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#### US is losing the War on Terrorism due to the proliferation of extra-AUMF Al Qaeda affiliates

Kagan, 13

[Frederick W., Christopher DeMuth Chair and Director, Critical Threats Project, American Enterprise Institute, “The Continued Expansion of Al Qaeda Affiliates and their Capabilities”, Statement before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade On “Global al-Qaeda: Affiliates, Objectives, and Future Challenges”, 7/18/13, <http://www.criticalthreats.org/al-qaeda/kagan-continued-expansion-al-qaeda-affiliates-capabilities-july-18-2013>, BJM]

**The war against al Qaeda is not going well**. Afghanistan has seen the most success, since Coalition and Afghan National Security Forces (ANSF) have been able to prevent al Qaeda from re-establishing effective sanctuary in the places from which the 9/11 attacks were planned and launched. The killing of Osama bin Laden has not been followed-up in Pakistan with disruption to the leadership group there on the scale of operations that preceded the Abbottabad raid. Al Qaeda affiliates in Iraq, Syria, Yemen, and West Africa have dramatically expanded their operating areas and capabilities since 2009 and appear poised to continue that expansion. Progress against al Shabaab, the al Qaeda affiliate in Somalia, is **extremely fragile** **and shows signs of beginning to unravel**. New groups with al Qaeda leanings, although not affiliations, are emerging in Egypt, and old groups that had not previously been affiliated with al Qaeda, such as Boko Haram in Nigeria, appear to be moving closer to it. Current trends point to continued expansion of al Qaeda affiliates and their capabilities, and it is difficult to see how current or proposed American and international policies are likely to contain that expansion, let alone reduce it to 2009 levels or below. Americans must seriously consider the possibility that **we are**, in fact, **starting to lose the war against al Qaeda**. The policy debate about al Qaeda has been bedeviled by competing definitions of the group and, consequently, evaluations of the threat it poses to the United States, as Katherine Zimmerman shows in a major paper that will be forthcoming from the Critical Threats Project at the American Enterprise Institute (AEI) in September. Whereas the Bush Administration saw the group as a global network of cells, the Obama Administration has focused narrowly on the "core group" in Pakistan around bin Laden and, after his death, around his successor, Ayman al Zawahiri. The current administration has also labored to distinguish al Qaeda franchises that have the intent and capability to attack the United States homeland from those that do not, implying (or sometimes stating) that the U.S. should act only against the former while observing the latter to ensure that they do not change course.

**Current AUMF ambiguity undermines effective counter-terrorism efforts against affiliates**

**Chesney et al. ‘13**

[Robert Chesney is a ¶ professor at the University ¶ of Texas School of Law, a ¶ nonresident senior fellow ¶ of the Brookings Institution, ¶ and a distinguished scholar ¶ at the Robert S. Strauss ¶ Center for International ¶ Security and Law. He is a ¶ cofounder and contributor to ¶ the Lawfare Blog and writes ¶ frequently on topics relating ¶ to US counterterrorism ¶ policy and law. Jack Goldsmith is the Henry ¶ L. Shattuck Professor of ¶ Law at Harvard Law School ¶ and a member of the Hoover ¶ Institution’s Jean Perkins ¶ Task Force on National ¶ Security and Law. He served ¶ in the Bush administration as ¶ assistant attorney general, ¶ Office of Legal Counsel, from ¶ 2003 to 2004 and as special ¶ counsel to the general ¶ counsel from 2002 to 2003. Matthew C. Waxman ¶ is a professor of law at ¶ Columbia Law School, ¶ an adjunct senior fellow ¶ at the Council on Foreign ¶ Relations, and a member ¶ of the Hoover Institution’s ¶ Jean Perkins Task Force ¶ on National Security and ¶ Law. He previously served ¶ in senior positions at the ¶ State Department, Defense ¶ Department, and National ¶ Security Council. Benjamin Wittes is a senior ¶ fellow in governance ¶ studies at the Brookings ¶ Institution, a member of ¶ the Hoover Institution’s ¶ Jean Perkins Task Force ¶ on National Security and ¶ Law, and the editor in chief ¶ of the Lawfare Blog. Jean Perkins Task Force on National Security and Law. <http://media.hoover.org/sites/default/files/documents/Statutory-Framework-for-Next-Generation-Terrorist-Threats.pdf> ETB]

The September 2001 AUMF provides for the use of force against the entity ¶ responsible for the 9/11 attacks, as well as those harboring that entity. It ¶ has been clear from the beginning that **the AUMF encompasses al Qaeda and** ¶ **the Afghan Taliban,** respectively. This was the right focus in late 2001, and for a ¶ considerable period thereafter. But for three reasons, **this focus is increasingly** ¶ **mismatched to the threat environment facing the U**nited **S**tates.4¶ **First, the original al Qaeda network has been substantially degraded by** ¶ **the success of the United States and its allies in killing or capturing the network’s** ¶ **leaders and key personnel**. That is not to say that al Qaeda no longer poses a ¶ significant threat to the United States, of course. The information available in the ¶ public record suggests that it does, and thus nothing we say below should be ¶ read to suggest that force is no longer needed to address the threat al Qaeda ¶ poses. Our point is simply that **the original al Qaeda network is no longer the** ¶ **preeminent operational threat to the homeland** that it once was.¶ **Second, the Afghan Taliban are growing increasingly marginal to the AUMF**. As ¶ noted above, **the AUMF extended to the Taliban because of the safe harbor they** ¶ **provided to al Qaeda. That rationale makes far less sense a dozen years later,** ¶ **with the remnants of al Qaeda long-since relocated** to Pakistan’s FATA region. ¶ This issue has gone largely unremarked in the interim because U.S. and coalition ¶ forces all along have been locked in hostilities with the Afghan Taliban, and ¶ thus no **occasion to reassess the AUMF nexus** has ever arisen. Such an occasion ¶ **may** well **loom on the horizon,** however, **as the U**nited **S**tates **draws down** ¶ **in Afghanistan with increasing rapidity**. To be sure, the United States no doubt ¶ will continue to support the Afghan government in its efforts to tamp down ¶ insurgency, and it also will likely continue to mount counterterrorism operations ¶ within Afghanistan. It may even be the case that at some future point, the Taliban ¶ will again provide safe harbor to what remains of al Qaeda, thereby at least ¶ arguably reviving their AUMF nexus. But for the time being, **the days of direct** ¶ **combat engagement with the Afghan Taliban appear to be numbered.**¶ If the decline of the original al Qaeda network and the decline of U.S. interest in ¶ the Afghan Taliban were the only considerations, one might applaud rather ¶ than fret over the declining relevance of the AUMF. **There is**, however, a **third** ¶ **consideration: significant new threats are emerging, ones that are not easily** ¶ **shoehorned into the current AUMF framework.** ¶To a considerable extent, **the new threats stem from the fragmentation of** ¶ **al Qaeda** itself. In this sense, the problem with the original AUMF is not so much ¶ that its primary focus is on al Qaeda, but rather that **it is increasingly difficult to** ¶ **determine with clarity which groups and individuals in al Qaeda’s orbit are** ¶ **sufficiently tied to the core so as to fall within the AUMF**. And given the gravity ¶ of the threat that some of these groups and individuals may pose on an ¶ independent basis, **it also is increasingly odd to premise the legal framework** ¶ **for using force against them on a chain of reasoning that requires a detour** ¶ **through the original, core al Qaeda organization.**¶The fragmentation process has several elements. First, **entities that** at ¶ least arguably **originated as** mere regional cells **of the core network have** ¶ **established a substantial degree of organizational and operational** ¶ **independence,** even while maintaining some degree of correspondence ¶ with al Qaeda’s leaders. **A**l **Q**aeda in the **A**rabian **P**eninsula **is a good example**. ¶ Al Qaeda in Iraq arguably fits this description as well, though in that case ¶ one might point to a substantial degree of strategic independence as well. ¶ Second, **entities that originated as independent, indigenous organizations** ¶ **have** to varying degrees **established formal ties to al Qaeda**, often rebranding ¶ themselves in the process. **Al** **Q**aeda in the **I**slamic **M**aghreb, formerly known ¶ as the Salafist Group for Call and Combat, **illustrates this path**. **Al Shabaab** ¶ in Somalia arguably **does as well**. **And then there are circumstances (such** ¶ **as the ones currently unfolding in Mali, Libya, and Syria) in which it is** ¶ **not entirely clear where the organizational lines lie** among (i) armed ¶ groups that work in concert with or even at the direction of one of the ¶ aforementioned al Qaeda affiliates; (ii) armed groups that are sympathetic ¶ and in communication with al Qaeda; and (iii) armed groups that are ¶ wholly independent of al Qaeda yet also stem from the same larger milieu ¶ of Salafist extremists.¶ **This situation**—which one of us has described as the emergence of “extraAUMF” threats—**poses a significant problem insofar as counterterrorism policy** ¶ **rests on the AUMF for its legal justification**. In some circumstances it remains ¶ easy to make the case for a nexus to the original al Qaeda network and hence to ¶ the AUMF. But **in a growing number of circumstances, drawing the requisite** ¶ **connection to the AUMF requires an increasingly complex daisy chain of** ¶ **associations—a task that is likely to be very difficult** (and hence subject to ¶ debate) **in some cases, and downright impossible in others**. The emergence of this problem should come as no surprise. **It has been nearly** ¶ **a dozen years since the AUMF’s passage, and circumstances have evolved** ¶ **considerably since then. It was inevitable that threats would emerge that might** ¶ **not fit easily or at all within its scope.** The question is whether Congress should ¶ do anything about this situation, and if so precisely what.

#### We’re at a turning point- the US must pivot to address the threat from al Qaeda affiliates. Congressional action is key because it provides legitimacy that induces public support for counter terrorism and international cooperation against terrorism

Wainstein ‘13

[STATEMENT OF ¶ KENNETH L. WAINSTEIN, PARTNER ¶ CADWALADER, WICKERSHAM & TAFT LLP ¶ BEFORE THE ¶ COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS ¶ UNITED STATES SENATE ¶ CONCERNING ¶ COUNTERTERRORISM POLICIES AND PRIORITIES: ¶ ADDRESSING THE EVOLVING THREAT ¶ PRESENTED ON ¶ MARCH 20, 2013. <http://www.foreign.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/Wainstein_Testimony.pdf> ETB]

It has recently become clear, however, that the Al Qaeda threat that occupied our ¶ attention after 9/11 is no longer the threat that we will need to defend against in the future. Due ¶ largely to the effectiveness of our counterterrorism efforts, the centralized leadership that had ¶ directed Al Qaeda operations from its sanctuary in Afghanistan and Pakistan -- known as “Al ¶ Qaeda Core” -- is now just a shadow of what it once was. While still somewhat relevant as an ¶ inspirational force, Zawahiri and his surviving lieutenants are reeling from our aerial strikes and ¶ no longer have the operational stability to manage an effective global terrorism campaign. The ¶ result has been a migration of operational authority and control from Al Qaeda Core to its ¶ affiliates in other regions of the world, such as Al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula, Al Qaeda in ¶ Iraq and Al Qaeda in the Islamic Maghreb. ¶ As Andy Liepman of the RAND Corporation cogently explained in a recent article, this ¶ development is subject to two different interpretations. While some commentators diagnose Al ¶ Qaeda as being in its final death throes, others see this franchising process as evidence that Al ¶ Qaeda is “coming back with a vengeance as the new jihadi hydra.” As is often the case, the truth ¶ likely falls somewhere between these polar prognostications. Al Qaeda Core is surely weakened, ¶ but its nodes around the world have picked up the terrorist mantle and continue to pose a threat ¶ to America and its allies -- as tragically evidenced by the recent violent takeover of the gas ¶ facility in Algeria and the American deaths at the U.S. Mission in Benghazi last September. This ¶ threat has been compounded by a number of other variables, including the opportunities created ¶ for Al Qaeda by the events following the Arab Spring; the ongoing threat posed by Hizballah, its ¶ confederates in Iran and other terrorist groups; and the growing incidence over the past few years ¶ of home-grown violent extremism within the United States, such as the unsuccessful plots ¶ targeting Times Square and the New York subway. ¶ We are now at a pivot point where we need to reevaluate the means and objectives of our ¶ counterterrorism program in light of the evolving threat. The Executive Branch is currently ¶ engaged in that process and has undertaken a number of policy shifts to reflect the altered threat ¶ landscape. First, it is working to develop stronger cooperative relationships with governments in ¶ countries like Yemen where the Al Qaeda franchises are operating. Second, they are ¶ coordinating with other foreign partners -- like the French in Mali and the African Union ¶ Mission in Somalia -- who are actively working to suppress these new movements. Finally, they ¶ are building infrastructure -- like the reported construction of a drone base in Niger -- that will ¶ facilitate counterterrorism operations in the regions where these franchises operate.¶ While it is important that the Administration is undergoing this strategic reevaluation, it ¶ is also important that Congress participate in that process. Over the past twelve years, Congress ¶ has made significant contributions to the post-9/11 reorientation of our counterterrorism ¶ program. First, it has been instrumental in strengthening our counterterrorism capabilities. From ¶ the Authorization for Use of Military Force passed within days of 9/11 to the Patriot Act and its ¶ reauthorization to the critical 2008 amendments to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, ¶ Congress has repeatedly answered the government’s call for strong but measured authorities to ¶ fight the terrorist adversary. ¶ Second, Congressional action has gone a long way toward institutionalizing measures ¶ that were hastily adopted after 9/11 and creating a lasting framework for what will be a “long ¶ war” against international terrorism. Some argue against such legislative permanence, citing the ¶ hope that today’s terrorists will go the way of the radical terrorists of the 1970’s and largely fade ¶ from the scene over time. That, I’m afraid, is a pipe dream. The reality is that international ¶ terrorism will remain a potent force for years and possibly generations to come. Recognizing ¶ this reality, both Presidents Bush and Obama have made a concerted effort to look beyond the ¶ threats of the day and to focus on regularizing and institutionalizing our counterterrorism ¶ measures for the future -- as most recently evidenced by the Administration’s effort to develop ¶ lasting procedures and rules of engagement for the use of drone strikes. ¶ Finally, Congressional action has provided one other very important element to our ¶ counterterrorism initiatives -- a measure of political legitimacy that could never be achieved ¶ through unilateral executive action. At several important junctures since 9/11, Congress has ¶ undertaken to carefully consider and pass legislation in sensitive areas of executive action, such ¶ as the legislation authorizing and governing the Military Commissions and the amendments to ¶ our Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act. On each such occasion, Congress’ action had the ¶ effect of calming public concerns and providing a level of political legitimacy to the Executive ¶ Branch’s counterterrorism efforts. That legitimizing effect -- and its continuation through ¶ meaningful oversight -- is critical to maintaining the public’s confidence in the means and methods our government uses in its fight against international terrorism. It also provides assurance to our foreign partners and thereby encourages them to engage in the operational cooperation that is so critical to the success of our combined efforts against international terrorism.

**We control the uniqueness- executive terror fatigue is creating sluggish responses and gutting info-sharing and cooperation- updating the AUMF is critical to revitalizing the executive and defeating afiliates**

**Leiter ‘13**

[The Honorable Michael E. Leiter ¶ Director, National Counterterrorism Center (2007-2011) ¶ Senior Counselor to the Chief Executive Officer, Palantir Technologies ¶ ¶ Testimony before the United States Senate ¶ Committee on Foreign Relations ¶ Counterterrorism Policies and Priorities: Addressing the Evolving Threat ¶ March 20, 2013. ETB]

Today **al‐Qa‘ida and its allies** in Pakistan **are at their weakest point** since 9/11. The ¶ death of Usama bin Ladin and the continued decimation of senior ranks has made the ¶ organization a shadow of its former self. Ayman al Zawahiri is not bin Ladin and ¶ although the organization still attempts to provide strategic guidance and global ¶ propaganda, **its influence continues to wane**. **Whether this trajectory can be ¶ maintained with a significant decrease of the U.S. presence in Afghanistan and a ¶ continued challenging political landscape in Pakistan will be,** in my view, **the biggest ¶ determinants of al Qa’ida Core’s relevance for the coming decade**. ¶ The degradation of al Qa’ida’s “higher headquarters” and relatively well‐coordinated ¶ command and control has allowed its affiliates and its message to splinter, posing ¶ new dangers and challenges. **Al Qa’ida affiliates** or those inspired by its message **have** ¶ worrisome **presences in Yemen, East Africa, North Africa, Syria, Western Europe, and** ¶ of course to a lesser degree **the U**nited **S**tates. ¶ Beginning with Yemen, in my view al Qa’ida in the Arabian Peninsula (**AQAP**)—as I ¶ stated two years ago—**continues to pose the most sophisticated** and deadly **threat** to ¶ the U.S. Homeland from an overseas affiliate. The death of operational commander ¶ Anwar al‐Aulaqi significantly reduced AQAP’s ability to attract and motivate English ¶ speakers, but its operational efforts continue with lesser abatement. As we saw in 2009, 2010, and 2012, AQAP has remained committed—and able—to pursue complex ¶ attacks involving innovative improvised explosives devices. Although some of the ¶ organization’s safe haven has been diminished because of Yemeni and U.S. efforts, the ¶ inability of the Government of Yemen to bring true control to wide swaths of the ¶ country suggests that **the group will pose a threat for the foreseeable future** **and** ¶ (unlike many other affiliates) **it** clearly **remains focused on transnational attacks**. ¶ East Africa, surprisingly to many, is a brighter spot in our efforts. Although al‐¶ Shabaab remains a force and poses significant risks in the region—most especially in ¶ Kenya and to the fledgling government in Somalia—its risk to the Homeland is ¶ markedly less today than just two years ago. Kenya’s offensive in the region ¶ shattered much of al Shabaab’s power base and most importantly the attractiveness ¶ of Somalia to Americans and other Westerners is radically less than was the case. The ¶ relative flood of Americans has turned into a trickle, thus significantly reducing the ¶ threat of trained terrorists returning to our shores. Maintaining this positive ¶ momentum will require continued U.S. attention and close cooperation with the ¶ African Union in Somalia (AMISOM) to nurture what clearly remains a fragile ¶ recovery. ¶ As the world witnessed over the past six months, al Qa’ida in the Islamic Maghreb ¶ (**AQIM) has shifted the focus in Africa as the organization has made gains in Mali, ¶ Libya, and the rural areas of Algeria.** To be clear, to those of us in the ¶ counterterrorism ranks this is not particularly surprising. In my view while the ¶ attacks in Benghazi and on the Algerian oil facility are tragic, the major change to the ¶ region is not a massive increase in AQIM’s attractiveness, but rather the huge shift ¶ that occurred with the virtual elimination of Libya’s security services, the associated ¶ flood of weapons in the region, and the coup d’état in Mali. ¶ AQIM has thus far proven a less tactically proficient and more regionally focused ¶ criminal organization than other al Qa’ida affiliates. Although we cannot blindly hope ¶ this remains the case, I would argue that we should also not read too much into ¶ recent events. Regional capacity building, targeted offensive measures, and forceful ¶ engagement with government like France, Algeria, and Libya that have a huge vested ¶ interest in the region should remain at the forefront of our strategy. And we must ¶ roundly condemn (and try to limit) the payment of ransoms that have proven to be ¶ the lifeblood of AQIM and its affiliates. ¶ **One notable area of concern that we must forcefully combat** in the region—and one ¶ which the U.S. is uniquely able to address given our global footprint—**is the cross‐¶ fertilization across the African continent that has recently accelerated. Coordination ¶ amongst al Shabaab, AQIM, Boko Haram, and others is particularly problematic as it ¶ allows each organization to leverage the others’ strengths. We must use our ¶ intelligence capabilities to define these networks and then assist in disrupting them**. ¶ The most troubling of emerging fronts in my view is Syria, where Jabhat al‐Nusra has ¶ emerged as the most radical of groups within the opposition. Given the enormous Terrorism Fatigue. After ten‐plus years of near constant public discussion of ¶ terrorism—in our politics, the media, and through public messaging—many have ¶ simply had enough. This is not all bad as an unhealthy obsession with the threat of ¶ terrorism at the expense of countless other societal woes, such as cyber threats and ¶ Iranian nuclear ambitions, would in many ways hand our enemy a victory. On the ¶ other hand, **there is real value in public discussion of terrorism: it can build resilience ¶ in the population and it can lead to the tackling of tough public policy questions like ¶ targeted killings and domestic intelligence**. **With terrorism fatigue we run a real risk ¶ of not addressing these issues in a way that provides a lasting counterterrorism ¶ framework**. In this regard **I** actually **see the** current discussion around the use of ¶ drones and the **potential for updating** **the** 2001 **A**uthorization for the **U**se of **M**ilitary ¶ **F**orce **as** quite **heartening signs. ¶ Terrorism fatigue poses** at least two **additional challenges**. First, with all of our ¶ counterterrorism success such victories have become expected and any failure—no ¶ matter how small—can result in political finger pointing and excoriation of our ¶ counterterrorism professionals. In effect we have become victims of our own success ¶ and unlike in 2001, perfection has become a political expectation. Although we ¶ should continuously examine how we can improve our capabilities, we must guard ¶ against ex poste investigations that lack a serious appreciation for the ex ante¶ difficulties of counterterrorism. ¶ Second, **terrorism fatigue can cause dangerous lethargy within the Executive Branch ¶ on issues that do not appear to require immediate attention but which can do longer ¶ term damage to counterterrorism efforts. I have repeatedly seen urgency morph into ¶ bureaucratic sluggishness as time passes since the last attack on issues like ¶ information sharing and interagency cooperation.** **Whether it is countering violent ¶ extremism programs or information access for the intelligence community, we must ¶ not take our foot off the gas pedal.** Weapons of Mass Destruction. There is no doubt that smallish terrorist attacks or at ¶ least attempts will continue to occur at home and abroad. Such attacks can cause ¶ enormous pain and suffering to victims and their families, but they are clearly of a ¶ scale—at least with respect to absolute numbers killed—that is dwarfed by other ¶ societal ills such as routine criminal activity. The same cannot be said of terrorists’ ¶ use of weapons of mass destruction—and more specifically biological weapons or an ¶ improvised nuclear device (IND). ¶ **Although we have also made progress in reducing the likelihood of terrorists ¶ obtaining WMD, for the foreseeable future we are faced with the possibility that a ¶ terrorist organization will successfully acquire these weapons**. In this case, ¶ technology is not yet our friend as the ease with which these weapons can be ¶ obtained and hidden continues to exceed our ability to detect them. ¶ Weapons of mass destruction pose a unique challenge as they are the prototypical ¶ low likelihood, high consequence event and thus determining the proper allocation of ¶ resources to combat them is particular contentious. That being said, we must ¶ continue to protect against the most dangerous of materials (e.g., HEU) being ¶ obtained by terrorists, secure weapons in the most dangerous places (e.g., Pakistan ¶ and increasingly Syria), and pursue research and development that will assist in ¶ detecting chemical and biological weapons in places where they would do the most ¶ harm.

#### Turning the tide is critical – al-Qaeda affiliates pose a high risk of nuclear and biological terrorism

Allison, IR Director @ Harvard, 12

[Graham, Director, Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs; Douglas Dillon Professor of Government, Harvard Kennedy School, "Living in the Era of Megaterror", Sept 7, <http://belfercenter.ksg.harvard.edu/publication/22302/living_in_the_era_of_megaterror.html>. BJM]

Forty years ago this week at the Munich Olympics of 1972, Palestinian terrorists conducted one of the most dramatic terrorist attacks of the 20th century. The kidnapping and massacre of 11 Israeli athletes attracted days of around-the-clock global news coverage of Black September’s anti-Israel message. Three decades later, on 9/11, Al Qaeda killed nearly 3,000 individuals at the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, announcing a new era of megaterror. In an act that killed more people than Japan’s attack on Pearl Harbor, a band of terrorists headquartered in ungoverned Afghanistan demonstrated that individuals and small groups can kill on a scale previously the exclusive preserve of states. Today, how many people can a small group of terrorists kill in a single blow? Had Bruce Ivins, the U.S. government microbiologist responsible for the 2001 anthrax attacks, distributed his deadly agent with sprayers he could have purchased off the shelf, tens of thousands of Americans would have died. Had the 2001 “Dragonfire” report that Al Qaeda had a small nuclear weapon (from the former Soviet arsenal) in New York City proved correct, and not a false alarm, detonation of that bomb in Times Square could have incinerated a half million Americans. In this electoral season, President Obama is claiming credit, rightly, for actions he and U.S. Special Forces took in killing Osama bin Laden. Similarly, at last week’s Republican convention in Tampa, Jeb Bush praised his brother for making the United States safer after 9/11. There can be no doubt that the thousands of actions taken at federal, state and local levels have made people safer from terrorist attacks. Many are therefore attracted to the chorus of officials and experts claiming that the “strategic defeat” of Al Qaeda means the end of this chapter of history. But we should remember a deeper and more profound truth. While applauding actions that have made us safer from future terrorist attacks, we must recognize that they **have not reversed an inescapable reality**: The relentless advance of science and technology is making it possible for smaller and **smaller groups to kill** **larger** and larger **numbers of people**. If a Qaeda affiliate, or some terrorist group in Pakistan whose name readers have never heard, acquires highly enriched uranium or plutonium made by a state, they can construct an elementary nuclear bomb capable of killing hundreds of thousands of people. At biotech labs across the United States and around the world, research scientists making medicines that advance human well-being are also capable of making pathogens, like anthrax, that can produce massive casualties. What to do? Sherlock Holmes examined crime scenes using a method he called M.M.O.: motive, means and opportunity. In a society where citizens gather in unprotected movie theaters, churches, shopping centers and stadiums, opportunities for attack abound. Free societies are inherently “target rich.” Motive to commit such atrocities poses a more difficult challenge. In all societies, a percentage of the population will be homicidal. No one can examine the mounting number of cases of mass murder in schools, movie theaters and elsewhere without worrying about a society’s mental health. Additionally, actions we take abroad unquestionably impact others’ motivation to attack us. As Faisal Shahzad, the 2010 would-be “Times Square bomber,” testified at his trial: “Until the hour the U.S. ... stops the occupation of Muslim lands, and stops killing the Muslims ... we will be attacking U.S., and I plead guilty to that.” Fortunately, it is more difficult for a terrorist to acquire the “means” to cause mass casualties. Producing highly enriched uranium or plutonium requires expensive industrial-scale investments that only states will make. If all fissile material can be secured to a gold standard beyond the reach of thieves or terrorists, aspirations to become the world’s first nuclear terrorist can be thwarted. Capabilities for producing bioterrorist agents are not so easily secured or policed. While more has been done, and much more could be done to further raise the technological barrier, as knowledge advances and technological capabilities to make pathogens become more accessible, the means for bioterrorism will come within the reach of terrorists. One of the hardest truths about modern life is that the same advances in science and technology that enrich our lives also empower potential killers to achieve their deadliest ambitions. To imagine that we can escape this reality and return to a world in which we are invulnerable to future 9/11s or worse is an illusion. For as far as the eye can see, we will live in an era of megaterror.

#### Nuclear terrorism causes nuclear escalation –retaliation goes global, it’s highly likely and rapid

Morgan 09

(Professor of Foreign Studies at Hankuk University, Dennis Ray, December, “World on fire: two scenarios of the destruction of human civilization and possible extinction of the human race” Futures, Vol 41 Issue 10, p 683-693, ScienceDirect)

In a remarkable website on nuclear war, Carol Moore asks the question “Is Nuclear War Inevitable??” In Section , Moore points out what most terrorists obviously already know about the nuclear tensions between powerful countries. No doubt, they’ve figured out that the best way to escalate these tensions into nuclear war is to set off a nuclear exchange. As Moore points out, all that militant terrorists would have to do is get their hands on one small nuclear bomb and explode it on either Moscow or Israel. Because of the Russian “dead hand” system, “where regional nuclear commanders would be given full powers should Moscow be destroyed,” it is likely that any attack would be blamed on the United States” Israeli leaders and Zionist supporters have, likewise, stated for years that if Israel were to suffer a nuclear attack, whether from terrorists or a nation state, it would retaliate with the suicidal “Samson option” against all major Muslim cities in the Middle East. Furthermore, the Israeli Samson option would also include attacks on Russia and even “anti-Semitic” European cities In that case, of course, Russia would retaliate, and the U.S. would then retaliate against Russia. China would probably be involved as well, as thousands, if not tens of thousands, of nuclear warheads, many of them much more powerful than those used at Hiroshima and Nagasaki, would rain upon most of the major cities in the Northern Hemisphere. Afterwards, for years to come, massive radioactive clouds would drift throughout the Earth in the nuclear fallout, bringing death or else radiation disease that would be genetically transmitted to future generations in a nuclear winter that could last as long as a 100 years, taking a savage toll upon the environment and fragile ecosphere as well. And what many people fail to realize is what a precarious, hair-trigger basis the nuclear web rests on. Any accident, mistaken communication, false signal or “lone wolf’ act of sabotage or treason could, in a matter of a few minutes, unleash the use of nuclear weapons, and once a weapon is used, then the likelihood of a rapid escalation of nuclear attacks is quite high while the likelihood of a limited nuclear war is actually less probable since each country would act under the “use them or lose them” strategy and psychology; restraint by one power would be interpreted as a weakness by the other, which could be exploited as a window of opportunity to “win” the war. In other words, once Pandora's Box is opened, it will spread quickly, as it will be the signal for permission for anyone to use them. Moore compares swift nuclear escalation to a room full of people embarrassed to cough. Once one does, however, “everyone else feels free to do so. The bottom line is that as long as large nation states use internal and external war to keep their disparate factions glued together and to satisfy elites’ needs for power and plunder, these nations will attempt to obtain, keep, and inevitably use nuclear weapons. And as long as large nations oppress groups who seek self-determination, some of those groups will look for any means to fight their oppressors” In other words, as long as war and aggression are backed up by the implicit threat of nuclear arms, it is only a matter of time before the escalation of violent conflict leads to the actual use of nuclear weapons, and once even just one is used, it is very likely that many, if not all, will be used, leading to horrific scenarios of global death and the destruction of much of human civilization while condemning a mutant human remnant, if there is such a remnant, to a life of unimaginable misery and suffering in a nuclear winter. In “Scenarios,” Moore summarizes the various ways a nuclear war could begin: Such a war could start through a reaction to terrorist attacks, or through the need to protect against overwhelming military opposition, or through the use of small battle field tactical nuclear weapons meant to destroy hardened targets. It might quickly move on to the use of strategic nuclear weapons delivered by short-range or inter-continental missiles or long-range bombers. These could deliver high altitude bursts whose electromagnetic pulse knocks out electrical circuits for hundreds of square miles. Or they could deliver nuclear bombs to destroy nuclear and/or non-nuclear military facilities, nuclear power plants, important industrial sites and cities. Or it could skip all those steps and start through the accidental or reckless use of strategic weapons.

#### High risk of nuke terror

Vladimir Z. 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. 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.

**Bioterrosim causes extinction**

**Ochs 2**

**(**Richard, Naturalist – Grand Teton National park with Masters in Natural Resource Management – Rutgers, “Biological Weapons must be abolished immediately” 6-9, http://www.freefromterror.net/other\_articles/abolish.html)

Of all the weapons of mass destruction, the genetically engineered **biological weapons**, many without a known cure or vaccine, **are an extreme danger to the continued survival of life** on earth. Any perceived **military** value **or deterrence pales in comparison to the great risk these weapons pose just sitting in vials in laboratories.** While a "nuclear winter," resulting from a massive exchange of **nuclear weapons**, could also kill off most of life on earth and severely compromise the health of future generations, they **are easier to control**. **Biological weapons**, on the other hand**, can get out of control very easily**, as the recent anthrax attacks has demonstrated. There is no way to guarantee the security of these doomsday weapons because very tiny amounts can be stolen or accidentally released and then grow or be grown to horrendous proportions. The Black Death of the Middle Ages would be small in comparison to the potential damage bioweapons could cause. Abolition of chemical weapons is less of a priority because, while they can also kill millions of people outright, their persistence in the environment would be less than nuclear or biological agents or more localized. Hence, chemical weapons would have a lesser effect on future generations of innocent people and the natural environment. Like the Holocaust, once a localized chemical extermination is over, it is over. With nuclear and biological weapons, the killing will probably never end. Radioactive elements last tens of thousands of years and will keep causing cancers virtually forever. Potentially worse than that, bio-engineered agents by the hundreds with no known cure could wreck even greater calamity on the human race than could persistent radiation. AIDS and ebola viruses are just a small example of recently emerging plagues with no known cure or vaccine. Can we imagine hundreds of such plagues? **HUMAN EXTINCTION IS NOW POSSIBLE**.

**New gene manipulation takes out their defense**

MSNBC 2011

(“Clinton warns of bioweapon threat from gene tech,” pg online @ http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/45584359/ns/… “For an international verification system — akin to that for nuclear weapons — saying it is too complicated to monitor every lab's activities.”)

GENEVA — **New gene assembly technology** that offers great benefits for scientific research **could** also **be used by terrorists to create biological weapons,** U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton warned Wednesday. **The threat from bioweapons has drawn little attention in recent years, as governments focused more on the risk of nuclear weapons proliferation to countries such as Iran and North Korea**. But **experts have warned that the increasing ease with which bioweapons can be created might be used by terror groups to develop and spread new diseases that could mimic the effects of** the fictional global epidemic portrayed in the Hollywood thriller **"Contagion."** Speaking at an international meeting in Geneva aimed at reviewing the 1972 Biological Weapons Convention, Clinton told diplomats that **the challenge was to maximize the benefits of scientific research and minimize the risks that it could be used for harm. "The emerging gene synthesis industry is making genetic material more widely available,"** she said. "**This** has many benefits for research, but it **could also potentially be used to assemble the components of a deadly organism." Gene synthesis allows genetic material — the building blocks of all organisms — to be artificially assembled in the lab, greatly speeding up the creation of artificial viruses and bacteria. The U.S. government has cited efforts by terrorist networks such as al-Qaeda to recruit scientists capable of making biological weapons** as a national security concern. "**A crude but effective terrorist weapon can be made using a small sample of any number of widely available pathogens, inexpensive equipment, and college-level chemistry and biology,"** Clinton told the meeting. "Less than a year ago**, al-Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula made a call to arms for**, and I quote, **'brothers with degrees in microbiology or chemistry ... to develop a weapon of mass destruction,'"** she said. **Clinton also mentioned the Aum Shinrikyo cult's attempts in Japan to obtain anthrax in the 1990s, and the 2001 anthrax attacks** in the United States that killed five people. Washington has urged countries to be more transparent about their efforts to clamp down on the threat of bioweapons. But **U.S. officials have also resisted calls for an international verification system** — akin to that for nuclear weapons — saying it is too complicated to monitor every lab's activities around the world.

### Adv. 2 Firebreaks

#### The AUMF will inevitably expire in the squo – updating the authorization is key to prevent a limitless War on Terror based on article 2 and self-defense justifications that undermine US legitimacy and erode the global firebreak against use of force

**Barnes ‘12**

[Beau, J.D., Boston University School of Law (expected May 2013); M.A. in Law and ¶ Diplomacy (expected May 2013), The Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy at Tufts ¶ University; B.A., 2006, Lewis & Clark College. Military law Review vol. 221. <https://www.jagcnet.army.mil/DOCLIBS/MILITARYLAWREVIEW.NSF/0/b7396120928e9d5e85257a700042abb5/$FILE/By%20Beau%20D.%20Barnes.pdf> ETB]

**The AUMF must inevitably expire because it is expressly linked to the September 11,** 2001, **attacks** against the United States. Moreover, **because of the impending downfall of Al Qaeda** as we know it, **the statute's demise will come more quickly than most assume.** Although the United States still faces myriad terrorist threats, **the threat from Al Qaeda itself**--the "core" group actually responsible for 9/11--**is dissipating. So long as a substantial terrorist threat continues, however, the United States will require a framework within which to combat terrorist organizations and activities.** Consequently, **Congress should enact a new statute that supersedes the AUMF and addresses the major legal and constitutional issues relating to the use of force by the President that have arisen since the September 11 attacks and will persist in the foreseeable future.**¶A. The AUMF's Inevitable Expiration¶ Although it is difficult to determine exactly when the AUMF will become obsolete, the mere fact that a precise date is unclear should not lead to the conclusion that the AUMF will be perpetually valid. Al Qaeda, the organization responsible for the September 11, 2001, attacks is considered by some to have been already rendered "operationally ineffective" n102 and "crumpled at its core." n103 Moreover, even if Al Qaeda continues to possess the ability to threaten the United States, n104 not all terrorist organizations currently possess a meaningful link to Al Qaeda, rendering the AUMF already insufficient in certain circumstances. Indeed, individuals from across the political spectrum have recognized that the AUMF's focus on those involved in "the terrorist attacks that occurred on September 11, 2001" is outdated and no longer addresses the breadth of threats facing the United States. n105 At a certain point, the [\*84] terrorist groups that threaten the United States targets will no longer have a plausible or sufficiently direct link to the September 11, 2001, attacks. n106¶ This shift has likely already occurred. Former Attorney General Michael Mukasey, writing recently in support of efforts to reaffirm the original AUMF, noted that currently "there are organizations, including the Pakistani Taliban, that are arguably not within its reach." n107 It is similarly unclear if the AUMF extends to organizations like Al Qaeda in the Arabian Penninsula, whose formation as a group--and connection to Al Qaeda's "core"--postdates 9/11 and is indirect at best. n108 Former State Department Legal Adviser John Bellinger has argued that the Obama Administration's reliance on the AUMF for its targeted killing and detention operations is "legally risky" because "[s]hould our military or intelligence agencies wish to target or detain a terrorist who is not part of al-Qaeda, they would lack the legal authority to do so, unless the [\*85] administration expands (and the federal courts uphold) its legal justification." n109 Indeed, "[c]ircumstances alone . . . will put enormous pressure on--and ultimately render obsolete--the legal framework we currently employ to justify these operations." n110¶ While the court of public opinion seems to have accepted the AUMF's inevitable expiration, courts of law appear poised to accept this argument as well. Justice O'Connor's plurality opinion in Hamdi admitted that the AUMF granted "the authority to detain for the duration of the relevant conflict." n111 She also suggested, however, that that authority would terminate at some point, based on "the practical circumstances of [this] conflict," which may be "entirely unlike those of the conflicts that informed the development of the law of war." n112 Justice Kennedy's opinion in Boumediene also hinted that the future contours of the war on terror might force the Court to revisit the extent of the conflict. n113 Lower federal courts have already started to ask some of the questions about the duration of the AUMF's authority, which the Supreme Court has left unaddressed to date. n114¶ [\*86] The Obama Administration has notably disagreed with these assessments, arguing that the AUMF "is still a viable authorization today." n115 The administration's position, however, appears contradictory, as it has simultaneously described the limited reach of the AUMF as "encompass[ing] only those groups or people with a link to the terrorist attacks on 9/11, or associated forces" n116 and celebrated the functional neutralization of Al Qaeda as a continuing threat to U.S. national security. n117 The administration's position, however, remains in the minority. Notwithstanding the administration's continuing fealty to the 2001 statute, as pressures build to address these issues, the "temporal vitality" n118 of the AUMF will continue to be challenged. The successful targeting of those responsible for the attacks of September 11, 2001, will ensure that the AUMF's vitality will not be indefinite.¶ Moreover, even if one rejects as overly optimistic the position that Al Qaeda is currently or will soon be incapable of threatening the United States, the AUMF is already insufficient to reach many terrorist organizations. Assuming a robust Al Qaeda for the indefinite future does not change the disconnected status of certain terrorist groups; as much as it might wish to the contrary, Al Qaeda does not control all Islamist terrorism. n119¶ B. The Consequences of Failing to Reauthorize¶ The AUMF's inevitable expiration, brought about by the increasingly tenuous link between current U.S. military and covert [\*87] operations and those who perpetrated the September 11 attacks, leaves few good options for the Obama Administration. Unless Congress soon reauthorizes military force in the struggle against international terrorists, the administration will face difficult policy decisions. Congress, however, shows no signs of recognizing the AUMF's limited lifespan or a willingness to meaningfully re-write the statute. In light of this reticence, one choice would be for the Obama Administration to acknowledge the AUMF's limited scope and, on that basis, forego detention operations and targeted killings against non-Al Qaeda-related terrorists. For both strategic and political reasons, this is extremely unlikely, especially with a president in office who has already shown a willingness to defy legal criticism and aggressively target terrorists around the globe. n120 Another option would be for the Executive Branch to acknowledge the absence of legal authority, but continue targeted killings nonetheless. For obvious reasons, this option is problematic and unlikely to occur.¶ Therefore, the more likely result is that the Executive Branch, grappling with the absence of explicit legal authority for a critical policy, would need to make increasingly strained legal arguments to support its actions. n121 Thus, the Obama Administration will soon be forced to rationalize ongoing operations under existing legal authorities, which, I argue below, will have significant harmful consequences for the United States. Indeed, the administration faces a Catch-22--its efforts to destroy Al Qaeda as a functioning organization will lead directly to the vitiation of the AUMF. The administration is "starting with a result and finding the legal and policy justifications for it," which often leads to poor policy formulation. n122 Potential legal rationales would perforce rest on exceedingly strained legal arguments based on the AUMF itself, the President's Commander in Chief powers, or the international law of self-defense. n123 [\*88] Besides the inherent damage to U.S. credibility attendant to unconvincing legal rationales, each alternative option would prove legally fragile, destabilizing to the international political order, or both.¶ 1. Effect on Domestic Law and Policy¶ Congress's failure to reauthorize military force would lead to bad domestic law and even worse national security policy. First, a legal rationale based on the AUMF itself will increasingly be difficult to sustain. Fewer and fewer terrorists will have any plausible connection to the September 11 attacks or Al Qaeda, and arguments for finding those connections are already logically attenuated. The definition of those individuals who may lawfully be targeted and detained could be expanded incrementally from the current definition, defining more and more groups as Al Qaeda's "co-belligerents" and "associated forces." n124 But this approach, apart from its obvious logical weakness, would likely be rejected by the courts at some point. n125 The policy of the United States should not be to continue to rely on the September 18, 2001, AUMF.¶ Second, basing U.S. counterterrorism efforts on the President's constitutional authority as Commander in Chief is legally unstable, and therefore unsound national security policy, because a combination of legal difficulties and political considerations make it unlikely that such a rationale could be sustained. This type of strategy would likely run afoul [\*89] of the courts and risk destabilizing judicial intervention, n126 because the Supreme Court has shown a willingness to step in and assert a more proactive role to strike down excessive claims of presidential authority. n127 Politically, using an overly robust theory of the Commander in Chief's powers to justify counterterrorism efforts would, ultimately, be difficult to sustain. President Obama, who ran for office in large part on the promise of repudiating the excesses of the Bush Administration, and indeed any president, would likely face political pressure to reject the claims of executive authority made "politically toxic" by the writings of John Yoo. n128 Because of the likely judicial resistance and political difficulties, claiming increased executive authority to prosecute the armed conflict against Al Qaeda would prove a specious and ultimately futile legal strategy. Simply put, forcing the Supreme Court to intervene and overrule the Executive's national security policy is anathema to good public policy. In such a world, U.S. national security policy would lack stability--confounding cooperation with allies and hindering negotiations with adversaries.¶ There are, of course, many situations where the president's position as Commander in Chief provides entirely uncontroversial authority for military actions against terrorists. In 1998, President Clinton ordered cruise missile strikes against Al Qaeda-related targets in Afghanistan and [\*90] Sudan in response to the embassy bombings in Kenya and Tanzania. In 1986, President Reagan ordered air strikes against Libyan targets after U.S. intelligence linked the bombing of a Berlin discotheque to Libyan operatives. n129 Executive authority to launch these operations without congressional approval was not seriously questioned, and no congressional approval was sought. n130 To be sure, many of the targeted killing operations carried out today fall squarely within the precedent of past practice supplied by these and other valid exercises of presidential authority. Notwithstanding disagreement about the scope of Congress's and the president's "war powers," few would disagree with the proposition that the president needs no authorization to act in self-defense on behalf of the country. However, it is equally clear that not all terrorists pose such a threat to the United States, and thus the [\*91] Commander in Chief cannot justify all counterterrorism operations as "self-defense."¶ A third option would be to conduct all counterterrorism operations as covert operations under the aegis of Title 50. n131 Although the CIA typically carries out such "Title 50 operations," the separate roles of the military and intelligence community have become blurred in recent years. n132 The president must make a "finding" to authorize such operations, n133 which are conducted in secret to provide deniability for the U.S. Government. n134¶ Relying entirely on covert counterterrorism operations, however, would suffer from several critical deficiencies. First, even invoking the cloak of "Title 50," it is "far from obvious" that covert operations are legal without supporting authority. n135 In other words, Title 50 operations, mostly carried out by the CIA, likely also require "sufficient domestic law foundation in terms of either an AUMF or a legitimate claim of inherent constitutional authority for the use of force under Article II." n136 Second, covert operations are by definition kept out of public view, making it difficult to subject them to typical democratic review. In light of "the democratic deficit that already plagues the nation in the legal war [\*92] on terror," n137 further distancing counterterrorism operations from democratic oversight would exacerbate this problem. n138 Indeed, congressional oversight of covert operations--which, presumably, operates with full information--is already considered insufficient by many. n139 By operating entirely on a covert basis, "the Executive can initiate more conflict than the public might otherwise [be] willing to support." n140¶ In a world without a valid AUMF, the United States could base its continued worldwide counterterrorism operations on various alternative domestic legal authorities. All of these alternative bases, however, carry with them significant costs--detrimental to U.S. security and democracy. The foreign and national security policy of the United States should rest on "a comprehensive legal regime to support its actions, one that [has] the blessings of Congress and to which a court would defer as the collective judgment of the American political system about a novel set of [\*93] problems." n141 Only then can the President's efforts be sustained and legitimate.¶ 2. Effect on the International Law of Self-Defense¶ A failure to reauthorize military force would lead to significant negative consequences on the international level as well. Denying the Executive Branch the authority to carry out military operations in the armed conflict against Al Qaeda would force the President to find authorization elsewhere, most likely in the international law of self-defense--the jus ad bellum. n142 Finding sufficient legal authority for the United States's ongoing counterterrorism operations in the international law of self-defense, however, is problematic for several reasons. As a preliminary matter, relying on this rationale usurps Congress's role in regulating the contours of U.S. foreign and national security policy. If the Executive Branch can assert "self-defense against a continuing threat" to target and detain terrorists worldwide, it will almost always be able to find such a threat. n143 Indeed, the Obama Administration's broad understanding of the concept of "imminence" illustrates the danger of allowing the executive to rely on a self-defense authorization alone. n144 [\*94] This approach also would inevitably lead to dangerous "slippery slopes." Once the President authorizes a targeted killing of an individual who does not pose an imminent threat in the strict law enforcement sense of "imminence," n145 there are few potential targets that would be off-limits to the Executive Branch. Overly malleable concepts are not the proper bases for the consistent use of military force in a democracy. Although the Obama Administration has disclaimed this manner of broad authority because the AUMF "does not authorize military force against anyone the Executive labels a 'terrorist,'" n146 relying solely on the international law of self defense would likely lead to precisely such a result.¶ The slippery slope problem, however, is not just limited to the United States's military actions and the issue of domestic control. The creation of international norms is an iterative process, one to which the United States makes significant contributions. Because of this outsized influence, the United States should not claim international legal rights that it is not prepared to see proliferate around the globe. Scholars have observed that the Obama Administration's "expansive and open-ended interpretation of the right to self-defence threatens to destroy the prohibition on the use of armed force . . . ." n147 Indeed, "[i]f other states were to claim the broad-based authority that the United States does, to kill people anywhere, anytime, the result would be chaos." n148¶ [\*95] Encouraging the proliferation of an expansive law of international self-defense would not only be harmful to U.S. national security and global stability, but it would also directly contravene the Obama Administration's national security policy, sapping U.S. credibility. The Administration's National Security Strategy emphasizes U.S. "moral leadership," basing its approach to U.S. security in large part on "pursu[ing] a rules-based international system that can advance our own interests by serving mutual interests." n149 Defense Department General Counsel Jeh Johnson has argued that "[a]gainst an unconventional enemy that observes no borders and does not play by the rules, we must guard against aggressive interpretations of our authorities that will discredit our efforts, provoke controversy and invite challenge." n150 Cognizant of the risk of establishing unwise international legal norms, Johnson argued that the United States "must not make [legal authority] up to suit the moment." n151 The Obama Administration's global counterterrorism strategy is to "adher[e] to a stricter interpretation of the rule of law as an essential part of the wider strategy" of "turning the page on the past [and rooting] counterterrorism efforts within a more durable, legal foundation." n152¶ [\*96] Widely accepted legal arguments also facilitate cooperation from U.S. allies, especially from the United States' European allies, who have been wary of expansive U.S. legal interpretations. n153 Moreover, U.S. strategy vis-a-vis China focuses on binding that nation to international norms as it gains power in East Asia. n154 The United States is an international "standard-bearer" that "sets norms that are mimicked by others," n155 and the Obama Administration acknowledges that its drone strikes act in a quasi-precedential fashion. n156 Risking the obsolescence of the AUMF would force the United States into an "aggressive interpretation" of international legal authority, n157 not just discrediting its [\*97] own rationale, but facilitating that rationale's destabilizing adoption by nations around the world. n158¶ United States efforts to entrench stabilizing global norms and oppose destabilizing international legal interpretations--a core tenet of U.S. foreign and national security policy n159 --would undoubtedly be hampered by continued reliance on self defense under the jus ad bellum to authorize military operations against international terrorists. Given the presumption that the United States's armed conflict with these terrorists will continue in its current form for at least the near term, ongoing authorization at the congressional level is a far better choice than continued reliance on the jus ad bellum. Congress should reauthorize the use of force in a manner tailored to the global conflict the United States is fighting today. Otherwise, the United States will be forced to continue to rely on a statute anchored only to the continued presence of those responsible for 9/11, a group that was small in 2001 and, due to the continued successful targeting of Al Qaeda members, is rapidly approaching zero.

#### We control terminal impact uniqueness - war taboo strong and effective now. Norms prevents miscalc and escalation

Beehner, 12

Council on Foreign Relations senior writer; Truman National Security Project fellow

[Lionel, "Is There An Emerging ‘Taboo’ Against Retaliation?" The Smoke Filled Room, 7-13-12, thesmokefilledroomblog.com/2012/07/13/is-there-an-emerging-taboo-against-retaliation/, accessed 9-22-13, ]

The biggest international news in the quiet months before 9/11 was the collision of a U.S. Navy spy aircraft and a PLA fighter jet in China, during which 24 American crew members were detained. Even though the incident was lampooned on SNL, there was real concern that the incident would blow up, damaging already-tense relations between the two countries. But it quickly faded and both sides reached an agreement. Quiet diplomacy prevailed. Flash-forward a decade later and we have a similar border incident of a spy plane being shot down between Turkey and Syria. Cue the familiar drumbeats for war on both sides. To save face, each side has ratcheted up its hostile rhetoric (even though Syria’s president did offer something of an admission of guilt). But, as in the spring of 2001, I wouldn’t get too worried. One of the least noted global norms to emerge in recent decades has been the persistence of state restraint in international relations. Retaliation has almost become an unstated taboo. Of course, interstate war is obviously not a relic of previous centuries, but nor is it as commonplace anymore, despite persistent flare-ups that have the potential to escalate to full-blown war. Consider the distinct cases of India and South Korea. Both have sustained serious attacks with mass casualties in recent years: South Korea saw 46 of its sailors killed after the Cheonan, a naval vessel, was sunk by North Korea; India saw 200 citizens killed by the Mumbai attacks, orchestrated by Islamist groups with links to Pakistani intelligence. Yet neither retaliated with military force. Why? The short answer might be: Because a response may have triggered a nuclear war (both Pakistan and North Korea are nuclear-armed states). So nukes in this case may have acted as a deterrent and prevented an escalation of hostilities. But I would argue that it was not the presence of nuclear weapons that led to restraint but rather normative considerations. South Korea and India are also both rising democratic powers with fast-growing economies, enemies along their peripheries, and the military and financial backing of the United States. Their leaders, subject to the whims of an electorate, may have faced domestic pressures to respond with force or suffer reputational costs. And yet no escalation occurred and war was averted. Again, I argue that this is because there is an emerging and under-reported norm of restraint in international politics. Even Russia’s invasion of Georgia in August 2008, which may at first appear to disprove this theory, actually upholds it: The Russians barely entered into Georgia proper and could easily have marched onto the capital. But they didn’t. The war was over in 5 days and Russian troops retreated to disputed provinces. Similarly, Turkey will not declare war on Syria, no matter how angry it is that Damascus shot down one of its spy planes. Quiet diplomacy will prevail. In 1999, Nina Tannenwald made waves by proclaiming the emergence of what she called a “nuclear taboo” – that is, the non-use of dangerous nukes had emerged as an important global norm. Are we witnessing the emergence of a similar norm for interstate war? Even as violence rages on in the form of civil war and internal political violence all across the global map, interstate conflict is increasingly rare. My point is not to echo Steven Pinker, whose latest book, The Better Angles of Our Nature, painstakingly details a “civilizing process” and “humanitarian revolution” that has brought war casualties and murder rates down over the centuries. I’m not fully convinced by his argument, but certainly agree with the observation that at the state level, a norm of non-retaliation has emerged. The question is why. Partly, war no longer makes as much sense as in the past because capturing territory is no longer as advantageous as it once was. We no longer live in a world where marauding throngs of Dothraki-like bandits – or what Mancur Olson politely called “non-stationary bandits” – seek to expand their writ over large unconquered areas. This goes on, of course, at the intrastate level, but the rationale for interstate war for conquest is no longer as strong. Interstate wars of recent memory — the Eritrea-Ethiopia conflicts of 1999 and 2005, the Russia-Georgia War of 2008 — upon closer inspection, actually look more like intrastate wars. The latter was fought over two secessionist provinces; the former between two former rebel leaders-turned-presidents who had a falling out. But if we have reached a norm of non-retaliation to threats or attacks, does that mean that deterrence is no longer valid? After all, if states know there will be no response, why not step up the level of attacks? I would argue that the mere threat of retaliation is enough, as evidenced by Turkish leaders’ harsh words toward Syria (there is now a de facto no-fly zone near their shared border). Still, doesn’t restraint send a signal of weakness and lack of resolve? After all, didn’t Seoul’s non-response to the Cheonan sinking only invite Pyongyang to escalate hostilities? Robert Jervis dismisses the notion that a tough response signals resolve as being overly simplified. The observers’ interpretation of the actor and the risks involved also matter. When Schelling writes about the importance of “saving face,” he describes it as the “interdependence of a country’s commitments; it is a country’s reputation for action, the expectations other countries have about its behavior.” Others note that the presence of nuclear weapons forces states, when attacked, to respond with restraint to avoid the risk of nuclear escalation. Hence, we get “limited wars” rather than full-blown conflicts, or what some deterrent theorists describe as the “stability-instability paradox.” This is not a new concept, of course: Thucydides quoted King Archimadus of Sparta: “And perhaps then they see that our actual strength is keeping pace with the language that we use, they will be more inclined to give way, since their land will still be untouched and, in making up their minds, they will be thinking of advantages which they still possess and which have not yet been destroyed.” There will be future wars between states, of course. But **the days when an isolated incident, such as a spy plane being shot down or a cross-border incursion, can unleash a chain of events that lead to interstate wars** I believe are largely over **because of the emergence of restraint as a powerful norm**ative force in international politics, not unlike Tannenwald’s “nuclear taboo.” Turkey and Syria will only exchange a war of words, not actual hostilities. To do otherwise would be a violation of this existing norm.

#### Specifically, erosion of the use of force taboo triggers nuclear conflict between India and Pakistan and China and Taiwan

Obayemi, 6

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

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

#### Indo-Pak nuclear war causes extinction

Starr ’11

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

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

#### So does China-Taiwan

Straits Times 2k

(6-25, Lexis, No one gains in war over Taiwan)

THE DOOMSDAY SCENARIO THE high-intensity scenario postulates a cross-strait war escalating into a full-scale war between the US and China. If Washington were to conclude that splitting China would better serve its national interests, then a full-scale war becomes unavoidable. Conflict on such a scale would embroil other countries far and near and -- horror of horrors -- raise the possibility of a nuclear war. Beijing has already told the US and Japan privately that it considers any country providing bases and logistics support to any US forces attacking China as belligerent parties open to its retaliation. In the region, this means South Korea, Japan, the Philippines and, to a lesser extent, Singapore. If China were to retaliate, east Asia will be set on fire. And the conflagration may not end there as opportunistic powers elsewhere may try to overturn the existing world order. With the US distracted, Russia may seek to redefine Europe's political landscape. The balance of power in the Middle East may be similarly upset by the likes of Iraq. In south Asia, hostilities between India and Pakistan, each armed with its own nuclear arsenal, could enter a new and dangerous phase. Will a full-scale Sino-US war lead to a nuclear war? According to General Matthew Ridgeway, commander of the US Eighth Army which fought against the Chinese in the Korean War, the US had at the time thought of using nuclear weapons against China to save the US from military defeat. In his book The Korean War, a personal account of the military and political aspects of the conflict and its implications on future US foreign policy, Gen Ridgeway said that US was confronted with two choices in Korea -- truce or a broadened war, which could have led to the use of nuclear weapons. If the US had to resort to nuclear weaponry to defeat China long before the latter acquired a similar capability, there is little hope of winning a war against China 50 years later, short of using nuclear weapons. The US estimates that China possesses about 20 nuclear warheads that can destroy major American cities. Beijing also seems prepared to go for the nuclear option. A Chinese military officer disclosed recently that Beijing was considering a review of its "non first use" principle regarding nuclear weapons. Major-General Pan Zhangqiang, president of the military-funded Institute for Strategic Studies, told a gathering at the Woodrow Wilson International Centre for Scholars in Washington that although the government still abided by that principle, there were strong pressures from the military to drop it. He said military leaders considered the use of nuclear weapons mandatory if the country risked dismemberment as a result of foreign intervention. Gen Ridgeway said that should that come to pass, we would see the destruction of civilisation. There would be no victors in such a war. While the prospect of a nuclear Armaggedon over Taiwan might seem inconceivable, it cannot be ruled out entirely, for China puts sovereignty above everything else.

### Plan

**The United States federal government should increase restrictions on the targeted killing and indefinite detention war powers authorities granted to the President of the United States by Public Law 107-40 and modified by the 2012 National Defense Authorization Act by limiting the targets of those authorities to al-Qaeda, the Taliban, or those nations, organizations, or persons who enjoy close and well-established collaboration with al-Qaeda or the Taliban.**

### Solvency

#### Action to clearly define the enemy restricts the executive scope of the AUMF while preserving presidential flexibility and the joint decision-making capabilities

**Cronogue ‘12**

[Graham. Duke University School of Law, J.D. expected 2013; University of North Carolina B.A. 2010. 22 Duke J. Comp. & Int'l L. 377 2011-2012. ETB]

The AUMF must be updated. In 2001, the AUMF authorized force to ¶ fight against America’s most pressing threat, the architects of 9/11. However, much has changed since 2001. Bin Laden is dead, the Taliban ¶ has been deposed, and it is extremist organizations other than al-Qaeda and ¶ the Taliban who are launching many of the attacks against Americans and ¶ coalition partners.124 In many ways, the greatest threat is coming from ¶ groups not even around in 2001, groups such as AQAP and al Shabaab.125¶ Yet these groups do not fall under the AUMF’s authorization of force. ¶ These groups are not based in the same country that launched the attacks, ¶ have different leaders, and were not involved in planning or coordinating ¶ 9/11. Thus, under a strict interpretation of the AUMF, the President is not ¶ authorized to use force against these groups. ¶ Congress needs to specifically authorize force against groups outside of al-Qaeda and the Taliban. Our security concerns demand that the ¶ President can act quickly and decisively when facing threats. The current ¶ authorization does not cover many of these threats, yet it is much more ¶ difficult to achieve this decisiveness if the President is forced to rely solely ¶ on his inherent powers. A clear congressional authorization would clear up ¶ much of this problem. Under Justice Jackson’s framework, granting or ¶ denying congressional authorization ensures that President does not operate ¶ in the “zone of twilight.”126 Therefore, if Congress lays out the exact scope ¶ of the President’s power, naming or clearly defining the targeted actors, the ¶ constitutionality or unconstitutionality of presidential actions will become ¶ much clearer.127¶ Removing the 9/11 nexus to reflect the current reality of war without ¶ writing a carte blanche is the most important form of congressional ¶ guidance regarding target authorization. In order for the President to ¶ operate under the current AUMF, he must find a strong nexus between the ¶ target and the attacks on September 11. As I have shown in this paper, this ¶ nexus is simply non-existent for many groups fighting the United States ¶ today. Yet, the President should want to operate pursuant to congressional ¶ authorization, Justice Jackson’s strongest zone of presidential authority. In ¶ order to achieve this goal, the administration has begun to stretch the ¶ statutory language to include groups whose connection to the 9/11 attacks, ¶ if any, is extraordinarily limited. The current presidential practice only ¶ nominally follows the AUMF, a practice Congress has seemingly ¶ consented to by failing to amend the statute for over ten years. This “stretching” is dangerous as Congress is no longer truly behind the ¶ authorization and has simply acquiesced to the President’s exercise of ¶ broad authority. ¶ The overarching purpose of the new authorization should be to make it ¶ clear that the domestic legal foundation for using military force is not ¶ limited to al-Qaeda and the Taliban but also extends to the many other ¶ organizations fighting the United States. The language in Representative ¶ McKeon’s bill does a fairly good job of achieving this goal by specifically ¶ naming al-Qaeda and the Taliban along with the term “associated force.” ¶ This provision makes it clear the President is still authorized to use force ¶ against those responsible for 9/11 and those that harbored them by ¶ specifically mentioning al-Qaeda and the Taliban. However, the additional ¶ term “associated force” makes it clear that the authorization is not limited ¶ to these two groups and that the President can use force against the allies ¶ and separate branches of al-Qaeda and the Taliban. This creates a very ¶ flexible authorization. ¶ Despite the significant flexibility of the phrase “associated force ¶ engaged in hostilities”, I would propose defining the term or substituting a ¶ more easily understood and limited term. Associated force could mean ¶ many things and apply to groups with varying levels of involvement. ¶ Arguably any group that strongly identifies with or funds al-Qaeda or the ¶ Taliban could be an associated force. Thus, we could end up in the ¶ previously describe situation where group “I” who is in conflict with the ¶ United States or a coalition partner in Indonesia over a completely different ¶ issue becomes a target for its support of an associated force of al-Qaeda. ¶ Beyond that, the United States is authorized to use all necessary force ¶ against any groups that directly aid group “I” in its struggle. ¶ My proposal for the new AUMF would appear as follows: ¶ AFFIRMATION OF ARMED CONFLICT WITH AL-QAEDA, ¶ THE TALIBAN, AND ASSOCIATED FORCES ¶ Congress affirms that— ¶ (1) the United States is engaged in an armed conflict with al-Qaeda, the ¶ Taliban, and associated forces and that those entities continue to ¶ pose a threat to the United States and its citizens, both domestically ¶ and abroad; ¶ a. for the purposes of this statute, an associated force is a ¶ nation, organization, or person who enjoys close and wellestablished collaboration with al-Qaeda or the Taliban and ¶ as part of this relationship has either engaged in or has ¶ intentionally provided direct tactical or logistical support ¶ for armed conflict against the United States or coalition ¶ partners.¶ the President has the authority to use all necessary and appropriate ¶ force during the current armed conflict with al-Qaeda, the Taliban, ¶ and associated forces pursuant to the Authorization for Use of ¶ Military Force (Public Law 107-40; 50 U.S.C. 1541); ¶ (3) the current armed conflict includes nations, organization, and ¶ persons who— ¶ a. are part of al-Qaeda, the Taliban, or associated forces; or ¶ b. engaged in hostilities or have directly supported hostilities ¶ in aid of a nation, organization or person described in ¶ subparagraph (A); ¶ c. or harbored a nation, organization, or person described in ¶ subparagraph (A); and ¶ (4) the President’s authority pursuant to the Authorization for Use of ¶ Military Force includes the authority to detain belligerents, ¶ including persons described in paragraph (3), until the termination ¶ of hostilities. ¶ (5) Nothing in this authorization should be construed to limit the ¶ President’s ability to respond to new and emerging threats or engage ¶ in appropriate and calculated actions of self-defense. ¶ The definition of “associated forces” will add much needed clarity and ¶ provide congressional guidance in determining what groups actually fall ¶ under this provision. Rather than putting faith in the President not to abuse ¶ his discretion, Congress should simply clarify what it means and limit his ¶ discretion to acceptable amounts. The “close and well-established ¶ collaboration” ensures that only groups with very close and observable ties ¶ to al-Qaeda and the Taliban are designated as “associated forces.” While ¶ the requirement that part of their collaboration involve some kind of ¶ tactical or logistical support ensures that those classified as enemy ¶ combatants are actually engaged, or part of an organization that is engaged, ¶ in violence against the United States. Also, requiring that the associated ¶ force’s violence be directed at the United States or a coalition partner and ¶ that this violence is part of its relationship with al-Qaeda or the Taliban is ¶ another important limitation. ¶ First, requiring the associated force to engage in violence that is ¶ directed at these nations ensures that “associated force” does not include ¶ countries such as Iran that might have a relationship with al-Qaeda and ¶ give it financial support but are not actually in violent conflict with the ¶ United States. Second, requiring that this violence is made in furtherance of ¶ its relationship with al-Qaeda and the Taliban ensures that the violence that ¶ makes a group an “associated force” is actually related to its collaboration ¶ with al-Qaeda and the Taliban. Without this second provision, a group that supports al-Qaeda would be elevated to an “associated force” if it engaged ¶ in violence with, for instance, Australia over a completely unrelated issue. ¶ While some groups that work closely with and support al-Qaeda ¶ would not be considered associated forces, it is important to limit the scope ¶ of this term. This label effectively elevates the group to the same status as ¶ al-Qaeda and the Taliban and attaches authorization for force against any ¶ group that supports or harbors it. Furthermore, there is little real harm by ¶ narrowly defining associated forces because the groups that do support alQaeda will still be subject to the authorization under the “support” or ¶ “harbor” prongs. Narrowly defining “associated forces” simply prevents ¶ the problem of authorization spreading to supporters of those who are ¶ merely supporters of al-Qaeda. ¶ Compared to Representative McKeon’s proposal, these new ¶ provisions would narrow the scope of authorization. The President would ¶ not be able to use this authorization to attack new groups that both spring ¶ up outside our current theater and have no relation to al-Qaeda, the Taliban ¶ or the newly defined associated forces. However, part (5) of my ¶ authorization would ensure that the President is not unnecessarily restricted ¶ in responding to new and emergent threats from organizations that do not ¶ collaborate and support al-Qaeda. In this way, the proposal incorporates ¶ Robert Chesney’s suggestion, “[i]t may be that it [is] better to draw the ¶ statutory circle narrowly, with language making clear that the narrow ¶ framing does not signify an intent to try and restrict the President’s ¶ authority to act when necessary against other groups in the exercise of ¶ lawful self-defense.”128 The purpose of the new AUMF should not be to ¶ give the President a carte blanche to attack any terrorist or extremist group ¶ all over the world. The purpose of this authorization is to provide clear ¶ authorization for the use of force against al-Qaeda and its allies. Moreover, ¶ if a new group is created that has no relation to any of the relevant actors ¶ defined in this statute, Congress can pass another authorization that ¶ addresses this reality. The purpose of congressional authorization should ¶ not be to authorize the President to act against every conceivable threat to ¶ American interests. In fact, such an authorization would effectively strip ¶ Congress of its constitutional war making powers. Instead, the new ¶ proposal should provide clear domestic authorization for the use of force against those nations that present the greatest threat to the United States ¶ today.

**Obama will adhere to the plan- wants to rely on congressional authority**

**WSJ ‘12**

[Julian Barnes and Evan Perez. December 6. <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424127887323316804578163724113421726.html> ETB]

Obama **administration officials, concerned about the legal justifications behind counterterrorism operations, have preferred to rely on congressional authority for the use of force against al Qaeda, seeing such authority as more defensible** and acceptable **to allies.**

#### No disads – restrictions now

Miller 1/15/14

(Greg Miller “Lawmakers seek to stymie plan to shift control of drone campaign from CIA to Pentagon” http://www.washingtonpost.com/world/national-security/lawmakers-seek-to-stymie-plan-to-shift-control-of-drone-campaign-from-cia-to-pentagon/2014/01/15/c0096b18-7e0e-11e3-9556-4a4bf7bcbd84\_print.html)

Congress has moved to block President Obama’s plan to shift control of the U.S. drone campaign from the CIA to the Defense Department, inserting a secret provision in the massive government spending bill introduced this week that would preserve the spy agency’s role in lethal counterterrorism operations, U.S. officials said.¶ The measure, included in a classified annex to the $1.1 trillion federal budget plan, would restrict the use of any funding to transfer unmanned aircraft or the authority to carry out drone strikes from the CIA to the Pentagon, officials said.¶ The provision represents an unusually direct intervention by lawmakers into the way covert operations are run, impeding an administration plan aimed at returning the CIA’s focus to traditional intelligence gathering and possibly bringing more transparency to drone strikes.

**Military will adhere to the plan**

**Dunlap ‘12**

[Maj. Gen. Charles J. Dunlap Jr. (Ret.), Professor of the Practice of Law¶ Executive Director, Center on Law, Ethics and National Security @ Duke. In Patriot Debates: Contemporary Issues in National Security Law. <http://www.americanbar.org/groups/public_services/law_national_security/patriot_debates2/the_book_online/ch9/ch9_ess2.html> ETB]

This raises an important question: **Should America wage war— cyber or otherwise—without legal “limits”? Military commanders have seen the no-legal-limits movie before and they do not like it.** In the aftermath of 9/11, civilian lawyers moved in exactly that direction. Former Attorney General Alberto Gonzales, for example, rejected parts of the Geneva Conventions as “quaint.” He then aligned himself with other civilian government lawyers who seemed to believe that the President’s war-making power knew virtually no limits. The most egregious example of this mindset was their endorsement of interrogation techniques now widely labeled as torture.25 **The results of the no-legal-limits approach were disastrous**. The ill-conceived civilian-sourced interrogation, detention, and military tribunal policies, implemented over the persistent objections of America’s military lawyers, caused an international uproar that profoundly injured critical relations with indispensable allies.26 Even more damaging, they put the armed forces on the road to Abu Ghraib, a catastrophic explosion of criminality that produced what military leaders like then U.S. commander in Iraq Lieutenant General Ricardo Sanchez labeled as a “clear defeat.”27 Infused with illegalities, Abu Ghraib became the greatest reversal America has suffered since 9/11. In fact, in purely military terms, it continues to hobble counterterrorism efforts. General David **Petraeus observed that “Abu Ghraib and other situations like that are non-biodegradable**. They don’t go away.” “**The enemy,” Petraeus says, “continues to beat you with them like a stick**.”28 In short, **military commanders want to adhere to the law because they have hard experience with the consequences of failing to do so.**

# 2AC

### 2ac- Restriction=Prohibition

#### W/M- plan prohibits use of force against individuals and groups that fall outside of the plan’s narrow definition of “associated force”- tht’s Cronogue

#### W/M- Ambiguity of “associated forces” gives Obama carte blanche to target and detain in the squo- plan restricts that authority.

#### Counter-interp: Statutory restrictions are legislative limits

Law dictionary No Date

http://thelawdictionary.org/statutory-restriction/

STATUTORY RESTRICTION?

Limits or controls that have been place on activities by its ruling legislation

#### W/M – We limit the president’s authority to determine those responsible for 9/11 in the AUMF.

Bradley & Goldsmith ‘5

[- Curtis & - Jack, Professors at University of Virginia and Harvard Law Schools Respectively, CONGRESSIONAL AUTHORIZATION AND THE

WAR ON TERRORISM, Harvard Law Review, Volume 118, May 2005]

The AUMF is arguably more restrictive in one respect, and argua-bly broader in another respect, than authorizations in declared wars. It is arguably more restrictive to the extent that it requires the Presi-dent to report to Congress on the status of hostilities. This difference from authorizations in declared wars, however, does not purport to af-fect the military authority that Congress has conferred on the Presi-dent. The AUMF is arguably broader than authorizations in declared wars in its description of the enemy against which force can be used. The AUMF authorizes the President to use force against those “na-tions, organizations, or persons he determines” have the requisite nexus with the September 11 attacks. This provision contrasts with authori-zations in declared wars in two related ways. First, it describes rather than names the enemies that are the objects of the use of force.144 Second, it expressly authorizes the President to determine which “nations, organizations, or persons” satisfy the statutory criteria for enemy status.145 One could argue that the effect of the “he determines” provision is to give the President broad, and possibly unreviewable, discretion to apply the nexus requirement to identify the covered enemy — at least to the extent that his determination does not implicate constitutional rights.146 Even if this argument is correct, this provision probably adds little to the President’s already-broad authority to de-termine the existence of facts related to the exercise of his authority under the AUMF.147

**In the area of refers to a certain scope**

Elizabeth **Miura 12**, China Presentation, prezi.com/tccgenlw25so/chin165a-final-presentation/

"**in the area of" refers to a certain scope**

**Substantial means important. We Meet. The aff prevents unlimited presidential WOT authority—that’s an important restriction of war power authority**

**Merriam-Webster**’s Collegiate Dictionary **02**

Merriam-Webster’s Collegiate Dictionary Tenth Edition 2002 http://www.m-w.com/cgi-bin/dictionary

**Considerable in importance**, value, degree, amount, or extent

#### Prefer our interp:

#### Theirs overlimits to 8 cases- prevents innovation and leads to statle debates- and their means that every aff would lose to pics. Lack of solvency advocates limits the proliferations of smaller affs and there are no qualified advocates for banning topic areas

#### Topic Education- most literature discusses restriction as a limit on presidential authority- their interp corresponds to an unreasonably tiny portion of the lit base

#### Bidirectionality is inevitable because whether a “restriction” increases prez power is a solvency question, which also proves their interp mixes burdens

#### Default to reasonability to prevent a race to the most limiting interpretation

### 2AC- Flex DA

#### The executive is swamped by terrorism fatigue, which creates sluggish response to crises- plan is key reinvigorate the executive- that’s Leiter

#### Plan is critical to making flexibility effective- a clear congressional authorization is key to quick and decisive executive action during- and it’s crucial to allow the president to fight emerging threats by clearly defining targets- that’s Cronogue and Chesney

\*\*Don’t read with XO

**More evidence**

\*plan is key to making prez powers effective – solves flex

**Cronogue ‘12**

[Graham. Duke University School of Law, J.D. expected 2013; University of North Carolina B.A. 2010. 22 Duke J. Comp. & Int'l L. 377 2011-2012. ETB]

Though the President's inherent authority to act in times of emergency¶ and war can arguably make **congressional authorization of force**¶ unnecessary, it **is extremely important for the conflict against al-Qaeda and** **its allies**. First, as seen above, the existence of a state of war or national¶ emergency is not entirely clear and might not authorize offensive war¶ anyway. Next, assuming that a state of war did exist, specific **congressional authorization would** further **legitimate and guide the executive branch** in the prosecution of this conflict **by setting out exactly what Congress authorizes** and what it does not. Finally, **Congress should** specifically **set out what the President can and cannot do to limit his discretionary authority** **and prevent adding to the gloss on executive power**.¶ Even during a state of war, **a congressional** authorizationfor conflict¶ thatclearly sets out **the acceptable** targets **and means would** further legitimate **the President's** actionsand **help** guide **his** decision making¶ **during this new form of warfare.** Under Justice Jackson's framework from¶ Youngstown, presidential authority is at its height when the Executive is acting pursuant to an implicit or explicit congressional authorization. 74 In¶ this zone, the President can act quickly and decisively because he knows the full extent of his power.75 In contrast, the constitutionality of¶ presidential action merely supported by a president's inherent authority¶ exists in the "zone of twilight." 76 **Without a congressional grant of power,** **the President's war actions are often of questionable constitutionality because Congress has not specifically delegated any of its own war powers to the executive.77**¶ **This** problem **forces the President to make complex judgments** **regarding the extent and scope of his inherent authority. The resulting uncertainty creates unwelcome issues of constitutionality that might hinder** the P**resident's ability to prosecute this conflict effectively.** **In time sensitive**¶ and dangerous **situations**, where **the President** needs to make splitsecond¶ decisions that could fundamentally impact American lives and¶ safety, he **should not have to guess at the scope of his authority. Instead, Congress should provide a clear, unambiguous grant of power, which would mitigate many questions of authorization. Allowing the President to understand the extent of his authority will enable him to act quickly, decisively but also constitutionally.**¶Finally, a grant or denial of **congressional authorization will allow Congress to control the "gloss" on the executive power.** There is¶ considerable **tension between the President's constitutional powers** as¶ Commander in Chief **and Congress's war making powers**.7 8 This tension is **not readily resolved** simply **by looking at the Constitution**. Instead **courts look to past presidential actions and congressional responses when evaluating the constitutionality of executive actions**.80 Indeed Justice¶ **Frankfurter** **noted** in Youngstown that "**a systematic**, unbroken, **executive**¶ **practice**, long pursued to the knowledge of the Congress and never before¶ questioned ... **may be treated as a gloss on 'executive Power'** vested in the¶ President by § 1 of Art. II."8 Thus, **congressional inaction can be deemed as implicit delegation of war making power to the executive.**82 Whether the United States is in a state of war or not, **an authorization of force provides legitimacy and clarity to the war effort**. **If the President acts pursuant to such an authorization his authority is at its height**;¶ consequently, **he can operate with greater certainty that his actions are constitutional**.83 **Absent such a declaration, the President's power is much less clear.** **While the President has the authority to frame the conflict and he might still be able to act pursuant to his inherent powers, he is operating in**¶ **the zone of twilight.84 Congressional authorizations remove this uncertainty by stamping specific acts with congressional approval or disapproval. This process also allows Congress to exert control over what the President can do in the future and prevents the "gloss" that comes from congressional acquiescence.**¶

### 2AC Iran Politics

#### No pass – momentum and AIPAC isn’t working

Ditz 1/22 <Jason, AntiWar.com, http://news.antiwar.com/2014/01/22/more-senate-leaders-oppose-iran-sanctions-vote/>#SPS

More key Senate Democrats are coming out against an immediate vote on Iran sanctions today, with Sen. Patty Murray (D – WA) and [usually hawkish](http://antiwar.com/blog/2011/10/17/elizabeth-warren-bomb-bomb-iran/) Sen. Elizabeth Warren (D – MA) [both opposing](http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/plum-line/wp/2014/01/22/another-blow-to-the-iran-sanctions-bill/) a vote.¶ This puts much of the Senate leadership on the side of waiting, and allowing diplomacy with Iran to continue, and suggests that the Iran sanctions bill, aimed at violating the Iran deal and ending the talks, is less likely than ever to see a vote in the near term.¶ The momentum has been swinging that way for awhile now, and with the interim Iran deal now formally in place, the push to kill it seems to be losing some of its urgency, with less and less confidence that they can get a veto-proof majority at any rate.¶ The Iran sanctions have 58 co-sponsors and 59 committed supporters, but with President Obama promising a veto they’d need 67 yes votes to override, and despite heavy support from Israeli lobbying groups like AIPAC, those last votes don’t seem to be materializing.

#### Reid won’t even bring it up for a vote

Rogin 1/14 (Josh, “Iran Sanctions Battle Heats Up”, http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2014/01/14/iran-sanctions-battle-heats-up.html)

The Senate is stalling on bringing new Iran sanctions legislation to a vote following another diplomatic breakthrough, but pro-sanctions Senators say the House may not wait to pass the bill that the White House says could kill the talks and lead to war. On Sunday, Iran and the P5+1 countries announced they had completed the implementation agreement for an interim deal regarding Iran’s nuclear program, starting the clock on a six-month period during which a potential final deal will be negotiated. Reports said today that there is also a 30-page informal side deal, known as a “non-paper,” that would spell out details of the interim agreement the parties don’t want made public. The new progress in negotiations with Iran prompted Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid to say Tuesday the time was not right for a vote on the Menendez-Kirk Iran bill, which would set out Congressional parameters on what a final deal should look like and impose new sanctions if Iran does not complete the final deal or honor it. "At this stage, I think we're where we should be,” Reid said, reversing his previous pledge that if the bill was bipartisan, he would bring it up for a vote on the senate floor. The bill currently has 59 co-sponsors, including 16 Democrats. Eleven Democratic Committee chairmen have also said they oppose moving forward to a vote at this time.

#### Disad isn’t intrinsic to the aff – it’s within the agential ambit of the USFG to do the plan and pass debt ceiling

#### Plan has bipartisan support – it’s not a loss

Munoz 6/3

Carlos Munoz, The Hill, House rolling back 9/11-era counter terrorism rules of war http://thehill.com/blogs/defcon-hill/policy-and-strategy/303153-house-rolling-back-911-era-counter-terrorism-rules-of-war-#ixzz2eGIF5zaI

**The other proposal will force the Pentagon and White House to review all groups or individuals now characterized as “associated forces” under the** 9/11 counter terrorism rules, known on Capitol Hill as the Authorization of the Use of Military Force (**AUMF**). Both measures were included in the House defense panel's version of the fiscal year 2014 Defense Authorization bill. The Hill first reported details of the House panel's efforts to reel in mandates in the AUMF last Friday. Individuals or groups with cursory ties to al Qaeda are now considered “associated forces,” and can be targeted in drone strikes just like members of terrorist cells or people with direct links to the terror group. The House-mandated review requires the Pentagon to specifically lay out whether those groups or individuals are directly tied to al Qaeda operations, and if they are engaged with ongoing or future terror plots against the United States or its allies. Those pushing to change the rules argue the current definition of associated forces gives U.S. military and intelligence agencies far too much leeway in determining who can and cannot be targeted by U.S. forces in counter terrorism “kill/capture” missions. The rules of war under the AUMF provide a "frightening amount of power and it is counter to the rights enshrined in the United States Constitution," House Armed Services Committee Ranking Member Rep. Adam Smith said in a statement Monday. "We have an opportunity, through this year’s bill, to protect constitutional rights and roll back this authority," he added. The kill/capture notification called for in the Pentagon spending bill will "ensure that every [counter terrorism] action is consistent with our civil liberties and freedoms," **Rep Mac Thornberry (R-Texas), head of the House defense committee's subpabel on emerging threats and intelligence, said** in a statement last month. Thornberry, who introduced the proposal as a stand-alone bill in May, **said the legislation has garnered widespread support on Capitol Hill. "There has been bipartisan support in the House and Senate for more ... oversight of such operations to ensure they are carried out in ways that are consistent with the United States Constitution,"** Thornberry said at the time.

Conceeded the Miller evidence at the bottom of the 1AC – Congress just prevented Obama from making a shift that he wanted – that’s a pretty big loss, you link is non-unique

#### No strike – no escalation anyway

Elhusseini 13 (Fadi, Palestinian Diplomat and Journalist, 3/12/2013, "Will Israel attack Iran?", jordantimes.com/will-israel-attack-iran)

That red line is fast approaching, but is Israel going to really attack Iran? Many observers say this is sheer fantasy, especially in view of the new Israeli government coalition and the current developments in the Middle East. Iran insists its nuclear programme is peaceful and a national right, yet the fiery speeches and comments delivered by its officials proffer neither good gestures nor convincing assurances to the international community or its sympathisers. The prospect of war terrifies not only Israelis, but also people across the Middle East and the rest of the world. Surveys in Israel show that most Israelis oppose launching a unilateral attack on Iranian nuclear facilities. Experts believe that no Israeli attack would deter the Iranian nuclear programme and its ambition would not be ended, but simply delayed. Israeli military and intelligence chiefs believe that a strike on Iran is a bad idea, while the Obama administration has told Israel to back off and wait for sanctions to work. While it is likely that Iran would retaliate against Israel and possibly the US in response to any attack, it is unlikely that Iran will instigate a major war. Albeit for different reasons, Iran, Israel and the US understand that a war would not serve their interests. Israeli decision makers are confident that if things go bad, the US will not leave Israel at peril. Neither the US, whose most difficult decisions are usually taken in the second presidential term, nor other international powers would leave Israel unaided or accept an Israeli defeat. Iranian decision makers are also aware of the fact that initiating a major war would lead to an eventual American intervention and an inevitable confrontation with the world’s biggest military might.

#### Won’t withdraw from negotiations – economics and no threat of war

Shapiro 12/31/13

(Dmitriy Shapiro “Working together against Iran” December 31, 2013, http://washingtonjewishweek.com/working-together-against-iran/)

“What I think might be a little new is the aggressiveness of the Obama administration in basically saying that if you want to increase Iran sanctions, you want war — and I think there are many members of Congress who just don’t believe that,” the aide said.¶ Both congressional sources agree that despite the back and forth, this bill is not meant to restrict the administration’s options, but to use the credible threat of greater sanctions to ensure Iran takes these talks seriously. They also doubt the Iranians would risk further collapse to its economy by withdrawing from negotiations under these circumstances.

### 2ac- Sunset CP

#### Perm- do the plan and the counterplan

#### Perm- do the counterplan, its not textually competitive, they only add a plank that includes a sunset in \_\_\_\_\_ years

#### No solvency-

#### CP makes counter terrorism policy unsustainable- recent gridlock proves congress won’t be able to pass a new aumf every \_\_\_\_\_\_ years- CP removes the authorization for the WOT, making nuclear/biological attack inevitable

#### CP wrecks legitimacy because it merely pushes the legal uncertainty regarding detention and targeted killing back \_\_\_\_\_\_ years- that’s Chesney

#### If plan is unpopular it proves the AUMF won’t get renewed

#### Perm- do the plan and insert a sunset provision but continue doing the plan regardless of its recommendations

#### Timeframe counterplans are bad- they only generate any offense based off a change in the plan \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ years from now, there is no literature as to how this would occur in relation to our plan, which makes 2ac offense impossible due to lack of predictive literature

#### Double Bind- Either

#### A. The plan will be rolled back later and the case outweighs politics

#### OR.

#### B. Theres no Net Benefit- Congresspeople will still fight the counterplan if they know it wont be rolled back

Deseret Morning News, 2/16/7’ [Seat-belt measure stumbles by 6 votes in House, Nexis]

Sen. Pat Jones, D-Salt Lake, sponsored the bill and helped shepherd it out of the Senate. Last year, similar legislation made it out of the Senate but failed in the House. She hoped a sunset provision in the legislation would have helped the bill pass. With the provision, the law would have expired after three years. The bill's House sponsor, Rep. Sheryl Allen, R-Bountiful, was disappointed with the outcome. "I think it's very unfortunate because this was a way to save lives." During floor debate, Allen pointed out that not wearing a seat belt is already illegal. She also used the impact accidents have on taxpayers and the sunset clause as selling points. "We have heard a number of studies that say ... seat belts do save lives. . ." But, the bill met resistance from Rep. Carl Wimmer, R-Herriman. Wimmer, who is a police officer by profession, told his fellow House members that he had been on the scene of many fatal car accidents and knew the consequences of not buckling up. But Wimmer said the bill represented "heavy-handed government." Something he called "uglier than any death I've ever seen." Rep. Curt Oda, R-Clearfield, dismissed the sunset clause when he offered a very different substitute version of the bill. "Once it's enacted it's not really ever going to go away."

#### Sunset provisions are unpopular- tax cuts proves

Guinto, Investor’s Business Daily, ’03 (Joseph, May 5, “House Nearing Final Tax-Cut Package That Trims Cap Gains, Dividend Levies; Senate Limits Still A Hurdle” lexis)

The idea would be to hold down long-term estimates of costs to the Treasury arising from the tax cut. And while that's nothing new on Capitol Hill, talk of a sunset provision has already proven unpopular in the Senate. That's just one of several things that continue to cleave apart even the Republican leaders in the House and Senate. A Senate blueprint on the tax cut might come today. But Senate tax writers are so far apart on the issue that sources told IBD that it could be as late as next Friday before an outline emerges. Still, Senate Majority Leader Bill Frist, R-Tenn., said Thursday he now favors phasing in an elimination of dividend taxes over 10 years. That would meet Bush's goal of eliminating the tax while letting the Senate hold down the 10-year cost of the overall tax cut to $350 billion. Senate leaders last month committed to capping the tax cut at that $350 billion level. But even that commitment remains in flux. "We want to fight for as high a number as possible," Frist said. His goal now is $550 billion. Even so, Thomas does not back Frist's phase-in and Frist does not back Thomas' plan to tax dividends as capital gains.

#### Drones don’t cause U.S adventurism---their ev is baseless speculation

Amitai Etzioni 13, professor of international relations at George Washington University, March/April 2013, “The Great Drone Debate,” Military Review, <http://usacac.army.mil/CAC2/MilitaryReview/Archives/English/MilitaryReview_20130430_art004.pdf>

Mary Dudziak of the University of Southern California’s Gould School of Law opines that “[d]rones are a technological step that further isolates the American people from military action, undermining political checks on . . . endless war.” Similarly, Noel Sharkey, in The Guardian, worries that drones represent “the ﬁnal step in the industrial revolution of war—a clean factory of slaughter with no physical blood on our hands and none of our own side killed.”

This kind of cocktail-party sociology does not stand up to even the most minimal critical examination. Would the people of the United States, Afghanistan, and Pakistan be better off if terrorists were killed in “hot” blood—say, knifed by Special Forces, blood and brain matter splashing in their faces? Would they be better off if our troops, in order to reach the terrorists, had to go through improvised explosive devices blowing up their legs and arms and gauntlets of machinegun ﬁre and rocket-propelled grenades—traumatic experiences that turn some of them into psychopath-like killers?

Perhaps if *all* or *most* ﬁghting were done in a cold-blooded, push-button way, it might well have the effects suggested above. However, as long as what we are talking about are a few hundred drone drivers, what they do or do not feel has no discernible effects on the nation or the leaders who declare war. Indeed, there is no evidence that the introduction of drones (and before that, high-level bombing and cruise missiles that were criticized on the same grounds) made going to war more likely or its extension more acceptable. Anybody who followed the American disengagement in Vietnam after the introduction of high-level bombing, or the U.S. withdrawal from Afghanistan (and Iraq)—despite the considerable increases in drone strikes—knows better. In effect, the opposite argument may well hold: if the United States could not draw on drones in Yemen and the other new theaters of the counterterrorism campaign, the nation might well have been forced to rely more on conventional troops and prolong our involvement in those areas, a choice which would greatly increase our casualties and zones of warfare.

[Italics in original]

#### Powers will work together to stabilize the region—security and economic incentives

Gresh 12

(Dr. Geoffrey F., Assistant Professor of International Security Studies at National Defense University, “Russia, China, and stabilizing South Asia”, 3/12, http://afpak.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2012/03/12/russia\_china\_and\_stabilizing\_south\_asia)

As the U.S. begins to withdraw troops from Afghanistan, Russia and China have both declared a desire to increase their military presence throughout Central and South Asia. This new regional alignment, however, should not be viewed as a threat to U.S. strategic national interests but seen rather as concurrent with strategic and regional interests of the United States: regional peace, stability and the prevention of future terrorist safe havens in ungoverned territories. As China and Russia begin to flex their military muscles, the U.S. military should harness their expanded regional influence to promote proactively a new period of responsible multilateral support for Afghanistan and Pakistan. This past December it became clearer that Russia had begun to re-assert its regional presence when the Collective Security Treaty Organization (CSTO) granted Russia the veto power over any member state's future decision to host a foreign military. CSTO members, including Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, and Uzbekistan, have become increasingly valuable U.S. partners in the Northern Distribution Network after Pakistan shut down U.S. military supply routes running from the south into Afghanistan when NATO troops killed 24 Pakistani soldiers last November in the border area of Salala. Though it appears the route may soon open again, the United States must still adopt a new strategy that works more closely with Russia and the CSTO to maintain the Northern Distribution Network long into the future, which currently accounts for about 60 percent of all cargo transiting Central Asia en route to Afghanistan. Certainly, the U.S. risks being unable to control many aspects of the Northern Distribution Network as it withdraws from the region, and this may in turn adversely affect Afghanistan's future success. However, if the United States remains concerned about leaving the region to a historically obdurate regional rival like Russia, it should also bear in mind that Russia has a vital strategic interest in the future stability of the region. Russia has approximately 15 million Muslims living within its borders, with an estimated 2 million Muslims in Moscow. Russia is fearful of what occurs on its periphery and wants to minimize the spread of Muslim extremism that may originate from an unstable Afghanistan or Pakistan. In addition, Russia does not want regional instability that threatens its oil and gas investments. In particular, Russia wants to ensure that it continues to influence the planning and implementation of the potentially lucrative natural gas pipeline that may one day traverse Turkmenistan, Afghanistan, Pakistan, and India. In a recent meeting with Pakistani Foreign Minister Hina Rabbani Khar, Russian Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov discussed Russia's commitment to preserving peace and stability throughout the AfPak region, and rejected the use of violence by al-Qaeda and its affiliates that aim to undermine the current Afghan government. Furthermore, he pledged to bolster bilateral ties and work cooperatively with Pakistan to achieve stability in Afghanistan. A newly-elected President Vladimir Putin also recently wrote in a campaign brief that "Russia will help Afghanistan develop its economy and strengthen its military to fight terrorism and drug production." It is not lost on the U.S. government that Russia is proposing to succeed where the U.S. has struggled. However, if Russia does succeed in helping establish a secure Afghanistan and Pakistan that can prevent the spread of bases for terrorism then it is a victory for everyone. Aside from Pakistan, and in line with promoting security throughout the region, Russia announced recently that it will provide $16 million to Kyrgyzstan to assist with border security in the south. Russia also agreed recently to pay $15 million in back rent for its four military facilities across the country, including an air base, a torpedo test center on Lake Issyk-Kul, and a communications center in the south. Further, Russia signed a security pact with Tajikistan last fall to extend its basing lease for 49 years, in addition to a bilateral agreement that will enable Russia to become more integrated into Tajikistan's border security forces that oversee an 830-mile border with Afghanistan. Providing similar types of U.S. aid and security support will also help ensure that the valuable Northern Distribution Network remains open and secure for supply lines into Afghanistan. If the northern trade routes are shut down it would adversely affect aid arriving to Afghanistan and therefore jeopardize the stability of Afghanistan and the region. It would also be in opposition to Russia's regional interests. Rather than citing these examples in Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan as a demonstration of how the U.S. will soon lose out in the region to a resurgent Russia, policymakers can view them as an indication of how Russian interests align with the U.S. to help maintain regional security. More importantly, if Russia wants to take a more active future role in Central Asia, the U.S. should address this shift and work directly with Russia and other CSTO members to ensure that the Northern Distribution Network remains operational in the distant future. Certainly, the U.S. should not be naïve to think that Russia will not at times oppose U.S. regional interests and that there will not be significant areas of conflict. In 2009, Russia tried to convince then President of Kyrgyzstan Kurmanbek Bakiyev to terminate the U.S. contract for its base in Manas. In this case, the U.S. fended off the threat of expulsion successfully through promises of increased U.S. military and economic aid. Continuing to maintain significant amounts of aid to the Central Asia Republics will therefore provide additional incentives to ensure the U.S. is less vulnerable to Russian whims, while at the same time remaining present and active for the benefit of regional security and the maintenance of the Northern Distribution Network. Another powerful regional player, China, also has a vested interest in the stability of the AfPak region, and has already begun to play a more active security role. It was reported this past January, for example, that China intends to establish one or more bases in Pakistan's Federally Administered Tribal Areas. Subsequently, at the end of February, Beijing played host to the first China-Afghanistan-Pakistan trilateral dialogue to discuss regional cooperation and stability. Due to China's shared borders and vibrant trade with both Afghanistan and Pakistan -- not to mention China's estimated 8 million Turkic-speaking Muslim Uyghurs living in western Xinjiang Province -- it has a direct interest in ensuring that both Afghanistan and Pakistan remain stable long into the future. Bilateral trade between China and Pakistan, for example, increased 28 percent in the past year to approximately $8.7 billion. China also signed an oil agreement with Afghanistan in December that could be worth $7 billion over the next two decades. Additionally, China is concerned about the rise of its Uyghur separatist movement that maintains safe havens in both countries, in addition to the spread of radical Islam. The United States should push China to become more actively engaged in Pakistan's security affairs as China has a direct interest in moderating radicalism in Pakistan and keeping it stable. Indicative of Pakistan's strategic value to China, since 2002 China has financed the construction and development of Pakistan's Gwadar deep water port project. China has contributed more than $1.6 billion toward the port's development as a major shipping and soon-to-be naval hub, which is located just 250 miles from the opening of the Persian Gulf. A Pakistan Supreme Court decision in 2011 enabled China to take full control of Gwadar from a Singapore management company further establishing China's firm position in the Pakistani port city. The creation of a new Chinese military network in Pakistan between Gwadar and the FATA would enable China to oversee the transit and protection of Chinese goods and investments that travel from both the coast and interior through the Karakorum corridor to China's Xinjiang Province. China already has an estimated 4,000 troops in Gilgit Baltistan, part of the larger and disputed Kashmir, and just recently it was reported after a January 2012 trip by Pakistani Army Chief General Ashfaq Kayani to China that Pakistan is considering leasing Gilgit Baltistan to China for the next 50 years. Such a move would indeed escalate tensions with India to the south, but from a Pakistani perspective, China would be positioned better than it already is to assist with any future Pakistani national security concerns. And from a Chinese perspective, it would improve their ability to monitor any illicit Uyghur activities aimed at inciting further rebellion in western China. With interest comes responsibility, and in the wake of the recent reports predicting the establishment of a more robust Chinese military network across Pakistan, it is time that China begins to supplement its increased involvement in Pakistan by helping to maintain peace and stability throughout the entire AfPak region. Certainly after fighting two long wars, the United States can no longer be the sole world power responsible for the region, and both China and Russia have been U.S. security free-riders for too long. They have benefited financially while NATO continues to lose soldiers and accrue a massive war debt. After 11 years of war, it is time the United States work more proactively with Russia, China, Pakistan and the Central Asian Republics to create solutions for the future stability and collective security of the region. Indeed, we may not have a choice, and the United States should embrace the transformation of a new era in Eurasia's heartland.

### 2AC Legalism – Top Level

#### Framework - the aff is a normative statement. Vote aff if plan is a good idea, neg if it isn’t.

#### A. Solves their offense – the impact of the K is a reason the aff is bad

#### B. Aff choice – they arbitrarily steal 9 minutes of offense, destroys the aff’s only advantage

#### Debating the law teaches us how to make it better – rejection is worse

Hedrick 12

Todd Hedrick, Assistant Professor of Philosophy at Michigan State University, Sept 2012, Democratic Constitutionalism as Mediation: The Decline and Recovery of an Idea in Critical Social Theory, Constellations Volume 19, Issue 3, pages 382–400

Habermas’ alleged abandonment of immanent critique, however, is belied by the role that the democratic legal system comes to play in his theory. While in some sense just one system among others, it has a special capacity to shape the environments of other systems by regulating their interaction. Of course, the legal system is not the only one capable of affecting the environments of other systems, but law is uniquely open to inputs from ordinary language and thus potentially more pliant and responsive to democratic will formation: “Normatively substantive messages can circulate throughout society only in the language of law … . Law thus functions as the ‘transformer’ that guarantees that the socially integrating network of communication stretched across society as a whole holds together.”55 This allows for the possibility of consensual social regulation of domains ranging from the economy to the family, where actors are presumed to be motivated by their private interests instead of respect for the law, while allowing persons directed toward such interests to be cognizant that their privately oriented behavior is compatible with respect for generally valid laws. While we should be cautious about automatically viewing the constitution as the fulcrum of the legal order, its status as basic law is significant in this respect. For, recalling Hegel's broader conception of constitutionalism, political constitutions not only define the structure of government and “the relationship between citizens and the state” (as in Hegel's narrower “political” constitution); they also “implicitly prefigure a comprehensive legal order,” that is, “the totality comprised of an administrative state, capitalist economy, and civil society.”56 So, while these social spheres can be conceived of as autonomous functional subsystems, their boundaries are legally defined in a way that affects the manner and degree of their interaction: “The political constitution is geared to shaping each of these systems by means of the medium of law and to harmonizing them so that they can fulfill their functions as measured by a presumed ‘common good’.”57 Thus, constitutional discourses should be seen less as interpretations of a positive legal text, and more as attempts to articulate legal norms that could shift the balance between these spheres in a manner more reflective of generalizable interests, occurring amidst class stratification and cultural pluralism.¶ A constitution's status as positive law is also of importance for fundamentally Hegelian reasons relating to his narrower sense of political constitutionalism: its norms must be public and concrete, such that differently positioned citizens have at least an initial sense of what the shared hermeneutic starting points for constitutional discourse might be. But these concrete formulations must also be understood to embody principles in the interest of all citizens, so that constitutional discourse can be the site of effective democratic will formation concerning the basic norms that mediate between particular individuals and the general interests of free and equal citizens. This recalls Hegel's point that constitutions fulfill their mediational function by being sufficiently positive so as to be publicly recognizable, yet are not exhausted by this positivity – the content of the constitution is instead filled in over time through ongoing legislation. In order to avoid Hegel's foreshortened conception of public participation in this process and his consequent authoritarian tendencies, Habermas and, later, Benhabib highlight the importance of being able to conceive of basic constitutional norms as themselves being the products of public contestation and discourse. In order to articulate this idea, they draw on legal theorists like Robert Cover and Frank Michelman who characterize this process of legal rearticulation as “jurisgenesis”58: a community's production of legal meaning by way of continuous rearticulation, through reflection and contestation, of its constitutional project.¶ Habermas explicitly conceives of the democratic legal order in this way when, in the context of considering the question of how a constitution that confers legitimacy on ordinary legislation could itself be thought to be democratically legitimate, he writes:¶ I propose that we understand the regress itself as the understandable expression of the future-oriented character, or openness, of the democratic constitution: in my view, a constitution that is democratic – not just in its content but also according to its source of legitimation – is a tradition-building project with a clearly marked beginning in time. All the later generations have the task of actualizing the still-untapped normative substance of the system of rights.59¶ A constitutional order and its interpretive history represent a community's attempt to render the terms under which they can give themselves the law that shapes their society's basic structure and secure the law's integrity through assigning basic liberties. Although philosophical reflection can give us some grasp of the presuppositions of a practice of legitimate lawmaking, this framework of presuppositions (“the system of rights”) is “unsaturated.”60 In Hegelian fashion, it must, to be meaningful, be concretized through discourse, and not in an one-off way during a founding moment that fixes the terms of political association once and for all, but continuously, as new persons enter the community and as new circumstances, problems, and perspectives emerge.¶ The stakes involved in sustaining a broad and inclusive constitutional discourse turn out to be significant. Habermas has recently invoked the concept of dignity in this regard, linking it to the process through which society politically constitutes itself as a reciprocal order of free and equal citizens. As a status rather than an inherent property, “dignity that accrues to all persons equally preserves the connotation of a self-respect that depends on social recognition.”61 Rather than being understood as a quality possessed by some persons by virtue of their proximity to something like the divine, the modern universalistic conception of dignity is a social status dependent upon ongoing practices of mutual recognition. Such practices, Habermas posits, are most fully instantiated in the role of citizens as legislators of the order to which they are subject.¶ [Dignity] can be established only within the framework of a constitutional state, something that never emerges of its own accord. Rather, this framework must be created by the citizens themselves using the means of positive law and must be protected and developed under historically changing conditions. As a modern legal concept, human dignity is associated with the status that citizens assume in the self-created political order.62¶ Although the implications of invoking dignity (as opposed to, say, autonomy) as the normative core of democratic constitutionalism are unclear,63 plainly Habermas remains committed to strongly intersubjective conceptions of democratic constitutionalism, to an intersubjectivity that continues to be legally and politically mediated (a dimension largely absent from Honneth's successor theory of intersubectivity).¶ What all of this suggests is a constitutional politics in which citizens are empowered to take part and meaningfully impact the terms of their cultural, economic, and political relations to each other. Such politics would need to be considerably less legalistic and precedent bound, less focused on the democracy-constraining aspects of constitutionalism emphasized in most liberal rule of law models. The sense of incompleteness and revisability that marks this critical theory approach to constitutionalism represents a point where critical theories of democracy may claim to be more radical and revisionary than most liberal and deliberative counterparts. It implies a sharp critique of more familiar models of bourgeois constitutionalism: whether they conceive of constitutional order as having a foundation in moral rights or natural law, or in an originary founding moment, such models a) tend to be backward-looking in their justifications, seeing the legal order as founded on some exogenously determined vision of moral order; b) tend to represent the law as an already-determined container within which legitimate ordinary politics takes place; and c) find the content of law to be ascertainable through the specialized reasoning of legal professionals. On the critical theory conception of constitutionalism, this presumption of completeness and technicity amounts to the reification of a constitutional project, where a dynamic social relation is misperceived as something fixed and objective.64 We can see why this would be immensely problematic for someone like Habermas, for whom constitutional norms are supposed to concern the generalizable interests of free and equal citizens. If it is overall the case for him that generalizable interests are at least partially constituted through discourse and are therefore not given in any pre-political, pre-discursive sense,65 this is especially so in a society like ours with an unreconciled class structure sustained by pseudo-compromises. Therefore, discursive rearticulation of basic norms is necessary for the very emergence of generalizable interests.¶ Despite offering an admirably systematic synthesis of radical democracy and the constitutional rule of law, Habermas’ theory is hobbled by the hesitant way he embraces these ideas. Given his strong commitment to proceduralism, the view that actual discourses among those affected must take place during the production of legitimate law if constitutionalism is to perform its mediational function, as well as his opposition to foundational or backward-looking models of political justification, we might expect Habermas to advocate the continuous circulation in civil society of constitutional discourses that consistently have appreciable impact on the way constitutional projects develop through ongoing legislation such that citizens can see the links between their political constitution (narrowly construed), the effects that democratic discourse has on the shape that it takes, and the role of the political constitution in regulating and transforming the broader institutional backbone of society in accordance with the common good. And indeed, at least in the abstract, this is what the “two track” conception of democracy in Between Facts and Norms, with its model of discourses circulating between the informal public sphere and more formal legislative institutions, seeks to capture.66 As such, Habermas’ version of constitutionalism seems a natural ally of theories of “popular constitutionalism”67 emerging from the American legal academy or of those who, like Jeremy Waldron,68 are skeptical of the merits of legalistic constitutionalism and press for democratic participation in the ongoing rearticulation of constitutional norms. Indeed, I would submit that the preceding pages demonstrate that the Left Hegelian social theoretic backdrop of Habermas’ theory supplies a deeper normative justification for more democratic conceptions of constitutionalism than have heretofore been supplied by their proponents (who are, to be fair, primarily legal theorists seeking to uncover the basic commitments of American constitutionalism, a project more interpretive than normative.69) Given that such theories have very revisionary views on the appropriate method and scope of judicial review and the role of the constitution in public life, it is surprising that Habermas evinces at most a mild critique of the constitutional practices and institutions of actually existing democracies, never really confronting the possibility that institutions of constitutional review administered by legal elites could be paternalistic or extinguish the public impetus for discourse he so prizes.70 In fact, institutional questions concerning where constitutional discourse ought to take place and how the power to make authoritative determinations of constitutional meaning should be shared among civil society, legislative, and judiciary are mostly abstracted away in Habermas’ post-Between Facts and Norms writings, while that work is mostly content with the professional of administration of constitutional issues as it exists in the United States and Germany.¶ This is evident in Habermas’ embrace of figures from liberal constitutional theory. He does not present an independent theory of judicial decision-making, but warmly receives Dworkin's well-known model of “law as integrity.” To a certain extent, this allegiance makes sense, given Dworkin's sensitivity to the hermeneutic dimension of interpretation and the fact that his concept of integrity mirrors discourse theory in holding that legal decisions must be justifiable to those affected in terms of publicly recognizable principles. Habermas does, however, follow Michelman in criticizing the “monological” form of reasoning that Dworkin's exemplary Judge Hercules employs,71 replacing it with the interpretive activities of a specialized legal public sphere, presumably more responsive to the public than Hercules. But this substitution does nothing to alleviate other aspects of Dworkin's theory that make a match between him and Habermas quite awkward: Dworkin's standard of integrity compels judges to regard the law as a complete, coherent whole that rests on a foundation of moral rights.72 Because Dworkin regards deontic rights in a strongly realistic manner and as an unwritten part of the law, there is a finished, retrospective, “already there” quality to his picture of it. Thinking of moral rights as existing independently of their social articulation is what moves Dworkin to conceive of them as, at least in principle, accessible to the right reason of individual moral subjects.73 Legal correctness can be achieved when lawyers and judges combine their specialized knowledge of precedent with their potentially objective insights into deontic rights. Fashioning the law in accordance with the demands of integrity thereby becomes the province of legal elites, rendering public discourse and the construction of generalizable interests in principle unnecessary. This helps explain Dworkin's highly un-participatory conception of democracy and his comfort with placing vast decision-making powers in the hands of the judiciary.7¶ There is more than a little here that should make Habermas uncomfortable. Firstly, on his account, legitimate law is the product of actual discourses, which include the full spate of discourse types (pragmatic, ethical-political, and moral). If the task of judicial decision-making is to reconstruct the types of discourse that went into the production of law, Dworkin's vision of filling in the gaps between legal rules exclusively with considerations of individual moral rights (other considerations are collected under the heading of “policy”75) makes little sense.76 While Habermas distances himself from Dworkin's moral realism, calling it “hard to defend,”77 he appears not to appreciate the extent to which Dworkin links his account of legal correctness to this very possibility of individual insight into the objective moral order. If Habermas wishes to maintain his long held position that constitutional projects involve the ongoing construction of generalizable interests through the democratic process – which in my view is really the heart of his program – he needs an account of legal correctness that puts some distance between this vision and Dworkin's picture of legal elites discovering the content of law through technical interpretation and rational intuition into a fixed moral order.¶ Also puzzling is the degree of influence exercised by civil society in the development of constitutional projects that Habermas appears willing to countenance. While we might expect professional adjudicative institutions to play a sort of yeoman's role vis-à-vis the public, Habermas actually puts forth something akin to Bruce Ackerman's picture of infrequent constitutional revolutions, where the basic meaning of a constitutional project is transformed during swelling periods of national ferment, only to resettle for decades at a time, during which it is administered by legal professionals.78 According to this position, American civil society has not generated new understandings of constitutional order that overcome group divisions since the New Deal, or possibly the Civil Rights era. Now, this may actually be the case, and perhaps Habermas’ apparent acquiescence to this view of once-every-few-generations national conversations is a nod to realism, i.e., a realistic conception of how much broad based, ongoing constitutional discourse it is reasonable to expect the public to conduct. But while a theory with a Left Hegelian pedigree should avoid “the impotence of the ought” and utopian speculation, and therefore ought not develop critical conceptions of legal practice utterly divorced from present ones, such concessions to realism are unnecessary. After all, critical theory conceptions of constitutionalism will aim to be appreciably different from the more authoritarian ones currently in circulation, which more often than not fail to stimulate and sustain public discourse on the basic constitution of society. Instead, their point would be to suggest how a more dynamic, expansive, and mediational conception of constitutionalism could unlock greater democratic freedom and rationally integrated social identities.¶ Given these problems in Habermas’ theory, the innovations that Benhabib makes to his conception of constitutionalism are most welcome. While operating within a discourse theoretic framework, her recent work more unabashedly recalls Hegel's broader conception of the constitution as the basic norms through which a community understands and relates to itself (of which a founding legal document is but a part): a constitution is a way of life through which individuals seek to connect themselves to each other, and in which the very identity and membership of a community is constantly at stake.79 Benhabib's concept of “democratic iterations,” which draws on meaning-as-use theories, emphasizes how meaning is inevitably transformed through repetition:¶ In the process of repeating a term or a concept, we never simply produce a replica of the original usage and its intended meaning: rather, very repetition is a form of variation. Every iteration transforms meaning, adds to it, enriches it in ever-so-subtle ways. In fact, there is really no ‘originary’ source of meaning, or an ‘original’ to which all subsequent forms must conform … . Every iteration involves making sense of an authoritative original in a new and different context … . Iteration is the reappropriation of the ‘origin’; it is at the same time its dissolution as the original and its preservation through its continuous deployment.80¶ Recalling the reciprocal relationship that Hegel hints at between the narrow “political” constitution and the broader constitution of society's backbone of interrelated institutions, Benhabib here seems to envision a circular process whereby groups take up the conceptions of social relations instantiated in the legal order and transform them in their more everyday attempts to live with others in accordance with these norms. Like Cover and Michelman, she stresses that the transformation of legal meaning takes place primarily in informal settings, where different groups try (and sometimes fail) to live together and to understand themselves in their relation to others according to the terms they inherit from the constitutional tradition they find themselves subject to.81 Her main example of such democratic iteration is the challenge Muslim girls in France raised against the head scarf prohibition in public schools (“L’Affaire du Foulard”), which, while undoubtedly antagonistic, she contends has the potential to felicitously transform the meaning of secularity and inclusion in the French state and to create new forms of togetherness and understanding. But although Benhabib illustrates the concept of democratic iterations through an exemplary episode, this iterative process is a constant and pervasive one, which is punctuated by events and has the tendency to have a destabilizing effect on authority.82¶ It is telling, however, that Benhabib's examples of democratic iterations are exclusively centered on what Habermas would call ethical-political discourses.83 While otherwise not guilty of the charge,84 Benhabib, in her constitutional theory, runs afoul of Nancy Fraser's critical diagnosis of the trend in current political philosophy to subordinate class and distributional conflicts to struggles for cultural inclusion and recognition.85 Perhaps this is due to the fact that “hot” constitutional issues are so often ones with cultural dimensions in the foreground, rarely touching visibly on distributional conflicts between groups. This nonetheless is problematic since much court business clearly affects – often subtly and invisibly – the outcomes of these conflicts, frequently with bad results.86 For another reason why centering constitutional discourse on inclusion and cultural issues is problematic, it is useful to remind ourselves of Habermas’ critique of civic republicanism, according to which the main deficit in republican models of democracy is its “ethical overburdening” of the political process.87 To some extent, republicanism's emphasis on ethical discourse is understandable: given the level of cooperativeness and public spirit that republicans view as the font of legitimate law, political discourses need to engage the motivations and identities of citizens. Arguably, issues of ethical self-understanding do this better than more abstract or arid forms of politics. But it is not clear that this is intrinsically so, and it can have distorting effects on politics. In the American media, for example, this amplification of the cultural facets of issues is very common; conflicts over everything from guns to taxes are often reduced to conflicts over who is a good, real American and who is not. It is hard to say that this proves edifying; substantive issues of rights and social justice are elided, politics becomes more fraudulent and conflictual. None of this is to deny a legitimate place for ethical-political discourse. However, we do see something of a two-steps-forward-one-step-back movement in Benhabib's advancement of Habermas’ discourse theory of law: although her concept of democratic iterations takes center stage, she develops the notion solely along an ethical-political track. Going forward, critical theorists developing conceptions of constitutional discourse should work to see it as a way of integrating questions of distributional justice with questions of moral rights and collective identities without subordinating or conflating them.¶ 4. Conclusion¶ Some readers may find the general notion of reinvigorating a politics of constitutionalism quixotic. Certainly, it has not been not my intention to overstate the importance or positive contributions of constitutions in actually existing democracies, where they can serve to entrench political systems experiencing paralysis in the face of long term fiscal and environmental problems, and where public appeals to them more often than not invoke visions of society that are more nostalgic, ethno-nationalistic, authoritarian, and reactionary than what Habermas and Benhabib presumably have in mind. Instead, I take the basic Hegelian point I started this paper with to be this: modern persons ought to be able to comprehend their social order as the work of reason; the spine of institutions through which their relations to differently abled and positioned others are mediated ought to be responsive to their interests as fully-rounded persons; and comprehending this system of mediation ought to be able to reconcile them to the partiality of their roles within the universal state. Though modern life is differentiated, it can be understood, when seen through the lens of the constitutional order, as a result of citizens’ jointly exercised rationality as long as certain conditions are met. These conditions are, however, more stringent than Hegel realized. In light of this point, that so many issues deeply impacting citizens’ social and economic relations to one another are rendered marginal – and even invisible – in terms of the airing they receive in the public sphere, that they are treated as mostly settled or non-questions in the legal system consitutues a strikingly deficient aspect of modern politics. Examples include the intrusion of market logic and technology into everyday life, the commodification of public goods, the legal standing of consumers and residents, the role of shareholders and public interests in corporate governance, and the status of collective bargaining arrangements. Surely a contributing factor here is the absence of a shared sense of possibility that the basic terms of our social union could be responsive to the force that discursive reason can exert. Such a sense is what I am contending jurisgenerative theories ought to aim at recapturing while critiquing more legalistic and authoritarian models of law.¶ This is not to deny the possibility that democratic iterations themselves may be regressive or authoritarian, populist in the pejorative sense. But the denial of their legitimacy or possibility moves us in the direction of authoritarian conceptions of law and political power and the isolation of individuals and social groups wrought by a political order of machine-like administration that Horkheimer and Adorno describe as a main feature of modern political domination. Recapturing some sense of how human activity makes reason actual in the ongoing organization of society need not amount to the claim that reason culminates in some centralized form, as in the Hegelian state, or in some end state, as in Marx. It can, however, move us to envision the possibility of an ongoing practice of communication, lawmaking, and revision that seeks to reconcile and overcome positivity and division, without the triumphalist pretension of ever being able to fully do so.
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Schmitt offers three reasons in support of this view. First, he implicitly relies on the stock argument that “authentic” politics necessarily elides legal regulation: when conflicts involve “existentially” distinct collectivities faced with “the real possibility of killing,” the attempt to tame such conflicts by juridical means is destined to fail, or at least badly distort the fundamental (political) questions at hand. Insofar as the partisan fighter represents one of the last vestiges of authentic (i.e., *Schmittian*) politics in an increasingly depoliticized world, he has to dub any attempt to regulate the phenomenon at hand as misguided and maybe even dangerous. Yet this argument relies on Schmitt’s controversial model of politics, as outlined eloquently but unconvincingly in his famous *Concept of the Political*. To be sure, there *are* intense conflicts in which it is naïve to expect an easy resolution by legal or juridical means. But the argument suffers from a troubling circularity: Schmitt occasionally wants to define “political” conflicts as those irresolvable by legal or juridical devices *in order then* to argue against legal or juridical solutions to them. The claim also suffers from a certain vagueness and lack of conceptual precision. At times, it seems to be directed against trying to resolve conflicts in *the courts or juridical system narrowly understood*; at other times it is directed against *any legal* regulation of intense conflict. The former argument is surely stronger than the latter. After all, legal devices have undoubtedly played a positive role in taming or at least minimizing the potential dangers of harsh political antagonisms. In the Cold War, for example, international law contributed to the peaceful resolution of conflicts which otherwise might have exploded into horrific violence, even if attempts to bring such conflicts before an international court or tribunal probably would have failed.22

#### PERM DO BOTH - legal reforms can utilized to protect vulnerable populations if we remain conscious of its dangers—the alternative leaves groups stranded
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B. Conceptual Boundaries: When the Dichotomies of Exit Are Unchecked At first glance, the idea of opting out of the legal sphere and moving to an extralegal space using alternative modes of social activism may seem attractive to new social movements. We are used to thinking in binary categories, constantly carving out different aspects of life as belonging to different spatial and temporal spheres. Moreover, we are attracted to declarations about newness - new paradigms, new spheres of action, and new strategies that are seemingly untainted by prior failures. n186 However, the critical insights about law's reach must not be abandoned in the process of critical analysis. Just as advocates of a laissez-faire market are incorrect in imagining a purely private space free of regulation, and just as the "state" is not a single organism but a multiplicity of legislative, administrative, and judicial organs, "nonstate arenas" are dispersed, multiple, and constructed. The focus on action in a separate sphere broadly defined as civil society can be self-defeating precisely because it conceals the many ways in which law continues to play a crucial role in all spheres of life. Today, the lines between private and public functions are increasingly blurred, forming what Professor Gunther Teubner terms "polycorporatist regimes," a symbiosis between private and public sectors. n187 Similarly, new economic partnerships and structures blur the lines between for-profit and nonprofit entities. n188 Yet much of the current literature on the limits of legal reform and the crisis of government action is built upon a privatization/regulation binary, particularly with regard [\*979] to social commitments, paying little attention to how the background conditions of a privatized market can sustain or curtail new conceptions of the public good. n189 In the same way, legal scholars often emphasize sharp shifts between regulation and deregulation, overlooking the continuing presence of legal norms that shape and inform these shifts. n190 These false dichotomies should resonate well with classic cooptation analysis, which shows how social reformers overestimate the possibilities of one channel for reform while crowding out other paths and more complex alternatives. Indeed, in the contemporary extralegal climate, and contrary to the conservative portrayal of federal social policies as harmful to the nonprofit sector, voluntary associations have flourished in mutually beneficial relationships with federal regulations. n191 A dichotomized notion of a shift between spheres - between law and informalization, and between regulatory and nonregulatory schemes - therefore neglects the ongoing possibilities within the legal system to develop and sustain desired outcomes and to eliminate others. The challenge for social reform groups and for policymakers today is to identify the diverse ways in which some legal regulations and formal structures contribute to socially responsible practices while others produce new forms of exclusion and inequality. Community empowerment requires ongoing government commitment. n192 In fact, the most successful community-based projects have been those which were not only supported by public funds, but in which public administration also continued to play some coordination role. n193 At both the global and local levels, with the growing enthusiasm around the proliferation of new norm-generating actors, many envision a nonprofit, nongovernmental organization-led democratization of new informal processes. n194 Yet this Article has begun to explore the problems with some of the assumptions underlying the potential of these new actors. Recalling the unbundled taxonomy of the cooptation critique, it becomes easier to identify the ways extralegal activism is prone to problems of fragmentation, institutional limitation, and professionalization. [\*980] Private associations, even when structured as nonprofit entities, are frequently undemocratic institutions whose legitimacy is often questionable. n195 There are problematic structural differences among NGOs, for example between Northern and Southern NGOs in international fora, stemming from asymmetrical resources and funding, n196 and between large foundations and struggling organizations at the national level. Moreover, direct regulation of private associations is becoming particularly important as the roles of nonprofits increase in the new political economy. Scholars have pointed to the fact that nonprofit organizations operate in many of the same areas as for-profit corporations and government bureaucracies. n197 This phenomenon raises a wide variety of difficulties, which range from ordinary financial corruption to the misrepresentation of certain partnerships as "nonprofit" or "private." n198 Incidents of corruption within nongovernmental organizations, as well as reports that these organizations serve merely as covers for either for-profit or governmental institutions, have increasingly come to the attention of the government and the public. n199 Recently, for example, the IRS revoked the tax-exempt nonprofit status of countless "credit counseling services" because these firms were in fact motivated primarily by profit and not by the not-for-profit cause of helping consumers get out of debt. n200 Courts have long recognized that the mere fact that an entity is a nonprofit does not preclude it from being concerned about raising cash revenues and maximizing profits or affecting competition in the market. n201 In the [\*981] application of antitrust laws, for example, almost every court has rejected the "pure motives" argument when it has been put forth in defense of nonprofits. n202 Moreover, akin to other sectors and arenas, nongovernmental organizations - even when they do not operate within the formal legal system - frequently report both the need to fit their arguments into the contemporary dominant rhetoric and strong pressures to subjugate themselves in the service of other negotiating interests. This is often the case when they appear before international fora, such as the World Bank and the World Trade Organization, and each of the parties in a given debate attempts to look as though it has formed a well-rounded team by enlisting the support of local voluntary associations. n203 One NGO member observes that "when so many different actors are drawn into the process, there is a danger that our demands may be blunted ... . Consequently, we may end up with a "lowest common denominator' which is no better than the kind of compromises the officials and diplomats engage in." n204 Finally, local NGOs that begin to receive funding for their projects from private investors report the limitations of binding themselves to other interests. Funding is rarely unaccompanied by requirements as to the nature and types of uses to which it is put. n205 These concessions to those who have the authority and resources to recognize some social demands but not others are indicative of the sorts of institutional and structural limitations that have been part of the traditional critique of cooptation. In this situation, local NGOs become dependent on players with greater repeat access and are induced to compromise their initial vision in return for limited victories. The concerns about the nature of both civil society and nongovernmental actors illuminate the need to reject the notion of avoiding the legal system and opting into a nonregulated sphere of alternative social activism. When we understand these different realities and processes as also being formed and sustained by law, we can explore new ways in which legality relates to social reform. Some of these ways include efforts to design mechanisms of accountability that address the concerns of the new political economy. Such efforts include [\*982] treating private entities as state actors by revising the tests of joint participation and public function that are employed in the state action doctrine; extending public requirements such as nondiscrimination, due process, and transparency to private actors; and developing procedural rules for such activities as standard-setting and certification by private groups. n206 They may also include using the nondelegation doctrine to prevent certain processes of privatization and rethinking the tax exemption criteria for nonprofits. n207 All of these avenues understand the law as performing significant roles in the quest for reform and accountability while recognizing that new realities require creative rethinking of existing courses of action. Rather than opting out of the legal arena, it is possible to accept the need to diversify modes of activism and legal categories while using legal reform in ways that are responsive to new realities. Focusing on function and architecture, rather than on labels or distinct sectors, requires legal scholars to consider the desirability of new legal models of governmental and nongovernmental partnerships and of the direct regulation of nonstate actors. In recent years, scholars and policymakers have produced a body of literature, rooted primarily in administrative law, describing ways in which the government can harness the potential of private individuals to contribute to the project of governance. n208 These new insights develop the idea that administrative agencies must be cognizant of, and actively involve, the private actors that they are charged with regulating. These studies, in fields ranging from occupational risk prevention to environmental policy to financial regulation, draw on the idea that groups and individuals will [\*983] better comply with state norms once they internalize them. n209 For example, in the context of occupational safety, there is a growing body of evidence that focusing on the implementation of a culture of safety, rather than on the promulgation of rules, can enhance compliance and induce effective self-monitoring by private firms. n210 Consequently, social activists interested in improving the conditions of safety and health for workers should advocate for the involvement of employees in cooperative compliance regimes that involve both top-down agency regulation and firm-and industry-wide risk-management techniques. Importantly, in all of these new models of governance, the government agency and the courts must preserve their authority to discipline those who lack the willingness or the capacity to participate actively and dynamically in collaborative governance. Thus, unlike the contemporary message regarding extralegal activism that privileges private actors and nonlegal techniques to promote social goals, the new governance scholarship is engaged in developing a broad menu of legal reform strategies that involve private industry and nongovernmental actors in a variety of ways while maintaining the necessary role of the state to aid weaker groups in order to promote overall welfare and equity. A responsive legal architecture has the potential to generate new forms of accountability and social responsibility and to link hard law with "softer" practices and normativities. Reformers can potentially use law to increase the power and access of vulnerable individuals and groups and to develop tools to increase fair practices and knowledge building within the new market.
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Paulson ’ s genuflection and Obama ’ s reticence, I will contend here, are symptomatic of our political system ’ s operation rather than being aberration al . It is generally the case that even in the heart of crisis, and even on matters where executive competence is supposedly at an acme , legislators employ formal institutional powers not only to delay executive initiatives but also affirmatively to end presidential policies. 20 Numerous examples from recent events illustrate the point. Congressional adversaries of Obama, for instance, cut off his policy of emptying Guantánamo Bay via appropriations riders. 21 Deficit hawks spent 2011 resisting the President’s solutions to federal debt, while the President declined to short - circuit negotiations with unilateral action. 22 Even in military matters, a growing body of empirical research suggests Congress often successfully influences the course of overseas engagements to a greater degree than legal scholars have discerned or acknowledged.//// 23¶ That work suggests that the failure of absolute congressional control over military matters cannot be taken as evidence of “the inability of law to constrain the executive ” in more subtle ways (p 5). The conventional narrative of executive dominance , in other words, is at best incomplete and demands supplementing .¶ This Review uses The Executive Unbound as a platform to explore how the boundaries of discretionary executive action are established. As the controversial national security policies of the Bush administration recede in time, the issue of executive power becomes ripe for reconsideration. Arguments for or against binding the executive are starting to lose their partisan coloration. There is more room to investigate the dynamics of executive power in a purely positive fashion without the impinging taint of ideological coloration.¶ Notwithstanding this emerging space for analys i s, t here is still surprising inattention to evidence of whether the executive is constrained and to the positive question of how constraint works. The Executive Unbound is a significant advance because it takes seriously this second “ mechanism question. ” Future studies of the executive branch will ignore its i mportant and trenchant analysis at their peril. 24 Following PV ’ s lead, I focus on the descriptive , positive question of how the executive is constrained . I do speak briefly and in concluding to normative matters . B ut f irst and foremost, my arguments should be understood as positive and not normative in nature unless otherwise noted.¶ Articulating and answering the question “ W hat binds the executive ?” , The Executive Unbound draws a sharp line between legal and political constraints on discretion — a distinction between laws and institutions on the one hand, and the incentives created by political competition on the other hand . While legal constraints usually fail, it argues, political constraints can prevail. PV thus postulate what I call a “strong law/ politics dichotomy. ” My central claim in this Review is that this strong law/politics dichotomy cannot withstand scrutiny. While doctrinal scholars exaggerate law ’s autonomy, I contend, the realists PV underestimate the extent to which legal rules and institutions play a pivotal role in the production of executive constraint. Further, the political mechanisms they identify as substitutes for legal checks cannot alone do the work of regulating executive discretion. Diverging from both legalist and realist positions, I suggest that law and politics do not operate as substitutes in the regulation of executive authority. 25 They instead work as interlocking complements. An account of the borders of executive discretion must focus on the interaction of partisan and electoral forces on the one hand and legal rules. It must specify the conditions under which the interaction of political actors’ exertions and legal rules will prove effective in limiting such discretion.