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#### Unemployment will pass pass – will get the votes

**Mimms 2/7** <Sarah, staff correspondent for National Journal Daily, covering Congress. Previously at National Journal, she served as senior analyst for the Hotline, where she covered federal and gubernatorial campaigns in the South. She joined National Journal in August 2010 and went on to cover the intersection of politics and the media during the 2012 elections for the Hotline, while writing a daily tipsheet on national politics and campaigns. Mimms attended Georgetown University, where she spent a year interning for the Washington Post, covering local issues and contributing to the Express magazine, “Why Democrats Will Win on Unemployment Insurance” February 7, 2014. <http://www.nationaljournal.com/congress/why-democrats-will-win-on-unemployment-insurance-20140207>>

For the fifth time this year, Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid brought an unemployment-insurance extension to the floor on Thursday, even though several members of his party admitted that they didn't have the votes to pass it.¶ They came close. But more important for Democratic campaign operatives across the country, they once again got Republicans on the record opposing assistance for the long-term unemployed.¶ Although Democrats have been crowing about the importance of passing an extension since the benefits expired on Dec. 28, the party has been hesitant to make concessions to Republicans to acquire more of their votes.¶ That is not to say that Democrats hope the legislation fails. Passing an unemployment-insurance extension would be great news for their party—and the 1.6 million Americans now living without support. Think of it as a win-win situation.¶ The party is facing little pressure to cave to Republicans, who are asking Democrats to pay for the extension for only the second time in the program's history. Instead, as each week passes, Democrats seem to be getting closer to the 60 votes they'll need to pass the extension—they reached 59 (not counting Reid's procedural switch) for the first time during a vote on Thursday—and Democrats are hopeful that if they hold out a little longer, they'll get the votes.¶ But more significant, as they prepare for an election in which they plan to run on income inequality and improving the middle class, the more times Republicans vote against an extension of popular benefits for unemployed individuals, or the House refuses to take up the issue, the better.¶ The Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee on Wednesday blasted out a CBS News polls showing that 65 percent of Americans—and, importantly, an equal number of independents—support extending unemployment insurance benefits.¶ With Republicans voting against the issue or avoiding it altogether, while simultaneously "spending a full day debating new restrictions to women's health," one national Democratic operative said, that fits in well with the party's broader electoral message.¶ National Democratic strategists are already messaging on the unemployment issue in key races across the country, setting up an even larger fight over what the operative termed "middle-class security"—that will include raising the minimum wage and other issues—in the fall.¶ Reid offered a preview of the Democratic messaging on the issue Thursday, telling the story of a 57-year-old woman from Nevada who has been forced to couch-surf while she looks for a job.¶ "[She has] worked from the time she was 18 years old. She's lost her job; she can't find a job. She's a long-term unemployed [person].… She sold everything she has except her clunker of a car, all her personal things. She did that so, madam president, she could buy gas in case she gets an interview. People are just like this in every state. Our job is to do right by them. All we need is one more Republican vote to step up, do the right thing, and cross the aisle," Reid said on the Senate floor.¶ He told that same story three separate times on Thursday, an indication of just how heavily Democrats plan to push that personal messaging this year.¶ Republicans argue that they don't oppose unemployment insurance in general and are trying to find a path forward. They blame Reid for refusing to compromise. Their objections are twofold. First, it must be paid for. But, second, Senate Republicans want to have a chance at an open amendment process.

#### Obama’s capital is key to votes

The Hill 2/3/14 (Justin Sink Amie arnes and Mike Lillis, "High Anxiety for Obama and Democrats")

A House Democratic leadership aide said in their meeting with the president, lawmakers will emphasize how they can coordinate their policy agendas.¶ “It’s not a political meeting,” the aide said.¶ Still, the aide acknowledged that the Democrats will need to apply intense public pressure on Speaker John Boehner (R-Ohio) and other GOP leaders if they want the Republicans to move on the minimum wage, unemployment benefits, immigration reform and other Democratic priorities this year. Leaders hope those issues won’t just motivate their base to come out during an off-year, but could woo independent voters, too. ¶ Part of that push will come from Obama using the bully pulpit — “The president’s doing a good job of that already,” the aide said — and Senate Democrats will also play a role by staging votes on unemployment insurance, the minimum wage and likely taking the lead on legislation to raise the debt ceiling this month.¶ House Democrats were pleased with the tone and content of Obama’s speech, the aide added, and will be looking for a continuation of the same themes Tuesday during their meeting.

#### **Plan destroys Obama**

Loomis 7 Dr. Andrew J. Loomis is a Visiting Fellow at the Center for a New American Security, and Department of Government at Georgetown University, “Leveraging legitimacy in the crafting of U.S. foreign policy”, March 2, 2007, pg 36-37, http://citation.allacademic.com//meta/p\_mla\_apa\_research\_citation/1/7/9/4/8/pages179487/p179487-36.php

Declining political authority encourages defection. American political analyst Norman Ornstein writes of the domestic context, In a system where a President has limited formal power, perception matters. The reputation for success—the belief by other political actors that even when he looks down, a president will find a way to pull out a victory—is the most valuable resource a chief executive can have. Conversely, the widespread belief that the Oval Office occupant is on the defensive, on the wane or without the ability to win under adversity can lead to disaster, as individual lawmakers calculate who will be on the winning side and negotiate accordingly. In simple terms, winners win and losers lose more often than not. Failure begets failure. In short, a president experiencing declining amounts of political capital has diminished capacity to advance his goals. As a result, political allies perceive a decreasing benefit in publicly tying themselves to the president, and an increasing benefit in allying with rising centers of authority. A president’s incapacity and his record of success are interlocked and reinforce each other. Incapacity leads to political failure, which reinforces perceptions of incapacity. This feedback loop accelerates decay both in leadership capacity and defection by key allies. The central point of this review of the presidential literature is that the sources of presidential influence—and thus their prospects for enjoying success in pursuing preferred foreign policies—go beyond the structural factors imbued by the Constitution. Presidential authority is affected by ideational resources in the form of public perceptions of legitimacy. The public offers and rescinds its support in accordance with normative trends and historical patterns, non-material sources of power that affects the character of U.S. policy, foreign and domestic.

#### Unemployment legislation key to economic recovery

**Harkin 2/5** <Tim, Senate HELP Committee & the Appropriations Subcommittee on Health, Education, Labor, “Extending unemployment benefits will help many” January 5, 2014. <http://www.press-citizen.com/article/D5/20140206/OPINION02/302060012/Extending-unemployment-benefits-will-help-many>>

For too many workers, that is the reality in our country today. The economy is improving, yet long-term unemployment continues to threaten that recovery. For every available job, there are currently three job seekers. About 4 million workers have been looking for a new job for at least six months.¶ Unemployment insurance helps struggling families and provides a major, immediate boost to the economy. Unemployed households spend these dollars on immediate needs such as paying the rent, buying groceries and school supplies, or repairing the family car — all economic activities that quickly inject dollars into our communities, helping businesses to keep up sales as the economy continues to recover.

#### nuclear war

Merlini 11

[Cesare Merlini, nonresident senior fellow at the Center on the United States and Europe and chairman of the Board of Trustees of the Italian Institute for International Affairs (IAI) in Rome. He served as IAI president from 1979 to 2001. Until 2009, he also occupied the position of executive vice chairman of the Council for the United States and Italy, which he co-founded in 1983. His areas of expertise include transatlantic relations, European integration and nuclear non-proliferation, with particular focus on nuclear science and technology. A Post-Secular World? DOI: 10.1080/00396338.2011.571015 Article Requests: Order Reprints : Request Permissions Published in: journal Survival, Volume 53, Issue 2 April 2011 , pages 117 - 130 Publication Frequency: 6 issues per year Download PDF Download PDF (357 KB) View Related Articles To cite this Article: Merlini, Cesare 'A Post-Secular World?', Survival, 53:2, 117 – 130]

Two neatly opposed scenarios for the future of the world order illustrate the range of possibilities, albeit at the risk of oversimplification. The first scenario entails the premature crumbling of the post-Westphalian system. One or more of the acute tensions apparent today evolves into an open and traditional conflict between states, perhaps even involving the use of nuclear weapons. The crisis might be triggered by a collapse of the global economic and financial system, the vulnerability of which we have just experienced, and the prospect of a second Great Depression, with consequences for peace and democracy similar to those of the first. Whatever the trigger, the unlimited exercise of national sovereignty, exclusive self-interest and rejection of outside interference would likely be amplified, emptying, perhaps entirely, the half-full glass of multilateralism, including the UN and the European Union. Many of the more likely conflicts, such as between Israel and Iran or India and Pakistan, have potential religious dimensions. Short of war, tensions such as those related to immigration might become unbearable. Familiar issues of creed and identity could be exacerbated. One way or another, the secular rational approach would be sidestepped by a return to theocratic absolutes, competing or converging with secular absolutes such as unbridled nationalism.
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#### War Powers are the “Power to wage war successfully”

SCOTUS 1948 (LICHTER ET AL., DOING BUSINESS AS SOUTHERN FIREPROOFING CO., v. UNITED STATES¶ No. 105¶ SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES¶ 334 U.S. 742; 68 S. Ct. 1294; 92 L. Ed. 1694; 1948 U.S. LEXIS 2705¶ November 20-21, 1947, Argued June 14, 1948, Decided¶ PRIOR HISTORY: CERTIORARI TO THE CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT. [\*](http://www.lexisnexis.com/lnacui2api/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-23.770161.6902095558&target=results_DocumentContent&returnToKey=20_T17977466602&parent=docview&rand=1376730771592&reloadEntirePage=true" \l "fnote1)¶ [\*](http://www.lexisnexis.com/lnacui2api/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-23.770161.6902095558&target=results_DocumentContent&returnToKey=20_T17977466602&parent=docview&rand=1376730771592&reloadEntirePage=true" \l "ref1) Together with No. 74, Pownall et al. v. United States, on certiorari to the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit; and No. 95, Alexander Wool Combing Co. v. United States, on certiorari to the Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, argued November 21, 1947.¶ The cases are stated concisely in the opinion with citations to the decisions below, pp. 746-753. Affirmed, p. 793.

The war powers of congress and the president are only those which are to be derived from the Constitution of the United States but the primary implication of a war power is that it shall be an effective power to wage the war successfully. While the constitutional structure and controls of our government are our guides equally in war and in peace, they must be read with the realistic purposes of the entire instrument fully in mind.

#### Restrictions need to be on a specified source of authority --- court application of evidence is NOT a restriction of war power authority

Curtis Bradley 10, Richard A. Horvitz Professor of Law and Professor of Public Policy Studies, Duke Law School, Curtis, “CLEAR STATEMENT RULES AND EXECUTIVE WAR POWERS” http://scholarship.law.duke.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2730&context=faculty\_scholarship

The scope of the President’s independent war powers is notoriously unclear, and courts are understandably reluctant to issue constitutional rulings that might deprive the federal government as a whole of the flexibility needed to respond to crises. As a result, courts often look for signs that Congress has either supported or opposed the President’s actions and rest their decisions on statutory grounds. This is essentially the approach outlined by Justice Jackson in his concurrence in Youngstown.1 For the most part, the Supreme Court has also followed this approach in deciding executive power issues relating to the war on terror. In Hamdi v. Rumsfeld, for example, Justice O’Connor based her plurality decision, which allowed for military detention of a U.S. citizen captured in Afghanistan, on Congress’s September 18, 2001, Authorization for Use of Military Force (AUMF).2 Similarly, in Hamdan v. Rumsfeld, the Court grounded its disallowance of the Bush Administration’s military commission system on what it found to be congressionally imposed restrictions.3 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 re‐ view in U.S. courts, it did not impose any specific restrictions on the executive’s detention, treatment, or trial of the detainees.5 In other words, Boumediene was more about preserving a role for the courts than about prohibiting the executive from exercising statutorily conferred authority.

#### express Congressional authorization is key

Curtis Bradley 10, Richard A. Horvitz Professor of Law and Professor of Public Policy Studies, Duke Law School, Curtis, “CLEAR STATEMENT RULES AND EXECUTIVE WAR POWERS” <http://scholarship.law.duke.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2730&context=faculty_scholarship>

Nevertheless, the contextual considerations outlined above support a requirement of more express congressional authorization for the Al‐Marri situation, for several reasons. First, his‐ torical practice is less helpful to the executive in the Al‐Marri context than in Hamdi: When one moves away from individuals connected to the fighting in Afghanistan, one is moving towards something more like indefinite detention, not just detention during active combat. To then apply nontraditional detention authority to individuals residing in U.S. territory is an additional step that further suggests the desirability of multi‐ branch deliberation.

Second,  considerations  of  functional  necessity  also  seem  low here: al‐Marri was already going to be tried in civilian court, and he was a class of one in terms of so‐called enemy combatants currently detained in the United States.44 More‐ over, this class has had a total of only three people during the war on terror, one of whom (Hamdi) was released and the other of whom (Padilla) was eventually tried in a regular ci‐ vilian court. With these facts, it is far from clear that a domes‐ tic military detention authority was necessary in order to fight  the war on terror effectively.

Third, there is also a reasonable argument that Congress had already attempted to regulate the al‐Marri situation in the Pa‐ triot Act because the Act contains provisions that allow for de‐ tention of alien residents suspected of being connected with terrorism, while also disallowing indefinite detention.45 Fourth, the amount of time that had elapsed since the enactment of the AUMF is also relevant, both because a variety of issues have arisen that probably were not anticipated by Congress and because the executive branch has had plenty of time to work with  Congress to obtain more specific legislation.

Finally, although the executive could argue that the deten‐ tion relates to a Commander‐in‐Chief power—interacting with  the enemy—and that Congress had identified al Qaeda as the  enemy, the enemy class is much more uncertain here than in  traditional wars. The al Qaeda organization is a decentralized  and  amorphous  collection  of  groups  with  no  clear  chain  of  command, and affiliation with that organization is both non‐ obvious and varies in extent from individual to individual.

Pushing this issue to Congress would likely produce more guidance for the courts about how to define the enemy class, a difficult issue once one moves beyond a traditional battlefield context. To put it differently, there is a good case here for a “democracy‐forcing” construction of the AUMF, similar to what the Court did in Hamdan.46

What this analysis ultimately suggests is that deciding issues of executive war powers requires contextual and pragmatic judgment rather than resort to abstract classifications, whether they are liberal or conservative in character, some‐ thing that Justice Jackson recognized in his justifiably famous Youngstown concurrence. Jackson’s concurrence is now so celebrated that it is becoming almost de rigueur among legal academics to criticize it, and some aspects of his three‐tiered framework are certainly vulnerable to criticism.47 Neverthe‐ less, as a starting point for the application of judicial review in  cases involving challenges to executive war powers, it still has  much to commend it.

#### Vote neg---

#### The affirmative violates- they “apply proof of burden and presumption for individuals in military detention- all this does is MAKE JUDGES SMARTER- the war powers of the president are not affect

#### Voting issue for ground and limits- allows the affirmative to no link or link turn our best offense like warfighting and they blow the lid off the topic by allowing affirmatives that *indirectly* affect war powers- direct restrictions key to equitable debate
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#### The President of the United States should request his Counsel and the Office of Legal Counsel for coordination over his war powers authority on indefinite detention. The President should apply burdens of proofs and presumptions regarding evidence in habeas corpus hearings that favor individuals in military detention and narrowly adhere to judicial rulings on such applicable indefinite detention cases. Indefinite detention remaining for enemy combatants should also adopt stringent anti-racism standards utilizing a multi-tiered test to determine whether they were detained as a result of racial biases.

#### plan would uniquely decimate Obama and the military’s ability to calm alliances and deter enemies through cyber arms --- Makes terrorism and global nuclear war more likely --- INDEPENDENTLY prevents ability to negotiate north Korean miscalc

WAXMAN 2013 - law professor at Columbia Law School, co-chairs the Roger Hertog Program on Law and National Security (Matthew Waxman, “The Constitutional Power to Threaten War,” August 27, 2013, http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=2316777)

As a prescriptive matter, Part II also shows that examination of threatened force and the credibility requirements for its effectiveness calls into question many orthodoxies of the policy advantages and risks attendant to various allocations of legal war powers, including the existing one and proposed reforms.23 Most functional arguments about war powers focus on fighting wars or hostile engagements, but that is not all – or even predominantly – what the United States does with its military power. Much of the time it seeks to avert such clashes while achieving its foreign policy objectives: to bargain, coerce, deter.24 The President’s flexibility to use force in turn affects decision-making about threatening it, with major implications for securing peace or dragging the United States into conflicts. Moreover, constitutional war power allocations affect potential conflicts not only because they may constrain U.S. actions but because they may send signals and shape other states’ (including adversaries’) expectations of U.S. actions.25 That is, most analysis of war-powers law is inward-looking, focused on audiences internal to the U.S. government and polity, but thinking about threatened force prompts us to look outward, at how war-powers law affects external perceptions among adversaries and allies. Here, extant political science and strategic studies offer few clear conclusions, but they point the way toward more sophisticated and realistic policy assessment of legal doctrine and proposed reform. More generally, as explained in Part III, analysis of threatened force and war powers exposes an under-appreciated relationship between constitutional doctrine and grand strategy. Instead of proposing a functionally optimal allocation of legal powers, as legal scholars are often tempted to do, this Article in the end denies the tenability of any such claim. Having identified new spaces of war and peace powers that legal scholars need to take account of in understanding how those powers are really exercised, this Article also highlights the extent to which any normative account of the proper distribution of authority over this area depends on many matters that cannot be predicted in advance or expected to remain constant.26 Instead of proposing a policy-optimal solution, this Article concludes that the allocation of constitutional war powers is – and should be –geopolitically and strategically contingent; the actual and effective balance between presidential and congressional powers over war and peace in practice necessarily depends on fundamental assumptions and shifting policy choices about how best to secure U.S. interests against potential threats.27 I. Constitutional War Powers and Threats of Force Decisions to go to war or to send military forces into hostilities are immensely consequential, so it is no surprise that debates about constitutional war powers occupy so much space. But one of the most common and important ways that the United States uses its military power is by threatening war or force – and the constitutional dimensions of that activity receive almost no scrutiny or even theoretical investigation. A. War Powers Doctrine and Debates The Constitution grants Congress the powers to create military forces and to “declare war,”28 which the Supreme Court early on made clear includes the power to authorize limited uses of force short of full-blown war.29 The Constitution then vests the President with executive power and designates him commander in chief of the armed forces,30 and it has been well-accepted since the Founding that these powers include unilateral authority to repel invasions if the United States is attacked.31 Although there is nearly universal acceptance of these basic starting points, there is little legal agreement about how the Constitution allocates responsibility for the vast bulk of cases in which the United States has actually resorted to force. The United States has declared war or been invaded only a handful of times in its history, but it has used force – sometimes large-scale force – hundreds of other times.32 Views split over questions like when, if ever, the President may use force to deal with aggression against third parties and how much unilateral discretion the President has to use limited force short of full-blown war. For many lawyers and legal scholars, at least one important methodological tool for resolving such questions is to look at historical practice, and especially the extent to which the political branches acquiesced in common practices.33 Interpretation of that historical practice for constitutional purposes again divides legal scholars, but most would agree at least descriptively on some basic parts of that history. In particular, most scholars assess that from the Founding era through World War II, Presidents and Congresses alike recognized through their behavior and statements that except in certain narrow types of contingencies, congressional authorization was required for large-scale military operations against other states and international actors, even as many Presidents pushed and sometimes crossed those boundaries.34 Whatever constitutional constraints on presidential use of force existed prior to World War II, however, most scholars also note that the President asserted much more extensive unilateral powers to use force during and after the Cold War, and many trace the turning point to the 1950 Korean War.35 Congress did not declare war in that instance, nor did it expressly authorize U.S. participation.36 From that point forward, presidents have asserted broad unilateral authority to use force to address threats to U.S. interests, including threats to U.S. allies, and that neither Congress nor courts pushed back much against this expanding power.37 Concerns about expansive presidential war-making authority spiked during the Vietnam War. In the wind-down of that conflict, Congress passed – over President Nixon’s veto – the War Powers Resolution,38 which stated its purpose as to ensure the constitutional Founders’ original vision that the “collective judgment of both the Congress and the President will apply to the introduction of United States Armed Forces into hostilities, or into situations where imminent involvement in hostilities is clearly indicated by the circumstances, and to the continued use of such forces in hostilities or in such situations.”39 Since then, presidentialists have argued that the President still retains expansive authority to use force abroad to protect American interests,40 and congressionalists argue that this authority is tightly circumscribed.41 These constitutional debates have continued through the first decade of the 21st century. Constitutional scholars split, for example, over President Obama’s power to participate in coalition operations against Libya without congressional authorization in 2011, especially after the War Powers Resolution’s 60-day clock expired.42 Some argue that President Obama’s use of military force without specific congressional authorization in that case reflects the broad constitutional discretion presidents now have to protect American interests, at least short of full-blown “war”, while others argue that it is the latest in a long record of presidential violations of the Constitution and the War Powers Resolution.43 B. Threats of Force and Constitutional Powers These days it is usually taken for granted that – whether or not he can make war unilaterally – the President is constitutionally empowered to threaten the use of force, implicitly or explicitly, through diplomatic means or shows of force. It is never seriously contested whether the President may declare that United States is contemplating military options in response to a crisis, or whether the President may move substantial U.S. military forces to a crisis region or engage in military exercises there. To take the Libya example just mentioned, is there any constitutional limitation on the President’s authority to move U.S. military forces to the Mediterranean region and prepare them very visibly to strike?44 Or his authority to issue an ultimatum to Libyan leaders that they cease their brutal conduct or else face military action? Would it matter whether such threats were explicit versus implicit, whether they were open and public versus secret, or whether they were just a bluff? If not a constitutional obstacle, could it be argued that the War Powers Resolution’s reporting requirements and limits on operations were triggered by a President’s mere ultimatum or threatening military demonstration, insofar as those moves might constitute a “situation where imminent involvement in hostilities is clearly indicated by the circumstances”? These questions simply are not asked (at least not anymore).45 If anything, most lawyers would probably conclude that the President’s constitutional powers to threaten war are not just expansive but largely beyond Congress’s authority to regulate directly. From a constitutional standpoint, to the extent it is considered at all, the President’s power to threaten force is probably regarded to be at least as broad as his power to use it. One way to look at it is that the power to threaten force is a lesser included element of presidential war powers; the power to threaten to use force is simply a secondary question, the answer to which is bounded by the primary issue of the scope of presidential power to actually use it. If one interprets the President’s defensive war powers very broadly, to include dealing with aggression not only directed against U.S. territories but also against third parties,46 then it might seem easy to conclude that the President can also therefore take steps that stop short of actual armed intervention to deter or prevent such aggression. If, however, one interprets the President’s powers narrowly, for example, to include only limited unilateral authority to repel attacks against U.S. territory,47 then one might expect objections to arguably excessive presidential power to include his unilateral threats of armed intervention. Another way of looking at it is that in many cases, threats of war or force might fall within even quite narrow interpretations of the President’s inherent foreign relations powers to conduct diplomacy or his express commander in chief power to control U.S. military forces – or some combination of the two – depending on how a particular threat is communicated. A President’s verbal warning, ultimatum, or declared intention to use military force, for instance, could be seen as merely exercising his role as the “sole organ” of U.S. foreign diplomacy, conveying externally information about U.S. capabilities and intentions.48 A president’s movement of U.S. troops or warships to a crisis region or elevation of their alert level could be seen as merely exercising his dayto- day tactical control over forces under his command.49 Generally it is not seriously contested whether the exercise of these powers alone could so affect the likelihood of hostilities or war as to intrude on Congress’s powers over war and peace.50 We know from historical examples that such unilateral military moves, even those that are ostensibly pure defensive ones, can provoke wars – take, for example, President Polk’s movement of U.S. forces to the contested border with Mexico in 1846, and the resulting skirmishes that led Congress to declare war.51 Coming at the issue from Congress’s Article I powers rather than the President’s Article II powers, the very phrasing of the power “To declare War” puts most naturally all the emphasis on the present tense of U.S. military action, rather than its potentiality. Even as congressionalists advance interpretations of the clause to include not merely declarative authority but primary decision-making authority as to whether or not to wage war or use force abroad, their modern-day interpretations do not include a power to threaten war (except perhaps through the specific act of declaring it). None seriously argues – at least not any more – that the Declare War Clause precludes presidential threats of war. This was not always the case. During the early period of the Republic, there was a powerful view that beyond outright initiation of armed hostilities or declaration of war, more broadly the President also could not unilaterally take actions (putting aside actual military attacks) that would likely or directly risk war,52 provoke a war with another state,53 or change the condition of affairs or relations with another state along the continuum from peace to war.54 To do so, it was often argued, would usurp Congress’s prerogative to control the nation’s state of peace or war.55 During the Quasi-War with France at the end of the 18th century, for example, some members of Congress questioned whether the President, absent congressional authorization, could take actions that visibly signaled an intention to retaliate against French maritime harassment,56 and even some members of President Adams’ cabinet shared doubts.57 Some questions over the President’s power to threaten force arose (eventually) in relation to the Monroe Doctrine, announced in an 1823 presidential address to Congress and which in effect declared to European powers that the United States would oppose any efforts to colonize or reassert control in the Western Hemisphere.58 “Virtually no one questioned [Monroe’s proclamation] at the time. Yet it posed a constitutional difficulty of the first importance.”59 Of course, Monroe did not actually initiate any military hostilities, but his implied threat – without congressional action – risked provoking rather than deterring European aggression and by putting U.S. prestige and credibility on the line it limited Congress’s practical freedom of action if European powers chose to intervene.60 The United States would have had at the time to rely on British naval power to make good on that tacit threat, though a more assertive role for the President in wielding the potential for war or intervention during this period went hand in hand with a more sustained projection of U.S. power beyond its borders, especially in dealing with dangers emanating from Spanish-held Florida territory.61 Monroe’s successor, John Quincy Adams, faced complaints from opposition members of Congress that Monroe’s proclamation had exceeded his constitutional authority and had usurped Congress’s by committing the United States – even in a non-binding way – to resisting European meddling in the hemisphere.62 The question whether the President could unilaterally send militarily-threatening signals was in some respects a mirror image of the issues raised soon after the Constitution was ratified during the 1793 Neutrality Controversy: could President Washington unilaterally declare the United States to be neutral as to the war among European powers. Washington’s politically controversial proclamation declaring the nation “friendly and impartial” in the conflict between France and Great Britain (along with other European states) famously prompted a back-and-forth contest of public letters by Alexander Hamilton and James Madison, writing pseudonymously as “Pacificus” and “Helvidius”, about whether the President had such unilateral power or whether it belonged to Congress.63 Legal historian David Currie points out the irony that the neutrality proclamation was met with stronger and more immediate constitutional scrutiny and criticism than was Monroe’s threat. After all, Washington’s action accorded with the principle that only Congress, representing popular will, should be able to take the country from the baseline state of peace to war, whereas Monroe’s action seemed (at least superficially) to commit it to a war that Congress had not approved.64 Curiously (though for reasons offered below, perhaps not surprisingly) this issue – whether there are constitutional limits on the President’s power to threaten war – has almost vanished completely from legal discussion, and that evaporation occurred even before the dramatic post-war expansion in asserted presidential power to make war. Just prior to World War II, political scientist and presidential powers theorist Edward Corwin remarked that “[o]f course, it may be argued, and has in fact been argued many times, that the President is under constitutional obligation not to incur the risk of war in the prosecution of a diplomatic policy without first consulting Congress and getting its consent.”65 “Nevertheless,” he continued,66 “the supposed principle is clearly a maxim of policy rather than a generalization from consistent practice.” In his 1945 study World Policing and the Constitution, James Grafton Rogers noted: [E]xamples of demonstrations on land and sea made for a variety of purposes and under Presidents of varied temper and in different political climates will suffice to make the point. The Commander-in-Chief under the Constitution can display our military resources and threaten their use whenever he thinks best. The weakness in the diplomatic weapon is the possibility of dissidence at home which may cast doubt on our serious intent. The danger of the weapon is war.67 At least since then, however, the importance to U.S. foreign policy of threatened force has increased dramatically, while legal questions about it have receded further from discussion. In recent decades a few prominent legal scholars have addressed the President’s power to threaten force, though in only brief terms.

[CONTINUED]
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Taylor Reveley noted in his volume on war powers the importance of allocating constitutional responsibility not only for the actual use of force but also “[v]erbal or written threats or assurances about the circumstances in which the United States will take military action …, whether delivered by declarations of American policy, through formal agreements with foreign entities, by the demeanor or words of American officials, or by some other sign of national intent.”68 Beyond recognizing the critical importance of threats and other non-military actions in affecting war and peace, however, Reveley made little effort to address the issue in any detail. Among the few legal scholars attempting to define the limiting doctrinal contours of presidentially threatened force, Louis Henkin wrote in his monumental Foreign Affairs and the Constitution that: Unfortunately, the line between war and lesser uses of force is often elusive, sometimes illusory, and the use of force for foreign policy purposes can almost imperceptibly become a national commitment to war. Even when he does not use military force, the President can incite other nations or otherwise plunge or stumble this country into war, or force the hand of Congress to declare or to acquiesce and cooperate in war. As a matter of constitutional doctrine, however, one can declare with confidence that a President begins to exceed his authority if he willfully or recklessly moves the nation towards war…69 The implication seems to be that the President may not unilaterally threaten force in ways that are dramatically escalatory and could likely lead to war, or perhaps that the President may not unilaterally threaten the use of force that he does not have the authority to initiate unilaterally.70 Jefferson Powell, who generally takes a more expansive view than Henkin of the President’s war powers, argues by contrast that “[t]he ability to warn of, or threaten, the use of military force is an ordinary and essential element in the toolbox of that branch of government empowered to formulate and implement foreign policy.”71 For Powell, the President is constantly taking actions as part of everyday international relations that carry a risk of military escalation, and these are well-accepted as part of the President’s broader authority to manage, if not set, foreign policy. Such brief mentions are in recent times among the rare exceptions to otherwise barren constitutional discussion of presidential powers to threaten force. That the President’s authority to threaten force is so well-accepted these days as to seem self-evident is not just an academic phenomenon. It is also reflected in the legal debates among and inside all three branches of government. In 1989, Michael Reisman observed: Military maneuvers designed to convey commitment to allies or contingent threats to adversaries … are matters of presidential competence. Congress does not appear to view as within its bailiwick many low-profile contemporaneous expressions of gunboat diplomacy, i.e., the physical interposition of some U.S. war-making capacity as communication to an adversary of United States’ intentions and capacities to oppose it.72 This was and remains a correct description but understates the pattern of practice, insofar as even major and high-profile expressions of coercive diplomacy are regarded among all three branches of government as within presidential competence. In Dellums v. Bush – perhaps the most assertive judicial scrutiny of presidential power to use large-scale force abroad since the end of the Cold War – the district court dismissed on ripeness grounds congressmembers’ suit challenging President George H. W. Bush’s intended military operations against Iraq in 1991 and seeking to prevent him from initiating an offensive attack against Iraq without first securing explicit congressional authorization for such action.73 That at the time of the suit the President had openly threatened war – through ultimatums and deployment of several hundred thousand U.S. troops – but had not yet “committed to a definitive course of action” to carry out the threat meant there was no justiciable legal issue, held the court.74 The President’s threat of war did not seem to give the district court legal pause at all; quite the contrary, the mere threat of war was treated by the court as a non-issue entirely.75 There are several reasons why constitutional questions about threatened force have dropped out of legal discussions. First, the more politically salient debate about the President’s unilateral power to use force has probably swallowed up this seemingly secondary issue. As explained below, it is a mistake to view threats as secondary in importance to uses of force, but they do not command the same political attention and their impacts are harder to measure.76 Second, the expansion of American power after World War II, combined with the growth of peacetime military forces and a set of defense alliance commitments (developments that are elaborated below) make at least some threat of force much more common – in the case of defensive alliances and some deterrent policies, virtually constant – and difficult to distinguish from other forms of everyday diplomacy and security policy.77 Besides, for political and diplomatic reasons, presidents rarely threaten war or intervention without at least a little deliberate ambiguity. As historian Marc Trachtenberg puts it: “It often makes sense … to muddy the waters a bit and avoid direct threats.”78 Any legal lines one might try to draw (recall early attempts to restrict the President’s unilateral authority to alter the state of affairs along the peacetime-wartime continuum) have become blurrier and blurrier. In sum, if the constitutional power to threaten war ever posed a serious legal controversy, it does so no more. As the following section explains, however, threats of war and armed force have during most of our history become a greater and greater part of American grand strategy, defined here as long-term policies for using the country’s military and non-military power to achieve national goals. The prominent role of threatened force in U.S. strategy has become the focus of political scientists and other students of security strategy, crises, and responses – but constitutional study has not adjusted accordingly.79 C. Threats of Force and U.S. Grand Strategy While the Korean and Vietnam Wars were generating intense study among lawyers and legal scholars about constitutional authority to wage military actions abroad, during that same period many political scientists and strategists – economists, historians, statesmen, and others who studied international conflict – turned their focus to the role of threatened force as an instrument of foreign policy. The United States was building and sustaining a massive war-fighting apparatus, but its security policy was not oriented primarily around waging or winning wars but around deterring them and using the threat of war – including demonstrative military actions – to advance U.S. security interests. It was the potential of U.S. military might, not its direct application or engagement with the enemy, that would do much of the heavy lifting. U.S. military power would be used to deter the Soviet Union and other hostile states from taking aggressive action. It would be unsheathed to prompt them to back down over disputes. It would reassure allies that they could depend on U.S. help in defending themselves. All this required that U.S. willingness to go to war be credible in the eyes of adversaries and allies alike. Much of the early Cold War study of threatened force concerned nuclear strategy, and especially deterrence or escalation of nuclear war. Works by Albert Wohlstetter, Herman Kahn, and others not only studied but shaped the strategy of nuclear threats, as well as how to use limited applications of force or threats of force to pursue strategic interests in remote parts of the globe without sparking massive conflagrations.80 As the strategic analyst Bernard Brodie wrote in 1946, “Thus far the chief purpose of our military establishment has been to win wars. From now on its chief purpose must be to avert them.”81 Toward that end, U.S. government security and defense planners during this time focused heavily on preserving and improving the credibility of U.S. military threats – while the Soviet Union was doing likewise.82 The Truman administration developed a militarized version of containment strategy against the Soviet empire, emphasizing that stronger military capabilities were necessary to prevent the Soviets from seizing the initiative and to resist its aggressive probes: “it is clear,” according to NSC-68, the government document which encapsulated that strategy, “that a substantial and rapid building up of strength in the free world is necessary to support a firm policy intended to check and to roll back the Kremlin's drive for world domination.”83 The Eisenhower administration’s “New Look” policy and doctrine of “massive retaliation” emphasized making Western collective security both more effective and less costly by placing greater reliance on deterrent threats – including threatened escalation to general or nuclear war. As his Secretary of State John Foster Dulles explained, “[t]here is no local defense which alone will contain the mighty landpower of the Communist world. Local defenses must be reinforced by the further deterrent of massive retaliatory power.”84 As described in Evan Thomas’s recent book, Ike’s Bluff, Eisenhower managed to convince Soviet leaders that he was ready to use nuclear weapons to check their advance in Europe and elsewhere. In part due to concerns that threats of massive retaliation might be insufficiently credible in Soviet eyes (especially with respect to U.S. interests perceived as peripheral), the Kennedy administration in 1961 shifted toward a strategy of “flexible response,” which relied on the development of a wider spectrum of military options that could quickly and efficiently deliver varying degrees of force in response to foreign aggression.85 Throughout these periods, the President often resorted to discrete, limited uses of force to demonstrate U.S. willingness to escalate. For example, in 1961 the Kennedy administration (mostly successfully in the short-run) deployed intervention-ready military force immediately off the coast of the Dominican Republic to compel its government's ouster,86 and that same year it used military exercises and shows of force in ending the Berlin crisis;87 in 1964, the Johnson administration unsuccessfully used air strikes on North Vietnamese targets following the Tonkin Gulf incidents, failing to deter what it viewed as further North Vietnamese aggression.88 The point here is not the shifting details of U.S. strategy after World War II – during this era of dramatic expansion in asserted presidential war powers – but the central role of credible threats of war in it, as well as the interrelationship of plans for using force and credible threats to do so. Also during this period, the United States abandoned its long-standing aversion to “entangling alliances,”89 and committed to a network of mutual defense treaties with dependent allies. Besides the global collective security arrangement enshrined in the UN Charter, the United States committed soon after World War II to mutual defense pacts with, for example, groups of states in Western Europe (the North Atlantic Treaty Organization)90 and Asia (the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization,91 as well as a bilateral defense agreement with the Republic of Korea,92 Japan,93 and the Republic of China,94 among others). These alliance commitments were part of a U.S. effort to “extend” deterrence of Communist bloc aggression far beyond its own borders.95 “Extended deterrence” was also critical to reassuring these U.S. allies that their security needs would be met, in some instances to head off their own dangerous rearmament.96 Among the leading academic works on strategy of the 1960s and 70s were those of Thomas Schelling, who developed the theoretical structure of coercion theory, arguing that rational states routinely use the threat of military force – the manipulation of an adversary’s perceptions of future risks and costs with military threats – as a significant component of their diplomacy.97 Schelling distinguished between deterrence (the use of threats to dissuade an adversary from taking undesired action) and compellence (the use of threats to persuade an adversary to behave a certain way), and he distinguished both forms of coercion from brute force: “[B]rute force succeeds when it is used, whereas the power to hurt is most successful when held in reserve. It is the threat of damage to come that can make someone yield of comply. It is latent violence that can influence someone’s choice.”98 Alexander George, David Hall, and William Simons then led the way in taking a more empirical approach, reviewing case studies to draw insights about the success and failure of U.S. coercive threats, analyzing contextual variables and their effects on parties’ reactions to threats during crises. Among their goals was to generate lessons informed by history for successful strategies that combine diplomatic efforts with threats or demonstrations of force, recognizing that the United States was relying heavily on threatened force in addressing security crises. Coercive diplomacy – if successful – offered ways to do so with minimal actual application of military force.99 One of the most influential studies that followed was Force Without War: U.S. Armed Forces as a Political Instrument, a Brookings Institution study led by Barry Blechman and Stephen Kaplan and published in 1977.100 They studied “political uses of force”, defined as actions by U.S. military forces “as part of a deliberate attempt by the national authorities to influence, or to be prepared to influence, specific behavior of individuals in another nation without engaging in a continued contest of violence.”101 Blechman and Kaplan’s work, including their large data set and collected case studies, was important for showing the many ways that threatened force could support U.S. security policy. Besides deterrence and compellence, threats of force were used to assure allies (thereby, for example, avoiding their own drive toward militarization of policies or crises) and to induce third parties to behave certain ways (such as contributing to diplomatic resolution of crises). The record of success in relying on threatened force has been quite mixed, they showed. Blechman and Kaplan’s work, and that of others who built upon it through the end of the Cold War and the period that has followed,102 helped understand the factors that correlated with successful threats or demonstrations of force without resort or escalation to war, especially the importance of credible signals.103 After the Cold War, the United States continued to rely on coercive force – threatened force to deter or compel behavior by other actors – as a central pillar of its grand strategy. During the 1990s, the United States wielded coercive power with varied results against rogue actors in many cases that, without the overlay of superpower enmities, were considered secondary or peripheral, not vital, interests: Iraq, Somalia, Haiti, Bosnia, and elsewhere. For analysts of U.S. national security policy, a major puzzle was reconciling the fact that the United States possessed overwhelming military superiority in raw terms over any rivals with its difficult time during this era in compelling changes in their behavior.104 As Daniel Byman and I wrote about that decade in our study of threats of force and American foreign policy: U.S. conventional and nuclear forces dwarf those of any adversaries, and the U.S. economy remains the largest and most robust in the world. Because of these overwhelming advantages, the United States can threaten any conceivable adversary with little danger of a major defeat or even significant retaliation. Yet coercion remains difficult. Despite the United States’ lopsided edge in raw strength, regional foes persist in defying the threats and ultimatums brought by the United States and its allies. In confrontations with Somali militants, Serb nationalists, and an Iraqi dictator, the U.S. and allied record or coercion has been mixed over recent years…. Despite its mixed record of success, however, coercion will remain a critical element of U.S. foreign policy.105 One important factor that seemed to undermine the effectiveness of U.S. coercive threats during this period was that many adversaries perceived the United States as still afflicted with “Vietnam Syndrome,” unwilling to make good on its military threats and see military operations through.106 Since the turn of the 21st Century, major U.S. security challenges have included non-state terrorist threats, the proliferation of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction (WMD), and rapidly changing power balances in East Asia, and the United States has accordingly been reorienting but retaining its strategic reliance on threatened force. The Bush Administration’s “preemption doctrine” was premised on the idea that some dangerous actors – including terrorist organizations and some states seeking WMD arsenals – are undeterrable, so the United States might have to strike them first rather than waiting to be struck.107 On one hand, this was a move away from reliance on threatened force: “[t]he inability to deter a potential attacker, the immediacy of today’s threats, and the magnitude of potential harm that could be caused by our adversaries’ choice of weapons, do not permit” a reactive posture.108 Yet the very enunciation of such a policy – that “[t]o forestall or prevent such hostile acts by our adversaries, the United States will, if necessary, act preemptively”109 – was intended to persuade those adversaries to alter their policies that the United States regarded as destabilizing and threatening. Although the Obama administration pulled back from this rhetoric and placed greater emphasis on international institutions, it has continued to rely on threatened force as a key pillar of its strategy with regard to deterring threats (such as aggressive Iranian moves), intervening in humanitarian crises (as in Libya), and reassuring allies.110 With regard to East Asia, for example, the credible threat of U.S. military force is a significant element of U.S. strategy for deterring Chinese and North Korean aggression as well as reassuring other Asian powers of U.S. protection, to avert a destabilizing arms race.111 D. The Disconnect Between Constitutional Discourse and Strategy There is a major disconnect between the decades of work by strategists and many political scientists on American security policy and practice since the Second World War and legal analysis and scholarship of constitutional war powers during that period. Lawyers and strategists have been relying on not only distinct languages but distinct logics of military force – in short, when it comes to using U.S. military power, lawyers think in terms of “going to war” while strategists focus on potential war and processes leading to it. These framings manifest in differing theoretical starting points for considering how exercises of U.S. military might affect war and peace, and they skew the empirical insights and normative prescriptions about Presidential power often drawn from their analyses. 1. Lawyers’ Misframing Lawyers’ focus on actual uses of force – especially engagements with enemy military forces – as constitutionally salient, rather than including threats of force in their understanding of modern presidential powers tilts analysis toward a one-dimensional strategic logic, rather than a more complex and multi-dimensional and dynamic logic in which the credible will to use force is as important as the capacity to do so. As discussed above, early American constitutional thinkers and practitioners generally wanted to slow down with institutional checks decisions to go to war, because they thought that would make war less likely. “To invoke a more contemporary image,” wrote John Hart Ely of their vision, “it takes more than one key to launch a missile: It should take quite a number to start a war.”112 They also viewed the exercise of military power as generally a ratchet of hostilities, whereby as the intensity of authorized or deployed force increased, so generally did the state of hostilities between the United States and other parties move along a continuum from peace to war.113 Echoes of this logic still reverberate in modern congressionalist legal scholarship: the more flexibly the President can use military force, the more likely it is that the United States will find itself in wars; better, therefore, to clog decisions to make war with legislative checks.114 Modern presidentialist legal scholars usually respond that rapid action is a virtue, not a vice, in exercising military force.115 Especially as a superpower with global interests and facing global threats, presidential discretion to take rapid military action – endowed with what Alexander Hamilton called “[d]ecision, activity, secrecy, and dispatch”116 – best protects American interests. In either case the emphasis tends overwhelmingly to be placed on actual military engagements with adversaries. Strategists and many political scientists, by contrast, view some of the most significant use of military power as starting well before armed forces clash – and including important cases in which they never actually do. Coercive diplomacy and strategies of threatened force, they recognize, often involve a set of moves and countermoves by opposing sides and third parties before or even without the violent engagement of opposing forces. It is often the parties’ perceptions of anticipated actions and costs, not the actual carrying through of violence, that have the greatest impact on the course of events and resolution or escalation of crises. Instead of a ratchet of escalating hostilities, the flexing of military muscle can increase as well as decrease actual hostilities, inflame as well as stabilize relations with rivals or enemies. Moreover, those effects are determined not just by U.S. moves but by the responses of other parties to them – or even to anticipated U.S. moves and countermoves.117 Indeed, as Schelling observed, strategies of brinkmanship sometimes operate by “the deliberate creation of a recognizable risk of war, a risk that one does not completely control.”118 This insight – that effective strategies of threatened force involve not only great uncertainty about the adversary’s responses but also sometimes involve intentionally creating risk of inadvertent escalation119 – poses a difficult challenge for any effort to cabin legally the President’s power to threaten force in terms of likelihood of war or some due standard of care.120 2. Lawyers’ Selection Problems Methodologically, a lawyerly focus on actual uses of force – a list of which would then commonly be used to consider which ones were or were not authorized by Congress – vastly undercounts the instances in which presidents wield U.S. military might. It is already recognized by some legal scholars that studying actual uses of force risks ignoring instances in which President contemplated force but refrained from using it, whether because of political, congressional, or other constraints.121 The point here is a different one: that some of the most significant (and, in many instances, successful) presidential decisions to threaten force do not show up in legal studies of presidential war powers that consider actual deployment or engagement of U.S. military forces as the relevant data set. Moreover, some actual uses of force, whether authorized by Congress or not, were preceded by threats of force; in some cases these threats may have failed on their own to resolve the crisis, and in other cases they may have precipitated escalation. To the extent that lawyers are interested in understanding from historical practice what war powers the political branches thought they had and how well that understanding worked, they are excluding important cases. Consider, as an illustration of this difference in methodological starting point, that for the period of 1946-1975 (during which the exercise of unilateral Presidential war powers had its most rapid expansion), the Congressional Research Service compilation of instances in which the United States has utilized military forces abroad in situations of military conflict or potential conflict to protect U.S. citizens or promote U.S. interests – which is often relied upon by legal scholars studying war powers – lists only about two dozen incidents.122 For the same time period, the Blechman and Kaplan study of political uses of force (usually threats) – which is often relied upon by political scientists studying U.S. security strategy – includes dozens more data-point incidents, because they divide up many military crises into several discrete policy decisions, because many crises were resolved with threat-backed diplomacy, and because many uses of force were preceded by overt or implicit threats of force.123 Among the most significant incidents studied by Blechman and Kaplan but not included in the Congressional Research Service compilation at all are the 1958-59 and 1961 crises over Berlin and the 1973 Middle East War, during which U.S. Presidents signaled threats of superpower war, and in the latter case signaled particularly a willingness to resort to nuclear weapons.124 Because the presidents did not in the end carry out these threats, these cases lack the sort of authoritative legal justifications or reactions that accompany actual uses of force. It is therefore difficult to assess how the executive branch and congress understood the scope of the President’s war powers in these cases, but historical inquiry would probably show the executive branch’s interpretation to be very broad, even to include full-scale war and even where the main U.S. interest at stake was the very credibility of U.S. defense commitments undergirding its grand strategy, not simply the interests specific to divided Germany and the Middle East region.
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Of course, one might argue that because the threatened military actions were never carried out in these cases, it is impossible to know if the President would have sought congressional authorization or how Congress would have reacted to the use of force; nonetheless, it is easy to see that in crises like these a threat by the President to use force, having put U.S. credibility on the line in addition to whatever other foreign policy stakes were at issues, would have put Congress in a bind. 3. Lawyers’ Mis-Assessment Empirically, analysis of and insights gleaned from any particular incident – which might then be used to evaluate the functional merits of presidential powers – looks very different if one focuses predominantly on the actual use of force instead of considering also the role of threatened force. Take for example, the Cuban Missile Crisis – perhaps the Cold War’s most dangerous event. To the rare extent that they consider domestic legal issues of this crisis at all, lawyers interested in the constitutionality of President Kennedy’s actions generally ask only whether he was empowered to initiate the naval quarantine of Cuba, because that is the concrete military action Kennedy took that was readily observable and that resulted in actual engagement with Soviet forces or vessels – as it happens, very minimal engagement.125 To strategists who study the crisis, however, the naval quarantine is not in itself the key presidential action; after all, as Kennedy and his advisers realized, a quarantine alone could not remove the missiles that were already in Cuba. The most consequential presidential actions were threats of military or even nuclear escalation, signaled through various means including putting U.S. strategic bombers on highest alert.126 The quarantine itself was significant not for its direct military effects but because of its communicative impact in showing U.S. resolve. If one is focused, as lawyers often are, on presidential military action that actually engaged the enemy in combat or nearly did, it is easy to dismiss this case as not very constitutionally significant. If one focuses on it, as strategists and political scientists often do, on nuclear brinkmanship, it is arguably the most significant historical exercise of unilateral presidential powers to affect war and peace.127 Considering again the 1991 Gulf War, most legal scholars would dismiss this instance as constitutionally a pretty uninteresting military conflict: the President claimed unilateral authority to use force, but he eventually sought and obtained congressional authorization for what was ultimately – at least in the short-run – a quite successful war. For the most part this case is therefore neither celebrated nor decried much by either side of legal war powers debates,128 though some congressionalist scholars highlight the correlation of congressional authorization for this war and a successful outcome.129 Political scientists look at the case differently, though. They often study this event not as a successful war but as failed coercive diplomacy, in that the United States first threatened war through a set of dramatically escalating steps that ultimately failed to persuade Saddam Hussein to withdraw from Kuwait.130 Some political scientists even see U.S. legal debate about military actions as an important part of this story, assessing that adversaries pay attention to congressional arguments and moves in evaluating U.S. resolve (an issue taken up in greater detail below) and that congressional opposition to Bush’s initial unilateralism in this case undermined the credibility of U.S. threats.131 Whether one sees the Gulf War as a case of (successful) war, as lawyers usually do, or (unsuccessful) threatened war, as political scientists usually do, colors how one evaluates the outcome and the credit one might attach to some factors such as vocal congressional opposition to initially-unilateral presidential moves. Notice also that legal analysis of Presidential authority to use force is sometimes thought to turn partly on the U.S. security interests at stake, as though those interests are purely contextual and exogenous to U.S. decision-making and grand strategy. In justifying President Obama’s 2011 use of force against the Libyan government, for example, the Justice Department’s Office of Legal Counsel concluded that the President had such legal authority “because he could reasonably determine that such use of force was in the national interest,” and it then went on to detail the U.S. security and foreign policy interests.132 The interests at stake in crises like these, however, are altered dramatically if the President threatens force: doing so puts the credibility of U.S. threats at stake, which is important not only with respect to resolving the crisis at hand but with respect to other potential adversaries watching U.S. actions.133 The President’s power to threaten force means that he may unilaterally alter the costs and benefits of actually using force through his prior actions.134 The U.S. security interests in carrying through on threats are partly endogenous to the strategy embarked upon to address crises (consider, for example, that once President George H.W. Bush placed hundred of thousands of U.S. troops in the Persian Gulf region and issued an ultimatum to Saddam Hussein in 1990, the credibility of U.S. threats and assurances to regional allies were put on the line).135 Moreover, interests at stake in any one crisis cannot simply be disaggregated from broader U.S. grand strategy: if the United States generally relies heavily on threats of force to shape the behavior of other actors, then its demonstrated willingness or unwillingness to carry out a threat and the outcomes of that action affect its credibility in the eyes of other adversaries and allies, too.136 It is remarkable, though in the end not surprising, that the executive branch does not generally cite these credibility interests in justifying its unilateral uses of force. It does cite when relevant the U.S. interest in sustaining the credibility of its formal alliance commitments or U.N. Security Council resolutions, as reasons supporting the President’s constitutional authority to use force.137 The executive branch generally refrains from citing the similar interests in sustaining the credibility of the President’s own threats of force, however, probably in part because doing so would so nakedly expose the degree to which the President’s prior unilateral strategic decisions would tie Congress’s hands on the matter. \* \* \* In sum, lawyers’ focus on actual uses of force – usually in terms of armed clashes with an enemy or the placement of troops into hostile environments – does not account for much vaster ways that President’s wield U.S. military power and it skews the claims legal scholars make about the allocation of war powers between the political branches. A more complete account of constitutional war powers should recognize the significant role of threatened force in American foreign policy. II. Democratic Checks on Threatened Force The previous Parts of this Article showed that, especially since the end of World War II, the United States has relied heavily on strategies of threatened force in wielding its military might – for which credible signals are a necessary element – and that the President is not very constrained legally in any formal sense in threatening war. Drawing on recent political science scholarship, this Part takes some of the major questions often asked by students of constitutional war powers with respect to the actual use of force and reframes them in terms of threatened force. First, as a descriptive matter, in the absence of formal legal checks on the President’s power to threaten war, is the President nevertheless informally but significantly constrained by democratic institutions and processes, and what role does Congress play in that constraint? Second, as a normative matter, what are the strategic merits and drawbacks of this arrangement of democratic institutions and constraints with regard to strategies of threatened force? Third, as a prescriptive matter, although it is not really plausible that Congress or courts would ever erect direct legal barriers to the President’s power to threaten war, how might legal reform proposals to more strongly and formally constrain the President’s power to use force indirectly impact his power to threaten it effectively? For reasons discussed below, I do not consider whether Congress could legislatively restrict directly the President’s power to threaten force or war; in short, I set that issue aside because assuming that were constitutionally permissible, even ardent congressionalists have exhibited no interest in doing so, and instead have focused on legally controlling the actual use of force. Political science insights that bear on these questions emerge from several directions. One is from studies of Congress’ influence on use of force decisions, which usually assume that Congress’s formal legislative powers play only a limited role in this area, and the effects of this influence on presidential decision-making about threatened force. Another is international relations literature on international bargaining138 as well as literature on the theory of democratic peace, the notion that democracies rarely, if ever, go to war with one another.139 In attempting to explain the near-absence of military conflicts between democracies, political scientists have examined how particular features of democratic governments – electoral accountability, the institutionalized mobilization of political opponents, and the diffusion of decision-making authority regarding the use of force among executive and legislative branches – affect decision-making about war.140 These and other studies, in turn, have led some political scientists (especially those with a rational choice theory orientation) to focus on how those features affect the credibility of signals about force that governments send to adversaries in crises.141 My purpose in addressing these questions is to begin painting a more complete and detailed picture of the way war powers operate, or could operate, than one sees when looking only at actual wars and use of force. This is not intended to be a comprehensive account but an effort to synthesize some strands of scholarship from other fields regarding threatened force to inform legal discourse about how war powers function in practice and the strategic implications of reform. The answers to these questions also bear on raging debates among legal scholars on the nature of American executive power and its constraint by law. Initially they seem to support the views of those legal scholars who have long believed that in practice law no longer seriously binds the President with respect to war-making.142 That view has been taken even further recently by Eric Posner and Adrian Vermeule, who argue that “[l]aw does little constraint the modern executive” at all, but also observe that “politics and public opinion” operate effectively to cabin executive powers.143 The arguments offered here, however, do more to support the position of those legal scholars who describe a more complex relationship between law and politics, including that law is constitutive of the processes of political struggle.144 That law helps constitute the processes of political struggles is true of any area of public policy, though, and what is special here is the added importance of foreign audiences – including adversaries and allies, alike – observing and reacting to those politics, too. Democratic Constraints on the Power to the Threaten Force Whereas most lawyers usually begin their analysis of the President’s and Congress’s war powers by focusing on their formal legal authorities, political scientists usually take for granted these days that the President is – in practice – the dominant branch with respect to military crises and that Congress wields its formal legislative powers in this area rarely or in only very limited ways. A major school of thought, however, is that congressional members nevertheless wield significant influence over decisions about force, and that this influence extends to threatened force, so that Presidents generally refrain from threats that would provoke strong congressional opposition. Even without any serious prospect for legislatively blocking the President’s threatened actions, Congress under certain conditions can loom large enough to force Presidents to adjust their policies; even when it cannot, congressional members can oblige the President expend lots of political capital. As Jon Pevehouse and William Howell explain: When members of Congress vocally oppose a use of force, they undermine the president’s ability to convince foreign states that he will see a fight through to the end. Sensing hesitation on the part of the United States, allies may be reluctant to contribute to a military campaign, and adversaries are likely to fight harder and longer when conflict erupts— thereby raising the costs of the military campaign, decreasing the president’s ability to negotiate a satisfactory resolution, and increasing the probability that American lives are lost along the way. Facing a limited band of allies willing to participate in a military venture and an enemy emboldened by domestic critics, presidents may choose to curtail, and even abandon, those military operations that do not involve vital strategic interests. 145 This statement also highlights the important point, alluded to earlier, that force and threatened force are not neatly separable categories. Often limited uses of force are intended as signals of resolve to escalate, and most conflicts involve bargaining in which the threat of future violence – rather than what Schelling calls “brute force”146 – is used to try to extract concessions. The formal participation of political opponents in legislative bodies provides them with a forum for registering dissent to presidential policies of force through such mechanisms floor statements, committee oversight hearings, resolution votes, and funding decisions.147 These official actions prevent the President “from monopolizing the nation’s political discourse” on decisions regarding military actions can thereby make it difficult for the President to depart too far from congressional preferences.148 Members of the political opposition in Congress also have access to resources for gathering policy relevant information from the government that informs their policy preferences. Their active participation in specialized legislative committees similarly gives opponent party members access to fact-finding resources and forums for registering informed dissent from decisions within the committee’s purview.149 As a result, legislative institutions within democracies can enable political opponents to have a more immediate and informed impact on executive’s decisions regarding force than can opponents among the general public. Moreover, studies suggest that Congress can actively shape media coverage and public support for a president’s foreign policy engagements.150 In short, these findings among political scientists suggest that, even without having to pass legislation or formally approve of actions, Congress often operates as an important check on threatened force by providing the president’s political opponents with a forum for registering dissent from the executive’s decisions regarding force in ways that attach domestic political costs to contemplated military actions or even the threats to use force. Under this logic, Presidents, anticipating dissent, will be more selective in issuing¶ threats in the first place, making only those commitments that would not incite¶ widespread political opposition should the threat be carried through.151 Political¶ opponents within a legislature also have few electoral incentives to collude in an¶ executive’s bluff, and they are capable of expressing opposition to a threatened use of¶ force in ways that could expose the bluff to a threatened adversary.152 This again narrows¶ the President’s range of viable policy options for brandishing military force. Counter-intuitively, given the President’s seemingly unlimited and unchallenged¶ constitutional power to threaten war, it may in some cases be easier for members of¶ Congress to influence presidential decisions to threaten military action than presidential¶ war decisions once U.S. forces are already engaged in hostilities. It is widely believed¶ that once U.S. armed forces are fighting, congress members’ hands are often tied: policy¶ opposition at that stage risks being portrayed as undermining our troops in the field.153¶ Perhaps, it could be argued, the President takes this phenomenon into account and¶ therefore discounts political opposition to threatened force; he can assume that such¶ opposition will dissipate if he carries it through. Even if that is true, before that point¶ occurs, however, members of Congress may have communicated messages domestically¶ and communicated signals abroad that the President will find difficult to counter.154 The bottom line is that a body of recent political science, while confirming the¶ President’s dominant position in setting policy in this area, also reveals that policymaking¶ with respect to threats of force is significantly shaped by domestic politics and¶ that Congress is institutionally positioned to play a powerful role in influencing those¶ politics, even without exercising its formal legislative powers. Given the centrality of¶ threatened force to U.S. foreign policy strategy and security crises, this suggests that the¶ practical war powers situation is not so imbalanced toward the President as many assume. B. Democratic Institutions and the Credibility of Threats A central question among constitutional war powers scholars is whether robust¶ checks – especially congressional ones – on presidential use of force lead to “sound”¶ policy decision-making. Congressionalists typically argue that legislative control over¶ war decisions promotes more thorough deliberation, including more accurate weighing of¶ consequences and gauging of political support of military action.155 Presidentialists¶ usually counter that the executive branch has better information and therefore better¶ ability to discern the dangers of action or inaction, and that quick and decisive military¶ moves are often required to deal with security crises.156 If we are interested in these sorts of functional arguments, then reframing the¶ inquiry to include threatened force prompts critical questions whether such checks also¶ contribute to or detract from effective deterrence and coercive diplomacy and therefore¶ positively or negatively affect the likelihood of achieving aims without resort to war.¶ Here, recent political science provides some reason for optimism, though the scholarship¶ in this area is neither yet well developed nor conclusive. To be sure, “soundness” of policy with respect to force is heavily laden with¶ normative assumptions about war and the appropriate role for the United States in the¶ broader international security system, so it is difficult to assess the merits and¶ disadvantages of constitutional allocations in the abstract. That said, whatever their¶ specific assumptions about appropriate uses of force in mind, constitutional war powers¶ scholars usually evaluate the policy advantages and dangers of decision-making¶ allocations narrowly in terms of the costs and outcomes of actual military engagements¶ with adversaries. The importance of credibility to strategies of threatened force adds important new¶ dimensions to this debate. On the one hand, one might intuitively expect that robust democratic checks would generally be ill-suited for coercive threats and negotiations –¶ that institutional centralization and secrecy of decision-making might better equip nondemocracies¶ to wield threats of force. As Quincy Wright speculated in 1944, autocracies¶ “can use war efficiently and threats of war even more efficiently” than democracies,157¶ especially the American democracy in which vocal public and congressional opposition¶ may undermine threats.158 Moreover, proponents of democratic checks on war powers¶ usually assume that careful deliberation is a virtue in preventing unnecessary wars, but¶ strategists of deterrence and coercion observe that perceived irrationality is sometimes¶ important in conveying threats: “don’t test me, because I might just be crazy enough to¶ do it!”159 On the other hand, some political scientists have recently called into question this¶ view and concluded that the institutionalization of political contestation and some¶ diffusion of decision-making power in democracies of the kind described in the previous¶ section make threats to use force rare but especially credible and effective in resolving¶ international crises without actual resort to armed conflict. In other words, recent¶ arguments in effect turn some old claims about the strategic disabilities of democracies¶ on their heads: whereas it used to be generally thought that democracies were ineffective¶ in wielding threats because they are poor at keeping secrets and their decision-making is¶ constrained by internal political pressures, a current wave of political science accepts this¶ basic description but argues that these democratic features are really strategic virtues.160 Rationalist models of crisis bargaining between states assume that because war is¶ risky and costly, states will be better off if they can resolve their disputes through¶ bargaining rather than by enduring the costs and uncertainties of armed conflict.161¶ Effective bargaining during such disputes – that which resolves the crisis without a resort¶ to force – depends largely on states’ perceptions of their adversary’s capacity to wage an¶ effective military campaign and its willingness to resort to force to obtain a favorable¶ outcome. A state targeted with a threat of force, for example, will be less willing to resist¶ the adversary’s demands if it believes that the adversary intends to wage and is capable of¶ waging an effective military campaign to achieve its ends. In other words, if a state¶ perceives that the threat from the adversary is credible, that state has less incentive to¶ resist such demands if doing so will escalate into armed conflict. The accuracy of such perceptions, however, is often compromised by¶ informational asymmetries that arise from private information about an adversary’s¶ relative military capabilities and resolve that prevents other states from correctly¶ assessing another states’ intentions, as well as by the incentives states have to¶ misrepresent their willingness to fight – that is, to bluff.162 Informational asymmetries¶ increase the potential for misperception and thereby make war more likely; war,¶ consequentially, can be thought of in these cases as a “bargaining failure.”163 Some political scientists have argued in recent decades – contrary to previously common wisdom – that features and constraints of democracies make them better suited than non-democracies to credibly signal their resolve when they threaten force. To bolster their bargaining position, states will seek to generate credible signals of their resolve by taking actions that can enhance the credibility of such threats, such as mobilizing military forces or making “hand-tying” commitments from which leaders cannot back down without suffering considerable political costs domestically.164 These domestic audience costs, according to some political scientists, are especially high for leaders in democratic states, where they may bear these costs at the polls.165 Given the potentially high domestic political and electoral repercussions democratic leaders face from backing down from a public threat, they have considerable incentives to refrain from bluffing. An adversary that understands these political vulnerabilities is thereby more likely to perceive the threats a democratic leader does issue as highly credible, in turn making it more likely that the adversary will yield.166 Other scholars have recently pointed to the special role of legislative bodies in signaling with regard to threatened force. This is especially interesting from the perspective of constitutional powers debates, because it posits a distinct role for Congress – and, again, one that does not necessarily rely on Congress’s ability to pass binding legislation that formally confines the President. Kenneth Schultz, for instance, argues that the open nature of competition within democratic societies ensures that the interplay of opposing parties in legislative bodies over the use of force is observable not just to their domestic publics but to foreign actors; this inherent transparency within democracies – magnified by legislative processes – provides more information to adversaries regarding the unity of domestic opponents around a government’s military and foreign policy decisions.167 Political opposition parties can undermine the credibility of some threats by the President to use force if they publicly voice their opposition in committee hearings, public statements, or through other institutional mechanisms. Furthermore, legislative processes – such as debates and hearings – make it difficult to conceal or misrepresent preferences about war and peace. Faced with such institutional constraints, Presidents will incline to be more selective about making such threats and avoid being undermined in that way.168 This restraining effect on the ability of governments to issue threats simultaneously makes those threats that the government issues more credible, if an observer assumes that the President would not be issuing it if he anticipated strong political opposition. Especially when members of the opposition party publicly support an executive’s threat to use force during a crisis, their visible support lends additional credibility to the government’s threat by demonstrating that political conditions domestically favor the use of force should it be necessary.169 In some cases, Congress may communicate greater willingness than the president to use force, for instance through non-binding resolutions.170 Such powerful signals of resolve should in theory make adversaries more likely to back down. The credibility-enhancing effects of legislative constraints on threats are subject to dispute. Some studies question the assumptions underpinning theories of audience costs – specifically the idea that democratic leaders suffer domestic political costs to failing to make good on their threats, and therefore that their threats are especially credible171 – and others question whether the empirical data supports claims that democracies have credibility advantages in making threats.172 Other scholars dispute the likelihood that leaders will really be punished politically for backing down, especially if the threat was not explicit and unambiguous or if they have good policy reasons for doing so.173 Additionally, even if transparency in democratic institutions allows domestic dissent from threats of force to be visible to foreign audiences, it is not clear that adversaries would interpret these mechanisms as political scientists expect in their models of strategic interaction, in light of various common problems of misperception in international relations.174 These disputes are not just between competing theoretical models but also over the links between any of the models and real-world political behavior by states. At this point there remains a dearth of good historical evidence as to how foreign leaders interpret political maneuvers within Congress regarding threatened force. Nevertheless, at the very least, strands of recent political science scholarship cast significant doubt on the intuition that democratic checks are inherently disadvantageous to strategies of threatened force. Quite the contrary, they suggest that legislative checks – or, indeed, even the signaling functions that Congress is institutionally situated to play with respect to foreign audiences interpreting U.S. government moves – can be harnessed in some circumstances to support such strategies. C. Legal Reform and Strategies of Threatened Force Among legal scholars of war powers, the ultimate prescriptive question is whether the President should be constrained more formally and strongly than he currently is by legislative checks, especially a more robust and effective mandatory requirement of congressional authorization to use force. Calls for reform usually take the form of narrowing and better enforcement (by all three branches of government) of purported constitutional requirements for congressional authorization of presidential uses of force or revising and enforcing the War Powers Resolutions or other framework legislation requiring express congressional authorization for such actions.175

[CONTINUED]

**Exec Power DA – 1NC [5/5]**

[CONTINUED]

As applied to strategies of threatened force, generally under these proposals the President would lack authority to make good on them unilaterally (except in whatever narrow circumstances for which he retains his own unilateral authority, such as deterring imminent attacks on the United States). Whereas legal scholars are consumed with the internal effects of war powers law, such as whether and when it constrains U.S. government decision-making, the analysis contained in the previous section shifts attention externally to whether and when U.S. law might influence decision-making by adversaries, allies, and other international actors. In prescriptive terms, if the President’s power to use force is linked to his ability to threaten it effectively, then any consideration of war powers reform on policy outcomes and longterm interests should include the important secondary effects on deterrent and coercive strategies – and how U.S. legal doctrine is perceived and understood abroad.176 Would stronger requirements for congressional authorization to use force reduce a president’s opportunities for bluffing, and if so would this improve U.S. coercive diplomacy by making ensuing threats more credible? Or would it undermine diplomacy by taking some threats off the table as viable policy options? Would stronger formal legislative powers with respect to force have significant marginal effects on the signaling effects of dissent within Congress, beyond those effects already resulting from open political discourse? These are difficult questions, but the analysis and evidence above helps generate some initial hypotheses and avenues for further research and analysis. One might ask at this point why, though, having exposed as a hole in war powers legal discourse the tendency to overlook threatened force, this Article does not take up whether Congress should assert some direct legislative control of threats – perhaps statutorily limiting the President’s authority to make them or establishing procedural conditions like presidential reporting requirements to Congress. This Article puts such a notion aside for several reasons. First, for reasons alluded to briefly above, such limits would be very constitutionally suspect and difficult to enforce.177 Second, even the most ardent war-power congressionalists do not contemplate such direct limits on the President’s power to threaten; they are not a realistic option for reform. Instead, this Article focuses on the more plausible – and much more discussed – possibility of strengthening Congress’s power over the ultimate decision whether to use force, but augments the usual debate over that question with appreciation for the importance of credible threats. A claim previously advanced from a presidentialist perspective is that stronger legislative checks on war powers is harmful to coercive and deterrent strategies, because it establishes easily-visible impediments to the President’s authority to follow through on threats. This was a common policy argument during the War Powers Resolution debates in the early 1970s. Eugene Rostow, an advocate inside and outside the government for executive primacy, remarked during consideration of legislative drafts that any serious restrictions on presidential use of force would mean in practice that “no President could make a credible threat to use force as an instrument of deterrent diplomacy, even to head off explosive confrontations.”178 He continued: In the tense and cautious diplomacy of our present relations with the Soviet Union, as they have developed over the last twenty-five years, the authority of the President to set clear and silent limits in advance is perhaps the *most* important of all the powers in our constitutional armory to prevent confrontations that could carry nuclear implications. … [I]t is the diplomatic power the President needs most under the circumstance of modern life—the power to make a credible threat to use force in order to prevent a confrontation which might escalate.179 In his veto statement on the War Powers Resolution, President Nixon echoed these concerns, arguing that the law would undermine the credibility of U.S. deterrent and coercive threats in the eyes of both adversaries and allies – they would know that presidential authority to use force would expire after 60 days, so absent strong congressional support they could assume U.S. withdrawal at that point.180 In short, those who oppose tying the president’s hands with mandatory congressional authorization requirements to use force sometimes argue that doing so incidentally and dangerously ties his hands in threatening it. A critical assumption here is that presidential flexibility, preserved in legal doctrine, enhances the credibility of presidential threats to escalate.

#### Korean war goes nuclear

STRATFOR ‘10 (International Think Tank, “North Korea, South Korea: The Military Balance on the Peninsula,” http://www.stratfor.com/analysis/20100526\_north\_korea\_south\_korea\_military\_balance\_peninsula, May 26, 2010)

So the real issue is the potential for escalation — or an accident that could precipitate escalation — that would be beyond the control of Pyongyang or Seoul. With both sides on high alert, both adhering to their own national (and contradictory) definitions of where disputed boundaries lie and with rules of engagement loosened, the potential for sudden and rapid escalation is quite real. Indeed, North Korea’s navy, though sizable on paper, is largely a hollow shell of old, laid-up vessels. What remains are small fast attack craft and submarines — mostly Sang-O “Shark” class boats and midget submersibles. These vessels are best employed in the cluttered littoral environment to bring asymmetric tactics to bear — not unlike those Iran has prepared for use in the Strait of Hormuz. These kinds of vessels and tactics — including, especially, the deployment of naval mines — are poorly controlled when dispersed in a crisis and are often impossible to recall. For nearly 40 years, tensions on the Korean Peninsula were managed within the context of the wider Cold War. During that time it was feared that a second Korean War could all too easily escalate into and a thermonuclear World War III, so both Pyongyang and Seoul were being heavily managed from their respective corners. In fact, USFK was long designed to ensure that South Korea could not independently provoke that war and drag the Americans into it, which for much of the Cold War period was of far greater concern to Washington than North Korea attacking southward. Today, those constraints no longer exist. There are certainly still constraints — neither the United States nor China wants war on the peninsula. But current tensions are quickly escalating to a level unprecedented in the post-Cold War period, and the constraints that do exist have never been tested in the way they might be if the situation escalates much further.
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#### AUMF strong now- Congress supports a broad interpretation

Brooks, 13 -- Georgetown University law professor

[Rosa, New America Foundation Schwartz senior fellow, served as a counselor to the U.S. defense undersecretary for policy from 2009 to 2011 and previously served as a senior advisor at the U.S. State Department, "Mission Creep in the War on Terror," Foreign Policy, 3-14-13, www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2013/03/14/mission\_creep\_in\_the\_war\_on\_terror, accessed 8-24-13, mss]

"When you're not near the girl you love, love the girl you're near," sang Frank Sinatra. The U.S. government seems to have its own variant: When you're not near the terrorist you're supposed to target, target the terrorist you're near. To accommodate this desire, both the Bush and Obama administrations have had to gradually stretch the AUMF's language to accommodate an ever-widening range of potential targets, ever more attenuated from the 9/11 perpetrators. The shift has been subtle, and for the most part **Congress** has **aided and abetted it**. In the 2006 and 2009 Military Commissions Acts, for instance, Congress gave military commissions jurisdiction over individuals who are "part of forces associated with al Qaeda or the Taliban," along with "those who purposefully and materially support such forces in hostilities against U.S. Coalition partners." This allowed the Bush and then the Obama administration to argue that in the original 2001 AUMF, Congress must have implicitly authorized the use of force against al Qaeda and Taliban "associated forces." That is, if Congress considers it appropriate for U.S. military commissions to have jurisdiction over al Qaeda and Taliban associates, Congress must believe the executive branch has the authority to detain such associates, and the authority to detain must stem from the authority to use force. This suggests that Congress must believe the AUMF should be read in the context of traditional law-of-war authorities, which include the implied authority to use force against (or detain) both the declared enemy and the enemy's "co-belligerents" or "associated forces." By 2009, the Obama administration was arguing in court that, at least when it comes to detention, the AUMF implicitly authorizes the president "to detain persons who were part of, or substantially supported, Taliban or al Qaeda forces or associated forces that are engaged in hostilities against the United States or its coalition partners" (my emphasis). Note how far this has shifted from the original language of the AUMF: The focus is no longer merely on those who were directly complicit in the 9/11 attacks, but on a far broader category of individuals. This broadened understanding of executive detention authority was later given the congressional nod in the 2012 National Defense Authorization Act, which used virtually identical language.

#### Detention authority comes from the AUMF

**Kelley ’12** [Michael, MA in journalism from Medill, writer for Business Insider, “Why Losing Indefinite Detention Powers Would Be A Disaster For Obama,” Oct. 24, http://www.businessinsider.com/why-losing-indefinite-detention-powers-would-be-a-disaster-for-obama-2012-10]

There's a big story by Greg Miller in the Washington Post on how the Obama administration has expanded its powers in the War on Terror.¶ Miller notes that the legal foundation for U.S. counterterrorism strategy is partially based on "the Congressional authorization to use military force" (AUMF) that was passed after 9/11.¶ Specifically it seems to be based on an interpretation of the AUMF that was "reaffirmed" by the indefinite detention clause of the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA). ¶ This explains why Obama is fighting so hard to keep the indefinite detention clause in effect.¶ **In court** **the government argued** that the **indefinite detention** clause **is simply a "reaffirmation" of the** Authorization Use Of Military Force (**AUMF**), which gives the president authority "to use all necessary and appropriate force against those ... [who] aided the terrorist attacks that occurred on September 11, 2001 or harbored such organizations or persons." In the NDAA lawsuit, the government argued that the NDAA §1021 is simply an "affirmation" or "reaffirmation" of the AUMF.

#### Decreasing AUMF authorizations snowballs- causes judicial rollback of the AUMF

Barnes, 12 -- J.D. Candidate, Boston University School of Law

[Beau, “Reauthorizing the ‘War on Terror’: The Legal and Policy Implications of the AUMF’s Coming Obsolescence,” Military Law Review, Vol 211, 2012, http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=2150874, accessed 8-21-13, mss]

**The scope of** the **AUMF is** also **important for** any **future judicial opinion** that might rely in part on Justice Jackson’s Steel Seizure concurrence.23 Support from Congress places the President’s actions in Jackson’s first zone, where executive power is at its zenith, because it “includes all that [the president]~~he~~ possesses in [their]~~his~~ own right plus all that Congress can delegate.”24 Express or implied **congressional disapproval, discernible by identifying the** outer limits **of** the **AUMF’s authorization, would place the President’s “power . . . at its** lowest ebb.”25 In this third zone, executive claims “must be scrutinized with caution, for what is at stake is the equilibrium established by our constitutional system.”26 Indeed, Jackson specifically rejected an overly powerful executive, observing that the Framers did not intend to fashion the President into an American monarch.27 Jackson’s concurrence has become the most significant **guidepost** in debates over the constitutionality of executive action in the realm of national security and foreign relations.28 Indeed, some have argued that it was given “the status of law”29 by then-Associate Justice William Rehnquist in Dames & Moore v. Regan.30 Speaking for the Court, Rehnquist applied Jackson’s tripartite framework to an executive order settling pending U.S. claims against Iran, noting that “[t]he parties and the lower courts . . . have all agreed that much relevant analysis is contained in [Youngstown].”31 More recently, Chief Justice John Roberts declared that “Justice Jackson’s familiar **tripartite scheme** provides the accepted framework for evaluating executive action in [the area of foreign relations law].”32 Should a future court adjudicate the nature or extent of the President’s authority to engage in military actions against terrorists, an applicable statute would confer upon such executive action “the strongest of presumptions and the widest latitude of judicial interpretation.”33 The AUMF therefore exercises a profound legal influence on the future of the United States’ struggle against terrorism, and its precise scope, authorization, and continuing vitality matter a great deal.

#### That shifts US doctrine to international self-defense- expanded *jus ad bellum* collapses global firebreak on use-of-force

Barnes, 12 -- J.D. Candidate, Boston University School of Law

[Beau, “Reauthorizing the ‘War on Terror’: The Legal and Policy Implications of the AUMF’s Coming Obsolescence,” Military Law Review, Vol 211, 2012, http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=2150874, accessed 9-19-13, mss]

In a world without a valid AUMF, the United States could base its continued worldwide counterterrorism operations on various alternative domestic legal authorities. All of these alternative bases, however, carry with them significant costs—detrimental to U.S. security and democracy. The foreign and national security policy of the United States should rest on “a comprehensive legal regime to support its actions, one that [has] the blessings of Congress and to which a court would defer as the collective judgment of the American political system about a novel set of problems.”141 Only then can the President’s efforts be sustained and legitimate. 2. Effect on the International Law of Self-Defense A failure to reauthorize military force would lead to significant negative consequences on the international level as well. Denying the Executive Branch the authority to carry out military operations in the armed conflict against Al Qaeda would force the President to find authorization elsewhere, most likely in the international law of selfdefense— the jus ad bellum.142 Finding sufficient legal authority for the United States’s ongoing counterterrorism operations in the international law of self-defense, however, is problematic for several reasons. As a preliminary matter, relying on this rationale usurps Congress’s role in regulating the contours of U.S. foreign and national security policy. If the Executive Branch can assert “self-defense against a continuing threat” to target and detain terrorists worldwide, it will almost always be able to find such a threat.143 Indeed, the Obama Administration’s broad understanding of the concept of “imminence” illustrates the danger of allowing the executive to rely on a self-defense authorization alone.144 This approach also would inevitably lead to dangerous “slippery slopes.” Once the President authorizes a targeted killing of an individual who does not pose an imminent threat in the strict law enforcement sense of “imminence,”145 there are few potential targets that would be off-limits to the Executive Branch. Overly malleable concepts are not the proper bases for the consistent use of military force in a democracy. Although the **Obama** Administration has **disclaimed** this manner of **broad authority because the AUMF “does not authorize** military **force** **against anyone** the Executive labels a ‘terrorist,’”146 **relying solely on** the **international** law of **self** **defense would** likely **lead to precisely such a result**. The slippery slope problem, however, is not just limited to the United States’s military actions and the issue of domestic control. The creation of international norms is an iterative process, one to which the United States makes significant contributions. Because of this outsized influence, the United States should not claim international legal rights that it is not prepared to see proliferate around the globe. Scholars have observed that the Obama Administration’s “expansive and open-ended interpretation of the right to self-defence threatens to destroy the prohibition on the use of armed force . . . .”147 Indeed, “[i]f other states were to claim the broad-based authority that the United States does, to kill people anywhere, anytime, **the result would be chaos**.”148

#### Causes global hotspots to go nuclear

Obayemi, 6 -- East Bay Law School professor

[Olumide, admitted to the Bars of Federal Republic of Nigeria and the State of California, Golden Gate University School of Law, "Article: Legal Standards Governing Pre-Emptive Strikes and Forcible Measures of Anticipatory Self-Defense Under the U.N. Charter and General International Law," 12 Ann. Surv. Int'l & Comp. L. 19, l/n, accessed 9-19-13, mss]

The United States must abide by the rigorous standards set out above that are meant to govern the use of preemptive strikes, because today's international system is characterized by a relative infrequency of interstate war. It has been noted that developing doctrines that lower the threshold for preemptive action could put that accomplishment at risk, and exacerbate regional crises already on the brink of open conflict. n100 This is important as O'Hanlon, Rice, and Steinberg have rightly noted: ...countries already on the brink of war, and leaning strongly towards war, might use the doctrine to justify an action they already wished to take, and the effect of the U.S. posture may make it harder for the international community in general, and the U.S. in particular, to counsel delay and diplomacy. Potential **examples abound**, ranging from Ethiopia and Eritrea, to China and Taiwan, to the Middle East. But perhaps the clearest case is the India-Pakistan crisis. n101 The world must be a safe place to live in. We cannot be ruled by bandits and rogue states. There must be law and order not only in the books but in enforcement as well. No nation is better suited to enforce international law than the United States. The Bush Doctrine will stand the test [\*42] of time and survive. Again, we submit that nothing more would protect the world and its citizens from nuclear weapons, terrorists and rogue states than an able and willing nation like the United States, acting as a policeman of the world within all legal boundaries. This is the essence of the preamble to the United Nations Charter.

### 1NC

#### Indefinite detention reforms result in catastrophic terrorism---releases terrorists and kills intel gathering

Jack Goldsmith 09, Henry L. Shattuck Professor at Harvard Law School, 2/4/09, “Long-Term Terrorist Detention and Our National Security Court,” http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/papers/2009/2/09%20detention%20goldsmith/0209\_detention\_goldsmith.pdf

These three concerns challenge the detention paradigm. They do nothing to eliminate the need for detention to prevent detainees returning to the battlefield. But many believe that we can meet this need by giving trials to everyone we want to detain and then incarcerating them under a theory of conviction rather than of military detention. I disagree. For many reasons, it is too risky for the U.S. government to deny itself the traditional military detention power altogether, and to commit itself instead to try or release every suspected terrorist. ¶ For one thing, military detention will be necessary in Iraq and Afghanistan for the foreseeable future. For another, we likely cannot secure convictions of all of the dangerous terrorists at Guantánamo, much less all future dangerous terrorists, who legitimately qualify for non-criminal military detention. The evidentiary and procedural standards of trials, civilian and military alike, are much higher than the analogous standards for detention. With some terrorists too menacing to set free, the standards will prove difficult to satisfy. Key evidence in a given case may come from overseas and verifying it, understanding its provenance, or establishing its chain of custody in the manners required by criminal trials may be difficult. This problem is exacerbated when evidence was gathered on a battlefield or during an armed skirmish. The problem only grows when the evidence is old. And perhaps most importantly, the use of such evidence in a criminal process may compromise intelligence sources and methods, requiring the disclosure of the identities of confidential sources or the nature of intelligence-gathering techniques, such as a sophisticated electronic interception capability. ¶ Opponents of non-criminal detention observe that despite these considerations, the government has successfully prosecuted some Al Qaeda terrorists—in particular, Zacharias Moussaoui and Jose Padilla. This is true, but it does not follow that prosecutions are achievable in every case in which disabling a terrorist suspect represents a surpassing government interest. Moreover, the Moussaoui and Padilla prosecutions highlight an under-appreciated cost of trials, at least in civilian courts. The Moussaoui and Padilla trials were messy affairs that stretched, and some observers believe broke, our ordinary criminal trial conceptions of conspiracy law and the rights of the accused, among other things. The Moussaoui trial, for example, watered down the important constitutional right of the defendant to confront witnesses against him in court, and the Padilla trial rested on an unprecedentedly broad conception of conspiracy.15 An important but under-appreciated cost of using trials in all cases is that these prosecutions will invariably bend the law in ways unfavorable to civil liberties and due process, and these changes, in turn, will invariably spill over into non-terrorist prosecutions and thus skew the larger criminal justice process.16¶ A final problem with using any trial system, civilian or military, as the sole lawful basis for terrorist detention is that the trials can result in short sentences (as the first military commission trial did) or even acquittal of a dangerous terrorist.17 In criminal trials, guilty defendants often go free because of legal technicalities, government inability to introduce probative evidence, and other factors beyond the defendant's innocence. These factors are all exacerbated in terrorist trials by the difficulties of getting information from the place of capture, by classified information restrictions, and by stale or tainted evidence. One way to get around this problem is to assert the authority, as the Bush administration did, to use non-criminal detention for persons acquitted or given sentences too short to neutralize the danger they pose. But such an authority would undermine the whole purpose of trials and would render them a sham. As a result, putting a suspect on trial can make it hard to detain terrorists the government deems dangerous. For example, the government would have had little trouble defending the indefinite detention of Salim Hamdan, Osama Bin Laden's driver, under a military detention rationale. Having put him on trial before a military commission, however, it was stuck with the light sentence that Hamdan is completing at home in Yemen.¶ As a result of these considerations, insistence on the exclusive use of criminal trials and the elimination of non-criminal detention would significantly raise the chances of releasing dangerous terrorists who would return to kill Americans or others. Since noncriminal military detention is clearly a legally available option—at least if it is expressly authorized by Congress and contains adequate procedural guarantees—this risk should be unacceptable. In past military conflicts, the release of an enemy soldier posed risks. But they were not dramatic risks, for there was only so much damage a lone actor or small group of individuals could do.18 Today, however, that lone actor can cause far more destruction and mayhem because technological advances are creating ever-smaller and ever-deadlier weapons. It would be astounding if the American system, before the advent of modern terrorism, struck the balance between security and liberty in a manner that precisely reflected the new threats posed by asymmetric warfare. We face threats from individuals today that are of a different magnitude than threats by individuals in the past; having government authorities that reflect that change makes sense.

#### *Dirty bomb* causes retaliation against Iran and North Korea - even if not involved

Millen ‘5 (LTC Raymond Millen, Strategic Studies Institute, “Welcome Iran and North Korea to the Nuclear Club: You’re Targeted”, <http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pdffiles/pub678.pdf>, June 1, 2005)

In one of the great ironies of the post -Cold War era, the United States, the most powerful nuclear state in the world, seems fear stricken by the possibility of Iran and North Korea obtaining nuclear weapons. Two facts frame the dilemma: both states are intent on becoming nuclear powers, and neit her the European Union (EU) nor China is willing to help curb their ambitions. Clea rly, nonproliferation is an important policy goal, but the United States should not view le akage as a catastrophe. Rather, the proper response is a declaratory policy of nuclear de terrence directed specifically at Iran and North Korea once they become nuclear powers. As scholars and practitioners long have affirmed, the essence of nuclear deterrence is the certitude that an attack with nuclear weapons will result in a retaliatory strike of assured destruction. The idea is to make the consequences so severe that the nuclear option is never contemplated. U.S. nuclear credibility rests on both the capability and the national will to retaliate with nuclea r weapons. The U.S. administration will underscore the nation’s resolve by decl aring a commitment of automatic nuclear retaliation against Iran or North Korea if th ey attack the United States, its allies, or signatories of the Non-proliferation Treaty (NPT) with nuclear weapons . The paradox of nuclear deterrence is that the more credible the threat to retaliate, the less likely the threat will be tested. Conversely, any init iative that lowers the credibility of nuclear retaliation (e.g., ballistic missile defense, reta liation with precision guided conventional munitions, or inclusion of chemical and biological weapons in this category for retaliation) increases the likelihood that nucle ar weapons will be used. In short, if Iran or North Korea perceives the U.S. threat to retaliate with nuclear weapons is not credible, the greater the likelihood th ey will misjudge during a crisis. But is directed nuclear deterrence unnece ssarily provocative? The response is simply that the past conduct of both Iran and North Korea counts, which is why they are singled out from the rest of the nuclear club. Both have clashed with the United States in the past and active ly foment anti-American behavi or. They are adversaries of the United States and should be treated as such. If they do not wish to be targeted, then they can give up their nuclear weapon ambitions. The pressing fear is of Iran or North Korea providing nuclear devices to terrorist proxies to attack the United States. The Un ited States must make clear that it views terrorist organizations as merely another de livery device, no different from a nuclear bomb delivered by an aircraft or ballistic missile. Should a terrorist organization detonate a nuclear device or dirty bomb in the United States or allies, a nuclear retaliation for both will be assured. Admittedly, such a nuclear retaliation against Iran and North Korea seems rash because their involvement will not likely be ascertained. Philosophers can debate the ethics of nuclear retaliation resulting from a nonattributive nuclear attack all they want, but Iran and North Korea must face the hard consequences of their reckless behavior. Under such conditions, they have strong incentives to practice nonproliferation as well as quietly in forming the United States of any terrorist plots to use nuclear devices.

### Case

#### The aff can’t solve the broader power grabs of the state

Nasser Hussain 7, an assistant professor in the Department of Law, Jurisprudence, and Social Thought at Amherst College, Summer 07, “Beyond Norm and Exception: Guantánamo,” Critical Inquiry, Vol. 33, No. 4

Finally, what are some of the implications of the argument that norm and exception have blurred severely and perhaps irrevocably? Let me stress that my efforts to draw attention to the ways in which an administrative legality has made the concept of a state of exception superfluous is not just theoretical disagreement or just an effort to discredit one particular paradigm. One may agree or disagree about the continuing validity of a concept, but my more immediate concern here is that the concept not overshadow or distort efforts to fashion a newer, fairer, and more just response.¶ Consider then one such effort to fashion a new response: Bruce Ackerman’s proposals in “The Emergency Constitution.”50 Ackerman’s essay begins with the recognition that attacks on the U.S. similar to 9/11 are almost a virtual certainty and that without creative new constitutional concepts each attack will only prompt harsher political measures in a “downward cycle” (“A,” p. 1044). Dismissing the models currently provided for by war and crime, Ackerman settles on the concept of emergency and sets out to find a way to grant and yet control the use of extraordinary powers in the case of a genuine emergency. For Ackerman, it is time to try to rescue the concept of a state of exception from fascist thinkers like Schmitt, who used it as a battering ram against liberal democracy. Ackerman would confine a genuine emergency to a bounded state (tellingly, the “triggering event” in Ackerman’s proposals is left entirely uncharted, left to the hope of political wisdom). But because Ackerman neglects the more dispersed condition of emergency in contemporary conditions, his proposals hinge on the use of legislative oversight largely in the form of a “supermajoritarian escalator”: “majority support should serve to sustain emergency for a short time—two or three months. Continuation should require an escalating cascade of supermajorities: sixty percent for the next two months; seventy for the next; eighty thereafter” (“A,” p. 1047). While such a sensible and even workable proposal would go some of the way towards removing some of the current excesses of executive policy, my effort at highlighting the role of administrative agencies and regulations suggests that the effectiveness of Ackerman’s proposals would remain extremely limited. That is to say, only if we presume that a bounded state of exception rather than a more dispersed emergency regulation is currently being used would efforts to bind it further be effective. But proposals such as the supermajoritarian escalator would do very little to change the “spitting on the sidewalk” strategy endorsed by Ashcroft or the use of petty visa violations to enable large‐scale roundups and prolonged detention—as I noted earlier, what enables the indefinite detention of hundreds of people without charge is not the use of an exceptional measure but the multiple use of an everyday measure. Moreover, as I earlier noted with reference to Nonet’s work, the internal structure of a rule of law and its relation to administrative regimes, far from negating such an outcome, actually facilitates it. The current emergency response whose operations we witness daily emerges from a broader field of governmentality, and until such a modular and legalistic character is addressed any effort to design a more liberal emergency constitution will invariably miss a great many of its intended targets.

#### Plan causes a compensatory shift to drone strikes – that’s worse

RT, 13 (5/3, “US targeted drone killings used as alternative to Guantanamo Bay - Bush lawyer.” http://rt.com/usa/obama-using-drones-avoid-gitmo-747/)

A lawyer who was influential in the United States’ adoption of unmanned aircraft has spoken out against the Obama administration for what he perceives as using drones as an alternative to capturing suspects and sending them to Guantanamo Bay prison camp. John Bellinger, the Bush administration attorney who drafted the initial legal specifications regarding drone killings after the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks, said that Bush’s successor has abused the framework, skirting international law for political points. “This government has decided that instead of detaining members of Al-Qaeda [at Guantanamo Bay prison camp in Cuba] they are going to kill them,” Bellinger told a conference at the Bipartisan Policy Center, as quoted by The Guardian. Earlier this week Obama promised to reignite efforts to close Guantanamo Bay, where prisoners have gone on a hunger strike to protest human rights violations and wrongful incarcerations. They were his first in-depth remarks on the subject since 2009, when Obama had just recently been elected to office after campaigning on a promise to close the facility. But international law is equally suspect of drone strikes. Almost 5,000 people are thought to have been killed by roughly 300 US attacks in four countries, according to The Guardian. Bellinger maintained that the government has justified strikes throughout Pakistan and Yemen by using the 'War on Terror' as an excuse. “We are about the only country in the world that thinks we are in an armed conflict with Al-Qaeda,” he said. “We really need to get on top of this and explain to our allies why it is legal and why it is permissible under international law." “These drone strikes are causing us great damage in the world, but on the other hand if you are the president and you do nothing to stop another 9/11 then you also have a problem,” he added. Of the 166 detainees at Guantanamo Bay, 86 have been cleared for release by a commission made up of officials from the Department of Homeland Security, Joint Chiefs of Staff and other influential government divisions. White House officials have justified the use of unmanned aircraft by saying the US is at war with Al-Qaeda and that those targeted in drone attacks were planning attacks on America. In the future, experts say, future countries could use the same rationale to explain their own attacks. “Countries under attack are the ones that get to decide whether or not they are at war,” said Philip Zelikow, a member of the White House Intelligence Advisory Board. While the conversation around drones is certainly a sign of things to come, Hina Shamsi of the American Civil Liberties Union encouraged Americans to think about the human rights issues posed by the new technology. It could be another long process, if the Guantanamo Bay handling is any indication. “The use of this technology is spreading and we have to think about what we would say if other countries used drones for targeted killing programs,” Shamsi said. “Few things are more likely to undermine our legitimacy than the perception that we are not abiding by the rule of law or are indifferent to civilian casualties.”

#### Obama will disregard the Court. He is on record

Pyle 12—Professor of constitutional law and civil liberties @ Mount Holyoke College [Christopher H. Pyle, “Barack Obama and Civil Liberties,” Presidential Studies Quarterly, Volume 42, Issue 4, December 2012, Pg. 867–880]

Preventive Detention

But this is not the only double standard that Obama's attorney general has endorsed. Like his predecessors, Holder has chosen to deny some prisoners any trials at all, either because the government lacks sufficient evidence to guarantee their convictions or because what “evidence” it does have is fatally tainted by torture and would deeply embarrass the United States if revealed in open court. At one point, the president considered asking Congress to pass a preventive detention law. Then he decided to institute the policy himself and defy the courts to overrule him, thereby forcing judges to assume primary blame for any crimes against the United States committed by prisoners following a court-ordered release (Serwer 2009).

According to Holder, courts and commissions are “essential tools in our fight against terrorism” (Holder 2009). If they will not serve that end, the administration will disregard them. The attorney general also assured senators that if any of the defendants are acquitted, the administration will still keep them behind bars. It is difficult to imagine a greater contempt for the rule of law than this refusal to abide by the judgment of a court. Indeed, it is grounds for Holder's disbarment.

As a senator, Barack Obama denounced President Bush's detentions on the ground that a “perfectly innocent individual could be held and could not rebut the Government's case and has no way of proving his innocence” (Greenwald 2012). But, three years into his presidency, Obama signed just such a law. The National Defense Authorization Act of 2012 authorized the military to round up and detain, indefinitely and without trial, American citizens suspected of giving “material support” to alleged terrorists. The law was patently unconstitutional, and has been so ruled by a court (Hedges v. Obama 2012), but President Obama's only objection was that its detention provisions were unnecessary, because he already had such powers as commander in chief. He even said, when signing the law, that “my administration will not authorize the indefinite military detention without trial of American citizens,” but again, that remains policy, not law (Obama 2011). At the moment, the administration is detaining 40 innocent foreign citizens at Guantanamo whom the Bush administration cleared for release five years ago (Worthington 2012b).

Thus, Obama's “accomplishments” in the administration of justice “are slight,” as the president admitted in Oslo, and not deserving of a Nobel Prize. What little he has done has more to do with appearances than substance. Torture was an embarrassment, so he ordered it stopped, at least for the moment. Guantanamo remains an embarrassment, so he ordered it closed. He failed in that endeavor, but that was essentially a cosmetic directive to begin with, because a new and larger offshore prison was being built at Bagram Air Base in Afghanistan—one where habeas petitions could be more easily resisted. The president also decided that kidnapping can continue, if not in Europe, then in Ethiopia, Somalia, and Kenya, where it is less visible, and therefore less embarrassing (Scahill 2011). Meanwhile, his lawyers have labored mightily to shield kidnappers and torturers from civil suits and to run out the statute of limitations on criminal prosecutions. Most importantly, kidnapping and torture remain options, should al-Qaeda strike again. By talking out of both sides of his mouth simultaneously, Obama keeps hope alive for liberals and libertarians who believe in equal justice under law, while reassuring conservatives that America's justice will continue to be laced with revenge.

It is probably naïve to expect much more of an elected official. Few presidents willingly give up power or seek to leave their office “weaker” than they found it. Few now have what it takes to stand up to the national security state or to those in Congress and the corporations that profit from it. Moreover, were the president to revive the torture policy, there would be insufficient opposition in Congress to stop him. The Democrats are too busy stimulating the economies of their constituents and too timid to defend the rule of law. The Republicans are similarly preoccupied, but actually favor torture, provided it can be camouflaged with euphemisms like “enhanced interrogation techniques” (Editorial 2011b).

#### Obama won't make silly war decisions-internal debates check

Pillar, 13 -- Brookings Foreign Policy Senior Fellow

[Paul, "The Danger of Groupthink," The National Interest, 2-26-13, webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:6rnyjYlVKY0J:www.brookings.edu/research/opinions/2013/02/26-danger-groupthink-pillar+&cd=3&hl=en&ct=clnk&gl=us, accessed 9-23-13, mss]

David Ignatius has an interesting take on national security decision-making in the Obama administration in the wake of the reshuffle of senior positions taking place during these early weeks of the president's second term. Ignatius perceives certain patterns that he believes reinforce each other in what could be a worrying way. One is that the new team does not have as much “independent power” as such first-term figures as Clinton, Gates, Panetta and Petraeus. Another is that the administration has “centralized national security policy to an unusual extent” in the White House. With a corps of Obama loyalists, the substantive thinking may, Ignatius fears, run too uniformly in the same direction. He concludes his column by stating that “by assembling a team where all the top players are going in the same direction, he [Obama] is perilously close to groupthink.” We are dealing here with tendencies to which the executive branch of the U.S. government is more vulnerable than many other advanced democracies, where leading political figures with a standing independent of the head of government are more likely to wind up in a cabinet. This is especially true of, but not limited to, coalition governments. Single-party governments in Britain have varied in the degree to which the prime minister exercises control, but generally room is made in the cabinet for those the British call “big beasts”: leading figures in different wings or tendencies in the governing party who are not beholden to the prime minister for the power and standing they have attained. Ignatius overstates his case in a couple of respects. Although he acknowledges that Obama is “better than most” in handling open debate, he could have gone farther and noted that there have been egregious examples in the past of administrations enforcing a national security orthodoxy, and that the **Obama** administration **does not even come close** to these examples. There was Lyndon Johnson in the time of the Vietnam War, when policy was made around the president's Tuesday lunch table and even someone with the stature of the indefatigable Robert McNamara was ejected when he strayed from orthodoxy. Then there was, as the most extreme case, the George W. Bush administration, in which there was no policy process and no internal debate at all in deciding to launch a war in Iraq and in which those who strayed from orthodoxy, ranging from Lawrence Lindsey to Eric Shinseki, were treated mercilessly. **Obama's prolonged**—to the point of inviting charges of dithering—**internal debates on** the **Afghanistan** War **were the polar opposite** of this Ignatius also probably underestimates the contributions that will be made to internal debate by the two most important cabinet members in national security: the secretaries of state and defense. He says John Kerry “has the heft of a former presidential candidate, but he has been a loyal and discreet emissary for Obama and is likely to remain so.” The heft matters, and Kerry certainly qualifies as a big beast. Moreover, the discreet way in which a member of Congress would carry any of the administration's water, as Kerry sometimes did when still a senator, is not necessarily a good indication of the role he will assume in internal debates as secretary of state. As for Chuck Hagel, Ignatius states “he has been damaged by the confirmation process and will need White House cover.” But now that Hagel's nomination finally has been confirmed, what other “cover” will he need? It's not as if he ever will face another confirmation vote in the Senate. It was Hagel's very inclination to flout orthodoxy, to arrive at independent opinions and to voice those opinions freely that led to the fevered opposition to his nomination.

### Impact

#### First, our ev comes from qualified professors – you don’t discount all of our DAs for the broad sweeping claim that people make bold claims

#### Maximizing all lives is the only way to affirm equality

Cummiskey 90 – Professor of Philosophy, Bates (David, Kantian Consequentialism, Ethics 100.3, p 601-2, p 606, jstor,)

We must not obscure the issue by characterizing this type of case as the sacrifice of individuals for some abstract "social entity." It is not a question of some persons having to bear the cost for some elusive "overall social good." Instead, the question is whether some persons must bear the inescapable cost for the sake of other persons. Nozick, for example, argues that "to use a person in this way does not sufficiently respect and take account of the fact that he is a separate person, that his is the only life he has."30 Why, however, is this not equally true of all those that we do not save through our failure to act? By emphasizing solely the one who must bear the cost if we act, one fails to sufficiently respect and take account of the many other separate persons, each with only one life, who will bear the cost of our inaction. In such a situation, what would a conscientious Kantian agent, an agent motivated by the unconditional value of rational beings, choose? We have a duty to promote the conditions necessary for the existence of rational beings, but both choosing to act and choosing not to act will cost the life of a rational being. Since the basis of Kant's principle is "rational nature exists as an end-in-itself' (GMM, p. 429), the reasonable solution to such a dilemma involves promoting, insofar as one can, the conditions necessary for rational beings. If I sacrifice some for the sake of other rational beings, I do not use them arbitrarily and I do not deny the unconditional value of rational beings. **Persons** may **have "dignity**, an unconditional and incomparable value" that transcends any market value (GMM, p. 436), **but**, as rational beings, persons **also** have **a fundamental equality which dictates that some must** sometimes **give way for the sake of others.** The formula of the end-in-itself thus does not support the view that we may never force another to bear some cost in order to benefit others. If one focuses on the equal value of all rational beings, then equal consideration dictates that one sacrifice some to save many. [continues] According to Kant, the objective end of moral action is the existence of rational beings. Respect for rational beings requires that, in deciding what to do, one give appropriate practical consideration to the unconditional value of rational beings and to the conditional value of happiness. Since agent-centered constraints require a non-value-based rationale, the most natural interpretation of the demand that one give equal respect to all rational beings lead to a consequentialist normative theory. We have seen that there is no sound Kantian reason for abandoning this natural consequentialist interpretation. In particular, a consequentialist interpretation does not require sacrifices which a Kantian ought to consider unreasonable, and it does not involve doing evil so that good may come of it. It simply requires an uncompromising commitment to the equal value and equal claims of all rational beings and a recognition that, in the moral consideration of conduct, one's own subjective concerns do not have overriding importance.

#### Crisis politics good

P. Stuart Robinson, Associate Professor of International Politics at the University of Norway, 1996The Politics of International Crisis Escalation: Decision-making under pressure, p. 1

Our concern is the phenomenon of international crisis, loosely defined as a period of extraordinary military tension between states, distinct form normal peaceful relations on the one hand, and all-out warfare on the other. Two reasons explain and justify our attention to this topic. First, crises are important: their events have a significant impact on the course of international history. Without an understanding of crisis, our general understanding of international relations will be **seriously deficient**. This assumes that events are not entirely determined by underlying economic or other structural conditions, and that the volatile and variable conditions of crisis are relevant. They are relevant, in particular, to whether or not states resort to arms to settle their differences; that is, to the traditional concern of the international relations scholar. Second, most of the existing theoretical work on crisis deals inadequately with this concern. Crisis scholars have either not seriously attempted to make sense of the relationship between crisis, escalation and war, or have tried and failed. They provide their too partial account of foreign policy-making in crisis via two main analytical paths.

#### Ethical policymaking requires calculation of consequences

Gvosdev 5 – Rhodes scholar, PhD from St. Antony’s College, executive editor of The National Interest (Nikolas, The Value(s) of Realism, SAIS Review 25.1, pmuse)

As the name implies, realists focus on promoting policies that are achievable and sustainable. In turn, the morality of a foreign policy action is judged by its results, not by the intentions of its framers. A foreign policymaker must weigh the consequences of any course of action and assess the resources at hand to carry out the proposed task. As Lippmann warned, Without the controlling principle that the nation must maintain its objectives and its power in equilibrium, its purposes within its means and its means equal to its purposes, its commitments related to its resources and its resources adequate to its commitments, it is impossible to think at all about foreign affairs.8 Commenting on this maxim, Owen Harries, founding editor of The National Interest, noted, "This is a truth of which Americans—more apt to focus on ends rather than means when it comes to dealing with the rest of the world—need always to be reminded."9 In fact, Morgenthau noted that "there can be no political morality without prudence."10 This virtue of prudence—which Morgenthau identified as the cornerstone of realism—should not be confused with expediency. Rather, it takes as its starting point that it is more moral to fulfill one's commitments than to make "empty" promises, and to seek solutions that minimize harm and produce sustainable results. Morgenthau concluded: [End Page 18] Political realism does not require, nor does it condone, indifference to political ideals and moral principles, but it requires indeed a sharp distinction between the desirable and the possible, between what is desirable everywhere and at all times and what is possible under the concrete circumstances of time and place.11 This is why, prior to the outbreak of fighting in the former Yugoslavia, U.S. and European realists urged that Bosnia be decentralized and partitioned into ethnically based cantons as a way to head off a destructive civil war. Realists felt this would be the best course of action, especially after the country's first free and fair elections had brought nationalist candidates to power at the expense of those calling for inter-ethnic cooperation. They had concluded—correctly, as it turned out—that the United States and Western Europe would be unwilling to invest the blood and treasure that would be required to craft a unitary Bosnian state and give it the wherewithal to function. Indeed, at a diplomatic conference in Lisbon in March 1992, the various factions in Bosnia had, reluctantly, endorsed the broad outlines of such a settlement. For the purveyors of moralpolitik, this was unacceptable. After all, for this plan to work, populations on the "wrong side" of the line would have to be transferred and resettled. Such a plan struck directly at the heart of the concept of multi-ethnicity—that different ethnic and religious groups could find a common political identity and work in common institutions. When the United States signaled it would not accept such a settlement, the fragile consensus collapsed. The United States, of course, cannot be held responsible for the war; this lies squarely on the shoulders of Bosnia's political leaders. Yet Washington fell victim to what Jonathan Clarke called "faux Wilsonianism," the belief that "high-flown words matter more than rational calculation" in formulating effective policy, which led U.S. policymakers to dispense with the equation of "balancing commitments and resources."12 Indeed, as he notes, the Clinton administration had criticized peace plans calling for decentralized partition in Bosnia "with lofty rhetoric without proposing a practical alternative." The subsequent war led to the deaths of tens of thousands and left more than a million people homeless. After three years of war, the Dayton Accords—hailed as a triumph of American diplomacy—created a complicated arrangement by which the federal union of two ethnic units, the Muslim-Croat Federation, was itself federated to a Bosnian Serb republic. Today, Bosnia requires thousands of foreign troops to patrol its internal borders and billions of dollars in foreign aid to keep its government and economy functioning. Was the aim of U.S. policymakers, academics and journalists—creating a multi-ethnic democracy in Bosnia—not worth pursuing? No, not at all, and this is not what the argument suggests. But aspirations were not matched with capabilities. As a result of holding out for the "most moral" outcome and encouraging the Muslim-led government in Sarajevo to pursue maximalist aims rather than finding a workable compromise that could have avoided bloodshed and produced more stable conditions, the peoples of Bosnia suffered greatly. In the end, the final settlement was very close [End Page 19] to the one that realists had initially proposed—and the one that had also been roundly condemned on moral grounds.

#### Scenario planning solves predictive failure

Han 10 – Dong-ho Han, Ph.D. Candidate in Political Science at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln, January 26, 2010, “Scenario Construction and Implications for IR Research: Connecting Theory to a Real World of Policy Making,” online: http://www.allacademic.com/one/isa/isa10/index.php?cmd=Download+Document&key=unpublished\_manuscript&file\_index=1&pop\_up=true&no\_click\_key=true&attachment\_style=attachment&PHPSESSID=3e890fb59257a0ca9bad2e2327d8a24f

In addition to providing the eclectic foundation for using multiple theoretical lenses in the field, the building of scenarios in analyzing world events could solve the difficulty of the matter of prediction in social science research. Predicting the future is not an easy task. In the field of IR, researchers making predictions tend to focus on their parsimonious assumptions and arguments drawn from a specific school of thought in which they are engaged. They present the rigor of their theoretical explanations by refuting other theoretical perspectives and make a prediction based on the victory of their theories over other approaches. The problem, however, is that making a prediction based on established theories and approaches can easily be disrupted as unexpected contingencies like wild cards occur.83 In other words, in a real world of politics too many uncertain factors are engaged and thus politics can be understood as a non-linear process toward unpredictable outcomes.84 There are many real cases of the difficulty of prediction in social science. The failure to predict the end of the Cold War is one of them.85 During the Cold War era, many scholars explored the causes of U.S.-Soviet confrontation and predicted that the Cold War would last quite a long time.86 Other scholars’ arguments for a quicker end to the Cold War were simply dismissed along with such upcoming events as the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989 and the demise of the Soviet Union in 1991.

Despite the difficulty of prediction in world politics some factors are relatively clear and easy to figure out, regardless of one’s theoretical background. For instance, it is hard to deny that U.S. power and influence is one of the critical factors in understanding the present world. In this sense, Robert Jervis is right when he argues that “Since the United States is the most influential power in the world, to predict the future of world politics requires us to predict the future of American foreign policy.”87 When it comes to the study of a specific region in world politics, though, things are more complicated. While understanding important variables such as U.S. foreign policy helps us to analyze more accurately the future course of international politics in general, in order to predict the future dynamics of regional politics in particular something more is needed.88 Given the complexity of regional issues making a prediction is still not an easy task.

Given this backdrop some scholars argue that prediction in the social sciences could be possible if we had some critical information regarding specific issues.89 Among others, Bruce Bueno de Mesquita makes his case for the possibility of prediction, arguing that if we know some information concerning identified policy makers with some stakes, their policy preferences (i.e. what they say they want), how salient the issue at stake is among these actors, and how influential these policy makers are in terms of changing and shaping the outcomes, then we can predict upcoming policy decisions and thus overall political outcomes based upon these “influential” policy makers’ strategic interactions with one another.90 Bueno de Mesquita’s prediction comes from the logic of how decision makers make various policy decisions in a game-theoretic term, with the support of a computer-based simulate model. In other words, by using mathematical techniques such as computer simulation models in predicting the future Bueno de Mesquita’s argument is mostly dependent on rational choice theory which assumes “self-interested” people and dictates their “strategic interactions.”91

Even if Bueno de Mesquita’s efforts could partially work and tend to be successful in predicting some emerging properties, it cannot be denied that various predictive efforts are limited and – for the most part – even impossible when dealing with surprising events and unexpected contingencies.92 Moreover, these predictions may sometimes be just estimates which are hard to project for the long term.93 The scenario method seems to be a good fit particularly in this regard; that is, in order to cope effectively with upcoming surprises and uncertainties it is essential to rehearse as many future possibilities as one can and scenario thinking facilitates this reasoning process. Despite sharing some similarities with other predicting tools such as a computer simulation model, the scenario method is fundamentally different from these methods. As one advocate for scenario analysis points out, scenarios are “more than just the output of a complex simulation model. Instead they attempt to interpret such output by identifying patterns and clusters of the millions of possible outcomes a computer simulation might generate…Hence, scenarios go beyond objective analyses to include subjective interpretations.”94

### 1NC

#### The judiciary adheres to political question deference now—but doctrinal repudiation would reverse that.

Franck ‘12

Thomas, Murray and Ida Becker Professor of Law, New York University School of Law Wolfgang Friedmann Memorial Award 1999, *Political Questions/Judicial Answers*

Sensitive to this historical perspective, many scholars, but few judges, have openly decried the judiciary’s tendency to suspend at the water’s edge their jealous defense of the power to say what the law is. Professor Richard Falk, for example, has criticized judges’ “ad hoc subordinations to executive policy”5 and urged that if the object of judicial deference is to ensure a single coherent American foreign po1icy, then that objective is far more likely to be secured if the policy is made in accordance with rules “that are themselves not subject to political manipulation.”6 Moreover, as a nation publicly proclaiming its adherence to the rule of law, Falk notes, it is unedifying for America to refuse to subject to that rule the very aspect of its governance that is most important and apparent to the rest of the world.7 Professor Michael Tigar too has argued that the deference courts show to the political organs, when it becomes abdication, defeats the basic scheme of the Constitution because when judges speak of “the people” as “the ultimate guardian of principle” in political-question cases, they overlook the fact that “the people” are the “same undifferentiated mass” that “historically, unmistakably and, at times, militantly insisted that when executive power immediately threatens personal liberty, a judicial remedy must be available.” Professor Louis Henkin, while acknowledging that certain foreign relations questions are assigned by the Constitution to the discretion of the political branches, also rejects the notion that the judiciary can evade responsibility for deciding the appropriate limits to that discretion, particularly when its exercise comes into conflict with other rights or powers rooted in the Constitution or laws enacted in accordance with its strictures.9 His views echo earlier ones espoused by Professor Louis Jaffe, who argued that while the courts should listen to advice tendered by the political branches on matters of foreign pol icy and national security, “[t]his should not mean that the court must follow such advice, but that without it the court should not prostrate itself before the fancied needs of diplomacy and foreign policy. The claim of policy should be made concrete in the particular instance. Only so may its weight, its content, and its value be appreciated. The claims of diplomacy are not absolute; to question their compulsion is not treason.”° There has been little outright support from the judiciary for such open calls to repudiate the practice of refusing to adjudicate foreign affairs cases on their merits. While some judges do refuse to apply the doctrine, holding it inapplicable in the specific situation or passing over it in silence, virtually none have hitherto felt able to repudiate it frontally. On the other side, some judges continue to argue vigorously for the continued validity of judicial abdication in cases implicating foreign policy or national security. These proponents still rely occasion ally on the early shards of dicta and more rarely on archaic British precedents that run counter to the American constitutional ethos. More frequently today, their arguments rely primarily on a theory of constitutionalism—separation of powers—and several prudential reasons.

#### PQD key to Sonar training

Gartland ‘12

Maj. Charles, B.A., University of Alaska - Anchorage; J.D., cum laude, Gonzaga University School of Law; LL.M., George Washington University Law School) is a United States Air Force judge advocate currently serving as the Environmental Liaison Officer for the Air Force Materiel Command, “ARTICLE: AT WAR AND PEACE WITH THE NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT: WHEN POLITICAL QUESTIONS AND THE ENVIRONMENT COLLIDE,” 68 A.F. L. Rev. 27

The public interest in conducting training exercises with active sonar under realistic conditions plainly outweighs the interests advanced by the plaintiffs" (emphasis added). n407 At least two Supreme Court Justices disagreed n408 with Chief Justice Roberts' characterization in Winter, and, arguably, four of them disagreed (depending on how the partial concurrence/dissent by Justice Breyer, partially joined by Justice Stevens, is construed). n409 Certainly the Ninth Circuit disagreed, n410 and that highlights a significant rub, namely, that the drastic remedy of an injunction appears to have no predictability whatsoever. In one nuclear detonation case, Committee for Nuclear Responsibility v. Schlesinger, the test goes forward; n411 another two years later, Enewetak, a different test is enjoined. n412 In one training case, Barcelo v. Brown, military training exercises are allowed to proceed, n413 whereas in others, Evans and Winter (until the Supreme Court phase) they are enjoined. n414 Such uncertainty is a natural outcome of the process unfolding in all these cases: a judicial decision to grant an injunction under NEPA against a national defense activity is--by the very nature of the four part injunction test--a policy decision; and people (and judges) disagree about what constitutes good public policy. Policy decisions lie with the legislative and executive branches, and in the case of national defense, the policy decision has already been settled by statute and the Constitution--both of which provide for a national defense establishment that, in protecting the Republic, allows statutes like NEPA to exist in the first place.

#### That’s key to overall Naval power and anti-submarine warfare.

Popeo et al ‘8

Daniel, Paul Kamenar, Washington Legal Foundation, Andrew McBride, Thomas McCarthy, Andrew Miller, William R. Dailey, Wiley Rein LLP, “Brief for Amici Curiae The Washington Legal Foundation, Rear Admiral James J. Carey, U.S. Navy (Ret.), National Defense Committee, and Allied Educational Foundation in Support of Petitioners,” http://www.wlf.org/upload/07-1239winter.pdf

Throughout our Nation's history, the Navy has played a vital role in major world events occurring during both times of war and peace. As a maritime Nation, the United States relies on the "Navy's ability to operate freely at sea to guarantee access, sustain trade and commerce, and partner with other nations to ensure not only regional security but defense of our own homeland." App. 314a (statement of Rear Admiral Ted N. Branch). For this reason, it has been recognized that this ability "to operate freely at sea is one of the most important enablers of national power- diplomatic, information, military and economic." App. 315a-316a (statement of Rear Admiral Ted N. Branch). The only way to ensure our Nation's ability to so operate at sea is through naval training. Indeed, it is a Navy maxim that "We train as we will fight so that we will fight as we have trained." J.A. 576 (statement of Captain Martin N. May). Antisubmarine warfare has long been a key component of naval warfare. Because submarine detection and antisubmarine warfare require the coordinated efforts of vast numbers of Navy personnel, repeated training in battle conditions is essential to naval readiness. And, in our modern era, advanced technologies enable our enemies to deploy submarines that are capable of carrying long-range weapons while operating in virtual silence, nearly wholly undetectable except through the use of MFA sonar. Thus, antisubmarine warfare training utilizing MFA sonar is an absolute necessity in preparing our Navy to detect and combat enemy submarines. It goes without saying that, in a time of armed conflict, naval training and readiness are indispensable. Indeed, with American troops currently deployed throughout the world and, specifically, engaged in war in Afghanistan and Iraq, the Navy's role in our national security has never been more important than at the present. Maintaining an effective and proficient Navy, therefore, is of the utmost importance to the United States' national defense and homeland security. It is for this reason that the President determined that "the COMPTUEX and JTFEX, including the use of mid-frequency active sonar in these exercises, are in the paramount interest of the United States." App. 232a. A. A Well-Trained Navy Has Always Been A Cornerstone Of Our National Defense. Naval training has undoubtedly been at the center of the U.S. Navy's prior wartime and peacetime successes. Only a well-trained navy could have successfully fought in both the Atlantic and Pacific oceans simultaneously, as the U.S. Navy demonstrated in World War II. During World War II, the U.S. Navy's antisubmarine training was largely responsible for defeating the German submarines that were dangerously close to securing victory in the Battle of the Atlantic. See THEODORE ROSCOE & RICHARD G. VOGE, UNITED STATES SUBMARINE OPERATIONS IN WORLD WAR II xviii (Naval Institute Press 1949). It was also the joint training exercises of Operation Tiger that prepared the U.S. Navy and Army for the Normandy Invasion. See Operational Archives, Naval Historical Center, Operation Tiger, available at http-//www.history. navy.mil/faqs/faq20-l.htm (last visited July 23, 2008). Without this preparation, one of the most important battles in world history, D-Day, may have resulted in devastating failure for the United States and its allies. The Cuban Missile Crisis presented another major world event in which the Navy's readiness was of critical importance to our national security. In 1962, naval forces under U.S. Atlantic Command maintained a month-long naval "quarantine" of the island of Cuba in order to prevent the Soviet Union's deployment of ballistic missiles there. Cuban Missile Crisis, 1962, available at http '//www. history, navy. mil/faqs/faq90-l.htm (last visited July 23, 2008). The immediate readiness of the U.S. Navy in these circumstances defused a situation that came as close as the United States and Soviet Union ever came to global nuclear war. Id. At a minimum, the Navy blockade was a demonstration of the United States' strength. Naturally, the beneficial effects of naval training did not end with World War II or even the Cold War. Naval training exercises have continued to adequately prepare the Navy for effective and safe military campaigns and have continued to symbolize a strong Nation at the ready to protect its interests at home and abroad. That a well-trained Navy indicates and symbolizes American strength is not a creation of fantasy. It is a theme well-recognized by our Nation's prior and current enemies. Indeed, the importance of the U.S. Navy was not overlooked by the Japanese in their bombing of Pearl Harbor, nor was the symbolism of a U.S. Navy destroyer lost in al-Qaeda's suicide bombing attack against the USS Cole. That the Navy has been a target of strategic and symbolic attacks from our Nation's enemies further demonstrates the need for proper training to ensure the safety and success of the Navy in its vital role of defending the homeland. Undoubtedly, thorough training is a requisite to an effective Navy. On-the-job training in combat, it follows, "is the worst possible way of training personnel" and can place the success of military missions "at significant risk." App. 278a (statement of Rear Admiral John M. Bird). Consequently, naval training should be performed prior to actual combat to ensure the preparedness and eventual success in our Navy's military missions. This seemingly obvious statement is, quite possibly, even more relevant to the Navy's mission of defending against enemy submarines. B. Training For Anti-Submarine Warfare Is A Critical Component Of Naval Readiness. The Navy is the only service—military or otherwise—that can address the threat from submarines, and any curtailment of its ability to train for this mission would decrease the Navy's ability to handle that threat. App. 315a (statement of Rear Admiral Ted N. Branch). For years, the Navy has employed SONAR to "identify and track submarines, determine water depth, locate mines, and provide for vessel safety." App. 266a (statement of Rear Admiral John M. Bird). The Navy started using SONAR after World War I, and every naval vessel engaged in antisubmarine activity was equipped with sonar systems by the start of World War II. App. 268a. Indeed, as indicated above, antisubmarine warfare was integral to the Navy's successful campaigns against German submarines in World War II. Antisubmarine warfare is a science in which considerable effort goes into making and maintaining contact with the submarine. App. 354a~356a; see also App. 278a ("ASW occurs over many hours or days. Unlike an aerial dogfight, over in minutes and even seconds, ASW is a cat and mouse game that requires large teams of personnel working in shifts around the clock to work through an ASW scenario.") This fact is even more applicable when quiet, diesel-electric submarines—submarines increasingly utilized by hostile nations—are involved; modern diesel-electric submarines are capable of defeating the best available passive sonar technology by "suppress[ing] emitted noise levels." App. 274a. In addition, the far-reaching range of weapons found on modern submarines make it possible for those submarines to avoid placing themselves within range of passive sonar. App. 274a. As a result, active sonar is necessary to detect the presence of diesel-electric submarines. App. 269a\_270a. The Nation's top naval officers agree that the Navy must be able to freely utilize MFAS during antisubmarine warfare training in order to properly defend against the threats posed by diesel-electric submarines. See, e.g., App. 311a-325a, 338a-347a, 350a-357a.. If the Navy were prevented from training with MFAS or other active sonar, and were limited to using passive sonar in certain situations, the survivability of the Navy's antisubmarine missions would ultimately be placed at "great risk." App. 269a (statement of Rear Admiral John M. Bird). "[Rlealistic and repetitive [antisubmarine warfare] training with active SONAR is necessary for our forces to be confident and knowledgeable in the Navy's plans, tactics, and procedures to perform and survive in situations leading up to hostilities as well as combat." App. 277a. Therefore, blanket mitigation measures on MFAS training "would dramatically reduce the realism of [antisubmarine warfare] training" and would be fraught with "severe national security consequences." App. 273a (statement of Rear Admiral John M. Bird). C. The Navy's Use Of MFA Sonar In The Challenged Military Exercises Is Indispensable To Our National Security In This Time Of Armed Hostilities Across the Globe. It is clear that the COMPTUEX and JTFEX training exercises are the only way the Navy's Pacific Fleet can gain the realistic training that is necessary, especially during a time of war. These exercises represent the singular opportunity for 6,000-plus Sailors and Marines to train together in a realistic environment prior to deployment and to gain proficiency in MFAS. App. 270a-271a; App. 343a. Anytime a strike group is prevented from becoming fully proficient in MFAS, and therefore cannot be certified as combat ready, national security is negatively affected. App. 271a (statement of Rear Admiral John M. Bird). And, considering the heightened sensibilities in a time of war, any interference creates a severe impact on training and certification of readiness to perform realistic antisubmarine warfare. Because the stakes of antisubmarine warfare are so high, contact with an enemy submarine is not surrendered unless there is an order to do so. App. 355a. Even a few minutes of MFAS shutdown "would be potentially fatal in combat." App. 355a-356a (statement of Vice Admiral Samuel J. Locklear, III). As a result, a single lost contact with the submarine "cripples certification for the units involved" in the exercises. App. 356a>\* see also id. ("It may take days to get to the pivotal attack in antisubmarine warfare, but only minutes to confound the results upon which certification is based."). For these reasons, the Chief of Naval Operations, who is specifically responsible for organizing, training, equipping, preparing and maintaining the readiness of Navy forces, described COMPTUEX and JTFEX as "indispensable" training exercises. App. 342a (statement of Admiral Gary Roughead). Unsuccessful naval training in the area of antisubmarine warfare can have far-reaching consequences. As Rear Admiral Ted N. Branch recognized Any restriction or disadvantage imposed on our [antisubmarine warfare] capability that impedes the U.S. Navy's ability to retain control of the sea or project naval forces may . . . result in nothing less than a breakdown of the global system, a significant change in our international standing, and an alteration in our established way of life.

#### That unleashes a laundry list of nuclear conflicts

Eaglen ‘11

(Mackenzie research fellow for national security – Heritage, and Bryan McGrath, former naval officer and director – Delex Consulting, Studies and Analysis, “Thinking About a Day Without Sea Power: Implications for U.S. Defense Policy,” Heritage Foundation

Global Implications. Under a scenario of dramatically reduced naval power, the United States would cease to be active in any international alliances. While it is reasonable to assume that land and air forces would be similarly reduced in this scenario, the lack of credible maritime capability to move their bulk and establish forward bases would render these forces irrelevant, even if the Army and Air Force were retained at today’s levels. In Iraq and Afghanistan today, 90 percent of material arrives by sea, although material bound for Afghanistan must then make a laborious journey by land into theater. China’s claims on the South China Sea, previously disputed by virtually all nations in the region and routinely contested by U.S. and partner naval forces, are accepted as a fait accompli, effectively turning the region into a “Chinese lake.” China establishes expansive oil and gas exploration with new deepwater drilling technology and secures its local sea lanes from intervention. Korea, unified in 2017 after the implosion of the North, signs a mutual defense treaty with China and solidifies their relationship. Japan is increasingly isolated and in 2020–2025 executes long-rumored plans to create an indigenous nuclear weapons capability.[11] By 2025, Japan has 25 mobile nuclear-armed missiles ostensibly targeting China, toward which Japan’s historical animus remains strong. China’s entente with Russia leaves the Eurasian landmass dominated by Russia looking west and China looking east and south. Each cedes a sphere of dominance to the other and remains largely unconcerned with the events in the other’s sphere. Worldwide, trade in foodstuffs collapses. Expanding populations in the Middle East increase pressure on their governments, which are already stressed as the breakdown in world trade disproportionately affects food importers. Piracy increases worldwide, driving food transportation costs even higher. In the Arctic, Russia aggressively asserts its dominance and effectively shoulders out other nations with legitimate claims to seabed resources. No naval power exists to counter Russia’s claims. India, recognizing that its previous role as a balancer to China has lost relevance with the retrenchment of the Americans, agrees to supplement Chinese naval power in the Indian Ocean and Persian Gulf to protect the flow of oil to Southeast Asia. In exchange, China agrees to exercise increased influence on its client state Pakistan. The great typhoon of 2023 strikes Bangladesh, killing 23,000 people initially, and 200,000 more die in the subsequent weeks and months as the international community provides little humanitarian relief. Cholera and malaria are epidemic. Iran dominates the Persian Gulf and is a nuclear power. Its navy aggressively patrols the Gulf while the Revolutionary Guard Navy harasses shipping and oil infrastructure to force Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) countries into Tehran’s orbit. Russia supplies Iran with a steady flow of military technology and nuclear industry expertise. Lacking a regional threat, the Iranians happily control the flow of oil from the Gulf and benefit economically from the “protection” provided to other GCC nations. In Egypt, the decade-long experiment in participatory democracy ends with the ascendance of the Muslim Brotherhood in a violent seizure of power. The United States is identified closely with the previous coalition government, and riots break out at the U.S. embassy. Americans in Egypt are left to their own devices because the U.S. has no forces in the Mediterranean capable of performing a noncombatant evacuation when the government closes major airports. Led by Iran, a coalition of Egypt, Syria, Jordan, and Iraq attacks Israel. Over 300,000 die in six months of fighting that includes a limited nuclear exchange between Iran and Israel. Israel is defeated, and the State of Palestine is declared in its place. Massive “refugee” camps are created to house the internally displaced Israelis, but a humanitarian nightmare ensues from the inability of conquering forces to support them. The NATO alliance is shattered. The security of European nations depends increasingly on the lack of external threats and the nuclear capability of France, Britain, and Germany, which overcame its reticence to military capability in light of America’s retrenchment. Europe depends for its energy security on Russia and Iran, which control the main supply lines and sources of oil and gas to Europe. Major European nations stand down their militaries and instead make limited contributions to a new EU military constabulary force. No European nation maintains the ability to conduct significant out-of-area operations, and Europe as a whole maintains little airlift capacity. Implications for America’s Economy. If the United States slashed its Navy and ended its mission as a guarantor of the free flow of transoceanic goods and trade, globalized world trade would decrease substantially. As early as 1890, noted U.S. naval officer and historian Alfred Thayer Mahan described the world’s oceans as a “great highway…a wide common,” underscoring the long-running importance of the seas to trade.[12] Geographically organized trading blocs develop as the maritime highways suffer from insecurity and rising fuel prices. Asia prospers thanks to internal trade and Middle Eastern oil, Europe muddles along on the largesse of Russia and Iran, and the Western Hemisphere declines to a “new normal” with the exception of energy-independent Brazil. For America, Venezuelan oil grows in importance as other supplies decline. Mexico runs out of oil—as predicted—when it fails to take advantage of Western oil technology and investment. Nigerian output, which for five years had been secured through a partnership of the U.S. Navy and Nigerian maritime forces, is decimated by the bloody civil war of 2021. Canadian exports, which a decade earlier had been strong as a result of the oil shale industry, decline as a result of environmental concerns in Canada and elsewhere about the “fracking” (hydraulic fracturing) process used to free oil from shale. State and non-state actors increase the hazards to seaborne shipping, which are compounded by the necessity of traversing key chokepoints that are easily targeted by those who wish to restrict trade. These chokepoints include the Strait of Hormuz, which Iran could quickly close to trade if it wishes. More than half of the world’s oil is transported by sea. “From 1970 to 2006, the amount of goods transported via the oceans of the world…increased from 2.6 billion tons to 7.4 billion tons, an increase of over 284%.”[13] In 2010, “$40 billion dollars [sic] worth of oil passes through the world’s geographic ‘chokepoints’ on a daily basis…not to mention $3.2 trillion…annually in commerce that moves underwater on transoceanic cables.”[14] These quantities of goods simply cannot be moved by any other means. Thus, a reduction of sea trade reduces overall international trade. U.S. consumers face a greatly diminished selection of goods because domestic production largely disappeared in the decades before the global depression. As countries increasingly focus on regional rather than global trade, costs rise and Americans are forced to accept a much lower standard of living. Some domestic manufacturing improves, but at significant cost. In addition, shippers avoid U.S. ports due to the onerous container inspection regime implemented after investigators discover that the second dirty bomb was smuggled into the U.S. in a shipping container on an innocuous Panamanian-flagged freighter. As a result, American consumers bear higher shipping costs. The market also constrains the variety of goods available to the U.S. consumer and increases their cost. A Congressional Budget Office (CBO) report makes this abundantly clear. A one-week shutdown of the Los Angeles and Long Beach ports would lead to production losses of $65 million to $150 million (in 2006 dollars) per day. A three-year closure would cost $45 billion to $70 billion per year ($125 million to $200 million per day). Perhaps even more shocking, the simulation estimated that employment would shrink by approximately 1 million jobs.[15] These estimates demonstrate the effects of closing only the Los Angeles and Long Beach ports. On a national scale, such a shutdown would be catastrophic. The Government Accountability Office notes that: [O]ver 95 percent of U.S. international trade is transported by water[;] thus, the safety and economic security of the United States depends in large part on the secure use of the world’s seaports and waterways. A successful attack on a major seaport could potentially result in a dramatic slowdown in the international supply chain with impacts in the billions of dollars.[16]
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#### Contextual definitions bad – intent to define outweighs

Eric Kupferbreg 87, University of Kentucky, Senior Assistant Dean, Academic & Faculty Affairs at Northeastern University, College of Professional Studies Associate Director, Trust Initiative at Harvard School of Public Health 1987 “Limits - The Essence of Topicality” http://groups.wfu.edu/debate/MiscSites/DRGArticles/Kupferberg1987LatAmer.htm

Often, field contextual definitions are too broad or too narrow for debate purposes. Definitions derived from the agricultural sector necessarily incorporated financial and bureaucratic factors which are less relevant in considering a 'should' proposition. Often subject experts' definitions reflected administrative or political motives to expand or limit the relevant jurisdiction of certain actors. Moreover, field context is an insufficient criteria for choosing between competing definitions. A particularly broad field might have several subsets that invite restrictive and even exclusive definitions. (e.g., What is considered 'long-term' for the swine farmer might be significantly different than for the grain farmer.) Why would debaters accept definitions that are inappropriate for debate? If we admit that debate is a unique context, then additional considerations enter into our definitional analysis.

#### Commander in Chief powers like self-defense are inherent to the prez and war powers are not

Robert Reinstein 09, Professor of Law, Temple University Beasley School of Law, “The Limits of Executive Power,” 59 Am. U.L. Rev. 259, December 2009

Six other prerogatives were delegated to the President, but in substantially limited ways. The Commander-in-Chief power was limited by vesting the war powers and substantial control over the military in Congress. The treaty and appointments powers (including the appointment of ambassadors and other public ministers) were made subject to the prior approval of the Senate, while the veto power was subject to congressional override. The pardoning power could be applied only to a relatively small percentage of criminal cases. Only the power to receive foreign ambassadors and ministers was left intact in the Executive, and no presidential power is greater than its royal counterpart.

#### Commander in chief powers are narrow and don’t involve war powers

Jeremy Telman 07, Assistant Professor, Valparaiso University Law School, “Review Essay: The Foreign Affairs Power: Does the Constitution Matter?: A Review of Peter Irons, War Powers: How the Imperial Presidency Hijacked the Constitution,” 80 Temp. L. Rev. 245

The traditional view that the commander-in-chief power is narrowly circumscribed is buttressed by the constitutional text, which specifies that the President "shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, and of the Militia of the several States, when called into the actual Service of the United States." n54 The Framers saw standing armies under the control of a powerful executive as a threat to democracy and thus anticipated that there would be no significant federal army. n55 Alexander Hamilton, no enemy of executive power, acknowledged that the President would exercise his commander-in-chief power only in "the direction of war when authorized or begun." n56 Moreover, as Irons indicates in the one area of seventeenth-and eighteenth-century history where he is more thorough than Yoo, the point of the commander-in-chief power traditionally was not to create executive war powers but to subordinate the military to civil authority. n57

## case

### A2 nixon

#### The status quo is structurally improving

Dash 2/4 Co-Founder and Managing Director at Activate, a new kind of strategy consultancy that advises companies about the opportunities at the intersection of technology and media co-founder and CEO of ThinkUp, which shows you how to be better at using your social networks, publisher, editor and owner of Dashes.com, my personal blog where I've been publishing continuously since 1999, entrepreneur, writer and geek living in New York City (Anil Dash, 4 February 2013, “THE WORLD IS GETTING BETTER. QUICKLY.,” http://dashes.com/anil/2013/02/the-world-is-getting-better-quickly.html)

The world is getting better, faster, than we could ever have imagined. For those of us who are fortunate enough to live in wealthy communities or countries, we have a common set of reference points we use to describe the world's most intractable, upsetting, unimaginable injustices. Often, we only mention these horrible realities in minimizing our own woes: "Well, that's annoying, but it's hardly as bad as children starving in Africa." Or "Yeah, this is important, but it's not like it's the cure for AIDS." Or the omnipresent description of any issue as a "First World Problem". But let's, for once, look at the actual data around developing world problems. Not our condescending, world-away displays of emotion, or our slacktivist tendencies to see a retweet as meaningful action, but the actual numbers and metrics about how progress is happening for the world's poorest people. Though metrics and measurements are always fraught and flawed, Gates' single biggest emphasis was the idea that measurable progress and metrics are necessary for any meaningful improvements to happen in the lives of the world's poor. So how are we doing? THE WORLD HAS CHANGED The results are astounding. Even if we caveat that every measurement is imprecise, that billionaire philanthropists are going to favor data that strengthens their points, and that some of the most significant problems are difficult to attach metrics to, it's inarguable that the past two decades have seen the greatest leap forward in the lives of the global poor in the history of humanity. Some highlights: Children are 1/3 less likely to die before age five than they were in 1990. The global childhood mortality rate for kids under 5 has dropped from 88 in 1000 in 1990 to 57 in 1000 in 2010. The global infant mortality rate for kids dying before age one has plunged from 61 in 1000 to 40 in 1000. Now, any child dying is of course one child too many, but this is astounding progress to have made in just twenty years. In the past 30 years, the percentage of children who receive key immunizations such as the DTP vaccine has quadrupled. The percentage of people in the world living on less than $1.25 per day has been cut in half since 1990, ahead of the schedule of the Millennium Development Goals which hoped to reach this target by 2015. The number of deaths to tuberculosis has been cut 40% in the past twenty years. The consumption of ozone-depleting substances has been cut 85% globally in the last thirty years. The percentage of urban dwellers living in slums globally has been cut from 46.2% to 32.7% in the last twenty years. And there's more progress in hunger and contraception, in sustainability and education, against AIDS and illiteracy. After reading the Gates annual letter and following up by reviewing the UN's ugly-but-data-rich Millennium Development Goals statistics site, I was surprised by how much progress has been made in the years since I've been an adult, and just how little I've heard about the big picture despite the fact that I'd like to keep informed about such things. I'm not a pollyanna — there's a lot of work to be done. But I can personally attest to the profound effect that basic improvements like clean drinking water can have in people's lives. Today, we often use the world's biggest problems as metaphors for impossibility. But the evidence shows that, actually, we're really good at solving even the most intimidating challenges in the world. What we're lacking is the ability to communicate effectively about how we make progress, so that we can galvanize even more investment of resources, time and effort to tackling the problems we have left.

#### Some rights violations are inevitable – cost-benefit analysis is the only way to justify action to solve concrete harms

Cummiskey Associate Professor of Philosophy – Bates 1999 Gewirth ed. Boylan p. 134

The PGC’s (Principle of Generic Consistency’s) goal of securing the generic rights of all may indeed require the infringement of the negative rights of some as a necessary means of securing the more weighty negative and positive rights of many others. Since the infringement of the rights of some would prevent the injustice of significant rights violations, the acts of coercion or harm would indeed function to prevent injustice as Gewirth requires. The duty to protect the more weighty rights of the many would thus require the infringements on the rights of the few. In truly tragic situations, someone’s rights are infringed no matter what choice is made. If we take seriously Gewirth’s compelling arguments for robust positive rights, then we cannot simply rely on the institutions of a common sense morality which is much more libertarian. We must instead treat the objective needs of those we would hurt by helping. The criterion of the degree of needfulness of action (which involves rights conflicts) simply provides no basis for a bias in favor of negative rights over positive rights. It thus leaves the limits of justified coercion to be determined by a cost-benefit analysis on the objective needs of generic agency. So once again we find no basis for limiting Gewirthian consequentialism.

#### Han ev

The scenario method seems to be a good fit particularly in this regard; that is, in order to cope effectively with upcoming surprises and uncertainties it is essential to rehearse as many future possibilities as one can and scenario thinking facilitates this reasoning process. Despite sharing some similarities with other predicting tools such as a computer simulation model, the scenario method is fundamentally different from these methods. As one advocate for scenario analysis points out, scenarios are “more than just the output of a complex simulation model. Instead they attempt to interpret such output by identifying patterns and clusters of the millions of possible outcomes a computer simulation might generate…Hence, scenarios go beyond objective analyses to include subjective interpretations.”94

#### Imagining scenarios, even if unlikely or flawed in construction, is key to good analysis—don’t grade our shit like a research paper

Wimbush ‘8 – director of the Center for Future Security Strategies

(S. Enders, senior fellow at the Hudson Institute and the author of several books and policy articles, “A Parable: The U.S.-ROK Security Relationship Breaks Down”, Asia Policy, Number 5 (January 2008), 7-24)

What if the U.S.-ROK security relationship were to break down? This essay explores the alternative futures of such a scenario. Analyzing scenarios is one technique for trying to understand the increasing complexity of strategic environments. A scenario is an account of an imagined sequence of events. The intent of a scenario is to suggest how alternative futures might arise and where they might lead, where conflicts might occur, how the interests of different actors might be challenged, and the kinds of strategies actors might pursue to achieve their objectives. Important to keep in mind is that scenarios are nothing more than invented, in-depth stories—stories about what different futures could look like and what might happen along plausible pathways to those futures. The trends and forces that go into building a scenario may be carefully researched, yet a scenario is not a research paper. Rather, it is a work of the imagination. As such, scenarios are, first, tools that can help bring order to the way analysts think about what might happen in future security environments; second, scenarios are a provocative way of revealing possible dynamics of future security environments that might not be apparent simply by projecting known trends into the future. Scenarios are particularly useful in suggesting where the interests and actions of different actors might converge or collide with other forces, trends, attitudes, and influences. By using scenarios, to explore the question “what if this or that happened?” in a variety of different ways, with the objective of uncovering as many potential answers as possible, analysts can build hedging strategies for dealing with many different kinds of potential problems. Though they may choose to discount some of these futures and related scenarios, analysts will not be ignorant of the possibilities, with luck avoiding having to say: “I never thought about that.”

## advantage

### Case 2nc

#### Prefer our evidence (funny enough on empirical quals)---all their scholarship rests on unproven assertions about the capacity and willingness of the Courts to restrain the Executive

Daniel Abebe & Eric A. Posner 11, Assistant Professor and Kirkland & Ellis Professor, University of Chicago Law School, The Flaws of Foreign Affairs Legalism, 51 Va. J. Int'l L. 507

Scholarship on foreign affairs law - the body of law, mainly constitutional, that governs the foreign affairs of the United States - reflects a striking divide between the courts and the academy. In the courts, the dominant judicial approach to foreign affairs law is "executive primacy" - the view that judges should defer to the executive's judgments about foreign affairs. n1 In the academy, the dominant approach is what we will call "foreign affairs legalism." Foreign affairs legalism holds that courts should impose more restrictions on the executive than they have in the past or that Congress should play a greater role in foreign affairs. This normative argument rests on two usually implicit descriptive premises: that courts and Congress have the capacity and motivation to restrain the executive, and that the courts and Congress will do so for the sake of promoting international law.

This disjunction between academic and judicial thought matters today more than it ever did in the past. The conflict with al Qaeda has generated an enormous quantity of jurisprudence, including some cases that reflect a new legalist sensibility in tension with the old commitment to executive primacy. n2 Globalization has produced more cross-border conflicts involving trade, migration, human rights, and investment - and the debate between executive primacy and foreign affairs legalism will help determine how courts handle these conflicts.

[\*509] Despite its prominence in the academy, there is no official school of foreign affairs legalism; no single scholar explicitly defends it. Much of the foreign affairs scholarship of the last twenty years advances this account, however; but the problem is that the argument is mostly implicit. In this Article, our minimal goal is to tease out the distinctive empirical and normative assumptions of foreign affairs legalism. We also argue, more ambitiously, that foreign affairs legalism rests on unproven and inaccurate assumptions about the capacities and motivations of courts and the executive, and it reflects confusion about the nature of international law. Of particular importance, foreign affairs legalists falsely assume that the judiciary seeks to advance international law while the executive seeks to limit it.

#### Deference inevitable---it’s institutionally locked in, the judiciary wants it, \* and the aff doesn’t clarify multiple constitutional issues

Jonathan L. Entin 12, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs (School of Law), David L. Brennan Professor of Law, and Professor of Political Science, Case Western Reserve University. War Powers, Foreign Affairs, and the Courts: Some Institutional Considerations, 45 Case W. Res. J. Int'l L. 443

To be sure, the Supreme Court has decided some well-known national security cases. Among them are the Steel Seizure case, Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. v. Sawyer; n2 the Pentagon Papers case, New York Times Co. v. United States; n3 the Iranian hostage case, Dames & Moore v. Regan; n4 and some notable First Amendment cases arising out of World War I, such as Schenck v. United States n5 and Abrams v. United States. n6 Then there are the Japanese internment decisions during World War II, notably Korematsu v. United States, n7 as well as Ex parte Quirin, n8 which upheld the use of military commissions to try German agents who landed in the United States as part of a sabotage mission. Most recently, the Supreme Court has addressed questions arising from the government's response to the attacks of September 11, 2001, in such cases as Hamdi v. Rumsfeld, n9 Hamdan v. Rumsfeld, n10 and Boumediene v. Bush. n11 These cases do matter, but they have not clearly resolved the constitutional and other legal issues that pervade the debate about presidential power and foreign affairs.

Beyond the limitations of the Supreme Court rulings, the judiciary probably will not contribute very much to the debate. Various procedural and jurisdictional obstacles make it difficult for courts to address the merits of disputes about war powers and foreign affairs. Even if those obstacles can be surmounted, those who decry what they view as presidential excess should note that the judiciary typically has taken a deferential role in reviewing challenges to executive action.

### 1ac cover

#### Like their 1ac cover ev makes a super big burden on the aff to solve

Cover 13, Assistant Professor and Associate Director of the Institute for Global Security Law

[02/25/2013, Avidan Cover is an Assistant Professor; Associate Director, Institute for Global Security Law and Policy, “PRESUMED IMMINENCE: JUDICIAL RISK ASSESSMENT IN THE POST-9/11 WORLD” works.bepress.com/avidan\_cover/3/‎]

Finally, even when invoking judicial deference and lack of national security expertise, what can be seen at work in many judges’ post-9/11 opinions are their own risk assessments, which evidence their own cognitive biases impacted by the fears engendered by terrorism. Ironically, their frequent fact finding of risks or lack of threat is wholly at odds with the purported deferential stance that judges insist they are taking in addressing the terrorism cases. This tendency can be seen in various Justices and lower court judges’ opinions, regardless of whether they uphold or strike down government actions. This Article takes Holder v. Humanitarian Law Project as its case study. Part I of the Article reviews the Supreme Court’s 2010 decision upholding application of the criminal prohibition on material support of a foreign terrorist organization to human rights advocates’ training of such groups in international humanitarian law and human rights law. The case reveals much about how the Court undertakes terrorism risk assessments and how the judiciary is likely to handle most terrorism cases going forward. The opinion also illustrates the Court’s tendency to fall prey to cognitive errors and biases in undertaking risk assessments even when stating it is deferring to other branches’ factual determinations. The decision also presages a reduced standard of evidence and suspicion in the name of preventing terrorism in the criminal context. Given the government’s increased emphasis on terrorism, there is reason to worry the standard will infect the criminal justice system. Finally, these findings of fact undermine the Court’s credibility because they will be perceived by the public as bad faith efforts to masquerade personal policy preferences as empirical facts. Part II of the Article explores the literature on decision making and risk assessment and how certain dread risks can influence people’s decisions, particularly those of judges. Part II does not limit the discussion to Sunstein’s focus on cognitive errors but builds on Dan Kahan, Paul Slovic, and others’ critique of that account by also reviewing social and cultural influences that affect a person or a judge’s perception of risk. Part III then examines various court opinions, in particular Humanitarian Law Project, to explore how these errors and influences manifest. Next Part IV addresses and ultimately rejects judicial deference as a means to adapting to the concomitant errors of judicial review of terrorism-related matters. Finally, Part V proposes solutions that will enable courts to overcome cognitive biases and other social and cultural influences. The Article concludes that evidentiary standards favoring those whose civil liberties are targeted is a necessary step toward overcoming particular biases that ignore probability. In addition, courts should resist writing in terms of certainty, including findings of fact, but should instead candidly disclose their uncertainty and anxiety over terrorism threats.

### Backlash

#### Congress will backlash. It will functionally bar the Court from exercising its authority

Vladeck 11—Professor of Law and Associate Dean for Scholarship @ American University [Stephen I. Vladeck, “Why Klein (Still) Matters: Congressional Deception and the War on Terrorism,” Journal of National Security Law, Volume 5, 6/16/2011, 9:38 AM

Six weeks later, Congress enacted the USA PATRIOT Act, which included a series of controversial revisions to immigration, surveillance, and other law enforcement authorities.34 But it would be over four years before Congress would again pass a key counterterrorism initiative, enacting the Detainee Treatment Act of 2005 (DTA)35 after—and largely in response to—the Supreme Court’s grant of certiorari in Hamdan v. Rumsfeld.36 In the five years since, Congress had enacted a handful of additional antiterrorism measures, including the Military Commissions Act (MCA) of 2006,37 as amended in 2009,38 the Protect America Act of 2007,39 and the 2008 amendments40 to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978, known in shorthand as the FAA.41 And yet, although Congress has spoken in these statutes both to the substantive authority for military commissions and to the scope of the government’s wiretapping and other surveillance powers, it has otherwise left some of the central debates in the war on terrorism completely unaddressed.42 Thus, Congress has not revisited the scope of the AUMF since September 18, 2001, even as substantial questions have been raised about whether the conflict has extended beyond that which Congress could reasonably be said to have authorized a decade ago.43 Nor has Congress intervened, despite repeated requests that it do so, to provide substantive, procedural, or evidentiary rules in the habeas litigation arising out of the military detention of noncitizen terrorism suspects at Guantánamo.44

As significantly, at the same time as Congress has left some of these key questions unanswered, it has also attempted to keep courts from answering them. Thus, the DTA and the MCA purported to divest the federal courts of jurisdiction over habeas petitions brought by individuals detained at Guantánamo and elsewhere.45 Moreover, the 2006 MCA precluded any lawsuit seeking collaterally to attack the proceedings of military commissions,46 along with “any other action against the United States or its agents relating to any aspect of the detention, transfer, treatment, trial, or conditions of confinement of an alien who is or was detained by the United States and has been determined by the United States to have been properly detained as an enemy combatant or is awaiting such determination.”47 And although the Supreme Court in Boumediene invalidated the habeas-stripping provision as applied to the Guantánamo detainees,48 the same language has been upheld as applied elsewhere,49 and the more general non-habeas jurisdiction-stripping section has been repeatedly enforced by the federal courts in other cases.50

Such legislative efforts to forestall judicial resolution of the merits can also be found in the telecom immunity provisions of the FAA,51 which provided that telecom companies could not be held liable for violations of the Telecommunications Act committed in conjunction with certain governmental surveillance programs.52 Thus, in addition to changing the underlying substantive law going forward, the FAA pretermitted a series of then-pending lawsuits against the telecom companies.53

Analogously, Congress has attempted to assert itself in the debate over civilian trials versus military commissions by barring the use of appropriated funds to try individuals held at Guantánamo in civilian courts,54 and by also barring the President from using such funds to transfer detainees into the United States for continuing detention or to other countries, as well.55 Rather than enact specific policies governing criteria for detention, treatment, and trial, Congress’s modus operandi throughout the past decade has been to effectuate policy indirectly by barring (or attempting to bar) other governmental actors from exercising their core authority, be it judicial review or executive discretion.

Wasserman views these developments as a period of what Professor Blasi described as “constitutional pathology,” typified by “an unusually serious challenge to one or more of the central norms of the constitutional regime.” Nevertheless, part of how Wasserman defends the “Klein vulnerable” provisions of the MCA and FAA is by concluding that the specific substantive results they effectuate can be achieved by Congress, and so Klein does not stand in the way. But if Redish and Pudelski’s reading of Klein is correct, then the fact that Congress could reach the same substantive results through other means is not dispositive of the validity of these measures. To the contrary, the question is whether any of these initiatives were impermissibly “deceptive,” such that Congress sought to “vest the federal courts with jurisdiction to adjudicate but simultaneously restrict the power of those courts to perform the adjudicatory function in the manner they deem appropriate.”56 pg. 257-259

## Aumf

### Impact Wall

#### India-Pakistan

Starr ’11 (Consequences of a Single Failure of Nuclear Deterrence by Steven Starr February 07, 2011 \* Associate member of the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation \* Senior Scientist for PSR)

Only a single failure of nuclear deterrence is required to start a nuclear war, and the consequences of such a failure would be profound. **Peer-reviewed studies predict** that **less than 1% of** the **nuclear weapons** now deployed in the arsenals of the Nuclear Weapon States, if detonated in urban areas, would immediately kill tens of millions of people, and cause long-term, **catastrophic disruptions** of the global **climate and** massive destruction ofEarth’sprotective **ozone** layer. The result would be a global nuclear famine that could kill up to one billion people. A full-scale war, fought with the strategic nuclear arsenals of the United States and Russia, would so utterly devastate Earth’s environment that most humans and other complex forms of life would not survive. Yet no Nuclear Weapon State has ever evaluated the environmental, ecological or agricultural consequences of the detonation of its nuclear arsenals in conflict. Military and political leaders in these nations thus remain dangerously unaware of the existential danger which their weapons present to the entire human race. Consequently, nuclear weapons remain as the cornerstone of the military arsenals in the Nuclear Weapon States, where nuclear deterrence guides political and military strategy. Those who actively support nuclear deterrence are trained to believe that deterrence cannot fail, so long as their doctrines are observed, and their weapons systems are maintained and continuously modernized. They insist that their nuclear forces will remain forever under their complete control, immune from cyberwarfare, sabotage, terrorism, human or technical error. They deny that the short 12-to-30 minute flight times of nuclear missiles would not leave a President enough time to make rational decisions following a tactical, electronic warning of nuclear attack. The U.S. and Russia continue to keep a total of 2000 strategic nuclear weapons at launch-ready status – ready to launch with only a few minutes warning. Yet both nations are remarkably unable to acknowledge that this high-alert status in any way increases the probability that these weapons will someday be used in conflict. How can strategic nuclear arsenals truly be “safe” from accidental or unauthorized use, when they can be launched literally at a moment’s notice? A cocked and loaded weapon is infinitely easier to fire than one which is unloaded and stored in a locked safe. The mere existence of immense nuclear arsenals, in whatever status they are maintained, makes possible their eventual use in a nuclear war. Our **best scientists** now **tell us** that **such a war would mean the end of human history**. We need to ask our leaders: Exactly what political or national goals could possibly justify risking a nuclear war that would likely cause the extinction of the human race? However, in order to pose this question, we must first make the fact known that existing nuclear arsenals – through their capacity to utterly devastate the Earth’s environment and ecosystems – threaten continued **human existence**. Otherwise, military and political leaders will continue to cling to their nuclear arsenals and will remain both unwilling and unable to discuss the real consequences of failure of deterrence. We can and must end the silence, and awaken the peoples of all nations to the realization that “nuclear war” means “global nuclear suicide”. A Single Failure of Nuclear Deterrence could lead to: \* A nuclear war **between India and Pakistan**; \* 50 Hiroshima-size (15 kiloton) weapons detonated in the mega-cities of both India and Pakistan (there are now 130-190 operational nuclear weapons which exist in the combined arsenals of these nations); \* The deaths of 20 to 50 million people as a result of the prompt effects of these nuclear detonations (blast, fire and radioactive fallout); \* Massive firestorms covering many hundreds of square miles/kilometers (created by nuclear detonations that produce temperatures hotter than those believed to exist at the center of the sun), that would engulf these cities and produce 6 to 7 million tons of thick, black smoke; \* About 5 million tons of smoke that would quickly rise above cloud level into the stratosphere, where strong winds would carry it around the Earth in 10 days; \* A stratospheric smoke layer surrounding the Earth, which would remain in place for 10 years; \* The dense smoke would heat the upper atmosphere, destroy Earth’s protective ozone layer, and block 7-10% of warming sunlight from reaching Earth’s surface; \* 25% to 40% of the protective ozone layer would be destroyed at the mid-latitudes, and 50-70% would be destroyed at northern and southern high latitudes; \* Ozone destruction would cause the average UV Index to increase to 16-22 in the U.S, Europe, Eurasia and China, with even higher readings towards the poles (readings of 11 or higher are classified as “extreme” by the U.S. EPA). It would take 7-8 minutes for a fair skinned person to receive a painful sunburn at mid-day; \* Loss of warming sunlight would quickly produce average surface temperatures in the Northern Hemisphere colder than any experienced in the last 1000 years; \* Hemispheric drops in temperature would be about twice as large and last ten times longer then those which followed the largest volcanic eruption in the last 500 years, Mt. Tambora in 1816. The following year, 1817, was called “The Year Without Summer”, which saw famine in Europe from massive crop failures; \* Growing seasons in the Northern Hemisphere would be significantly shortened. It would be too cold to grow wheat in most of Canada for at least several years; \* World grain stocks, which already are at historically low levels, would be completely depleted; grain exporting nations would likely cease exports in order to meet their own food needs; \* The one billion already hungry people, who currently depend upon grain imports, would likely starve to death in the years following this nuclear war; \* The total explosive power in these 100 Hiroshima-size weapons is less than 1% of the total explosive power contained in the currently operational and deployed U.S. and Russian nuclear forces.

#### AND- We control uniqueness- there’s court deference in counter-terror now- because of congressional signals

Schuck, 13 -- Yale Law School Simeon E. Baldwin law professor

[Peter, "The Courts and National Security: A False Hope," Huffington Post, 7-3-13, www.huffingtonpost.com/peter-h-schuck/national-security\_b\_3543312.html, accessed 9-21-13, mss]

Our federal courts have played a central role in safeguarding our precious constitutional values from encroachments by government and other power centers. But history teaches that where Congress and the president have invoked plausible national security interests, **the courts have almost always deferred** to them, for better and for worse. In the infamous Dred Scott case, the Supreme Court upheld a system of slavery that the Buchanan administration argued was necessary to hold the nation together. During and after World War I, the Court upheld government efforts to suppress criticism; recall that the great defenses of free speech in those cases were written by the losing side. In World War II, the Court upheld the execrable Japanese internment programs. This pattern of deference to national security claims continues to today -- **especially where the president's actions appear grounded in congressional action**, as with FISA and military court prosecution of suspected terrorists. Deference continues even in detention cases, which are closer to traditional judicial functions than the NSA and targeting decisions. The fact that courts have little or no role to play in these latter efforts is no cause for dismay. Placing them at the center of such decisions would tend to tarnish them, as is now occurring with the FISA court. If they could significantly improve that process, the risk might be worth taking, but they cannot.

#### War on terror jurisprudence is congress-centric- the Court looks to congressional signals to determine war on terror authorizations

D.C. Circuit Review, 12 ["Judge Kavanaugh on War-on-Terror Jurisprudence," 6-20-13, dccircuitreview.com/2012/06/20/judge-kavanaugh-on-war-on-terror-jurisprudence/, accessed 9-21-13, mss]

Judge Kavanaugh articulated a **Congress-centric war powers jurisprudence**: What’s the big picture of where we are right now in terms of federal courts, separation of powers, war powers? I would start with, in the wake of September 11th, Congress authorizing two wars: it authorized the war against Al-Qaeda and the Taliban, and authorized the war in Iraq. . . . A President, who in the future tries to engage in an unauthorized ground war of any significance, will be faced with those precedents used against them. President Bush obtained authorization for those two wars. Second– . . . Congress has regulated the Executive’s conduct of war in many respects, both before and after September 11th. We tend to forget that and sometimes think, well this is all just the Executive Branch operating in kind of a free zone, free from congressional restraint. And in fact, whether it’s interrogation or detention, surveillance, a number of particulars of how the Executive goes about the war effort, Congress has been deeply involved, including in the wake of September 11th. . . . I start with background notions of judicial restraint in times of war . . . [I]f Congress hasn’t put a restriction in and if the Executive action is not something that’s concrete or our history talks about, or is contrary to something that the Executive has done before may a court reach out and say, we’re going to restrain the Executive nonetheless, because we think it’s contrary to international law? Although he stood by his concurrence in the denial of rehearing en banc in Al-Bihani v. Obama, Judge Kavanaugh opined that the political branches should heed international law even when it is not binding from the perspective of domestic law. [T]he Executive Branch and Congress should, as I said upfront in my concurrence, should pay attention to international law obligations when thinking about what to put in the statutes. And when the Executive Branch is exercising its discretion pursuant to an authorization for the use of military force, or the President’s Article II authority. . . . Congress, on many occasions, has taken international law principles and put them into federal statutes, sometimes directly, by borrowing from the principle that’s at hand, sometimes by just having a reference, as in Hamdan, to international law or the laws of war more generally or the law of nations more generally. . . . I think it’s a good thing when the Executive pays attention to international law principles for purposes of our international relations and otherwise. During Q&A, Trevor Morrison suggested that the approach in Al-Bihani most consistent with judicial restraint would have been to take no position on whether the Executive’s power under the AUMF is constrained by international law and to simply accept the Government’s concession that it is so constrained for the limited purpose of the case at hand. In response, Judge Kavanaugh defended his statement that “Courts must be careful before enshrining [the Executive's] concessions [on legal questions affecting government power] into binding judicial precedent protected by stare decisis that a future Executive could not readily undo.” I thought it was an important point . . . to reemphasize . . . the central role of Congress in war powers issues, which is not necessarily something that was evident in the immediate wake of September 11th . . . . When Congress imposes limits on the Executive Branch’s conduct of war, courts will enforce those limits . . . . But when Congress has not put something into the statute . . . how should the courts then act? . . . . The Chief had just said this, in Free Enterprise v. PCAOB, . . . –the Executive may want to tie its own hands, but it can’t tie the hands of future presidents. . . . In terms of deferring to the Executive, . . . [i]f they think they’re detaining someone in violation of international law, they can release the person, but to the extent they come to court, it’s usually up to the courts to decide . . . the tools of statutory construction and the like.

[Matt note: Kavanaugh = Brett Kavanaugh, federal judge on the United States Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit]

#### The aff collapses international laws of armed conflict doctrine but the CP doesn’t ---- creates a dangerous precedent

Bialke, 4

(Lt. Colonel, MA & JD-University of North Dakota, LLM-University of Iowa, “Al-Qaeda & Taliban Unlawful Combatant Detainees, Unlawful Belligerency, and the International Laws of Armed Conflict,” 55 A.F. L. Rev. 1, Lexis)

International Obligations & Responsibilities and the International Rule of Law

The United States (U.S.) is currently detaining several hundred al-Qaeda and Taliban unlawful enemy combatants from more than 40 countries at a multi-million dollar maximum-security detention facility at the U.S. Naval Base in Guantanamo Bay, Cuba. These enemy detainees were captured while engaged in hostilities against the U.S. and its allies during the post-September 11, 2001 international armed conflict centered primarily in Afghanistan. The conflict now involves an ongoing concerted international campaign in collective self-defense against a common stateless enemy dispersed throughout the world. Domestic and international human rights organizations and other groups have criticized the U.S., n1 arguing that al-Qaeda and Taliban detainees in Cuba should be granted Geneva Convention III prisoner of war (POW) n2 status. They contend broadly that pursuant to the international laws of armed conflict (LOAC), combatants captured during armed conflict must be treated equally and conferred POW status. However, no such blanket obligation exists in international law. There is no legal or moral equivalence in LOAC between lawful combatants and unlawful combatants, or between lawful belligerency [\*2] and unlawful belligerency (also referred to as lawful combatantry and unlawful combatantry). The U.S. has applied well-established existing international law in holding that the al-Qaeda and Taliban **detainees are presumptively unlawful combatants** not entitled to POW status. n3 Taliban and al-Qaeda enemy combatants captured without military uniforms in armed conflict are not presumptively entitled to, nor automatically granted, POW status. POW status is a privileged status given by a capturing party as an international obligation to a captured enemy combatant, if and when the enemy's previous lawful actions in armed conflict demonstrate that POW status is merited. In the case of captured al-Qaeda and Taliban combatants, their combined unlawful actions in armed conflict, and al-Qaeda's failure to adequately align with a state show POW status is not warranted. The role of the U.S. in the international community is unique. The U.S., although relatively a young state, is the world's oldest continuing democracy and constitutional form of government. The U.S. is a permanent member of the United Nations Security Council, the world's leading economic power, and its only military superpower. The U.S. is the only country in the world capable of commencing and supporting effectively substantial international military operations with an extensive series of military alliances, and the required numbers of mission-ready expeditionary forces consisting of combat airpower, land and naval forces, intelligence, special operations, airlift, sealift, and logistics. Great influence and capabilities, however, exact great responsibility. As a result of its unique role and influence within the international community, the U.S. has been placed at the forefront of respecting LOAC and promoting international respect for LOAC. The U.S. military has the largest, most sophisticated and comprehensive LOAC program in the world. The U.S. demonstrates respect for LOAC by devoting an extraordinary and unequalled level of resources to the development and enforcement of these laws, through an unparalleled LOAC training and education regimen for U.S. and allied [\*3] military members, and a **conscientious and consistent requirement that its forces comply with these laws in all military operations**. Customary LOAC binds every country in the world including the U.S. **International collective security and U.S. national security may be achieved only through a steadfast commitment to the Rule of Law**. For the U.S. to grant POW status to captured members of al-Qaeda or the Taliban **would be an abdication of these international legal responsibilities** and obligations. It would set a **dangerous precedent contrary to the Rule of Law and LOAC,** and to the highest purpose of the laws of warfare, the protection of civilians during armed conflict. This article begins by explaining how LOAC protects civilians through the **enforcement of clear distinctions between lawful combatants, unlawful combatants, and protected noncombatants**. It summarizes the four conditions of lawful belligerency under customary and treaty-based LOAC, and instructs why combatants who do not meet these conditions do not possess combatant's privilege; that is, the immunity provided to members of the armed forces for acts in armed conflict that would otherwise be crimes in time of peace. The article then reviews why LOAC does not require that captured unlawful combatants be afforded POW status, and addresses specifically captured al-Qaeda and Taliban fighters. The practices and behavior of these fighters en masse in combat deny them privileges as lawful belligerents entitled to combatant's privilege. The article argues that al-Qaeda unlawful combatants are most appropriately described as hostes humani generis, "the common enemies of humankind." The article subsequently explains why al-Qaeda members, as hostes humani generis, are classic unlawful combatants, as part of a stateless organization that en masse engaged in combat unlawfully in an international armed conflict without any legitimate state or other authority. The article explicates al-Qaeda's theocratic-political hegemonic objectives and its use of global terrorism to further those objectives. The article expounds as to why international law deems a transnational act of private warfare by al-Qaeda as malum in se, "a wrong in itself." Related to al-Qaeda's status as hostes humani generis, the article describes one of the Taliban's many violations of international law; that is, willfully allowing al-Qaeda hostes humani generis to reside within Afghanistan's sovereign borders from where al-Qaeda could and did attack unlawfully other sovereign states. The article then details a state's inherent rights if and when attacked by such hostes humani generis. Following this, the article continues by asserting that there is no doubt or ambiguity as to the unlawful combatant status of the Taliban and al-Qaeda (shown by the failure of the Taliban en masse to meet the four fundamental criteria of lawful belligerency, al-Qaeda's statelessness en masse, and both their many acts of unlawful belligerency and violations of LOAC). As a result, the article states that **there is no need or requirement for proceedings** under [\*4] Geneva Convention III, art. 5 **to adjudicate their presumptive unlawful combatant status and non-entitlement to POW status pro forma.** The article subsequently illustrates that, even though captured al-Qaeda and Taliban are unlawful combatants and not POWs, the U.S. as a matter of policy has treated and continues to treat all al-Qaeda and Taliban detainees humanely in accordance with customary international law, to the extent appropriate and consistent with military necessity and in a manner consistent with the principles and spirit of the Geneva Conventions. The article discusses that, under LOAC, the detainees are captured unlawful combatants that **can be interned without criminal charges or access to legal counsel until the cessation of hostilities**. However, the article then points out that the U.S. has no desire to, and will not, hold any unlawful combatant indefinitely. The article then notes that al-Qaeda and Taliban detainees, as unlawful combatants, are subject to trial by U.S. military commissions for their acts of unlawful belligerency or other violations of LOAC and international humanitarian law. It expounds that, when an opposing force detains an unlawful combatant in time of armed conflict, the unlawful combatant's right to legal counsel or other representation only arises if criminal charges are brought against the unlawful combatant. The article illustrates the security measures, evidence procedures, and the many executive due process protections afforded to detainees subject to the jurisdiction of U.S. military commissions. The article states that; if tried and convicted in a U.S. military commission, a detainee may be required to serve the adjudged sentence, such as punitive confinement. The article concludes that it is in the immediate and long-term national security interests of the **U.S. to respect and uphold LOAC in all military operations**. Ultimately, the United States has an obligation to the international community and the Rule of Law not to afford POW status to captured unlawful combatants such as the al-Qaeda and Taliban detainees in furtherance of both domestic and international security.

#### Nuclear war

Delahunty, associate prof – U St. Thomas Law, and Yoo, law prof – UC Berkeley, ‘10

(Robert and John, 59 DePaul L. Rev. 803)

Finally, the extension of IHRL to armed conflict may have significant consequences for the success of international law in advancing global welfare. Rules of the LOAC represent the delicate balancing between the imperatives of combat and the humanitarian goals in wartime. The LOAC has been remarkably successful in achieving compliance from warring nations in obeying these rules. This is most likely due to the reciprocal nature of the obligations involved. Nations treat prisoners of war well in order to guarantee that their own captive soldiers will be treated well by the enemy; nations will refrain from usingweapons of mass destruction because they are deterred by their enemy's possession of the same weapons. It has been one of the triumphs of international law to increase the restrictions on the use of unnecessarily destructive and cruel weapons, and to advance the norms of distinction and the humane treatment of combatants and civilians in wartime. IHRL norms, on the other hand, may suffer from much lower rates of compliance. This may be due, in part, to the non-reciprocal nature of the obligations. One nation's refusal to observe freedom of speech, for example, will not cause another country to respond by depriving its own citizens of their rights. If IHRL norms--which were developed without much, if any, consideration of the imperatives of combat--merge into the LOAC, it will be likely that compliance with international law will decline. If nations must balance their security [\*849] needs against ever more restrictive and out-of-place international rules supplied by IHRL, we hazard to guess that the latter will give way. Rather than attempt to superimpose rules for peacetime civilian affairs on the unique circumstances of the "war on terror," a better strategy for encouraging compliance with international law would be to adapt the legal system already specifically designed for armed conflict.