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#### Contention 1 is Due Process

#### Scenario One: Rights Protections

#### Targeted killing policy under executive authority will collapse due process protections

Alford, 11 [Copyright (c) 2011 Utah Law Review Society Utah Law Review 2011 Utah Law Review 2011 Utah L. Rev. 1203 LENGTH: 41771 words ARTICLE: The Rule of Law at the Crossroads: Consequences of Targeted Killing of Citizens NAME: Ryan Patrick Alford\* BIO: \* © 2011 Ryan Patrick Alford, Assistant Professor, Ave Maria School of Law, p. lexis]

From 2001 to 2004, the constitutional order of the United States was severely tested. In Hamdi v. Rumsfeld, n408 the Supreme Court held that the writ of habeas corpus extended to a United States citizen held at Guantanamo Bay. n409 Eight of the nine Justices agreed that the executive branch did not have the power to hold a citizen indefinitely, without access to basic due process protections enforceable in open court. n410 This case was properly seen as a watershed, a rejection of theories of executive detention that were incompatible with the basic tenets of our common law tradition. n411 However, the clear right to habeas corpus is only slightly over three hundred years old - the right not to be killed without due process of law is twice as old and considerably more fundamental. As Blackstone made clear, habeas corpus was originally necessary because it was a prophylactic protection for Magna Carta's right not to be killed. n412 To turn a blind eye to executive death warrants would be to trample upon numerous principles the Framers believed so important as to put into a document that outlines the parameters of the state itself. It would also trample upon principles that predate the Bill of Rights: the balance of powers, the constraints on arbitrary executive action, and the specific requirements of additional due process for those accused of crimes amounting to treason. It would also make a mockery of their [\*1271] comprehensive view of due process, which precluded the use of military justice against civilians. It would allow a return to the very features of royalist justice that they and their forbearers detested, such as allowing the executive the power of judgment and denying the courts the power to intervene - this was the hallmark of the detested Star Chamber, which was abolished on these grounds in 1641. n413 What is perhaps most perplexing about this current crossroads is that there seems to be very little discussion of the importance of this case within the legal profession in general, and in particular among the scholars and lawyers who had opposed the legal framework for the indefinite detention of the detainees at Guantanamo Bay. It is difficult to understand why so much determined opposition should emerge to the withholding of the rights of habeas corpus from American citizens (which led to the decision in Hamdi), n414 while the administration's decision to issue executive death warrants has led to so little. Apart from the decision of the ACLU and the CCR to litigate the case on behalf of Nasser Al-Aulaqi, there has been very little action taken within the legal community to publicize the Obama Administration's decision to use the targeted killing program to assassinate an American citizen. n415 As the discussion of the targeted killing program after Al-Awlaki's extrajudicial execution reveals, American militants like Anwar al-Awlaki are placed on a kill or capture list by a secretive panel of senior government officials, which then informs the president of its decisions ... . There is no public record of the operations or decisions of the panel, which is a subset of the White House's National Security Council ... . Neither is there any law establishing its existence or setting out the rules by which it is supposed to operate. n416 [\*1272] Not only is there no law addressing the due process rights of Americans with respect to targeted killing, but no law on this subject can be made. The executive branch has prevented the judiciary from addressing the killing of citizens by asserting that the courts do not have jurisdiction over these cases because they present political questions. Since the judiciary may not adjudicate the claims of those about to be killed, the prevailing law of the land now comes in the form of secret memoranda created by the executive's Office of Legal Counsel ("OLC"). n417 The executive branch now has the final say on the constitutionality of its decision to kill an American citizen, since it asserts that no court has jurisdiction to review its opinion. This is executive privilege beyond James I's wildest dreams. While the administration insists that the OLC memorandum did not formulate general criteria for deciding whether Americans accused (impliedly, but not formally) of treason may be tortured or killed, n418 its version of events is actually worse than the alternative. The administration advances the position that a citizen suspected of treason may be killed after a singular determination within the executive branch that this would not violate the citizen's due process rights. "If that's true, then the Obama Administration is **playing legal Calvinball**, making decisions based on individual cases, rather than consistent legal criteria." n419 Unfortunately, this has been confirmed to be true: the recommendations for targeted killings are reportedly made on a case-by-case basis by "a grim debating society" of "more than 100 members of the government's sprawling national security apparatus," who provide no indication of using legal principles when determining such issues as which sort of "facilitators" of terrorism should be marked for death. n420 This sort of Star Chamber is precisely what the rule of law was designed to protect us against. After months of silence, Attorney General of the United States Eric Holder traced out the rationale for the targeted killing of an American citizen. n421 Rebutting this article's thesis, he argued: Some have argued that the president is required to get permission from a federal court before taking action against a United States citizen who is a senior operational leader of Al Qaeda or associated forces... . [\*1273] This is simply not accurate. "Due process" and "judicial process" are not one and the same, particularly when it comes to national security. The Constitution guarantees due process, not judicial process. n422 Given the Obama Administration's decision not to release the OLC memorandum or even acknowledge that they did in fact kill Al-Awlaki, n423 this will likely be the most comprehensive description of the legal case for targeted killings the American people ever receive. Its arrogance is stunning. Attorney General Holder appears to rely implicitly on a Court decision holding that those having their social security benefits terminated are not entitled to a hearing in advance in support of another proposition. Namely, that some unspecified degree of procedural fairness apportioned in secret within the executive branch is all that is required before an American citizen can be killed. The Constitution, and a tradition of resistance to arbitrary executive power that it reaffirmed that extends back to the Magna Carta, is being held for naught - on the basis of a holding from an administrative law case wrenched forcibly out of context. With this flimsy justification, the administration rationalizes the creation of a new Star Chamber, newly empowered to administer capital punishment in secret and unchallengeable proceedings. Should this pass unchallenged, this may herald the end of the rule of law in America.

#### That spills over -- it’s the knockout blow for rights guarantees

Blum and Heymann 10 (Gabriella, Assistant Professor of Law – Harvard Law School, and Philip, Professor of Law – Harvard Law School, “Law and Policy of Targeted Killing,” Harvard National Security Journal, 1 Harv. Nat'l Sec. J. 145, Lexis)

As we have shown, targeted killings may be justified even without declaring an all-out "war" on terrorism. A war paradigm is overbroad in the sense that it allows the targeting of any member of a terrorist organization. For the United States, it has had no geographical limits. When any suspected member of a hostile terrorist organization--regardless of function, role, or degree of contribution to the terrorist effort--might be targeted anywhere around the world without any due process guarantees or monitoring procedures, targeted killings run grave risks of doing both short-term and lasting harm. In contrast, a peacetime paradigm that enumerates specific exceptions for the use of force in self-defense is more legitimate, more narrowly tailored to the situation, offers potentially greater guarantees for the rule of law. It is, however, harder to justify targeted killing operations under a law enforcement paradigm when the tactic is used as a continuous and systematic practice rather than as an exceptional measure. Justifying targeted killings under a law enforcement paradigm also threatens to erode the international rules that govern peacetime international relations as well as the human rights guarantees that governments owe their own citizens.

#### New legal framework key to effective norms – clear standards bridge the gap

Mutua 7 (Makau, SUNY Distinguished Professor, Professor of Law, Floyd H. & Hilda L. Hurst Faculty Scholar, and Director of the Human Rights Center – Buffalo Law School, “Standard Setting in Human Rights: Critique and Prognosis,” Human Rights Quarterly, Vol. 29, http://www.law.buffalo.edu/content/dam/law/restricted-assets/pdf/faculty/mutuaM/journals/hrq2907.pdf)

Even with historic conceptual and institutional breakthroughs, a lot remains to be done to secure human dignity. Although human rights standards have been set in virtually all areas that touch on human dignity, normative gaps and weaknesses still exist in many areas. New normative frameworks are needed in some areas, while in others they must be elaborated and strengthened. Standard setting is a dynamic process that must respond to a rapidly changing globe and challenges that come with the emergence of new problems and conditions. The argument that the era of standard setting is over is not only mistaken, but dangerous.

The setting of human rights standards is not a static process. The conditions of humanity that human rights standards seek to safeguard and promote are evolving concepts. New conditions of oppression and powerlessness are forever being discovered, and new challenges are constantly emerging. For example, the gay rights movement and the campaign for the rights of people with disabilities were unthinkable just a few decades ago. The current US war on terror has similarly thrown up new obstacles to established norms. There is no doubt that these and many other issues require a normative response. The struggle for and definition of human freedom and development is a continuous and evolutionary process. These issues require unceasing vigilance, revision, re-evaluation, deepening, and re-definition. Broad norms and standards must be unpacked, broken down, elucidated, revised, and may even need to be rejected and replaced by new and different standards. The scope, reach, and content of norms must be comprehensible to their beneficiaries, as well as to those who bear the responsibility for their implementation. Vacuous, rhetorical, and vague standards accomplish little.

To be effective, standards must have a clear path for their implementation and enforcement. This is an area of weakness. Institutions that are responsible for the promotion and protection of human rights standards—states and IGOs—are largely perceived by NGOs as reluctant, unwilling, unable, or ineffectual actors. They are seen as interested mostly in blunting the bite of human rights to safeguard state sovereignty. The effect of human rights must be translated at the national level, so municipal institutions that safeguard basic rights are critical to enforcement. Judiciaries, national human rights institutions, bar associations, NGOs, police and security apparatuses, and legislatures must be in the frontline to entrench, deepen, promote, and protect human rights. However, only human rights NGOs among these institutions can usually be relied on to advance the human rights agenda with vigor, honesty, and a healthy disinterest. Human rights norms must be internalized by states in their legal and political orders to be effective.

#### Executive clarity isn't enough – creates a double standard that impacts global perception

Zimmerman, 13 [Evan, Citing Zenko of CFR, Jane Dao of the NYT, Kristin Roberts of the Atlantic, etc. “Secrecy and the Obama Drone Program: a Violation of the Fifth Amendment”, April 22, 2013 http://uculr.com/articles/2013/4/22/secrecy-and-the-obama-drone-program-a-violation-of-the-fifth-amendment]

Notwithstanding the ease with which the Administration authorized the killing of al-Awlaki, the Administration has a clear understanding that the primary impediment to lawfully killing Americans is the due process clause of the Fifth Amendment of the US Constitution, which states that, “no person shall…be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law.”[19] DOJ “assumes that the rights afforded by the Fifth Amendment’s Due Process Clause…attach to a US citizen even while he is abroad.”[20] However, such a protection does not make a US citizen immune from a lethal operation if he is an enemy combatant.[21] Rather, the Administration believes it must weigh the “private interest that will be affected by the official action” against the government’s asserted interest,[22] including “the burdens the government would face in providing process.”[23] The person in question has, indeed, a very weighty, in fact “uniquely compelling,” private interest: his life.[24] However, the Administration says that its war and accordant duty to defend the lives of innocent US citizens is also compelling, maybe even more so in this context than the accused’s own life.[25] Perhaps to satisfy such Fifth Amendment concerns, the DOJ White Paper states that there are three conditions that a targeted killing of a US citizen must fulfill before death may be considered: (a) an “informed, high-level”[26] US official must believe that there is an “imminent threat of violent attack”[27] against the US; (b) capture, which is a “fact-specific, and potentially time-sensitive, question,”[28] must be infeasible, and (c) the operation to kill must be conducted in “a manner consistent with applicable law of war principles.”[29] To be killed, targets must present an “imminent threat,” the first condition.[30] Traditionally, an “imminent threat” means an attack of some sort is about to happen. However, the Administration maintains that al-Qaida “does not behave like a traditional military,”[31] meaning that this conflict is not a traditional war. Specifically, “the Constitution does not require the President to delay action until some theoretical end-stage of planning—when the precise time, place, and manner of an attack become clear,”[32] according to the Administration. So, in accordance with this unconventional war, there is a similarly unconventional definition of “imminent.” DOJ maintains that an “imminent threat” does not require the US “to have clear evidence that a specific attack on US persons and interests will take place in the immediate future,”[33] leading one to question what standard of evidence is required at all. To justify itself, the Administration agrees with the Supreme Court that there must be “the greatest respect and consideration of judgments of military authorities in matters relating to the actual prosecution of war, and…the scope of that discretion is necessarily wide.”[34] DOJ states that it is not required to refrain from action until “preparations for an attack are concluded” because that would not allow the US “sufficient time to defend itself.”[35] Furthermore, for the US to lawfully defend itself, it must demonstrate that the people it defends against are legitimate targets and that the modes of defense are legitimate, which DOJ attempts to root in the traditional laws of war. The US is in armed conflict with al-Qaida and associated forces,[36] making its members legitimate targets of the US military and conduct with them subject to national self-defense laws.[37] Congress designated as enemy combatants those who aid al-Qaida and its associated forces, prompting the Administration to cite the public authority justification[38] when targeting their members.[39] The Administration believes that, as it has the right to detain US citizens who are enemy combatants,[40] it may similarly use lethal force as an “important incident of war,”[41] against those citizens.[42] Although the Administration believes it may only unilaterally conduct a drone strike in a place where al-Qaida is believed to have a “significant and organized presence,”[43] it also believes that there is little geographical limitation of its scope to target al-Qaida militants.[44] Furthermore, although the DOJ White Paper only addresses US citizens in foreign countries, public statements of DOJ suggest that they believe there would also be lawful circumstances in which US citizens on American soil could be killed.[45] The Administration recognizes that its powers are not unlimited, and that even powers granted to it by Congress may not have unlimited scope.[46] However, it believes that these killings are within the bounds of proper executive authority. Even more, under the Administration’s position, there is no mode for the public to police the propriety and legality of targetedkillings by drones, as DOJ believes there is no proper forum for any case that would be brought against the government for its use of the drone program.[47] In effect, the only form of checks and balances here is to trust the US government not to overstep its authority. IV. Criticism of Official Policy The US has indicated that it believes that it may lawfully take out a citizen with a drone. What might a citizen do to trigger this? It is difficult to say, as the government’s asserted justifications are secret and, it claims, broad. If someone is wrongfully killed by a drone, how can his or her family[48] know that they have standing to sue the US government if the program is mostly secret?[49] There is **great confusion** surrounding the administration of US drone strikes, and the government has provided no adequate guidance. Since the US has kept its policies governing the drone program secret, the policy of targeted killings of US citizens is also secret. Such secrecy makes it so that no one can defend himself against the authorization of a drone strike or sue for restitution if accidentally killed. Secrecy is not the only impediment to the public’s understanding of the drone program; more obfuscation arises from the Administration’s own clear contradictions of its own policies. For example, Eric Holder’s letter to Rand Paul indicates that the Administration believes that it is possible legally to take out a US citizen with a drone on US soil, notwithstanding the DOJ White Paper’s requirement that US citizens only be targeted if they are, (a) on foreign soil, and are (b) senior leaders, (c) of al-Qaida. Why? We do not know, rendering the law impermissibly unclear. Furthermore, the Administration has already broken from its own standards. The only US citizen killed who was a senior leader of al-Qaida is Anwar al-Awlaki. An American subordinate of his—who was, in fact, dismissed as collateral damage, and never considered a senior leader publicly—was killed. A few weeks later, al-Awlaki’s son was also killed despite no indication that he was even involved in any terrorism group. The Administration has clearly conducted drone strikes that violate their own stated legal framework for proper and lawful targeted killings. Compounding the issue, the Administration’s rules are built on shaky ground. Hamdi v. Rumsfeld, a case that is crucial foundation for the legal positions taken within the DOJ White Paper, refers to the capture and detainment of a US citizen in combat, not assassination from a distance at a time potentially far removed from the time of attack. Hamdi admits that “while the full protections…may prove unworkable and inappropriate” in combat, “threats to military operations posed by a basic system of independent review are not so weighty as to trump a citizen’s core right to challenge meaningfully the Government’s case and to be heard by an impartial adjudicator.”[50] The right to an impartial adjudicator implies the right to a place and time to be heard, as well as the right to construct and present a case that has a “meaningful” possibility of success. In sum, Hamdi demands that due process of law be maintained outside of the combat setting, which by definition is where targeted killings occur. These rights have been violated with the way that targeted killings have been carried out so far. The Administration maintains that the killing of al-Awlaki’s son was collateral damage rather than the result of an authorized strike specifically against him. But this still means that, as a result, his family is now eligible to sue for restitution.[51] How would al-Awlaki’s son’s family be granted damages from the impartial adjudicator Hamdi calls for if the program that killed him is secret?[52] How could they prove that he was not a legitimate target if the criteria for targeted killings are unknown, or at least not clearly defined? They may not, perhaps most clearly because of DOJ’s position that there is no proper forum for such a trial.[53] Additionally, the secrecy of the program - and the fact that the government maintains that any decisions regarding targeted killing may only be reached through the its own “internal deliberations”[54] - ensures that, before they are killed, targets are impeded in their efforts to collect facts about their case and therefore wage a “meaningful” defense against the government’s accusations. Both of these situations directly violate the right to a robust defense before an impartial adjudicator called for in Hamdi, presenting serious constitutional issues relating to the Fifth Amendment. It is simply incorrect to compare the power to capture someone from the battlefield[55] with the right to be tried before one is killed, considering the right to an impartial adjudicator in a non- combat situation[56] and the highly compelling—in fact, paramount—interest a person has in saving his own life from imposition by the government.[57] The government may cite its own compelling interests and the power to strike secretly, but that is not mutually exclusive from a system with an acceptable level of disclosure. The exact manner and time at which they strike may remain secret, and may conform with the laws of war, but US citizens are entitled to know what they did to be targeted, to contest their targeting in some way, and for their families to pursue just compensation—and be awarded it—if they are wrongfully killed. This is only possible if the families know how and why their kin was killed, and what laws were broken. V. Conclusion and Summary A person has a clear right to due process. It would go too far to suggest that this implies that a person is absolutely free from being killed by the government. However, it is clear that a person has the right to defend himself in court, which requires that the charges against him be made known and the laws that he has broken publicized. The secrecy of the drone program does not allow Americans these protections that the Fifth Amendment requires. **There are alternatives to a fully public trial**—at the very least, a person is entitled to a military tribunal, if not a grand jury, for a capital offense. Being in a state of war does not allow the government to cease following the rule of law, but merely means some of its conduct becomes governed by the laws of war instead. Wartime perhaps permits targeted persons to be tried in absentia, for which there is some precedent,[58] represented by a public defender or his family and their private attorney.[59] If there truly is no “proper forum” in existence, Congress has the power to establish a court[60] with special jurisdiction over these matters. If the US government is concerned about speed,[61] it may establish special courts with a high, but not absolute, level of secrecy that try these cases with special speed.[62] If the government is worried that a publicized drone program will harm the United States’ image, secrecy is doing so already**,** causing speculation that the U.S. has secret agreements with other governments.[63] This further engenders suspicion of America, particularly in countries where citizens only have state-owned media and assume such information is vetted and condoned by the Administration.[64] If the government is concerned that such actions will slow down the U.S., it already has. Rand Paul recently stopped Senate business with a 13-hour filibuster of the architect of the drone program, John Brennan’s, nomination to Director of the CIA in order to force Eric Holder to say whether the Administration would target U.S. citizens on American soil. Holder was forced to respond, thereby delaying other DOJ business. There may be more such delays in the future as dissent, already present,[65] grows. The secrecy of the drone program is harming US citizens and their right to defend themselves and their families’ rights to just compensation if the accused are unjustly harmed. The issue is not that drones as a new technology are inherently problematic, but that they are used as a proxy targeted killing program, the secrecy of which is leveraged to sidestep the provision of Fifth Amendment rights. Americans do not know whether they are targeted, or what they can be targeted for. Due process of law requires these protections, especially when one’s life is at stake. Secrecy prevents these protections from being provided, a clear violation of the Fifth Amendment. There is a distinction between secrecy provided for the purpose of national security and an unacceptable lack of oversight. And it is clear that, with its drone policy, the Administration has not afforded the public the necessary information, rights, and protections it deserves.

#### Prior, judicial oversight fosters capable, procedural decisions – vital to due process

Adelsberg 12 (Samuel, J.D. – Yale Law School, “Bouncing the Executive's Blank Check: Judicial Review and the Targeting of Citizens,” Harvard Law & Policy Review, Summer, 6 Harv. L. & Pol'y Rev. 437, Lexis)

The relevance of these precedents to the targeting of citizens is clear: the constitutional right to due process is alive and well--regardless of geographic location. We now turn to what type of process is due.

III. BRING IN THE COURTS: BRINGING JUDICIAL LEGITIMACY TO TARGETED KILLINGS

The function of this Article is not to argue that targeted killing should be removed from the toolbox of American military options. Targeted killing as a military tactic is here to stay. n34 Targeting strikes have robust bipartisan political support and have become an increasingly relied upon weapon as the United States decreases its presence in Iraq and Afghanistan. n35 The argument being asserted here, therefore, is that in light of the protections the Constitution affords U.S. citizens, there must be a degree of inter-branch process when the government targets such individuals.

The current intra-executive process afforded to U.S. citizens is not only unlawful, but also dangerous. n36 Justice O'Connor acknowledged the danger inherent in exclusively intra-branch process in Hamdi when she asserted that an interrogator is not a neutral decision-maker as the "even purportedly fair adjudicators are disqualified by their interest in the controversy." n37 In rejecting the government's argument that a "separation of powers" analysis mandates a heavily circumscribed role for the courts in these circumstances, Justice O'Connor contended that, in times of conflict, the Constitution "most assuredly envisions a role for all three branches when individual liberties are at stake." n38 Similarly, Justice Kennedy was unequivocal in Boumediene about the right of courts to enforce the Constitution even in times of war. Quoting Chief Justice Marshall in Marbury v. Madison, n39 Kennedy argued that holding "that the political branches may switch the constitution on or off at will would lead to a regime in which they, not this Court, say 'what the law is.'" n40 This sentiment is very relevant to our targeted killing analysis: in the realm of targeted killing, where the deprivation is of one's life, the absence of any "neutral decision-maker" outside the executive branch is a clear violation of due process guaranteed by the Constitution.

Justices O'Connor and Kennedy are pointing to a dangerous institutional tension inherent in any intra-executive process regime. Targeting decisions are no different; indeed, the goal of those charged with targeting citizens like al-Awlaki is not to strike a delicate balance between security [\*444] and liberty but rather, quite single-mindedly, to prevent attacks on the United States. n41 In describing the precarious nature of covert actions, James Baker, a distinguished military judge, noted, "the twin necessities of secrecy and speed may pull as they do against the competing interests of deliberate review, dissent, and informed accountable decision-making." n42 While Judge Baker concluded that these risks "magnify the importance of a meaningful process of ongoing executive appraisal," he overlooked the institutional tension, seized upon by Justices O'Connor and Kennedy, which would preclude the type of process that he was advocating. n43

Although there may be a role for Congress in such instances, a legislative warrant for specific cases would likely be cumbersome, carry significant security risks, and may violate the spirit of the Bill of Attainder Clause, which prohibits the legislature from performing judicial or executive functions. The current inter-branch process for covert actions, in which the President must make a finding and notify the leaders of Congress and the intelligence committees, is entirely ex post and also has not been proven to provide a meaningful check on executive power. n44 Moreover, most politicians are unqualified to make the necessary legal judgments that these situations require.

Solutions calling for the expatriation of citizens deemed to be terrorists are fraught with judicial complications and set very dangerous precedents for citizenship revocation. n45 Any post-deprivation process, such as a Bivens-style action, for a targeted attack would also be problematic. n46 Government officials charged with carrying out these attacks might be hesitant to do so if there were a threat of prosecution. Moreover, post-deprivation process for a target would be effectively meaningless in the wake of a successful attack.

[\*445] Rather, as recognized by the Founders in the Fourth Amendment, balancing the needs of security against the imperatives of liberty is a traditional role for judges to play. Two scholars of national security law recently highlighted the value of judicial inclusion in targeting decisions: "Judicial control of targeted killing could increase the accuracy of target selection, reducing the danger of mistaken or illegal destruction of lives, limbs, and property. Independent judges who double-check targeting decisions could catch errors and cause executive officials to avoid making them in the first place." n47 Judges are both knowledgeable in the law and accustomed to dealing with sensitive security considerations. These qualifications make them ideal candidates to ensure that the executive exercises constitutional restraint when targeting citizens.

Reforming the decision-making process for executing American citizens to allow for judicial oversight would restore the separation of powers framework envisioned by the Founders and increase democratic legitimacy by placing these determinations on steadier constitutional ground. For those fearful of judicial encroachment on executive war-making powers, there is a strong argument that this will actually strengthen the President and empower him to take decisive action without worrying about the judicial consequences. As Justice Kennedy put it, "the exercise of [executive] powers is vindicated, not eroded, when confirmed by the Judicial Branch." n48 Now, we will turn to what this judicial involvement would look like.

#### That’s key to economic leadership and preventing democratic backsliding

Khodorkovsky, 11 [Mikhail, once Russia’s Richest Man, was arrested in 2003 after speaking out against the growing power of then-president Vladimir Putin. He was tried and sentenced to nine years for alleged tax evasion. A second trial last year on new charges, widely viewed as a sham, brought him an additional 14 years.Stop Coddling My Country’s Rulers, http://mag.newsweek.com/2011/09/25/khodorkovsky-america-is-weakening-on-human-rights.html]

If America can still be said to lead the world today, then its leadership is first and foremost a moral one. Millions of people around the world still look to the United States as a lighthouse of freedom. In large part, America’s economic might follows from that moral leadership. People believe in the dollar because they believe in America’s economic model. But they also believe in the values that the U.S. has created at home and promotes in the international arena: political competition, free elections, an independent media and judiciary. Of course, President Obama has to deal with hard realities—one of the hardest being that global economic growth has increased competition for resources, particularly energy resources. And it’s also clear that in times of economic crisis there is a huge temptation to make friends with countries rich in such resources, however obnoxious their regimes, rather than make war against them or antagonize them. But the moral hazard in this kind of appeasement is far greater than its short-term advantages. By ignoring its basic values to make friends with dictators, America risks losing its moral capital—capital that is by no means limitless. If the U.S. fails to live up to the values of its own democracy, faith in the American Dream—that everyone is entitled to a fair chance, a fair say, and a fair hearing—will crumble. Just as important, faith in the fact that democracy is the world’s most successful and effective system of government will crumble, too. There is another way. Return ideals to their rightful, central place in politics, and deal with economic questions in the way that smart, honorable men and women have decided them in times past—through the power of intellect. To take a simple, concrete example, if the U.S. spent as much on saving energy and developing alternative energies as, say, Israel or Germany do, then its dependence on imported oil would be a thing of the past. Politicians seem to shy away from those kinds of farsighted policies because they might lose elections. But is there any doubt that America would be the long-term winner for achieving energy independence? That wouldn’t be a good thing only for America. Regimes in, say, Russia, would have to actually get down to some serious political and economic modernization rather than just paying lip service to reform in nice-sounding but ultimately empty speeches. The time to make a decision is approaching: will America be moral, or merely pragmatic? It’s a crucial decision. For America to turn its back on defending human rights around the world is not just wrong. It’s dangerous. One might say as dangerous as its continued dependence on imported energy. America’s economic might is dependent on its moral leadership: to lose one is to lose the other. If that happens it will be America, not Russia, that will turn out to have been the real loser of the Cold War. And those of us who continue to believe in and fight for the ideals of freedom will find ourselves fighting an even lonelier battle.

#### Democracy prevents global war

Halperin 11 (Morton H., Senior Advisor – Open Society Institute and Senior Vice President of the Center for American Progress, “Unconventional Wisdom – Democracy is Still Worth Fighting For”, Foreign Policy, January / February, <http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2011/01/02/unconventional_wisdom?page=0,11>)

As the United States struggles to wind down two wars and recover from a humbling financial

crisis, realism is enjoying a renaissance. Afghanistan and Iraq bear scant resemblance to the democracies we were promised. The Treasury is broke. And America has a president, Barack Obama, who once compared his foreign-policy philosophy to the realism of theologian Reinhold Niebuhr: "There's serious evil in the world, and hardship and pain," Obama said during his 2008 campaign. "And we should be humble and modest in our belief we can eliminate those things." But one can take such words of wisdom to the extreme-as realists like former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger and writer Robert Kaplan sometimes do, arguing that the United States can't afford the risks inherent in supporting democracy and human rights around the world. Others, such as cultural historian Jacques Barzun, go even further, saying that America can't export democracy at all, "because it is not an ideology but a wayward historical development." Taken too far, such realist absolutism can be just as dangerous, and wrong, as neoconservative hubris. For there is one thing the neocons get right: As I argue in *The Democracy Advantage*, democratic governments are more likely than autocratic regimes to engage in conduct that advances U.S. interests and avoids situations that pose a threat to peace and security. Democratic states are more likely to develop and to avoid famines and economic collapse. They are also less likely to become failed states or suffer a civil war. Democratic states are also more likely to cooperate in dealing with security issues, such as terrorism and proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. As the bloody aftermath of the Iraq invasion painfully shows, democracy cannot be imposed from the outside by force or coercion. It must come from the people of a nation working to get on the path of democracy and then adopting the policies necessary to remain on that path. But we should be careful about overlearning the lessons of Iraq. In fact, the outside world can make an enormous difference in whether such efforts succeed. There are numerous examples-starting with Spain and Portugal and spreading to Eastern Europe, Latin America, and Asia-in which the struggle to establish democracy and advance human rights received critical support from multilateral bodies, including the United Nations, as well as from regional organizations, democratic governments, and private groups. It is very much in America's interest to provide such assistance now to new democracies, such as Indonesia, Liberia, and Nepal, and to stand with those advocating democracy in countries such as Belarus, Burma, and China. It will still be true that the United States will sometimes need to work with a nondemocratic regime to secure an immediate objective, such as use of a military base to support the U.S. mission in Afghanistan, or in the case of Russia, to sign an arms-control treaty. None of that, however, should come at the expense of speaking out in support of those struggling for their rights. Nor should we doubt that America would be more secure if they succeed.

#### Failure to shore up legal safeguards reverberates globally and causes backlash to rights protections

Ghitis, 12 [“On human rights, U.S. must lead — or no one will”, Frida,a world affairs columnist at the World Politics Review, author and consultant. She started her career at CNN, where she worked initially as a show producer, http://www.miamiherald.com/2012/08/06/2930361/on-human-rights-us-must-lead-or.html]

Now, in an unexpected turn of events, Washington’s harshest critics are asking the United States to take an even greater role in world affairs, but to do it for the sake of protecting human rights across the globe. Whoever wins the presidential elections, President Obama or Mitt Romney, human-rights activists, including Amnesty International and the ACLU, are imploring him to move decisively to the forefront of world affairs and take a firm stand in order to prevent genocide, human rights abuses and terrorism. The goal is morally defensible — what could be more important than preventing genocide — but it is also one with strategic benefits for the United States. It turns out the alternative to American leadership is no leadership at all, or not much of one. Often that means conflicts that spiral out of control with disastrous consequences, as we have seen time and time again. America’s relative power has declined significantly, especially in the last half-decade of economic weakness. The powers whose rise has paralleled the American decline, such as China, have shown no inclination to lift a finger in defense of human rights or for the prevention of conflicts that could devastate civilian populations. As far as China, and still Russia, are concerned, conflicts are a problem only in that they interfere with trade or with strategic alliances. But the greatest threat, in their view, is a world that gives itself the right to tell other countries to respect freedoms, because they might later come calling in places like Tibet. As the United States’ ability to shape events diminished, it sought to rely more on international organizations and multilateral partnerships. But time and time again it has become clear that, as Bill Clinton’s Secretary of State Madeleine Albright put it back in the days of the war in Bosnia, America is “the indispensable nation.” Back then, Albright was arguing that the United States should step in and stop the slaughter in the Balkans. The massacres ended rather quickly after U.S. fighter planes started slicing across the sky. In many quarters, American military power is viewed with suspicion. And that’s understandable. But even on the left, among those who care deeply about the suffering of human beings of all nationalities regardless of who their tormentors are, the view that the United States is indispensable is growing. They don’t want to see American soldiers marching across the globe, but they want to see America prevent and solve conflicts and lead the international community to a consensus that human-rights matter. Amnesty International and the ACLU joined in a group of 22 well-known organizations and individuals who recently released a detailed study of the human-rights challenges facing the world — and the American president. They listed the top 10, along with a plaintive appeal that whoever sits in the Oval Office next year should embrace America’s leadership position. They didn’t call for the United States to act alone and didn’t necessarily call for military intervention of any kind, but they noted that “U.S. leadership is critical to effectively address international human-rights issues.” They recommended 10 policies, beginning with the need to “Prioritize U.S. leadership on international norms and universality of human rights.” Not everyone will agree with their second policy recommendation, that America “Act to prevent genocide and mass atrocities,” or the next one, that Washington “Pursue policies that protect people from the threat of terrorism . . . ” Ideally, American actions to prevent genocide and human-rights abuses would not require military action. Making them a priority would enlist international support and help countries everywhere internalize rules of behavior, and send a message that violating them could have consequences. For that, however, there really must be consequences. That includes international condemnation, economic sanctions and, as a final resort, the use of force. The authors of the human-rights paper correctly argue that a policy with a strong focus on human rights makes sense strategically. It’s an argument others, including Albright, have made many times before. When the United States stands for the dignity of individuals against the worst abuses of tyrants, it strengthens its moral core and it becomes a magnet for international support. Doing this is not always easy. It can create enormous practical dilemmas. Still, both Romney and Obama would do well to listen to this group’s advice.

#### The impact is global war

William W. Burke-White 4, Lecturer in Public and International Affairs and Senior Special Assistant to the Dean, Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, Princeton University, Spring 2004, Harvard Human Rights Journal, 17 Harv. Hum. Rts. J. 249, p. 279-280

This Article presents a strategic--as opposed to ideological or normative--argument that the promotion of human rights should be given a more prominent place in U.S. foreign policy. It does so by suggesting a correlation between the domestic human rights practices of states and their propensity to engage in aggressive international conduct. Among the chief threats to U.S. national security are acts of aggression by other states. Aggressive acts of war may directly endanger the United States, as did the Japanese bombing of Pearl Harbor in 1941, or they may require U.S. military action overseas, as in Kuwait fifty years later. Evidence from the post-Cold War period [\*250] indicates that states that systematically abuse their own citizens' human rights are also those most likely to engage in aggression. To the degree that improvements in various states' human rights records decrease the likelihood of aggressive war, a foreign policy informed by human rights can significantly enhance U.S. and global security.¶ Since 1990, a state's domestic human rights policy appears to be a telling indicator of that state's propensity to engage in international aggression. A central element of U.S. foreign policy has long been the preservation of peace and the prevention of such acts of aggression. n2 If the correlation discussed herein is accurate, it provides U.S. policymakers with a powerful new tool to enhance national security through the promotion of human rights. A strategic linkage between national security and human rights would result in a number of important policy modifications. First, it changes the prioritization of those countries U.S. policymakers have identified as presenting the greatest concern. Second, it alters some of the policy prescriptions for such states. Third, it offers states a means of signaling benign international intent through the improvement of their domestic human rights records. Fourth, it provides a way for a current government to prevent future governments from aggressive international behavior through the institutionalization of human rights protections. Fifth, it addresses the particular threat of human rights abusing states obtaining weapons of mass destruction (WMD). Finally, it offers a mechanism for U.S.-U.N. cooperation on human rights issues.

#### Leadership solves extinction

Zhang and Shi 11 Yuhan Zhang is a researcher at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Washington, D.C.; Lin Shi is from Columbia University. She also serves as an independent consultant for the Eurasia Group and a consultant for the World Bank in Washington, D.C., 1/22, “America’s decline: A harbinger of conflict and rivalry”, http://www.eastasiaforum.org/2011/01/22/americas-decline-a-harbinger-of-conflict-and-rivalry/

This does not necessarily mean that the US is in systemic decline, but it encompasses a trend that appears to be negative and perhaps alarming. Although the US still possesses incomparable military prowess and its economy remains the world’s largest, the once seemingly indomitable chasm that separated America from anyone else is narrowing. Thus, the global distribution of power is shifting, and the inevitable result will be a world that is less peaceful, liberal and prosperous, burdened by a dearth of effective conflict regulation. Over the past two decades, no other state has had the ability to seriously challenge the US military. Under these circumstances, motivated by both opportunity and fear, many actors have bandwagoned with US hegemony and accepted a subordinate role. Canada, most of Western Europe, India, Japan, South Korea, Australia, Singapore and the Philippines have all joined the US, creating a status quo that has tended to mute great power conflicts. However, as the hegemony that drew these powers together withers, so will the pulling power behind the US alliance. The result will be an international order where power is more diffuse, American interests and influence can be more readily challenged, and conflicts or wars may be harder to avoid. As history attests, power decline and redistribution result in military confrontation. For example, in the late 19th century America’s emergence as a regional power saw it launch its first overseas war of conquest towards Spain. By the turn of the 20th century, accompanying the increase in US power and waning of British power, the American Navy had begun to challenge the notion that Britain ‘rules the waves.’ Such a notion would eventually see the US attain the status of sole guardians of the Western Hemisphere’s security to become the order-creating Leviathan shaping the international system with democracy and rule of law. Defining this US-centred system are three key characteristics: enforcement of property rights, constraints on the actions of powerful individuals and groups and some degree of equal opportunities for broad segments of society. As a result of such political stability, free markets, liberal trade and flexible financial mechanisms have appeared. And, with this, many countries have sought opportunities to enter this system, proliferating stable and cooperative relations. However, what will happen to these advances as America’s influence declines? Given that America’s authority, although sullied at times, has benefited people across much of Latin America, Central and Eastern Europe, the Balkans, as well as parts of Africa and, quite extensively, Asia, the answer to this question could affect global society in a profoundly detrimental way. Public imagination and academia have anticipated that a post-hegemonic world would return to the problems of the 1930s: regional blocs, trade conflicts and strategic rivalry. Furthermore, multilateral institutions such as the IMF, the World Bank or the WTO might give way to regional organisations. For example, Europe and East Asia would each step forward to fill the vacuum left by Washington’s withering leadership to pursue their own visions of regional political and economic orders. Free markets would become more politicised — and, well, less free — and major powers would compete for supremacy. Additionally, such power plays have historically possessed a zero-sum element. In the late 1960s and 1970s, US economic power declined relative to the rise of the Japanese and Western European economies, with the US dollar also becoming less attractive. And, as American power eroded, so did international regimes (such as the Bretton Woods System in 1973). A world without American hegemony is one where great power wars re-emerge, the liberal international system is supplanted by an authoritarian one, and trade protectionism devolves into restrictive, anti-globalisation barriers. This, at least, is one possibility we can forecast in a future that will inevitably be devoid of unrivalled US primacy.

#### Scenario Two: Legal Crises

#### Obama’s white paper defended due process for citizens, but executive implementation creates a legal disaster that wrecks due process – providing notice and opportunity is key

Feldman 13 (Noah, Professor of Constitutional and International Law – Harvard University, “Obama’s Drone Attack on Your Due Process,” Bloomberg, 2-8, <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2013-02-08/obama-s-drone-attack-on-your-due-process.html>)

\*gender modified

The biggest problem with the recently disclosed Obama administration white paper defending the drone killing of radical clerk Anwar al-Awlaki isn’t its secrecy or its creative redefinition of the words “imminent threat.” It is the revolutionary and shocking transformation of the meaning of due process.

Fortunately, as seen during John Brennan’s confirmation hearing for Central Intelligence Agency director, Congress is starting to notice.

Due process is the oldest and most essential component of the rule of law. It goes back to the Magna Carta, when the barons insisted that King John agree not to kill anyone or take property without following legal procedures.

What they meant -- and what has been considered the essence of due process since -- is that the accused must be notified of the charges against him and have the opportunity to have his[\*/her\*] case heard by an impartial decision maker. If you get due process, you can’t complain about the punishment that follows. If you don’t get that opportunity, you’ve been the victim of arbitrary power.

Are U.S. enemies entitled to due process? Well, no -- not if they are arrayed against the country on the battlefield. In war, you don’t try the enemy. You kill him, preferably before he kills you. And if some of the Japanese troops at Guadalcanal had held U.S. citizenship, it wouldn’t have suddenly given them due process rights. If Awlaki was an enemy fighting on the battlefield, he wouldn’t have deserved due process while the fight was on. Off it, he should legally be like any other U.S. citizen, innocent until proven guilty.

Generous Idea

Yet, despite claiming that the Awlaki killing was justified because he was an operational leader of al-Qaeda, and thus in some sense an enemy on the battlefield, the white paper still assumes that due process applies to U.S. citizens abroad who adhere to the enemy. On the surface, this sounds plausible and even generous: Why not consider the possibility that a U.S. citizen abroad has some rights against being killed out of the blue?

In fact, though, applying due process analysis to Awlaki produces a legal disaster. The problem is, once you consider due process, you have to give it some meaning -- and the meaning you choose will cast a long shadow over what the term means everywhere else.

The white paper uses two Supreme Court cases to assess what process is due to an American about to be killed by a drone. The first, Mathews v. Eldridge, is a 1976 case in which the court held that the elaborate administrative processes necessary after a person lost his Social Security disability benefits were constitutionally acceptable even though there was no evidentiary hearing before the benefits were terminated. In that case, the court said that the process due could be determined by balancing the individual’s interest against the government’s.

The other case was 2004’s Hamdi v. Rumsfeld, where the court held that a detained enemy combatant -- in custody, not on the battlefield -- must receive “notice of the factual basis for his classification, and a fair opportunity to rebut the Government’s factual assertions before a neutral decision- maker.”

Astonishingly, the white paper follows its summary of these decisions with the bald assertion that a citizen outside U.S. territory can be killed if a high-level official determines that he poses an imminent threat, it would be unfeasible to capture him and the laws of war would otherwise permit the killing.

Never Explained

The non sequitur is breathtaking. Awlaki wouldn’t receive notice, the opportunity to be heard or a hearing before a decision maker. In other words, he would receive none of the components of traditional due process -- not even one. How the absence of due process could be magically transformed into its satisfaction is never stated or explained. All we get is the assertion that a target’s interest in life must be “balanced against” the government’s interest in protecting other Americans. On this theory, no due process would be due to those accused of murder, because their lives would have to be balanced against the government’s interest in protecting their potential victims.

#### Obama relies on internal review to legally say targeted killing meets due process – external review prevents manipulation of the law that weakens it in other areas

Powell 13 (Jeff, Professor of Law – Duke University School of Law, Former Member – Justice Department’s Office of Legal Counsel, Former Deputy Assistant Attorney, “Jeff Powell on Targeted Killing and Due Process,” Lawfare Blog, 6-21, <http://www.lawfareblog.com/2013/06/jeff-powell-on-targeted-killing-and-due-process/>)

There is much to admire in the speech President Barack Obama gave on May 23rd in which he gave us his views on “lethal, targeted action” against high ranking members of al-Qaeda and its allies, above all his acknowledgment that the “laws constrain the power of the President, even during wartime.” For all his speech’s virtues, however, Mr. Obama’s comments about one legal issue, due process, should disturb us deeply. In discussing his insistence “on strong oversight of all lethal action,” the President stated, “for the record,” that he “do[es] not believe it would be constitutional for the government to target and kill any U.S. citizen – with a drone, or a shotgun – without due process.” Mr. Obama had just referred to the killing of Anwar Awlaki, whose death was “the one instance when we targeted an American citizen,” and he plainly was not confessing constitutional error. There is no serious doubt, then, that the President thinks that the US government deprived Mr. Awlaki of his life with due process. Unfortunately, Mr. Obama’s discussion of that issue is fundamentally flawed in two ways: first, in his assumption that due process applies at all, and second, in his belief that the administration’s procedures satisfy due process.

The President’s blanket assertion that our government must always provide due process before killing a citizen may seem self-evident – after all, the Fifth Amendment demands that no person (not citizen!) shall be deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of law — but Mr. Obama was wrong nonetheless. Due process requires fairness in government’s dealings with those it governs; it simply does not apply to military decisions, in hostilities that Congress has authorized, about attacking members of enemy forces who are not under American control. Mr. Obama was not justifying the killing of Mr. Awlaki as an extrajudicial execution but as the elimination of a particular enemy officer in the field as an act of war. The Constitution imposes other constraints on presidential action in a time of war, but due process has no role in what the Supreme Court’s 2004 decision in Hamdi v. Rumsfeld termed “the Executive in its exchanges …with enemy organizations in times of conflict.”

If there is no constitutional due process requirement at all, why does it matter that Mr. Obama assumes that there is? Is there any real harm in putting forth a standard for meeting a burden that doesn’t exist? There is, because the President’s reasoning may undercut the meaning of due process in other circumstances where the constitutional requirement does apply.

From comments he and other officials have made, and from the Justice Department “White Paper” that was leaked earlier this year, what he had in mind seems clear: it is the “strong oversight” over targeting decisions that the President himself has mandated that he and his advisors believe satisfies the Constitution. The White Paper lays out the argument: the executive branch itself has provided a targeted US citizen due process because only high-level members of al-Qaeda and its allies are targeted, the decision to use lethal force is made by an “informed, high-level official of the U.S. government,” that official must determine that the potential target poses an “imminent threat of violent attack,” and it must not be feasible to capture the individual without excessive risk to the lives of American personnel or vital American interests. As the President put it, Mr. Awlaki “was continuously trying to kill people” as part of his role in al-Qaeda, and although Mr. Obama “would have detained and prosecuted Awlaki if we captured him before he carried out a plot … we couldn’t.”

I have no objection to the procedures that the White Paper outlines: indeed they are roughly the sort of careful decisionmaking that I would hope my government would employ in such a grave matter. (Whether our current practices of targeted killing are a wise or even moral policy overall is another question.) Nor am I criticizing the determination that Mr. Awlaki met the White Paper’s targeting criteria: I have no reason or inclination to doubt the President’s view of the facts. But the White Paper’s claim that these laudable procedures amount to due process is quite indefensible.

The White Paper (correctly) invoked the Hamdi v. Rumsfeld decision for the due process analysis that applies in the war against al-Qaeda, but its understanding of the Constitution’s requirements could hardly be more at odds with the discussion of “the central meaning of procedural due process” in Justice Sandra Day O’Connor’s lead opinion: “Parties whose rights are to be affected are entitled to be heard; and in order that they may enjoy that right they must first be notified. It is equally fundamental that the right to notice and an opportunity to be heard must be granted at a meaningful time and in a meaningful manner,” and they must be heard by a “neutral and detached judge.” “These essential constitutional promises may not be eroded,” Justice O’Connor concluded, but the White Paper – and I think we can assume the President as well – apparently find these promises inapplicable in the context of targeted killings.

It takes only a moment’s reflection to see that the President’s laudable procedures for imposing “strong oversight” over targeting decisions are worlds apart from Hamdi’s “essential constitutional promises” – indeed, it is hard to imagine how a military decision about attacking an enemy combatant could be otherwise. Of course the White Paper does not propose that potential targets be given notice of the government’s possible interest in killing them. Of course it does not contemplate, much less require, that a targeted individual be heard at any time or in any manner as to why the government is mistaken about his identity or activities. Of course it does not provide for a neutral and detached decisionmaker to resolve any factual uncertainty: the ultimate decisionmaker here is the President in his capacity as commander in chief, who (we should hope) is not in the least neutral or detached in carrying out his responsibility for national security. Calling the executive’s own procedures the due process that is meant to check arbitrary executive decisions isn’t merely an erosion of the “essential constitutional promises” but their wholesale repudiation. If Mr. Awlaki was entitled to due process, then his killing violated the Constitution.

Since due process doesn’t apply to a US military decision, in a situation of actual and authorized hostilities, to attack a member of the enemy’s forces who is a legitimate target under the law of war, the Constitution was not in fact violated. But my concern here is to identify the patent error in the White Paper’s and the President’s thinking about due process, because that error is likely to confuse our thinking about the wisdom and morality of targeted killing. The decision to kill a known, identified human being is a brutal one, the action of doing so is ugly to think about, even apart from the fact that sometimes other people die (as Mr. Obama acknowledged with sorrow). This brutality and ugliness are part of the grim reality of war. When we pretend to ourselves that our procedures for making such decisions satisfies the constitutional requirements of due process, we cast a veil of civility and even humanity over something that is inherently violent and dehumanizing.

I am not a pacifist, and I accept that the brutality of war is sometimes unavoidable. But the law’s antiseptic language about the weighing and balancing of interests according to “the traditional due process analysis” that supplies the legal “framework for assessing the process due a U.S. citizen” (I quote from the White Paper) masks, in a deeply misleading fashion, the brutality, the terror and the violence of war – even if we are right to conclude that we should take lethal action against our enemies. It serves no good purpose for the President and his advisors, or for any of us as citizens, to pretend that targeted killing is or can be anything other than the brutality it is.

The problem with the President’s constitutional error is not limited to its power to confuse our thinking about the reality of targeted killing. Once a legal argument gains legitimacy in the courts, or among executive officials, or in public discussion, it tends to expand beyond its original boundaries – the intellectual habits of lawyers and the traditional legalism of American public debate make this almost inevitable. By dint of repetition if nothing else, the claim that the executive’s own internal cogitations can amount to constitutional due process threatens to acquire the sort of legitimacy that will tempt future lawyers, and future Presidents, to apply it in other contexts. During World War Two, Justice Robert Jackson rejected the government’s argument that it was constitutional to intern US citizens purely on the basis of their Japanese ancestry because the decision rested on the executive’s claim of military necessity. Jackson didn’t propose that the courts interfere with the military’s actions, but he vigorously objected to anyone rationalizing the decision as constitutional. Accept that conclusion, Jackson wrote, and “[t]he principle then lies about like a loaded weapon ready for the hand of any authority that can bring forward a plausible claim of an urgent need.” The same worry applies to the President’s rewriting of what due process requires. Neither Mr. Obama nor anyone else can foresee or prevent future claims that we must turn the idea of due process on its head because of some perceived need to do so. The President and his advisors should rethink the White Paper’s faulty reasoning, and we should all keep in view the difference between “the essential constitutional promises” due process embodies, and the modes of military decision that our government employs in waging war.

#### Independently – culminates in misuse of drones in Mexico

Sager and Schneider 13 (Josh and Dan, Writers – The Boston Occupier, “America’s Dangerous Drone Precedent: A Secret and Unaccountable Program of Targeted Killings,” Progressive Cynic, 1-29, <http://theprogressivecynic.com/2013/01/29/americas-dangerous-drone-precedent-a-secret-and-unaccountable-program-of-targeted-killings/>)

In addition to their use as a tool in extrajudicial assassination, drones are quickly becoming a hot-ticket item for government agencies that want to conduct surveillance. U.S. Customs and Border Protection currently operates nine drones, using them for border and drug trafficking surveillance; Homeland Security has used them to support FEMA during disaster relief operations; and the Seattle Police Department recently caused a stir when the Mayor and City Council found out that they were operating a pair of surveillance drones.

Support for laissez-faire regulation of this new industry is likely to find a home in the new Congress. Changes between the 112th and 113th sessions haven’t done much to alter the makeup of the House Unmanned Systems Caucus, a bipartisan group of Representatives that collectively received over $8 million in campaign donations from drone manufacturers during the 2012 elections. In early 2012, the “drone caucus” was instrumental in shaping the Federal Aviation Administration Authorization Act (FAAAA), a law passed annually to approve funding for the FAA. This year’s FAAAA contained a special section addressing unmanned aerial vehicles, and specifically requests that both representatives of the aviation and drone industries have a say in crafting how drones are deployed within the country.

This kind of private-public partnership strengthens as the use of drones for surveillance and war around the world increases, and will surely have a strong influence over which countries will have access to this technology, and will set the terms for how it is used. A September study released by NYU and Stanford pointed out the dangers in allowing drone use to spread without a legal framework for their sale and use.

When it comes to them being as a tool of war, researchers ominously noted that:

“US practices may also facilitate recourse to lethal force around the globe by establishing dangerous precedents for other governments. As drone manufacturers and officials successfully reduce export control barriers, and as more countries develop lethal drone technologies, these risks increase.”

Three months into the Afghanistan War, Ali Qaed Sinan al-Harithi and five others (including a U.S. citizen) became the first six fatalities of the U.S. drone program. Not in Afghanistan, however, but in Yemen. In 2001, the U.S. justified the strikes similarly to how Israel, during the First Intifada, justified its own “targeted killing” program. The U.S. said that because Harithi could not possibly be arrested, and was alleged to be a member of al-Qaeda, it was legal to kill him because the U.S. was “at war” with terrorism and this conflict justified ignoring the sovereignty of another state.

Without the constraint of an enforceable international law, there may be too few barriers in place to stop other nations from exploiting the same loopholes that the U.S. has to kill members of groups they deem ‘terrorists’—say, Mexican drug cartels or the Free Syrian Army—but their own citizens, as well. Seen in this light, the assassinations of Harithi, Awlaki, and thousands of others are not mere casualties of short-term war; they are the first dead in new breed of globalized warfare, bound only by feasibility and the size of one’s defense budget.

#### That will destroy relations

News 7-24 (Mexico’s News Service, “US, Mexico talk bilateral security,” 7-24, <http://www.thenews.com.mx/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=12173&Itemid=276>)

Delegates from Mexico and the U.S. met near the countries’ border on Tuesday to discuss security and immigration issues. Mexican Interior Secretary Miguel Ángel Osorio Chong held talks with counterpart Janet Napolitano at the U.S.-Mexico Binational Meeting in Tamaulipas.

The meeting took place behind closed doors, and delegates did not share details on any outcomes. Osorio Chong said in his twitter account prior to the meeting that the Mexico and the U.S. “share a vision of a dynamic and secure border, implicating a shared responsibility.” Border security has been hotly discussed in both countries since the U.S. Senate passed an immigration reform bill that would see border security tightened and the estimated 11 million undocumented immigrants living in the U.S. given a path to citizenship.

Mexico’s relationship with the U.S. has been under the spotlight after former President Felipe Calderón was accused of allowing U.S. agencies conduct surveillance operations in Mexico, causing uproar among the Mexican public. President Enrique Peña Nieto said that if found to be true, the operations would have been “totally unacceptable.” The U.S. is also known to have flown surveillance drones over Mexico in the fight against organized crime.

#### The impact is extinction

Selee and Wilson, 12- Andrew Selee is Vice President for Programs and Senior Advisor to the Mexico Institute and Christopher Wilson is an associate with the Mexico Institute, (Andrew and Christopher, Wilson Center, November 2012, [http://www.wilsoncenter.org/sites/default/files/a\_new\_agenda\_with\_mexico.pdf)](http://www.wilsoncenter.org/sites/default/files/a_new_agenda_with_mexico.pdf)//sawyer)

The depth of economic ties with Mexico, together with declines in illegal immigration and organized crime violence in Mexico, Open up an opportunity for U.S. policymakers to deepen the economic relationship with Mexico and to engage Mexico more on major global issues. Security cooperation, especially strengthening institutions for rule of law and disrupting money laundering, will remain important to the relationship, and there are clear opportunities to reform the U.S. legal immigration system over the next few years, which would have important implications for the relationship with Mexico. The strongest engagement, going forward, is likely to be on the economic issues that can help create jobs for people on both sides of the border, and on the shared global challenges that both countries face. Few countries will shape America’s future as much as Mexico. The two countries share a 2,000 mile border, and Mexico is the second largest destination for U.S. exports and third source of oil for the U.S. market. A quarter of all U.S. immigrants are from Mexico, and one in ten Americans are of Mexican descent. Joint security challenges, including both terrorist threats and the violent operations of drug cartels, have forced the two governments to work more closely than ever. What’s more, cooperation has now extended to a range of other global issues, from climate change to economic stability. Nonetheless, the landscape of U.S.-Mexico relations is changing. and organized crime violence, which has driven much of the recent cooperation, is finally declining. Violence will remain a critical issue, but economic issues—bilateral and global—have risen to the fore as both countries struggle to emerge from the global slowdown. Trade has increased dramatically, connecting the manufacturing base of the two countries as never before, so that gains in one country benefit the other. To keep pace with these changes, U.S. policymakers will need to deepen the agenda with Mexico to give greater emphasis to economic issues, including ways to spur job creation, and they will have opportunities to strengthen cooperation on global issues. Security cooperation will remain critical, and determined but nuanced followthrough to dismantle the operations of criminal groups on both sides of the border will be needed to continue the drop in violence. With less illegal immigration, it will be easier to address legal migration in new ways. However, economic issues are likely to dominate the bilateral agenda for the first time in over a decade. Strengthening economic ties and creating Jobs In most trading relationships, the U.S. simply buys or sells finished goods to another country. However, with its neighbors, Mexico and Canada, the U.S. actually co-manufactures products. Indeed, roughly 40 percent of all content in Mexican exports to the United States originates in the United States. The comparable figures with China, Brazil, and India are four, three, and two percent respectively. Only Canada, at 25 percent, is similar. With the economies of North America deeply linked, growth in one country benefits the others, and lowering the transaction costs of goods crossing the common borders among these three countries helps put money in the pockets of both workers and consumers. Improving border ports of entry is critical to achieving this and will require moderate investments in infrastructure and staffing, as well as the use of new risk management techniques and the expansion of pre-inspection and trusted shipper programs to speed up border crossing times. Transportation costs could be further lowered — and competitiveness further strengthened — by pursuing an Open Skies agreement and making permanent the cross-border trucking pilot program. While these are generally seen as border issues, the benefits accrue to all U.S. states that depend on exports and joint manufacturing with Mexico, including Michigan, Ohio, Nebraska, Iowa, South Dakota, New Hampshire, and Georgia, to name just a few. Mexico also has both abundant oil reserves and one of the largest stocks of shale gas in the world. The country will probably pursue a major energy reform over the next couple years that could spur oil and gas production, which has been declining over the past decade. If that happens, it is certain to detonate a cycle of investment in the Mexican economy, could significantly contribute to North American energy security, and may open a space for North American discussions about deepened energy cooperation Reinforcing Security cooperation Organized crime groups based in Mexico supply most of the cocaine, heroin, and methamphetamines, and some of the marijuana, to U.S. consumers, who, in return, send six to nine billion dollars to Mexico each year that fuels the violence associated with this trade. The U.S. and Mexican governments have significantly improved intelligence sharing, which has helped weaken many of these criminal networks and disrupt some of their financial flows. At the same time, the congressionally funded Merida Initiative, which has provided $1.6 billion to Mexico for national and public security since 2008, has been successfully strengthening the Mexican government’s capacity and rule of law institutions. These efforts appear to be yielding some success as violence has dropped noticeably since mid-2011. Going forward, the two countries will need to do more to disrupt the southbound flows of illegal money and weapons that supply the criminal groups, strengthen communities under the stress of violence, and improve the performance of police, prosecutors, and courts in Mexico. In many ways, Mexico has been successful at turning a national security threat into a public security threat, but the country now requires significant investment to create an effective and accountable criminal justice system and to slow the flow of illegal funds from the U.S. that undermine these efforts. As Mexico’s security crisis begins to recede, the two countries will also have to do far more to strengthen the governments of Central America, which now face a rising tide of violence as organized crime groups move southward. Mexico is also a U.S. ally in deterring terrorist threats and promoting robust democracy in the Western Hemisphere, and there will be numerous opportunities to strengthen the already active collaboration as growing economic opportunities reshape the region’s political and social landscape managing Legal migration flows Since 2007, the number of Mexican migrants illegally entering the United States has dropped to historically low levels, with a net outflow of unauthorized immigrants from the U.S. over the past three years. The drop is partially because of the weak U.S. economy, but it also has to do with more effective U.S. border enforcement and better economic opportunities in Mexico. This shift offers the potential for both countries to explore new approaches to migration for the first time in a decade In the United States, policymakers have an opportunity to look specifically at how to reform the legal immigration system. Almost all sides agree that the current immigration system, originally developed in the 1960s, fails to address the realities of a twenty-first century economy. A renewed discussion on this issue could focus on how to restructure the U.S. visa system to bring in the kinds of workers and entrepreneurs the United States needs to compete globally in the future. This includes both high-skilled and lowerskilled workers, who fill important gaps in the U.S. economy. Policymakers should consider whether those already in the United States, who have set down roots and are contributing effectively to the economy and their communities, might also be able to apply through a restructured visa system. Mexican policymakers, on the other hand, have huge opportunities to consolidate Mexico’s burgeoning middle class in those communities where out-migration has been a feature of life so as to make sure that people no longer need to leave the country to get ahead. There are a number of ambitious efforts, including some led by Mexican migrants that can serve as models for this. Mexican policymakers could also facilitate U.S. reform efforts by indicating how they could help cooperate with a new U.S. visa system if the U.S. Congress moves forward on a legal immigration reform. Addressing Major Global Issues With Mexico Over the past few years, the U.S. and Mexican governments have expanded beyond the bilateral agenda to work closely together on global issues, from climate change to international trade and the economic crisis. The U.S. government should continue to take advantage of the opportunities this creates for joint problem-solving. Mexico’s active participation in the G-20, which it hosted in 2012, and in the U.N. Framework on Climate Change, which it hosted in 2010, have helped spur this collaboration, and the recent accession of Mexico into the Trans-Pacific Partnership negotiations provides one obvious avenue to continue it. The two countries also coordinate more extensively than ever before on diplomatic issues, ranging from the breakdown of democratic order in Honduras to Iran’s nuclear ambitions. Mexico is likely to play an increasingly active role on global economic and environmental issues, areas where the country has significant experience, and through cooperative efforts the U.S. can take advantage of Mexico’s role as a bridge between the developed and developing worlds, and between North America and Latin America. The bilateral agenda will remain critically important —and the increasingly deep integration of the two economies and societies means that efforts on trade, security, and migration will remain vital for the future of both countries. In addition, the maturation of the bilateral relationship means that it may one day resemble that between the United States and Canada, in which global issues can be as important as the strictly bilateral issues. A balanced and wide-ranging U.S.-Mexico agenda—one that seeks creative and collaborative approaches on topics ranging from local gangs to global terrorist networks and from regional supply chains to international finance—promises significant mutually beneficial results in the coming years. Key Recommendations Work together with Mexico and Canada to strengthen regional competitiveness and to grow North American exports to the world. Economic issues can drive the next phase in deepening U.S.-Mexico cooperation. Investments in trusted shipper programs, pre-inspection programs, and enhanced border infrastructure will be crucial. Deepen support for Mexico’s criminal justice institutions, and strengthen U.S. antimoney laundering efforts in order to combat organized crime and violence. Reform the legal immigration system to ensure U.S. labor needs are met for both high-skilled and low-skilled workers, and incorporate those who are already contributing to the U.S. economy and their communities. Engage Mexico more actively on hemispheric and extra-hemispheric foreign policy issues, ranging from terrorism to international trade and finance, as Mexico’s role as a global power grows.

#### India models US due process reforms

Mate, ‘10

[Manoj, “The Origins of Due Process in India: The Role of

Borrowing in Personal Liberty and Preventive

Detention Cases,” Berkeley Journal of International Law, v. 28, no. 1, <http://scholarship.law.berkeley.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1381&context=bjil>]

How did the Indian Supreme Court overcome the lack of a due process clause, a prolix Constitution designed to limit the power of the Court and a legacy of positivism and parliamentary sovereignty inherited from British rule to develop a doctrine of due process? As previous scholars have noted, the Constituent Assembly designed the Indian Court to be a relatively weak institution in a system in which the parliament and the executive were supreme,3 and most justices of the Court in its early years operated in the British traditions of legal positivism and deference to Parliament.4 Leading scholarship on Indian law highlights the significant shift from a more formal, positivist interpretive approach to the Indian Constitution, exemplified by the Court's decision in Gopalan v. State of Madras (1950), to the more expansive approach adopted by the Indian Court in Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India (1978) in which the court adopted an activist approach to interpreting the fundamental rights and effectively created new doctrines of due process and nonarbitrariness. 5 What the literature highlighted as groundbreaking in Maneka Gandhi was the court's recognition of "an implied substantive component to the term "liberty" in Article 21 that provides broad protection of individual freedom against unreasonable or arbitrary curtailment."6 However, this Article analyzes how the Court's use of foreign precedent underwent a fundamental transformation in a line of cases preceding Maneka, which helps to account for the development of substantive due process in the specific area of preventive detention and personal liberty. Thus, the Maneka Gandhi decision cannot be understood as a sudden, synoptic change. Rather, I contend that the move toward substantive due process was a gradual one, in which universalist approaches gradually overcame particularist ones, through close analysis of a series of key decisions involving personal liberty: Gopalan v. State of Madras (1950), Kharak Singh v. State of Punjab (1964), Govind v. State of Madhya Pradesh (1975), and Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India (1978). This Article specifically examines how the Indian Supreme Court used U.S. and foreign precedent in its interpretation of the right to life and liberty contained in Article 21 of the Indian Constitution, examining the role of judicial borrowing in the Court's move toward more expansive, substantive interpretive approaches. 7 It then considers several explanatory factors that help shed light on this shift in the Court, including: an emphasis on "borrowing" of American and other foreign legal precedents and norms, institutional changes in the Court, and direct American influence in the development of Indian law, changes in the education, training and background of judges, and finally the changed political environment and context of the post-Emergency period (1977-1979) in India.

#### That's key to their Constitutional model—they have a strong judiciary, but this determines their democratic credentials

Mehta, 7

[Pratap Bhanu, president -- the Centre for Policy Research, New Delhi, “India’s Unlikely Democracy: The Rise of Judicial Sovereignty,” Journal of Democracy, v. 18, no. 2, http://www.journalofdemocracy.org/articles/gratis/Mehta-18-2.pdf]

The Indian Supreme Court’s chief duty is to interpret and enforce the Constitution of 1950. Running to more than a hundred-thousand words in its English-language version, this document is the longest basic law of any of the world’s independent countries. It contains, at latest count, 444 articles and a dozen schedules. Since its original adoption, it has been amended more than a hundred times, and now fills about 250 printed pages. It is fair to say that the Supreme Court, operating under the aegis of this book-sized liberal constitution, has by and large played a significant and even pivotal role in sustaining India’s liberal-democratic institutions and upholding the rule of law.1 The Court’s justices, who by law now number twenty-six, have over the years carved out an independent role for the Court in the matter of judicial appointments and transfers, upheld extensive judicial review of executive action, and even declared several constitutional amendments unconstitutional. The Court upon which they sit is one of the world’s most powerful judicial bodies, and yet precisely because of this its career has been and remains shadowed by irony and controversy, with implications for democracy that are both positive and problematic. A simple issue-wise scorecard of the Court’s contribution to maintaining liberty and the rule of law might begin by noting that the Court has generally upheld basic freedoms associated with liberal democracy, albeit with some glaring exceptions. The Court has a relatively weak record when it comes to questioning executive action in cases of preventive detention. While the Court has generally upheld the right to free expression, it has given the state more leeway in banning books—particularly those held to offend religious sensibilties—that officials fear may threaten public order. During the period of emergency rule declared at the instigation of Prime Minister Indira Gandhi from June 1975 to March 1977, the Supreme Court shrank from its duty and—in a now universally condemned decision— chose supinely to concur with the executive’s suspension of the writ of habeas corpus. Besides protecting the basic liberties that put the “liberal” in India’s liberal democracy, the Court has helped to ensure the polity’s democratic character by safeguarding the integrity of the electoral process. The Court has acted to curb the central government’s tendency to misuse Article 356 as a pretext to sack elected state governments and install “president’s rule” instead. Supreme Court interventions have also promoted democratic transparency by making political candidates meet fuller norms of disclosure. The Supreme Court’s record in promoting decentralized governance is mixed. On the one hand, the Court has ensured the integrity of Indian federalism by pronouncing that the central government cannot dismiss a state government without a high threshold of public justification. On the other hand, courts across the country have been less receptive to the claims of lower tiers of government against state governments. The Supreme Court has so far proven unable to clarify the law in this area. While the social and economic rights that the Constitution lists were not at first deemed justiciable, the Supreme Court has managed over the years to apply a more substantive conception of equality that justices have used to uphold rights to health, education, and shelter, among others. To one degree or another, the executive branch has responded by at least trying to make provisions for the guarantee of these rights. The Court’s greatest judicial innovation—and the most important vehicle for the expansion of its powers—has been its institution of Public-Interest Litigation (PIL). In PIL cases, the Court relaxes the normal legal requirements of “standing” and “pleading,” which require that litigation be pressed by a directly affected party or parties, and instead allows anyone to approach it seeking correction of an alleged evil or injustice. Such cases also typically involve the abandonment of adversarial fact-finding in favor of Court-appointed investigative and monitoring commissions. Finally, in PIL matters the Court has expanded its own powers to the point that it sometimes takes control over the operations of executive agencies. The PIL movement has allowed all kinds of public-interest matters to be heard, and given hundreds of poor people a route by which to approach the Court. While PIL cases to date have had mixed success at shrinking poverty or correcting injustices, the provision of a forum to which citizens marginalized by the corruptions of routine politics can turn has arguably given serious moral and psychological reinforcement to the legitimacy of the democratic system. In the Shadow of Irony The Indian Supreme Court’s undeniable contributions to democracy and the rule of law, to say nothing of its reachings for power in service of these aims, are shadowed by three profound ironies. First, even as the nation’s most senior judicial panel engages in high-profile PIL interventions, routine access to justice remains extremely difficult. India’s federal judicial system has a backlog of almost twenty million cases, thousands of prisoners are awaiting trial, and the average time it takes to get a judgment has been steadily increasing. There is a saying in India that you do not get punishment after due process—due process is the punishment.

#### Key to Asian political and economic stability

Chadda, ‘8

[Maya, professor of political science -- William Patterson University, research fellow, Southern Asia Institute -- Columbia University, Winter, “Human Rights and Democracy in India's Emerging Role in Asia,” <http://csis.org/files/media/csis/pubs/090201_bsa_chadda.pdf>]

The “Look East” policy suggests that New Delhi is actively globalizing its diplomatic leverage and deploying military power to buttress diplomacy. India is Asia’s third largest economy after Japan and China and has entered into numerous free trade agreements with East Asian economies, including a comprehensive economic cooperation agreement with Singapore and an early harvest scheme with Thailand. It is also negotiating similar agreements with Japan, South Korea, and ASEAN. In turn, Japan, South Korea, and Singapore have invested large amounts of funds into India's infrastructure development.28 **What role can India’s democratic credentials play in Asia’s emerging security environment?** While India is reluctant to promote democratic forces in Myanmar (for fear of losing advantage to China), it is willing to participate in constructing a grand narrative that will secure its forward thrust in Southeast Asia. In his speech before a joint session of India's parliament in August 2007,Japanese Prime Minister Shinzo Abe talked about common interests among of democratic states such as India, Japan and the United States. He included India in a "broader Asia" that would span "the entirety of the Pacific Ocean, incorporating the United States and Australia." This was undoubtedly an invitation to India to participate in building a normative and security architecture for Asia but in its subtext it is also a subtle warning to Beijing that a China-centered Asia would not be countenanced by the “democratic” states in Asia. Abe noted that these states comprise as "Arc of Freedom and Prosperity" of "like-minded countries" that "share fundamental values such as freedom, democracy and respect for basic human rights as well as strategic interests." Shinzo Abe is the third successive Japanese prime minister to visit India after Yoshiro Mori in 2000 and Koizumi in 2005. Manmohan Singh's 2006 visit culminated in signing of the "joint statement Towards Japan-India strategic and Global Partnership."29 India can make significant security contributions to the alliance of “democratic” states envisaged in Premier Abe’s speech. This has been steadily demonstrated in the joint naval exercises with Singapore since 1993, with Vietnam in 2000, and with Indonesia in the Andaman Sea. The Malabar CY 07-2 naval exercises in the Bay of Bengal held in September 2007 brought the navies of Japan, United States, Australia, and India together in a well advertised, large-scale exercise. The joint statement by the Japan, United States, and Australian governments spoke of "a partnership with India to advance areas of common interests and increase cooperation, recognizing that India's continued growth is inextricably tied to the prosperity, freedom and security of the region." Not coincidentally the first four power talks occurred at the same time that the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF) meeting was held in Manila. Similar discussions about promoting India in regional forums were conducted when President Bush, Japanese Prime Minister Abe, and Australian Prime Minster Howard met at the 2007APEC meeting in Sydney. Conclusion Asia’s political alignments are in flux, but at least three broad security futures can be envisaged. Democratic India can play an important part in each future although each will engage India differently and to a different degree. The first is a region divided along an opposite axis, a kind of Asian bipolar order in which the United States and China constitute the opposing poles. This future assumes hardened Westphalian inter-state relations and a more blatant game of “real politick” in forging alignments. The second hypothetical future revolves around an entente of great powers, a group of leading states that strive to keep order and preserve peace by rewarding those who toe the line and punish those who deviate from it. Although the Concert of Europe (following the Congress in Vienna) comes to mind as a historic analogy, its applicability to contemporary Asia remains limited. The concert of Europe presumed an external state – England – could throw in its weight to restore balance and deter potential aggressors. No such power is on the horizon in Asia at least in the foreseeable future. Only the United States can balance a powerful China; and only China can challenge the United States in Asia. But both these states would also be the leaders of their respective clusters in the second scenario. The third future is akin to the order founded on the38 1975 Helsinki agreement in Europe that established a normative consensus(claimed by 35 States in Europe as a universal guide to international relations). The Helsinki consensus does not legitimize an uneven distribution of power or at least it is not meant to do so. Nor is it a front to secure hegemony of any single state. It is meant to be an open-ended order admitting revisions, inclusion, amendment, and extension based on democratic consensus. The steady incorporation of Eastern European states to the European Union underscores the flexibility of the otherwise “value-based” Helsinki consensus. India benefits least from the first scenario of a bipolar, divided Asia although it will be regarded an attractive prize by those competing for influence and markets in Asia. The objective of “strategic autonomy” will by definition confine India to the margins of a bipolar Asia. India’s current dilemma in dealing with China can only worsen in a divided Asia. Joining an anti-China alliance is sure to provoke Beijing; not joining an alliance will mean isolation. As in the days of Cold War, India’s democratic credentials will have a limited role to play in the first future. But the first future does not seem likely because neither Japan nor the United States wish to push China into a corner. In the second future, democracy and human rights do not become a means to exclude and punish recalcitrant regimes. Rather, it instead becomes instead an invitation to peacefully integrate into the new normative order and its rules of conduct. The Japanese proposal to build an “arc of freedom” or a “value based alliance” is an attempt to construct a grand narrative for such a collective order. It has39 the immediate purpose of preempting the moral high ground and inviting China to join in the common platform, which automatically rules out expansionist or destabilizing policies. Supported by a strategic alliance, the “arc of freedom” would enable powerful democratic states – the United States, Japan, India, Australia – to define a common set of interests such as freedom of international seas, protection of the environment, the war against terrorism, and open access to Asian markets, but it would also seek to prevent domination of Asia by China. The fact that no country has yet acted on it forcefully is testimony to the power of China and the uncertainty it has sown about the goals it is meant to serve. But a multi-polar Asia best serves India’s interests as long as it does not become blatantly anti-Chinese or a front for promoting exclusive U.S. interests. The possibility of creating an Asian Helsinki is remote given the force of nationalism and spread of ethnic conflicts across Asia’s borders. There is no regional consensus on how to deal with separatist nationalities nor is there a possibility of arriving at one in the near future. India would find it extremely difficult to accept external guidelines while it deals with its own ethnic separatism in its Northwest and Northeast. Should such an order ever become a reality, **India’s democratic voice would assume immense importance**. Among the three futures outlined above, the second future best fits India’s current and midterm security concerns. During his recent visit to Japan, Prime Minister Manmohan Singh suggested that the time has come for Japan and India, "our two ancient civilizations to build a40 strong contemporary relationship involving strategic and global partnership" and the "most important area in which we can build this partnership isin the field of knowledge economy." He was less reticent in stressing India’s exceptional achievement as a developing democracy. "If there is an “idea of India” by which India should be defined,” he said, "it is the idea of an inclusive, open, multi-cultural, multi-ethnic, multi-lingual society...(we) have an obligation to history and mankind to show that pluralism worked. Liberal democracy is the natural order of political organization in today's world. All alternate systems, authoritarian and majoritarian in varying degree, are an aberration."30 Prime Minister Singh explicitly linked for the first time the Indian model of democracy to an alliance of democratic states in Asia; he saw it as India’s obligation to reject authoritarian alternatives to prosperity. In diplomatic parlance, this was a pointed reference to India as the alternative to China. As an authoritarian state, China could not become a core country in the proposed order For Asia. India’s preferred grand narrative is then distinctly different from the one China might construct. Indian leaders remain anxious not to get ahead of the current developments in this regard; they are keenly aware nevertheless of the advantages in establishing a loose alliance of democracies. What is more, their ability to back it up has expanded substantially with the rapid growth in India’s economic and military power.

#### Nuclear war

Christopher P. **Twomey**, January 20**11**; Assistant Professor of National Security Affairs at the Naval Postgraduate School in Monterey, California, and a Research Fellow of the National Asia Research Program; Asia's Complex Strategic Environment: Nuclear Multipolarity and Other Dangers, Asia Policy Number 11, January 2011, Mirlyn

Ongoing changes in traditional state-to-state nuclear dynamics are reshaping international security in Asia. Today, Asia is a multipolar nuclear environment in which long-range nuclear weapons are joined by other systems with strategic effect, and in which countries hold different views about the role and utility of nuclear weapons. This article discusses the implications of these shifts from the Cold War to the present for several guises of stability, on the one hand, and for competition and conflict, on the other. Though each of these considerations leads to dangerous outcomes in isolation, their combined effect is even more deleterious. The implications of this analysis are deeply pessimistic, both for peace in general and for U.S. national security interests in particular. Policy Implications • Asia is likely to see vigorous competition in the strategic arena, ranging from increased offensive nuclear weapons to the development of advanced conventional offensive munitions and missile defenses. These technologies will likely continue to spread. • Competition between Asian states is likely to lead to increased reliance on nuclear threats, bluster, and statecraft. **This will erode any "nuclear taboo" and will increase the chance of nuclear weapons detonation**. • Arms control is unlikely to substantially mitigate any of these concerns in the current environment. • Given the pessimistic factors outlined above, **increased understanding across states** of how each sees the utility of nuclear weapons **will be extremely beneficial**. • Missile defenses systems make, on balance, a positive contribution to regional security; nevertheless, their negative implications should be addressed through judicious use of transparency about nontechnical aspects of the systems. • Expansive national security goals such as regime change should be abandoned, given the potential for catastrophic nuclear escalation. [End Page 52] The Cold War continues to constrain thinking about nuclear issues. In the first 20 years of the Cold War, a dynamic nuclear environment posed great risks of truly catastrophic war. Yet by the end of the 50 years of bipolar rivalry, many argued that nuclear weapons had stabilized Soviet-U.S. relations. Traditional deterrence theory, with its emphasis on calculating rationality, seemed to contribute to Americans' understanding of world events. Certainly the latter years of the rivalry saw the rise of arms control efforts within and beyond the nuclear arena that facilitated the end of the Cold War. Throughout that period, the two primary nuclear powers developed sophisticated national security apparatuses with an increasingly deep understanding of the efficacies and dangers of nuclear weapons. Few of these factors speak to the nuclear environment in Asia today. It is increasingly clear that the second nuclear age is upon us.1 Much work on this epochal shift focuses both on the role of asymmetry in nuclear balances and on the role of nonstate actors.2 Indeed, some analysts characterize this situation in pejorative terms: an advanced set of nuclear "haves" declaring less developed latecomers to be the primary source of danger in the nuclear order smacks of hypocrisy and Orientalism.3

### Plan

#### The United States Federal Government should grant limited jurisdiction to a federal court that prohibits targeted killings of individual United States citizens when, after being afforded notice and opportunity as well as defense from an independent public advocate, it is determined that the target is not a senior member of Al Qaeda or associated force.

### Solvency

#### SOLVENCY!

#### Unchecked targeted killing is the largest violation of due process --- external review key

McKelvey, 11 (Benjamin, JD Candidate, Senior Editorial Board – Vanderbilt Journal of Transnational Law, “Due Process Rights and the Targeted Killing of Suspected Terrorists: The Unconstitutional Scope of Executive Killing Power,” Vanderbilt Journal of Transnational Law, November, 44 VAND. J. TRANSNAT'L L. 1353, <http://www.vanderbilt.edu/jotl/2012/06/due-process-rights-and-the-targeted-killing-of-suspected-terrorists-the-unconstitutional-scope-of-executive-killing-power/>)

IV. CHALLENGING THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF TARGETED KILLING: A CLEAR VIOLATION OF DUE PROCESS The President’s supposed authority to conduct targeted killings of Americans is highly questionable.119 Moreover, the DOJ’s argument that targeted killing is a political question within executive discretion inaccurately portrays the judiciary’s power to review broader questions of law.120 Yet in addition to these compelling objections to the legal underpinnings of targeted killing authority, targeted killing likely violates existing law as well.121 Targeted killing is a unilateral government execution that completely circumvents traditional notions of law enforcement and violates even minimum notions of established due process.122 A. How Due Process Rights Are Determined Despite the fact that Aulaqi was hiding in Yemen, the Fifth Amendment still protected him. The Supreme Court has held that Americans enjoy the same constitutional protections abroad as in American territory, unless the application of the Bill of Rights would prove “impracticable and anomalous.”123 The rationale for this principle is that although Americans are not completely without constitutional protections abroad, it may not always be feasible to ensure all of these protections.124 The application of the Bill of Rights abroad must take into account “the particular circumstances, the practical necessities, and the possible alternatives” of the situation at hand.125 Analyzing Aulaqi’s Fifth Amendment rights is especially complex given the many political, economic, and security problems in Yemen at the time of his killing.126 The Fifth Amendment provides, in part, that no American may be “deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law.”127 The case of Anwar al-Aulaqi implicates procedural due process because the plaintiff’s complaint alleges that the government is attempting to deprive Aulaqi of life without any formal presentation of the charges against him or an opportunity to protest these charges at a hearing before an impartial judge.128 The Supreme Court uses a balancing test for determining the level of due process in different contexts.129 This balancing test has three factors: the private interest that will be affected by a deprivation, the risk of an erroneous deprivation by the procedural method in question, and the government interests involved.130 Aulaqi’s case represents a collision of the first and third factors.131 The deprivation in question was Aulaqi’s life, the most serious deprivation in law.132 In the case of judicial error or procedural shortfall, property can be returned and liberty can be restored, but the deprivation of life is permanent. However, the government’s interest in protecting American citizens from the unrelenting threat of terrorism is also compelling.133 The exigencies involved in combating terrorism require decisive action and safeguards for intelligence sources that help identify threats.134 Under such extraordinary circumstances, the time and resources involved in satisfying procedural due process rights might also serve to inadvertently amplify specific threats of terrorism.135 The purpose of the Fifth Amendment, however, is to provide protections for citizens, not to increase the power of government or to ease the burden of government agencies under exigent circumstances.136 Given this constitutional purpose and the unique importance of life as a civil liberty, it is clear that Aulaqi is owed at least the minimum form of due process protection. B. A Comparative Perspective: The Due Process Rights of Detainees The position that minimum due process protections are required in Aulaqi is a natural extension of the holding in Hamdi v. Rumsfeld. In Hamdi, the Supreme Court held that the government may not indefinitely detain a citizen without providing some form of procedural due process.137 Yaser Hamdi was an American captured in Afghanistan in 2001 and turned over to U.S. authorities during the invasion of Afghanistan.138 He was initially held at the detention facility in Guantanamo Bay, but was transferred to military holding brigs in Virginia and South Carolina after the military learned that he was an American.139 Originally, President George W. Bush claimed the authority to hold Hamdi as an enemy combatant caught within a theatre of war.140 As an enemy combatant, Hamdi was not entitled to any procedural rights such as the right to an attorney or access to a federal court.141 However, the Eastern District of Virginia granted next-friend standing to his father, and that court subsequently found the evidence against Hamdi insufficient to support his detention.142 The Fourth Circuit reversed, citing the broad wartime powers designated to the president under Article II of the Constitution and the infringement on executive power that would occur if judicial review proceeded in this case.143 Hamdi’s father appealed the reversal of the Fourth Circuit and the Supreme Court granted certiori.144 Although the Court did not reach a majority opinion in its decision, a plurality of Justices agreed that the Executive Branch does not have the power to detain an American citizen indefinitely without providing some basic due process protections.145 A majority of Justices agreed that Hamdi had the right to challenge his detention.146 Because it is a plurality opinion, the extent of the due process protections required in a federal detention scenario is unclear.147 But the basic principle of Hamdi is that the Executive does not have the authority to detain an American citizen without some form of due process.148 If elements of due process are required when the government deprives an American of liberty, is it not logical to conclude that the government must also satisfy due process when depriving an American of life? This is a natural extension of the Hamdi holding, especially because a deprivation of life must be treated more seriously and carefully than a deprivation of liberty.149 Not only is the Hamdi holding a natural theoretical cousin of Aulaqi, but the legal analysis is also similar. In its brief in response to the Aulaqi complaint, the DOJ made several arguments that echo the overturned Fourth Circuit’s arguments in Hamdi: judicial review represents an infringement on textually committed executive authority and litigating this issue would involve the disclosure of sensitive intelligence that would threaten national security.150 Hamdi was an American citizen, and the government detained him due to allegations that he was fighting for the Taliban in Afghanistan.151 Similarly, Aulaqi was an American citizen accused of providing leadership and spiritual counsel to al-Qaeda terrorists.152 He was therefore considered a high-risk threat to national security, and the DOJ claims that the authority to kill Aulaqi is a nonjusticiable political question protected by the state secrets privilege.153 Because the Supreme Court held that Hamdi’s deprivation of liberty merited due process, it is a natural extension of this holding to find that the government also owes Aulaqi basic due process.However, there are important factual distinctions between Hamdi and Aulaqi to balance against the similarities. Although both cases fit the general category of due process rights in the context of national security concerns, the circumstances of the Hamdi holding limit its application to Aulaqi.154 Hamdi was captured in a theatre of war and originally accused of aiding the Taliban in hostilities against the United States.155 But once he was moved to holding brigs within the United States, Hamdi was fully secured under government control.156 Therefore, at the time of the Supreme Court’s decision, Hamdi was not an imminent threat to national security and was completely subject to government authority.157 The same cannot be said of Aulaqi. As an alleged high-value terrorist target hiding in Yemen, a known staging ground for al-Qaeda operations, Aulaqi was not under government control.158 Assuming that the government’s allegations against him were true, Aulaqi posed an imminent threat to national security.159 These are important factual distinctions that may render the Hamdi opinion inapplicable to the Aulaqi case. The lack of government control over Aulaqi and the potential for an imminent threat to national security may serve as government interests that trump Aulaqi’s due process rights. The exigencies of the Aulaqi situation are important distinctions that may render the Hamdi analysis inapplicable. However, even if the Hamdi holding is not directly controlling in the Aulaqi context, it is still highly relevant to the analysis. After Hamdi, it is clear that very serious constitutional rights are implicated, and perhaps violated, when the president authorizes the targeted killing of an American without any independent judicial review of that decision or of the criteria involved.160 As demonstrated in Aulaqi, it is equally clear that litigating this issue in federal court is an ineffective ex post mechanism for ensuring basic due process protections.161 Yet the result in Aulaqi is unsatisfactory and potentially very dangerous. Given the constitutional protections guaranteed by the Supreme Court in Hamdi, it is important to clarify the law of targeted killing and ensure basic safeguards against the abuse of this power.

#### Clarifications don’t ensure guaranteed protections --- executive error rate collapses due process

McKelvey, 11 (Benjamin, JD Candidate, Senior Editorial Board – Vanderbilt Journal of Transnational Law, “Due Process Rights and the Targeted Killing of Suspected Terrorists: The Unconstitutional Scope of Executive Killing Power,” Vanderbilt Journal of Transnational Law, November, 44 VAND. J. TRANSNAT'L L. 1353, <http://www.vanderbilt.edu/jotl/2012/06/due-process-rights-and-the-targeted-killing-of-suspected-terrorists-the-unconstitutional-scope-of-executive-killing-power/>)

V. CHALLENGING THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH DEFENSE OF TARGETED KILLING A. The Obama Administration’s Reassurances Are Circular and Unsatisfactory The Obama Administration has addressed the controversy over targeted killing in an effort to assuage concerns over the program’s constitutionality, including concerns over due process protections.162 However, the Administration’s explanations do little but reiterate the gaping hole in guaranteed due process protections if Americans are justify the current response emphasize the desperate need for a clear articulation of the law and a mechanism for constitutional safeguards.164 Harold Koh, the Legal Adviser to the Department of State, addressed the criticisms of targeted killing in a speech at the Annual Meeting of the American Society of International Law in March 2010.165 Koh addressed the concern that “the use of lethal force against specific individuals fails to provide adequate process and thus constitutes unlawful extrajudicial killing.”166 First, he asserted that a state engaged in armed conflict is not required to provide legal process to military targets.167 Koh then attempted to reassure the critics of targeted killing that the program was conducted responsibly and with precision.168 He said that the procedures for identifying targets for the use of lethal force are “extremely robust,” without providing any explanation or details to substantiate this claim.169 He then argued that “[i]n my experience, the principles of proportionality and distinction . . . are implemented rigorously throughout the planning and execution of lethal operations to ensure that such operations are conducted in accordance with international law.”170 Koh dismissed constitutional claims over targeted killing by simply suggesting that the program is legal and responsible.171 But this response only begs the question over targeted killing: what mechanisms are in place to prevent the unsafe and irresponsible use of this extraordinary power? Asserting that theprogram is legal and responsible without substantiating this assertion rests on notions of blind faith in executive prudence and responsibility, and provides no grounds for reassurance.172 The Obama Administration’s assurances regarding the targeted killing program are unsatisfactory because they fail to address the primary concern at issue: the possibility that an unchecked targeted killing power within the Executive Branch is an invitation for abuse.173 Without some form of independent oversight, there is no mechanism for ensuring the accurate and legitimate use of targeted killings in narrowly tailored circumstances.174 B. A Record of Error and Abuse of Authority Currently, there is no specific evidence that the targeted killing program has been used for illegitimate purposes other than national defense and security. However, the Executive’s exercise of authority in identifying and pursuing threats of terror has produced a worrisome error rate.175 According to an analysis of Predator drone strikes in Pakistan conducted by the New America Foundation, since 2004, the non-militant fatality rate has been roughly 20 percent.176 In other words, about one-fifth of those killed by Predator drone strikes have been non-military targets, including innocent civilians.177 In June of 2010, it was reported that the government lost nearly 75 percent of the cases involving habeas petitions filed by detainees at Guantanamo Bay.178 This suggests that for the majority of detained enemy combatants, the government has had insufficient evidence for the assertion that the detained individuals were involved in hostilities against the United States.179 The rate of error in these instances only adds to the concern over the procedural guarantees of the targeted killing process and the need for a more standardized process with a robust system of screening and oversight. There is also historical precedent for cautiously evaluating the legitimacy and constitutionality of unreviewable executive authority in matters of espionage and national security. In 1976, President Ford issued an executive order outlawing political assassination.180 The order was a response to revelations after the Watergate scandal that the CIA had attempted to assassinate Cuban President Fidel Castro multiple times.181 Every U.S. president since Ford has upheld the ban on political assassinations in subsequent executive orders.182 This is an example of classified CIA activity that, once publicly known, was deemed unacceptable as a matter of law and policy.183 The current targeted killing program conducted in executive secrecy raises concerns similar to those of political assassination.

#### The plans model is empirically proven to create an effective balance

McKelvey, 11 (Benjamin, JD Candidate, Senior Editorial Board – Vanderbilt Journal of Transnational Law, “Due Process Rights and the Targeted Killing of Suspected Terrorists: The Unconstitutional Scope of Executive Killing Power,” Vanderbilt Journal of Transnational Law, November, 44 VAND. J. TRANSNAT'L L. 1353, <http://www.vanderbilt.edu/jotl/2012/06/due-process-rights-and-the-targeted-killing-of-suspected-terrorists-the-unconstitutional-scope-of-executive-killing-power/>)

C. The Need for a Resolution Concerns over targeted killing error rates and historical abuses of executive power cast extraordinary doubt over the adequacy of the Obama Administration’s legal justification of targeted killing, as articulated by the Department of State.194 The government’s argument is that it should be taken at its word when it assures the public that the process for identifying and targeting suspected terrorists with lethal force is careful, rigorous, and legal.195 This is not an adequate explanation of targeted killing law for two reasons. First, this explanation leaves unanswered the question of how the targeted killing program is careful, rigorous, and legal.196 Second, there is **ample historical evidence** that suggests that executive guarantees of authority and privilege ought to be met with skepticism.197 Without some form of independent oversight or review, taking the Executive Branch at its word is not an adequate form of due process and provides no minimum constitutional guarantee.198 VI. THE RESPONSIBLE WAY FORWARD: CONGRESS SHOULD EITHER PROHIBIT THE TARGETED KILLING OF AMERICANS OR ESTABLISH OVERSIGHT The targeted killing of Americans, as demonstrated by the Aulaqi case, presents complex questions of constitutional law that are not easily answered or resolved.199 This is more than an academic debate; the stakes are high, as targeted killing in its current form provides the Executive Branch with a power over American lives that is chillingly broad in scope.200 It is concerning that the President’s grounds for claiming this extraordinary authority are tenuous and subject to compelling challenges.201 Furthermore, the absence of basic due process protection in Aulaqi appears unconstitutional after Hamdi.202 But the Aulaqi case shows that the constitutional objections to targeted killing cannot be resolved in federal court.203 For these reasons, Congress should intervene by passing legislation with the goal of establishing clear principles that safeguard fundamental due process liberties from potential executive overreach. A. Option One: Congress Could Pass Legislation to Establish Screening and Oversight of Targeted Killing As the Aulaqi case demonstrates, any resolution to the problem of targeted killing would require a delicate balance between due process protections and executive power.204 In order to accomplish this delicate balance, Congress can pass legislation modeled on the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA) that establishes a federal court with jurisdiction over targeted killing orders, similar to the wiretapping court established by FISA.205 There are several advantages to a legislative solution. First, FISA provides a working model for the judicial oversight of real-time intelligence and national security decisions that have the potential to violate civil liberties.206 FISA also effectively balances the legitimate but competing claims at issue in Aulaqi: the sensitive nature of classified intelligence and national security decisions versus the civil liberties protections of the Constitution.207 A legislative solution can provide judicial enforcement of due process while also respecting the seriousness and sensitivity of executive counterterrorism duties.208 In this way, congress can alleviate fears over the abuse of targeted killing without interfering with executive duties and authority. Perhaps most importantly, a legislative solution would provide the branches of government and the American public with a clear articulation of the law of targeted killing.209 The court in Aulaqi began its opinion by explaining that the existence of a targeted killing program is no more than media speculation, as the government has neither confirmed nor denied the existence of the program.210 Congress can acknowledge targeted killing in the light of day while ensuring that it is only used against Americans out of absolute necessity.211 Independent oversight would promote the use of all peaceful measures before lethal force is pursued.212 i. FISA as an Applicable Model FISA is an existing legislative model that is applicable both in substance and structure.213 FISA was passed to resolve concerns over civil liberties in the context of executive counterintelligence.214 It is therefore a legislative response to a set of issues analogous to the constitutional problems of targeted killing.215 FISA also provides a structural model that could help solve the targeted killing dilemma.216 The FISA court is an example of a congressionally created federal court with special jurisdiction over a sensitive national security issue.217 Most importantly, FISA works. Over the years, the FISA court has proven itself capable of handling a large volume of warrant requests in a way that provides judicial screening without diminishing executive authority.218 Contrary to the DOJ’s claims in Aulaqi, the FISA court proves that independent judicial oversight is institutionally capable of managing real-time executive decisions that affect national security.219 The motivation for passing FISA makes this an obvious choice for a legislative model to address targeted killing. With FISA, Congress established independent safeguards and a form of oversight in response to President Nixon’s abusive wiretapping practices.220 The constitutional concern in FISA involved the violation of Fourth Amendment privacy protections by excessive, unregulated executive power.221 Similarly, the current state of targeted killing law allows for executive infringement on Fifth Amendment due process rights. Although there is no evidence of abusive or negligent practices of targeted killing, the main purpose of congressional intervention is to ensure that targeted killing is conducted only in lawful circumstances after a demonstration of sufficient evidence.

#### Special court for targeting eligibility is key to check executive backsliding—due process will collapse without it

Weinberger 13 (Dr. Seth, Associate Professor in the Department of Politics & Government – University of Puget Sound, “Enemies Among Us: The Targeted Killing of American Members of al Qaeda and the Need for Congressional Leadership,” Global Security Studies Review, 5-7, <https://blogs.commons.georgetown.edu/globalsecuritystudiesreview/2013/05/07/enemies-among-us-the-targeted-killing-of-american-members-of-al-qaeda-and-the-need-for-congressional-leadership/>)

On September 30, 2011, an American drone fired on and destroyed a convoy of members of al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula (AQAP). The target of the strike was Anwar al-Awlaki, a U.S. citizen born in New Mexico in 1971, accused of being a propagandist and operational leader for AQAP. The targeted killing of an American citizen raises a simple yet extremely discomfiting problem: Should the President of the United States be able to order an American citizen to be killed without trial, without any external review process, and without appeal?

In June 2010, John Brennan, then Deputy National Security Adviser for Homeland Security and Counterterrorism and current CIA director, stated that “there are dozens of U.S. persons [who have joined international terrorist organizations] who are in different parts of the world and they are very concerning to us.”[1] The issue was made even more salient on February 4, 2013, when an unclassified U.S. Justice Department (DOJ) white paper was released which laid out the legal justification for the targeted killing of “a U.S. citizen who is a senior operational leader of al Qaeda or an associated force.”[2]

The release of the targeted killing white paper unleashed a barrage of criticism of the policy. One author called the brief “a disaster” and asserted that “the Obama administration…wants to justify…assassinating citizens without specific and credible evidence of imminent violence.”[3] Another warned that “what’s so terrifying about this white paper is that it’s unconstitutional, not in the sense that it violates any particular tenet of the American Constitution, but in that it doesn’t respect the premise of there being a Constitution in the first place.”[4] Yet another claims that “[the white paper] is every bit as chilling as the Bush Office of Legal Counsel (OLC) torture memos in how its clinical, legalistic tone completely sanitizes the radical and dangerous power it purports to authorize.”[5] A few voices defended the policy, arguing, for example, that “once you take up arms against the United States, you become an enemy combatant, thereby forfeiting the privileges of citizens and the protections of the Constitution,”[6] and that “American presidents…have lawfully deployed military force against citizens in insurrection, rebellion, or war against the United States from the beginning of the nation.”[7]

However, focusing on the question of whether and when the president can order the targeted killing of an American citizen who has joined al Qaeda – as did almost all of the analyses of the DOJ white paper – not only misses the more important question involved but also obscures the best avenue to a potential solution. Instead of asking whether the president ought to be able to order the killing of American members of al Qaeda, we should instead be asking whether the president should be allowed to determine when an American citizen can be considered to be a senior operational member of al Qaeda, and if so, by what process?

Why is the question of determining who is a member of al Qaeda more important than the question of whether the president can kill American senior operational members of al Qaeda? As made clear by the World War II-era case Ex Parte Quirin, American citizens who join the armed forces of an enemy of the United States during wartime forfeit many of their basic constitutional protections and can be, as was the American citizen involved in the case, tried by military tribunal and executed under the laws of war.[8] The 2004 case of Hamdi v. Rumsfeld built on the Quirin case, finding that not only were at least some of the president’s war powers activated by congressional passage of the Authorization for the Use of Military Force (AUMF) in 2001, but that, as is normal under the laws of war, American citizens seized on the battlefield can be detained until the end of the conflict.[9]

However, the Hamdi decision also illustrates why the question of who is and is not a member of al Qaeda is the more critical question. The U.S. Supreme Court’s decision in Hamdi contained language vital for understanding the issue. The Court acknowledged that while enemy soldiers seized on the battlefield during a “normal” war do not receive an opportunity to challenge their detention, the exigencies of the war in Afghanistan against the Taliban dictate that “the circumstances surrounding Hamdi’s seizure cannot in any way be characterized as ‘undisputed’.”[10] Furthermore, because “‘the risk of erroneous deprivation’ of [Hamdi’s] liberty is unacceptably high” and as the case dealt with “the most elemental of liberty interests – the interest in being free from physical detention by one’s own government,” the Court decided that the traditional rules of war needed adjusting for the armed conflict against the Taliban.[11] Thus, the Court ruled that “a citizen-detainee seeking to challenge his classification as an enemy combatant must receive notice of the factual basis for his classification and a fair opportunity to rebut the Government’s factual assertions before a neutral decision maker.”[12] In essence, the Court ruled that the armed conflict with the Taliban sufficiently resembled traditional conflict as to allow for the indefinite military detention of enemy combatants, but that the difficulties involved in determining who is and is not an enemy combatant (for example, fighters in the Taliban neither wore uniforms nor carried identification) warranted an alteration in the normal application of the president’s war powers where American citizens are concerned.

The laws of war were designed to govern ‘traditional’ wars, in which the armies of states met on the battlefield and in which soldiers wore uniforms clearly identifying themselves as combatants. The lack of clarity that prompted the ruling in Hamdi comes from the inherent ambiguities in a low-intensity war against a non-state actor that is not limited to a specific battlefield. These ambiguities are magnified in the conflict against al Qaeda. Not only do al Qaeda’s members not wear uniforms or carry identification cards, but, given the decentralized nature of the organization, it is not even clear what exactly constitutes membership. It might be possible that one can become a “member” of al Qaeda simply by declaring or even believing oneself to be a member. In short, we should be much less confident in our judgments about who is and who is not a member of al Qaeda.

Several examples illustrate the problems caused by this ambiguity over membership in al Qaeda. First, consider Major Nidal Hassan, who stands accused of 13 counts of murder and 32 counts of attempted murder in the shootings at Ft. Hood, Texas. While Hasan had been in communication with Anwar al-Awlaki, he was ultimately court martialed rather than tried as a terrorist. This decision troubled terrorism scholar Bruce Hoffman, who argued that while he “used to argue it was only terrorism if it were part of some identifiable, organized conspiracy… this new strategy of al-Qaeda is to empower and motivate individuals to commit acts of violence completely outside any terrorist chain of command.”[13]

Next is the case of al Shabaab, an Islamist insurgent movement dedicated to bringing Sharia to Somalia. In February 2012, leaders of al Shabaab officially pledged allegiance to al Qaeda, a pledge that was enthusiastically accepted by Ayman al-Zawahiri, who succeeded Osama bin Laden as the formal head of al Qaeda.[14] Since the 2012 National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) expanded the scope of the 2001 AUMF to include “associated groups,” al Shabaab is now a legitimate target for American forces. This poses several problems. First, a number of Somali-American citizens have joined al Shabaab, mostly for religious and nationalistic reasons related to the domestic political situation in Somalia.[15] Second, al Shabaab has largely confined its activities to inside Somalia, with the exceptions of a bombing in Uganda and a grenade attack in Kenya, attacks almost certainly intended to convince Uganda and Kenya to withdraw their respective troops from Somalia.[16] Third, many members have splintered-off from the main body of al Shabaab in the wake of the union with al Qaeda, apparently to keep their struggle focused on Somalia rather than the global jihad.[17] There seems to be little evidence, other than the formal affiliation, that al Shabaab has taken any actions against American citizens or interests or that al Shabaab is in any way other than name a part of the global terrorist movement.

And yet, under the 2012 NDAA, a Somali-American who becomes a senior operational leader of al Shabaab in order to liberate and Islamize Somalia is the legal equivalent of Anwar al-Awlaki and is therefore eligible for being targeted for death. Is this the enemy as envisioned by Congress and defined in the 2001 AUMF?

These examples call attention to several vital questions surrounding the Obama Administration’s use of targeted killing against American citizens. Is every group that is somehow connected to al Qaeda the “enemy” in this conflict, regardless of the threat it poses to American national interests or its involvement in global jihad? What kind of connection – formal, operational, or ideological – is sufficient justification for including an affiliated group under the scope of the 2001 AUMF and 2012 NDAA? Exactly what actions make an individual a member of al Qaeda? Given these serious questions about what constitutes involvement with al Qaeda, it is dangerous for decisions about the eligibility of American citizens for targeted killing to be made without legislative definition or judicial process or review.

The Obama Administration would likely claim that such decisions are a fundamental incident of war and therefore part of the president’s war powers that were activated by the 2001 AUMF. And under the current legal regime, the President’s use of drones to eliminate American senior operational members of al Qaeda is indeed legal.

But legal is not the same thing as prudent. Simply because a course of action is permitted does not mean it should be taken. For a number of reasons, perhaps most importantly because it is increasingly unclear what constitutes being a senior operational member of al Qaeda, we should be skeptical of allowing the Executive Branch to judge these decisions on its own. Without effective checks or definition, there can be little doubt that the bar for defining membership in al Qaeda and eligibility for targeting will move downwards, allowing more Americans to be targeted without due process. And in the absence of additional congressional actions to limit the president’s ability to make such determinations, that is exactly the situation that exists.

But how could such checks or definitions be imposed? The President’s likely defense – that under the 2001 AUMF, only the Executive Branch can determine questions of al Qaeda membership – is a strong one. Here we must return to the Hamdi decision. By focusing attention and criticism on the power to target American members of al Qaeda rather than on the power to determine eligibility for being targeted, most analysts and pundits have missed the importance of the Hamdi decision for suggesting a solution to the problem of targeted killings.

By giving Yasir Hamdi a status hearing to determine his eligibility for indefinite military detention without trial, the Supreme Court interfered with the traditional war powers of the president and altered the standard applications of the rules of war. The Court argued, as mentioned earlier, that as the prospect of indefinite detention involves the “most elemental of liberty interests,” “striking the proper constitutional balance…is of great importance to the Nation during this period of ongoing combat.”[18] What is true for an American citizen detained on the battlefield and assigned for indefinite detention is undoubtedly true for an American citizen who has been targeted for death by a U.S. drone strike. Surely, the right not to be killed by a Hellfire missile ordered by one’s own government without due process must be as elemental of a liberty interest, if not more so, as “the interest in being free from physical detention.”[19]

Furthermore, while the Court did add a hearing into the process for military detention, it still permitted the U.S. government to assign an American citizen to indefinite detention. It did so even while acknowledging that, given the undefined nature of the conflict against the Taliban, which the U.S. government might not consider won for two generations or more, “Hamdi’s detention could last for the rest of his life.”[20] The justification given for leaving the basic structure of military detention in place was the determination that conflict between the U.S. and the Taliban resembles the traditional conflicts for which the laws of war were created. However, the Court warned that “if the practical circumstances of a given conflict are entirely unlike those of the conflicts that informed the development of the law of war, [the long-standing law of war principles] unravel.”[21] It seems reasonable that a conflict like the one with al Qaeda –in which drones are used to target American citizens who have been identified as senior operational leaders of decentralized affiliates of an already decentralized non-state terrorist organization – presents circumstances unlike traditional wars in which enemies were readily identifiable by their uniforms, identification cards, and adherence to a clearly visible military and political chain of command.

From the logic of the Hamdi decision, it follows that adjustments or adaptations to the traditional war powers of the president to target American citizens believed to be members of the armed forces of the enemy might be both justifiable and allowable. What options or procedures could be put into place? Two options stand out. First, Congress could attempt to identify the positive criteria for membership in al Qaeda, the nature of the relationships between al Qaeda and its various affiliates, and, more specifically, the definition of a senior operational leader. While this would undoubtedly be a difficult task, there is precedent for such efforts by the Legislative Branch. The laws surrounding conspiracy must define at what point constitutionally-protected free speech switches to the illegal preparation for criminal activity.

But once again, what is possible is not always the best course of action. Given the diffuse nature of global terrorist networks and the flexible nature of the battlefield, trusting an a priori assessment to accurately account for all possibilities and to do so in a timely manner is likely a bad idea. A better option would be the creation of a special national security court, along the lines of the courts that hear federal requests for warrantless wiretapping in accordance with the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA). Such a court could be created and empowered by Congress to hear presidential requests to designate an American citizen as a senior operational leader of either al Qaeda or of an affiliated group as defined under the 2001 AUMF and the 2012 NDAA.

#### None of their drone court answers apply – the aff is a uniquely limited court

Weinberger 13 (Dr. Seth, Associate Professor in the Department of Politics & Government – University of Puget Sound, “Enemies Among Us: The Targeted Killing of American Members of al Qaeda and the Need for Congressional Leadership,” Global Security Studies Review, 5-7, <https://blogs.commons.georgetown.edu/globalsecuritystudiesreview/2013/05/07/enemies-among-us-the-targeted-killing-of-american-members-of-al-qaeda-and-the-need-for-congressional-leadership/>)

Several people have voiced objections to the creation of a FISA-style “drone court.” One worries that a court of “generalist federal judges” will lack “national security expertise,” “are not accustomed to ruling on lightning-fast timetables,” and should not be able to involve themselves in “questions about whether to target an individual for assassination by a drone strike.” [22] Another writes that, “the determination of whether a person is a combatant to judicial review would seem to rather clearly violate the separation of powers requirements in the Constitution,” as in Ex Parte Milligan, the Supreme Court ruled that the congressional war power “extends to all legislation essential to the prosecution of the war…except such as interferes with the command of the forces and the conduct of campaigns,” which includes, the author argues, the “sole authority to determine who the specific combatants are when conducting a campaign.”[23] While in a traditional war such objections are almost certainly correct, in the context of the Hamdi decision and with the unconventional nature of the armed conflict against al Qaeda, they become less compelling.

First, if properly defined, the new court could be limited solely to questions of eligibility, not the decision of whether and when to conduct a drone strike. The court would carry out a function quite similar to the FISA courts, judging whether the Executive Branch has sufficient evidence to support its claim that a citizen has become a senior operational member of a group covered under the AUMF and 2012 NDAA. This would differ little from the FISA courts’ assessments of Executive Branch requests to wiretap individuals believed to be agents of a foreign power without a warrant.

Second, given the definition of imminent threat in the Department of Justice’s white paper – a definition that incorporates “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”[24] – such eligibility decisions are not likely to be made in the moments immediately prior to a drone strike. Rather, eligibility decisions are likely made in the process of long investigations and in light of much intelligence.

Finally, while Anthony Arend is almost certainly correct that in nearly every other incidence of armed conflict, Congress would not be permitted to involve itself in determinations of who is and who is not an eligible target for the American military, as Hamdi makes clear, the armed conflict against al Qaeda is not like every other armed conflict. The Supreme Court has already inserted a judicial proceeding into the determination of whether an American citizen seized on the battlefield is actually an enemy combatant and therefore eligible for indefinite detention, a determination that traditionally has been solely within the purview of executive power. It would be counterintuitive – to say the least – if an American citizen could be killed, but not detained, without judicial involvement.

#### Limited and external review is key – allows for processes that can’t be circumvented

Somin 13 (Ilya, Professor of Law – George Mason University School of Law, Hearing on “Drone Wars: The Constitutional and Counterterrorism Implications of Targeted Killing,” United States Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on the Constitution, Civil Rights, and Human Rights, 4-23, <http://www.judiciary.senate.gov/pdf/04-23-13SominTestimony.pdf>)

One partial solution to the problem of target selection would be to require officials to get advance authorization for targeting a United States citizen from a specialized court, similar to the FISA Court, which authorizes intelligence surveillance warrants for spying on suspected foreign agents in the United States. The specialized court could act faster than ordinary courts do and without warning the potential target, yet still serve as a check on unilateral executive power. In the present conflict, there are relatively few terrorist leaders who are American citizens. Given that reality, we might even be able to have more extensive judicial process than exists under FISA.

Professor Amos Guiora of the University of Utah, a leading expert on legal regulation of counterterrorism operations with extensive experience in the Israeli military, has developed a proposal for a FISA-like oversight court that deserves serious consideration by this subcommittee, and Congress more generally.22 The idea of a drone strike oversight court has also been endorsed by former Secretary of Defense Robert Gates, who served in that position in both the Obama and George W. Bush administrations. Gates emphasizes that “some check on the president’s ability to do this has merit as we look to the long-term future,” so that the president would not have the unilateral power of “being able to execute” an American citizen.23

We might even consider developing a system of judicial approval for targeted strikes aimed at non-citizens. The latter process might have to be more streamlined than that for citizens, given the larger number of targets it would have to consider. But it is possible that it could act quickly enough to avoid compromising operations, while simultaneously acting as a check on abusive or reckless targeting. However, the issue of judicial review for strikes against non-citizens is necessarily more difficult than a court that only covers relatively rare cases directed at Americans.

Alternatively, one can envision some kind of more extensive due process within the executive branch itself, as advocated by Neal Katyal of the Georgetown University Law Center.24 But any internal executive process has the flaw that it could always be overriden by the president, and possibly other high-ranking executive branch officials. Moreover, lower level executive officials might be reluctant to veto drone strikes supported by their superiors, either out of careerist concerns, or because administration officials are naturally likely to share the ideological and policy priorities of the president. An external check on targeting reduces such risks. External review might also enhance the credibility of the target-selection process with informed opinion both in the United States and abroad.

#### Back to India—democratic model key to resolve every global threat

**Chandra 11** (Naresh, Chair – India's National Security Advisory Board and Former Indian Ambassador to the United States, et al., “The United States and India: A Shared Strategic Future”, September, p. 3-6)

India is an indispensable partner for the United States. Geographically, it sits between the two most immediate problematic regions for U.S. national interests. The arc of instability that begins in North Africa, goes through the Middle East, and proceeds to Pakistan and Afghanistan ends at India’s western border. To its east, India shares a contested land border with the other rising Asian power of the twenty-first century, China. India—despite continuing challenges with internal violence— is a force for stability, prosperity, **democracy, and the rule of law** in a very dangerous neighborhood.

The Indian landmass juts into the ocean that bears its name. With the rise of Asian economies, the Indian Ocean is home to critical global lines of communication, with perhaps 50 percent of world container products and up to 70 percent of ship-borne oil and petroleum traffic transiting through its waters. For the United States, India’s location alone makes it a more consequential partner than other nations more distant from these U.S. zones of concern. Unlike many U.S. treaty allies, India does not need to be convinced that a distant problem requires the projection of U.S. power to be successfully managed. Many of America’s global challenges are India’s regional challenges, and therefore India is uniquely positioned to exert influence and offer resources to help deal with them.

India’s growing national capabilities give it ever greater tools to pursue its national interests to the benefit of the United States. India has the world’s third-largest army, fourth-largest air force, and fifth-largest navy. All three of these services are modernizing, and the Indian air force and Indian navy have world-class technical resources, and its army is seeking more of them. Moreover, unlike some longtime U.S. partners, India has demonstrated that it possesses not only a professional military force, but also a willingness to suffer substantial military hardship and loss in order to defend Indian national interests.

India is an important U.S. partner in international efforts to prevent the further spread of weapons of mass destruction. Despite India’s principled refusal to sign the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT), India has shown itself to be a responsible steward of nuclear technology. Similarly, despite decades of work on missile and space launch vehicle technology, India has not been a proliferator of these technologies. India’s assistance on nonproliferation will also be critical regarding chemical and biological weapons, given its substantial chemical and biotechnology industries, which could unwittingly be the source of precursor materials to dangerous actors. In all of these areas where India has considerable technological expertise, India has exhibited restraint and responsibility in its international behavior.

During President Barack Obama’s visit to India in 2010, the United States announced its intent to support India’s phased induction into the four multilateral export control regimes (the Nuclear Suppliers Group, Missile Technology Control Regime, Australia Group, and Wassenaar Arrangement), continuing efforts begun in the Bush administration to bring India fully into the nonproliferation mainstream. In addition to its role as a potential technology provider, India will play an important and growing political role on international nonproliferation issues. India’s **broad diplomatic ties** globally (most importantly in the Middle East), its aspirations for United Nations (UN) Security Council permanent membership, and its role in international organizations such as the International Atomic Energy Agency make New Delhi an especially effective voice in calls to halt proliferation.

India’s **position against radicalism and terrorism corresponds** with that of the United States. India has suffered terribly from terrorism over the last three decades and like the United States is determined to prevent, deter, and disrupt the terrorist groups that most threaten it. There was no hesitation to India’s offer of assistance to the United States following the attacks of September 11, 2001, because India viewed its national interests as congruent with those of the United States’ in uprooting transnational terrorist groups. Similarly, the United States quickly offered law enforcement and intelligence cooperation after the terrorist attacks on Mumbai that began on November 26, 2008.

Economically, India has grown at an average of 7.6 percent in real terms over the last decade, according to International Monetary Fund statistics, with only a modest decline due to the global economic crisis in 2008 and 2009. After charting 10.4 percent growth in 2010, the government of India believes that it can sustain rates of 8 to 9 percent economic expansion for the foreseeable future. Goldman Sachs agrees, estimating that the Indian economy will expand at an average rate of 8.4 percent through 2020. In short, over the next two decades India is on a path to become a global economic powerhouse, with all that implies for the U.S. and world economies.

With respect to economic enterprise and science and technology cooperation, the United States is India’s collaborator of choice. India’s English-speaking and Western-oriented elite and middle classes comfortably partner with their counterparts in U.S. firms and institutions, including more than 2.8 million Indian Americans. The U.S. higher educational system is an incubator of future collaboration, with more than 100,000 Indian students in American universities, more than from any other country except China. Trade between the United States and India has doubled twice in the last ten years. Bilateral trade has been balanced in terms of its content and is beneficial to both countries. In many sectors, the role of governments is simply to encourage what the private sector already desires by removing remaining barriers that prevent cooperative outcomes. As India modernizes and grows it will spend trillions of dollars on infrastructure, transportation, energy production and distribution, and defense hardware. U.S. firms can benefit immensely by providing expertise and technology that India will need to carry out this sweeping transformation.

India-U.S. cooperation is critical to global action against climate change. According to the International Energy Agency, India is already the fourth-largest aggregate producer of carbon dioxide from energy use, behind China, the United States, and Russia. India’s high ranking as a greenhouse gas producer has mostly to do with its sheer size; India produces dramatically fewer greenhouse gases than industrialized or other developing nations on a per capita basis and is below the global average in terms of greenhouse gas emissions per unit of gross domestic product. Even so, because of India’s aggressive economic growth profile combined with higher than average population growth, its share of global greenhouse gas production will rise substantially between now and 2050. India has shown itself to be keenly interested in cooperation on renewable energy technology and efficiency standards that would allow it to retain its growth and still reduce its emissions intensity over time. India’s role, both as a fast-growing large economy and as a leader of the developing world, makes Indian agreement a necessary condition for the success of any prospective international climate change accord.

On issues of global governance, India will remain the most important swing state in the international system. Importantly, India is genuinely committed to a world order based on multilateral institutions and cooperation and the evolution of accepted international norms leading to accepted international law. Despite being a rising power with some complaints regarding the existing global governance structure, India seeks to reform the present system and not to overturn it. U.S. and Indian national interests naturally overlap on many of these issues, given India’s commitment to a stable Asia, democracy, market-driven growth, the rule of law, and opposition to violent extremism.

India’s capability extends well beyond the realm of military, economic, and global diplomatic power. Indian culture and diplomacy has generated goodwill in its extended neighborhood. New Delhi has positive relations with critical states in the Middle East, in Central Asia, in Southeast Asia, and with important middle powers such as Brazil, South Africa, and Japan—all of strategic value to the United States. India’s soft power is manifest in wide swaths of the world where its civil society has made a growing and positive impression. This includes the global spread of its private corporate sector, the market for its popular culture, its historical religious footprint, and the example of its democracy and nongovernmental institutions.

In addition, India has demonstrated an enduring **commitment to democratic values**. Indian democracy has prospered despite endemic poverty; extraordinary ethnic, religious, and linguistic diversity; and foreign and internal conflicts. It **has provided** Indian society **the resilience and adaptability necessary to overcome and respond to the myriad challenges** the nation has faced since independence. India and the United States share the objective to strengthen pluralist and secular democracies worldwide, and India’s rise as a democratic great power promotes that profound global objective.

For many of the reasons indicated, a stronger India inevitably makes managing a stable balance of power in Asia significantly easier for the United States. Although other friendly countries in the region writ large will also play a critical role, over the next two decades India may well become the most important Asian partner for the United States in ensuring that the broad balance of power that serves Asia so well is preserved.

# 2ac

### 2AC Norms

#### This takes out their Moravcsik evidence – US policy outweighs

Mutua 7 (Makau, SUNY Distinguished Professor, Professor of Law, Floyd H. & Hilda L. Hurst Faculty Scholar, and Director of the Human Rights Center – Buffalo Law School, “Standard Setting in Human Rights: Critique and Prognosis,” Human Rights Quarterly, Vol. 29, http://www.law.buffalo.edu/content/dam/law/restricted-assets/pdf/faculty/mutuaM/journals/hrq2907.pdf)

The relationship between universal norms and IGOs, on the one hand, and national norms and institutions of enforcement, on the other, must be streamlined and harmonized to enhance their inter-penetration. This vertical relationship between international and national processes is critical for the domestic internalization of human rights norms. Without this relationship, states cannot cultivate a human rights culture to police themselves. It is through the experience gained in enforcement by national institutions that NGOs, IGOs, and states can identify normative gaps that need to be addressed and institutional weaknesses that must be corrected. In other words, the national space is the anvil on which human rights norms are unpacked and forged. It is the crucible in which human rights must be grown. The lessons gained from this interpenetration must inform the future of standard setting and the work of rectifying institutional weaknesses in implementation**.**

### AT: Circumvention

#### President believes he is constrained by statute

Saikrishna Prakash 12**,** professor of law at the University of Virginia and Michael Ramsey, professor of law at San Diego, “The Goldilocks Executive” Feb, SSRN

We accept that the President’s lawyers search for legal arguments to justify presidential action, that they find the President’s policy preferences legal more often than they do not, and that the President sometimes disregards their conclusions. But the close attention the Executive pays to legal constraints suggests that the President (who, after all, is in a good position to know) believes himself constrained by law. Perhaps Posner and Vermeule believe that the President is mistaken. But we think, to the contrary, it represents the President’s recognition of the various constraints we have listed, and his appreciation that attempting to operate outside the bounds of law would trigger censure from Congress, courts, and the public.

#### Obama will comply

David J Barron 8, Professor of Law at Harvard Law School and Martin S. Lederman, Visiting Professor of Law at the Georgetown University Law Center, “The Commander in Chief at the Lowest Ebb -- A Constitutional History”, Harvard Law Review, February, 121 Harv. L. Rev. 941, Lexis

In addition to offering important guidance concerning the congressional role, our historical review also illuminates the practices of the President in creating the constitutional law of war powers at the "lowest ebb." Given the apparent advantages to the Executive of possessing preclusive powers in this area, it is tempting to think that Commanders in Chief would always have claimed a unilateral and unregulable authority to determine the conduct of military operations. And yet, as we show, for most of our history, the presidential practice was otherwise. Several of our most esteemed Presidents - Washington, Lincoln, and both Roosevelts, among others - never invoked the sort of preclusive claims of authority that some modern Presidents appear to embrace without pause. In fact, no Chief Executive did so in any clear way until the onset of the Korean War, even when they confronted problematic restrictions, some of which could not be fully interpreted away and some of which even purported to regulate troop deployments and the actions of troops already deployed.¶ Even since claims of preclusive power emerged in full, the practice within the executive branch has waxed and waned. No consensus among modern Presidents has crystallized. Indeed, rather than denying the authority of Congress to act in this area, some modern Presidents, like their predecessors, have acknowledged the constitutionality of legislative regulation. They have therefore concentrated their efforts on making effective use of other presidential authorities and institutional [\*949] advantages to shape military matters to their preferred design. n11 In sum, there has been much less executive assertion of an inviolate power over the conduct of military campaigns than one might think. And, perhaps most importantly, until recently there has been almost no actual defiance of statutory limitations predicated on such a constitutional theory.¶ This repeated, though not unbroken, deferential executive branch stance is not, we think, best understood as evidence of the timidity of prior Commanders in Chief. Nor do we think it is the accidental result of political conditions that just happened to make it expedient for all of these Executives to refrain from lodging such a constitutional objection. This consistent pattern of executive behavior is more accurately viewed as reflecting deeply rooted norms and understandings of how the Constitution structures conflict between the branches over war. In particular, this well-developed executive branch practice appears to be premised on the assumption that the constitutional plan requires the nation's chief commander to guard his supervisory powers over the military chain of command jealously, to be willing to act in times of exigency if Congress is not available for consultation, and to use the very powerful weapon of the veto to forestall unacceptable limits proposed in the midst of military conflict - but that otherwise, the Constitution compels the Commander in Chief to comply with legislative restrictions.¶ In this way, the founding legal charter itself exhorts the President to justify controversial military judgments to a sympathetic but sometimes skeptical or demanding legislature and nation, not only for the sake of liberty, but also for effective and prudent conduct of military operations. Justice Jackson's famous instruction that "with all its defects, delays and inconveniences, men have discovered no technique for long preserving free government except that the Executive be under the law, and that the law be made by parliamentary deliberations" n12 continues to have a strong pull on the constitutional imagination. n13 What emerges from our analysis is how much pull it seemed to [\*950] have on the executive branch itself for most of our history of war powers development.

### AT: CMR DA

#### Policy disagreements don’t spill over --- no turns case

Hansen 9 – Victor Hansen, Associate Professor of Law, New England Law School, Summer 2009, “SYMPOSIUM: LAW, ETHICS, AND THE WAR ON TERROR: ARTICLE: UNDERSTANDING THE ROLE OF MILITARY LAWYERS IN THE WAR ON TERROR: A RESPONSE TO THE PERCEIVED CRISIS IN CIVIL-MILITARY RELATIONS,” South Texas Law Review, 50 S. Tex. L. Rev. 617, p. lexis

According to Sulmasy and Yoo, these conflicts between the military and the Bush Administration are the latest examples of a [\*624] crisis in civilian-military relations. n32 The authors suggest the principle of civilian control of the military must be measured and is potentially violated whenever the military is able to impose its preferred policy outcomes against the wishes of the civilian leaders. n33 They further assert that it is the attitude of at least some members of the military that civilian leaders are temporary office holders to be outlasted and outmaneuvered. n34 If the examples cited by the authors do in fact suggest efforts by members of the military to undermine civilian control over the military, then civilian-military relations may have indeed reached a crisis. Before such a conclusion can be reached, however, a more careful analysis is warranted. We cannot accept at face value the authors' broad assertions that any time a member of the military, whether on active duty or retired, disagrees with the views of a civilian member of the Department of Defense or other member of the executive branch, including the President, that such disagreement or difference of opinion equates to either a tension or a crisis in civil-military relations. Sulmasy and Yoo claim there is heightened tension or perhaps even a crisis in civil-military relations, yet they fail to define what is meant by the principle of civilian control over the military. Instead, the authors make general and rather vague statements suggesting any policy disagreements between members of the military and officials in the executive branch must equate to a challenge by the military against civilian control. n35 However, until we have a clear understanding of the principle of civilian control of the military, we cannot accurately determine whether a crisis in civil-military relations exists. It is to this question that we now turn.

#### No impact – empirics prove

Feaver and Kohn 5 - Peter Feaver, professor of Political Science and Public Policy and the director of the Triangle Institute for Security Studies at Duke University, and Richard H. Kohn, Professor of History at the University of North Carolina, 2005, “The Gap: Soldiers, Civilians, and Their Mutual Misunderstanding,” in American Defense Policy, 2005 edition, ed. Paul J. Bolt, Damon V. Coletta, Collins G. Shackelford, p. 339

Concerns about a troublesome divide between the armed forces and the society they serve are hardly new and in fact go back to the beginning of the Republic. Writing in the 1950s, Samuel Huntington argued that the divide could best be bridged by civilian society tolerating, if not embracing, the conservative values that animate military culture. Huntington also suggested that politicians allow the armed forces a substantial degree of cultural autonomy. Countering this argument, the sociologist Morris Janowitz argued that in a democracy, military culture necessarily adapts to changes in civilian society, adjusting to the needs and dictates of its civilian masters.2 The end of the Cold War and the extraordinary changes in American foreign and defense policy that resulted have revived the debate. The contemporary heirs of Janowitz see the all volunteer military as drifting too far away from the norms of American society, thereby posing problems for civilian control. They make tour principal assertions. First, the military has grown out of step ideologically with the public, showing itself to be inordinately right-wing politically, and much more religious (and fundamentalist) than America as a whole, having a strong and almost exclusive identification with the Republican Party. Second, the military has become increasingly alienated from, disgusted with, and sometimes even explicitly hostile to, civilian culture. Third, the armed forces have resisted change, particularly the integration of women and homosexuals into their ranks, and have generally proved reluctant to carry out constabulary missions. Fourth, civilian control and military effectiveness will both suffer as the military—seeking ways to operate without effective civilian oversight and alienated from the society around it—loses the respect and support of that society. By contrast, the heirs of Huntington argue that a degenerate civilian culture has strayed so far from traditional values that it intends to eradicate healthy and functional civil-military differences, particularly in the areas of gender, sexual orientation, and discipline. This camp, too, makes four key claims. First, its members assert that the military is divorced in values from a political and cultural elite that is itself alienated from the general public. Second, it believes this civilian elite to be ignorant of, and even hostile to, the armed forces—eager to employ the military as a laboratory for social change, even at the cost of crippling its warfighting capacity. Third, it discounts the specter of eroding civilian control because it sees a military so thoroughly inculcated with an ethos of subordination that there is now too much civilian control, the effect of which has been to stifle the military's ability to function effectively Fourth, because support for the military among the general public remains sturdy, any gap in values is inconsequential. The problem, if anything, is with the civilian elite. The debate has been lively (and inside the Beltway, sometimes quite vicious), but it has rested on very thin evidence—(tunneling anecdotes and claims and counterclaims about the nature of civilian and military attitudes. Absent has been a body of systematic data exploring opinions, values, perspectives, and attitudes inside the military compared with those held by civilian elites and the general public. Our project provides some answers.

#### Congress is cutting the drones budget significantly.

Ackerman, 13 (Spencer Ackerman. American national security reporter. Graduated from Rutgers University. “Budget Cuts Are Set to Hit U.S. Military’s Drone Fleet”. Wired. Apr. 2nd, 2013. http://www.wired.com/dangerroom/2013/04/drone-cuts/)

For all the ongoing hype about the U.S. military’s arsenal of flying robots, they’re anything but safe from budget cuts. Pentagon officials anticipate spending significantly less on their surveillance and attack drones over the next several years, effectively ending the drone boom of the previous decade.¶ The impending budget cuts are expected to affect each major funding source for the drones

: the research and development accounts that keep new models coming online; the operations and maintenance accounts that keep current ones in the air; and the procurement accounts that keep the military purchasing them**.**¶ Already, the Pentagon is signaling that the boom times for drones are coming to an end, even as the robots remain one of the U.S.’s signature counterterrorism weapons. An overview prepared in February by Dyke Weatherington, who oversees unmanned systems for the Pentagon’s acquisitions and technology directorate, outlined the downturn.¶ Across all the various military drone programs, R&D cash is expected to fall to $1.03 billion in fiscal 2017, nearly half of the $1.99 billion the Pentagon requested in the fiscal 2013 budget. Budget cuts caused the Pentagon to shrink its anticipated drone-research spending: Weatherington’s presentation, delivered to the drone advocates at AUVSI and acquired by Danger Room, anticipates spending $1.3 billion in fiscal 2014, some $866 million less than the fiscal 2012 budget anticipated for that year.¶ Same goes for procurement, and what’s known as “operations and maintenance.” Weatherington anticipated that the Pentagon will spend $3 billion on drone purchases in 2014, some $814 less than the fiscal 2012 budget foresaw. And he expected that it’ll want $983 million in fiscal 2014 to keep its current fleet flying and tuned up, down $309 million from the expectation in the fiscal 2012 budget. The downward pattern for all drone accounts continues through 2017.¶ It’s possible that the fiscal 2014 budget, expected to be released on April 10, will revise those numbers further. “We’re still looking at those numbers,” says Maureen Schumann, a spokeswoman for Weatherington. Pentagon officials have described the current budget process as chaotic, as it’s occurred against the backdrop of an ongoing White House-congressional feud over spending cuts.¶ But drone manufacturers and their advocates have been bracing themselves for the downturn for a while, even as the drones remain busy worldwide. Last year, the Air Force cut its drone purchases by half while actually upping the combat air patrols they fly. AUVSI has been pushing the utility of drones to farmers as the advocacy group sees the military market shrinking.¶ Every defense account is feeling pressure under mandatory budget cuts enacted by Congress. But some observers see the robots as being particularly vulnerable, as they don’t have the traditional bureaucratic constituencies of other weapons systems.¶ “As the Pentagon wrestles with declining overall budget numbers, this would be the time to not let sunk costs drive us in the future. But the reality is that in tough budget times, the new becomes more directly threatening to the old,” says Peter Singer, a defense analyst at the Brookings Institution. (Where, full disclosure, Danger Room boss Noah Shachtman has a non-resident fellowship.) “And in bureaucracies, the old is not only more established, but is often at an advantage. It is more likely to have existing internal constituencies and tribes, and stronger support from Congressional members protecting existing factories and jobs in their district versus the potential of future program offices and future pork barrel spending.”¶ Despite the anticipated budget cuts, there are still new, experimental drone programs under way in the military. The Navy is pushing forward with an effort to launch an armed drone from an aircraft carrier. Darpa wants drones to operate from the decks of even smaller ships. In Afghanistan, Army units are using a six-pound lethal robot that bridges the gap between drone and missile.¶ But the funding reductions are “all the more striking,” Singer says, because of the enthusiasm that senior military leaders have mouthed for the drones. “In the next 20-30 years these things are going to explode,” Gen. Mark Welsh, the Air Force chief of staff, told an airpower conference in September. (He meant that colloquially.) “Who knows what will happen next, but it’s going to be exciting to watch and our Air Force has to be in the lead because we’ll know the best way to use them. Innovation is what we’re all about.”¶ Weatherington’s presentation pointed to a 33 percent reduction in drone funding in the coming years inside the Air Force alone.¶ “One is reminded a bit of that cavalry officer after World War I who is reputed to have said, ‘Thank goodness now the war is over, we can get back to real soldiering,” Singer says.

### Caucuse Add on

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

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.”

### AT: Flex DA (2AC) – (1)

#### The aff is key middle ground---total flex causes worse decision-making in crises

Deborah N. Pearlstein 9, lecturer in public and international affairs, Woodrow Wilson School of Public & International Affairs, July 2009, "Form and Function in the National Security Constitution," Connecticut Law Review, 41 Conn. L. Rev. 1549, lexis nexis

It is in part for such reasons that studies of organizational performance in crisis management have regularly found that "planning and effective [\*1604] response are causally connected." n196 Clear, well-understood rules, formalized training and planning can function to match cultural and individual instincts that emerge in a crisis with commitments that flow from standard operating procedures and professional norms. n197 Indeed, "the less an organization has to change its pre-disaster functions and roles to perform in a disaster, the more effective is its disaster [sic] response." n198 In this sense, a decisionmaker with absolute flexibility in an emergency-unconstrained by protocols or plans-may be systematically more prone to error than a decision-maker who is in some way compelled to follow procedures and guidelines, which have incorporated professional expertise, and which are set as effective constraints in advance.¶ Examples of excessive flexibility producing adverse consequences are ample. Following Hurricane Katrina, one of the most important lessons independent analysis drew from the government response was the extent to which the disaster was made worse as a result of the lack of experience and knowledge of crisis procedures among key officials, the absence of expert advisors replacing those rules with more than the most general guidance about custodial intelligence collection. available to key officials (including the President), and the failure to follow existing response plans or to draw from lessons learned from simulations conducted before the fact. n199 Among the many consequences, [\*1605] basic items like food, water, and medicines were in such short supply that local law enforcement (instead of focusing on security issues) were occupied, in part, with breaking into businesses and taking what residents needed. n200¶ Or consider the widespread abuse of prisoners at U.S. detention facilities such as Abu Ghraib. Whatever the theoretical merits of applying coercive interrogation in a carefully selected way against key intelligence targets, n201 the systemic torture and abuse of scores of detainees was an outcome no one purported to seek. There is substantial agreement among security analysts of both parties that the prisoner abuse scandals have produced predominantly negative consequences for U.S. national security. n202 While there remain important questions about the extent to which some of the abuses at Abu Ghraib were the result of civilian or senior military command actions or omissions, one of the too often overlooked findings of the government investigations of the incidents is the unanimous agreement that the abuse was (at least in part) the result of structural organization failures n203 -failures that one might expect to [\*1606] produce errors either to the benefit or detriment of security.¶ In particular, military investigators looking at the causes of Abu Ghraib cited vague guidance, as well as inadequate training and planning for detention and interrogation operations, as key factors leading to the abuse. Remarkably, "pre-war planning [did] not include[] planning for detainee operations" in Iraq. n204 Moreover, investigators cited failures at the policy level- decisions to lift existing detention and interrogation strictures without n205 As one Army General later investigating the abuses noted: "By October 2003, interrogation policy in Iraq had changed three times in less than thirty days and it became very confusing as to what techniques could be employed and at what level non-doctrinal approaches had to be approved." n206 It was thus unsurprising that detention and interrogation operations were assigned to troops with grossly inadequate training in any rules that were still recognized. n207 The uncertain effect of broad, general guidance, coupled [\*1607] with the competing imperatives of guidelines that differed among theaters of operation, agencies, and military units, caused serious confusion among troops and led to decisionmaking that it is overly kind to call arbitrary. n208¶ Would the new functionalists disagree with the importance of government planning for detention operations in an emergency surrounding a terrorist nuclear attack? Not necessarily. Can an organization anticipate and plan for everything? Certainly not. But such findings should at least call into question the inclination to simply maximize flexibility and discretion in an emergency, without, for example, structural incentives that might ensure the engagement of professional expertise. n209 Particularly if one embraces the view that the most potentially damaging terrorist threats are nuclear and biological terrorism, involving highly technical information about weapons acquisition and deployment, a security policy structure based on nothing more than general popular mandate and political instincts is unlikely to suffice; a structure that systematically excludes knowledge of and training in emergency response will almost certainly result in mismanagement. n210 In this light, a general take on role effectiveness might suggest favoring a structure in which the engagement of relevant expertise in crisis management is required, leaders have incentives to anticipate and plan in advance for trade-offs, and [\*1608] organizations are able to train subordinates to ensure that plans are adhered to in emergencies. Such structural constraints could help increase the likelihood that something more than arbitrary attention has been paid before transcendent priorities are overridden.

#### The plan bolsters the credibility of threats – solves escalation

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)

Part II draws on several strands of political science literature to illuminate the relationship between war powers law and threats of force. As a descriptive matter, the swelling scope of the president’s practice in wielding threatened force largely tracks the standard historical narrative of war powers shifting from Congress to the President. Indeed, adding threats of force to that story might suggest that this shift in powers of war and peace has been even more dramatic than usually supposed, at least in terms of how formal congressional checks are exercised. Part II also shows, however, that congressional checks and influence – even if not formal legislative powers – operate more robustly and in different ways to shape strategic decision-making than usually supposed in legal debates about war powers, and that **these checks and influence can** enhance **the** potency of threatened force. This Article thus fits into a broader scholarly debate now raging about the extent to which the modern President is meaningfully constrained by law, and in what ways. 20 Recent political science scholarship suggests that Congress already exerts constraining influences on presidential decisions to threaten force, even without resorting to binding legislative actions. 21 Moreover, when U.S. security strategy relies heavily on threats of force, credibility of signals is paramount. Whereas it often used to be assumed that institutional checks on executive discretion undermined democracies’ ability to threaten war credibly, some **recent political science scholarship** also offers reasons to expect that congressional political constraints can actually bolster the credibility of U.S. threats. 22

#### Restrictions inevitable---the aff prevents haphazard ones which are worse

Benjamin Wittes 9, senior fellow and research director in public law at the Brookings Institution, is the author of Law and the Long War: The Future of Justice in the Age of Terror and is also a member of the Hoover Institution's Task Force on National Security and Law, “Legislating the War on Terror: An Agenda for Reform”, November 3, Book, p. 17

A new administration now confronts the same hard problems that plagued its ideologically opposite predecessor, and its very efforts to turn the page on the past make acute the problems of institutionalization. For while the new administration can promise to close the detention facility at Guantanamo Bay and can talk about its desire to prosecute suspects criminally, for example, it cannot so easily forswear noncriminal detention. While it can eschew the term "global war on terror," it cannot forswear those uses of force—Predator strikes, for example—that law enforcement powers would never countenance. Nor is it hastening to give back the surveillance powers that Congress finally gave the Bush administration. In other words, its very efforts to avoid the Bush administrations vocabulary have only emphasized the conflicts hybrid nature—indeed- emphasized that the United States is building something new here, not merely applying something old.¶ That point should not provoke controversy. The evidence that the United States is fumbling toward the creation of hybrid institutions to handle terrorism cases is everywhere around us. U.S. law, for example, now contemplates extensive- probing judicial review of detentions under the laws of war—a naked marriage of criminal justice and wartime traditions. It also contemplates warrantless wiretapping with judicial oversight of surveillance targeting procedures—thereby mingling the traditional judicial role in reviewing domestic surveillance with the vacuum cleaner-type acquisition of intelligence typical of overseas intelligence gathering. Slowly but surely, through an unpredictable combination of litigation, legislation, and evolutionary developments within executive branch policy, the nation is creating novel institutional arrangements to authorize and regulate the war on terror. The real question is not whether institutionalization will take place but whether it will take place deliberately or haphazardly, whether the United States will create through legislation the institutions with which it wishes to govern itself or whether it will allow an endless sequence of common law adjudications to shape them.¶ The authors of the chapters in this book disagree about a great many things. They span a considerable swath of the U.S. political spectrum, and they would no doubt object to some of one another's policy prescriptions. Indeed, some of the proposals are arguably inconsistent with one another, and it will be the very rare reader who reads this entire volume and wishes to see all of its ideas implemented in legislation. What binds these authors together is not the programmatic aspects of their policy prescriptions but the belief in the value of legislative action to help shape the contours of the continuing U.S. confrontation with terrorism. That is, the authors all believe that Congress has a significant role to play in the process of institutionalization—and they have all attempted to describe that role with reference to one of the policy areas over which Americans have sparred these past several years and will likely continue sparring over the next several years.

**No miscalc or accidents—their examples are weak**

**Trachtenberg 2k** – History Professor, Pennsylvania (Marc, The "Accidental War" Question, http://www.sscnet.ucla.edu/polisci/faculty/trachtenberg/cv/inadv(1).pdf)

There are two points to be made on this issue. First of all, as long as states choose courses of action with their eyes open--if they decide to engage in a test of will, knowing full well that this is what they are doing, and deliberately adopt tactics limiting their own freedom of action (and in particular their ability to avoid ending up in an armed conflict) as a way of prevailing in the crisis--then it can scarcely be said that the outcome of that confrontation is to be viewed as essentially an "accident." And the basic point here is that states, by and large, do know what they are doing; to a certain extent, they burn their bridges in the course of a crisis, but they do this with important political objectives in mind. They know that if their prestige is engaged, their adversary will know that it is hard for them to draw back, and so their adversary will be under more pressure to accommodate them on the issue at hand.

The second point has to do with how much risk there really is in situations of this sort. It should not be assumed too readily that states underestimate the degree to which they lose control of the situation when they engage in a crisis. States can generally pull back from the brink if they really want to; prestige will be sacrificed, but often states are willing to pay that price. The history of international politics in the century that just ended is full of crises that were liquidated by one side accepting what amounted to defeat, sometimes even humiliating defeat; and in the July Crisis in 1914, the German government chose at the most critical moment to let the war come rather than press for a compromise solution.9

The key thing here is that in 1914 and 1939 political leaders had not totally lost control, but had chosen to accept war rather than back off in a crisis. Their aversion to war was not overwhelming. But when both sides very much want to avoid a full-scale armed conflict, the story is very different.

markmarkmark

This was the case during the Cold War. People sometimes seem to assume that peace was hanging by a thread during that conflict, and that we were lucky to make our way through it without a thermonuclear holocaust. But I don't think this is true at all: and in general I think it is very unlikely that a great war would break out if both sides are determined to avoid it.

These arguments about how war could break out almost by accident were frequently made during the Cold War itself--and indeed were made by responsible and experie nced officials. A British document from March 1946, for example, argued that the Soviets did not want war, but the kind of tactics they used with the West might lead to a war that neither side wanted: "although the intention may be defensive, the tactics will be offensive, and the danger always exists that Russian leaders may misjudge how far they can go without provoking war with American or ourselves."10 A year later, a British Foreign Office official warned that the fact that the Soviets had military superiority in Europe might make them careless, and that they might "misjudge what measures can safely be taken without producing a serious crisis." Events might get out of control and a situation might develop that could "lead to disaster."11

What is wrong with this point of view? It assumes that the Soviets would not be cautious, that they would not frame their actions very carefully with an eye to the American reaction, that in deciding how far to go they would not gauge very closely how the Americans reacted to the measures they had taken up to that point. This point of view assumes also that the Soviets would find it very hard to draw back if it became clear that they had overstepped the bounds and had thought the American reaction would not be as vigorous as it in fact was--or indeed that they had not made the mental reservation that they could draw back, in necessary, when they decided to embark on a provocative course of action. Basically the assumption is that the Soviets did not care enough about what a war would entail to take these rather elementary and normal precautions. This point of view also assumes that the American response would be very rigid and "spring-loaded": a slight Soviet infringement, and the Americans immediately take the plunge into general war--as though there are no intermediate measures of a political or military nature that would be taken, no process that would unfold within which the two sides would test each other out before resorting to extreme measures. To my mind, anyone with any sense should know that things would never move directly and mechanically from initial provocation to full-scale war, that things would unfold almost inevitably in a more complex way--or, in short, that enough "cushioning" exists in the system to keep relatively minor provocations from leading directly to general war.

### AT: Warism K

#### Mindset doesn’t come first – must start with political advocacy

Kratochwil, professor of international relations – European University Institute, 2008 (Friedrich, “The Puzzles of Politics,” pg. 200-213)

The lesson seems clear. Even at the danger of “fuzzy boundaries”, when we deal with “practice” ( just as with the “pragmatic turn”), we would be well advised to rely on the use of the term rather than on its reference (pointing to some property of the object under study), in order to draw the bounds of sense and understand the meaning of the concept. My argument for the fruitful character of a pragmatic approach in IR, therefore, does not depend on a comprehensive mapping of the varieties of research in this area, nor on an arbitrary appropriation or exegesis of any specific and self-absorbed theoretical orientation. For this reason, in what follows, I will not provide a rigidly specified definition, nor will I refer exclusively to some prepackaged theoretical approach. Instead, I will sketch out the reasons for which a pragmatic orientation in social analysis seems to hold particular promise. These reasons pertain both to the more general area of knowledge appropriate for praxis and to the more specific types of investigation in the field. The follow- ing ten points are – without a claim to completeness – intended to engender some critical reflection on both areas. Firstly, a pragmatic approach does not begin with objects or “things” (ontology), or with reason and method (epistemology), but with “acting” (prattein), thereby preventing some false starts. Since, **as historical beings placed in a** specific situations**, we do not have the luxury** of deferring decisions **until we have** found the “truth”, **we have to act and must do so always under time pressures and in the face of incomplete information.** Pre- cisely because the social world is characterised by strategic interactions, what a situation “is”, is hardly ever clear ex ante, because it is being “produced” by the actors and their interactions, and the multiple possibilities are rife with incentives for (dis)information. This puts a premium on quick diagnostic and cognitive shortcuts informing actors about the relevant features of the situ- ation, and on leaving an alternative open (“plan B”) in case of unexpected difficulties. Instead of relying on certainty and universal validity gained through abstraction and controlled experiments, we know that completeness and attentiveness to detail, rather than to generality, matter. To that extent, likening practical choices to simple “discoveries” of an already independently existing “reality” which discloses itself to an “observer” – or relying on optimal strategies – is somewhat heroic. These points have been made vividly by “realists” such as Clausewitz in his controversy with von Bülow, in which he criticised the latter’s obsession with a strategic “science” (Paret et al. 1986). While Clausewitz has become an icon for realists, only a few of them (usually dubbed “old” realists) have taken seriously his warnings against the misplaced belief in the reliability and use- fulness of a “scientific” study of strategy. Instead, most of them, especially “neorealists” of various stripes, have embraced the “theory”-building based on the epistemological project as the via regia to the creation of knowledge. A pragmatist orientation would most certainly not endorse such a position. Secondly, since acting in the social world often involves acting “for” someone, special responsibilities arise that aggravate both the incompleteness of knowledge as well as its generality problem. Since we owe special care to those entrusted to us, for example, as teachers, doctors or lawyers, we cannot just rely on what is generally true, but have to pay special attention to the particular case. Aside from avoiding the foreclosure of options, we cannot refuse to act on the basis of incomplete information or insufficient know- ledge, and the necessary diagnostic will involve typification and comparison, reasoning by analogy rather than generalization or deduction. Leaving out the particularities of a case, be it a legal or medical one, in a mistaken effort to become “scientific” would be a fatal flaw. Moreover, **there still remains the crucial element of “timing” –** of knowing when to act. Students of crises have always pointed out the importance of this factor but, in attempts at building a general “theory” of international politics analogously to the natural sci- ences, such elements are neglected on the basis of the “continuity of nature” and the “large number” assumptions. Besides, “timing” seems to be quite recalcitrant to analytical treatment.

#### Alt doesn’t solve – resisting war is hopelessly utopian and prioritizing the case impacts comes first

Richard J. Regan, Prof of Poly Sci @ Fordham, 1996, Just War: Principles and Causes, p 6

Pacifists generally argue that nonviolence and nonresistance will ultimately win the minds and hearts of aggressors and oppressors, but that argument is neither convincing nor dispositive. The success of Gandhi or King may have been due (at least in part) to the appeal of their nonviolent campaigns to the conscience of their oppressors. But if that is true, it is because Gandhi could appeal to the moral conscience of a free British electorate over the heads of colonial administrators, and King could appeal to the moral conscience of the national American electorate over the heads of regional southern officials. There is no reason to believe that such campaigns would have been successful against the rulers of Nazi Germany. Second, the argument rests on an extremely optimistic view about the reformability of human behavior. Hobbes was surely correct in describing a persistent conflictual pattern of human behavior. To imagine that every or even most human beings will behave like saints seems to be wishful thinking. And even were human beings to be so transformed at some indefinite future point of time, why should innocent human beings suffer oppression in the intervening short run?

#### The causality of their impact is backwards

Ridley 10 – professor at Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory

(Matt, The Rational Optimist, pg. 13-15)//BB

If my fictional family is not to your taste, perhaps you prefer statistics. Since 1800, the population of the world has multiplied six times, yet average life expectancy has more than doubled and real income has risen more than nine times. Taking a shorter perspective, in 2005, compared with 1955, the average human being on Planet Earth earned nearly three times as much money (corrected for inflation), ate one-third more calories of food, buried one-third as many of her children and could expect to live one-third longer. She was less likely to die as a result of war, murder, childbirth, accidents, tornadoes, flooding, famine, whooping cough, tuberculosis, malaria, diphtheria, typhus, typhoid, measles, smallpox, scurvy or polio. She was less likely, at any given age, to get cancer, heart disease or stroke. She was more likely to be literate and to have finished school. She was more likely to own a telephone, a flush toilet, a refrigerator and a bicycle. All this during a half-century when the world population has more than doubled, so that far from being rationed by population pressure, the goods and services available to the people of the world have expanded. It is, by any standard, an astonishing human achievement. Averages conceal a lot. But even if you break down the world into bits, it is hard to find any region that was worse off in 2005 than it was in 1955. Over that half-century, real income per head ended a little lower in only six countries (Afghanistan, Haiti, Congo, Liberia, Sierra Leone and Somalia), life expectancy in three (Russia, Swaziland and Zimbabwe), and infant survival in none. In the rest they have rocketed upward. Africa’s rate of improvement has been distressingly slow and patchy compared with the rest of the world, and many southern African countries saw life expectancy plunge in the 1990s as the AIDS epidemic took hold (before recovering in recent years). There were also moments in the half-century when you could have caught countries in episodes of dreadful deterioration of living standards or life chances – China in the 1960s, Cambodia in the 1970s, Ethiopia in the 1980s, Rwanda in the 1990s, Congo in the 2000s, North Korea throughout. Argentina had a disappointingly stagnant twentieth century. But overall, after fifty years, the outcome for the world is remarkably, astonishingly, dramatically positive. The average South Korean lives twenty-six more years and earns fifteen times as much income each year as he did in 1955 (and earns fifteen times as much as his North Korean counter part). The average Mexican lives longer now than the average Briton did in 1955. The average Botswanan earns more than the average Finn did in 1955. Infant mortality is lower today in Nepal than it was in Italy in 1951. The proportion of Vietnamese living on less than $2 a day has dropped from 90 per cent to 30 per cent in twenty years. The rich have got richer, but the poor have done even better. The poor in the developing world grew their consumption twice as fast as the world as a whole between 1980 and 2000. The Chinese are ten times as rich, one-third as fecund and twenty-eight years longer-lived than they were fifty years ago. Even Nigerians are twice as rich, 25 per cent less fecund and nine years longer-lived than they were in 1955. Despite a doubling of the world population, even the raw number of people living in absolute poverty (defined as less than a 1985 dollar a day) has fallen since the 1950s. The percentage living in such absolute poverty has dropped by more than half – to less than 18 per cent. That number is, of course, still all too horribly high, but the trend is hardly a cause for despair: at the current rate of decline, it would hit zero around 2035 – though it probably won’t. The United Nations estimates that poverty was reduced more in the last fifty years than in the previous 500.

#### Resisting war is useless – military deterrence provides an opportunity to expand peace

**Futterman**, **95** (J.A.H., Researcher at Lawrence Libermore Lab, Obscenity and Peace : Mediations on the Bomb http://www.dogchurch.org/scriptorium/nuke.html )

Internationally, peace requires empowerment of some groups that seem eager to earn the hatred of the civilized world — like the Palestinians. Now that nuclear deterrence and economic necessity have combined to bring about more freedom, empowerment, and therefore peace in Europe, the Middle East is one of the next hot-spots for triggering a nuclear war. In order to have peace, the world must empower the Palestinians to determine their political and economic destiny, while at the same time it must deter them from warring with Israel. Such empowerment and deterrence will require the active involvement of the Islamic nations who thus far have been unwilling to empower the Palestinians to engage in much beyond stone-throwing and terrorism. May the Palestinians awaken to how they have been used by their brethren. So we need to make peace, at home and abroad. Before you demonstrate to make your town a nuclear-free zone or to stop nuclear testing, [12] consider what you can do to enlarge someone's freedom, or to help them obtain the power to determine a better life for themselves. In other words, rather than fight against nuclear weapons or even against war, try making peace. Meanwhile, I do what I can to make waging unlimited war dangerous, and preparation for it expensive. I can provide palliative treatment, but you, physicians/patients, must heal yourselves. Or to put it more bluntly, as long as we continue to express our human nature in disenfranchising, disempowering ways, we will cling to armament -- nuclear or worse -- to distance ourselves from our own nearness to war.

### cp

#### Drones key

Press TV, 13 [Drone attacks on US citizens shows 'collapse' of system: Assanagehttp://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:zZEbbpjfO7gJ:www.presstv.com/detail/2013/02/09/288075/drone-war-shows-us-collapse-assange/+&cd=1&hl=en&ct=clnk&gl=us&client=firefox-a]

The founder of the whistleblower website WikiLeaks, Julian Assange has criticized the US administration over killing American citizens in drone strikes, saying the deadly campaign denotes the “collapse” of the system in the US. "I can't see a greater collapse when the executive can kill its own citizens arbitrarily, at will, in secret, without any of the decision-making becoming public," Assange told the HBO talk show "Real Time with Bill Maher."

#### Drones key to due process – outweighs detention

SL, 9/25/13 [22 years ago, I started studying law and philosophy at third level, while concurrently running mainframe applications across a VAX/VMS in the windowless computer rooms of what was then UCG, or University College, Galway, in Ireland. Since then, I’ve made my career in technology while maintaining a persistent interest in law, politics, and the state. Ten years or so ago, I completed a post grad in International Human Rights Law. Over the past several years, I have been slowly gestating a theory on technology and state, and the impact of technology on state legitimacy and perhaps even the rule of law. I considered a doctoral programme, but decided instead to commit to doing as much research as I can on the subject, while publishing my thinking on a website. This blog was established for that purpose.

Drones and American Identity http://statelegitimacy.com Drones and American Identity /2013/09/25/283/]

In the first instance, drone strikes subvert due process and the rule of law, as happened in Guantanamo Bay. The people who are the subjects of the military operations have different standards of justice applied because of the judgement of military intelligence, a historically unreliable and often incredible source. Once a ‘target’ is designated a ‘bad guy’, he is denied the right to life. There is no accountability for the action – getting the wrong guy, being slightly off with the intelligence, none of that is possible, nor cared about once the target has been eliminated. There is an implicit sense that no matter what happens, killing a suspected bad guy can’t increase the risk of terrorism. The bad guy has no advocate. It should be noted that the administration of justice of any kind outside the territory of the country is extraordinary in and of itself; the power of the state is no longer confined to its territory or indeed to its citizens. Technically, this is less about the administration of justice and more about national defence, and the right to self-defence. However, as most drone strikes appear pre-emptive (or indeed retributive) and not expressly defensive, we find ourselves in yet another grey area brought upon us by globalization and technology. This doesn’t just circumvent due process for the target, but it creates an intolerable double standard in the criminal justice system. There are now different kinds of people. While there is one class of person – an American who does not threaten national security, and anyone else (including Americans) who do. There are no human rights, but non-combatant rights versus enemy (or unlawful) combatant rights. Substantially, in addition, this equates to enemy combatants not on American soil; for some reason, there is a sense that, once ‘landed’, enemy combatants somehow become subject to non-combatant legal process; hence the reluctance to bring Guantanamo detainees ashore, and the government setting its face against the use of drones on American soil. Each then is held to a different standard.

#### Drone policy’s key – it’s Obama’s main talking point and it reshaped the war on terror

Nossel 12 (Suzanne, Executive Director – Amnesty International, “Time for a Reset on Human Rights,” Foreign Policy, 11-7, <http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/11/07/time_for_a_reset_on_human_rights?page=0,0>)

Although Obama faced truculent political opposition in his first term, his weak record on human rights cannot be explained away by economic exigencies or even congressional defiance. Obama now openly embraces the concept of a global "war on terror" as grounds to override international human rights norms and reinterpret the Constitution. Osama Bin Laden's killing was not only the chief talking point of his campaign but a synecdoche for his approach to the terrorist threat, one in which the administration writes its own rules. Although preventing attacks on U.S. soil represents an important human rights victory, this should not overshadow the worrisome direction of U.S. human rights policy and its long-term consequences. If the president's legacy is to include reclaiming U.S. human rights credibility, he needs to face up to his troubling record, and fix it.

The Obama administration has led in some areas of human rights policy; examples include advancing gay and lesbian rights, bolstering U.N. human rights mechanisms, and promoting Internet freedom. But where human rights norms are pitted against counterterrorism tactics, it has fallen down. Blocked by Congress, Obama broke his first-term promise to close Guantánamo. Four years later, that failure barely seems to register as a disappointment; 167 men languish in the prison, including 55 who are cleared for release but have not been transferred.

Recent weeks have revealed details of an Orwellian "disposition matrix" -- a kill list of top terrorist targets that keeps getting longer. The administration claims the authority to kill those named, anytime and anywhere, based on secret information and unreviewable judgments. The administration has declared any man killed by a drone to be an enemy terrorist, and defends such killings regardless of resulting civilian casualties.

With the U.S. withdrawing from Afghanistan, these extraordinary powers are detached from any major battlefield or conventional war. The administration is now backed into claiming that a war exists because it has convinced itself it cannot function without a broad license to kill. Short of al Qaeda suing for peace, this war may never end. The administration's reshaping of the concept of war risks undoing over 100 years of evolution of the laws of war, and the protections those laws have delivered.

### AT: Debt Ceiling (Kentucky)

#### Obama solves the impact—

#### Emergency powers

Liptak 10/3—American journalist, lawyer and instructor in law and journalism (Adam, 10/3/13, “Experts See Potential Ways Out for Obama in Debt Ceiling Maze,” <http://www.nytimes.com/2013/10/04/us/politics/experts-see-potential-ways-out-for-obama-in-debt-ceiling-maze.html?_r=0>)

The view that Mr. Obama could continue borrowing without Congressional authorization is based on three arguments.¶ One is grounded in an aggressive understanding of presidential power, the second in an interpretation of an obscure provision of the 14th Amendment and the third on a choice among three irreconcilable constitutional obligations.¶ A senior administration official was dismissive of all three options, calling them “unicorn theories,” reflecting the White House’s position that only Congress can solve a problem of its own creation.¶ “The Constitution gives Congress — not the president — the authority to borrow money, and only Congress can increase the debt ceiling,” Jay Carney, the White House press secretary, said on Thursday, adding that Congress must “authorize the Treasury to pay the bills that Congress racked up.”¶ But Eric Posner, a law professor at the University of Chicago, said that the meaning if not the words of the Constitution left Mr. Obama with **room to act**.¶ “The president has **inherent emergency powers**,” he said. “It has long been understood that the president should act to protect the country.”¶

#### He can issue more debt

Liptak 10/3—American journalist, lawyer and instructor in law and journalism (Adam, 10/3/13, “Experts See Potential Ways Out for Obama in Debt Ceiling Maze,” <http://www.nytimes.com/2013/10/04/us/politics/experts-see-potential-ways-out-for-obama-in-debt-ceiling-maze.html?_r=0>)

The third alternative, the subject of a 2012 article in The Columbia Law Review, focuses on what the article’s authors call the irreconcilable instructions Congress will have provided to Mr. Obama if it fails to act. Having been told to spend, but not to raise taxes or issue debt, “the president has to decide which of Congress’s orders to follow,” said Neil H. Buchanan, a law professor at George Washington University, who wrote the article with Michael C. Dorf, a law professor at Cornell. The president must, in the article’s words, “choose the least unconstitutional option.”

That option, the authors concluded, is issuing more debt**.**

#### The debt ceiling won’t cause a crisis—it will just force a balanced budget

Dorfman 10/3—professor of economics at The University of Georgia and consultant on economic issues to a variety of corporations and local governments (Jeffrey, 10/3/13, “Don't Believe The Debt Ceiling Hype: The Federal Government Can Survive Without An Increase,” <http://www.forbes.com/sites/jeffreydorfman/2013/10/03/dont-believe-the-debt-ceiling-hype-the-federal-government-can-survive-without-an-increase/>)

Ignore what you hear and read in the news. **The federal government actually reached the legal debt ceiling about four months ago**. Since then, the government has been financing its monthly budget deficit by stealing/borrowing money from other government funds, like the federal government employees’ pension fund. In about two weeks, the government will run out of tricks to keep operating as if nothing has happened. If the debt ceiling is not raised by then, the government has to balance its budget.¶ That’s right. As much as the politicians and news media have tried to convince you that the world will end without a debt ceiling increase, it is simply not true. The federal debt ceiling sets a legal limit for how much money the federal government can borrow. In other words, it places an upper limit on the national debt. It is like the credit limit on the government’s gold card.¶ Reaching the debt ceiling does not mean that the government will default on the outstanding government debt. In fact, the U.S. Constitution forbids defaulting on the debt (14th Amendment, Section 4), so the government is not allowed to default even if it wanted to.¶ In reality, if the debt ceiling is not raised in the next two weeks, the government will actually have to prioritize its expenses and keep its monthly, weekly, and daily spending under the revenue the government collects. In simple terms, the government would have to spend an amount less than or equal to what it earns. Just like ordinary Americans have to do in their everyday lives.¶ Once the reality of what hitting the debt ceiling means is understood, the important question is: can the government actually live with a balanced budget? How much money could it spend? Could enough spending be cut to live within a balanced budget? The answer is **yes**, the federal government could live with a balanced budget. Below I will show you precisely how.¶

#### No econ decline war---best and most recent data

Daniel W. Drezner 12, Professor, The Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University, October 2012, “The Irony of Global Economic Governance: The System Worked,” <http://www.globaleconomicgovernance.org/wp-content/uploads/IR-Colloquium-MT12-Week-5_The-Irony-of-Global-Economic-Governance.pdf>

The final outcome addresses a dog that hasn’t barked: the effect of the Great Recession on cross-border conflict and violence. During the initial stages of the crisis, multiple analysts asserted that the financial crisis would lead states to increase their use of force as a tool for staying in power.37 Whether through greater internal repression, diversionary wars, arms races, or a ratcheting up of great power conflict, there were genuine concerns that the global economic downturn would lead to an increase in conflict. Violence in the Middle East, border disputes in the South China Sea, and even the disruptions of the Occupy movement fuel impressions of surge in global public disorder. ¶ The aggregate data suggests otherwise, however. The Institute for Economics and Peace has constructed a “Global Peace Index” annually since 2007. A key conclusion they draw from the 2012 report is that “The average level of peacefulness in 2012 is approximately the same as it was in 2007.”38 Interstate violence in particular has declined since the start of the financial crisis – as have military expenditures in most sampled countries. Other studies confirm that the Great Recession has not triggered any increase in violent conflict;

the secular decline in violence that started with the end of the Cold War has not been reversed.39 Rogers Brubaker concludes, “the crisis has not to date generated the surge in protectionist nationalism or ethnic exclusion that might have been expected.”40¶ None of these data suggest that the global economy is operating swimmingly. Growth remains unbalanced and fragile, and has clearly slowed in 2012. Transnational capital flows remain depressed compared to pre-crisis levels, primarily due to a drying up of cross-border interbank lending in Europe. Currency volatility remains an ongoing concern. Compared to the aftermath of other postwar recessions, growth in output, investment, and employment in the developed world have all lagged behind. But the Great Recession is not like other postwar recessions in either scope or kind; expecting a standard “V”-shaped recovery was unreasonable. One financial analyst characterized the post-2008 global economy as in a state of “contained depression.”41 The key word is “contained,” however. Given the severity, reach and depth of the 2008 financial crisis, the proper comparison is with Great Depression. And by that standard, the outcome variables look impressive. As Carmen Reinhart and Kenneth Rogoff concluded in This Time is Different: “that its macroeconomic outcome has been only the most severe global recession since World War II – and not even worse – must be regarded as fortunate.”42

#### No GOP cave – redistricting and primary challenger fears

**Isenstadt, 10/3/13** (Alex, Politico, “Government shutdown: Why many Republicans have no reason to deal” <http://www.politico.com/story/2013/10/government-shutdown-republicans-deal-97768.html?hp=l23>

The prevailing wisdom ahead of the government shutdown was that tea party lawmakers who agitated for it would fold within a few days, once they got an earful from angry constituents and felt the sting of bad headlines. House GOP leaders called it a “touch the stove” moment for the band of Republican rebels, when ideology would finally meet reality.

But there’s another reality that explains why that thinking may well be wrong, and the country could be in for a protracted standoff: Most of the Republicans digging in have no reason to fear voters will ever punish them for it.

The vast majority of GOP lawmakers are safely ensconced in districts that, based on the voter rolls, would never think of electing a Democrat. Their bigger worry is that someone even more conservative than they are — bankrolled by a cadre of uncompromising conservative groups — might challenge them in a primary.

So from the standpoint of pure political survival, there’s every incentive to keep the government closed in what looks like a futile protest over Obamacare. The latest theory gaining currency in Congress is that it will take a potential default on the nation’s debt in a few weeks to bring the crisis to a head.

#### Obama likes the plan – he won’t fight it

Rosen 13 (Jeffrey, Legal Affairs Editor – New Republic, “A New Idea to Limit Drone Strikes Could Actually Legitimize Them,” New Republic, 2-11, <http://www.newrepublic.com/article/112392/drone-courts-congress-should-exercise-oversight-instead>)

On Sunday, Robert Gates, the former Pentagon chief for Presidents Obama and Bush, endorsed an idea that has been floated by Democratic lawmakers in the wake of John O. Brennan's confirmation hearings to be CIA Director: a drone court that would review the White House’s targeted killings of American citizens linked to al Qaida. The administration has signaled its openness to the idea of a congressionally created drone court, which would be modeled on the secret Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court that reviews requests for warrants authorizing the surveillance of suspected spies or terrorists. But although senators at the Brennan hearings were rightly concerned about targeted killings operating without any judicial or congressional oversight, the proposed drone court would raise as many constitutional and legal questions as it resolved. And it would give a congressional and judicial stamp of approval to a program whose effectiveness, morality, and constitutionality are open to serious questions. Rather than rushing to create a drone court, Congress would do better to hold hearings about whether targeted drone killings are, in fact, morally, constitutionally, and pragmatically defensible in the first place.

From the administration’s perspective, the appeal of a drone court is obvious: Despite the suggestion in the recently released Department of Justice White Paper white paper that the president’s unilateral decisions about targeted killings can’t be reviewed by judges, the administration cites Supreme Court cases that suggest the opposite: namely, that the president’s decision to designate Americans as enemy combatants can only be justified when authorized by Congress, with the possibility of independent judicial review.

#### Their delay links are inevitable

**Sahadi, 9/17/13** (Jeanne, “Deficits: Better now, worse later” CNN Wire, lexis)

But finding bipartisan agreement on the right balance has hobbled Congress for years.

The CBO report lands at the start of what promises to be yet another bruising battle over the budget and debt ceiling this fall -- a battle that has a new twist this year -- a push by a group of House conservatives to defund and delay the implementation of Obamacare.

That battle is likely to be marked with yet more rounds of 11th hour brinksmanship. So whatever deal is eventually struck to keep the government funded and raise the debt ceiling very well may not comprehensively and adequately address the long-term fiscal imbalances.

# 1ar

### --Gitmo/Detention

#### Recent amendment solves

Hafetz, 12 [Due Process under the U.S. Constitution and International Law: The Rift Widens by Jonathan Hafetz [Jonathan Hafetz is an Associate Professor of Law at Seton Hall Law School and was previously a senior attorney at the ACLU’s National Security Project. He has served as counsel in numerous national security detention cases, including al-Marri v. Spagone.]http://opiniojuris.org/2012/12/05/due-process-under-the-u-s-constitution-and-international-law-the-rift-widens/]

The U.S. Senate last week approved an amendment to the FY 2013 National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) introduced by Senator Diane Feinstein (D-CA) that would make it harder for the government to subject U.S. citizens and lawful permanent residents (LPRs) apprehended in the United States to indefinite military detention. The amendment—originally proposed last year as the “Due Process Guarantee Act”—provides that such domestic military detention authority cannot be inferred from a declaration of war or an authorization to use military force, but must instead be expressly provided by Congress.

### terror d

#### Combined probability approaches zero

**Schneidmiller 9** (Chris, Experts Debate Threat of Nuclear, Biological Terrorism, 13 January 2009, http://www.globalsecuritynewswire.org/gsn/nw\_20090113\_7105.php, AMiles)

There is an "almost **vanishingly small" likelihood** that terrorists would ever be able to acquire and detonate a nuclear weapon, one expert said here yesterday (see GSN, Dec. 2, 2008). In even the most likely scenario of nuclear terrorism, there are 20 barriers between extremists and a successful nuclear strike on a major city, said John Mueller, a political science professor at Ohio State University. The process itself is seemingly straightforward but exceedingly difficult -- buy or steal highly enriched uranium, manufacture a weapon, take the bomb to the target site and blow it up. Meanwhile, variables strewn across the path to an attack would increase the complexity of the effort, Mueller argued. Terrorists would have to bribe officials in a state nuclear program to acquire the material, while avoiding a sting by authorities or a scam by the sellers. The material itself could also turn out to be bad. "Once the purloined material is purloined, [police are] going to be chasing after you. They are also going to put on a high reward, extremely high reward, on getting the weapon back or getting the fissile material back," Mueller said during a panel discussion at a two-day Cato Institute conference on counterterrorism issues facing the incoming Obama administration. Smuggling the material out of a country would mean relying on criminals who "are very good at extortion" and might have to be killed to avoid a double-cross, Mueller said. The terrorists would then have to find scientists and engineers willing to give up their normal lives to manufacture a bomb, which would require an expensive and sophisticated machine shop. Finally, further technological expertise would be needed to sneak the weapon across national borders to its destination point and conduct a successful detonation, Mueller said. Every obstacle is "difficult but not impossible" to overcome, Mueller said, putting the chance of success at no less than one in three for each. The likelihood of successfully passing through each obstacle, in sequence, would be roughly one in 3 1/2 billion, he said, but for argument's sake dropped it to 3 1/2 million. "It's a total gamble. This is a very expensive and difficult thing to do," said Mueller, who addresses the issue at greater length in an upcoming book, Atomic Obsession. "So unlike buying a ticket to the lottery ... you're basically putting everything, including your life, at stake for a gamble that's maybe one in 3 1/2 million or 3 1/2 billion." Other scenarios are even less probable, Mueller said. A nuclear-armed state is "exceedingly unlikely" to hand a weapon to a terrorist group, he argued: "States just simply won't give it to somebody they can't control." Terrorists are also not likely to be able to steal a whole weapon, Mueller asserted, dismissing the idea of "loose nukes." Even Pakistan, which today is perhaps the nation of greatest concern regarding nuclear security, keeps its bombs in two segments that are stored at different locations, he said (see GSN, Jan. 12). Fear of an "extremely improbable event" such as nuclear terrorism produces support for a wide range of homeland security activities, Mueller said. He argued that there has been a major and costly overreaction to the terrorism threat -- noting that the Sept. 11 attacks helped to precipitate the invasion of Iraq, which has led to far more deaths than the original event. Panel moderator Benjamin Friedman, a research fellow at the Cato Institute, said academic and governmental discussions of acts of nuclear or biological terrorism have tended to focus on "worst-case assumptions about terrorists' ability to use these weapons to kill us." There is need for consideration for what is probable rather than simply what is possible, he said. Friedman took issue with the finding late last year of an experts' report that an act of WMD terrorism would "more likely than not" occur in the next half decade unless the international community takes greater action. "I would say that the report, if you read it, actually offers no analysis to justify that claim, which seems to have been made to change policy by generating alarm in headlines." One panel speaker offered a partial rebuttal to Mueller's presentation. Jim Walsh, principal research scientist for the Security Studies Program at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, said he agreed that nations would almost certainly not give a nuclear weapon to a nonstate group, that most terrorist organizations have no interest in seeking out the bomb, and that it would be difficult to build a weapon or use one that has been stolen.

#### Retaliation won’t cause global war

**Schuyler 2007** (Dave, “Restating the U.S. Policy of Nuclear Deterrence,” Last Mod Nov 13)

A recent post on nuclear deterrence on American Future drew several comments on another blog. The blogger at American Future, Marc Schulman, outlines the responses in this post. In summary the responses were that a nuclear response to a nuclear terrorist attack was itself terrorism, a nuclear retaliation would inevitably draw other state actors to escalate the exchange, a nuclear retaliation would be collective punishment, and attacking Muslim holy sites would be counterproductive. I agree with this last point but I want to deal with each of the other points in some detail. \* A nuclear response to a nuclear terrorist attack is terrorism.There’s no generally accepted definition of terrorism so before tackling this point I’ll propose one. Ignoring the issue of state actors vs. non-state actors I think that a terrorist attack is an attack on civilians or civilian assets whose purpose is to provoke terror. It has no other tactical or strategic significance. Any nuclear response by the United States would be against military or governmental facilities, sites involved in military production, or command and control. The objective would be to eliminate the possibility of future attacks or the support for those who would engage in future attacks. That such a response would inevitably result in massive civilian casualties is sad. But such a response would not, by definition, be terrorism \* A nuclear retaliation Iran in response to a terrorist nuclear attack would inevitably draw France, Russia, and China to enter the conflict.To believe this you must believe that France, Russia, and China will act irrationally. There is absolutely no reason to believe that this is the case. All three nations know that their intervention against the U. S. would result in total annihilation. There are other issues as well and let’s examine the two distinct cases: Russia on the one hand and France and China on the other. As a major non-Gulf producer of oil Russia would be in a position to benefit enormously in case of a disruption of Gulf oil production or shipment. That being the case they would publicly deplore a retaliation against Iran but privately rejoice. Both France and China are in an extremely delicate position. A nuclear response by either would result in total annihilation and, equally importantly, wouldn’t keep the oil flowing. Lack of a blue water navy means that both nations are completely at the mercy of the United States’s (or more specifically the U. S. Navy’s) willingness to keep shipments of oil moving out of the Gulf. China is particularly vulnerable since it has only about two weeks’ worth of strategic oil reserves. Neither France nor China has any real ability to project military force other than nuclear force beyond their borders. They’d be upset. But they’re in no position to do anything about it.

### terror turn

#### Drones cause more terrorism---Hydra effect and local backlash

Gabriella Blum 10, Assistant Professor of Law, Harvard Law School, and Philip Heymann, the James Barr Professor of Law, Harvard Law School, June 27, 2010, “Law and Policy of Targeted Killing,” Harvard National Security Journal, http://harvardnsj.org/wp-content/uploads/2010/06/Vol-1\_Blum-Heymann\_Final.pdf

An immediate consequence of eliminating leaders of terrorist organizations will sometimes be what may be called the Hydra effect, the rise of more—and more resolute—leaders to replace them. The decapitating of the organization may also invite retaliation by the other members and followers of the organization. Thus, when Israel assassinated Abbas Mussawi, Hezbollah‘s leader in Lebanon, in 1992, a more charismatic and successful leader, Hassan Nassrallah, succeeded Mussawi. The armed group then avenged the assassination of its former leader in two separate attacks, blowing up Israeli and Jewish targets in Buenos Aires, killing over a hundred people and injuring hundreds more.¶ Targeted killing may also interfere with important gathering of critical intelligence. The threat of being targeted will drive current leaders into hiding, making the monitoring of their movements and activities by the counterterrorist forces more difficult. Moreover, if these leaders are found and killed, instead of captured, the counterterrorism forces lose the ability to interrogate them to obtain potentially valuable information about plans, capabilities, or organizational structure.¶ The political message flowing from the use of targeted killings may be harmful to the attacking country’s interest, as it emphasizes the disparity in power between the parties and reinforces popular support for the terrorists, who are seen as a David fighting Goliath. Moreover, by resorting to military force rather than to law enforcement, targeted killings might strengthen the sense of legitimacy of terrorist operations, which are sometimes viewed as the only viable option for the weak to fight against a powerful empire. If collateral damage to civilians accompanies targeted killings, this, too, may bolster support for what seems like the just cause of the terrorists, at the same time as it weakens domestic support for fighting the terrorists.¶ When targeted killing operations are conducted on foreign territory, they run the risk of heightening international tensions between the targeting government and the government in whose territory the operation is conducted. Israel’s relations with Jordan became dangerously strained following the failed attempt in September 1997 in Jordan to assassinate Khaled Mashaal, the leader of Hamas. Indeed, international relations may suffer even where the local government acquiesces in the operation, but the operation fails or harms innocent civilians, bringing the local government under political attack from domestic constituencies (recall the failed attack in Pakistan on Al-Zawahiri that left eighteen civilians dead).¶ Even if there is no collateral damage, targeted killings in another country’s territory threatens to draw criticism from local domestic constituencies against the government, which either acquiesced or was too weak to stop the operation in its territory. Such is the case now in both Pakistan and Yemen, where opposition forces criticize the governments for permitting American armed intervention in their countries.¶ The aggression of targeted killings also runs the risk of spiraling hatred and violence, numbing both sides to the effects of killing and thus continuing the cycle of violence. Each attack invites revenge, each revenge invites further retaliation. Innocent civilians suffer whether they are the intended target of attack or its unintentional collateral consequences.¶ Last but not least, exceptional measures tend to exceed their logic. As in the case of extraordinary detention or interrogation methods, there is a danger of over-using targeted killings, both within and outside of the war on terrorism. A particular danger in this context arises as the killing of a terrorist often proves a simpler operation than protracted legal battles over detention, trial, extradition, and release.

### Russia d

#### No Russia war

**Graham 7** (senior advisor on Russia in the US National Security Council staff 2002-2007, Thomas, Russia in Global Affairs, July - September 2007, “The Dialectics of Strength and Weakness,” http://eng.globalaffairs.ru/numbers/20/1129.html)

An astute historian of Russia, Martin Malia, wrote several years ago that “Russia has at different times been demonized or divinized by Western opinion less because of her real role in Europe than because of the fears and frustrations, or hopes and aspirations, generated within European society by its own domestic problems.” Such is the case today. To be sure, mounting Western concerns about Russia are a consequence of Russian policies that appear to undermine Western interests, but they are also a reflection of declining confidence in our own abilities and the efficacy of our own policies. Ironically, this growing fear and distrust of Russia come at a time when Russia is arguably less threatening to the West, and the United States in particular, than it has been at any time since the end of the Second World War. Russia does not champion a totalitarian ideology intent on our destruction, its military poses no threat to sweep across Europe, its economic growth depends on constructive commercial relations with Europe, and its strategic arsenal – while still capable of annihilating the United States – is under more reliable control than it has been in the past fifteen years and the threat of a strategic strike **approaches zero probability**. Political gridlock in key Western countries, however, precludes the creativity, risk-taking, and subtlety needed to advance our interests on issues over which we are at odds with Russia while laying the basis for more constructive long-term relations with Russia.

### Econ Internal (1ar)

#### He’s keeping the 14th Amendment as an option

**Bruce, 10/5/13** (Mary, “Obama Doesn’t Rule Out Using 14th Amendment To Raise The Debt Limit” <http://abcnews.go.com/blogs/politics/2013/10/obama-doesnt-rule-out-using-14th-amendment-to-raise-the-debt-limit/>)

With the October 17 deadline to raise the debt limit rapidly approaching, President Obama is not specifically ruling out using the 14th Amendment to increase the nation’s borrowing ability if the political impasse continues and Congress fails to do so, but says “I don’t expect to get there.”¶ “There is one way to make sure that America pays its bills, and that’s for Congress to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury, Jack Lew, to pay bills that they have already accrued,” the president told The Associated Press in an interview Friday that was released this morning.¶ “I’m pretty willing to bet that there are enough votes in the House of Representatives right now to make sure that the United States doesn’t end up being a deadbeat. The only thing that’s preventing that from happening is Speaker Boehner calling the vote,” he said.¶ The White House has long maintained that “this administration does not believe that the 14th Amendment gives the power to the president to ignore the debt ceiling,” as White House Press Secretary Jay Carney said on Thursday. “We do not believe that the 14th Amendment provides that authority to the president.”¶ Pressed about whether he would be willing to take unilateral action to prevent default, the president told the AP that he hopes the fight doesn’t get to that point.¶ Four days into the government shutdown, the president reiterated to the Associated Press that he is not going to make concessions on his signature health care law or negotiate with House Republicans until they agree to reopen the government and raise the nation’s debt ceiling.¶ “The only thing that is keeping that from happening is Speaker Boehner has made a decision that he is going to hold out to see if he can get additional concessions from us,” Obama told the Associated Press’ Julie Pace.

#### No markets impact

Peter Lefkin 13, Senior Vice President of Government and External Affairs for Allianz of North America, “Round 2 of the Debt-Ceiling Debate,” Allianz Global, 5/21, <http://us.allianzgi.com/Commentary/MarketInsights/Pages/5QuestionswithPeterLefkin.aspx>

Expect more brinkmanship from Democrats and Republicans. Both parties will go through the rhetoric and the charade of partisan politics. After several years of political uncertainty, markets generally discount dysfunction in Washington. But the political leverage has shifted: The fiscal cliff was a strategic loss for Republicans but it set the stage for them to stand pat on the sequester. The cards are now in their favor. And they’re going to play them. Earlier this year, everyone expected Republicans to demand sweeping changes to entitlement spending as a condition of agreeing to raise the debt limit. With the budget numbers improving, and the public already lulled into complacency about the deficit by low interest rates, many Republicans realize that they may have to shift gears. They could tie the debt-ceiling increase to something else. The Republican wish list includes comprehensive tax reform, entitlement reform and construction of the Keystone oil pipeline.

#### Obama will act unilaterally to auction Treasury bonds to protect the economy

**Drum, 9/25/13** – blogger for Mother Jones (Kevin, “If We Reach the Debt Limit, Obama Will Probably Just Break Through It Anyway” <http://www.motherjones.com/kevin-drum/2013/09/obama-debt-ceiling-bond-auction>)

We have various laws that require the federal government to disburse money. However, if we reach our statutory debt limit without Congress raising it, we'll have another law that says the government can't borrow any more money. Matt Yglesias comments: So we're headed straight for a legal and constitutional crisis that could also become a financial crisis. What laws does the executive branch follow and which does it break? What litigation will result from any decision, and who will prevail? I think the conventional wisdom actually somewhat overstates the odds of this leading to a total financial meltdown. Worst comes to worst, you pay people with IOUs for a week and then organize an "illegal" debt auction where bonds will sell at a modest premium to currently prevailing rates and ultimately the courts legitimize the option. But that will definitely be a kind of constitutional meltdown that will permanently shake confidence in the American financial and political system. I don't know if this is exactly how things will unfold, but it's in the right ballpark. I realize that a lot of people are still pushing the platinum coin thing, but keep in mind that even if you don't buy any of the arguments for why it's illegal, it only works if you can deposit the coin at the Fed. And the Fed has already said it wouldn't accept it. So it's not a live option no matter how passionately you believe it's legal. But if the debt ceiling showdown lasts more than a couple of weeks, it's likely that President Obama will simply order the Treasury to start auctioning bonds regardless. Maybe under the authority of the 14th Amendment, maybe under his authority as commander-in-chief. Maybe he'll declare a state of emergency of some kind. Who knows? But eventually this is how things will work out, with Obama acting because he has to, and because he knows that courts will be loathe to intervene in a political dispute between the executive and legislative branches. In any case, it would be a helluva mess. Republicans really need to grow up and stop treating the livelihoods of millions of workers and the good faith of the United States as mere partisan chew toys. It's long past time for the business community to stage an intervention.

### 2ac – PC fails

#### Obama’s strategy is backfiring – no deal

**Schlapp, 10/4/13** (Mercedes, “Obama’s Dysfunctional Shutdown Strategy” US News,

<http://www.usnews.com/opinion/blogs/mercedes-schlapp/2013/10/04/obamas-shutdown-strategy-ignore-republicans-and-dont-negotiate>

President Barack Obama is acting like the head of the Democratic National Committee rather than the president of all Americans. He seems to forget that the American people voted for a divided government and want Congress and the president to negotiate.

The president is taking a huge political risk by choosing to ignore the Republicans in hopes that he can gain political capital in the long run and attempt to diminish the other side. However, his strategy is starting to backfire.

President Obama's and the liberal Democrats' refusal to negotiate with the other side is a destructive path. The Democrats believed that by painting the tea party as anarchists and Republicans as hostage takers they could win the fight. However, the Democrats are looking more like the obstructionist party, while the Republicans appear to take on the role of fighting for the people.

A White House senior administration official even stated that "we are winning … it doesn't really matter to us" how long the shutdown lasts. With those types of comments, the perception is that the White House does not care, but it does matter to those federal employees who rely on their paychecks and those individuals who depend on government services.

With presidential leadership and bipartisan support, we could reach a resolution and a compromise. We are already seeing one-third of the Democrats in the U.S. House of Representatives voting with Republicans to pass the piece-meal spending bills that would reopen the National Parks, the Veterans Administration and fully fund the National Guard, among other measures. The House is voting on back pay for furloughed government workers.

So it seems that the House is working while the Senate Democrats and the president cross their arms and do nothing; they are sending the message that it does not matter to them how long the government shutdown lasts. The House Democrats are also being discredited by the Senate Democrats who refuse to support the piecemeal approach. It is all or nothing for the liberals.

In the meantime, Washington is lacking the parent in the room to help keep the process moving and resolve the gridlock. Obama needs to rise to the occasion, move beyond party politics and work with Republicans.

President Obama's delayed response in meeting with the congressional leaders on the spending bill only exasperated the problem. He took a backseat and relinquished all authority to Congress, knowing that he would refuse to deal with the Republicans. His lack of engagement and unwillingness to move an inch is frustrating and further creates division in an already radioactive and dynamic environment.

### Won’t Pass (1ar)

#### Won’t pass---GOP irrational

Paul Krugman 10/1, Professor of Economics and International Affairs at Princeton, “Commentary: Rebels without a clue,” http://www.rutlandherald.com/article/20131001/OPINION04/710019982

No sane political system would run this kind of risk. But we don’t have a sane political system; we have a system in which a substantial number of Republicans believe that they can force President Barack Obama to cancel health reform by threatening a government shutdown, a debt default, or both, and in which Republican leaders who know better are afraid to level with the party’s delusional wing. For they are delusional, about both the economics and the politics.¶ On the economics: Republican radicals generally reject the scientific consensus on climate change; many of them reject the theory of evolution, too. So why expect them to believe expert warnings about the dangers of default? Sure enough, they don’t: The GOP caucus contains a significant number of “default deniers,” who simply dismiss warnings about the dangers of failing to honor our debts.¶ Meanwhile, on the politics, reasonable people know that Obama can’t and won’t let himself be blackmailed in this way, and not just because health reform is his key policy legacy. After all, once he starts making concessions to people who threaten to blow up the world economy unless they get what they want, he might as well tear up the Constitution. But Republican radicals — and even some leaders — still insist that Obama will cave in to their demands.¶ So how does this end? The votes to fund the government and raise the debt ceiling are there, and always have been: Every Democrat in the House would vote for the necessary measures, and so would enough Republicans. The problem is that GOP leaders, fearing the wrath of the radicals, haven’t been willing to allow such votes. What would change their minds?