing** in the disputed territory, **both** sides **now show** glimmers of willingness to dial down hostilities and to reestablish stability**.** Some analysts have cited North Korea's recent nuclear test as a factor in the countries' reluctance to engage in military conflict. They argue that the detonation, and Kim Jong Un's belligerence, brought China and Japan together, unsettling them and placing their differences in a scarier context. Rory Medcalf, a senior fellow at the Brookings Institution, explained that "the nuclear test gives the leadership in both Beijing and Tokyo a chance to focus on a foreign and security policy challenge where their interests are not diametrically at odds." The nuclear test, though, is a red herring in terms of the conflict over the disputed islands. In truth, the roots of the conflict -- and the reasons it has not yet exploded -- are much deeper. Put simply, **China** cannot afford military conflict **with** any of its **Asian neighbors.** It is not that China believes it would lose such a spat; the country increasingly enjoys strategic superiority over the entire region, and it is difficult to imagine that its forces would be beaten in a direct engagement over the islands, in the South China Sea or in the disputed regions along the Sino-Indian border. However**, Chinese officials see** thateven the most pronounced victory would be outweighed by the collateral damagethat such a use of force would cause **to Beijing's** two most fundamental national interests **--** economic **growth and preventing the escalation of** radical **nationalist sentiment at home.** These constraints, rather than any external deterrent**, will keep** Xi Jinping, **China's new leader, from** authorizing the use of deadly **force** in the Diaoyu Islands theater. For over three decades, **Beijing has promoted** peace and stability **in Asia** to facilitate conditions amenable to **China's** **economic** **development**. The origins of the policy can be traced back to the late 1970s, when Deng Xiaoping repeatedly contended that to move beyond the economically debilitating Maoist period, China would have to seek a common ground with its neighbors. Promoting cooperation in the region would allow China to spend less on military preparedness, focus on making the country a more welcoming destination for foreign investment, and foster better trade relations. All of this would strengthen the Chinese economy. Deng was right. Today, China's economy is second only to that of the United States. The fundamentals of Deng's grand economic strategy are still revered in Beijing. But any war in the region would erode the hard-won, and precariously held, political capital that China has gained in the last several decades. It would also disrupt trade relations, complicate efforts to promote the yuan as an international currency, and send shock waves through the country's economic system at a time when it can ill afford them. There is thus little reason to think that China is readying for war with Japan. At the same time, the specter of rising Chinese nationalism, **although** often seen as **a promoter of conflict**, further limits the prospects for armed engagement. This is because Beijing will try to discourage nationalism if it fears it may lose control or be forced by popular sentiment to take an action it deems unwise. **Ever since** the **Tiananmen Square** massacre put questions about the Chinese Communist Party's right to govern before the population, **successive generations of Chinese leaders have carefully negotiated a balance** between promoting nationalist sentiment and preventing it from boiling over. In the process, they cemented the legitimacy of their rule. A war with Japan could easily upset that balance by inflaming nationalism that could blow back against China's leaders. Consider a hypothetical scenario in which a uniformed Chinese military member is killed during a firefight with Japanese soldiers. Regardless of the specific circumstances, the casualty would create a new martyr in China and, almost as quickly, catalyze popular protests against Japan. Demonstrators would call for blood, and if the government (fearing economic instability) did not extract enough, citizens would agitate against Beijing itself. Those in Zhongnanhai, the Chinese leadership compound in Beijing, would find themselves between a rock and a hard place. It is possible that Xi lost track of these basic facts during the fanfare of his rise to power and in the face of renewed Japanese assertiveness. It is also possible that the Chinese state is more rotten at the core than is understood. That is, party elites believe that a diversionary war is the only way to hold on to power -- damn the economic and social consequences. But Xi does not seem blind to the principles that have served Beijing so well over the last few decades. Indeed, although he recently warned unnamed others about infringing upon China's "national core interests" during a foreign policy speech to members of the Politburo, he also underscored China's commitment to "never pursue development at the cost of sacrificing other country's interests" and to never "benefit ourselves at others' expense or do harm to any neighbor." Of course, wars do happen -- and still could in the East China Sea. Should either side draw first blood through accident or an unexpected move, Sino-Japanese relations would be pushed into terrain that has not been charted since the middle of the last century. However, understanding that war would be a no-win situation, China has avoided rushing over the brink. This relative restraint seems to have surprised everyone. But it shouldn't. Beijing will continue to disagree with Tokyo over the sovereign status of the islands, and will not budge in its negotiating position over disputed territory. However, it cannot take the risk of going to war over a few rocks in the sea. On the contrary, in the **coming months it will quietly** seek a way to **shelve the dispute in return for** securing **regional stability**, facilitating economic development, and keeping a lid on the Pandora's box of rising nationalist sentiment. The ensuing peace, while unlikely to be deep, or especially conducive to improving Sino-Japanese relations, will be enduring.

#### No risk of drone wars

Singh 12

Joseph Singh 12, researcher at the Center for a New American Security, 8/13/12, “Betting Against a Drone Arms Race,” <http://nation.time.com/2012/08/13/betting-against-a-drone-arms-race/#ixzz2eSvaZnfQ>

In short, the doomsday drone scenario Ignatieff and Sharkey predict results from an excessive focus on rapidly-evolving military technology. ¶ Instead, we must return to what we know about state behavior in an anarchistic international order. Nations will confront the same principles of deterrence, for example, when deciding to launch a targeted killing operation regardless of whether they conduct it through a drone or a covert amphibious assault team. ¶ Drones may make waging war more domestically palatable, but they don’t change the very serious risks of retaliation for an attacking state. Any state otherwise deterred from using force abroad will not significantly increase its power projection on account of acquiring drones. ¶ What’s more, the very states whose use of drones could threaten U.S. security – countries like China – are not democratic, which means that the possible political ramifications of the low risk of casualties resulting from drone use are irrelevant. For all their military benefits, putting drones into play requires an ability to meet the political and security risks associated with their use. ¶ Despite these realities, there remain a host of defensible arguments one could employ to discredit the Obama drone strategy. The legal justification for targeted killings in areas not internationally recognized as war zones is uncertain at best. ¶ Further, the short-term gains yielded by targeted killing operations in Pakistan, Somalia and Yemen, while debilitating to Al Qaeda leadership in the short-term, may serve to destroy already tenacious bilateral relations in the region and radicalize local populations. ¶ Yet, the past decade’s experience with drones bears no evidence of impending instability in the global strategic landscape. Conflict may not be any less likely in the era of drones, but the nature of 21st Century warfare remains fundamentally unaltered despite their arrival in large numbers.

### Solvency

#### Aff use of "zone of active hostilities" guarantees circumvention – it’s impossible to define the precise geographic scope and what constitutes active hostilities

Daskal 13

Jennifer C. Daskal, Fellow and Adjunct Professor, Georgetown Center on National Security and the Law, Georgetown University Law Center, April, 2013 161 U. Pa. L. Rev. 1165

Consistent with treaty and case law, overt and sustained fighting are key factors in identifying a zone of active hostilities. Specifically, the fighting must be of sufficient duration and intensity to create the exigent circumstances that justify application of extraordinary war authorities, to put civilians on notice, and to justify permissive evidentiary presumptions regarding the identification of the enemy. n133 The presence of troops on the [\*1207] ground is a significant factor, although neither necessary nor sufficient to constitute a zone of active hostilities. Action by the Security Council or regional security bodies such as NATO, as well as the belligerent parties' express recognition of the existence of a hot conflict zone, are also relevant. Linking the zone of active hostilities primarily to the duration and intensity of the fighting and to states' own proclamations suffers, however, from an inherent circularity. A state can itself create a zone of active hostilities by ratcheting up violence or issuing a declaration of intent, thereby making previously unlawful actions lawful. n134 It is impossible to fully address this concern. The problem can, however, be significantly reduced by insisting on strict compliance with the law-of-war principles of distinction and proportionality and by vigorously punishing states for acts of aggression. n135 There will, of course, be disagreement as to whether a state's escalation of a certain conflict constitutes aggression, particularly given underlying disagreements about who qualifies as a lawful target. The zone approach is helpful in this regard as well: it narrows the range of disagreement by demanding heightened substantive standards as to who qualifies as a legitimate target outside the zones of active hostilities. Under the zone approach, the escalation of force must be aimed at a narrower set of possible military targets until the increased use of force is sufficiently intense and pervasive enough to create a new zone of active hostilities. 3. Geographic Scope of the Zone A secondary question relates to the geographic scope of the zone of active hostilities. In answering the related question of the scope of the overarching armed conflict, the Tadic court defined the conflict as extending throughout the state in which hostilities were conducted (in the case of international armed conflict) n136 and the area over which a party had territorial control (in the case of a noninternational armed conflict that did not extend [\*1208] throughout an entire state). n137 Neither approach, however, maps well onto the practical realities of a transnational conflict between a state and a non-state actor. In many cases, the non-state actor and related hostilities will be concentrated in a small pocket of the state. It would be contrary to the justifications of exigency and proper notice to define the zone of active hostilities as extending to the entire state. A territorial control test also does not make sense when dealing with a non-state actor, such as al Qaeda, which does not exercise formal control over any territory and is driven more by ideology than territorial ambition. This Article suggests a more nuanced, albeit still imperfect, approach: If the fighting is sufficiently widespread throughout the state, then the zone of active hostilities extends to the state's borders. If, however, hostilities are concentrated only in certain regions within a state, then the zone will be geographically limited to those administrative areas or provinces in which there is actual fighting, a significant possibility of fighting, or preparation for fighting. This test is fact-intensive and will depend on both the conditions on the ground and preexisting state and administrative boundaries.

#### No political will to implement the plan

Druck 12

Druck, JD – Cornell Law, ‘12¶ (Judah, 98 Cornell L. Rev. 209)

There are obvious similarities between the causes and effects of the public scrutiny associated with the larger wars discussed above. In each situation, the United States was faced with some, or even all, of the traditional costs associated with war: a draft, an increasingly large military industry, logistical sacrifices (such as rationing and other noncombat expenses), and significant military casualties. n114 Americans looking to keep the United States out of foreign affairs ob-viously had a great deal on the line, which provided sufficient incentive to scrutinize military policy. In the face of these potentially colossal harms, the public was willing to assert a significant voice, which in turn increased the willingness of politicians to challenge and subsequently shift presidential policy. As a result, public scrutiny and activism placed a President under constant scrutiny in one war, delayed U.S. intervention in another, and even helped end two wars entire-ly. Thus, we may extract a general principle from these events: when faced with the prospect of a war requiring heavy domestic sacrifices, and absent an incredibly compelling reason to engage in such a war (as seen in World War II, for example), n115 the public is properly incentivized to emerge and exert social (and, consequently, political) pressure in order to engage and shift foreign policy. However, as we will see, the converse is true as well. B. The Introduction of Technology-Driven Warfare and Shifting Wartime Doctrines The recent actions in Libya illustrate the culmination of a shift toward a new era of warfare, one that upsets the system of social and political checks on presidential military action. Contrary to the series of larger conflicts fought in the twen-tieth century, this new era has ushered in a system of war devoid of some of the fundamental aspects of war, including the traditional costs discussed above. Specifically, through the advent of military technology, especially in the area of robotics, modern-day hostilities no longer require domestic sacrifices, thereby concealing the burden of war from main-stream consciousness. n116 By using fewer troops and introducing drones and other [\*228] forms of mechanized warfare into hostile areas more frequently, n117 an increased number of recent conflicts have managed to avoid many domestic casualties, economic damages, and drafts. n118 In a way, less is on the line when drones, rather than people, take fire from enemy combatants, and this reality displaces many hindrances and considerations when deciding whether to use drones in the first place. n119 This move toward a limited form of warfare has been termed the "Obama Doctrine," which "emphasizes air power and surgical strikes, rather than boots on the ground." n120 Under this military framework, as indicated by the recent use of drones in the Middle East, the traditional harms associated with war might become increasingly obsolete as technolo-gy replaces the need for soldiers. Indeed, given the increased level of firepower attached to drones, we can imagine a situation where large-scale military engagements are fought without any American soldiers being put in harm's way, without Americans having to ration their food purchases, and without teenagers worrying about being drafted. n121 For example, "with no oxygen-and sleep-needing human on board, Predators and other [unmanned aerial vehicles] can watch over a potential target for 24 hours or more - then attack when opportunity knocks." n122 Thus, if the recent actions in Libya are any indication of what the future will look like, we can predict a major shift in the way the United States carries out wars . n123 [\*229] C. The Effects of Technology-Driven Warfare on Politics and Social Movements The practical effects of this move toward a technology-driven, and therefore limited, proxy style of warfare are mixed. On the one hand, the removal of American soldiers from harm's way is a clear benefit, n124 as is the reduced harm to the American public in general. For that, we should be thankful. But there is another effect that is less easy to identify: pub-lic apathy. By increasing the use of robotics and decreasing the probability of harm to American soldiers, modern war-fare has "affected the way the public views and perceives war" by turning it into "the equivalent of sports fans watching war, rather than citizens sharing in its importance." n125 As a result, the American public has slowly fallen victim to the numbing effect of technology-driven warfare; when the risks of harm to American soldiers abroad and civilians at home are diminished, so too is the public's level of interest in foreign military policy. n126 In the political sphere, this effect snowballs into both an uncaring public not able (or willing) to effectively mobi-lize in order to challenge presidential action and enforce the WPR, and a Congress whose own willingness to check presidential military action is heavily tied to public opinion. n127 Recall, for example, the case of the Mayaguez, where potentially unconstitutional action went unchecked because the mission was perceived to be a success. n128 Yet we can imagine that most missions involving drone strikes will be "successful" in the eyes of [\*230] the public: even if a strike misses a target, the only "loss" one needs to worry about is the cost of a wasted missile, and the ease of deploying another drone would likely provide a quick remedy. Given the political risks associated with making critical statements about military action, especially if that action results in success, n129 we can expect even less congressional WPR en-forcement as more military engagements are supported (or, at the very least, ignored) by the public. In this respect, the political reaction to the Mayaguez seems to provide an example of the rule, rather than the exception, in gauging politi-cal reactions within a technology-driven warfare regime. Thus, when the public becomes more apathetic about foreign affairs as a result of the limited harms associated with technology-driven warfare, and Congress's incentive to act consequently diminishes, the President is freed from any possible WPR constraints we might expect him to face, regardless of any potential legal issues. n130 Perhaps unsurpris-ingly, nearly all of the constitutionally problematic conflicts carried out by presidents involved smaller-scale military actions, rarely totaling more than a few thousand troops in direct contact with hostile forces. n131 Conversely, conflicts that have included larger forces, which likely provided sufficient incentive for public scrutiny, have generally complied with domestic law. n132 The result is that as wars become more limited, n133 unilateral presidential action will likely become even more un-checked as the triggers for WPR enforcement fade away. In contrast with the social and political backlash witnessed during the Civil War, World War I, the Vietnam War, and the Iraq War, contemporary military actions provide insuffi-cient incentive to prevent something as innocuous and limited as a drone strike. Simply put, technology-driven warfare is not conducive to the formation of a substantial check on presidential action. n134

#### Executive branch lawyers will circumvent

Cheng 12

Cheng, co-director – Institute for Global Law, Justice, & Policy and professor @ NYU Law, ‘12¶ (Tai-Heng, 106 A.J.I.L. 710)

Lubell's analysis of drone attacks shows the limits of his method in clarifying the law as it stands. He explains that "IHL and human rights law can lead to differing conclusions" about the legality of drone attacks (p. 258). Under human rights law, "the intentional killing of the individuals is likely to have been unlawful" (p. 255). In contrast, in an armed conflict, "[t]argeting [persons] could be lawful under IHL if they are seen to be non-civilians" (p. 257). Although he proposes various criteria for selecting between human rights law and IHL, Lubell ultimately concludes: "While the concurrent applicability of human rights and IHL is a legal reality, the lack of an agreed approach to interpretation leads to difficulties of implementation in practice" (pp. 258-59), resulting in "difficulty in achieving certainty on this matter" (p. 258). Ruys's survey of state practice to determine whether customary international law currently permits the use of force against nonstate actors in a foreign state illustrates the limits of his method in identifying clear legal rules, even within a single legal regime. He concedes that the legal significance of relevant incidents is open to interpretation. For example, whether the invasion of Afghanistan by the United States and its allies extended the right of self-defense to armed attacks by nonstate actors is open to "a wide range of possible interpretative outcomes depending on one's point of view" (p. 442). Similarly, a "possible interpretation" of Turkey's attacks on Iraqi Kurds in 2008 (p. 461) is that it changed the law to authorize force against nonstate actors, but an observer could also conclude that "States felt uncomfortable about setting a new precedent" (p. 462). Likewise, when Ethiopian troops were sent in 2006 into Somalia to fight the Union of Islamic Courts that threatened Ethiopia, the lack of legal debates among states about Ethiopia's actions "impede[s] the analysis" of that incident (p. 470). Based on his review of events, Ruys proposes that the attack **[\*713]** on these nonstate actors is "not unambiguously illegal" (p. 487). This triple negative assessment of legality leaves much room for further clarification of the law. Lubell's and Ruys's analyses of preemptive self-defense also show how policy appraisals of what the law ought to be can shape the law as it stands. Both authors argue that customary international law prohibits the use of preemptive force against a nonimminent threat. Lubell supports his contention with a Security Council resolution that "strongly condemn[ed] Israel for carrying out a pre-emptive strike [in 1981] against the Osiraq nuclear reactor in Iraq" (p. 61). However, he also concedes that this evidence of *opinio juris* against preemptive attacks is inconclusive because the resolution "can be the result of a number of factors, including a perception that the circumstances of that particular case may not have warranted an attack due to a lack of exhaustion of viable alternatives as well as no imminent need" (*id.*). Faced with this inconclusive evidence of state practice and *opinio juris*, the reader might infer that Lubell believes that preemptive self-defense is legally prohibited for policy reasons. Quoting Rosalyn Higgins, he emphasizes a "primary and fundamental concern . . . that preemption will become 'a pretext for unprovoked aggression'" (p. 62). Ruys similarly rejects the legality of preemptive self-defense on policy grounds. As noted, Ruys argues that the 2003 invasion of Iraq by the United States and its allies did not constitute state practice and *opinio juris* permitting preemptive self-defense because, inter alia, the states that supported the invasion did not justify it with a broad reading of Article 51 of the UN Charter and "a majority of States apparently held the opinion that the operation violated the UN Charter" (pp. 317-18). His footnotes show, however, that, while many states opposed the invasion, the number was far short of "a majority of States" in the world and that some of those states criticized the invasion as illegitimate rather than a violation of the Charter (p. 317 nn.338-39). Ruys also acknowledges that Michael Reisman has found numerous statements by states about the legality of preemptive force but minimizes their importance as "political sabre-rattling . . . rather than as reliable manifestations of States' *opinio juris*" (pp. 333-34). Based on these interpretations of evidence, Ruys concludes that "it is impossible to identify *de lege lata* a general right of pre-emptive--and a fortiori preventive--self-defence" (p. 342). Taken alone, this analysis of preemptive self-defense might persuade some readers. Yet when studied alongside Ruys's analysis of the use of force against terrorists, doubts emerge. Just as Ruys's evidence for the acceptance of preemptive self-defense is mixed, his evidence for the legality of use of force against nonstate actors is not entirely persuasive. While Ruys dismisses statements by states in favor of preemptive self-defense as political and not legal, he characterizes the acquiescence of some states to the use of force against nonstate actors to be "a fickle barometer of *opinio juris*" (p. 462). However, although he claims that a right of preemptive self-defense does not exist because no evidence clearly supports it, Ruys concludes in contrast, as noted, that the use of force against nonstate actors is "not unambiguously illegal" (p. 487) in spite of the equivocal evidence. Although his assessment about the legality of force against nonstate actors is couched in qualified terms, the practical difference with his position on preemptive force is sharp. If policy makers accept his view, they may choose to attack, without clearly breaking the law, nonstate actors who have attacked the state of those policy makers. However, if they use force preemptively against a state or nonstate actor, they will have acted unlawfully. Certainly, one might finely parse the evidence to argue that state practice as well as *opinio juris* in support of the use of force against nonstate actors was stronger than the evidence in support of preemptive force, thereby justifying Ruys's conclusions that the former is "not unambiguously illegal" while the latter remains clearly illegal. However, another equally plausible--and perhaps more compelling--explanation is that Ruys was guided by his differing policy appraisals of the use of force against nonstate actors versus the use of preemptive force. When considering the use of force against nonstate actors, Ruys emphasizes "the delicacy of balancing the national security interests of a State that falls victim to non-State attacks and the fundamental rights to sovereignty" [\*714] (*id.*). He explicitly acknowledges the competing policy concerns of magnified "destructive potential" of terrorists through modern technologies (p. 488) versus the risks of "increased legitimacy of the non-State group [once they are attacked] or a further degradation of the authority of the 'host State' . . . [or] military escalation" (*id.*). In contrast, Ruys appraises preemptive force as "highly undesirable from a *de lege ferenda* perspective" because it would usurp the Security Council's responsibility for keeping international peace and because the right to use preemptive force would be open to abuse (p. 324). While acknowledging that supporters of preemptive self-defense "stress time and again . . . the increasing speed and destructive potential of modern weaponry" (p. 257), Ruys neither explicitly assesses the weight of this policy concern relative to the potential for abuse nor explains why he chose not to do so. These methodological observations about Ruys's and Lubell's findings do not significantly diminish their contribution to international legal scholarship. Quite the contrary. Their books are not just studies on the use of force. They are also case studies of contemporary positivism. Ruys's and Lubell's methods reveal how much it has in common with other international legal theories. As discussed earlier, Lubell recognizes that the choice between IHL and human rights law can lead to different conclusions about the legality *vel non* of drone attacks, but the methods of choosing among legal theories remain unclear. This conclusion is consistent with Martii Koskemenmi's recent critical legal studies research showing uncertainty about the legality of actions where different legal regimes may apply to the same international problem and where each regime may lead to a different legal conclusion. n1 Ruys asserts that the legal significance of "incidents"--a term of art proposed by Reisman to describe basic epistemic units in international law n2 --is determined by claims and counterclaims among states (p. 51). This view comes close to the conceptualization of law in policy-oriented jurisprudence as an ongoing process of communication among relevant actors, n3 with which international legal process and constructivist international relations theories also seem to agree. n4

# 2NC

## CP

### 2NC Solvency – Top Shelf

#### Strongly err neg---their authors don’t understand how thorough and effective inter-executive mechanisms are---adding transparency’s clearly sufficient

McNeal 13

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

To date scholars have lacked a thorough understanding of the U.S. government’s targeted killing practices. As such, their commentary is oftentimes premised on easily describable issues, and fails to grapple with the multiple levels of intergovernmental accountability present in current practice. When dealing with the theoretical and normative issues associated with targeted killings, scholars have failed to specify what they mean when they aver that targeted killings are unaccountable. Both trends have impeded legal theory, and constrained scholarly discourse on a matter of public import.¶ This article is a necessary corrective to the public and scholarly debate. It has presented the complex web of bureaucratic, legal, professional, and political accountability mechanisms that exert influence over the targeted killing process. It has demonstrated that many of the critiques of targeted killings rest upon poorly conceived understandings of the process, unclear definitions, and unsubstantiated speculation. The article’s reform recommendations, grounded in a deep understanding of the actual process, reflect an assumption that transparency, performance criteria, and politically grounded independent review can enhance the already robust accountability mechanisms embedded in current practice.

### Solvency – Modeling/Drone Prolif

#### CP solves drone prolif

#### A) Lining up policy - Executive-branch transparency and bringing U.S. practice in line with policy builds the international diplomatic capital to press for drone norms

Roberts 13

Kristin Roberts 13, News Editor, National Journal, 3/22/13, “When the Whole World Has Drones,” <http://www.nationaljournal.com/magazine/when-the-whole-world-has-drones-20130321>

But even without raising standards, tightening up drone-specific restrictions in the standing control regime, or creating a new control agreement (which is never easy to pull off absent a bad-state actor threatening attack), just the process of lining up U.S. policy with U.S. practice would go a long way toward establishing the kind of precedent on use of this technology that America—in five, 10, or 15 years—might find helpful in arguing against another’s actions.¶ A not-insignificant faction of U.S. defense and intelligence experts, Dennis Blair among them, thinks norms play little to no role in global security. And they have evidence in support. The missile-technology regime, for example, might be credited with slowing some program development, but it certainly has not stopped non-signatories—North Korea and Iran—from buying, building, and selling missile systems. But norms established by technology-leading countries, even when not written into legal agreements among nations, have shown success in containing the use and spread of some weapons, including land mines, blinding lasers, and nuclear bombs.¶ Arguably more significant than spotty legal regimes, however, is the behavior of the United States. “History shows that how states adopt and use new military capabilities is often influenced by how other states have—or have not—used them in the past,” Zenko argued. Despite the legal and policy complexity of this issue, it is something the American people have, if slowly, come to care about. Given the attention that Rand Paul’s filibuster garnered, it is not inconceivable that public pressure on drone operations could force the kind of unforeseen change to U.S. policy that it did most recently on “enhanced interrogation” of terrorists.¶ The case against open, transparent rule-making is that it might only hamstring American options while doing little good elsewhere—as if other countries aren’t closely watching this debate and taking notes for their own future policymaking. But the White House’s refusal to answer questions about its drone use with anything but “no comment” ensures that the rest of the world is free to fill in the blanks where and when it chooses. And the United States will have already surrendered the moment in which it could have provided not just a technical operations manual for other nations but a legal and moral one as well.

### Solvency - Allies

#### Transparency solves allied perception, blowback, and drone norms while maintaining the counter-terror benefits of targeted killings

Aaronson 13

Michael Aaronson 13, Professorial Research Fellow and Executive Director of cii – the Centre for International Intervention – at the University of Surrey, and Adrian Johnson, Director of Publications at RUSI, the book reviews editor for the RUSI Journal, and chair of the RUSI Editorial Board, “Conclusion,” in Hitting the Target?: How New Capabilities are Shaping International Intervention, ed. Aaronson & Johnson, <http://www.rusi.org/downloads/assets/Hitting_the_Target.pdf>

The Obama administration faces some tough dilemmas, and analysts should be careful not to downplay the security challenges it faces. It must balance the principles of justice and accountability with a very real terrorist threat; and reconcile the need to demonstrate a credibly tough security policy with the ending of a long occupation of Afghanistan while Al-Qa’ida still remains active in the region. Nevertheless, more transparency would provide demonstrable oversight and accountability without sacrificing the necessary operational secrecy of counter-terrorism. It might also help assuage the concern of allies and their publics who worry about what use the intelligence they provide might be put to. A wise long-term vision can balance the short-term demands to disrupt and disable terrorist groups with a longer-term focus to resolve the grievances that give rise to radicalism, and also preclude inadvertently developing norms of drone use that sit uneasily with the civilised conduct of war. Drones are but one kinetic element of a solution to terrorism that is, ultimately, political.

### AT Perm Do Both – Links to Terror DA

#### The counterplan aloneis key to effective drone operations---the permutation sends the signal that the rest of the government sides with critics of drones over the executive---that delegitimizes drones and collapses the program

Anderson 10

Kenneth Anderson 10, Professor of International Law at American University, 3/8/10, “Predators Over Pakistan,” The Weekly Standard, <http://www.weeklystandard.com/print/articles/predators-over-pakistan>

Obama deserves support and praise for this program from across the political spectrum. More than that, though, the drone strikes need an aggressive defense against increasingly vocal critics who are moving to create around drone warfare a narrative of American wickedness and cowardice and of CIA perfidy. ¶ Here the administration has dropped the ball. It has so far failed to provide a robust affirmation of the propositions that underwrite Predator drone warfare. Namely: ¶ n Targeted killings of terrorists, including by Predators and even when the targets are American citizens, are a lawful practice; ¶ n Use of force is justified against terrorists anywhere they set up safe havens, including in states that cannot or will not prevent them; ¶ n These operations may be covert—and they are as justifiable when the CIA is tasked to carry them out secretly as when the military does so in open armed conflict. ¶ n All of the above fall within the traditional American legal view of “self-defense” in international law, and “vital national security interests” in U.S. domestic law. ¶ There are good reasons for Republicans and centrist Democrats to make common cause in defending these propositions. On the one hand, they should want to aggressively protect the administration against its external critics—the domestic and international left—who are eager to prosecute Americans for their actions in the war on terror. They should also want to make clear that in defending drone strikes, they are defending the American (and not just the Obama) legal and strategic position. Moreover, it will be the American view of domestic and international law for future administrations, Democratic and Republican. ¶ At the same time, congressional Republicans and centrist Democrats need to put Obama’s senior legal officials on the record and invite them to defend their own administration, defend it to the full extent that the Obama administration’s actions require. Which is to say, Congress needs to hear publicly from senior administration lawyers and officials who might be personally less-than-enthused about targeted killings of terrorists and not eager to endorse them publicly, or to do so only with hedged and narrow legal rationales from which they can later walk away. ¶ Consider, for instance, the diffidence of Harold Koh, the legal adviser of the Department of State. In an informal public discussion with his predecessor, John Bellinger, aired on C-SPAN on February 17, he was asked about drones and targeted killings and declined to say that the practice was lawful. (Granted, it was in an unscripted setting, which cannot be taken as anyone’s last word and on which it would be unfair to place too much weight.) All he said was that if he concluded that it was unlawful, he would, if he thought it appropriate, resign his position. He added that he remained at his post. The statement falls far short of the defense one might hope for from such a high-ranking administration lawyer. More than a year into the new administration, that ought surely to strike the general counsels of the CIA, the Pentagon, the Director of National Intelligence, the NSC, and other agencies directly conducting these activities as somewhat less than reassuring. ¶ In fact, the administration’s top lawyers should offer a public legal defense of its policies, and congressional Republicans and Democrats should insist on such a defense. This is partly to protect the full use-of-force tools of national security for future administrations, by affirming the traditional U.S. view of their legality. But it is also to protect and reassure the personnel of the CIA, NSC, and intelligence and military agencies who carry out these policies that they are not just effective but lawful policies of the U.S. government and will be publicly defended as such by their superiors. ¶ Even as the Obama administration increasingly relies on Predator strikes for its counterterrorism strategy, the international legal basis of drone warfare (more precisely, its perceived international legal legitimacy) is eroding from under the administration’s feet—largely through the U.S. government’s inattention and unwillingness to defend its legal grounds, and require its own senior lawyers to step up and defend it as a matter of law, legal policy, and legal diplomacy. On the one hand, the president takes credit for the policy—as frankly he should—as taking the fight to the enemy. His vice president positively beams with pride over the administration’s flock of Predator goslings. On the other hand, the Obama administration appears remarkably sanguine about the campaign gearing up in the “international law community” aimed at undermining the legal basis of targeted killing as well as its broad political legitimacy, and ultimately at stigmatizing the use of Predators as both illegal and a coward’s weapon. ¶ Stigmatizing the technology and the practice of targeted killing is only half of it, though. The other half is to undermine the idea that the CIA may use force and has the authority to act covertly under orders from the president and disclosure to Congress, as long provided in U.S. law. The aim is to create a legal and political perception that, under international law, all uses of force must be overt—either as law enforcement or as armed conflict conducted by uniformed military. ¶ The Obama administration is complacent about this emerging “international soft law” campaign. But Obama’s opponents in this country, for their part, likewise underestimate and ignore the threat such a campaign presents to national security. That’s apparently because many on the right find it hard to imagine that mere congeries of NGOs, academics, activists, U.N. officials, and their allies could ever overcome “hard” American national security interests, particularly when covered by the magic of the Obama administration. Both liberal and conservative national security hands, looking at the long history of accepted lawfulness of targeted killings under American law, think, “Come on, there’s obvious sense to this, legal and political. These arguments in domestic and international law have long been settled, at least as far as the U.S. government is concerned.” But if there’s a sense to it, there’s a sensibility as well, one that goes to the overall political and legal “legitimacy” of the practice within a vague, diaphanous, but quite real thing called “global public opinion,” the which is woven and spun by the interlocking international “soft law” community and global media. ¶ It’s a mistake to remain oblivious to either the sense or the sensibility. Outside of government, the oblivious include hard-realist conservatives. Inside government, some important political-legal actors are struggling impressively both to overcome bureaucratic inertia and get in front of this issue, and to overcome factions within government unpersuaded by, if not overtly opposed to, this program—particularly as conducted by the CIA. Those actors deserve political support from congressional Republicans and Democrats. Because obliviousness to the sensibility of lawfulness and legitimacy—well, we should all know better by now. Does anyone still believe that the international legal-media-academic-NGO-international organization-global opinion complex cannot set terms of debate over targeted killing or covert action? Or that it cannot overcome “hard” American security interests? Or that this is merely another fringe advocacy campaign of no real consequence, whether in the United States, or abroad in Europe, or at the United Nations?¶ The Obama administration assumes that it uniquely sets the terms of legal legitimacy and has the final word on political sensibility. This is not so—certainly not on this issue. The international soft-law campaign looks to the long-term if necessary, and will seek the political death of targeted killings, Predator drones, and their progeny, and even perhaps to CIA covert action, by a hundred thousand tiny paper cuts. The campaign has already moved to the media. Starting with Jane Mayer’s narrative of Predator drone targeted killing in the New Yorker last October, and followed by many imitators, the ideological framework of the story has shifted. In the space of a year—Obama’s year, no less—it has moved from Candidate Obama’s brave articulation of a bold new strategy for attacking terrorists to the NGOs’ preferred narrative of a cowardly, secretive American CIA dealing collateral damage from the skies. Here’s the thumbnail version of drone warfare, as portrayed in the media.

### AT Object Fiat

#### And, it matches the academic debate

Sinnar, assistant professor of law at Stanford Law School, May 2013

(Shirin, “Protecting Rights from Within? Inspectors General and National Security Oversight,” 65 Stan. L. Rev. 1027, Lexis)

More than a decade after September 11, 2001, the debate over which institutions of government are best suited to resolve competing liberty and national security concerns continues unabated. While the Bush Administration's unilateralism in detaining suspected terrorists and authorizing secret surveillance initially raised separation of powers concerns, the Obama Administration's aggressive use of drone strikes to target suspected terrorists, with little oversight, demonstrates how salient these questions remain. Congress frequently lacks the [\*1029] information or incentive to oversee executive national security actions that implicate individual rights. Meanwhile, courts often decline to review counterterrorism practices challenged as violations of constitutional rights out of concern for state secrets or institutional competence. n1¶ These limitations on traditional external checks on the executive - Congress and the courts - have led to increased academic interest in potential checks within the executive branch. Many legal scholars have argued that executive branch institutions supply, or ought to supply, an alternative constraint on executive national security power. Some argue that these institutions have comparative advantages over courts or Congress in addressing rights concerns; others characterize them as a second-best option necessitated by congressional enfeeblement and judicial abdication.

## DA

**AT Aff = Squo**

#### Our link destroys all their spin about the plan merely codifying current policy---the current approach makes limits on first-resort killings part of the rules of engagement, not a legal restriction on authority---legally codifying them would destroy flexibility

Corn 13

Geoffrey Corn 13, Professor of Law and Presidential Research Professor, South Texas College of Law, 2013, “Geography of Armed Conflict: Why it is a Mistake to Fish for the Red Herring,” International Legal Studies, 89 INT’L L. STUD. 77 (2013)

Ironically, when Professor Gabrielle Blum proposed such a limitation in her article The Dispensable Lives of Soldiers,76 I was quite skeptical. However, my skepticism focused primarily on two considerations. First, her proposal extended to “hot zones”. I remain opposed to such an extension, as I believe it would inject a dangerous dilution of tactical initiative into the ex-ecution of combat operations.77 Second, it was unclear whether Professor Blum was proposing a legal norm, or a policy constraint on permissible legal authority. Once it was clear that we shared opposition to modifying the existing legal authority to attack even an inoffensive enemy belligerent operative (such as an enemy soldier sleeping in a barracks or assembly area or attempting to retreat from an ongoing attack), and that she was in fact proposing consideration of policy limits on that authority, we were much more closely aligned in our views.78¶ This latter aspect of the “capture or kill” debate is critical, and in my opinion, if such a limitation on targeting authority is justified, it must be framed as a policy limit on otherwise lawful authority: a rule of engagement.79 This is because there may be situations, even where these conditions are satisfied, when an attack is justified because of the influence it will produce on enemy leadership and other belligerent operatives. It is this corporate, as opposed to individualized, approach to attack justification that distinguishes targeting belligerent operatives from targeting civilians taking a direct part in hostilities. It therefore requires strictly limiting any “capture or kill” obligation to a policy applique restricting underlying legal authority. In short, even when capture is a completely feasible option to incapacitate an enemy belligerent operative, there still are times when attack is preferred because of the shock effect it will produce on the corporate enemy capability.80

#### Legal codification wrecks operational flexibility even if the President has adopted it as policy – which means Obama doesn’t want to give up the authority to act

Corn, 13­

Professor Geoffrey Corn (South Texas College of Law) (“Corn Comments on the Costs of Shifting to a Pure Self-Defense Model” 6/2, <http://www.lawfareblog.com/2013/06/corn-comments-on-the-prospect-of-a-shift-to-a-pure-self-defense-model/>)

It may be that a shift to this use of force framework is not only inevitable, but likely to come sooner than later. It may also be that such a shift might produce positive second and third order effects, such as improving the perception of legitimacy and mitigating the perception of a boundless war. It will not be without cost, and it is not self-evident that the scope of attack authority will be functionally analogous to that provided by the armed conflict model. Policy may in fact routinely limit the exercise of authority under this model today, but once the legal box is constricted, operationally flexibility will inevitably be degraded. It is for this reason that I believe the administration is unlikely to be too quick to abandon reliance on the AUMF.

### 2NC Link Wall

#### 1) Capture - The only alternative to first-resort killing is a capture mandate

Corn 13

Geoffrey Corn 13, Professor of Law and Presidential Research Professor, South Texas College of Law, 2013, “Geography of Armed Conflict: Why it is a Mistake to Fish for the Red Herring,” International Legal Studies, 89 INT’L L. STUD. 77 (2013)

One of the issues Daskal addresses in her article beyond that of target identification is the legitimacy of applying the authority to kill as a measure of first resort to enemy belligerents outside “hot zones” of hostilities.64 This issue is obviously a focal point of the contemporary debate over the use of unmanned aerial systems (armed drones) to attack belligerent operatives. It is also at the center of the debate related to the authority to engage civilians taking a direct part in hostilities.65 What Daskal proposes, which is analogous to the ICRC DPH Interpretive Guidance,66 is that capture (rather than kill) should be obligatory when it is a feasible alternative to employing deadly force.67¶ No single aspect of the DPH Interpretive Guidance generated more controversy than Section IX of the study, which asserted an identical obligation to capture instead of kill civilians engaged in DPH whenever feasible.68 In support of this assertion, the study relies on an article published by Jean Pictet (the well–known author of the ICRC commentaries to the 1949 Geneva Conventions) in which he asserts that the principle of humanity obli-gates belligerents to refrain from using deadly force against enemy belligerents when capture is a “risk free” alternative.69 Many LOAC experts, including this author, contest this interpretation of the law, arguing instead that unless and until the enemy belligerent becomes hors de combat, the law permits the application of deadly force as a measure of first resort.70

#### New detentions are politically impossible---requiring capture before killing means we won’t do either

Haijar 12

Lisa Hajjar 12, chair of the Law and Society Program at the University of California, Santa Barbara, Fall 2012, “Anatomy of the US Targeted Killing Policy,” Middle East Report, No. 264, <http://www.merip.org/mer/mer264/anatomy-us-targeted-killing-policy?ip_login_no_cache=fe0d21bdc1a90052f29270e6930e1752>

These uncertain answers in the spring of 2011 highlighted the lack of a clear detention policy. Harvard law professor Jack Goldsmith, who served in the Defense and Justice Departments under the Bush administration, summed up the dilemma: “We are all obsessed with Gitmo, but I don’t think that’s where the important action is. The important action is who we are not detaining because Gitmo has become this black-eye place where we can’t have future detentions.” [7] The reason, as he explained, stems from domestic politics: Congress has restricted the president’s ability to move people out of Guantánamo, whether for trials in federal courts, which are now prohibited by legislation, or through transfers to other countries because of the burdensome assurances that the secretary of defense would have to provide Congress that anyone exiting would pose no future threat to national security. The barriers to getting people out of Guantánamo function as a political deterrent to moving anyone new in; the last detainee arrived there in 2008. According to Goldsmith, “The lack of a detention policy and the inability to detain members of the enemy going forward creates a heightened incentive to kill people.”

#### 2) Surrender - restricting targeted killing as a first resort establishes a requirement that the U.S. offer opportunities for surrender before targeting

Blank 12

Laurie R. Blank 12, Director, International Humanitarian Law Clinic, Emory Law School, 2012, “NATIONAL SECURITY: PART II: ARTICLE: TARGETED STRIKES: THE CONSEQUENCES OF BLURRING THE ARMED CONFLICT AND SELF-DEFENSE JUSTIFICATIONS,” William Mitchell Law Review, 38 Wm. Mitchell L. Rev. 1655

In the immediate aftermath of the May 1, 2011 raid that killed Osama bin Laden, one issue that dominated news stories and blogs for several days was the question of whether the Navy Seals executing the mission were obligated to attempt to capture bin Laden before killing him and, as a subsidiary question, whether bin Laden attempted to surrender before he was killed. n92 This issue highlights the distinction between the armed conflict and self-defense regimes and the dangers of conflating them most directly.¶ Under the LOAC, an individual who is a legitimate target can be targeted with deadly force as a first resort. Once an individual is hors de combat, either through injury, sickness or capture, he or she may not be attacked. n93 Furthermore, the LOAC outlaws any [\*1684] denial of quarter. n94 Indeed, killing or wounding an enemy fighter who has laid down his arms and surrendered is a war crime under Article 8(2)(b)(vi) of the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court. n95 The prohibition on killing or harming detained persons, whether prisoners of war or other detainees, does not extend to an obligation to seek to capture before killing, however. Rather, "combatants and civilians directly participating in the hostilities must be hors de combat ... before an obligation to capture attaches." n96 Thus, while combatants must not attack persons who have surrendered (technically there is no obligation to actually capture persons who surrender; the law prohibits attacking persons who have surrendered), they have no obligation to offer opportunities for surrender. n97 As one scholar has explained, ¶ Once an armed conflict exists, it is not incumbent on the army of the one party to inquire whether members of a military unit of the other party wish to surrender before attacking it. The onus is on the party that wishes to surrender and thereby prevent attack to make this clear. n98 ¶ At the heart of the matter, therefore, the legal issue centers on a clear expression of the intent to surrender. n99 Surrender must be [\*1685] accepted but need not be solicited. By all accounts, for example, this appeared to be the rules of engagement for the bin Laden raid. According to then-CIA director Leon Panetta's explanation, ¶ The authority here was to kill bin Laden. And obviously, under the rules of engagement, if he had in fact thrown up his hands, surrendered and didn't appear to be representing any kind of threat, then they were to capture him. But they had full authority to kill him. n100 ¶ In contrast, human rights law's requirement that force only be used as a last resort when absolutely necessary for the protection of innocent victims of an attack creates an obligation to attempt to capture a suspected terrorist before any lethal targeting. n101 A state using force in self-defense against a terrorist cannot therefore target him or her as a first resort but can only do so if there are no alternatives - meaning that an offer of surrender or an attempt at capture has been made or is entirely unfeasible in the circumstances. Thus, if non-forceful measures can foil the terrorist attack without the use of deadly force, then the state may not use force in self-defense. n102 The supremacy of the right to life means that "even the most dangerous individual must be captured, rather than killed, so long as it is practically feasible to do so, bearing in mind all of the circumstances." n103 No more, this obligation to capture first rather than kill is not dependent on the target's efforts to surrender; the obligation actually works the other way: the forces [\*1686] may not use deadly force except if absolutely necessary to protect themselves or innocent persons from immediate danger, that is, self-defense or defense of others. As with any law enforcement operation, "the intended result ... is the arrest of the suspect," n104 and therefore every attempt must be made to capture before resorting to lethal force.

### 2NC AT Allied Coop

#### Too interdependent to dump us over drones

Dworkin 13

Anthony Dworkin 7-3-2013; Senior Policy Fellow working on human rights, international justice and international humanitarian law at the European Council on foreign relations “Drones and targeted killing: defining a European position” http://ecfr.eu/publications/summary/drones\_and\_targeted\_killing\_defining\_a\_european\_position211

Torn between an evident reluctance to accuse Obama of breaking international law and an unwillingness to endorse his policies, divided in part among themselves and in some cases bound by close intelligence relationships to the US, European countries have remained essentially disengaged as the era of drone warfare has dawned. Yet, as drones proliferate, such a stance seems increasingly untenable. Moreover, where in the past the difference between US and European conceptions of the fight against al-Qaeda seemed like an insurmountable obstacle to agreement on a common framework on the use of lethal force, the evolution of US policy means that there may now be a greater scope for a productive dialogue with the Obama administration on drones.

#### Self-interest overwhelms legal disputes

NYT 13

(“Drone Strike Prompts Suit, Raising Fears for U.S. Allies”)

The issue is more complex than drone-strike foes suggest, the current and former officials said, and is based on decades of cooperation rather than a shadowy pact for the United States to do the world’s dirty work. The arrangements for intensive intelligence sharing by Western allies go back to World War II, said Richard Aldrich, professor of international security at the University of Warwick, when the United States, Canada, Britain, Australia and New Zealand agreed to continue to collaborate. “There’s a very high volume of intelligence shared, some of which is collected automatically, so it’s impossible to track what every piece is potentially used for,” said Mr. Aldrich, who is also the author of a history of the Government Communications Headquarters, the British signal-intelligence agency. Britain’s history and expertise in South Asia means that the intelligence it gathers in Pakistan, Afghanistan and the tribal areas in between is in high demand, Mr. Aldrich said. The arrangement has been focused recently by a chill in relations between the United States and Pakistan, and by the shared war in Afghanistan. Other nations, too, intercept communications in the region that are shared broadly with the United States, he said. In Afghanistan, for example, German and Dutch forces run aggressive electronic interception operations, he said, because their rules on collaborating with local interpreters are less stringent than those of the United States. A spokesman for the coalition forces in Afghanistan, Lt. Col. Lester Carroll, declined to give details about intelligence sharing, saying agreements were classified. But he confirmed that American military forces “do share information with other U.S. government organizations on a need-to-know basis.” Few argue against the notion that European nations, many of which have been attacked by terrorists, have benefited from the drone killing, however controversial, of many of the most hardened Islamic extremist leaders.

### 1NC Impact

#### Nuclear terrorism is feasible - high risk of theft and attacks escalate

Dvorkin 12

Vladimir Z. Dvorkin 12 Major General (retired), doctor of technical sciences, professor, and senior fellow at the Center for International Security of the Institute of World Economy and International Relations of the Russian Academy of Sciences. The Center participates in the working group of the U.S.-Russia Initiative to Prevent Nuclear Terrorism, 9/21/12, "What Can Destroy Strategic Stability: Nuclear Terrorism is a Real Threat," belfercenter.ksg.harvard.edu/publication/22333/what\_can\_destroy\_strategic\_stability.html

Hundreds of scientific papers and reports have been published on nuclear terrorism. International conferences have been held on this threat with participation of Russian organizations, including IMEMO and the Institute of U.S. and Canadian Studies. Recommendations on how to combat the threat have been issued by the International Luxembourg Forum on Preventing Nuclear Catastrophe, Pugwash Conferences on Science and World Affairs, Russian-American Elbe Group, and other organizations. The UN General Assembly adopted the International Convention for the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism in 2005 and cooperation among intelligence services of leading states in this sphere is developing.¶ At the same time, **these efforts fall short for a number of reasons, partly because various acts of nuclear terrorism are possible. Dispersal of radioactive material by detonation of conventional explosives (“dirty bombs”) is a method that is most accessible for terrorists. With the wide spread of radioactive sources, raw materials for such attacks have become much more accessible than weapons-useable nuclear material or nuclear weapons.** The use of **“**dirty bombs**”** will not cause many immediate casualties, but it **will result into long-term radioactive contamination, contributing to the spread of** panic and socio-economic destabilization**.**¶ Severe **consequences can be caused by sabotaging nuclear power plants, research reactors, and radioactive materials storage facilities. Large cities are especially vulnerable to such attacks. A large city may host dozens of research reactors with a nuclear power plant or a couple of spent nuclear fuel storage facilities and dozens of large radioactive materials storage facilities located nearby.** The past few years have seen significant efforts made to enhance organizational and physical aspects of security at facilities, especially at nuclear power plants. **Efforts have also been made to improve security culture. But these efforts do not preclude the possibility that** well-trained terrorists may be able to penetrate nuclear facilities**.**¶ **Some estimates show that sabotage of a research reactor in a metropolis may expose hundreds of thousands to high doses of radiation. A formidable part of the city would become uninhabitable for a long time**.¶ Of all the scenarios, it **is building an improvised nuclear device by terrorists that poses the maximum risk. There are no engineering problems that cannot be solved if terrorists decide to build a simple “gun-type” nuclear device.** **Information on the design of such devices, as well as implosion-type devices, is available in the public domain**. It is the acquisition of weapons-grade uranium that presents the sole serious obstacle. Despite numerous preventive measures taken, we cannot rule out the possibility that **such materials can be bought on the black market.** Theft of weapons-grade uranium is also possible**. Research reactor fuel is considered to be particularly vulnerable to theft, as it is scattered at sites in dozens of countries. There are about 100 research reactors in the world that run on weapons-grade uranium fuel, according to the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA).**¶ **A terrorist “gun-type” uranium bomb can have a yield of least 10-15 kt, which is** comparable to the yield of the bomb dropped on Hiroshima**.** **The explosion of such a bomb in a modern metropolis can kill and wound hundreds of thousands and cause serious economic damage. There will also be long-term sociopsychological and political consequences**.¶ The vast majority of states have introduced unprecedented security and surveillance measures at transportation and other large-scale public facilities after the terrorist attacks in the United States, Great Britain, Italy, and other countries. These measures have proved burdensome for the countries’ populations, but the public has accepted them as necessary. **A nuclear terrorist attack will make the public accept further measures meant to enhance control even if these measures significantly restrict the democratic liberties they are accustomed to. Authoritarian states could be expected to adopt even more restrictive measures**.¶ If a nuclear terrorist act occurs, **nations will delegate tens of thousands of their secret services’ best personnel to investigate and attribute the attack. Radical Islamist groups are among those capable of such an act.** We can imagine what would happen if they do so, **given the anti-Muslim sentiments and resentment that conventional terrorist attacks by Islamists have generated in developed democratic countries. Mass deportation of the non-indigenous population and severe sanctions would follow such an attack in what will cause violent protests in the Muslim world. Series of armed clashing terrorist attacks may follow. The prediction that Samuel Huntington has made in his book “**The Clash of Civilizations **and the Remaking of World Order” may come true**. Huntington’s book clearly demonstrates that it is not Islamic extremists that are the cause of the Western world’s problems. Rather there is a deep, intractable conflict that is rooted in the fault lines that run between Islam and Christianity. **This is especially dangerous for Russia because these fault lines run across its territory.** To sum it up, the political leadership of Russia has every reason to revise its list of factors that could undermine strategic stability.  BMD does not deserve to be even last on that list because its effectiveness in repelling massive missile strikes will be extremely low. BMD systems can prove useful only if deployed to defend against launches of individual ballistic missiles or groups of such missiles. Prioritization of other destabilizing factors—that could affect global and regional stability—merits a separate study or studies. But even without them I can conclude that nuclear terrorism should be placed on top of the list. The threat of nuclear terrorism is real, and a successful nuclear terrorist attack would lead to a radical transformation of the global order.  All of the threats on the revised list must become a subject of thorough studies by experts. States need to work hard to forge a common understanding of these threats and develop a strategy to combat them.

## Drone Prolif

### 2NC No Drone Wars

#### No drone wars – deterrence checks – the states that would threaten the US aren’t democratic which means they wouldn’t model anyway – that’s Singh

#### Air defense takes them out – prevents escalation

Lewis 12

Michael W. Lewis 12, Associate Professor of Law at Ohio Northern University Pettit College of Law, Spring 2012, “ARTICLE: SYMPOSIUM: THE 2009 AIR AND MISSILE WARFARE MANUAL: A CRITICAL ANALYSIS: Drones and the Boundaries of the Battlefield,” Texas International Law Journal, p. lexis

Like any weapons system drones have significant limitations in what they can achieve. Drones are extremely vulnerable to any type of sophisticated air defense system. They are slow. Even the jet-powered Avenger recently purchased by the Air Force only has a top speed of around 460 miles per hour, n20 meaning that it cannot escape from any manned fighter aircraft, not even the outmoded 1970s-era fighters that are still used by a number of nations. n21 Not only are drones unable to escape manned fighter aircraft, they also cannot hope to successfully fight them. Their air-to-air weapons systems are not as sophisticated as those of manned fighter aircraft, n22 and in the dynamic environment of an air-to-air engagement, the drone operator could not hope to match the situational awareness n23 of the pilot of manned fighter aircraft. As a result, the outcome of any air-to-air engagement between drones and manned fighters is a foregone conclusion. Further, drones are not only vulnerable to manned fighter aircraft, they are also vulnerable to jamming. Remotely piloted aircraft are dependent upon a continuous signal from their operators to keep them flying, and this signal is vulnerable to disruption and jamming. n24 If drones were [\*299] perceived to be a serious threat to an advanced military, a serious investment in signal jamming or disruption technology could severely degrade drone operations if it did not defeat them entirely. n25¶ These twin vulnerabilities to manned aircraft and signal disruption could be mitigated with massive expenditures on drone development and signal delivery and encryption technology, n26 but these vulnerabilities could never be completely eliminated. Meanwhile, one of the principal advantages that drones provide - their low cost compared with manned aircraft n27 - would be swallowed up by any attempt to make these aircraft survivable against a sophisticated air defense system. As a result, drones will be limited, for the foreseeable future, n28 to use in "permissive" environments in which air defense systems are primitive n29 or non-existent. While it is possible to find (or create) such a permissive environment in an inter-state conflict, n30 permissive environments that will allow for drone use will most often be found in counterinsurgency or counterterrorism operations.

#### No impact—drones make wars less intense

McGinnis 10

McGinnis, senior professor – Northwestern Law, ‘10¶ (John O., 104 Nw. U. L. Rev. Colloquy 366)

It is not as if in the absence of AI wars or weapons will cease to exist. The way to think about the effects of AI on war is to think of the consequences of substituting technologically advanced robots for humans on the battlefield. In at least three ways, that substitution is likely to be beneficial to humans. First, robots make conventional forces more effective and less vulnerable to certain weapons of mass destruction, like chemical and biological weapons. Rebalancing the world to make such weapons less effective, even if marginally so, must be counted as a benefit.

Second, one of the reasons that conventional armies deploy lethal force is to protect the human soldiers against death or serious injury. If only robots are at stake in a battle, a nation is more likely to use non-lethal force, such as stun guns and the like. The United States is in fact considering outfitting some of its robotic forces with non-lethal weapon-ry. Third, AI-driven weaponry gives an advantage to the developed world and particularly to the United States, be-cause of its advanced capability in technological innovation. Robotic weapons have been among the most successful in the fight against Al-Qaeda and other groups waging asymmetrical warfare against the United States. The Predator, a robotic airplane, has been successfully targeting terrorists throughout Afghanistan and Pakistan, and more technologi-cally advanced versions are being rapidly developed. Moreover, it does so in a targeted manner without the need to launch large-scale wars to hold territory--a process that would almost certainly result in more collateral damage. n61 If one believes that the United States is on the whole the best enforcer of rules of conduct that make for a peaceful and prosperous world, this development must also be counted as a benefit.
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### AT Huq

#### Huq admits that the executive can play fast and loose with the law

Huq 12

Aziz Z. Assistant Professor of Law, University of Chicago Law School. University of Chicago Law Review, Spring, 79 U. Chi. L. Rev. 777

I should be clear that my goal here is not to suggest that PV's skepticism about legal constraints is categorically unwarranted. Concern that Presidents can on occasion play fast and loose with the law is unquestionably grounded in fact. It does not follow from my analysis that law is always, necessarily, or automatically effective - PV persuasively show it is often not for reasons sketched in Part I. My point is rather that law cannot be dismissed so quickly and that PV's treatment of law as functionally marginal understates its actual salience. 50 At least in some nontrivial set of conditions, law is relevant to the imposition of an effective constraint on the executive. It therefore must be awarded a substantial role in any general political economy of the executive branch.

#### Huq doesn’t know when constraints will work AND he doesn’t think constraints work mid-stream

Huq 12

Aziz Z. Assistant Professor of Law, University of Chicago Law School. University of Chicago Law Review, Spring, 79 U. Chi. L. Rev. 777

Nevertheless, neither Neustadt nor Skowronek articulate the precise role of law in congressional obstruction of presidential goals. Perhaps observed executive reticence is merely a result of political calculations, consistent with PV's core hypothesis. But the evidence that the limits on executive authority tend to arise when Congress or existing law preclude a discretionary act suggests that institutions and statutes do play a meaningful role. Such correlations do not, however, establish the precise mechanisms whereby laws and institutions impose frictions on the employment of executive discretion. Alternatively, perhaps the Neustadt and Skowronek accounts can be explained solely in terms of Congress's negative veto in bicameralism and presentment, which is anticipated by the White House and so delimits the scope of presidential agendas. This would suggest that Congress's power is asymmetrical: it can block some [\*795] executive initiatives but do little midstream to regulate the use of discretion powers already possessed by the presidency. Consistent with this interpretation, The Executive Unbound stresses the failure of framework laws passed after the Nixon presidency to regulate war and emergency powers (pp 86-87). 74 If the executive can so easily find work-arounds, PV explain, it follows that Congress also has less incentive to pass [restrictions] such laws. In the long term, the incentives for Congress to enact statutory limits on presidential authorities will accordingly atrophy.