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### Plan Text

#### Plan: The United States Congress should establish a National Security Court with sole jurisdiction over cases pursuant to Section 1021 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012.

### Leadership

#### Contention 1: is Leadership

#### First, human right deficits on detention fuels authoritarian crackdowns in Russia---destroys US-Russia engagement.

Mendelson 9 (Sarah, director, Human Rights and Security Initiative, CSIS, "U.S.-Russian Relations and the Democracy and Rule of Law Deficit" tcf.org/assets/downloads/tcf-russiarelations.pdf, DOA: 7-23-13, y2k]

Since the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991, every U.S. administration has considered Russia’s political trajectory a national security concern.1 Based on campaign statements and President Barack Obama’s early personnel choices, this perspective likely will affect policy toward Russia in some way for the foreseeable future.2 While the Obama administration plans to cooperate with Moscow on a number of issues, it will find that Russia’s current deficit in the areas of democracy and the rule of law complicate the relationship and may, in some cases, undermine attempts at engagement. The organizers of the Century Foundation Russia Working Group have labeled this policy problem “coping with creeping authoritarianism.” Results from nearly a dozen large, random sample surveys in Russia since 2001 that examine the views and experiences of literally thousands of Russians, combined with other research and newspaper reporting, all suggest the current democracy and rule of law deficit is rather stark.3 The deficit does not diminish the importance of Russia in international affairs, nor is it meant to suggest the situation is unique to Russia. The internal conditions of many states have negative international security implications. As Europeans repeatedly pointed out during the administration of George W. Bush, U.S. departures from the rule of law made the United States increasingly problematic as a global partner, whether through the use of force in Iraq or the manner in which the United States pursued and handled terrorist suspects. In fact, coping with authoritarian trends in Russia (and elsewhere) will involve changes in U.S. policies that have, on the surface, nothing to do with Russia. Bush administration counterterrorism policies that authorized torture, indefinite detention of terrorist suspects, and the rendering of detainees to secret prisons and Guantánamo have had numerous negative unintended consequences for U.S. national security, including serving as a recruitment tool for al Qaeda and insurgents in Iraq.4 Less often recognized, these policies also have undercut whatever leverage the United States had, as well as limited the effectiveness of American decision-makers, to push back on authoritarian policies adopted by, among others, the Putin administration. At its worst, American departures from the rule of law may have enabled abuse inside Russia. These departures certainly left human rights defenders isolated.5 Repairing the damage to U.S. soft power and reversing the departure from human rights norms that characterized the Bush administration’s counterterrorism policies will provide the Obama administration strategic and moral authority and improve the ability of the United States to work with allies. It also can have positive consequences for Obama’s Russia policy. The changes that need to be made in U.S. counterterrorism policies, however politically sensitive, are somewhat more straightforward than the adjustments that must be made to respond to the complex issues concerning Russia. The Obama administration must determine how best to engage Russian leaders and the population on issues of importance to the United States, given Russia’s poor governance structures, the stark drop in oil prices, Russia’s continued aspirations for great power status, and the rather serious resentment by Russians concerning American dominance and prior policies. The policy puzzle, therefore, is how to do all this without, at the same time, sacrificing our values and undercutting (yet again) U.S. soft power.

#### Continued human rights violations risk a Russian revolution.

Ullman 13 Senior Advisor at the Atlantic Council, Harlan, “The Third Russian Revolution,” UPI, 6—12—13, www.upi.com/Top\_News/Analysis/Outside-View/2013/06/12/Outside-View-The-third-Russian-Revolution/UPI-84461371009900/]

Make no mistake: On the current trajectory, Russia won't be immune to many of the forces that provoked the so-called colored revolutions in adjacent states and even the misnomered Arab Awakening. A third Russian revolution is unfolding. The only questions are when will that revolution reach a critical mass and, most importantly, will the forces of autocracy or pluralism carry the day? Russia, of course, experienced two revolutions in the 20th century. The Kaiser's Germany provoked the first by sending Lenin from Switzerland to Russia in the famous sealed train in 1917. That led to the undoing of the tsar and the Kerensky government as well as the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk that ended the war with Germany and allowed the Bolsheviks to sweep away the opposition. The second revolution came about in some seven decades later. The causes were a corrupt and fundamentally dishonest political system kept in place by a disciplined central leadership and dictatorship of the party. But that required able or at least competent leadership. Instead, the ruling Politburo became a genitocracy headed by sick, old men. Leonid Brezhnev took years to die and was replaced by two even less well general secretaries. In the mid-1970s, CIA Director William Colby repeatedly predicted Brezhnev's pending demise. It wasn't until 1982 that Colby's forecast came true. In the succession process, a few younger members were elevated to the Politburo. Because of the succession of antiquated leaders, Mikhail Gorbachev found himself moving from post to post from his appointment to the Politburo in 1979. In each post, he realized that the Soviet Union was an empty shell and each department was grossly mismanaged and underperforming. Six years later, when he became general secretary, Gorbachev was determined to save the Soviet Union and modernize the failing system. Gorbachev's tools were glasnost (openness) and perestroika (restructuring). The floodgates of reform were fully opened and the old and unworkable system couldn't resist them. By 1991, the Soviet Union was no more. In the two decades since, Vladimir Putin has emerged as the Ironman of Russia. In the process, Russia has been described and viewed by many as a kleptocracy ruled by the few who have pillaged national wealth for their own benefits. Under what Republicans and Democrats alike in the United States see as a government of and by thugs, human rights have been violated; dissidents and members of the media arrested; and opponents of the Kremlin subjected to purges and show trials leading to long prison sentences. Russia's immediate neighbors are fearful of the return of the aggressive Russian bear anxious to spread its influence through manipulating its oil and natural gas reserves for political purposes and through military maneuvers designed to intimidate. Further, cyberattacks, principally against Estonia, reinforce this perception of a neo-Soviet Union under the leadership of former KGB Colonel Putin. And Putin's commitment to far greater military spending as well as unwillingness to accept NATO's missile defenses raises sinister possibilities. Within Russia, discontent on the part of many Russians is waxing. Outright theft on the part of oligarchs has gone too far. Persecution of political opposition is particularly vexing. And the health and longevity of a declining population reflects more than excesses of consumption of vodka and harsh winters. Indeed, as a buffer to Putin's intent to ramp up his military, the Kremlin faces a very limiting factor: 90 percent of all Russian youth are unfit for military service. Unfortunately, the West in general and the United States in particular have never been very good at Kremlinology (or indeed in understanding many foreign cultures). Whether Putin is aware of the ticking time bomb over which he presides or not, Russia is still very important to Western interests. Syria and Iran are two major crises where Russian support could be important.

#### That causes miscalculation and nuclear war

Pry 99 (Former US Intelligence Operative, ‘Peter Vincent, War Scare: U.S.-Russia on the Nuclear Brink, netlibrary]

Russian internal troubles—such as a leadership crisis, coup, or civil war—could aggravate Russia’s fears of foreign aggression and lead to a miscalculation of U.S. intentions and to nuclear overreaction. While this may sound like a complicated and improbable chain of events, Russia’s story in the 1990s is one long series of domestic crises that have all too often been the source of nuclear close calls. The war scares of August 1991 and October 1993 arose out of coup attempts. The civil war in Chechnya caused a leadership crisis in Moscow, which contributed to the nuclear false alarm during Norway’s launch of a meteorological rocket in January 1995. Nuclear war arising from Russian domestic crises is a threat the West did not face, or at least faced to a much lesser extent, during the Cold War. The Russian military’s continued fixation on surprise-attack scenarios into the 1990s, combined with Russia’s deepening internal problems, has created a situation in which the United States might find itself the victim of a preemptive strike for no other reason than a war scare born of Russian domestic troubles. At least in nuclear confrontations of the 1950s–1970s—during the Berlin crisis, Cuban missile crisis, and 1973 Middle East war—both sides knew they were on the nuclear brink. There was opportunity to avoid conflict through negotiation or deescalation. The nuclear war scares of the 1980s and 1990s have been one-sided Russian affairs, with the West ignorant that it was in grave peril.

#### US-Russia relations key to solve extinction.

Allison 11 (Director of the Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs at Harvard’s Kennedy School of Government, 10-30-11, “10 reasons why Russia still matters,” <http://dyn.politico.com/printstory.cfm?uuid=161EF282-72F9-4D48-8B9C-C5B3396CA0E6>]

That central point is that Russia matters a great deal to a U.S. government seeking to defend and advance its national interests. Prime Minister Vladimir Putin’s decision to return next year as president makes it all the more critical for Washington to manage its relationship with Russia through coherent, realistic policies. No one denies that Russia is a dangerous, difficult, often disappointing state to do business with. We should not overlook its many human rights and legal failures. Nonetheless, Russia is a player whose choices affect our vital interests in nuclear security and energy. It is key to supplying 100,000 U.S. troops fighting in Afghanistan and preventing Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons. Ten realities require U.S. policymakers to advance our nation’s interests by engaging and working with Moscow. First, Russia remains the only nation that can erase the United States from the map in 30 minutes. As every president since John F. Kennedy has recognized, Russia’s cooperation is critical to averting nuclear war. Second, Russia is our most consequential partner in preventing nuclear terrorism. Through a combination of more than $11 billion in U.S. aid, provided through the Nunn-Lugar [CTR] Cooperative Threat Reduction program, and impressive Russian professionalism, two decades after the collapse of the “evil empire,” not one nuclear weapon has been found loose. Third, Russia plays an essential role in preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons and missile-delivery systems. As Washington seeks to stop Iran’s drive toward nuclear weapons, Russian choices to sell or withhold sensitive technologies are the difference between failure and the possibility of success. Fourth, Russian support in sharing intelligence and cooperating in operations remains essential to the U.S. war to destroy Al Qaeda and combat other transnational terrorist groups. Fifth, Russia provides a vital supply line to 100,000 U.S. troops fighting in Afghanistan. As U.S. relations with Pakistan have deteriorated, the Russian lifeline has grown ever more important and now accounts for half all daily deliveries. Sixth, Russia is the world’s largest oil producer and second largest gas producer. Over the past decade, Russia has added more oil and gas exports to world energy markets than any other nation. Most major energy transport routes from Eurasia start in Russia or cross its nine time zones. As citizens of a country that imports two of every three of the 20 million barrels of oil that fuel U.S. cars daily, Americans feel Russia’s impact at our gas pumps. Seventh, Moscow is an important player in today’s international system. It is no accident that Russia is one of the five veto-wielding, permanent members of the U.N. Security Council, as well as a member of the G-8 and G-20. A Moscow more closely aligned with U.S. goals would be significant in the balance of power to shape an environment in which China can emerge as a global power without overturning the existing order. Eighth, Russia is the largest country on Earth by land area, abutting China on the East, Poland in the West and the United States across the Arctic. This territory provides transit corridors for supplies to global markets whose stability is vital to the U.S. economy. Ninth, Russia’s brainpower is reflected in the fact that it has won more Nobel Prizes for science than all of Asia, places first in most math competitions and dominates the world chess masters list. The only way U.S. astronauts can now travel to and from the International Space Station is to hitch a ride on Russian rockets. The co-founder of the most advanced digital company in the world, Google, is Russian-born Sergei Brin. Tenth, Russia’s potential as a spoiler is difficult to exaggerate. Consider what a Russian president intent on frustrating U.S. international objectives could do — from stopping the supply flow to Afghanistan to selling S-300 air defense missiles to Tehran to joining China in preventing U.N. Security Council resolutions.

#### Plan solves – removes the stigma from GITMO and is modeled globally.

Kimery 9 (Homeland Security Today's Online Editor and Online Media Division manager, Anthony, draws on 30 years of experience and extensive contacts as he investigates homeland security, counterterrorism and border security, citing Glenn Sulmasy, first permanent commissioned military law professor at the Coast Guard Academy, where he is a Professor of Law teaching international, constitutional, and criminal law, "The Case For A 'National Security Court'", December 3, [www.hstoday.us/blogs/the-kimery-report/blog/the-case-for-a-national-security-court/a9333d82c11cecd35e74c8c0b65c2698.html](http://www.hstoday.us/blogs/the-kimery-report/blog/the-case-for-a-national-security-court/a9333d82c11cecd35e74c8c0b65c2698.html)]

However, in interviews with HSToday.us, Sulmasy argued that “we have to be aware that the issue of captured fighters will not go away once GITMO is closed - it will continue with the Bagram detainees and other inevitable captures in the generational conflict against international terrorism.”¶ So, “rather than creating opportunities for ‘forum shopping’ - either employing military commissions for some and civilian courts for others - the nation needs ‘one’ system - a hybrid system that meets all needs associated with the unique legal status of these detainees” – and all future combatants captured or arrested in the WOAQ, Sulmasy argues.¶ Sulmasy insists that a National Security Court “offers the United States a ‘way out’ of GITMO-like problems” in the future.¶ In the July 2007 HSToday.us report, Toward a Homeland Security Court for Captured Terrorists, Sulmasy’s ideas about how best to resolve the dilemma GITMO and the Military Commissions Act (MCA) created were first discussed in detail. They are rooted in the spacious realization that the war on terrorism inherently presents complex new legalities as a consequence of the unparalleled, un-conventional war on terrorists - and it is a war.¶ Sulmasy says the approach he proposes would not only restore respect for America’s system of justice and legitimize the judicial handling of WOAQ prisoners, but it would serve as a template for other nations to emulate.¶ “Another need for [national security] courts is to deal with the latest issues,” Sulmasy explained. “US citizens who turn their backs on the government and seek to overthrow it by engaging in jihad right now are treated differently than jihadists from other countries. A homeland security court would remove this disparity … We cannot, once again, allow the sleeping giant to go back to sleep. We must remain vigilant and recognize that how we deal with the detention of the Al Qaeda jihadists [and like-minded jihadists] is critical to our winning this long war."¶ The Bush administration and Congress unquestionably rushed to conceive an ill-thought-out post-9/11 process for legally meting out the fate of suspected terrorists captured during combat in the WOAQ. But now the US requires a new judicial system for this new non-state war that likely will continue to be waged for decades to come, proponents for this system like Sulmasy argue.¶ “I think they were right, initially: We were being attacked and expecting flurries of attacks over the next few years … five to six years later, however, we need to look at fresh options,” Sulmasy said.

#### Next, blanket indefinite detention violates the Geneva Convention – doesn’t differentiate between types of combatants nor the different durations of conflict.

Murphy 7 (Law Professor at George Washington University Law School, “Evolving Geneva Convention Paradigms in the¶ 'War on Terrorism': Applying the Core Rules to the¶ Release of Persons Deemed 'Unprivileged¶ Combatants'”, GW Law Faculty Publications & Other Works, 2007, RSR]

The general assertion that all detainees at Guantánamo Bay may be detained for the “duration¶ of hostilities” is doubtful. First, that assertion may be overbroad in covering all persons detained¶ worldwide in the “war on terrorism.” While detention of persons on the battlefield in Afghanistan,¶ whether the person is associated with the Taliban or with Al Qaeda, seems fairly to fall within the¶ scope of the evolving laws of war, the detention of persons outside Afghanistan who are suspected¶ of connections to global terrorism is more problematic. The laws of war operate within temporal and¶ geographic realms; considerable attention is given to when it can be said that an “armed conflict”¶ has arisen and ended, and to where it is that protected persons are located (in enemy territory, in¶ occupied territory, in neutral territory, etc.) These rules do not fit well the new paradigm of an armed¶ conflict between a state and a non-state actor that is transnational in nature, especially when that nonstate actor is not a centralized organization. Links to Al Qaeda may be found in numerous countries,¶ not because the indigenous factions there are actively engaged in a coordinated fight against the¶ United States, but because Al Qaeda attracts movements that seek to reduce Western influence in their countries or region, be it Somalia, Algeria, or elsewhere.135 A principal architect of the radical¶ thinking that came to characterize Al Qaeda, Abu Musab al-Suri, has written that Al Qaeda is not¶ an organization, it is not a group, nor do we want it to be. . . . It is a call, a reference, a¶ methodology.”136 If that is correct, it becomes very strained to view all persons suspected of ties to¶ Al Qaeda as unlawful combatants engaged in an armed conflict with the United States. It would be¶ as if, during the Cold War, the United States decided to treat all persons suspected of being¶ communists as combatants because communist groups were fighting the United States in places like¶ Vietnam or Korea.¶ While it may be the case that Al Qaeda persons detained outside Afghanistan fall within the¶ same rules at those detained on the battlefield, it may also be the case that the rules are different.¶ Perhaps in recognition of this fact, the Supreme Court in Hamdi, after stating the general principle¶ of the law of war that detention may last no longer than active hostilities, went on to note that “[i]f¶ the practical circumstances of a given conflict are entirely unlike those of the conflicts that informed¶ the development of the law of war, that understanding may unravel.”137 Indeed, the Court appears¶ to have been influenced by the fact that Hamdi allegedly took up arms with the Taliban and that¶ active fighting against Taliban forces remained ongoing in Afghanistan. ¶ If Al Qaeda suspects picked up in places other than the battlefield in Afghanistan are not¶ regarded as combatants under the laws of war, then they would fall under the same rules that apply¶ to any transnational criminal; they could be arrested and tried in regular courts for transnational¶ crime, and otherwise could be closely monitored by law enforcement authorities. They could not,¶ however, simply be detained without trial indefinitely.¶ Second, even if one assumes that all the detainees at Guantánamo Bay should be treated¶ alike, the general assertion that they may be detained for the “duration of hostilities” still is¶ problematic. That general assertion appears based on Article 118 of Geneva Convention III¶ (“[p]risoners of war shall be released and repatriated without delay after the cessation of active¶ hostilities”), and perhaps on the analogous Article 133 of Geneva Convention IV (any internment¶ of civilians “shall cease as soon as possible after the close of hostilities”). Persons who have been¶ prosecuted in accordance with the conventions, of course, may be held even after the cessation of¶ hostilities, but they remain under the protections of the conventions until the completion of their sentences and their release.¶ The sentiment expressed by the 1949 Geneva Convention provisions in favor of expeditious¶ release after the cessation of hostilities was animated by the problems that were experienced prior¶ to 1949. The 1907 Hague Regulations138 and the 1929 Geneva Conventions on Prisoners of War139¶ were interpreted as allowing a detaining power not to repatriate until either the conclusion of an¶ armistice agreement or even a final peace agreement. Since those agreements might take months or¶ even years after the cessation of active hostilities, the repatriation of millions of prisoners of war in¶ both the world wars were considerably delayed.140 Consequently, the1949 Geneva Conventions (and¶ Protocol I) sought to detach the issue of repatriation from the conclusion of a formal agreement, and¶ instead tie the matter to core justification for detention—i.e., whether the individual would pose a¶ threat to the detaining power after release. In this sense, the obligation became a unilateral one¶ imposed on the detaining power, and not one contingent on some formal of consent from the¶ opposing belligerent. For the 1949 Geneva Conventions, the threat no longer existed once the¶ hostilities were over.¶ Yet, regardless of the duration of the conflict, Geneva Convention III and Geneva Convention¶ IV are oriented toward an individualized assessment of the circumstances arising with respect to¶ individual POWs and civilian internees. Under Geneva Convention III, a detaining power may¶ release a particular POW on “parole or promise,”141 and may also “conclude agreements with a view¶ to the direct repatriation or interment in a neutral country of able-bodied prisoners of war who have¶ undergone a long period of captivity.”142 Likewise, the standard set forth in Geneva Convention IV¶ for release of civilian internees is not tied to the cessation of hostilities; it provides that civilian¶ internees “shall be released by the Detaining Power as soon as the reasons which necessitated his¶ internment no longer exist.”143

#### Adapting to public perception on detention and international law is key to regain credibility of US compliance

Murphy 7 (Law Professor at George Washington University Law School, “Evolving Geneva Convention Paradigms in the¶ 'War on Terrorism': Applying the Core Rules to the¶ Release of Persons Deemed 'Unprivileged¶ Combatants'”, GW Law Faculty Publications & Other Works, 2007, RSR]

The dominant paradigms of the 1949 Geneva Conventions, which concern either inter-state¶ or internal armed conflict, do not sit well with the new face of armed conflict presented by Al Qaeda.¶ The non-state actor who engages in heinous conduct has been an outcast to the laws of war, whether¶ one looks at the terrorism of William Quantrill in the 1860's or the terrorism of Al Qaeda today. For¶ that reason, it is understandable that the full protections envisaged by those conventions were not¶ applied in the types of conflicts that emerged after 9/11. Nevertheless, influenced by developments¶ in the fields of human rights and international criminal law, the laws of war have now evolved to a¶ point where the “public dictates of conscience” compel the application of core protections even for¶ the outcast. Those protections are reflected in both conventional and customary international law,¶ and may be seen in common Article 3 of the 1949 Geneva Conventions, and Article 75 of their¶ Additional Protocol I. If the United States wishes to act in accordance with international law, such standards should guide the United States in the conditions of the detention and the mechanisms by¶ which detainees are prosecuted for crimes.¶ Moreover, those standards should guide the United States in its decision-making on the¶ release of detainees. Detainees in the “war on terror” may not be held until the “cessation of¶ hostilities.” They may only be held so long as the particular detainee at issue represents a danger or¶ threat to the detaining power. The detaining power is obligated to undertake periodic reviews, by an¶ appropriate court or administrative board, of whether that threat continues to exist. Once the detainee¶ is determined not to be a threat, or their mental or physical fitness has been gravely diminished, the¶ detainee must be released immediately. If the detainee will likely be exposed to abuse by being sent¶ back to his country of origin, he may not be returned. In that case, or in the case of a detainee whose¶ country of origin will not accept his return or recognize his nationality, the United States is obligated¶ to release the detainee in the United States until an appropriate alternative place for relocation can¶ be resolved. Continued detention of persons deemed not to be a threat is unlawful and¶ unconscionable.

#### US Failure to adhere to Geneva undermines the entire Geneva regime

Beard 7 (Jack, ecturer at UCLA former Deputy General Counsel at the D.o.D., “The Geneva Boomerang: The Military Commissions Act of 2006 And US Counterterror operations,” The American Journal of International Law, KM]

At a fundamental level, unilateral revision of the Geneva Conventions by the United States undermines the credibility of the U.S. commitment to the existing Geneva regime. In an international setting that lacks effective external enforcement mechanisms, allowing the easy violation of agreements, a state may seek to send a signal of credible commitment to other states by constraining its own ability to act in ex ante legal structures, institutions, or procedures that reduce ex post incentives for such noncompliance. n58 A legislative act that restrains or makes it [\*66] costly to exercise such discretionary power and reduces the attractiveness of breaching an agreement can serve such a signaling function. n59 To the extent, however, that the MCA is perceived as unilaterally revising key obligations in the Geneva Conventions and providing the president with the discretion to issue further reinterpretations, it undermines the credible commitment of the United States to other states in the international community. n60 And to the extent that the U.S. commitment is perceived as increasingly less credible, theory suggests that other countries are unlikely to maintain the stringency of their own commitments.

#### The Geneva Conventions are key to prevent the development and use of chemical and biological weapons.

GCSP 5 [Geneva Centre for Security Policy, “Biological and Chemical Weapons Seminar,” June 2005, <http://www.gcsp.ch/e/meetings/Security_Challenges/WMD/Meeting_Conf/2005/BC%20Weapons%20Seminar/summary.htm>, KM]

On 9-10 June 2005, the GCSP hosted an international seminar initiated by France and Switzerland on the occasion of the 80th anniversary of the signing of the Geneva Protocol prohibiting the Use of Chemical and Bacteriological Weapons in collaboration with the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR). Over 100 participants attended the event, representing 39 States Parties, 8 UN agencies and the European Union, 12 non-governmental organisations and 10 media organisations. Ambassador Raimund Kunz, Head of the Directorate of Security Policy of the Swiss Defence Department, and Ambassadors François Rivasseau and Jürg Streuli, respectively the French and Swiss Permanent Representatives to the Conference on Disarmament, opened the seminar. The first session considered the historical background to the adoption of the 1925 Geneva Protocol and why its prohibition was extended to include bacteriological weapons, and the philosophical and ethical reasons for preserving humankind from the scourge of weapons of mass destruction. The second session considered the current situation and why there is a continuing threat from biological weapons, including from non-State actors, as well as the measures that should be taken to counter this threat, including inter-governmental cooperation through Interpol. The WHO presented the global health response to epidemics, caused naturally, accidentally or deliberately, and the International Organisation for Animal Health (OIE) described its policies to prevent or cure animal epidemics. The session also considered the implications of industrial and scientific developments in biology and biotechnology as well as legal and ethical measures in relation to bio-security. The third session examined the possible responses of international law, including the classical rules of humanitarian law relating to poisoning and the deliberate spread of disease as related to modern responsibilities, and responses that could be based on traditional instruments of disarmament, namely the 1972 Biological Weapons Convention and the 1993 Chemical Weapons Convention. The final session considered emergency responses to the threat of biological and chemical weapons. The French Head of the MFA Disarmament Unit took stock of the implementation of the Chemical Weapons Convention and the UK Permanent Representative to the Conference on Disarmament, President of the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention Review Process, envisaged what the States Parties to the Convention might do at the Sixth Review Conference in 2006. Then the seminar considered the actions taken by groups of States such as the G8 (Global Partnership against Weapons of Mass Destruction) and the European Union (Common Strategy on the Non-Proliferation of WMD) to strengthen the regimes prohibiting chemical and biological weapons, as well as the implementation of the UN Security Council Resolution 1540 (2004). Thanks in particular to the active presence of NGOs, think tanks and journalists, the seminar was lively with a rich debate following the presentations that covered much ground and led to the recognition of a number of conclusions and points for further consideration: The 1925 Geneva Protocol was the cornerstone of a multilateral regime that now, through the 1972 Biological Weapons Convention and the 1993 Chemical Weapons Convention, totally prohibits not only the use but also the production and possession of both chemical and biological weapons.

#### Bioweapons cause extinction – new advances in biotech

Myhrvold 13 (Nathan, former Chief Technology Officer at Microsoft, founder of Intellectual Ventures—one of the largest patent holding companies in the world, “Strategic Terrorism: A Call to Action”, The Lawfare Research Paper Series Research paper NO . 2, http://www.lawfareblog.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/07/Strategic-Terrorism-Myhrvold-7-3-2013.pdf]

**Biotech**nology **is advancing so rapidly** that **it is hard to**  **keep track of all** **the new potential threats**. Nor is it clear that anyone is even trying. In addition to lethality and drug resistance, many other parameters can be played with, given that the infectious power of an epidemic depends on many properties, including the length of the latency period during which a person is contagious but asymptomatic. Delaying the onset of serious symptoms allows each new case to spread to more people and thus makes the virus harder to stop. This dynamic is perhaps best illustrated by HIV , which is very difficult to transmit compared with smallpox and many other viruses. Intimate contact is needed, and even then, the infection rate is low. The balancing factor is that HIV can take years to progress to AIDS , which can then take many more years to kill the victim. What makes HIV so dangerous is that infected people have lots of opportunities to infect others. This property has allowed HIV to claim more than 30 million lives so far, and approximately 34 million people are now living with this virus and facing a highly uncertain future.15 A virus genetically engineered to infect its host quickly, to generate symptoms slowly—say, only after weeks or months—and to spread easily through the air or by casual contact would be vastly more devastating than HIV . It could silently penetrate the population to unleash its deadly effects suddenly. This type of epidemic would be almost impossible to combat because most of the infections would occur before the epidemic became obvious. **A technologically sophisticated terrorist group could**  **develop** such **a virus and kill a large part of humanity with it**. **Indeed, terrorists may not have to develop it themselves:**  **some scientist may** do so first and publish the details. **Given the rate at which biologists are making discoveries** about viruses and the immune system, **at some point in**  **the near future**, **someone may create artificial pathogens**  **that could** drive the human race to extinction. Indeed, a detailed species-elimination plan of this nature was openly proposed in a scientific journal. The ostensible purpose of that particular research was to suggest a way to extirpate the malaria mosquito, but similar techniques could be directed toward humans.16 When I’ve talked to molecular biologists about this method, they are quick to point out that it is slow and easily detectable and could be fought with biotech remedies. If you challenge them to come up with improvements to the suggested attack plan, however, they have plenty of ideas. **Modern biotechnology** **will soon be capable**, if it is not already, **of bringing about the demise of the human race**— or at least of killing a sufficient number of people to end high-tech civilization and set humanity back 1,000 years or more. **That terrorist groups could achieve this level of technological**  **sophistication may seem far-fetched, but** keep in mind **that it takes only a handful of individuals to accomplish**  **these tasks**. Never has lethal power of this potency been accessible to so few, so easily. Even more dramatically than nuclear proliferation, **modern biological science has frighteningly undermined the correlation between the lethality of a weapon and its cost**, a fundamentally stabilizing mechanism throughout history. **Access to extremely lethal**  **agents**—lethal enough to exterminate Homo sapiens—**will**  **be available to anybody with a solid background in biology,**  **terrorists included**. The 9/11 attacks involved at least four pilots, each of whom had sufficient education to enroll in flight schools and complete several years of training. **Bin Laden had a degree**  **in civil engineering**. Mohammed Atta attended a German university, where he earned a master’s degree in urban planning—not a field he likely chose for its relevance to terrorism. **A future set of terrorists could** just as **easily be**  **students of molecular biology who enter their studies innocently**  **enough but later put their skills to homicidal use**. Hundreds of universities in Europe and Asia have curricula sufficient to train people in the skills necessary to make a sophisticated biological weapon, and hundreds more in the United States accept students from all over the world. **Thus it seems likely that sometime in the near future a** **small band of terrorists**, or even a single misanthropic individual, **will overcome our best defenses and do something**  **truly terrible, such as fashion a bioweapon that could kill millions or even billions of people**. Indeed, **the creation of such weapons within the next 20 years seems to be a virtual certainty**. The repercussions of their use are hard to estimate. One approach is to look at how the scale of destruction they may cause compares with that of other calamities that the human race has faced.

#### A national security court would solve US compliance with Geneva - allows for oversight to review the individual detentions

McCarthy and Velshi 9 [Andrew (Director of the Center for Law & Counterterrorism at the Foundation for the Defense of Democracies) and Alykhan (staff attorney at the Center for Law & Counterterrorism, where he focuses on the international law of armed conflict and the use of force), “We Need a National Security Court”, Submission for AEI, 2009, RSR]

The NSC would oversee a new process for ¶ monitoring and reviewing the detention of alien enemy combatants captured by our ¶ military (and allied forces) outside U.S. territory and detained wherever the military ¶ chooses to detain them (including within the United States). The district court division of ¶ the NSC would perform, primarily, a monitoring function. As already noted, judicial ¶ review would principally proceed at the appellate level, as it now does under the DTA ¶ and MCA. The process would work as follows. Within a reasonable time after capture, the ¶ Justice Department would report to the NSC the fact that an alleged unlawful combatant ¶ had been captured in a particular theater of combat and was being detained.69¶ Presumptively within one year of capture, the military would hold a CSRT pursuant to ¶ the procedures currently in place.70 Assuming the detainee is designated an alien enemy¶ combatant, the appeal process would proceed, first in the military system and, ultimately, ¶ to the appellate tribunal of the NSC. ¶ Review in the NSC would proceed in a manner similar to that envisioned by the ¶ MCA. In creating the NSC, Congress would (a) make a finding that aliens who are nonU.S. persons (i.e., who are neither American citizens nor lawful permanent resident aliens ¶ of the United States) have no entitlements under the Constitution, and (b) provide that ¶ such aliens have no enforceable entitlements against detention during wartime under any ¶ U.S. statute or treaty if found by a properly constituted CSRT to be enemy combatants. ¶ Consequently, review in the NSC would be limited to challenging compliance at the ¶ appellant’s CSRT with the military’s standards and procedures for CSRTs. To avoid the empirical problem of judicial activism, the Congress would make clear that the grounds it ¶ has set forth are the only available grounds for judicial review.71¶ In connection with each certified combatant, the Justice Department would also ¶ certify to the NSC (at the district court level) that hostilities were ongoing in the war on ¶ terror, that hostilities were ongoing in the theater of combat relevant to the particular ¶ enemy combatant (which, of course, will not necessarily be the place where the ¶ combatant was captured), and that it was in the national security interest of the United ¶ States that the combatant continue to be held because of the likelihood that he would ¶ resume operations against the United States if released. The CSRT determination would ¶ be reviewed annually, as would DOJ’s certification.¶ The government’s certification would be unreviewable as long as the executive ¶ branch represented that combat operations were still ongoing in the theater which was the ¶ predicate (or were the predicates) for finding the particular detainee an alien enemy ¶ combatant. Here, it is worth pausing to rehearse that, once prospects for useful ¶ intelligence have been exhausted, the sole justification for holding enemy combatants is ¶ to prevent them from rejoining the battle. While it is often observed that the global war ¶ on terror may go on indefinitely, this does not mean it will go on throughout the world ¶ indefinitely. ¶ Of course, some detainees will be a credible threat to join the battle wherever it ¶ rages. However, the evidence that would make such a threat credible will frequently ¶ provide grounds for charging the terrorist-combatant with war crimes and prosecuting ¶ him – such that it will not be necessary to detain him interminably merely as an enemy ¶ combatant (which is the principal international objection to current U.S. policy). Other ¶ detainees will only be credible local threats, and will not be a continuing national security ¶ challenge for the United States once combat operations have been completed in the place ¶ where they were captured. Such combatants should be repatriated once combat operations ¶ in their region have wound down (and it bears mention here that the United States has, in fact, released hundreds of combatants from Guantanamo Bay).72 Moreover, as progress is ¶ made in the war on terror, and particularly if functioning governments replace tyrannical ¶ regimes, it will increasingly be possible to repatriate combatants with the confidence that ¶ they will be treated appropriately (including by prosecution, if grounds exist) by the new ¶ governments in their home countries (or in countries where they have committed crimes). ¶

### New Advantage

#### Contention 2: Judicial Activism

#### Court intervention on detention is inevitable now

Horowitz 13 (Colby, J.D. Candidate at Fordham University, “CREATING A MORE MEANINGFUL ¶ DETENTION STATUTE: LESSONS LEARNED ¶ FROM HEDGES V. OBAMA”, Fordham Law Review, Vol. 81, 2013, RSR]

The Supreme Court has not decided the merits of a detention case since ¶ Boumediene in 2008.144 Additionally, in 2011 the Supreme Court denied ¶ certiorari to six different Guantanamo detainee cases appealed from the D.C. Circuit.145 As a result of its continued abstention, the Supreme Court ¶ has had little impact in shaping the substantive parameters of executive ¶ detention.146¶ The substantive law of executive detention has been primarily created by ¶ the D.C. District Court and the D.C. Circuit as they evaluate habeas corpus ¶ petitions from detainees held at Guantanamo Bay.147 As the law has ¶ evolved since 2008, the D.C. courts have often applied different or ¶ changing standards, and some believe that “the D.C. Circuit’s opinions ¶ almost uniformly favor the government.”148 Additionally, some ¶ commentators have expressed concerns about “the habeas process as a ¶ lawmaking device” and fear that the standards established by the D.C. ¶ Courts are “interim steps” or “a kind of draft” until the Supreme Court ¶ eventually steps in to resolve the issues.149¶ The judges of the D.C. courts recognize that they are creating law. In ¶ their opinions, they have often commented on the lack of guidance from the ¶ Supreme Court150 and their significant role in shaping substantive detention ¶ law with each decision.151

#### Vagueness in the NDAA hampers executive flexibility by encouraging judicial activism. The plan is key to reverse that.

Horowitz 13 (Colby, J.D. Candidate at Fordham University, “CREATING A MORE MEANINGFUL ¶ DETENTION STATUTE: LESSONS LEARNED ¶ FROM HEDGES V. OBAMA”, Fordham Law Review, Vol. 81, 2013, RSR]

This part recommends ways to improve section 1021, with the goal of ¶ creating a clearer, more meaningful detention statute. In section 1021, ¶ Congress simply codified verbatim the executive branch’s interpretation of ¶ detention authority.350 Congress failed to define or limit key terms like ¶ “substantial support” or “associated forces,” and thus abdicated its role in ¶ shaping the substantive parameters of executive detention. This section ¶ recommends ways to improve a future detention statute and includes some ¶ proposed definitions of key detention criteria. ¶ A vague and unclear detention statute harms the separation of powers ¶ between the three branches. As Justice Jackson’s widely accepted ¶ Youngstown framework explains,351 executive war powers are relational to ¶ Congress, and the judiciary decides what Congress has or has not ¶ authorized—thus all three branches have a role. Vague statutes enhance the ¶ power of the judiciary at the expense of the legislature for two reasons. ¶ First, vague statutes make congressional intent unclear and give the courts ¶ significant discretion to determine if the President is in Zone 1, 2, or 3.352¶ Second, vague statutes invite close judicial scrutiny because they ¶ demonstrate to the courts that the political process has failed.353 Thus, ¶ vague congressional authorizations that attempt to delegate broad authority ¶ to the President can be counterproductive because, instead of empowering ¶ the President, they actually empower the courts.354¶ In addition to expanding the role of the judiciary, vague statutes create ¶ uncertainty for the executive. The President cannot act quickly and ¶ decisively if the limits of his authority are unclear.355 Finally, Congress ¶ plays an important role in detention policy, and vague statutes like section 1021 represent a congressional abdication of that role.356 Congressional ¶ legislation is essential when creating long-term, effective antiterrorism ¶ policies that have a solid legal foundation.357 This Note recommends ¶ substantive changes to section 1021 to make it a clearer, more meaningful ¶ congressional statement about the limits of indefinite executive detention. ¶ The major recommendations are: (1) move away from the AUMF; ¶ (2) provide specific definitions of key terms (proposed definitions are ¶ suggested); (3) exclude protected First Amendment activities; and ¶ (4) include a clear statement about the indefinite detention of American ¶ citizens.

#### Court action on indefinite detention promotes a shift to drones by hampering effective warfighting.

Chertoff 11 [Michael, Former Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security,

THE DECLINE OF JUDICIAL DEFERENCE ON NATIONAL SECURITY, Rutgers Law Review, 3 February 2011, http://www.rutgerslawreview.com/wp-content/uploads/archive/vol63/Issue4/Chertoff\_Speech\_PDF.pdf, pg. 1125-1128]

So, where has this left us? It has left us in a puzzling situation. ¶ In a decision called Al-Bihani in the D.C. Circuit in 2010, Judge ¶ Janice Rogers Brown talked about the consequences—practical ¶ consequences—of having habeas review in Guantánamo as it affects ¶ the battlefield.42 And what she said is that the process at the tail end ¶ is now impacting the front end because when you conduct combat ¶ operations, you now have to worry about collecting evidence.43¶ A somewhat darker analysis has been put forward by Ben Wittes ¶ who has recently written a book called Detention and Denial, where ¶ he argues that the courts have now created an incentive system to ¶ kill rather than capture.44 And much of the law of war over the years ¶ was designed to move away from the “give no quarter” theory, where ¶ you killed everybody at the battlefield, into the theory of you would ¶ rather capture than kill. And his point, and you can agree or ¶ disagree with it, is that you have now actually loaded it the other ¶ way; you have pushed it in the direction of kill rather than capture.45 We have complete uncertainty now in the standards to be ¶ applied in the individual cases. If you read Ben Wittes‟s book ¶ Detention and Denial, he will details about ten or twelve district ¶ court cases where literally on the same facts you get different ¶ answers.46 And it is not that the district judges are not doing their ¶ best, but they have no guidance. There is no standard, and no one ¶ has offered them a standard.¶ We now have litigation about Bagram Air Force Base in ¶ Afghanistan.47 It was absolutely predictable when Boumediene was ¶ decided that the next case would be against Bagram Airbase. I do ¶ not know how it is going to come out at the end. I think it is still in ¶ the district court, but I will tell you, the logic—now they may have ¶ stopped the logic of Guantánamo—the logic of Boumediene certainly ¶ raises questions about Bagram. How do you wind up having habeas ¶ in Bagram? And then what is going to happen when you are in a ¶ forward firebase? Are you going to have habeas cases there? No one¶ knows, but the big problem is that the battlefield commanders do not ¶ know either; that is a serious operational problem.¶ In many ways, it is absolutely a great example of what the Court ¶ in Eisentrager predicted.48 When you go down this path, you are ¶ going to actually have real operational problems with warfighting. ¶ But of course, we are not in 1950 now; we are actually in active ¶ operations.¶ Finally, and I find this really to be the most interesting ¶ contemporary question posed by this series of issues, the press ¶ reports—and I cannot verify this, I am not confirming it, but I am ¶ assuming it to be true—the press reports that President Obama has ¶ authorized the killing of Anwar al-Aulaki, the American citizen in ¶ Yemen who is, in my mind for quite good reason, believed to be a ¶ major recruiter and operation leader for al-Qaeda.49 I want to be ¶ clear: I am perfectly okay with that, and I think it is exactly the right ¶ decision, so I do not want to be misunderstood. But I will say that if ¶ you read the decision and logic of Boumediene that is a very puzzling ¶ situation for al-Aulaki. Because if you need court permission to ¶ detain somebody, and if you need court permission to wiretap ¶ somebody, how can you kill that person without court permission? But that is what warfighting is. You cannot fight a war without that. ¶ There is current litigation on this issue where people are purporting ¶ to represent al-Aulaki‟s family.50 It has been tossed out, but we are ¶ just at the early stages. And frankly, I think we are going to see ¶ more of this.51 I have been reading that there are debates taking ¶ place about this. They are holding a moot court, I believe, on this ¶ issue.¶ A lot of interesting comments can be made about where we find ¶ ourselves, where the current administration finds itself if you believe ¶ the al-Aulaki allegations to be true. But to me, what it suggests is ¶ that when you abruptly change the attitude of deference—and I ¶ think you must look at Boumediene as an abrupt change—the ¶ consequences become unpredictable and very serious. And there is a ¶ reason that judges and courts in the past forswore from doing that. ¶ We may be seeing some of this play out. How it ends is difficult to ¶ predict. ¶ Before I take a few minutes of questions, let me conclude by ¶ making sure I do not cast blame only on the Court, because it is not ¶ the Court‟s fault. This is something where everybody was complicit in ¶ putting us in this situation—all three branches of government. The ¶ fact is, I was here about seven or eight years ago in 2003, at Rutgers, ¶ not here in this particular building but across the street where they ¶ have a campus, and I gave a talk. I had just left as head of the ¶ criminal division, and I said we have kind of put a lot of things ¶ together in a jerry-built way. We need to have a sustainable legal ¶ architecture that is going to make this a framework that we are ¶ comfortable with over a long period of time. Congress has to get ¶ involved—the executive branch has to go to Congress. It is seven ¶ years later, and we have not done it. So that, to me, is a failure of ¶ both branches. For the executive branch, the failure to push ¶ Congress on this has been a mistake. It has led to, for example, a lot ¶ of delay in setting up the administrative process for dealing with ¶ these detainees. Frankly, I think that was a strategic error that more ¶ or less baited the Court into doing what the Court did. I come from ¶ the old school of believing that whatever you think the right answer ¶ is, you do not want to test the limit of what you think it is if you can ¶ avoid it. You want to go into court with the strongest possible position, and you want to be the most modest and incremental in ¶ asking for power because that is how you maximize your chance to ¶ win. I do not think the executive branch was wise in pushing the ¶ envelope on this. That included also delaying the process for years. ¶ There was a lot of internal back and forth on that. It is unfortunate ¶ that the delaying impulse won. I think that some of the processes put ¶ in place in the first couple of rounds were overly scanty—it was more ¶ parsimonious than it should have been and than it needed to be. And ¶ this comes to the point: do not tempt fate. So the executive branch, by ¶ delaying and being parsimonious with how it handled these cases, ¶ essentially begged the Court—not literally but functionally—to get ¶ involved and to step into this. And that is historically, of course, ¶ what courts do.¶ Congress has never stepped up to the plate on this—other than ¶ the jurisdiction stripping in the Detainee Treatment Act and the ¶ Military Commissions Act.52 Even there, in terms of looking at what ¶ habeas might be and writing the kind of complex procedures you ¶ would need to really build the process for detaining people, Congress ¶ still has not stepped up to do that. There are people like Senator ¶ Lindsey Graham of South Carolina who are constantly out there ¶ saying that both parties should work together to identify a solution, ¶ but I have not seen the action taken yet. So, in a way, I have to say in ¶ defense of the decision in Boumediene, at some point when the Court ¶ sees that neither branch is addressing the problem, where there is a ¶ serious issue of balancing security and liberty, and where we are ¶ uncomfortable about the idea of just locking people up indefinitely ¶ without having some confidence that we can review it, the courts are ¶ going to step in. And that leads to the old adage that hard cases ¶ make bad law.¶ The best result, in my mind, would be for the executive branch ¶ and Congress to sit down and put together, like they did with the ¶ Debt Commission now, a plan that talks about how we deal with ¶ detaining people when we are not going to put them in a criminal ¶ case or in a military commission. What is the process of review? ¶ What should the procedural rights be? What should the standard be? ¶ And what is the ultimate target that the judge has to find? I would ¶ hope that if we got that kind of comprehensive and robust statute ¶ that the courts would back off and would give the deference that has ¶ traditionally been good both for the executive and for the courts when ¶ dealing with these kinds of sensitive national security issues.

#### Increased drone use sets a precedent that causes South China Sea conflict.

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

And that’s a NATO ally seeking the capability to conduct missions that would run afoul of U.S. interests in Iraq and the broader Middle East. Already, Beijing says it considered a strike in Myanmar to kill a drug lord wanted in the deaths of Chinese sailors. What happens if China arms one of its remote-piloted planes and strikes Philippine or Indian trawlers in the South China Sea? Or if India uses the aircraft to strike Lashkar-e-Taiba militants near Kashmir? “We don’t like other states using lethal force outside their borders. It’s destabilizing. It can lead to a sort of wider escalation of violence between two states,” said Micah Zenko, a security policy and drone expert at the Council on Foreign Relations. “So the proliferation of drones is not just about the protection of the United States. It’s primarily about the likelihood that other states will increasingly use lethal force outside of their borders.” LOWERING THE BAR Governments have covertly killed for ages, whether they maintained an official hit list or not. Before the Obama administration’s “disposition matrix,” Israel was among the best-known examples of a state that engaged, and continues to engage, in strikes to eliminate people identified by its intelligence as plotting attacks against it. But Israel certainly is not alone. Turkey has killed Kurds in Northern Iraq. Some American security experts point to Russia as well, although Moscow disputes this. In the 1960s, the U.S. government was involved to differing levels in plots to assassinate leaders in Congo and the Dominican Republic, and, famously, Fidel Castro in Cuba. The Church Committee’s investigation and subsequent 1975 report on those and other suspected plots led to the standing U.S. ban on assassination. So, from 1976 until the start of President George W. Bush’s “war on terror,” the United States did not conduct targeted killings, because it was considered anathema to American foreign policy. (In fact, until as late as 2001, Washington’s stated policy was to oppose Israel’s targeted killings.) When America adopted targeted killing again—first under the Bush administration after the September 11 attacks and then expanded by President Obama—the tools of the trade had changed. No longer was the CIA sending poison, pistols, and toxic cigars to assets overseas to kill enemy leaders. Now it could target people throughout al-Qaida’s hierarchy with accuracy, deliver lethal ordnance literally around the world, and watch the mission’s completion in real time. The United States is smartly using technology to improve combat efficacy, and to make war-fighting more efficient, both in money and manpower. It has been able to conduct more than 400 lethal strikes, killing more than 3,500 people, in Afghanistan, Pakistan, Yemen, Somalia, and North Africa using drones; reducing risk to U.S. personnel; and giving the Pentagon flexibility to use special-forces units elsewhere. And, no matter what human-rights groups say, it’s clear that drone use has reduced the number of civilians killed in combat relative to earlier conflicts. Washington would be foolish not to exploit unmanned aircraft in its long fight against terrorism. In fact, defense hawks and spendthrifts alike would criticize it if it did not. “If you believe that these folks are legitimate terrorists who are committing acts of aggressive, potential violent acts against the United States or our allies or our citizens overseas, should it matter how we choose to engage in the self-defense of the United States?” asked Rep. Mike Rogers, R-Mich., chairman of the House Intelligence Committee. “Do we have that debate when a special-forces team goes in? Do we have that debate if a tank round does it? Do we have the debate if an aircraft pilot drops a particular bomb?” But defense analysts argue—and military officials concede—there is a qualitative difference between dropping a team of men into Yemen and green-lighting a Predator flight from Nevada. Drones lower the threshold for military action. That’s why, according to the Council on Foreign Relations, unmanned aircraft have conducted 95 percent of all U.S. targeted killings. Almost certainly, if drones were unavailable, the United States would not have pursued an equivalent number of manned strikes in Pakistan. And what’s true for the United States will be true as well for other countries that own and arm remote piloted aircraft. “The drones—the responsiveness, the persistence, and without putting your personnel at risk—is what makes it a different technology,” Zenko said. “When other states have this technology, if they follow U.S. practice, it will lower the threshold for their uses of lethal force outside their borders. So they will be more likely to conduct targeted killings than they have in the past.” The Obama administration appears to be aware of and concerned about setting precedents through its targeted-strike program. When the development of a disposition matrix to catalog both targets and resources marshaled against the United States was first reported in 2012, officials spoke about it in part as an effort to create a standardized process that would live beyond the current administration, underscoring the long duration of the counterterrorism challenge. Indeed, the president’s legal and security advisers have put considerable effort into establishing rules to govern the program. Most members of the House and Senate Intelligence committees say they are confident the defense and intelligence communities have set an adequate evidentiary bar for determining when a member of al-Qaida or an affiliated group may be added to the target list, for example, and say that the rigor of the process gives them comfort in the level of program oversight within the executive branch. “They’re not drawing names out of a hat here,” Rogers said. “It is very specific intel-gathering and other things that would lead somebody to be subject for an engagement by the United States government.”

#### Asian war goes nuclear - no defense - interdependence and institutions don’t check.

Mohan 13 (distinguished fellow at the Observer Research Foundation in New Delhi, C. Raja, March 2013, Emerging Geopolitical Trends and Security in the Association of Southeast Asian Nations, the People’s Republic of China, and India (ACI) Region,” background paper for the Asian Development Bank Institute study on the Role of Key Emerging Economies, <http://www.iadb.org/intal/intalcdi/PE/2013/10737.pdf>]

Three broad types of conventional conflict confront Asia. The first is the prospect of war between great powers. Until a rising PRC grabbed the attention of the region, there had been little fear of great power rivalry in the region. The fact that all major powers interested in Asia are armed with nuclear weapons, and the fact that there is growing economic interdependence between them, has led many to argue that great power conflict is not likely to occur. Economic interdependence, as historians might say by citing the experience of the First World War, is not a guarantee for peace in Asia. Europe saw great power conflict despite growing interdependence in the first half of the 20th century. Nuclear weapons are surely a larger inhibitor of great power wars. Yet we have seen military tensions build up between the PRC and the US in the waters of the Western Pacific in recent years. The contradiction between the PRC’s efforts to limit and constrain the presence of other powers in its maritime periphery and the US commitment to maintain a presence in the Western Pacific is real and can only deepen over time.29 We also know from the Cold War that while nuclear weapons did help to reduce the impulses for a conventional war between great powers, they did not prevent geopolitical competition. Great power rivalry expressed itself in two other forms of conflict during the Cold War: inter-state wars and intra-state conflict. If the outcomes in these conflicts are seen as threatening to one or other great power, they are likely to influence the outcome. This can be done either through support for one of the parties in the inter-state conflicts or civil wars. When a great power decides to become directly involved in a conflict the stakes are often very high. In the coming years, it is possible to envisage conflicts of all these types in the ACI region. ¶ Asia has barely begun the work of creating an institutional framework to resolve regional security challenges. Asia has traditionally been averse to involving the United Nations (UN) in regional security arrangements. Major powers like the PRC and India are not interested in “internationalizing” their security problems—whether Tibet; Taipei,China; the South China Sea; or Kashmir—and give other powers a handle. Even lesser powers have had a tradition of rejecting UN interference in their conflicts. North Korea, for example, prefers dealing with the United States directly rather than resolve its nuclear issues through the International Atomic Energy Agency and the UN. Since its founding, the involvement of the UN in regional security problems has been rare and occasional.¶ The burden of securing Asia, then, falls squarely on the region itself. There are three broad ways in which a security system in Asia might evolve: collective security, a concert of major powers, and a balance of power system.30 Collective security involves a system where all stand for one and each stands for all, in the event of an aggression. While collective security systems are the best in a normative sense, achieving them in the real world has always been difficult. A more achievable goal is “cooperative security” that seeks to develop mechanisms for reducing mutual suspicion, building confidence, promoting transparency, and mitigating if not resolving the sources of conflict. The ARF and EAS were largely conceived within this framework, but the former has disappointed while the latter has yet to demonstrate its full potential. ¶ A second, quite different, approach emphasizes the importance of power, especially military power, to deter one’s adversaries and the building of countervailing coalitions against a threatening state. A balance of power system, as many critics of the idea point out, promotes arms races, is inherently unstable, and breaks down frequently leading to systemic wars. There is growing concern in Asia that amidst the rise of Chinese military power and the perception of American decline, many large and small states are stepping up their expenditure on acquiring advanced weapons systems. Some analysts see this as a structural condition of the new Asia that must be addressed through deliberate diplomatic action. 31 A third approach involves cooperation among the great powers to act in concert to enforce a broad set of norms—falling in between the idealistic notions of collective security and the atavistic forms of balance of power. However, acting in concert involves a minimum level of understanding between the major powers. The greatest example of a concert is the one formed by major European powers in the early 18th century through the Congress of Vienna after the defeat of Napoleonic France. The problem of adapting such a system to Asia is the fact that there are many medium-sized powers who would resent any attempt by a few great powers to impose order in the region.32 In the end, the system that emerges in Asia is likely to have elements of all the three models. In the interim, though, there are substantive disputes on the geographic scope and the normative basis for a future security order in Asia.

#### Judicial oversight results in eventual civilian trials

McCarthy and Velshi 9 [Andrew (Director of the Center for Law & Counterterrorism at the Foundation for the Defense of Democracies. From 1985 through 2003, he was a federal prosecutor at the U.S. Attorney’s Office for the Southern District of New York, and was the lead prosecutor in the seditious conspiracy trial against Sheikh Omar Abdel Rahman and eleven others, described subsequently) and Alykhan (a staff attorney at the Center for Law & Counterterrorism, where he focuses on the international law of armed conflict and the use of force), “Outsourcing American Law,” AEI Working Paper, <http://www.aei.org/files/2009/08/20/20090820-Chapter6.pdf>]

2. While alien enemy combatants, who are neither U.S. citizens nor lawful aliens, have no rights under the U.S. constitution, judicial oversight of their cases without thoughtful consideration of the standards and procedures under which those cases should proceed, is a prescription for turning those cases into full-blown criminal trials. Even the Rasul decision recognized the inarguable point that persons who are neither citizens nor aliens lawfully resident in the United States do not enjoy the protections of our Constitution, including its habeas corpus provision. The majority argued that the alien combatants’ right of access to U.S. courts for the purpose of challenging their detention under habeas corpus was statutory (i.e., derived from the federal habeas statute, 28 U.S.C., 2241 et seq.).26¶ This distinction, though seemingly salient, proved in the event to be of little moment. Regardless of their lack of constitutional entitlements, experience shows that once alien combatants are permitted access to our courts, judges, under the rubric of due process, will effectively treat them as if they are every bit as vested as citizens with substantive and procedural protections – even in wartime and regardless of the what this portends for national security. Only firm instructions to the contrary could have bucked this inevitability. The Supreme Court’s decision in Rasul failed to provide any guidance to lower courts, and the guidance provided in this regard by Congress since late 2005 has been insufficient.¶ Some explanation is in order here. In the other 2004 Supreme Court case noted above, Hamdi v. Rumsfeld, at issue was the very different scenario of the rights of American citizens captured and detained in the course of fighting against the U.S. in wartime. The Justice Department did not dispute that such citizen combatants had a constitutional right to file habeas claims. To the contrary, at issue were the questions whether they could compel a judicial review of the executive’s decision to detain, and how searching that review should be. The case is instructive for present purposes because the court, in holding that judicial review was available, also indicated that the habeas proceedings in connection with U.S. citizens would be very deferential to the executive branch, to the point of indicating that a military determination would be accepted by the court as long as the citizen combatant had received adequate notice and a meaningful opportunity in the military proceeding to contest his detention.27¶ Of course, the entitlement of alien enemy combatants – assuming they have any rights (other than the right not to be tortured, which is provided by both U.S. and international law28) – should be dramatically less substantial than the very limited rights the Supreme Court accorded to American citizens in Hamdi. Predictably, however, that is not what developed in the district courts when they considered alien combatants detained at Guantanamo Bay on the basis of a decision, Rasul, which opened the courthouse doors but gave district judges no substantive or procedural guidance. Until Congress finally stepped in and put a stop to the experiment, the trajectory was toward an array of judicially fashioned rights approximating not merely those of citizens but, indeed, those accorded to American criminal defendants.

#### Criminal prosecutions result in more terrorism – signal weakness.

McCarthy and Velshi 9 [Andrew (Director of the Center for Law & Counterterrorism at the Foundation for the Defense of Democracies) and Alykhan (staff attorney at the Center for Law & Counterterrorism, where he focuses on the international law of armed conflict and the use of force), “We Need a National Security Court”, Submission for AEI, 2009, RSR]

The ¶ treatment of a national security problem as a criminal justice issue has consequences that ¶ imperil Americans. To begin with, there are the obvious numerical and motivational ¶ results. As noted above, the justice system is simply incapable, given its finite resources, ¶ of meaningfully countering the threat posed by international terrorism. Of equal salience, ¶ prosecution in the justice system actually increases the threat because of what it conveys ¶ to our enemies. Nothing galvanizes an opposition, nothing spurs its recruiting, like the ¶ combination of successful attacks and a conceit that the adversary will react weakly. ¶ (Hence, bin Laden’s well-known allusion to people’s instinctive attraction to the “strong ¶ horse” rather than the “weak horse,” and his frequent citation to the U.S. military pullout from Lebanon after Hezbollah’s 1983 attack on the marine barracks, and from Somalia ¶ after the 1993 “Black Hawk Down” incident). For militants willing to immolate ¶ themselves in suicide-bombing and hijacking operations, mere prosecution is a ¶ provocatively weak response. Put succinctly, where they are the sole or principal ¶ response to terrorism, trials in the criminal justice system inevitably cause more ¶ terrorism: they leave too many militants in place and they encourage the notion that the ¶ nation may be attacked with relative impunity.

#### High risk of nuclear terror - an attack results in extinction.

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

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

#### Delays and security issues with civilian courts kill perception of due process.

Guiora 9 (AmosProfessor of Law at the S.J. Quinney College of Law, University of Utah, served in the Judge Advocate General's Corps of the Israel Defense Forces where he held senior command positions related to the legal and policy aspects of operational counterterrorism, “Creating a Domestic Terror Court”, PDF]

As mentioned above, this article assumes that both traditional Article III courts and international treaty-based courts are inadequate to try suspected terrorists. With respect to Article III courts, the reasons are primarily two-fold. First, constituting jury trials for thousands of detainees who have been held in detention for years awaiting trial would take an additional, substantial period of time, unnecessarily prolonging the pre-trial detention period (not to mention, all the inherent problems- if not impossibilities-of convening a "jury of your peers" for detainee trials). Second, terrorism trials necessarily involve unique and confidential intelligence information in a manner qualitatively different from that envisioned in the Classified Information Protection Act,9 and how such information is used as evidence in trial clearly affects national security concerns.10¶ To that end, as subsequently explained, the introduction of classified information -necessary to prosecuting terrorists-will be most effectively facilitated by a DTC. Although advocates of Article III courts suggest the success of previous trials proves their claims regarding the efficacy of their approach, I suggest the mere handful of cases tried (including the highly problematic Moussaoui trial) does not strengthen the argument in the least.1 Perhaps the opposite; for by highlighting the success of trials before juries in an extraordinarily limited number of cases, the proponents suggest-inadvertently-that the logistical nightmare of the sheer number of potential trials is something they have not fully internalized.¶ This was abundantly clear to me when I testified before the Senate Judiciary Committee,'12 where the proponents of Article III courts repeatedly emphasized how well the process had worked in one particular case. My response was: We are talking about thousands of trials, not one. Jury trials and traditional processes are not going to provide defendants with speedy trials, but in fact, quite the opposite. Bench trials- with judges trained in understanding and analyzing intelligence information- will much more effectively guarantee terrorism suspects their rights. That is, the traditional Article III courts will be less effective in preserving the rights and protections of thousands of detainees than the proposed DTC. I predicate this assumption on a "numbers analysis": not establishing an alternative judicial paradigm will all but ensure the continued denial of the right to trial to thousands of detainees.¶ A recent report published by Human Rights First defends traditional Article III courts' abilities to try individuals suspected of terrorism. 13 The authors demonstrate confidence in the courts' abilities to maintain a balance between upholding defendants' rights while simultaneously keeping confidential information secure.'4 Nevertheless, the report recognizes the limitations inherent in trying terrorist suspects in traditional courts as illustrated by the discussion concerning Zacarias Moussaoui's trial. 15¶ Moussaoui was brought to trial in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia after he was suspected of training with al Qaeda in preparation for the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001.16 Although Moussaoui eventually pled guilty and admitted that he intended to fly a fifth plane into the White House, the trial itself reached a standstill when Moussaoui refused to proceed unless given access to "notorious terrorism figures who were in government custody.' 17 Because of its constitutional obligations to criminal defendants, the court was faced with an irreconcilable choice: either allow national security to be compromised or violate Moussaoui's guaranteed constitutional rights. Despite the fact that the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit determined that "carefully crafted summaries of interviews"' 8 would satisfy constitutional requirements, the fact that the terrorist suspects in federal custody are even allowed to give deposition testimony could alone compromise security. 19¶ Regardless of the attempted solution, because of the special nature of prosecuting terrorist suspects, traditional Article III courts will always either compromise at least some national security or violate defendants' constitutional rights. My proposed DTC bridges the gap in that it allows the introduction of classified intelligence in conjunction with traditional criminal law evidence. This, then, meets Confrontation Clause requirements. The intelligence information can only be used to bolster the available evidence for conviction purposes but cannot under any circumstances-be the sole basis of conviction.

#### Plan solves –

#### First, creating an appropriate framework limits judicial creativity

McCarthy and Velshi 9 [Andrew (Director of the Center for Law & Counterterrorism at the Foundation for the Defense of Democracies) and Alykhan (staff attorney at the Center for Law & Counterterrorism, where he focuses on the international law of armed conflict and the use of force), “We Need a National Security Court”, Submission for AEI, 2009, RSR]

What is an asset in the criminal justice system, however, would be a liability in a system whose priority is not justice for the individual but the security of the American people. That liability, though, can be satisfactorily rectified by clear procedural rules which underscore that the overriding mission – into which the judicial function is being imported for very limited purposes – remains executive and military. The default position of the criminal justice system would not carry over to a system conceived for enemies of the United States – i.e., terrorist operatives who would not be facing NSC trials in the first place absent a finding, tested by judicial review, that they were alien enemy combatants. ¶ In such a system, the opportunities for judicial creativity would be limited by being plainspoken and unapologetic in enabling legislation about the fact that the defendants are not Americans but those who mean America harm; that the task of federal judges is not to ensure that defendants are considered as equals to our government before the bar of justice, but merely to ensure that they are not capriciously convicted of war crimes by the same branch of government that is prosecuting the war; that if credible and convincing evidence supports the allegations, the system’s preference is that defendants be convicted and harshly sentenced; and that the authority of judges is enumerated and finite – if the rules as promulgated do not expressly provide for the defendant to have particular relief, the judge is powerless to direct it. In short, the system would curb judicial excess by the recognition, which underlies the military justice system, that prosecuting war remains a quintessentially executive endeavor; in the NSC, judges would be a check against arbitrariness but they would not have any general supervisory authority over the conduct of proceedings and they would not be at liberty to create new entitlements by analogizing to ordinary criminal proceedings.

#### Second, plan accommodates concerns from all sides preventing forum shopping.

Sulmasy and Logman 9 [Glenn (professor of law at the U.S. Coast Guard Academy) and Andrea (assistant professor of law at the U.S. Coast Guard Academy), “A HYBRID COURT FOR A HYBRID WAR”, Case Western Reserve Journal of International Law, Vol. 42, RSR]

Prior to the anticipated closure of the Guantánamo Bay Detention ¶ Facility on January 22, 2010 many questions remain. To date, no decision ¶ has been made regarding the transfer of the detainees. In August 2009 it was ¶ reported that the Obama Administration is reviewing a proposal that would bring the detainees to U.S. soil.46 The reported proposal would transfer ¶ Guantánamo detainees to a U.S. federal prison facility, would allow for ¶ prosecution of detainees in either federal criminal courts or under military ¶ commissions, would co-locate a court facility with the prison facility, and ¶ would allow for preventive detention of detainees considered a threat to ¶ U.S. security interests.47 The potential transfer of detainees to U.S. facilities ¶ is raising public concern and many in Congress have publicly resisted this ¶ notion.48¶ This potential forum shopping is also problematic, sets a dangerous ¶ precedent, and will likely lead, if implemented, to numerous defense challenges. It is, however, a recognition of the hybrid nature of this war with alQaeda. There must be a dedicated process and forum for addressing the ¶ detention and adjudication of the detainees. Congress has made it clear that ¶ it will not approve the requested funding for transfer of prisoners from ¶ Guantánamo until there is a definite plan in place. ¶ The NSCS is fundamentally a balance and a reasonable accommodation of many competing legal and policy interests. It is structured upon ¶ the foundations of the U.S. understanding of the rule of law. The NSCS ¶ exceeds the standards of most requirements of international law and embraces human rights by ensuring that the dignity of each alleged detainee is ¶ maintained. It is an outgrowth—or an evolution—of the military commissions. It provides the answer for policy makers to get us out of the quicksand we find ourselves in regarding detainees. We have been attempting to ¶ force the civilian justice model or the military justice model onto a new ¶ entity—the al-Qaeda fighter. Neither will work. The proposed system provides a delicate balance between the competing interests of U.S. national ¶ security and our human rights obligations to the detainees. The NSCS provides an adjudicatory system of justice that will answer the needs of policy ¶ makers for years to come. We simply cannot remain mired in the ways of ¶ the past or the ideals of our generation, but rather must step forward with ¶ pragmatic idealism as our guide and promote the rule of law while bringing ¶ unlawful combatants to justice.

### Solvency

#### Contention 3 is solvency

#### The court preserves national security while sending an international signal

Sulmasy 6 (Commander and associate professor of law at the U.S. Coast Guard Academy,

[Glenn, “THE LEGAL LANDSCAPE AFTER HAMDAN:¶ THE CREATION OF HOMELAND SECURITY¶ COURTS”, NEW ENG. J.INT'L & COMP.L., Vol. 13, RSR]

Article I judges with law of armed conflict expertise would proceed¶ over the trials. Theses judges will be appointed by the President and¶ possess the educational background necessary to determine the lawfulness¶ of intelligence gathering, terrorist surveillance, and other necessary areas in¶ the field of terrorism and homeland security. Several scholars, advocating¶ against judicial intervention in the war, correctly note that those who are¶ making such decisions now are not necessarily versed in this unique area of¶ the law.43 Whether you agree or disagree, the nature of this war seems to¶ necessitate judicial intervention more than has been custom or standard in¶ previous U.S. military wars and operations. As it stands now, the system¶ allows for judges who have no background in warfare or national security¶ to intervene, hear, and decide cases with little or no understanding of the¶ issues because they are beyond the scope of their expertise.4 The threat¶ we face demands these procedures as a minimum requirement.¶ Prosecutors, assigned by the Department of Justice (hereinafter¶ referred to as "DOJ") would represent the government and exercise¶ prosecutorial discretion on whether or not to proceed in cases. Oversight¶ would be conducted by the Chief, Criminal Division of DOJ. 45 The powers¶ of these prosecutors, as in other nations, would be great, but they would¶ still operate under the ethical rules standard for all U.S. government¶ attorneys.¶ Judge advocates (military lawyers) would serve as government¶ provided defense counsel. This group would be similar to what has been¶ provided for the detainees in the military commissions. The judge¶ advocates would be made available by the Department of Homeland Security46 and the Department of Defense. Initially, a pool of ten judge¶ advocates would serve on defense teams. If desired, the accused may¶ employ, at his expense, civilian counsel as long as they have requisite¶ classified document clearance(s). This would ensure alleged international¶ terrorists with a defense capable of handling their cases. Further, this¶ would help satisfy some international concern about lack of representation.¶ As a result of the sensitive nature of intelligence gathering and¶ methods employed as well as ensuring such hearings do not become¶ propaganda tools for the enemy,47 the trials would be closed to the public.¶ Reasons for closed trials include disallowing access to the media, an action¶ that was not taken in the trials of the perpetrators of the World Trade¶ Center bombings in 1993 and the recent Moussaoui case.48 However,¶ representatives from several appointed NGO's and the United Nations¶ would be permitted to attend as "observers" to ensure fairness of the trial¶ and to witness the procedural protections expected of a nation dedicated to¶ upholding the rule of law.¶ The trials would be held on military bases located within the¶ continental United States. This would keep the detainees held in a location¶ that is secure, like GITMO, but with less controversy. This would, in part,¶ also remove some of the international concerns about the detention centers¶ located in GITMO. Under this proposal, our own armed forces, alleged¶ and convicted criminals, are held at the same location as the terrorist. Fort¶ Leavenworth in Kansas, or even Fort Belvoir in Washington D.C., would¶ be appropriate locations to detain, try, and imprison persons accused of¶ engaging in international terror. Since Eisentrager has been essentially¶ overruled by recent cases, 49 the extraterritoriality needs are no longer¶ applicable and, in essence, are moot.50¶ As noted previously, military brigs are the most appropriate place to detain accused terrorists because it is both a secure place and it affords the¶ same protection against abuse given to those in the U.S. service members¶ who are tried, convicted, and sentenced under the UCMJ by courts-martial.¶ Having the detainees alongside members of the U.S. military would go a¶ long way toward reducing international concerns of torture and unfair¶ tribunals. In addition, it seems as though keeping the detainees within our¶ nation would provide an additional appearance of process and certainly¶ remove the taint of being held in the base at GITMO. Remaining¶ consistent with the theme of the homeland security courts being a hybrid,¶ any appeals would go through the Courts of Appeals of the Armed Forces¶ (CAAF)." This limited right of appeal would ensure the cases were heard¶ by an outside panel of judges versed in military law, the laws of war, and¶ have some background in the procedural nuances of national security law.¶ Appellate counsel would be provided by Air Force, Coast Guard, Navy-¶ Marine Corps, and the Army.¶ Under this system, the death penalty would still be an authorized¶ punishment. This penalty would only be authorized in those cases deemed¶ egregious enough and ones that severely impact the homeland security of¶ the United States. Certain aggravating factors would have to be developed¶ and codified to distinguish between what cases are appropriate for a life¶ sentence or those better suited as capital cases. Recognizing that this¶ would still cause concern among our European and other international¶ colleagues, this proposal certainly requires further elaboration prior to¶ implementation.

#### Congressional action is the only way to make the executive accountable – empirically proven, the court will back them up and preserves executive flexibility.

Harvard Law Review 12 [“RECENT LEGISLATION”, Vol. 125, 2012, RSR]

Just as the Commander-in-Chief power is not preclusive with respect to detainee transfers in general (sections 1026 through 1028), the ¶ President’s foreign affairs powers are also not preclusive with respect ¶ to transfers to foreign countries (section 1028). The Court has long ¶ recognized that the President’s foreign affairs powers go beyond those ¶ explicitly granted in the Constitution and that the President has a ¶ unique role as “the sole organ of the federal government in the field of ¶ international relations.”59 Yet the Court has not held that the President enjoys preclusive power over the whole foreign affairs arena;60¶ nor has it ever invalidated an act of Congress as infringing upon the ¶ President’s foreign affairs power.61 Even strong foreign affairs ¶ presidentialists concede that Congress retains those powers granted by ¶ the constitutional text.62 Congress’s constitutionally granted foreign affairs powers include not only those facially related to foreign affairs — ¶ such as ratifying treaties, confirming ambassadors, and regulating foreign commerce63 — but also those that clearly affect foreign relations, ¶ such as declaring and regulating war.64 History and custom also support ¶ the constitutionality of congressional restrictions on detainee transfers to ¶ foreign states.65 Congress has long helped shape immigration and deportation policies,66 and — most relevant for the detainee-transfer con- text — has regulated extradition, both by treaty and by legislation.67¶ As the Court has recognized, extradition is “not confided to the Executive in the absence of treaty or legislative provision.”68¶ Despite Congress’s constitutional authority to regulate detainee ¶ transfers, President Obama’s policy criticisms of the specific restrictions in the NDAA were valid. The statute eliminates the flexibility to try Guantánamo detainees in civilian courts (a practice used to ¶ great effect by the Bush administration with other terrorism suspects69), makes it impossible to close Guantánamo Bay,70 and abandons many of the detainees whom the administration no longer views ¶ as dangerous but is barred by statute from transferring.71¶ Nevertheless, Congress’s general involvement in detention policy ¶ may be positive for its own sake, even if it missteps in individual cases. ¶ Congress not only legitimates and helps make accountable executive ¶ branch actions,72 but it is also the only branch capable of fashioning a ¶ comprehensive legal regime for military detention of terrorist suspects.73 In addition, institutional constraints such as the bicameralism ¶ requirement and the presidential veto74 limit the potential damage of ¶ congressional meddling in tactical wartime decisions.75 Although the ¶ President is right to work with Congress to repeal the problematic ¶ NDAA provisions,76 he should respect its role in this policy arena and ¶ neither ignore the restrictions nor interpret them out of existence in the ¶ name of avoiding constitutional difficulties.77 Just because a congressional policy choice is wrong does not make it unconstitutional.

## 2AC

### Executive Restraint CP

#### Permutation do both.

#### Court Creation DA – The executive cannot create a national security court, only Congress is vested with this power.

Schuck, Lecturer at Yale Law School, ‘4

[Peter, “Terrorism Cases Demand New Hybrid Courts”, LA Times, 7-9-2004,

<http://articles.latimes.com/2004/jul/09/opinion/oe-schuck9>, RSR]

The Supreme Court in its recent rulings has given U.S. citizens who are captives in the war on terror, as well as noncitizen Guantanamo detainees, the right to hearings. Now comes the hard part: what kinds of hearings, in what courts, by what process?¶ The court wisely refrained from answering these questions in detail. Arguments on the specifics had not been presented to the court, and the limited guidance that the justices did offer was more intuitive than analytical. Wisdom aside, this sort of self-restraint is constitutionally required: Article 1, Section 8, Clause 14 gives Congress -- not the judicial or the executive branch -- the authority to make rules for the armed forces, including the initial design of hearings for the prisoners.

#### Rollback DA - Future presidents prevent solvency

Harvard Law Review 12,

["Developments in the Law: Presidential Authority," Vol. 125:2057, www.harvardlawreview.org/media/pdf/vol125\_devo.pdf]

The recent history of signing statements demonstrates how public opinion can effectively check presidential expansions of power by inducing executive self-binding. **It remains to be seen**, however, **if this more restrained view of signing statements can remain intact, for it relies on the promises of one branch — indeed of one person — to enforce and maintain the separation of powers**. To be sure, President **Obama’s guidelines for the use of signing statements contain all the hallmarks of good executive branch policy: transparency, accountability, and fidelity to constitutional limitations.** Yet, in practice**, this apparent constraint (**however well intentioned**) may amount to** little more than voluntary self-restraint. 146 Without a formal institutional check, it is unclear what mechanism will prevent the next President (or President Obama himself) from reverting to the allegedly abusive Bush-era practices. 147 Only time, and perhaps public opinion, will tell.

#### Status quo detention policy violates separation of powers – plan solves by reinstituting judicial review.

Chemerinsky, Alston & Bird Professor of Law, Duke University School of Law, ‘5

[Erwin, “Enemy Combatants and Separation of Powers”, Journal of National Security Law and Policy, Vol. 1, 2005, RSR]

From the perspective of these cases, the President’s action in detaining¶ individuals as enemy combatants violates the separation of powers because¶ it prevents the judiciary from carrying out its essential function of hearing the¶ claims of individuals who contend that they are being wrongly detained.¶ These claims go to the very heart of the judicial role as it was defined in¶ Marbury v. Madison more than 200 years ago.49 In Marbury, the Supreme¶ Court stressed that we are a nation of laws, and that no one, not even the¶ President, is above the law. Marbury unequivocally held that it is the power¶ and duty of the federal judiciary to provide a remedy, even against the¶ Executive, when rights of individuals are violated. Chief Justice John¶ Marshall emphatically declared that “[t]he very essence of civil liberty¶ certainly consists in the right of every individual to claim the protection of the¶ laws, whenever he receives an injury.”50¶ Put another way, the system of checks and balances in the Constitution¶ requires that two branches of government concur for almost every major form¶ of government action. Enacting a law generally requires both legislative and¶ executive action. Putting a person in prison requires executive prosecution¶ and judicial conviction. The fundamental flaw in the Bush administration’s¶ claim of unreviewable authority to detain enemy combatants is that it¶ obliterates any notion of checks and balances.

### China Politics DA

#### Chinese power struggles inevitable – saps political capital and factionalizes the party

DW 9-4 (China corruption probes reflect power struggle, DW, 4 September 2013, http://www.dw.de/china-corruption-probes-reflect-power-struggle/a-17065484, da 9-15-13) PC

Beijing recently dismissed the head of a commission that oversees the country's major state-owned companies. Jiang Jiemin was removed as chief of the State-owned Assets Supervision and Administration Commission of the State Council because of "suspected serious disciplinary violations," state news agency Xinhua reported on Tuesday, September 3rd.¶ In a statement the commission expressed the support of its members for the dismissal, saying the decision represents "the fundamental requirements of the party to be strict with its members and demonstrates the party's steadfast determination to fight corruption."¶ Jiang is a former chairman of China National Petroleum Corp (CNPC) and its subsidiary PetroChina, Asia's top oil and gas producer and one of the world's most valuable listed energy companies. But he is also a member of the party's Central Committee, which is made up of its top 200 members, making Jiang the most senior official to fall since President Xi Jinping took over power last November.¶ A series of investigations¶ Xi has made the fight against corruption a priority of his new administration, in a bid to "clean up" the ranks of the 80-million-member Communist Party of China (CPC) amid growing public consternation over inequality and corruption.¶ Analysts argue the investigation, which involves four other top executives, is an attempt by Xi and Premier Li Keqiang (main photo, right) to assert their authority over powerful state-owned companies. "It's long been known that state-owned enterprises are a key part of the ecosystem of corruption. They have vast political influence, and their ostensible aim, unlike most other state organs, is to maximize profits," said China expert Rebecca Liao, adding that this combination enables China's state-owned enterprises to "pass off corruption as legitimate."¶ The Chinese newspaper 21st Century Business Herald cited unidentified "insiders" on Tuesday, September 3rd, as saying Jiang had been close to the former party secretary of the city of Chongqing, Bo Xilai, whose downfall was connected to a scandal surrounding the death of British businessman Neil Heywood in November 2011. The trial of the leftist politician ended in August, with the verdict being expected in the coming days.¶ Bo, Jiang and Zhou¶ But it seems that Jiang isn't the only high-ranking CPC member under investigation linked to both Bo and the oil industry. According to the Hong Kong-based newspaper South China Morning Post, China's top leaders have also endorsed a corruption probe into former security Chief Zhou Yongkang (main photo, left), who was once one of the country's most powerful politicians.¶ Zhou rose through party ranks, eventually becoming a member of the Politburo Standing Committee (PBSC), the top body of the CPC. He spent the early part of his career in the state-run oil sector, working for China National Petroleum Corp., the country's biggest oil and Gas Company. As a PBSC member, he was responsible for internal security and stability and wielded great influence over the country's police and security forces.¶ "Zhou was also Bo's most vocal supporter, a role that pitted him against President Xi and much of the current and former Politburo Standing Committee," Liao told DW. Zhou was widely believed to be grooming Bo as his successor and supporting Bo's bid for a seat on the PBSC. According to a New York Times report, he was the only member of the Standing Committee who opposed a decision to oust Bo in March last year.¶ Liao, a China law expert based in California, pointed out that although no direct evidence had been presented to suggest a solid connection between Zhou and the case against Bo, the timing was indeed of "some coincidence," given the relationship between Zhou, Bo, the current leadership.¶ 'Bringing down political opponents'¶ China scholar Perry Link doesn't believe the campaigns against Bo, Jiang and potentially Zhou are truly aimed at fighting corruption: "For more than two decades there have been two reasons why top Chinese authorities launch "anti-corruption" drives, and in neither case is the goal to wipe out corruption," he told DW.¶ Ousted Chinese politician Bo Xilai speaks in court on the third day of his trial in Jinan, Shandong Province, in this still image taken from video shot on August 24, 2013. Bo Xilai accepted responsibility for 5 million yuan ($817,000) in funds he is accused of embezzling which ended up in his wife's bank account, saying he had let his attention wander, in testimony read out in court on Saturday. Bo, once a rising star in China's leadership, is facing charges of corruption, bribery and abuse of power. ¶ Bo xilai was tried on charges of bribery, abuse of power and corruption¶ The expert from the University of California, Riverside said that corruption charges are used, on the one hand, as a "public cover for bringing down political opponents." On the other hand, he added, they are aimed at "making a show, to an increasingly Internet-savvy public, that 'we top leaders share your indignation, and are on your side.'"¶ "To strike out against such big fish as Zhou Yongkang and Jiang Jiemin suggests that in this case reason one is more likely than reason two. It would be dangerous to go after such big targets simply for the purpose of making a show," Link explained.¶ Any move against Zhou could be unprecedented since no sitting or retired Standing Committer member has been jailed for economic crimes since the Communists swept to power in 1949. This would cross a line, according to Link, which would show that the "stakes may be high in the struggle" inside the top leadership.¶ 'No one is safe'¶ Some experts say that Bo's unexpected spirited defense at his trial late August ripped open the political divide within the Party that his arrest was supposed to have assuaged. "The attack on Bo has always been about political power, not "corruption," and it may be that Xi & Co. wants to bring down Zhou-Bo & Co." said Link.¶ Liao believes Xi cannot be an effective president as long as that factional struggle continues to be significant. His most important political moment to date is coming up in November at a meeting of the 18th Central Committee, where he will lay out his agenda.¶ China's newly elected President and chairman of the Central Military Commission Xi Jinping (L) talks with China's Vice Premier Li Keqiang during the fourth plenary meeting of the first session of the 12th National People's Congress (NPC) in Beijing, March 14, 2013. (Photo: REUTERS/China Daily) It is said that under Xi Jinping 'tigers and flies' will be subject to the rule of law'¶ "He must consolidate political power by then, and investigating Zhou goes a long way towards establishing his authority," she said.¶ She also stated that the CPC was sending out a message to its members that no one is safe: "The catchphrase has been that 'tigers and flies' will be subject to the rule of law."¶ While the leadership may eventually succeed in convincing cadres that rank is not a protector, they will have a much more difficult job making the case that political allies are also no guarantee. "Without outside controls on the party, self-enforcement turns into a struggle between political factions," said Liao.

#### Economic reform won’t happen – CCP acts too slowly.

Marshall, Contributor, 9-18

[John, “Can the Chinese Communist Party Still Reform?”, 9-18-13, The Diplomat,

<http://thediplomat.com/2013/09/18/can-the-chinese-communist-party-still-reform/>, RSR]

There can be no doubt in the period of reform and opening up the Party machine has forged a formidable track record of successful and far-reaching reform. In more recent years, however, there has been a strong sense that it has failed to live up to earlier achievements. Many commentators now refer to the last ten years as a lost decade and point to a lack of significant reform as the root cause of a series of worsening problems.¶ One explanation for this lack of effectiveness is what some have termed the “stability trap.” Put simply, it is argued that the Party's preoccupation with maintaining stability and its grip on power above all else has made it excessively cautious, unable to take the bold decisions of its predecessors for fear of upsetting the status quo.¶ Allied to the increasing bureaucratization and factionalism, resulting in often painfully long negotiations to form consensus before action can be taken, the Party has lost its capability to react decisively to the new demands placed on it by China's rapidly changing circumstances. As a result China actually faces the risk of much greater instability as unresolved problems exacerbate social tensions.

### Multi-Plank CP

#### Perm do both

#### Status quo habeas corpus hearings gut national security. Plan solves.

Sulmasy, Commander and associate professor of law at the U.S. Coast Guard Academy, ‘9

[Glenn, The National Security Court System: A Natural Evolution of Justice in an Age of Terror, Oxford University Press, 2009, RSR]

Boumediene placed civilian judges with oversight of military detention. Within the civilian law context, this is reasonable. However, during armed conflict such a decision can have major impacts on the security of the United States. 83 It seems to me the Court was legitimately concerned about the process at Guantanamo and, as Justice Souter noted in his thoughtful and impassioned concurrence, the length of time the detainees have been in custody without charges. 84 However, it may have overreacted to these perceived injustices. The Supreme Court has now formally given greater due process rights to the detainees than would be afforded to prisoners of war under the Geneva Conventions. 85 This is simply not the best means to ensure the legality of the detainees’ detention. The National Security Court System will ameliorate these suggested weaknesses contained within the Supreme Court’s holding. The NSCS ensures a habeas corpus hearing is held before a civilian Article III federal judge but without necessarily granting constitutional rights to noncitizens captured outside the United States. The system, once again, captures the middle ground. The National Security Judge, an impartial and detached magistrate (not in the trial rotation), would conduct the habeas hearings with military JAGs representing the government as well as the detainees. The strength of this process is that it includes the military’s input and can be seen as overt recognition that this is a war requiring military expertise while still retaining civilian oversight of the process. This will respond, to some degree, to the recent concerns about habeas corpus rights for detainees while still remaining faithful to the Supreme Court’s ruling in Boumediene. The three-judge panels in the trials will use the “beyond a reasonable doubt” standard and require a two-thirds majority of the judges to convict any alleged detainee. Unanimity of the three judges will be required only for capital cases. The evidentiary standards will also be diminished from standard, civilian prosecutions - or military courts- martial for that matter. The NSCS offers the detainee great process and protections but necessarily a decreased expectation of the process ordinarily afforded U.S. citizens. No detainee should, by virtue of his or her status, have traditional U.S. constitutional rights attach. Specifically, the Fourth and Fifth Amendment rights so precious within our judicial system must necessarily be reduced in significance or removed altogether in the NSCS. To do otherwise would be to ensure acquittals in virtually all cases against the detainees.

#### US detention policy has justified democratic backsliding globally – plan reverses that.

CJA, ‘4

[The Center for Justice and Accountability, Amici Curiae in support of petitioners in Al Odah et al. v USA, "Brief of the Center for Justice and Accountability, the International League for Human Rights, and Individual Advocates for the Independence of the Judiciary in Emerging Democracies," 3-10]

While much of the world is moving to adopt the institutions necessary to secure individual rights, many still regularly abuse these rights. One of the hallmarks of tyranny is the lack of a strong and independent judiciary. Not surprisingly, where countries make the sad transition to tyranny, one of the first victims is the judiciary. Many of the rulers that go down that road justify their actions on the basis of national security and the fight against terrorism, and, disturbingly, many claim to be modeling their actions on the United States. Again, a few examples illustrate this trend. In Peru, one of former President Alberto Fujimori’s first acts in seizing control was to assume direct executive control of the judiciary, claiming that it was justified by the threat of domestic terrorism. He then imprisoned thousands, refusing the right of the judiciary to intervene. International Commission of Jurists, Attacks on Justice 2000-Peru, August 13, 2001, available at ttp://www.icj.org/news.php3?id\_article=2587&lang=en (last visited Jan. 8, 2004). In Zimbabwe, President Mugabe’s rise to dictatorship has been punctuated by threats of violence to and the co-opting of the judiciary. He now enjoys virtually total control over Zimbabweans' individual rights and the entire political system. R.W. Johnson, Mugabe’s Agents in Plot to Kill Opposition Chief, Sunday Times (London), June 10, 2001; International Commission of Jurists, Attacks on Justice 2002— Zimbabwe, August 27, 2002, available at http://www.icj.org/news.php3?id\_article=2695〈=en (last visited Jan. 8, 2004). While Peru and Zimbabwe represent an extreme, the independence of the judiciary is under assault in less brazen ways in a variety of countries today. A highly troubling aspect of this trend is the fact that in many of these instances those perpetuating the assaults on the judiciary have pointed to the United States’ model to justify their actions. Indeed, many have specifically referenced the United States’ actions in detaining persons in Guantánamo Bay. For example, Rais Yatim, Malaysia's "de facto law minister" explicitly relied on the detentions at Guantánamo to justify Malaysia's detention of more than 70 suspected Islamic militants for over two years. Rais stated that Malyasia's detentions were "just like the process in Guantánamo," adding, "I put the equation with Guantánamo just to make it graphic to you that this is not simply a Malaysian style of doing things." Sean Yoong, "Malaysia Slams Criticism of Security Law Allowing Detention Without Trial," Associated Press, September 9, 2003 (available from Westlaw at 9/9/03 APWIRES 09 :34:00). Similarly, when responding to a United States Government human rights report that listed rights violations in Namibia, Namibia's Information Permanent Secretary Mocks Shivute cited the Guantánamo Bay detentions, claiming that "the US government was the worst human rights violator in the world." BBC Monitoring, March 8, 2002, available at 2002 WL 15938703. Nor is this disturbing trend limited to these specific examples. At a recent conference held at the Carter Center in Atlanta, President Carter, specifically citing the Guantánamo Bay detentions, noted that the erosion of civil liberties in the United States has "given a blank check to nations who are inclined to violate human rights already." Doug Gross, "Carter: U.S. human rights missteps embolden foreign dictators," Associated Press Newswires, November 12, 2003 (available from Westlaw at 11/12/03 APWIRES 00:30:26). At the same conference, Professor Saad Ibrahim of the American University in Cairo (who was jailed for seven years after exposing fraud in the Egyptian election process) said, "Every dictator in the world is using what the United States has done under the Patriot Act . . . to justify their past violations of human rights and to declare a license to continue to violate human rights." Id. Likewise, Shehu Sani, president of the Kaduna, Nigeriabased Civil Rights Congress, wrote in the International Herald Tribune on September 15, 2003 that "[t]he insistence by the Bush administration on keeping Taliban and Al Quaeda captives in indefinite detention in Guantánamo Bay, Cuba, instead of in jails in the United States — and the White House's preference for military tribunals over regular courts — helps create a free license for tyranny in Africa. It helps justify Egypt's move to detain human rights campaigners as threats to national security and does the same for similar measures by the governments of Ivory Coast, Cameroon and Burkina Faso." Available at http://www.iht.com/ihtsearch.php?id=109927&owner=(IHT)&dat e=20030121123259. In our uni-polar world, the United States obviously sets an important example on these issues. As reflected in the foundational documents of the United Nations and many other such agreements, the international community has consistently affirmed the value of an independent judiciary to the defense of universally recognized human rights. In the crucible of actual practice within nations, many have looked to the United States model when developing independent judiciaries with the ability to check executive power in the defense of individual rights. Yet others have justified abuses by reference to the conduct of the United States. Far more influential than the words of Montesquieu and Madison are the actions of the United States. This case starkly presents the question of which model this Court will set for the world.

#### Democratic backsliding causes great power war.

Gat, Ezer Weizman Professor of National Security at Tel Aviv University, ‘11

[Azar, 2011, “The Changing Character of War,” in The Changing Character of War, ed. Hew Strachan and Sibylle Scheipers, p. 30-32]

Since 1945, the decline of major great power war has deepened further. Nuclear weapons have concentrated the minds of all concerned wonderfully, but no less important have been the institutionalization of free trade and the closely related process of rapid and sustained economic growth throughout the capitalist world. The communist bloc did not participate in the system of free trade, but at least initially it too experienced substantial growth, and, unlike Germany and Japan, it was always sufﬁciently large and rich in natural resources to maintain an autarky of sorts. With the Soviet collapse and with the integration of the former communist powers into the global capitalist economy, the prospect of a major war within the developed world seems to have become very remote indeed. This is one of the main sources for the feeling that war has been transformed: its geopolitical centre of gravity has shifted radically. The modernized, economically developed parts of the world constitute a ‘zone of peace’. War now seems to be conﬁned to the less-developed parts of the globe, the world’s ‘zone of war’, where countries that have so far failed to embrace modernization and its pacifying spin-off effects continue to be engaged in wars among themselves, as well as with developed countries.¶ While the trend is very real, one wonders if the near disappearance of armed conﬂict within the developed world is likely to remain as stark as it has been since the collapse of communism. The post-Cold War moment may turn out to be a ﬂeeting one. The probability of major wars within the developed world remains low—because of the factors already mentioned: increasing wealth, economic openness and interdependence, and nuclear deterrence. But the deep sense of change prevailing since 1989 has been based on the far more radical notion that the triumph of capitalism also spelled the irresistible ultimate victory of democracy; and that in an afﬂuent and democratic world, major conﬂict no longer needs to be feared or seriously prepared for. This notion, however, is fast eroding with the return of capitalist non-democratic great powers that have been absent from the international system since 1945. Above all, there is the formerly communist and fast industrializing authoritarian-capitalist China, whose massive growth represents the greatest change in the global balance of power. Russia, too, is retreating from its postcommunist liberalism and assuming an increasingly authoritarian character.¶ Authoritarian capitalism may be more viable than people tend to assume. 8 The communist great powers failed even though they were potentially larger than the democracies, because their economic systems failed them. By contrast, the capitalist authoritarian/totalitarian powers during the ﬁrst half of the twentieth century, Germany and Japan, particularly the former, were as efﬁcient economically as, and if anything more successful militarily than, their democratic counterparts. They were defeated in war mainly because they were too small and ultimately succumbed to the exceptional continental size of the United States (in alliance with the communist Soviet Union during the Second World War). However, the new non-democratic powers are both large and capitalist. China in particular is the largest player in the international system in terms of population and is showing spectacular economic growth that within a generation or two is likely to make it a true non-democratic superpower.¶ Although the return of capitalist non-democratic great powers does not necessarily imply open conﬂict or war, it might indicate that the democratic hegemony since the Soviet Union’s collapse could be short-lived and that a universal ‘democratic peace’ may still be far off. The new capitalist authoritarian powers are deeply integrated into the world economy. They partake of the development-open-trade-capitalist cause of peace, but not of the liberal democratic cause. Thus, it is crucially important that any protectionist turn in the system is avoided so as to prevent a grab for markets and raw materials such as that which followed the disastrous slide into imperial protectionism and conﬂict during the ﬁrst part of the twentieth century. Of course, the openness of the world economy does not depend exclusively on the democracies. In time, China itself might become more protectionist, as it grows wealthier, its labour costs rise, and its current competitive edge diminishes.¶ With the possible exception of the sore Taiwan problem, China is likely to be less restless and revisionist than the territorially conﬁned Germany and Japan were. Russia, which is still reeling from having lost an empire, may be more problematic. However, as China grows in power, it is likely to become more assertive, ﬂex its muscles, and behave like a superpower, even if it does not become particularly aggressive. The democratic and non-democratic powers may coexist more or less peacefully, albeit warily, side by side, armed because of mutual fear and suspicion, as a result of the so-called ‘security dilemma’, and against worst-case scenarios. But there is also the prospect of more antagonistic relations, accentuated ideological rivalry, potential and actual conﬂict, intensiﬁed arms races, and even new cold wars, with spheres of inﬂuence and opposing coalitions. Although great power relations will probably vary from those that prevailed during any of the great twentieth-century conﬂicts, as conditions are never quite the same, they may vary less than seemed likely only a short while ago.

### Politics DA

#### Inevitable government shutdown thumps the DA.

Politico 9/30 (http://www.politico.com/story/2013/09/government-shutdown-john-boehner-pivotal-moment-97535\_Page2.html)

As of late Sunday, there were no negotiations occurring between Boehner, Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-Nev.) and Obama. The Senate wasn’t even in session, and House GOP leaders weren’t holding emergency discussions internally. Both sides seem prepared to let the government shutdown happen and then squabble over who is to blame. The House will reconvene Monday at 10 a.m., but Republicans will just wait. The Senate is scheduled to return Monday afternoon, and Reid says Senate Democrats will move quickly then to reject two House amendments to the government funding bill. That would leave just hours before a government shutdown.¶ Boehner, who also faces in coming weeks an even more daunting battle with Obama and Reid over raising the $16.7 trillion debt ceiling, may need a shutdown now in order to reassert control over his members and cool their passion for a winner-takes-all showdown with Democrats.¶ (WATCH: Cruz: GOP 'scared' over shutdown)¶ Following Saturday’s late-night vote on a three-month $986 billion government funding bill that would delay Obamacare for a year, Boehner tried to shift blame for the looming shutdown onto Reid and Senate Democrats. House Republicans also pushed through a bill funding U.S. troops in the event of a shutdown, adopted a repeal of a tax on medical devices and approved a conscience clause postponing a government mandate that employers cover the cost of birth control in their health insurance plans.¶ (Also on POLITICO: Government shutdown impact: Mail, air travel, prisons)¶ Reid has already rejected the House GOP changes to the government funding bill, demanding that Boehner send him a “clean” funding bill. Reid refused to call the Senate back into session on Sunday. Boehner then used Reid’s inaction to bash Senate Democrats.¶ “If the Senate stalls until Monday afternoon instead of working today, it would be an act of breathtaking arrogance by the Senate Democratic leadership,” Boehner said in a statement released on Sunday. “They will be deliberately bringing the nation to the brink of a government shutdown for the sake of raising taxes on seniors’ pacemakers and children’s hearing aids and plowing ahead with the train wreck that is the president’s health care law. The American people will not stand for it.”¶ But Reid — backed by Obama — has refused to yield an inch. Reid and the White House won’t defund Obamacare or delay its implementation. A top Senate Democratic aide compared Boehner’s complaint about Senate inaction to “a tree falling in the woods. No one is hearing it. The American people know where the blame lays for a shutdown.”¶ And Obama is also expected to hit House Republicans hard on Monday, as he did several times last week, showing that the president’s bully pulpit is more powerful than any press blitz by congressional leaders.

#### Boehner can’t unite the GOP on the debt ceiling

Alberta 9-26 (Tim Alberta, leadership reporter for the National Journal, Republicans Not Sold on Boehner's Debt-Ceiling Plan, National Journal, 26 September 2013, http://www.nationaljournal.com/congress/republicans-not-sold-on-boehner-s-debt-ceiling-plan-20130926, da 9-26-13) PC

Speaker John Boehner attempted Thursday morning to sell House Republicans on a debt-ceiling plan that would delay the implementation of Obamacare, jumpstart the Keystone Pipeline, and introduce other conservative reforms in hopes of uniting the GOP conference ahead of tough votes on the continuing resolution and debt-ceiling.¶ But reaction from members was mixed, at best.¶ "We shouldn't even be talking about the debt-ceiling until we get [the Senate] to vote on a good CR for America," fumed Rep. Louie Gohmert of Texas, who plans to vote against the debt-ceiling bill when it hits the floor, which could happen as soon as Friday.¶ Rep. Mo Brooks of Alabama said he was undecided on the debt-limit package, even though "it definitely has a lot of goodies in it." Brooks added: "It does not cut spending and does not solve the problem."¶ Asked if it could pass the House, Brooks replied, "In my judgment, no."¶ Others Republicans, though, were more optimistic. Rep. Tom Price of Georgia, who has been working with leadership to craft a comprehensive strategy to deal with the CR and debt-ceiling fights, said members seemed satisfied that Boehner's proposal meets the criteria they have long demanded for a debt-ceiling increase.¶ "It meets the Boehner Rule -- any increase is met by dollar-for-dollar decrease in spending as well as reforms," Price said. "It will delay Obamacare for a year. ... And it keeps the House moving in a direction where the Senate has to respond, which is important."¶ But does it have enough support to pass the House? "I think so, yeah," Price said.¶ Rep. Kevin Brady of Texas agreed, saying conservatives should rally behind the Boehner plan. "We should be unified in bringing this debt-ceiling proposal out of the House," said Brady, noting that the package includes "very strong, pro-growth policies that will help reduce the deficit."¶ Brady said of a potential floor vote Friday: "There should be more than 218."¶ The prospect of a quick floor vote, however, did not sit well with undecided Republicans like Rep. Jim Bridenstine of Oklahoma. "I'm looking forward to seeing what leadership puts on the table," he said. "I think there's a lot more to be discussed."¶ Rep. Randy Weber of Texas agreed: "I have decided not take a position as of yet," he said. "I want to hear more."¶ Meanwhile, conservative leaders wouldn't bite when asked whether the debt-ceiling proposal has the votes to pass.¶ "You must confuse me with the whip," said a smiling Rep. Jeb Hensarling of Texas. Pressed to analyze the support within his conference for Boehner's plan, Hensarling repeated three times: "I expect Republicans to be united."¶ Even Rep. Steve Scalise, chairman of the Republican Study Committee, seemed uncertain of whether Boehner's presentation had won over a sufficient number of conservatives. "We're going to find out," he said. "You'll have to ask the whip."

#### Debt ceiling downgrade won’t hurt the economy---empirics

Brian Dooley 12, "Will US debt rating be downgraded again?", 12/29, [www.royalgazette.com/article/20121229/BUSINESS08/712299981](http://www.royalgazette.com/article/20121229/BUSINESS08/712299981)

So what happens when the world’s largest bond sector faces a potential downgrade due to political instability, runaway budget deficits and an anaemic economic recovery?¶ The answer might be found in what was witnessed last year at the time of the S&P downgrade, which also involved longer term US securities being placed on “negative watch”. S&P said they believed “the fiscal consolidation plan that Congress and the Administration recently agreed fell short of what is necessary to stabilise the government’s medium term debt dynamics”. The downgrade was prompted by the debt ceiling debate which requires Congress to approve increases in America’s debt capacity at regular intervals.¶ S&P argued that the predictability and effectiveness of American policymaking had both declined to a level of concern and cited pessimism that Congress and the Administration could bridge the vast gulf between the two main political parties. In short, the agency took a “show me” attitude about America being able to hammer out an effective plan which put the country back on track.¶ Oddly enough, Treasury bond prices had actually been increasing in the midst of the debt ceiling debate in the summer of 2011 as investors grew sanguine about the prospects for a successful budget negotiation. Prices rose and yields fell right up until the day of the downgrade after which bonds sold off sharply. On that day, the benchmark ten-year US Treasury bond yield ticked up to from 2.47 percent to 2.58 percent and prices of bonds declined across the curve.¶ Immediately after the S&P downgrade, however, investors shrugged off the news and Treasury bonds resumed their rally into the end of the year. Perhaps bond buyers were encouraged that an agreement had finally been struck and that Moody’s and Fitch, the two other major credit rating agencies had not followed the S&P action. Massive bond buying the US Federal Reserve didn’t hurt either.

### Flex DA

#### Our credibility internals solve the impact better than flexibility

Schwarz, senior counsel, and Huq, associate counsel at the Brennan Center for Justice at NYU School of Law, 2007 [Frederick A.O., Jr., partner at Cravath, Swaine & Moore, chief counsel to the Church Committee, and Aziz Z, former clerk for the U.S. Supreme Court, Unchecked and Unbalanced: Presidential Power in a Time of Terror, p. 201]

The Administration insists that its plunge into torture, its lawless spying, and its lock-up of innocents have made the country safer. Beyond mere posturing, they provide little evidence to back up their claims. Executive unilateralism not only undermines the delicate balance of our Constitution, but also lessens our human liberties and hurts vital counterterrorism campaigns. How? Our reputation has always mattered. In 1607, Massachusetts governor John Winthrop warned his fellow colonists that because they were a "City on a Hill," "the eyes of all people are upon us."4 Thomas Jefferson began the Declaration of Independence by invoking the need for a "decent respect to the opinions of mankind:' In today's battle against stateless terrorists, who are undeterred by law, morality, or the mightiest military power on earth, our reputation matters greatly.¶ Despite its military edge, the United States cannot force needed aid and cooperation from allies. Indeed, our status as lone superpower means that only by persuading other nations and their citizens—that our values and interests align with theirs, and so merit support, can America maintain its influence in the world. Military might, even extended to the globe's corners, is not a sufficient condition for achieving America's safety or its democratic ideals at home. To be "dictatress of the world," warned John Quincy Adams in 1821, America "would be no longer the ruler of her own spirit." A national security policy loosed from the bounds of law, and conducted at the executive's discretion, will unfailingly lapse into hypocrisy and mendacity that alienate our allies and corrode the vitality of the world's oldest democracy.5

#### Congress has already killed Obama’s flexibility – prevented transfer of detainees from Guantanamo.

Alexander, Frederick I. Richman Professor of Law, Stanford Law School, ‘12

[Janet, “MILITARY COMMISSIONS: A PLACE OUTSIDE THE LAW’S REACH”, SAINT LOUIS UNIVERSITY LAW JOURNAL, Vol. 56, 2012, RSR]

On the other hand, the limitations on presidential ability to prosecute ¶ detainees in federal court, release them to other countries, or transfer them to ¶ facilities within the United States for detention or to serve their sentences are ¶ contained in statutes and thus will apply regardless of who is president. These ¶ include the mandatory military detention provisions of the 2012 NDAA.260¶ Indeed, the Feinstein amendment to the 2012 NDAA, designed in part to meet ¶ objections to mandating military custody or trial of U.S. citizens, could well ¶ turn out to support that very outcome.261 The compromise, which helped to ¶ secure passage of the 2012 NDAA without a provision for mandatory military ¶ custody or trial, is worded simply to state that the statute does not change ¶ ―existing law.‖ Many argued at the time—apparently supported by a phrase in ¶ Hamdi—that existing law already permits treating U.S. citizens and permanent ¶ residents who are determined to be ―enemy combatants‖ or unprivileged ¶ belligerents exactly the same as foreign nationals, even if they are taken into ¶ custody inside the United States. If in the future the Supreme Court, the D.C. ¶ Circuit, or another federal circuit, so holds, then the trial, detention, and waiver ¶ provisions of the 2012 NDAA will apply equally to U.S. citizens.¶ Thus, because Congress has frustrated the executive branch‘s efforts to ¶ bring the treatment of suspected terrorists back to fundamental principles of the ¶ rule of law and the Obama Administration has abandoned as futile any attempt ¶ to secure legislation to make the changes permanent, the military ¶ commissions—however improved over the Bush era—remain ―outside the ¶ law‘s reach.‖¶ 262

#### Creating a fair process for detainees preserves executive flexibility – results in judicial deference.

Bauer, Junior Editor at the Alabama Law Review, ‘6

[Jay, “DETAINEES UNDER REVIEW: STRIKING THE RIGHT¶ CONSTITUTIONAL BALANCE BETWEEN THE EXECUTIVE'S¶ WAR POWERS AND JUDICIAL REVIEW”, Vol. 57, No. 4, RSR]

Establishing a detainee review process that is as transparent and fair as¶ possible may be the best way to "strik[e] the proper constitutional balance."'179 In considering the executive's concerns for national security and¶ protection of classified information, the courts have shown an ability to be¶ flexible and accommodate the special needs of the executive while preserving¶ the fundamental precepts of the Constitution. That flexibility will likely¶ come into play regardless of whether a court is reviewing a habeas petition¶ or the final decision of a tribunal under a separate statutory scheme like that¶ in the Detainee Treatment Act.¶ If a court is reviewing a non-citizen detainee's habeas claim, now that¶ the Supreme Court has established in Rasul that federal courts do have jurisdiction¶ over detainees at Guantanamo, the federal courts and habeas jurisprudence¶ may actually prove beneficial for the executive. For instance,¶ because a habeas court looks primarily to the authority and process of detention¶ in a habeas case, this Comment argues that from a practical standpoint¶ the more the executive branch establishes a solidly fair and judicial¶ process for determining detainee status, the better it would be for the executive.¶ Since the courts tend to deny habeas petitions when there is apparent¶ authority and alternative remedies available to a habeas petitioner, it is logical¶ that a full and fair process establishing those remedies for non-citizen¶ detainees is in the executive's best interest. In other words, if the executive¶ branch wants to preserve its independent control over detainees, then practically¶ speaking it could rely on history and precedence as a model. The¶ courts will defer to executive action, but only to a point. They will seek to¶ preserve the authority of the Constitution, albeit in a restrained sense considering¶ the unique nature of detaining enemy combatants in the "war on¶ terror." Habeas corpus jurisprudence teaches that as long as there is a way¶ for an independent judiciary to examine the lawfulness of executive detention,¶ or at least ensure that the detainee has an appropriate alternative remedy¶ available, then that detention will be upheld. Thus, ironically, the way¶ for the executive to retain control over detainees is to create a full and fair¶ tribunal process. Moreover, the traditional deference the judiciary pays to¶ the executive branch when it is looking at executive wartime actions or¶ judgments should also give the executive branch confidence that federal¶ court jurisdiction over detainees at Guantanamo Bay is not going to hinder¶ its execution of the "war on terror."¶ When it passed the Detainee Treatment Act, Congress intended to interject¶ congressional oversight into the detainee review process by dictating¶ the standard of evidence used, and it wanted to ensure that the procedures of¶ the CSRT are in accordance with the Constitution. 80 The passage of the Act¶ clearly shows that the executive should anticipate more, not less, assertion¶ of authority over the detainee review process by the other branches of government.¶ Although the consequences of the Act are unknown at this point in¶ time, it is also fairly clear that however the courts consider the detainee review process-whether it is through habeas litigation or under another¶ statutorily prescribed method like that of the Detainee Treatment Act-the¶ analysis will be in terms of whether that process fundamentally complies¶ with the Constitution. Thus, from just a pragmatic standpoint, it would be¶ prudent for the executive branch to ensure that the detainee review procedures¶ uphold the ideals of that great charter.¶ Consequently, creating a detainee review process as transparent and fair¶ as possible is the best option for our government and this nation as it seeks¶ to strike the right balance between executive war powers and judicial right¶ of review.

## 1AR

### Flex DA

#### The recent decision to block the transfer to Guantanamo has MASSIVELY encroached on the president’s war powers.

Martinez, J.D. from Stanford Law School, ‘12

[Nicolas, “PINCHING THE PRESIDENT'S PROSECUTORIAL PREROGATIVE: CAN CONGRESS USE ITS PURSE POWER TO BLOCK KHALID SHEIKH MOHAMMED'S TRANSFER TO THE UNITED STATES?”, Stanford Law Review, Vol. 64, June 2012, RSR]

More recently, however, Congress has taken the unprecedented step of prohibiting the executive branch from using any appropriated funds to transfer foreign detainees held by the Department of Defense-Khalid Sheikh Mohammed in particular-from Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to the United States.6 In so doing, Congress has encroached not only on the President's power as commander- in-chief of the armed forces, but also on the traditionally executive function of criminal prosecution. The question this Note aims to answer is whether that encroachment has unconstitutionally infringed on presidential authority, or whether, in light of historical precedent, Congress has merely exercised its own constitutional prerogative to check the President's war powers and prosecutorial powers.¶ Attorney General Eric Holder shared his candid views on that question in a December 2010 letter to the Senate leadership: "We have been unable to identify any parallel to [the funding restrictions] in the history of our nation in which Congress has intervened to prohibit the prosecution of particular persons or crimes."7 Attorney General Holder considered Congress's singling out of Khalid Sheikh Mohammed "an extreme and risky encroachment on the authority of the Executive branch" that would establish a "dangerous precedent."8 For his part, President Barack Obama has issued sternly worded signing statements in which he has labeled the restrictions, inter alia, "a dangerous and unprecedented challenge to critical executive branch authority to determine when and where to prosecute Guantanamo detainees."9 Though President Obama has stopped short of calling Congress's actions unconstitutional, he has recently indicated that these funding prohibitions would, in some circumstances, "violate constitutional separation of powers principles."10 The President has yet to elaborate on what exactly these circumstances might be. Whereas the President, perhaps for political reasons, has largely chosen not to challenge the constitutionality of the congressional funding constraints, this Note aims to be the first piece of scholarship to do just that.11

#### Plan solves executive flexibility – Court will defer to executive if Congress has set bounds.

Bauer, Junior Editor at the Alabama Law Review, ‘6

[Jay, “DETAINEES UNDER REVIEW: STRIKING THE RIGHT¶ CONSTITUTIONAL BALANCE BETWEEN THE EXECUTIVE'S¶ WAR POWERS AND JUDICIAL REVIEW”, Vol. 57, No. 4, RSR]

More recently, during the Cold War, the Court found it appropriate to¶ defer to the executive's judgment when Congress specifically authorized¶ executive action.' 4 1 In Dames and Moore v. Regan, the petitioner sued the¶ government of Iran for breach of contract. 142 Around the time that the claim¶ was being adjudicated, however, President Carter was negotiating with the¶ Iranian Government to resolve a hostage crisis. 143 Acting under the International¶ Emergency Powers Act of 1976, the President issued orders blocking¶ the removal or attachment of any Iranian asset. 44 These "blocking orders"¶ effectively cut off any judgments or encumbrances on Iranian property,¶ which the petitioner in Dames and More sought. 145 The power to preempt¶ any civil judgment against Iran enabled the executive to agree in the hostage¶ negotiations to terminate all litigation between the two governments and¶ respective citizens. 46 The petitioner in Dames and Moore sought an injunction¶ against the government to stop it from transferring Iranian property as a¶ part of the eventual hostage negotiation agreement. 47 Ultimately, however,¶ the Supreme Court refused to grant the injunction because it found that the executive acted lawfully, and it found that when the executive acts with¶ either express or implied congressional authorization, it acts not only with¶ executive powers, but also with delegated congressional powers. 148 Accordingly,¶ in such a case, the executive's action "would be supported by the¶ strongest of presumptions and the widest latitude of judicial interpretation,¶ and the burden of persuasion would rest heavily upon any who might attack¶ it.' ' 149 Thus, once again, the Court showed that it is reluctant to scrutinize¶ executive judgment or action, especially if it is done pursuant to the executive's¶ enumerated constitutional powers or congressionally delegated powers.¶ 150