## 1AC

### Same as R2 but…

#### Plan text change to: Plan: The United States federal judiciary should restrict the war power of the President of the United States to indefinitely detain without the Third Geneva Conventions Article Five rights.

## Case

### Absention

#### Threats real and not constructed—urgency of required action is the basis for determination

**Knudsen 1**– PoliSci Professor at Sodertorn (Olav, Post-Copenhagen Security Studies, Security Dialogue 32:3)

Moreover, I have a problem with the underlying implication that it is unimportant whether states 'really' face dangers from other states or groups. In the Copenhagen school, threats are seen as coming mainly from the actors' own fears, or from what happens when the fears of individuals turn into paranoid political action. In my view, this emphasis on the subjective is a **misleading conception of threat**, in that it discounts an independent existence for what- ever is perceived as a threat. Granted, political life is often marked by misperceptions, mistakes, pure imaginations, ghosts, or mirages, but such phenomena **do not occur simultaneously** to large numbers of politicians, and **hardly most of the time**. During the Cold War, threats - in the sense of plausible possibilities of danger - referred to 'real' phenomena, and they **refer to 'real' phenomena** now. The objects referred to are often not the same, but that is a different matter. Threats have to be dealt with both ín terms of perceptions and in terms of the phenomena which are perceived to be threatening. The point of Waever’s concept of security is not the potential existence of danger somewhere but the use of the word itself by political elites. In his 1997 PhD dissertation, he writes, ’One can View “security” as that which is in language theory called a speech act: it is not interesting as a sign referring to something more real - it is the utterance itself that is the act.’24 The deliberate disregard of objective factors is even more explicitly stated in Buzan & WaeVer’s joint article of the same year.” As a consequence, the phenomenon of threat is reduced to a matter of pure domestic politics.” It seems to me that the security dilemma, as a central notion in security studies, then loses its foundation. Yet I see that Waever himself has no compunction about referring to the security dilemma in a recent article." This discounting of the objective aspect of threats shifts security studies to insignificant concerns. What has long made 'threats' and ’threat perceptions’ important phenomena in the study of IR is the implication that **urgent action may be required**. Urgency, of course, is where Waever first began his argument in favor of an alternative security conception, because a convincing sense of urgency has been the chief culprit behind the abuse of 'security' and the consequent ’politics of panic', as Waever aptly calls it.” Now, here - in the case of urgency - another baby is thrown out with the Waeverian bathwater. When real situations of urgency arise, those situations are challenges to democracy; they are actually at the core of the problematic arising with the process of making security policy in parliamentary democracy. But in Waever’s world, threats are merely more or less persuasive, and the claim of urgency is just another argument. I hold that instead of 'abolishing' threatening phenomena ’out there’ by reconceptualizing them, as Waever does, we should continue paying attention to them, because **situations with a credible claim to urgency will keep coming back** and then we need to know more about how they work in the interrelations of groups and states (such as civil wars, for instance), not least to find adequate democratic procedures for dealing with them.

#### . No impact – threat construction isn’t sufficient to cause wars

**Kaufman ‘9** (Prof Poli Sci and IR – U Delaware, ‘9 (Stuart J, “Narratives and Symbols in Violent Mobilization: The Palestinian-Israeli Case,” Security Studies 18:3, 400 – 434)

Even when hostile narratives, group fears, and opportunity are strongly present, war occurs only if these factors are harnessed. Ethnic narratives and fears must combine to create significant ethnic hostility among mass publics. Politicians must also seize the opportunity to manipulate that hostility, evoking hostile narratives and symbols to gain or hold power by riding a wave of chauvinist mobilization. Such mobilization is often spurred by prominent events (for example, episodes of violence) that increase feelings of hostility and make chauvinist appeals seem timely. If the other group also mobilizes and if each side's felt security needs threaten the security of the other side, the result is a security dilemma spiral of rising fear, hostility, and mutual threat that results in violence. A virtue of this symbolist theory is that symbolist logic explains why ethnic peace is more common than ethnonationalist war. Even if hostile narratives, fears, and opportunity exist, severe violence usually can still be avoided if ethnic elites skillfully define group needs in moderate ways and collaborate across group lines to prevent violence: this is consociationalism.17 War is likely only if hostile narratives, fears, and opportunity spur hostile attitudes, chauvinist mobilization, and a security dilemma.

#### the alt locks in status quo power structures and makes war inevitable

**McCormack 10** (Tara McCormack, ’10, is Lecturer in International Politics at the University of Leicester and has a PhD in International Relations from the University of Westminster. 2010, Critique, Security and Power: The political limits to emancipatory approaches, page 59-61)

A corollary of this retreat from a political interpretation of conflict or social instability, is the delegitimation of social transformation in developing countries. Historically, social and political transformation has often been accompanied by war and strife. By pathologising conflict, the human security framework acts to prohibit social or political transformation, as such changes can only be understood in an entirely negative way (see for further discussion, Cramer 2006). As an important contributor to the human security framework has argued: ‘much human insecurity surely results from structural factors and the distribution of power, which are essentially beyond the reach of individuals’ (Newman, 2004b: 358). Thus to actually overcome human insecurity, collective action and change is needed. But this **may result in** **internal conflict or strife**, **precisely the changes that human security problematises in the first place**. People may be prepared to experience disruptions to their daily existence, or even severe societal conflict or economic deprivation in the pursuit of some other goals which are understood as worthy. The shift away from the pluralist security framework is **highly problematic**. The formal links between the state and its citizens are problematised and weak and failing states are potentially held up to increased international scrutiny and international intervention. International institutions and states have potentially greater freedom to intervene in other states, but with no reciprocal methods of control to replace the old political links between the state and its citizens which are weakened. The shift away from the pluralist security framework and the rhetorical adoption by international institutions and states of a more cosmopolitan security framework **does not challenge contemporary power inequalities, rather it serves to entrench them**. Once we separate rights from any rights bearing subject, these rights are only things that can be given by external agencies, indeed as Chandler (2009) has argued, here the subject is created by external powers. Ultimately the cosmopolitan and emancipatory framework which seeks to give universal human rights through international law or forms of intervention posits abstract rights, seeking to make the world conform to universal human rights and justice in the absence of a political constituency to give it content. Indeed this is seen as necessary in the face of the current global injustices. Yet the problem is that **without a political constituency to give content to those rights these rights are gifts of the powerful, they are closer to charity**. **Rights in themselves, without political form, are of little value**. Here rights are assumed to be able to correct political and economic and social wrongs, such as inequality or disempowerment. Yet such problems are not the result of a lack of rights, and cannot be corrected through rights. A lack of development is a political, economic and social problem (Lewis, 1998; Heartfield, 1996), the lack of rights or equality and empowerment stem from the real inequalities and power relations in the world. Divorcing rights from rights bearing subjects, and positing abstract individual rights that can only be ‘given’ by external agencies, does not enhance rights but ends up formalising real inequality (Lewis, 1998). Indeed, this is precisely what we can see with, for example, human security and contemporary interventions. Here, the old formal equality of the pluralist security framework is no longer relevant and it is increasingly accepted that more powerful states have a right to intervene in other states and to frame certain states as ‘outlaw states’ (Simpson, 2005). Conclusion In this chapter I have argued that there have been significant shifts in the post-Cold War security problematic which cannot be understood in terms of the pluralist security framework. The most striking aspect of the contemporary international security problematic seems to be a shift away from and problematisation of the old security framework in both international and national security policy discourse. I have already discussed that the pluralist security framework with its underlying commitments of non-intervention and sovereign equality is held to be both anachronistic and immoral. This chapter lends support to broadening the initial conclusions drawn about the critical security theory more generally. In their own terms critical security theorists do not seem to be very critical. Critical security theorists **are not** **critically engaging and explaining the contemporary security problematic and offering an alternative** to contemporary power inequalities. A critical question to ask would be why have international institutions and states framed their security policies in terms of a rejection of the pluralist security framework and taken up cosmopolitan rhetoric? Where does this shift come from? Despite their ostensible focus on power and power inequalities, it is striking that critical security theorists exclude the way in which power is being exercised in the post-Cold War international order from their analysis. Were critical security theorists to include this in their analysis they would discover that they seem to be sharing many of the assumptions and aims of the post-Cold War international order. Specifically in the context of the shifting international security problematic, critical security theorists seem to share a normative and ethical critique of the old security framework, combined with a depoliticised account of conflict and social, economic and political instability, and a depoliticised and idealised view of the potential of major international institutions and states to intervene. Moreover, in the behaviour and rhetoric of international institutions, the problematic theoretical implications of critical security theory’s idealised assumptions of the potential of international institutions or transnational organisations to be a force for emancipation and freedom for individuals is shown to be problematic in practice. I have argued that this rejection of the pluralist security framework does not challenge the status quo, but serves to further entrench power inequalities. In fact, it seems to reflect the increased freedom of the international community to intervene in other states.

### Terror Reps

#### You’ve conceded that terror is inevitable that’s sufficient justification of our reps. And describing terrorists as threats is key to solvency

O’Sullivan 01 (John, Editor-in-chief of United Press International, National Review Online, Sept 25, http://www.nationalreview.com/jos/josprint092501.html)

It is terrorists hijacking planes who put themselves on a different and lower level to other people — not the journalists who report their actions with attempted objectivity. Terrorism is a part of contemporary reality. To gloss over it is to paint a **false picture**. And insofar as that false picture erases the real distinction between, say, a politician whose power derives from votes and one whose power derives from bombs, then a serious distortion enters into reporting.¶ Nor is this a hypothetical criticism. Much reporting of the conflicts in Northern Ireland, Colombia, and the Basque country has blurred exactly that distinction.¶ Finally, let us look at Mr. Jukes's underlying justification that "one man's terrorist is another man's freedom fighter." By a nice coincidence this argument was justly characterized on Saturday in Canada's National Post as "an adolescent sophistry" by the Canadian poet and journalist, George Jonas.¶ Simply put, the sophistry consists of confusing a terrorist's cause with his methods.¶ A terrorist is a man who murders indiscriminately, distinguishing neither between innocent and guilty nor between soldier and civilian. He may employ terrorism — planting bombs in restaurants, or hijacking planes and aiming them at office towers-in a bad cause or in a good one.¶ He may be a Nazi terrorist, or an anti-Nazi terrorist, a Communist or an anti-Communist, pro-Palestinian or pro-Israel. We may want to defeat his political cause or see it triumph. For his methods, however, the terrorist is **always to be condemned**. Indeed, to describe him objectively is to condemn him — even if his cause is genuinely a fight for freedom with which we sympathize.¶ Therein lies Mr. Jukes's trial and temptation.¶ Those who sympathize with the terrorist's cause — whether they are Islamic fundamentalists seeking America's withdrawal from Saudi Arabia, or Spanish citizens in the Basque country who want an independent Basque state, or Irish Americans seeking Britain's withdrawal from Northern Ireland — are tempted to overlook or deny his methods. They do not want to acknowledge that someone is killing innocent people in the name of a cause they passionately support. They wish to banish such an uncomfortable truth from their minds. So they do not like to see him accurately described as a terrorist. It makes them feel guilty about the support and sympathy they give him; it may even make them reconsider that support.¶ When Reuters decided not to call the perpetrators of the World Trade Center attack "terrorists," it took a step towards making people **feel less guilty about** aiding or **sympathizing with such evil**. It was a small step, but an unnecessary one. And it **should be retraced**.

### 2AC AT: Executive Circumvention

#### No circumvention- Obama has asked for our aff- wouldn’t want to be perceived as flip flopping post plan

#### Your evidence doesn’t apply to our mechanism- circumvention happened before because rulings weren’t explicit restrictions

Bradely 10 (Curtis is the William Van Alstyne Professor of Law, Professor of Public Policy Studies, and Senior Associate Dean for Faculty & Research at the Duke University School of Law, “CLEAR STATEMENT RULES AND¶ EXECUTIVE WAR POWERS”, http://www.harvard-jlpp.com/wp-content/uploads/2010/01/bradley.pdf)

The Court’s decision in Boumediene v. Bush4 might seem an¶ aberration in this regard, but it is not. Although the Court in¶ Boumediene did rely on the Constitution in holding that the detainees¶ at Guantanamo have a right to seek habeas corpus review¶ in U.S. courts, it did not impose any specific restrictions¶ on the executive’s detention, treatment, or trial of the detain‐ees.5 In other words, Boumediene was more about preserving a¶ role for the courts than about prohibiting the executive from¶ exercising statutorily conferred authority.

#### There ev is nothing more than presidential posturing- Obama would comply with the aff

Green 11 (Craig, Prof of Law at Temple Unviersity , Northwestern University Law Review, Vol 105, No 3"Ending the Korematsu Era: An Early View From the War on Terror Cases")

Jackson’s hard-nosed analysis may seem intellectually bracing, but it understates the real-world power of judicial precedent to shape what is po- litically possible.306 Although presidential speeches occasionally declare a willingness to disobey Supreme Court rulings, actual disobedience of this sort is rare and would carry grave political consequences.307 Even President Bush’s losses in the GWOT cases did not spur serious consideration of noncompliance despite broad support from a Republican Congress.308 Likewise, from the perspective of strengthening presidential power, Kore- matsu-era decisions emboldened President Bush in his twenty-first-century choices about Guantánamo and military commissions.309 Thus, the modern historical record shows that judicial precedent can both expand and restrict the political sphere of presidential action.¶ The operative influence of judicial precedent is even stronger than a court-focused record might suggest, as the past sixty years have witnessed a massive bureaucratization and legalization of all levels of executive gov- ernment.310 From the White House Counsel, to the Pentagon, to other enti- ties addressing intelligence and national security issues, lawyers now occupy such high-level governmental posts that almost no significant policy is determined without multiple layers of legal review.311 And these execu- tive lawyers are predominantly trained to think—whatever else they may believe—that Supreme Court precedent is authoritative and binding.312

## T

### 2AC T

#### War power authority does not require use of military during war time – applies at all times

Manget 87 (<http://media.nara.gov/dc-metro/rg-263/6922330/Box-10-114-7/263-a1-27-box-10-114-7.pdf>, declassified document, “PRESIDENTIAL WAR POWERS” accessed 8/17/13)

The President's war powers autho ity is actually a national defense power ¶ that exists at all times, whether or not ¶ there is a war declared by Congress, an ¶ armed conflict, or any other hostilities ¶ or fighting. In a recent case the Supreme ¶ Court upheld the revocation of the passport of a former CIA employee (Agee) ¶ and rejected his contention that certain ¶ statements of Executive Branch policy ¶ were entitled to diminished weight ¶ because they concerned the powers of ¶ the Executive in wartime. The Court stated: "History eloquently attests that ¶ grave problems of national security and foreign policy are by no means limited ¶ to times of formally declared war. "¶ 3; Another court has said that the war power ¶ is not confined to actual engagements on fields of battle only but embraces ¶ every aspect of national defense and comprehends everything reQuired to wage ¶ war successfully.3¶ H A third court stated: "It is-and must be-true that the ¶ Executive should be accorded wide and normally unassailable discretion with ¶ respect to the conduct of the national defense and the prosecution of national ¶ objectives through military means. "¶ 39

## DA

### 2AC Exec Power DA

#### Congress already has taken away Obama’s control of detention

Janet Cooper Alexander 13, professor of law at Stanford University, March 21st, 2013, "The Law-Free Zone and Back Again," Illinois Law Review, [illinoislawreview.org/wp-content/ilr-content/articles/2013/2/Alexander.pdf](http://illinoislawreview.org/wp-content/ilr-content/articles/2013/2/Alexander.pdf)

Congressalsopassed legislation requiringsuspectedmembers of al- Qaeda or “associated forces” to be held in military custody,again making it difficult to prosecute them in federal court.The bill as passed contained some moderating elements, including the possibility of presidential waiver of the military custody requirement, 7 recognition of the FBI’s ability to interrogate suspects, 8 and a disclaimer stating that the statute was not intended to change existing law regarding the authority of the President, the scope of the Authorization for Use of Military Force, 9 or the detention of U.S. citizens, lawful residents, or persons captured in the United States. 10 All the while, Republican presidential hopefuls were vying to see who could be the most vigorous proponent of indefinite detention, barring trials in civilian courts, and reinstating a national policy of interrogation by torture.¶11¶During the same period, the D.C. Circuit issued a series of decisions that effectively reversed the Supreme Court’s habeas decisions of 2004 and 2008. 12The Supreme Court’s failure to review these decisions has left detainees with essentially no meaningful opportunity to challenge their custody.¶Thus,a decade that began with the executive branch’s assertion of sole and exclusive power to act unconstrained by law or the other branches ended, ironically, with Congress asserting its power to countermand the executive branch’s decisions, regardless of detainee claims of legal rights, in order to maintain those law-free policies. And although the Supreme Court had blocked the Bush administration’s law-free zone strategy by upholding detainees’ habeas rights, the D.C. Circuit has since rendered those protections toothless

#### Checks on the Presidents power solves deterrence better- makes our threats credible

**Waxman 13** (Matthew C- Professor of Law at Columbia Law School; Adjunct Senior Fellow for Law and Foreign Policy, Council on Foreign Relations, “The Constitutional Power to Threaten War”, Forthcoming in Yale Law Journal, vol. 123 (2014), 8/25/2013, PDF)

A second argument, this one advanced by some congressionalists, is that stronger legislative checks on presidential uses of force would improve deterrent and coercive strategies by making them more selective and credible. The most credible U.S. threats, this argument holds, are those that carry formal approval by Congress, which reflects strong public support and willingness to bear the costs of war; requiring express legislative backing to make good on threats might therefore be thought to enhance the potency of threats by encouraging the President to seek congressional authorization before acting.181 A frequently cited instance is President Eisenhower’s request (soon granted) for standing congressional authorization to use force in the Taiwan Straits crises of the mid- and late-1950s – an authorization he claimed at the time was important to bolstering the credibility of U.S. threats to protect Formosa from Chinese aggression.182 (Eisenhower did not go so far as to suggest that congressional authorization ought to be legally required, however.) “It was [Eisenhower’s] seasoned judgment … that a commitment the United States would have much greater impact on allies and enemies alike because it would represent the collective judgment of the President and Congress,” concludes Louis Fisher. “Single-handed actions taken by a President, without the support of Congress and the people, can threaten national prestige and undermine the presidency. Eisenhower’s position was sound then. It is sound now.”183 A critical assumption here is that legal requirements of congressional participation in decisions to use force filters out unpopular uses of force, the threats of which are unlikely to be credible and which, if unsuccessful, undermine the credibility of future U.S. threats.¶ A third view is that legal clarity is important to U.S. coercive and deterrent strategies; that ambiguity as to the President’s powers to use force undermines the credibility of threats. Michael Reisman observed, for example, in 1989: “Lack of clarity in the allocation of competence and the uncertain congressional role will sow uncertainty among those who depend on U.S. effectiveness for security and the maintenance of world order. Some reduction in U.S. credibility and diplomatic effectiveness may result.”184 Such stress on legal clarity is common among lawyers, who usually regard it as important to planning, whereas strategists tend to see possible value in “constructive ambiguity”, or deliberate fudging of drawn lines as a negotiating tactic or for domestic political purposes.185 A critical assumption here is that clarity of constitutional or statutory design with respect to decisions about force exerts significant effects on foreign perceptions of U.S. resolve to make good on threats, if not by affecting the substance of U.S. policy commitments with regard to force then by pointing foreign actors to the appropriate institution or process for reading them.

#### Flexibility is irrelevant in the hegemonic era—rule-breaking is a greater risk

Knowles 09 (Robert, Assistant Professor, New York University School of Law, Spring 2009, "American Hegemony and the Foreign Affairs Constitution" Arizona State Law Journal, Lexis)

The hegemonic model also reduces the need for executive branch flexibility, and the institutional competence terrain shifts toward the courts. The stability of the current U.S.-led international system depends on the ability of the U.S. to govern effectively. Effective governance depends on, among other things, predictability. n422 G. John Ikenberry analogizes America's hegemonic position to that of a "giant corporation" seeking foreign investors: "The rule of law and the institutions of policy making in a democracy are the political equivalent of corporate transparency and [\*155] accountability." n423 Stable interpretation of the law bolsters the stability of the system because other nations will know that they can rely on those interpretations and that there will be at least some degree of enforcement by the United States. At the same time, the separation of powers serves the global-governance function by reducing the ability of the executive branch to make "abrupt or aggressive moves toward other states." n424 The Bush Administration's detainee policy, for all of its virtues and faults, was an exceedingly aggressive departure from existing norms, and was therefore bound to generate intense controversy. It was formulated quickly, by a small group of policy-makers and legal advisors without consulting Congress and over the objections of even some within the executive branch. n425 Although the Administration invoked the law of armed conflict to justify its detention of enemy combatants, it did not seem to recognize limits imposed by that law. n426 Most significantly, it designed the detention scheme around interrogation rather than incapacitation and excluded the detainees from all legal protections of the Geneva Conventions. n427 It declared all detainees at Guantanamo to be "enemy combatants" without establishing a regularized process for making an individual determination for each detainee. n428 And when it established the military commissions, also without consulting Congress, the Administration denied defendants important procedural protections. n429 In an anarchic world characterized by great power conflict, one could make the argument that the executive branch requires maximum flexibility to defeat the enemy, who may not adhere to international law. Indeed, the precedents relied on most heavily by the Administration in the enemy combatant cases date from the 1930s and 1940s - a period when the international system was radically unstable, and the United States was one of several great powers vying for advantage. n430 But during that time, the executive branch faced much more exogenous pressure from other great powers to comply with international law in the treatment of captured enemies. If the United States strayed too far from established norms, it would risk retaliation upon its own soldiers or other consequences from [\*156] powerful rivals. Today, there are no such constraints: enemies such as al Qaeda are not great powers and are not likely to obey international law anyway. Instead, the danger is that American rule-breaking will set a pattern of rule-breaking for the world, leading to instability. n431 America's military predominance enables it to set the rules of the game. When the U.S. breaks its own rules, it loses legitimacy.

## K

### 2AC K

The alternative should be evaluated based on their ability to engage 1AC institutions- society shapes individual beliefs and create behavioral patterns for macro-level trends- their pedagogy is irrelevant absent a method of engagement

Wight – Professor of IR @ University of Sydney – 6

(Colin, Agents, Structures and International Relations: Politics as Ontology, pgs. 48-50

One important aspect of this relational ontology is that these relations constitute our identity as social actors. According to this relational model of societies, one is what one is, by virtue of the relations within which one is embedded. A worker is only a worker by virtue of his/her relationship to his/her employer and vice versa. ‘Our social being is constituted by relations and our social acts presuppose them.’ At any particular moment in time an individual may be implicated in all manner of relations, each exerting its own peculiar causal effects. This ‘lattice-work’ of relations constitutes the structure of particular societies and endures despite changes in the individuals occupying them. Thus, the relations, the structures, are ontologically distinct from the individuals who enter into them. At a minimum, the social sciences are concerned with two distinct, although mutually interdependent, strata. There is an ontological difference between people and structures: ‘people are not relations, societies are not conscious agents’. Any attempt to explain one in terms of the other should be rejected. If there is an ontological difference between society and people, however, we need to elaborate on the relationship between them. Bhaskar argues that we need a system of mediating concepts, encompassing both aspects of the duality of praxis into which active subjects must fit in order to reproduce it: that is, a system of concepts designating the ‘point of contact’ between human agency and social structures. This is known as a ‘positioned practice’ system. In many respects, the idea of ‘positioned practice’ is very similar to Pierre Bourdieu’s notion of *habitus*. Bourdieu is primarily concerned with what individuals do in their daily lives. He is keen to refute the idea that social activity can be understood solely in terms of individual decision-making, or as determined by surpa-individual objective structures. Bourdieu’s notion of the *habitus* can be viewed as a bridge-building exercise across the explanatory gap between two extremes. Importantly, the notion of a habitus can only be understood in relation to the concept of a ‘social field’. According to Bourdieu, a social field is ‘a network, or a configuration, of objective relations between positions objectively defined’. A social field, then, refers to a structured system of social positions occupied by individuals and/or institutions – the nature of which defines the situation for their occupants. This is a social field whose form is constituted in terms of the relations which define it as a field of a certain type. A *habitus* (positioned practices) is a mediating link between individuals’ subjective worlds and the socio-cultural world into which they are born and which they share with others. The power of the habitus derives from the thoughtlessness of habit and habituation, rather than consciously learned rules. The habitus is imprinted and encoded in a socializing process that commences during early childhood. It is inculcated more by experience than by explicit teaching. Socially competent performances are produced as a matter of routine, without explicit reference to a body of codified knowledge, and without the actors necessarily knowing what they are doing (in the sense of being able adequately to explain what they are doing). As such, the *habitus* can be seen as the site of ‘internalization of reality and the externalization of internality.’ Thus social practices are produced in, and by, the encounter between: (1) the *habitus* and its dispositions; (2) the constraints and demands of the socio-cultural field to which the habitus is appropriate or within; and (3) the dispositions of the individual agents located within both the socio-cultural field and the *habitus*. When placed within Bhaskar’s stratified complex social ontology the model we have is as depicted in Figure 1. The explanation of practices will require all three levels. Society, as field of relations, exists prior to, and is independent of, individual and collective understandings at any particular moment in time; that is, social action requires the conditions for action. Likewise, given that behavior is seemingly recurrent, patterned, ordered, institutionalised, and displays a degree of stability over time, there must be sets of relations and rules that govern it. Contrary to individualist theory, these relations, rules and roles are not dependent upon either knowledge of them by particular individuals, or the existence of actions by particular individuals; that is, their explanation cannot be reduced to consciousness or to the attributes of individuals. These emergent social forms must possess emergent powers. This leads on to arguments for the reality of society based on a causal criterion. Society, as opposed to the individuals that constitute it, is, as Foucault has put it, ‘a complex and independent reality that has its own laws and mechanisms of reaction, its regulations as well as its possibility of disturbance. This new reality is society…It becomes necessary to reflect upon it, upon its specific characteristics, its constants and its variables’.

#### Alt doesn’t solve detention- engagement is key

Jenks and Talbot-Jensen 11 (INDEFINITE DETENTION UNDER THE LAWS OF WAR Chris Jenks\* & Eric Talbot Jensen\*\* Lieutenant Colonel, U.S. Army Judge Advocate General's Corps. Presently serving as the Chief of the International Law Branch, Office of The Judge Advocate General, Washington D.C. The views expressed in this Article are those of the author and not The Judge Advocate General's Corps, the U.S. Army, or the Department of Defense. \*\* Visiting Assistant Professor, Fordham Law School. The authors wish to thank Sue Ann Johnson for her exceptional research and editing skills, and the organizers and attendees at both the 3rd Annual National Security Law Jtinior Faculty Workshop at the University of Texas School of Law, where we first discussed the ideas for this article, and the Stanford Law and Policy Review National Defense Symposium, where we first presented the finished product. STANFORD LAW & POLICY REVIEW [Vol. 22:1] Page Lexis)

Those who would deconstruct the law of war as applied to detention stemming from armed conflict with non state actors may achieve victory, but in an academic, and, practically speaking, pyrrhic sense. Arguing that the Geneva Conventions for Prisoners and Civilians do not, on their face, apply to members of al-Qaeda or the Taliban may be correct, and in more than one way. But in so arguing, the deconstructionist approach removes a large portion of intemationally recognized and accepted provisions for regulating detention associated with armed conflict—^the Geneva Conventions—^while leaving the underlying question of how to govern detention unanswered. At some point, even the deconstmctionist must shift to positivism and propose an altemative, an altemative we submit would inevitably resemble that which is already extant in the law of war. Moreover, while there has been discussion about the strained application of the Geneva Conventions and Additional Protocols to states combating transnational terrorism, attempts at a new convention have gained little traction. Our approach is more an attempt at pragmatism than radicalism—there are individuals currently detained, purportedly indefinitely and under the law of war. Yet despite years of such detention, two administrations have provided little if any information on what exactly such detention means, how and by what it is govemed, and if and how it ends. Conflating aspects of intemationally recognized law of war conventions allows for a transparent process that could be promulgated now. Whether for the up to fifty or so individuals currently detained at Guantanamo or for those who may be detained in the future, we posit that the law of war provides a legitimate model for indefinite detention. And, as the Walsh Report recognized,^' the longer detainees are held, the more concern for their individual situations must be given. We therefore analyze the complete protections provided by the law of war and advocate that all of them, over time and to varying degrees, be applied to the detainees in Guantanamo. In this way, detention under the laws of war can provide a humane system of indefinite detention that strikes the right balance between the security of the nation and the rights of individuals

#### Liberalism is true and promotes peace

Recchia and Doyle 11

[Stefano (Assistant Professor in International Relations at the University of Cambridge) and Michael (Harold Brown Professor of International Affairs, Law and Political Science at Columbia University), “Liberalism in International Relations”, In: Bertrand Badie, Dirk Berg-Schlosser, and Leonardo Morlino, eds., International Encyclopedia of Political Science (Sage, 2011), pp. 1434-1439, RSR]

Relying on new insights from game theory, ¶ scholars during the 1980s and 1990s emphasized ¶ that so-called international regimes, consisting of ¶ agreed-on international norms, rules, and decision-making procedures, can help states effectively coordinate their policies and collaborate in ¶ the production of international public goods, such ¶ as free trade, arms control, and environmental ¶ protection. Especially, if embedded in formal multilateral institutions, such as the World Trade ¶ Organization (WTO) or North American Free ¶ Trade Agreement (NAFT A), regimes crucially ¶ improve the availability of information among ¶ states in a given issue area, thereby promoting ¶ reciprocity and enhancing the reputational costs ¶ of noncompliance. As noted by Robert Keohane, ¶ institutionalized multilateralism also reduces strategic competition over relative gains and thus ¶ further advances international cooperation. ¶ Most international regime theorists accepted ¶ Kenneth Waltz's (1979) neorealist assurription of ¶ states as black boxes-that is, unitary and rational ¶ actors with given interests. Little or no attention ¶ was paid to the impact on international cooperation of domestic political processes and dynamics. ¶ Likewise, regime scholarship largely disregarded ¶ the arguably crucial question of whether prolonged interaction in an institutionalized international setting can fundamentally change states' ¶ interests or preferences over outcomes (as opposed ¶ to preferences over strategies), thus engendering ¶ positive feedback loops of increased overall cooperation.

For these reasons, international regime ¶ theory is not, properly speaking, liberal, and the ¶ term neoliberal institutionalism frequently used to ¶ identify it is somewhat misleading. ¶ It is only over the past decade or so that liberal ¶ international relations theorists have begun to systematically study the relationship between domestic politics and institutionalized international cooperation or global governance. This new scholarship ¶ seeks to explain in particular the close interna tional ¶ cooperation among liberal democracies as well as ¶ higher-than-average levels of delegation b)' democracies to complex multilateral bodies, such as the ¶ \ ¶ Liberalism in International Relations 1437 ¶ European Union (EU), North Atlantic Treaty ¶ Organization (NATO), NAFTA, and the WTO ¶ (see, e.g., John Ikenberry, 2001; Helen Milner & ¶ Andrew Moravcsik, 2009). The reasons that make ¶ liberal democracies particularly enthusiastic about ¶ international cooperation are manifold: First, ¶ transnational actors such as nongovernmental ¶ organizations and private corporations thrive in ¶ liberal democracies, and they frequently advocate ¶ increased international cooperation; second, ¶ elected democratic officials rely on delegation to ¶ multilateral bodies such as the WTO or the EU to ¶ commit to a stable policy line and to internationally lock in fragile domestic policies and constitutional arrangements; and finally, powerful liberal ¶ democracies, such as the United States and its ¶ allies, voluntarily bind themselves into complex ¶ global governance arrangements to demonstrate ¶ strategic restraint and create incentives for other ¶ states to cooperate, thereby reducing the costs for ¶ maintaining international order. ¶ Recent scholarship, such as that of Charles ¶ Boehmer and colleagues, has also confirmed the ¶ classical liberal intuition that formal international ¶ institutions, such as the United Nations (UN) or ¶ NATO, independently contribute to peace, especially when they are endowed with sophisticated ¶ administrative structures and information-gathering ¶ capacities. In short, research on global governance ¶ and especially on the relationship between democracy and international cooperation is thriving, and ¶ it usefully complements liberal scholarship on the democratic peace.

#### Our speech act is sufficient to solve- the affs introduction of detention to the public consciousness creates effective political movements for change

Cole 12 (David Cole is a Professor of Law, Georgetown University Law Center, “Legal Affairs: Dreyfus, Guantanamo, and the Foundation of the Rule of Law, 29 Touro L. Rev. 43)

Moreover, while district courts exercising habeas corpus jurisdiction initially ruled in favor of the detainees in the large majority of cases they heard, the United States Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit has consistently sided with the government on its appeals, and has eased the government's burden to demonstrate that a detainee is lawfully held. n69 The Supreme Court has repeatedly denied petitions for certiorari from these D.C. Circuit decisions. n70 Meanwhile, the Supreme Court's other post-9/11 national security decisions have all been decided in the government's favor. n71 [\*54] The Court rejected two lawsuits seeking damages against Attorney General John Ashcroft for alleged unconstitutional detentions in the roundups that occurred in the wake of 9/11. n72 And the Court rejected a First Amendment challenge to the criminalization of pure speech advocating peace and human rights under the "material support" statute. n73 The Court's record on protecting human rights, in short, while better than in previous crises, is mixed. Moreover, most of the Bush administration's curtailments of its aggressive initiatives enumerated above were not ordered by a court. No court ordered the abandonment of the first torture memo, an end to extraordinary rendition, the suspension of the NSA warrantless wiretapping program, the release of the secret torture memos, or the closure of the CIA's black sites. n74 Approximately 600 men have been released from Guantanamo, but the vast majority was released without a court order, and none have been released under a non-appealable court order. While several district courts have ordered the release of Guantanamo detainees, every time the administration has appealed to the District of Columbia Circuit ("D.C. Circuit"), it has prevailed. n75 No court ordered the administration to abandon the Article II Commander-in-Chief theory of uncheckable executive power. Additionally, as noted above, when the D.C. Circuit ruled that international law did not play any role in constraining the president's detention authority, President Obama in effect objected that the court had granted him too much unchecked authority, and insisted that his actions were bound by international law. What, then, caused the United States, specifically the executive branch, to change course? In my view, they were much the same sorts of forces that worked to vindicate Alfred Dreyfus: not the formal separation of powers, but informal nongovernmental resistance in the name of upholding the rule of law. As in the Dreyfus affair, this resistance took the form of individuals, acting on their own and [\*55] in association with others, speaking out, issuing critical reports, organizing protests, filing lawsuits, and generally challenging perceived abuses of power. n76 As in the Dreyfus affair, the media played a critical role, by disclosing secret rights abuses and writing countless editorials espousing the importance of adhering to the rule of law and the Constitution. Were it not for leaks reported in the media, we would not know about the torture at Abu Ghraib, the torture memo, the NSA warrantless wiretapping program, secret CIA prisons, and extraordinary renditions to torture. In addition, international voices played a major role. Guantanamo, after all, held nationals from forty-two countries, and some of those countries objected strongly to the way their countrymen were treated there. A former United Kingdom Law Lord, Lord Steyn, dubbed Guantanamo a "legal black hole," and 175 members of the Houses of Parliament filed an amicus brief on the Guantanamo detainees' behalf in the Supreme Court. n77 Together, these informal forces are responsible, as much as the formal separation of powers, for reining in the United States' "war on terror" in important ways. What lessons, then, can we draw from the Dreyfus affair and the first post-9/11 decade? The first is that the rule of law and individual rights are all too vulnerable to fear and demagoguery in times of crisis. Designed to constrain short-sighted decision making by insisting on adherence to basic principles of fairness, constitutional rights often seem inconvenient obstacles in a crisis. For Dreyfus and many Arabs and Muslims after 9/11, the law was initially unable to offer much, if any, protection. But both affairs also suggest that the rule of law is more resilient than many cynics might think. Alfred Dreyfus was eventually exonerated. The rule of law recovered in significant measure from its hasty dismissal in the aftermath of the 9/11 terrorist attacks. However, in both instances, the tide turned only because individuals, associations, and nongovernmental organizations [\*56] mobilized behind the cause of justice for the vulnerable. When it comes to the reality of rights protections, much depends on the mobilization of the polity. But as the other "affair" under examination in this conference - the lynching of American Jewish businessman Leo Frank - chillingly demonstrates, popular mobilization can go either way. n78 When, in 1915, Georgia's governor commuted Frank's death sentence for murder to life without imprisonment, based on substantial concerns with the fairness of the trial and the accuracy of the verdict, a mob gathered, abducted Frank from his cell, and lynched him. n79 Popular mobilization does not always take the side of human rights, and it can easily overwhelm legal bulwarks through brute force and terror. Precisely because they help to establish and reinforce a culture of respect for equality and the rule of law, the assessments and reassessments of the "Dreyfus affair" that continue to this day in France are critically important for sustaining contemporary commitments to the rule of law. The fact that the case has become an "affair," a narrative widely known, exhaustively studied, and frequently invoked is crucial, for the history of the "affair" reminds us of what can go wrong when we depart from principles of fairness and justice. Whether the story of the United States' response to 9/11 will similarly become an "affair" from which the United States and others draw lessons about resisting the temptation to sacrifice our fundamental commitments on the backs of the most vulnerable, remains to be seen. As was the case with Dreyfus for many years, the particular lessons to be drawn from the post-9/11 era are a matter of deep contestation. President Bush, Vice-President Cheney, and their supporters have sought to portray their actions as tough, but necessary and reasonable, decisions to recalibrate security and liberty. n80 Others, myself included, have insisted that the principal lesson [\*57] of the first post-9/11 decade is that sacrifices in the rule of law are all too easy to make, generally unnecessary, and come at a great cost to the legitimacy and long-term success of a democracy's struggle against terrorism. The fact that Guantanamo has become one of the world's leading symbols for "lawlessness" suggests that the latter narrative has taken hold, at least in the rest of the world. The struggle over its meaning within the United States, however, continues. n81 At stake is nothing less than the nature of our constitutional culture.

Whether, after the next attack, we repeat our mistakes or respond in a more resilient and rights-respecting manner depends ultimately on the lessons we learn as a nation from our recent past. Those who are committed to the protection of civil liberties and the rule of law must continue to work to ensure that the "Guantanamo affair" takes on the character of the "Dreyfus affair" in popular consciousness. At the end of the day, the strength of our legal protections turns on our culture's engaged commitment to the values of the Constitution, the rule of law, and human rights.

#### Adopting legal tactics are vital for movements that seek to promote the rights of the disempowered
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(Penda D Louder than Words:Lawyers, Communities and the Struggle for Justice, <http://www.racialequitytools.org/resourcefiles/hair.pdf>, Penda D. Hair is Co-Director of the Advancement Project at the Rockafeller Foundation, The many lawyers, clients, community organizations and activists whose visionary work in the field is reflected herein generously shared their time, experiences, lessons and mistakes, as well as triumphs. This is their report. I have tried to be an accurate and thoughtful recorder. Dayna L. Cunningham, Associate Director of the Rockefeller Foundation’s Working Communities Division, conceived this project and brought together the people and the resources to bring it to fruition. Her penetrating ideas on race and lawyering infuse every page of the Report. As important, her strong belief in the project and her incredible determination inspired the author and the advisers, and pushed this work to completion. Susan P. Sturm, Professor of Law, Columbia Law School, and Lani Guinier, Professor of Law, Harvard Law School, were participants from the inception, helping to frame the project, identify case studies and put together the larger group of advisers. Angela Glover Blackwell, then Vice President of the Rockefeller Foundation (now President of PolicyLink, a national organization working to identify, support and promote local policy innovation), played a critical role in initiating and supporting this project and provided many valuable insights. Fifteen advisers guided the development of this report. Coming from national civil rights organizations, local public-interest law centers, universities and foundations, all of the advisers in their separate capacities have been deeply involved in the struggle for justice for many years. Their commitment to this project has been unwavering. )

THE CONTINUING IMPORTANCE OF STRATEGIC LITIGATION Even with judicial cutbacks in legal protections for minorities and the poor, litigation—particularly when carried out in connection with a broader social movement—can effectively build communities’ capacity to confront inequitable power structures. Community-linked litigation can function as “both symbolic and actual political activity: first, it can provide actual educational, participatory experiences for poor groups; second, it is the vehicle through which a community coheres and mobilizes.” 1 Litigation can frame issues powerfully, influence public perceptions and, ultimately, restructure unfair institutions. The courtroom can be an important space for making public the often-hidden stories of marginalized people

and for connecting those stories to disputed policies. A well-placed tactical intervention, be it a successful restraining order or discovery motion, can defend a movement against attack, keep it from closing down or remove obstacles that undercut its effectiveness. In the Los Angeles MTA and the El Monte garment-worker struggles, the litigation process provided a platform for activism that helped marginalized people mobilize themselves. They developed a better understanding of the forces shaping their circumstances, of the heightened efficacy of group action, and of the ways that pressure can force local government and institutions to be more responsive. In each of these cases, through their participation, marginalized people actively shaped both the local government decision-making process and the outcomes that had fundamental impact on their lives. MAKING USE OF THE ENTIRE ARRAY OF LEGAL TOOLS In a 1992 report for the Rockefeller Foundation titled “Sustaining the Struggle for Justice,” Professor Charles Lawrence concluded that minorities and the poor ought to have access to 1 See, Lois H. Johnson, “The New Public Interest Law: From Old Theories to a New Agenda,” 1 Public Interest Law Journal, at 169, 185 (1991). 142
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#### Authority and power are interchangeable

Virginia E. Sloan No date¶ President and Founder¶ Director, Death Penalty and Right to Counsel Initiatives¶ Co-Director, Sentencing Initiative ¶ , http://www.constitutionproject.org/pdf/28.pdf

Congress tried to settle these disputes by passing the War Powers Resolution in 1973¶ over President Richard Nixon’s veto. Since then, however, presidents have consistently¶ maintained that parts of the Resolution intrude unconstitutionally on the President’s¶ war powers. Many congressional leaders, on the other hand, have argued that the executive¶ branch has failed to abide either by constitutional limitations on presidential authority¶ or by the provisions of the Resolution. The federal courts have typically declined¶ to referee war powers disputes or decided cases on narrow grounds that shed little light¶ on broad war powers questions.

#### The conventions restrict how we act during wartime- 2AC interp ev says that’s T

Wolensky 9 (Spring, 2009¶ Chapman Law Review¶ 12 Chap. L. Rev. 721¶ LENGTH: 10495 words Comment: Discretionary Sentencing in Military Commissions: Why and How the Sentencing Guidelines in the Military Commissions Act Should be Changed\* \* This article was initially written and published when the state of military commissions were in flux. It reflects the events regarding military commissions up to and through April 2009. However, an important decision was made by President Obama in May of 2009. See William Glaberson, Obama Considers Allowing Please by 9/11 Suspects, N. Y. Times, June 6, 2009, at A1, A12. Obama decided to continue the use of military commissions under a new set of rules which provide more protections for detainees. Id. Due to the timing of publication, this decision is not incorporated in this article. Although Obama has decided to continue the military commissions, he has not finalized a set of rules. Id. This article serves as a recommendation for changes to the rules of the Military Commissions Act, which Congress and the Obama Administration should consider. NAME: Brian Wolensky\*\*)

One of the main treatises included in the Law of War is the Third Geneva Convention, which was enacted in 1949 to regulate the treatment of prisoners of war**.** [n31](http://www.lexisnexis.com/lnacui2api/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.719762.7040113385&target=results_DocumentContent&returnToKey=20_T17977639921&parent=docview&rand=1376739692140&reloadEntirePage=true#n31) The Law of War places restrictions on the way certain countries can act during times of warand the United States is bound by it when it establishes and uses military commissions. [n32](http://www.lexisnexis.com/lnacui2api/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.719762.7040113385&target=results_DocumentContent&returnToKey=20_T17977639921&parent=docview&rand=1376739692140&reloadEntirePage=true#n32)