### 2AC PQD DA

#### Deference on questions of executive war authority is a myth – the court has never adopted that practice and the Zivotofsky ruling is the death knell

Skinner 8/23, Professor of Law at Willamette

(13, Gwynne, Misunderstood, Misconstrued, and Now Clearly Dead: The 'Political Question Doctrine' in Cases Arising in the Context of Foreign Affairs, papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=2315237)

Lower federal courts often erroneously cite the “political question doctrine” to dismiss as nonjusticiable individual rights claims arising in foreign or military affairs contexts, a trend that has increased since the 1962 case of Baker v. Carr. Similarly, lower courts have begun citing “special factors counselling hesitation” when dismissing constitutional claims (“Bivens claims”) in similar contexts, inappropriately treating “special factors” as a nonjusticiability doctrine. Lower federal courts should not cite either doctrine as a reason to avoid adjudicating individual rights claims arising in the context of foreign or military affairs. Rather, lower federal courts should adjudicate these claims on their merits by deciding whether the political branch at issue had the power under the Constitution to act as it did. Doing so is consistent with the manner in which the Supreme Court has approached these types of cases for over 200 years. The Court affirmed this approach in the 2012 case of Zivotofsky v. Clinton, a case in which the Court once and for all rung the death knell for the application of the “political question doctrine” as a nonjusticiability doctrine in cases involving individual rights – even those arising in a foreign policy context. In fact, a historical review of Supreme Court cases demonstrates that the Supreme Court has never applied the so-called “political question doctrine” as a true nonjusticiable doctrine to dismiss individual rights claims (and arguably, not to any claims at all), even those arising in the context of foreign or military affairs. This includes the seminal “political question” case of Marbury v. Madison. Rather, the Supreme Court has almost always rejected the “political question doctrine” as a basis to preclude adjudication of individual rights claims, even in the context of foreign or military affairs. Moreover, the Supreme Court has consistently admonished lower courts regarding the importance of the judiciary branch’s adjudication of individual rights claims, even in such contexts.13 That is not to say that from time to time the Court has not cited a “political question doctrine” in certain of its cases. However, a close review of those cases demonstrates that rather than dismissing such claims in those cases as “nonjusticiable,” the Court in fact adjudicated the claims by finding that either the executive or Congress acted constitutionally within their power or discretion. Moreover, the post-9/11 Supreme Court cases of Hamdi v. Rumsfeld, Rasul v. Bush, and Bush v. Boumediene, in which the Supreme Court consistently found that the political branches overstepped their constitutional authority, clarified that the doctrine should not be used to dismiss individual rights claims as nonjusticiable, even those arising in a foreign or military affairs context. In case there remained any doubt, the Supreme Court in Zivotofsky rejected the “political question doctrine” as a nonjusticiability doctrine, at least in the area individual rights, if not altogether. The Court found the case, involving whether the parents of a boy born in Jerusalem had the right to list Israel as his place of birth pursuant to a Congressional statute, was justiciable.17 The Court addressed the real issue, which was whether Congress had the authority to trump the President over whether Israel could be listed as the country of birth on passports where a person was born in Jerusalem, notwithstanding the President’s sole authority to recognize other governments. 18 In ruling as it did, the Court stayed true to many of its earlier cases involving “political questions” by adjudicating the claim through deciding whether one of the political branches took action that was within its constitutional authority. In the case, the Court showed its willingness to limit the power of the President in the area of foreign affairs rather than finding the claim nonjusticiable.

#### Multiple detention cases prove there’s no court deference on issues of war powers authority

Skinner 8/23, Professor of Law at Willamette

(13, Gwynne, Misunderstood, Misconstrued, and Now Clearly Dead: The 'Political Question Doctrine' in Cases Arising in the Context of Foreign Affairs, papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=2315237)

RECENT SUPREME COURT CASE LAW HAS SOUNDED THE DEATH KNELL FOR THE “POLITICAL QUESTION DOCTRINE”WITH REGARD TO INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS CLAIMS IN THE REALM OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS. Four important Supreme Court cases in the aftermath of 9/11 and Iraq and Afghanistan Wars clarify that individual rights claims – even those arising in the context of national security and foreign policy – will be adjudicated notwithstanding that they involve important questions for the executive and legislative branch, including in the areas of military and foreign affairs. In these cases, the Supreme Court ensured that the federal judiciary’s role in adjudicating individual rights cases in the area of Constitutional and international law would be maintained. The Supreme Court either did not invoke the “political question doctrine” when it could have, or in the case of one, rejected it altogether. Hamdi v. Rumsfeld In 2004 case of Hamdi v. Rumsfeld,279 the Supreme Court found although Congress had authorized the President to hold indefinitely a U.S. citizen who met the definition of an enemy combatant,280, the citizen-detainee was entitled to challenge his classification as an enemy combatant given that right to habeas had not been suspended, to receive notice of the factual basis for his classification, and a fair opportunity to rebut the Government's factual assertions before a neutral decisionmaker.281 In Hamdi, the Supreme Court noted that even in a military context, the Court is not usurping the role of the military when it simply exercises its “time-honored and constitutionally mandated roles of reviewing and resolving claims…” The Court stated that “simply because this case touches upon the military’s judgment in its treatment of Plaintiff does not mean that the courts are prohibited from exercising their respective power. Although the Supreme Court has acknowledged that ‘core strategic matters of warmaking,’ deserve deference to the “coordinate branches of the government” – something not at issue here - the Constitution ‘most assuredly envisions a role for all three branches when individual liberties are at stake.’ Rasul v. Bush Importantly, Rasul v. Bush, the 2004 Supreme Court case that held that detainees in Guantanamo Bay had statutory habeas rights, also addressed access to U.S. courts in civil cases brought by detainees. In Rasul, the Court found that nothing precluded aliens detained in military custody outside of the U.S. from the privilege in litigation in U.S. courts. The district court had dismissed civil claims brought under the Alien Tort Statute and the Torture Victim Protection for conditions of confinement, noting that the aliens did not have the privilege of litigation in U.S. courts for claims that rest on the habeas statute, which the lower court had found the aliens were not entitled to invoke.286 First, the Supreme Court noted that because the lower court was in error in finding that the federal habeas statute did not extend to the plaintiff, its analysis regarding the civil claims was equally flawed.287 Moreover, in addition, the Court noted that “in any event, nothing in Eisentrager or in any of our other cases categorically excludes aliens detained in military custody outside the United States from the “privilege of litigation” in U.S. courts.288 The Court noted that the ATS in particular gives aliens the right to sue in federal courts for violations of the law of nations.289 The Court further noted, “The fact that petitioners in these cases are being held in military custody is immaterial to the question of the District Court's jurisdiction over their non-habeas statutory claims.” 290 In its decision, the Supreme Court did not foreclose the possibility that special factors counseling hesitation might prevent a Bivens claim or that the “political question doctrine” might preclude an ATS or TVPA claim. However, its clarification that the federal courts are open to those in military custody for such claims, without any obvious restriction, casts doubt on decisions that limit access to remedies for violations of both human rights and constitutional rights. Justice Kennedy’s concurrence in Rasul arguably addressed the “political question doctrine” (without calling it that directly), and appears to add support for the position taken in this article that rather than dismiss cases as nonjusticiable, courts should directly address whether the branch at issue acted within its constitutional powers. In his concurrence in Rasul, Kennedy agreed that the federal courts should have jurisdiction to consider challenges to the legality of the detaining of foreign nationals held at Guantanamo Bay Naval Base.2 He distinguished Eisentrager in two signification ways: first, that unlike the prisoners in the Landsberg prison Germany, the detainees at issue in Rasul were held in what was in all practical purposes a United States Territory.292 Second, the plaintiffs in Eisentrager were tried and convicted by a military commission for violating the laws of war and were sentenced to prison,293 where the Guantanamo Bay detainees were being held indefinitely and without any benefit of any legal proceeding to determine their case.294 While noting that Eisentrager indicates there is a “realm of political authority over military affairs where the judicial power may not enter” and acknowledging the power over military affairs the President and Congress has, 295 Justice Kennedy stated that a “faithful application” of Eisentrager “requires an initial inquiry into the general circumstances of the detention to determine whether the Court has the authority to entertain the petition and to grant relief after considering all of the facts presented.”296 This demonstrates Justice Kennedy’s view that the real issue whether the President and Congress are acting within their constitutional powers, not turning a blind eye to justiciability. Justice Kennedy confirmed this reading by stating, “A necessary corollary of Eisentrager is that there are circumstances in which the courts maintain the power and the responsibility to protect persons from unlawful detention even where military affairs are implicated.”297 Boumediene v. Bush Perhaps the most important, recent case clarifying that individual rights claims will be adjudicated in foreign and military contexts is the 2008 case of Boumediene v. Bush.298 In the case, the Supreme Court found that the Constitutional right to habeas corpus extended to those held at Guantanamo Bay, striking down Congress’ attempt to strip the federal courts of jurisdiction to hear such cases as part of the Military Commissions Act.299 In Boumediene, the Supreme Court specifically rejected the “political question doctrine” as a reason for dismissal of the case.300 The Court found that although the Constitution grants Congress and the President the power to acquire, dispose of, and govern territory, it does not grant them the power to decide when and where the Constitutions’ terms apply. 301 When the United States acts outside its borders, the Court opined, its powers are not “absolute and unlimited” but are subject “to such restrictions as are expressed in the Constitution.”302 The Court went on: Abstaining from questions involving formal sovereignty and territorial governance is one thing. To hold the political branches have the power to switch the Constitution on or off at will is quite another. The former position reflects this Court's recognition that certain matters requiring political judgments are best left to the political branches. The latter would permit a striking anomaly in our tripartite system of government, leading to a regime in which Congress and the President, not this Court, say “what the law is.

#### No link – the aff only operates within established judicial authority

Chow 11, JD from Cardozo

(Samuel, THE KIYEMBA PARADOX: CREATING A JUDICIAL FRAMEWORK TO ERADICATE INDEFINITE, UNLAWFUL EXECUTIVE DETENTIONS, www.cjicl.com/uploads/2/9/5/9/2959791/cjicl\_19.3\_chow\_note.pdf)

Additionally, there are ever-present concerns surrounding separation of powers. The degree to which the Court is concerning itself with foreign relations issues is unprecedented, which means any application of a balancing test would be usurping powers of the political branches that were traditionally exercised without the possibility of judicial participation. There is a general hesitation in potentially augmenting the courts authority in terrorist detentions. Yet, separation-of-powers concerns must be reconciled with the opposing, though equally compelling, counter-part—our government's system of checks and balances. Since the ideal of our tripartite government system is one where areas of authority are clearly defined, an augmentation of jurisdiction by the courts may seem suspicious. However, the idea of an unchecked Executive with the authority to indefinitely detain individuals (who the government itself has determined have no legal basis for detention) is equally, if not more so, disquieting. Moreover, the historical role of habeas courts as the final arbiter of a detention's legality provides a legitimate counter-argument that it is in fact the Executive that is intruding upon the judiciary's traditional authority. It does so by appropriating itself as the sole source of a functional remedy, thereby interfering with the courts habeas authority.

#### No deference now and case by case approach means no spillover

Siegel 12, Associate at Cleary Gottlieb

(Ashley E., SOME HOLDS BARRED: EXTENDING EXECUTIVE DETENTION HABEAS LAW BEYOND GUANTANAMO BAY, www.bu.edu/law/central/jd/organizations/journals/bulr/documents/SIEGEL\_000.pdf)

This Note explores the novel area of law extending habeas rights to war-on terror detainees, the past precedents that may suggest what direction the jurisprudence will take, and how the jurisprudence should resolve the case of a foreign detainee held by a foreign government at the behest of the United States. Part I reviews habeas law from its historical roots to its modern application in executive detention cases brought about by the United States’ detention of aliens at Guantanamo Bay. Part II examines alien detention abroad apart from the habeas context. Part III explores the likelihood and appropriateness of extending the Boumediene line of cases to scenarios of alien detainees held abroad by foreign governments at the behest of the United States. The Supreme Court has recently demonstrated a greater willingness to exert its power in the national security realm, no longer giving broad deference to the Executive’s wartime powers. The Supreme Court in this realm appears to take a functionalist, case-by-case approach that leaves open the possibility that the Court will exert itself in different executive detention contexts. Given the vital, fundamental individual rights implicated by executive detention, the Supreme Court should continue to actively review the actions of the legislative and executive branches. Further, based on the reasoning supporting its past precedents, the Court should extend jurisdiction to detainees held by foreign nations at the behest of the U.S. government.

#### Review inevitable – now is better

Wittes 08, Senior Fellow in Governance Studies at the Brookings Institution

(Benjamin, The Necessity and Impossibility of Judicial Review, https://webspace.utexas.edu/rmc2289/National%20Security%20and%20the%20Courts/Law%20and%20the%20Long%20War%20%20Chapter%204.pdf)

WE COME, then, to the question of what judicial review ought to look like in the war on terror if one accepts that it should exist more robustly than the administration prefers but should not be of an unbridled or general nature, as human rights advocates wish to see. The answer is conceptually simple, though devilishly complicated in operation: Judicial review should be designed for the relatively narrow purpose of holding the executive to clearly articulated legislative rules, not to the often vague standards of international legal instruments that have not been implemented through American law. Judges should have an expanded role in the powers of presidential preemption in the antiterrorism arena, for the judiciary is essential to legitimizing the use of those powers. Without them, the powers themselves come under a barrage of criticism which they cannot easily withstand. And eventually the effort to shield them from judicial review fails, and the review that results from the effort is more intrusive, more suspicious, and less accommodating of the executive's legitimate need for operational flexibility. Judges, in other words, should be a part of the larger rules the legislature will need to write to govern the global fight against terrorism. Their role within these legal regimes will vary-from virtually no involvement in cases of covert actions and overseas surveillance to extensive involvement in cases of long-term detentions. The key is that the place of judges within those systems is not itself a matter for the judges to decide. The judiciary must not serve as the designer of the rules.

#### U.S. and Afghani militaries can’t make gains and are the root cause of instability

Rosen Fellow Center on Law and Security NYU 12-20-10

(Nir-, Foreign Policy, “Spare Afghanistan Iraq's success”, <http://mideast.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2010/12/20/>spare\_

afghanistan\_iraq\_s\_success)

In Iraq the American surge led to a strategic reassessment on the part of Iraqi militias. But successive surges in Afghanistan have only led to surges in violence in that country. The Taliban are not changing their calculus. At best when the Americans surge in a village, as they did in Helmand's Marjah, the Taliban may simply move on to another village, knowing the Americans can never achieve enough troop number so make a strategic difference and that the Americans will eventually leave anyway while the Afghan "government in a box" is not coming to replace them. There is also no surge in Afghan security forces. The Afghan security forces are ineffective except at provoking the ire of the population and encouraging them to join the Taliban. In the south many of them can't even speak Pashto, the local language, and are viewed as outsiders. They can neither protect the population nor kill their enemy. At least the Iraqi security forces were effective at being brutal, which led to the Shiite victory in the civil war. In Afghanistan we have created a massive mercenary force that the Afghan government will never be able to pay for on its own, and should we ever cut their salaries they will turn to warlordism. In 2009 in Helmand during Obama's first surge the Afghan army didn't show up. I was there and listened to angry and impatient American officers. Likewise today in Kandahar the Americans are relying on a warlord, not the Afghan army. Our operations there remind people of the Russians' brutality. Afghans are being displaced in large numbers once again. We are hated in more and more of Afghanistan. Opinion polls that say otherwise have just been made up. A key element in American counterinsurgency theory is building the government's capacity. But Karzai is no Maliki. There was no government to start with, unlike in Iraq, and the Karzai government is reviled and has no legitimacy or credibility or presence among most of the population. It is predatory and needs to be starved, not fed. The Americans are creating new militias but they are not former insurgents, and they cannot fight the Taliban. And past attempts at setting up militias have led to defections to the Taliban. And that's when the police aren't defecting to the Taliban. The generals are trying the same thing over and over and expecting new results. Finally, in Iraq there was a key resource to fight over. Whoever controls the state controls the oil. In Afghanistan, we are the resource. The more money we pour in to a country that can't absorb it the more we encourage warlords and corruption and a conflict economy. Our very presence is malign and corrosive. Material incentives do not outweigh issues like dignity, nationalism or Islam which matter to Afghans. Too many groups have an interest in perpetuating the conflict. Even the Taliban are benefitting from our money. The conflict in Afghanistan is a political one and it requires a political settlement. But Petraeus seems to have given up on the hearts and minds approach and is undermining or preventing negotiations, focusing on killing or capturing Taliban commanders. These are easily replaced by younger and more radical Taliban commanders with less ties to the community and less respect for Mullah Omar's authority, which means it will be even harder to negotiate with them. Meanwhile al Qaeda has moved on to Pakistan and it has evolved into something else. It will never again have training camps that could easily be targeted -- it is now an idea and not a base. We have been surging in Afghanistan every year since 2005. We have been engaged in counterinsurgency since then as well. More and more of the same failed tactic is not going to work. And there is no strategy. The generals are begging for more time, more reviews and moving the goalposts year after year. How many Afghan and American lives are we going to throw away while we experiment with counterinsurgency in a country of no strategic importance? Pity the Afghans if we impose the Iraqi success on them.

### 2AC Release =/= Restrictoin

#### We meet—release means they are NO LONGER INDEFINITELY DETAINED—the aff says that a category of people “people who have won their habeas hearing” must be released which means that we restrict the president’s authority to keep detaining anyone who wins their habeas corpus hearing

#### C/I—War powers authority of indefinite detention is keeping people without being charges filed—the aff means he can no longer do that for a CATEGORY OF PEOPLE

The Committee on Federal Courts 4 [2004, The Committee on Federal Courts, “THE INDEFINITE DETENTION OF "ENEMY COMBATANTS": BALANCING DUE PROCESS AND NATIONAL SECURITY IN THE CONTEXT OF THE WAR ON TERROR \*”, 59 The Record 41, The Record of The Association of The Bar of the City of New York]

The President, assertedly acting under his "war power" in prosecuting the "war on terror," has claimed the authority to detain indefinitely, and without access to counsel, persons he designates as "enemy combatants," an as yet undefined term that embraces selected suspected terrorists or their accomplices.

Two cases, each addressing a habeas corpus petition brought by an American citizen, have reviewed the constitutionality of detaining "enemy combatants" pursuant to the President's determination:

- Hamdi v. Rumsfeld, 316 F.3d 450 (4th Cir. 2003), cert. granted, 124 S. Ct. 981 (Jan. 9, 2004) (No. 03-6696), concerns a citizen seized with Taliban military forces in a zone of armed combat in Afghanistan;

 - Padilla ex. rel. Newman v. Bush, 233 F. Supp. 2d 564 (S.D.N.Y. 2002), rev'd sub nom., Padilla ex. rel. Newman v. Rumsfeld, 352 F.3d 695 (2d Cir. 2003), cert. granted, 124 S. Ct. 1353 (Feb. 20, [\*42] 2004) (No. 03-1027), concerns a citizen seized in Chicago, and suspected of planning a terrorist attack in league with al Qaeda.

Padilla and Hamdi have been held by the Department of Defense, without any access to legal counsel, for well over a year. No criminal charges have been filed against either one. Rather, the government asserts its right to detain them without charges to incapacitate them and to facilitate their interrogation. Specifically, the President claims the authority, in the exercise of his war power as "Commander in Chief" under the Constitution (Art. II, § 2), to detain persons he classifies as "enemy combatants":

- indefinitely, for the duration of the "war on terror";

 - without any charges being filed, and thus not triggering any rights attaching to criminal prosecutions;

 - incommunicado from the outside world;

 - specifically, with no right of access to an attorney;

 - with only limited access to the federal courts on habeas corpus, and with no right to rebut the government's showing that the detainee is an enemy combatant.

#### Restriction includes a limitation

STATE OF ARIZONA, Appellee, v. JEREMY RAY WAGNER, April 10, 2008, Filed, Appellant., 1 CA-CR 06-0167, 2008 Ariz. App. Unpub. LEXIS 613, opinion by Judge G. MURRAY SNOW

P10 The term "restriction" is not defined by the Legislature for the purposes of the DUI statutes. See generally A.R.S. § 28-1301 (2004) (providing the "[d]efinitions" section of the DUI statutes). In the absence of a statutory definition of a term, we look to ordinary dictionary definitions and do not construe the word as being a term of art. Lee v. State, 215 Ariz. 540, 544, ¶ 15, 161 P.3d 583, 587 (App. 2007) ("When a statutory term is not explicitly defined, we assume, unless otherwise stated, that the Legislature intended to accord the word its natural and obvious meaning, which may be discerned from its dictionary definition."). P11 The dictionary definition of "restriction" is "[a] limitation or qualification." Black's Law Dictionary 1341 (8th ed. 1999). In fact, "limited" and "restricted" are considered synonyms. See Webster's II New Collegiate Dictionary 946 (2001). Under these commonly accepted definitions, Wagner's driving privileges were "restrict[ed]" when they were "limited" by the ignition interlock requirement. Wagner was not only [\*7] statutorily required to install an ignition interlock device on all of the vehicles he operated, A.R.S. § 28-1461(A)(1)(b), but he was also prohibited from driving any vehicle that was not equipped with such a device, regardless whether he owned the vehicle or was under the influence of intoxicants, A.R.S. § 28-1464(H). These limitations constituted a restriction on Wagner's privilege to drive, for he was unable to drive in circumstances which were otherwise available to the general driving population. Thus, the rules of statutory construction dictate that the term "restriction" includes the ignition interlock device limitation.

#### Prefer—

#### Precision—our ev cites the committee on federal courts and a court case—limits are meaningless if they’re not predictable

#### Aff ground—every aff in their interpretation would lose to the circumvention—aff ground outweighs cuz it sets the direction of the debate

#### Good is good enough—competing interpretations leads to a race to the bottom and a substance crowdout

### 2AC CP

#### Constitutional amendments are a voting issue—never happens and no advocate prove its not a germaine or legitimate opportunity cost

Baker 10

[Director of the Con Law Center at Drake, 10 Widener J. Pub. L. 1]

There is a reason that there have been only 27 amendments over more than 200 years: Constitutional amendments must have the sustained and one-sided support of great majorities in the Congress and across the states. Very few issues ever garner such importance and support.

#### Immediate court action is key—the Kiyemba case is in the spotlight now for democratic transitions and those questioning US leadership—the CP doesn’t do anything until the court strikes down the executive’s continued detention on the basis of the amendment

#### Even they fiat immediacy, it takes years to have a meaningful effect

Joyce, Prof of Public Administration at George Washington, 98

“The Rescissions Process After the Line Item Veto: Tools for Controlling Spending”

<http://www.rules.house.gov/archives/rules_joyc07.htm>

In the final analysis, there is no clear fallback position for supporters of the Line Item Veto Act. The Supreme Court, in its majority opinion, stated flatly that a different role for the President in the lawmaking process could only "come through the Article V amendment procedures". Deciding the issue through amending the Constitution, however, has two substantial drawbacks. The first is that Constitutional amendments are notoriously difficult to adopt. Even if a Constitutional amendment were adopted, it would likely not take effect for a number of years. The second is more substantive. A constitutionally provided line item veto would only allow the President to veto items that were specifically provided for in appropriation bills. Most federal "line items", however, are found not in statute, but in report language accompanying statutes.

#### It undermines US legitimacy—shifts the spotlight to the constitutional convention

Schiafly 99

[May 1999, The Schiafly Report, Vol 29 No 10, http://www.eagleforum.org/psr/1996/may96/psrmay96.html]

Most of us have watched a Republican National Convention or a Democratic National Convention on television. We've seen the bedlam of people milling up and down the aisles. We've watched how the emotions of the crowd can be stirred, and we've felt the tension when thousands of people make group decisions in a huge auditorium. Now imagine holding the Republican and Democratic National Conventions together -- at the same time and in the same hall. Imagine the confrontations of partisan politicians and pressure groups, the clash of liberals and conservatives, and the tirades of the activists -- all demanding that their view of constitutional issues prevail. Imagine the gridlock as the Jesse Helms caucus tries to work out constitutional change with the Jesse Jackson caucus! No wonder Rush Limbaugh said that a Con Con would be the worst thing that could happen to America and that it might signal time to "move to Australia." That's what it would be like if the United States calls a new Constitutional Convention (Con Con) for the first time in 209 years. It would be a self-inflicted wound that could do permanent damage to our nation, to our process of self-government, and possibly even to our liberty. A Con Con would throw confusion, uncertainty, and court cases around our governmental process by opening up our entire Constitution to be picked apart by special-interest groups that want various changes. It would make America look foolish in the eyes of the world, unsettle our financial markets, and force all of us to re-fight the same battles that the Founding Fathers so brilliantly won in the Constitutional Convention of 1787. George Washington and James Madison both called our Constitution a "miracle". We can't count on a miracle happening again.

#### The CP destroys credible judicial review

Sullivan 96, Professor of Law

[January, 1996, Kathleen M. Sullivan, Professor of Law, Stanford University, “CONSTITUTIONAL CONSTANCY: WHY CONGRESS SHOULD CURE ITSELF OF AMENDMENT FEVER”, 17 Cardozo L. Rev. 691]

How have we managed to survive over two hundred years of social and technological change with only twenty-seven constitutional amendments? The answer is that we have granted broad interpretive latitude to the Supreme Court. Narrow construction would necessitate more frequent resort to formal constitutional amendments. Broad construction eliminates the need. Thus, the Court has determined that eighteenth century restrictions on searches of our "papers and effects" apply to our twentieth century telephone calls, and that the command of equal protection forbids racially segregated schools even though such segregation was known to the Fourteenth Amendment's framers. Neither of these decisions - Katz v. United States and Brown v. Board of Education - required a constitutional amendment. Nor did the Court's "switch in time that saved nine" during the New Deal. In the early twentieth century, the Court struck down much federal economic legislation as exceeding Congress's power and invading the province of the states. Under President Roosevelt's threat to expand and pack the Court, the Court desisted, and started to defer to all legislation bearing some plausible relationship to interstate commerce. Some scholars have called the Court's decision to defer to national economic legislation revolutionary enough to count as an informal constitutional amendment, but most view it as within the broad contours of reasonable interpretive practice. Increasing the frequency of constitutional amendment would undermine the respect and legitimacy the Court now enjoys in this interpretive role. This danger is especially acute in the case of proposed constitutional amendments that would literally overturn Supreme Court decisions, such as amendments that would declare a fetus a person with a right to life, permit punishment of flag-burning, or authorize school prayer. Such amendments suggest that if you don't like a Court decision, you mobilize to overturn it. Justice Jackson once quipped that the Court's word is not final because it is infallible, but is infallible because it is final. That finality, though, has many salutary social benefits. For example, it allows us to treat abortion clinic bombers as terrorists rather than protesters. If every controversial Supreme Court decision resulted in plebiscitary overruling in the form of a constitutional amend- [\*703] ment, surely the finality of its word would be undermined, and with it the social benefits of peaceful conflict resolution. The fact that we have amended the Constitution only four times in order to overrule the Supreme Court is worth remembering.

#### The CP doesn’t do anything

Strauss, Law Prof at Chicago, 01

114 Harv. L. Rev. 1457

One final implication is the most practical of all. If amendments are in fact a sidelight, then it will usually be a mistake for people concerned about an issue to try to address it by amending the Constitution. Their resources are generally better spent on legislation, litigation, or private-sector activities. It is true that the effort to obtain a constitutional amendment may serve very effectively as a rallying point for political activity. A constitutional amendment may be an especially powerful symbol, and it may be worthwhile for a group to seek an amendment for just that reason. But in this respect constitutional amendments are comparable to congressional resolutions, presidential proclamations, or declarations of national holidays. If they bring about change, they do so because of their symbolic value, not because of their operative legal effect. The claim that constitutional amendments under Article V are not a principal means of constitutional change is a claim about the relationship between supermajoritarian amendments and fundamental, constitutional change. It should not be confused with the very different claim that judicial decisions cannot make significant changes without help from Congress or the President; n25 and it certainly should not be confused with a global skepticism about the efficacy of political activity generally. The point is that changes of constitutional magnitude - changes in the small-"c" constitution - are not brought about by discrete, supermajoritarian political acts like Article V amendments. It may also be true that such fundamental change is always the product of an evolutionary process and cannot be brought about by any discrete political act - by a single statute, judicial decision, or executive action, or (at the state level) by a constitutional amendment, whether adopted by majoritarian referendum or by some other means. What is true of Article V amendments may be equally true of these other acts: either they will ratify (while possibly contributing to) changes that have already taken place, or they will be ineffective until society catches up with the aspirations of the statute or decision. Alternatively, it may be that majoritarian acts (or judicial decisions), precisely because they do not require that the ground be prepared so thoroughly, can force the pace of change in a way that supermajoritarian acts cannot. A coalition sufficient to enact legislation might be assembled - or a judicial decision rendered - at a point when a society for the most part has not changed, but the legislation, once enacted (or the decision, once made), might be an important factor in bringing about more comprehensive change. The difference between majoritarian legislation and a supermajoritarian constitutional amendment is that the latter is far more likely to occur only after the change has, for all practical purposes, already taken place. Whatever one thinks of these broader speculations, however, they certainly do not entail a general skepticism about whether political activity matters at all. On the contrary, legislation and judicial decisions - as well as activity in the private realm that may not even be explicitly political - can accumulate to bring about fundamental and lasting changes that are then, sometimes, ratified in a textual amendment. Sustained political and nonpolitical activity of that kind is precisely what does bring about changes of constitutional magnitude. My claim is that such changes seldom come about, in a mature democracy, as the result of a formal amendment adopted by a supermajority.

#### Amendments are uniquely at risk for narrow interpretation by the Supreme Court

Segal, Poli Sci Prof at SUNY Stony Brok, 02

The Supreme Court and the Attitudinal Model Revisited, Pg. 5-6

If action by Congress to undo the Court's interpretation of one of its laws does not subvert judicial authority, a fortiori neither does the passage of a constitutional amendment, for example, the Twenty-Sixth Amendment reducing the voting age to eighteen and thereby undoing the decision in Oregon v. Mitchell,' which held that Congress could not constitutionally lower the voting age in state elections. Furthermore, not only does a constitutional amendment not subvert judicial authority, courts themselves – ultimately, the Supreme Court – have the last word when determining the sanctioning amendment's meaning. Thus, the Court is free to construe any amendment – whether or not it overturns one of its decisions – as it sees fit, even though its construction deviates appreciably from the language or purpose of the amendment.

#### Constitutional amendments creates legal instability and undermines rights protections

Rapsi 1/24

[01/24/13, Rapsi, Russian Electronic Periodical, “Russia faces emerging instability of law - Presidential Human Rights Council chief”, <http://rapsinews.com/news/20130124/266179163.html>]

MOSCOW, January 24 - RAPSI. The tendency in Russia to "immediately" amend laws as the authorities respond to current events with new bills, is evidence of a legal instability which poses a threat to the public's legal protection, Mikhail Fedotov, head of the Presidential Human Rights Council, said at a news conference on the issue of protecting citizens' religious feelings. "The legal system is effective only when it is stable. A constitution that has been in effect through the decades is much better than a constitution that changes every year. I personally advocate stability in the law," Fedotov said.

### 2AC Nietzsche

**PERM DO BOTH**

#### Calls for change are the best means to celebrate life – inaction breeds resentment

May, Lemon Professor of Philosophy at Clemson University, ‘5 (Todd, “To change the world, to celebrate life” Philosophy and Social Criticism, Vol 31 No 5-6, p 517-531, SagePub)

To change the world and to celebrate life. This, as the theologian Harvey Cox saw, is the struggle within us.1 It is a struggle in which one cannot choose sides; or better, a struggle in which one must choose both sides. The abandonment of one for the sake of the other can lead only to disaster or callousness. Forsaking the celebration of life for the sake of changing the world is the path of the sad revolutionary. In his preface to Anti-Oedipus, Foucault writes that one does not have to be sad in order to be revolu­tionary. The matter is more urgent than that, however. One cannot be both sad and revolutionary. Lacking a sense of the wondrous that is already here, among us, one who is bent upon changing the world can only become solemn or bitter. He or she is focused only on the future; the present is what is to be overcome. The vision of what is not but must come to be overwhelms all else, and the point of change itself becomes lost. The history of the left in the 20th century offers numerous examples of this, and the disaster that attends to it should be evident to all of us by now. The alternative is surely not to shift one's allegiance to the pure celebration of life, although there are many who have chosen this path. It is at best blindness not to see the misery that envelops so many of our fellow humans, to say nothing of what happens to sentient non-human creatures. The attempt to jettison world-changing for an un­critical assent to the world as it is requires a self-deception that I assume would be anathema for those of us who have studied Foucault. Indeed, it is anathema for all of us who awaken each day to an America whose expansive boldness is matched only by an equally expansive disregard for those we place in harm's way. This is the struggle, then. The one between the desire for life-celebration and the desire for world-changing. The struggle between reveling in the contingent and fragile joys that constitute our world and wresting it from its intolerability. I am sure it is a struggle that is not foreign to anyone who is reading this. I am sure as well that the stakes for choosing one side over another that I have recalled here are obvious to everyone. The question then becomes one of how to choose both sides at once. III Maybe it happens this way. You walk into a small meeting room at the back of a local bookstore. There are eight or ten people milling about. They're dressed in dark clothes, nothing fancy, and one or two of them have earrings or dreadlocks. They vary in age. You don't know any of them. You've never seen them before. Several of them seem to know one another. They are affectionate, hugging, letting a hand linger on a shoulder or an elbow. A younger man, tall and thin, with an open face and a blue baseball cap bearing no logo, glides into the room. Two others, a man and a woman, shout, 'Tim!' and he glides over to them and hugs them, one at a time. They tell him how glad they are that he could make it, and he says that he just got back into town and heard about the meeting. You stand a little off to the side. Nobody has taken a seat at the rectangle of folding tables yet. You don't want to be the first to sit down. Tim looks around the room and smiles. Several other people filter in. You're not quite sure where to put your hands so you slide them into your jean pockets. You hunch your shoulders. Tim's arrival has made you feel more of an outsider. But then he sees you. He edges his way around several others and walks up to you and introduces himself. You respond. Tim asks and you tell him that this is your first time at a meeting like this. He doesn't ask about politics but about where you're from. He tells you he has a friend in that neighborhood and do you know . . . ? Then several things happen that you only vaguely notice because you're talking with Tim. People start to sit down at the rec­tangle of tables. One of them pulls out a legal pad with notes on it. She sits at the head of the rectangle; or rather, when she sits down there, it becomes the head. And there's something you don't notice at all. You are more relaxed, your shoulders have stopped hunching, and when you sit down the seat feels familiar. The woman at the head of the table looks around. She smiles; her eyes linger over you and a couple of others that you take to be new faces, like yours. She says, 'Maybe we should begin.' IV I can offer only a suggestion of an answer here today. It is a suggestion that brings together some thoughts from the late writings of Maurice Merleau-Ponty with those of Foucault, in order to sketch not even a framework for thought, but the mere outlines of a framework. It is not a framework that would seek to find the unconscious of each in the writings of the other. Neither thinker finishes or accomplishes the other. (Often, for example regarding methodology, they do not even agree.) Rather, it is a framework that requires both of them, from their very different angles, in order to be able to think it. My goal in constructing the outlines of this framework is largely philosophical. That is to say, the suggestion I would like to make here is not one for resolving for each of us the struggle of life-celebration and world-changing, but of offering a way to conceive ourselves that allows us to embrace both sides of this battle at the same time. Given the thinkers I have chosen as reference points, it will be no surprise when I say that that conception runs through the body. Let me start with Merleau-Ponty. In his last writings, particularly in The Visible and the Invisible, he offers a conception of the body that is neither at odds nor even entangled with the world, but is of the very world itself. His concept of the flesh introduces a point of contact that is also a point of undifferentiation. The flesh, Merleau-Ponty writes, 'is the coiling over of the visible upon the seeing body, of the tangible upon the touching body, which is attested in particular when the body sees itself, touches itself seeing and touching the things, such that, as tangible it descends among them'.2 We must recall this economy of the flesh before we turn to Foucault. There is, for Merleau-Ponty, a single Being. Our world is of that Being, and we are of our world. We are not something that confronts the world from outside, but are born into it and do not leave it. This does not mean that we cannot remove ourselves from the immediacy of its grasp. What it means is that to remove ourselves from that immedi­acy is neither the breaking of a bond nor the discovery of an original dichotomy or dualism. What is remarkable about human beings is pre­cisely our capacity to confront the world, to reflect upon it, understand it, and change it, while still being of a piece with it. To grasp this remarkable character, it is perhaps worth recalling Gilles Deleuze's concept of the fold. The world is not composed of different parts; there is no transcendent, whether of God or of subjec­tivity. The world is one. As Deleuze sometimes says, being is univocal. This oneness is not, however, inert or inanimate. Among other things, it can fold over on itself, creating spaces that are at once insides and outsides, at once different from and continuous with one another. The flesh is a fold of Being in this sense. It is of the world, and yet encounters it as if from a perceptual or cognitive distance. It is a visi­bility that sees, a tangible that touches, an audible that hears. Merleau-Ponty writes: There is vision, touch when a certain visible, a certain tangible, turns back upon the whole of the visible, the whole of the tangible, of which it is a part, or when suddenly it finds itself surrounded by them, or when between it and them, and through their commerce, is formed a Visibility, a Tangible in itself, which belong properly neither to the body qua fact nor to the world qua fact . . . and which therefore form a couple, a couple more real than either of them.3 For Merleau-Ponty, thought and reflection do not attach themselves to this flesh from beyond it, but arise through it. As our body is of this world, our thought is of our bodies, its language of a piece with the world it addresses. '[I]f we were to make completely explicit the archi­tectonics of the human body, its ontological framework, and how it sees itself and hears itself, we would see the possibilities of language already given in it.'4 This conception of the body as flesh of the world is not foreign to Foucault, although of course the terms Merleau-Ponty uses are not his. We might read Foucault's politics as starting from here, inaugurated at the point of undifferentiation between body and world. The crucial addition he would make is that that point of undifferentiation is not historically inert. The body/world nexus is inscribed in a history that leaves its traces on both at the same time, and that crosses the border of the flesh and reaches the language that arises from it, and the thought that language expresses. How does this work? V Maybe it doesn't happen that way. Maybe it happens another way. Maybe you walk into a room at a local community center. The room is large, but there aren't many people, at least yet. There's a rectangular table in the center, and everyone is sitting around it. A couple of people look up as you walk in. They nod slightly. You nod back, even more slightly. At the head of the table is someone with a legal pad. She does not look up. She is reading the notes on the pad, making occasional marks with the pen in her right hand. Other people come in and take places at the table. One or two of them open laptop computers and look for an outlet. Eventually, the table fills up and people start sitting in chairs behind the table. Your feel as though you're in an inner circle where you don't belong. You wonder whether you should give up your chair and go sit on the outside with the others who are just coming in now. Maybe people notice you, think you don't belong there. At this moment you'd like to leave. You begin to feel at once large and small, visually intrusive and an object of scrutiny. You don't move because maybe this is OK after all. You just don't know. The room is quiet. A couple of people cough. Then the woman seated at the head of the table looks up. She scans the room as if taking attendance. She says, 'Maybe we should begin.' VI Merleau-Ponty's discussion of the body as flesh is an ontological one. Although he does not see the body as remote from its historical inscrip­tion, his discussion does not incorporate the role such inscription plays. For a body to be of the world is also for it to be temporal, to be encrusted in the continuous emerging of the world over time. And this emerging is not abstract; rather, it is concrete. The body/world nexus evolves during particular historical periods. This fold of the flesh, this body, is not nowhere and at any time. It is there, then; or it is here, now. A body is entangled within a web of specific events and relations that, precisely because it is of this world, are inescapably a part of that body's destiny. As Merleau-Ponty tells us in Phenomenology of Perception, 'our open and personal existence rests on an initial foundation of acquired and stabilized existence. But it could not be otherwise, if we are tem­porality, since the dialectic of acquisition and future is what constitutes time.'5 The medium for the body's insertion into a particular net of events and relations is that of social practices. Our bodies are not first and foremost creatures of the state or the economy, no more than they are atomized wholes distinct from the world they inhabit. Or better, they are creatures of the state and the economy inasmuch as those appear through social practices, through the everyday practices that are the ether of our lives. Social practices are the sedimentation of history at the level of the body. When I teach, when I write this article, when I run a race or teach one of my children how to ride a bicycle, my body is oriented in particular ways, conforming to or rejecting particular norms, responding to the constraints and restraints of those practices as they have evolved in interaction with other practices over time. Through its engagement in these practices, my body has taken on a history that is not of my making but is nevertheless part of my inheritance. It is pre­cisely because, as Merleau-Ponty has written, the body and the world are not separate things but rather in a chiasmic relation that we can think this inheritance. And it is because of Foucault's histories that we can recognize that this inheritance is granted through specific social practices. And of course, as Foucault has taught us, social practices are where the power is. It is not, or not simply, at the level of the state or the modes of production where power arises. It is, as he sometimes puts it, at the capillaries. One of the lessons of Discipline and Punish is that, if the soul is the prison of the body, this is because the body is inserted into a set of practices that create for it a soul. These practices are not merely the choices of an individual whose thought surveys the world from above, but instead the fate of a body that is of a particular world at a particular time and place. Moreover, these practices are not merely in service to a power that exists outside of them; they are mechanisms of power in their own right. It is not because Jeremy Bentham disliked the prison population that the Panopticon became a grid for thinking about penal institutions. It is instead because the evolution of penal practices at that time created an opening for the economy of visibility that the Panopticon represented. When Foucault writes that. . . the soul has a reality, it is produced permanently around, on, within the body by the functioning of a power that is exercised on those punished - and, in a more general way, on those one supervises, trains and corrects, over madmen, children at home and at school, the colonized, over those who are stuck at a machine and supervised for the rest of their lives6 his claim is informed by four other ones that lie behind it: that bodies are of a piece with the world, that the body/world nexus is a temporal one, that the medium of that corporeal temporality is the practices a body is engaged in, and that that medium is political as well as social. The last three claims are, of course, of the framework of Foucault's thought. The first one is the ontological scaffolding provided by Merleau-Ponty. And it is by means of all four that we can begin to conceive things so as to be able to choose both world-changing and life-celebrating at the same time. VII It could happen yet another way. Increasingly, it does. There is no meeting. There are no tables and no legal pads. Nobody sits down in a room together, at least nobody sits down at a place you know about. There may not even be a leaflet. Maybe you just got an email that was for­warded by someone you know slightly and who thought you might be interested. At the bottom there's a link, in case you want to unsubscribe. If you don't unsubscribe you get more notices, with petitions to sign or times and places for rallies or teach-ins or marches. Maybe there's also a link for feedback or a list for virtual conversations or suggestions. If you show up, it's not to something you put together but to some­thing that was already in place before you arrived. How did you decide on this rally or teach-in? You sat in front of your computer screen, stared at it, pondering. Maybe you emailed somebody you know, asking for their advice. Is it worth going? If it's on campus you probably did. It matters who will see you, whether you have tenure, how much you've published. There are no Tims here. You've decided to go. If it's a teach-in, you've got plausible denia-bility; you're just there as an observer. If it's a rally, you can stand to the side. But maybe you won't do that. The issue is too important. You don't know the people who will be there, but you will stand among them, walk among them. You will be with them, in some way. Bodies at the same time and place. You agree on the issue, but it's a virtual agreement, one that does not come through gestures or words but through sharing the same values and the same internet connections. As you march, as you stand there, nearly shoulder to shoulder with others of like mind, you're already somewhere else, telling this story to someone you know, trying to get them to understand the feeling of solidarity that you are projecting back into this moment. You say to yourself that maybe you should have brought a friend along. VIII There are many ways to conceive the bond between world-changing and life-celebrating. Let me isolate two: one that runs from Merleau-Ponty to Foucault, from the body's chiasmic relation with the world to the politics of its practices; and the other one running back in the opposite direction. The ontology Merleau-Ponty offers in his late work is one of wonder. Abandoning the sterile philosophical debates about the relation of mind and body, subject and object, about the relation of reason to that which is not reason, or the problem of other minds, his ontology forges a unity of body and world that puts us in immediate contact with all of its aspects. No longer are we to be thought the self-enclosed crea­tures of the philosophical tradition. We are now in touch with the world, because we are of it. Art, for example, does not appeal solely to our minds; its beauty is not merely a matter of the convergence of our fac­ulties. We are moved by art, often literally moved, because our bodies and the work of art share the same world. As Merleau-Ponty says, 'I would be at great pains to say where is the painting I am looking at. For I do not look at it as I do a thing; I do not fix it in its place. My gaze wanders in it as in the halos of Being. It is more accurate to say that I see according to it, or with it, than that I see it.'7 It is only because my body is a fold of this world that art can affect me so. But this affection is also a vulnerability. As my look can happen according to a work of art, so it can happen according to a social practice. And even more so in proportion as that social practice and its effects are suffused through the world in which I carry on my life, the world my body navigates throughout the day, every day. I do not have a chance to look according to a painting by Cezanne very often; but I do encounter the effects of normalization as it has filtered through the practices of my employment, of my students' upbringing, and of my family's expectations of themselves and one another. The vulnerability of the body, then, is at once its exposure to beauty and its opening to what is intolerable. We might also see things from the other end, starting from politics and ending at the body. I take it that this is what Foucault suggests when he talks about bodies and pleasures at the end of the first volume of the History of Sexuality. If we are a product of our practices and the con­ception of ourselves and the world that those practices have fostered, so to change our practices is to experiment in new possibilities both for living and, inseparably, for conceiving the world. To experiment in sexu­ality is not to see where the desire that lies at the core of our being may lead us; that is simply the continuation of our oppression by other means. Rather, it is to construct practices where what is at issue is no longer desire but something else, something that might go by the name of bodies and pleasures. In doing so, we not only act differently, we think differently, both about ourselves and about the world those selves are inseparable from. And because these experiments are practices of our bodies, and because our bodies are encrusted in the world, these experiments become not merely acts of political resistance but new folds in the body/ world nexus. To construct new practices is to appeal to aspects or possibilities of the world that have been previously closed to us. It is to offer novel, and perhaps more tolerable, engagements in the chiasm of body and world. Thus we might say of politics what Merleau-Ponty has said of painting, that we see according to it. Here, I take it, is where the idea of freedom in Foucault lies. For Foucault, freedom is not a metaphysical condition. It does not lie in the nature of being human, nor is it a warping, an atomic swerve, in the web of causal relations in which we find ourselves. To seek our freedom in a space apart from our encrustation in the world is not so much to liberate ourselves from its influence as to build our own private prison. Foucault once said: There's an optimism that consists in saying that things couldn't be better. My optimism would consist rather in saying that so many things can be changed, fragile as they are, bound up more with circumstances than with necessities, more arbitrary than self-evident, more a matter of complex, but temporary, historical circumstances than with inevitable anthropological constraints . . .8 That is where to discover our freedom. IX And what happens from there? From the meetings, from the rallies, from the petitions and the teach-ins? What happens next? There is, after all, always a next. If you win this time - end aid to the contras, divest from apartheid South Africa, force debt-forgiveness by techno­logically advanced countries - there is always more to do. There is the de-unionization of workers, there are gay rights, there is Burma, there are the Palestinians, the Tibetans. There will always be Tibetans, even if they aren't in Tibet, even if they aren't Asian. But is that the only question: Next? Or is that just the question we focus on? What's the next move in this campaign, what's the next campaign? Isn't there more going on than that? After all, engaging in political organizing is a practice, or a group of practices. It contributes to making you who you are. It's where the power is, and where your life is, and where the intersection of your life and those of others (many of whom you will never meet, even if it's for their sake that you're involved) and the buildings and streets of your town is. This moment when you are seeking to change the world, whether by making a suggestion in a meeting or singing at a rally or marching in silence or asking for a signature on a petition, is not a moment in which you don't exist. It's not a moment of yours that you sacrifice for others so that it no longer belongs to you. It remains a moment of your life, sedimenting in you to make you what you will become, emerging out of a past that is yours as well. What will you make of it, this moment? How will you be with others, those others around you who also do not cease to exist when they begin to organize or to protest or to resist? The illusion is to think that this has nothing to do with you. You've made a decision to participate in world-changing. Will that be all there is to it? Will it seem to you a simple sacrifice, for this small period of time, of who you are for the sake of others? Are you, for this moment, a political ascetic? Asceticism like that is dangerous. X Freedom lies not in our distance from the world but in the historically fragile and contingent ways we are folded into it, just as we ourselves are folds of it. If we take Merleau-Ponty's Being not as a rigid foun­dation or a truth behind appearances but as the historical folding and refolding of a univocity, then our freedom lies in the possibility of other foldings. Merleau-Ponty is not insensitive to this point. His elusive concept of the invisible seems to gesture in this direction. Of painting, he writes: the proper essence of the visible is to have a layer of invisibility in the strict sense, which it makes present as a certain absence . . . There is that which reaches the eye directly, the frontal properties of the visible; but there is also that which reaches it from below . . . and that which reaches it from above . . . where it no longer participates in the heaviness of origins but in free accomplishments.9 Elsewhere, in The Visible and the Invisible, he says: if . . . the surface of the visible, is doubled up over its whole extension with an invisible reserve; and if, finally, in our flesh as the flesh of things, the actual, empirical, ontic visible, by a sort of folding back, invagination, or padding, exhibits a visibility, a possibility that is not the shadow of the actual but its principle . . . an interior horizon and an exterior horizon between which the actual visible is a partitioning and which, nonetheless, open indefinitely only upon other visibles . . .10 What are we to make of these references? We can, to be sure, see the hand of Heidegger in them. But we may also, and for present purposes more relevantly, see an intersection with Foucault's work on freedom. There is an ontology of freedom at work here, one that situates freedom not in the private reserve of an individual but in the unfinished character of any historical situation. There is more to our historical juncture, as there is to a painting, than appears to us on the surface of its visibility. The trick is to recognize this, and to take advantage of it, not only with our thoughts but with our lives. And that is why, in the end, there can be no such thing as a sad revolutionary. To seek to change the world is to offer a new form of life-celebration. It is to articulate a fresh way of being, which is at once a way of seeing, thinking, acting, and being acted upon. It is to fold Being once again upon itself, this time at a new point, to see what that might yield. There is, as Foucault often reminds us, no guarantee that this fold will not itself turn out to contain the intolerable. In a complex world with which we are inescapably entwined, a world we cannot view from above or outside, there is no certainty about the results of our experiments. Our politics are constructed from the same vulnerability that is the stuff of our art and our daily practices. But to refuse to experi­ment is to resign oneself to the intolerable; it is to abandon both the struggle to change the world and the opportunity to celebrate living within it. And to seek one aspect without the other - life-celebration without world-changing, world-changing without life-celebration - is to refuse to acknowledge the chiasm of body and world that is the well-spring of both. If we are to celebrate our lives, if we are to change our world, then perhaps the best place to begin to think is our bodies, which are the openings to celebration and to change, and perhaps the point at which the war within us that I spoke of earlier can be both waged and resolved. That is the fragile beauty that, in their different ways, both Merleau-Ponty and Foucault have placed before us. The question before us is whether, in our lives and in our politics, we can be worthy of it. XI So how might you be a political body, woven into the fabric of the world as a celebrator and as a changer? You went to the meeting, and then to the demonstration. How was it there? Were the bodies in harmony or in counterpoint? Did you sing with your feet, did your voice soar? Did your mind come alive? Did you see possibilities you had not seen before? Were there people whose words or clothes, or even the way they walked hand in hand (how long has it been since you've walked hand in hand with someone out in public?) offer you a possibility, or make you feel alive as well as righteous? And how about those people off to the side, the ones on the sidewalk watching? Maybe they just stared, or maybe nodded as you went past. Or maybe some of them shouted at you to stop blocking the streets with your nonsense. Did you recoil within yourself, see yourself as in a mirror, or as the person at Sartre's keyhole who's just been caught? Did you feel superior to them, smug in your knowledge? Or did they, too, show you something you might learn from? Are they you at another moment, a moment in the past or in the future? Are they your parents that you have not explained to, sat down beside, or just shared a meal with? That one over there, the old man slightly stooped in the long overcoat: whom does he remind you of? What message might he have unwittingly brought for you? And why does it have to be a demonstration? You go to a few meetings, a few more demonstrations. You write some letters to legis­lators. You send an email to the President. And then more meetings. The next thing you know, you're involved in a political campaign. By then you may have stopped asking why. This is how it goes: demonstra­tions, meetings with legislators, internet contacts. Does it have to be like this? Are demonstrations and meetings your only means? Do they become, sooner or later, not only means but ends? And what kinds of ends? In some sense they should always be ends: a meeting is a celebra­tion, after all. But there are other ends as well. You go to the meeting because that fulfills your obligation to your political conscience. Does it come to that? There are other means, other ends. Other means/ends. Some people ride bicycles, en masse, slowly through crowded urban streets. You want environmentalism? Then have it. The streets are beautiful with their tall corniced buildings and wide avenues. To ride a bike through these streets instead of hiding in the armor of a car would be exhilarating. If enough of you do it together it would make for a pleasant ride, as well as a little lived environmentalism. Would you want to call it a demonstra­tion? Would it matter? There are others as well who do other things with their bodies, more dangerous things. Some people have gone to Palestine in order to put their bodies between the Palestinians and the Israeli soldiers and settlers who attack them. They lie down next to Palestinians in front of the bulldozers that would destroy homes or build a wall through a family's olive orchard. They feel the bodies of those they are in solidarity with. They smell the soil of Palestine as they lay there. Sometimes, they are harmed by it. A young woman, Rachel Corrie, was deliberately crushed by a US bulldozer operated by an Israeli soldier as she kneeled in front of a Palestinian home, hoping to stop its demolition. To do politics with one's body can be like this. To resist, to celebrate, is also to be vulner­able. The world that you embrace, the world of which you are a part, can kill you too. And so you experiment. You try this and you try that. You are a phenomenologist and a genealogist. You sense what is around you, attend to the way your body is encrusted in your political involvements. And you know that that sensing has its own history, a history that often escapes you even as it envelops you. There is always more to what you are, and to what you are involved in, than you can know. So you try to keep vigilant, seeking the possibilities without scorning the realities. It's a difficult balance. You can neglect it if you like. Many do. But your body is there, woven into the fabric of all the other bodies, animate and inanimate. Whether you like it or not, whether you recognize it or not. The only question is whether you will take up the world that you are of, or leave it to others, to those others who would be more than willing to take your world up for you.

#### Legal and rights based detention strategies are a critical form of resistance and life affirming

Ahmad 9, Professor of Law

[2009, Muneer I. Ahmad is a Clinical Professor of Law, Yale Law School, “RESISTING GUANTÁNAMO: RIGHTS AT THE BRINK OF DEHUMANIZATION”, Northwestern University Law Review, Vol. 103, p. 1683, American University, WCL Research Paper No. 08-65]

This Article is about the work that rights do, and the work of the lawyers who assert them on their clients‘ behalf, particularly in the face of inordinate state violence, as is the case with Guantánamo. I write this story of Guantánamo based on my experiences of nearly three years of representing a prisoner there.14 While commentators can point to an unbroken record of legal victories in Guantánamo cases at the Supreme Court,15 the view from the prisoners‘ perspective is quite different, and throws into question the claim of transformative legal practice that the Court cases might otherwise suggest. This is not to say that the lawyering has itself been a failure. Rather, I argue that instead of expecting rights-based legal contest at and around Guantánamo to produce transformative results, we might better understand it as a form of resistance to dehumanization. Such a reframing of the Guantánamo litigation invites comparison with other forms of resistance, and helps explain both the power and the limitations of legal practice in extreme instances of state violence. When placed in a human rights frame, Guantánamo is often described in terms of the government‘s denial of rights to the prisoners, but equally important has been the denial of their humanity. Guantánamo has been a project of dehumanization, in the literal sense; it has sought to expel the prisoners—consistently referred to as ―terrorists‖— from our shared understanding of what it means to be human, so as to permit, if not necessitate, physical and mental treatment (albeit in the context of interrogation) abhorrent to human beings. This has been accomplished through three forms of erasure of the human: cultural erasure through the creation of a terrorist narrative; legal erasure through formalistic legerdemain; and physical erasure through torture. While these three dimensions of dehumanization are distinct, they are also interrelated. All are pervaded by law, and more specifically, by rights. This is to say that law has been deployed to create the preconditions for the exercise of a state power so brutal as to deprive the Guantánamo prisoners of the ability to be human. In this way, Guantánamo recalls Hannah Arendt‘s formulation of citizenship as the right to have rights.16 By this she meant that without membership in the polity, the individual stood exposed to the violence of the state, unmediated and unprotected by rights. The result of such exposure, she argued, was to reduce the person to a state of bare life, or life without humanity. What we see at Guantánamo is the inverse of citizenship: no right to have rights, a rights vacuum that enables extreme violence, so as to place Guantánamo at the center of a struggle not merely for rights, but for humanity—that state of being that distinguishes human life from mere biological existence.17 In order to better understand the work that rights do, this Article explores why prisoners‘ advocates, including myself, adopted a rights-based advocacy strategy in an environment defined explicitly by the absence of rights. Since the first prisoners arrived at Guantánamo, the Bush Administration‘s position had been that they lack any rights whatsoever, under any source of law.18 Thus did the Bush Administration attempt to define a rights-free zone, through a manipulation of rights which seemed demonstrably political. And yet, despite the overwhelming evidence of politics animating law at Guantánamo, as advocates we made a conscious decision to engage in rights-based argument, and ―rights talk‖ 19 more generally. This approach finds some support in the work of rights scholars (and critical race theorists in particular) regarding the continuing vitality of rights-based approaches and the promise of ―critical legalism‖ 20 or ―radical constitutionalism‖ 21—the very kinds of progressive constitutional optimism that the Rasul and Boumediene decisions inspire. But the subsequent litigation history demands further inquiry into the political, cultural, jurisprudential, and strategic value of arguing rights in the historical moment and place of Guantá- namo. I argue that while we might hope for rights to obtain transformative effect—to close Guantánamo, for example, or to free those who are wrongfully imprisoned—at Guantánamo and in other places of extreme state violence, rights may do the more modest work of resistance. Rather than fundamentally reconfiguring power arrangements, as rights moments aspire to do, resistance slows, narrows, and increases the costs for the state‘s exercise of violence. Resistance is a form of power contestation that works from within the structures of domination.22 While it may aspire to overturn prevailing power relations, its value derives from its means as much as from its ends. Through resistance, new political spaces may open, but even if they do not, the mere fact of resistance, the assertion of the self against the violence of the state, is self- and life-affirming. Resistance is, in short, a way of staying human. This, then, is the work that rights do: when pushed to the brink of annihilation, they provide us with a rudimentary and perhaps inadequate tool to maintain our humanity. In Part I of this Article, I discuss the cultural erasure of the Guantánamo prisoners through the creation of a post-September 11 terrorist narrative, or what I term an iconography of terror, their legal erasure through the crea-tion of the now abandoned ―enemy combatant‖ 23 category and their physical erasure through torture. I contextualize these discussions with narrative descriptions of the place and space of Guantánamo, which I argue are necessary to understand the contextual nature of rights and rights claims, and the integral connection between law and narrative. In Part II, I deepen the discussion of legal erasure through critique and analysis of my representation of a teenage Canadian Guantánamo prisoner, Omar Khadr, in military commission proceedings, and through a doctrinal analysis of the shifting meanings of core legal terms in the Guantánamo legal regime. In so doing, I suggest how the experience of lawyering in and around Guantánamo helped to prove up its lawless nature. Part III considers the tactical, strategic, and theoretical values of adopting rights-based legal approaches in the rights-free zone of Guantánamo, paying particular attention to the value of rights as recognition, and ultimately arguing the importance of rights as a mode of resistance to state violence. In Part IV, I build upon this discussion of resistance by considering direct forms of resistance in which prisoners themselves have participated. In particular, I suggest the hunger strike as a paradigmatic form of prisoner resistance, and argue the lawyers‘ rights-based litigation and the prisoners‘ hunger strikes share a conceptual understanding of the relationship between rights, violence, and humanity. I conclude by reflecting on the value and limitations of reframing the work of the Guantánamo prisoners‘ lawyers as nothing more, but also nothing less, than resistance. I suggest that neither the resistance of the lawyers nor that of the prisoners may be enough to gain the prisoners‘ freedom, but that they are nonetheless essential when, as at Guantánamo, state violence is so extreme as to attempt to extinguish the human.

#### Rejection of action or doing nothing corrupts their criticism – turns the alt

Solomon, Quincy Lee Centennial Professor at the University of Texas at Austin, ’90 (Robert, “Nietzsche as Postmodernist” p 291-292)

It has too long been fashionable to dismiss Nietzsche for his hyperbole and crypto-fascists remarks, but now Nietzsche seems to be subjected to an equally devastating mode of dismissal which turns him into a mere metaphilosopher and ignores the very "dangerous" substantial issues he raises for (against) us. Indeed, the jargon of postmodernism is even used to deny the existence of "substantial issues"—easy enough in the ethereal comfort of the seminar room but not even plausible while reading the newspaper. It ignores Nietzsche's insis­tence on the need for ideals and the need to take a stand. Indeed, it defends the importance of not taking a stand. What troubled Europe for so much of this century and awakened so many bright undergrad­uates was not Nietzsche's metaphilosophy but his uninhibited accusa­tions and invitations to a boldness in thinking about our lives that had all but disappeared from philosophy. I would like to think that this is what postmodern philosophy is all about—moving beyond the for­mulaic and overly technical academic dogmatism of the recent past to personal involvement and a pluralism that is concerned with how a particular philosophy contributes to a particular life rather than how a jargonized essay fits into the latest professional fashion. There is currently a widespread suspicion that much of postmodernism is an excuse not to believe in anything, to avoid both personal and political involvement and take refuge in apathy, despair, or mere ambition. But it seems to me that Nietzsche stood for a postmodernism that involved far more. I am reminded of a statement that Peter Schjeldahl made some years ago, commenting on the artist Mark Rothko as a precursor of postmodernism: "He was too early to know that believing in something is always risky; we have the edge on him." So, too, one forms the impression, reading so many postmodern authors and commen­tators, that anything can be said, without responsibility, without any risk at all. But the Nietzschean conclusion to be drawn from that postmodern observation should not be retreat; it invites engagement. Postmodernism is nothing but an unusally hysterical reaction to the quickening historical process of evolution and change. It is, in that sense, the very opposite of that attitude of amor fati, which Nietzsche opposed to ressentiment and tried so hard to make his own. In this bold sense, amor fati is not resignation but the willingness to throw ourselves into our projects and into history. But this willingness seems to me to be the dominant urge of modernism, not postmodernism, and if Nietzsche is a postmodernist in this sense, he resembles Marx far more than he does Derrida (though the aims of the revolution are obviously quite opposed). There are many Nietzsches, and only one of them is the Nietzsche who anticipated the worst features of modern European history. I find it disturbing that this Nietzsche is today being resurrected and celebrated as "postmodern."

### 2AC Law K

#### Framework—the primary purpose of debate should be to improve our skills as decisionmakers through a discussion of public policy

#### Decisionmaking skills are necessary to decide between individual courses of action that affect us on a daily basis—flexing our muscles in the high-stakes games of public policymaking is necessary to make those individual decisions easier

#### The neg must connect their alternative to policy concerns and institutional practices—absent these questions shifts in knowledge production are useless – governments’ obey institutional logics that exist independently of individuals and constrain decisionmaking

Wight – Professor of IR @ University of Sydney – 6

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

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

#### Discussions of structure should precede substance—second generation Guantanamo issues require a more detailed focus on the legal system—student advocacy enables us to make change

Marguiles 11, Professor of Law

[February 9, 2011, Peter Margulies is Professor of Law, Roger Williams University., “The Ivory Tower at Ground Zero: Conflict and Convergence in Legal Education’s Responses to Terrorism”Journal of Legal Education, Vol. 60, p. 373, 2011, Roger Williams Univ. Legal Studies Paper No. 100]

If timidity in the face of government overreaching is the academy’s overarching historical narrative,1 responses to September 11 broke the mold. In what I will call the first generation of Guantánamo issues, members of the legal academy mounted a vigorous campaign against the unilateralism of Bush Administration policies.2 However, the landscape has changed in Guantánamo’s second generation, which started with the Supreme Court’s landmark decision in Boumediene v. Bush,3 affirming detainees’ access to habeas corpus, and continued with the election of Barack Obama. Second generation Guantánamo issues are murkier, without the clarion calls that marked first generation fights. This Article identifies points of substantive and methodological convergence4 in the wake of Boumediene and President Obama’s election. It then addresses the risks in the latter form of convergence. Substantive points of convergence that have emerged include a consensus on the lawfulness of detention of suspected terrorists subject to judicial review5 and a more fragile meeting of the minds on the salutary role of constraints generally and international law in particular. However, the promise of substantive consensus is marred by the peril of a methodological convergence that I call dominant doctrinalism. Too often, law school pedagogy and scholarship squint through the lens of doctrine, inattentive to the way that law works in practice.6 Novel doctrinal developments, such as the president’s power to detain United States citizens or persons apprehended in the United States, get disproportionate attention in casebooks and scholarship. In contrast, developments such as an expansion in criminal and immigration law enforcement that build on settled doctrine get short shrift, even though they have equal or greater real-world consequences. Consumers of pedagogy and scholarship are ill-equipped to make informed assessments or push for necessary changes. If legal academia is to respond adequately to second generation Guantánamo issues, as well as issues raised by any future attacks, it must transcend the fascination with doctrine displayed by both left and right, and bolster its commitment to understanding and changing how law works “on the ground.” To combat dominant doctrinalism and promote positive change, this Article asks for greater attention in three areas. First, law schools should do even more to promote clinical and other courses that give students first-hand experience in advocacy for vulnerable and sometimes unpopular clients, including the need for affirming their clients’ humanity and expanding the venue of advocacy into the court of public opinion.7 Clinical students also often discover with their clients that legal rights matter, although chastened veterans of rights battles like Joe Margulies and Hope Metcalf are correct that victories are provisional and sometimes pyrrhic.8 Second, legal scholarship and education should encourage the study of social phenomena like path dependence—the notion that past choices frame current advocacy strategies, so that lawyers recommending an option must consider the consequences of push-back from that choice. Aggressive Bush Administration lawyers unduly discounted risks flagged by more reflective colleagues on the consequences of push-back from the courts. Similarly, both the new Obama Administration and advocates trying to cope with Guantánamo’s post-Boumediene second generation failed to gauge the probability of push-back from the administration’s early announcement of plans to close the facility within a year. In each case, unexpected but reasonably foreseeable reactions skewed the implementation of legal and policy choices. Students should learn more about these dynamics before they enter the legal arena. Third, teachers need to focus more on ways in which bureaucratic structures affect policy choices. For example, terrorism fears gave conservative politicians like John Ashcroft an opportunity to decimate asylum adjudication, harming many victims of persecution who have been unable to press meritorious claims for refugee status and other forms of relief. Similarly, creation of the Department of Homeland Security turned a vital governmental function like disaster relief into a bureaucratic orphan, thereby paving the way for the inadequate response to Hurricane Katrina. Students need more guidance on what to look for when structure shapes substance.

#### Cooptation isn’t offense—the alternative is equally at risk for cooptation—you should affirm an optimistic outlook towards the law to reform and redefine it for positive purposes

Lobel 7, Assistant Professor of Law

[February, 2007; Orly Lobel is an Assistant Professor of Law, University of San Diego. LL.M. 2000 (waived), Harvard Law School; LL.B. 1998, Tel-Aviv University, “THE PARADOX OF EXTRALEGAL ACTIVISM: CRITICAL LEGAL CONSCIOUSNESS AND TRANSFORMATIVE POLITICS”, 120 Harv. L. Rev. 937]

A critique of cooptation often takes an uneasy path. Critique has always been and remains not simply an intellectual exercise but a political and moral act. The question we must constantly pose is how critical accounts of social reform models contribute to our ability to produce scholarship and action that will be constructive. To critique the ability of law to produce social change is inevitably to raise the question of alternatives. In and of itself, the exploration of the limits of law and the search for new possibilities is an insightful field of inquiry. However, the contemporary message that emerges from critical legal consciousness analysis has often resulted in the distortion of the critical arguments themselves. This distortion denies the potential of legal change in order to illuminate what has yet to be achieved or even imagined. Most importantly, cooptation analysis is not unique to legal reform but can be extended to any process of social action and engagement. When claims of legal cooptation are compared to possible alternative forms of activism, the false necessity embedded in the contemporary [\*988] story emerges - a story that privileges informal extralegal forms as transformative while assuming that a conservative tilt exists in formal legal paths. In the triangular conundrum of "law and social change," law is regularly the first to be questioned, deconstructed, and then critically dismissed. The other two components of the equation - social and change - are often presumed to be immutable and unambiguous. Understanding the limits of legal change reveals the dangers of absolute reliance on one system and the need, in any effort for social reform, to contextualize the discourse, to avoid evasive, open-ended slogans, and to develop greater sensitivity to indirect effects and multiple courses of action. Despite its weaknesses, however, law is an optimistic discipline. It operates both in the present and in the future. Order without law is often the privilege of the strong. Marginalized groups have used legal reform precisely because they lacked power. Despite limitations, these groups have often successfully secured their interests through legislative and judicial victories. Rather than experiencing a disabling disenchantment with the legal system, we can learn from both the successes and failures of past models, with the aim of constantly redefining the boundaries of legal reform and making visible law's broad reach.

#### PERM DO BOTH The permutation is best—legal reforms can utilized to protect vulnerable populations if we remain conscious of its dangers—the alternative leaves groups stranded

Lobel 7, Assistant Professor of Law

[February, 2007; Orly Lobel is an Assistant Professor of Law, University of San Diego. LL.M. 2000 (waived), Harvard Law School; LL.B. 1998, Tel-Aviv University, “THE PARADOX OF EXTRALEGAL ACTIVISM: CRITICAL LEGAL CONSCIOUSNESS AND TRANSFORMATIVE POLITICS”, 120 Harv. L. Rev. 937]

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.

#### Rights demands and legal strategies prevent state violence—habeas specific

Ahmad 9, Professor of Law

[2009, Muneer I. Ahmad is a Clinical Professor of Law, Yale Law School, “RESISTING GUANTÁNAMO: RIGHTS AT THE BRINK OF DEHUMANIZATION”, Northwestern University Law Review, Vol. 103, p. 1683, American University, WCL Research Paper No. 08-65]

Rights as Resistance.—Habeas corpus, whose history has been explored exhaustively by others,297 translates as ―show me the body,‖ and captures the communitarian, corporeal, and testimonial dimensions of not just rights claims, but citizenship. For a judge to order the government to produce a defendant for the purposes of considering the legality of his detention is to recognize the defendant‘s a priori membership in the community. To require that the defendant himself—his corpus—be produced, and not just reasons for his detention proffered, is to acknowledge the physicality and inescapably human experience of an otherwise abstract liberty interest. And to permit the defendant to not only attend his own hearing, but to speak on his own behalf, is to credit his standing as an actor and agent. Taken together, the communitarian, corporeal, and testimonial bespeak a shared concern: human dignity. It is this human dignity, the human as distinguished from the merely biological, with which Arendt was fundamentally concerned. For Arendt, rights are indispensable to humanity, a protective membrane poised between the state and the individual. What she saw, and Giorgio Agamben has recently revived,298 is the idea that a confrontation between the state and the individual unmediated by rights reduces the individual to bare life, or naked life,299 which is life without humanity. It is this unmediated, unmitigated confrontation that both requires and enables the rendering of the human inhuman, animal, and savage.300 It is this rights-free confrontation that permits torture—the hand of the state encumbered by no law other than the laws of physics. And it is this unmediated confrontation that permits the transmogrification of a child into a terrorist. For Arendt, to be a citizen is to be human, and to be anything else is merely, and barely, life. The conception of rights as a bare protection interposed between the individual and state violence is intuitively familiar to the anti-death penalty advocate301 and to criminal defense lawyers generally. But the American legal embodiment of citizenship as rights is Dred Scott.302 While Scott was suing for his freedom from slavery, the case turned upon his citizenship. The Supreme Court found that Scott was not a ―citizen of a State,‖ and therefore, under the jurisdictional limits of Article III of the Constitution, could not bring suit in federal court.303 Thus, the case removed Scott‘s right even to be heard, by removing him from the polity. Like the Guantánamo prisoners, he had no right to have rights, and the negation of his political citizenship condemned him to the unmitigated violence of slavery. The denial of habeas to Omar and the other prisoners similarly placed them outside the communitarian consent that rights require. This expulsion from the polity authorizes the expulsion from humanity that torture represents. Here, we must remember that this expulsion was prefigured by the state iconography that placed the prisoners outside the realm of human understanding, and therefore outside of humanity itself.304 Stripped of the mediation of rights, Guantánamo reveals the essential and inescapable violence of law. Politics may dictate who is entitled to mediation and what form it will take, but all are subject to the force of the state that, fundamentally, animates law. The demand for rights is a plea to blunt state force, and not to fundamentally reorganize the structure of power. With this understanding of rights in mind, I return to the litigation strategy we adopted in Omar‘s case. By invoking rights, we sought recognition of Omar in a polity of significance. In this way, rights hailed Omar into the community, though his admission would depend upon community consent. As Arendt‘s analysis suggests, the demand for recognition is tantamount to a claim to humanity. To be human, to rise above biological existence and to secure political and social life, requires rights. And yet, once more, this bid was subject to political forces. No amount of rights-claiming could overcome a political will to deny the prisoners‘ humanity. In light of this, our strategy can be understood in a third way: rights as resistance. By this account, the rights claim sought not to escape the violence of the state, but to make that violence more costly to the state. To continue its brutal regime at Guantánamo, the government first would have to do violence to rights; to lay its hands on Omar again, the state would have to crash through his rights claims. Rather than avoid the state‘s confrontation with the individual, this strategy seeks to expose it. The onus then shifts from the prisoner trying to establish the existence of rights to the state establishing their nonexistence, from the individual establishing harm done to the state justifying its own violence. In some respects, this strategy has worked. So long as it could avoid any discussion of Guantánamo, as it long attempted to do, the government could enact violence without political cost. But rights claims force the government into discourse in which the violence of the state is put on display and must be justified. The claim of rights itself may interpose a membrane between the state and the individual even if the right itself ultimately is found not to exist. Thus, our rights-based strategy could be understood as interposing a protective membrane between Omar and the state. In this way, we wanted to mediate, and moderate, the relationship between the state and Omar, with the hope of ultimately transforming the relationship from one of potentate and biological mass to one more recognizable as warden and prisoner. This was a form of resistance to Omar‘s mistreatment, which required the state either to stop its violence or to engage in it in the public forum of the court. This approach had some success, as the worst of the mistreatment of Omar and the other prisoners stopped once the government was forced to grapple with it in the daylight of federal court.305 And yet, Omar‘s other fundamental material conditions—indefinite detention, and trial before a substandard tribunal—remained the same, just as the fundamentals of Guantánamo have remained largely the same for the hundreds of other prisoners. At the end of the day, I believe our approach has not proven more successful because the fundamental question of political citizenship has not been resolved in the prisoners‘ favor, and as I have argued, the success of even first-order rights depends upon a priori political membership. When I have rehearsed these arguments for others, particularly lawyers, the response I have often gotten is that we did the best that we could, and that there was no alternative. To argue the existence of rights, and to do so forcefully, is to fulfill the professional obligation of a lawyer. But this strikes me as too weak a conception of professional obligation. I believe that the rights-based approach has been worthy and necessary, but not merely because it was a form of last-resort lawyering. Rather, the rightsbased lawyering has performed an essential role of mounting resistance to the unbridled exercise of state violence, essential not because there is nothing else to be done, but because of the opportunities and potentialities that resistance creates. This is consistent with what Scott Cummings has termed ―constrained legalism,‖ 306 for it capitalizes on what law can accomplish, even as it recognizes what law cannot.