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## plan

The United States federal government should limit the war power authority of the president for self-defense targeted killings to outside an armed conflict.

## adv

The advantage is legal regimes

US targeted killing derives authority from both armed conflict (jus in bello) and self-defense (jus ad bellum) legal regimes—that authority overlap conflates the legal regimes

Laurie Blank, Director, International Humanitarian Law Clinic, Emory Law School, 2012, Targeted Strikes: The Consequences of Blurring the Armed Conflict and Self-Defense Justifications, http://www.wmitchell.edu/lawreview/Volume38/documents/11.BlankFINAL.pdf

For the past several years, the United States has relied on both armed conflict and self-defense as legal justifications for targeted strikes outside of the zone of active combat in Afghanistan. A host of interesting questions arise from both the use of targeted strikes and the expansive U.S. justifications for such strikes, including the use of force in self-defense against non-state actors, the use of force across state boundaries, the nature and content of state consent to such operations, the use of targeted killing as a lawful and effective counterterrorism measure, and others.7 Furthermore, each of the justifications—armed conflict and self-defense—raises its own challenging questions regarding the appropriate application of the law and the parameters of the legal paradigm at issue. For example, if the existence of an armed conflict is the justification for certain targeted strikes, the immediate follow-on questions include the determination of a legitimate target within an armed conflict with a terrorist group and the geography of the battlefield. Within the self-defense paradigm, key questions include the very contours of the right to use force in self-defense against individuals and the implementation of the concepts of necessity and imminence, among many others. However, equally fundamental questions arise from the use of both justifications at the same time, without careful distinction delimiting the boundaries between when one applies and when the other applies. From the perspective of the policymaker, the use of both justifications without further distinction surely offers greater flexibility and potential for action in a range of circumstances.8 To the extent such flexibility does not impact the implementation of the relevant law or hinder the development and enforcement of that law in the future, it may well be an acceptable goal. In the case of targeted strikes in the current international environment of armed conflict and counterterrorism operations occurring at the same time, however, the mixing of legal justifications raises significant concerns about both current implementation and future development of the law. One overarching concern is the conflation in general of jus ad bellum and jus in bello. The former is the law governing the resort to force—sometimes called the law of self-defense—and the latter is the law regulating the conduct of hostilities and the protection of persons in conflict—generally called the law of war, the law of armed conflict, or international humanitarian law. International law reinforces a strict separation between the two bodies of law, ensuring that all parties have the same obligations and rights during armed conflict to ensure that all persons and property benefit from the protection of the laws of war. For example, the Nuremberg Tribunal repeatedly held that Germany’s crime of aggression neither rendered all German acts unlawful nor prevented German soldiers from benefitting from the protections of the jus in bello.9 More recently, the Special Court for Sierra Leone refused to reduce the sentences of Civil Defense Forces fighters on the grounds that they fought in a “legitimate war” to protect the government against the rebels.10 The basic principle that the rights and obligations of jus in bello apply regardless of the justness or unjustness of the overall military operation thus remains firmly entrenched. Indeed, if the cause at arms influenced a state’s obligation to abide by the laws regulating the means and methods of warfare and requiring protection of civilians and persons hors de combat, states would justify all departures from jus in bello with reference to the purported justness of their cause. The result: an invitation to unregulated warfare.11

Authority overlap destroys both regimes.

Laurie Blank, Director, International Humanitarian Law Clinic, Emory Law School, 2012, Targeted Strikes: The Consequences of Blurring the Armed Conflict and Self-Defense Justifications, [http://www.wmitchell.edu/lawreview/Volume38/documents/11.BlankFINAL.pdf\*we](http://www.wmitchell.edu/lawreview/Volume38/documents/11.BlankFINAL.pdf%2Awe) do not endorse gendered language

In contrast, human rights law’s requirement that force only be used as a last resort when absolutely necessary for the protection of innocent victims of an attack creates an obligation to attempt to capture a suspected terrorist before any lethal targeting.101 A state using force in self-defense against a terrorist cannot therefore target him or her as a first resort but can only do so if there are no alternatives—meaning that an offer of surrender or an attempt at capture has been made or is entirely unfeasible in the circumstances. Thus, if non-forceful measures can foil the terrorist attack without the use of deadly force, then the state may not use force in self-defense.102 The supremacy of the right to life means that “even the most dangerous individual must be captured, rather than killed, so long as it is practically feasible to do so, bearing in mind all of the circumstances.”103 No more, this obligation to capture first rather than kill is not dependent on the target’s efforts to surrender; the obligation actually works the other way: the forces may not use deadly force except if absolutely necessary to protect themselves or innocent persons from immediate danger, that is, self-defense or defense of others. As with any law enforcement operation, “the intended result . . . is the arrest of the suspect,”104 and therefore every attempt must be made to capture before resorting to lethal force. In the abstract, the differences in the obligations regarding surrender and capture seem straightforward. The use of both armed conflict and self-defense justifications for all targeted strikes without differentiation runs the risk of conflating the two very different approaches to capture in the course of a targeting operation. This conflation, in turn, is likely to either emasculate human rights law’s greater protections or undermine the LOAC’s greater permissiveness in the use of force, either of which is a problematic result. An oft-cited example of the conflation of the LOAC and human rights principles appears in the 2006 targeted killings case before the Israeli Supreme Court. In analyzing the lawfulness of the Israeli government’s policy of “targeted frustration,” the Court held, inter alia, that [a] civilian taking a direct part in hostilities cannot be attacked at such time as he is doing so, if a less harmful means can be employed. . . . Indeed, among the military means, one must choose the means whose harm to the human rights of the harmed person is smallest. Thus, if a terrorist taking a direct part in hostilities can be arrested, interrogated, and tried, those are the means which should be employed.105 The Israeli Supreme Court’s finding that targeting is only lawful if no less harmful means are available—even in the context of an armed conflict—“impose[s] a requirement not based in [the LOAC].”106 Indeed, the Israeli Supreme Court “used the kernel of a human rights rule—that necessity must be shown for any intentional deprivation of life, to restrict the application of [a LOAC] rule—that in armed conflict no necessity need be shown for the killing of combatants or civilians taking a direct part in hostilities.”107 Although the holding is specific to Israel and likely influenced greatly by the added layer of belligerent occupation relevant to the targeted strikes at issue in the case,108 it demonstrates some of the challenges of conflating the two paradigms. First, if this added obligation of less harmful means was understood to form part of the law applicable to targeted strikes in armed conflict, the result would be to disrupt the delicate balance of military necessity and humanity and the equality of arms at the heart of the LOAC. Civilians taking direct part in hostilities—who are legitimate targets at least for the time they do so—would suddenly merit a greater level of protection than persons who are lawful combatants, a result not contemplated in the LOAC.109 Second, soldiers faced with an obligation to always use less harmful means may well either refrain from attacking the target—leaving the innocent victims of the terrorist’s planned attack unprotected—or disregard the law as unrealistic and ineffective. Neither option is appealing. The former undermines the protection of innocent civilians from unlawful attack, one of the core purposes of the LOAC. The latter weakens respect for the value and role of the LOAC altogether during conflict, a central component of the protection of all persons in wartime. From the opposing perspective, if the armed conflict rules for capture and surrender were to bleed into the human rights and law enforcement paradigm, the restrictions on the use of force in selfdefense would diminish. Persons suspected of terrorist attacks and planning future terrorist attacks are entitled to the same set of rights as other persons under human rights law and a relaxed set of standards will only minimize and infringe on those rights. Although there is no evidence that targeted strikes using drones are being used in situations where there is an obligation to seek capture and arrest, it is not hard to imagine a scenario in which the combination of the extraordinary capabilities of drones and the conflation of standards can lead to exactly that scenario. If states begin to use lethal force as a first resort against individuals outside of armed conflict, the established framework for the protection of the right to life would begin to unravel. Not only would targeted individuals suffer from reduced rights, but innocent individuals in the vicinity would be subject to significantly greater risk of injury and death as a consequence of the broadening use of force outside of armed conflict.

This degrades the entire collective security structure resulting in widespread interstate war

Craig Martin, Associate Professor of Law at Washburn University School of Law, 2011, GOING MEDIEVAL: TARGETED KILLING, SELFDEFENSE AND THE JUS AD BELLUM REGIME, http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=1956141

The United States has been engaging in this practice of using drone-mounted missile systems to kill targeted individuals since at least 2002.98 An increasing number of countries are developing drone capabilities, and other countries have employed different methods of targeted killing that constitute a use of force under jus ad bellum.99 The evidence suggests that the United States intends to continue and indeed expand the program, and there is a growing body of scholarly literature that either defends the policy’s legality, or advocates adjustment in international law to permit such action. There is, therefore, a real prospect that the practice could become more widespread, and that customary international law could begin to shift to reflect the principles implicit in the U.S. justification andin accordance with the rationales developed to support it**.** Some of the implications of such an adjustment in the jus ad bellum regime are obvious from the foregoing analysis. As discussed, there would be a rejection of the narrow principle of self-defense in favor of something much closer to the Grotian concept of defensive war, encompassing punitive measures in response to past attacks and preventative uses of force to halt the development of future threats. The current conditions for a legitimate use of force in self-defense, namely the occurrence or imminence of an armed attack, necessity, and proportionality, would be significantly diluted or abandoned. Not only the doctrine of self-defense, but other aspects of the collective security system would be relaxed as well. Harkening back to Grotian notions of law enforcement constituting a just cause for war, the adjusted jus ad bellum regime would potentially permit the unilateral use of force against and within states for the purpose of attacking NSAs as such, in effect to enforce international law in jurisdictions that were incapable of doing so themselves.100 This would not only further undermine the concept of self-defense, but would undermine the exclusive jurisdiction that the U.N. Security Council currently has to authorize the use of force for purposes of “law enforcement” under Chapter VII of the Charter. Thus, both of the exceptions to the Article 2(4) prohibition on the use of force would be expanded. In addition, however, the targeted killing policy threatens to create other holes in the jus ad bellum regime. This less obvious injury would arise from changes that would be similarly required of the IHL regime, and the resulting modifications to the fundamental relationship between the two regimes. These changes could lead to a complete severance of the remaining connection between the two regimes. Indeed, Ken Anderson, a scholar who has testified more than once on this subject before the U.S. Congress,101 has advocated just such a position, suggesting that the United States should assert that its use of force against other states in the process of targeted killings, while justified by the right to self-defense, does not rise to such a level that it would trigger the existence of an international armed conflict or the operation of IHL principles.102 If customary international law evolved along such lines, reverting to gradations in the types of use of force, the change would destroy the unity of the system comprised of the jus ad bellum and IHL regimes, and there would be legal “black holes” in which states could use force without being subject to the limitations and conditions imposed by the IHL regime. The structure of Harold Koh’s two-pronged justification similarly implies a severance of this relationship between jus ad bellum and IHL, albeit in a different and even more troubling way. His policy justification consists of two apparently independent and alternative arguments—that the United States is in an armed conflict with Al Qaeda and associated groups; and that the actions are justified as an exercise of self-defense. The suggestion seems to be that the United States is entitled on either basis to use armed force not just against the individuals targeted, but also against states in which the terrorist members are located. In other words, the first prong of the argument is that the use of force against another sovereign state, for the purposes of targeting Al Qaeda members, is justified by the existence of an armed conflict with Al Qaeda. If this is indeed what is intended by the policy justification, it represents an extraordinary move, not just because it purports to create a new category of armed conflict (that is, a “transnational” armed conflict without geographic limitation),103 but because it also suggests that there need be no jus ad bellum justification at all for a use of force against another state. Rather, the implication of Koh’s rationale is that the existence of an armed conflict under IHL can by itself provide grounds for exemption from the prohibition against the threat or use of force under the jus ad bellum regime. This interpretation of the justifications cannot be pressed too far on the basis of the language of Mr. Koh’s speech alone, which he hastened to explain at the time was not a legal opinion.104 The two justifications could be explained as being supplementary rather than independent and alternative in nature. But the conduct of the United States in the prosecution of the policy would appear to confirm that it is based on these two independent justifications.105 The strikes against groups and states unrelated to the 9/11 attacks could be explained in part by the novel idea that force can be used against NSAs as such, wherever they may be situated. But even assuming some sort of strict liability for states in which guilty NSAs are found, that explanation still does not entirely account for the failure to tie the use of force against the different groups to specific armed attacks launched by each such group. This suggests that the United States is also relying quite independently on the argument that it is engaged in an armed conflict with all of these groups, and that the existence of such an armed conflict provides an independent justification for the use of force against the states in which the groups may be operating. While the initial use of force in jus ad bellum terms is currently understood to bring into existence an international armed conflict and trigger the operation of IHL, the changes suggested by the policy would turn this on its head, by permitting the alleged existence of a “transnational” armed conflict to justify the initial use of force against third states. Whereas the two regimes currently operate as two components of an overall legal system relating to war, with one regime governing the use of force and the other the conduct of hostilities in the resulting armed conflict, the move attempted by the U.S. policy would terminate these independent but inter-related roles within a single system, and expand the role and scope of IHL to essentially replace aspects of the jus ad bellum regime. This would not only radically erode the jus ad bellum regime’s control over the state use of force, but it could potentially undermine the core idea that war, or in more modern terms the use of force and armed conflict, constitutes a legal state that triggers the operation of special laws that govern the various aspects of the phenomenon. There is a risk of return to a pre-Grotian perspective in which “war” was simply a term used to describe certain kinds of organized violence, rather than constituting a legal institution characterized by a coherent system of laws designed to govern and constrain all aspects of its operation. There is a tendency in the U.S. approach to the so-called “global war on terror” to cherry-pick principles of the laws of war and to apply them in ways and in circumstances that are inconsistent with the very criteria within that legal system that determine when and how it is to operate. This reflects a certain disdain for the idea that the laws of war constitute an internally coherent system of law.106 In short, the advocated changes to the jus ad bellum regime and to the relationship between it and the IHL regime, and thus to the laws of war system as a whole,107 would constitute marked departures from the trajectory the system has been on during its development over the past century, and would be a repudiation of deliberate decisions that were made in creating the U.N. system after the Second World War.108 The premise of my argument is not that any return to past principles is inherently regressive. A rejection of recent innovations in favor of certain past practices might be attractive to some in the face of new transnational threats. The argument here is not even to deny the idea that the international law system may have to adapt to respond to the transnational terrorist threat. The point, rather, is that the kind of changes to the international law system that are implicit in the targeted killing policy, and which are advocated by its supporters, would serve to radically reduce the limitations and constraints on the use of force by states against states. The modern principles that are being abandoned were created for the purpose of limiting the use of force and thus reducing the incidence of armed conflict among nations. The rejection of those ideas and a return to older concepts relating to the law of war would restore aspects of a system in which war was a legitimate tool of statecraft, and international armed conflict was thus far more frequent and widespread.109 The entire debate on targeted killing is so narrowly focused on the particular problems posed by transnational terrorist threats, and how to manipulate the legal limitations that tend to frustrate some of the desired policy choices, that there is insufficient reflection on the broader context, and the consequences that proposed changes to the legal constraints would have on the wider legal system of which they are a part. It may serve the immediate requirements of the American government, in order to legitimize the killing of AQAP members in Yemen, to expand the concept of self-defense, and to suggest that states can use force on the basis of a putative “transnational” armed conflict with NSAs. The problem is that the jus ad bellum regime applies to all state use of force, and it is not being adjusted in some tailored way to deal with terrorism alone. If the doctrine of self-defense is expanded to include preventative and punitive elements, it will be so expanded for all jus ad bellum purposes. The expanded doctrine of self-defense will not only justify the use of force to kill individual terrorists alleged to be plotting future attacks, but to strike the military facilities of states suspected of preparing for future aggression. If the threshold for use of force against states “harboring” NSAs is significantly reduced, the gap between state responsibility and the criteria for use of force will be reduced for all purposes. If the relationship between jus ad bellum and IHL is severed or altered, so as to create justifications for the use of force that are entirely independent of the jus ad bellum regime, then states will be entitled to use force against other states under the pretext of self-proclaimed armed conflict with NSAs generally. We may think about each of these innovations as being related specifically to operations against terrorist groups that have been responsible for heinous attacks, and applied to states that have proven uniquely unwilling or unable to take the actions necessary to deal with the terrorists operating within their territory. But no clear criteria or qualifications are in fact tied to the modifications that are being advanced by the targeted killing policy. Relaxing the current legal constraints on the use of force and introducing new but poorly defined standards, will open up opportunities for states to use force against other states for reasons that have nothing to do with anti-terrorist objectives. Along the lines that Jeremy Waldron argues in chapter 4 in this volume,110 more careful thought ought to be given to the general norms that we are at risk of developing in the interest of justifying the very specific targeted killing policy. Ultimately, war between nations is a far greater threat, and is a potential source of so much more human suffering than the danger posed by transnational terrorism. This is not to trivialize the risks that terrorism represents, particularly in an age when Al Qaeda and others have sought nuclear weapons. But we must be careful not to undermine the system designed to constrain the use of force and reduce the incidence of international armed conflict, in order to address a threat that is much less serious in the grand scheme of things.

Robust support for the impact—legal regime conflation results in uncontrollable conflict escalation

Ryan Goodman, Anne and Joel Ehrenkranz Professor of Law, New York University School of Law, December 2009, CONTROLLING THE RECOURSE TO WAR BY MODIFYING JUS IN BELLO, Yearbook of International Humanitarian Law / Volume 12

A substantial literature exists on the conflation of jus ad bellum and jus in bello. However, the consequences for the former side of the equation – the resort to war – is generally under-examined. Instead, academic commentary has focused on the effects of compliance with humanitarian rules in armed conflict and, in particular, the equality of application principle. In this section, I attempt to help correct that imbalance.

In the following analysis, I use the (admittedly provocative) short-hand labels of ‘desirable’ and ‘undesirable’ wars. The former consists of efforts that aim to promote the general welfare of foreign populations such as humanitarian interventions and, on some accounts, peacekeeping operations. The latter – undesirable wars – include conflicts that result from security spirals that serve neither state’s interest and also include predatory acts of aggression. 4.1.1 Decreased likelihood of ‘desirable wars’ A central question in debates about humanitarian intervention is whether the international community should be more concerned about the prospect of future Kosovos – ambitious military actions without clear legal authority – or future Rwandas – inaction and deadlock at the Security Council. Indeed, various institutional designs will tend to favor one of those outcomes over the other. In 1999, Kofi Annan delivered a powerful statement that appeared to consider the prospect of repeat Rwandas the greater concern; and he issued a call to arms to support the ‘developing international norm in favor of intervention to protect civilians from wholesale slaughter’.95 Ifoneassumesthatthereis,indeed,aneedforcontinuedorgreatersupport for humanitarian uses of force, Type I erosions of the separation principle pose a serious threat to that vision. And the threat is not limited to unilateral uses of force. It also applies to military operations authorized by the Security Council. In short, all ‘interventions to protect civilians from wholesale slaughter’ are affected. Two developments render desirable interventions less likely. First, consider implications of the Kosovo Commission/ICISS approach. The scheme imposes greater requirements on armed forces engaged in a humanitarian mission with respect to safeguarding civilian ives.96 If that scheme is intended to smoke out illicit intent,97 it is likely to have perverse effects: suppressing sincere humanitarian efforts at least on the margins. Actors engaged in a bona fide humanitarian intervention generally tend to be more protective of their own armed forces than in other conflicts. It is instructive to consider, for instance, the precipitous US withdrawal from the UN mission in Somalia – code-named Operation Restore Hope – after the loss of eighteen American soldiers in the Battle of Mogadishu in 1993, and the ‘lesson’ that policymakers drew from that conflict.98 Additionally, the Kosovoc ampaign – code-named Operation Noble Anvil – was designed to be a ‘zero-casualty war’ for US soldiers, because domestic public support for the campaign was shallow and unstable. The important point is that the Kosovo Commission/ICISS approach would impose additional costs on genuine humanitarian efforts, for which it is already difficult to build and sustain popular support. As a result, we can expect to see fewer bona fide interventions to protect civilians from atrocities.99 Notably, such results are more likely to affect two types of states: states with robust, democratic institutions that effectively reflect public opinion and states that highly value compliance with jus in bello. Both of those are the very states that one would most want to incentivize to initiate and participate in humanitarian interventions. The second development shares many of these same consequences. Consider the implications of the British House of Lords decision in Al-Jedda which cast doubt on the validity of derogations taken in peacekeeping operations as well as other military efforts in which the homeland is not directly at stake and the state could similarly withdraw. The scheme imposes a tax on such interventions by precluding the government from adopting measures that would otherwise be considered lawful and necessary to meet exigent circumstances related to the conflict. Such extraordinary constraints in wartime may very well temper the resolve to engage in altruistic intervention and military efforts that involve similar forms of voluntarism on the part of the state. Such a legal scheme may thus yield fewer such operations and the participation of fewer states in such multilateral efforts. And, the impact of the scheme should disproportionately affect the very states that take international human rights obligations most seriously. Notably, in these cases, the disincentives might weigh most heavily on third parties: states that decide whether and to what degree to participate in a coalition with the principal intervener. It is to be expected that the commitment on the part of the principal intervener will be stronger, and thus not as easily shifted by the erosion of the separation principle. The ability, however, to hold together a coalition of states is made much more difficult by these added burdens. Indeed, as the United States learned in the Kosovo campaign, important European allies were wary about the intervention, in part due to its lack of an international legal pedigree. And the weakness of the alliance, including German and Italian calls for an early suspension of the bombing campaign, impeded the ability to wage war in the first place. It may be these third party states and their decision whether to join a humanitarian intervention where the international legal regime matters most. Without such backing of important allies, the intervention itself is less likely to occur. It is also those states – the more democratic, the more rights respecting, and the more law abiding – that the international regime should prefer to be involved in these kinds of interventions.

The developments regulating jus ad bellum through jus in bello also threaten to make ‘undesirable wars’ more likely. In previous writing, I argue that encouraging states to frame their resort to force through humanitarian objectives rather than other rationales would, in the aggregate, reduce the overall level of disputes that result in uncontrolled escalation and war.100 A reverse relationship also holds true. That is, encouraging states to forego humanitarian rationales in favor of other justifications for using force may culminate in more international disputes ending in uncontrolled escalation and war. This outcome is **especially likely** to result from the pressures created by Type I erosions of the separation principle. First, increasing the tax on humanitarian interventions (the Kosovo Commission/ICISS approach) and ‘wars of choice’ (the Al-Jedda approach) would encourage states to justify their resort to force on alternative grounds. For example, states would be incentivized to invoke other legitimated frameworks – such as security rationales involving the right to self-defense, collective self-defense, anticipatory self-defense, and traditional threats to international peace and security. And, even if military action is pursued through the Security Council, states may be reluctant to adopt language (in resolutions and the like) espousing or emphasizing humanitarian objectives. Second, the elevation of self-regarding – security and strategic – frameworks over humanitarian ones is more likely to lead to uncontrolled escalation and war. A growing body of social science scholarship demonstrates that the type of issue in dispute can constitute an important variable in shaping the course of interstate hostilities. The first generation of empirical scholarship on the origins of war did not consider this dimension. Political scientists instead concentrated on features of the international system (for example, the distribution of power among states) and on the characteristics of states (for example, forms of domestic governance structures) as the key explanatory variables. Research agendas broadened considerably, however, in subsequent years. More recently, ‘[s]everal studies have identified substantial differences in conflict behavior over different types of issues’.101 The available evidence shows that states are significantly more inclined to fight over particular types of issues that are elevated in a dispute, despite likely overall material and strategic losses.102 Academic studies have also illuminated possible causal explanations for these empirical patterns. Specifically, domestic (popular and elite) constituencies more readily support bellicose behavior by their government when certain salient cultural or ideological issues are in contention. Particular issue areas may also determine the expert communities (humanitarian versus security mindsets) that gain influence in governmental circles – a development that can shape the hard-line or soft-line strategies adopted in the course of the dispute. In short, these links between domestic political processes and the framing of international disputes exert significant influence on whether conflicts will eventually culminate in war. Third, a large body of empirical research demonstrates that states will routinely engage in interstate disputes with rivals and that those disputes which are framed through security and strategic rationales are more likely to escalate to war. Indeed, the inclusion of a humanitarian rationale provides windows of opportunity to control and deescalate a conflict. Thus, eliminating or demoting a humanitarian rationale from a mix of justifications (even if it is not replaced by another rationale) can be independently destabilizing. Espousing or promoting security rationales, on the other hand, is more likely to culminate in public demands for increased bellicosity, unintended security spirals, and military violence.103 Importantly, these effects may result even if one is skeptical about the power of international law to influence state behavior directly. It is reasonable to assume that international law is unlikely to alter the determination of a state to wage war, and that international law is far more likely to influence only the justificatory discourse states employ while proceeding down the warpath. However, as I argue in my earlier work, leaders (of democratic and nondemocratic) states become caught in their official justifications for military campaigns. Consequently, framing the resort to force as a pursuit of security objectives, or adding such issues to an ongoing conflict, can reshape domestic political arrangements, which narrows the subsequent range of policy options. Issues that initially enter a conflict due to disingenuous representations by political leaders can become an authentic part of the dispute over time. Indeed, the available social science research, primarily qualitative case studies, is even more relevant here. A range of empirical studies demonstrate such unintended consequences primarily in the case of leaders employing security-based and strategic rationales to justify bellicose behavior.104 A central finding is that pretextual and superficial justifications can meaningfully influence later stages of the process that shape popular and elite conceptions of the international dispute. And it is those understandings that affect national security strategies and the ladder of escalation to war. Indeed, one set of studies – of empires – suggests these are mechanisms for powerful states entering into disastrous military campaigns that their leaders did not initially intend.

Self-defense regime collapse causes global war—US TK legal regime key—only Congress solves international norm development

Beau Barnes, J.D., Boston University School of Law, Spring 2012, REAUTHORIZING THE “WAR ON TERROR”: THE LEGAL AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS OF THE AUMF’S COMING OBSOLESCENCE, https://www.jagcnet.army.mil/DOCLIBS/MILITARYLAWREVIEW.NSF/20a66345129fe3d885256e5b00571830/b7396120928e9d5e85257a700042abb5/$FILE/By%20Beau%20D.%20Barnes.pdf

Therefore, the more likely result is that the Executive Branch, grappling with the absence of explicit legal authority for a critical policy, would need to make increasingly strained legal arguments to support its actions.121 Thus, the Obama Administration will soon be forced to rationalize ongoing operations under existing legal authorities, which, I argue below, will have significant harmful consequences for the United States. Indeed, the administration faces a Catch-22—its efforts to destroy Al Qaeda as a functioning organization will lead directly to the vitiation of the AUMF. The administration is “starting with a result and finding the legal and policy justifications for it,” which often leads to poor policy formulation.122 Potential legal rationales would perforce rest on exceedingly strained legal arguments based on the AUMF itself, the President’s Commander in Chief powers, or the international law of selfdefense.123 Besides the inherent damage to U.S. credibility attendant to unconvincing legal rationales, each alternative option would prove legally fragile, destabilizing to the international political order, or both. 1. Effect on Domestic Law and Policy Congress’s failure to reauthorize military force would lead to bad domestic law and even worse national security policy. First, a legal rationale based on the AUMF itself will increasingly be difficult to sustain. Fewer and fewer terrorists will have any plausible connection to the September 11 attacks or Al Qaeda, and arguments for finding those connections are already logically attenuated. The definition of those individuals who may lawfully be targeted and detained could be expanded incrementally from the current definition, defining more and more groups as Al Qaeda’s “co-belligerents” and “associated forces.”124 But this approach, apart from its obvious logical weakness, would likely be rejected by the courts at some point.125 The policy of the United States should not be to continue to rely on the September 18, 2001, AUMF. Second, basing U.S. counterterrorism efforts on the President’s constitutional authority as Commander in Chief is **legally unstable**, and therefore unsound national security policy, because a combination of legal difficulties and political considerations make it unlikely that such a rationale could be sustained. This type of strategy would likely run afoul of the courts and risk destabilizing judicial intervention,126 because the Supreme Court has shown a willingness to step in and assert a more proactive role to strike down excessive claims of presidential authority.127 Politically, using an overly robust theory of the Commander in Chief’s powers to justify counterterrorism efforts would, ultimately, be difficult to sustain. President Obama, who ran for office in large part on the promise of repudiating the excesses of the Bush Administration, and indeed any president, would likely face political pressure to reject the claims of executive authority made “politically toxic” by the writings of John Yoo.128 Because of the likely judicial resistance and political difficulties, claiming increased executive authority to prosecute the armed conflict against Al Qaeda would prove a specious and ultimately futile legal strategy. Simply put, forcing the Supreme Court to intervene and overrule the Executive’s national security policy is anathema to good public policy. In such a world, U.S. national security policy would lack stability—confounding cooperation with allies and hindering negotiations with adversaries. There are, of course, many situations where the president’s position as Commander in Chief provides entirely uncontroversial authority for military actions against terrorists. In 1998, President Clinton ordered cruise missile strikes against Al Qaeda-related targets in Afghanistan and Sudan in response to the embassy bombings in Kenya and Tanzania. In 1986, President Reagan ordered air strikes against Libyan targets after U.S. intelligence linked the bombing of a Berlin discotheque to Libyan operatives.129 Executive authority to launch these operations without congressional approval was not seriously questioned, and no congressional approval was sought.130 To be sure, many of the targeted killing operations carried out today fall squarely within the precedent of past practice supplied by these and other valid exercises of presidential authority. Notwithstanding disagreement about the scope of Congress’s and the president’s “war powers,” few would disagree with the proposition that the president needs no authorization to act in selfdefense on behalf of the country. However, it is equally clear that not all terrorists pose such a threat to the United States, and thus the on terror,”137 further distancing counterterrorism operations from democratic oversight would exacerbate this problem.138 Indeed, congressional oversight of covert operations—which, presumably, operates with full information—is already considered insufficient by many.139 By operating entirely on a covert basis, “the Executive can initiate more conflict than the public might otherwise [be] willing to support.”140 In a world without a valid AUMF, the United States could base its continued worldwide counterterrorism operations on various alternative domestic legal authorities. All of these alternative bases, however, carry with them significant costs—detrimental to U.S. security and democracy. The foreign and national security policy of the United States should rest on “a comprehensive legal regime to support its actions, one that [has] the blessings of Congress and to which a court would defer as the collective judgment of the American political system about a novel set of problems.”141 Only then can the President’s efforts be sustained and legitimate. 2. Effect on the International Law of Self-Defense A failure to reauthorize military force would lead to significant negative consequences on the international level as well. Denying the Executive Branch the authority to carry out military operations in the armed conflict against Al Qaeda would force the President to find authorization elsewhere, most likely in the international law of selfdefense—the jus ad bellum.142 Finding sufficient legal authority for the United States’s ongoing counterterrorism operations in the international law of self-defense, however, is problematic for several reasons. As a preliminary matter, relying on this rationale usurps Congress’s role in regulating the contours of U.S. foreign and national security policy. If the Executive Branch can assert “self-defense against a continuing threat” to target and detain terrorists worldwide, it will almost always be able to find such a threat.143 Indeed, the Obama Administration’s broad understanding of the concept of “imminence” illustrates the danger of allowing the executive to rely on a self-defense authorization alone.144 This approach also would inevitably lead to dangerous “slippery slopes.” Once the President authorizes a targeted killing of an individual who does not pose an imminent threat in the strict law enforcement sense of “imminence,”145 there are few potential targets that would be off-limits to the Executive Branch. Overly malleable concepts are not the proper bases for the consistent use of military force in a democracy. Although the Obama Administration has disclaimed this manner of broad authority because the AUMF “does not authorize military force against anyone the Executive labels a ‘terrorist,’”146 relying solely on the international law of self defense would likely lead to precisely such a result.The slippery slope problem, however, is not just limited to the United States’s military actions and the issue of domestic control. The creation of international norms is an iterative process, one to which the United States makes significant contributions. Because of this outsized influence, the United States should not claim international legal rights that it is not prepared to see proliferate around the globe. Scholars have observed that the Obama Administration’s “expansive and open-ended interpretation of the right to self-defence threatens to destroy the prohibition on the use of armed force . . . .”147 Indeed, “[i]f other states were to claim the broad-based authority that the United States does, to kill people anywhere, anytime, the result would be chaos.”148 Encouraging the proliferation of an expansive law of international self-defense would not only be harmful to U.S. national security and global stability, but it would also directly contravene the Obama Administration’s national security policy, sapping U.S. credibility. The Administration’s National Security Strategy emphasizes U.S. “moral leadership,” basing its approach to U.S. security in large part on “pursu[ing] a rules-based international system that can advance our own interests by serving mutual interests.”149 Defense Department General Counsel Jeh Johnson has argued that “[a]gainst an unconventional enemy that observes no borders and does not play by the rules, we must guard against aggressive interpretations of our authorities that will discredit our efforts, provoke controversy and invite challenge.”150 Cognizant of the risk of establishing unwise international legal norms, Johnson argued that the United States “must not make [legal authority] up to suit the moment.”151 The Obama Administration’s global counterterrorism strategy is to “adher[e] to a stricter interpretation of the rule of law as an essential part of the wider strategy” of “turning the page on the past [and rooting] counterterrorism efforts within a more durable, legal foundation.”152 Widely accepted legal arguments also facilitate cooperation from U.S. allies, especially from the United States’ European allies, who have been wary of expansive U.S. legal interpretations.153 Moreover, U.S. strategy vis-à-vis China focuses on binding that nation to international norms as it gains power in East Asia.154 The United States is an international “standard-bearer” that “sets norms that are mimicked by others,”155 and the Obama Administration acknowledges that its drone strikes act in a quasi-precedential fashion.156 Risking the obsolescence of the AUMF would force the United States into an “aggressive interpretation” of international legal authority,157 not just discrediting its own rationale, but facilitating that rationale’s destabilizing adoption by nations around the world.158

TK self-defense norms modeled globally --- causes global war

Fisk & Ramos 13 (Kerstin Fisk --- PhD in Political Science focusing on interstate war @ Claremont Graduate University, Jennifer M. Ramos-- PhD in Polisci and Professor @ Loyola Marymount focusing on norms and foreign policy, including drone warfare and preventative use of force, “Actions Speak Louder Than Words: Preventive Self-Defense as a Cascading Norm” 15 APR 2013, International Studies Perspectives (2013), 1–23)

Conclusion

Preventive self-defense entails waging a war or an attack by choice, in order to prevent a suspected enemy from changing the status quo in an unfavorable direction. Prevention is acting in anticipation of a suspected latent threat that might fully emerge someday. One might rightfully point out that preventive strikes are nothing new—the Iraq War is simply a more recent example in a long history of the preventive use of force. The strategic theorist Colin Gray (2007:27), for example, argues that “far from being a rare and awful crime against an historical norm, preventive war is, and has always been, so common, that its occurrence seems remarkable only to those who do not know their history.” Prevention may be common throughout history, but this does not change the fact that it became increasingly difficult to justify after World War II, as the international community developed a core set of normative principles to guide state behavior, including war as a last resort. The threshold for war was set high, imposing a stringent standard for states acting in self-defense. Gray concedes that there has been a “slow and erratic, but nevertheless genuine, growth of a global norm that regards the resort to war as an extraordinary and even desperate measure” and that the Iraq war set a “dangerous precedent” (44). Although our cases do not provide a definitive answer for whether a preventive self-defense norm is diffusing, they do provide some initial evidence that states are re-orienting their military and strategic doctrines toward offense. In addition, these states have all either acquired or developed unmanned aerial vehicles for the purposes of reconnaissance, surveillance, and/or precision targeting. Thus, the results of our plausibility probe provide some evidence that the global norm regarding the use of force as a last resort is waning, and that **a preventive self-defense norm is emerging and cascading following the example set by the U**nited **S**tates. At the same time, there is variation among our cases in the extent to which they apply the strategy of self-defense. China, for example, has limited their adaption of this strategy to targeted killings, while Russia has declared their strategy to include the possibility of a preventive nuclear war. Yet, the preventive self-defense strategy is not just for powerful actors. Lesser powers may choose to adopt it as well, though perhaps only implementing the strategy against actors with equal or lesser power. Research in this vein would compliment our analyses herein. With the proliferation of technology in a globalized world, it seems only a matter of time before countries that do not have drone technology are in the minority. While preventive self-defense strategies and drones are not inherently linked, current rhetoric and practice do tie them together. Though it is likely far into the future**, it is all the more important to consider the final stage of norm evolution—internalization—for this particular norm**. While scholars tend to think of norms as “good,” this one is not so clear-cut. If the preventive self-defense norm is taken for granted, integrated into practice without further consideration, it inherently changes the functioning of international relations. And unmanned aerial vehicles, by reducing the costs of war, make claims of preventive self-defense more palatable to the public. Yet **a global norm of preventive self-defense is likely to be** destabilizing**,** leading to more war **in the international system**, not less. It clearly violates notions of just war principles—jus ad bellum. **The U**nited **S**tates **has set a dangerous precedent, and by continuing its preventive strike policy it continues to provide other states with the justification to do the same.**

Causes escalation everywhere

William Bradford, Assistant Professor of Law, Indiana University School of Law, July 2004, SYMPOSIUM: THE CHANGING LAWS OF WAR: DO WE NEED A NEW LEGAL REGIME AFTER SEPTEMBER 11?: "THE DUTY TO DEFEND THEM": n1 A NATURAL LAW JUSTIFICATION FOR THE BUSH DOCTRINE OF PREVENTIVE WAR, 79 Notre Dame L. Rev. 1365

For restrictivists, n67 anticipatory self-defense, despite its pedigree, is "fertile ground for torturing the self-defense concept" n68 and a dangerous warrant for manipulative, self-serving states to engage in prima facie illegal aggression while cloaking their actions under the guise of anticipatory self-defense and claiming legal legitimacy. n69 Analysis of the legitimacy of an act of anticipatory self-defense requires replacing the objectively verifiable prerequisite of an "armed attack" under Article 51 with the subjective perception of a "threat" of such an attack as perceived by the state believing itself a target, and thus determination of whether a state has demonstrated imminence before engaging in anticipatory self-defense lends itself to post hoc judgments of an infinite number of potential scenarios, spanning a continuum from the most innocuous of putatively civilian acts, including building roads and performing scientific research, to the most threatening, including the overt marshaling of thousands of combat troops in offensive dispositions along a contested border. Establishing the necessity of anticipatory self-defense in response to a pattern of isolated incidents over a period of time is an equally subjective task susceptible to multiple determinations and without empirical standards to guide judgment. n70 History is replete with examples of aggression masquerading as anticipatory self-defense, n71 including the Japanese invasion of Manchuria in [\*1385] 1931 n72 and the German invasion of Poland in 1939, n73 and by simply recharacterizing their actions as anticipatory self-defense rather than aggression dedicated to territorial revanchism or fulfillment of religious obligations, self-interested states such as China, North Korea, Pakistan, or members of the Arab League**,** restrictivists warn, might claim the legal entitlement to attack, respectively, Taiwan, South Korea, India, and Israel. n74 Moreover, taken to its logical extreme the doctrine of anticipatory self-defense might be interpreted as authorizing a state under the leadership of a paranoid decisionmaker to attack the entire world on the false suspicion of threats emanating from every corner. n75

China models US self-defense precedent --- they’ll strike in the South China Sea

Fisk & Ramos 13 (Kerstin Fisk --- PhD in Political Science focusing on interstate war @ Claremont Graduate University, Jennifer M. Ramos PhD in Polisci and Professor @ Loyola Marymount focusing on norms and foreign policy, including drone warfare and preventative use of force, “Actions Speak Louder Than Words: Preventive Self-Defense as a Cascading Norm” 15 APR 2013, International Studies Perspectives (2013), 1–23)

China

Though scholars debate the strategic culture of China, the dominant view has been one that emphasizes the defensive nature of Chinese military strategy (for an alternative view, see Johnston 1995; Feng 2007; Silverstone 2009). In this view, China prefers diplomacy over the use of force to achieve its objectives, and is more focused on defending against aggressors than acting as one. Seemingly consistent with this view, in 2003, China publically declared its position against states seeking to legitimize preventive self-defense. From China's perspective, the US-led war in Iraq was an example of America's hegemonic lust for power (Silverstone 2009). It was an act of aggression that violated the international norm that China holds dear—the norm of sovereignty. **However, the country's position on this may be evolving**, or at least **contingent on its own geo-political interests**. In 2005, the People's Congress of China passed an anti-secession law, clearly with an eye toward Taiwan. This law includes language that allows “non-peaceful means” in the case that reunification goals are not achieved (Reisman and Armstrong 2006). This suggests that China leaves open the possibility of some kind of military action to thwart Taiwan's formal secession—a preventive move. Still, China considers the Taiwan “problem” a domestic issue, thus the anti-secession law is not compelling evidence that China is buying into the norm of preventive self-defense.

Indeed, a year later (in 2006), China released a national defense report that articulates a strategy of “active defense” for the twenty-first century, in which China moves to an offensive defensive strategy (Yang 2008). Within this report, China declares a policy that prohibits the first use of nuclear weapons “at any time and under any circumstances.” This is consistent with its general orientation against preventive strikes, though it only specifies this idea with regard to nuclear weapons, and may leave the door open to a first use strategy with other types of weapons, but it is not clear from the report. China is likely to be tested in several key areas beyond the Taiwan situation mentioned earlier.71 **China is quite aggressive regarding its claims to territories in the South China Sea**. One of the most hotly disputed assertions is its sovereignty over the Spratly Islands and areas close to the Philippine island of Palawan, which is contested by the Philippines among other countries (Beckman 2012). With Chinese Premier Wen Jiabao's recent statement regarding the necessity of possessing a military that could win “local wars under information age conditions,” it is not surprising that **states in the region are on edge**.72 Last October, **Chinese news reported that states with which China has territorial disputes should “mentally prepare for the** sounds of cannons.”73

Beyond the territorial disputes, also consider the recent terrorist attacks within China and their connection to Pakistan and Afghanistan. The East Turkistan Islamic Movement (ETIM) is responsible for several deadly attacks in the Chinese province of Xinjiang, driving Chinese officials to “go all out to counter the violence” that originates from both ETIM terrorist training camps in Pakistan and remote areas in Xinjiang.74 The significance of these threats to China is reflected in its continuing military modernization efforts, including increasing defense spending by more than 11%.75 Amid investment in aircraft carriers and stealth fighter jets, **China is focused on the development of drone technology, hoping to rival that of the U**nited **S**tates.76 Such technology would likely be used in preventive self-defense against terrorists along China's borders.77 Reports suggest that after seeing the critical use of drones by the United States in its engagements abroad, **China has prioritized drone technology acquisition and production**. 78 In sum, these developments in Chinese defense strategy point to a quite offensive posture—one consistent with a commitment to a norm of preventive use of force (though not as clear-cut as in the India and Russia cases).

In each of the cases under review, **the military has shifted in its orientation from defense to offense**. In India, for example, where UAV development is further along compared to the other cases, there have been notable changes in defense strategy. The strategies in all four cases are tied to a concurrent trend toward states’ acquiring unmanned systems, or drones for precision strikes and real-time surveillance. Political and military elites have demonstrated a desire to successfully harness sophisticated new RMA technology, after having observed US success in this area.

Alongside our analysis of state rhetoric, **these changes in strategies** and high-tech tactical weaponry **suggest the diffusion of a preventive use of force norm** across cases, though to varying degrees, depending on their geostrategic interests. India is largely focused on fighting terrorism abroad, whereas Russia's main terrorist concern is within its own borders. China is concerned about terrorism from domestic and foreign sources. Thus, India is more compelled to espouse the norm of preventive self-defense as a legitimate norm governing international state behavior than Russia. China's commitment to such a norm is evolving, perhaps somewhere in between that of Russia and India. Unlike the cases of India, Russia, and China, Germany's military modernization and interest in drones stems largely from pressure from the United States to take on a larger, global role in promoting security and stability, particularly within NATO. In 2008, for example, US Secretary of Defense Robert Gates scolded “defensive players” who “sometimes…have to focus on offense.”79 At the time, Germany had troops in Afghanistan—but they were located in the safest part of the country (the north) while the United States, Canada and Britain fought in the volatile south. Directing his criticism toward Germany in particular, Gates stated, “In NATO, some allies ought not to have the luxury of opting only for stability and civilian operations, thus forcing other allies to bear a disproportionate share of the fighting and dying.”79 As stated above, one of the ways in which norm entrepreneurs promote norms is by invoking a state's reputation or “international image.” This has certainly been the case with Germany, which took on a direct role in combat operations in Afghanistan in 2009—by borrowing American drones.

Taken together, though, in terms of their position on the idea of preventive self-defense, our findings suggest two similarities. First, **in all** four **cases** reviewed here, leaders invoked the US example to justify their actions. Particularly in India, similarities to 9/11 were drawn in an effort to legitimize moves toward offensive strategies. Second, asymmetric tactics are not only a tool of the weak, but also of stronger states**. We found a strong correlation between strategies of preventive self-defense and the acquisition of drone technology. Because of their precision-strike capability, drones are an obvious choice for states committed to preventive self-defense.**

SCS conflict causes extinction

Wittner 11 (Lawrence S. Wittner, Emeritus Professor of History at the State University of New York/Albany, Wittner is the author of eight books, the editor or co-editor of another four, and the author of over 250 published articles and book reviews. From 1984 to 1987, he edited Peace & Change, a journal of peace research., 11/28/2011, "Is a Nuclear War With China Possible?", [www.huntingtonnews.net/14446](http://www.huntingtonnews.net/14446))

While nuclear weapons exist, there remains a danger that they will be used. After all, for centuries national conflicts have led to wars, with nations employing their deadliest weapons. The current deterioration of U.S. relations with China might end up providing us with yet another example of this phenomenon. The gathering tension between the United States and China is clear enough. Disturbed by China’s growing economic and military strength, the U.S. government recently challenged China’s claims in the South China Sea, increased the U.S. military presence in Australia, and deepened U.S. military ties with other nations in the Pacific region. According to Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, the United States was “asserting our own position as a Pacific power.” But need this lead to nuclear war? Not necessarily. And yet, there are signs that it could. After all, both the United States and China possess large numbers of nuclear weapons. The U.S. government threatened to attack China with nuclear weapons during the Korean War and, later, during the conflict over the future of China’s offshore islands, Quemoy and Matsu. In the midst of the latter confrontation, President Dwight Eisenhower declared publicly, and chillingly, that U.S. nuclear weapons would “be used just exactly as you would use a bullet or anything else.” Of course, China didn’t have nuclear weapons then. Now that it does, perhaps the behavior of national leaders will be more temperate. But the loose nuclear threats of U.S. and Soviet government officials during the Cold War, when both nations had vast nuclear arsenals, should convince us that, even as the military ante is raised, nuclear saber-rattling persists. Some pundits argue that nuclear weapons prevent wars between nuclear-armed nations; and, admittedly, there haven’t been very many—at least not yet. But the Kargil War of 1999, between nuclear-armed India and nuclear-armed Pakistan, should convince us that such wars can occur. Indeed, in that case, the conflict almost slipped into a nuclear war. Pakistan’s foreign secretary threatened that, if the war escalated, his country felt free to use “any weapon” in its arsenal. During the conflict, Pakistan did move nuclear weapons toward its border, while India, it is claimed, readied its own nuclear missiles for an attack on Pakistan. At the least, though, don’t nuclear weapons deter a nuclear attack? Do they? Obviously, NATO leaders didn’t feel deterred, for, throughout the Cold War, NATO’s strategy was to respond to a Soviet conventional military attack on Western Europe by launching a Western nuclear attack on the nuclear-armed Soviet Union. Furthermore, if U.S. government officials really believed that nuclear deterrence worked, they would not have resorted to championing “Star Wars” and its modern variant, national missile defense. Why are these vastly expensive—and probably unworkable—military defense systems needed if other nuclear powers are deterred from attacking by U.S. nuclear might? Of course, the bottom line for those Americans convinced that nuclear weapons safeguard them from a Chinese nuclear attack might be that the U.S. nuclear arsenal is far greater than its Chinese counterpart. Today, it is estimated that the U.S. government possesses over five thousand nuclear warheads, while the Chinese government has a total inventory of roughly three hundred. Moreover, only about forty of these Chinese nuclear weapons can reach the United States. Surely the United States would “win” any nuclear war with China. But what would that “victory” entail? A nuclear attack by China would immediately slaughter at least 10 million Americans in a great storm of blast and fire, while leaving many more dying horribly of sickness and radiation poisoning. The Chinese death toll in a nuclear war would be far higher. Both nations would be reduced to smoldering, radioactive wastelands. Also, radioactive debris sent aloft by the nuclear explosions would blot out the sun and bring on a “nuclear winter” around the globe—destroying agriculture, creating worldwide famine, and generating chaos and destruction.

Preventative self-defense guarantees broader escalation

Kulacki 12

(Gregory Kulacki, Senior Analyst & China Project Manager for the Global Security Program at the Union of Concerned Scientists, 9/21/2012, "The Risk of Nuclear War with China", www.huffingtonpost.com/gregory-kulacki/the-risk-of-nuclear-war-w\_b\_1903336.html)

Last week two separate studies warned that China and the United States are pursuing military strategies and implementing defense policies that could lead to a nuclear war. John Lewis and Xue Litai of Stanford University concluded a detailed exposition of China's nuclear war plans with a very sober warning. "Both sides, clinging to incongruous assessments, run the risk of provoking unanticipated escalation to nuclear war by seeking a quick victory or tactical advantages in a conventional conflict. This dilemma is not only real, but perilous." Thomas Christensen of Princeton expressed concern about the same problem; the possibility that a conventional military conflict between the United States and China could end in a nuclear exchange. "For example, if strikes by the United States on China's conventional coercive capabilities or their critical command and control nodes and supporting infrastructure were to appear in Beijing as a conventional attack on its nuclear retaliatory capability or as a precursor to a nuclear first strike, even a China that generally adheres to a No-First-Use posture might escalate to the nuclear level." Neither study suggests that the military or political leadership of China or the United States intends to resort to nuclear weapons in the event of a military conflict. China's commitment not to be the first to use nuclear weapons "at any time under any circumstances" is drilled into the officers and soldiers of China's strategic missile forces. A classified text used to train those forces, The Science of Second Artillery Operations, unambiguously instructs, "In accord with our national principle not to be the first to use nuclear weapons under any circumstances, the Second Artillery's strategic nuclear forces can carry out a retaliatory nuclear attack against the enemy, following the command of the 'high leadership,' only after the enemy has first attacked us with nuclear weapons." Although the United States is unwilling to make a similar commitment, U.S. superiority in conventional weapons and overall military capabilities makes it unlikely the United States would consider using nuclear weapons for any purpose other than preventing a Chinese nuclear attack on the United States. The most recent U.S. Nuclear Posture Review, in an effort to deemphasize the role of nuclear weapons in U.S. defense policy, declared that the "fundamental role of U.S. nuclear weapons...is to deter a nuclear attack on the United States, our allies and partners." The risk of a nuclear war with China lies in the potential for misunderstanding or miscommunication during a conventional conflict. China's current strategy for employing its conventional and nuclear missile forces during a future conflict with the United States is self-consciously designed to create uncertainty, with the expectation that uncertainty will restrain U.S. military action. Unfortunately, China's strategy could also precipitate a large-scale U.S. attack on China's missile forces. There are several Chinese military policies that might confuse U.S. decision-makers in a time of war. Some Chinese conventional missiles are located on the same missile bases as Chinese nuclear missiles. Some Chinese missiles, particularly the DF-21, can be armed with either a conventional or a nuclear warhead. Chinese conventional war plans call for long-range "strategic" conventional missile strikes at key enemy targets, including U.S. military bases on allied soil and the continental United States. If this were not confusing enough already, The Science of Second Artillery Operations contains a section on "lowering the nuclear threshold" that details procedures for alerting China's nuclear forces in a crisis for the express purpose of forcing a halt to an enemy's conventional attacks on a select group of targets, such as Chinese nuclear power plants, large dams and civilian population centers. Although the Science of Second Artillery Operations unambiguously states that if alerting China's nuclear missile forces fails to halt conventional enemy attacks China will hold firm to its "no first use" commitment, U.S. decision-makers might not believe it. Indeed, U.S. interlocutors have repeatedly told their Chinese counterparts that they do not find China's "no first use" pledge credible. The combination of these factors makes a nuclear exchange between the United States and China not only plausible, but also probable if the two countries were to become embroiled in a military conflict. As Lewis and Xue explain, "If, in a time of high tension, the Chinese command authorized a conventional missile attack as an act of preemptive self-defense, the enemy and its allies could not know if the incoming missiles were conventional or nuclear. In a worst-case scenario, a Chinese first-strike conventional attack could spark retaliation that destroys Chinese nuclear assets, creating a situation in which escalation to full-scale nuclear war would not just be possible, but even likely." The Obama administration is "rebalancing" U.S. military forces in response to perceived relative increases in Chinese military capabilities. China sees this so-called "pivot" to Asia, especially when pared with new U.S. military strategies such as "Air-Sea Battle," as a policy of containment. Both sides downplay the risks of conflict, but they also see each other as potential adversaries, and are hedging their diplomatic bets with expensive investments in new military hardware, including new technologies that will expand the conflict into cyberspace and outer space. Territorial disputes between China and U.S. allies, rising nationalist sentiment in the region, and the potential for domestic political instability within China could produce any number of casussen belli that could trigger the conventional conflict that carries the risk of ending in a nuclear war.

## solvency

Solvency

Congressional limits of self-defense authority within armed conflict is necessary to resolve legal ambiguity

Mark David Maxwell, Colonel, Judge Advocate with the U.S. Army, Winter 2012, TARGETED KILLING, THE LAW, AND TERRORISTS, Joint Force Quarterly, http://www.ndu.edu/press/targeted-killing.html

In the wake of the attacks by al Qaeda on September 11, 2001, an analogous phenomenon of feeling safe has occurred in a recent U.S. national security policy: America’s explicit use of targeted killings to eliminate terrorists, under the legal doctrines of selfdefense and the law of war. Legal scholars define targeted killing as the use of lethal force by a state4 or its agents with the intent, premeditation, and deliberation to kill individually selected persons who are not in the physical custody of those targeting them.5 In layman’s terms, targeted killing is used by the United States to eliminate individuals it views as a threat.6 Targeted killings, for better or for worse, have become “a defining doctrine of American strategic policy.”7 Although many U.S. Presidents have reserved the right to use targeted killings in unique circumstances, making this option a formal part of American foreign policy incurs risks that, unless adroitly controlled and defined in concert with Congress, could drive our practices in the use of force in a direction that is not wise for the long-term health of the rule of law. This article traces the history of targeted killing from a U.S. perspective. It next explains how terrorism has traditionally been handled as a domestic law enforcement action within the United States and why this departure in policy to handle terrorists like al Qaeda under the law of war—that is, declaring war against a terrorist organization—is novel. While this policy is not an ill-conceived course of action given the global nature of al Qaeda, there are practical limitations on how this war against terrorism can be conducted under the orders of the President. Within the authority to target individuals who are terrorists, there are two facets of Presidential power that the United States must grapple with: first, how narrow and tailored the President’s authority should be when ordering a targeted killing under the rubric of self-defense; and second, whether the President must adhere to concepts within the law of war, specifically the targeting of individuals who do not don a uniform. The gatekeeper of these Presidential powers and the prevention of their overreach is Congress. The Constitution demands nothing less, but thus far, Congress’s **silence is deafening.**

History of Targeted Killing During the Cold War, the United States used covert operations to target certain political leaders with deadly force.8 These covert operations, such as assassination plots against Fidel Castro of Cuba and Ngo Dinh Diem of South Vietnam, came to light in the waning days of the Richard Nixon administration in 1974. In response to the public outrage at this tactic, the Senate created a select committee in 1975, chaired by Senator Frank Church of Idaho, to “Study Government Operations with Respect to Intelligence Activities.”9 This committee, which took the name of its chairman, harshly condemned such targeting, which is referred to in the report as assassination: “We condemn assassination and reject it as an instrument of American policy.”10 In response to the Church Committee’s findings, President Gerald R. Ford issued an Executive order in 1976 prohibiting assassinations: “No employee of the United States Government shall engage in, or conspire to engage in political assassination.”11 The order, which is still in force today as Executive Order 12333, “was issued primarily to preempt pending congressional legislation banning political assassination.”12 President Ford did not want legislation that would impinge upon his unilateral ability as Commander in Chief to decide on the measures that were necessary for national security. 13 In the end, no legislation on assassinations was passed; national security remained under the President’s purview. Congress did mandate, however, that the President submit findings to select Members of Congress before a covert operation commences or in a timely fashion afterward.14 This requirement remains to this day. Targeted killings have again come to center stage with the Barack Obama administration’s extraordinary step of acknowledging the targeting of the radical Muslim cleric Anwar al-Awlaki, a U.S. citizen who lived in Yemen and was a member of an Islamic terrorist organization, al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula.15 Al-Awlaki played a significant role in an attack conducted by Umar Farouk Abdulmutallab, the Nigerian Muslim who attempted to blow up a Northwest Airlines flight bound for Detroit on Christmas Day 2009.16 According to U.S. officials, al-Awlaki was no longer merely encouraging terrorist activities against the United States; he was “acting for or on behalf of al-Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula . . . and providing financial, material or technological support for . . . acts of terrorism.”17 Al-Awlaki’s involvement in these activities, according to the United States, made him a belligerent and therefore a legitimate target. The context of the fierce debates in the 1970s is different from the al-Awlaki debate. The targeted killing of an individual for a political purpose, as investigated by the Church Committee, was the use of lethal force during peacetime, not during an armed conflict. During armed conflict, the use of targeted killing is quite expansive.18 But in peacetime, the use of any lethal force is highly governed and limited by both domestic law and international legal norms. The presumption is that, in peacetime, all use of force by the state, especially lethal force, must be necessary. The Law Enforcement Paradigm Before 9/11, the United States treated terrorists under the law enforcement paradigm—that is, as suspected criminals.19 This meant that a terrorist was protected from lethal force so long as his or her conduct did not require the state to respond to a threat or the indication of one. The law enforcement paradigm assumes that the preference is not to use lethal force but rather to arrest the terrorist and then to investigate and try him before a court of law.20 The presumption during peacetime is that the use of lethal force by a state is not justified unless necessary. Necessity assumes that “only the amount of force required to meet the threat and restore the status quo ante may be employed against [the] source of the threat, thereby limiting the force that may be lawfully applied by the state actor.”21 The taking of life in peacetime is only justified “when lesser means for reducing the threat were ineffective.”22 Under both domestic and international law, the civilian population has the right to be free from arbitrary deprivation of life. Geoff Corn makes this point by highlighting that a law enforcement officer could not use deadly force “against suspected criminals based solely on a determination an individual was a member of a criminal group.”23 Under the law enforcement paradigm, “a country cannot target any individual in its own territory unless there is no other way to avert a great danger.”24 It is the individual’s conduct at the time of the threat that gives the state the right to respond with lethal force. The state’s responding force must be reasonable given the situation known at the time. This reasonableness standard is a “commonsense evaluation of what an objectively reasonable officer might have done in the same circumstances.”25 The U.S. Supreme Court has opined that this reasonableness is subjective: “[t]he calculus of reasonableness must embody allowances for the fact that police officers often are forced to make split-second judgments . . . about the amount of force that is necessary in a particular situation.”26 The law enforcement paradigm attempts to “minimize the use of lethal force to the extent feasible in the circumstances.”27 This approach is the starting point for many commentators when discussing targeted killing: “It may be legal for law enforcement personnel to shoot to kill based on the imminence of the threat, but the goal of the operation, from its inception, should not be to kill.”28 The presumption is that intentional killing by the state is unlawful unless it is necessary for self-defense or defense of others.29 Like the soldier who acts under the authority of self-defense, if one acts reasonably based on the nature of the threat, the action is justified and legal. What the law enforcement paradigm never contemplates is a terrorist who works outside the state and cannot be arrested. These terrorists hide in areas of the world where law enforcement is weak or nonexistent. The terrorists behind 9/11 were lethal and lived in ungovernable areas; these factors compelled the United States to rethink its law enforcement paradigm. The Law of War Paradigm The damage wrought by the 9/11 terrorists gave President George W. Bush the political capital to ask Congress for authorization to go to war with these architects of terror, namely al Qaeda. Seven days later, Congress gave the President the Authorization for the Use of Military Force (AUMF) against those “nations, organizations, or persons [the President] determines planned, authorized, committed, or aided the terrorist attacks that occurred on September 11, 2001, or harbored such organizations or persons, in order to prevent any future acts of international terrorism against the United States by such nations, organizations, or persons.”30 For the first time in modern U.S. history, the country was engaged in an armed conflict with members of an organization, al Qaeda, versus a state. The legal justification to use force, which includes targeted killings, against al Qaeda, the Taliban, and associated forces is twofold: self-defense and the law of war.31 In armed conflict, the rules governing when an individual can be killed are starkly different than in peacetime. The law enforcement paradigm does not apply in armed conflict. Rather, designated terrorists may be targeted and killed because of their status as enemy belligerents. That status is determined solely by the President under the AUMF. Unlike the law enforcement paradigm, the law of war requires neither a certain conduct nor an analysis of the reasonable amount of force to engage belligerents. In armed conflict, it is wholly permissible to inflict “death on enemy personnel irrespective of the actual risk they present.”32 Killing enemy belligerents is legal unless specifically prohibited—for example, enemy personnel out of combat like the wounded, the sick, or the shipwrecked.33 Armed conflict also negates the law enforcement presumption that lethal force against an individual is justified only when necessary. If an individual is an enemy, then “soldiers are not constrained by the law of war from applying the full range of lawful weapons.”34 Now the soldier is told by the state that an enemy is hostile and he may engage that individual without any consideration of the threat currently posed. The enemy is declared hostile; the enemy is now targetable. Anticipatory Self-defense

This paradigm shift is novel for the United States. The President’s authority to order targeted killings is clear under domestic law; it stems from the AUMF. Legal ambiguity of the U.S. authority to order targeted killings emerges, however, when it is required to interpret international legal norms like self-defense and the law of war. The United States has been a historic champion of these international norms, but now they are hampering its desires to target and kill terrorists.

Skeptics of targeted killing admit that “[t]he decision to target specific individuals with lethal force after September 11 was neither unprecedented nor surprising.”35 Mary Ellen O’Connell has conceded, for example, that targeted killing against enemy combatants in Afghanistan is not an issue because “[t]he United States is currently engaged in an armed conflict” there.36 But when the United States targets individuals outside a zone of conflict, as it did with alAwlaki in Yemen,37 it runs into turbulence because a state of war does not exist between the United States and Yemen.38 A formidable fault line that is emerging between the Obama administration’s position and many academics, international organizations,39 and even some foreign governments40 is where these targeted killings can be conducted.41

According to the U.S. critics, if armed conflict between the states is not present at a location, then the law of war is never triggered, and the state reverts to a peacetime paradigm. In other words, the targeted individual cannot be killed merely because of his or her status as an enemy, since there is no armed conflict. Instead, the United States, as in peacetime, must look to the threat the individual possesses at the time of the targeting. There is a profound shift of the burden upon the state: the presumption now is that the targeted killing must be necessary. When, for example, the United States targeted and killed six al Qaeda members in Yemen in 2002, the international reaction was extremely negative: the strike constituted “a clear case of extrajudicial killing.”42

The Obama administration, like its predecessor, disagrees. Its legal justification for targeted killings outside a current zone of armed conflict is anticipatory self-defense. The administration cites the inherent and unilateral right every nation has to engage in anticipatory self-defense. This right is codified in the United Nations charter43 and is also part of the U.S. interpretation of customary international law stemming from the Caroline case in 1837. A British warship entered U.S. territory and destroyed an American steamboat, the Caroline. In response, U.S. Secretary of State Daniel Webster articulated the lasting acid test for anticipatory self-defense: “[N]ecessity of self defense [must be] instant, overwhelming, leaving no choice of means and no moment for deliberation . . . [and] the necessity of self defense, must be limited by that necessity and kept clearly within it.”44

A state can act under the guise of anticipatory self-defense. This truism, however, leaves domestic policymakers to struggle with two critical quandaries: first, the factual predicate required by the state to invoke anticipatory self-defense, on the one hand; and second, the protections the state’s soldiers possess when they act under this authority, on the other. As to the first issue, there is simply no guidance from Congress to the President; the threshold for triggering anticipatory self-defense is ad hoc. As to the second issue, under the law of war, a soldier who kills an enemy has immunity for these precapture or warlike acts.45 This “combatant immunity” attaches only when the law of war has been triggered. Does combatant immunity attach when the stated legal authority is self-defense? There is no clear answer.

The administration is blurring the contours of the right of the state to act in Yemen under self-defense and the law of war protections afforded its soldiers when so acting. Therefore, what protections do U.S. Airmen enjoy when operating the drone that killed an individual in Yemen, Somalia, or Libya? If they are indicted by a Spanish court for murder, what is the defense? Under the law of war, it is combatant immunity. But if the law of war is not triggered because the killing occurred outside the zone of armed conflict, the policy could expose Airmen to prosecution for murder. In order to alleviate both of these quandaries, Congress must step in with legislative guidance. Congress has the constitutional obligation to fund and oversee military operations.46 The goal of congressional action must not be to thwart the President from protecting the United States from the dangers of a very hostile world. As the debates of the Church Committee demonstrated, however, the President’s unfettered authority in the realm of national security is a cause for concern. Clarification is required because the AUMF gave the President a blank check to use targeted killing under domestic law, but it never set parameters on the President’s authority when international legal norms intersect and potentially conflict with measures stemming from domestic law.

That clarity over legal authority is necessary to solve

Laurie Blank, Director, International Humanitarian Law Clinic, Emory Law School, 2012, Targeted Strikes: The Consequences of Blurring the Armed Conflict and Self-Defense Justifications, http://www.wmitchell.edu/lawreview/Volume38/documents/11.BlankFINAL.pdf

As noted in the introduction to this article, maintaining the separation between and independence of jus ad bellum and jus in bello is vital for the effective application of the law and protection of persons in conflict. The discussion that follows will refer to both the LOAC and the law of self-defense extensively in a range of situations in order to analyze and highlight the risks of blurring the lines between the two paradigms. However, it is important to note that the purpose here is not to conflate the two paradigms, but to emphasize the risks inherent in blurring these lines. Preserving the historic separation remains central to the application of both bodies of law, to the maintenance of international security, and to the regulation of the conduct of hostilities. III. BLURRING THE LINES The nature of the terrorist threat the United States and other states face does indeed raise the possibility that both the armed conflict and the self-defense paradigms are relevant to the use of targeted strikes overall. The United States has maintained for the past ten years that it is engaged in an armed conflict with al Qaeda66 and, notwithstanding continued resistance to the notion of an armed conflict between a state and a transnational terrorist group in certain quarters, there is general acceptance that the scope of armed conflict can indeed encompass such a state versus non-state conflict. Not all U.S. counterterrorism measures fit within the confines of this armed conflict, however, with the result that many of the U.S. targeted strikes over the past several years may well fit more appropriately within the self-defense paradigm. The existence of both paradigms as relevant to targeted strikes is not inherently problematic. It is the United States’ insistence on using reference to both paradigms as justification for individual attacks and the broader program of targeted strikes that raises **significant concerns** for the use of international law and the protection of individuals by **blurring the lines** between the key parameters of the two paradigms. A. Location of Attacks: International Law and the Scope of the Battlefield The distinct differences between the targeting regimes in armed conflict and in self-defense and who can be targeted in which circumstances makes understanding the differentiation between the two paradigms essential to lawful conduct in both situations. The United States has launched targeted strikes in Afghanistan, Pakistan, Yemen, Somalia, and Syria during the past several years. The broad geographic range of the strike locations has produced significant questions—as yet mostly unanswered— and debate regarding the parameters of the conflict with al Qaeda.67 The U.S. armed conflict with al Qaeda and other terrorist groups has focused on Afghanistan and the border regions of Pakistan, but the United States has launched an extensive campaign of targeted strikes in Yemen and some strikes in Somalia in the past year as well. In the early days of the conflict, the United States seemed to trumpet the notion of a global battlefield, in which the conflict with al Qaeda extended to every corner of the world.68 Others have argued that conflict, even one with a transnational terrorist group, can only take place in limited, defined geographic areas.69 At present, the United States has stepped back from the notion of a global battlefield, although there is little guidance to determine precisely what factors influence the parameters of the zone of combat in the conflict with al Qaeda.70

Traditionally, the law of neutrality provided the guiding framework for the parameters of the battlespace in an international armed conflict. When two or more states are fighting and certain other states remain neutral, the line between the two forms the divider between the application of the laws of war and the law of neutrality.71 The law of neutrality is based on the fundamental principle that neutral territory is inviolable72 and focuses on three main goals: (1) contain the spread of hostilities, particularly by keeping down the number of participants; (2) define the legal rights of parties and nonparties to the conflict; and (3) limit the impact of war on nonparticipants, especially with regard to commerce.73 In this way, neutrality law leads to a geographic-based framework in which belligerents can fight on belligerent territory or the commons, but must refrain from any operations on neutral territory. In essence, the battlespace in a traditional armed conflict between two or more states is anywhere outside the sovereign territory of any of the neutral states.74 The language of the Geneva Conventions tracks this concept fairly closely. Common Article 2, which sets forth the definition of international armed conflict, states that such conflict occurs in “all cases of declared war or . . . any other armed conflict which may arise between two or more of the High Contracting Parties.”75 In Common Article 3, noninternational armed conflicts include conflicts between a state and non-state armed groups that are “occurring in the territory of one of the High Contracting Parties.”76 Both of these formulations tie the location of the armed conflict directly to the territory of one or more belligerent parties. The neutrality framework as a geographic parameter is left wanting in today’s conflicts with terrorist groups, however. First, as a formal matter, the law of neutrality technically only applies in cases of international armed conflict.77 Even analogizing to the situations we face today is highly problematic, however, because today’s conflicts not only pit states against non-state actors, but because those actors and groups often do not have any territorial nexus beyond wherever they can find safe haven from government intrusion. As state and non-state actors have often shifted unpredictably and irregularly between acts characteristic of wartime and those characteristic of not-wartime[, t]he unpredictable and irregular nature of these shifts makes it difficult to know whether at any given moment one should understand them as armies and their enemies or as police forces and their criminal adversaries.78 Simply locating terrorist groups and operatives does not therefore identify the parameters of the battlefield—the fact that the United States and other states use a combination of military operations and law enforcement measures to combat terrorism blurs the lines one might look for in defining the battlefield. In many situations, “the fight against transnational jihadi groups . . . largely takes place away from any recognizable battlefield.”79 Second, a look at U.S. jurisprudence in the past and today demonstrates a clear break between the framework applied in past wars and the views courts are taking today. U.S. courts during World War I viewed “the port of New York [as] within the field of active [military] operations.”80 Similarly, a 1942 decision upholding the lawfulness of an order evacuating JapaneseAmericans to a military area stated plainly that the field of military operation is not confined to the scene of actual physical combat. Our cities and transportation systems, our coastline, our harbors, and even our agricultural areas are all vitally important in the all-out war effort in which our country must engage if our form of government is to survive.81 In each of those cases, the United States was a belligerent in an international armed conflict; the law of neutrality mandated that U.S. territory was belligerent territory and therefore part of the battlefield or combat zone. The courts take a decidedly different view in today’s conflicts, however, consistently referring to the United States as “outside a zone of combat,”82 “distant from a zone of combat,”83 or not within any “active [or formal] theater of war,”84 even while recognizing the novel geographic nature of the conflict. Even more recently, in Al Maqaleh v. Gates, both the District Court and the Court of Appeals distinguished between Afghanistan, “a theater of active military combat,”85 and other areas (including the United States), which are described as “far removed from any battlefield.”86 In a traditional belligerency-neutrality framework, one would expect to see U.S. territory viewed as part of the battlefield; the fact that courts consistently trend the other way highlights both the difference in approach and the uncertainty involved in defining today’s conflicts.

The current U.S. approach of using both the armed conflict paradigm and the self-defense paradigm as justifications for targeted strikes without further clarification serves to exacerbate the legal challenges posed by the geography of the conflict, at both a theoretical and a practical level. First, at the most fundamental level, uncertainty regarding the parameters of the battlefield has significant consequences for the safety and security of individuals. During armed conflict, the LOAC authorizes the use of force as a first resort against those identified as the enemy, whether insurgents, terrorists or the armed forces of another state. In contrast, human rights law, which would be the dominant legal framework in areas where there is no armed conflict, authorizes the use of force only as a last resort.87 Apart from questions regarding the application of human rights law during times of war, which are outside the scope of this article, the distinction between the two regimes is nonetheless starkest in this regard. The former permits targeting of individuals based on their status as members of a hostile force; the latter—human rights law—permits lethal force against individuals only on the basis of their conduct posing a direct threat at that time. The LOAC also accepts the incidental loss of civilian lives as collateral damage, within the bounds of the principle of proportionality;88 human rights law contemplates no such casualties. These contrasts can literally mean the difference between life and death in many situations. Indeed, “If it is often permissible to deliberately kill large numbers of humans in times of armed conflict, even though such an act would be considered mass murder in times of peace, then it is essential that politicians and courts be able to distinguish readily between conflict and nonconflict, between war and peace.”89 However, the overreliance on flexibility at present means that U.S. officials do not distinguish between conflict and non-conflict areas but rather simply use the broad sweep of armed conflict and/or self-defense to cover all areas without further delineation. Second, on a broader level of legal application and interpretation, the development of the law itself is affected by the failure to delineate between relevant legal paradigms. “Emerging technologies of potentially great geographic reach raise the issue of what regime of law regulates these activities as they spread,”90 and emphasize the need to foster, rather than hinder, development of the law in these areas. Many argue that the ability to use armed drones across state borders without risk to personnel who could be shot down or captured across those borders has an expansive effect on the location of conflict and hostilities. In effect, they suggest that it is somehow “easier” to send unmanned aircraft across sovereign borders because there is no risk of a pilot being shot down and captured, making the escalation and spillover of conflict more likely.91 Understanding the parameters of a conflict with terrorist groups is important, for a variety of reasons, none perhaps more important than the life-and-death issues detailed above. By the same measure, understanding the authorities for and limits on a state’s use of force in self-defense is essential to maintaining orderly relations between states and to the ability of states to defend against attacks, from whatever quarter. The extensive debates in the academic and policy worlds highlight the fundamental nature of both inquiries. However, the repeated assurances from the U.S. government that targeted strikes are lawful in the course of armed conflict or in exercise of the legitimate right of self-defense—without further elaboration and specificity—allows for a significantly less nuanced approach. As long as a strike seems to fit into the overarching framework of helping to defend the United States against terrorism, there no longer would be a need to carefully delineate the parameters of armed conflict and self-defense, where the outer boundaries of each lie and how they differ from each other. From a purely theoretical standpoint, this limits the development and implementation of the law. Even from a more practical policy standpoint, the United States may well find that the blurred lines prove detrimental in the future when it seeks sharper delineations for other purposes.

The aff does not legitimize war

Debra Bergoffen, Professor of Philosophy and a member of the Women's Studies and Cultural Studies programs at George Mason University, Spring 2008, The Just War Tradition: Translating the Ethics of Human Dignity into Political Practices, Hypatia Volume 23, Number 2

The just war tradition is riddled with ambiguities. It speaks of a single human community bounded by universal moral laws, as it recognizes and, under certain conditions, legitimates the division of that community into enemy factions in violation of those laws. It recognizes the inevitability of war while speaking of the demands of peace. It sets up reason as the arbiter of wartime strategies, while noting that armed conflicts, once begun, may not be amenable to the rule of reason. Given these ambiguities, a result of the ways in which just war theory attempts to negotiate the competing demands of justice and the politics of power, it is no accident that the just war tradition has been ridiculed by power "realists" for its utopian naïveté and dismissed by pacifists for sacrificing the principles of peace to the demands of war.

Twentiethand twenty-first-century war waging has bolstered "realist" and pacifist critiques of the just war doctrine. The trench warfare strategy of World War I, the Allied bombing strategies of World War II, the genocidal evil of Nazi Germany, and the nuclear capacities of the United States and the USSR mocked the just war premise that war could be morally and rationally [End Page 72] constrained. Ironically, the cold-war policy of mutual assured destruction, with its acronym MAD, made the case for the pacifist argument that a just war in a world of nuclear weapons was impossible. MAD did not, however, create the conditions for peace envisioned by just war advocates.

The twenty-first century, young as it is, has managed to establish itself as an heir to the twentieth century's mockery of the idea of a just war. Erasing the "never again" post–World War II just war promise with multiple spectacles of genocides, betraying the promise of a post–cold-war world of peaceful coexistence with the reality of a world dominated by ideological wars of terror, a U.S.–declared war on terrorism, and the proliferation of nuclear and biological weapons, **this century has made it increasingly difficult for the just war tradition to establish itself as a counterweight to the politics of violence**.

Given the destructive powers of modern weaponry and the absolutist ideologies of contemporary conflicts, and given the fact that the just war tradition is historically tied to the idea of the sovereign state as the sole legitimate source of war and to Western notions of natural law and rights, it might seem time to declare the very idea of a just war a relic of more manageable and naïve times, and a symptom of Eurocentric ideology. It might seem time to face the fact that politically motivated violence is more chaotic than envisioned by just war advocates, and less amenable to the rule of reason required by just war restrictions.

Before writing the just war obituary, however, we need to note the ways in which institutional responses to the evils of unbridled violence—war crimes tribunals, a body of international laws and treaties delineating the particulars of war crimes and crimes against humanity, the development of human rights laws—speak the language of just war theory. For these institutions and laws insist that political and military officials are bound by just war morality and hold military and political actors punishably responsible for failing to adhere to the moral obligations of the just war code. These developments suggest that despite the antipathy between current technologies and ideologies of war and the principles of just war doctrines, **the just war insistence that the political and moral worlds are tethered remains relevant**.

To see whether just war theory can meet the challenges of its origins and of our times we need to see how it fares against the criticisms of power-politics advocates, such as Carl von Clausewitz (1780–1831), and how it stands up to pacifist and nonviolent rejections of all forms of political violence.

In his classic text, On War, Clausewitz argued that even when/if the original objectives of war are limited, war, once begun, cannot escape its absolutist logic.1 According to Clausewitz, as an act of force intended to compel an enemy to surrender, war is subject to the rules of unintended consequences and escalation that no rule of justice can counter (Shaw 2003, 19). In advancing his thesis of reality politics, Clausewitz analyzed the very idea of the just war, the thesis [End Page 73] that war could and should be limited both in its objectives and in its conduct. He made it clear that it is the logic of war, not the technologies of warfare, that constitute its inherent peril. He anticipated Rwanda. Machetes were all the Hutu needed to perpetuate genocide.

Clausewitz's argument against the just war premise of rule-governed war has been joined by two other arguments that point to serious loopholes in just war theory. The first of these arguments demonstrates the ways in which the logic of just war itself can become a justification for unlimited war waging. The point of just war doctrine is to distinguish morally justifiable from morally unjustifiable political violence. Thus, just war doctrine can be invoked to establish the righteousness of certain types of war (for example, holy wars, wars to make the world safe for democracy, wars to liberate the proletariat from the exploitations of capitalism, or wars to create democratic states). Once appealed to in this way, however, just war principles, far from limiting or preventing war, become a war-enhancing tool, a (self-) righteous justification of unlimited war (Coates 1997, 2–3). The second objection concerns the authority to declare war. Just war thinking assumes that war is the province of legitimate states. It presumes that legitimate states have some interest in limiting wars. The logic of this link among legitimate states, war making, and limited war is less than compelling. It is, however, thoroughly undermined in our postmodern world of international conglomerates, paramilitary armies, and "rogue" states, where legitimate states no longer monopolize the power of war making (Coates 1997, 6; Shaw 2003, 63).

Arguments against the just war premise that war can be contained both in its objectives and its conduct do not necessarily make the "realist" case for unrestrained power politics, however. Instead of linking the failed logic of just war thinking to the inevitable amorality of politics, pacifists, among whom we may include such eighteenth-century advocates of perpetual peace as Immanuel Kant, and those who would limit the fight against injustice to nonviolent methods argue that the failures of just war theory alert us to our moral obligation to reject the very idea of war. They see the fact of the inevitability of unlimited war as requiring us to reject of all forms of politically sanctioned violence. Sara Ruddick, for example, recommends a suspicion of the "rhetoric and reason of deliberate collective violence" and advocates developing nonviolent methods of resistance to violence (Ruddick 1990, 232).

Power-politics advocates, nonviolence proponents, and perpetual-peace defenders agree that once political violence begins it cannot be controlled. Their differences concern how to deal with this absolute trajectory of war. Power-politics realists argue that it renders all talk of war and justice superfluous. Pacificists argue that it renders all recourse to war unjustifiable. Just war theorists reject the idea that political violence is always either self-interested or unjust. **They find that rules of war have and can be observed, and that our desires and** [End Page 74] **behaviors are better accounted for by the ambiguous logic of justice and war than the clear-cut justice or war logic of power-politics and pacifist advocates**.

Between the ambiguous agenda of the just war tradition and its realist and pacifist critics, we are confronted with the violence of war, the realities of injustice, the moral demand of peace with justice, and the question of how to counter the violence of injustice without unleashing the absolute logic of war. **Different as they are in their prescriptions for international order, political realists and nonviolent pacifists find the demands of power politics radically incompatible with the demands of morality**. Whether it is the realists accusing nonviolence proponents of a naïve utopianism, or the pacifists finding the realists lacking in moral courage and imagination, both agree that the just war tradition is fundamentally misguided in its attempt to tether a politics that accepts the legitimacy of violence to the moral demands of justice. It seems to me, however, that it is precisely this ambiguity of the just war tradition that constitutes its value for the feminist pursuit of global justice; for in invoking the utopian imagination and yoking the realities of violence to the demands for justice, **it puts injustice on trial within the context of the dialectics of power politics**. **The ambiguity of the just war tradition signals its commitment to the intersection of the ethical and the political**. Its strength lies in the ways in which it looks to the moral imagination to set the political agenda. Rather than severing the political from the moral, or finding current visions of politics morally impossible, it looks for ways to translate moral discourses into (imperfect) political strategies.

My sympathy for the project of the just war tradition owes much to Simone de Beauvoir and her principle of ambiguity, which, in part at least, requires that we tie our "impossible" visions of justice to the concrete realities of human existence. Specifically, Beauvoir reminds us that violence and evil are part of the horizon of our world. The complexity of our condition and tragedy of our situation is such that violence, though never morally justified, is sometimes morally necessary (Beauvoir 1947/1991). Violence is never moral because it is an assault on our humanity. Invoking it, however, is sometimes necessary to preserve our humanity. **When injustice cannot be rectified in any other way, the resort to violence is justified**. As justified, however, it remains tragic. Beauvoir's concept of the tragic here is crucial; for it stops the logic of justified war from sliding into a doctrine of (self-) righteous, absolute war. Though The Second Sex is notable for its refusal to include violent revolution in the arsenal of liberatory strategies to be taken up by women, it nowhere calls upon women to renounce violence. Further, when Beauvoir discusses the liberatory meanings of violence available to patriarchal men but not women and calls women's exclusion from certain violent practices a curse, she makes it clear that, although she is not renouncing her Ethics of Ambiguity assessment of the tragic relationship between violence and justice, she finds the turn to violence, under certain circumstances, an affirmation of one's dignity. [End Page 75]

Between her discussions of what must be done when confronted by the Nazi soldier in The Ethics of Ambiguity and her invocation of the power of the imagination in her defense of the slave and the harem women who do not rebel in The Second Sex, we find Beauvoir validating the utopian imagination as an antidote to passivity in the face of injustice and accepting the idea of legitimate war/violence. By joining the utopian demands for justice with the acceptance of violence through the idea of the tragic, however, she rejects the legitimacy of unrestrained violence. **However legitimate the cause, absolute war is never legitimated**. Here, she and just war advocates share common ground. Both find that the intersecting demands of politics and ethics require a logic of ambiguity rather than a logic of the either/or. In posing the question of feminist justice in the context of the question of war, peace, and human rights, I take up the ambiguities of this common ground.

Simulated national security law debates inculcate agency and decision-making skills—that enables activism and avoids cooption

Laura K. Donohue, Associate Professor of Law, Georgetown Law, 4/11/13, National Security Law Pedagogy and the Role of Simulations, http://jnslp.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/04/National-Security-Law-Pedagogy-and-the-Role-of-Simulations.pdf

The concept of simulations as an aspect of higher education, or in the law school environment, is not new.164 Moot court, after all, is a form of simulation and one of the oldest teaching devices in the law. What is new, however, is the idea of designing a civilian national security course that takes advantage of the doctrinal and experiential components of law school education and integrates the experience through a multi-day simulation. In 2009, I taught the first module based on this design at Stanford Law, which I developed the following year into a full course at Georgetown Law. It has since gone through multiple iterations. The initial concept followed on the federal full-scale Top Official (“TopOff”) exercises, used to train government officials to respond to domestic crises.165 It adapted a Tabletop Exercise, designed with the help of exercise officials at DHS and FEMA, to the law school environment. The Tabletop used one storyline to push on specific legal questions, as students, assigned roles in the discussion, sat around a table and for six hours engaged with the material. The problem with the Tabletop Exercise was that it was too static, and the rigidity of the format left little room, or time, for student agency. Unlike the government’s TopOff exercises, which gave officials the opportunity to fully engage with the many different concerns that arise in the course of a national security crisis as well as the chance to deal with externalities, the Tabletop focused on specific legal issues, even as it controlled for external chaos. The opportunity to provide a more full experience for the students came with the creation of first a one-day, and then a multi-day simulation. The course design and simulation continues to evolve. It offers a model for achieving the pedagogical goals outlined above, in the process developing a rigorous training ground for the next generation of national security lawyers.166 A. Course Design The central idea in structuring the NSL Sim 2.0 course was to bridge the gap between theory and practice by conveying doctrinal material and creating an alternative reality in which students would be forced to act upon legal concerns.167 The exercise itself is a form of problem-based learning, wherein students are given both agency and responsibility for the results. Towards this end, the structure must be at once bounded (directed and focused on certain areas of the law and legal education) and flexible (responsive to student input and decisionmaking). Perhaps the most significant weakness in the use of any constructed universe is the problem of authenticity. Efforts to replicate reality will inevitably fall short. There is simply too much uncertainty, randomness, and complexity in the real world. One way to address this shortcoming, however, is through design and agency. The scenarios with which students grapple and the structural design of the simulation must reflect the national security realm, even as students themselves must make choices that carry consequences. Indeed, to some extent, student decisions themselves must drive the evolution of events within the simulation.168 Additionally, while authenticity matters, it is worth noting that at some level the fact that the incident does not take place in a real-world setting can be a great advantage. That is, the simulation creates an environment where students can make mistakes and learn from these mistakes – without what might otherwise be devastating consequences. It also allows instructors to develop multiple points of feedback to enrich student learning in a way that would be much more difficult to do in a regular practice setting. NSL Sim 2.0 takes as its starting point the national security pedagogical goals discussed above. It works backwards to then engineer a classroom, cyber, and physical/simulation experience to delve into each of these areas. As a substantive matter, the course focuses on the constitutional, statutory, and regulatory authorities in national security law, placing particular focus on the interstices between black letter law and areas where the field is either unsettled or in flux. A key aspect of the course design is that it retains both the doctrinal and experiential components of legal education. Divorcing simulations from the doctrinal environment risks falling short on the first and third national security pedagogical goals: (1) analytical skills and substantive knowledge, and (3) critical thought. A certain amount of both can be learned in the course of a simulation; however, the national security crisis environment is not well-suited to the more thoughtful and careful analytical discussion. What I am thus proposing is a course design in which doctrine is paired with the type of experiential learning more common in a clinical realm. The former precedes the latter, giving students the opportunity to develop depth and breadth prior to the exercise. In order to capture problems related to adaptation and evolution, addressing goal [1(d)], the simulation itself takes place over a multi-day period. Because of the intensity involved in national security matters (and conflicting demands on student time), the model makes use of a multi-user virtual environment. The use of such technology is critical to creating more powerful, immersive simulations.169 It also allows for continual interaction between the players. Multi-user virtual environments have the further advantage of helping to transform the traditional teaching culture, predominantly concerned with manipulating textual and symbolic knowledge, into a culture where students learn and can then be assessed on the basis of their participation in changing practices.170 I thus worked with the Information Technology group at Georgetown Law to build the cyber portal used for NSL Sim 2.0. The twin goals of adaptation and evolution require that students be given a significant amount of agency and responsibility for decisions taken in the course of the simulation. To further this aim, I constituted a Control Team, with six professors, four attorneys from practice, a media expert, six to eight former simulation students, and a number of technology experts. Four of the professors specialize in different areas of national security law and assume roles in the course of the exercise, with the aim of pushing students towards a deeper doctrinal understanding of shifting national security law authorities. One professor plays the role of President of the United States. The sixth professor focuses on questions of professional responsibility. The attorneys from practice help to build the simulation and then, along with all the professors, assume active roles during the simulation itself. Returning students assist in the execution of the play, further developing their understanding of national security law. Throughout the simulation, the Control Team is constantly reacting to student choices. When unexpected decisions are made, professors may choose to pursue the evolution of the story to accomplish the pedagogical aims, or they may choose to cut off play in that area (there are various devices for doing so, such as denying requests, sending materials to labs to be analyzed, drawing the players back into the main storylines, and leaking information to the media). A total immersion simulation involves a number of scenarios, as well as systemic noise, to give students experience in dealing with the second pedagogical goal: factual chaos and information overload. The driving aim here is to teach students how to manage information more effectively. Five to six storylines are thus developed, each with its own arc and evolution. To this are added multiple alterations of the situation, relating to background noise. Thus, unlike hypotheticals, doctrinal problems, single-experience exercises, or even Tabletop exercises, the goal is not to eliminate external conditions, but to embrace them as part of the challenge facing national security lawyers. The simulation itself is problem-based, giving players agency in driving the evolution of the experience – thus addressing goal [2(c)]. This requires a realtime response from the professor(s) overseeing the simulation, pairing bounded storylines with flexibility to emphasize different areas of the law and the students’ practical skills. Indeed, each storyline is based on a problem facing the government, to which players must then respond, generating in turn a set of new issues that must be addressed. The written and oral components of the simulation conform to the fourth pedagogical goal – the types of situations in which national security lawyers will find themselves. Particular emphasis is placed on nontraditional modes of communication, such as legal documents in advance of the crisis itself, meetings in the midst of breaking national security concerns, multiple informal interactions, media exchanges, telephone calls, Congressional testimony, and formal briefings to senior level officials in the course of the simulation as well as during the last class session. These oral components are paired with the preparation of formal legal instruments, such as applications to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court, legal memos, applications for search warrants under Title III, and administrative subpoenas for NSLs. In addition, students are required to prepare a paper outlining their legal authorities prior to the simulation – and to deliver a 90 second oral briefing after the session. To replicate the high-stakes political environment at issue in goals (1) and (5), students are divided into political and legal roles and assigned to different (and competing) institutions: the White House, DoD, DHS, HHS, DOJ, DOS, Congress, state offices, nongovernmental organizations, and the media. This requires students to acknowledge and work within the broader Washington context, even as they are cognizant of the policy implications of their decisions. They must get used to working with policymakers and to representing one of many different considerations that decisionmakers take into account in the national security domain. Scenarios are selected with high consequence events in mind, to ensure that students recognize both the domestic and international dimensions of national security law. Further alterations to the simulation provide for the broader political context – for instance, whether it is an election year, which parties control different branches, and state and local issues in related but distinct areas. The media is given a particularly prominent role. One member of the Control Team runs an AP wire service, while two student players represent print and broadcast media, respectively. The Virtual News Network (“VNN”), which performs in the second capacity, runs continuously during the exercise, in the course of which players may at times be required to appear before the camera. This media component helps to emphasize the broader political context within which national security law is practiced. Both anticipated and unanticipated decisions give rise to ethical questions and matters related to the fifth goal: professional responsibility. The way in which such issues arise stems from simulation design as well as spontaneous interjections from both the Control Team and the participants in the simulation itself. As aforementioned, professors on the Control Team, and practicing attorneys who have previously gone through a simulation, focus on raising decision points that encourage students to consider ethical and professional considerations. Throughout the simulation good judgment and leadership play a key role, determining the players’ effectiveness, with the exercise itself hitting the aim of the integration of the various pedagogical goals. Finally, there are multiple layers of feedback that players receive prior to, during, and following the simulation to help them to gauge their effectiveness. The Socratic method in the course of doctrinal studies provides immediate assessment of the students’ grasp of the law. Written assignments focused on the contours of individual players’ authorities give professors an opportunity to assess students’ level of understanding prior to the simulation. And the simulation itself provides real-time feedback from both peers and professors. The Control Team provides data points for player reflection – for instance, the Control Team member playing President may make decisions based on player input, giving students an immediate impression of their level of persuasiveness, while another Control Team member may reject a FISC application as insufficient. The simulation goes beyond this, however, focusing on teaching students how to develop (6) opportunities for learning in the future. Student meetings with mentors in the field, which take place before the simulation, allow students to work out the institutional and political relationships and the manner in which law operates in practice, even as they learn how to develop mentoring relationships. (Prior to these meetings we have a class discussion about mentoring, professionalism, and feedback). Students, assigned to simulation teams about one quarter of the way through the course, receive peer feedback in the lead-up to the simulation and during the exercise itself. Following the simulation the Control Team and observers provide comments. Judges, who are senior members of the bar in the field of national security law, observe player interactions and provide additional debriefing. The simulation, moreover, is recorded through both the cyber portal and through VNN, allowing students to go back to assess their performance. Individual meetings with the professors teaching the course similarly follow the event. Finally, students end the course with a paper reflecting on their performance and the issues that arose in the course of the simulation, develop frameworks for analyzing uncertainty, tension with colleagues, mistakes, and successes in the future. B. Substantive Areas: Interstices and Threats As a substantive matter, NSL Sim 2.0 is designed to take account of areas of the law central to national security. It focuses on specific authorities that may be brought to bear in the course of a crisis. The decision of which areas to explore is made well in advance of the course. It is particularly helpful here to think about national security authorities on a continuum, as a way to impress upon students that there are shifting standards depending upon the type of threat faced. One course, for instance, might center on the interstices between crime, drugs, terrorism and war. Another might address the intersection of pandemic disease and biological weapons. A third could examine cybercrime and cyberterrorism. This is the most important determination, because the substance of the doctrinal portion of the course and the simulation follows from this decision. For a course focused on the interstices between pandemic disease and biological weapons, for instance, preliminary inquiry would lay out which authorities apply, where the courts have weighed in on the question, and what matters are unsettled. Relevant areas might include public health law, biological weapons provisions, federal quarantine and isolation authorities, habeas corpus and due process, military enforcement and posse comitatus, eminent domain and appropriation of land/property, takings, contact tracing, thermal imaging and surveillance, electronic tagging, vaccination, and intelligence-gathering. The critical areas can then be divided according to the dominant constitutional authority, statutory authorities, regulations, key cases, general rules, and constitutional questions. This, then, becomes a guide for the doctrinal part of the course, as well as the grounds on which the specific scenarios developed for the simulation are based. The authorities, simultaneously, are included in an electronic resource library and embedded in the cyber portal (the Digital Archives) to act as a closed universe of the legal authorities needed by the students in the course of the simulation. Professional responsibility in the national security realm and the institutional relationships of those tasked with responding to biological weapons and pandemic disease also come within the doctrinal part of the course. The simulation itself is based on five to six storylines reflecting the interstices between different areas of the law. The storylines are used to present a coherent, non-linear scenario that can adapt to student responses. Each scenario is mapped out in a three to seven page document, which is then checked with scientists, government officials, and area experts for consistency with how the scenario would likely unfold in real life. For the biological weapons and pandemic disease emphasis, for example, one narrative might relate to the presentation of a patient suspected of carrying yersinia pestis at a hospital in the United States. The document would map out a daily progression of the disease consistent with epidemiological patterns and the central actors in the story: perhaps a U.S. citizen, potential connections to an international terrorist organization, intelligence on the individual’s actions overseas, etc. The scenario would be designed specifically to stress the intersection of public health and counterterrorism/biological weapons threats, and the associated (shifting) authorities, thus requiring the disease initially to look like an innocent presentation (for example, by someone who has traveled from overseas), but then for the storyline to move into the second realm (awareness that this was in fact a concerted attack). A second storyline might relate to a different disease outbreak in another part of the country, with the aim of introducing the Stafford Act/Insurrection Act line and raising federalism concerns. The role of the military here and Title 10/Title 32 questions would similarly arise – with the storyline designed to raise these questions. A third storyline might simply be well developed noise in the system: reports of suspicious activity potentially linked to radioactive material, with the actors linked to nuclear material. A fourth storyline would focus perhaps on container security concerns overseas, progressing through newspaper reports, about containers showing up in local police precincts. State politics would constitute the fifth storyline, raising question of the political pressures on the state officials in the exercise. Here, ethnic concerns, student issues, economic conditions, and community policing concerns might become the focus. The sixth storyline could be further noise in the system – loosely based on current events at the time. In addition to the storylines, a certain amount of noise is injected into the system through press releases, weather updates, private communications, and the like. The five to six storylines, prepared by the Control Team in consultation with experts, become the basis for the preparation of scenario “injects:” i.e., newspaper articles, VNN broadcasts, reports from NGOs, private communications between officials, classified information, government leaks, etc., which, when put together, constitute a linear progression. These are all written and/or filmed prior to the exercise. The progression is then mapped in an hourly chart for the unfolding events over a multi-day period. All six scenarios are placed on the same chart, in six columns, giving the Control Team a birds-eye view of the progression. C. How It Works As for the nuts and bolts of the simulation itself, it traditionally begins outside of class, in the evening, on the grounds that national security crises often occur at inconvenient times and may well involve limited sleep and competing demands.171 Typically, a phone call from a Control Team member posing in a role integral to one of the main storylines, initiates play. Students at this point have been assigned dedicated simulation email addresses and provided access to the cyber portal. The portal itself gives each team the opportunity to converse in a “classified” domain with other team members, as well as access to a public AP wire and broadcast channel, carrying the latest news and on which press releases or (for the media roles) news stories can be posted. The complete universe of legal authorities required for the simulation is located on the cyber portal in the Digital Archives, as are forms required for some of the legal instruments (saving students the time of developing these from scratch in the course of play). Additional “classified” material – both general and SCI – has been provided to the relevant student teams. The Control Team has access to the complete site. For the next two (or three) days, outside of student initiatives (which, at their prompting, may include face-to-face meetings between the players), the entire simulation takes place through the cyber portal. The Control Team, immediately active, begins responding to player decisions as they become public (and occasionally, through monitoring the “classified” communications, before they are released). This time period provides a ramp-up to the third (or fourth) day of play, allowing for the adjustment of any substantive, student, or technology concerns, while setting the stage for the breaking crisis. The third (or fourth) day of play takes place entirely at Georgetown Law. A special room is constructed for meetings between the President and principals, in the form of either the National Security Council or the Homeland Security Council, with breakout rooms assigned to each of the agencies involved in the NSC process. Congress is provided with its own physical space, in which meetings, committee hearings and legislative drafting can take place. State government officials are allotted their own area, separate from the federal domain, with the Media placed between the three major interests. The Control Team is sequestered in a different area, to which students are not admitted. At each of the major areas, the cyber portal is publicly displayed on large flat panel screens, allowing for the streaming of video updates from the media, AP wire injects, articles from the students assigned to represent leading newspapers, and press releases. Students use their own laptop computers for team decisions and communication. As the storylines unfold, the Control Team takes on a variety of roles, such as that of the President, Vice President, President’s chief of staff, governor of a state, public health officials, and foreign dignitaries. Some of the roles are adopted on the fly, depending upon player responses and queries as the storylines progress. Judges, given full access to each player domain, determine how effectively the students accomplish the national security goals. The judges are themselves well-experienced in the practice of national security law, as well as in legal education. They thus can offer a unique perspective on the scenarios confronted by the students, the manner in which the simulation unfolded, and how the students performed in their various capacities. At the end of the day, the exercise terminates and an immediate hotwash is held, in which players are first debriefed on what occurred during the simulation. Because of the players’ divergent experiences and the different roles assigned to them, the students at this point are often unaware of the complete picture. The judges and formal observers then offer reflections on the simulation and determine which teams performed most effectively. Over the next few classes, more details about the simulation emerge, as students discuss it in more depth and consider limitations created by their knowledge or institutional position, questions that arose in regard to their grasp of the law, the types of decision-making processes that occurred, and the effectiveness of their – and other students’ – performances. Reflection papers, paired with oral briefings, focus on the substantive issues raised by the simulation and introduce the opportunity for students to reflect on how to create opportunities for learning in the future. The course then formally ends.172 Learning, however, continues beyond the temporal confines of the semester. Students who perform well and who would like to continue to participate in the simulations are invited back as members of the control team, giving them a chance to deepen their understanding of national security law. Following graduation, a few students who go in to the field are then invited to continue their affiliation as National Security Law fellows, becoming increasingly involved in the evolution of the exercise itself. This system of vertical integration helps to build a mentoring environment for the students while they are enrolled in law school and to create opportunities for learning and mentorship post-graduation. It helps to keep the exercise current and reflective of emerging national security concerns. And it builds a strong community of individuals with common interests. CONCLUSION The legal academy has, of late, been swept up in concern about the economic conditions that affect the placement of law school graduates. The image being conveyed, however, does not resonate in every legal field. It is particularly inapposite to the burgeoning opportunities presented to students in national security. That the conversation about legal education is taking place now should come as little surprise. Quite apart from economic concern is the traditional introspection that follows American military engagement. It makes sense: law overlaps substantially with political power, being at once both the expression of government authority and the effort to limit the same. The one-size fits all approach currently dominating the conversation in legal education, however, appears ill-suited to address the concerns raised in the current conversation. Instead of looking at law across the board, greater insight can be gleaned by looking at the specific demands of the different fields themselves. This does not mean that the goals identified will be exclusive to, for instance, national security law, but it does suggest there will be greater nuance in the discussion of the adequacy of the current pedagogical approach. With this approach in mind, I have here suggested six pedagogical goals for national security. For following graduation, students must be able to perform in each of the areas identified – (1) understanding the law as applied, (2) dealing with factual chaos and uncertainty, (3) obtaining critical distance, (4) developing nontraditional written and oral communication skills, (5) exhibiting leadership, integrity, and good judgment in a high-stakes, highly-charged environment, and (6) creating continued opportunities for self-learning. They also must learn how to integrate these different skills into one experience, to ensure that they will be most effective when they enter the field. The problem with the current structures in legal education is that they fall short, in important ways, from helping students to meet these goals. Doctrinal courses may incorporate a range of experiential learning components, such as hypotheticals, doctrinal problems, single exercises, extended or continuing exercises, and tabletop exercises. These are important classroom devices. The amount of time required for each varies, as does the object of the exercise itself. But where they fall short is in providing a more holistic approach to national security law which will allow for the maximum conveyance of required skills. Total immersion simulations, which have not yet been addressed in the secondary literature for civilian education in national security law, may provide an important way forward. Such simulations also cure shortcomings in other areas of experiential education, such as clinics and moot court. It is in an effort to address these concerns that I developed the simulation model above. NSL Sim 2.0 certainly is not the only solution, but it does provide a starting point for moving forward. The approach draws on the strengths of doctrinal courses and embeds a total immersion simulation within a course. It makes use of technology and physical space to engage students in a multi-day exercise, in which they are given agency and responsibility for their decision making, resulting in a steep learning curve. While further adaptation of this model is undoubtedly necessary, it suggests one potential direction for the years to come.

**Simulating the plan creates unique pedagogical benefits by forcing us to build expertise on the details of national security policy—the simulation iself activates agency and enables change—it also builds problem-solving and decision-making skills**

Laura K. **Donohue**, Associate Professor of Law, Georgetown Law, 4/11/**13**, National Security Law Pedagogy and the Role of Simulations, http://jnslp.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/04/National-Security-Law-Pedagogy-and-the-Role-of-Simulations.pdf

2. Factual Chaos and Uncertainty

One of the most important skills for students going into national security law is the ability to deal with factual chaos. The presentation of factual chaos significantly differs from the traditional model of legal education, in which students are provided a set of facts which they must analyze. Lawyers working in national security law must figure out what information they need, integrate enormous amounts of data from numerous sources, determine which information is reliable and relevant, and proceed with analysis and recommendations. Their recommendations, moreover, must be based on contingent conditions: facts may be classified and unavailable to the legal analyst, or facts may change as new information emerges. This is as true for government lawyers as it is for those outside of governmental structures. They must be aware of what is known, what is unsure, what is unknown, and the possibility of changing circumstances, and they must advise their clients, from the beginning, how the legal analysis might shift if the factual basis alters.

a. Chaos. Concern about information overload in the national security environment is not new: in the 1970s scholars discussed and debated how to handle the sequential phases of intelligence gathering and analysis in a manner that yielded an optimal result.132 But the digital revolution has exponentially transformed the quantitative terms of reference, the technical means of collection and analysis, and the volume of information available. The number of sources of information – not least in the online world – is staggering.

Added to this is the rapid expansion in national security law itself: myriad new Executive Orders, Presidential Directives, institutions, programs, statutes, regulations, lawsuits, and judicial decisions mean that national security law itself is rapidly changing. Lawyers inside and outside of government must keep abreast of constantly evolving authorities.

The international arena too is in flux, as global entities, such as the United Nations, the European Court of Human Rights, the G-7/G-8, and other countries, introduce new instruments whose reach includes U.S. interests. Rapid geopolitical changes relating to critical national security concerns, such as worldwide financial flows, the Middle East, the Arab Spring, South American drug cartels, North Korea, the former Soviet Union, China, and other issues require lawyers to keep up on what is happening globally as a way of understanding domestic concerns. Further expanding the information overload is the changing nature of what constitutes national security itself.133

In sum, the sheer amount of information the national security lawyer needs to assimilate is significant. The basic skills required in the 1970s thus may be similar – such as the ability (a) to know where to look for relevant and reliable information; (b) to obtain the necessary information in the most efficient manner possible; (c) to quickly discern reliable from unreliable information; (d) to know what data is critical; and (e) to ascertain what is as yet unknown or contingent on other conditions. But the volume of information, the diversity of information sources, and the heavy reliance on technology requires lawyers to develop new skills. They must be able to obtain the right information and to ignore chaos to focus on the critical issues. These features point in opposite directions – i.e., a broadening of knowledge and a narrowing of focus.

A law school system built on the gradual and incremental advance of law, bolstered or defeated by judicial decisions and solidified through the adhesive nature of stare decisis appears particularly inapposite for this rapidly-changing environment. An important question that will thus confront students upon leaving the legal academy is how to keep abreast of rapidly changing national security and geopolitical concerns in an information-rich world in a manner that allows for capture of relevant information, while retaining the ability to focus on the immediate task at hand.

Staying ahead of the curve requires developing a sense of timing – when to respond to important legal and factual shifts – and identifying the best means of doing so. Again, this applies to government and non-government employees. How should students prioritize certain information and then act upon it? This, too, is an aspect of information overload.

b. Uncertainty. National security law proves an information-rich, factuallydriven environment. The ability to deal with such chaos may be hampered by gaps in the information available and the difficulty of engaging in complex fact-finding – a skill often under-taught in law school. Investigation of relevant information may need to reach far afield in order to generate careful legal analysis. Uncertainty here plays a key role.

In determining, for instance, the contours of quarantine authority, lawyers may need to understand how the pandemic in question works, where there have been outbreaks, how it will spread, what treatments are available, which social distancing measures may prove most effective, what steps are being taken locally, at a state-level, and internationally, and the like. Lawyers in non-profit organizations, legal academics, in-house attorneys, and others, in turn, working in the field, must learn how to find out the relevant information before commenting on new programs and initiatives, agreeing to contractual terms, or advising clients on the best course of action. For both government and non-government lawyers, the secrecy inherent in the field is of great consequence. The key here is learning to ask intelligent questions to generate the best legal analysis possible.

It may be the case that national security lawyers are not aware of the facts they are missing – facts that would be central to legal analysis. This phenomenon front-loads the type of advice and discussions in which national security lawyers must engage. It means that analysis must be given in a transparent manner, contingent on a set of facts currently known, with indication given up front as to how that analysis might change, should the factual basis shift. This is particularly true of government attorneys, who may be advising policymakers who may or may not have a background in the law and who may have access to more information than the attorney. Signaling the key facts on which the legal decision rests with the caveat that the legal analysis of the situation might change if the facts change, provides for more robust consideration of critically important issues.

c. Creative Problem Solving. Part of dealing with factual uncertainty in a rapidly changing environment is learning how to construct new ways to address emerging issues. Admittedly, much has been made in the academy about the importance of problem-based learning as a method in developing students’ critical thinking skills.134 Problem-solving, however, is not merely a method of teaching. It is itself a goal for the type of activities in which lawyers will be engaged. The means-ends distinction is an important one to make here. Problemsolving in a classroom environment may be merely a conduit for learning a specific area of the law or a limited set of skills. But problem-solving as an end suggests the accumulation of a broader set of tools, such as familiarity with multidisciplinary approaches, creativity and originality, sequencing, collaboration, identification of contributors’ expertise, and how to leverage each skill set.

This goal presents itself in the context of fact-finding, but it draws equally on strong understanding of legal authorities and practices, the Washington context, and policy considerations. Similarly, like the factors highlighted in the first pedagogical goal, adding to the tensions inherent in factual analysis is the abbreviated timeline in which national security attorneys must operate. Time may not be a commodity in surplus. This means that national security legal education must not only develop students’ complex fact-finding skills and their ability to provide contingent analysis, but it must teach them how to swiftly and efficiently engage in these activities.

3. Critical Distance

As was recognized more than a century ago, analytical skills by themselves are insufficient training for individuals moving into the legal profession.135 Critical thinking provides the necessary distance from the law that is required in order to move the legal system forward. Critical thought, influenced by the Ancient Greek tradition, finds itself bound up in the Socratic method of dialogue that continues to define the legal academy. But it goes beyond such constructs as well.

Scholars and educators disagree, of course, on what exactly critical thinking entails.136 For purposes of our present discussion, I understand it as the metaconversation in the law. Whereas legal analysis and substantive knowledge focus on the law as it is and how to work within the existing structures, critical thought provides distance and allows students to engage in purposeful discussion of theoretical constructs that deepen our understanding of both the actual and potential constructs of law. It is inherently reflective.

For the purpose of practicing national security law, critical thought is paramount. This is true partly because of the unique conditions that tend to accompany the introduction of national security provisions: these are often introduced in the midst of an emergency. Their creation of new powers frequently has significant implications for distribution of authority at a federal level, a diminished role for state and local government in the federalism realm, and a direct impact on individual rights.137 Constitutional implications demand careful scrutiny.

Yet at the time of an attack, enormous pressure is on officials and legislators to act and to be seen to act to respond.138 With the impact on rights, in particular, foremost in legislators’ minds, the first recourse often is to make any new powers temporary. However, they rarely turn out to be so, instead becoming embedded in the legislative framework and providing a baseline on which further measures are built.139 In order to withdraw them, legislators must demonstrate either that the provisions are not effective or that no violence will ensue upon their withdrawal (either way, a demanding proof). Alternatively, legislators would have to acknowledge that some level of violence may be tolerated – a step no politician is willing to take.

Any new powers, introduced in the heat of the moment, may become a permanent part of the statutory and regulatory regime. They may not operate the way in which they were intended. They may impact certain groups in a disparate manner. They may have unintended and detrimental consequences. Therefore, it is necessary for national security lawyers to be able to view such provisions, and related policy decisions, from a distance and to be able to think through them outside of the contemporary context.

There are many other reasons such critical analysis matters that reflect in other areas of the law. The ability to recognize problems, articulate underlying assumptions and values, understand how language is being used, assess whether argument is logical, test conclusions, and determine and analyze pertinent information depends on critical thinking skills. Indeed, one could draw argue that **it is the goal of higher education to build the capacity to engage in critical thought**. Deeply humanistic theories underlie this approach. The ability to develop discerning judgment – the very meaning of the Greek term, 􏰀􏰁􏰂􏰃􏰄􏰅􏰆 – provides the basis for advancing the human condition through reason and intellectual engagement.

Critical thought as used in practicing national security law may seem somewhat antithetical to the general legal enterprise in certain particulars. For government lawyers and consultants, there may be times in which not providing legal advice, when asked for it, may be as important as providing it. That is, it may be important not to put certain options on the table, with legal justifications behind them. Questions whether to advise or not to advise are bound up in considerations of policy, professional responsibility, and ethics. They may also relate to questions as to who one’s client is in the world of national security law.140 It may be unclear whether and at what point one’s client is a supervisor, the legal (or political) head of an agency, a cross-agency organization, the White House, the Constitution, or the American public. Depending upon this determination, the national security lawyer may or may not want to provide legal advice to one of the potential clients. Alternatively, such a lawyer may want to call attention to certain analyses to other clients. Determining when and how to act in these circumstances requires critical distance.

4. Nontraditional Written and Oral Communication Skills

Law schools have long focused on written and oral communication skills that are central to the practice of law. Brief writing, scholarly analysis, criminal complaints, contractual agreements, trial advocacy, and appellate arguments constitute standard fare. What is perhaps unique about the way communication skills are used in the national security world is the importance of non-traditional modes of legal communication such as concise (and precise) oral briefings, email exchanges, private and passing conversations, agenda setting, meeting changed circumstances, and communications built on swiftly evolving and uncertain information.

For many of these types of communications speed may be of the essence – and unlike the significant amounts of time that accompany preparation of lengthy legal documents (and the painstaking preparation for oral argument that marks moot court preparations.) Much of the activity that goes on within the Executive Branch occurs within a hierarchical system, wherein those closest to the issues have exceedingly short amounts of time to deliver the key points to those with the authority to exercise government power. Unexpected events, shifting conditions on the ground, and deadlines require immediate input, without the opportunity for lengthy consideration of the different facets of the issue presented. This is a different type of activity from the preparation of an appellate brief, for instance, involving a fuller exposition of the issues involved. It is closer to a blend of Supreme Court oral argument and witness crossexamination – although national security lawyers often may not have the luxury of the months, indeed, years, that cases take to evolve to address the myriad legal questions involved.

Facts on which the legal analysis rests, moreover, as discussed above, may not be known. This has substantive implications for written and oral communications. Tension between the level of legal analysis possible and the national security process itself may lead to a different norm than in other areas of the law. Chief Judge Baker explains,

If lawyers insist on knowing all the facts all the time, before they are willing to render advice, or, if they insist on preparing a written legal opinion in response to every question, then national security process would become dysfunctional. The delay alone would cause the policymaker to avoid, and perhaps evade, legal review.141

Simultaneously, lawyers cannot function without some opportunity to look carefully at the questions presented and to consult authoritative sources. “The art of lawyering in such context,” Baker explains, “lies in spotting the issue, accurately identifying the timeline for decision, and applying a meaningful degree of formal or informal review in response.”142 The lawyer providing advice must resist the pressure of the moment and yet still be responsive to the demand for swift action. The resulting written and oral communications thus may be shaped in different ways. Unwilling to bind clients’ hands, particularly in light of rapidly-changing facts and conditions, the potential for nuance to be lost is considerable.

The political and historical overlay of national security law here matters. In some circumstances, even where written advice is not formally required, it may be in the national security lawyer’s best interests to commit informal advice to paper in the form of an email, notation, or short memo. The process may serve to provide an external check on the pressures that have been internalized, by allowing the lawyer to separate from the material and read it. It may give the lawyer the opportunity to have someone subject it to scrutiny. Baker suggests that “on issues of importance, even where the law is clear, as well as situations where novel positions are taken, lawyers should record their informal advice in a formal manner so that they may be held accountable for what they say, and what they don’t say.”143

Written and oral communication may occur at highly irregular moments – yet it is at these moments (in the elevator, during an email exchange, at a meeting, in the course of a telephone call), that critical legal and constitutional decisions are made. This model departs from the formalized nature of legal writing and research. Yet it is important that students are prepared for these types of written and oral communication as an ends in and of themselves.

5. Leadership, Integrity and Good Judgment

National security law often takes place in a high stakes environment. There is tremendous pressure on attorneys operating in the field – not least because of the coercive nature of the authorities in question. The classified environment also plays a key role: many of the decisions made will never be known publicly, nor will they be examined outside of a small group of individuals – much less in a court of law. In this context, leadership, integrity, and good judgment stand paramount.

The types of powers at issue in national security law are among the most coercive authorities available to the government. Decisions may result in the death of one or many human beings, the abridgment of rights, and the bypassing of protections otherwise incorporated into the law. The amount of pressure under which this situation places attorneys is of a higher magnitude than many other areas of the law. Added to this pressure is the highly political nature of national security law and the necessity of understanding the broader Washington context, within which individual decision-making, power relations, and institutional authorities compete. Policy concerns similarly dominate the landscape. It is not enough for national security attorneys to claim that they simply deal in legal advice. Their analyses carry consequences for those exercising power, for those who are the targets of such power, and for the public at large. The function of leadership in this context may be more about process than substantive authority. It may be a willingness to act on critical thought and to accept the impact of legal analysis. It is closely bound to integrity and professional responsibility and the ability to retain good judgment in extraordinary circumstances.

Equally critical in the national security realm is the classified nature of so much of what is done in national security law. All data, for instance, relating to the design, manufacture, or utilization of atomic weapons, the production of special nuclear material, or the use of nuclear material in the production of energy is classified from birth.144 NSI, the bread and butter of the practice of national security law, is similarly classified. U.S. law defines NSI as “information which pertains to the national defense and foreign relations (National Security) of the United States and is classified in accordance with an Executive Order.” Nine primary Executive Orders and two subsidiary orders have been issued in this realm.145

The sheer amount of information incorporated within the classification scheme is here relevant. While original classification authorities have steadily decreased since 1980, and the number of original classification decisions is beginning to fall, the numbers are still high: in fiscal year 2010, for instance, there were nearly 2,300 original classification authorities and almost 225,000 original classification decisions.146

The classification realm, moreover, in which national security lawyers are most active, is expanding. Derivative classification decisions – classification resulting from the incorporation, paraphrasing, restating, or generation of classified information in some new form – is increasing. In FY 2010, there were more than seventy-six million such decisions made.147 This number is triple what it was in FY 2008. Legal decisions and advice tend to be based on information already classified relating to programs, initiatives, facts, intelligence, and previously classified legal opinions.

The key issue here is that with so much of the essential information, decisionmaking, and executive branch jurisprudence necessarily secret, lawyers are limited in their opportunity for outside appraisal and review.

Even within the executive branch, stove-piping occurs. The use of secure compartmentalized information (SCI) further compounds this problem as only a limited number of individuals – much less lawyers – may be read into a program. This diminishes the opportunity to identify and correct errors or to engage in debate and discussion over the law. Once a legal opinion is drafted, the opportunity to expose it to other lawyers may be restricted. The effect may be felt for decades, as successive Administrations reference prior legal decisions within certain agencies. The Office of Legal Counsel, for instance, has an entire body of jurisprudence that has never been made public, which continues to inform the legal analysis provided to the President. Only a handful of people at OLC may be aware of the previous decisions. They are prevented by classification authorities from revealing these decisions. This results in a sort of generational secret jurisprudence. Questions related to professional responsibility thus place the national security lawyer in a difficult position: not only may opportunities to check factual data or to consult with other attorneys be limited, but the impact of legal advice rendered may be felt for years to come.

The problem extends beyond the executive branch. There are limited opportunities, for instance, for external judicial review. Two elements are at work here: first, very few cases involving national security concerns make it into court. Much of what is happening is simply not known. Even when it is known, it may be impossible to demonstrate standing – a persistent problem with regard to challenging, for instance, surveillance programs. Second, courts have historically proved particularly reluctant to intervene in national security matters. Judicially-created devices such as political question doctrine and state secrets underscore the reluctance of the judiciary to second-guess the executive in this realm. The exercise of these doctrines is increasing in the post-9/11 environment. Consider state secrets. While much was made of some five to seven state secrets cases that came to court during the Bush administration, in more than 100 cases the executive branch formally invoked state secrets, which the courts accepted.148 Many times judges did not even bother to look at the evidence in question before blocking it and/or dismissing the suit. In numerous additional cases, the courts treated the claims as though state secrets had been asserted – even where the doctrine had not been formally invoked.149

In light of these pressures – the profound consequences of many national security decisions, the existence of stovepiping even within the executive branch, and limited opportunity for external review – the practice of national security law requires a particularly rigorous and committed adherence to ethical standards and professional responsibility. This is a unique world in which there are enormous pressures, with potentially few external consequences for not acting in accordance with high standards. It thus becomes particularly important, from a pedagogical perspective, to think through the types of situations that national security attorneys may face, and to address the types of questions related to professional responsibility that will confront them in the course of their careers.

Good judgment and leadership similarly stand paramount. These skills, like many of those discussed, may also be relevant to other areas of the law; however, the way in which they become manifest in national security law may be different in important ways. Good judgment, for instance, may mean any number of things, depending upon the attorney’s position within the political hierarchy. Policymaking positions will be considerably different from the provision of legal advice to policymakers. Leadership, too, may mean something different in this field intimately tied to political circumstance. It may mean breaking ranks with the political hierarchy, visibly adopting unpopular public or private positions, or resigning when faced by unethical situations. It may mean creating new bureaucratic structures to more effectively respond to threats. It may mean holding off clients until the attorneys within one’s group have the opportunity to look at issues while still being sensitive to the political needs of the institution. Recourse in such situations may be political, either through public statements and use of the media, or by going to different branches of government for a solution.

6. Creating Opportunities for Learning

In addition to the above skills, national security lawyers must be able to engage in continuous self-learning in order to improve their performance. They must be able to identify new and emerging legal and political authorities and processes, systems for handling factual chaos and uncertainty, mechanisms to ensure critical distance, evaluating written and oral performance, and analyzing leadership skills. Law schools do not traditionally focus on how to teach students to continue their learning beyond the walls of academia. Yet it is vital for their future success to give students the ability to create conditions of learning.

States choose to follow LOAC based on a system of incentives – studies prove that solves violence

Prorock and Appel ’13 (Alyssa, and Benjamin, Department of Political Science, Michigan State University, “Compliance with International Humanitarian Law: Democratic Third Parties and Civilian Targeting in Interstate War,” Journal of Conflict Resolution 00(0) 1-28)

Coercion is a strategy of statecraft involving the threat or use of positive inducements and negative sanctions to alter a target state’s behavior. It influences the decision making of governments by altering the payoffs of pursuing various policies. Recent studies demonstrate, for example, that third-party states have used the carrot of preferential trade agreements (PTAs) to induce better human rights outcomes in target states (Hafner-Burton 2005, 2009), while the World Bank has withheld aid to states with poor human rights records as a form of coercive punishment (Lebovic and Voeten 2009).

We focus theoretically and empirically on the **expectation of coercion**. As Thompson (2009) argues, coercion has already failed once an actor has to carry through on its coercive threat. Thus, an accurate understanding of coercion’s impact must account for the expectation rather than the implementation **of overt penalties** or benefits. It follows that leaders likely incorporate the expected reactions of third parties into their decision making when they weigh the costs/benefits of complying with international law (Goodliffe and Hawkins 2009; Goodliffe et al. 2012). Because governments care about the ‘‘economic, security, and political goods their network partners provide, they anticipate likely reactions of their partners and behave in ways they expect their partners will approve’’ (Goodliffe et al. 2012, 132).8 Anticipated positive third-party reactions for compliance increase the expected payoffs for adhering to legal obligations, while anticipated negative responses to violation decrease the expected payoffs for that course of action. Coercion succeeds, therefore, when states comply with the law because the expected reactions of third parties alter payoffs such that compliance has a higher utility than violating the law. Based on this logic, we focus on the conditions under which states expect third parties to engage in coercive statecraft. We identify when combatant states will anticipate coercion and when that expectation will alter payoffs sufficiently to induce compliance with the law.

While a **growing body of literature** recognizes that international coercion can **induce compliance and contribute to international cooperation** more generally (Goldsmith and Posner 2005; Hafner-Burton 2005; Thompson 2009; Von Stein 2010), many scholars remain skeptical about coercion’s effectiveness as an enforcement mechanism. Skeptics argue that coercion is costly to implement; third parties value the economic, political, and military ties they share with target states and may suffer along with the target from cutting those ties. This may undermine the credibility of coercive threats and a third party’s ability to induce compliance through this enforcement mechanism.

While acknowledging this critique of coercion, we argue that it can act as an **effective enforcement mechanism** under certain conditions. Specifically, successful coercion requires that third parties have (1) the incentive to commit to and implement their coercive threats and (2) sufficient leverage over target states in order to meaningfully alter payoffs for compliance. This suggests that only some third parties can engage in successful coercion and that it is necessary to identify the specific conditions under which third parties can generate credible coercive threats to enforce compliance with international humanitarian law. In the following sections, we argue that third-party states are most likely to effectively use coercion to alter the behavior of combatants when they have both the willingness and opportunity to coerce (e.g., Most and Starr 1989; Siverson and Starr 1990; Starr 1978).

Willingness: Clarity, Democracy, and the Salience of International Humanitarian Law

Enforcement through the coercion mechanism is only likely when at least one third-party state has a substantial enough interest in another party’s compliance that it is willing to act (Von Stein 2010). Third-party willingness, in turn, depends upon two conditions: (1) legal principles must be clearly defined, making violations easily identifiable and (2) third parties must regard the legal obligation as highly salient.

First, scholars have long recognized that there is significant variation in the precision and clarity of legal rules, and that clarity contributes to compliance with the law (e.g., Abbott et al. 2000; Huth, Croco, and Appel 2011; Morrow 2007; Wallace 2013**).** Precise rules **increase the effectiveness of the law** by **narrowing the range of possible interpretations** and allowing all states to clearly identify acceptable versus unacceptable conduct. By clearly proscribing unacceptable behavior, clear legal obligations allow states to more precisely respond to compliant versus noncompliant behavior. In contrast, **ambiguous legal principle**s often lead to **multiple interpretations** among relevant actors, **impeding a convergence of expectations** and increasing uncertainty about the payoffs for violating (complying with) the law. Thus, the clarity of the law shapes states’ expectations by allowing them to predict the reactions of other states with greater confidence. In particular, they can expect **greater cooperation and rewards following compliance** and more punishment and sanctions for violating the law when legal obligations are clearly defined.

While some bodies of law are imprecise, i**nternational humanitarian law establishes a comprehensive code of conduct** regarding the intentional targeting of noncombatants during war (e.g., Murphy 2006; Shaw 2003). Starting with the 1899 and 1907 Hague Conventions and continuing through the 1949 Geneva Convention (Protocol IV), the law clearly prohibits the intentional targeting of noncombatants in war.

This clarity **allows international humanitarian law to** serve as a “bright line” **that coordinates the expectations of both war combatants and third parties** (Morrow 2007). By creating a **common set of standards,** it reduces uncertainty, narrowing the range of interpretations of the law and allowing both combatants and third parties to readily recognize violations of these standards. Third parties are, as a result, more likely to expend resources to punish conduct that transgresses legal standards or to support behavior in accordance with them. This, in turn, alters the expectations of war combatants who can expect greater support for abiding by the law and greater punishment for violating it when the clarity condition is met.

## \*\*2AC

## 2AC circumvention

#### No circumvention

David J. Barron 8, Professor of Law at Harvard Law School and Martin S. Lederman, Visiting Professor of Law at the Georgetown University Law Center, “The Commander in Chief at the Lowest Ebb -- A Constitutional History”, Harvard Law Review, February, 121 Harv. L. Rev. 941, Lexis

In addition to offering important guidance concerning the congressional role, our historical review also illuminates the practices of the President in creating the constitutional law of war powers at the "lowest ebb." Given the apparent advantages to the Executive of possessing preclusive powers in this area, it is tempting to think that Commanders in Chief would always have claimed a unilateral and unregulable authority to determine the conduct of military operations. And yet, as we show, for most of our history, the presidential practice was otherwise. Several of our most esteemed Presidents - Washington, Lincoln, and both Roosevelts, among others - never invoked the sort of preclusive claims of authority that some modern Presidents appear to embrace without pause. In fact, no Chief Executive did so in any clear way until the onset of the Korean War, even when they confronted problematic restrictions, some of which could not be fully interpreted away and some of which even purported to regulate troop deployments and the actions of troops already deployed. Even since claims of preclusive power emerged in full, the practice within the executive branch has waxed and waned. No consensus among modern Presidents has crystallized. Indeed, rather than denying the authority of Congress to act in this area, some modern Presidents, like their predecessors, have acknowledged the constitutionality of legislative regulation. They have therefore concentrated their efforts on making effective use of other presidential authorities and institutional [\*949] advantages to shape military matters to their preferred design. n11 In sum, there has been much less executive assertion of an inviolate power over the conduct of military campaigns than one might think. And, perhaps most importantly, until recently there has been almost no actual defiance of statutory limitations predicated on such a constitutional theory. This repeated, though not unbroken, deferential executive branch stance is not, we think, best understood as evidence of the timidity of prior Commanders in Chief. Nor do we think it is the accidental result of political conditions that just happened to make it expedient for all of these Executives to refrain from lodging such a constitutional objection. This consistent pattern of executive behavior is more accurately viewed as reflecting deeply rooted norms and understandings of how the Constitution structures conflict between the branches over war. In particular, this well-developed executive branch practice appears to be premised on the assumption that the constitutional plan requires the nation's chief commander to guard his supervisory powers over the military chain of command jealously, to be willing to act in times of exigency if Congress is not available for consultation, and to use the very powerful weapon of the veto to forestall unacceptable limits proposed in the midst of military conflict - but that otherwise, the Constitution compels the Commander in Chief to comply with legislative restrictions. In this way, the founding legal charter itself exhorts the President to justify controversial military judgments to a sympathetic but sometimes skeptical or demanding legislature and nation, not only for the sake of liberty, but also for effective and prudent conduct of military operations. Justice Jackson's famous instruction that "with all its defects, delays and inconveniences, men have discovered no technique for long preserving free government except that the Executive be under the law, and that the law be made by parliamentary deliberations" n12 continues to have a strong pull on the constitutional imagination. n13 What emerges from our analysis is how much pull it seemed to [\*950] have on the executive branch itself for most of our history of war powers development.

## AT: Pan

#### View the debate through a lens of specificity – rigid rejection of “China threat” gets warped into a new orthodoxy and fuels extremism. Recognizing plural interpretations and linkages is more productive.

Callahan 5 (William A., Professor of Politics – University of Manchester, “How to Understand China: The Dangers and Opportunities of Being a Rising Power”, Review of International Studies, 31)

Although ‘China threat theory’ is ascribed to the Cold War thinking of foreigners who suffer from an enemy deprivation syndrome, the use of containment as a response to threats in Chinese texts suggests that Chinese strategists are also seeking to fill the symbolic gap left by the collapse of the Soviet Union, which was the key threat to the PRC after 1960. Refutations of ‘China threat theory’ do not seek to deconstruct the discourse of ‘threat’ as part of critical security studies. Rather they are expressions of a geopolitical identity politics because they refute ‘Chinese’ threats as a way of facilitating the production of an America threat, a Japan threat, an India threat, and so on. Uniting to fight these foreign threats affirms China’s national identity. Unfortunately, by refuting China threat in this bellicose way – that is by generating a new series of threats – the China threat theory texts end up confirming the threat that they seek to deny: Japan, India and Southeast Asia are increasingly threatened by China’s protests of peace.43 Moreover, the estrangement produced and circulated in China threat theory is not just among nation-states. The recent shift in the focus of the discourse from security issues to more economic and cultural issues suggests that China is estranged from the ‘international standards’ of the ‘international community’. After a long process of difficult negotiations, China entered the WTO in December 2001. Joining the WTO was not just an economic or a political event; it was an issue of Chinese identity.44 As Breslin, Shih and Zha describe in their articles in this Forum, this process was painful for China as WTO membership subjects the PRC to binding rules that are not the product of Chinese diplomacy or culture. Thus although China enters international organisations like the WTO based on shared values and rules, China also needs to distinguish itself from the undifferentiated mass of the globalised world. Since 2002, a large proportion of the China threat theory articles have been published in economics, trade, investment, and general business journals – rather than in international politics, area studies and ideological journals as in the 1990s. Hence China threat theory is one way to differentiate China from these international standards, which critics see as neo-colonial.45 Another way is for China to assert ownership over international standards to affirm its national identity through participation in globalisation.46 Lastly, some China threat theory articles go beyond criticising the ignorance and bad intentions of the offending texts to conclude that those who promote China threat must be crazy: ‘There is a consensus within mainland academic circles that there is hardly any reasonable logic to explain the views and practices of the United States toward China in the past few years. It can only be summed up in a word: ‘‘Madness’’ ’.47 Indians likewise are said to suffer from a ‘China threat theory syndrome’.48 This brings us back to Foucault’s logic of ‘rationality’ being constructed through the exclusion of a range of activities that are labelled as ‘madness’. The rationality of the rise of China depends upon distinguishing it from the madness of those who question it. Like Joseph Nye’s concern that warnings of a China threat could become a self-fulfilling prophesy, China threat theory texts vigorously reproduce the dangers of the very threat they seek to deny. Rather than adding to the debate, they end up policing what Chinese and foreigners can rationally say. Conclusion The argument of this essay is not that China is a threat. Rather, it has examined the productive linkages that knit together the image of China as a peacefully rising power and the discourse of China as a threat to the economic and military stability of East Asia. It would be easy to join the chorus of those who denounce ‘China threat theory’ as the misguided product of the Blue Team, as do many in China and the West. But that would be a mistake, because depending on circumstances anything – from rising powers to civilian aircraft – can be interpreted as a threat. The purpose is not to argue that interpretations are false in relation to some reality (such as that China is fundamentally peaceful rather than war-like), but that it is necessary to unpack the political and historical context of each perception of threat. Indeed, ‘China threat’ has never described a unified American understanding of the PRC: it has always been one position among many in debates among academics, public intellectuals and policymakers. Rather than inflate extremist positions (in both the West and China) into irrefutable truth, it is more interesting to examine the debates that produced the threat/opportunity dynamic.

## 2AC Israel

#### Expansive self-defense regime enables Israel strike on Iran --- escalates and causes World War 3

Slager 12 (Katherine, J.D. Candidate 2013, University of North Carolina School of Law, “Legality, Legitimacy and Anticipatory Self-Defense: Considering an Israeli Preemptive Strike on Iran's Nuclear Program” Fall, 2012, 38 N.C.J. Int'l L. & Com. Reg. 267)

I. Introduction

World War III **is an event the world universally wishes to avoid**. n3 **Threats of preemptive strikes**, retaliations, **and nuclear weapons development bring speculation to the foreground about whether tensions today between Israel and Iran might result in an escalation of hostilities leading to a third World War**. n4 Iran has long professed hatred for the Jewish state, n5 and, according to the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), may be developing nuclear weapons. n6 Israeli leaders say that if necessary, they will preemptively strike Iran to prevent it from developing nuclear attack capability. n7

 [\*269] While a strike might forestall a nuclear Iran, at least for the time being, the international community may not view this preemptive measure as legal or legitimate. **Using force in** self-defense must be subject to clear boundaries **in order to prevent rampant violence**. While war is never desired, "a legal war is more human than an illegal war." n8 But the rules of using force must be generally known and accepted in order to be effective. n9 This comment attempts to clarify the field of international law regarding use of force in anticipatory self-defense, and recommends that clear standards be widely established to better guide both nations considering such use of force and the international community, which must respond to this use of force.

This comment assesses the legality of a potential Israeli preemptive strike against Iran's nuclear program. There is no recognized and accepted analytical framework to assess this legality. n10 Therefore, this comment employs two methods of analysis and considers them both: first, it will employ the time-tested analytical methodology of analogy by comparing the state of the current Israeli-Iran conflict to incidents of anticipatory self-defense. Second, it will apply an analytical framework, proposed by David A. Sadoff, that offers a clear, practicable standard to govern evaluation of anticipatory use of force. n11 Part I discusses [\*270] the backdrop of international law regarding the use of force in self-defense. Part II defines the terms used and discusses both the traditional and proposed analytical frameworks used to assess the legality of anticipatory acts of self-defense. Part III describes and analyzes generally recognized incidents of anticipatory self-defense. Part IV assesses the current situation between Israel and Iran using analogies to past incidents and Sadoff's proposed analytical framework. Part V concludes that while the traditional framework under customary international law would condemn an Israeli strike, a clearer standard encompassing legitimacy as well as legality would better guide the international community in evaluating anticipatory uses of force in the modern era. II. International Law and the Use of Force in Self-Defense Self-defense has been described as "nature's eldest law." n12 Today, this right to self-defense has been codified in Article 51 of the U.N. Charter. n13 In order to analyze the legality of an Israeli preemptive strike on Iran's nuclear program, it is first necessary to understand the state of international law concerning the use of force in preemptive or anticipatory self-defense. A. The Road to Modern International Law and the Use of Force Before aspiring to describe the modern intricacies of international law, it is helpful to first understand the origins of international law and regulation of the use of force between nations. Person to person, community to community, and state to state, the use of force is a salient aspect of humankind's history. n14 As one scholar puts it, "force has been a consistent feature of the global system since the beginning of time." n15 War has been so prevalent in human history that it has been considered a "perennial [\*271] fact of life ... tantamount to ... plague or flood or fire." n16 It would "appear every once in a while, leave death and devastation in its wake, and temporarily pass away to return at a later date." n17 Over time, the need to restrict and regulate wars between nations developed, and war assumed a "legal status." n18 The attempt to restrict is first characterized by the "just war-unjust war" dichotomy of Ancient Greece and Ancient Rome, n19 which classical jurists and scholars of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries advanced with their writings. n20 By the nineteenth century, however, this dichotomy was abandoned. n21 The accepted view of this period was that international law had nothing to do with attempting to distinguish just and unjust wars. n22 War was viewed as "a right inherent in sovereignty itself." n23 Through the nineteenth century, there was a widespread acceptance of a sovereign nation's right to go to war. n24 Perhaps in reaction to this widespread acceptance, bilateral treaties between nations began to arise at the end of the nineteenth century. n25 These treaties were formed to create contractual obligations between states to not go to war with each other. n26 Bilateral treaties eventually led to the creation of multilateral [\*272] treaties in an effort to "curtail somewhat the freedom of war in general international law." n27 After a few multilateral attempts to restrict inter-state use of force, n28 war finally became "illegal in principle" in 1928 with the General Treaty for Renunciation of War as an Instrument of National Policy (otherwise known as the Kellogg-Briand Pact). n29 Though flawed, the Kellogg-Briand Pact was a "watershed date in the history of the legal regulation of the use of inter-state force." n30 These early developments in establishing the illegality of war led to the Charter of the United Nations, signed in 1945 in San Francisco. n31 In response to the Second World War, the United Nations was created "to establish a universal international organization charged with the management of international conflict." n32 Delegates of forty-nine states were determined "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war." n33 To this end, Article 2(4) of the U.N. Charter proscribes both the use and threat of force. n34 Two major exceptions exist, however, to this general prohibition against use of force. n35 Nations may use force [\*273] if they are acting either in individual or collective self-defense or if force has been authorized by the U.N. Security Council. n36 B. Self-Defense Even before the creation of the U.N. Charter, self-defense has been historically recognized as an inherent right of both individuals and sovereign nations. n37 As one scholar notes, self-defense "has long been founded on the simple notion that every rational being ... must conclude that it is permissible to defend himself when his life is threatened with immediate danger." n38 In addition to an individual's right to self-defense, the right of nations to use force in self-defense has also traditionally been recognized. n39 The right of a nation to defend its sovereignty is "embedded" in the "fundamental right of states to survival." n40 This being the case, there is no dispute over the legality of a state defending itself against attacks on its sovereignty. n41 What remains unsettled in modern legal scholarship, however, is when a nation [\*274] may invoke this right. n42 Traditionally, self-defense may only be used when necessary to repel an "overt armed attack," and is impermissible as a form of retaliation. n43 The notion behind self-defense in anticipation of an armed attack, however, is that "states faced with a perceived immediate attack cannot be expected to await the attack like "sitting ducks' but should be allowed to take the appropriate measures for their defense." n44 1. Customary International Law Under customary international law, nations may use force in anticipatory self-defense in order to "thwart discernible impending attacks." n45 The established doctrine arises from an incident known as the "Caroline incident." n46 In 1837, the United States and Great Britain were at peace and Canada was under British colonial rule. n47 However, factions of Canadians were engaged in an "armed insurrection" against the British. n48 The Caroline, a privately-owned American steamship owned and operated by Americans, was used to transport men and supplies across the Niagara River to support the Canadian rebels. n49 On the night of December 29, 1837, British soldiers seized the Caroline while it was docked on the American side of the river, dragged the boat into the current, set it afire, and let it loose to drift over the Niagara Falls. n50 Two Americans were killed in the incident. n51 In response, a series of letters were exchanged between Henry [\*275] Fox, the British Minister in Washington, and the U.S. Secretary of State. n52 The British claimed that the destruction of the Caroline was justified as "necessity of self-defense and self-preservation." n53 The response of Secretary of State Daniel Webster has become immortalized as the factors necessary to justify an act of self-defense. n54 Webster stated that the act would not be justifiable unless the British could show: necessity of self-defence, instant, overwhelming, leaving no choice of means, and no moment of deliberation. It will be for it to [show], also, that the local authorities of Canada, even supposing the necessity of the moment authorized them to enter the territories of the United States at all, did nothing unreasonable or excessive; since the act, justified by the necessity of self-defence, must be limited by that necessity, and kept clearly within it. n55 This response has become known as the Caroline doctrine, and asserts that for a use of force in anticipatory self-defense to be justified, it must be necessary, proportionate, and in response to an imminent threat of armed attack where no other means of redress are available. n56 These factors have become generally accepted and incorporated into customary international law. n57 [\*276] 2. The U.N. Charter and Article 51 The Charter of the United Nations was adopted in 1945. n58 As discussed above, Article 2(4) of the Charter prohibits the use of force between nations, except in the case of two major exceptions. First, Article 51 articulates a nation's right to use force in self-defense. n59 Second, Chapter VII of the Charter allows the use of force "as may be necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security" under authorization of the U.N. Security Council. n60 This analysis focuses on Article 51, as it is "the focal point" in discussing the permissibility of self-defense. n61 Under Article 51 of the Charter, a nation has the right to use force in individual or collective self-defense. n62 The Article provides: Nothing in the present Charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defence if an armed attack occurs against a Member of the United Nations, until the Security Council has taken measures necessary to maintain international peace and security. Measures taken by Members in the exercise of this right of self-defence shall be immediately reported to the Security Council and shall not in any way affect the authority and responsibility of the Security Council under the present Charter to take at any time such action as it deems necessary in [\*277] order to maintain or restore international peace and security. n63 While "the right of self-defence pursuant to the U.N. Charter has its origins in customary international law," Article 51 appears to limit uses of force in self-defense only to situations where an "armed attack" has occurred. n64 As Professor Dinstein succinctly observes, this limitation presents a "material difference in the range of operation of the right [of self-defense] between these two sources [of international law]." n65 Many scholars have very divergent views on the implications of this difference. 3. The Debate The debate surrounding the legality of anticipatory defense in modern international law is extensive and seemingly unlimited. Scholars can generally be divided into two camps: restrictionist and expansionist. n66 First, however, it is necessary to clarify the terminology used in the debate on self-defense. n67 While a plethora of scholars seem to offer as many definitions and distinctions as there are authors, n68 this article will use the terminology as categorized by David Sadoff. n69 First, there are two general types of self-defense: reactive and non-reactive. n70 Reactive strikes occur "when a State responds to an attack after it [\*278] has occurred." n71 Non-reactive strikes, otherwise referred to as "defensive first strikes," occur "when a State takes military action before being hit." n72 Defensive first strikes can be further sub-divided into three categories: interceptive, anticipatory, and preemptive. n73 These three categories can be viewed as the rough points on a spectrum of "real or perceived timing of the threat posed by an aggressor State." n74 Interceptive self-defense encompasses the most immediate threats, while preemptive encompasses the least immediate. n75 Interceptive self-defense, as first articulated by Professor Dinstein, "takes place after the other side has committed itself to an armed attack in an ostensibly irrevocable way." n76 This refers to scenarios with the shortest amount of time between the self-defensive act and the perceived threat. n77 As Sir Humphrey Waldock describes, "where there is convincing evidence not merely of threats and potential danger but of an attack being actually mounted, then an armed attack may be said to have begun to occur, though it has not passed the frontier." n78 Dinstein asserts that not only is interceptive self-defense legitimate under customary international law, it is also legitimate under Article 51. n79 Anticipatory self-defense, by contrast, is "the use of force in [\*279] "anticipation' of an attack when a State has manifested its capability and intent to attack imminently." n80 The Caroline doctrine is generally considered to reflect assertions of anticipatory self-defense. n81 This refers to scenarios where an attack may be imminent but not yet underway. n82 The temporal definition of what constitutes "imminence" is not well-established or even well-articulated. n83 Many scholars assert that Article 51 of the U.N. Charter recognizes anticipatory self-defense through its preservation of states' "inherent right of ... self-defense." n84 Preemptive self-defense, which is used in this comment to encompass the concept of "preventive" self-defense, n85 refers to the use of force "to quell any possibility of future attack by another state, even where there is no reason to believe that an attack is planned and where no prior attack has occurred." n86 This scenario refers to defensive first strikes that are temporally the most removed from the perceived threat. n87 While the majority of [\*280] scholars reject the legality of preemptive self-defense under international law, n88 it has been argued that use of preemptive force may still be legitimate. n89 The restrictionist and expansivist schools of interpreting the legality of self-defense focus their debate on the "middle-ground" of defensive first-strikes, that of anticipatory self-defense. Professor Ronzitti aligns the two camps in terms of a geographical divergence. n90 The restrictionist camp is referred to as the "continental doctrine," while the expansivist doctrine is attributed to common law countries and Israel. n91 The question that divides the two camps is "whether the words "if an armed attack occurs' introduces ... a rigid test of legitimate self-defense." n92 The restrictionist camp asserts that "self-defense [can] lawfully be exercised only if the State is the object of an actual attack." n93 Under this view, "use of force under the Charter is expressly limited to situations where an armed attack has already commenced or occurred." n94 The restrictionist camp recognizes the right to use force in anticipatory self-defense under customary international law, but asserts that the adoption of the Charter in 1945 limited "the scope of that right." n95 As Professor Dinstein emphasizes, "the use of the phrase "armed attack' in Article 51 is [\*281] not inadvertent ... [it] is deliberately restrictive." n96 Dinstein concludes that "self-defence consistent with Article 51 implies resort to counter-force ... in reaction to the use of force by the other party." n97 By contrast, the expansivist camp asserts that "the right of self-defence can be exercised not only when the State has been the object of an armed attack but also when the attack is imminent." n98 Three reasons have been cited to support this theory. First, expansivists cite that the actual reading of "if an armed attack occurs" does not necessarily mean "after an armed attack has occurred." n99 Professor Waldock elaborates that this "goes beyond the necessary meaning of the words," and cites the French text: "dans un cas ou un Membre des Nations Unies est l'objet d'une agression armee." n100 Second, expansivists note that the Article 51's preservation of the "inherent right" of self-defense was "a comparatively late addition to the Charter, for most States initially assumed that "the right of self-defense was inherent in the proposals and did not need explicit mention in the Charter.'" n101 Lastly, and most persuasively, the expansivist camp notes that Article 51 preserves the "inherent right" of self-defense. n102 D. W. Bowettt remarks that "the reference to an "inherent' right suggests something of the philosophy of natural law." n103 Professor Dinstein himself points out that "the right of self-defence pursuant to the U.N. Charter has its origins in customary international law." n104 As customary international law permits an act of [\*282] anticipatory self-defence "when the threat of an armed attack is "imminent'," n105 it is therefore "not implausible to interpret article 51 as leaving unimpaired the right of self-defense as it existed prior to the Charter." n106 As Professor Shah articulates, "the intention of article 51 seems to be to make anticipatory self-defence a statutory right, not to limit it," n107 strongly evidenced by "the inclusion of the word "inherent' and the absence of any objection to it by states." n108 With such a dispute over the ambiguity of Article 51, many scholars would turn to the International Court of Justice (ICJ) for a judicial ruling on whether anticipatory self-defense is legal under Article 51. n109 Yet the ICJ has not ruled on the matter. In Nicaragua v. United States, n110 while the ICJ "based its decision on the norms of customary international law concerning self-defence as a sequel to an armed attack," the Court explicitly refrained from pronouncing a judgment on the legality of anticipatory self-defense. n111 Without a judicial pronouncement on the matter, [\*283] scholars will continue to battle over the legality of anticipatory self-defense. 4. The State of the Law and Implications Today, there is no accepted state of international law regarding the use of force as anticipatory self-defense against an imminent armed attack. n112 However, as numerous scholars have noted, the world has changed in many significant ways since the drafting of the U.N. Charter in 1945. n113 At that time, drafters were primarily concerned with "overt acts of conventional aggression." n114 Since 1945, however, most conflicts have been in the form of civil conflicts, covert actions, or acts of terrorism. n115 The "ever-present threat of the use of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction" is changing our traditional notions of warfare. n116 While nuclear weapons physically existed at the time the U.N. Charter was drafted, "the delegates at San Francisco knew nothing of the nature and effects of nuclear weapons" and thus "could not have addressed the threat, proliferation, and potential use of these weapons of mass destruction." n117 One delegate specifically referred to the Charter as a "pre-atomic age charter." n118 Many scholars of the expansivist view point out this seemingly obvious observation: "no state can be expected to await an initial attack which, in the present state of armaments, may well destroy the state's capacity for further resistance and so jeopardize its very existence." n119 The ICJ itself, in its advisory opinion in the Nuclear [\*284] Weapons Case, n120 recognizes the "right to resort to self-defence, in accordance with Article 51 of the Charter, when its survival is at stake." n121 It seems that there is room for a preemptive use of force under the U.N. Charter if and only if a state's very survival is at stake. Lastly, one could argue against even considering the legality of using preemptive force. n122 Abraham Sofaer notes that despite the "illegality" of using force for "preventive purposes," states have engaged in such force in over 100 instances since the signing of the U.N. Charter in 1945. n123 He argues that rather than being concerned over the legality of a preemptive use of force, states should be concerned over the legitimacy of such an act. n124 Sofaer advocates adopting a proposal from the 2004 report of the Secretary General's High-Level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change: n125 the U.N. Security Council should "adopt and systematically address a set of agreed guidelines, going directly not to whether force can legally be used but whether, as a matter of good conscience and good sense, it should be." n126 According to Sofaer, the benefits of "using legitimacy as a guide ... would allow states to take into account a broader range of considerations than current international law typically dictates." n127 [\*285] The state of the law concerning the legality of using force in preemptive or anticipatory self-defense is convoluted, to say the least. However, this does not mean that it is impossible to evaluate the legality of an Israel preemptive attack on the Iranian nuclear program. III. The Legality of Anticipatory Self-Defense and Preemptive Force Though the state of modern international law is unclear, there are many arguments to support the legality of using force in anticipatory self-defense. Under the Caroline doctrine of customary international law, n128 the traditional framework to evaluate use of force in anticipatory self-defense addresses three elements: necessity, proportionality, and imminence of a threat such that no other recourse is available. n129 Alternative frameworks have also been proposed to expand the customary Caroline framework. n130 Using both the traditional and alternative analytical frameworks to analyze several modern incidents where the use of anticipatory self-defense was evidenced or claimed, it is possible to evaluate the legality of a potential Israeli strike on Iran's nuclear reactor. A. Framework under Customary International Law Regardless of legality under strict interpretation of Article 51 of the U.N. Charter, n131 the Caroline-based elements of necessity, proportionality, and imminence must be fulfilled for an anticipatory use of force to be legal under customary international law. n132 While some commentators include imminence in their analysis of necessity, n133 most commentators include imminence as [\*286] a separate element. n134 1. Necessity and Proportionality The principles of necessity and proportionality are "part of the basic core of self-defence [upon which] all states agree." n135 The requirements of necessity and proportionality in self-defense are not expressly included in the U.N. Charter, but rather, are tenets of customary international law that have been reaffirmed by the ICJ in the Nicaragua case and in the ICJ's Advisory Opinion on the Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons. n136 As Gray succinctly describes, the "basic, uncontroversial principles" of necessity and proportionality are that self-defense "must not be retaliatory or punitive; the aim should be to halt and repel an attack." n137 Necessity and proportionality "constitute a minimum test" that is determinative of the legality of using force in self-defense. n138 Thus, if a nation's use of force is lacking in either necessity or proportionality, the use of force is not justified under the doctrine of self-defense, and may in fact be unlawfully retaliatory or punitive. n139 [\*287] Necessity, by itself, is not a controversial proposition. n140 States need to demonstrate that "such forceful action was necessary to defend itself against an impending attack." n141 However, applying necessity to a particular scenario "calls for assessments of intentions and conditions bearing upon the likelihood of attack." n142 The nature of necessity is that it is often interposed with the "imminence" factor. n143 One scholar explains the logical relation between necessity and legal use of force in self-defense by describing necessity to mean that "there must have been no other feasible means of dealing with a particular threat." n144 Notably, this means that "force should not be considered necessary until peaceful measures have been found wanting." n145 As this comment assesses a preemptive strike in defense of a potential nuclear attack, the element of necessity - as separate from an analysis of imminence - will primarily address whether "peaceful measures" are still available to Israel. Proportionality assesses the appropriateness of a nation's action in response to a perceived threat. n146 Thus, an ex ante analysis of proportionality is not immediately relevant when attempting to predict the legality of a future act of self-defense. However, as proportionality is an integral component to the legality of inter-state uses of force, understanding the role proportionality plays in lawful acts of anticipatory self-defense is still pertinent to this comment's analysis. The requirement of proportionality means that "acts done in self-defense must not exceed in manner or aim the necessity provoking them." n147 Another scholar notes that "a forcible response must be limited to removing that threat, and cannot extend beyond this defensive [\*288] objective to encompass the pursuit of broader offensive or strategic goals." n148 An act in self-defense that exceeds the bare minimum necessary to respond to the threat risks becoming a retaliatory act, and thus unlawful under customary international law. n149 Simply put, a nation's "counter-attack" must not amount to a reprisal for the purpose of revenge or as a penalty. n150 Proportionality is also relevant to the theoretical implications of anticipatory self-defense. In its pure form, proportionality dictates that "harm returned should not exceed harm received." n151 Inherent in this concept is that an attack as deterrence is actually at odds with this precept of proportionality, as the purpose of an attack meant to deter is that "the greater the disproportionality, the greater the chance of avoiding harm to either party by avoiding conflict altogether." n152 Thus, the element of proportionality serves as the essential limit on the acts that nations may engage in when using force in anticipatory self-defense. For the purposes of this comment's analysis, "necessity" is limited to assessing whether Israel has exhausted all available peaceful means n153 and "proportionality" is limited to exploring the limits of any acts Israel would be permitted to take in defending itself against a nuclear strike. 2. Imminence Imminence is "the most problematic variable of anticipatory self-defense ... that has no precise definition in international law." n154 However, the importance that imminence plays in the legitimacy of using force in anticipatory self-defense is clear. As one scholar recognizes: It is important that the right of self-defense should not freely [\*289] allow the use of force in anticipation of an attack or in response to a threat. At the same time, we must recognize that there may well be situations in which the imminence of an attack is so clear ... that defensive action is essential for self-preservation. n155 Illustrating its role in customary international law, the absence of imminence was indeed determinative when the International Military Tribunals at Nuremberg applied the Caroline test following World War II, rejecting Germany's proffered justification that their "invasion of Norway had been an act of anticipatory self-defense." n156 Today, however, the doctrinal debate surrounding the legality of states using force in anticipatory self-defense stems primarily from the varying definitions and meanings of "imminence." n157 Thus, imminence becomes the most essential factor to define when determining whether a use of force in self-defense is permissible, n158 and is therefore the primary question in analyzing whether Israel would be presently justified to strike Iran's nuclear program. The notion of imminence in customary international law reaches back to the Caroline incident. n159 Under the Caroline doctrine, "an attack must be apparent in certain terms, and the impending harm must be of such an immediate nature that instant armed force is the only way to ward off the blow." n160 This standard for imminence focuses on the temporal aspect and is strictly measured. n161 An imminent attack, strictly measured, is one that is "just about to occur or, in other words, when "an attack is in evidence.'" n162 Scholars have suggested that the imminence of an attack can rise to such urgency that use of force in anticipatory self-defense would fall within the stricture of Article 51. n163 [\*290] Many scholars are now arguing that a relevant measurement of imminence, however, should no longer be strictly temporal. n164 The strict requirement is out of touch with "the realities of modern military conditions." n165 The nature of imminence has been affected in two significant ways since the development of the Caroline doctrine. n166 First, the "gravity of the threat" has changed significantly. n167 Today we face nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction that have the capacity to destroy a nation before it ever has a chance to defend itself. n168 This is vastly different from the "cross-border raids conducted by men armed only with rifles" that were the predominant form of international uses of force at the time of the Caroline incident. n169 Second, the method of delivering an attack has changed. n170 With increased rapidity of an attack reaching its target once launched, it is now "far more difficult to determine the time scale within which a threat of attack ... would materialize." n171 Within this framework, Professor Greenwood asserts that in order to justify the existence of an "imminent threat," there must be sufficient evidence that "the threat of attack exists ... [requiring] evidence not only of the possession of weapons but also of an intention to use them." n172 Customary international law is, by its very nature, an important groundwork for establishing the bounds on inter-state actions. n173 Nevertheless, it has many shortcomings as a framework [\*291] to assess the legality of using force in self-defense. While strict interpretation of the U.N. Charter's restriction on using force in self-defense is often too restrictive, n174 customary international law suffers from being too vague to serve as a guide for state actors. n175 Additionally, it may be "out of sync" with the realities of a state's reasoning and behavior when facing threats to their very survival. n176 Thus, scholars began to look for, or propose, alternatives. B. Alternative Framework The scholarly landscape concerned with anticipatory self-defense is consumed with widespread disagreement, from expansivist-restrictionist doctrinal dichotomies n177 to inconsistent definitions of prevention, preemption, anticipatory self-defense, n178 and the very factors of necessity, proportionality and imminence n179 that are essential to this vast doctrinal theory of international law. However, there is one observation on which all scholars can perhaps agree: at present, the international arena does not have a practicable framework to consistently evaluate the legality or legitimacy of a nation's use of force in anticipatory self-defense. As a result, several scholars have proffered a variety of proposals to compensate for the vagueness of customary international law and the unrealistic restrictiveness of the U.N. Charter in assessing anticipatory self-defense. Though several proposals have been offered by numerous scholars, n180 this comment limits its [\*292] consideration to the framework proposed by David Sadoff, which focuses its proposal specifically to assessing use of force in anticipatory, rather than preventive, self-defense. 1. David Sadoff, "Striking a Sensible Balance" Sadoff proposes an alternative legal framework to assess the legality of "proactive defense," which encompasses interceptive, anticipatory and preemptive self-defense. n181 His analysis, while derived from customary international law, seeks to expand on this doctrine to produce a "clear, practicable legal standard to govern the use of first strikes." n182 The substantive components of the proposed framework include (1) properly gauging the threat, (2) exhausting peaceful alternatives, and (3) taking responsive action. n183 As the second and third components tend to follow the same considerations as under a traditional customary international law analysis, this comment describes only the first component in depth. In order to gauge the threat of attack, Sadoff proposes analyzing the (i) nature and scale, (ii) likelihood, and (iii) timing of the threat. n184 With a state gauging the threat of attack, Sadoff calls for establishing an evidentiary standard to "address[] the nature, quality, and reliability of a state's information about the underlying facts and circumstances that have led it to decide to act against a given threat." n185 He proposes that the evidentiary standard requires a state to show "with clear and compelling evidence the existence of a serious and urgent need with respect to [\*293] a given threat." n186 The first two prongs of a state's assessment using Sadoff's framework appear to go to the necessity element of the Caroline doctrine. When assessing the nature and scale of a potential attack, a state will need to consider (1) "the character and magnitude" of the threatened attack (including (a) the type of weapons the enemy may use, (b) the size of an army, or (c) whether it would be an invasion or an isolated attack); (2) whether or not there would be warning; (3) what the likely targets of an attack would be; and (4) what the impact of an attack would be on the state's capacity to defend itself. n187 In assessing the likelihood of an attack, Sadoff explains that a state would assess the probability of whether the attack would in fact occur if there were no "proactive defense" measures taken. n188 The analysis by the target state would be subjective, in that it considers the state-actor's perceptions of the "intent and capabilities of the presumed aggressor state." n189 The author recommends using an "operational assessment" of likelihood (e.g., when the attacking state's "decision to attack has become "effectively irrevocable'"), rather than a probability-based assessment (e.g., ""reasonable certainty' or "highly probable'"). n190 An operational-based standard would be a higher threshold than a probability-based standard, so that defensive actions are [\*294] appropriate when the question of attack is not if an attack will occur, but when - "the uncertainty lies in whether the attack will occur sooner rather than later." n191 Such a high threshold would surely satisfy the "necessity" prong of the Caroline doctrine. n192 An assessment of "timing" is an important consideration because it addresses the urgency of a potential defensive action. n193 This factor appears to go to the imminence prong of the Caroline doctrine. Sadoff advocates mandating a "last window of opportunity" approach in the timing analysis, meaning that a defensive action would be appropriate when "a present danger ... is known and ... [when] any additional delay in acting would "seriously compromise security.'" n194 He advocates this approach over requiring "temporal imminence" because "the underlying rationale of the imminence requirement is to ensure military action is truly necessary." n195 Sadoff brings a "realist" approach to the matter of assessing when using force in anticipatory self-defense would be appropriate. n196 He appropriately notes that the standards currently employed under customary international law and the Caroline doctrine are "too limited in scope to be of general use" and lack the details needed for utility purposes. n197 Furthermore, his suggested framework provides numerous questions and factors that would provide practical guidance to nations considering using [\*295] force in "proactive defense." n198 This guidance would also enable the international community to consistently evaluate the legitimacy of a nation's use of force. n199 As Sadoff remarks, this would enable third parties to "cast their military and diplomatic support accordingly behind the state whose conduct more closely conformed to international law." n200 2. Considering Legitimacy Legitimacy is vital to the success of any legal order. n201 In the present context, legitimacy refers to the "the anticipated reaction of the relevant international community to a State's decision to use force." n202 In 2004, the U.N. Secretary-General's High-Level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change n203 observed that "the effectiveness of the global collective security system ... depends ultimately not only on the legality of decisions but also on the common perception of their legitimacy." n204 The panel notes that if either "common global understanding" or "acceptance" of when use of force is both legal and legitimate is lacking, the result will be a weaker international legal order. n205 In realist terms, however, legitimacy and legality are often separate considerations. n206 An act that is considered legitimate [\*296] may not always be deemed legal, and an act that is legal may not always be considered legitimate. n207 Legitimacy differs from legality on several points. First, legitimacy is established by the "actual views and values of states and other relevant parties" rather than by the academic or professional opinions of international legal scholars on the meaning of the U.N. Charter. n208 Second, legitimacy differs from legality in that it is usually a "relative judgment, rather than a definitively positive or negative one." n209 The very nature of legitimacy is that it turns on numerous factors, rather than requiring that "certain standards be met" as with legality. n210 Third, an assessment of legitimacy should consider not only the views of other nation states, but the views of non-state entities such as international agencies, non-governmental groups, the press and the public. n211 The U.N. High-Level Panel, however, has demonstrated a recognition of the vital importance of legitimacy by citing five criteria that the Security Council should always address when deciding whether to authorize or endorse the use of force: (1) "seriousness of threat," (2) "proper purpose," (3) "last resort," (4) "proportional means," and (5) "balance of consequences." n212 For the first criterion, "seriousness of threat," the question to pose is, "Is the threatened harm to State or human security of a kind, and sufficiently clear and serious, to justify prima facie the use of military force?" n213 Inquiry regarding "proper purpose" begs the question "Is it clear that the primary purpose of the proposed military action is to halt or avert the threat in question?" n214 "Last resort" is relatively straight-forward, and asks whether "every non- [\*297] military option for meeting the threat in question [has] been explored, with reasonable grounds for believing that other measures will not succeed." n215 This criterion can be viewed as synonymous with an analysis of "necessity." n216 "Proportional means" predictably refers to proportionality: "Are the scale, duration and intensity of the proposed military action the minimum necessary to meet the threat in question?" n217 The final criterion recommended by the Panel, "balance of consequences," goes to the heart of the legitimacy inquiry. n218 The Panel illustrates this inquiry by posing whether "there [is] a reasonable chance of the military action being successful in meeting the threat in question, with the consequences of action not likely to be worse than the consequences of inaction." n219 This is essentially the age-old question, "Will the proposed action do more harm than good?" n220 Sofaer recommends that when answering this question, one "should go beyond the immediate, physical effects of a particular action and take into account the long-term, ethical consequences." n221 The Caroline doctrine has been a pillar in the development of customary international law's analysis of anticipatory self-defense. However, widespread debate on the relationship between this doctrine and Article 51 of the U.N. Charter has created a vague understanding of what constitutes the strict bounds of legality when using force in self-defense. While alternative frameworks effectively address the doctrinal weaknesses of the Caroline doctrine and customary international law, understanding [\*298] international reactions to past incidents of anticipatory self-defense is essential. Analysis of these incidents will illustrate the bounds of legality and legitimacy within the international community and provide insight on how an alternative framework would be applied to future incidents. IV. Anticipatory Self-Defense: Examples and Incidents Without a clear legal framework to guide an evaluation of using force in anticipatory self-defense, modern day incidents of "non-reactive force" used in anticipatory self-defense are crucial to answering two essential questions: First, are there instances in which the use of anticipatory self-defense would be recognized as legitimate, and secondly, where would the line be drawn to distinguish acceptable and unacceptable uses of force? Four examples of nations using force in anticipatory self-defense have been generally recognized and analyzed as such since the adoption of the U.N. Charter. n222 These examples shed light on the current acceptance or rejection of the doctrine of anticipatory self-defense and provide a baseline to examine whether the current situation between Israel and Iran might give rise to a legitimate use of anticipatory self-defense. A. 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis In 1962, the U.S.S.R. sent "over 100 shiploads of armaments" [\*299] to Cuba, which included numerous launch missile sites. n223 The United States responded by creating a naval quarantine around Cuba, so that all ships going to Cuba would be inspected and no ships with weapons would be allowed to pass through. n224 In the course of the quarantine, no ships tried to get around the quarantine, no ships were seized, and only one ship was boarded without incident. n225 One day after announcing the quarantine, the United States asked for and received regional support from the Organization of American States (OAS). n226 The United States did not seek to justify the act on the basis of Article 51. n227 Nor did the United States claim that the U.S.S.R.'s posturing with Cuba's cooperation was unlawful. n228 Instead, the United States relied on Article 52 to justify its actions, citing its use of "regional arrangements ... relating to the maintenance of international peace and security." n229 International reactions to the legality of the quarantine reflected "ideological lines," with Chile, China, France, Ireland, the United Kingdom, and Venezuela supporting the quarantine, and Ghana, Romania, the Soviet Union, and Egypt opposing it. n230 As this incident involved a non-reactive use of force, a brief Caroline analysis is relevant. n231 The element of necessity may have been present, as the gravity of the threat (proximity of nuclear missiles) was immense. n232 Nevertheless, all peaceful measures may not have been exhausted. The proportionality element seems to be met, in that almost no force was actually used. n233 Satisfying the imminence requirement is more difficult because it is not clear that using force was the only way "to ward [\*300] off the blow." n234 The possession of weapons and a clear intention to use them, at least as a threat against the United States, however, were clearly present. n235 Regarding the reaction of the international community, "very few [states] ... relied on a strict interpretation of Articles 2(4), 51, and 53." n236 Thus, even though this incident does not suggest either "clear acceptance or rejection" of anticipatory self-defense, it demonstrates that in 1962, states were not interpreting the U.N. Charter in a clearly "restrictive" way. n237 B. 1967 Six Day War n238 Scholars have described the Six Day War between Israel and Egypt as a "classic case of military preemption." n239 In 1967, tensions were rising between Israel and its Arab neighbors. n240 Leading up to the incident of June 5, 1967, five overt acts indicated that Egypt would launch an attack on Israel. n241 First, Egypt mobilized troops along Israel's Sinai border "to an unprecedented extent." n242 Second, Egypt began cementing ties with Jordan, Syria and Iraq. n243 Third, the Egyptian president ordered U.N. Emergency Force troops to leave Sinai, where they had been deployed as a buffer between Egypt and Israel. n244 Fourth, Egypt imposed a blockade of the Straits of Tiran, a waterway vital to Israeli shipping. n245 Lastly, the Egyptian [\*301] president proclaimed that in any war with Israel, Egypt's goal would be "the destruction of the Jewish state." n246 The final result of this buildup was that on June 5, Israel launched a "surprise" air attack on Egypt's forces that resulted in a "decisive victory" in a matter of days. n247 In the ensuing period, Israel first claimed that Egypt had made the first move. n248 Shortly thereafter, however, this argument lost weight and Israel made the alternative claim that the blockade represented an "act of war" and the deployments of troops appeared to be an imminent attack. n249 Thus, though Israel's attack on Egypt was an act of anticipatory self-defense in substance, Israel did not rely on this doctrine to justify its actions. n250 International reaction was generally supportive of Israel, though some states viewed the incident as an act of aggression by Israel. n251 Despite the fact that the "primary facts" demonstrated a clear example of anticipatory self-defense, n252 no state cited the principle [\*302] of anticipatory self-defense in its support. n253 In a Caroline analysis of this incident, necessity, proportionality and imminence all appear to be present. For the necessity requirement, Israel was facing the possibility of invasion, as evidenced by the amassing of the troops along its Sinai border. n254 The proportionality of the response also seems appropriate, as the duration of the armed engagement was only six days and the attack was limited to Egypt's military forces. n255 Furthermore, the mobilization of troops, the blockade, the removal of U.N. troops, and the accompanying threatening remarks by the Egyptian president all strongly indicate the imminence of an invasion. Though there was a lack of consensus in the international community regarding the legitimacy of anticipatory self-defense, Israel's actions were widely viewed as legitimate when the customary international law elements of necessity, proportionality and imminence were all present. n256 C. 1981 Israeli Attack on Osirak n257 Nuclear Reactor The Osirak incident has been described as an example of "preemptive" force. n258 In early 1981, Iraq was constructing a nuclear reactor near Baghdad, "code-named Osirak." n259 Israel viewed the Osirak reactor as "a threat to Israel's survival." n260 The type of reactor used and the type of fuel purchased could both be [\*303] used in weapons manufacture. n261 Additionally, Israel noticed that Iraq was buying more uranium than it would need for scientific research. n262 Iraqi leaders were expressing "vehement hostility" to Israel. n263 This last factor was augmented by the history of three wars between Israel and Iraq and the fact that Iraq continued to deny Israel's legal existence. n264 Lastly, the nature of the threat and Israel's vulnerability to an initial strike were factors in Israel's decision to act. n265 On June 7, 1981, Israel attacked and destroyed the Iraqi nuclear reactor. n266 Israel said it acted to "remove a nuclear threat to its existence." n267 To justify its actions, Israel claimed anticipatory self-defense. n268 Though citing scholars' expansive interpretation of Article 51, Israel was unable to cite any examples of state practice of anticipatory self-defense. n269 The U.N. Security Council, while not reaching a consensus on the matter of anticipatory self-defense, did unanimously condemn the act as a "clear violation" of the U.N. Charter and "the norms of international conduct." n270 Individual states had varied reactions to Israel's actions. Some states agreed with the doctrine of anticipatory defense, but condemned the incident for lack of imminence: there was no "instant and overwhelming need for self-defense." n271 Other states simply rejected the principle of anticipatory self-defense. n272 The United States condemned the incident, citing the fact that peaceful means were not pursued, given that the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) did not have evidence that the reactor would be used to develop [\*304] nuclear weapons. n273 Under a Caroline analysis, it can be argued that both necessity and proportionality were present. The possibility of nuclear armament and the state of hostilities between Israel and Iraq suggest there could have been a grave threat to Israel, satisfying the necessity prong of the Caroline doctrine. The action taken, a targeted destruction of the "threat" (the nuclear reactor), seems to meet the proportionality requirement. n274 Imminence, however, was clearly not present. n275 The threat to Israel had not been "of such an immediate nature that instant armed force [was] the only way to ward off the blow." n276 From this incident, we have a possible recognition of the principle of anticipatory self-defense, though it was not in fact viewed to be present here. n277 D. 2007 Israeli Attack on a Syrian Nuclear Facility In the early hours of September 6, 2007, Israeli jets launched an attack on an undisclosed target near Al-Kibar in north-eastern Syria. n278 While the Syrian government has never admitted it, the general consensus of the international community is that the target of the attack was a secret Syrian nuclear reactor, and that it was destroyed in the attack. n279 The first official intelligence report regarding the target was released by the United States in April 2008. n280 This report stated that there was evidence as early as spring 2007 that the Syrian target "was a nearly completed nuclear reactor intended to produce plutonium for a weapons programme." n281 The report also indicated that the complex was [\*305] "weeks and possibly months from operational capacity." n282 To support the intelligence conclusions of the United States, IAEA investigators did discover plutonium particles at the Al-Kibar site. n283 The IAEA all but officially concluded that the Al-Kibar site was a nuclear reactor when the IAEA Director General Yukiya Amono "explicitly confirmed" that the destroyed facility was "a nuclear reactor under construction." n284 Interestingly, Syria's immediate reaction to the attack was rather muted. On September 9, 2007, Syria registered an official complaint with the U.N. Security Council and General Assembly, asserting only that "Israel had committed a breach of the airspace of the Syrian Arab Republic." n285 The complaint also asserted that during the attack, Israel "dropped some munitions but without managing to cause any human casualties or material damage." n286 [\*306] More interestingly, the international reaction to the incident was also muted. Israel itself, while eventually admitting that they were responsible for the attack, n287 did not provide any legal justifications for the attack. n288 While the United States issued "tentative support" for the attack, no states other than Syria condemned the incident. n289 Professor Garwood-Gowers asserts that even under the customary international law doctrine of anticipatory self-defense, this attack on Syria is clearly unlawful under current international law by failing to meet the requirements of necessity and imminence. n290 Specifically, he cites Israel's failure to "exhaust peaceful means of resolving its concerns over Syria's nuclear intentions" through either the IAEA or the U.N. Security Council. n291 In analyzing this incident, Garwood-Gowers seeks to evaluate whether the state of modern international law regarding the use of preventive force has changed. n292 "If the international community's response ... indicates general acceptance of a new practice or interpretation, then it can be said that a change to customary international law has taken place." n293 Garwood-Gowers explains that any "significant opposition" would be enough to disrupt any [\*307] display of "general acceptance," indicating that international law remains unchanged. n294 He concludes that while there is still no "general acceptance" sufficient to mark a shift in international law, the incident does reflect a shift in state practice that "indicates a broader lack of concern over the legality of relatively minor uses of force." n295 The muted reaction by the international community may demonstrate that even though such an attack may be illegal under current international law, it may be that the international community does not view the incident as illegitimate. These incidents do not clearly demonstrate that using of force in anticipatory self-defense is definitively legal, or even legitimate, under modern international law. Yet they provide guidance as to what situations do and do not warrant use of non-reactive force in the eyes of this same international community. n296 The Six Day War strongly suggests that there are situations in which "non-reactive" uses of force would be widely seen as legitimate. n297 Overt preparations for attack, as in the Cuban Missile Crisis and the Six Day War, appear to warrant acts bordering on "unlawful" under the restrictive interpretation of Article 2(4)'s prohibition on the use of force. n298 These situations are thus more likely to warrant acceptance of using force in anticipatory self-defense. Nevertheless, overt hostility with the mere possibility of nuclear weapon development, such as in the Osirak incident, n299 does not appear to automatically warrant the use of force. These various incidents thus provide real world examples of what the international community would consider necessary, proportionate, and imminent. The most controversial element seems to be imminence. These incidents provide the baseline to which the three prongs of the Caroline doctrine can be applied in evaluating whether the present conflict between Israel and Iran constitutes such imminence as would justify a preemptive strike. [\*308] V. Today: Israel and Iran A. History While it may be hard to believe in today's era of hostility and threat, history reveals that Israel and Iran have not always been enemies. In World War II, Iranian diplomats helped save "thousands of Jews" from the Holocaust. n300 Iran was one of the first Muslim nations to establish economic and trade ties with Israel. n301 Indeed, Iran has a long history of "Jews [being] welcome members of Iranian society." n302 The two states were allies for a period spanning almost three decades, united by the common "enemy" of Sunni Arabs. n303 The friendly economic ties between the two nations changed in 1979 with Iran's Islamic Revolution. n304 The Ayatollah that ousted the Shah in the revolution preached strong anti-Israeli rhetoric, setting the stage for the severe decline of Iran-Israel relations in modern Iran. n305 This history of cooperation is a far cry from today's state of affairs, where Iran proclaims a strong anti-Israeli stance. Iran's support of Hamas and Hezbollah, two militant groups that seek the destruction of Israel, exemplifies the current view of Iran towards Israel and has often been cited by Israel in their reasons to need to take defensive measures against Iran. n306 B. Current Events For Iran to be a threat to Israel, it has to have both the capability to attack Israel with nuclear weapons and the intention to do so. n307

 [\*309]

1. Capability: Iran's Nuclear Development

Towards the end of 2011 and into the early part of 2012, world tensions concerning Iran's nuclear program mounted quite dramatically. n308 Iran's nuclear program has been a controversial issue since the program's "re-birth" in the 1990s. n309 Though Iran is a signatory to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, n310 members of the international community have long been suspicious of the purposes underlying Iran's clandestine nuclear research. n311 Many worry that Iran is seeking to develop nuclear weapons. n312 Yet Iran has consistently asserted that its nuclear program is purely for peaceful purposes. n313

The most recent round of mounting tensions was marked by a November 2011 IAEA report n314 indicating Iran may be "carrying out activities relevant to the development of a nuclear device." n315 The report was "the harshest judgment that United Nations weapons inspectors had ever issued" against Iran's program. n316 It reports that Iran is employing a variety of "research, development and testing activities ... that would be useful in designing a nuclear weapon." n317 It does not, however, provide an estimate on [\*310] how long it will be before Iran develops nuclear weapons. n318 Yet should Iran enrich its uranium to 90%, it would have enough enriched uranium for four nuclear weapons. n319 A separate report estimates that Iran could develop nuclear weapons in sixty-two days or less. n320

Following the release of the November IAEA report, the United States and Europe began a series of economic sanctions intending to derail Iran's nuclear development. n321 The sanctions target both Iran's access to foreign banks and financial institutions, as well as companies involved in Iran's nuclear, oil, and petrochemical industries. n322 These sanctions appear to have an effect on Iran's economy. n323 Iranian leaders, in response to the strains on the economy resulting from the sanctions, have been making public statements encouraging "Iranian self-reliance and resentment toward the West." n324 Iran also threatened to close the Strait of Hormuz, "a vital artery for transporting about one-fifth of the world's oil supply." n325 Some commentators believe that these "aggressive gestures" may demonstrate that Iranian leaders are responding "frantically, and with increasing unpredictability" to the sanctions. n326

In February 2012, the IAEA released another report. n327 This [\*311] report indicates Iran may not be cooperating sufficiently with IAEA, as Iran refused to grant the IAEA inspectors access to one of their nuclear sites and dismissed IAEA's November concerns because "Iran considered them to be based on unfounded allegations." n328 Most significantly, however, the report shows a dramatic increase in Iran's production of enriched uranium: a nearly 50% increase in Iran's stockpile since the IAEA's November report. n329 Iran already has enough enriched uranium to build four nuclear weapons, should it attempt to build them. n330 The report concludes by stating that the IAEA "is unable ... to conclude that all nuclear material in Iran is in peaceful activities" and "continues to have serious concerns regarding possible military dimensions to Iran's nuclear programme." n331

The summer of **2012 saw an increase in concerns over the volatility of the Israel-Iran situation**. An August 2012 IAEA report revealed that Iran has indeed completed installation of three-quarters of the centrifuges it would need to develop "nuclear fuel" in a deep underground site. n332 Further, Iran has "cleansed" a site that IAEA inspectors suspect was used to conduct "explosive experiments that could be relevant to the production of a nuclear weapon" - such a cleanup impedes the ability of IAEA inspectors to determine what work exactly had been conducted at the site. n333 These IAEA concerns have culminated in an official IAEA resolution, passed on September 13, 2012, that rebukes Iran for the continued development of its nuclear program. n334 The jump in enriched uranium production, coupled with Iran's [\*312] lack of transparency, quite rightly exacerbates international concern about "Iran's march toward nuclear-weapons capability." n335 2. Intention: Iran-Israel Tensions For almost twenty years, **Israel has asserted that Iran poses** an "existential threat" **to Israel**. n336 In 2005, President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, at a conference entitled "The World without Zionism," made the following statement: Our dear Imam [Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini] said that the occupying regime must be wiped off the map and this was a very wise statement. We cannot compromise over the issue of Palestine. Is it possible to create a new front in the heart of an old front. This would be a defeat and whoever accepts the legitimacy of [Israel] has in fact, signed the defeat of the Islamic world. n337 It should be noted, however, that shortly after this speech was posted, it was removed from its original website and Iran's foreign ministry "insisted [Iran] had no intention of attacking Israel." n338 Yet the President himself insisted that his remarks were "just." n339 Ayatollah Khomeini, Iran's supreme religious leader, referred to Israel as a "cancerous tumor." n340 One scholar noted in 1996 that "Israel faces serious and unprecedented danger from Iran" stemming from "that revolutionary Islamic regime's ... unalterable commitment to destruction of the Jewish State." n341 **In Israel, top officials are openly considering** conducting **a** [\*313] preemptive strike **on Iran's nuclear program**. n342 In early November, Israel simulated a "mass-casualty attack," which prompted speculations that Israel was simulating an attack on Iran. n343 In the past, Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin **Netanyahu has asserted** that if the United States does not prevent Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons, "**Israel may be forced to attack Iran's nuclear facilities itself**." n344 More recently, Prime Minister Netanyahu and Ehud Barak, Israel's defense minister, have publicly supported an Israeli preemptive strike against Iran's nuclear program. n345 Barak has outlined three questions that Israel would have to answer in the affirmative to order to preemptively strike Iran: 1. Does Israel have the ability to cause severe damage to Iran's nuclear sites and bring about a major delay in the Iranian nuclear project? And can the military and the Israeli people withstand the inevitable counterattack? 2. Does Israel have overt or tacit support, particularly from America, for carrying out an attack? 3. Have all other possibilities for the containment of Iran's nuclear threat been exhausted, bringing Israel to the point of last resort? If so, is this the last opportunity for an attack? n346 [\*314] While Israeli leaders assert that there is no deadline to make the final decision of whether to strike and assure the public that such a decision is not imminent, Barak warned in January 2012 that "no more than one year remains to stop Iran from obtaining nuclear weaponry." n347 If Israel is to conduct a preemptive strike to take out Iran's nuclear program, they must do so before "Iran's accumulated know-how, raw materials, experience and equipment ... will be such that an attack could not derail the nuclear project." n348 This point in the Iranian nuclear program, when the program enters its "immunity zone," may be reached as early as the fall of 2012. n349 In response to these threats of preemptive strike, **Iran has in turn made threats of its own**. n350 The day after the IAEA released its February report, which indicated extensive developments in Iran's nuclear program, n351 Iran stated that any Israeli attacks on Iranian nuclear installations "will undoubtedly lead to the collapse of the [Zionist] regime." n352 **Iran has threatened retaliation through its long-range missile program**. n353 In November, **Iran also asserted it would attack NATO bases in Turkey if either Israel or the U**nited **S**tates **launched an attack against Iran**. n354 Overall, it appears that Iran does not presently have the capability to employ nuclear weapons, but the prospect of attaining this capability is growing increasingly - and worryingly - likely. Iran's intention to use these weapons against Israel is not definite or transparent, but it is still a possibility. n355 Strikingly, **the clearest Iranian threats against Israel are** seen primarily **in the context of warning Israel of the possibility of** [\*315] **retaliation against an Israeli preemptive strike**. n356 It is in this convoluted history of threat-and-reaction that it is necessary to anticipate whether an Israeli preemptive strike on Iran's nuclear program would be legal or legitimate under modern international law.

C. Analysis

Under a restrictive interpretation of the U.N. Charter, Israel would not be justified in attacking Iran's nuclear program because Iran has not yet conducted an "armed attack." n357 Yet most authorities agree that Israel would be justified in a preemptive strike against Iran if the imminence of an Iranian attack were "clear." n358 An analysis under customary international law's Caroline doctrine provides the foundation to determine whether the possibility of an Iranian nuclear attack on Israel is sufficiently imminent to justify an Israeli preemptive strike. However, as discussed in Part II.A, the present analytical framework under customary international law is vague and difficult to apply. n359 To supplement the traditional Caroline analysis, this comment will also apply the analytical framework proposed by David Sadoff, which offers clear factors to guide an analysis of whether an Israeli preemptive strike would be acceptable under modern international law. n360

1. Customary International Law

The Caroline doctrine, which underlies the customary international law analysis of anticipatory self-defense, has three prongs: necessity, proportionality, and imminence. n361 Assessing the necessity and proportionality prongs of the Caroline doctrine is straightforward for the purposes of this comment. Necessity requires that an action be "necessary to defend ... against an impending attack" and occur only after peaceful measures have [\*316] been exhausted. n362 Successfully defending against a nuclear attack requires, by its very nature, a preemptive strike because an attack would decimate a nation instantly. n363 In addition, it might be argued that peaceful measures have been exhausted if Iran continues its present course of action: non-cooperation with U.N. inspectors and apparent development of nuclear weapons, in contravention of the Non-Proliferation Treaty n364 and in spite of the international pressure of multilateral economic sanctions. Thus, for the purposes of this comment, a preemptive strike to deter the threat of nuclear attack would meet the "necessity" requirement of the Caroline doctrine.

Proportionality requires that action should not exceed what is minimally necessary to respond to a threat. n365 It would be in Israel's diplomatic interests to respond with only the minimum required to avert the threat of nuclear attack. A preemptive strike that neutralizes Iran's nuclear program and does not exceed the immediate threat to Israel to pursue "broader offensive or strategic goals" would satisfy the requirement of proportionality. n366

With the assumption that an Israeli preemptive strike would meet both the necessity and proportionality prongs of a customary international law analysis, this comment focuses on whether the threat posed by Iran is sufficiently imminent to allow an Israeli preemptive strike. As imminence is implicitly fact-based, this comment will compare the present situation to the two incidents that provide the most guidance on whether an act of anticipatory self-defense is justified: the 1967 Six Day War, in which Israel was considered justified in its defensive actions, n367 and the 1981 Israeli attack on Osirak, which was uniformly condemned. n368

As discussed in Part III.B, several threats were present in the [\*317] period leading up to the Six Day War that support the conclusion that the threat of an Egyptian armed attack on Israel was "imminent:" (1) Egypt's troops were mobilized at Israel's border, (2) Egypt was forming military ties with Israel's enemies, (3) Egypt ordered the removal of the U.N. troops who were present for conflict-diffusing purposes, (4) Egypt invoked a blockade on Israel's trade, and (5) the leader of Egypt proclaimed a goal of "destroying" Israel. As Israel's strike on Egypt's troops was generally considered to be legitimate by the international community, it is these factors, taken together, that seem to meet the "imminence" requirement of customary international law.

Israel, taken in the light most favorable to an argument for legitimacy, may face two of these Six Day War factors in the present situation with Iran. First, it is widely reported that Iranian leaders believe that Israel should be "wiped off the map." n369 This is somewhat similar to the threats by Egypt's leader that preceded the Six Day War. n370 However, other than a few well-publicized statements from public leaders, there does not appear to be any further corroborations of an intention to attack Israel. n371

Developing nuclear weapons, because of their first-strike capabilities, may be tantamount to a mobilization of troops. With nuclear capability, Iran would be able to attack Israel as swiftly as if it had a legion of troops on Israel's border. However, the mobilization of troops in the Six Day War was a threat that was unique to Israel, due to the geographical nature of the region. n372 Comparatively, there is no strong tie between Iran's nuclear program and Israel that would indicate that such a "mobilization," if it were to be considered such, would be specifically targeting Israel. The only tie that could conceivably serve as such a link is Iran's professed hatred of the Jewish state. n373 However, the remaining three factors from the Six Day War - developing [\*318] regional military ties, a blockade, and the removal of U.N. troops - are not present. The absence of these factors indicates that the threat currently posed by Iran only moderately resembles the threat posed by Egypt preceding the Six Day War.

The present situation between Israel and Iran more closely resembles Israel's attack on the Osirak reactor in 1981, which was widely regarded as an unacceptable use of force under customary international law. n374 Several factors that were considered to be insufficient to justify an act of anticipatory self-defense are present here: the development of nuclear weapons and the attendant risk of a nuclear first strike; IAEA reports indicating that Iran's nuclear program are quite possibly directed towards the development of nuclear weapons; and a high production of enriched uranium that could be intended for use in nuclear weapons. n375 However, the IAEA reports and the vast quantities of enriched uranium indicate that there may an even stronger argument for an "imminent attack" by Iran today.

The presence of these factors, without more, does not rise to the "imminence" seen in the Six Day War. First, two factors articulated by Professor Greenwood are not definitively present: n376 possession of weapons and an intention to use these weapons. The IAEA has not reported that Iran actually has, or will soon have, nuclear weapons; it merely suggests that there may be military dimensions to the nuclear program. n377 Second, though it seems clear that Iranian leaders would prefer that Israel not exist, this does not necessarily equate to an "intention" to use nuclear weapons - should they come into Iran's possession - against the Israeli state.

While Israel may have a stronger argument for imminence today than it did in 1981, the present situation bears much stronger resemblance to the 1981 Osirak incident, where imminence was clearly not found, than to the 1967 Six Day War. As the Iranian threat against Israel does not rise to the imminence required by the Caroline doctrine, an Israeli preemptive strike against Iran would not be legal under customary international law.

 [\*319]

2. Sadoff's Framework

The analytical framework proposed by David Sadoff offers an analysis of anticipatory self-defense that is significanltly less vague than analysis available under customary international law. The first component of Sadoff's framework, properly gauging the threat, is precisely the task undertaken by this comment. Sadoff's framework breaks down this component in a way that reflects and clarifies the "imminence" analysis of the Caroline doctrine. This framework analyzes the factors of (a) the nature and scale, (b) the likelihood, and (c) the timing of the threat to determine whether a threat would be sufficiently imminent to justify an act of anticipatory self-defense. n378

First, assessing the nature and scale of an Iranian nuclear attack is fairly straightforward. Israel fears facing the threat of "first strike" nuclear attack, which would leave little or no time for Israel to respond defensively once launched. n379 Israel would likely receive little to no warning of a nuclear launch. Such an attack could decimate the entirety of the Israeli state. The nature and scale of the threat is likely the gravest threat imaginable.

The "likelihood" of the attack, however, is much more ambiguous. First, the statements by Iranian leaders that demonstrate a desire to see Israel "wiped off the map," n380 though troubling, do not seem to effectively constitute a "public expression" of a "will to attack." n381 The intent of the attacker here is couched in public rhetoric. Though there are strong ideological tensions embodied in Israeli-Arab conflict that engulf the entirety of the Middle East. n382 There is little doubt that Iranian leaders would be happy to have a world without the Israeli state, this does not indicate a clear intention to launch an attack. Second, Iran does not presently have the capacity to mount the attack. n383 Though Iran is possibly on the path to achieving this capacity, n384 it [\*320] is not synonymous with being on the path to actually using nuclear weapons against Israel. There does not seem to be any certainty that a nuclear attack on Israel will occur. Thus, the present situation is not a matter of when, but of if. n385 Third, Sadoff's framework considers the international community's reaction to a nuclear attack on Israel. n386 Such a reaction would be extremely condemnatory, and would likely deter such an attack. Though Iran expresses strong anti-Israel sentiments, it has not outwardly expressed any intention to attack and does not presently have the capacity to attack.

The third factor in gauging the threat, timing, is interspersed with the likelihood factor. Sadoff suggests similar questions for the assessment of these two components. n387 This seems appropriate. If an attack is not very likely to occur, then it is moot to consider whether the timing of an attack is sufficiently immediate to justify a pre-emptive strike.

3. Considerations

Under the analyses of both the customary international law and Sadoff's frameworks, an Israeli preemptive strike on Iran would be neither legitimate nor legal. The legality afforded by the Caroline doctrine is restricted to situations where the threat of attack is imminent and the use of force employed to defend is necessary and proportionate to the threat posed. n388 Though a threat of nuclear attack would be very serious, such a threat from Iran is not presently imminent. Yet if a nuclear threat were to become "imminent" under the Caroline doctrine or "likely" under the Sadoff framework, using preemptive force to deter an attack would be justified.

Also significant to the Caroline doctrine's approach is that there are more options available to Israel than just using force. First, Israel has the option of appealing to the U.N. Security [\*321] Council, which may authorize the preemptive use of force through its Chapter VII authority. n389 Second, **the use of diplomatic pressure and international sanctions by Israel's allies** n390 **has not been exhausted, and may yet** prove successful **in subduing Iran as a nuclear threat**. **The evidence that the economic sanctions are having an effect on Ira**n, though sparking worry in some due to concerns the leaders may be acting more erratically, n391 **is actually a strong indicator that** alternatives to using force are working. VI. Conclusion There are several problems in the traditional customary international law framework of analyzing necessity, proportionality, and imminence to evaluate uses of force in anticipatory self-defense. First, the rules that govern use of force must be generally known. n392 The expansivist-restrictionist doctrinal debate concerning the strict legality of anticipatory self-defense under Article 51 creates ambiguity inunderstandings of the law. This ambiguity **undermines the ability of the international community to reach consensus in condemning or endorsing uses of force in anticipation of an armed attack**. Yet the solution cannot be found in choosing one side over the other. On one hand, adopting the restrictivist approach to Article 51 of the U.N. Charter and precluding the legality of using force in any instance not first preceded by an "armed attack" would leave nations vulnerable to first strikes that threaten state survival. n393 On the other hand, **adopting** the expansivist approach can leave too much room for using force in self-defense **where there is no actual imminence of a threatened attack**. n394

 [\*322] Second, the rules that govern use of force must be generally accepted. The current legal framework is unsuited to the realities of modern warfare, where weapons of mass destruction carry first-strike capabilities that leave no opportunity for self-defense. Modern international law must have the flexibility to recognize the right of a state to use preemptive force when it is the only defense available against an attack threatening the state's very existence. Without this flexibility, the legal order loses legitimacy. Without general acceptance of the laws that should bind, these laws lose their normative and prescriptive value. n395

Expansive overhaul of the modern international legal order is not the solution. Customary international law is established by the general practices of states, which in turn generates a collective sense of legal obligation. n396 If changes to modern international law occur too quickly and in too high a degree, it will be even more difficult for laws to be generally known. Another risk is that any large overhaul may favor the large, powerful states at the expense of states with less influence. n397 The solution should be incremental changes to the existing legal framework. This would allow the law to retain its normative value that would favor all states as equal entities under the law. Incremental changes would also allow the law to develop at a pace with which international consensus can keep up.

Incorporating legitimacy into modern international law is a priority. Legitimacy ensures the general acceptance necessary to sustain a legal order. The criteria suggested by the U.N. High-Level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change is a good starting point. n398 The Panel encourages the U.N. Security Council to address these criteria when deciding whether to authorize or endorse the use of military force in anticipatory self-defense. n399 However, the U.N. should affirmatively endorse consideration of these criteria to member-states and to intergovernmental [\*323] organizations charged with moderating international use of force. n400 In addition, modern law should formally incorporate consideration of the normative views of both state actors and non-state actors, including the nongovernmental organizations and the press.

Furthermore, the international community needs predictability and transparency in modern international law to assure legitimacy. A clear, practicable framework for the evaluation of uses of force must be adopted. The framework proposed by David Sadoff would be a good candidate. His proposal incorporates the traditional Caroline model of analysis while also including a mode of assessment of modern day considerations, such as nuclear threats. n401 The framework lists numerous factors to consider when gauging the severity of a threat. Factors such as these will help create a clear method to evaluate use of force, which will result in predictability and transparency in future evaluations.

Under both traditional and alternative analyses, Israel would not be **presently justified** to preemptively strike Iran's nuclear program. Under the customary international law analysis, Israel would not be justified because the threat is not yet imminent: Iran has not demonstrated a clear intent to attack Israel and does not yet have the capability to carry out a nuclear attack. Under Sadoff's proposed framework, Israel would not be justified for many of the same reasons: there is not a sufficient likelihood that an attack would occur. There is room**, however,** for Israel to justify a preemptive strike **under the "preventive" self-defense approach, in which a preemptive strike may occur though the threat is more temporally removed.** n402 This demonstrates the danger inherent in adopting such an approach, which discounts the importance of anticipatory force being used only as a "last resort." An approach that strays too far from existing modern law norms runs the risk of endorsing actions that would be widely viewed as illegitimate. n403 [\*324] An additional consideration is that under a legitimacy argument, the danger that a nuclear Iran poses to global peace and security may be enough to justify a preemptive strike in order to ensure global security. Many nations have indeed spoken out against Iran's development of nuclear weapons. By several accounts, a nuclear-capable Iran would be a serious threat to the entire Middle East region and the world. n404 For example, Algerian ministers claim that once Iran achieves nuclear capability, they will share the technology with "its fellow Muslim nations." n405 **However**, this danger should not be addressed by the unilateral assessment of a paternalistic nation, such as the United States. If the threat Iran poses to global security warrants a preemptive strike, then multilateral action by the U.N. Security Council should be taken. n406 In conclusion, though it is tempting to simply "rewrite the rules" to adapt the traditional international laws to address modern day threats, **doing so would disrupt the international legal order.** **Deficiencies in the modern legal framework should be addressed** incrementally, **with** a priority given to **incorporating legitimacy and creating clear, practicable standards to evaluate use of force in anticipatory self-defense**. Such a framework would clarify the [\*325] present illegitimacy and illegality of an Israeli strike on Iran's nuclear program. Wide recognition of the illegitimacy of a strike would lead to international condemnation, thus foiling the trigger that would lead the world into World War III.

## Terror

Conflation makes terror attacks inevitable

Geoffrey Corn, South Texas College of Law, 6/2/13, Corn Comments on the Costs of Shifting to a Pure Self-Defense Model, www.lawfareblog.com/2013/06/corn-comments-on-the-prospect-of-a-shift-to-a-pure-self-defense-model/

The President’s speech – like prior statements of other administration officials – certainly suggests that the inherent right of self-defense is defining the permissible scope of kinetic attacks against terrorists. I wonder, however, if this is more rhetoric than reality? I think only time will tell whether actual operational practice confirms that “we are using force within boundaries that will be no different postwar”. More significantly, if practice does confirm this de facto abandonment of AUMF targeting authority, I believe it will result in a loss of the type of operational and tactical flexibility that has been, according to the President, decisive in the degradation of al Qaeda to date. The inherent right of self-defense is undoubtedly a critical source of authority to disable imminent threats to the nation, but it simply fails to provide the scope of legal authority to employ military force against the al Qaeda (and associated force) threat that will provide an analogous decisive effect in the future.

It strikes me (no pun intended) that arguments – or policy choices – in favor of abandoning the armed conflict model because the inherent right of self-defense will provide sufficient counter-terrorism response authority may not fully consider the operational impact of such a shift. From an operational perspective, the scope of authority to employ military force against the al Qaeda belligerent threat pursuant to the inherent right of self-defense is in no way analogous to the authority to do so within an armed conflict framework. This seems especially significant in relation to counter-terror operations. According to the President, the strategic vision for the “next generation” counter-terror military operations is not a “boundless ‘global war on terror’ – but rather a series of persistent, targeted efforts to dismantle specific networks of violent extremists that threaten America.”

Relying exclusively on the inherent right of self-defense would, I suggest, potentially undermine implementing this strategic vision. It seems to me that disruption, and not necessarily destruction, is the logical operational “effect” commanders routinely seek to achieve to implement this strategy. Destruction, when feasible, would obviously contribute to this strategy. It is, however, doubtful that a group like al Qaeda and its affiliates can be completely destroyed – at least to the point that they are brought into complete submission – through the use of military power. Instead, military force can effectively be used to disrupt this opponent, thereby seizing and retaining the initiative and keeping the opponent off balance. Indeed, President Obama signaled the benefit of using military force to achieve this effect when he noted that al Qaeda’s “remaining operatives spend more time thinking about their own safety than plotting against us. They did not direct the attacks in Benghazi or Boston. They have not carried out a successful attack on our homeland since 9/11.”

A key advantage of the armed conflict framework is that it provides the legal maneuver space to employ military force in a manner that will effectively produce this disruptive and degrading effect. In contrast, under a pure self-defense framework, use of military force directed against such networks would necessarily require a determination of imminent threat of attack against the nation. Unlike the armed conflict model, this would arguably make conducting operations to “disrupt” terrorist networks more difficult to justify. I believe this is borne out by the reference to the pre-9/11 self-defense model. While it is true that military force was periodically employed as an act of self-defense during this era, such use seems to have been quite limited and only in response to attacks that already occurred, or at best were imminent in a restrictive interpretation of that term. In short, the range of legally permissible options to use military power to achieve this disruptive effect is inevitably broader in the context of an existing armed conflict than in isolated self-defense actions.

It may, of course, be possible to adopt an interpretation of imminence expansive enough to facilitate the range of operational flexibility needed to achieve this disruptive effect against al Qaeda networks. But this would just shift the legality debate from the legitimacy of continuing an armed conflict model to the legitimacy of the imminence interpretation. Even this would not, however, provide analogous authority to address the al Qaeda belligerent threat. Even if an expanded definition of imminence undergirded a pure self-defense model, it would inevitably result in hesitancy to employ force to disrupt, as opposed to disable, terrorist threats, because of concerns of perceived overreach.

It may be that a shift to this use of force framework is not only inevitable, but likely to come sooner than later. It may also be that such a shift might produce positive second and third order effects, such as improving the perception of legitimacy and mitigating the perception of a boundless war. It will not be without cost, and it is not self-evident that the scope of attack authority will be functionally analogous to that provided by the armed conflict model. Policy may in fact routinely limit the exercise of authority under this model today, but once the legal box is constricted, operationally flexibility will inevitably be degraded. It is for this reason that I believe the administration is unlikely to be too quick to abandon reliance on the AUMF.

Extinction

Hellman 8 (Martin E. Hellman, emeritus prof of engineering @ Stanford, “Risk Analysis of Nuclear Deterrence” SPRING 2008 THE BENT OF TAU BETA PI, <http://www.nuclearrisk.org/paper.pdf>)

The threat of nuclear terrorism looms much larger in the public’s mind than the threat of a full-scale nuclear war, yet this article focuses primarily on the latter. An explanation is therefore in order before proceeding. A terrorist attack involving a nuclear weapon would be a catastrophe of immense proportions: “A 10-kiloton bomb detonated at Grand Central Station on a typical work day would likely kill some half a million people, and inflict over a trillion dollars in direct economic damage. America and its way of life would be changed forever.” [Bunn 2003, pages viii-ix]. The likelihood of such an attack is also significant. Former Secretary of Defense William Perry has estimated the chance of a nuclear terrorist incident within the next decade to be roughly 50 percent [Bunn 2007, page 15]. David Albright, a former weapons inspector in Iraq, estimates those odds at less than one percent, but notes, “We would never accept a situation where the chance of a major nuclear accident like Chernobyl would be anywhere near 1% .... A nuclear terrorism attack is a low-probability event, but we can’t live in a world where it’s anything but extremely low-probability.” [Hegland 2005]. In a survey of 85 national security experts, Senator Richard Lugar found a median estimate of 20 percent for the “probability of an attack involving a nuclear explosion occurring somewhere in the world in the next 10 years,” with 79 percent of the respondents believing “it more likely to be carried out by terrorists” than by a government [Lugar 2005, pp. 14-15]. I support increased efforts to reduce the threat of nuclear terrorism, but that is not inconsistent with the approach of this article. Because terrorism is one of the potential trigger mechanisms for a full-scale nuclear war, the risk analyses proposed herein will include estimating the risk of nuclear terrorism as one component of the overall risk. If that risk, the overall risk, or both are found to be unacceptable, then the proposed remedies would be directed to reduce which- ever risk(s) warrant attention. Similar remarks apply to a number of other threats (e.g., nuclear war between the U.S. and China over Taiwan). his article would be incomplete if it only dealt with the threat of nuclear terrorism and neglected the threat of full- scale nuclear war. If both risks are unacceptable, an effort to reduce only the terrorist component would leave humanity in great peril. In fact, society’s almost total neglect of the threat of full-scale nuclear war makes studying that risk all the more important. The cosT of World War iii The danger associated with nuclear deterrence depends on both the cost of a failure and the failure rate.3 This section explores the cost of a failure of nuclear deterrence, and the next section is concerned with the failure rate. While other definitions are possible, this article defines a failure of deterrence to mean a full-scale exchange of all nuclear weapons available to the U.S. and Russia, an event that will be termed World War III. Approximately 20 million people died as a result of the first World War. World War II’s fatalities were double or triple that number—chaos prevented a more precise deter- mination. In both cases humanity recovered, and the world today bears few scars that attest to the horror of those two wars. Many people therefore implicitly believe that a third World War would be horrible but survivable, an extrapola- tion of the effects of the first two global wars. In that view, World War III, while horrible, is something that humanity may just have to face and from which it will then have to recover. In contrast, some of those most qualified to assess the situation hold a very different view. In a 1961 speech to a joint session of the Philippine Con- gress, General Douglas MacArthur, stated, “Global war has become a Frankenstein to destroy both sides. … If you lose, you are annihilated. If you win, you stand only to lose. No longer does it possess even the chance of the winner of a duel. It contains now only the germs of double suicide.” Former Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara ex- pressed a similar view: “If deterrence fails and conflict develops, the present U.S. and NATO strategy carries with it a high risk that Western civilization will be destroyed” [McNamara 1986, page 6]. More recently, George Shultz, William Perry, Henry Kissinger, and Sam Nunn4 echoed those concerns when they quoted President Reagan’s belief that nuclear weapons were “totally irrational, totally inhu- mane, good for nothing but killing, possibly destructive of life on earth and civilization.” [Shultz 2007] Official studies, while couched in less emotional terms, still convey the horrendous toll that World War III would exact: “The resulting deaths would be far beyond any precedent. Executive branch calculations show a range of U.S. deaths from 35 to 77 percent (i.e., 79-160 million dead) … a change in targeting could kill somewhere between 20 million and 30 million additional people on each side .... These calculations reflect only deaths during the first 30 days. Additional millions would be injured, and many would eventually die from lack of adequate medical care … millions of people might starve or freeze during the follow- ing winter, but it is not possible to estimate how many. … further millions … might eventually die of latent radiation effects.” [OTA 1979, page 8] This OTA report also noted the possibility of serious ecological damage [OTA 1979, page 9], a concern that as- sumed a new potentiality when the TTAPS report [TTAPS 1983] proposed that the ash and dust from so many nearly simultaneous nuclear explosions and their resultant fire- storms could usher in a nuclear winter that might erase homo sapiens from the face of the earth, much as many scientists now believe the K-T Extinction that wiped out the dinosaurs resulted from an impact winter caused by ash and dust from a large asteroid or comet striking Earth. The TTAPS report produced a heated debate, and there is still no scientific consensus on whether a nuclear winter would follow a full-scale nuclear war. Recent work [Robock 2007, Toon 2007] suggests that even a limited nuclear exchange or one between newer nuclear-weapon states, such as India and Pakistan, could have devastating long-lasting climatic consequences due to the large volumes of smoke that would be generated by fires in modern megacities. While it is uncertain how destructive World War III would be, prudence dictates that we apply the same engi- neering conservatism that saved the Golden Gate Bridge from collapsing on its 50th anniversary and assume that preventing World War III is a necessity—not an option.

## Isaac

#### Consequentialism key---alt is complicit with evil

Isaac 2—Professor of Political Science at Indiana-Bloomington, Director of the Center for the Study of Democracy and Public Life, PhD from Yale (Jeffery C., Dissent Magazine, Vol. 49, Iss. 2, “Ends, Means, and Politics,” p. Proquest)

As a result, the most important political questions are simply not asked. It is assumed that U.S. military intervention is an act of "aggression," but no consideration is given to the aggression to which intervention is a response. The status quo ante in Afghanistan is not, as peace activists would have it, peace, but rather terrorist violence abetted by a regime--the Taliban--that rose to power through brutality and repression. This requires us to ask a question that most "peace" activists would prefer not to ask: What should be done to respond to the violence of a Saddam Hussein, or a Milosevic, or a Taliban regime? What means are likely to stop violence and bring criminals to justice? Calls for diplomacy and international law are well intended and important; they implicate a decent and civilized ethic of global order. But they are also vague and empty, because they are not accompanied by any account of how diplomacy or international law can work effectively to address the problem at hand. The campus left offers no such account. To do so would require it to contemplate tragic choices in which moral goodness is of limited utility. Here what matters is not purity of intention but the intelligent exercise of power. Power is not a dirty word or an unfortunate feature of the world. It is the core of politics. Power is the ability to effect outcomes in the world. Politics, in large part, involves contests over the distribution and use of power. To accomplish anything in the political world, one must attend to the means that are necessary to bring it about. And to develop such means is to develop, and to exercise, power. To say this is not to say that power is beyond morality. It is to say that power is not reducible to morality. As writers such as Niccolo Machiavelli, Max Weber, Reinhold Niebuhr, and Hannah Arendt have taught, an unyielding concern with moral goodness **undercuts political responsibility**. The concern may be morally laudable, reflecting a kind of personal integrity, but it suffers from three fatal flaws: (1) It fails to see that the purity of one's intention does not ensure the achievement of what one intends. Abjuring violence or refusing to make common cause with morally compromised parties may seem like the right thing; but if such tactics entail impotence, then it is hard to view them as serving any moral good beyond the clean conscience of their supporters; (2) it fails to see that in a world of real violence and injustice, moral purity is not simply a form of powerlessness; it is often a form of **complicity in injustice**. This is why, from the standpoint of politics--as opposed to religion--pacifism is always a potentially immoral stand. In categorically repudiating violence, it refuses in principle to oppose certain violent injustices with any effect; and (3) it fails to see that **politics is as much about unintended consequences as it is about intentions**; it is the effects of action, rather than the motives of action, that is most significant. Just as the alignment with "good" may engender impotence, it is often the pursuit of "good" that generates evil. This is the lesson of communism in the twentieth century: it is not enough that one's goals be sincere or idealistic; it is equally important, always, to ask about the effects of pursuing these goals and to judge these effects in pragmatic and historically contextualized ways. Moral absolutism inhibits this judgment. It alienates those who are not true believers. It promotes arrogance. And it undermines political effectiveness.

## LOAC

#### LOAC does not legitimize violence—alternative is militarized violence

Charles Kels, attorney for the Department of Homeland Security and a major in the Air Force Reserve, 12/6/12, THe Perilous Position of the Laws of War, harvardnsj.org/2012/12/the-perilous-position-of-the-laws-of-war/

The real nub of the current critique of U.S. policy, therefore, is that the Bush administration’s war on terror and the Obama administration’s war on al Qaeda and affiliates constitute a distinction without a difference. The latter may be less rhetorically inflammatory, but it is equally amorphous in application, enabling the United States to pursue non-state actors under an armed conflict paradigm. This criticism may have merit, but it is really about the use of force altogether, not the parameters that define how force is applied. It is, in other words, an ad bellum argument cloaked in the language of in bello.

LOAC is apolitical. Adherence to it does not legitimize an unlawful resort to force, just as its violation—unless systematic—does not automatically render one’s cause unjust. The answer for those who object to U.S. targeted killing and indefinite detention is not to apply a peace paradigm that would invalidate LOAC and undercut the belligerent immunity of soldiers, but to direct their arguments to the political leadership regarding the decision to use force in the first place. Attacking LOAC for its perceived leniency and demanding the “pristine purity” of HRL in military operations is actually quite dangerous and counterproductive from a humanitarian perspective, because there remains the distinct possibility that the alternative to LOAC is not HRL but “lawlessness.” While there are certainly examples of armies that have acquitted themselves quite well in law enforcement roles—and while most nations do not subscribe to the strict U.S. delineation between military and police forces—the vast bulk of history indicates that in the context of armed hostilities, LOAC is by far the best case scenario, not the worst.

Transnational terrorist networks pose unique security problems, among them the need to apply preexisting legal rubrics to an enemy who is dedicated to undermining and abusing them. Vital to meeting this challenge—of “building a durable framework for the struggle against al Qaeda that [draws] upon our deeply held values and traditions”—is to refrain from treating the deeply-ingrained tenets of honorable warfare as a mere mechanism for projecting force. The laws of war are much more than “lawyerly license” to kill and detain, subject to varying levels of application depending upon political outlook. They remain a bulwark against indiscriminate carnage, steeped in history and tried in battle.

#### Antagonism is inevitable in the international sphere only LOAC provides a high barrier to militarized solutions to those conflicts. The plan is key to give legal constraints meaning and prevent conflict escalation

Luban ’13 (David, University Professor in Law and Philosophy, Georgetown University Law Center, “Military Necessity and the Cultures of Military Law,” Leiden Journal of International Law, Volume 26, Issue 02, pp 315-349)

These arguments about military necessity are not meant as a ‘refutation’ of the LOAC version of the laws of war or anything resembling it. That would be silly. **Military necessities are real**, and law will not make them go away. The same is true of the other elements of the LOAC vision. States may no longer be the sole sources of international law, but we live in a world of states, which **remain the pre-eminent international lawmakers**. The laws of war must take the civilian point of view seriously, but it is still a long step from there to human rights. On all these points, humanitarian lawyers who pretend otherwise are fooling themselves both legally and practically. Legally, because the sources of law will not bear so much humanitarian weight, and practically because the only hope for the humanitarian project lies in militaries and military lawyers who believe in it and want to make it happen. Like it or not, the two legal cultures must live with each other, and that requires reasonableness, in the sense defined by John Rawls: a reciprocal desire for principles that could be accepted even by adherents of the other comprehensive view.

To illustrate with an example: Article 57 of AP I requires militaries to take all ‘feasible’ precautions to verify that their targets are legitimately military and to minimize civilian damage. Notoriously, there is no agreement on what ‘feasible’ means. Does it include anything technologically possible, regardless of cost or risk to the attacker? Alternatively, does it exclude anything that might increase military risk, no matter how slightly? Clearly, militaries could not reasonably accept the former, and humanitarians could not reasonably accept the latter – so, on my proposal, neither of these interpretations can be right, and lawyers should not advance them.

This conciliatory approach is not self-evident. In purely scientific pursuits, epistemologists offer powerful arguments that it is more rational both for individual researchers and for the scientific community at large if competing research programmes **forcefully press their own agendas**, even in cases when one programme is less likely than its rivals to be fruitful.101 Lawyers are, for obvious reasons, instinctively drawn to a similarly adversarial, competitive model of truth seeking. Why not let the LOAC and IHL versions of the law of war continue to compete for supremacy? Is that not the most likely way in which truth will out?

The obvious difference is that lawyers arguing about the interpretation of law are not pursuing hidden truths. They are not physicists hunting the Higgs boson or mathematicians vying for the honour of being first to solve a famous problem.102 They are trying to give concrete meaning to past lawmakers’ constructions**, in order to impose** discipline on violence **when collectivities go to war.** The obvious danger in an adversarial competition over who owns the law of war is one David Kennedy highlights: when legal interpretation turns into a political game, the players’ trust in each other's candour inevitably erodes, so that ‘as we use the discourse more, we believe it less – at least when spoken by others’.103 The result (Kennedy adds) is a law of armed combat that undermines itself and casts its own legitimacy into disrepute, even in the eyes of its practitioners. I wholeheartedly agree with this diagnosis, but not with Kennedy's cure, which is to downplay legality in favour of pure choice – to ‘be wary of treating the legal issues as the focal points for our ethics and politics’.104 In place of legalism, Kennedy calls for ‘recapturing the human experience of responsibility for the violence of war’ – accepting that ‘those who kill do “decide in the exception”, . . . [and] as men and women, our military, political, and legal experts are, in fact, free – free from the comfortable ethical and political analytics of expertise, but not from responsibility for the havoc they unleash’.105 His argument appears to be that debates over the laws of war are irredeemably strategic. Officers and political leaders – and, for that matter, humanitarians – find it all too convenient to fob responsibility onto lawyers and the law when in fact the law is ‘an elaborate discourse of evasion’.106

But suppose there were no LOAC or ICL. **Do we really believe that more responsible decisions would result, that fewer lives would be lost**, or that an alternative and better vocabulary than ‘the analytics of expertise’ would arise for deliberation? I see no reason to think so. Without some vocabulary for deliberation, the pure experience of responsibility floats in a vacuum and goes nowhere. Like it or not, and **no matter where we end up,** we must start with the vocabulary we have. **That is the legal vocabulary of the law of war**, heavily inflected with the just-war theory of past centuries. **Where else could we start?** In Quine's words, ‘We are like sailors who on the open sea must reconstruct their ship but are never able to start afresh from the bottom.’107

**The two cultures are stuck with each** other aboard the same wounded ship. The argument of this article has been that their differing comprehensive views arise from competing premises about the primacy of military necessity and human dignity. Both are reasonable premises, and mutual recognition that they are reasonable – more precisely, willingness to discard one's own interpretations if a similarly willing adherent to the alternative view could not possibly accept them – seems like a plausible canon of interpretation. It is also the most plausible strategy for achieving whatever convergence is humanly possible.

Nobody accepts the alt

Brooks ’12 (Rosa, Professor of Law at Georgetown University Law Center and a Bernard L. Schwartz Senior Fellow at the New America Foundation, “Strange Bedfellows: The Convergence of Sovereignty-Limiting Doctrines in Counterterrorist and Human Rights Discourse,” Law and Ethics Summer/Fall 2012)

None of these projects would be straightforward; each might be seen as facing barriers so high as to be virtually insurmountable. If the various institutional and legal “fixes” we might envision are unrealistic in the near term, is there any responsible way forward? The overall thrust of this essay has been to call for intellectual honesty about the logical implications of emerging sovereignty-limiting doctrines. But, perhaps, this is one of those areas where discretion—even disingenuousness—is the better part of valor, or at least the better part of preserving stability. Stephen Krasner makes a variant of this argument in some of his recent work. Krasner famously dubbed sovereignty “organized hypocrisy,” noting that while the notion of “sovereignty” has long been associated with clear legal criteria and rules, states have, for just as long, routinely ignored those rules when it suited them to do so.18 To Krasner, this organized hypocrisy is nonetheless functional—or at least **more functional than any available alternative.** In a 2010 essay on “The Durability of Organized Hypocrisy,” Krasner argues that this remains true today.19 He grants that emerging normative or legal doctrines will continue to challenge and delegitimize traditional notions of sovereignty, and significant “shocks”— such as “the possibility of mega-terrorist attacks”—might lead to radical change: “Governments in advanced countries would begin to reconfigure their bureaucratic structures to… [reflect] new rules and principles about responsibilities for territories or functions beyond national borders.” But, argues Krasner, “Such fundamental challenges to the existing sovereignty regime are not to be welcomed. Any new set of principles…would be contested. External actors, even if their claims were legitimated…would not find it easy to exercise the authority they had asserted…there are no formulaic solutions.” Krasner concludes, **“Sovereignty has worked very imperfectly but it has still worked better than any other structure that decision-makers have been able to envision**.”20 In other words: in the end, perhaps, when it comes to teasing out the implications of emerging sovereigntylimiting doctrines, organized hypocrisy is the best we can do.

## Impact

#### No risk of endless warfare

Gray 7—Director of the Centre for Strategic Studies and Professor of International Relations and Strategic Studies at the University of Reading, graduate of the Universities of Manchester and Oxford, Founder and Senior Associate to the National Institute for Public Policy, formerly with the International Institute for Strategic Studies and the Hudson Institute (Colin, July, “The Implications of Preemptive and Preventive War Doctrines: A Reconsideration”, [http://www.ciaonet.org/wps/ssi10561/ssi10561.pdf](http://www.ciaonet.org/wps/ssi10561/ssi10561.pdf%22%20%5Ct%20%22_blank))

7. A policy that favors preventive warfare expresses a futile quest for absolute security. It could do so. Most controversial policies contain within them the possibility of misuse. In the hands of a paranoid or boundlessly ambitious political leader, prevention could be a policy for endless warfare. However, the American political system, with its checks and balances, was designed explicitly for the purpose of constraining the executive from excessive folly. Both the Vietnam and the contemporary Iraqi experiences reveal clearly that although the conduct of war is an executive prerogative, in practice that authority is disciplined by public attitudes. Clausewitz made this point superbly with his designation of the passion, the sentiments, of the people as a vital component of his trinitarian theory of war. 51 It is true to claim that power can be, and indeed is often, abused, both personally and nationally. It is possible that a state could acquire a taste for the apparent swift decisiveness of preventive warfare and overuse the option. One might argue that the easy success achieved against Taliban Afghanistan in 2001, provided fuel for the urge to seek a similarly rapid success against Saddam Hussein’s Iraq. In other words, the delights of military success can be habit forming. On balance, claim seven is not persuasive, though it certainly contains a germ of truth. A country with unmatched wealth and power, unused to physical insecurity at home—notwithstanding 42 years of nuclear danger, and a high level of gun crime—is vulnerable to demands for policies that supposedly can restore security. But we ought not to endorse the argument that the United States should eschew the preventive war option because it could lead to a futile, endless search for absolute security. One might as well argue that the United States should adopt a defense policy and develop capabilities shaped strictly for homeland security approached in a narrowly geographical sense. Since a president might misuse a military instrument that had a global reach, why not deny the White House even the possibility of such misuse? In other words, constrain policy ends by limiting policy’s military means. This argument has circulated for many decades and, it must be admitted, it does have a certain elementary logic. It is the opinion of this enquiry, however, that the claim that a policy which includes the preventive option might lead to a search for total security is **not at all convincing**. Of course, folly in high places is always possible, which is one of the many reasons why popular democracy is the superior form of government. It would be absurd to permit the fear of a futile and dangerous quest for absolute security to preclude prevention as a policy option. Despite its absurdity, this rhetorical charge against prevention is a stock favorite among prevention’s critics. It should be recognized and dismissed for what it is, a debating point with little pragmatic merit. And strategy, though not always policy, **must be nothing if not pragmatic**.

## SV

#### Prioritize prevention of interstate conflict – outweighs and turns structural violence

Jean Bethke Elshtain, Laura Spelman Rockefeller Professor of Social and Political Ethics, Divinity School, The University of Chicago, with appointments in Political Science and the Committee on International Relations, 2008, Peace, Order, Justice: Competing Understandings, Millennium - Journal of International Studies, 36: 413

We arrive, finally at model III. Let’s call this hard-headed peace. This is a peace that is mindful at every point of justice claims and the overriding need for at least a modicum of civil order and tranquility if other worthy goals, including justice claims, are to be heard and worked towards at all. Within hard-headed peace, various dichotomies – not only realism/ idealism but peace/war – as absolutes, break down. We recognise, with Hedley Bull and others, that war plays a central role in the maintenance of international law and the preservation of the balance of power, thereby effecting changes that are just. Of course, war can also be a destroyer of order and a force for injustice – but we cannot pace, the peace advocates I have criticised - condemn every war in advance as necessarily a paragon of the latter rather than the former.

As with every human endeavour this limited – neither absolute nor perpetual – peace is a precious, fragile human achievement. Its advocates recognise that we often need disturbers of the peace should a ‘peace’ be unjust even as we require defenders of the peace against those who would overturn it in the name of some dangerously eschatological political ideology – the triumph of the Aryan race, the triumph of the universal class – with their death camps and gulags to deal with those who stand in the way of the absolutist projects.

I recall being haunted by a story I read – an ancient Chinese parable – of the necessary precondition for perpetual peace, namely, that one should be so far removed from any other ‘city’ that, in the dead calm of night, the echoes of a dog barking could not carry – not alert some other city that aliens, strangers, were within striking distance. Your only options, if you heard that dog bark, were to go kill the inhabitants of the other city and destroy it or to incorporate them – to make them as ‘one’ with yourself – for the mere existence of this alien entity marred ‘peace’. Extreme, yes. But instructive, for it alerts us to the often ontologically suspicious features or absolute or perpetual peace – the presence of the alien suffices to mar it.

As much as I loved the late John Lennon and remain an unreconstructed Beatlesmaniac – his song ‘Imagine’ is the stringing together of empty banalities: no states, no religion, nothing to kill or die for, and the world will be as one. Fat chance. I don’t know how one gets from the song’s subjectivist anarchy to perpetual peace but we confront the high hill of moral upmanship yet again in popular, simplistic form.

If, however, you find the moral problems of international politics ‘infinitely complex, bewildering and perplexing’, in Martin Wight’s words, it makes you a ‘natural Grotian’.15 I’m going to have to reflect on his claim a bit more but this much is clear to me:

War will never be abolished, so we must limit it ethically and politically in the manner of just war teaching and here debates will turn on how hick’ the restraints must be; Human nature – yes, I said it – politically incorrect as it is – is a complex admixture of good and evil, nastiness and niceness, good Harry Potter with a bit of evil Voldemortian temptation thrown in and this is unavoidable That means we should be appropriately humble about even our best intentions, for on this earth there is neither absolute good nor absolute evil as a characteristic of either persons or states;

Quality of life is skyrocketing worldwide by all measures

Ridley, visiting professor at Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory, former science editor of *The Economist*, and award-winning science writer, 2010

(Matt, *The Rational Optimist*, pg. 13-15)

If my fictional family is not to your taste, perhaps you prefer statistics. Since 1800, the population of the world has multiplied six times, yet **average life expectancy has more than doubled and real income has risen more than nine times**. Taking a shorter perspective, in 2005, compared with 1955, the average human being on Planet Earth earned nearly three times as much money (corrected for inflation), ate one-third more calories of food, buried one-third as many of her children and could expect to live one-third longer. She was less likely to die as a result of war, murder, childbirth, accidents, tornadoes, flooding, famine, whooping cough, tuberculosis, malaria, diphtheria, typhus, typhoid, measles, smallpox, scurvy or polio. She was less likely, at any given age, to get cancer, heart disease or stroke. She was more likely to be literate and to have finished school. She was more likely to own a telephone, a flush toilet, a refrigerator and a bicycle. All this during a half-century when the world population has more than doubled, so that far from being rationed by population pressure, the goods and services available to the people of the world have expanded. It is, by any standard, an astonishing human achievement. Averages conceal a lot. **But even if you break down the world into bits**, **it is hard to find any region that was worse off in 2005 than it was in 1955**. Over that half-century, real income per head ended a little lower in only six countries (Afghanistan, Haiti, Congo, Liberia, Sierra Leone and Somalia), life expectancy in three (Russia, Swaziland and Zimbabwe), and infant survival in none. In the rest they have rocketed upward. Africa’s rate of improvement has been distressingly slow and patchy compared with the rest of the world, and many southern African countries saw life expectancy plunge in the 1990s as the AIDS epidemic took hold (before recovering in recent years). There were also moments in the half-century when you could have caught countries in episodes of dreadful deterioration of living standards or life chances – China in the 1960s, Cambodia in the 1970s, Ethiopia in the 1980s, Rwanda in the 1990s, Congo in the 2000s, North Korea throughout. Argentina had a disappointingly stagnant twentieth century. But overall, after fifty years, **the outcome for the world is** remarkably, astonishingly, **dramatically positive**. The average South Korean lives twenty-six more years and earns fifteen times as much income each year as he did in 1955 (and earns fifteen times as much as his North Korean counter part). The average Mexican lives longer now than the average Briton did in 1955. The average Botswanan earns more than the average Finn did in 1955. **Infant mortality is lower today in Nepal than it was in Italy in 1951**. The proportion of Vietnamese living on less than $2 a day has dropped from 90 per cent to 30 per cent in twenty years. The rich have got richer, but the poor have done even better. **The poor in the developing world grew their consumption twice as fast as the world as a whole between 1980 and 2000**. The Chinese are ten times as rich, one-third as fecund and twenty-eight years longer-lived than they were fifty years ago. Even Nigerians are twice as rich, 25 per cent less fecund and nine years longer-lived than they were in 1955. **Despite a doubling of the world population**, even **the raw number of people living in absolute poverty** (defined as less than a 1985 dollar a day) **has fallen since the 1950s**. The percentage living in such absolute poverty has dropped by more than half – to less than 18 per cent. That number is, of course, still all too horribly high, but the trend is hardly a cause for despair: at the current rate of decline, it would hit zero around 2035 – though it probably won’t. The United Nations estimates that poverty was reduced more in the last fifty years than in the previous 500.

## AT: Rana

#### Rana’s claim is too sweeping, the alt is impossible

David Cole 12, professor of law at Georgetown, “Confronting the Wizard of Oz: National Security,

Expertise, and Secrecy” 44 Conn. L. Rev. 1617-1625 (2012), <http://scholarship.law.georgetown.edu/facpub/1085>)

Rana is right to focus our attention on the assumptions that frame modern Americans’ conceptions about national security, but his assessment raises three initial questions. First, it seems far from clear that there ever was a “golden” era in which national security decisions were made by the common man, or “the people themselves,” as Larry Kramer might put it.8 Rana argues that neither Hobbes nor Locke would support a worldview in which certain individuals are vested with superior access to the truth, and that faith in the superior abilities of so-called “experts” is a phenomenon of the New Deal era.9 While an increased faith in scientific solutions to social problems may be a contributing factor in our current overreliance on experts,10 I doubt that national security matters were ever truly a matter of widespread democratic deliberation. Rana notes that in the early days of the republic, every able-bodied man had to serve in the militia, whereas today only a small (and largely disadvantaged) portion of society serves in the military.11 But serving in the militia and making decisions about national security are two different matters. The early days of the Republic were at least as dominated by “elites” as today. Rana points to no evidence that decisions about foreign affairs were any more democratic then than now. And, of course, the nation as a whole was far less democratic, as the majority of its inhabitants could not vote at all.12 Rather than moving away from a golden age of democratic decision-making, it seems more likely that we have simply replaced one group of elites (the aristocracy) with another (the experts). Second, to the extent that there has been an epistemological shift with respect to national security, it seems likely that it is at least in some measure a response to objective conditions, not just an ideological development. If so, it’s not clear that we can solve the problem merely by “thinking differently” about national security. The world has, in fact, become more interconnected and dangerous than it was when the Constitution was drafted. At our founding, the oceans were a significant buffer against attacks, weapons were primitive, and travel over long distances was extremely arduous and costly. The attacks of September 11, 2001, or anything like them, would have been inconceivable in the eighteenth or nineteenth centuries. Small groups of non-state actors can now inflict the kinds of attacks that once were the exclusive province of states. But because such actors do not have the governance responsibilities that states have, they are less susceptible to deterrence. The Internet makes information about dangerous weapons and civil vulnerabilities far more readily available, airplane travel dramatically increases the potential range of a hostile actor, and it is not impossible that terrorists could obtain and use nuclear, biological, or chemical weapons.13 The knowledge necessary to monitor nuclear weapons, respond to cyber warfare, develop technological defenses to technological threats, and gather intelligence is increasingly specialized. The problem is not just how we think about security threats; it is also at least in part objectively based.

## Perm

Solves cooption

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

In chapter 7 I engaged with the human security framework and some of the problematic implications of ‘emancipatory’ security policy frameworks. In this chapter I argued that the shift away from the pluralist security framework and the elevation of cosmopolitan and emancipatory goals **has served to** **enforce international power inequalities rather than lessen them**. Weak or unstable states are subjected to greater international scrutiny and international institutions and other states have greater freedom to intervene, but the citizens of these states have **no way of controlling or influencing** these international institutions or powerful states. This shift away from the pluralist security framework **has not challenged the status quo**, which may help to explain why major international institutions and states **can easily adopt** a more cosmopolitan rhetoric in their security policies. As we have seen, the shift away from the pluralist security framework has entailed a shift towards a more openly hierarchical international system, in which states are differentiated according to, for example, their ability to provide human security for their citizens or their supposed democratic commitments. In this shift, the old pluralist international norms of (formal) international sovereign equality, non-intervention and ‘blindness’ to the content of a state are overturned. Instead, international institutions and states have more freedom to intervene in weak or unstable states in order to ‘protect’ and emancipate individuals globally. Critical and emancipatory security theorists argue that the goal of the emancipation of the individual means that security must be reconceptualised away from the state. As the domestic sphere is understood to be the sphere of insecurity and disorder, the international sphere represents greater emancipatory possibilities, as Tickner argues, ‘if security is to start with the individual, its ties to state sovereignty must be severed’ (1995: 189). For critical and emancipatory theorists there must be a shift towards a ‘cosmopolitan’ legal framework, for example Mary Kaldor (2001: 10), Martin Shaw (2003: 104) and Andrew Linklater (2005). For critical theorists, one of the fundamental problems with Realism is that it is unrealistic. Because it prioritises order and the existing status quo, Realism attempts to impose a particular security framework onto a complex world, ignoring the myriad threats to people emerging from their own governments and societies. Moreover, traditional international theory serves to obscure power relations and omits a study of why the system is as it is: [O]mitting myriad strands of power amounts to exaggerating the simplicity of the entire political system. Today’s conventional portrait of international politics thus too often ends up looking like a Superman comic strip, whereas it probably should resemble a Jackson Pollock. (Enloe, 2002 [1996]: 189) Yet as I have argued, contemporary critical security theorists seem to show a marked lack of engagement with their problematic (whether the international security context, or the Yugoslav break-up and wars). **Without concrete engagement and analysis**, however, **the critical project is undermined and critical theory becomes nothing more than a request that people behave in a nicer way to each other**. Furthermore, whilst contemporary critical security theorists argue that they present a more realistic image of the world, through exposing power relations, for example, their lack of concrete analysis of the problematic considered **renders them actually unable to engage** with existing power structures and the way in which power is being exercised in the contemporary international system. For critical and emancipatory theorists the central place of the values of the theorist mean that it cannot fulfil its promise to critically engage with contemporary power relations and emancipatory possibilities. Values must be joined with engagement with the material circumstances of the time.

### Liberalism Good – Horgan

#### Shocks to the system are the ONLY propensity for conflict—liberal norms have eradicated warfare and structural violence—every field study proves

JOHN HORGAN 9 is Director of the Center for Science at Stevens Institute of Technology, former senior writer at Scientific American, B.A. from Columbia and an M.S. from Columbia “The End of the Age of War,” Dec 7, http://www.newsweek.com/id/225616/page/1

The economic crisis was supposed to increase violence around the world. The truth is that we are now living in one of the most peaceful periods since war first arose 10 or 12 millennia ago. The relative calm of our era, say scientists who study warfare in history and even prehistory, belies the popular, pessimistic notion that war is so deeply rooted in our nature that we can never abolish it. In fact, war seems to be a largely cultural phenomenon, which culture is now helping us eradicate. Some scholars now even cautiously speculate that the era of traditional war—fought by two uniformed, state-sponsored armies—might be drawing to a close. "War could be on the verge of ceasing to exist as a substantial phenomenon," says John Mueller, a political scientist at Ohio State University.¶ That might sound crazy, but consider: if war is defined as a conflict between two or more nations resulting in at least 1,000 deaths in a year, there have been no wars since the U.S. invasion of Iraq in 2003 and no wars between major industrialized powers since World War II. Civil wars have also declined from their peak in the early 1990s, when fighting tore apart Rwanda, the Balkans, and other regions. Most armed conflicts now consist of low-level guerrilla campaigns, insurgencies, and terrorism—what Mueller calls the "remnants of war."¶ These facts would provide little comfort if war's remnants were nonetheless killing millions of people—but they're not. Recent studies reveal a clear downward trend. In 2008, 25,600 combatants and civilians were killed as a direct result of armed conflicts, according to the University of Uppsala Conflict Data Program in Sweden. Two thirds of these deaths took place in just three trouble spots: Sri Lanka (8,400), Afghanistan (4,600), and Iraq (4,000).¶ Uppsala's figures exclude deaths from "one-sided conflict," in which combatants deliberately kill unarmed civilians, and "indirect" deaths from war-related disease and famine, but even when these casualties are included, annual war-related deaths from 2004 to 2007 are still low by historical standards. Acts of terrorism, like the 9/11 attacks or the 2004 bombing of Spanish trains, account for less than 1 percent of fatalities. In contrast, car accidents kill more than 1 million people a year.¶ The contrast between our century and the previous one is striking. In the second half of the 20th century, war killed as many as 40 million people, both directly and indirectly, or 800,000 people a year, according to Milton Leitenberg of the University of Maryland. He estimates that 190 million people, or 3.8 million a year, died as a result of wars and state--sponsored genocides during the cataclysmic first half of the century. Considered as a percentage of population, the body count of the 20th century is comparable to that of blood-soaked earlier cultures, such as the Aztecs, the Romans, and the Greeks.¶ By far the most warlike societies are those that preceded civilization. War killed as many as 25 percent of all pre-state people, a rate 10 times higher than that of the 20th century, estimates anthropologist Lawrence Keeley of the University of Illinois. Our ancestors were not always so bellicose, however: there is virtually no clear-cut evidence of lethal group aggression by humans prior to 12,000 years ago. Then, "warfare appeared in the evolutionary trajectory of an increasing number of societies around the world," says anthropologist Jonathan Haas of Chicago's Field Museum of Natural History. He attributes the emergence of warfare to several factors: growing population density, environmental stresses that diminished food sources, and the separation of people into culturally distinct groups. "It is only after the cultural foundations have been laid for distinguishing 'us' from 'them,' " he says, "that raiding, killing, and burning appear as a complex response to the external stress of environmental problems."¶ Early civilizations, such as those founded in Mesopotamia and Egypt 6,000 years ago, were extremely warlike. They assembled large armies and began inventing new techniques and technologies for killing, from horse-drawn chariots and catapults to bombs. But nation-states also developed laws and institutions for resolving disputes nonviolently, at least within their borders. These cultural innovations helped reduce the endless, tit-for-tat feuding that plagued pre-state societies.¶ A host of other cultural factors may explain the more recent drop-off in international war and other forms of social violence. One is a surge in democratic rather than totalitarian governance. Over the past two centuries democracies such as the U.S. have rarely if ever fought each other. Democracy is also associated with low levels of violence within nations. Only 20 democratic nations existed at the end of World War II; the number has since more than quadrupled. Yale historian Bruce Russett contends that international institutions such as the United Nations and the European Union also contribute to this "democratic peace" phenomenon by fostering economic interdependence. Advances in civil rights for women may also be making us more peaceful. As women's education and economic opportunities rise, birthrates fall, decreasing demands on governmental and medical services and depletion of natural resources, which can otherwise lead to social unrest.¶ Better public health is another contributing factor. Over the past century, average life spans have almost doubled, which could make us less willing to risk our lives by engaging in war and other forms of violence, proposes Harvard psychologist Steven Pinker. At the same time, he points out, globalization and communications have made us increasingly interdependent on, and empathetic toward, others outside of our immediate "tribes."¶ Of course, the world remains a dangerous place, vulnerable to disruptive, unpredictable events like terrorist attacks. Other looming threats to peace include climate change, which could produce droughts and endanger our food supplies; overpopulation; and the spread of violent religious extremism, as embodied by Al Qaeda. A global financial meltdown or ecological catastrophe could plunge us back into the kind of violent, Hobbesian chaos that plagued many pre--state societies thousands of years ago. "War is not intrinsic to human nature, but neither is peace," warns the political scientist Nils Petter Gleditsch of the International Peace Research Institute in Oslo.¶ So far the trends are positive. If they continue, who knows? World peace—the dream of countless visionaries and -beauty--pageant -contestants—or something like it may finally come to pass.

## Epistemology

#### We have a defense of the way we view international relations---game-theory proves that liberal internationalism is effective

Recchia and Doyle 11 Stefano, Assistant Professor in International Relations at the University of Cambridge, and Michael, Harold Brown Professor of International Affairs, Law and Political Science at Columbia University, “Liberalism in International Relations”, In: Bertrand Badie, Dirk Berg-Schlosser, and Leonardo Morlino, eds., International Encyclopedia of Political Science (Sage, 2011), pp. 1434-1439

Relying on new insights from game theory, scholars during the 1980s and 1990s emphasized that so-called international regimes, consisting of agreed-on international norms, rules, and decision-making procedures, can help states effectively coordinate their policies and collaborate in the production of international public goods, such ¶ as free trade, arms control, and environmental protection. Especially, if embedded in formal multilateral institutions, such as the World Trade ¶ Organization (WTO) or North American Free ¶ Trade Agreement (NAFT A), regimes crucially ¶ improve the availability of information among ¶ states in a given issue area, thereby promoting ¶ reciprocity and enhancing the reputational costs ¶ of noncompliance. As noted by Robert Keohane, ¶ institutionalized multilateralism also reduces strategic competition over relative gains and thus ¶ further advances international cooperation. ¶ Most international regime theorists accepted ¶ Kenneth Waltz's (1979) neorealist assurription of ¶ states as black boxes-that is, unitary and rational ¶ actors with given interests. Little or no attention ¶ was paid to the impact on international cooperation of domestic political processes and dynamics. ¶ Likewise, regime scholarship largely disregarded ¶ the arguably crucial question of whether prolonged interaction in an institutionalized international setting can fundamentally change states' interests or preferences over outcomes (as opposed ¶ to preferences over strategies), thus engendering positive feedback loops of increased overall cooperation. For these reasons, international regime ¶ theory is not, properly speaking, liberal, and the ¶ term neoliberal institutionalism frequently used to ¶ identify it is somewhat misleading. ¶ It is only over the past decade or so that liberal ¶ international relations theorists have begun to systematically study the relationship between domestic politics and institutionalized international cooperation or global governance. This new scholarship ¶ seeks to explain in particular the close interna tional ¶ cooperation among liberal democracies as well as ¶ higher-than-average levels of delegation b)' democracies to complex multilateral bodies, such as the ¶ \ ¶ Liberalism in International Relations 1437 ¶ European Union (EU), North Atlantic Treaty ¶ Organization (NATO), NAFTA, and the WTO ¶ (see, e.g., John Ikenberry, 2001; Helen Milner & ¶ Andrew Moravcsik, 2009). The reasons that make liberal democracies particularly enthusiastic about international cooperation are manifold: First, transnational actors such as nongovernmental ¶ organizations and private corporations thrive in liberal democracies, and they frequently advocate increased international cooperation; second, elected democratic officials rely on delegation to multilateral bodies such as the WTO or the EU to commit to a stable policy line and to internationally lock in fragile domestic policies and constitutional arrangements; and finally, powerful liberal democracies, such as the United States and its ¶ allies, voluntarily bind themselves into complex global governance arrangements to demonstrate strategic restraint and create incentives for other states to cooperate, thereby reducing the costs for ¶ maintaining international order. ¶ Recent scholarship, such as that of Charles ¶ Boehmer and colleagues, has also confirmed the ¶ classical liberal intuition that formal international ¶ institutions, such as the United Nations (UN) or ¶ NATO, independently contribute to peace, especially when they are endowed with sophisticated ¶ administrative structures and information-gathering ¶ capacities. In short, research on global governance ¶ and especially on the relationship between democracy and international cooperation is thriving, and ¶ it usefully complements liberal scholarship on the ¶ democratic peace.

## Reps

#### Discourse/framing doesn’t shape reality

Tuathail 96 (Gearóid, Professor of Government and International Affairs, Virginia Tech, The patterned mess of history and the writing of critical geopolitics: a reply to Dalby, Political Geography 15:6/7, p 661-5 http://www.nvc.vt.edu/toalg/Website/Publish/miscellaneous/DalbyResponse.htm)

While theoretical debates at academic conferences are important to academics, the discourse and concerns of foreign policy decision makers are quite different, so different that they constitutes a distinctive problem-solving theory-averse policy making sub-culture. There is a danger that academics assume that the discourses they engage are more significant in the practice of foreign policy and the exercise of power than they really are. This is not, however, to minimize the obvious importance of academia as a general institutional structure among many which sustain certain epistemic communities in particular states. In general, I do not disagree with Dalby's fourth point about politics and discourse except to note that his statement -- "Precisely because reality could be represented in particular ways political decisions could be taken, troops and material moved and war fought" -- evades the important question of agency I noted in my review essay. The assumption that it is representations that make action possible is inadequate by itself. Political, military and economic structures, institutions, discursive networks and leadership are all crucial in explaining social action and should be theorized together with representational practices. Both here and earlier, Dalby's reasoning inclines towards a form of idealism. In response to Dalby's fifth point (with its three subpoints), it is worth noting, first, that his book is about the CPD not the Reagan administration. He analyzes certain CPD discourses not the geographical reasoning practices of the Reagan administration nor its public policy reasoning on national security. Dalby's book is narrowly textual; the general contextuality of the Reagan administration is not dealt with in the book. Second, let me simply note that I find that the distinction between critical theorists and post-structuralists is a little too rigidly and heroically drawn by Dalby and others. Third, Dalby's interpretation of the reconceptualization of national security in Moscow as heavily influenced by dissident peace researchers in Europe is highly idealist, an interpretation that ignores the structural and ideological crises facing the Soviet elite at that time. Gorbachev's reforms and his new security discourse were also strongly self-interested, an ultimately futile attempt to save the Communist Party and a discredited regime of power from disintegration. The issues raised by Simon Dalby in his comment are important ones for all those interested in the practice of critical geopolitics. While I agree with Dalby that questions of discourse are extremely important ones for political geographer's to engage, there is a danger of fetishizing this concern with discourse so that we neglect the institutional and the sociological, the materialist and the cultural, the political and the geographical contexts within which particular discursive strategies become significant. Critical geopolitics, in other words, should not be a prisoner of the sweeping ahistorical cant that sometimes accompanies "post-structuralism" nor convenient reading strategies like the identity politics narrative; it needs to always be open to the patterned mess that is human history.

## Liberalism

#### Legal restraints work – the theory of the exception is self-serving and wrong

William E. **Scheuerman 6**, Professor of Political Science at Indiana University, Carl Schmitt and the Road to Abu Ghraib, Constellations, Volume 13, Issue 1

Yet this argument relies on Schmitt’s controversial model of politics, as outlined eloquently but unconvincingly in his famous Concept of the Political. To be sure, there are intense conflicts in which it is naïve to expect an easy resolution by legal or juridical means. But the argument suffers from a troubling circularity: **Schmitt** occasionally **wants to define “political” conflicts as those irresolvable by legal** or juridical **devices in order** then **to argue against** **legal** or juridical **solutions** to them. **The claim** also **suffers from** a certain **vagueness** and lack of conceptual precision. At times, it seems to be directed against trying to resolve conflicts in the courts or juridical system narrowly understood; at other times it is directed against any legal regulation of intense conflict. The former argument is surely stronger than the latter. After all, **legal devices have undoubtedly played a positive role** **in taming** or at least minimizing the potential dangers of harsh **political antagonisms**. In the Cold War, for example, international law contributed to the peaceful resolution of conflicts which otherwise might have exploded into horrific violence, even if attempts to bring such conflicts before an international court or tribunal probably would have failed.22

Second, Schmitt dwells on the legal inconsistencies that result from modifying the traditional state-centered system of international law by expanding protections to non-state fighters. His view is that irregular combatants logically enjoyed no protections in the state-centered Westphalian model. By broadening protections to include them, international law helps undermine the traditional state system and its accompanying legal framework. Why is this troubling? The most obvious answer is that Schmitt believes that the traditional state system is normatively superior to recent attempts to modify it by, for example, extending international human rights protections to individuals against states. 23 But what if we refuse to endorse his nostalgic preference for the traditional state system? Then a sympathetic reading of the argument would take the form of suggesting that the project of regulating irregular combatants by ordinary law must fail for another reason: it rests on a misguided quest to integrate incongruent models of interstate relations and international law. We cannot, in short, maintain core features of the (state-centered) Westphalian system while extending ambitious new protections to non-state actors.

This is a powerful argument, but it remains flawed. Every modern legal order rests on diverse and even conflicting normative elements and ideals, in part because human existence itself is always “in transition.” When one examines the so-called classical liberal legal systems of nineteenth-century England or the United States, for example, one quickly identifies liberal elements coexisting uneasily alongside paternalistic and authoritarian (e.g., the law of slavery in the United States), monarchist, as well as republican and communitarian moments. The same may be said of the legal moorings of the modern welfare state, which arguably rest on a hodgepodge of socialist, liberal, and Christian and even Catholic (for example, in some European maternity policies) programmatic sources. In short, **it is by no means self-evident that trying to give coherent legal form to a transitional** political and social **moment is always doomed to fail**. Moreover, there may be sound reasons for claiming that the contemporary transitional juncture in the rules of war is by no means as incongruent as Schmitt asserts. In some recent accounts, **the general trend** towards extending basic protections to non-state actors **is** plausibly interpreted in a more **positive** – **and by no means incoherent** – light.24

Third, Schmitt identifies a deep tension between the classical quest for codified and stable law and the empirical reality of a social world subject to permanent change: “The tendency to modify or even dissolve classical [legal] concepts…is general, and in view of the rapid change of the world it is entirely understandable” (12). Schmitt’s postwar writings include many provocative comments about what contemporary legal scholars describe as the dilemma of legal obsolescence. 25 In The Partisan, he suggests that the “great transformations and modifications” in the technological apparatus of modern warfare place strains on the aspiration for cogent legal norms capable of regulating human affairs (17; see also 48–50). Given the ever-changing character of warfare and the fast pace of change in military technology, it inevitably proves difficult to codify a set of cogent and stable rules of war. The Geneva Convention proviso that legal combatants must bear their weapons openly, for example, seems poorly attuned to a world where military might ultimately depends on nuclear silos buried deep beneath the surface of the earth, and not the success of traditional standing armies massed in battle on the open field. “Or what does the requirement mean of an insignia visible from afar in night battle, or in battle with the long-range weapons of modern technology of war?” (17).

As I have tried to show elsewhere, these are powerful considerations deserving of close scrutiny; Schmitt is probably right to argue that the enigma of legal obsolescence takes on special significance in the context of rapid-fire social change.26 Unfortunately, he seems uninterested in the slightest possibility that we might successfully adapt the process of lawmaking to our dynamic social universe. To be sure, he discusses the “motorization of lawmaking” in a fascinating 1950 publication, but only in order to underscore its pathological core.27 Yet **one** possible **resolution** of the dilemma he describes **would be** to figure how **to reform the process** whereby rules of war are adapted to novel changes in military affairs in order **to minimize the danger of** anachronistic or **out-of-date law. Instead, Schmitt** simply **employs the dilemma of legal obsolescence as a battering ram** against the rule of law and the quest to develop a legal apparatus suited to the special problem of irregular combatants.

## \*\*1AR

## Terror

#### Their authors are wrong about everything

Graham Allison 9**,** Douglas Dillon Professor of Government and Director of the Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs at Harvard University's Kennedy School of Government, “A Response to Nuclear Terrorism Skeptics” Brown Journal of World Affairs, Hein Online

What drives Mueller and other skeptics to arrive at such different conclusions?¶ They make four major claims that merit serious examination and reflection.¶ CLAIM 1: No ONE IS SERIOUSLY MOTIVATED TO CONDUCT A NUCLEAR TERRORIST ATTACK.¶ More than a decade ago, no one could have imagined that a Japanese doomsday cult would be sufficiently motivated to disseminate sarin gas on the Tokyo subway. Indeed, at the time of that attack, the consensus among terrorism experts was that terrorists wanted an audience and sympathy-not casualties. The leading American student of terrorism, Brian Jenkins, summarized the consensus judgment in 1975: "terrorists seem 34 to be more interested in having a lot of people watching, not a lot of people dead.""¶ As intelligence officials later testified, an inability to recognize the shifting modus operandi of some terrorist groups was part of the reason why members of Aum Shinrikyo "were simply not on anybody's radar screen."" This, despite the fact that the group owned a 12-acre chemical weapons factory in Tokyo, had $1 billion in its bank account, and had a history of serious nuclear ambitions.'9¶ Similarly, before the 9/11 attacks on the World Trade Center and Pentagon that extinguished 3,000 lives, few imagined that terrorists could mount an attack upon the American homeland that would kill more Americans than the Japanese attack at Pearl Harbor. As Secretary Rice testified to the 9/11 Commission, "No one could have imagined them taking a plane, slamming it into the Pentagon and into the World Trade Center, using planes as a missile." 20 For most Americans, the idea of international terrorists mounting an attack on our homeland and killing thousands of citizens was not just unlikely, but inconceivable. But assertions about what is "imaginable" or "conceivable" are propositions about individuals' mental capacities, not about what is objectively possible.¶ In fact, Al Qaeda's actions in the decade prior to the 9/11 attacks provided clear evidence both of intent and capability. While its 1993 attack on the World Trade Center succeeded in killing only six people, Ramzi Yousef, the key operative in this case, had planned to collapse one tower onto the second, killing 40,000. In the summer of 1996, Osama bin Laden issued a fatwa declaring war upon the United States. Two years later, Al Qaeda attacked the U.S. embassies in Nairobi, Kenya, and Dar es Salaam, Tanzania, killing more than 200 people. In October 2000, Al Qaeda attacked the warship USS Cole. Throughout this period, Al Qaeda's leadership was running thousands of people through training camps, preparing them for mega-terrorist attacks.¶ Notwithstanding Aum Shinrikyo's brazen attack, Al Qaedas audacious 9/11 attack, and the recent attacks in Mumbai that killed 179 people, Mueller maintains that "terrorists groups seem to have exhibited only limited desire... they have discovered that the tremendous effort required is scarcely likely to be successful." He asserts that the evidence about Al Qaedas nuclear intentions ranges from the "ludicrous to the merely dubious," and that those who take Al Qaeda's nuclear aspiration seriously border on "full-on fantasyland."1¶ Even scholars who would have been inclined to agree with this point of view have revised their judgment as new facts have accumulated. In 2006, for example, Jenkins reversed the basic proposition that he had set forth three decades earlier. In his summary: "In the 1970s the bloodiest incidents caused fatalities in the tens. In the 1980s, fatalities from the worst incidents were in the hundreds; by the 1990s, attacks on this scale had become more frequent. On 9/11 there were thousands of fatalities, and there could have been far more. We now contemplate plausible scenarios in which tens of 35 thousands might die." Underlining the contrast with his own 1975 assessment, Jenkins now says: "Jihadists seem ready to murder millions, if necessary. Many of today's terrorists want a lot of people watching and a lot of people dead."22 (Emphasis added.)¶ Al Qaeda has been deadly clear about its ambitions. In 1998, Osama bin Laden declared that he considered obtaining weapons of mass destruction "a religious duty."" In December 2001, he urged his supporters to trump the 9/11 attacks: "America is in retreat by the grace of God Almighty..but it needs further blows."2 A few months later, Al Qaeda announced its goal to "kill four million Americans."5 It eVen managed to gain religious sanction from a radical Saudi cleric in 2003 to kill "ten million Americans" with a nuclear or biological weapon.26¶ We also now know that Al Qaeda has been seriously seeking a nuclear bomb. According to the Report of the 9/11 Commission, "Al Qaeda has tried to acquire or make nuclear weapons for at least ten years... and continues to pursue its strategic goal of obtaining a nuclear capability." It further reveals "bin Laden had reportedly been heard to speak of wanting a 'Hiroshima." The Commission provides evidence of Al Qaedas effort to recruit nuclear expertise-including evidence about the meeting between two Pakistani nuclear weapon scientists, bin Laden, and his deputy Ayman al-Zawahiri in Afghanistan to discuss nuclear weapons.2 These scientists were founding members of Ummah Tamer-e-Nau (UTN), a so-called charitable agency to support projects in Afghanistan. The foundation's board included a fellow nuclear scientist knowledgeable about weapons construction, two Pakistani Air Force generals, one Army general, and an industrialist who owned Pakistan's largest foundry.28¶ In his memoir, former CIA Director George Tenet offers his own conclusion that "the most senior leaders of Al Qaeda are still singularly focused on acquiring WMD" and that "the main threat is the nuclear one." In Tenet's view, Al Qaedas strategic goal is to obtain a nuclear capability. He concludes as follows: "I am convinced that this is where Osama bin Laden and his operatives desperately want to go."2 9¶ CLAIM 2: IT IS IMPOSSIBLE FOR TERRORISTS TO ACQUIRE FISSILE MATERIAL.¶ Assuming that terrorists have the intent-could they acquire the necessary materials for a Hiroshima-model bomb? Tenet reports that after 9/11, President Bush showed President Putin his briefing on UTN. In Tenet's account of the meeting, Bush "asked Putin point blank if Russia could account for all of its material." Putin responded that he could guarantee it was secure during his watch, underlying his inability to provide assurance about events under his predecessor, Boris Yeltsin.3o¶ When testifying to the Senate Intelligence Committee in February 2005, Commit- 36 tee Vice-Chairman John Rockefeller (D-WV) asked CIA Director Porter Goss whether the amount of nuclear material known to be missing from Russian nuclear facilities was sufficient to construct a nuclear weapon. Goss replied, "There is sufficient material unaccounted for that it would be possible for those with know-how to construct a weapon.. .I can't account for some of the material so I can't make the assurance about its whereabouts."¶ Mueller sidesteps these inconvenient facts to assert a contrary claim. According to his telling, over the last 10 years, there have been only 10 known thefts of highly enriched uranium (HEU), totaling less than 16 pounds, far less than required for an atomic explosion. He acknowledges, however, that "There may have been additional thefts that went undiscovered."32¶ Yet, as Matthew Bunn testified to the Senate in April 2008, "Theft of HEU and plutonium is not a hypothetical worry, it is an ongoing reality." He notes that "nearly all of the stolen HEU and plutonium that has been seized over the years had never been missed before it was seized." The IAEA Illicit Nuclear Trafficking Database notes 1,266 incidents reported by 99 countries over the last 12 years, including 18 incidents involving HEU or plutonium trafficking. 130 research reactors around the world in 40 developing and transitional countries still hold the essential ingredient for nuclear weapons. As Bunn explains, "The world stockpiles of HEU and separated plutonium are enough to make roughly 200,000 nuclear weapons; a tiny fraction of one percent of these stockpiles going missing could cause a global catastrophe."¶ Consider the story of Russian citizen Oleg Khinsagov. Arrested in February 2006 in Georgia, he was carrying 100 grams of 89-percent enriched HEU as a sample and attempting to find a buyer for what he claimed were many additional kilograms. Mueller asserts that "although there is a legitimate concern that some material, particularly in Russia, may be somewhat inadequately secured, it is under lock and key, and even sleepy, drunken guards, will react with hostility (and noise) to a raiding party.""¶ CLAIM 3: IT IS EXTREMELY DIFFICULT TO CONSTRUCT A NUCLEAR DEVICE THAT WORKS.¶ Rolf Mowatt-Larssen, former director of the Department of Energy's Office of Intelligence and Counterintelligence, testified that, "The 21s' century will be defined first by the desire and then by the ability of non-state actors to procure or develop crude nuclear weapons."6 In contrast, Mueller contends that, "Making a bomb is an extraordinarily difficult task... the odds, indeed, are stacked against the terrorists, perhaps massively so." 37¶ Mueller argues that his conclusion follows from an analysis of 20 steps an atomic terrorist would have to accomplish in what he judges to be the most likely nuclear terrorism scenario. On the basis of this list, he claims that there is "worse than one in a 37 million" chance of success. 38¶ His approach, however, misunderstands probabilistic risk assessment. For example, some of the steps on the list would have to be completed before an attempt to acquire material could begin (therefore, the success rate for any of those steps during the path would, by definition, be 100 percent). Other steps are unnecessary, such as having a technically sophisticated team pre-deployed in the target country. Although he assumes that stolen materials will be missed, in none of the 18 documented cases mentioned earlier had the seized material been reported missing."¶ At U.S. weapons labs and among the U.S. intelligence community, experts who have examined this issue largely agree. John Foster, a leading American bomb maker and former director of the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratories, wrote a quarter century ago, "If the essential nuclear materials are at hand, it is possible to make an atomic bomb using information that is available in the open literature." 4 Similarly, Theodore Taylor, the nuclear physicist who designed America's smallest and largest atomic bombs, has repeatedly stated that, given fissile material, building a bomb is "very easy. Double underline. Very Easy." 4¶ Inquiring into such claims, then-Senator Joe Biden (D-DE) asked the major nuclear weapons laboratories whether they could make such a device if they had nuclear materials. All three laboratories answered affirmatively. The laboratories built a gun-type device using only components that were commercially available and without breaking a single U.S. law.¶ The Commission on the Intelligence Capabilities of the United States Regarding Weapons of Mass Destruction, known as the Silberman-Robb Commission, reported in 2005 that the intelligence community believed Al Qaeda "probably had access to nuclear expertise and facilities and that there was a real possibility of the group developing a crude nuclear device." It went on to say that "fabrication of at least a 'crude' nuclear device was within Al Qaedas capabilities, if it could obtain fissile material."43¶ Skeptics argue that terrorists cannot replicate the effort of a multi-billion dollar nuclear program of a state. This claim does not distinguish between the difficulty of producing nuclear materials for a bomb (the most difficult threshold) and the difficulty of making a bomb once the material has been acquired. The latter is much easier. In the Iraq case, for example, the CIA noted that if Saddam Hussein had stolen or purchased nuclear materials from abroad, this would have cut the time Iraq needed to make a bomb from years to months.1 Moreover, terrorists do not require a state-of-the art weapon and delivery system, since for blowing up a single city a crude nuclear device would suffice.¶ The grim reality of globalization's dark underbelly is that non-state actors are 38 increasingly capable of enacting the kind of lethal destruction heretofore the sole reserve of states.¶ CLAIM 4: IT IS TOO DIFFICULT TO DELIVER A NUCLEAR DEVICE TO THE UNITED STATES.¶ In the spring of 1946, J. Robert Oppenheimer was asked whether units of the atom bomb could be smuggled into New York and then detonated. He answered, "Of course it could be done, and people could destroy New York." As for how such a weapon smuggled in a crate or a suitcase might be detected, Oppenheimer opined, "with a screwdriver." He went on to explain that because the HEU in a nuclear weapon emits so few radioactive signals, a bomb disguised with readily available shielding would not be detected when inspectors opened the crates and examined the cargo.41¶ The nuclear weapon that terrorists would use in the first attack on the United States is far more likely to arrive in a cargo container than on the tip of a missile. In his appearance before a Senate subcommittee in March 2001, six months before 9/11, National Intelligence Officer Robert Walpole testified that "non-missile delivery means are less costly, easier to acquire, and more reliable and accurate."' 6¶ Citing the 1999-2003 U.S. Congressional Advisory Panel to Assess Domestic Response Capabilities for Terrorism Involving Weapons of Mass Destruction (the Gilmore Commission), Mueller states that transporting an improvised nuclear device would require overcoming "Herculean challenges.""¶ He does not explain, however, why bringing a crude nuclear weapon into an American city would be materially different than the challenge faced by drug smugglers or human traffickers. According to the Government Accountability Organization, an average of 275 metric tons of cocaine have arrived in Mexico each year for transshipment to the United States since 2000. Reported seizures averaged about 36 tons a year, a 13 percent success rate for the intelligence and law enforcement community. Three million illegal immigrants enter the country each year, and only one in three gets caught."

#### No defense

Bunn 13 (Matthew, Valentin Kuznetsov, Martin B. Malin, Yuri Morozov, Simon Saradzhyan, William H. Tobey, Viktor I. Yesin, and Pavel S. Zolotarev. "Steps to Prevent Nuclear Terrorism." Paper, Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs, Harvard Kennedy School, October 2, 2013, Matthew Bunn. Professor of the Practice of Public Policy at Harvard Kennedy School andCo-Principal Investigator of Project on Managing the Atom at Harvard University’s Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs. • Vice Admiral Valentin Kuznetsov (retired Russian Navy). Senior research fellow at the Institute for U.S. and Canadian Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Senior Military Representative of the Russian Ministry of Defense to NATO from 2002 to 2008. • Martin Malin. Executive Director of the Project on Managing the Atom at the Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs. • Colonel Yuri Morozov (retired Russian Armed Forces). Professor of the Russian Academy of Military Sciences and senior research fellow at the Institute for U.S. and Canadian Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences, chief of department at the Center for Military-Strategic Studies at the General Staff of the Russian Armed Forces from 1995 to 2000. • Simon Saradzhyan. Fellow at Harvard University’s Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs, Moscow-based defense and security expert and writer from 1993 to 2008. • William Tobey. Senior fellow at Harvard University’s Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs and director of the U.S.-Russia Initiative to Prevent Nuclear Terrorism, deputy administrator for Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation at the U.S. National Nuclear Security Administration from 2006 to 2009. • Colonel General Viktor Yesin (retired Russian Armed Forces). Leading research fellow at the Institute for U.S. and Canadian Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences and advisor to commander of the Strategic Missile Forces of Russia, chief of staff of the Strategic Missile Forces from 1994 to 1996. • Major General Pavel Zolotarev (retired Russian Armed Forces). Deputy director of the Institute for U.S. and Canadian Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences, head of the Information and Analysis Center of the Russian Ministry of Defense from1993 to 1997, section head - deputy chief of staff of the Defense Council of Russia from 1997 to 1998., 10/2/2013, “Steps to Prevent Nuclear Terrorism: Recommendations Based on the U.S.-Russia Joint Threat Assessment”, <http://belfercenter.ksg.harvard.edu/publication/23430/steps_to_prevent_nuclear_terrorism.html>)

I. Introduction In 2011, Harvard’s Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs and the Russian Academy of Sciences’ Institute for U.S. and Canadian Studies published “The U.S. – Russia Joint Threat Assessment on Nuclear Terrorism.” The assessment analyzed the means, motives, and access of would-be nuclear terrorists, and concluded that the threat of nuclear terrorism is urgent and real. The Washington and Seoul Nuclear Security Summits in 2010 and 2012 established and demonstrated a consensus among political leaders from around the world that nuclear terrorism poses a serious threat to the peace, security, and prosperity of our planet. For any country, a terrorist attack with a nuclear device would be an immediate and catastrophic disaster, and the negative effects would reverberate around the world far beyond the location and moment of the detonation. Preventing a nuclear terrorist attack requires international cooperation to secure nuclear materials, especially among those states producing nuclear materials and weapons. As the world’s two greatest nuclear powers, the United States and Russia have the greatest experience and capabilities in securing nuclear materials and plants and, therefore, share a special responsibility to lead international efforts to prevent terrorists from seizing such materials and plants. The depth of convergence between U.S. and Russian vital national interests on the issue of nuclear security is best illustrated by the fact that bilateral cooperation on this issue has continued uninterrupted for more than two decades, even when relations between the two countries occasionally became frosty, as in the aftermath of the August 2008 war in Georgia. Russia and the United States have strong incentives to forge a close and trusting partnership to prevent nuclear terrorism and have made enormous progress in securing fissile material both at home and in partnership with other countries. However, to meet the evolving threat posed by those individuals intent upon using nuclear weapons for terrorist purposes, the United States and Russia need to deepen and broaden their cooperation. The 2011 “U.S. - Russia Joint Threat Assessment” offered both specific conclusions about the nature of the threat and general observations about how it might be addressed. This report builds on that foundation and analyzes the existing framework for action, cites gaps and deficiencies, and makes specific recommendations for improvement. “The U.S. – Russia Joint Threat Assessment on Nuclear Terrorism” (The 2011 report executive summary): • Nuclear terrorism is a real and urgent threat. Urgent actions are required to reduce the risk. The risk is driven by the rise of terrorists who seek to inflict unlimited damage, many of whom have sought justification for their plans in radical interpretations of Islam**;** by the spread of information about the decades-old technology of nuclear weapons; by the increased availability of weapons-usable nuclear materials; and by globalization, which makes it easier to move people, technologies, and materials across the world. • Making a crude nuclear bomb would not be easy, but is potentially within the capabilities of a technically sophisticated terrorist group, as numerous government studies have confirmed. Detonating a stolen nuclear weapon would likely be difficult for terrorists to accomplish, if the weapon was equipped with modern technical safeguards (such as the electronic locks known as Permissive Action Links, or PALs). Terrorists could, however, cut open a stolen nuclear weapon and make use of its nuclear material for a bomb of their own. • The nuclear material for a bomb is small and difficult to detect, making it a major challenge to stop nuclear smuggling or to recover nuclear material after it has been stolen. Hence, a primary focus in reducing the risk must be to keep nuclear material and nuclear weapons from being stolen by continually improving their security, as agreed at the Nuclear Security Summit in Washington in April 2010. • Al-Qaeda has sought nuclear weapons for almost two decades. The group has repeatedly attempted to purchase stolen nuclear material or nuclear weapons, and has repeatedly attempted to recruit nuclear expertise. Al-Qaeda reportedly conducted tests of conventional explosives for its nuclear program in the desert in Afghanistan. The group’s nuclear ambitions continued after its dispersal following the fall of the Taliban regime in Afghanistan. Recent writings from top al-Qaeda leadership are focused on justifying the mass slaughter of civilians, including the use of weapons of mass destruction, and are in all likelihood intended to provide a formal religious justification for nuclear use. While there are significant gaps in coverage of the group’s activities, al-Qaeda appears to have been frustrated thus far in acquiring a nuclear capability; it is unclear whether the the group has acquired weapons-usable nuclear material or the expertise needed to make such material into a bomb. Furthermore, pressure from a broad range of counter-terrorist actions probably has reduced the group’s ability to manage large, complex projects, but has not eliminated the danger. However, there is no sign the group has abandoned its nuclear ambitions. On the contrary, leadership statements as recently as 2008 indicate that the intention to acquire and use nuclear weapons is as strong as ever.

#### Any attack turns the K
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Indeed, while the Bush administration bears the blame for these hor- rors, White House officials exploited a shift in public values after 9/11. When asked by Princeton Survey Research Associates in 1997 whether stopping terrorism required citizens to cede some civil liberties, less than one-t hird of Americans said yes. By the spring of 2002, that had grown to almost three- quarters. Public support for the government’s right to wire- tap phones and read people’s mail also grew exponentially. In fact, polling in the months after the attack showed Americans less concerned that the Bush administration was violating civil liberties than that **it wasn’t violating them enough**. What will happen the next time? It is, of course, impossible to predict the reaction to any particular attack. But in 2003, the Center for Public Integrity got a draft of something called the Domestic Security Enhance- ment Act, quickly dubbed Patriot II. According to the center’s executive director, Charles Lewis, **it expanded government power** five or **ten times as much as its predecessor**. One provision permitted the government to strip native-born Americans of their citizenship, allowing them to be indefinitely imprisoned without legal recourse if they were deemed to have provided any support—even nonviolent support—to groups designated as terrorist. After an outcry, the bill was shelved. But it offers a hint of what this administration—or any administration—might do if the United States were hit again. ¶ When the CIA recently tried to imagine how the world might look in 2020, it conjured four potential scenarios. One was called the “cycle of fear,” and it drastically inverted the assumption of security that C. Vann Woodward called central to America’s national character. The United States has been attacked again and the government has responded with “large- scale intrusive security measures.” In this dystopian future, two arms dealers, one with jihadist ties, text- message about a potential nuclear deal. One notes that terrorist networks have “turned into mini-s tates.” The other jokes about the global recession sparked by the latest attacks. And he muses about how terrorism has changed American life. “That new Patriot Act,” he writes, “went **way beyond anything imagined after 9/11**.” “The fear cycle generated by an increasing spread of WMD and terrorist attacks,” comments the CIA report, “once under way, would be one of the **hardest to break**.” And the more entrenched that fear cycle grows, the less free America will become. Which is why a new generation of American liberals must make the fight against this new totalitarianism their own.
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While theoretical debates at academic conferences are important to academics, the discourse and concerns of foreign policy decision makers are quite different, so different that they constitutes a distinctive problem-solving theory-averse policy making sub-culture. There is a danger that academics assume that the discourses they engage are more significant in the practice of foreign policy and the exercise of power than they really are. This is not, however, to minimize the obvious importance of academia as a general institutional structure among many which sustain certain epistemic communities in particular states. In general, I do not disagree with Dalby's fourth point about politics and discourse except to note that his statement -- "Precisely because reality could be represented in particular ways political decisions could be taken, troops and material moved and war fought" -- evades the important question of agency I noted in my review essay. The assumption that it is representations that make action possible is inadequate by itself. Political, military and economic structures, institutions, discursive networks and leadership are all crucial in explaining social action and should be theorized together with representational practices. Both here and earlier, Dalby's reasoning inclines towards a form of idealism. In response to Dalby's fifth point (with its three subpoints), it is worth noting, first, that his book is about the CPD not the Reagan administration. He analyzes certain CPD discourses not the geographical reasoning practices of the Reagan administration nor its public policy reasoning on national security. Dalby's book is narrowly textual; the general contextuality of the Reagan administration is not dealt with in the book. Second, let me simply note that I find that the distinction between critical theorists and post-structuralists is a little too rigidly and heroically drawn by Dalby and others. Third, Dalby's interpretation of the reconceptualization of national security in Moscow as heavily influenced by dissident peace researchers in Europe is highly idealist, an interpretation that ignores the structural and ideological crises facing the Soviet elite at that time. Gorbachev's reforms and his new security discourse were also strongly self-interested, an ultimately futile attempt to save the Communist Party and a discredited regime of power from disintegration. The issues raised by Simon Dalby in his comment are important ones for all those interested in the practice of critical geopolitics. While I agree with Dalby that questions of discourse are extremely important ones for political geographer's to engage, there is a danger of fetishizing this concern with discourse so that we neglect the institutional and the sociological, the materialist and the cultural, the political and the geographical contexts within which particular discursive strategies become significant. Critical geopolitics, in other words, should not be a prisoner of the sweeping ahistorical cant that sometimes accompanies "post-structuralism" nor convenient reading strategies like the identity politics narrative; it needs to always be open to the patterned mess that is human history.
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But the idea that poverty and peace are directly related presupposes that wealth inequalities are – in and of themselves – unjust, and that the solution to the problem of war is to alleviate the injustice that inspires conflict, namely poverty. However, it also suggests that poverty is a legitimate inspiration for violence, otherwise there would be no reason to alleviate it in the interests of peace. It has become such a commonplace to suggest that poverty and conflict are linked that it rarely suffers any examination. To suggest that war causes poverty is to utter an obvious truth, but to suggest the opposite is – on reflection – quite hard to believe. War is an expensive business in the twenty-first century, even asymmetrically. And just to examine Bangladesh for a moment is enough at least to raise the question concerning the actual connection between peace and poverty. The government of Bangladesh is a threat only to itself, and despite 30 years of the Grameen Bank, Bangladesh remains in a state of incipient civil strife. So although Muhammad Yunus should be applauded for his work in demonstrating the efficacy of micro-credit strategies in a context of development, it is not at all clear that this has anything to do with resolving the social and political crisis in Bangladesh, nor is it clear that this has anything to do with resolving the problem of peace and war in our times. It does speak to the Western liberal mindset – as Geir Lundestad acknowledges – but then perhaps this exposes the extent to which the Peace Prize itself has simply become an award that reflects a degree of Western liberal wish-fulfilment. It is perhaps comforting to believe that poverty causes violence, as it serves to endorse a particular kind of concern for the developing world that in turn regards all problems as fundamentally economic rather than deeply – and potentially radically – political.