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## plan

The United States Federal Government should restrict the executive’s war power authority to use targeted killing as a first resort outside zones of active hostilities.

## allies

The plan is key to prevent collapse of the drone program

Zenko 13 (Micah Zenko is the Douglas Dillon fellow in the Center for Preventive Action (CPA) at the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR). Previously, he worked for five years at the Harvard Kennedy School and in Washington, DC, at the Brookings Institution, Congressional Research Service, and State Department's Office of Policy Planning, Council Special Report No. 65, January 2013, “U.S. Drone Strike Policies”, i.cfr.org/content/publications/attachments/Drones\_CSR65.pdf‎)

In his Nobel Peace Prize acceptance speech, President Obama declared: “Where force is necessary, we have a moral and strategic interest in binding ourselves to certain rules of conduct. Even as we confront a vicious adversary that abides by no rules, I believe the United States of America must remain a standard bearer in the conduct of war.”63 Under President Obama drone strikes have expanded and intensified, and they will remain a central component of U.S. counterterrorism operations for at least another decade, according to U.S. officials.64 But much as the Bush administration was compelled to reform its controversial coun- terterrorism practices, **it is likely that the United States will ultimately be forced by domestic and international pressure to scale back its drone strike policies**. The Obama administration can preempt this pressure by clearly articulating that the rules that govern its drone strikes, like all uses of military force, are based in the laws of armed conflict and inter- national humanitarian law; by engaging with emerging drone powers; and, most important, by matching practice with its stated policy by limiting drone strikes to those individuals it claims are being targeted (which would reduce the likelihood of civilian casualties since the total number of strikes would significantly decrease). The choice the United States faces is not between unfettered drone use and sacrificing freedom of action, but **between drone policy reforms by design or drone policy reforms by** default. Recent history demonstrates that domestic **political pressure could** severely limit **drone strikes in** ways that the CIA or JSOC **have not anticipated**. In support of its counterterrorism strategy, the Bush administration engaged in the extraordinary rendition of terrorist suspects to third countries, the use of enhanced interrogation techniques, and warrantless wiretapping. Although the Bush administration defended its policies as critical to protecting the U.S. homeland against terrorist attacks, unprecedented domestic political pressure led to significant reforms or termination. Compared to Bush-era counterterrorism policies, drone strikes are vulnerable to similar—albeit still largely untapped—moral outrage, **and they are even more susceptible to political constraints because they occur in plain sight.** Indeed, a negative trend in U.S. public opinion on drones is already apparent. Between February and June 2012, U.S. support for drone strikes against suspected terrorists fell from 83 per- cent to 62 percent—which represents less U.S. support than enhanced interrogation techniques maintained in the mid-2000s.65 Finally, U.S. drone strikes are also widely opposed by the citizens of important allies, emerging powers, and the local populations in states where strikes occur.66 States polled reveal **overwhelming opposition** to U.S. drone strikes: Greece (90 percent), Egypt (89 percent), Turkey (81 percent), Spain (76 percent), Brazil (76 percent), Japan (75 percent), and Pakistan (83 percent).67 This is significant because the United States cannot conduct drone strikes in the most critical corners of the world by itself. Drone strikes require the tacit or overt support of host states or neighbors. **If such states decided not to cooperate—or to actively resist—U.S. drone strikes, their effectiveness would be immediately and sharply reduced**, and the likelihood of civilian casualties would increase. This danger is not hypothetical. In 2007, the Ethiopian government terminated its U.S. military presence after public revelations that U.S. AC-130 gun- ships were launching attacks from Ethiopia into Somalia. Similarly, in late 2011, Pakistan evicted all U.S. military and intelligence drones, forc- ing the United States to completely rely on Afghanistan to serve as a staging ground for drone strikes in Pakistan. The United States could attempt to lessen the need for tacit host-state support by making signifi- cant investments in armed drones that can be flown off U.S. Navy ships, conducting electronic warfare or missile attacks on air defenses, allow- ing downed drones to not be recovered and potentially transferred to China or Russia, and losing access to the human intelligence networks on the ground that are critical for identifying targets. According to U.S. diplomats and military officials, active resis- tance—such as the Pakistani army shooting down U.S. armed drones— is a legitimate concern. In this case, the United States would need to either end drone sorties or escalate U.S. military involvement by attack- ing Pakistani radar and antiaircraft sites, thus increasing the likelihood of civilian casualties.68 Beyond where drone strikes currently take place, political pressure could severely limit options for new U.S. drone bases. For example, the Obama administration is debating deploying armed drones to attack al-Qaeda in the Islamic Maghreb (AQIM) in North Africa, which would likely require access to a new airbase in the region. To some extent, anger at U.S. sovereignty violations is an inevitable and necessary trade-off when conducting drone strikes. Nevertheless, in each of these cases, domestic anger would partially or fully abate if the United States modified its drone policy in the ways suggested below.

Only the plan can retain allied cooperation on counter-terrorism

Dworkin 12

Anthony Dworkin is a Senior Policy Fellow at the European Council on Foreign Relations, European Council on Foreign Relations, June 19, 2012, "Obama’s Drone Attacks: How the EU Should Respond", http://ecfr.eu/content/entry/commentary\_obamas\_drone\_attacks\_how\_the\_eu\_should\_respond

Obama’s Concession to European Views

In a speech on the subject last autumn, Obama’s chief counter-terrorism advisor John Brennan gave a glimpse into the administration’s discussions with some of its European allies. Brennan acknowledged that a number of the United States’ closest partners took a different view about the scope of the armed conflict against al-Qaeda, rejecting the use of force outside battlefield situations except when it was the only way to prevent the imminent threat of a terrorist attack. He went on to say that the United States depended on the assistance and cooperation of its allies in fighting terrorism, and that this was much easier to obtain when there was a convergence between their respective legal views. Increasingly, Brennan argued, such convergence was taking place as a matter of practice, as the United States chose to pursue an approach to targeting that was aligned with its partners’ vision.

In a further speech this year, Brennan developed this point. He said that even though the United States believed in general it had a legal right under the laws of war to shoot to kill anyone who was part of al-Qaeda, the Taliban or associated forces, in practice it followed a more restrictive approach. “We do not engage in lethal action in order to eliminate every single member of al-Qaeda in the world,” Brennan said. “Rather, we conduct targeted strikes because they are necessary to mitigate an actual ongoing threat – to stop plots, prevent future attacks, and save American lives.” In other words, the Obama administration presents itself as following a policy of voluntary restraint – deliberately confining its use of targeted killing to those cases where officials believe it is necessary to prevent an imminent attack, in part out of respect for its allies’ sensibilities and to make cooperation easier.

There are two reasons why this concession, on its own, is unlikely to – and ought not to – satisfy European concerns. It is true that many European states would accept that the use of lethal force is permissible when it is the only way to prevent the imminent loss of innocent life. Indeed the European Court of Human Rights endorsed such a standard several years ago in an influential ruling on the shooting by British special forces of three IRA members in Gibraltar. But if the United States is indeed following the principle of imminent threat in making targeting decisions outside the “hot battlefield” of Afghanistan and the Pakistani border region, it seems to interpret the concept of imminence in a rather more permissive way than most Europeans would be comfortable with. The sheer number of strikes testifies to the accommodating nature of the administration’s analysis: the New America Foundation estimates that there have been 265 drone strikes in Pakistan and 28 in Yemen since Obama took office. Moreover, in both Pakistan and now Yemen, Obama has reportedly given permission for so-called “signature strikes” in which attacks are carried against targets on the basis of a pattern of behavior that is indicative of terrorist activity without identifying the individuals involved – a policy that seems particularly hard to justify under an imminence test outside battlefield conditions.

Over time, the United States and its European allies might be able move closer to a common understanding of the concept of imminence through a process of discussion. But in any case there is an independent reason why the Obama administration’s policy of claiming expansive legal powers, while limiting them in practice on a voluntary basis, is a dangerous one. Precisely because he has greater international credibility than President Bush, the claims that Obama makes are likely to be influential in setting global standards for the use of the use of this new and potentially widely available technology. The United States is currently the only country that uses armed drones for targeted killing outside the battlefield, but several other countries already have remotely controlled pilotless aircraft or are in the process of acquiring them. The United States is unlikely to remain alone in this practice for long. At the same time, there have been several other examples in recent years of countries engaging in military campaigns against non-state groups outside their borders – as with Israel in Lebanon and Ethiopia in Somalia. For this reason, there is a strong international interest in trying to establish clear and agreed legal rules (not merely a kind of pragmatic best practice) to govern the use of targeted killing of non-state fighters.

Causes backlash that crushes negotiation over EU-US cyber agreement - Snowden pushed the issue to the brink

Nagel 13

Hadley Nagel is a researcher at the American Foreign Policy Council in Washington, DC, US News and World Report, August 6, 2013, "NSA Leaks Cause Waves Across the Atlantic", http://www.usnews.com/opinion/blogs/world-report/2013/08/06/after-nsa-leaks-the-us-must-work-with-the-eu-on-cyber-issues

Germany provides a case in point. Cooperation on intelligence and surveillance issues between Berlin and Washington has been broad and robust. A brand new $124 million U.S. Army base with bug-proof offices and a high-tech control center is currently being built in Wiesenbaden, Germany to jointly house elements from the NSA and Germany's Federal Intelligence Service, the BND.

German authorities have also budgeted an additional $130 million over the next five years to beef up their own surveillance effortsas part of an effort called the Technikaufwuchsprogramm ("Technological Coming-of-Age Program"). So it was not particularly revelatory when Snowden disclosed that the U.S. is "in bed together with the Germans" on intelligence matters.

These leaks, however, have brought critical attention to a process that had gone on constructively behind the scenes for quite some time. Worse still, they have made intelligence cooperation with America a distinct campaign issue in Germany's forthcoming national elections, slated to take place on September 22nd.

As a result, a new debate is now casting a shadow over Germany's political process: What did Chancellor Angela Merkel know about the NSA's Prism program? And, if she was in fact unaware of it, does that not indicate that she is incompetent? To the latter point, Merkel was recently lampooned for a comment she made during a joint press conference in which she called the Internet "Neuland," or "uncharted territory." Her comments became an instant Internet meme. Merkel continues to leave important questions unanswered, and German citizens remain skeptical. As a result, September is shaping up to be a referendum of sorts regarding Germany's intelligence cooperation with the U.S.

The problem is broader still. In order to achieve any kind of global multilateral agreement on governance in cyberspace, America will need to engage and harness already-existing international efforts. These include the International Telecommunication Union, a specialized agency of the United Nations, and the Freedom Online Coalition, whose membership spans Europe, North and South America as well as Asia.

To do so, however, the U.S. needs Europe. Prior to the NSA Prism scandal, America's closest ally in cyber governance, despite some differences, was the European Union. The logic behind that cooperation still remains, but the recent revelations by Snowden have given EU members reason to pause. As Neelie Kroes of the Netherlands, who serves as a Vice-President of the EU and as the European Commissioner for Digital Agenda, recently put it, "if European... customers cannot trust the United States government or their assurances, then maybe they won't trust U.S... providers either. That is my guess, and if I am right then there are multi-billion euro consequences for American companies."

Rebuilding that trust requires actively working with Brussels to create a transparent and accountable framework for intelligence cooperation and data sharing. A relationship in good standing is also integral for protecting U.S. economic interests in the EU.

Washington has done little on that score – at least so far. While every U.S. president since Lyndon Johnson has journeyed to Brussels, the headquarters of the E.U., to engage with the European Union as a body, President Obama – now in his fifth year in office – still has not done so. Yet rapprochement with the entire EU is key to creating a sustainable long-term structure for global cyber governance.

Fortunately, an opportunity to begin to do so is around the corner. The Freedom Online Coalition will convene at the United Nation's 8th Internet Governance Forum in Bali, Indonesia from October 22 to 25th. The world will be watching to see if the United States and the EU arrive as a consolidated alliance, or as estranged bedfellows.

Key to prevent global internet censorship

Bendiek 9/9/13

Annegret Bendiek is a Fellow with the EuroFuture Project of The German Marshall Fund of the United States, based in Washington, DC and a Senior Associate and Deputy Head of the EU External Relations Division of the German Institute for International and Security Affairs, German Marshall Fund, September 9, 2013, "Why We Need a Transatlantic Deal on Cyber Security and Privacy", http://blog.gmfus.org/2013/09/09/why-we-need-a-transatlantic-deal-on-cyber-security-and-privacy/

WASHINGTON—The recent debate over the U.S. National Security Agency’s surveillance activities has highlighted the United States’ and European Union’s different approaches to security, liberty, and executive power. How much privacy should the Internet provide? What security measures should be taken against crime and terrorism? Where should boundaries be drawn between the sovereign rights of national governments and the global sphere? The manner in which these debates play out and which concerns receive priority will have decisive effects on the emerging new order of cyberspace.

Europe and the United States are currently implementing differing levels of cyber security and privacy vigilance. This creates inconsistencies for companies operating in both jurisdictions, and will complicate negotiations toward a proposed free trade and investment deal. Only a transatlantic deal on cyber security and privacy can help the United States and European Union position themselves as credible actors on Internet governance. There is precedent for that kind of cooperation. Along with the EU-U.S. Working Group on Cybersecurity and Cybercrime, the United States and EU have since 2010 held regular cyber-attack defensive exercises. And a new U.S.-EU working group has been created to address the access of non-American citizens’ personal data by U.S. authorities.

Security problems are without a doubt one of the most important issues facing the regulation of the Internet, but the apparent tussle between security and freedom is not a zero-sum game. For example, protection from industrial espionage renders important economic advantages — online sales are 4 percent of total EU sales — but it requires substantial faith in Internet security. Yet an excessive emphasis on the security aspect and neglect of the idea of the Internet as a global public good threatens fundamental freedoms and thereby the democratic values upon which the Internet is supposedly based.

The challenge for both the EU and the United States will be to ensure sufficient democratic oversight over cyber security. While some countries’ idea of Internet governance is clearly based on the expansion of state control, the current multi-stakeholder model is biased toward the interests of the developed states, specifically the United States, and their multinational corporations. In their own ways, both models fail to provide democratic legitimacy and accountability.

A first objective of further transatlantic cooperation should be to maintain the current architecture of the Internet, with its open standards and decentralized administration, while making it more democratic. The multi-stakeholder approach and multilateral negotiations would benefit from involving developing states as equal partners rather than expecting them to blithely accept the global digital divide.

Secondly, the private sector needs to be involved in any legally binding mechanism to ensure adherence to codes of conduct in cyberspace. A code of conduct can only benefit from the expertise of large global corporations, and their involvement will help ensure that they adhere to universal standards on security, informational self-determination, and data protection.

Finally, the EU and the United States should push for an update to the General Comments on Article 17 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights of the UN Human Rights Commission, which serves as an international anchor for the right to privacy. The last such interpretation of international human rights law on the protection of privacy took place in 1988 and is in desperate need of being updated for the Internet age.

Only when the political, social, and economic dimensions of the Internet are considered and legislatures are more fully involved can a transatlantic Internet and cyber security market truly develop. Only in this way, can the transatlantic community ensure that security is not sacrificed for liberty and that the interests of the state are not pitted against privacy. Such a forward-looking transatlantic market will also hopefully function as an important bridge to other countries at the international level.

Censorship coming now and destroys the internet - ends global innovation and coordination efforts key to solve extinction

Genachowski and Bollinger 13

Julius Genachowski is chairman of the U.S. Federal Communications Commission, First Amendment scholar Lee C. Bollinger is president of Columbia University. Bollinger serves on the board of the Washington Post Company, Foreign Policy, April 16, 2013, "The Plot to Block Internet Freedom", http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2013/04/16/plot\_block\_internet\_freedom?page=full

The Internet has created an extraordinary new democratic forum for people around the world to express their opinions. It is revolutionizing global access to information: Today, more than 1 billion people worldwide have access to the Internet, and at current growth rates, 5 billion people -- about 70 percent of the world's population -- will be connected in five years.

But this growth trajectory is not inevitable, and threats are mounting to the global spread of an open and truly "worldwide" web. The expansion of the open Internet must be allowed to continue: The mobile and social media revolutions are critical not only for democratic institutions' ability to solve the collective problems of a shrinking world, but also to a dynamic and innovative global economy that depends on financial transparency and the free flow of information.

The threats to the open Internet were on stark display at last December's World Conference on International Telecommunications in Dubai, where the United States fought attempts by a number of countries -- including Russia, China, and Saudi Arabia -- to give a U.N. organization, the International Telecommunication Union (ITU), new regulatory authority over the Internet. Ultimately, over the objection of the United States and many others, 89 countries voted to approve a treaty that could strengthen the power of governments to control online content and deter broadband deployment.

In Dubai, two deeply worrisome trends came to a head.

First, we see that the Arab Spring and similar events have awakened nondemocratic governments to the danger that the Internet poses to their regimes. In Dubai, they pushed for a treaty that would give the ITU's imprimatur to governments' blocking or favoring of online content under the guise of preventing spam and increasing network security. Authoritarian countries' real goal is to legitimize content regulation, opening the door for governments to block any content they do not like, such as political speech.

Second, the basic commercial model underlying the open Internet is also under threat. In particular, some proposals, like the one made last year by major European network operators, would change the ground rules for payments for transferring Internet content. One species of these proposals is called "sender pays" or "sending party pays." Since the beginning of the Internet, content creators -- individuals, news outlets, search engines, social media sites -- have been able to make their content available to Internet users without paying a fee to Internet service providers. A sender-pays rule would change that, empowering governments to require Internet content creators to pay a fee to connect with an end user in that country.

Sender pays may look merely like a commercial issue, a different way to divide the pie. And proponents of sender pays and similar changes claim they would benefit Internet deployment and Internet users. But the opposite is true: If a country imposed a payment requirement, content creators would be less likely to serve that country. The loss of content would make the Internet less attractive and would lessen demand for the deployment of Internet infrastructure in that country.

Repeat the process in a few more countries, and the growth of global connectivity -- as well as its attendant benefits for democracy -- would slow dramatically. So too would the benefits accruing to the global economy. Without continuing improvements in transparency and information sharing, the innovation that springs from new commercial ideas and creative breakthroughs is sure to be severely inhibited.

To their credit, American Internet service providers have joined with the broader U.S. technology industry, civil society, and others in opposing these changes. Together, we were able to win the battle in Dubai over sender pays, but we have not yet won the war. Issues affecting global Internet openness, broadband deployment, and free speech will return in upcoming international forums, including an important meeting in Geneva in May, the World Telecommunication/ICT Policy Forum.

The massive investment in wired and wireless broadband infrastructure in the United States demonstrates that preserving an open Internet is completely compatible with broadband deployment. According to a recent UBS report, annual wireless capital investment in the United States increased 40 percent from 2009 to 2012, while investment in the rest of the world has barely inched upward. And according to the Information Technology and Innovation Foundation, more fiber-optic cable was laid in the United States in 2011 and 2012 than in any year since 2000, and 15 percent more than in Europe.

All Internet users lose something when some countries are cut off from the World Wide Web. Each person who is unable to connect to the Internet diminishes our own access to information. We become less able to understand the world and formulate policies to respond to our shrinking planet. Conversely, we gain a richer understanding of global events as more people connect around the world, and those societies nurturing nascent democracy movements become more familiar with America's traditions of free speech and pluralism.

That's why we believe that the Internet should remain free of gatekeepers and that no entity -- public or private -- should be able to pick and choose the information web users can receive. That is a principle the United States adopted in the Federal Communications Commission's 2010 Open Internet Order. And it's why we are deeply concerned about arguments by some in the United States that broadband providers should be able to block, edit, or favor Internet traffic that travels over their networks, or adopt economic models similar to international sender pays.

We must preserve the Internet as the most open and robust platform for the free exchange of information ever devised. Keeping the Internet open is perhaps the most important free speech issue of our time.

Allied cooperation’s key to effective drone use

Zenko 13

Micah Zenko is the Douglas Dillon fellow with the Center for Preventive Action at the Council on Foreign Relations, Newsday, January 30, 2013, "Zenko: Why we can't just drone Algeria", http://www.newsday.com/opinion/oped/zenko-why-we-can-t-just-drone-algeria-1.4536641

CNN should not have been surprised. Neither the Bush nor Obama administrations received blanket permission to transit Algerian airspace with surveillance planes or drones; instead, they received authorization only on a case-by-case basis and with advance notice. According to Washington Post journalist Craig Whitlock, the U.S. military relies on a fleet of civilian-looking unarmed aircraft to spy on suspected Islamist groups in North Africa, because they are less conspicuous - and therefore less politically sensitive for host nations - than drones. Moreover, even if the United States received flyover rights for armed drones, it has been unable to secure a base in southern Europe or northern Africa from which it would be permitted to conduct drone strikes; and presently, U.S. armed drones cannot be launched and recovered from naval platforms. According to Hollywood movies or television dramas, with its immense intelligence collection and military strike capabilities, the United States can locate, track, and kill anyone in the world. This misperception is continually reinvigorated by the White House's, the CIA's, and the Pentagon's close cooperation with movie and television studios. For example, several years before the CIA even started conducting non-battlefield drone strikes, it was recommending the tactic as a plotline in the short-lived (2001-2003) drama "The Agency." As the show's writer and producer later revealed: "The Hellfire missile thing, they suggested that. I didn't come up with this stuff. I think they were doing a public opinion poll by virtue of giving me some good ideas." Similarly, as of November there were at least 10 movies about the Navy SEALs in production or in theaters, which included so much support from the Pentagon that one film even starred active-duty SEALs. The Obama administration's lack of a military response in Algeria reflects how sovereign states routinely constrain U.S. intelligence and military activities. As the U.S. Air Force Judge Advocate General's Air Force Operations and the Law guidebook states: "The unauthorized or improper entry of foreign aircraft into a state's national airspace is a violation of that state's sovereignty. . . . Except for overflight of international straits and archipelagic sea lanes, all nations have complete discretion in regulating or prohibiting flights within their national airspace." Though not sexy and little reported, deploying CIA drones or special operations forces requires constant behind-the-scenes diplomacy: with very rare exceptions - like the Bin Laden raid - the U.S. military follows the rules of the world's other 194 sovereign, independent states. These rules come in many forms. For example, basing rights agreements can limit the number of civilian, military and contractor personnel at an airbase or post; what access they have to the electromagnetic spectrum; what types of aircraft they can fly; how many sorties they can conduct per day; when those sorties can occur and how long they can last; whether the aircraft can drop bombs on another country and what sort of bombs; and whether they can use lethal force in self-defense. When the United States led the enforcement of the northern no-fly zone over Iraq from the Incirlik Air Base in southern Turkey from 1991 to 2003, a Turkish military official at the rank of lieutenant colonel or higher was always on board U.S. Air Force AWACS planes, monitoring the airspace to assure that the United States did not violate its highly restrictive basing agreement. As Algeria is doing presently, the denial or approval of overflight rights is a powerful tool that states can impose on the United States. These include where U.S. air assets can enter and exit another state, what flight path they may take, how high they must fly, what type of planes can be included in the force package, and what sort of missions they can execute. In addition, these constraints include what is called shutter control, or the limits to when and how a transiting aircraft can collect information. For example, U.S. drones that currently fly out of the civilian airfield in Arba Minch, Ethiopia, to Somalia, are restricted in their collection activities over Ethiopia's Ogaden region, where the government has conducted an intermittent counterinsurgency against the Ogaden National Liberation Front.

Drones solve safe havens – prevents an attack in the US

Johnston 12 (Patrick B. Johnston is an associate political scientist at the RAND Corporation, a nonprofit, nonpartisan research institution. He is the author of "Does Decapitation Work? Assessing the Effectiveness of Leadership Targeting in Counterinsurgency Campaigns," published in International Security (Spring 2012)., 8/22/2012, "Drone Strikes Keep Pressure on al-Qaida", www.rand.org/blog/2012/08/drone-strikes-keep-pressure-on-al-qaida.html)

Should the U.S. continue to strike at al-Qaida's leadership with drone attacks? A recent poll shows that while most Americans approve of drone strikes, in 17 out of 20 countries, more than half of those surveyed disapprove of them. My study of leadership decapitation in 90 counter-insurgencies since the 1970s shows that when militant leaders are captured or killed militant attacks decrease, terrorist campaigns end sooner, and their outcomes tend to favor the government or third-party country, not the militants. Those opposed to drone strikes often cite the June 2009 one that targeted Pakistani Taliban leader Baitullah Mehsud at a funeral in the Tribal Areas. That strike reportedly killed 60 civilians attending the funeral, but not Mehsud. He was killed later by another drone strike in August 2009. His successor, Hakimullah Mehsud, developed a relationship with the foiled Times Square bomber Faisal Shahzad, who cited drone strikes as a key motivation for his May 2010 attempted attack. Compared to manned aircraft, drones have some advantages as counter-insurgency tools, such as lower costs, longer endurance and the lack of a pilot to place in harm's way and risk of capture. These characteristics can enable a more deliberative targeting process that serves to minimize unintentional casualties. But the weapons employed by drones are usually identical to those used via manned aircraft and can still kill civilians—creating enmity that breeds more terrorists. Yet many insurgents and terrorists have been taken off the battlefield by U.S. drones and special-operations forces. Besides Mehsud, the list includes Anwar al-Awlaki of al-Qaida in the Arabian Peninsula; al-Qaida deputy leader Abu Yahya al-Li-bi; and, of course, al-Qaida leader Osama bin Laden. Given that list, it is possible that the drone program has prevented numerous attacks by their potential followers, like Shazad. What does the removal of al-Qaida leadership mean for U.S. national security? Though many in al-Qaida's senior leadership cadre remain, the historical record suggests that "decapitation" will likely weaken the organization and could cripple its ability to conduct major attacks on the U.S. homeland. Killing terrorist leaders is not necessarily a knockout blow, but can make it harder for terrorists to attack the U.S. Members of al-Qaida's central leadership, once safely amassed in northwestern Pakistan while America shifted its focus to Iraq, have been killed, captured, forced underground or scattered to various locations with little ability to communicate or move securely. Recently declassified correspondence seized in the bin Laden raid shows that the relentless pressure from the drone campaign on al-Qaida in Pakistan led bin Laden to advise al-Qaida operatives to leave Pakistan's Tribal Areas as no longer safe. Bin Laden's letters show that U.S. counterterrorism actions, which had forced him into self-imposed exile, had made running the organization not only more risky, but also more difficult. As al-Qaida members trickle out of Pakistan and seek sanctuary elsewhere, the U.S. military is ramping up its counterterrorism operations in Somalia and Yemen, while continuing its drone campaign in Pakistan. Despite its controversial nature, the U.S. counter-terrorism strategy has demonstrated a degree of effectiveness. The Obama administration is committed to reducing the size of the U.S. military's footprint overseas by relying on drones, special operations forces, and other intelligence capabilities. These methods have made it more difficult for al-Qaida remnants to reconstitute a new safe haven, as Osama bin Laden did in Afghanistan in 1996, after his ouster from Sudan.

Drones are operationally effective and alternatives are worse—establishing a clear strike policy solves criticism.

Byman 13 (Daniel Byman, Brookings Institute Saban Center for Middle East Policy, Research Director, and Foreign Policy, Senior Fellow, July/Aug 2013, “Why Drones Work: The Case for the Washington's Weapon of Choice”, www.brookings.edu/research/articles/2013/06/17-drones-obama-weapon-choice-us-counterterrorism-byman)

Despite President Barack Obama’s recent call to reduce the United States’ reliance on drones, they will likely remain his administration’s weapon of choice. Whereas President George W. Bush oversaw fewer than 50 drone strikes during his tenure, Obama has signed off on over 400 of them in the last four years, making the program the centerpiece of U.S. counterterrorism strategy. The drones have done their job remarkably well: by killing key leaders and denying terrorists sanctuaries in Pakistan, Yemen, and, to a lesser degree, Somalia, drones have **devastated** al Qaeda and associated anti-American militant groups. And they have done so at little financial cost, at no risk to U.S. forces, and with fewer civilian casualties than many alternative methods would have caused. Critics, however, remain skeptical. They claim that drones kill thousands of innocent civilians, alienate allied governments, anger foreign publics, illegally target Americans, and set a dangerous precedent that irresponsible governments will abuse. Some of these criticisms are valid; others, less so. In the end, drone strikes remain a necessary instrument of counterterrorism. The United States simply cannot tolerate terrorist safe havens in remote parts of Pakistan and elsewhere, and drones offer a comparatively low-risk way of targeting these areas while minimizing collateral damage. So drone warfare is here to stay, and it is likely to expand in the years to come as other countries’ capabilities catch up with those of the United States. But Washington must continue to improve its drone policy, spelling out clearer rules for extrajudicial and extraterritorial killings so that tyrannical regimes will have a harder time pointing to the U.S. drone program to justify attacks against political opponents. At the same time, even as it solidifies the drone program, Washington must remain mindful of the built-in limits of low-cost, unmanned interventions, since the very convenience of drone warfare risks dragging the United States into conflicts it could otherwise avoid. NOBODY DOES IT BETTER 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. Critics of drone strikes often fail to take into account the fact that the alternatives are either too risky or unrealistic. To be sure, in an ideal world, militants would be captured alive, allowing authorities to question them and search their compounds for useful information. Raids, arrests, and interrogations can produce vital intelligence and can be less controversial than lethal operations. That is why they should be, and indeed already are, used in stable countries where the United States enjoys the support of the host government. But in war zones or unstable countries, such as Pakistan, Yemen, and Somalia, arresting militants is highly dangerous and, even if successful, often inefficient. In those three countries, the government exerts little or no control over remote areas, which means that it is highly dangerous to go after militants hiding out there. Worse yet, in Pakistan and Yemen, the governments have at times cooperated with militants. If the United States regularly sent in special operations forces to hunt down terrorists there, sympathetic officials could easily tip off the jihadists, likely leading to firefights, U.S. casualties, and possibly the deaths of the suspects and innocent civilians. Of course, it was a Navy SEAL team and not a drone strike that finally got bin Laden, but in many cases in which the United States needs to capture or eliminate an enemy, raids are too risky and costly. And even if a raid results in a successful capture, it begets another problem: what to do with the detainee. Prosecuting detainees in a federal or military court is difficult because often the intelligence against terrorists is inadmissible or using it risks jeopardizing sources and methods. And given the fact that the United States is trying to close, rather than expand, the detention facility at Guantánamo Bay, Cuba, it has become much harder to justify holding suspects indefinitely. It has become more politically palatable for the United States to kill rather than detain suspected terrorists. Furthermore, although a drone strike may violate the local state’s sovereignty, it does so to a lesser degree than would putting U.S. boots on the ground or conducting a large-scale air campaign. And compared with a 500-pound bomb dropped from an F-16, the grenade like warheads carried by most drones create smaller, more precise blast zones that decrease the risk of unexpected structural damage and casualties. Even more important, drones, unlike traditional airplanes, can loiter above a target for hours, waiting for the ideal moment to strike and thus reducing the odds that civilians will be caught in the kill zone. Finally, using drones is also far less bloody than asking allies to hunt down terrorists on the United States’ behalf. The Pakistani and Yemeni militaries, for example, are known to regularly torture and execute detainees, and they often indiscriminately bomb civilian areas or use scorched-earth tactics against militant groups.

Nuke terror likely—continued vigilance is key

Dahl 13 (Fredrik, Reuters, covers mainly nuclear-related issues, including Iran's dispute with the West over its atomic plans. I previously worked in Tehran, Iran, between 2007-2010, and have also been posted to Belgrade, Sarajevo, London, Brussels, Helsinki and Stockholm during two decades with Reuters, 7/1/2013, "Governments warn about nuclear terrorism threat", www.reuters.com/article/2013/07/01/us-nuclear-security-idUSBRE96010E20130701)

**More action is needed to prevent militants acquiring plutonium or** h**ighly-**e**nriched** u**ranium** that could be used in bombs, governments agreed at a meeting on nuclear security in Vienna on Monday, without deciding on any concrete steps. A declaration adopted by more than 120 states at the meeting said "substantial progress" had been made in recent years to improve nuclear security globally, but it was not enough. **Analysts say radical groups could theoretically build a crude but deadly nuclear bomb** if they had the money, technical knowledge and materials needed. Ministers remained "concerned about the threat of nuclear and radiological terrorism ... More needs to be done to further strengthen nuclear security worldwide", the statement said. The document "encouraged" states to take various measures such as minimizing the use of highly-enriched uranium, but some diplomats said they would have preferred firmer commitments. Many countries regard nuclear security as a sensitive political issue that should be handled primarily by national authorities. This was reflected in the statement's language. Still, Yukiya Amano, director general of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), which hosted the conference, said the agreement was "very robust" and represented a major step forward. RADICAL GROUPS' "NUCLEAR AMBITIONS" Amano earlier warned the IAEA-hosted conference **against a "false sense of security" over the danger of nuclear terrorism**. Holding up a small lead container that was used to try to traffic highly enriched uranium in Moldova two years ago, the U.N. nuclear chief said it showed a "**worrying level of knowledge on the part of the smugglers**". "This case ended well," he said, referring to the fact that the material was seized and arrests were made. But he added: "We cannot be sure if such cases are just the tip of the iceberg." Obtaining weapons-grade fissile material - highly enriched uranium or plutonium - poses the biggest challenge for militant groups, so it must be kept secure both at civilian and military facilities, experts say. An apple-sized amount of plutonium in a nuclear device and detonated in a highly populated area could instantly kill or wound hundreds of thousands of people, according to the Nuclear Security Governance Experts Group (NSGEG) lobby group. But experts say a so-called "dirty bomb" is a more likely threat than a nuclear bomb. In a dirty bomb, conventional explosives are used to disperse radiation from a radioactive source, which can be found in hospitals or other places that are generally not very well protected. More than a hundred incidents of thefts and other unauthorized activities involving nuclear and radioactive material are reported to the IAEA every year, Amano said. "**Some material goes missing and is never found**," he said. U.S. Energy Secretary Ernest Moniz said **al Qaeda was still likely to be trying to obtain nuclear material for a weapon**. "Despite the strides we have made in dismantling core al Qaeda we should expect its adherents ... to continue trying to achieve their nuclear ambitions," he said.

Their defense is wrong.

Us Russia Joint Threat Assessment May 11
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There are two basic types of INDs terrorists might make. A “gun-type” bomb made from HEU, in particular, is basically a matter of slamming two pieces of HEU together at high speed. An “implosion-type” bomb—in which precisely arranged explosives crush nuclear material to a much higher density, setting off the chain reaction—would be substantially more difficult for terrorists to achieve, but still plausible, particularly if they were able to obtain knowledgeable help (as they have been actively attempting to do).4 A crude implosion-type design does not have to be as complex and sophisticated as the Nagasaki bomb. One study by the now-defunct U.S. Congressional Office of Technology Assessment summarized the technical reality (referring to both the gun-type bomb and the implosion-type bomb): “A small group of people, none of whom have ever had access to the classified literature, could possibly design and build a crude nuclear explosive device. Only modest machine-shop facilities that could be contracted for without arousing suspicion would be required.”5 Indeed, even before the revelations from Afghanistan, U.S. intelligence concluded that “fabrication of at least a ‘crude’ nuclear device was within [al-Qaeda]’s capabilities, if it could obtain fissile material.”6

Extinction

Hellman 8 (Martin E. Hellman, emeritus prof of engineering @ Stanford, “Risk Analysis of Nuclear Deterrence” SPRING 2008 THE BENT OF TAU BETA PI, <http://www.nuclearrisk.org/paper.pdf>)

The threat of nuclear terrorism looms much larger in the public’s mind than the threat of a full-scale nuclear war, yet this article focuses primarily on the latter. An explanation is therefore in order before proceeding. A terrorist attack involving a nuclear weapon would be a catastrophe of immense proportions: “A 10-kiloton bomb detonated at Grand Central Station on a typical work day would likely kill some half a million people, and inflict over a trillion dollars in direct economic damage. America and its way of life would be changed forever.” [Bunn 2003, pages viii-ix]. The likelihood of such an attack is also significant. Former Secretary of Defense William Perry has estimated the chance of a nuclear terrorist incident within the next decade to be roughly 50 percent [Bunn 2007, page 15]. David Albright, a former weapons inspector in Iraq, estimates those odds at less than one percent, but notes, “We would never accept a situation where the chance of a major nuclear accident like Chernobyl would be anywhere near 1% .... A nuclear terrorism attack is a low-probability event, but we can’t live in a world where it’s anything but extremely low-probability.” [Hegland 2005]. In a survey of 85 national security experts, Senator Richard Lugar found a median estimate of 20 percent for the “probability of an attack involving a nuclear explosion occurring somewhere in the world in the next 10 years,” with 79 percent of the respondents believing “it more likely to be carried out by terrorists” than by a government [Lugar 2005, pp. 14-15]. I support increased efforts to reduce the threat of nuclear terrorism, but that is not inconsistent with the approach of this article. Because terrorism is one of the potential trigger mechanisms for a full-scale nuclear war, the risk analyses proposed herein will include estimating the risk of nuclear terrorism as one component of the overall risk. If that risk, the overall risk, or both are found to be unacceptable, then the proposed remedies would be directed to reduce which- ever risk(s) warrant attention. Similar remarks apply to a number of other threats (e.g., nuclear war between the U.S. and China over Taiwan). his article would be incomplete if it only dealt with the threat of nuclear terrorism and neglected the threat of full- scale nuclear war. If both risks are unacceptable, an effort to reduce only the terrorist component would leave humanity in great peril. In fact, society’s almost total neglect of the threat of full-scale nuclear war makes studying that risk all the more important. The cosT of World War iii The danger associated with nuclear deterrence depends on both the cost of a failure and the failure rate.3 This section explores the cost of a failure of nuclear deterrence, and the next section is concerned with the failure rate. While other definitions are possible, this article defines a failure of deterrence to mean a full-scale exchange of all nuclear weapons available to the U.S. and Russia, an event that will be termed World War III. Approximately 20 million people died as a result of the first World War. World War II’s fatalities were double or triple that number—chaos prevented a more precise deter- mination. In both cases humanity recovered, and the world today bears few scars that attest to the horror of those two wars. Many people therefore implicitly believe that a third World War would be horrible but survivable, an extrapola- tion of the effects of the first two global wars. In that view, World War III, while horrible, is something that humanity may just have to face and from which it will then have to recover. In contrast, some of those most qualified to assess the situation hold a very different view. In a 1961 speech to a joint session of the Philippine Con- gress, General Douglas MacArthur, stated, “Global war has become a Frankenstein to destroy both sides. … If you lose, you are annihilated. If you win, you stand only to lose. No longer does it possess even the chance of the winner of a duel. It contains now only the germs of double suicide.” Former Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara ex- pressed a similar view: “If deterrence fails and conflict develops, the present U.S. and NATO strategy carries with it a high risk that Western civilization will be destroyed” [McNamara 1986, page 6]. More recently, George Shultz, William Perry, Henry Kissinger, and Sam Nunn4 echoed those concerns when they quoted President Reagan’s belief that nuclear weapons were “totally irrational, totally inhu- mane, good for nothing but killing, possibly destructive of life on earth and civilization.” [Shultz 2007] Official studies, while couched in less emotional terms, still convey the horrendous toll that World War III would exact: “The resulting deaths would be far beyond any precedent. Executive branch calculations show a range of U.S. deaths from 35 to 77 percent (i.e., 79-160 million dead) … a change in targeting could kill somewhere between 20 million and 30 million additional people on each side .... These calculations reflect only deaths during the first 30 days. Additional millions would be injured, and many would eventually die from lack of adequate medical care … millions of people might starve or freeze during the follow- ing winter, but it is not possible to estimate how many. … further millions … might eventually die of latent radiation effects.” [OTA 1979, page 8] This OTA report also noted the possibility of serious ecological damage [OTA 1979, page 9], a concern that as- sumed a new potentiality when the TTAPS report [TTAPS 1983] proposed that the ash and dust from so many nearly simultaneous nuclear explosions and their resultant fire- storms could usher in a nuclear winter that might erase homo sapiens from the face of the earth, much as many scientists now believe the K-T Extinction that wiped out the dinosaurs resulted from an impact winter caused by ash and dust from a large asteroid or comet striking Earth. The TTAPS report produced a heated debate, and there is still no scientific consensus on whether a nuclear winter would follow a full-scale nuclear war. Recent work [Robock 2007, Toon 2007] suggests that even a limited nuclear exchange or one between newer nuclear-weapon states, such as India and Pakistan, could have devastating long-lasting climatic consequences due to the large volumes of smoke that would be generated by fires in modern megacities. While it is uncertain how destructive World War III would be, prudence dictates that we apply the same engi- neering conservatism that saved the Golden Gate Bridge from collapsing on its 50th anniversary and assume that preventing World War III is a necessity—not an option.

Causes US-Russia miscalc—extinction

Barrett et al. 13—PhD in Engineering and Public Policy from Carnegie Mellon University, Fellow in the RAND Stanton Nuclear Security Fellows Program, and Director of Research at Global Catastrophic Risk Institute—AND Seth Baum, PhD in Geography from Pennsylvania State University, Research Scientist at the Blue Marble Space Institute of Science, and Executive Director of Global Catastrophic Risk Institute—AND Kelly Hostetler, BS in Political Science from Columbia and Research Assistant at Global Catastrophic Risk Institute (Anthony, 24 June 2013, “Analyzing and Reducing the Risks of Inadvertent Nuclear War Between the United States and Russia,” Science & Global Security: The Technical Basis for Arms Control, Disarmament, and Nonproliferation Initiatives, Volume 21, Issue 2, Taylor & Francis)

War involving significant fractions of the U.S. and Russian nuclear arsenals, which are by far the largest of any nations, could have globally catastrophic effects such as severely reducing food production for years, 1 potentially leading to collapse of modern civilization worldwide, and even the extinction of humanity. 2 Nuclear war between the United States and Russia could occur by various routes, including accidental or unauthorized launch; deliberate first attack by one nation; and inadvertent attack. In an accidental or unauthorized launch or detonation, system safeguards or procedures to maintain control over nuclear weapons fail in such a way that a nuclear weapon or missile launches or explodes without direction from leaders. In a deliberate first attack, the attacking nation decides to attack based on accurate information about the state of affairs. In an inadvertent attack, the attacking nation mistakenly concludes that it is under attack and launches nuclear weapons in what it believes is a counterattack. 3 (Brinkmanship strategies incorporate elements of all of the above, in that they involve intentional manipulation of risks from otherwise accidental or inadvertent launches. 4 ) Over the years, nuclear strategy was aimed primarily at minimizing risks of intentional attack through development of deterrence capabilities, and numerous measures also were taken to reduce probabilities of accidents, unauthorized attack, and inadvertent war. For purposes of deterrence, both U.S. and Soviet/Russian forces have maintained significant capabilities to have some forces survive a first attack by the other side and to launch a subsequent counter-attack. However, concerns about the extreme disruptions that a first attack would cause in the other side's forces and command-and-control capabilities led to both sides’ development of capabilities to detect a first attack and launch a counter-attack before suffering damage from the first attack. 5 Many people believe that with the end of the Cold War and with improved relations between the United States and Russia, the risk of East-West nuclear war was significantly reduced. 6 However, it also has been argued that inadvertent nuclear war between the United States and Russia has continued to present a substantial risk. 7 While the United States and Russia are not actively threatening each other with war, they have remained ready to launch nuclear missiles in response to indications of attack. 8 False indicators of nuclear attack could be caused in several ways. First, a wide range of events have already been mistakenly interpreted as indicators of attack, including weather phenomena, a faulty computer chip, wild animal activity, and control-room training tapes loaded at the wrong time. 9 Second, terrorist groups or other actors might cause attacks on either the United States or Russia that resemble some kind of nuclear attack by the other nation by actions such as exploding a stolen or improvised nuclear bomb, 10 especially if such an event occurs during a crisis between the United States and Russia. 11 A variety of nuclear terrorism scenarios are possible. 12 Al Qaeda has sought to obtain or construct nuclear weapons and to use them against the United States. 13 Other methods could involve attempts to circumvent nuclear weapon launch control safeguards or exploit holes in their security. 14 It has long been argued that the probability of inadvertent nuclear war is significantly higher during U.S.–Russian crisis conditions, 15 with the Cuban Missile Crisis being a prime historical example. It is possible that U.S.–Russian relations will significantly deteriorate in the future, increasing nuclear tensions. There are a variety of ways for a third party to raise tensions between the United States and Russia, making one or both nations more likely to misinterpret events as attacks. 16

## norms

Global proliferation of drone-capabilities is inevitable–only the plan establishes norms for restrained use that solves global war

Roberts 13 (Kristen, news editor for the National Journal, master in security studies from Georgetown, “When the Whole World Has Drones”, 3/22/2013, <http://www.nationaljournal.com/magazine/when-the-whole-world-has-drones-20130321>)

The proliferation of drone technology has moved well beyond the control of the United States government and its closest allies. The aircraft are too easy to obtain, with barriers to entry on the production side crumbling too quickly to place limits on the spread of a technology that promises to transform warfare on a global scale. Already, more than 75 countries have remote piloted aircraft. More than 50 nations are building a total of nearly a thousand types. At its last display at a trade show in Beijing, China showed off 25 different unmanned aerial vehicles. Not toys or models, but real flying machines. It’s a classic and common phase in the life cycle of a military innovation: An advanced country and its weapons developers create a tool, and then others learn how to make their own. But what makes this case rare, and dangerous, is the powerful combination of efficiency and lethality spreading in an environment lacking internationally accepted guidelines on legitimate use. This technology is snowballing through a global arena where the main precedent for its application is the one set by the United States; it’s a precedent Washington does not want anyone following. America, the world’s leading democracy and a country built on a legal and moral framework unlike any other, has adopted a war-making process that too often bypasses its traditional, regimented, and rigorously overseen military in favor of a secret program never publicly discussed, based on legal advice never properly vetted. The Obama administration has used its executive power to refuse or outright ignore requests by congressional overseers, and it has resisted monitoring by federal courts. To implement this covert program, the administration has adopted a tool that lowers the threshold for lethal force by reducing the cost and risk of combat. This still-expanding counterterrorism use of drones to kill people, including its own citizens, outside of traditionally defined battlefields and established protocols for warfare, has given friends and foes a green light to employ these aircraft in extraterritorial operations that could not only affect relations between the nation-states involved but also destabilize entire regions and potentially upset geopolitical order. Hyperbole? Consider this: Iran, with the approval of Damascus, carries out a lethal strike on anti-Syrian forces inside Syria; Russia picks off militants tampering with oil and gas lines in Ukraine or Georgia; Turkey arms a U.S.-provided Predator to kill Kurdish militants in northern Iraq who it believes are planning attacks along the border. Label the targets as terrorists, and in each case, Tehran, Moscow, and Ankara may point toward Washington and say, we learned it by watching you. In Pakistan, Yemen, and Afghanistan. This is the unintended consequence of American drone warfare. For all of the attention paid to the drone program in recent weeks—about Americans on the target list (there are none at this writing) and the executive branch’s legal authority to kill by drone outside war zones (thin, by officials’ own private admission)—what goes undiscussed is Washington’s deliberate failure to establish clear and demonstrable rules for itself that would at minimum create a globally relevant standard for delineating between legitimate and rogue uses of one of the most awesome military robotics capabilities of this generation. THE WRONG QUESTION The United States is the indisputable leader in drone technology and long-range strike. Remote-piloted aircraft have given Washington an extraordinary ability to wage war with far greater precision, improved effect, and fewer unintended casualties than conventional warfare. The drones allow U.S. forces to establish ever greater control over combat areas, and the Pentagon sees the technology as an efficient and judicious force of the future. And it should, given the billions of dollars that have gone into establishing and maintaining such a capability. That level of superiority leads some national security officials to downplay concerns about other nations’ unmanned systems and to too narrowly define potential threats to the homeland. As proof, they argue that American dominance in drone warfare is due only in part to the aircraft itself, which offers the ability to travel great distances and loiter for long periods, not to mention carry and launch Hellfire missiles. The drone itself, they argue, is just a tool and, yes, one that is being copied aggressively by allies and adversaries alike. The real edge, they say, is in the unparalleled intelligence-collection and data-analysis underpinning the aircraft’s mission. “There is what I think is just an unconstrained focus on a tool as opposed to the subject of the issue, the tool of remotely piloted aircraft that in fact provide for greater degrees of surety before you employ force than anything else we use,” said retired Lt. Gen. David Deptula, the Air Force’s first deputy chief of staff for intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance. “I think people don’t realize that for the medium altitude aircraft—the MQ-1 [Predator] and MQ-9 [Reaper] that are generally written about in the press—there are over 200 people involved in just one orbit of those aircraft.… The majority of those people are analysts who are interpreting the information that’s coming off the sensors on the aircraft.” The analysts are part of the global architecture that makes precision strikes, and targeted killing, possible. At the front end, obviously, intelligence—military, CIA, and local—inform target decisions. But in as near-real time as technologically possible, intel analysts in Nevada, Texas, Virginia, and other locations watch the data flood in from the aircraft and make calls on what’s happening on target. They monitor the footage, listen to audio, and analyze signals, giving decision-makers time to adjust an operation if the risks (often counted in potential civilian deaths) outweigh the reward (judged by the value of the threat eliminated). “Is that a shovel or a rifle? Is that a Taliban member or is this a farmer? The way that warfare has advanced is that we are much more exquisite in our ability to discern,” Maj. Gen. Robert Otto, commander of the Air Force Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance Agency, told National Journal at Nellis Air Force Base in Nevada. “We’re not overhead for 15 minutes with a fighter that’s about to run out of gas, and we have to make a decision. We can orbit long enough to be pretty sure about our target.” Other countries, groups, and even individuals can and do fly drones. But no state or group has nearly the sophisticated network of intelligence and data analysis that gives the United States its strategic advantage. Although it would be foolish to dismiss the notion that potential U.S. adversaries aspire to attain that type of war-from-afar, pinpoint-strike capability, they have neither the income nor the perceived need to do so. That’s true, at least today. It’s also irrelevant. Others who employ drones are likely to carry a different agenda, one more concerned with employing a relatively inexpensive and ruthlessly efficient tool to dispatch an enemy close at hand. “It would be very difficult for them to create the global-strike architecture we have, to have a control cell in Nevada flying a plane over Afghanistan. The reality is that most nations don’t want or need that,” said Peter Singer, director of the Brookings Institution’s Center for 21st Century Security and Intelligence and one of the foremost experts in advanced military technology. “Turkey’s not looking to conduct strikes into the Philippines.... But Turkey is looking to be able to carry out long-duration surveillance and potentially strike inside and right on its border.” And that’s a NATO ally seeking the capability to conduct missions that would run afoul of U.S. interests in Iraq and the broader Middle East. Already, Beijing says it considered a strike in Myanmar to kill a drug lord wanted in the deaths of Chinese sailors. What happens if China arms one of its remote-piloted planes and strikes Philippine or Indian trawlers in the South China Sea? Or if India uses the aircraft to strike Lashkar-e-Taiba militants near Kashmir? “We don’t like other states using lethal force outside their borders. It’s destabilizing. It can lead to a sort of wider escalation of violence between two states,” said Micah Zenko, a security policy and drone expert at the Council on Foreign Relations. “So the proliferation of drones is not just about the protection of the United States. It’s primarily about the likelihood that other states will increasingly use lethal force outside of their borders.” LOWERING THE BAR Governments have covertly killed for ages, whether they maintained an official hit list or not. Before the Obama administration’s “disposition matrix,” Israel was among the best-known examples of a state that engaged, and continues to engage, in strikes to eliminate people identified by its intelligence as plotting attacks against it. But Israel certainly is not alone. Turkey has killed Kurds in Northern Iraq. Some American security experts point to Russia as well, although Moscow disputes this. In the 1960s, the U.S. government was involved to differing levels in plots to assassinate leaders in Congo and the Dominican Republic, and, famously, Fidel Castro in Cuba. The Church Committee’s investigation and subsequent 1975 report on those and other suspected plots led to the standing U.S. ban on assassination. So, from 1976 until the start of President George W. Bush’s “war on terror,” the United States did not conduct targeted killings, because it was considered anathema to American foreign policy. (In fact, until as late as 2001, Washington’s stated policy was to oppose Israel’s targeted killings.) When America adopted targeted killing again—first under the Bush administration after the September 11 attacks and then expanded by President Obama—the tools of the trade had changed. No longer was the CIA sending poison, pistols, and toxic cigars to assets overseas to kill enemy leaders. Now it could target people throughout al-Qaida’s hierarchy with accuracy, deliver lethal ordnance literally around the world, and watch the mission’s completion in real time. The United States is smartly using technology to improve combat efficacy, and to make war-fighting more efficient, both in money and manpower. It has been able to conduct more than 400 lethal strikes, killing more than 3,500 people, in Afghanistan, Pakistan, Yemen, Somalia, and North Africa using drones; reducing risk to U.S. personnel; and giving the Pentagon flexibility to use special-forces units elsewhere. And, no matter what human-rights groups say, it’s clear that drone use has reduced the number of civilians killed in combat relative to earlier conflicts. Washington would be foolish not to exploit unmanned aircraft in its long fight against terrorism. In fact, defense hawks and spendthrifts alike would criticize it if it did not. “If you believe that these folks are legitimate terrorists who are committing acts of aggressive, potential violent acts against the United States or our allies or our citizens overseas, should it matter how we choose to engage in the self-defense of the United States?” asked Rep. Mike Rogers, R-Mich., chairman of the House Intelligence Committee. “Do we have that debate when a special-forces team goes in? Do we have that debate if a tank round does it? Do we have the debate if an aircraft pilot drops a particular bomb?” But defense analysts argue—and military officials concede—there is a qualitative difference between dropping a team of men into Yemen and green-lighting a Predator flight from Nevada. Drones lower the threshold for military action. That’s why, according to the Council on Foreign Relations, unmanned aircraft have conducted 95 percent of all U.S. targeted killings. Almost certainly, if drones were unavailable, the United States would not have pursued an equivalent number of manned strikes in Pakistan. And what’s true for the United States will be true as well for other countries that own and arm remote piloted aircraft. “The drones—the responsiveness, the persistence, and without putting your personnel at risk—is what makes it a different technology,” Zenko said. “When other states have this technology, if they follow U.S. practice, it will lower the threshold for their uses of lethal force outside their borders. So they will be more likely to conduct targeted killings than they have in the past.” The Obama administration appears to be aware of and concerned about setting precedents through its targeted-strike program. When the development of a disposition matrix to catalog both targets and resources marshaled against the United States was first reported in 2012, officials spoke about it in part as an effort to create a standardized process that would live beyond the current administration, underscoring the long duration of the counterterrorism challenge. Indeed, the president’s legal and security advisers have put considerable effort into establishing rules to govern the program. Most members of the House and Senate Intelligence committees say they are confident the defense and intelligence communities have set an adequate evidentiary bar for determining when a member of al-Qaida or an affiliated group may be added to the target list, for example, and say that the rigor of the process gives them comfort in the level of program oversight within the executive branch. “They’re not drawing names out of a hat here,” Rogers said. “It is very specific intel-gathering and other things that would lead somebody to be subject for an engagement by the United States government.” BEHIND CLOSED DOORS The argument against public debate is easy enough to understand: Operational secrecy is necessary, and total opacity is easier. “I don’t think there is enough transparency and justification so that we remove not the secrecy, but the mystery of these things,” said Dennis Blair, Obama’s former director of national intelligence. “The reason it’s not been undertaken by the administration is that they just make a cold-blooded calculation that it’s better to hunker down and take the criticism than it is to get into the public debate, which is going to be a hard one to win.” But by keeping legal and policy positions secret, only partially sharing information even with congressional oversight committees, and declining to open a public discussion about drone use, the president and his team are asking the world to just trust that America is getting this right. While some will, many people, especially outside the United States, will see that approach as hypocritical, coming from a government that calls for transparency and the rule of law elsewhere. “I know these people, and I know how much they really, really attend to the most important details of the job,” said Barry Pavel, a former defense and security official in the Bush and Obama administrations who is director of the Brent Scowcroft Center on International Security at the Atlantic Council. “If I didn’t have that personal knowledge and because there isn’t that much really in the press, then I would be giving you a different rendering, and much more uncertain rendering.” That’s only part of the problem with the White House’s trust-us approach. The other resides in the vast distance between the criteria and authorization the administration says it uses in the combat drone program and the reality on the ground. For example, according to administration officials, before a person is added to the targeted strike list, specific criteria should be met. The target should be a 1) senior, 2) operational 3) leader of al-Qaida or an affiliated group who presents 4) an imminent threat of violent attack 5) against the United States. But that’s not who is being targeted. Setting aside the administration’s redefining of “imminence” beyond all recognition, the majority of the 3,500-plus people killed by U.S. drones worldwide were not leaders of al-Qaida or the Taliban; they were low- or mid-level foot soldiers. Most were not plotting attacks against the United States. In Yemen and North Africa, the Obama administration is deploying weaponized drones to take out targets who are more of a threat to local governments than to Washington, according to defense and regional security experts who closely track unrest in those areas. In some cases, Washington appears to be in the business of using its drone capabilities mostly to assist other countries, not to deter strikes against the United States (another precedent that might be eagerly seized upon in the future). U.S. defense and intelligence officials reject any suggestion that the targets are not legitimate. One thing they do not contest, however, is that the administration’s reliance on the post-9/11 Authorization for Use of Military Force as legal cover for a drone-strike program that has extended well beyond al-Qaida in Afghanistan or Pakistan is dodgy. The threat that the United States is trying to deal with today has an ever more tenuous connection to Sept. 11. (None of the intelligence officials reached for this article would speak on the record.) But instead of asking Congress to consider extending its authorization, as some officials have mulled, the administration’s legal counsel has chosen instead to rely on Nixon administration adviser John Stevenson’s 1970 justification of the bombing of Cambodia during the Vietnam War, an action new Secretary of State John Kerry criticized during his confirmation hearing this year. Human-rights groups might be loudest in their criticism of both the program and the opaque policy surrounding it, but even the few lawmakers who have access to the intelligence the administration shares have a hard time coping with the dearth of information. “We can’t always assume we’re going to have responsible people with whom we agree and trust in these positions,” said Sen. Angus King, I-Maine, who sits on the Senate Intelligence Committee. “The essence of the Constitution is, it shouldn’t matter who is in charge; they’re still constrained by principles and rules of the Constitution and of the Bill of Rights.” PEER PRESSURE Obama promised in his 2013 State of the Union to increase the drone program’s transparency. “In the months ahead, I will continue to engage Congress to ensure not only that our targeting, detention, and prosecution of terrorists remains consistent with our laws and system of checks and balances, but that our efforts are even more transparent to the American people and to the world,” the president said on Feb. 12. Since then, the administration, under pressure from allies on Senate Intelligence, agreed to release all of the legal memos the Justice Department drafted in support of targeted killing. But, beyond that, it’s not certain Obama will do anything more to shine light on this program. Except in situations where leaks help it tell a politically expedient story of its skill at killing bad guys, the administration has done little to make a case to the public and the world at large for its use of armed drones. Already, what’s become apparent is that the White House is not interested in changing much about the way it communicates strike policy. (It took Sen. Rand Paul’s 13-hour filibuster of CIA Director John Brennan’s nomination to force the administration to concede that it doesn’t have the right to use drones to kill noncombatant Americans on U.S. soil.) And government officials, as well as their surrogates on security issues, are actively trying to squash expectations that the administration would agree to bring the judicial branch into the oversight mix. Indeed, judicial review of any piece of the program is largely off the table now, according to intelligence officials and committee members. Under discussion within the administration and on Capitol Hill is a potential program takeover by the Pentagon, removing the CIA from its post-9/11 role of executing military-like strikes. Ostensibly, that shift could help lift the secret-by-association-with-CIA attribute of the program that some officials say has kept them from more freely talking about the legitimate military use of drones for counterterrorism operations. But such a fix would provide no guarantee of greater transparency for the public, or even Congress. And if the administration is not willing to share with lawmakers who are security-cleared to know, it certainly is not prepared to engage in a sensitive discussion, even among allies, that might begin to set the rules on use for a technology that could upend stability in already fragile and strategically significant places around the globe. Time is running out to do so. “The history of technology development like this is, you never maintain your lead very long. Somebody always gets it,” said David Berteau, director of the International Security Program at the Center for Strategic and International Studies. “They’re going to become cheaper. They’re going to become easier. They’re going to become interoperable,” he said. “The destabilizing effects are very, very serious.” Berteau is not alone. Zenko, of the Council on Foreign Relations, has urged officials to quickly establish norms. Singer, at Brookings, argues that the window of opportunity for the United States to create stability-supporting precedent is quickly closing. The problem is, the administration is not thinking far enough down the line, according to a Senate Intelligence aide. Administration officials “are thinking about the next four years, and we’re thinking about the next 40 years. And those two different angles on this question are why you see them in conflict right now.” That’s in part a symptom of the “technological optimism” that often plagues the U.S. security community when it establishes a lead over its competitors, noted Georgetown University’s Kai-Henrik Barth. After the 1945 bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the United States was sure it would be decades before the Soviets developed a nuclear-weapon capability. It took four years. With drones, the question is how long before the dozens of states with the aircraft can arm and then operate a weaponized version. “Pretty much every nation has gone down the pathway of, ‘This is science fiction; we don’t want this stuff,’ to, ‘OK, we want them, but we’ll just use them for surveillance,’ to, ‘Hmm, they’re really useful when you see the bad guy and can do something about it, so we’ll arm them,’ ” Singer said. He listed the countries that have gone that route: the United States, Britain, Italy, Germany, China. “Consistently, nations have gone down the pathway of first only surveillance and then arming.” The opportunity to write rules that might at least guide, if not restrain, the world’s view of acceptable drone use remains, not least because this is in essence a conventional arms-control issue. The international Missile Technology Control Regime attempts to restrict exports of unmanned vehicles capable of carrying weapons of mass destruction, but it is voluntary and nonbinding, and it’s under attack by the drone industry as a drag on business. Further, the technology itself, especially when coupled with data and real-time analytics, offers the luxury of time and distance that could allow officials to raise the evidentiary bar for strikes—to be closer to certain that their target is the right one. 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.

Geographic restrictions from congress are key to a successful legal framework

Rosa Brooks, Professor of Law, Georgetown University Law Center, Bernard L. Schwartz Senior Fellow, New America Foundation, 4/23/13, The Constitutional and Counterterrorism Implications of Targeted Killing, http://www.judiciary.senate.gov/pdf/04-23-13BrooksTestimony.pdf

Mr. Chairman, I would like to turn now to the legal framework applicable to US drone strikes. Both the United States and the international community have long had rules governing armed conflicts and the use of force in national self-defense. These rules apply whether the lethal force at issue involves knives, handguns, grenades or weaponized drones. When drone technologies are used in traditional armed conflicts—on “hot battlefields” such as those in Afghanistan, Iraq or Libya, for instance – they pose no new legal issues. As Administration officials have stated, their use is subject to the same requirements as the use of other lawful means and methods of warfare.28 But if drones used in traditional armed conflicts or traditional self-defense situations present no “new” legal issues, some of the activities and policies enabled and facilitated by drone technologies pose significant challenges to existing legal frameworks. As I have discussed above, the availability of perceived low cost of drone technologies makes it far easier for the US to “expand the battlefield,” striking targets in places where it would be too dangerous or too politically controversial to send troops. Specifically, drone technologies enable the United States to strike targets deep inside foreign states, and do so quickly, efficiently and deniably. As a result, drones have become the tool of choice for so-called “targeted killing” – the deliberate targeting of an individual or group of individuals, whether known by name or targeted based on patterns of activity, inside the borders of a foreign country. **It is when drones are used in targeted killings outside of traditional or “hot” battlefields that their use challenges existing legal frameworks**. Law is almost always out of date: we make legal rules based on existing conditions and technologies, perhaps with a small nod in the direction of predicted future changes. As societies and technologies change, law increasingly becomes an exercise in jamming square pegs into round holes. Eventually, that process begins to do damage to existing law: it gets stretched out of shape, or broken. Right now, I would argue, US drone policy is on the verge of doing significant damage to the rule of law. A. The Rule of Law At root, the idea of “rule of law” is fairly simple, and well understood by Americans familiar with the foundational documents that established our nation, such as the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. The rule of law requires that governments follow transparent, clearly defined and universally applicable laws and procedures. The goal of the rule of law is to ensure predictability and stability, and to prevent the arbitrary exercise of power. In a society committed to the rule of law, the government cannot fine you, lock you up, or kill you on a whim -- it can restrict your liberty or take your property or life only in accordance with pre-established processes and rules that reflect basic notions of justice, humanity and fairness. Precisely what constitutes a fair process is debatable, but most would agree that at a minimum, fairness requires that individuals have reasonable notice of what constitutes the applicable law, reasonable notice that they are suspected of violating the law, a reasonable opportunity to rebut any allegations against them, and a reasonable opportunity to have the outcome of any procedures or actions against them reviewed by some objective person or body. These core values are enshrined both in the US Constitution and in international human rights law instruments such as the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, to which the United States is a party. In ordinary circumstances, this bundle of universally acknowledged rights (together with international law principles of sovereignty) means it is clearly unlawful for one state to target and kill an individual inside the borders of another state. Recall, for instance, the 1976 killing of Chilean dissident Orlando Letelier in Washington DC. When Chilean government intelligence operatives planted a car bomb in the car used by Letelier, killing him and a US citizen accompanying him, the United States government called this an act of murder—an unlawful political assassination. B. Targeted Killing and the Law of Armed Conflict Of course, sometimes the “ordinary” legal rules do not apply. In war, the willful killing of human beings is permitted, whether the means of killing is a gun, a bomb, or a long-distance drone strike. The law of armed conflict permits a wide range of behaviors that would be unlawful in the absence of an armed conflict. Generally speaking, the intentional destruction of private property and severe restrictions on individual liberties are impermissible in peacetime, but acceptable in wartime, for instance. Even actions that a combatant knows will cause civilian deaths are lawful when consistent with the principles of necessity, humanity, proportionality,29 and distinction.30 It is worth briefly explaining these principles. The principle of necessity requires parties to a conflict to limit their actions to those that are indispensible for securing the complete submission of the enemy as soon as possible (and that are otherwise permitted by international law). The principle of humanity forbids parties to a conflict to inflict gratuitous violence or employ methods calculated to cause unnecessary suffering. The principle of proportionality requires parties to ensure that the anticipated loss of life or property incidental to an attack is not excessive in relation to the concrete and direct military advantage expected to be gained. Finally, the principle of discrimination or distinction requires that parties to a conflict direct their actions only against combatants and military objectives, and take appropriate steps to distinguish between combatants and non-combatants.31 This is a radical oversimplification of a very complex body of law.32 But as with the rule of law, the basic idea is pretty simple. When there is no war -- when ordinary, peacetime law applies -- agents of the state aren't supposed to lock people up, take their property or kill them, unless they have jumped through a whole lot of legal hoops first. When there is an armed conflict, however, everything changes. War is not a legal free-for-all33 -- torture, rape are always crimes under the law of war, as is killing that is willful, wanton and not justified by military necessity34 -- but there are far fewer constraints on state behavior. Technically, the law of war is referred to using the Latin term “lex specialis” – special law. It is applicable in—and only in -- special circumstances (in this case, armed conflict), and in those special circumstances, it supersedes “ordinary law,” or “lex generalis,” the “general law” that prevails in peacetime. We have one set of laws for “normal” situations, and another, more flexible set of laws for “extraordinary” situations, such as armed conflicts. None of this poses any inherent problem for the rule of law. Having one body of rules that tightly restricts the use of force and another body of rules that is far more permissive does not fundamentally undermine the rule of law, as long as we have a reasonable degree of consensus on what circumstances trigger the “special” law, and as long as the “special law” doesn’t end up undermining the general law. To put it a little differently, war, with its very different rules, does not challenge ordinary law as long as war is the exception, not the norm -- as long as we can all agree on what constitutes a war -- as long as we can tell when the war begins and ends -- and as long as we all know how to tell the difference between a combatant and a civilian, and between places where there's war and places where there's no war. Let me return now to the question of drones and targeted killings. When all these distinctions I just mentioned are clear, the use of drones in targeted killings does not necessarily present any great or novel problem. In Libya, for instance, a state of armed conflict clearly existed inside the borders of Libya between Libyan government forces and NATO states. In that context, the use of drones to strike Libyan military targets is no more controversial than the use of manned aircraft. That is because our core rule of law concerns have mostly been satisfied: we know there is an armed conflict, in part because all parties to it agree that there is an armed conflict, in part because observers (such as international journalists) can easily verify the presence of uniformed military personnel engaged in using force, and in part because the violence is, from an objective perspective, widespread and sustained: it is not a mere skirmish or riot or criminal law enforcement situation that got out of control. We know who the “enemy” is: Libyan government forces. We know where the conflict is and is not: the conflict was in Libya, but not in neighboring Algeria or Egypt. We know when the conflict began, we know who authorized the use of force (the UN Security Council) and, just as crucially, we know whom to hold accountable in the event of error or abuse (the various governments involved).35 Once you take targeted killings outside hot battlefields, it’s a different story. The Obama Administration is currently using drones to strike terror suspects in Pakistan, Somalia, Yemen, and –perhaps—Mali and the Philippines as well. Defenders of the administration's increasing reliance on drone strikes in such places assert that the US is in an armed conflict with “al Qaeda and its associates,” and on that basis, they assert that the law of war is applicable -- in any place and at any time -- with regard to any person the administration deems a combatant. The trouble is, no one outside a very small group within the US executive branch has any ability to evaluate who is and who isn’t a combatant. The war against al Qaeda and its associates is not like World War II, or Libya, or even Afghanistan: it is an open-ended conflict with an inchoate, undefined adversary (who exactly are al Qaeda’s “associates”?). What is more, targeting decisions in this nebulous “war” are based largely on classified intelligence reporting. **As a result, Administration assertions** about who is a combatant and what constitutes a threat **are entirely non-falsifiable, because they're based wholly on undisclosed evidence**. Add to this still another problem: most of these strikes are considered covert action, so although the US sometimes takes public credit for the deaths of alleged terrorist leaders, most of the time, the US will not even officially acknowledge targeted killings. This leaves all the key rule-of-law questions related to the ongoing war against al Qaeda and its "associates" unanswered.36 Based on what criteria might someone be considered a combatant or directly participating in hostilities? What constitutes “hostilities” in the context of an armed conflict against a non-state actor, and what does it mean to participate in them? And just where is the war? Does the war (and thus the law of war) somehow "travel" with combatants? Does the US have a “right” to target enemy combatants anywhere on earth, or does it depend on the consent of the state at issue? Who in the United States government is authorized to make such determinations, and what is the precise chain of command for such decisions? I think the rule of law problem here is obvious: when “armed conflict” becomes a term flexible enough to be applied both to World War II and to the relations between the United States and “associates” of al Qaeda such as Somalia’s al Shabaab, the concept of armed conflict is not very useful anymore. And **when we lack clarity and consensus on how to recognize “armed conflict,” we no longer have a clear or principled basis for deciding how to categorize US** t**argeted** k**illing**s. Are they, as the US government argues, legal under the laws of war? Or are they, as some human rights groups have argued, unlawful murder? C. Targeted Killing and the International Law of Self-Defense When faced with criticisms of the law of war framework as a justification for targeted killing, Obama Administration representatives often shift tack, arguing that international law rules on national self-defense provide an alternative or additional legal justification for US targeted killings. Here, the argument is that if a person located in a foreign state poses an "imminent threat of violent attack" against the United States, the US can lawfully use force in self-defense, provided that the defensive force used is otherwise consistent with law of war principles. Like law of war-based arguments, this general principle is superficially uncontroversial: if someone overseas is about to launch a nuclear weapon at New York City, no one can doubt that the United States has a perfect right (and the president has a constitutional duty) to use force if needed to prevent that attack, regardless of the attacker's nationality. But once again, the devil is in the details. To start with, what constitutes an "imminent" threat? Traditionally, both international law and domestic criminal law understand that term narrowly: 37 to be "imminent," a threat cannot be distant or speculative.38 But much like the Bush Administration before it, the Obama Administration has put forward an interpretation of the word “imminent” that bears little relation to traditional legal concepts. According to a leaked 2011 Justice Department white paper39—the most detailed legal justification that has yet become public-- the requirement of imminence "does not require the United States to have clear evidence that a specific attack on U.S. persons and interests will take place in the immediate future." This seems, in itself, like a substantial departure from accepted international law definitions of imminence. But the White Paper goes even further, stating that "certain members of al Qaeda are continually plotting attacks...and would engage in such attacks regularly [if] they were able to do so, [and] the US government may not be aware of all... plots as they are developing and thus cannot be confident that none is about to occur." For this reason, it concludes, anyone deemed to be an operational leader of al Qaeda or its "associated forces" presents, by definition, an imminent threat even in the absence of any evidence whatsoever relating to immediate or future attack plans. In effect, the concept of "imminent threat" (part of the international law relating to self-defense) becomes conflated with identity or status (a familiar part of the law of armed conflict). That concept of imminence has been called Orwellian, and although that is an overused epithet, in this context it seems fairly appropriate. According to the Obama Administration, “imminent” no longer means “immediate,” and in fact the very absence of clear evidence indicating specific present or future attack plans becomes, paradoxically, the basis for assuming that attack may perpetually be “imminent.” The 2011 Justice Department White Paper notes that the use of force in self-defense must comply with general law of war principles of necessity, proportionality, humanity, and distinction. The White Paper offers no guidance on the specific criteria for determining when an individual is a combatant (or a civilian participating directly in hostilities), however. It also offers no guidance on how to determine if a use of force is necessary or proportionate. From a traditional international law perspective, this necessity and proportionality inquiry relates both to imminence and to the gravity of the threat itself, but so far there has been no public Administration statement as to how the administration interprets these requirements. Is any threat of "violent attack" sufficient to justify killing someone in a foreign country, including a U.S. citizen? Is every potential suicide bomber targetable, or does it depend on the gravity of the threat? Are we justified in drone strikes against targets who might, if they get a chance at some unspecified future point, place an IED that might, if successful, kill one person? Ten people? Twenty? 2,000? How grave a threat must there be to justify the use of lethal force against an American citizen abroad -- or against non-citizens, for that matter? As I have noted, it is impossible for outsiders to fully evaluate US drone strikes, since so much vital information remains classified. In most cases, we know little about the identities; activities or future plans of those targeted. Nevertheless, given the increased frequency of US targeted killings in recent years, it seems reasonable to wonder whether the Administration conducts a rigorous necessity or proportionality analysis in all cases. So far, the leaked 2011 Justice Department White Paper represents the most detailed legal analysis of targeted killings available to the public. It is worth noting, incidentally, that this White Paper addresses only the question of whether and when it is lawful for the US government to target US citizens abroad. We do not know what legal standards the Administration believes apply to the targeting of non-citizens. It seems reasonable to assume, however, that the standards applicable to non-citizens are less exacting than those the Administration views as applicable to citizens. Defenders of administration targeted killing policy acknowledge that the criteria for determining how to answer these many questions have not been made public, but insist that this should not be cause for concern. The Administration has reportedly developed a detailed “playbook” outlining the targeting criteria and procedures,40, and insiders insist that executive branch officials go through an elaborate process in which they carefully consider every possible issue before determining that a drone strike is lawful.41 No doubt they do, but this is somewhat cold comfort. Formal processes tend to further normalize once-exceptional activities -- and "trust us" is a rather shaky foundation for the rule of law. Indeed, the whole point of the rule of law is that individual lives and freedom should not depend solely on the good faith and benevolence of government officials. As with law of war arguments, stating that US targeted killings are clearly legal under traditional self-defense principles requires some significant cognitive dissonance. Law exists to restrain untrammeled power. It is no doubt possible to make a plausible legal argument justifying each and every U.S. drone strike -- but this merely suggests that we are working with a legal framework that has begun to outlive its usefulness. The real question isn't whether U.S. drone strikes are "legal." The real question is this: Do we really want to live in a world in which the U.S. government's justification for killing is so malleable? 5. Setting Troubling International Precedents **Here is an a**dditional **reason to worry** about the U.S. overreliance on drone strikes: Other states will follow America's example, and the results are not likely to be pretty. Consider once again the Letelier murder, which was an international scandal in 1976: If the Letelier assassination took place today, the Chilean authorities would presumably insist on their national right to engage in “targeted killings” of individuals deemed to pose imminent threats to Chilean national security -- and they would justify such killings using precisely the same legal theories the US currently uses to justify targeted killings in Yemen or Somalia. We should assume that governments around the world—including those with less than stellar human rights records, such as Russia and China—are taking notice. Right now, the United States has a decided technological advantage when it comes to armed drones, but that will not last long. **We should use this window to advance a robust legal** and normative **framework that will help protect against abuses by those states whose leaders can rarely be trusted**. Unfortunately, we are doing the exact opposite: Instead of articulating norms about transparency and accountability, the United States is effectively handing China, Russia, and every other repressive state a playbook for how to foment instability and –literally -- get away with murder. Take the issue of sovereignty. Sovereignty has long been a core concept of the Westphalian international legal order.42 In the international arena, all sovereign states are formally considered equal and possessed of the right to control their own internal affairs free of interference from other states. That's what we call the principle of non-intervention -- and it means, among other things, that it is generally prohibited for one state to use force inside the borders of another sovereign state. There are some well-established exceptions, but they are few in number. A state can lawfully use force inside another sovereign state with that state's invitation or consent, or when force is authorized by the U.N. Security Council, pursuant to the U.N. Charter,43 or in self-defense "in the event of an armed attack." The 2011 Justice Department White Paper asserts that targeted killings carried out by the United States don't violate another state's sovereignty as long as that state either consents or is "unwilling or unable to suppress the threat posed by the individual being targeted." That sounds superficially plausible, but since the United States views itself as the sole arbiter of whether a state is "unwilling or unable" to suppress that threat, the logic is in fact circular. It goes like this: The United States -- using its own malleable definition of "imminent" -- decides that Person X, residing in sovereign State Y, poses a threat to the United States and requires killing. Once the United States decides that Person X can be targeted, the principle of sovereignty presents no barriers, because either 1) State Y will consent to the U.S. use of force inside its borders, in which case the use of force presents no sovereignty problems or 2) State Y will not consent to the U.S. use of force inside its borders, in which case, by definition, the United States will deem State Y to be "unwilling or unable to suppress the threat" posed by Person X and the use of force again presents no problem. This is a legal theory that more or less eviscerates traditional notions of sovereignty, and has the potential to significantly destabilize the already shaky collective security regime created by the U.N. Charter.44 If the US is the sole arbiter of whether and when it can use force inside the borders of another state, any other state strong enough to get away with it is likely to claim similar prerogatives. And, of course, if the US executive branch is the sole arbiter of what constitutes an imminent threat and who constitutes a targetable enemy combatant in an ill- defined war, why shouldn’t other states make identical arguments—and use them to justify the killing of dissidents, rivals, or unwanted minorities?

Drones cause miscalculation and conflict in the South and East China Seas–US precedent is key

Brimley 13 (Shawn Brimley, Ben FitzGerald, and Ely Ratner are, respectively, vice president, director of the Technology and National Security Program, and deputy director of the Asia Program at the Center for a New American Security., 9/17/2013, "The Drone War Comes to Asia", www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2013/09/17/the\_drone\_war\_comes\_to\_asia)

It's now been a year since Japan's previously ruling liberal government purchased three of the Senkaku Islands to prevent a nationalist and provocative Tokyo mayor from doing so himself. The move was designed to dodge a potential crisis with China, which claims "indisputable sovereignty" over the islands it calls the Diaoyus. Disregarding the Japanese government's intent, Beijing has reacted to the "nationalization" of the islands by flooding the surrounding waters and airspace with Chinese vessels in an effort to undermine Japan's de facto administration, which has persisted since the reversion of Okinawa from American control in 1971. Chinese incursions have become so frequent that the Japanese Air Self-Defense Forces (JASDF) are now scrambling jet fighters on a near-daily basis in response. In the midst of this heightened tension, you could be forgiven for overlooking the news early in September that Japanese F-15s had again taken flight after Beijing graciously commemorated the one-year anniversary of Tokyo's purchase by sending an unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV) toward the islands. But this wasn't just another day at the office in the contested East China Sea: this was the first known case of a Chinese drone approaching the Senkakus. Without a doubt, China's drone adventure 100-miles north of the Senkakus was significant because it aggravated already abysmal relations between Tokyo and Beijing. Japanese officials responded to the incident by suggesting that Japan might have to place government personnel on the islands, a red line for Beijing that would have been unthinkable prior to the past few years of Chinese assertiveness. But there's a much bigger and more pernicious cycle in motion. The introduction of indigenous drones into Asia's strategic environment -- now made official by China's maiden unmanned provocation -- will bring with it additional sources of instability and escalation to the fiercely contested South and East China Seas. Even though no government in the region wants to participate in major power war, there is widespread and growing concern that military conflict could result from a minor incident that spirals out of control. Unmanned systems could be just this trigger. They are less costly to produce and operate than their manned counterparts, meaning that we're likely to see more crowded skies and seas in the years ahead. UAVs also tend to encourage greater risk-taking, given that a pilot's life is not at risk. But being unmanned has its dangers: any number of software or communications failures could lead a mission awry. Combine all that with inexperienced operators and you have a perfect recipe for a mistake or miscalculation in an already tense strategic environment. The underlying problem is not just the drones themselves. Asia is in the midst of transitioning to a new warfighting regime with serious escalatory potential. China's military modernization is designed to deny adversaries freedom of maneuver over, on, and under the East and South China Seas. Although China argues that its strategy is primarily defensive, the capabilities it is choosing to acquire to create a "defensive" perimeter -- long-range ballistic and cruise missiles, aircraft carriers, submarines -- are acutely offensive in nature. During a serious crisis when tensions are high, China would have powerful incentives to use these capabilities, particularly missiles, before they were targeted by the United States or another adversary. The problem is that U.S. military plans and posture have the potential to be equally escalatory, as they would reportedly aim to "blind" an adversary -- disrupting or destroying command and control nodes at the beginning of a conflict. At the same time, the increasingly unstable balance of military power in the Pacific is exacerbated by the (re)emergence of other regional actors with their own advanced military capabilities. Countries that have the ability and resources to embark on rapid modernization campaigns (e.g., Japan, South Korea, Indonesia) are well on the way. This means that in addition to two great powers vying for military advantage, the region features an increasingly complex set of overlapping military-technical competitions that are accelerating tensions, adding to uncertainty and undermining stability. This dangerous military dynamic will only get worse as more disruptive military technologies appear, including the rapid diffusion of unmanned and increasingly autonomous aerial and submersible vehicles coupled with increasingly effective offensive cyberspace capabilities. Of particular concern is not only the novelty of these new technologies, but the lack of well-established norms for their use in conflict. Thankfully, the first interaction between a Chinese UAV and manned Japanese fighters passed without major incident. But it did raise serious questions that neither nation has likely considered in detail. What will constrain China's UAV incursions from becoming increasingly assertive and provocative? How will either nation respond in a scenario where an adversary downs a UAV? And what happens politically when a drone invariably falls out of the sky or "drifts off course" with both sides pointing fingers at one another? Of most concern, how would these matters be addressed during a crisis, with no precedents, in the context of a regional military regime in which actors have powerful incentives to strike first? These are not just theoretical questions: Japan's Defense Ministry is reportedly looking into options for shooting down any unmanned drones that enter its territorial airspace. Resolving these issues in a fraught strategic environment between two potential adversaries is difficult enough; the United States and China remain at loggerheads about U.S. Sensitive Reconnaissance Operations along China's periphery. But the problem is multiplying rapidly. The Chinese are running one of the most significant UAV programs in the world, a program that includes Reaper- style UAVs and Unmanned Combat Aerial Vehicles (UCAVs); Japan is seeking to acquire Global Hawks; the Republic of Korea is acquiring Global Hawks while also building their own indigenous UAV capabilities; Taiwan is choosing to develop indigenous UAVs instead of importing from abroad; Indonesia is seeking to build a UAV squadron; and Vietnam is planning to build an entire UAV factory. One could take solace in Asia's ability to manage these gnarly sources of insecurity if the region had demonstrated similar competencies elsewhere. But nothing could be further from the case. It has now been more than a decade since the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) and China signed a declaration "to promote a peaceful, friendly and harmonious environment in the South China Sea," which was meant to be a precursor to a code of conduct for managing potential incidents, accidents, and crises at sea. But the parties are as far apart as ever, and that's on well-trodden issues of maritime security with decades of legal and operational precedent to build upon. It's hard to be optimistic that the region will do better in an unmanned domain in which governments and militaries have little experience and where there remains a dearth of international norms, rules, and institutions from which to draw. The rapid diffusion of advanced military technology is not a future trend. These capabilities are being fielded -- right now -- in perhaps the most geopolitically dangerous area in the world, over (and soon under) the contested seas of East and Southeast Asia. These risks will only increase with time as more disruptive capabilities emerge. In the absence of political leadership, these technologies could very well lead the region into war.

SCS conflict causes extinction

Wittner 11 (Lawrence S. Wittner, Emeritus Professor of History at the State University of New York/Albany, Wittner is the author of eight books, the editor or co-editor of another four, and the author of over 250 published articles and book reviews. From 1984 to 1987, he edited Peace & Change, a journal of peace research., 11/28/2011, "Is a Nuclear War With China Possible?", [www.huntingtonnews.net/14446](http://www.huntingtonnews.net/14446))

While nuclear weapons exist, there remains a danger that they will be used. After all, for centuries national conflicts have led to wars, with nations employing their deadliest weapons. The current deterioration of U.S. relations with China might end up providing us with yet another example of this phenomenon. The gathering tension between the United States and China is clear enough. Disturbed by China’s growing economic and military strength, the U.S. government recently challenged China’s claims in the South China Sea, increased the U.S. military presence in Australia, and deepened U.S. military ties with other nations in the Pacific region. According to Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, the United States was “asserting our own position as a Pacific power.” But need this lead to nuclear war? Not necessarily. And yet, there are signs that it could. After all, both the United States and China possess large numbers of nuclear weapons. The U.S. government threatened to attack China with nuclear weapons during the Korean War and, later, during the conflict over the future of China’s offshore islands, Quemoy and Matsu. In the midst of the latter confrontation, President Dwight Eisenhower declared publicly, and chillingly, that U.S. nuclear weapons would “be used just exactly as you would use a bullet or anything else.” Of course, China didn’t have nuclear weapons then. Now that it does, perhaps the behavior of national leaders will be more temperate. But the loose nuclear threats of U.S. and Soviet government officials during the Cold War, when both nations had vast nuclear arsenals, should convince us that, even as the military ante is raised, nuclear saber-rattling persists. Some pundits argue that nuclear weapons prevent wars between nuclear-armed nations; and, admittedly, there haven’t been very many—at least not yet. But the Kargil War of 1999, between nuclear-armed India and nuclear-armed Pakistan, should convince us that such wars can occur. Indeed, in that case, the conflict almost slipped into a nuclear war. Pakistan’s foreign secretary threatened that, if the war escalated, his country felt free to use “any weapon” in its arsenal. During the conflict, Pakistan did move nuclear weapons toward its border, while India, it is claimed, readied its own nuclear missiles for an attack on Pakistan. At the least, though, don’t nuclear weapons deter a nuclear attack? Do they? Obviously, NATO leaders didn’t feel deterred, for, throughout the Cold War, NATO’s strategy was to respond to a Soviet conventional military attack on Western Europe by launching a Western nuclear attack on the nuclear-armed Soviet Union. Furthermore, if U.S. government officials really believed that nuclear deterrence worked, they would not have resorted to championing “Star Wars” and its modern variant, national missile defense. Why are these vastly expensive—and probably unworkable—military defense systems needed if other nuclear powers are deterred from attacking by U.S. nuclear might? Of course, the bottom line for those Americans convinced that nuclear weapons safeguard them from a Chinese nuclear attack might be that the U.S. nuclear arsenal is far greater than its Chinese counterpart. Today, it is estimated that the U.S. government possesses over five thousand nuclear warheads, while the Chinese government has a total inventory of roughly three hundred. Moreover, only about forty of these Chinese nuclear weapons can reach the United States. Surely the United States would “win” any nuclear war with China. But what would that “victory” entail? A nuclear attack by China would immediately slaughter at least 10 million Americans in a great storm of blast and fire, while leaving many more dying horribly of sickness and radiation poisoning. The Chinese death toll in a nuclear war would be far higher. Both nations would be reduced to smoldering, radioactive wastelands. Also, radioactive debris sent aloft by the nuclear explosions would blot out the sun and bring on a “nuclear winter” around the globe—destroying agriculture, creating worldwide famine, and generating chaos and destruction.

Senkaku conflict causes extinction

Baker 12 (Kevin R., Member of the Compensation Committee of Calfrac, Chair of the Corporate Governance and Nominating Committee, served as President and Chief Executive Officer of Century Oilfield Services Inc. from August 2005 until November 10, 2009, when it was acquired by the Corporation. He also has served as the President of Baycor Capital Inc., 9/17/2012, “What Would Happen if China and Japan Went to War?”, http://appreviews4u.com/2012/09/17/what-would-happen-if-china-and-japan-went-to-war/)

China is not an isolationist country but it is quite nationalistic. Their allies include, Russia, which is a big super power, Pakistan and Iran as well as North Korea. They have more allies than Japan, although most relations have been built on economic strategies, being a money-centric nation. Countries potentially hostile toward China in the event of a Japan vs. China war include Germany, Britain, Australia and South Korea. So even though Japan does not outwardly build relationships with allies, Japan would have allies rallying around them if China were to attack Japan. The island dispute would not play out as it did in the UK vs. Argentina island dispute, as both sides could cause massive damage to each other, whereas the UK was far superior in firepower compared to Argentina. Conclusion Even though China outweighs Japan in numbers, the likelihood that a war would develop into a nuclear war means that numbers don’t really mean anything anymore. The nuclear capabilities of Japan and China would mean that each country could destroy each other many times over. The island dispute would then escalate to possible mass extinction for the human race. The nuclear fall out would affect most of Asia and to a certain extent the West. If the allies were then to turn on each other it would spell the end of the human race. Bear in mind that it will take an estimated 10,000 years for Chernobyl to become safe to walk around and you’ll get an idea of what state land masses will be in after a war of such magnitude. I say ‘land masses’ as countries and nations would cease to exist then and it would be a case of ‘if’ and ‘where’ could human beings, plant life and animals could exist, if at all possible, which is very doubtful. Even with underground bunkers, just how long could people survive down there? With plant and animal life eradicated above? I would say maybe 20 years at best, if there are ample supplies of course.

The best scholarship validates our theory of arms races–unless norms precede formal agreements, they’ll be ineffective

Robert Farley 11, assistant professor at the Patterson School of Diplomacy and International Commerce at the University of Kentucky, Over the Horizon: U.S. Drone Use Sets Global Precedent, October 12, http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/10311/over-the-horizon-u-s-drone-use-sets-global-precedent

Is the world about to see a "drone race" among the United States, China and several other major powers? Writing in the New York Times, Scott Shane argued that just such an arms race is already happening and that it is largely a result of the widespread use of drones in a counterterror role by the United States. Shane suggests that an international norm of drone usage is developing around how the United States has decided to employ drones. In the future, we may expect that China, Russia and India will employ advanced drone technologies against similar enemies, perhaps in Xinjiang or Chechnya. Kenneth Anderson agrees that the drone race is on, but disagrees about its cause, arguing that improvements in the various drone component technologies made such an arms race inevitable. Had the United States not pursued advanced drone technology or launched an aggressive drone campaign, some other country would have taken the lead in drone capabilities. So which is it? Has the United States sparked a drone race, or was a race with the Chinese and Russians inevitable? While there's truth on both sides, on balance Shane is correct. Arms races don't just "happen" because of outside technological developments. Rather, they are embedded in political dynamics associated with public perception, international prestige and bureaucratic conflict. China and Russia pursued the development of drones before the United States showed the world what the Predator could do, but they are pursuing capabilities more vigorously because of the U.S. example. Understanding this is necessary to developing expectations of what lies ahead as well as a strategy for regulating drone warfare. States run arms races for a variety of reasons. The best-known reason is a sense of fear: The developing capabilities of an opponent leave a state feeling vulnerable. The Germany's build-up of battleships in the years prior to World War I made Britain feel vulnerable, necessitating the expansion of the Royal Navy, and vice versa. Similarly, the threat posed by Soviet missiles during the Cold War required an increase in U.S. nuclear capabilities, and so forth. However, states also "race" in response to public pressure, bureaucratic politics and the desire for prestige. Sometimes, for instance, states feel the need to procure the same type of weapon another state has developed in order to maintain their relative position, even if they do not feel directly threatened by the weapon. Alternatively, bureaucrats and generals might use the existence of foreign weapons to argue for their own pet systems. All of these reasons share common characteristics, however: They are both social and strategic, and they depend on the behavior of other countries. Improvements in technology do not make the procurement of any given weapon necessary; rather, geostrategic interest creates the need for a system. So while there's a degree of truth to Anderson's argument about the availability of drone technology, he ignores the degree to which dramatic precedent can affect state policy. The technologies that made HMS Dreadnought such a revolutionary warship in 1906 were available before it was built; its dramatic appearance nevertheless transformed the major naval powers' procurement plans. Similarly, the Soviet Union and the United States accelerated nuclear arms procurement following the Cuban Missile Crisis, with the USSR in particular increasing its missile forces by nearly 20 times, partially in response to perceptions of vulnerability. So while a drone "race" may have taken place even without the large-scale Predator and Reaper campaign in Pakistan, Yemen and Somalia, the extent and character of the race now on display has been driven by U.S. behavior. Other states, observing the effectiveness -- or at least the capabilities -- of U.S. drones will work to create their own counterparts with an enthusiasm that they would not have had in absence of the U.S. example. What is undeniable, however, is that we face a drone race, which inevitably evokes the question of arms control. Because they vary widely in technical characteristics, appearance and even definition, drones are poor candidates for "traditional" arms control of the variety that places strict limits on number of vehicles constructed, fielded and so forth. Rather, to the extent that any regulation of drone warfare is likely, it will come through treaties limiting how drones are used. Such a treaty would require either deep concern on the part of the major powers that advances in drone capabilities threatened their interests and survival, or widespread revulsion among the global public against the practice of drone warfare. The latter is somewhat more likely than the former, as drone construction at this point seems unlikely to dominate state defense budgets to the same degree as battleships in the 1920s or nuclear weapons in the 1970s. However, for now, drones are used mainly to kill unpleasant people in places distant from media attention. So creating the public outrage necessary to force global elites to limit drone usage may also prove difficult, although the specter of "out of control robots" killing humans with impunity might change that. P.W. Singer, author of "Wired for War," argues that new robot technologies will require a new approach to the legal regulation of war. Robots, both in the sky and on the ground, not to mention in the sea, already have killing capabilities that rival those of humans. Any approach to legally managing drone warfare will likely come as part of a more general effort to regulate the operation of robots in war. However, even in the unlikely event of global public outrage, any serious effort at regulating the use of drones will require U.S. acquiescence. Landmines are a remarkably unpopular form of weapon, but the United States continues to resist the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention. If the United States sees unrestricted drone warfare as being to its advantage -- and it is likely to do so even if China, Russia and India develop similar drone capabilities -- then even global outrage may not be sufficient to make the U.S. budge on its position. This simply reaffirms the original point: Arms races don't just "happen," but rather are a direct, if unexpected outcome of state policy. Like it or not, the behavior of the United States right now is structuring how the world will think about, build and use drones for the foreseeable future. Given this, U.S. policymakers should perhaps devote a touch more attention to the precedent they're setting.

## solvency

Solvency

Status quo administration policy delineates between geographic zones, but our legal justification for war everywhere remains in place

Anthony Dworkin 13, senior policy fellow at the European Council on Foreign Relations, “Drones And Targeted Killing: Defining A European Position”, July, <http://ecfr.eu/page/-/ECFR84_DRONES_BRIEF.pdf>

Two further points are worth noting. First, the administration has acknowledged that in the case of American citizens, even when they are involved in the armed conflict, the US Constitution imposes additional requirements of due process that bring the threshold for targeted killing close to that involved in a self-defence analysis. These requirements were listed in a Department of Justice white paper that became public earlier this year.26 Second, **the administration has** at times **suggested** that even in the case of non-Americans **its policy is to concentrate its efforts against individuals who pose a significant and imminent threat to the US**. For example, John Brennan said in his Harvard speech in September 2011 that the administration’s counterterrorism efforts outside Afghanistan and Iraq were “focused on those individuals who are a threat to the United States, whose removal would cause a significant – even if only temporary – disruption of the plans and capabilities of al-Qaeda and its associated forces”.27 However, the **details** that have emerged about US targeting practices in the past few years **raise questions about how closely this approach has been followed in practice**. An analysis published by McClatchy Newspapers in April, based on classified intelligence reports, claimed that 265 out of 482 individuals killed in Pakistan in a 12-month period up to September 2011 were not senior al-Qaeda operatives but instead were assessed as Afghan, Pakistani, and unknown extremists.28 It has been widely reported that in both Pakistan and Yemen the US has at times carried out “signature strikes” or “Terrorist Attack Disruption Strikes” in which groups are targeted based not on knowledge of their identity but on a pattern of behaviour that complies with a set of indicators for militant activity. It is widely thought that these attacks have accounted for many of the civilian casualties caused by drone strikes. In both Pakistan and Yemen, there may have been times when some drone strikes – including signature strikes – could perhaps best be understood as counterinsurgency actions in support of government forces in an internal armed conflict or civil war, and in this way lawful under the laws of armed conflict. Some attacks in Pakistan may also have been directly aimed at preventing attacks across the border on US forces in Afghanistan. However, **by presenting its drone programme overall as part of** a global armed conflict. the **Obama** administration **continues to set** an expansive precedent **that is damaging to the international rule of law**. Obama’s new policy on drones It is against this background that Obama’s recent counterterrorism speech and the policy directive he announced at the same time should be understood. On the subject of remotely piloted aircraft and targeted killing, there were two key aspects to his intervention. First, he suggested that the military element in US counterterrorism may be scaled back further in the coming months, and that he envisages a time in the not-too-distant future when the fight against the al-Qaeda network will no longer qualify as an armed conflict. He said that “the core of al Qaeda in Afghanistan and Pakistan is on the path to defeat” and that while al-Qaeda franchises and other terrorists continued to plot against the US, “the scale of this threat closely resembles the types of attacks we faced before 9/11”.29 Obama promised that he would not sign legislation that expanded the mandate of the AUMF, and proclaimed that the United States’ “systematic effort to dismantle terrorist organizations must continue […] but this war, like all wars, must end”. The tone of Obama’s speech contrasted strongly with that of US **military officials** who testified before the Senate Committee on Armed Services the week before; Michael Sheehan, the Assistant Secretary of Defence for Special Operations and Low-Intensity Conflict, **said** then that **the end of the armed conflict was “a long way off**” and appeared to say that **it might continue for 10 to 20 years**.30 Second, the day before his speech, **Obama set out regulations** for drone strikes that appeared to restrict them beyond previous commitments (the guidance remains classified but a summary has been released). The guidance set out standards and procedures for drone strikes “that are either already in place or will be transitioned into place over time”.31 **Outside areas of active hostilities, lethal force will only be used “when capture is not feasible and no other reasonable alternatives exist to address the threat effectively”. It will only be used against a target “that poses a continuing, imminent threat to US persons”. And there must be “near certainty that non-combatants will not be injured or killed**”. In some respects, these standards remain unclear: the president did not specify how quickly they would be implemented, or how “areas of active hostilities” should be understood. Nevertheless, **taken at face value,** they **seem to** represent a meaningful change**, at least on a conceptual level**. Effectively, they bring the criteria for all targeted strikes into line with the standards that the administration had previously determined to apply to US citizens. **Where the administration had previously said on occasions that it focused in practice on those people who pose the greatest threat,** this is **now formalised as** official policy. In this way, the standards are **significantly** more restrictive than the limits that the laws of armed conflict set for killing in wartime, and represent a shift towards a threat-based rather than status-based approach. **In effect, the new policy endorses a self-defence standard as the** de facto basis **for US drone strikes**, even if the continuing level of attacks would strike most Europeans as far above what a genuine self-defence analysis would permit.32 The new standards would seem to prohibit signature strikes in countries such as Yemen and Somalia and confine them to Pakistan, where militant activity could be seen as posing a cross-border threat to US troops in Afghanistan. According to news reports, signature strikes will continue in the Pakistani tribal areas for the time being.33 However, the impact of the new policy will depend very much on how the concept of a continuing, imminent threat is interpreted. The administration has not given any definition of this phrase, and the leaked Department of Justice white paper contained a strikingly broad interpretation of imminence; among other points, the white paper said that it “does not require the United States to have clear evidence that a specific attack on US persons or interests will take place in the immediate future” and that it “must incorporate considerations of the relevant window of opportunity, the possibility of reducing collateral damage to civilians, and the likelihood of heading off future disastrous attacks on Americans”.34 The presidential policy guidance captures the apparent concerns behind the administration’s policy more honestly by including the criterion of continuing threat, but this begs the question of how the notions of a “continuing” and “imminent” threat relate to each other. Even since Obama’s speech, the US is reported to have carried out four drone strikes (two in Pakistan and two in Yemen) killing between 18 and 21 people – suggesting that the level of attacks is hardly diminishing **under the new guidelines**.35 It is also notable that the new standards **announced by Obama** represent a policy decision **by the US** rather than **a** revised **interpretation of its** legal obligations. In his speech, **Obama drew a distinction between legality and morality**, pointing out that “to say a military tactic is legal, or even effective, is not to say it is wise or moral in every instance”. The suggestion was that the US was scaling back its use of drones out of practical or normative considerations, not because of any new conviction that the its previous legal claims went too far. The **background** assertion that the US **is engaged in an armed conflict with al-Qaeda and associated forces, and** might **therefore** lawfully kill any member **of the opposing forces** wherever they were found, remains in place **to serve** as a precedent **for other states that wish to claim it**.

Limiting the use of force as a first resort is critical to sustainable consensus-building on targeted killing standards

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

Legal scholars, policymakers, and state actors are embroiled in a heated debate about whether the conflict with al Qaeda is concentrated within specific geographic boundaries or extends to wherever al Qaeda members and associated forces may go. The United States' expansive view of the conflict, coupled with its broad definition of the enemy, has led to a legitimate concern about the creep of war. Conversely, the European and human rights view, which confines the conflict to a limited geographic region, ignores the potentially global nature of the threat and unduly constrains the state's ability to respond. Neither the law of international armed conflict (governing conflicts between states) nor the law of noninternational armed conflict (traditionally understood to govern intrastate conflicts) provides the answers that are so desperately needed. The zone approach proposed by this Article fills the international law gap, effectively mediating the multifaceted liberty and security interests at stake. It recognizes the broad sweep of the conflict, but distinguishes between zones of active hostilities and other areas in determining which rules apply. Specifically, it offers a set of standards that would both limit and legitimize the use of out-of-battlefield targeted killings and law of war-based detentions, subjecting their use to an individualized threat assessment, a least-harmful-means test, and significant procedural safeguards. This approach confines the use of out-of-battlefield targeted killings and detention without charge to extraordinary situations in which the security of the state so demands. It thus limits the use of force as a first resort, protects against the unnecessary erosion of peacetime norms and institutions, and safeguards individual liberty. At the same time, the zone approach ensures that the state can effectively respond to grave threats to its security, wherever those threats are based. The United States has already adopted a number of policies that distinguish between zones of active hostilities and elsewhere, implicitly recognizing the importance of this distinction. By adopting the proposed framework as a matter of law, the United States can begin to set the standards and build an international consensus as to the rules that ought to apply, not only to this conflict, but to future conflicts. The likely reputational, security, and foreign policy gains make acceptance of this framework a worthy endeavor.

Only congressional action on the scope of hostilities sends a clear signal that the US abides by the laws of armed conflict

Kenneth Anderson, Professor of Law, Washington College of Law, American University, and Research Fellow, The Hoover Institution, Stanford University and Member of its Task Force on National Security and the Law, 3/18/10, Rise of the Drones: Unmanned Systems and the Future of War, digitalcommons.wcl.american.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1002&context=pub\_disc\_cong

• First, the United States government urgently needs publicly to declare the legal rationale behind its use of drones, and defend that legal rationale in the international community, which is increasingly convinced that parts, if not all, of its use is a violation of international law. • Second, the legal rationale offered by the United States government needs to take account, not only of the use of drones on traditional battlefields by the US military, but also of the Obama administration’s signature use of drones by the CIA in operations outside of traditionally conceived zones of armed conflict, whether in Pakistan, or further afield, in Somalia or Yemen or beyond. This legal rationale must be certain to protect, in plain and unmistakable language, the lawfulness of the CIA’s participation in drone-related uses of force as it takes place today, and to protect officials and personnel from moves, in the United States or abroad, to treat them as engaged in unlawful activity. It must also be broad enough to encompass the use of drones (under the statutory arrangements long set forth in United States domestic law) by covert civilian agents of the CIA, in operations in the future, involving future presidents, future conflicts, and future reasons for using force that have no relationship to the current situation. • Third, the proper legal rationale for the use of force in drone operations in special, sometimes covert, operations outside of traditional zones of armed conflict is the customary international law doctrine of self-defense, rather than the narrower law of armed conflict. • Fourth, Congress has vital roles to play here, mostly in asserting the legality of the use of drones. These include: (i) Plain assertion of the legality of the programs as currently used by the Obama administration, as a signal to courts in the US as well as the international community and other interested actors, that the two political branches are united on an issue of vital national security and foreign policy. (ii) Congressional oversight mechanisms should also be strengthened in ensuring Congress’s meaningful knowledge and ability to make its views known. (iii) Congress also should consider legislation to clarify once and for all that that covert use of force is lawful under US law and international law of self-defense, and undertake legislation to make clear the legal protection of individual officers. (iv) Congress should also strongly encourage the administration to put a public position on the record. In my view, that public justification ought to be something (self-defense, in my view) that will ensure the availability of targeted killing for future administrations outside the context of conflict with Al Qaeda – and protect against its legal erosion by acquiescing or agreeing to interpretations of international law that would accept, even by implication, that targeted killing by the civilian CIA using drones is per se an unlawful act of extrajudicial execution. The Multiple Strategic Uses of Drones and Their Legal Rationales 4. Seen through the lens of legal policy, drones as a mechanism for using force are evolving in several different strategic and technological directions, with different legal implications for their regulation and lawful use. From my conversations and research with various actors involved in drone warfare, the situation is a little bit like the blind men and the elephant – each sees only the part, including the legal regulation, that pertains to a particular kind of use, and assumes that it covers the whole. The whole, however, is more complicated and heterogeneous. They range from traditional tactical battlefield uses in overt war to covert strikes against non-state terrorist actors hidden in failed states, ungoverned, or hostile states in the world providing safe haven to terrorist groups. They include use by uniformed military in ordinary battle but also use by the covert civilian service. 5. Although well-known, perhaps it bears re-stating the when this discussion refers to drones and unmanned vehicle systems, the system is not “unmanned” in the sense that human beings are not in the decision or control loop. Rather, “unmanned” here refers solely to “remote-piloted,” in which the pilot and weapons controllers are not physically on board the aircraft. (“Autonomous” firing systems, in which machines might make decisions about the firing of weapons, raise entirely separate issues not covered by this discussion because they are not at issue in current debates over UA Vs.) 6. Drones on traditional battlefields. The least legally complicated or controversial use of drones is on traditional battlefields, by the uniformed military, in ordinary and traditional roles of air power and air support. From the standpoint of military officers involved in such traditional operations in Afghanistan, for example, the use of drones is functionally identical to the use of missile fired from a standoff fighter plane that is many miles from the target and frequently over-the-horizon. Controllers of UAVs often have a much better idea of targeting than a pilot with limited input in the cockpit. From a legal standpoint, the use of a missile fired from a drone aircraft versus one fired from some remote platform with a human pilot makes no difference in battle as ordinarily understood. The legal rules for assessing the lawfulness of the target and anticipated collateral damage are identical. 7. Drones used in Pakistan’s border region. Drones used as part of the on-going armed conflict in Afghanistan, in which the fighting has spilled over – by Taliban and Al Qaeda flight to safe havens, particularly – into neighboring areas of Pakistan likewise raise relatively few questions about their use, on the assumption that the armed conflict has spilled, as is often the case of armed conflict, across an international boundary. There are no doubt important international and diplomatic questions raised about the use of force across the border – and that is presumably one of the major reasons why the US and Pakistan have both preferred the use of drones by the CIA with a rather shredded fig leaf, as it were, of deniability, rather than US military presence on the ground in Pakistan. The **legal questions are important**, but (unless one takes the view that the use of force by the CIA is always and per se illegal under international law, even when treated as part of the armed forces of a state in what is unquestionably an armed conflict) there is nothing legally special about UAVs that would distinguish them from other standoff weapons platforms. 8. Drones used in Pakistan outside of the border region. The use of drones to target Al Qaeda and Taliban leadership outside of places in which it is factually plain that hostilities are underway begins to invoke the current legal debates over drone warfare. From a strategic standpoint, of course, the essence of much fighting against a raiding enemy is to deny it safe haven; as safe havens in the border regions are denied, then the enemy moves to deeper cover. The strategic rationale for targeting these leaders (certainly in the view of the Obama administration) is overwhelming. Within the United States, and even more without, arguments are underway as to whether Pakistan beyond the border regions into which overt fighting has spilled can justify reach to the law of armed conflict as a basis and justification for drone strikes. 9. Drones used against Al Qaeda affiliates outside of AfPak – Somalia, Yemen or beyond. The President, in several major addresses, has stressed that the United States will take the fight to the enemy, and pointedly included places that are outside of any traditionally conceived zone of hostilities in Iraq or AfPak – Somalia and Yemen have each been specifically mentioned. And indeed, the US has undertaken uses of force in those places, either by means of drones or else by human agents. The Obama administration has made clear – entirely correctly, in my view – that it will deny safe haven to terrorists. As the president said in an address at West Point in fall 2009, we “cannot tolerate a safe-haven for terrorists whose location is known, and whose intentions are clear.”1 In this, the President follows the long-standing, traditional view of the US government endorsing, as then-State Department Legal Advisor Abraham Sofaer put it in a speech in 1989, the “right of a State to strike terrorists within the territory of another State where terrorists are using that territory as a location from which to launch terrorist attacks and where the State involved has failed to respond effectively to a demand that the attacks be stopped.”2 10. The United States might assert in these cases that the armed conflict goes where the combatants go, in the case particularly of an armed conflict (with non-state actors) that is already acknowledged to be underway. In that case, those that it targets are, in its view, combats that can lawfully be targeted, subject to the usual armed conflict rules of collateral damage. One says this without knowing for certain whether this is, in fact, the US view – although the Obama administration is under pressure for failing to articulate a public legal view, this was equally the case for the preceding two administrations. In any case, however, that view is sharply contested as a legal matter. The three main contending legal views at this point are as follows: • One legal view (the traditional view and that presumably taken by the Obama administration, except that we do not know for certain, given its reticence) is that we are in an armed conflict. Wherever the enemy goes, we are entitled to follow and attack him as a combatant. Geography and location – important for diplomatic reasons and raising questions about the territorial integrity of states, true – are irrelevant to the question of whether it is lawful to target under the laws of war; the war goes where the combatant goes. We must do so consistent with the laws of war and attention to collateral damage, and other legal and diplomatic concerns would of course constrain us if, for example, the targets fled to London or Istanbul. But the fundamental right to attack a combatant, other things being equal, surely cannot be at issue. • A second legal view directly contradicts the first, and says that the legal rights of armed conflict are limited to a particular theatre of hostilities, not to wherever combatants might flee throughout the world. This creates a peculiar question as to how, lawfully, hostilities against a non-state actor might ever get underway. But the general legal policy response is that if there is no geographic constraint consisting of a “theatre” of hostilities, then the very special legal regime of the laws of armed conflict might suddenly, and without any warning, apply – and overturn – ordinary laws of human rights that prohibit extrajudicial execution, and certainly do not allow attacks subject merely to collateral damage rules, with complete surprise and no order to it. Armed conflict is defined by its theatres of hostilities, on this view, as a mechanism for limiting the scope of war and, importantly, the reach of the laws of armed conflict insofar as the displace (with a lower standard of protection) ordinary human rights law. Again, this leaves a deep concern that this view, in effect, empowers the fleeing side, which can flee to some place where, to some extent, it is protected against attack. • A third legal view (to which I subscribe) says that armed conflict under the laws of war, both treaty law of the Geneva Conventions and customary law, indeed accepts that non-international armed conflict is defined, and therefore limited by, the presence of persistent, sustained, intense hostilities. In that sense, then, an armed conflict to which the laws of war apply exists only in particular places where those conditions are met. **That is not the end of the legal story, however**. Armed conflict as defined under the Geneva Conventions (common articles 2 and 3) is not the only international law basis for governing the use of force. The international law of self-defense is a broader basis for the use of force in, paradoxically, more limited ways that do not rise to the sustained levels of fighting that legally define hostilities. • Why is self-defense the appropriate legal doctrine for attacks taking place away from active hostilities? From a strategic perspective, a large reason for ordering a limited, pinprick, covert strike is in order to avoid, if possible, an escalation of the fighting to the level of overt intensity that would invoke the laws of war – the intent of the use of force is to avoid a wider war. Given that application of the laws of war, in other words, requires a certain level of sustained and intense hostilities, that is not always a good thing. It is often bad and precisely what covert action seeks to avoid. The legal basis for such an attack is not armed conflict as a formal legal matter – the fighting with a non-state actor does not rise to the sustained levels required under the law’s threshold definition – but instead the law of self-defense. • Is self-defense law simply a standardless license wantonly to kill? This invocation of self-defense law should not be construed as meaning that it is without limits or constraining standards. On the contrary, it is not standardless, even though it does not take on all the detailed provisions of the laws of war governing “overt” warfare, including the details of prison camp life and so on. It must conform to the customary law standards of necessity and proportionality – necessity in determining whom to target, and proportionality in considering collateral damage. The standards in those cases should essentially conform to military standards under the law of war, and in some cases the standards should be still higher. 11. The United States government seems, to judge by its lack of public statements, remarkably indifferent to the increasingly vehement and pronounced rejection of the first view, in particular, that the US can simply follow combatants anywhere and attack them. The issue is not simply collateral damage in places where no one had any reason to think there was a war underway; prominent voices in the international legal community question, at a minimum, the lawfulness of even attacking what they regard as merely alleged terrorists. In the view of important voices in international law, the practice outside of a traditional battlefield is a violation of international human rights law guarantees against extrajudicial execution and, at bottom, is just simple murder. On this view, the US has a human rights obligation to seek to arrest and then charge under some law; it cannot simply launch missiles at those it says are its terrorist enemies. It shows increasing impatience with US government silence on this issue, and with the apparent – but quite undeclared – presumption that the armed conflict goes wherever the combatants go. 12. Thus, for example, the UN special rapporteur on extrajudicial execution, NYU law professor Philip Alston, has asked in increasingly strong terms that, at a minimum, the US government explain its legal rationales for targeted killing using drones. The American Civil Liberties Union in February 2010 filed an extensive FOIA request (since re-filed as a lawsuit), seeking information on the legal rationales (but including requests for many operational facts) for all parts of the drones programs, carefully delineating military battlefield programs and CIA programs outside of the ordinary theatres of hostilities. Others have gone much further than simply requests that the US declare its legal views and have condemned them as extrajudicial execution – as Amnesty International did with respect to one of the earliest uses of force by drones, the 2002 Yemen attack on Al Qaeda members. The addition of US citizens to the kill-or-capture list, under the authorization of the President, has raised the stakes still further. The stakes, in this case, are highly unlikely to involve President Obama or Vice-President Biden or senior Obama officials. They are far more likely to involve lower level agency counsel, at the CIA or NSC, who create the target lists and make determinations of lawful engagement in any particular circumstance. It is they who would most likely be investigated, indicted, or prosecuted in a foreign court as, the US should take careful note, has already happened to Israeli officials in connection with operations against Hamas. **The reticence of the US government on this matter is frankly hard to justify**, at this point; this is not a criticism per se of the Obama administration, because the George W. Bush and Clinton administrations were equally unforthcoming. But this is the Obama administration, and **public silence on the legal legitimacy of targeted killings especially in places** and ways **that are not obviously** by the military in obvious **battlespaces is increasingly problematic**. 13. Drones used in future circumstances by future presidents against new non-state terrorists. A government official with whom I once spoke about drones as used by the CIA to launch pinpoint attacks on targets in far-away places described them, in strategic terms, as the “lightest of the light cavalry.” He noted that if terrorism, understood strategically, is a “raiding strategy” launched largely against “logistical” rather than “combat” targets – treating civilian and political will as a “logistical target” in this strategic sense – then how should we see drone attacks conducted in places like Somalia or Yemen or beyond? We should understand them, he said, as a “counter-raiding” strategy, aimed not at logistical targets, but instead at combat targets, the terrorists themselves. Although I do not regard this use of “combat” as a legal term – because, as suggested above, the proper legal frame for these strikes is self-defense rather than “armed conflict” full-on – as a strategic description, this is apt. 14. This blunt description suggests, however, that it is a profound mistake to think that the importance of drones lies principally on the traditional battlefield, as a tactical support weapon, or even in the “spillover” areas of hostilities. In those situations, it is perhaps cheaper than the alternatives of manned systems, but is mostly a substitute for accepted and existing military capabilities. Drone attacks become genuinely special as a form of strategic, yet paradoxically discrete, air power outside of overt, ordinary, traditional hostilities – the farthest project of discrete force by the lightest of the light cavalry. As these capabilities develop in several different technological direction – on the one hand, smaller vehicles, more contained and limited kinetic weaponry, and improved sensors and, on the other hand, large-scale drone aircraft capable of going after infrastructure targets as the Israelis have done with their Heron UAVs – it is highly likely that they will become a weapon of choice for future presidents, future administrations, in future conflicts and circumstances of self- defense and vital national security of the United States. Not all the enemies of the United States, including transnational terrorists and non-state actors, will be Al Qaeda or the authors of 9/11. Future presidents will need these technologies and strategies – and will need to know that they have sound, publicly and firmly asserted legal defenses of their use, including both their use and their limits in law.

Congressional restriction key to credibility and signal

Kenneth Anderson, Professor of Law, Washington College of Law, American University, and Research Fellow, The Hoover Institution, Stanford University and Member of its Task Force on National Security and the Law, 5/11/2009, Targeted Killing in U.S. Counterterrorism Strategy and Law, http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/papers/2009/5/11%20counterterrorism%20anderson/0511\_counterterrorism\_anderson.pdf

What Should Congress Do?

Does this analysis offer any practical policy prescriptions for Congress and the administration? The problem is not so much a need for new legislation to create new structures or new policies. The legislative category in which many instances of targeted killing might take place in the future already exists. The task for Congress and the administration, rather, is instead to preserve a category that is likely to be put under pressure in the future and, indeed, is already seen by many as a legal non-starter under international law. Before addressing what Congress should do in this regard, we might ask from a strictly strategic political standpoint whether, given that the Obama Administration is committed to this policy anyway, whether it is politically prudent to draw public attention to the issue at all. Israeli officials might be threatened with legal action in Spain; but so far no important actor has shown an appetite for taking on the Obama Administration. Perhaps it is better to let sleeping political dogs lie. These questions require difficult political calculations. However, the sources cited above suggest that even if no one is quite prepared at this moment to take on the Obama Administration on targeted killing, the intellectual and legal pieces of the challenge are already set up and on the table. Having asserted certain positions concerning human rights law and its application and the United States having unthinkingly abandoned its self-defense rationale for its policy, the play can be made at any time—at some later time in the Obama Administration or in the next Republican administration, prying apart the “American” position to create a de facto alliance among Democrats and Europeans and thereby undermining the ability of the United States to craft a unified American security strategy.101 The United States would be best served if the Obama Administration did that exceedingly rare thing in international law and diplomacy: Getting the United States out in front of the issue by making plain the American position, rather than merely reacting in surprise when its sovereign prerogatives are challenged by the international soft-law community. The deeper issue here is not merely a strategic and political one about targeted killing and drones but goes to the very grave policy question of whether it is time to move beyond the careful ambiguity of the CIA’s authorizing statute in referring to covert uses of force under the doctrines of vital national interest and self-defense. Is it time to abandon strategic ambiguity with regards to the Fifth Function and assert the right to use force in self-defense and yet in “peacetime”—that is, outside of the specific context of an armed conflict within the meaning of international humanitarian law? Quite possibly, the strategic ambiguity, in a world in which secrecy is more and more difficult, and in the general fragmentation of voice and ownership of international law, has lost its raison d’etre. This is a larger question than the one undertaken here, but on a range of issues including covert action, interrogation techniques, detention policy, and others, a general approach of overt legislation that removes ambiguity is to be preferred. The single most important role for Congress to play in addressing targeted killings, therefore, is the open, unapologetic, plain insistence that the American understanding of international law on this issue of self-defense is legitimate. The assertion, that is, that the United States sees its conduct as permissible for itself and for others. And it is the putting of congressional strength behind the official statements of the executive branch as the opinio juris of the United States, its authoritative view of what international law is on this subject. If this statement seems peculiar, that is because the task—as fundamental as it is—remains unfortunately poorly understood. Yet if it is really a matter of political consensus between Left and Right that targeted killing is a tool of choice for the United States in confronting its non-state enemies, then this is an essential task for Congress to play in support of the Obama Administration as it seeks to speak with a single voice for the United States to the rest of the world. The Congress needs to backstop the administration in asserting to the rest of the world— including to its own judiciary—how the United States understands international law regarding targeted killing. And it needs to make an unapologetic assertion that its views, while not dispositive or binding on others, carry international authority to an extent that relatively few others do—even in our emerging multi-polar world. International law traditionally, after all, accepts that states with particular interests, power, and impact in the world, carry more weight in particular matters than other states. The American view of maritime law matters more than does landlocked Bolivia’s. American views on international security law, as the core global provider of security, matter more than do those of Argentina, Germany or, for that matter, NGOs or academic commentators. But it has to speak—and speak loudly—if it wishes to be heard. It is an enormously important instance of the need for the United States to re-take “ownership” of international law— not as its arbiter, nor as the superpower alone, but as a very powerful, very important, and very legitimate sovereign state. Intellectually, continuing to squeeze all forms and instances of targeted killing by standoff platform under the law of IHL armed conflict is probably not the most analytically compelling way to proceed. It is certainly not a practical long-term approach. Not everyone who is an intuitively legitimate target from the standpoint of self-defense or vital national security, after all, will be already part of an armed conflict or combatant in the strict IHL sense. Requiring that we use such IHL concepts for a quite different category is likely to have the deleterious effect of deforming the laws of war, over the long term—starting, for example, with the idea of a “global war,” which is itself a certain deformation of the IHL concept of hostilities and armed conflict.
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## 2AC Caucasus

#### Unrestricted drone use causes nuclear war in the Caucasus

Clayton 12 (Nick Clayton, Worked in several publications, including the Washington Times the Asia Times and Washington Diplomat. He is currently the senior editor of Kanal PIK TV's English Service (a Russian-language channel), lived in the Caucuses for several years,10/23/2012, "Drone violence along Armenian-Azerbaijani border could lead to war", www.globalpost.com/dispatch/news/regions/europe/121022/drone-violence-along-armenian-azerbaijani-border-could-lead-war)

Armenia and Azerbaijan could soon be at war if drone proliferation on both sides of the border continues. In a region where a fragile peace holds over three frozen conflicts, the nations of the South Caucasus are buzzing with drones they use to probe one another’s defenses and spy on disputed territories. The region is also host to strategic oil and gas pipelines and a tangled web of alliances and precious resources that observers say threaten to quickly escalate the border skirmishes and airspace violations to a wider regional conflict triggered by Armenia and Azerbaijan that could potentially pull in Israel, Russia and Iran. To some extent, these countries are already being pulled towards conflict. Last September, Armenia shot down an Israeli-made Azerbaijani drone over Nagorno-Karabakh and the government claims that drones have been spotted ahead of recent incursions by Azerbaijani troops into Armenian-held territory. Richard Giragosian, director of the Regional Studies Center in Yerevan, said in a briefing that attacks this summer showed that Azerbaijan is eager to “play with its new toys” and its forces showed “impressive tactical and operational improvement.” The International Crisis Group warned that as the tit-for-tat incidents become more deadly, “there is a growing risk that the increasing frontline tensions could lead to an accidental war.” “Everyone is now saying that the war is coming. We know that it could start at any moment.” ~Grush Agbaryan, mayor of Voskepar With this in mind, the UN and the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) have long imposed a non-binding arms embargo on both countries, and both are under a de facto arms ban from the United States. But, according to the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI), this has not stopped Israel and Russia from selling to them. After fighting a bloody war in the early 1990s over the disputed territory of Nagorno-Karabakh, Armenia and Azerbaijan have been locked in a stalemate with an oft-violated ceasefire holding a tenuous peace between them. And drones are the latest addition to the battlefield. In March, Azerbaijan signed a $1.6 billion arms deal with Israel, which consisted largely of advanced drones and an air defense system. Through this and other deals, Azerbaijan is currently amassing a squadron of over 100 drones from all three of Israel’s top defense manufacturers. Armenia, meanwhile, employs only a small number of domestically produced models. Intelligence gathering is just one use for drones, which are also used to spot targets for artillery, and, if armed, strike targets themselves. Armenian and Azerbaijani forces routinely snipe and engage one another along the front, each typically blaming the other for violating the ceasefire. At least 60 people have been killed in ceasefire violations in the last two years, and the Brussels-based International Crisis Group claimed in a report published in February 2011 that the sporadic violence has claimed hundreds of lives. “Each (Armenia and Azerbaijan) is apparently using the clashes and the threat of a new war to pressure its opponent at the negotiations table, while also preparing for the possibility of a full-scale conflict in the event of a complete breakdown in the peace talks,” the report said. Alexander Iskandaryan, director of the Caucasus Institute in the Armenian capital, Yerevan, said that the arms buildup on both sides makes the situation more dangerous but also said that the clashes are calculated actions, with higher death tolls becoming a negotiating tactic. “This isn’t Somalia or Afghanistan. These aren’t independent units. The Armenian, Azerbaijani and Karabakh armed forces have a rigid chain of command so it’s not a question of a sergeant or a lieutenant randomly giving the order to open fire. These are absolutely synchronized political attacks,” Iskandaryan said. The deadliest recent uptick in violence along the Armenian-Azerbaijani border and the line of contact around Karabakh came in early June as US Secretary of State Hillary Clinton was on a visit to the region. While death tolls varied, at least two dozen soldiers were killed or wounded in a series of shootouts along the front. The year before, at least four Armenian soldiers were killed in an alleged border incursion by Azerbaijani troops one day after a peace summit between the Armenian, Azerbaijani and Russian presidents in St. Petersburg, Russia. “No one slept for two or three days [during the June skirmishes],” said Grush Agbaryan, the mayor of the border village of Voskepar for a total of 27 years off and on over the past three decades. “Everyone is now saying that the war is coming. We know that it could start at any moment." Azerbaijan refused to issue accreditation to GlobalPost’s correspondent to enter the country to report on the shootings and Azerbaijan’s military modernization. Flush with cash from energy exports, Azerbaijan has increased its annual defense budget from an estimated $160 million in 2003 to $3.6 billion in 2012. SIPRI said in a report that largely as a result of its blockbuster drone deal with Israel, Azerbaijan’s defense budget jumped 88 percent this year — the biggest military spending increase in the world. Israel has long used arms deals to gain strategic leverage over its rivals in the region. Although difficult to confirm, many security analysts believe Israel’s deals with Russia have played heavily into Moscow’s suspension of a series of contracts with Iran and Syria that would have provided them with more advanced air defense systems and fighter jets. Stephen Blank, a research professor at the United States Army War College, said that preventing arms supplies to Syria and Iran — particularly Russian S-300 air defense systems — has been among Israel’s top goals with the deals. “There’s always a quid pro quo,” Blank said. “Nobody sells arms just for cash.” In Azerbaijan in particular, Israel has traded its highly demanded drone technology for intelligence arrangements and covert footholds against Iran. In a January 2009 US diplomatic cable released by WikiLeaks, a US diplomat reported that in a closed-door conversation, Azerbaijani President Ilham Aliyev compared his country’s relationship with Israel to an iceberg — nine-tenths of it is below the surface. Although the Jewish state and Azerbaijan, a conservative Muslim country, may seem like an odd couple, the cable asserts, “Each country finds it easy to identify with the other’s geopolitical difficulties, and both rank Iran as an existential security threat.” Quarrels between Azerbaijan and Iran run the gamut of territorial, religious and geo-political disputes and Tehran has repeatedly threatened to “destroy” the country over its support for secular governance and NATO integration. In the end, “Israel’s main goal is to preserve Azerbaijan as an ally against Iran, a platform for reconnaissance of that country and as a market for military hardware,” the diplomatic cable reads. But, while these ties had indeed remained below the surface for most of the past decade, a series of leaks this year exposed the extent of their cooperation as Israel ramped up its covert war with the Islamic Republic. In February, the Times of London quoted a source the publication said was an active Mossad agent in Azerbaijan as saying the country was “ground zero for intelligence work.” This came amid accusations from Tehran that Azerbaijan had aided Israeli agents in assassinating an Iranian nuclear scientist in January. Then, just as Baku had begun to cool tensions with the Islamic Republic, Foreign Policy magazine published an article citing Washington intelligence officials who claimed that Israel had signed agreements to use Azerbaijani airfields as a part of a potential bombing campaign against Iran’s nuclear sites. Baku strongly denied the claims, but in September, Azerbaijani officials and military sources told Reuters that the country would figure in Israel’s contingencies for a potential attack against Iran. "Israel has a problem in that if it is going to bomb Iran, its nuclear sites, it lacks refueling," Rasim Musabayov, a member of the Azerbiajani parliamentary foreign relations committee told Reuters. “I think their plan includes some use of Azerbaijan access. We have (bases) fully equipped with modern navigation, anti-aircraft defenses and personnel trained by Americans and if necessary they can be used without any preparations." He went on to say that the drones Israel sold to Azerbaijan allow it to “indirectly watch what's happening in Iran.” According to SIPRI, Azerbaijan had acquired about 30 drones from Israeli firms Aeronautics Ltd. and Elbit Systems by the end of 2011, including at least 25 medium-sized Hermes-450 and Aerostar drones. In October 2011, Azerbaijan signed a deal to license and domestically produce an additional 60 Aerostar and Orbiter 2M drones. Its most recent purchase from Israel Aeronautics Industries (IAI) in March reportedly included 10 high altitude Heron-TP drones — the most advanced Israeli drone in service — according to Oxford Analytica. Collectively, these purchases have netted Azerbaijan 50 or more drones that are similar in class, size and capabilities to American Predator and Reaper-type drones, which are the workhorses of the United States’ campaign of drone strikes in Pakistan and Yemen. Although Israel may have sold the drones to Azerbaijan with Iran in mind, Baku has said publicly that it intends to use its new hardware to retake territory it lost to Armenia. So far, Azerbaijan’s drone fleet is not armed, but industry experts say the models it employs could carry munitions and be programmed to strike targets. Drones are a tempting tool to use in frozen conflicts, because, while their presence raises tensions, international law remains vague at best on the legality of using them. In 2008, several Georgian drones were shot down over its rebel region of Abkhazia. A UN investigation found that at least one of the drones was downed by a fighter jet from Russia, which maintained a peacekeeping presence in the territory. While it was ruled that Russia violated the terms of the ceasefire by entering aircraft into the conflict zone, Georgia also violated the ceasefire for sending the drone on a “military operation” into the conflict zone. The incident spiked tensions between Russia and Georgia, both of which saw it as evidence the other was preparing to attack. Three months later, they fought a brief, but destructive war that killed hundreds. The legality of drones in Nagorno-Karabakh is even less clear because the conflict was stopped in 1994 by a simple ceasefire that halted hostilities but did not stipulate a withdrawal of military forces from the area. Furthermore, analysts believe that all-out war between Armenia and Azerbaijan would be longer and more difficult to contain than the five-day Russian-Georgian conflict. While Russia was able to quickly rout the Georgian army with a much superior force, analysts say that Armenia and Azerbaijan are much more evenly matched and therefore the conflict would be prolonged and costly in lives and resources. Blank said that renewed war would be “a very catastrophic event” with “a recipe for a very quick escalation to the international level.” Armenia is militarily allied with Russia and hosts a base of 5,000 Russian troops on its territory. After the summer’s border clashes, Russia announced it was stepping up its patrols of Armenian airspace by 20 percent. Iran also supports Armenia and has important business ties in the country, which analysts say Tehran uses as a “proxy” to circumvent international sanctions. Blank said Israel has made a risky move by supplying Azerbaijan with drones and other high tech equipment, given the tenuous balance of power between the heavily fortified Armenian positions and the more numerous and technologically superior Azerbaijani forces. If ignited, he said, “[an Armenian-Azerbaijani war] will not be small. That’s the one thing I’m sure of.”
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#### “Restrictions” are on time, place, and manner – this includes geography

Lobel, professor of law at the University of Pittsburgh, 2008

(Jules, “Conflicts Between the Commander in Chief and Congress: Concurrent Power over the Conduct of War,” Ohio State Law Journal, http://moritzlaw.osu.edu/students/groups/oslj/files/2012/04/69.3.lobel\_.pdf)

Throughout American history, Congress has placed restrictions on the President’s power as Commander in Chief to conduct warfare. On numerous occasions, **Congress has authorized the President to conduct warfare but placed significant restrictions on the time**, **place and manner of warfare**. Congress has regulated the tactics the President could employ, the armed forces he could deploy, the geographical area in which those forces could be utilized, and the time period and specific purposes for which the President was authorized to use force. Its regulations have both swept broadly and set forth detailed instructions and procedures for the President to follow. This historical practice is consistent with the Constitution’s text and Framers’ intent, which made clear that the President was not to have the broad powers of the British King, but was subject to the control and oversight of Congress in the conduct of warfare.

#### “On” means there’s no limits disad

Dictionary.com, http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/on

On

preposition

1.so as to be or remain supported by or suspended from: Put your package down on the table; Hang your coat on the hook.

2.so as to be attached to or unified with: Hang the picture on the wall. Paste the label on the package.

## 2AC OLC

#### OLC can’t solve and links to politics

Posner 11 Eric Posner is the Kirkland & Ellis Professor, University of Chicago Law School. “DEFERENCE TO THE EXECUTIVE IN THE UNITED STATES AFTER 9/11 CONGRESS, THE COURTS AND THE OFFICE OF LEGAL COUNSEL” available at http://www.law.uchicago.edu/academics/publiclaw/index.html.

These two events neatly encapsulate the dilemma for OLC, and indeed all the president’s legal advisers. If OLC tries to block the president from acting in the way he sees fit, it takes the risk that he will disregard its advice and marginalize the institution. If OLC gives the president the advice that he wants to hear, it takes the risk that it will mislead him and fail to prepare him for adverse reactions from the courts, Congress, and the public. Can OLC constrain the executive? That is the position taken by many scholars, most notably Jack Goldsmith. 18 The underlying idea here is that even if Congress and the courts cannot constrain the executive, perhaps offices within the executive can. The opposite view, advanced by Bruce Ackerman, is that OLC is a rubber stamp. 19 I advocate a third view: OLC does not constrain the executive but enables him to accomplish goals that he would not otherwise be able to accomplish. It is more accurate to say that OLC enables than constrains. B. OLC as a Constraint on the Executive A number of scholars have argued that OLC can serve as an important constraint on executive power. I will argue that OLC cannot act as a constraint on executive power. Indeed, its only function is the opposite—as an “enabler” (as I will put it) or extender of executive power. A president must choose a course of action. He goes to OLC for advice. Ideally, OLC will provide him good advice as to the legality of the course of action. It will not provide him political advice and other relevant types of advice. The president wants to maximize his political advantage, 21 and so he will follow OLC’s advice only if the legal costs that OLC identifies are greater than the political benefits. On this theory, OLC will properly always give the president neutral advice, and the president will gratefully accept it although not necessarily follow it. If the story ended here, then it would be hard to see what the controversy over OLC could be about. As an adviser, it possesses no ability to constrain the executive. It merely provides doctrinal analysis, in this way, if it does its job properly, merely supplying predictions as to how other legal actors will react to the president’s proposed action. The executive can choose to ignore OLC’s advice, and so OLC cannot serve as a “constraint” on executive power in any meaningful sense. Instead, it merely conveys to the president information about the constraints on executive power that are imposed from outside the executive branch. However, there is an important twist that complicates the analysis. The president may choose to publicize OLC’s opinions. Naturally, the president will be tempted to publicize only favorable opinions. When Congress 22 claims that a policy is illegal, the president can respond that his lawyers advised him that the policy is legal. This response at least partially deflects blame from the president. There are two reasons for this. First, the Senate consented to the appointment of these lawyers; thus, if the lawyers gave bad advice, the Senate is partly to blame, and so the blame must be shared. Second, OLC lawyers likely care about their future prospects in the legal profession, which will turn in part on their ability to avoid scandals and to render plausible legal advice; they may also seek to maintain the office’s reputation. When OLC’s opinions are not merely private advice, but are used to justify actions, then OLC takes on a quasi-judicial function. Presidents are not obliged to publicize OLC’s opinions, but clearly they see an advantage to doing so, and they have in this way given OLC quasi-judicial status. But if the president publicizes OLC opinions, he takes a risk. The risk is that OLC will publicly advise him that an action is illegal. If OLC approval helps deflect blame from the president, then OLC disapproval will tend to concentrate blame on the president who ignores its advice. Congress and the public will note that after all the president is ignoring the advice of lawyers that he appointed and thus presumably he trusts, and this can only make the president look bad. To avoid such blame, the president may refrain from engaging in a politically advantageous action. In this way, OLC may be able to prevent the president from taking an action that he would otherwise prefer. At a minimum, OLC raises the political cost of the action. I have simplified greatly, but I believe that this basic logic has led some scholars to believe that OLC serves as a constraint on the president. But this is a mistake. OLC strengthens the president’s hand in some cases and weakens them in others; but overall it extends his power—it serves as enabler, not constraint. To see why, consider an example in which a president must choose an action that lies on a continuum. One might consider electronic surveillance. At one extreme, the president can engage in actions that are clearly lawful—for example, spying on criminal suspects after obtaining warrants from judges. At the other extreme, the president can engage in actions that are clearly unlawful—for example, spying on political opponents. OLC opinions will not affect Congress’s or the public’s reaction to either the obviously lawful or the obviously unlawful actions. But then there are middle cases. Consider a policy L, which is just barely legal, and a policy I, which is just barely illegal. The president would like to pursue policy L but fears that Congress and others will mistakenly believe that L is illegal. As a result, political opposition to L will be greater than it would be otherwise. In such a case, a favorable advisory opinion from a neutral legal body that has credibility with Congress will help the president. OLC’s approval of L would cause political opposition (to the extent that it is based on the mistaken belief that L is unlawful) to melt away. Thus, OLC enables the president to engage in policy L, when without OLC’s participation that might be impossible. True, OLC will not enable the president to engage in I, assuming OLC is neutral. And, indeed, OLC’s negative reaction to I may stiffen Congress’ resistance. However, the president will use OLC only because he believes that OLC will strengthen his hand on net. It might be useful to make this point using a little jargon. In order for OLC to serve its ex ante function of enabling the president to avoid confrontations with Congress in difficult cases, it must be able to say “no” to him ex post for barely illegal actions as well as “yes” to him for barely legal actions. It is wrong to consider an ex post no as a form of constraint because, ex ante, it enables the president to act in half of the difficult cases. OLC does not impose any independent constraint on the president, that is, any constraint that is separate from the constraint imposed by Congress. An analogy to contract law might be useful. People enter contracts because they enable them to do things ex ante by imposing constraints on them ex post. For example, a debtor can borrow money from a creditor only because a court will force the debtor to repay the money ex post. It would be strange to say that contract law imposes “constraints” on people because of ex post enforcement. In fact, contract law enables people to do things that they could not otherwise do—it extends their power. If it did not,people would not enter contracts. A question naturally arises about OLC’s incentives. I have assumed that OLC provides neutral advice—in the sense of trying to make accurate predictions as to how other agents like Congress and the courts would reaction to proposed actions. It is possible that OLC could be biased—either in favor of the president or against him. However, if OLC were biased against the president, he would stop asking it for advice (or would ask for its advice in private and then ignore it). This danger surely accounts for the fact that OLC jurisprudence is pro-executive. 23 But it would be just as dangerous for OLC to be excessively biased in favor of the president. If it were, it would mislead the president and lose its credibility with Congress, with the result that it could not help the president engage in L policies. So OLC must be neither excessively pro-president nor anti-president. If it can avoid these extremes, it will be an “enabler”; if it cannot, it will be ignored. In no circumstance could it be a “constraint.” If the OLC cannot constrain the president on net, why have people claimed that OLC can constrain the president? What is the source of this mistake? One possibility, which I have already noted, is that commentators might look only at one side of the problem. Scholars note that OLC may “prevent” the president from engaging in barely illegal actions without also acknowledging that it can do so only if at the same time it enables the president to engage in barely legal actions. This is simply a failure to look at the full picture. For example, in The Terror Presidency, Goldsmith argues that President Bush abandoned a scheme of warrantless wiretapping without authorization from the FISA court because OLC declared the scheme illegal, and top Justice Department officials threatened to resign unless Bush heeded OLC’s advice. 25 This seems like a clear example of constraint. But it is important to look at the whole picture. If OLC had approved the scheme, and subsequently executive branch agents in the NSA had been prosecuted and punished by the courts, then OLC’s credibility as a supplier of legal advice would have been destroyed. For the president, this would have been a bad outcome. As I have argued, a credible OLC helps the president accomplish his agenda in “barely legal” cases. Without taking into account those cases where OLC advice helps the president’s agenda ex post as well as the cases where OLC advice hurts the president’s agenda ex post, one cannot make an overall judgment about OLC’s ex ante effect on executive power. Another possible source of error is that scholars imagine that “neutral” advice will almost always prevent the president from engaging in preferred actions, while rarely enabling the president to engage in preferred actions. The implicit picture here is that a president will normally want to break the law, that under the proper interpretation of the Constitution and relevant standards the president can accomplish very little. So if OLC is infact neutral and the president does obey its advice, then it must constrain the president. But this theory cannot be right, either. If OLC constantly told the president that he cannot do what he wants to do, when infact Congress and other agents would not object to the preferred actions, then the president would stop asking OLC for advice. As noted above, for OLC to maintain its relevance, it cannot offer an abstract interpretation of the Constitution that is divorced from political realities; it has to be able to make realistic predictions as to how other legal agents will react to the president’s actions. This has led OLC to develop a pro-executive jurisprudence in line with the long-term evolution of executive power. If OLC tried to impose constraints other than those imposed by Congress and other institutions with political power, then the president would ignore it.

#### Congress is key

#### First – public backlash

Anderson 13 (Kenneth Anderson is a professor of international law at American University and a member of the Task Force on National Security and Law at the Hoover Institution, June 2013, "The Case for Drones", https://www.commentarymagazine.com/articles/the-case-for-drones/)

**Without a hardheaded effort on the part of Congress** and the executive branch to make drone policy, **the efforts to discredit drones will continue**. The current wide public support in the United States today should not mask the ways in which **public perception and sentiment can be shifted,** here and abroad. The campaign of delegitimation is modeled on the one against Guantanamo Bay during the George W. Bush administration; the British campaigning organization Reprieve tweets that it will make drones the Obama administration’s Guantanamo. **Then as now, administration officials did not, or were unforgivably slow to, believe that a mere civil-society campaign could** force a reset of their policies. They miscalculated then and, as former Bush administration officials John Bellinger and Jack Goldsmith have repeatedly warned, **they might well be miscalculating now**.

#### Only congress can ensure sufficient clarity

Mark David Maxwell, Colonel, Judge Advocate with the U.S. Army, Winter 2012, TARGETED KILLING, THE LAW, AND TERRORISTS, Joint Force Quarterly, http://www.ndu.edu/press/targeted-killing.html

The weakness of this theory is that it is not codified in U.S. law; it is merely the extrapolation of international theorists and organizations. The only entity under the Constitution that can frame and settle Presidential power regarding the enforcement of international norms is Congress. As the check on executive power, Congress must amend the AUMF to give the executive a statutory roadmap that articulates when force is appropriate and under what circumstances the President can use targeted killing. This would be the needed endorsement from Congress, the other political branch of government, to clarify the U.S. position on its use of force regarding targeted killing. For example, it would spell out the limits of American lethality once an individual takes the status of being a member of an organized group. Additionally, statutory clarification will give other states a roadmap for the contours of what constitutes anticipatory self-defense and the proper conduct of the military under the law of war. Congress should also require that the President brief it on the decision matrix of articulated guidelines before a targeted killing mission is ordered. As Kenneth Anderson notes, “[t]he point about briefings to Congress is partly to allow it to exercise its democratic role as the people’s representative.”74 The desire to feel safe is understandable. The consumers who buy SUVs are not buying them to be less safe. Likewise, the champions of targeted killings want the feeling of safety achieved by the elimination of those who would do the United States harm. But allowing the President to order targeted killing without congressional limits means the President can manipulate force in the name of national security without tethering it to the law advanced by international norms. The potential consequence of such unilateral executive action is that it gives other states, such as North Korea and Iran, the customary precedent to do the same. Targeted killing might be required in certain circumstances, but if the guidelines are debated and understood, the decision can be executed with the full faith of the people’s representative, Congress. When the decision is made without Congress, the result might make the United States feel safer, but the process eschews what gives a state its greatest safety: the rule of law.

#### Non unique since we codify squo policy - dworkin

#### No warfighting link

Waxman 8/25/13 (Matthew Waxman is a law professor at Columbia Law School, where he co-chairs the Roger Hertog Program on Law and National Security. He is also Adjunct Senior Fellow for Law and Foreign Policy at the Council on Foreign Relations and a member of the Hoover Institution Task Force on National Security and Law. He previously served in senior policy positions at the State Department, Defense Department, and National Security Council. After graduating from Yale Law School, he clerked for Judge Joel M. Flaum of the U.S. Court of Appeals and Supreme Court Justice David H. Souter, “The Constitutional Power to Threaten War” Forthcoming in YALE LAW JOURNAL, vol. 123, 2014, August 25th DRAFT)

A. Democratic Constraints on the Power to the Threaten Force

At first blush, including the power to threaten war or force in our understanding of how the President wields military might seems to suggest a conception of presidential war powers even more expansive in scope and less checked by other branches than often supposed, especially since the President can by threatening force put the United States on a path to war that Congress will have difficulty resisting. That is partially true, though recent political science scholarship reveals that democratic politics significantly constrain the President’s decisions to threaten force and, moreover, that Congress plays important roles in shaping those politics even in the absence of binding legislative action.

Whereas most lawyers usually begin their analysis of the President’s and Congress’s war powers by focusing on their formal legal authorities, political scientists usually take for granted these days that the President is – in practice – the dominant branch with respect to military crises and that Congress wields its formal legislative powers in this area rarely or in only very limited ways. A major school of thought, however, is that congressional members nevertheless wield significant influence over decisions about force, and that this influence extends to threatened force, so that Presidents generally refrain from threats that would provoke strong congressional opposition. Even without any serious prospect for legislatively blocking the President’s threatened actions, Congress under certain conditions can loom large enough to force Presidents to adjust their policies; even when it cannot, congressional members can oblige the President expend lots of political capital. As Jon Pevehouse and William Howell explain:

**When** members of **Congress** vocally **oppose a use of force, they undermine the president’s ability to convince foreign states that he will see a fight through to the end**. Sensing hesitation on the part of the United States, allies may be reluctant to contribute to a military campaign, and adversaries are likely to fight harder and longer when conflict erupts— thereby raising the costs of the military campaign, decreasing the president’s ability to negotiate a satisfactory resolution, and increasing the probability that American lives are lost along the way. Facing a limited band of allies willing to participate in a military venture and an enemy emboldened by domestic critics, presidents may choose to curtail, and even abandon, those military operations that do not involve vital strategic interests. 145

This statement also highlights the important point, alluded to earlier, that force and threatened force are not neatly separable categories. Often limited uses of force are intended as signals of resolve to escalate, and most conflicts involve bargaining in which the threat of future violence – rather than what Schelling calls “brute force” 146 – is used to try to extract concessions.

#### No impact

Jamieson9/12/’7(US may attack but will Iran fight back? Asia Times, <http://www.atimes.com/atimes/Middle_East/II12Ak02.html>)

Even those Americans actively seeking to provoke a war with Iran have had little success in finding or provoking a suitable incident that can be presented to the American people as a good reason to launch an attack on Iran. Despite the seizure of Iranian personnel in Iraq, at Irbil in January and more recently in Baghdad, the Iranians have refrained from any reckless response, although only their people seized in Baghdad have been returned. The capture of British sailors in March by Iranian Revolutionary Guards might have been a suitable flash point. However, Tehran soon released the sailors after squeezing every propaganda advantage from their capture, and Britain specifically asked the United States not to exacerbate the situation. Since the beginning of the year there have been constant US claims of Iranian interference in Iraq and of the Iranians supplying arms to militias and insurgents in that country. However, no clear link has ever been established between the Iranians and any particular attack on US forces. Even if the United States chose to respond to these alleged Iranian hostile acts with "hot pursuit" Special Forces raids into Iran or the bombing of alleged terrorist training camps in that country, this would not precipitate the sort of crisis needed to justify a wholesale assault on Iran's nuclear facilities and its armed forces in the near future.

## 2AC DA

#### Unconstrained geographic war destroys LOAC – only the plan solves

Sasha Radin, Visiting Research Scholar at the Naval War College, Newport Rhode Island; PhD candidate, Asia Pacific Centre for Military Law, University of Melbourne Law School, 2013, Global Armed Conflict? The Threshold of Extraterritorial Non-International Armed Conflicts, www.usnwc.edu/getattachment/311c6f17-ee69-4870-a00d-b7d845e4387c/Global-Armed-Conflict--The-Threshold-of-Extraterri.aspx

State sovereignty was another impetus for creating the requirement that the hostilities reach a certain level of intensity before LOAC could apply. States wanted to limit the involvement of outside States in their domestic affairs. This objective must, therefore, be seen in light of the fact that the types of conflicts envisioned were mainly internal armed conflicts. In an extraterritorial NIAC context, the reluctance of the State party to the conflict to be subject to interference from other States in its internal affairs largely disappears.150 Neither internal disturbances nor the conflict itself takes place in their own territory.

Does it matter in terms of what LOAC requires for its application that it is the State not party to the conflict whose territorial integrity is infringed? In other words, could this geographic shift in where the hostilities occur affect one of the original underlying reasons for the existence of the threshold? In contrast to the previous two points (whether the violence undertaken by various armed groups may be conglomerated and whether the distribution of violence over space means that it does not reach the sufficient level of intensity), this point questions whether the level of intensity customarily required for internal armed conflicts is the same for extraterritorial conflicts.

It may be argued that the territorial State (i.e., the State in which an extraterritorial NIAC physically takes place) has an interest in trying to prevent incursions into its sovereignty, even though it may not be a party to that NIAC. An incursion by an outside State in order to fight an armed group would likely have implications for the “uninvolved” territorial State. For instance, such an action could be an indication that the territorial State is not able to maintain its own security—an image that States usually take pains to avoid. Or, the territorial State may be concerned that the outside State might gain control or influence within their State.

The implications this shift might have on establishing the threshold of an extraterritorial armed conflict are not clear. At the very least, the reassignment of which State’s sovereignty is affected indicates that issues arising from the shifted location of the conflict warrant further examination. Therefore, even if one accepts the premise that NIACs may exist extraterritorially, the fact that the law was designed for a different context presents challenges in determining the existence of an armed conflict.

VI. GEOGRAPHIC BOUNDARIES OF EXISTING ARMED CONFLICTS

The removal of territorial boundaries from a system based on these physical limits raises the related question of where LOAC may be applied once the law of armed conflict has been triggered. Limited discussion has arisen previously on this issue in the context of purely internal conflicts. However, the main controversy surfaces today specifically with regard to individuals affiliated with an organized armed group located in a second State (“outside of an active battlefield”151). The unease of some commentators that the world could become a battlefield reappears here.

Because NIAC law was designed for internal application, its extraterritorial parameters are not clear. Two main options have been discussed for how to deal with this challenge. One proposes that the geographic application of LOAC is limited to the area of hostilities. The other maintains that once an armed conflict exists the law may extend beyond the immediate zone of hostilities. This latter approach has been interpreted by some to suggest that the law applies to the parties to the conflict wherever they may be located.

The first proposal, suggesting that LOAC would not apply at a distance from wherever the hostilities were taking place,152 may seem logical on its face, but lacks a legal basis. Jurisprudence from the ICTY dealing with the geographic scope of Common Article 3 within a State contradicts this interpretation, providing that “international humanitarian law continues to apply . . . in the case of internal conflicts . . . [to] the whole territory under the control of a party, whether or not actual combat takes place there.”153 The ICTY case law has generally been interpreted by other bodies to mean that Common Article 3 applies to the entire country in which a conflict is taking place, regardless of where hostilities occur.154 This language has been repeatedly upheld by subsequent ICTY and ICTR judgments.155 In the absence of explicit treaty law or customary international law, this jurisprudence could be said to have relevance when it comes to interpreting the geographic contours of internal conflicts.

Resort to the object and purpose of the law also supports application of the law beyond areas of hostilities. One of the law’s fundamental purposes is to ensure protection of individuals once in the hands of the enemy. To interpret the law as only applying to areas of combat would reduce the protection afforded to some of the most vulnerable, who may be located at a distance from active hostilities.

Finally, the text of AP II can be turned to for some guidance, even though the types of conflicts under discussion here are those with a lower threshold. AP II explicitly provides that it applies to “to all persons affected by an armed conflict.”156 This indicates that although AP II limits its applicability to the State in which the conflict is taking place,157 its application is not restricted to areas of active hostilities.158

The second approach considers that once an armed conflict exists LOAC applies beyond the area of active hostilities.159 It is argued that this is the more defensible position of the two. Although this view does not find an explicit basis in treaty law, it is difficult to find justification within the existing law for restricting the application of LOAC to a certain region once an armed conflict exists. In addition, the ICTY and ICTR case law just noted could be said to indirectly support this position in that it interprets the application of the law as extending beyond the combat zones. However, too much reliance on this jurisprudence is misguided as it still depends on State boundaries. For example, if one accepts that the armed conflict in Afghanistan has spilled over into Pakistan, does Common Article 3 then apply throughout the country of Pakistan?

The view that LOAC applies beyond the area of active hostilities leads to the question of whether anything restricts the geographic application of LOAC. One approach is to interpret the ICTY case law as literally referring to the areas where the parties to the conflict have control.160 Under such a view, NIAC law would only apply to the territory under control of the Pakistani Taliban (and other armed groups) in the North-West Frontier Province. This construction, however, presents hurdles.161 First, what is meant by control?162 Second, if it is territorial control that is envisioned, the majority of commentators and jurisprudence view the control of territory by an armed group as an indicator for the applicability of Common Article 3, rather than an obligation.163 It would not make sense to require territorial control by an armed group in order to determine the reach of an armed conflict within a country, but not to require territorial control for the existence of an armed conflict.164 Third, taken to its extreme this interpretation illogically suggests that if neither party controls territory, then LOAC does not apply,165 leading to the possibility that LOAC would not apply precisely where the battle rages.

The U.S. government position that LOAC is not geographically constrained with regard to individual members of a party to a conflict166 has engendered criticism.167 However, it is a defensible stance if one has already accepted that the territorial boundaries of States do not limit LOAC’s application. The bigger issue seems to be that the law was not designed for extraterritorial application. As such, should the view that territorial boundaries are not relevant to LOAC’s application gain force, it may be that the law will develop in a clearer and more nuanced manner.168 Notwithstanding the lack of clarity with regard to this issue, significant restrictions on the use of force against an individual located at a distance from hostilities in a second country already exist. Perhaps most importantly, the question only arises in the first place if an armed conflict exists between the State using force and the armed group against which the force is directed (which includes establishing that the group to which the individual belongs is an identifiable party). Second, and crucially, the separate question then arises of whether an individual is targetable (either by virtue of the membership approach or because s/he is directly participating in hostilities).169 This includes determining that the individual in question has a sufficient nexus to the ongoing armed conflict.170

Should those conditions be fulfilled, then the constraints within LOAC still apply (such as all of the rules pertaining to the principles of distinction and proportionality), as would the country’s domestic law and human rights law to the degree that it interacts with LOAC. It is likely that if the occurrence were far from active hostilities the latter two bodies of law would play a greater role. Issues of State sovereignty could, and often do, present one of the greatest limitations on action. Therefore, it is not the case that force may be used anywhere in the world at any time against parties to the conflict once an armed conflict exists.

VII. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the general trend today is that some extraterritorial conflicts may qualify as NIACs, despite the fact that they are not geographically confined to a single State. This interpretation recognizes that to artificially restrict the law in a way that does not reflect either the realities on the ground or the purpose of the law itself is counterproductive. However, because the existing law was not designed for extraterritorial conflicts, challenges arise in its application.

The issue of links between armed groups in NIACs is an area where the law may need reinterpretation or development. Analogies with other areas of the law do not lead to more clarity. The tenuous suggestion that in order to fulfill the intensity requirement not only should the affiliated armed group be organized and part of an identifiable party, but also that the group’s actions and goals should constitute a threat to the opposing party carries with it practical problems. Specifically, it could be difficult to ascertain both the threat and which members of an armed group are actually participating in actions that are part of the global conflict, as opposed to part of a separate internal conflict.

Determining whether amassing violence that is diffused over distances may fulfill the intensity requirement is another example of how the geographic extension of the law’s application may present difficulties. It has been argued here that taking into account the underlying purpose of the law, the violence must reach a certain level of intensity within a geographic region for an armed conflict to exist. When the violence is spread out geographically, such that in an individual country the law enforcement regimes may function, it is difficult to view the intensity requirement as being met. However, as with links, this issue is far from resolved.

The third principal challenge resulting from the extraterritorial application of NIAC law is that a reassignment of sovereignty occurs. It is unclear if this shift might impact on how States perceive the threshold of the existence of an armed conflict.

Once the existence of an armed conflict has been established, a separate issue arises as to the geographic boundaries of that conflict. This impacts the controversial question of when an individual may be targeted or detained if located in another country away from the main battlefield. Here too, because the law was originally intended to apply within State boundaries, very little guidance exists. It is argued that as the law currently stands, once an armed conflict exists LOAC applies to the parties to the conflict wherever they may be located, but that other restraints within LOAC and jus ad bellum limit its application. In particular, the question of whether an armed conflict exists in the first place is not self-evident. The debate on who can be targeted and when applies both to internal NIACs and extraterritorial NIACs. It may be that additional stipulations will be considered necessary as the law develops given the lack of State boundaries and the distance from an active battlefield. However, currently the law does not require this. Finally, the restrictions found in jus ad bellum curtail action that may be taken.

Therefore, to erase territorial boundaries from the equation entirely when establishing the existence of an armed conflict raises challenges to the structure of the law and some of its underlying purposes. Certain obstacles may prompt clarification in the law; others may remain as limitations on the law’s application. As a consequence, it is not clear where the bar for the application of Common Article 3, and thus LOAC, lies, particularly when applied to conflicts that spread across multiple countries. Some States want to ensure that they have sufficient flexibility to deal with these circumstances. Other States (as well as organizations and commentators) are concerned that the law may be interpreted too permissively and ultimately be abused. A balance must be found in the solution to these issues.

#### We control uq – squo policy renders the entire legal framework obsolete

Charles Garraway, former Stockton Professor, United States Naval War College, Dec 2009, Can the Law of Armed Conflict Survive 9/11?, Yearbook of International Humanitarian Law / Volume 14

The initial response to the attacks was to launch an attack on Afghanistan where Al Qaeda were sheltering under Taliban protection. In principle, this was sup- ported by the international community and should have posed few problems to the existing legal framework. This was an international armed conflict within that framework, though running alongside an existing non-international armed conflict between the Taliban and the Northern Alliance. However, the rhetoric from the United States leadership seemed to go further, indicating that the United States was at war not merely with Afghanistan but with terrorism in general in a Global War on Terror. Supported by legal advice, though not unchallenged, President Bush drew a distinction between ‘‘our present conflict with the Taliban’’ to which the laws of war (‘‘the provisions of Geneva’’) applied and ‘‘our conflict with al Qaeda in Afghanistan or elsewhere throughout the world’’ to which none of the ‘‘provisions of Geneva’’, including Common Article 3 applied.

In so far as Afghanistan was concerned, whilst the legal reasoning might have been faulty, the effects on the legal framework might not have been too bad. There was clearly an armed conflict underway and although it could indeed be argued that Al Qaeda were not entitled to combatant status in that conflict, there were still provisions within the legal framework that covered them. In an armed conflict, nobody is totally outside the protection of the law.

The problem lay with the words ‘‘or elsewhere throughout the world’’. The United States was now claiming to be involved in a global conflict—and furthermore one which was outside the traditional legal framework being neither an international armed conflict within the terms of Common Article 2 to the Geneva Conventions nor an ‘‘armed conflict not of an international character’’ governed by Common Article 3. It appeared that the United States was claiming the right to carry out military operations against Al Qaeda throughout the globe. The legal implications of this were huge. It could be argued that, because of the universal condemnation of international terrorism by the United Nations, the laws of neutrality in their classic form did not apply. Indeed, President Bush himself announced, in an address to a joint session of Congress on September 20, 2001, ‘‘Either you are with us, or you are with the terrorists.’’ It was not long before the United States showed that it meant business when, in November 2002, a Hellfire missile attack on a convoy travelling in Yemen killed Abu Ali al-Harithi, supposedly the mastermind behind the bombing of the USS Cole in October 2000. Further strikes in Yemen have followed, as well as numerous attacks in Pakistan, culminating in the death of Osama Bin Laden himself.

But what law applies to these ‘‘targeted killings’’? The United States maintains that it is at war and these matters are therefore governed by the laws and customs of war. As a result of the Supreme Court decision in Hamdan v Rumsfeld, the Administration have conceded that this ‘‘war’’ is governed by Common Article 3 of the 1949 Geneva Conventions but that article, in itself, says nothing on the rules governing the conduct of hostilities. It is unclear what rules the United States consider binding in that context although one thing is clear—targeting is based on status, as under the traditional law of war paradigm, and not immediate threat as under human rights law. Al-Harithi was posing no immediate threat to anyone at the time he was killed. Osama Bin Laden was, according to US sources, subject to lethal force because of his position as an enemy commander. The Navy Seals did not have to rely on any actions taken by him at the time of the attack.

In principle, there is no obstacle to the United States, on this reasoning, taking out an Al Qaeda leader on the streets of London or Paris. It is argued that, in practice, this would never happen because it would be left to the authorities in those countries to take action. But because Europe, and indeed much of the rest of the world, has not bought into this ‘‘Global War on Terror’’, the action would need to be taken under a law enforcement paradigm. What if domestic law did not provide the grounds for such action?

We seem to face here a dilemma. Do the laws of war extend down to cover all actions against Al Qaeda and affiliated organisations operating anywhere in the world, or are such actions covered by the law enforcement paradigm except where they take place within the bounds of a recognised armed conflict? If United States Navy Seals killed an unarmed Al Qaeda leader on the streets of London, would they be committing murder or could they claim combatant privilege? The boundaries between armed conflict and law enforcement now seem to have merged together in a way that there is no longer any clear dividing line. It can hardly be appropriate to say that the law governing the situation depends on the stability of the country in which the operation takes place.

This confusion is having a double effect. First, there is a fightback by those in the human rights community who argue that the events of the last 10 years have shown that the laws of war are inadequate to address modern day situations. Targeted killings are often accompanied by the deaths of other innocent people and this is seen as unacceptable. The danger here is that such a viewpoint will extend into more traditional armed conflicts. In Afghanistan, the McChrystal doctrine of ‘‘courageous restraint’’ led to a restriction on permitted collateral damage in planned attacks almost to the extent of zero tolerance. This is far more akin to a human rights standard than one emanating from the laws of war where the expected collateral damage must not be excessive to the anticipated military advantage. We have already seen how human rights bodies are becoming increasingly involved in situations of armed conflict. Whereas the United States continues to insist that human rights law and the laws of war are mutually exclusive, this is a position that is becoming increasingly untenable internationally. As has been pointed out above, the European Convention on Human Rights was always envisaged as applying to some extent in time of war and the Court has already considered cases arising from situations of armed conflict, most recently in relation to Chechnya and Iraq. There are a number of cases currently before it in relation to the Russia-Georgia conflict in 2008.

The International Court of Justice also has endorsed the continued application of human rights law in time of armed conflict. In the ‘‘Barrier’’ advisory opinion involving the Israeli security wall, it stated:

As regards the relationship between international humanitarian law and human rights law, there are thus three possible situations: some rights may be exclusively matters of inter- national humanitarian law; others may be exclusively matters of human rights law; yet others may be matters of both these branches of international law. In order to answer the question put to it, the Court will have to take into consideration both these branches of international law, namely human rights law and, as lex specialis, international humani- tarian law.

Of course, the Court did not go on to outline where those situations can be found. There is a growing school that argues that human rights law is the foun- dation legal framework and that the law of war as the ‘‘lex specialis’’ should only apply where it is compatible with human rights law and can add to it. This is probably workable in relation to much ‘‘Geneva law’’, relating to the protection of victims of war, but it would play havoc with the traditional law of war relating to the conduct of hostilities, particularly in relation to the use of force where the standards are diametrically opposed.

There is a second and less obvious danger. There has been a tendency to look upon ‘‘terrorists’’ as modern day outlaws, beyond the pale. They should, like pirates, be subject to universal jurisdiction and ‘‘terrorism’’ should be an inter- national crime. Attractive as this argument might be, it falls down on closer analogy. One of the reasons why pirates are subject to universal jurisdiction is because their crimes are committed on the high seas, territory beyond the juris- diction of any one State. Acts which would amount to piracy if committed on the high seas but which are committed within the territorial sea of a State are classified as ‘‘armed robbery’’ and not subject to universal jurisdiction. Most acts of ter- rorism are committed within the territory of a State. Whilst I agree that there is a need for greater international cooperation in the justice sphere in dealing with acts of terrorism, and indeed the various United Nations Conventions were designed to do exactly that, there is a risk in making ‘‘terrorism’’ an international crime.

Apart from the difficulty in defining the term, it has become usual in recent years for Governments to describe all opponents who resort to arms as ‘‘terrorists’’. If such people were in theory committing an international crime subject to universal jurisdiction, it would completely undermine the application of the laws of war to non-international armed conflict. Already there is difficulty in persuading non-State actors that it is in their interests to apply the laws of war in a non- international armed conflict. Non-State actors remain subject to domestic juris- diction and, if captured, can be tried and sentenced under that domestic law. However, provided that they comply with the laws of war, they will not be committing international crimes, war crimes, and thus, Additional Protocol II can urge the ‘‘authorities in power’’ at the end of hostilities to ‘‘endeavor to grant the broadest possible amnesty to persons who have participated in the armed conflict’’. This is not designed to protect those who have committed war crimes but those who have fought in accordance with the laws of war.

If ‘‘terrorism’’ is to become an international crime and all non-State actors in a non-international armed conflict are to be classed as terrorists, and thus interna- tional criminals, this provision of Additional Protocol II will become obsolete as it is generally accepted that amnesties should not apply to international crimes. There would then be no incentive at all for non-State actors to comply with the laws of war. If the laws of war were thus seen to be ineffectual, it would be a further argument for their subordination to human rights law.

It follows that the decision by the Bush Administration in the immediate aftermath of ‘‘9/11’’ to treat the fight against terrorism as a matter governed primarily by the laws of war rather than by a law enforcement paradigm may in fact have serious consequences for the laws of war themselves. The perceived underlying unsuitability of using the use of force provisions from the laws of war in counter-terrorist operations outside situations of armed conflict has given human rights lawyers a platform to attack some of the fundamental principles of the laws of war, such as the balance between humanity and military necessity, even in traditional conflict situations.

In addition, the extension of the definition of ‘‘terrorist’’, at least colloquially, and the wish to ensure that acts of terrorism are universally condemned and subject to the widest possible jurisdiction has cast doubt on the efficacy of the laws of war as they relate to non-international armed conflict and led to calls for a wider application of human rights standards, even where they conflict with the laws of war.

If the long term effect of this is to make it impossible to conduct military operations effectively in a legal manner, it could be disastrous. However much theorists may look forward to the days when war is no more, that utopian dream has never been achieved in past millennia. The laws of war were designed to recognize the sad reality of war but to seek to alleviate as far as possible the calamities of war. Human rights law does not recognize that reality, coming as it does from the law of peace. This clash of philosophies is already being seen in Afghanistan where there is increasing pressure on ISAF European contingents to refrain from handing detainees to the national authorities on human rights grounds. But such contingents have no legal authority themselves to hold the detainees for any length of time. The result is that they may have to be released. A soldier who captures an insurgent who has killed one of his colleagues on Monday only to find him back on the streets on Wednesday will not be impressed. If he captures him again and the same thing happens, he will wonder as to the point of what he is doing. The temptation will be to take the law into his own hands with fatal consequences.

The laws of war are there for a purpose, limited though it may be. The United States, in seeking to extend the scope of those laws into areas for which they were not designed have done the laws no service. Indeed, they may, in a worst case scenario, have struck a death knell for those laws. As wars unfortunately, like taxes, are not going to disappear in the foreseeable future, if the laws that regulate them no longer can be applied, then we are back to the law of the jungle. Henry Dunant would be turning in his grave.

#### Alt cause – disputes over terrorist status (also a reason the CP links more)

Margulies ’12 (Peter, Professor of Law, Roger Williams University, “The Fog of War Reform: Change and Structure in the Law of Armed Conflict After September 11,” Marquette Law Review Vol. 95 Iss. 4 Summer 2012)

In the last forty years, the rise of non-state actors has prompted new tensions. Drafters of Additional Protocol I to the Geneva Conventions believed that non-state actors “fighting against colonial domination and . . . racist régimes”67 had standing to participate in international armed conflict. That innovation challenged the traditional jus ad bellum norm of “right authority,” which extends to state actors the sole privilege of conducting hostilities while denying this privilege to non-state actors, whom LOAC has traditionally assumed could obtain a remedy from their states of nationality.68 While compelling examples supporting higher status for non-state actors span centuries, from the American colonists at Lexington and Concord to the African National Congress (ANC), the drafters of Additional Protocol I **did not provide any criteria** for deciding which group among rivals would be found the authentic representative. This **definitional vacuum** left inter-group violence as the default selection process, risking harm to members of the community that each group purports to represent. Protocol I yielded additional anomalies. While it codified the principle of distinction that forbids targeting civilians,69 it also made **concessions to irregular forces** that severely complicated implementation of that “basic principle.” Article 44(3) shields such forces until they have “engaged in a military deployment preceding the launching of an attack.”70 Some countries have construed this language as barring targeting of such forces until “‘moments immediately prior to an attack.’”71 Because a state’s uniformed forces can be targeted at any time,72 this reading creates a **marked asymmetry** in the targeting options of non-state and state actors. The drafters felt that this tactical advantage would at least encourage non-state actors to shun the most egregious forms of perfidy, where no arms were displayed until the attack was in progress.73 Although some non-state actors may have considered availing themselves of this opportunity, one cannot imagine Al Qaeda operatives following suit.74 However, a non-state fighting force without the duty to identify itself will **impel states to cut corners on the principle of distinction, shooting first and asking questions about participation in hostilities later**. As with even more blatant forms of perfidy, the result is greater risk to those hors de combat. Because LOAC, like other forms of international law, is increasingly fragmented,75 the increasing role of non-state actors has buttressed arguments for giving states more flexibility in the jus ad bellum. For example, states dealing with ideologically committed terrorist networks have sought to relax the customary requirement of imminent attack as a condition for self-defense. Scholars argued that obliging a state to wait until a terrorist plot approaches consummation was both unrealistic and risky for civilians whom the network plans to target.76

These debates have accelerated since September 11. Two opposing developments each reflected an effort to change LOAC. First, in the eighteen months after September 11, Bush administration officials sought to deprive suspected terrorists of protections against coercive interrogation and also sought to establish indefinite detention without judicial review and military commission trials that lacked fundamental guarantees of fairness.77 Even more recently, the ICRC proposed that civilians be shielded from targeting even if they have participated in hostilities.78 Over the objections of a majority of commentators convened for its study, the ICRC asserted that only civilians with a narrowly defined “continuous combat function” could be targeted at all times. Others could in effect choose the time and place of their vulnerability, even as they planned a return to the fray. Each change **threatened to destabilize LOAC**.

## 2AC CP

#### Specifically the EU – they’re key

Dworkin 7/17/13

Anthony Dworkin is a senior policy fellow at the European Council on Foreign Relations, CNN, July 17, 2013, "Actually, drones worry Europe more than spying", http://globalpublicsquare.blogs.cnn.com/2013/07/17/actually-drones-worry-europe-more-than-spying/

Behind the scenes, though, it is not data protection and surveillance that produces the most complications for the transatlantic intelligence relationship, but rather America's use of armed drones to kill terrorist suspects away from the battlefield. Incidents such as the recent killing of at least 17 people in Pakistan are therefore only likely to heighten European unease.

In public, European governments have displayed a curiously passive approach to American drone strikes, even as their number has escalated under Barack Obama’s presidency. Many Europeans believe that the majority of these strikes are unlawful, but their governments have maintained an uneasy silence on the issue. This is partly because of the uncomfortable fact that information provided by European intelligence services may have been used to identify some targets. It is also because of a reluctance to accuse a close ally of having violated international law. And it is partly because European countries have not worked out exactly what they think about the use of drones and how far they agree within the European Union on the question. Now, however, Europe’s muted stance on drone strikes looks likely to change.

Why? For one thing, many European countries are now trying to acquire armed drones themselves, and this gives them an incentive to spell out clearer rules for their use. More importantly, perhaps, Europeans have noticed that drones are proliferating rapidly, and that countries like China, Russia and Saudi Arabia are soon likely to possess them. There is a clear European interest in trying to establish some restrictive standards on drone use before it is too late. For all these reasons, many European countries are now conducting internal reviews of their policy on drones, and discussions are also likely to start at a pan-European level.

But as Europeans begin to articulate their policy on the use of drones, a bigger question looms. Can Europe and the United States come together to agree on when drone strikes are permissible? Until now, that would have seemed impossible. Since the September 11 attacks, the United States has based its counterterrorism operations on the claim that it is engaged in a worldwide armed conflict with al Qaeda and associated forces — an idea that President Obama inherited from President George W. Bush and has been kept as the basis for an expanded drone strike campaign. European countries have generally rejected this claim.

However, the changes to American policy that President Obama announced in May could open the way to at least the possibility of a dialogue. Obama suggested that he anticipated a time in the not-too-distant future when the armed conflict against al Qaeda might come to an end. More substantially, he made clear that his administration was in the process of switching its policy so that, outside zones of hostilities, it would only use drone strikes against individuals who posed a continuing and imminent threat to the U.S. That is a more restrictive standard than the claim that any member of al Qaeda or an associated force could lawfully be killed with a drone strike at any time.

European countries might be more willing to accept an approach based on this kind of “self-defense” idea. However, there remain some big stumbling blocks.

First, a good deal about Obama’s new standards is still unclear. How does he define a “zone of hostilities,” where the new rules will not apply? And what is his understanding of an “imminent” threat? European countries are likely to interpret these key terms in a much narrower way than the United States.

Second, Obama’s new approach only applies as a policy choice. His more expansive legal claims remain in the background so that he is free to return to them if he wishes.

But if the United States is serious about working toward international standards on drone strikes, as Obama and his officials have sometimes suggested, then Europe is the obvious place to start. And there are a number of steps the administration could take to make an agreement with European countries more likely.

#### Geography’s key to norm-setting

Rosa Brooks, Associate Professor of Law, University of Virginia School of Law, December 2004, ARTICLE: WAR EVERYWHERE: RIGHTS, NATIONAL SECURITY LAW, AND THE LAW OF ARMED CONFLICT IN THE AGE OF TERROR, 153 U. Pa. L. Rev. 675

Here again, I think there is no single "legal" answer. The approach taken by Amnesty International rests on a traditional, if formalistic, reading of the law of armed conflict; the approach of the U.S. also rests on a plausible, if flexible, reading of the law of armed conflict n167 and the U.N. Charter. n168 The policy choice made by the Bush administration can nonetheless be questioned and criticized, however, for just as the breakdown of the boundaries between crime and conflict has potentially staggering implications, so too does the breakdown of the spatial boundaries between zones of conflict and zones of peace. If there is no place on earth where the U.S. cannot legitimately use military force at any time, without warning, other states will claim the same rights, and we risk an escalating spiral of unconstrained violence precisely what the creators of the U.N. Charter system sought to avoid. n169

#### Lack of geographical limits means the CP does nothing

Rosa Brooks, Associate Professor of Law, University of Virginia School of Law, December 2004, ARTICLE: WAR EVERYWHERE: RIGHTS, NATIONAL SECURITY LAW, AND THE LAW OF ARMED CONFLICT IN THE AGE OF TERROR, 153 U. Pa. L. Rev. 675

If the war knows no geographical or temporal boundaries, if no one deemed an enemy enjoys any of the protections envisioned by the law of armed conflict, and if the line between terrorist combatants and terrorist civilians makes no sense, then there are very few legal constraints on U.S. behavior abroad. U.S. forces can attack, capture, detain, and kill with impunity, subject, of course, to political and diplomatic constraints, but virtually unfettered by legal constraints. To be sure, it is true that even in earlier periods, there has been no effective international legal enforcement mechanism able to restrain U.S. behavior abroad in matters relating to national security. Nonetheless, the U.S. has to a significant degree internalized the law of armed conflict, and willingly accepted the constraints that flow from this body of law. n247 Now, however, the law of armed conflict appears to dictate very few constraints, either internal or external, and this has had a spillover effect on other areas of the law that do contain clear guidelines, such as prohibitions on torture.

## 2AC Politics

Food shortage doesn’t cause war – best studies

Allouche, research Fellow – water supply and sanitation @ Institute for Development Studies, frmr professor – MIT, ‘11

(Jeremy, “The sustainability and resilience of global water and food systems: Political analysis of the interplay between security, resource scarcity, political systems and global trade,” Food Policy, Vol. 36 Supplement 1, p. S3-S8, January)

The question of resource scarcity has led to many debates on whether scarcity (whether of food or water) will lead to conflict and war. The underlining reasoning behind most of these discourses over food and water wars comes from the Malthusian belief that there is an imbalance between the economic availability of natural resources and population growth since while food production grows linearly, population increases exponentially. Following this reasoning, neo-Malthusians claim that finite natural resources place a strict limit on the growth of human population and aggregate consumption; if these limits are exceeded, social breakdown, conflict and wars result. Nonetheless, it seems that most empirical studies do not support any of these neo-Malthusian arguments. Technological change and greater inputs of capital have dramatically increased labour productivity in agriculture. More generally, the neo-Malthusian view has suffered because during the last two centuries humankind has breached many resource barriers that seemed unchallengeable.

Lessons from history: alarmist scenarios, resource wars and international relations

In a so-called age of uncertainty, a number of alarmist scenarios have linked the increasing use of water resources and food insecurity with wars. The idea of water wars (perhaps more than food wars) is a dominant discourse in the media (see for example Smith, 2009), NGOs (International Alert, 2007) and within international organizations (UNEP, 2007). In 2007, UN Secretary General Ban Ki-moon declared that ‘water scarcity threatens economic and social gains and is a potent fuel for wars and conflict’ (Lewis, 2007). Of course, this type of discourse has an instrumental purpose; security and conflict are here used for raising water/food as key policy priorities at the international level.

In the Middle East, presidents, prime ministers and foreign ministers have also used this bellicose rhetoric. Boutrous Boutros-Gali said; ‘the next war in the Middle East will be over water, not politics’ (Boutros Boutros-Gali in Butts, 1997, p. 65). The question is not whether the sharing of transboundary water sparks political tension and alarmist declaration, but rather to what extent water has been a principal factor in international conflicts. The evidence seems quite weak. Whether by president Sadat in Egypt or King Hussein in Jordan, none of these declarations have been followed up by military action.

The governance of transboundary water has gained increased attention these last decades. This has a direct impact on the global food system as water allocation agreements determine the amount of water that can used for irrigated agriculture. The likelihood of conflicts over water is an important parameter to consider in assessing the stability, sustainability and resilience of global food systems.

None of the various and extensive databases on the causes of war show water as a casus belli. Using the International Crisis Behavior (ICB) data set and supplementary data from the University of Alabama on water conflicts, Hewitt, Wolf and Hammer found only seven disputes where water seems to have been at least a partial cause for conflict (Wolf, 1998, p. 251). In fact, about 80% of the incidents relating to water were limited purely to governmental rhetoric intended for the electorate (Otchet, 2001, p. 18).

As shown in The Basins At Risk (BAR) water event database, more than two-thirds of over 1800 water-related ‘events’ fall on the ‘cooperative’ scale (Yoffe et al., 2003). Indeed, if one takes into account a much longer period, the following figures clearly demonstrate this argument. According to studies by the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), organized political bodies signed between the year 805 and 1984 more than 3600 water-related treaties, and approximately 300 treaties dealing with water management or allocations in international basins have been negotiated since 1945 (FAO, 1978 and FAO, 1984).

The fear around water wars have been driven by a Malthusian outlook which equates scarcity with violence, conflict and war. There is however no direct correlation between water scarcity and transboundary conflict. Most specialists now tend to agree that the major issue is not scarcity per se but rather the allocation of water resources between the different riparian states (see for example Allouche, 2005, Allouche, 2007 and [Rouyer, 2000] ). Water rich countries have been involved in a number of disputes with other relatively water rich countries (see for example India/Pakistan or Brazil/Argentina). The perception of each state’s estimated water needs really constitutes the core issue in transboundary water relations. Indeed, whether this scarcity exists or not in reality, perceptions of the amount of available water shapes people’s attitude towards the environment (Ohlsson, 1999). In fact, some water experts have argued that scarcity drives the process of co-operation among riparians (Dinar and Dinar, 2005 and Brochmann and Gleditsch, 2006).

In terms of international relations, the threat of water wars due to increasing scarcity does not make much sense in the light of the recent historical record. Overall, the water war rationale expects conflict to occur over water, and appears to suggest that violence is a viable means of securing national water supplies, an argument which is highly contestable.

The debates over the likely impacts of climate change have again popularised the idea of water wars. The argument runs that climate change will precipitate worsening ecological conditions contributing to resource scarcities, social breakdown, institutional failure, mass migrations and in turn cause greater political instability and conflict (Brauch, 2002 and Pervis and Busby, 2004). In a report for the US Department of Defense, Schwartz and Randall (2003) speculate about the consequences of a worst-case climate change scenario arguing that water shortages will lead to aggressive wars (Schwartz and Randall, 2003, p. 15). Despite growing concern that climate change will lead to instability and violent conflict, the evidence base to substantiate the connections is thin ( [Barnett and Adger, 2007] and Kevane and Gray, 2008).

#### Economic collapse doesn’t cause war

Jervis, professor of political science – Columbia University, ‘11

(Robert, Force in Our Times,” Survival, Vol. 25, No. 4, p. 403-425)

Even if war is still seen as evil, the security community could be dissolved if severe conflicts of interest were to arise. Could the more peaceful world generate new interests that would bring the members of the community into sharp disputes? 45 A zero-sum sense of status would be one example, perhaps linked to a steep rise in nationalism. More likely would be a worsening of the current economic difficulties, which could itself produce greater nationalism, undermine democracy and bring back old-fashioned beggar-my-neighbor economic policies. While these dangers are real, it is hard to believe that the conflicts could be great enough to lead the members of the community to contemplate fighting each other. It is not so much that economic interdependence has proceeded to the point where it could not be reversed – states that were more internally interdependent than anything seen internationally have fought bloody civil wars. Rather it is that even if the more extreme versions of free trade and economic liberalism become discredited, it is hard to see how without building on a preexisting high level of political conflict leaders and mass opinion would come to believe that their countries could prosper by impoverishing or even attacking others. Is it possible that problems will not only become severe, but that people will entertain the thought that they have to be solved by war? While a pessimist could note that this argument does not appear as outlandish as it did before the financial crisis, an optimist could reply (correctly, in my view) that the very fact that we have seen such a sharp economic down-turn without anyone suggesting that force of arms is the solution shows that even if bad times bring about greater economic conflict, it will not make war thinkable.

#### Biotech strong and resilient

WSJ 10/14 (Timothy Hay, Staff Writer, "Biotechonology Boom is Here to Stat, Investors Say," blogs.wsj.com/venturecapital/2013/10/14/biotechnology-boom-is-here-to-stay-investors-say/)

But don’t call it a bubble. Those in the know are **calling it a boom**, and saying the good times are likely to continue for biotech, **even in the face of clinical setbacks** and other bumps in the road.

These were the impressions of investors in **both publicly traded and privately** held biotechnology companies who served as panelists at the Bio Investor Forum in San Francisco. The conference is organized by the Biotechnology Industry Organization.

Every area of medical technology has been hammered in recent years by high development costs, the recession, regulatory problems and other maladies. But 2013 has seen biotech roar back to life, especially in terms of new companies trading on the public markets. A surge like this has not been seen since 2000, VentureSource data shows, when 46 biotechnology startups went public.

While some have referred to this as an “IPO window,” indicating that it could just as easily slam shut again, investors at the Bio Investor Forum characterized the phenomenon differently.

“**There is no reason to believe this window is going to shut any time soon,**” said Evan McCulloch, a portfolio manager with Franklin Templeton Investments. “As far as I can tell, this will continue for a while.”

#### Other issues are destroying US-India ties, but relations remain resilient

Joshi, 10/8

(PhD Student-Harvard, “US-India relations hit a rough patch,”

http://www.lowyinterpreter.org/post/2013/10/08/US-India-relations-hit-a-rough-patch.aspx)

When Indian Prime Minister Manmohan Singh visited Washington last week for the first time in four years, the mood was distinctly subdued. India's once-stratospheric growth rate is stubbornly depressed. The Indian government is low on political capital and stuck in risk-averse mode until next year's general elections, with a huge question mark over Singh's personal future. Most Indians anyway focussed on Singh's New York meeting with his Pakistani counterpart Nawaz Sharif — underwhelming, as it turned out, and marred by a perceived slur — rather than his meetings with President Obama. More generally, **the promise of US-India relations remains far below the levels anticipated** only a few years ago. Why the stasis? There are any number of reasons. Indian journalist Indrani Bagchi suggests that 'there remains a strong lobby within this government starting with [ruling Congress Party chairwoman] Sonia Gandhi and [Defence Minister] AK Antony downwards, **which retains an instinctive aversion to America'.** That same government's slow rate of economic reform irks American companies who want to invest in India. In particular, a strict nuclear liability law limits those companies' ability to exploit a landmark civil nuclear cooperation agreement initiated by the Bush administration in 2005. Also, India's byzantine procurement rules madden the American defence companies eager to sell into what is one of the few growing arms markets in the world. A sense prevails that the low-hanging fruit in the bilateral relationship was picked some years ago. But one less-noticed problem is that the limited bandwidth of US foreign policy is presently occupied by issues in which India is either wary of US policy or simply apathetic. The Middle East In his speech to the United Nations General Assembly on 24 September, President Obama noted that 'in the near term, America's diplomatic efforts will focus on two particular issues: Iran's pursuit of nuclear weapons and the Arab-Israeli conflict'. India has much to gain from a rapprochement between Iran and the United States, not least the ability to once again freely import Iranian oil. India was circumventing international sanctions by paying for a diminished flow of Iranian oil in rupees, but the new Iranian government is insisting that India can only pay for half this way. India is a bystander rather than active participant in the broader dispute, watching from the sidelines as the P5+1 bloc, which includes Russia and China, participates in negotiations. On Syria, India is sympathetic to the regime of President Bashar al-Assad. It views the issue through the lens of the Afghan jihad in the 1980s, which Indians see as indelibly associated with the subsequent uprising in Kashmir and the growth of anti-Indian militancy. When the Indian Government summoned the Syrian Ambassador in Delhi last month, it was not because of Syrian policies but because the ambassador had alleged that Indian jihadists were fighting with the rebels. The ambassador stated, tellingly, that 'he was always deeply appreciative of India's position on Syria'. India unsurprisingly opposes efforts to arm the Syrian rebels, tends to see the armed opposition as irredeemably compromised by jihadists and reflexively opposes US proposals for military action, particularly outside the ambit of the UN Security Council. India has already had to abandon several oil fields in Syria and, in September 2013, India's foreign secretary even referred to an existing Indian line of credit to the Syrian government. Yet, despite these equities, India has no leverage over the parties to the conflict. In May, an Iranian suggestion of greater Indian involvement went nowhere. There is little that Singh would usefully have been able to say to Obama on the subject. At a broader level, the more the Middle East distracts from US attention to Asia-Pacific — including the so-called 'pivot' of American military forces eastwards — the less high-level attention India receives in Washington. India was not mentioned once in Obama's UN address (to compare: China was mentioned once, Iran 26 times, and Syria 20). Afghanistan India's attitude to US policy in Afghanistan is even more conflicted. India is ostensibly supportive of US policy, and has formally signed on to an Afghan-led peace process. But Indian officials and strategists scarcely disguise their discomfort towards what they see as undue American haste in withdrawing troops, an over-eagerness to accommodate the Taliban as part of political reconciliation, and a continued indulgence of Pakistan despite its support for Afghan insurgents. India felt that its views were vindicated by the June debacle over the opening of a Taliban office in Doha, which deviated from the agreed protocol, handed a propaganda victory to the Taliban, and angered the Afghan government. Indian national security reporter Praveen Swami summed up many Indians' views in complaining that the US was 'subcontracting the task of keeping the peace in Afghanistan to the ISI', Pakistan's premier intelligence service. In recent months, Indians have taken offence at statements by James Dobbins, the US Special Representative for Afghanistan and Pakistan, echoing earlier Indian anger at the late Richard Holbrooke, and have chafed at what they see as a Western equivalence between Indian and Pakistani policy in Afghanistan. For their part, US and British officials have grown increasingly frustrated with India's approach to the issue, arguing that India offers no plausible alternative to the policy of reconciliation given the long-term weakness of the Afghan state. Yet it is in Obama's interests to assuage Indian concerns, emphasise that reconciliation with the Taliban will be constrained by the established 'red lines', that the US will not abandon counterterrorism efforts in Afghanistan after 2014, and that India's role in Afghanistan is not only welcome, but also necessary to the strengthening of the Afghan state. India rebuffed Afghan President Hamid Karzai's request for arms earlier this year, wary of provoking Pakistan. But one area that deserves more discussion is greater direct cooperation between India and the NATO-led coalition in Afghanistan to train and equip Afghan National Security Forces (ANSF). According to one report, Obama asked Singh last week for an 'increased effort' in Afghanistan, although it's unclear whether this included an implied or explicit training dimension. India, entirely reasonably, sees a potential eastward flow of militants from Afghanistan and Pakistan as a major security threat, particularly with violent trends in Kashmir worsening this year. India would therefore be particularly receptive to a US commitment to monitor and disrupt militant movement in the years after 2014. In truth, it will be difficult to make progress on these issues until Washington settles its own internal debates over what its posture in Afghanistan will be after 2014 (for example, how many (if any) troops will remain in a training capacity?), which in turn will depend on the peace process itself, President Karzai's domestic political calculations in the face of presidential elections next year, the integrity of that election, and trends in Afghanistan. Where next? **The level of US-India tension should not be exaggerated.** It is telling that recent revelations over US intelligence collection against Indian diplomatic targets have, unlike in the case of Brazil, had negligible impact on the relationship. Indian officials chose to brush the issue under the carpet, presumably hoping that the issue had little domestic salience and perhaps even tacitly acknowledging that the NSA's activities against Indian internet traffic were indirectly beneficial to Indian policy objectives. Twenty years ago, the Indian response may have been very different. It is these changes in tone that convey strategic shifts as much as any large policy initiative. And **although the two countries differ on the contentious big-picture issues outlined above, this has not prevented the relationship from advancing on other tracks.** In September, US Deputy Secretary of Defense Ashton Carter visited India to push ahead with the bilateral Defence Trade Initiative (DTI), which Carter co-chairs with India's National Security Advisor, Shivshankar Menon. Carter reiterated his suggestion, dating from last year, that US and Indian firms cooperate to produce military equipment — including helicopters, next-generation anti-tank missiles, mine systems, and naval guns — for both countries' use. India has been bafflingly slow and reticent to respond to these overtures, despite the possibility of much-needed technology transfer to Indian industry (though many analysts are sceptical as to its capacity for technology absorption). The negotiations nevertheless reflect the US perception that the defence strand of its relationship with India are a priority. The road ahead is rocky. Over the next eighteen months, the US-India relationship will be severely buffeted by US policy towards Afghanistan. As the American drawdown accelerates, one possibility is that the US intensifies diplomatic efforts to peel away moderate factions within the Afghan Taliban, Whether that amounts to anything or not (and few are optimistic) the process is certain to involve at least a period of deeper US-Pakistan consultations, at the expense of India. Later this month, for instance, a fourth Afghanistan-Pakistan-UK trilateral summit will take place in London. India has quietly seethed at the previous three, viewing them as a coordinated effort to reduce Indian influence. Yet, for the United States at least, **the centre of gravity of the US-India relationship is not Afghanistan, but China**. The Middle East's fast-moving and highly visible crises have briefly distracted from a slow-moving background trend: the political and economic rise of China. Yet this remains where Indian and American strategic interests are most collectively at stake, if not necessarily congruent. Following India's most recent crisis with China, involving deep Chinese incursions into disputed territory a few months ago, New Delhi's instinctive response was not to make a prominent feint towards Washington — something that might have been the natural response of other states eager to balance against Beijing — but to engage China more intensively, including on the border dispute itself. Indeed, Singh will make a trip to Beijing next month, with indications that he may sign an upgraded border agreement. Nothing better underscores how India's internal debate over the desired scope of its relationship with the United States is unsettled, on-going, and erratic. More generally, much of India's press and strategic community have accepted the popular narrative that American leadership, as well as American power, is in decline, and that US reliability is therefore in question. These issues are unlikely to be settled within the tenures of either Obama or Singh, leaving a lingering note of ambivalence in the US-India relationship even as it deepens outside of the high politics.

#### Zero chance of passage—House opposition, window too narrow, Obama not credible

Russell Berman, The Hill, 10/25/13, GOP comfortable ignoring Obama pleas for vote on immigration bill, thehill.com/homenews/house/330527-gop-comfortable-ignoring-obama-pleas-to-move-to-immigration-reform

For President Obama and advocates hoping for a House vote on immigration reform this year, the reality is simple: Fat chance.

Obama repeatedly since the shutdown has sought to turn the nation’s focus to immigration reform and pressure Republicans to take up the Senate’s bill, or something similar.

But there are no signs that Republicans are feeling any pressure.

Speaker John Boehner (R-Ohio) has repeatedly ruled out taking up the comprehensive Senate bill, and senior Republicans say it is unlikely that the party, bruised from its internal battle over the government shutdown, will pivot quickly to an issue that has long rankled conservatives.

Rep. Tom Cole (R-Okla.), a leadership ally, told reporters Wednesday there is virtually no chance the party would take up immigration reform before the next round of budget and debt ceiling fights are settled. While that could happen by December if a budget conference committee strikes an agreement, that fight is more likely to drag well in 2014: the next deadline for lifting the debt ceiling, for example, is not until Feb. 7.

“I don’t even think we’ll get to that point until we get these other problems solved,” Cole said.

He said it was unrealistic to expect the House to be able to tackle what he called the “divisive and difficult issue” of immigration when it can barely handle the most basic task of keeping the government’s lights on.

“We’re not sure we can chew gum, let alone walk and chew gum, so let’s just chew gum for a while,” Cole said.

In a colloquy on the House floor, Minority Whip Steny Hoyer (D-Md.) asked Majority Leader Eric Cantor (R-Va.) to outline the GOP's agenda between now and the end of 2013.

Cantor rattled off a handful of issues – finishing a farm bill, energy legislation, more efforts to go after ObamaCare – but immigration reform was notably absent.

When Hoyer asked Cantor directly on the House floor for an update on immigration efforts, the majority leader was similarly vague.

“There are plenty of bipartisan efforts underway and in discussion between members on both sides of the aisle to try and address what is broken about our immigration system,” Cantor said. “The committees are still working on this issue, and I expect us to move forward this year in trying to address reform and what is broken about our system.”

Immigration reform advocates in both parties have long set the end of the year as a soft deadline for enacting an overhaul because of the assumption that it would be impossible to pass such contentious legislation in an election year.

Aides say party leaders have not ruled out bringing up immigration reform in the next two months, but there is no current plan to do so.

The legislative calendar is also quite limited; because of holidays and recesses, the House is scheduled to be in session for just five weeks the remainder of the year.

In recent weeks, however, some advocates have held out hope that the issue would remain viable for the first few months of 2014, before the midterm congressional campaigns heat up.

Democrats and immigration reform activists have long vowed to punish Republicans in 2014 if they stymie reform efforts, and the issue is expected play prominently in districts with a significant percentage of Hispanic voters next year.

With the shutdown having sent the GOP’s approval rating plummeting, Democrats have appealed to Republicans to use immigration reform as a chance to demonstrate to voters that the two parties can work together and that Congress can do more than simply careen from crisis to crisis.

“Rather than create problems, let’s prove to the American people that Washington can actually solve some problems,” Obama said Thursday in his latest effort to spur the issue on.

But Republicans largely dismiss that line of thinking and say the two-week shutdown damaged what little trust between the GOP and Obama there was at the outset.

“There is a sincere desire to get it done, but there is also very little goodwill after the president spent the last two months refusing to work with us,” a House GOP leadership aide said. “In that way, his approach in the fiscal fights was very short-sighted: it made his achieving his real priorities much more difficult.”

#### That boosts Obama’s capital without triggering a fight over authority

Douglas Kriner, Assistant Profess of Political Science at Boston University, 2010, After the Rubicon: Congress, Presidents, and the Politics of Waging War, p. 59-60

Presidents and politicos alike have long recognized Congress's ability to reduce the political costs that the White House risks incurring by pursuing a major military initiative. While declarations of war are all but extinct in the contemporary period, Congress has repeatedly moved to authorize presidential military deployments and consequently to tie its own institutional prestige to the conduct and ultimate success of a military campaign. Such authorizing legislation, even if it fails to pass both chambers, creates a sense of shared legislative-executive responsibility for a military action's success and provides the president with considerable political support for his chosen policy course.34 Indeed, the desire for this political cover—and not for the constitutional sanction a congressional authorization affords—has historically motivated presidents to seek Congress's blessing for military endeavors. For example, both the elder and younger Bush requested legislative approval for their wars against Iraq, while assiduously maintaining that they possessed sufficient independent authority as commander in chief to order the invasions unilaterally.35 This fundamental tension is readily apparent in the elder Bush's signing statement to HJ Res 77, which authorized military action against Saddam Hussein in January of 1991. While the president expressed his gratitude for the statement of congressional support, he insisted that the resolution was not needed to authorize military action in Iraq. "As I made clear to congressional leaders at the outset, my request for congressional support did not, and my signing this resolution does not, constitute any change in the long-standing positions of the executive branch on either the President's constitutional authority to use the Armed Forces to defend vital U.S. interests or the constitutionality of the War Powers Resolution."36

#### Obama capital backfires on immigration

Dan Nowicki, USA Today, 10/25/13, Pleas from Obama may hinder immigration bill push, www.usatoday.com/story/news/politics/2013/10/25/obama-immigration-bill-partisanship/3188629/

As President Barack Obama re-engages on immigration reform, some of his allies disagree about how big of a role he should take in the debate. In Thursday remarks at the White House, Obama reiterated his position that common-sense changes to immigration law are a politically popular way to "grow the economy and shrink our deficits" while securing the U.S. border, modernizing the visa system and offering a pathway to citizenship for most of the estimated 11 million undocumented immigrants who already have settled in the United States. Urging Congress to act this year, Obama also made it clear that he prefers the bipartisan approach of the Democratic-controlled Senate, which passed a comprehensive package June 27 that has been languishing in the GOP-controlled House. House Democrats have offered similar legislation, but Obama added that "if House Republicans have new and different, additional ideas for how we should move forward, then we want to hear them." The House has been working on its own series of smaller immigration-related bills but has yet to pass any. House Speaker John Boehner, R-Ohio, has signaled that action on immigration is still possible, and several GOP lawmakers have indicated they are exploring approaches to addressing the legal status of the undocumented population. Obama's remarks earned applause in the immigrant community, but some observers said they want the president to move beyond prodding Congress and use his executive authority to halt deportations. Other reform supporters, particularly in the business world, worry that his high-profile stand risks further alienating conservative House Republicans, many of whom are still nursing bruised egos from the recent government shutdown and debt-ceiling fight. Immigration-reform advocates have considered 2013 their best opportunity to pass a comprehensive bill since the last serious effort failed in 2007, but time is running out. The push is on to finish immigration reform in the next few months because midterm-election politics will overshadow Congress by early 2014. Those partisan atmospherics make bipartisan cooperation less likely although some are hoping for another window of opportunity once primary-election ballots are set and Republican incumbents won't need to worry about challenges from conservatives who oppose "amnesty" for undocumented immigrants. "It doesn't make sense to have 11 million people who are in this country illegally without any incentive or any way for them to come out of the shadows, get right with the law, meet their responsibilities and permit their families then to move ahead," Obama said. "We have kicked this particular can down the road for too long." Growing support For most of this year, Obama has kept his distance from the legislative action, giving the Senate's bipartisan "Gang of Eight" of four Democrats and four Republicans the time they needed to craft their bill. Because of the delicate political dynamics of the House, Obama's increasing presence in the immigration debate gives anxiety to some pro-reform business leaders who traditionally have a good rapport with Republicans. The fear is that some GOP partisans who might otherwise support a bill could balk if they feel Obama is muscling them. "It hurts more than it helps," said President and Chief Executive Glenn Hamer of the Arizona Chamber of Commerce and Industry, who will travel to Washington next week with other business leaders to lobby lawmakers to pass immigration reform. "We understand and we appreciate that this is a big issue for him. It's a big issue for the country. This would be a good time for the House of Representatives to really pass out its vision for immigration reform." PNI1025-met immig obama 2 Undocumented immigrant Mario Montoya of Phoenix, left, takes a photo Oct. 24, 2013, of Alfanso Vazquez outside the White House while the president addressed nation urging House Republicans to act on immigration reform.(Photo: Nick Oza, The Arizona Republic) In his Thursday statement, Obama acknowledged that his support could provoke new antagonism from his conservative critics, but he emphasized that immigration reform — the top domestic priority of Obama's second term — has broad-based political appeal and historically has attracted support from Republicans, including former President George W. Bush. "I know that there are some folks in this town who are primed to think, 'Well, if Obama is for it, then I'm against it,'" Obama said. "But I'd remind everybody that my Republican predecessor was also for it when he proposed reforms like this almost a decade ago." He added: "I'm not running for office again. I just believe this is the right thing to do." One leading national champion of immigration change dismissed the idea that Obama should defer to House Republicans who dislike him. Frank Sharry, executive director of the pro-reform organization America's Voice and an expert in immigration politics, said the restraint that Obama has shown thus far is testament to how badly the president wants a bill passed. For example, Obama has refrained from trying to punish Republicans politically for holding it up, he said. "Come on, he's the president. He gets to use the bully pulpit to try to set the agenda," Sharry said. "Obviously, it's only going to happen if the House Republicans decide to do it. Everybody in the world knows that everybody wants to get it done except for the divided House GOP." Another immigrant advocate called on Obama to show more leadership by curtailing his administration's "outrageous number of deportations" although such a step also could rile House Republicans. Some GOP lawmakers already have suggested they don't trust the Obama administration to properly enforce any new immigration or border-security laws that might be passed. "From our perspective, the president is definitely a big stakeholder and player in getting immigration reform done," said Cristina Jimenez, managing director of the immigrant-youth network United We Dream. "We don't believe that for the president to step up and push Congress to get this done undermines the efforts," she said. "But we also believe that the president himself could do more." Limited influence Other observers, including two members of the Senate Gang of Eight, suggested that **Obama's powers of persuasion** probably **are limited with** many **House Republicans**.
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AUMF is collapsing now

Robert Chesney, University of Texas School of Law Professor, 8/29/12, Beyond the Battlefield, Beyond Al Qaeda: The Destabilizing Legal Architecture of Counterterrorism, http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=2138623

The drawdown in Afghanistan, combined with the expansion of the shadow war model, ensures that the legal architecture of counterterrorism will be far more contested—and hence unstable—going forward than it was during the first post-9/11 decade. When U.S. involvement in overt armed conflict in Afghanistan comes to an end, so too will the other key stabilizing factor identified in Part II: the existence of at least one location as to which LOAC indisputably applies, and as to which many cases could be linked.189 The fact patterns that will matter most in the future—i.e., the instances in which the U.S. government will be most likely to wish to use lethal force or military detention—will instead increasingly be rooted in other locations, such as Yemen and Somalia. It does not follow that LOAC accordingly will be irrelevant to future instances of detention or lethal force. To the extent that the government continues to invoke LOAC, its arguments will be more or less persuasive from case to case. In some contexts, for example, the government can make relatively-conventional arguments to the effect that the level of violence in a given state has risen to a level constituting a non-international armed conflict, quite apart from whether there also exists a borderless armed conflict with al Qaeda or its successors. Where that is the case, and where the level of U.S. participation in those hostilities warrants the conclusion that it is a party to such a conflict, LOAC arguments may prove persuasive after all. Yemen currently provides a good example of an area ripe for such an analysis.190 But even in those cases, the very nature of the shadow war approach is such that there can be no guarantees that such arguments will be accepted, certainly not as was the case during the first post-9/11 decade vis-à-vis Afghanistan. And since not all shadow war contexts will match Yemen in terms of supporting such a conventional analysis, attempts to invoke LOAC in some cases will have to stand or fall instead on the far-broader argument that the United States is engaged in a borderless armed conflict governed by LOAC wherever the parties may be found. The borderless-conflict position at first blush appears nicely entrenched in the status quo legal architecture. It is supported, after all, by a substantial degree of cross-party consensus (it was endorsed most recently in a series of speeches by Obama administration officials).191 But it has always been fiercely disputed, including by the ICRC and many of America’s allies. That dispute was not so much resolved over the past decade as persistently avoided; the caselaw of that era almost always involved persons who could be linked in some way back to the undisputed combat zone of Afghanistan. Thanks to the U.S. government’s shift toward shadow war, however, this will not be the situation going forward when new cases arise, as they are sure to do.192 Making matters worse, the U.S. government’s position on the relevance of LOAC to its use of detention and lethal force may become harder to maintain going forward even without a drawdown in Afghanistan. The reason why has to do with the decline and fragmentation of al Qaeda. The borderless-conflict position does require, after all, identifiable parties on both sides. Even if one accepts that the United States and al Qaeda are engaged in a borderless armed conflict, in other words, organizational ambiguity of the sort described above will increasingly call into question whether specific cases are sufficiently linked to that conflict (or to any other that might be said to exist with respect to specific al Qaeda-linked groups, such as AQAP). Again Warsame’s situation provides a useful illustration, or perhaps more accurately, a cautionary tale. \*\* \* Though widely perceived at the time as a period of great legal controversy and uncertainty, the first post-9/11 decade will in retrospect be perceived as a comparatively simple state of affairs during which it was largely undisputed that LOAC applied somewhere and that the central objects of the U.S. government’s use of detention and lethal force were entities one could coherently describe as al Qaeda and the Afghan Taliban. But that period is ending, and it may be that the second post-9/11 decade will witness far more serious legal disputes as a result.

## link turn

#### Unconstrained geographic war destroys LOAC – only the plan solves—specific to territorial boundaries which means CP doesn’t access link turn—that’s Radin

Sasha Radin, Visiting Research Scholar at the Naval War College, Newport Rhode Island; PhD candidate, Asia Pacific Centre for Military Law, University of Melbourne Law School, 2013, Global Armed Conflict? The Threshold of Extraterritorial Non-International Armed Conflicts, www.usnwc.edu/getattachment/311c6f17-ee69-4870-a00d-b7d845e4387c/Global-Armed-Conflict--The-Threshold-of-Extraterri.aspx

State sovereignty was another impetus for creating the requirement that the hostilities reach a certain level of intensity before LOAC could apply. States wanted to limit the involvement of outside States in their domestic affairs. This objective must, therefore, be seen in light of the fact that the types of conflicts envisioned were mainly internal armed conflicts. In an extraterritorial NIAC context, the reluctance of the State party to the conflict to be subject to interference from other States in its internal affairs largely disappears.150 Neither internal disturbances nor the conflict itself takes place in their own territory.

Does it matter in terms of what LOAC requires for its application that it is the State not party to the conflict whose territorial integrity is infringed? In other words, could this geographic shift in where the hostilities occur affect one of the original underlying reasons for the existence of the threshold? In contrast to the previous two points (whether the violence undertaken by various armed groups may be conglomerated and whether the distribution of violence over space means that it does not reach the sufficient level of intensity), this point questions whether the level of intensity customarily required for internal armed conflicts is the same for extraterritorial conflicts.

It may be argued that the territorial State (i.e., the State in which an extraterritorial NIAC physically takes place) has an interest in trying to prevent incursions into its sovereignty, even though it may not be a party to that NIAC. An incursion by an outside State in order to fight an armed group would likely have implications for the “uninvolved” territorial State. For instance, such an action could be an indication that the territorial State is not able to maintain its own security—an image that States usually take pains to avoid. Or, the territorial State may be concerned that the outside State might gain control or influence within their State.

The implications this shift might have on establishing the threshold of an extraterritorial armed conflict are not clear. At the very least, the reassignment of which State’s sovereignty is affected indicates that issues arising from the shifted location of the conflict warrant further examination. Therefore, even if one accepts the premise that NIACs may exist extraterritorially, the fact that the law was designed for a different context presents challenges in determining the existence of an armed conflict.

VI. GEOGRAPHIC BOUNDARIES OF EXISTING ARMED CONFLICTS

The removal of territorial boundaries from a system based on these physical limits raises the related question of where LOAC may be applied once the law of armed conflict has been triggered. Limited discussion has arisen previously on this issue in the context of purely internal conflicts. However, the main controversy surfaces today specifically with regard to individuals affiliated with an organized armed group located in a second State (“outside of an active battlefield”151). The unease of some commentators that the world could become a battlefield reappears here.

Because NIAC law was designed for internal application, its extraterritorial parameters are not clear. Two main options have been discussed for how to deal with this challenge. One proposes that the geographic application of LOAC is limited to the area of hostilities. The other maintains that once an armed conflict exists the law may extend beyond the immediate zone of hostilities. This latter approach has been interpreted by some to suggest that the law applies to the parties to the conflict wherever they may be located.

The first proposal, suggesting that LOAC would not apply at a distance from wherever the hostilities were taking place,152 may seem logical on its face, but lacks a legal basis. Jurisprudence from the ICTY dealing with the geographic scope of Common Article 3 within a State contradicts this interpretation, providing that “international humanitarian law continues to apply . . . in the case of internal conflicts . . . [to] the whole territory under the control of a party, whether or not actual combat takes place there.”153 The ICTY case law has generally been interpreted by other bodies to mean that Common Article 3 applies to the entire country in which a conflict is taking place, regardless of where hostilities occur.154 This language has been repeatedly upheld by subsequent ICTY and ICTR judgments.155 In the absence of explicit treaty law or customary international law, this jurisprudence could be said to have relevance when it comes to interpreting the geographic contours of internal conflicts.

Resort to the object and purpose of the law also supports application of the law beyond areas of hostilities. One of the law’s fundamental purposes is to ensure protection of individuals once in the hands of the enemy. To interpret the law as only applying to areas of combat would reduce the protection afforded to some of the most vulnerable, who may be located at a distance from active hostilities.

Finally, the text of AP II can be turned to for some guidance, even though the types of conflicts under discussion here are those with a lower threshold. AP II explicitly provides that it applies to “to all persons affected by an armed conflict.”156 This indicates that although AP II limits its applicability to the State in which the conflict is taking place,157 its application is not restricted to areas of active hostilities.158

The second approach considers that once an armed conflict exists LOAC applies beyond the area of active hostilities.159 It is argued that this is the more defensible position of the two. Although this view does not find an explicit basis in treaty law, it is difficult to find justification within the existing law for restricting the application of LOAC to a certain region once an armed conflict exists. In addition, the ICTY and ICTR case law just noted could be said to indirectly support this position in that it interprets the application of the law as extending beyond the combat zones. However, too much reliance on this jurisprudence is misguided as it still depends on State boundaries. For example, if one accepts that the armed conflict in Afghanistan has spilled over into Pakistan, does Common Article 3 then apply throughout the country of Pakistan?

The view that LOAC applies beyond the area of active hostilities leads to the question of whether anything restricts the geographic application of LOAC. One approach is to interpret the ICTY case law as literally referring to the areas where the parties to the conflict have control.160 Under such a view, NIAC law would only apply to the territory under control of the Pakistani Taliban (and other armed groups) in the North-West Frontier Province. This construction, however, presents hurdles.161 First, what is meant by control?162 Second, if it is territorial control that is envisioned, the majority of commentators and jurisprudence view the control of territory by an armed group as an indicator for the applicability of Common Article 3, rather than an obligation.163 It would not make sense to require territorial control by an armed group in order to determine the reach of an armed conflict within a country, but not to require territorial control for the existence of an armed conflict.164 Third, taken to its extreme this interpretation illogically suggests that if neither party controls territory, then LOAC does not apply,165 leading to the possibility that LOAC would not apply precisely where the battle rages.

The U.S. government position that LOAC is not geographically constrained with regard to individual members of a party to a conflict166 has engendered criticism.167 However, it is a defensible stance if one has already accepted that the territorial boundaries of States do not limit LOAC’s application. The bigger issue seems to be that the law was not designed for extraterritorial application. As such, should the view that territorial boundaries are not relevant to LOAC’s application gain force, it may be that the law will develop in a clearer and more nuanced manner.168 Notwithstanding the lack of clarity with regard to this issue, significant restrictions on the use of force against an individual located at a distance from hostilities in a second country already exist. Perhaps most importantly, the question only arises in the first place if an armed conflict exists between the State using force and the armed group against which the force is directed (which includes establishing that the group to which the individual belongs is an identifiable party). Second, and crucially, the separate question then arises of whether an individual is targetable (either by virtue of the membership approach or because s/he is directly participating in hostilities).169 This includes determining that the individual in question has a sufficient nexus to the ongoing armed conflict.170

Should those conditions be fulfilled, then the constraints within LOAC still apply (such as all of the rules pertaining to the principles of distinction and proportionality), as would the country’s domestic law and human rights law to the degree that it interacts with LOAC. It is likely that if the occurrence were far from active hostilities the latter two bodies of law would play a greater role. Issues of State sovereignty could, and often do, present one of the greatest limitations on action. Therefore, it is not the case that force may be used anywhere in the world at any time against parties to the conflict once an armed conflict exists.

VII. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the general trend today is that some extraterritorial conflicts may qualify as NIACs, despite the fact that they are not geographically confined to a single State. This interpretation recognizes that to artificially restrict the law in a way that does not reflect either the realities on the ground or the purpose of the law itself is counterproductive. However, because the existing law was not designed for extraterritorial conflicts, challenges arise in its application.

The issue of links between armed groups in NIACs is an area where the law may need reinterpretation or development. Analogies with other areas of the law do not lead to more clarity. The tenuous suggestion that in order to fulfill the intensity requirement not only should the affiliated armed group be organized and part of an identifiable party, but also that the group’s actions and goals should constitute a threat to the opposing party carries with it practical problems. Specifically, it could be difficult to ascertain both the threat and which members of an armed group are actually participating in actions that are part of the global conflict, as opposed to part of a separate internal conflict.

Determining whether amassing violence that is diffused over distances may fulfill the intensity requirement is another example of how the geographic extension of the law’s application may present difficulties. It has been argued here that taking into account the underlying purpose of the law, the violence must reach a certain level of intensity within a geographic region for an armed conflict to exist. When the violence is spread out geographically, such that in an individual country the law enforcement regimes may function, it is difficult to view the intensity requirement as being met. However, as with links, this issue is far from resolved.

The third principal challenge resulting from the extraterritorial application of NIAC law is that a reassignment of sovereignty occurs. It is unclear if this shift might impact on how States perceive the threshold of the existence of an armed conflict.

Once the existence of an armed conflict has been established, a separate issue arises as to the geographic boundaries of that conflict. This impacts the controversial question of when an individual may be targeted or detained if located in another country away from the main battlefield. Here too, because the law was originally intended to apply within State boundaries, very little guidance exists. It is argued that as the law currently stands, once an armed conflict exists LOAC applies to the parties to the conflict wherever they may be located, but that other restraints within LOAC and jus ad bellum limit its application. In particular, the question of whether an armed conflict exists in the first place is not self-evident. The debate on who can be targeted and when applies both to internal NIACs and extraterritorial NIACs. It may be that additional stipulations will be considered necessary as the law develops given the lack of State boundaries and the distance from an active battlefield. However, currently the law does not require this. Finally, the restrictions found in jus ad bellum curtail action that may be taken.

Therefore, to erase territorial boundaries from the equation entirely when establishing the existence of an armed conflict raises challenges to the structure of the law and some of its underlying purposes. Certain obstacles may prompt clarification in the law; others may remain as limitations on the law’s application. As a consequence, it is not clear where the bar for the application of Common Article 3, and thus LOAC, lies, particularly when applied to conflicts that spread across multiple countries. Some States want to ensure that they have sufficient flexibility to deal with these circumstances. Other States (as well as organizations and commentators) are concerned that the law may be interpreted too permissively and ultimately be abused. A balance must be found in the solution to these issues.

#### Plan is critical to resolve structural problems within LAOC – geography is the biggest issue

Sasha Radin, Visiting Research Scholar at the Naval War College, Newport Rhode Island; PhD candidate, Asia Pacific Centre for Military Law, University of Melbourne Law School, 2013, Global Armed Conflict? The Threshold of Extraterritorial Non-International Armed Conflicts, www.usnwc.edu/getattachment/311c6f17-ee69-4870-a00d-b7d845e4387c/Global-Armed-Conflict--The-Threshold-of-Extraterri.aspx

This topic has particular relevance today given the frequency with which armed groups disregard State boundaries in conducting their operations and the ambiguity surrounding the applicable legal framework. The law of armed conflict is structured around State-centric concepts of sovereignty and territory, and is designed for either inter-State conflicts or for purely internal armed conflicts.2 Its contours have been based on territorial boundaries.3 Thus, international armed conflicts (IACs)4 may generally only occur between States.5 Non-international armed conflicts (NIACs),6 or

Conflicts such as the Israeli-Hezbollah war of 2006, the ongoing conflict in Afghanistan that has spilled over into Pakistan and the U.S. global armed conflict against Al Qaeda challenge this traditional State-centric structure of LOAC. As a result, there is considerable debate as to how such extraterritorial hostilities (i.e., those that cross State borders) should be characterized. If hostilities do not rise to the level of an armed conflict, they fall under a law enforcement regime9 and are governed mainly by domestic law and international human rights law. Although extraterritorial hostilities do not fit neatly into any of these three existing legal divisions— IACs, NIACs or law enforcement—their categorization has serious practical implications. Particularly, the classification of conflict affects such matters as how force may be used, what rules apply for detention and whether an individual may be held criminally liable.10

Several approaches have been put forth for how to legally categorize extraterritorial hostilities with armed groups. In Part II, this article provides a contextual framework for the discussion by laying out these various approaches. Part III outlines the law applicable to NIACs. Part IV discusses why the prevailing view is that some of these extraterritorial conflicts may qualify as NIACs despite the fact that such conflicts do not conform to the traditional interpretations limiting the application of LOAC to within a State’s own borders.11

Part V examines potential problems in applying a body of law that was intended for internal application to an extraterritorial context. The fact that the law was not designed for such use has led to inconsistencies in the rationale for when and where this body of law applies. Today, many argue that NIAC law may apply to spill-over conflicts and even to hostilities that occur between a State and an armed group predominantly in the territory of a second uninvolved State (e.g., the Israeli-Hezbollah conflict). In contrast, a great deal of unease surrounds the notion that a global armed conflict is taking place with Al Qaeda. There is concern that the removal of territorial restrictions when establishing the existence of an armed conflict could transform the entire world into a potential “battlefield.”12

An examination of the requirements for the existence of an armed conflict and their underlying purpose suggest that the criteria for establishing when a NIAC exists cannot be entirely divorced from geography. In particular, difficulties may arise in establishing that an armed conflict exists when hostilities with armed groups span multiple States. One challenge is how the law factors in the links between various armed groups when calculating whether the violence has reached a sufficient level of intensity necessary to trigger LOAC. This involves a combination of distinguishing the identifiable party and establishing the intensity requirement. Another issue is whether violence diffused over a number of countries can be amassed in order to reach a total level of intensity. In addition, a shift in the State whose sovereignty is affected could have an impact on the underlying purpose of the intensity criterion.

Part VI briefly considers the separate issue of where LOAC may be applied once the law of armed conflict has been triggered. The question is contentious and at this point unresolved. The article suggests that the most defensible position is that once an armed conflict exists, the law applies to the parties to the conflict even if in another country, but that a number of other factors restrict whether or not an individual may be targeted or detained. Under this view, the key question is whether an armed conflict exists in the first place. The majority of the article concentrates on this former question.

Part VII concludes that although the law applicable to NIACs may apply extraterritorially, the process of establishing when an armed conflict exists is still partially bound geographically by virtue of the intensity requirement. In this sense, the law does not simply follow the parties to the conflict. Because the law was designed with territorial constraints in mind, there is a need for clarification of when the law is to apply extraterritorially.

#### The link is backwards – we restrict the battlefield, not the scope of IHL – that’s key

Sasha Radin, Visiting Research Scholar at the Naval War College, Newport Rhode Island; PhD candidate, Asia Pacific Centre for Military Law, University of Melbourne Law School, 2013, Global Armed Conflict? The Threshold of Extraterritorial Non-International Armed Conflicts, www.usnwc.edu/getattachment/311c6f17-ee69-4870-a00d-b7d845e4387c/Global-Armed-Conflict--The-Threshold-of-Extraterri.aspx

Setting aside these dual strands in the development of LOAC, an acknowledgment that Common Article 3 and customary international law apply extraterritorially suggests that an assessment of the intensity and organization requirements cannot be conducted separately per country. Even in accepting this conclusion, however, the concern remains that if the territorial restrictions are removed when establishing the existence of an armed conflict over multiple, geographically dispersed States, what constraints within LOAC remain?99

[FOOTNOTE] 99. See, e.g., Geiss, supra note 39, at 138:

Clearly, a sweeping and global application of IHL without any territorial confines whatsoever is not maintainable owing to the unjustifiable worldwide derogations from human rights law this would bring about, and in light of the very object and purpose of IHL, i.e. to provide relatively basic but feasible standards in areas where the reality of armed conflict simply forestalls the application of more protective (human rights) standards.

It is suggested that territory does still play a role in determining when an armed conflict exists, particularly in the case of “global” armed conflicts. Problems arise if the manner in which the threshold of a NIAC has been determined in internal conflicts is simply transposed to those conflicts that are geographically dispersed across numerous territories. Two issues in particular may challenge the way in which the organization and intensity criteria are applied to “global” armed conflicts. The first concerns the matter of links between armed groups—can violence conducted by various armed groups that are linked to one another be conglomerated in order to fulfill the intensity requirement? If so, what must the nature of the link be? Second, can violence that is dispersed over large geographic spaces be amassed in order to meet the requisite level of intensity for the existence of an armed conflict? In addition, the underlying purpose of the requirements may be affected by a shift in State sovereignty. These factors are now examined.

#### Legal clarity’s a prerequisite to future applications of the law

Sasha Radin, Visiting Research Scholar at the Naval War College, Newport Rhode Island; PhD candidate, Asia Pacific Centre for Military Law, University of Melbourne Law School, 2013, Global Armed Conflict? The Threshold of Extraterritorial Non-International Armed Conflicts, www.usnwc.edu/getattachment/311c6f17-ee69-4870-a00d-b7d845e4387c/Global-Armed-Conflict--The-Threshold-of-Extraterri.aspx

The questions of what link is required between an organized armed group and a party to the conflict and how the intensity criterion is assessed take on increased significance when applied to an extraterritorial context. In particular, when it comes to a global armed conflict, the lack of clarity has generated disquiet.113 The United States claims to be in a “global” armed conflict with Al Qaeda and its affiliates.114 The argument is that these affiliated armed groups are connected and collectively constitute a threat to the United States. Therefore, they are part of the same conflict, which happens to be spread out geographically.

However, to simply transfer the model of establishing the requisite level of intensity that is sometimes used in practice in internal (or even regional) armed conflicts to a global armed conflict creates problems. Most importantly, the degree to which these affiliated groups are, in fact, part of the same conflict is less clear in situations spread out across multiple States. Territory no longer serves as a presupposed link between the armed groups that connects the violence. Hostilities undertaken by an affiliated group may be part of an entirely separate conflict. For example, the majority of fighting conducted by groups affiliated with Al Qaeda, such as Al Shabaab in Somalia, often takes place as part of separate internal conflicts.115 Al Shabaab’s interests and targets are predominantly local.116

At the same time, the law does not specify how multiple organized armed groups might be part of a single party to a conflict in NIACs. Part of the problem is that the test for the existence of an armed conflict has been articulated in terms of the organized armed group requirement in some cases (the Tadić test) and at other times in terms of a party to the conflict (Common Article 3). Over the years little attention or clarification has been given to this issue of what constitutes a party to a conflict in NIACs.117

The United States claims to be in an armed conflict not only with Al Qaeda, but also with affiliated groups.118 These affiliates include Al Qaida in the Arabian Peninsula (AQAP), al-Qa’ida in the Islamic Maghreb, Al Shabaab, Al Qaeda in Iraq and Boko Haram (although not formally).119 Pejic pertinently questions whether the violent acts committed since 9/11 have stemmed from the same group, or if distinct armed groups have carried them out: “[C]an it be said that the totality of terrorist acts that have been perpetrated since 11 September 2011—in Bali, Moscow, Peshawar, Casablanca, Riyadh, Madrid, Istanbul, Beslan, London, Egypt, and elsewhere—constitute a global non-international armed conflict that can be attributed to one and the same party?”120

## \*\*\*CP

## solvency

CP seriously solves nothing

Gregory Conners, Georgetown University Law Center J.D., Former US Air Force, Summer 2012, NOTE: The World Is Not a Battlefield, Or Is It? Defining the Extent of the Battlefield in the Global War on Terror, 10 Geo. J.L. & Pub. Pol'y 645

This question in the most recent context of the post-9/11 world may elicit some attractively simple answers, ranging from Iraq, Afghanistan, and other countries where militaries are engaged in major operations, to anywhere and everywhere the enemy can be found. The simplicity of these answers, and their potential attractiveness to those who seek to either limit or expand military operations against terrorists, may be what has led to an as-yet unanswered legal question. However, because "twenty-first-century armed conflicts often have no battlefield in the traditional sense," the question can no longer be ignored as self-evident. n63 This lack of clarity has fostered the current ad hoc approaches to the questions which raise significant risks. n64 It is clearly inappropriate to claim that approval in international circles of the U.S. practice following the 9/11 attacks could constitute immediate customary international law, were such a concept possible. n65 Yet "instantaneous custom" is not necessarily the only way to accept U.S. practice as defining. As Professor Dinstein made clear, "[w]ar can be waged over large portions of the planet and beyond. The space subject to the potential spread of hostilities is known as the region of war." n66 This region, where combat operations have not yet reached but where they may be waged under the auspices of the armed conflict, is the potential battlefield.

As former President George W. Bush stated, "Today we focus on Afghanistan, but the battle is broader . . . . In this conflict, there is no neutral ground." n67 Likewise, as Undersecretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz stated after the airstrike against al-Harithi in Yemen in 2002, there is no principal front in this war. It is a global conflict. n68 These claims of global conflict are not confined to the Bush administration, as the Obama administration, which continues to decry the so-called "Bush Doctrine," n69 has simultaneously made the doctrine its own and even expanded upon it. n70 This can be seen from the nomination hearings for Attorney General Eric Holder and Supreme Court Justice Elena Kagan regarding [\*655] the recent strike that killed an American citizen in Yemen. In his nomination hearings, Attorney General Holder stated, "The battlefield .. . [is] in Afghanistan, but there are battlefields, potentially, you know, in our Nation." n71 Similarly, in her Supreme Court nomination hearings, in relation to her work as Solicitor General of the United States, Justice Kagan confirmed that an al Qaeda financier in the Philippines qualified as someone within the physical battlefield. n72 Yet this global battlefield doctrine was not even new in its fundamentals, n73 as Secretary of State George P. Shultz stated in 1984, "[w]e can expect more terrorism directed at our strategic interests around the world in the years ahead. To combat it, we must be willing to use military force." n74

It is also important to consider the U.S. approach in light of the contentions made by the terrorists themselves and the practice of other states in the current context. The World Islamic Front, in a statement signed by Osama bin Laden, and representative of much that he has published, stated that "to kill the Americans and their allies--civilians and military--is an individual duty for every Muslim who can do it in any country in which it is possible to do it." n75 The U.S. is not alone in practicing this aggressive form of self-defense. Considering Turkish incursions against the PKK in northern Iraq or Columbian military strikes against FARC insurgents in Ecuador, it is clear the U.S. approach is not unique. n76

The most significant modern development is not merely that the enemy is transnational and stateless, without "headquarters [or] designated zones of operation." n77 Technological developments have cast whatever historical clarity there may have been into even greater disarray. The utilization of special operations forces, while in many ways similar to guerrilla warfare in past conflicts, is enhanced by the ability to infiltrate and exfiltrate to strike targets in states not party to any conflict, and possibly without that state's knowledge. n78 More expansive is the use of drones to strike targets worldwide with extreme precision while the pilot launching the strike may be located within the U.S. n79 In the historical context and, as some currently argue, this could be said to render both locations clearly within the boundaries of a battlefield, because the combatants are physically located in both places. n80 If these strikes are found to be based upon clear military necessity and are not otherwise unlawful, then they could be lawful under established LOAC principles. n81 Yet this is not a universally accepted proposition, and the ICRC rejects it outright. n82 However, the question of whether such a drone strike could render the operator's location part of the battlefield, if only for the duration of those operations, is legitimate.

In the context of the fast-evolving threat of cyber-warfare, some have contended that the "[s]tate subjected to an armed attack is entitled to resort to self-defense measures against the aggressor, regardless of the geographic point where the attack was delivered." n83 This statement brings to light the lack of geographic boundaries in this new realm of warfare. With such indistinct and global possibilities, assuming that (1) the "cyber battlefield" extends beyond cyberspace to encompass both the physical computer infrastructure supporting the attack and being attacked, (2) the "cyber battlefield" extends to the physical targets of the attack, like power plants, and (3) that cyber attacks constitute armed conflict, the ramifications for the battlefield may be extreme. n84 Not only are civilian targets vulnerable, but a civilian server either apparently or actually hijacked and put into service for such cyber-attacks may be vulnerable under LOAC to either kinetic or non-kinetic attacks in response. n85 There does not appear to be a clear answer in the current framework addressing to what extent a civilian server might constitute the battlefield in such a cyber-attack, but the possibilities for kinetic targeting of civilian network infrastructure could render unprecedented geographic breadth subject to the LOAC applicable to the battlefield. Attempting to create a framework under which such decisions could be made in a consistent manner, in light of perhaps the most global potential for a "battlefield" status, might "serve as a first step to re-evaluating lawful participation in hostilities in other forms of remote warfare." n86

State practice in the context of such new and evolving threats reveals an inherent tension in the legal framework of the UN Charter right to self-defense n87 and the territorial sovereignty of the state who is not actively supporting [\*657] a terrorist organization yet refuses, or is unable, to counter their illegal acts or simply their presence. n88 This tension is resolved to a certain degree in States that cooperate, n89 yet this may be the exception rather than the rule. And with this exception comes a change in status of the neutral state because "[n]eutral states must refrain from allowing their territory to be used by belligerent states for the purposes of military operations." n90 Thus, a cooperating state opens itself up to attack. n91 Yet this tension may shed light on the status of the battlefield, for example in Yemen where U.S. military operations are allowed in its territory.

A recent instance highlighting what is ostensibly the battlefield during such an operation, is the targeted killing of Anwar al-Awlaki in Yemen. On Sept. 30, 2011, al-Awlaki was reportedly killed in a drone strike on his convoy of vehicles traveling in Yemen. n92 This targeted killing of a U.S. citizen, and radical Islamic militant reportedly a member of al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula and "cobelligerent with al Qaeda," on Yemeni soil was reportedly authorized by a memorandum from the U.S. Department of Justice that placed al-Awlaki on a kill or capture list. n93 Whether this strike was carried out with the consent or assistance of the Yemeni government or not raises important questions; however, in either case it was a military strike on foreign soil apart from recognized traditional "battlefields" as they exist in Iraq and Afghanistan. This exercise of military force fits within Dinstein's region of war paradigm and begs the question whether, if Yemen is within the region of war, there is an area outside of it, and thus not susceptible to the "battlefield" label. n94

One might argue that it is only the terrorist combatant who can be taken out with military force, and he is likely to be found on a more traditional battlefield, yet it may be that the financier or planner plays a more important role and presents the greatest threat. n95 These higher-level, arguably more important targets are unlikely to ever be found on what could be more traditionally labeled a battlefield, yet a military strike where they are located might be far more [\*658] critical in prosecuting the war on terror. The potential breadth to which this practice could push the battlefield, similar to the possibilities with cyber warfare, threatens to further support the idea of the global battlefield.

Yet, despite the breadth of what has historically been treated as the battlefield, there has never been a truly global battlefield. As seen above, from Lieber to the Additional Protocols to the Geneva Conventions, and throughout state practice there have been limits on the extent of what could be termed the battlefield. Though recent trends such as cyber warfare and remotely operated weapons pose a greater possibility of claims that the battlefield is global, n96 limits have existed and must continue to be explored in greater depth to define clearly what is and is not the battlefield in the newest realms of war. While the law of armed conflict has not yet spoken definitively to this question, it is not incapable of growth and development and often must be readdressed in light of changes in the world and the state's capability to wage war.

V. FUTURE OPERATIONS AND A FRAMEWORK FOR MOVING FORWARD

The armed conflicts of the future, and the battlefields on which they are fought, will likely challenge the application of the law of armed conflict in ways today's military and legal scholars cannot foresee. The advent of cyber warfare, financial warfare, advances in space, and the development of stealth drones capable of worldwide unmanned strikes suggest even more radical changes to come. While the law continues to grow and evolve to meet these new challenges and ones not yet foreseen, a framework for answering the question of where the battlefield extends may help control unchecked applications of force. Bearing in mind the admonishment that, "[w]hen principle is involved, [one must] be deaf to expediency," n97 it is necessary to base current and future actions on a principled, rather than ad hoc approach to this important question. A framework for deciding the legality of extending the battlefield in new conflict can provide this principled approach.

#### It’s a slippery slope – geography’s key to all limitations on force

Rosa Brooks, Associate Professor of Law, University of Virginia School of Law, December 2004, ARTICLE: WAR EVERYWHERE: RIGHTS, NATIONAL SECURITY LAW, AND THE LAW OF ARMED CONFLICT IN THE AGE OF TERROR, 153 U. Pa. L. Rev. 675

In response to these arguments, many in the human rights, civil rights, and international law communities have struggled to insist on the continuing viability of the law of armed conflict's traditional boundaries, n11 since the erosion of these boundaries has had (and will [\*680] almost certainly continue to have) a disastrous effect on basic rights and vulnerable populations. n12 Many in these communities have insisted, for instance, that the law of armed conflict should be interpreted in a strict and formalistic manner when it comes to evaluating U.S. actions in the "war on terror," n13 and some human rights groups (including Amnesty International) have asserted that since al Qaeda is neither a state nor a domestic insurgent group, the law of armed conflict does not apply at all to the U.S. struggle against terrorism, n14 which should be governed instead by the principles of domestic and international criminal law.

It is somewhat ironic for any in the human rights law community to insist on a rigid and traditional reading of the law of armed conflict when it comes to the war on terror, since in many other contexts the human rights community has appropriately been at the forefront of calls for progressive and flexible interpretations of international law. n15 [\*681] In the longer run, shifting from one interpretive methodology to another based on the likely results of different methodologies is both unprincipled and likely to be self-defeating, as it is difficult to simultaneously argue, for instance, that the law of armed conflict should be construed narrowly when the goal is reining in U.S. government actions, but flexibly when the goal is holding nonstate actors accountable for crimes against humanity or ending impunity for gender-based crimes committed during armed conflicts. n16

The effort to insist on the viability of the customary distinctions drawn by the laws of armed conflict is also, increasingly, a rearguard action. The erosion of boundaries is an inescapable social fact, and this Article asserts that it needs to be candidly acknowledged and addressed, rather than ignored or denied.

To say that the erosion of traditional legal boundaries is an inescapable fact is not to minimize the degree to which it is nonetheless genuinely cause for alarm, however; rights advocates are justifiably concerned about the consequences of this boundary erosion. The existence of reasonably clear boundaries between conflict and nonconflict, combatants and noncombatants, and "lawful" and "unlawful" belligerents is what allows us to determine which legal rules apply in different situations, and, even more critically, allows us to identify people and rights meriting protection. As traditional categories lose their logical underpinnings, we are entering a new era: the era of War Everywhere. n17 It is an era in which the legal rules that were designed [\*682] to protect basic rights and vulnerable groups have lost much of their analytical force, and thus, too often, their practical force.

The erosion of clear boundaries in some areas of the law also leads to a slippery slope, allowing the disingenuous to assert that there is also blurriness even in areas of the law that remain both relevant and clear. Thus, lawyers for the Bush administration went from the legitimate conclusion that the Geneva Conventions cannot easily be applied to many modern conflicts, to the disingenuous and flawed conclusion that there were therefore no legal constraints at all on U.S. interrogation practices. n18 In fact, regardless of whether or not the Geneva Conventions apply to a given conflict, and regardless of whether [\*683] or not a particular detainee is entitled to the protections of the Geneva Conventions, international law and U.S. treaty commitments prohibit the use of torture and other forms of cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment of detainees and there can be little doubt that many of the interrogation practices authorized by the Pentagon constitute torture or cruel, inhuman, and degrading treatment. n19 In practice, then, the breakdown of clear boundaries in some areas of the law also dangerously undermines the efficacy of other legal rules. n20

#### Geography’s the key issue – ad hoc standards mean nothing

Kenneth Anderson, Professor of Law, Washington College of Law, American University, and Research Fellow, The Hoover Institution, Stanford University and Member of its Task Force on National Security and the Law, 2011, targeted Killing and Drone Warfare, How We Came to Debate Whether There Is a ‘Legal Geography of War’, http://media.hoover.org/sites/default/files/documents/FutureChallenges\_Anderson.pdf

Even if collateral damage to civilians is significantly less, however, important concerns remain. Emerging technologies of potentially great geographic reach raise the issue of what regime of law regulates these activities as they spread. This is to ask what are the boundaries of that regime of law—if there are any—when the reach of the weapon extends ever farther. The question has special salience when these uses of force are, indeed, highly discrete—but simultaneously far less limited by the physical constraints of geography than before. Having said that, however, we should not overstate how much drones overcome geography; the broadly acknowledged effectiveness of the current programs in Afghanistan and Pakistan is owed in large part to robust on-the-ground human intelligence operations that identify targets in the first place; this is profoundly local, not global, intelligence work, and the ability effectively to target depends on it. Drone technology is not a substitute for on-the-ground local intelligence but rather depends vitally on it.

Moving beyond the issue of civilian collateral damage, the most salient anxiety among the practice’s critics comes from a sense that these weapons redefine the geography of war in ways that reveal an apparent lacuna in the laws of war (viz., the law of war’s implicit reliance on a bounded geography). The laws of war have inchoate boundaries for where they apply, lex specialis, and where the Law of Everyday Life applies. Redefine those boundaries through changes in war’s technologies, and the ordinary law of everyday life, including criminal law, constitutional protections, and more, suddenly might not apply. The laws of war might apply instead.

In earlier times, these boundaries did not need to be specified in a direct legal way, and the law of war did not speak of “geography of war” or the “boundaries” of the laws of war. But then they didn’t need to. The technologies of war more or less established these things because they established the places in which hostilities were under way. It was enough to say that war took place, and the law of war governed, where hostilities took place. There were indeed boundary issues—largely created by the development of aircraft—but the nature of the weapons launched from aircraft, and the frequency, still made clear where hostilities were under way and where not for purposes of the laws of war.

The emergence of technologies for targeted killing using drones seems to alter that implicit constraint on war and law of war and still more so in the emergence of global counterterrorism operations. So what might be seen—and certainly is, in my view—an extraordinary and salutary technological revolution in both conventional armed conflict and global counterterrorism is nonetheless a source of profound anxiety to many. It has the possibility of disturbing and undermining a mostly tacit underpinning to the laws of war: an implied geography of war.

#### Plan’s middle ground best—key to avoid collapse of interstate cooperation—impacted in both advs

Laurie Blank, Director, International Humanitarian Law Clinic, Emory Law School, 2010, \*1 DEFINING THE BATTLEFIELD IN CONTEMPORARY CONFLICT AND COUNTERTERRORISM: UNDERSTANDING THE PARAMETERS OF THE ZONE OF COMBAT, papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=1677965‎

The ramifications of including areas within the zone of combat, such as the accompanying authority to use lethal force as a first resort, raise a variety of policy considerations. The two primary considerations weigh directly against each other and perhaps, as a result, lend credence to the need for a middle ground in defining the zone of combat. First, some argue that creating geographic limits to the battlefield has the problematic effect of granting terrorists a safe haven. For example, a member of al Qaeda can be a legitimate target as a result of continuous participation in hostilities, thus losing any immunity from attack he might have had by dint of being a civilian. [FN105] If the zone of combat is limited geographically to certain areas, then this member of al Qaeda can avoid being targeted--and thus regain civilian immunity, in essence--simply by crossing an international border even while remaining active in a terrorist organization engaged in a conflict with the U.S. [FN106] Geographic limits designed to curtail the use of governmental military force thus effectively grant terrorists a safe haven and extend the conflict by enabling them to regroup and continue their attacks.

Alternatively, others argue that the **lack of geographic limitations on the zone of combat has grave consequences**, both locally and **globally**. In particular, “[t]he implications of allowing the use of armed force to capture or kill enemies outside a country's own territory, and outside a theater of traditional armed conflict, may **include spiraling violence, the erosion of territorial sovereignty, and a weakening of international cooperation**.” [FN107] Use of military force to target a person inside the territory of another state without its consent inherently violates that state's sovereignty. A conception of the battlefield enabling regular incursions into another state's territory will, over time, have the effect of weakening the importance of state sovereignty as a defining part of the international legal order. It also increases the likelihood of violence on a more regular and more widespread basis, as more and more locations fall within the arena of military operations.