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## Norms

#### Drone prolif is inevitable---the plan establishes norms for restrained use that prevents great powers war.

**Roberts 13**. Roberts, Kristen. March 22nd, 2013. “When the whole world has drones” “ <http://www.nationaljournal.com/magazine/when-the-whole-world-has-drones-20130321> (news editor for the National Journal. She has a Masters degree in security studies from Georgetown)

The proliferation of drone technology has moved well beyond the control of the United States government and its closest allies. The aircraft are too easy to obtain, with barriers to entry on the production side crumbling too quickly to place limits on the spread of a technology that promises to transform warfare on a global scale. Already, more than 75 countries have remote piloted aircraft. More than 50 nations are building a total of nearly a thousand types. At its last display at a trade show in Beijing, China showed off 25 different unmanned aerial vehicles. Not toys or models, but real flying machines. It’s a classic and common phase in the life cycle of a military innovation: An advanced country and its weapons developers create a tool, and then others learn how to make their own. But what makes this case rare, and dangerous, is the powerful combination of efficiency and lethality spreading in an environment lacking internationally accepted guidelines on legitimate use. This technology is snowballing through a global arena where the main precedent for its applicationis theoneset by the United States; it’s a precedent Washington does not want anyone following. America, the world’s leading democracy and a country built on a legal and moral framework unlike any other, has adopted a war-making process that too often bypasses its traditional, regimented, and rigorously overseen military in favor of a secret program never publicly discussed, based on legal advice never properly vetted. The Obama administration has used its executive power to refuse or outright ignore requests by congressional overseers, and it has resisted monitoring by federal courts. To implement this covert program, the administration has adopted a tool that lowers the threshold for lethal force by reducing the cost and risk of combat. This still-expanding counterterrorism use of drones to kill people, including its own citizens, outside of traditionally defined battlefields and established protocols for warfare, has given friends and foes a green light to employ these aircraft in extraterritorial operations that could not only affect relations between the nation-states involved but also destabilize entire regions and potentially upset geopolitical order. Hyperbole? Consider this: Iran, with the approval of Damascus, carries out a lethal strike on anti-Syrian forces inside Syria; Russia picks off militants tampering with oil and gas lines in Ukraine or Georgia; Turkey arms a U.S.-provided Predator to kill Kurdish militants in northern Iraq who it believes are planning attacks along the border. Label the targets as terrorists, and in each case, Tehran, Moscow, and Ankara may point toward Washington and say, we learned it by watching you. In Pakistan, Yemen, and Afghanistan. This is the unintended consequence of American drone warfare. For all of the attention paid to the drone program in recent weeks—about Americans on the target list (there are none at this writing) and the executive branch’s legal authority to kill by drone outside war zones (thin, by officials’ own private admission)—what goes undiscussed is Washington’s deliberate failure to establish clear and demonstrable rules for itself that would at minimum create a globally relevant standard for delineating between legitimate and rogue usesof one of the most awesome military robotics capabilities of this generation. THE WRONG QUESTION The United States is the indisputable leader in drone technology and long-range strike. Remote-piloted aircraft have given Washington an extraordinary ability to wage war with far greater precision, improved effect, and fewer unintended casualties than conventional warfare. The drones allow U.S. forces to establish ever greater control over combat areas, and the Pentagon sees the technology as an efficient and judicious force of the future. And it should, given the billions of dollars that have gone into establishing and maintaining such a capability. That level of superiority leads some national security officials to downplay concerns about other nations’ unmanned systems and to too narrowly define potential threats to the homeland. As proof, they argue that American dominance in drone warfare is due only in part to the aircraft itself, which offers the ability to travel great distances and loiter for long periods, not to mention carry and launch Hellfire missiles. The drone itself, they argue, is just a tool and, yes, one that is being copied aggressively by allies and adversaries alike. The real edge, they say, is in the unparalleled intelligence-collection and data-analysis underpinning the aircraft’s mission. “There is what I think is just an unconstrained focus on a tool as opposed to the subject of the issue, the tool of remotely piloted aircraft that in fact provide for greater degrees of surety before you employ force than anything else we use,” said retired Lt. Gen. David Deptula, the Air Force’s first deputy chief of staff for intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance. “I think people don’t realize that for the medium altitude aircraft—the MQ-1 [Predator] and MQ-9 [Reaper] that are generally written about in the press—there are over 200 people involved in just one orbit of those aircraft.… The majority of those people are analysts who are interpreting the information that’s coming off the sensors on the aircraft.” The analysts are part of the global architecture that makes precision strikes, and targeted killing, possible. At the front end, obviously, intelligence—military, CIA, and local—inform target decisions. But in as near-real time as technologically possible, intel analysts in Nevada, Texas, Virginia, and other locations watch the data flood in from the aircraft and make calls on what’s happening on target. They monitor the footage, listen to audio, and analyze signals, giving decision-makers time to adjust an operation if the risks (often counted in potential civilian deaths) outweigh the reward (judged by the value of the threat eliminated). “Is that a shovel or a rifle? Is that a Taliban member or is this a farmer? The way that warfare has advanced is that we are much more exquisite in our ability to discern,” Maj. Gen. Robert Otto, commander of the Air Force Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance Agency, told National Journal at Nellis Air Force Base in Nevada. “We’re not overhead for 15 minutes with a fighter that’s about to run out of gas, and we have to make a decision. We can orbit long enough to be pretty sure about our target.” Other countries, groups, and even individuals can and do fly drones. But no state or group has nearly the sophisticated network of intelligence and data analysis that gives the United States its strategic advantage. Although it would be foolish to dismiss the notion that potential U.S. adversaries aspire to attain that type of war-from-afar, pinpoint-strike capability, they have neither the income nor the perceived need to do so. That’s true, at least today. It’s also irrelevant. Others who employ drones are likely to carry a different agenda, one more concerned with employing a relatively inexpensive and ruthlessly efficient tool to dispatch an enemy close at hand. “It would be very difficult for them to create the global-strike architecture we have, to have a control cell in Nevada flying a plane over Afghanistan. The reality is that most nations don’t want or need that,” said Peter Singer, director of the Brookings Institution’s Center for 21st Century Security and Intelligence and one of the foremost experts in advanced military technology. “Turkey’s not looking to conduct strikes into the Philippines.... But Turkey is looking to be able to carry out long-duration surveillance and potentially strike inside and right on its border.” And that’s a NATO ally seeking the capability to conduct missions that would run afoul of U.S. interests in Iraq and the broader Middle East. Already, Beijing says it considered a strike in Myanmar to kill a drug lord wanted in the deaths of Chinese sailors. What happens if China arms one of its remote-piloted planes and strikes Philippine or Indian trawlers in the South China Sea? Or if India uses the aircraft to strike Lashkar-e-Taiba militants near Kashmir? “We don’t like other states using lethal force outside their borders. It’s destabilizing. It can lead to a sort of wider escalation of violence between two states,” said Micah Zenko, a security policy and drone expert at the Council on Foreign Relations. “So the proliferation of drones is not just about the protection of the United States. It’s primarily about the likelihood that other states will increasingly use lethal force outside of their borders.” LOWERING THE BAR Governments have covertly killed for ages, whether they maintained an official hit list or not. Before the Obama administration’s “disposition matrix,” Israel was among the best-known examples of a state that engaged, and continues to engage, in strikes to eliminate people identified by its intelligence as plotting attacks against it. But Israel certainly is not alone. Turkey has killed Kurds in Northern Iraq. Some American security experts point to Russia as well, although Moscow disputes this. In the 1960s, the U.S. government was involved to differing levels in plots to assassinate leaders in Congo and the Dominican Republic, and, famously, Fidel Castro in Cuba. The Church Committee’s investigation and subsequent 1975 report on those and other suspected plots led to the standing U.S. ban on assassination. So, from 1976 until the start of President George W. Bush’s “war on terror,” the United States did not conduct targeted killings, because it was considered anathema to American foreign policy. (In fact, until as late as 2001, Washington’s stated policy was to oppose Israel’s targeted killings.) When America adopted targeted killing again—first under the Bush administration after the September 11 attacks and then expanded by President Obama—the tools of the trade had changed. No longer was the CIA sending poison, pistols, and toxic cigars to assets overseas to kill enemy leaders. Now it could target people throughout al-Qaida’s hierarchy with accuracy, deliver lethal ordnance literally around the world, and watch the mission’s completion in real time. The United States is smartly using technology to improve combat efficacy, and to make war-fighting more efficient, both in money and manpower. It has been able to conduct more than 400 lethal strikes, killing more than 3,500 people, in Afghanistan, Pakistan, Yemen, Somalia, and North Africa using drones; reducing risk to U.S. personnel; and giving the Pentagon flexibility to use special-forces units elsewhere. And, no matter what human-rights groups say, it’s clear that drone use has reduced the number of civilians killed in combat relative to earlier conflicts. Washington would be foolish not to exploit unmanned aircraft in its long fight against terrorism. In fact, defense hawks and spendthrifts alike would criticize it if it did not. “If you believe that these folks are legitimate terrorists who are committing acts of aggressive, potential violent acts against the United States or our allies or our citizens overseas, should it matter how we choose to engage in the self-defense of the United States?” asked Rep. Mike Rogers, R-Mich., chairman of the House Intelligence Committee. “Do we have that debate when a special-forces team goes in? Do we have that debate if a tank round does it? Do we have the debate if an aircraft pilot drops a particular bomb?” But defense analysts argue—and military officials concede—there is a qualitative difference between dropping a team of men into Yemen and green-lighting a Predator flight from Nevada. Drones lower the threshold for military action. That’s why, according to the Council on Foreign Relations, unmanned aircraft have conducted 95 percent of all U.S. targeted killings. Almost certainly, if drones were unavailable, the United States would not have pursued an equivalent number of manned strikes in Pakistan. And what’s true for the United States will be true as well for other countries that own and arm remote piloted aircraft. “The drones—the responsiveness, the persistence, and without putting your personnel at risk—is what makes it a different technology,” Zenko said. “When other states have this technology, if they follow U.S. practice, it will lower the threshold for their uses of lethal force outside their borders. So they will be more likely to conduct targeted killings than they have in the past.” The Obama administration appears to be aware of and concerned about setting precedents through its targeted-strike program. When the development of a disposition matrix to catalog both targets and resources marshaled against the United States was first reported in 2012, officials spoke about it in part as an effort to create a standardized process that would live beyond the current administration, underscoring the long duration of the counterterrorism challenge. Indeed, the president’s legal and security advisers have put considerable effort into establishing rules to govern the program. Most members of the House and Senate Intelligence committees say they are confident the defense and intelligence communities have set an adequate evidentiary bar for determining when a member of al-Qaida or an affiliated group may be added to the target list, for example, and say that the rigor of the process gives them comfort in the level of program oversight within the executive branch. “They’re not drawing names out of a hat here,” Rogers said. “It is very specific intel-gathering and other things that would lead somebody to be subject for an engagement by the United States government.” BEHIND CLOSED DOORS The argument against public debate is easy enough to understand: Operational secrecy is necessary, and total opacity is easier. “I don’t think there is enough transparency and justification so that we remove not the secrecy, but the mystery of these things,” said Dennis Blair, Obama’s former director of national intelligence. “The reason it’s not been undertaken by the administration is that they just make a cold-blooded calculation that it’s better to hunker down and take the criticism than it is to get into the public debate, which is going to be a hard one to win.” But by keeping legal and policy positions secret, only partially sharing information even with congressional oversight committees, and declining to open a public discussion about drone use, the president and his team are asking the world to just trust that America is getting this right. While some will, many people, especially outside the United States, will see that approach as hypocritical, coming from a government that calls for transparency and the rule of law elsewhere. “I know these people, and I know how much they really, really attend to the most important details of the job,” said Barry Pavel, a former defense and security official in the Bush and Obama administrations who is director of the Brent Scowcroft Center on International Security at the Atlantic Council. “If I didn’t have that personal knowledge and because there isn’t that much really in the press, then I would be giving you a different rendering, and much more uncertain rendering.” That’s only part of the problem with the White House’s trust-us approach. The other resides in the vast distance between the criteria and authorization the administration says it uses in the combat drone program and the reality on the ground. For example, according to administration officials, before a person is added to the targeted strike list, specific criteria should be met. The target should be a 1) senior, 2) operational 3) leader of al-Qaida or an affiliated group who presents 4) an imminent threat of violent attack 5) against the United States. But that’s not who is being targeted. Setting aside the administration’s redefining of “imminence” beyond all recognition, the majority of the 3,500-plus people killed by U.S. drones worldwide were not leaders of al-Qaida or the Taliban; they were low- or mid-level foot soldiers. Most were not plotting attacks against the United States. In Yemen and North Africa, the Obama administration is deploying weaponized drones to take out targets who are more of a threat to local governments than to Washington, according to defense and regional security experts who closely track unrest in those areas. In some cases, Washington appears to be in the business of using its drone capabilities mostly to assist other countries, not to deter strikes against the United States (another precedent that might be eagerly seized upon in the future). U.S. defense and intelligence officials reject any suggestion that the targets are not legitimate. One thing they do not contest, however, is that the administration’s reliance on the post-9/11 Authorization for Use of Military Force as legal cover for a drone-strike program that has extended well beyond al-Qaida in Afghanistan or Pakistan is dodgy. The threat that the United States is trying to deal with today has an ever more tenuous connection to Sept. 11. (None of the intelligence officials reached for this article would speak on the record.) But instead of asking Congress to consider extending its authorization, as some officials have mulled, the administration’s legal counsel has chosen instead to rely on Nixon administration adviser John Stevenson’s 1970 justification of the bombing of Cambodia during the Vietnam War, an action new Secretary of State John Kerry criticized during his confirmation hearing this year. Human-rights groups might be loudest in their criticism of both the program and the opaque policy surrounding it, but even the few lawmakers who have access to the intelligence the administration shares have a hard time coping with the dearth of information. “We can’t always assume we’re going to have responsible people with whom we agree and trust in these positions,” said Sen. Angus King, I-Maine, who sits on the Senate Intelligence Committee. “The essence of the Constitution is, it shouldn’t matter who is in charge; they’re still constrained by principles and rules of the Constitution and of the Bill of Rights.” PEER PRESSURE Obama promised in his 2013 State of the Union to increase the drone program’s transparency. “In the months ahead, I will continue to engage Congress to ensure not only that our targeting, detention, and prosecution of terrorists remains consistent with our laws and system of checks and balances, but that our efforts are even more transparent to the American people and to the world,” the president said on Feb. 12. Since then, the administration, under pressure from allies on Senate Intelligence, agreed to release all of the legal memos the Justice Department drafted in support of targeted killing. But, beyond that, it’s not certain Obama will do anything more to shine light on this program. Except in situations where leaks help it tell a politically expedient story of its skill at killing bad guys, the administration has done little to make a case to the public and the world at large for its use of armed drones. Already, what’s become apparent is that the White House is not interested in changing much about the way it communicates strike policy. (It took Sen. Rand Paul’s 13-hour filibuster of CIA Director John Brennan’s nomination to force the administration to concede that it doesn’t have the right to use drones to kill noncombatant Americans on U.S. soil.) And government officials, as well as their surrogates on security issues, are actively trying to squash expectations that the administration would agree to bring the judicial branch into the oversight mix. Indeed, judicial review of any piece of the program is largely off the table now, according to intelligence officials and committee members. Under discussion within the administration and on Capitol Hill is a potential program takeover by the Pentagon, removing the CIA from its post-9/11 role of executing military-like strikes. Ostensibly, that shift could help lift the secret-by-association-with-CIA attribute of the program that some officials say has kept them from more freely talking about the legitimate military use of drones for counterterrorism operations. But such a fix would provide no guarantee of greater transparency for the public, or even Congress. And if the administration is not willing to share with lawmakers who are security-cleared to know, it certainly is not prepared to engage in a sensitive discussion, even among allies, that might begin to set the rules on use for a technology that could upend stability in already fragile and strategically significant places around the globe. Time is running out to do so. “The history of technology development like this is, you never maintain your lead very long. Somebody always gets it,” said David Berteau, director of the International Security Program at the Center for Strategic and International Studies. “They’re going to become cheaper. They’re going to become easier. They’re going to become interoperable,” he said. “The destabilizing effects are very, very serious.” Berteau is not alone. Zenko, of the Council on Foreign Relations, has urged officials to quickly establish norms. Singer, at Brookings, argues that the window of opportunity for the United States to create stability-supporting precedent is quickly closing. The problem is, the administration is not thinking far enough down the line, according to a Senate Intelligence aide. Administration officials “are thinking about the next four years, and we’re thinking about the next 40 years. And those two different angles on this question are why you see them in conflict right now.” That’s in part a symptom of the “technological optimism” that often plagues the U.S. security community when it establishes a lead over its competitors, noted Georgetown University’s Kai-Henrik Barth. After the 1945 bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the United States was sure it would be decades before the Soviets developed a nuclear-weapon capability. It took four years. With drones, the question is how long before the dozens of states with the aircraft can arm and then operate a weaponized version. “Pretty much every nation has gone down the pathway of, ‘This is science fiction; we don’t want this stuff,’ to, ‘OK, we want them, but we’ll just use them for surveillance,’ to, ‘Hmm, they’re really useful when you see the bad guy and can do something about it, so we’ll arm them,’ ” Singer said. He listed the countries that have gone that route: the United States, Britain, Italy, Germany, China. “Consistently, nations have gone down the pathway of first only surveillance and then arming.” The opportunity to write rules that might at least guide, if not restrain, the world’s view of acceptable drone use remains, not least because this is in essence a conventional arms-control issue. The international Missile Technology Control Regime attempts to restrict exports of unmanned vehicles capable of carrying weapons of mass destruction, but it is voluntary and nonbinding, and it’s under attack by the drone industry as a drag on business. Further, the technology itself, especially when coupled with data and real-time analytics, offers the luxury of time and distance that could allow officials to raise the evidentiary bar for strikes—to be closer to certain that their target is the right one. But even without raising standards, tightening up drone-specific restrictions in the standing control regime, or creating a new control agreement (which is never easy to pull off absent a bad-state actor threatening attack), just the process of lining up U.S. policy with U.S. practice would go a long way toward establishing the kind of precedent on use of this technology that America—in five, 10, or 15 years—might find helpful in arguing against another’s actions. A not-insignificant faction of U.S. defense and intelligence experts, Dennis Blair among them, thinks norms play little to no role in global security. And they have evidence in support. The missile-technology regime, for example, might be credited with slowing some program development, but it certainly has not stopped non-signatories—North Korea and Iran—from buying, building, and selling missile systems. But norms established by technology-leading countries, even when not written into legal agreements among nations, have shown success in containing the use and spread of some weapons, including land mines, blinding lasers, and nuclear bombs. Arguably more significant than spotty legal regimes, however, is the behavior of the United States. “History shows that how states adopt and use new military capabilities is often influenced by how other states have—or have not—used them in the past,” Zenko argued. Despite the legal and policy complexity of this issue, it is something the American people have, if slowly, come to care about. Given the attention that Rand Paul’s filibuster garnered, it is not inconceivable that public pressure on drone operations could force the kind of unforeseen change to U.S. policy that it did most recently on “enhanced interrogation” of terrorists. The case against open, transparent rule-making is that it might only hamstring American options while doing little good elsewhere—as if other countries aren’t closely watching this debate and taking notes for their own future policymaking. But the White House’s refusal to answer questions about its drone use with anything but “no comment” ensures that the rest of the world is free to fill in the blanks where and when it chooses. And the United States will have already surrendered the moment in which it could have provided not just a technical operations manual for other nations but a legal and moral one as well.

#### That lowers the threshold for use for US policymakers

Rosa **Brooks 13**, Prof of Law @ Georgetown University Law Center, Bernard L. Schwartz Senior Fellow, New America Foundation, 4/23/13, The Constitutional and Counterterrorism Implications of Targeted Killing, http://www.judiciary.senate.gov/pdf/04-23-13BrooksTestimony.pdf

But the advantages of drones are as overstated and misunderstood as the problems they pose — and in some ways, their very perceived advantages cause new problems. Drone technologies temptingly lower or disguise the costs of lethal force, but their availability can blind us to the potentially dangerous longer - term costs and consequences of our strategic choices. Armed drones lower the perceived costs of using lethal force in at least three ways. First, drones reduce the dollar cost of using lethal force inside foreign countries. 13 Most drones are economical compared with the available alternatives. 14 Manned aircraft, for instance, are quite expensive: 15 Lockheed Martin's F - 22 fighter jets cost about $150 million each; F - 35s are $90 million; and F - 16s are $55 million. But the 2011 price of a Reaper drone was approximately $28.4 million, while Predator drones cost only about $5 million to make. 16 As with so many things, putting a dollar figure on drones is difficult; it depends what costs are counted, and what time frame is used. Nevertheless, drones continue to be perceived as cheaper by government decision - makers. Second, relying on drone strikes rather than alternative means reduces the domestic political costs of using lethal force. Sending manned aircraft or special operations forces after a suspected terrorist places the lives of U.S. personnel at risk, and full - scale invasions and occupations endanger even more American lives. In contrast, using armed drones eliminates all short - term risks to the lives of U.S. personnel involved in the operations. Third, by reducing accidental civilian casualties, 17 precision drone technologies reduce the perceived moral and reputational costs of using lethal force. The US government is extraordinarily concerned about avoiding unnecessary civilian casualties, and rightly so. There are moral and legal reasons for this concern, and there are also pragmatic reasons: civilian casualties cause pain and resentment within local populations and host - country governments and alienate the international community It is of course not a bad thing to possess military technologies that are cost little, protect American lives and enable us to minimize civilian casualties. When new technologies appear to reduce the costs of using lethal force, however, the threshold for deciding to use lethal force correspondingly drops, and officials will be tempted to use lethal force with greater frequency and less wisdom.¶ Over the last decade, we have seen US drone strikes evolve from a tool used in extremely limited circumstances to go after specifically identified high - ranking al Qaeda officials to a tool relied on in an increasing number of countries to go after an eternally lengthening list of putative bad actors, with increasingly tenuous links to grave or imminent threats to the United States. Some of these suspected terrorists have been identified by name and specifically targeted, while others are increasingly targeted on the basis of suspicious behavior patterns. Increasingly, drones strikes have targeted militants who are lower and lower down the terrorist food chain, 18 rather than terrorist masterminds. 19 Although drone strikes are believed to have killed more than 3,000 people since 2004, 20 analysis by the New America Foundation and more recently by a the McClatchy newspaper s suggests that only a small fraction of the dead appear to have been so - called "high - value targets." 21 What’s more, drone strikes have spread ever further from "hot" battlefields, migrating from Pakistan to Yemen to Somalia (and perhaps to Mali 22 and the Philippines as well). 23

#### These conflicts go nuclear --- wrecks global stability

Michael J **Boyle 13**, Assistant Professor of Political Science at La Salle University, former Lecturer in International Relations and Research Fellow at the Centre for the Study of Terrorism and Political Violence at the University of St Andrews, PhD from Cambridge University, January 2013, “The costs and consequences of drone warfare,” International Affairs 89: 1 (2013) 1–29, http://www.chathamhouse.org/sites/default/files/public/International%20Affairs/2013/89\_1/89\_1Boyle.pdf

A second consequence of the spread of drones is that many of the traditional concepts which have underwritten stability in the international system will be radically reshaped by drone technology. For example, much of the stability among the Great Powers in the international system is driven by deterrence, specifically nuclear deterrence.135 Deterrence operates with informal rules of the game and tacit bargains that govern what states, particularly those holding nuclear weapons, may and may not do to one another.136 While it is widely understood that nuclear-capable states will conduct aerial surveillance and spy on one another, overt military confrontations between nuclear powers are rare because they are assumed to be costly and prone to escalation. One open question is whether these states will exercise the same level of restraint with drone surveillance, which is unmanned, low cost, and possibly deniable. States may be more willing to engage in drone overflights which test the resolve of their rivals, or engage in ‘salami tactics’ to see what kind of drone-led incursion, if any, will motivate a response.137 This may have been Hezbollah’s logic in sending a drone into Israeli airspace in October 2012, possibly to relay information on Israel’s nuclear capabilities.138 After the incursion, both Hezbollah and Iran boasted that the drone incident demonstrated their military capabilities.139 One could imagine two rival states—for example, India and Pakistan—deploying drones to test each other’s capability and resolve, with untold consequences if such a probe were misinterpreted by the other as an attack. As drones get physically smaller and more precise, and as they develop a greater flying range, the temptation to use them to spy on a rival’s nuclear programme or military installations might prove too strong to resist. If this were to happen, drones might gradually erode the deterrent relationships that exist between nuclear powers, thus magnifying the risks of a spiral of conflict between them.

#### That makes great power war inevitable---causes escalation as traditional checks don’t apply

Eric **Posner 13**, a professor at the University of Chicago Law School, May 15th, 2013, "The Killer Robot War is Coming," Slate, www.slate.com/articles/news\_and\_politics/view\_from\_chicago/2013/05/drone\_warfare\_and\_spying\_we\_need\_new\_laws.html

Drones have existed for decades, but in recent years they have become ubiquitous. Some people celebrate drones as an effective and humane weapon because they can be used with precision to slay enemies and spare civilians, and argue that they pose no special risks that cannot be handled by existing law. Indeed, drones, far more than any other weapon, enable governments to comply with international humanitarian law by avoiding civilian casualties when attacking enemies. Drone defenders also mocked Rand Paul for demanding that the Obama administration declare whether it believed that it could kill people with drones on American territory. Existing law permits the police to shoot criminals who pose an imminent threat to others; if police can gun down hostage takers and rampaging shooters, why can’t they drone them down too?¶ While there is much to be said in favor of these arguments, drone technology poses a paradox that its defenders have not confronted. Because drones are cheap, effective, riskless for their operators, and adept at minimizing civilian casualties, governments may be tempted to use them too frequently.¶ Indeed, a panic has already arisen that the government will use drones to place the public under surveillance. Many municipalities have passed laws prohibiting such spying even though it has not yet taken place. Why can’t we just assume that existing privacy laws and constitutional rights are sufficient to prevent abuses?¶ To see why, consider U.S. v. Jones, a 2012 case in which the Supreme Court held that the police must get a search warrant before attaching a GPS tracking device to a car, because the physical attachment of the device trespassed on property rights. Justice Samuel Alito argued that this protection was insufficient, because the government could still spy on people from the air. While piloted aircraft are too expensive to use routinely, drones are not, or will not be. One might argue that if the police can observe and follow you in public without obtaining a search warrant, they should be able to do the same thing with drones. But when the cost of surveillance declines, more surveillance takes place. If police face manpower limits, then they will spy only when strong suspicions justify the intrusion on targets’ privacy. If police can launch limitless drones, then we may fear that police will be tempted to shadow ordinary people without good reason.¶ Similarly, we may be comfortable with giving the president authority to use military force on his own when he must put soldiers into harm’s way, knowing that he will not risk lives lightly. Presidents have learned through hard experience that the public will not tolerate even a handful of casualties if it does not believe that the mission is justified. But when drones eliminate the risk of casualties, the president is more likely to launch wars too often.¶ The same problem arises internationally. The international laws that predate drones assume that military intervention across borders risks significant casualties. Since that check normally kept the peace, international law could give a lot of leeway for using military force to chase down terrorists. But if the risk of casualties disappears, then nations might too eagerly attack, resulting in blowback and retaliation. Ironically, the reduced threat to civilians in tactical operations could wind up destabilizing relationships between countries, including even major powers like the United States and China, making the long-term threat to human life much greater.¶ These three scenarios illustrate the same lesson: that law and technology work in tandem. When technological barriers limit the risk of government abuse, legal restrictions on governmental action can be looser. When those technological barriers fall, legal restrictions may need to be tightened.

#### Congressional inaction has made this a defining policy doctrine---expansive executive authority triggers overreach

Maxwell 12 - Colonel and Judge Advocate, U.S. Army, 1st Quarter 2012, “TARGETED KILLING, THE LAW, AND TERRORISTS: FEELING SAFE?,” Joint Force Quarterly, p. 123-130, Mark David Maxwell.

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 self-defense 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.

#### Congressional restrictions are key---prevents global war

Rosa **Brooks 13**, Professor of Law, Georgetown University Law Center, Bernard L. Schwartz Senior Fellow, New America Foundation, 4/23, The Constitutional and Counterterrorism Implications of Targeted Killing, http://www.judiciary.senate.gov/pdf/04-23-13BrooksTestimony.pdf

Mr. Chairman, I would like to turn now to the legal framework applicable to US drone strikes. Both the United States and the international community have long had rules governing armed conflicts and the use of force in national self-defense. These rules apply whether the lethal force at issue involves knives, handguns, grenades or weaponized drones. When drone technologies are used in traditional armed conflicts—on “hot battlefields” such as those in Afghanistan, Iraq or Libya, for instance – they pose no new legal issues. As Administration officials have stated, their use is subject to the same requirements as the use of other lawful means and methods of warfare.28 But if drones used in traditional armed conflicts or traditional self-defense situations present no “new” legal issues, some of the activities and policies enabled and facilitated by drone technologies pose significant challenges to existing legal frameworks. As I have discussed above, the availability of perceived low cost of drone technologies makes it far easier for the US to “expand the battlefield,” striking targets in places where it would be too dangerous or too politically controversial to send troops. Specifically, drone technologies enable the United States to strike targets deep inside foreign states, and do so quickly, efficiently and deniably. As a result, drones have become the tool of choice for so-called “targeted killing” – the deliberate targeting of an individual or group of individuals, whether known by name or targeted based on patterns of activity, inside the borders of a foreign country. It is when drones are used in targeted killings outside of traditional or “hot” battlefields that their use challenges existing legal frameworks. Law is almost always out of date: we make legal rules based on existing conditions and technologies, perhaps with a small nod in the direction of predicted future changes. As societies and technologies change, law increasingly becomes an exercise in jamming square pegs into round holes. Eventually, that process begins to do damage to existing law: it gets stretched out of shape, or broken. Right now, I would argue, US drone policy is on the verge of doing significant damage to the rule of law. A. The Rule of Law At root, the idea of “rule of law” is fairly simple, and well understood by Americans familiar with the foundational documents that established our nation, such as the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. The rule of law requires that governments follow transparent, clearly defined and universally applicable laws and procedures. The goal of the rule of law is to ensure predictability and stability, and to prevent the arbitrary exercise of power. In a society committed to the rule of law, the government cannot fine you, lock you up, or kill you on a whim -- it can restrict your liberty or take your property or life only in accordance with pre-established processes and rules that reflect basic notions of justice, humanity and fairness. Precisely what constitutes a fair process is debatable, but most would agree that at a minimum, fairness requires that individuals have reasonable notice of what constitutes the applicable law, reasonable notice that they are suspected of violating the law, a reasonable opportunity to rebut any allegations against them, and a reasonable opportunity to have the outcome of any procedures or actions against them reviewed by some objective person or body. These core values are enshrined both in the US Constitution and in international human rights law instruments such as the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, to which the United States is a party. In ordinary circumstances, this bundle of universally acknowledged rights (together with international law principles of sovereignty) means it is clearly unlawful for one state to target and kill an individual inside the borders of another state. Recall, for instance, the 1976 killing of Chilean dissident Orlando Letelier in Washington DC. When Chilean government intelligence operatives planted a car bomb in the car used by Letelier, killing him and a US citizen accompanying him, the United States government called this an act of murder—an unlawful political assassination. B. Targeted Killing and the Law of Armed Conflict Of course, sometimes the “ordinary” legal rules do not apply. In war, the willful killing of human beings is permitted, whether the means of killing is a gun, a bomb, or a long-distance drone strike. The law of armed conflict permits a wide range of behaviors that would be unlawful in the absence of an armed conflict. Generally speaking, the intentional destruction of private property and severe restrictions on individual liberties are impermissible in peacetime, but acceptable in wartime, for instance. Even actions that a combatant knows will cause civilian deaths are lawful when consistent with the principles of necessity, humanity, proportionality,29 and distinction.30 It is worth briefly explaining these principles. The principle of necessity requires parties to a conflict to limit their actions to those that are indispensible for securing the complete submission of the enemy as soon as possible (and that are otherwise permitted by international law). The principle of humanity forbids parties to a conflict to inflict gratuitous violence or employ methods calculated to cause unnecessary suffering. The principle of proportionality requires parties to ensure that the anticipated loss of life or property incidental to an attack is not excessive in relation to the concrete and direct military advantage expected to be gained. Finally, the principle of discrimination or distinction requires that parties to a conflict direct their actions only against combatants and military objectives, and take appropriate steps to distinguish between combatants and non-combatants.31 This is a radical oversimplification of a very complex body of law.32 But as with the rule of law, the basic idea is pretty simple. When there is no war -- when ordinary, peacetime law applies -- agents of the state aren't supposed to lock people up, take their property or kill them, unless they have jumped through a whole lot of legal hoops first. When there is an armed conflict, however, everything changes. War is not a legal free-for-all33 -- torture, rape are always crimes under the law of war, as is killing that is willful, wanton and not justified by military necessity34 -- but there are far fewer constraints on state behavior. Technically, the law of war is referred to using the Latin term “lex specialis” – special law. It is applicable in—and only in -- special circumstances (in this case, armed conflict), and in those special circumstances, it supersedes “ordinary law,” or “lex generalis,” the “general law” that prevails in peacetime. We have one set of laws for “normal” situations, and another, more flexible set of laws for “extraordinary” situations, such as armed conflicts. None of this poses any inherent problem for the rule of law. Having one body of rules that tightly restricts the use of force and another body of rules that is far more permissive does not fundamentally undermine the rule of law, as long as we have a reasonable degree of consensus on what circumstances trigger the “special” law, and as long as the “special law” doesn’t end up undermining the general law. To put it a little differently, war, with its very different rules, does not challenge ordinary law as long as war is the exception, not the norm -- as long as we can all agree on what constitutes a war -- as long as we can tell when the war begins and ends -- and as long as we all know how to tell the difference between a combatant and a civilian, and between places where there's war and places where there's no war. Let me return now to the question of drones and targeted killings. When all these distinctions I just mentioned are clear, the use of drones in targeted killings does not necessarily present any great or novel problem. In Libya, for instance, a state of armed conflict clearly existed inside the borders of Libya between Libyan government forces and NATO states. In that context, the use of drones to strike Libyan military targets is no more controversial than the use of manned aircraft. That is because our core rule of law concerns have mostly been satisfied: we know there is an armed conflict, in part because all parties to it agree that there is an armed conflict, in part because observers (such as international journalists) can easily verify the presence of uniformed military personnel engaged in using force, and in part because the violence is, from an objective perspective, widespread and sustained: it is not a mere skirmish or riot or criminal law enforcement situation that got out of control. We know who the “enemy” is: Libyan government forces. We know where the conflict is and is not: the conflict was in Libya, but not in neighboring Algeria or Egypt. We know when the conflict began, we know who authorized the use of force (the UN Security Council) and, just as crucially, we know whom to hold accountable in the event of error or abuse (the various governments involved).35 Once you take targeted killings outside hot battlefields, it’s a different story. The Obama Administration is currently using drones to strike terror suspects in Pakistan, Somalia, Yemen, and –perhaps—Mali and the Philippines as well. Defenders of the administration's increasing reliance on drone strikes in such places assert that the US is in an armed conflict with “al Qaeda and its associates,” and on that basis, they assert that the law of war is applicable -- in any place and at any time -- with regard to any person the administration deems a combatant. The trouble is, no one outside a very small group within the US executive branch has any ability to evaluate who is and who isn’t a combatant. The war against al Qaeda and its associates is not like World War II, or Libya, or even Afghanistan: it is an open-ended conflict with an inchoate, undefined adversary (who exactly are al Qaeda’s “associates”?). What is more, targeting decisions in this nebulous “war” are based largely on classified intelligence reporting. **As a result, Administration assertions** about who is a combatant and what constitutes a threat **are entirely non-falsifiable, because they're based wholly on undisclosed evidence**. Add to this still another problem: most of these strikes are considered covert action, so although the US sometimes takes public credit for the deaths of alleged terrorist leaders, most of the time, the US will not even officially acknowledge targeted killings. This leaves all the key rule-of-law questions related to the ongoing war against al Qaeda and its "associates" unanswered.36 Based on what criteria might someone be considered a combatant or directly participating in hostilities? What constitutes “hostilities” in the context of an armed conflict against a non-state actor, and what does it mean to participate in them? And just where is the war? Does the war (and thus the law of war) somehow "travel" with combatants? Does the US have a “right” to target enemy combatants anywhere on earth, or does it depend on the consent of the state at issue? Who in the United States government is authorized to make such determinations, and what is the precise chain of command for such decisions? I think the rule of law problem here is obvious: when “armed conflict” becomes a term flexible enough to be applied both to World War II and to the relations between the United States and “associates” of al Qaeda such as Somalia’s al Shabaab, the concept of armed conflict is not very useful anymore. And **when we lack clarity and consensus on how to recognize “armed conflict,” we no longer have a clear or principled basis for deciding how to categorize US** t**argeted** k**illing**s. Are they, as the US government argues, legal under the laws of war? Or are they, as some human rights groups have argued, unlawful murder? C. Targeted Killing and the International Law of Self-Defense When faced with criticisms of the law of war framework as a justification for targeted killing, Obama Administration representatives often shift tack, arguing that international law rules on national self-defense provide an alternative or additional legal justification for US targeted killings. Here, the argument is that if a person located in a foreign state poses an "imminent threat of violent attack" against the United States, the US can lawfully use force in self-defense, provided that the defensive force used is otherwise consistent with law of war principles. Like law of war-based arguments, this general principle is superficially uncontroversial: if someone overseas is about to launch a nuclear weapon at New York City, no one can doubt that the United States has a perfect right (and the president has a constitutional duty) to use force if needed to prevent that attack, regardless of the attacker's nationality. But once again, the devil is in the details. To start with, what constitutes an "imminent" threat? Traditionally, both international law and domestic criminal law understand that term narrowly: 37 to be "imminent," a threat cannot be distant or speculative.38 But much like the Bush Administration before it, the Obama Administration has put forward an interpretation of the word “imminent” that bears little relation to traditional legal concepts. According to a leaked 2011 Justice Department white paper39—the most detailed legal justification that has yet become public-- the requirement of imminence "does not require the United States to have clear evidence that a specific attack on U.S. persons and interests will take place in the immediate future." This seems, in itself, like a substantial departure from accepted international law definitions of imminence. But the White Paper goes even further, stating that "certain members of al Qaeda are continually plotting attacks...and would engage in such attacks regularly [if] they were able to do so, [and] the US government may not be aware of all... plots as they are developing and thus cannot be confident that none is about to occur." For this reason, it concludes, anyone deemed to be an operational leader of al Qaeda or its "associated forces" presents, by definition, an imminent threat even in the absence of any evidence whatsoever relating to immediate or future attack plans. In effect, the concept of "imminent threat" (part of the international law relating to self-defense) becomes conflated with identity or status (a familiar part of the law of armed conflict). That concept of imminence has been called Orwellian, and although that is an overused epithet, in this context it seems fairly appropriate. According to the Obama Administration, “imminent” no longer means “immediate,” and in fact the very absence of clear evidence indicating specific present or future attack plans becomes, paradoxically, the basis for assuming that attack may perpetually be “imminent.” The 2011 Justice Department White Paper notes that the use of force in self-defense must comply with general law of war principles of necessity, proportionality, humanity, and distinction. The White Paper offers no guidance on the specific criteria for determining when an individual is a combatant (or a civilian participating directly in hostilities), however. It also offers no guidance on how to determine if a use of force is necessary or proportionate. From a traditional international law perspective, this necessity and proportionality inquiry relates both to imminence and to the gravity of the threat itself, but so far there has been no public Administration statement as to how the administration interprets these requirements. Is any threat of "violent attack" sufficient to justify killing someone in a foreign country, including a U.S. citizen? Is every potential suicide bomber targetable, or does it depend on the gravity of the threat? Are we justified in drone strikes against targets who might, if they get a chance at some unspecified future point, place an IED that might, if successful, kill one person? Ten people? Twenty? 2,000? How grave a threat must there be to justify the use of lethal force against an American citizen abroad -- or against non-citizens, for that matter? As I have noted, it is impossible for outsiders to fully evaluate US drone strikes, since so much vital information remains classified. In most cases, we know little about the identities; activities or future plans of those targeted. Nevertheless, given the increased frequency of US targeted killings in recent years, it seems reasonable to wonder whether the Administration conducts a rigorous necessity or proportionality analysis in all cases. So far, the leaked 2011 Justice Department White Paper represents the most detailed legal analysis of targeted killings available to the public. It is worth noting, incidentally, that this White Paper addresses only the question of whether and when it is lawful for the US government to target US citizens abroad. We do not know what legal standards the Administration believes apply to the targeting of non-citizens. It seems reasonable to assume, however, that the standards applicable to non-citizens are less exacting than those the Administration views as applicable to citizens. Defenders of administration targeted killing policy acknowledge that the criteria for determining how to answer these many questions have not been made public, but insist that this should not be cause for concern. The Administration has reportedly developed a detailed “playbook” outlining the targeting criteria and procedures,40, and insiders insist that executive branch officials go through an elaborate process in which they carefully consider every possible issue before determining that a drone strike is lawful.41 No doubt they do, but this is somewhat cold comfort. Formal processes tend to further normalize once-exceptional activities -- and "trust us" is a rather shaky foundation for the rule of law. Indeed, the whole point of the rule of law is that individual lives and freedom should not depend solely on the good faith and benevolence of government officials. As with law of war arguments, stating that US targeted killings are clearly legal under traditional self-defense principles requires some significant cognitive dissonance. Law exists to restrain untrammeled power. It is no doubt possible to make a plausible legal argument justifying each and every U.S. drone strike -- but this merely suggests that we are working with a legal framework that has begun to outlive its usefulness. The real question isn't whether U.S. drone strikes are "legal." The real question is this: Do we really want to live in a world in which the U.S. government's justification for killing is so malleable? 5. Setting Troubling International Precedents **Here is an a**dditional **reason to worry** about the U.S. overreliance on drone strikes: Other states will follow America's example, and the results are not likely to be pretty. Consider once again the Letelier murder, which was an international scandal in 1976: If the Letelier assassination took place today, the Chilean authorities would presumably insist on their national right to engage in “targeted killings” of individuals deemed to pose imminent threats to Chilean national security -- and they would justify such killings using precisely the same legal theories the US currently uses to justify targeted killings in Yemen or Somalia. We should assume that governments around the world—including those with less than stellar human rights records, such as Russia and China—are taking notice. Right now, the United States has a decided technological advantage when it comes to armed drones, but that will not last long. **We should use this window to advance a robust legal** and normative **framework that will help protect against abuses by those states whose leaders can rarely be trusted**. Unfortunately, we are doing the exact opposite: Instead of articulating norms about transparency and accountability, the United States is effectively handing China, Russia, and every other repressive state a playbook for how to foment instability and –literally -- get away with murder. Take the issue of sovereignty. Sovereignty has long been a core concept of the Westphalian international legal order.42 In the international arena, all sovereign states are formally considered equal and possessed of the right to control their own internal affairs free of interference from other states. That's what we call the principle of non-intervention -- and it means, among other things, that it is generally prohibited for one state to use force inside the borders of another sovereign state. There are some well-established exceptions, but they are few in number. A state can lawfully use force inside another sovereign state with that state's invitation or consent, or when force is authorized by the U.N. Security Council, pursuant to the U.N. Charter,43 or in self-defense "in the event of an armed attack." The 2011 Justice Department White Paper asserts that targeted killings carried out by the United States don't violate another state's sovereignty as long as that state either consents or is "unwilling or unable to suppress the threat posed by the individual being targeted." That sounds superficially plausible, but since the United States views itself as the sole arbiter of whether a state is "unwilling or unable" to suppress that threat, the logic is in fact circular. It goes like this: The United States -- using its own malleable definition of "imminent" -- decides that Person X, residing in sovereign State Y, poses a threat to the United States and requires killing. Once the United States decides that Person X can be targeted, the principle of sovereignty presents no barriers, because either 1) State Y will consent to the U.S. use of force inside its borders, in which case the use of force presents no sovereignty problems or 2) State Y will not consent to the U.S. use of force inside its borders, in which case, by definition, the United States will deem State Y to be "unwilling or unable to suppress the threat" posed by Person X and the use of force again presents no problem. This is a legal theory that more or less eviscerates traditional notions of sovereignty, and has the potential to significantly destabilize the already shaky collective security regime created by the U.N. Charter.44 If the US is the sole arbiter of whether and when it can use force inside the borders of another state, any other state strong enough to get away with it is likely to claim similar prerogatives. And, of course, if the US executive branch is the sole arbiter of what constitutes an imminent threat and who constitutes a targetable enemy combatant in an ill- defined war, why shouldn’t other states make identical arguments—and use them to justify the killing of dissidents, rivals, or unwanted minorities?

## SOF

#### Legal challenges are coming now---failure to get out in front of the issue crushes US security strategy---Congress is key

**Anderson 9** – Prof. of Law @ American University & Research Fellow @ Hoover, Kenneth Anderson, Professor of Law, Washington College of Law, American University, and Research Fellow, The Hoover Institution, Stanford University and Member of its Task Force on National Security and the Law, 5/11/2009, Targeted Killing in U.S. Counterterrorism Strategy and Law,

http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/papers/2009/5/11%20counterterrorism%20anderson/0511\_counterterrorism\_anderson.pdf

Does this analysis offer any practical policy prescriptions for Congress and the administration? The problem is not so much a need for new legislation to create new structures or new policies. The legislative category in which many instances of targeted killing might take place in the future already exists. The task for Congress and the administration, rather, is instead to preserve a category that is likely to be put under pressure in the future and, indeed, is already seen by many as a legal non-starter under international law. Before addressing what Congress should do in this regard, we might ask from a strictly strategic political standpoint whether, given that the Obama Administration is committed to this policy anyway, whether it is politically prudent to draw public attention to the issue at all. Israeli officials might be threatened with legal action in Spain; but so far no important actor has shown an appetite for taking on the Obama Administration. Perhaps it is better to let sleeping political dogs lie. These questions require difficult political calculations. However, the sources cited above suggest that even if no one is quite prepared at this moment to take on the Obama Administration on targeted killing, the intellectual and legal pieces of the challenge are already set up and on the table. Having asserted certain positions concerning human rights law and its application and the United States having unthinkingly abandoned its self-defense rationale for its policy, the play can be made at any time—at some later time in the Obama Administration or in the next Republican administration, prying apart the “American” position to create a de facto alliance among Democrats and Europeans and thereby undermining the ability of the United States to craft a unified American security strategy. 101 The United States would be best served if the Obama Administration did that exceedingly rare thing in international law and diplomacy: Getting the United States out in front of the issue by making plain the American position, rather than merely reacting in surprise when its sovereign prerogatives are challenged by the international soft-law community.

**Although no CIA officials have been prosecuted yet, that is due to considerable US diplomatic power – the continuation of current targeted killing practices will ensure legal challenges increase**

**Alston 11** (Philip Alston, Norton Pomeroy Professor of Law. New York University School of Law “ARTICLE: The CIA and Targeted Killings Beyond Borders,” Harvard National Security Journal, 2011 Harvard National Security Journal 2 Harv. Nat'l Sec. J. 283)

A more pragmatic reason is that judicial action against CIA personnel is certain to increase in the years ahead as the agency becomes more actively engaged at an operational level in targeted killings. The United States would be better placed to counter such actions if it could demonstrate that it is acting in compliance with the applicable international law. Recent years have seen high-profile prosecutions in several countries in which the CIA has been operating. In the 2011 case of Raymond Davis, a CIA official widely reported to have been involved in drone-based targeted killing operations, was accused of two murders in Lahore. The United States indicated that diplomatic and other relations between the two countries would suffer greatly unless he was released. Although the local court system had insisted on proceeding to trial, blood money (*diyya)* was paid to the families of the two deceased and the case was closed, amid allegations of coercion and bribery.568 In 2007 courts in both Germany and Italy opened prosecutions against CIA agents. In Italy, an Egyptian cleric named Abu Omar was kidnapped on the streets of Milan, rendered to Egypt, and tortured and interrogated. Italian prosecutors charged 22 CIA officials.569 In Germany, a Lebanese-born German national named Khaled el-Masri was seized in Macedonia, and rendered to a CIA prison in Afghanistan where he was interrogated and tortured. Prosecutors issued arrest warrants for 13 CIA officers alleged to have been responsible. In both the German and Italian cases, United States diplomatic cables reveal strong and determined high-level lobbying by U.S. officials who warned their counterparts of extremely serious repercussions if the prosecutions went forward. In the German case, they were abandoned,570 and in the Italian case the courts went ahead and convicted the CIA officers in absentia but the Italian Government, responding to representations by the U.S. Secretary of Defense to the Italian Prime Minister, refrained from taking the steps necessary to pursue the convictions internationally.571 In all known cases the United States has applied immense diplomatic and perhaps other pressure in order to ensure that CIA agents have not had to answer for alleged violations of the law of the states concerned. But these responses have come at a high price in terms of the public standing of the United States in the countries concerned and future prosecutions are likely. At present the German Federal Prosecutor’s Office is examining the possibility of bringing charges over the killing of a German citizen by a drone attack in Pakistan in October 2010,572 and in July 2011 a complaint was filed in Pakistan against a former CIA official for his involvement in drone strikes.573

#### Even if lawsuits are lost, that crushes special operations

**Goldsmith 12** (Jack Goldsmith 12, Harvard Law School Professor, focus on national security law, presidential power, cybersecurity, and conflict of laws, Former Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legal Counsel, and Special Counsel to the Department of Defense, Hoover Institution Task Force on National Security and Law, March, Power and Constraint, P. 199-201)

For the GTMO Bar and its cousin NGOs and activists, however, the al-Aulaqi lawsuit, like other lawsuits on different issues, was merely an early battle in a long war over the legitimacy of U.S. targeting practices—a war that will take place not just in the United States, but in other countries as well. When the CCR failed to achieve what it viewed as adequate accountability for Bush administration officials in the United States in connection with interrogation and detention practices, it started pursuing, and continues to pursue, lawsuits and prosecutions against U.S. officials in Spain, Germany, and other European countries. "You look for every niche you can when you can take on the issues that you think are important," said Michael Ratner, explaining the CCR's strategy for pursuing lawsuits in Europe.¶ Clive Stafford Smith, a former CCR attorney who was instrumental in its early GTMO victories and who now leads the British advocacy organization Reprieve, is using this strategy in the targeted killing context. "There are endless ways in which the courts in Britain, the courts in America, the international Pakistani courts can get involved" in scrutinizing U.S. targeting killing practices, he argues. "It's going to be the next 'Guantanamo Bay' issue."' Working in a global network of NGO activists, Stafford Smith has begun a process in Pakistan to seek the arrest of former CIA lawyer John Rizzo in connection with drone strikes in Pakistan, and he is planning more lawsuits in the United States and elsewhere against drone operators." "The crucial court here is the court of public opinion," he said, explaining why the lawsuits are important even if he loses. His efforts are backed by a growing web of proclamations in the United Nations, foreign capitals, the press, and the academy that U.S. drone practices are unlawful. What American University law professor Ken Anderson has described as the "international legal-media-academic-NGO-international organization-global opinion complex" is hard at work to stigmatize drones and those who support and operate them."¶ This strategy is having an impact. The slew of lawsuits in the United States and threatened prosecutions in Europe against Bush administration officials imposes reputational, emotional, and financial costs on them that help to promote the human rights groups' ideological goals, even if courts never actually rule against the officials. By design, these suits also give pause to current officials who are considering controversial actions for fear that the same thing might later happen to them. This effect is starting to be felt with drones. Several Obama administration officials have told me that they worry targeted killings will be seen in the future (as Stafford Smith predicts) as their administration's GTMO. The attempted judicial action against Rizzo, the earlier lawsuits against top CIA officials in Pakistan and elsewhere, and the louder and louder proclamations of illegality around the world all of which have gained momentum after al-Aulaqi's killing—are also having an impact. These actions are rallying cries for protest and political pushback in the countries where the drone strikes take place. And they lead CIA operators to worry about legal exposure before becoming involved in the Agency's drone program." We don't know yet whether these forces have affected actual targeting practices and related tactics. But they induce the officials involved to take more caution. And it is only a matter of time, if it has not happened already, before they lead the U.S. government to forgo lawful targeted killing actions otherwise deemed to be in the interest of U.S. national security.

#### JSOC/CIA conflation means prosecution threat ends SOF effectiveness

Thorsten **Wetzling 11**, non-resident fellow at the Center for Transatlantic Relations at the Paul H. Nitze School of Advanced International Studies (SAIS), PhD in Political Science, “What role for what rule of law in EU-US counterterrorism cooperation?”, <http://transatlantic.sais-jhu.edu/publications/articles/Chapter1_EUISS_ChaillotPaper127_WETZLING.pdf>

While President Obama deserves credit for having abolished the most controversial counterterrorism practice to date (i.e. the ‘enhanced interrogation techniques’ and the extraordinary rendition of terrorist suspects to secret and indeﬁnite detention), his administration currently relies heavily on two practices that also bode rather poorly for the rule of law: capture-or-kill raids and drone strikes against suspected terrorists by poorly overseen CIA and JSOC operatives in various hotspots around the globe. ¶ ‘The individuals targeted are alleged terrorists or others deemed dangerous, and their inclusion on what are known as kill-or-capture lists is based on undisclosed intelligence applied against secretive criteria.’44 This practice45 raises severe doubts on the US’s ‘full respect for our obligations under applicable [...] domestic constitutional law’.46 Philip Alston argues convincingly that the convergence of the CIA (intelligence) and JSOC (military) activities in these raids clearly undermines the effectiveness of the two separate oversight regimes for ‘traditional military activities’ (Title 10 US Code) and covert intelligence activities (Title 50 US code) in the US constitution. The ‘extensive ﬂuidity between the JSOC (DOD) special forces and their CIA counterparts’ makes it ‘virtually impossible for anyone outside the two agencies to know who is in fact responsible in any given context.’47 While there is no room here to spell out the separate oversight regimes for the military and the intelligence services, it should be noted, however, that this intentional double-hatting of CIA and JSOC forces creates de facto accountability gaps. These activities often ‘escape the scrutiny of the intelligence committees, and the congressional defense committees cannot be expected to exercise oversight outside of their jurisdiction’.48

#### SOF key to counter A2/AD capabilities globally---key to effective power projection and U.S. defense alliances

Jim **Thomas 13**, Vice President and Director of Studies at the Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments, and Chris Dougherty is a Research Fellow at the Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments, 2013, “BEYOND THE RAMPARTS THE FUTURE OF U.S. SPECIAL OPERATIONS FORCES,” http://www.csbaonline.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/05/SOF-Report-CSBA-Final.pdf

The spread of advanced military technologies, such as precision-guided munitions, is enabling a number of countries to construct A2/AD networks that could erode the United States’ ability to project military power into key regions. Nations such as China and Iran are actively seeking to acquire and field A2/AD capabilities, including precision-guided ballistic and cruise missiles, attack submarines, fast-attack craft, anti-satellite (ASAT) weapons, computer-network attack capabilities, advanced fighter aircraft, and integrated air defenses, that may challenge the U.S. military’s ability to project power. The cumulative effect of spreading A2/ AD systems is that the land, air, sea, space, and cyberspace domains will be far less permissive for U.S. military operations. In the face of growing A2/AD threats, the value of low-signature forces capable of operating independently and far forward in denied areas is likely to increase substantially. SOF may offer the most viable ground-force option in future A2/AD environments, either executing direct action against key targets or working by, with, and through partner forces to conduct peripheral campaigns (i.e., operations designed to impose costs and conducted beyond the territory or reach of the enemy). Prior to hostilities, SOF could carry out preparation of the environment (PE) and special reconnaissance (SR) missions. At the outset of hostilities, SOF might serve as an early-entry force to blind or disrupt enemy command, control, communications, computers, intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (C4ISR) networks, thereby enabling higher-signature conventional forces to penetrate A2/AD networks. Inserting or extracting SOF from denied environments, and supporting them once there, will challenge SOF aviation and undersea capabilities. Accordingly, SOF will need stealthy means of insertion from the air and sea. SOF may also need to conduct foreign external defense (FED) missions in states to build their capacity to repel foreign military aggression. This could entail helping key partners to create their own versions of A2/AD networks.¶ The proliferation of WMD and A2/AD capabilities will erode the conventional power-projection capability of not only the United States, but of other countries as well. In the future, states may therefore avoid direct confrontations and be more inclined to use unconventional methods and measures short of war to gain influence and achieve their foreign policy goals. States may also turn to third-party proxies to maintain plausible deniability for their actions. States could engage in influence campaigns and proxy competitions to achieve objectives such as: imposing costs on major competitors, foreclosing opportunities for other countries or non-state actors to gain a foothold in a region, “peeling away” allies or partners from competitors, diverting the attention and resources of competitors (misdirection), conducting cross-border operations against a major power with less risk of confrontation, or controlling (or denying) critical resources and trade routes. SOF will be critical to success in persistent influence campaigns and pro􀁛y competitions. They will need exquisite, local-area expertise and language skills, along with deep, longstanding relationships with key local actors built over time by embedding and living with foreign partner forces. Though SOF already operate in smaller units than GPF, the breadth, specificity, and need to minimize the visibility of these operations will place an emphasis on even smaller SOF teams and single operators working in close collaboration with other government agencies. These four security challenges􀂲coming to the fore during a time of 􀂿scal austerity in the United States and global economic uncertainty􀂲are likely to dominate the national security agenda for decades to come. These challenges are not mutually e􀁛clusive and, in almost every case, the challenges are intertwined with opportunities for SOF to impose costs on U.S. adversaries. Given their global nature, and recognizing the interrelationship between the various challenges and opportunities, SOF are uniquely suited to address them asymmetrically.

#### Solves a laundry list of nuclear conflicts

Mackenzie **Eaglen 11**, research fellow for national security – Heritage, and Bryan McGrath, former naval officer and director – Delex Consulting, Studies and Analysis, “Thinking About a Day Without Sea Power: Implications for U.S. Defense Policy,” Heritage Foundation

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

## Plan

**The Congress of the United States federal government should statutorily restrict funding for targeted killing strikes carried out under Title 50.**

## Hezbollah

#### CIA Focus on targeted killing trades off with combating Hezbollah – the CIA needs to shift its foucs

Max **Fisher**, Nov 21, **11,** CIA Outsmarted by Hezbollah: Is This the Cost of Counterterrorism?

<http://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2011/11/cia-outsmarted-by-hezbollah-is-this-the-cost-of-counterterrorism/248830/>

Since 2001, the U.S. spy agency has been retooled to fight terror, but what has it lost?

The Lebanese militant group **Hezbollah has unraveled much of the CIA's mission in Lebanon, capturing up to a dozen U.S. spies in the country and effectively shutting down the agency's crucial operations there. "Beirut station is out of business," a source told the Los Angeles Times today. The incident is a major blow to the CIA and to U.S. intelligence. The agency's posting in Lebanon has for decades been one of its most aggressive, most highly valued, and, for its staff, most prestigious.** Though the CIA base there aggressively tracks Hezbollah, it is also a headquarters for monitoring and often countering Syria and Iran**.**¶**How was the CIA outmaneuvered by one of its oldest foes** in one of its proudest outposts? **CIA sources**that spoke to the Associated Press, which broke the story along with the L.A. Times, seem not to fear a strengthening Hezbollah or even to blame the agency's White House overseers, as spy officials often do, but rather **cite a changing culture in the CIA itself. The old CIA mission of counterintelligence, of spy-versus-spy, has taken a back seat to** the new emphasis on **killing terrorists**, they seem to worry, and the agency has suffered as a result.¶ **The Lebanon crisis is the latest mishap involving CIA counterintelligence, the undermining or manipulating of the enemy's ability to gather information**. Former CIA officials have said **that once-essential skill has been eroded as the agency shifted from outmaneuvering rival spy**agencies **to fighting terrorists. In the rush for immediate results,** former officers say, **tradecraft has suffered**.¶ The most recent high-profile example was the suicide bomber who posed as an informant and killed seven CIA employees and wounded six others in Khost, Afghanistan in December 2009.¶ The Khost incident, which was devastating to the CIA, neatly encapsulates how the world's premier spy agency managed to lose so much of its spy skills. Since September 2001, **the agency's mission has been less and less about subterfuge and intelligence-gathering but more and more about killing terrorists. In its growing emphasis on finding targets over finding information, it over-exposed itself** to the double-agent at Khost. This year, **as it was ramping up drone strikes** **in Pakistan, paramilitary operations in Somalia, and targeted killings in Yemen**, **it seems to have lost**some of **its once-prized focus on outwitting** such hostile agencies as **Hezbollah's "spy**combat **unit**."¶ The CIA first began to take a more aggressive posture during the Cold War, when presidents from Kennedy to Reagan used it to arm and train anti-Soviet opposition groups. But even then it remained mostly in the shadows, attempting to manipulate world events in the U.S.'s favor. And its primary tools -- back channels, foreign assets, secret bank accounts, and misinformation -- remained the same, even as the mission evolved. It was not until September 2001, when the U.S. quickly and dramatically changed its national security focus to terrorism, that the CIA began its slow transformation from a spy agency into something that at times more closely resembles a paramilitary organization.¶ How much has the CIA changed since 2001? In the late 1990s, senior officials in the Clinton administration debated endlessly over whether the CIA could legally be granted the authority to kill Osama bin Laden; the agency had been banned from assassinations since 1976, following revelations that it had tried to kill Fidel Castro a decade earlier. Even the idea of a direct presidential order to kill the world's most dangerous terrorist, a man who had already blown up two U.S. embassies, was considered controversial and outside the CIA's normal realm. Yet in the first 20 months of the Obama administration, the CIA's drone program in Pakistan alone killed over 800 people. It runs or helps run drone programs and special operations in several countries and even operates detention centers. Under Obama, the CIA and Pentagon have borrowed one another's methods in Afghanistan and Iraq (not to mention one another's leadership) so regularly that the line between U.S. intelligence and the U.S. military has blurred in unprecedented ways.¶ The change has also been political. In the days immediately after September 11, 2001, the Bush administration decided to put the agency on a much tighter leash, using something it called Top Secret Codeword/Threat Matrix. Intelligence reports were fed directly to the White House, which announced it would begin more directly controlling CIA activities. "The mistake was not to have proper analysis of the intelligence before giving it to the president," National Security Council member Roger Cressey told New Yorker reporter Jane Mayer for her Pulitzer-winning book on U.S. national security policy after September 2001, The Dark Side. "There was no filter. Most of it was garbage. None of it had been corroborated or screened. But it went directly to the president and his advisers, who are not intelligence experts. That's when mistakes got made."¶ That's also when the White House began pushing the CIA in a way that encouraged it to put less emphasis on its long-term information-collection and counterintelligence efforts, slow-boil missions that might takes years or more to yield results and that might be more about detecting future threats than combating existing ones. The White House's new urgency about terrorism and al-Qaeda placed far greater pressure on the CIA to deliver immediate results on known threats. First that meant tracking terrorists, then capturing and "interrogating" them, and within a few years it meant killing them outright. That urgency and pressure has been sustained for over a decade now. Judging by Hezbollah's recent victory over the CIA in Lebanon, which appears to have grown somewhat sloppy in its spycraft, some of the patience from the old days was lost.¶ While some in the CIA have zealously embraced the new mission, some have not, speaking out (though always anonymously) to the press. Ultimately, the CIA is guided by the White House and its prevailing assessment of what threatens the nation and how to fight back. In the 1980s, the CIA was so consumed by the Reagan administration's anti-Soviet fervor that in funneled millions of dollars to mujaheddin fighting the Soviet Union in Afghanistan without sufficiently considering whether its actions would increase other threats. The agency was so focused on bleeding the Soviets that, while the mission succeeded, it helped fuel a generation of militants who are still fighting against the U.S. around the world. **A similar sense of myopia appears to have returned to CIA policy since September 2001, with the agency and its White House overseers so obsessed with fighting terrorism that other skills go underdeveloped and other threats under-addressed**.¶As in the Cold War, unity of purpose has made the CIA incredibly effective at its central task: al-Qaeda's "central" organization in Afghanistan and Pakistan has been decimated, its Yemen-based branch severely curtailed, and its efforts at expansion left struggling. But as Andrew Exum wrote in response to the story, "It's great to have an intelligence agency with a knife in its teeth, but **the primary mission of an intelligence organization is to gather and analyze intelligence, not to thwack bad guys."**¶ It's not clear if the CIA's "primary mission" has changed as a result of deliberate, top-down decision-making, or if it was simply a slow but inexorable process of mission creep. As the CIA has gotten better at killing, it appears to have simultaneously become worse at spying. Maybe that's the path that the CIA had to take, with instability-fueled insurgencies increasingly able, willing, and interested in attacking U.S. assets and even civilians. **But this changing focus will necessarily leave it, and the U.S., more vulnerable to the non-terrorism threats that the CIA traditionally battles: rogue states, rising powers, and violent but shrewd organizations such as Hezbollah.**¶**Maybe the CIA can continue to handle both its old missions as well as its new, more aggressive tasks. But the agency's embarrassment in Lebanon suggests that it has emphasized paramilitary-style counterterrorism at the expense of spycraft. And while al-Qaeda has certainly posed a significant threat to the U.S., the terrorist group's power is eroding. Meanwhile, the U.S. still has to live in a world with dangerous rogue states such as Iran and North Korea, semi-hostile foreign intelligence services such as Russia's and China's, and anti-American groups from Hezbollah to the Pakistani Inter-Services Intelligence to Mexican drug cartels. At some point, the CIA -- and the White House -- will have to decide whether al-Qaeda and related groups really outweigh all of those threats**

#### Hezbollah weapons transfers cause third Lebanon war – it has embedded military infrastructure throughout the country

**Badran 13** Tony Badran, 7th March 2013. “A Nifty Conceit: The EU, Hezbollah, and Lebanon.” <http://www.defenddemocracy.org/media-hit/a-nifty-conceit-the-eu-hezbollah-and-lebanon/> (Tony Badran is a Research Fellow at the Foundation for Defense of Democracies (FDD) in Washington, DC. He focuses on Lebanon, Syria and Hezbollah. His research includes US policy towards Lebanon and Syria; Syrian foreign policy, with a focus on its regional relations and its ties to militant non-state actors and terrorist groups)

The Hezbollah bus bombing in Bulgaria as well as their foiled operation in Cyprus have put Europe in an uncomfortable position, as pressure increases on the EU to designate Hezbollah as a terrorist organization. The plot in Cyprus is especially embarrassing, as the Hezbollah operative there was arrested and is being publicly tried, making it harder for EU officials to deny evidence laid out in the open. Still, it is painfully obvious that Europe would much prefer this whole Hezbollah inconvenience go away. In resisting calls to designate the Shiite group, the Europeans have hid behind a nifty conceit: designating Hezbollah could destabilize Lebanon. Espousing such a seemingly altruistic position is rather convenient. It affords the Europeans the semblance of judicious sagacity, enabling them to skirt the issue altogether, regardless of the evidence. Take for instance what Gilles de Kerchove, the EU’s Counterterrorism Coordinator, had to [say](http://euobserver.com/foreign/118859) about the matter. While strong evidence is a prerequisite for designating the group, Kechrove opined, there’s also a “political assessment.” The EU counterterrorism official then added, “for Hezbollah, you might ask, given the situation in Lebanon, which is a highly fragile, highly fragmented country, is listing it going to help you achieve what you want?” **The proposition that targeting Hezbollah would negatively impact Lebanon presupposes that the group currently contributes to stability. Such a view requires quite the suspension of disbelief. In reality, Hezbollah has thoroughly subverted the country and its citizens in virtually every aspect. Left unmolested, Hezbollah not only undermines Lebanon's security, institutions, and political system, but is also set track to compromise its foreign relations, ruin its financial system, and destroy whatever remains of its social cohesion. The most obvious threat has been and continues to be Hezbollah’s illegal arsenal.** As I have [written](https://now.mmedia.me/lb/en/commentaryanalysis/israels_free_hand) in recent weeks, **Hezbollah’s effort to transport into Lebanon the strategic weapons it had stored in Syria is placing the country in tremendous danger. What makes the peril inescapable is the fact that Hezbollah has turned entire population centers into military sites. It has embedded its military infrastructure inside towns and villages all throughout the country**. **The Israelis have already struck one such convoy in Syria. However, eventually Hezbollah may succeed in bringing another convoy across the border. This will surely prompt another Israeli strike, which in turn is sure to result in significant collateral damage**. In his February 16 address, Hezbollah’s Secretary **General Hassan Nasrallah** [declared](http://www.ynetnews.com/articles/0%2C7340%2CL-4345592%2C00.html) **that any such Israeli strike inside Lebanon would be met with retaliation against Israel’s infrastructure. Nasrallah’s threats, whether or not they’re to be taken seriously, are unlikely to alter Israel’s calculations regarding the smuggling of strategic weapons. Given that Hezbollah will surely attempt to bring in more of these weapons systems stored in Syria, an Israeli strike in Lebanon is, in all likelihood, a matter of time.** **Hezbollah’s involvement in Syria has had other deleterious effects on Lebanon and its fragile social fabric. By joining the war on the side of the Assad regime, Hezbollah is also acting as the regime’s flank in Lebanon. As such, it has taken action against Lebanese Sunnis who are assisting the Syrian opposition**. Whenever the Shiite group could not do so itself, it has relied on its allies in the military and security apparatuses to perform a task on its behalf, as we witnessed in the Arsal [incident](https://now.mmedia.me/lb/en/commentaryanalysis/hollow-praise-for-the-laf) several weeks ago. The damage has been, therefore, double. On the one hand, Hezbollah further exacerbated Sunni-Shiite tensions. Already it had brought those communal relations to the brink in May 2008, when it assaulted Sunni neighborhoods of Beirut (and the Druze Shouf Mountains), killing dozens. On the other hand, it pitted the Lebanese Armed Forces (LAF) against the Sunni community, which has come to view the Party of God’s relationship with the LAF with great suspicion. In addition, not only does Hezbollah provide cover to a host of criminal activities in its areas of influence – keeping them beyond the reach of the law – but also, the Party of God stands accused in the murder of former Prime Minister Rafiq Hariri. Four of its commanders and operatives have been named as suspects, but, naturally, the LAF would never consider moving in to apprehend them. Perhaps the EU would also prefer to abort justice and gloss over political assassination in order to avoid action that would ‘destabilize’ the country. It’s bad enough that [suspicions](http://www.realclearworld.com/articles/2012/10/25/irans_bloody_power_play_100309.html) over Hezbollah’s role in other political murders and assassination [attempts](http://www.dailystar.com.lb/News/Local-News/2013/Mar-06/209068-judge-requests-life-in-prison-for-suspect-in-harb-case.ashx) have eaten at the core of communal coexistence and the political system altogether. But the Party of God’s penetration of state institutions has also implicated the Lebanese state in Hezbollah’s activities, both in Lebanon and abroad. Take for instance Hezbollah’s control over General Security. That apparatus is responsible for ports of entry as well as for the issue of travel documents. In recent years, as Hezbollah cells have been uncovered abroad, it came to light that many of its operatives held false identification papers that were nevertheless issued by the government. The case of Sami Shehab, who was [arrested](http://www.nytimes.com/2009/04/14/world/middleeast/14egypt.html) in Egypt in 2009, is but one example. Shehab was in Egypt on an officially issued false passport. Such activities abroad have not only damaged Lebanon’s diplomatic relations, but have also hurt Lebanese expatriates, especially those working in the Gulf Arab states. Most recently, the uncovering of Hezbollah cells in the United Arab Emirates have led to the [deportation of Lebanese resident workers](http://www.naharnet.com/stories/en/42441of) in that country. This is hardly the worst economic calamity Hezbollah has brought on Lebanon. **The Party of God’s vast,** [global](http://www.defenddemocracy.org/media-hit/hezbollah-acts-local-thinks-global/)**, criminal,** [enterprise](https://now.mmedia.me/lb/en/reportsfeatures/eyes_on_hezbollah) **has infected the backbone of the Lebanese economy: the banking sector.** [The case of the Lebanese Canadian Bank](http://www.nytimes.com/2011/12/14/world/middleeast/beirut-bank-seen-as-a-hub-of-hezbollahs-financing.html?pagewanted=all) **is one ominous example. And while it may have been papered over, the potential damage to Lebanese banks, as a result of Hezbollah (and Iranian) money-laundering operations is simply devastating.** The group’s terrorist activities in Bulgaria and Cyprus (with whom Lebanon has critical energy interests) are bad enough. But its involvement in the drug trade and laundering of the proceeds through the banking sector and exchange houses is earning Lebanon the unenviable title of a “veritable money laundering machine,” [as illicit finance expert David Asher put it](http://ricks.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2012/01/17/time_to_get_serious_about_sanctions_on_iran_especially_through_lebanese_banks). Asher also notes that Hezbollah’s money laundering has infiltrated the real estate sector just as much as it has the banking sector. Designating Hezbollah, and purging it from the Lebanese financial system, may be the only way to salvage the critical banking sector down the road. The above is but a quick sample of how Hezbollah has corroded Lebanon’s security, economy, society, politics and state institutions. There is much more, including the [mutilation of the political system by force of arms](https://now.mmedia.me/lb/en/commentaryanalysis/the_tyranny_of_the_black_shirts). The bottom line is that the EU rationale for not designating Hezbollah is not only absurd; it is detrimental to Lebanon’s long-term prospects. Lebanon may not in the end survive the metastasis of Hezbollah. But Europe’s refusal to take action against the Party of God will only help ensure Lebanon’s demise.

#### Also, a war in Lebanon would go global and nuclear.

The Earl of **Stirling 11**, hereditary Governor & Lord Lieutenant of Canada, Lord High Admiral of Nova Scotia, & B.Sc. in Pol. Sc. & History; M.A. in European Studies, “General Middle East War Nears - Syrian events more dangerous than even nuclear nightmare in Japan”, http://europebusines.blogspot.com/2011/03/general-middle-east-war-nears-syrian.html

**The large number of 'Hezbollah' rockets/missiles are a grave danger that is specific to Israel. In the Second Lebanon War (which Israel lost), the 'Hezbollah' forces were simply demonstrating their ability to 'deliver ordinance-on-target' over northern Israel using mostly relatively short range unguided rockets and 'dumb' warheads (simple high explosive warheads).** Like Saddam Hussein did in the first Gulf War with his Scuds (actually al-Hussein missiles; a modified version of the Scud), the Iranians and Syrians using their Hezbollah proxies, were delivering a warning by firing repeatedly into their enemy. They were demonstrating their ability to hit their enemy but were only, by choice, using low impact 'dumb' high explosive warheads. Saddam held back a force (19 or more) of missiles armed with WMD, which is why we did not 'finish' the war the first time. (It was only after he had denuded himself of his WMD and delivery capabilities that we began the Iraqi War - Second Gulf War). The Iranians and Syrians and their **Hezbollah allies/proxies have a considerable selection of WMD available for these 40,000 to 60,000 rockets/missiles (in addition to their Syrian and Iranian based longer range missiles). The WMD(s) can range from FAE (fuel air explosive) warheads (which if fired in a coordinated pattern can lay down a FAE 'brew' over a wide area, such as over a heavily populated urban area) and achieve PSI (pounds per square inch) levels higher than standard NATO tactical nuclear warheads. The WMD can also include chemical warheads of various types. Syria and Iran have one of the largest (if not the largest) joint chemical warfare programs on Earth**. Additionally, they can use Advanced Biologically produced biotoxin warheads for a longer lasting chemical war 'effect'. They can also use 'dirty bombs', that is Radiological warheads using things like Cobalt 60 and Strontium 90, which give the 'effect' of radiological fallout without using a nuclear blast. They can also use Radiological weapons encased in an advanced matrix containing hard to remove glue, so that the radioactive particles are glued to buildings, cars, etc., making any decontamination efforts most difficult. **The Israelis see these rockets/missiles and their assorted warheads as a grave threat.** The Second Lebanon War was planned as the first step in a war against Syria and Iran but the low-cost but powerful AT-14 Russian built and supplied anti-tank missiles proved too much for the IDF armor; the losses were simply too high. This time the IDF will be using different tactics, strategies, and weapons. **Both Syria and Lebanon have make it very clear, over the last few months, that any large-scale Israeli attack on Lebanon/Hezbollah will be considered an attack on them and will immediately trigger a regional war with themselves and Israel.** They simply cannot allow Israel to destroy the rocket/missile element to their MAD counter-force, as they know that the Syrian and Iranian homelands would be next. **So any war on Lebanon/Hezbollah means a General Middle East War from day one. Any Third Lebanon War/General Middle East War is apt to involve WMDs on both sides quickly as both sides know the stakes and that the Israelis are determined to end, once and for all, any Iranian opposition to a 'Greater Israel' domination of the entire Middle East. It will be a case of 'use your WMD or lose them' to enemy strikes. Any massive WMD usage against Israel will result in the usage of Israeli thermonuclear warheads against Arab and Persian populations centers in large parts of the Middle East, with the resulting spread of radioactive fallout over large parts of the Northern Hemisphere**. However, the first use of nukes is apt to be lower yield warheads directed against Iranian underground facilities including both nuclear sites and governmental command and control and leadership bunkers, with some limited strikes also likely early-on in Syrian territory. **The Iranians are well prepared to launch a global Advanced Biological Warfare terrorism based strike against not only Israel and American and allied forces in the Middle East but also against the American, Canadian, British, French, German, Italian, etc., homelands. This will utilize DNA recombination based genetically engineered 'super killer viruses' that are designed to spread themselves throughout the world using humans** as vectors. There are very few defenses against such warfare, other than total quarantine of the population until all of the different man-made viruses (and there could be dozens or even over a hundred different viruses released at the same time) have 'burned themselves out'. This could kill a third of the world's total population. Such a result from **an Israeli triggered war would almost certainly cause a Russian-Chinese response that would eventually finish off what is left of Israel and begin a truly global war/WWIII with multiple war theaters around the world. It is highly unlikely that a Third World War, fought with 21st Century weaponry will be anything but the Biblical Armageddon.**

#### Independently, Iran bioweapon usage causes extinction

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

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

#### CIA is trying to stop Syria weapons spillover, but efforts have been unsuccessful

**Lake 12.** Eli Lake, July 19th 2012. “Syria’s Next Act” <http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2012/07/19/syria-s-next-act.html> (Eli Lake is the senior national-security correspondent for The Daily Beast. He previously covered national security and intelligence for The Washington Times. Lake has also been a contributing editor at The New Republic since 2008 and covered diplomacy, intelligence, and the military for the late New York Sun. He has lived in Cairo and traveled to war zones in Sudan, Iraq, and Gaza. He is one of the few journalists to report from all three members of President Bush’s axis of evil: Iraq, Iran, and North Korea)

With the days and weeks of the Syrian government appearing numbered, **the Central Intelligence Agency is scrambling to get a handle on the locations of the country’s chemical and biological weapons,** while assessing the composition, loyalties, and background of the rebel groups poised to take power in the event President Bashar al-Assad falls. Obama administration officials tell The Daily Beast that **the CIA has sent officers to the region to assess Syria’s weapons program. One major task for the CIA right now is to work with military defectors to find out as much information on Syria’s weapons of mass destruction, according to one U.S. official with access to Syrian intelligence. Another focus will be to sort through reams of intercepted phone calls and emails, satellite images, and other collected intelligence to find the exact locations of the Syrian weapons,** this official said. This task has become more urgent in recent days. Last week, The Wall Street Journal [reported](http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702303644004577523251596963194.html) that the Syrian military was moving its chemical weapons out of storage. On July 17, Nawaf Fares, Syria’s ex-ambassador to Iraq, [told the BBC](http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-middle-east-18864629) the regime would not hesitate to use chemical weapons against the rebel fighters. On Wednesday, a bomb killed the Syrian defense minister and the brother-in-law of President al-Assad in Damascus. The blow to the al-Assad cabinet raised the prospect that the Syrian regime may be on its last legs. Rep. Mike Rogers, the Republican chairman of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, declined to provide details on what intelligence assets have been sent to Syria or to say whether the CIA has sent officers on the ground there. He said that the administration had recently deployed "the resources necessary to collect the information that we need to make a good decision on chemical and biological [weapons], opposition groups and leadership transition strategies." But, he added, "We don’t know nearly what we need to know to be completely effectiveif the regime were to implode tomorrow." A CIA spokesman Thursday declined to comment. Syria never signed the 1992 Chemical Weapons Convention, the treaty that bans the use, stockpiling, or production of chemical weapons. Steven Heydemann, a senior adviser for Middle East initiatives at the U.S. Institute of Peace, a nonpartisan think tank, said he understands Syria’s stockpiles to be “massive.” Brian Sayers, the director of government relations for the Syria Support Group, a new lobby in Washington that is pressing the Obama administration to give guns and training to Syria’s opposition said, “We believe that **if the United States does not act urgently, there is a real risk of a political vacuum in Syria, including the possibility of a dispersion of chemical weapons to rogue groups such as Hezbollah.”** **P**aula DeSutter, who served as assistant secretary of state for verification, compliance, and implementation between 2002 and 2009 and is now retired, said biological weapons could be a bigger a concern. A 2011 [State Department report](http://www.state.gov/t/avc/rls/rpt/170447.htm) on the compliance of countries with arms control and nonproliferation agreements said it "remained unclear" whether Syria would use biological weapons as a military option or whether Syria had violated the Biological Weapons Convention. DeSutter also said she would want the U.S. and international community to secure any remaining nuclear-related equipment from the al-Kibar reactor destroyed in 2007 by Israeli jets. Also unclear is what, if anything, Iraq transferred to Syria before the 2003 U.S. invasion. “That is the wild card,” said DeSutter. Whether or not sensitive weapons technology was moved to Syria is a hotly disputed question in the intelligence community. James Clapper, now the Director of National Intelligence and formerly the director of the National Geospatial Intelligence Agency, said in 2003 that he believed materials had been moved out of Iraq in the months before the war and cited [satellite imagery](http://articles.chicagotribune.com/2003-10-29/news/0310290219_1_illicit-weapons-clapper-weapons-inspector). Obama administration officials say the White House has yet to decide on how it will respond if pro-al-Assad forces use chemical weapons against the Syrian population or a neighboring country. The administration has told senior regime officials that they will be held responsible if they fail to secure chemical weapons. DeSutter said the U.S. should remain vague about the exact consequences. “You could say we will target the president of Syria if they are used and we will target any military organization that used them,” DeSutter said. “I would let them wonder. You might want to drop the word ‘Israel’ in the conversation, too, as a subtle point.” Hydemann said, “There is absolutely no question there has been a great deal of attention in different agencies of the government to the location and security of the chemical weapons stockpiles.” He says the U.S. has done some contingency planning on securing Syria’s borders as well as airports and sea ports to make sure sensitive weapons or terrorist and regime officials do not escape in the event of the regime’s collapse. Other issues pending at the White House include who in the current Syrian government could remain in place if the regime falls and what the U.S. will do to protect Syrian religious and ethnic minorities. While several government agencies and departments are drawing up contingency plans and drafting policy memos, the White House has ultimate control of the policy process and has yet to make a decision. “We are still waiting for red lines,” one Obama administration official who works on Syria issues told The Daily Beast. “This is a decision for the president.” Up until now, the Obama administration has preferred to influence events in Syria from behind the scenes. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton has helped create a group of states known as “Friends of Syria” that seek a managed transition through financial support for the opposition. The State Department is also providing nonlethal aid to Syria’s opposition such as communications equipment. U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations Susan Rice has pushed for U.N. Security Council resolutions and sanctions targeting President al-Assad and his top aides. A resolution authorizing military intervention in Syria was vetoed Thursday by China and Russia at the United Nations.

#### Creating effective Intelligence gathering is key to stop weapons transfers

**Riedel 12** Bruce Riedel. December 12th, 2012. “Syria and Chemical Weapons: What Can the U.S. do now? “<http://www.brookings.edu/research/opinions/2012/12/12-syria-chemical-weapons-us-riedel> (Bruce Riedel is senior fellow and director of the [Brookings Intelligence Project](http://www.brookings.edu/about/projects/intelligence), part of Brookings’ new [Center for 21st Century Security and Intelligence](http://www.brookings.edu/about/centers/security-and-intelligence). Riedel also serves as a senior fellow in the [Saban Center for Middle East Policy](http://www.brookings.edu/about/centers/saban). Riedel joined Brookings following a 30-year career at the Central Intelligence Agency, a tenure which included multiple overseas postings. He served as a senior advisor to the last four U.S. presidents on South Asia and the Middle East, working as a senior member of the National Security Council)

**Syria has the Arab world’s most lethal arsenal of weapons of mass destruction, hundreds of chemical warheads, dozens of Scud missiles and bombs which can deliver them anywhere in the Levant. Stopping them from falling into terrorist hands should be our top intelligence priority.** Syrian scientists developed an effective chemical weapons program using primarily the nerve agent sarin, a substance 500 times more toxic than cyanide, in the 1980s. Syria mated the nerve agent with Scud missiles and with bombs and artillery shells. When Israel learned of the Syrian program it considered military action to destroy it but concluded the program was too disbursed to be susceptible to air attacks without an unacceptable risk that Syria would respond by firing chemicals into Tel Aviv. Securing all of the arsenal today would require a very large military intervention. As Syria collapses further into chaos over the next few months the most immediate danger is that al-Qaeda’s Syrian wing, the al-Nusra front, will take control of a military facility with a cache of chemical weapons. They could use them against Assad’s forces, or more likely spirit them into a third country to attack an American target. Jordan foiled an al-Qaeda plot to attack our Embassy in Amman this fall with mortar fire. How well al-Qaeda could maintain and use chemicals is unknown. Chemical weapons in amateur hands can be very dangerous both to the amateur and his enemy. We don’t want to take the chance**. The key to stopping al-Qaeda or Hezbollah gaining control of a cache is good real time actionable intelligence. The CIA and Mossad have had almost two years to ramp up intelligence collection on Syria but it’s a formidable challenge. U.S. and Jordanian commandoes need to be ready to secure any loose bombs**.

#### Only congress can refocus the CIA- charter legislation is key

**Prados 12** – (2012, John, Senior Fellow and Co-Director of the Iraq Documentation Project, and Director of the Vietnam Project at the National Security Archive at The George Washington University, “The Continuing Quandary of Covert Operations,” JOURNAL OF NATIONAL SECURITY LAW &POLICY, Vol. 5:359)

Reviving the covert operations capability from its present atrophied state immediately raises overarching questions as to the suitability and constitutionality of covert operations techniques. The issues need to be addressed much more systematically. Within the terms of this discussion, **a branch able to do little more than rent armies is not a proper covert operations unit**. Moreover, the present formula of a high tech marriage between secret intelligence – primarily technical collection – and remote action (drones) is not a robust covert action capability either. It is attractive. Much like reconnaissance satellites, such mechanisms can be managed and budgeted with some ease, and have a certain apparent responsiveness. But that does not make them supple instruments, nor does such activity amount to a covert operation. **At the core, it is a conventional military action.** The Pakistanis today complain of a drone campaign out of control and they are right. **When the drones are striking, on average, every three days, that is aerial interdiction, not a targeted covert operation**. CIA lawyers insist that every individual drone target is selected from careful accumulation of evidence resulting in a proposal to neutralize, put in a memorandum and approved at a high level. That is not possible, given the number of targets struck, without expanding the target set far beyond the top levels of adversary leadership. Former CIA Director Panetta has affirmed that al Qaeda activists still in the region number only forty to fifty persons. By Pakistani accounts, most Predators now strike much lower level operatives, and of the Taliban, not al Qaeda. This follows perfectly from the fact that the top leaders have learned to exercise complete communications security, while CIA high technology surveillance depends on those data to acquire the targets. The drones are fishing, and the big fish are not biting. The bin Laden attack – apart from potential controversies about his assassination, or U.S. relations with Pakistan – shows that old school methods still work. Someone off the grid could be hunted down and dealt with. But the momentum of the technologically-driven covert operation has arguably reached the point of no return. **This is not an intelligence approach; it is a military one**. Today’s CIA is increasingly an auxiliary of the U.S. military. Since the 1990-1991 Persian Gulf war, and the Somali and Bosnian peacemaking operations that followed, the Pentagon has made increasing demands for improved national intelligence “support to military operations.” Larger numbers of military personnel have been seconded to the CIA, and military culture increasingly pervades the Agency. **The support has become the operation.** Director Panetta’s predecessor was an Air Force general. His successor is an Army general. Support for military operations has involved a learning curve, but increasingly the intelligence agencies are cast as adjuncts to the military. The high “operational tempo” demanded by Director Michael Hayden, Panetta’s predecessor, in fact required the CIA to work more like the military, discarding careful intelligence work in favor of “actionable intelligence,” further emphasizing technical collection programs. Under Director David Petraeus, another general, it is a safe prediction that this trend will continue. Under Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld, the Pentagon moved strongly to supplant CIA operations. Under the slogan “military preparation of the battlefield,” the U.S. Special Operations Command tried to recruit agents, conduct operations, and do all manner of things traditionally reserved to the clandestine service. Secretary of Defense Robert Gates cut back some of those efforts and negotiated with the CIA regarding the roles and missions of each. Needless to say **this has been made easier as the agency became more militarized.** In Presidents’ Secret Wars, written amid the excesses of Reagan-era covert operations, I argued for vesting authority for the covert operations function within the Department of Defense (DoD). That was partly a matter of the DoD providing more of the full-service covert operations panoply within its Special Operations Forces – a point illustrated by the bin Laden attack – and partly a reflection of the sense that military regulations should ensure more proper legal controls. In Safe for Democracy, written in 2006, I was not so confident, and argued for preserving the main lines of covert operations authority within the CIA. But the CIA was guilty of excesses in the struggle against terrorism and has become excessively militarized, while the military remains as clumsy as ever. Today I am not comfortable with either solution. The presumptive authority for covert operations remains where it has been, with the CIA, but the Agency has become militarized, has **lost skills**, and still lacks a proper mechanism for cost-benefit analysis. **Covert capability needs to rebuild tradecraft, refine its decision devices, and be placed within a proper legal framework.** This brings us to the final, legal questions. I have consistently held, and still do, that no legal authority for covert operations exists under the U.S. Constitution. The underpinning for presidential approval of covert operations rests entirely on the ambiguous “such other functions” clause of the National Security Act of 1947. The CIA’s own General Counsel concluded on multiple occasions that covert operations did not fall within the scope of that language. Should the President instead rely upon his authority as Commander in Chief of the armed forces, the problem is that the CIA is not an “armed force.” Even if it were, the President would then have to be deemed to be acting under the provisions of the War Powers Resolution of 1973. This requires congressional approval of an action within sixty to ninety days. We can debate whether Congress has abdicated its responsibilities for enforcement of this statute, but the fact remains that it is the law of the land. Alternatively, were the CIA to be construed as an unofficial armed force for the purpose of conducting paramilitary action – which is, after all, an act of force – then the Constitution (Article I, Section 8) expressly reserves to the Congress all authority to issue “Letters of Marque.” The eighteenth century equivalent of grants of unofficial combatant status, given to privateers, Letters of Marque authorize the use of force by private individuals (read CIA operatives). The system of “presidential findings” (“Memoranda of Notification”) that exists today was cobbled together through the 1970s and 1980s by a Congress anxious to assert some sort of oversight and an Executive eager to avoid it. These presidential findings are functional equivalents of Letters of Marque. Since statutory law does not and cannot supersede the Constitution, the current system still fails to meet constitutional requirements. Congress and the Executive spent more than a decade from the 1980s into the 1990s fighting each other to regularize the format and content of presidential findings, which became a staple of congressional oversight debates. The wounds had barely healed when, after 9/11, the Bush administration further exploited the presidential finding system regarding non-covert operations matters (National Security Agency telephone monitoring) as covered by the system, by manipulating questions of what legislators (“Big Eight,” “Big Four,” the intelligence oversight committees, no one?) had to be informed on particular issues, and by continuing to dispute the issue left outstanding in the 1990s – what constituted “current” notification. The proper constitutional solution under Article I, Section 8, is to craft a mechanism for congressional approval of presidential findings. That would locate responsibility squarely and settle the matter of definitions. Congress would be entitled to whatever information is required to reach its decisions, and its affirmative action would give covert operations a degree of **political cover** they presently lack. **The legitimate vehicle for the expression of this formula is a CIA charter**, or more precisely a charter covering the intelligence community as a whole. **Charter legislation is the place to reframe all the questions of regulation and responsibility for various aspects of intelligence agency roles and missions that have been raised here and in other recent assessments of covert operations**. Congress and the Executive failed to reach agreement on intelligence charter legislation during the Carter administration. It is long overdue, and its necessity has only been confirmed by recent excesses.
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#### We meet- we ban the president’s authority to conduct strikes using the CIA-and that’s Authority

**Chesney 12**  (2012, Robert, Charles I. Francis Professor in Law at the University of Texas School of Law, non-resident Senior Fellow of the Brookings Institution, “Military-Intelligence Convergence and the Law of the Title 10/Title 50 Debate,” JOURNAL OF NATIONAL SECURITY LAW and POLICY, Vol. 5:539)

Title 50 is a portion of the U.S. Code that contains a diverse array of statutes relating to national security and foreign affairs. These include the standing affirmative grants of authority through which Congress originally empowered the CIA to carry out its various functions. That set in turn includes the sweeping language of the so-called fifth function, which the executive branch has long construed to grant authority to engage in covert action. Separately, Title 50 also contains the statutes that define covert action, require presidential findings in support of them, and oblige notification of them to SSCI and HPSCI. As a result, Title 50 authority has also become a shorthand, in this case one that refers to the domestic law authorization for engaging in quintessential intelligence activities such as intelligence collection and covert action.

#### 2. we meet- by definition the Pesident can not act without money to carry out the strike, means authority is limited

#### C/I Authority includes power to act or conduct an act

#### Hill 05 Free Legal Dictionary definition. <http://legal-dictionary.thefreedictionary.com/authority> (Gerald and Kathleen Hill are co-authors of 25 books, including The People's Law Dictionary, Real Life Dictionary of the Law, Encyclopedia of Federal Agencies and Commissions, Facts On File Dictionary of American Politics, and the popular Hill Guides: Sonoma Valley: The Secret Wine Country, Napa Valley: Land of Golden Vines; Victoria and Vancouver Island: the Almost Perfect Eden; Northwest Wine Country; Santa Barbara and the Central Coast: California's Riviera; and Monterey and Carmel: Eden by the Sea. Gerald has practiced law for more than four decades in both San Francisco's financial district and the town of Sonoma, California. He has an A.B. from Stanford University and Juris Doctor from Hastings College of the Law of the University of California. He was Executive Director of the California Governor’s Housing Commission, drafted legislation, taught at Golden Gate University Law School, served as an arbitrator and pro tem judge, edited and co-authored Housing in California, was an elected trustee of a public hospital, and has testified before Congressional committees.)

authority n. permission, a right coupled with the power to do an act or order others to act. Often one person gives another authority to act, as an employer to an employee, a principal to an agent, a corporation to its officers, or governmental empowerment to perform certain functions. There are different types of authority including "apparent authority" when a principal gives an agent various signs of authority to make others believe he or she has authority, "express authority" or "limited authority" which spell out exactly what authority is granted (usually a written set of instructions), "implied authority" which flows from the position one holds, and "general authority" which is the broad power to act for another.

#### Funding restrictions are restrictions on authority , rooted in U.S. code

Richard F. Grimmett, Specialist in National Defense Foreign Affairs, Defense, and Trade Division, 2007 CRS, Congressional Use of Funding Cutoffs Since 1970 Involving U.S. Military Forces and Overseas Deployments

Uses by Congress of Funding Restrictions to Affect Presidential Policy Toward Foreign Military/Paramilitary Operations

Although not directly analogous to efforts to seek withdrawal of American military forces from abroad by use of funding cutoffs, Congress has used funding restrictions to limit or prevent foreign activities of a military or paramilitary nature. As such, these actions represent alternative methods to affect elements of presidentially sanctioned foreign military operations. Representative examples of these actions are in legislation relating to Angola and Nicaragua, which are summarized below. In 1976, controversy over U.S. covert assistance to paramilitary forces in Angola led to legislative bans on such action. These legislative restrictions are summarized below. ! The Defense Department Appropriations Act for FY1976, P.L. 94-212, signed February 9, 1976, provided that none of the funds “appropriated in this Act may be used for any activities involving Angola other than intelligence gathering....” This funding limitation would expire at the end of this fiscal year. Consequently, Congress provided for a ban in permanent law, which embraced both authorization and appropriations acts, in the International Security Assistance and Arms Export Control Act of 1976. ! Section 404 of the International Security Assistance and Arms Export Control Act of 1976, P.L. 94-329, signed June 30, 1976, stated that “Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no assistance of any kind may be provided for the purpose, or which would have the effect, of promoting, augmenting, directly or indirectly, the capacity of any nation, group, organization, movement, or individual to conduct military or paramilitary operations in Angola, unless and until Congress expressly authorizes such assistance by law enacted after the date of enactment of this section.” This section also permitted the President to provide the prohibited assistance to Angola if he made a detailed, unclassified report to Congress stating the specific amounts and categories of assistance to be provided and the proposed recipients of the aid. He also had to certify that furnishing such aid was “important to the national security interests of the United States.” ! Section 109 of the Foreign Assistance and Related Programs Appropriations Act for FY1976, P.L. 94-330, signed June 30, 1976, provided that “None of the funds appropriated or made available pursuant to this Act shall be obligated to finance directly or indirectly any type of military assistance to Angola.” In 1984, controversy over U.S. assistance to the opponents of the Nicaraguan government (the anti-Sandinista guerrillas known as the “contras”) led to a prohibition on such assistance in a continuing appropriations bill. This legislative ban is summarized below. ! The continuing appropriations resolution for FY1985, P.L. 98-473, 98 Stat. 1935-1937, signed October 12, 1984, provided that “During fiscal year 1985, no funds available to the Central Intelligence Agency, the Department of Defense, or any other agency or entity of the United States involved in intelligence activities may be obligated or expended for the purpose or which would have the effect of supporting, directly or indirectly, military or paramilitary operations in Nicaragua by any nation, group, organization, movement or individual.” This legislation also provided that after February 28, 1985, if the President made a report to Congress specifying certain criteria, including the need to provide further assistance for “military or paramilitary operations” prohibited by this statute, he could expend $14 million in funds if Congress passed a joint resolution approving such action.

#### The “war powers authority” of the President is his Commander-in-Chief authority

Gallagher, Pakistan/Afghanistan coordination cell of the U.S. Joint Staff, Summer 2011

(Joseph, “Unconstitutional War: Strategic Risk in the Age of Congressional Abdication,” *Parameters*, http://strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pubs/parameters/Articles/2011summer/Gallagher.pdf)

First, consider the constitutional issue of power imbalance. Central to the Constitution is the foundational principle of power distribution and provisions to check and balance exercises of that power. This clearly intended separation of powers across the three branches of government ensures that no single federal officeholder can wield an inordinate amount of power or influence. The founders carefully crafted constitutional war-making authority with the branch most representative of the people—Congress.4

The Federalist Papers No. 51, “The Structure of Government Must Furnish the Proper Checks and Balances Between the Different Departments,” serves as the wellspring for this principle. Madison insisted on the necessity to prevent any particular interest or group to trump another interest or group.5 This principle applies in practice to all decisions of considerable national importance. **Specific to war powers authority**, **the Constitution empowers the legislative branch with the authority to declare war but endows the Executive with the authority to act as Commander-in-Chief.**6 This construct designates Congress, not the president, as the primary decisionmaking body to commit the nation to war—a decision that ultimately requires the consent and will of the people in order to succeed. By vesting the decision to declare war with Congress, the founders underscored their intention to engage the people—those who would ultimately sacrifice their blood and treasure in the effort.

#### Commander in Chief powers are the justification for TK

Wheeler 13 “The AUMF fallacy” Marcy Wheeler, founder of EmptyWheel – a national security blog, PhD in comparative lit

<http://www.emptywheel.net/2013/02/18/the-aumf-fallacy/>

And ultimately, we should look to what Stephen Preston — the General Counsel of the agency that actually carried out the Awlaki killing — has to say about where the CIA gets its authorization to engage in lethal covert operations.

Let’s start with the first box: **Authority to Act under U.S. Law**.

First, we would confirm that **the contemplated activity is authorized by the President in the exercise of his powers under Article II of the U.S. Constitution, for example, the President’s responsibility as Chief Executive and Commander-in-Chief to protect the country from an imminent threat of violent attack**. This would not be just a one-time check for legal authority at the outset. Our hypothetical program would be engineered so as to ensure that, through careful review and senior-level decision-making, each individual action is linked to the imminent threat justification.

#### Prefer our interpriation

1. Key to real world education- learning about how congress appropriates money is necessary to learn about the real world.

#### 1) Prefer our definition: Congresses enforcement power is the purse – any affirmative that fails to specify has no leverage power - they’re a resolution

#### 2) Turn – we increase your ground by specifying our enforcement, you can counterplan out or run disads

**3) Their interp crushes aff innovation, it’s easy to be negative on this topic – repertoire of Ks, Cps, and disads makes it important for the aff to be able to adapt**

#### 4) Prevents bidirectionality – checks aff circumvention good arguments

#### 5) Literature and substantial check limits explosions

#### 6) Vietnam proves – congress threatened to cut funding if the president failed to withdrawal. Our interp accesses historic and topic specific education

#### No ground loss- they still can read all of their Das based off of a reduction of war powers.

#### Default to reasonability – competing interpretations forces a race to the bottom and leads to stale, hyper-generic debates.

### K

#### Perms

#### Military solutions can solve terror—empirically proven

Gordon 10—journalist living in Israel and the author of “The Deadly Price of Pursuing Peace,” (Evelyn, West Bank Shows There Is a Military Solution to Terror, 12.14.2010, http://www.commentarymagazine.com/blogs/index.php/category/contentions/page/4)

The “expert” report Max cited yesterday, which declared Afghanistan unwinnable even while acknowledging progress in the war, reflects a broader problem: the claim that “there is no military solution to terror” has become virtually unchallenged dogma among Western intelligentsia. Yet as Israel’s experience in the West Bank shows, terrorist organizations can be defeated — if their opponents are willing to invest the requisite time and resources. In March 2002, Israel was at the height of a terrorist war begun in 2000 that ultimately claimed more victims — mainly civilians — than all the terror of the preceding 53 years combined. Every day saw multiple attacks, and a day without fatalities was rare. But then Israel launched a multi-year military campaign that steadily reduced Israeli fatalities from a peak of 450 in 2002 to 13 in 2007. Last month, Haaretz published two other statistics reflecting this success: the number of wanted terrorists in the West Bank, once in the hundreds, is now almost zero. And Israeli troop levels in the West Bank are lower than they have been since the first intifada began in 1987. Western bon ton likes to credit these achievements to Palestinian Prime Minister Salam Fayyad and his American-trained security forces. But in reality, the number of Israelis killed by West Bank terror in the year before May 2008, when Fayyad’s forces began deploying, was all of eight — virtually identical to last year’s five and this year’s six. Indeed, had the war not already been over, Israel wouldn’t have agreed to Fayyad’s plan. What produced this victory was the grunt work of counterterrorism: intelligence, arrests, interrogations, military operations, and, above all, enough boots on the ground long enough to make this possible. That wasn’t obvious in advance: as Haaretz reported, many senior Israel Defense Forces officers accepted the dogma that terrorist organizations can’t be defeated, because they have an infinite supply of new recruits. But then-Shin Bet security service chief Avi Dichter, who insisted that “the ‘terror barrel’ had a bottom,” proved correct. What Dichter understood was that while there may be millions of potential terrorist recruits, counterterrorism can dry up the supply of actual recruits by making terrorism a business that doesn’t pay. The more terrorists you arrest or kill, the more potential recruits decide that the likelihood of death or imprisonment has become too high to make terror an attractive proposition. Two articles, in 2007 and 2008, reveal how this dynamic works: Palestinian terrorists, once lionized, were now unmarriageable, because the near-certainty of Israeli retribution made marriage to a wanted man no life. As one father explained: “I wouldn’t want my daughter to marry one. I want her to have a good life, without having the army coming into her house all the time to arrest her while her husband escapes into the streets.” And therefore, the terrorists were quitting. Most terrorists aren’t die-hard fanatics, and non-fanatics respond to cost-benefit incentives. When terrorist organizations rule the roost, recruits will flock to their banner. But when the costs start outweighing the benefits, they will desert in droves. And then the “unwinnable” war is won.

#### And, Strict review of targeted killing operations is key to maintain morality in war

Guiora, 2012

[Amos, Professor of Law, S.J. Quinney College of Law, University of Utah, Targeted killing: when proportionality gets all out of proportion, Case Western Reserve Journal of International Law. 45.1-2 (Fall 2012): p235., Academic onefile] /Wyo-MB

One of the dominant, and admittedly controversial, arguments this essay advances is that states have an obligation to conduct themselves morally, including during armed conflict. Although some may find this notion inherently contradictory, "morality in armed conflict" is a term of art (and not an oxymoron) that lies at the core of the instant discussion. This concept imposes an absolute requirement that soldiers treat the civilian population of areas in which they are engaged in conflict with the utmost dignity and respect. This obligation holds true whether combat takes place "house-to-house" or using remotely piloted aircraft tens of thousands of feet up in the sky. This concept may be simple to articulate, yet it is difficult to implement; the operational reality of armed conflict short of war requires a soldier to make multiple decisions involving various factors, all of which have never-ending spin-off potential. After all, every decision is not only complicated in and of itself, but each operational situation has a number of "forks." The implication is that no decision is linear, and every decision leads to additional dilemmas and spurs further decision making.¶ Operational decision-making is thus predicated on a complicated triangle that must incorporate the rule of law, morality, and effectiveness. I have been asked repeatedly whether that triangle endangers soldiers while giving the "other side" an undue advantage. The concern is understandable; however, the essence of armed conflict is that innocent civilians are in the immediate vicinity of combatants, and there is a duty to protect them even at the risk of harm to soldiers. (12) The burden to distinguish between combatant and civilian is extraordinarily complicated and poses significant operational dilemmas for and burdens on soldiers.¶ For armed conflict conducted in accordance with the rule of law and morality, this burden of distinction can never be viewed as mere mantra. Distinction, (13) then, is integral to the discussion. It is as relevant and important to the soldier standing at a check-point, uncertain whether the person standing opposite him is a combatant or civilian, as it must be in any targeted killing dilemma. The decision whether to operationally engage must reflect a variety of criteria and guidelines. (14) Otherwise, the nation state conducts itself in the spirit of a video game where victims are not real and represent mere numbers, regardless of the degree of threat they pose.¶ At the most fundamental level, operational decision making in the context of counterterrorism involves the decision whether to kill an individual defined as a legitimate target. (15) Although some argue killing is inherently immoral, I argue that killing in the context of narrowly defined self-defense is both legal and moral provided that the decision to "pull the trigger" is made in the context of a highly circumscribed and criteria-based framework. If limits are not imposed in defining a legitimate target, then decisions take on the hue of both illegality and immorality.

#### 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>)

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**.

### 2.0

#### Perm do both- the plan would cut the funding from CIA drone stirkes, while the president stops using them. Perms should be a test of mutal exclusivity, and should not be required to have a net bennifit. Its aslo normal means.

#### Doesn’t solve the Overreach adv Congress is key to create satatory restrictions to protect SFOs that’s Anderson

#### Dosent slove norms- A. only congress can send a statory road map for other state to follow. That’s Maxwell. B. Only congress can send a strong legal signal to other countries, XOs are too covert

#### Only congress can refocus the CIA- charter legislation is key

**Prados 12** – (2012, John, Senior Fellow and Co-Director of the Iraq Documentation Project, and Director of the Vietnam Project at the National Security Archive at The George Washington University, “The Continuing Quandary of Covert Operations,” JOURNAL OF NATIONAL SECURITY LAW &POLICY, Vol. 5:359)

Reviving the covert operations capability from its present atrophied state immediately raises overarching questions as to the suitability and constitutionality of covert operations techniques. The issues need to be addressed much more systematically. Within the terms of this discussion, **a branch able to do little more than rent armies is not a proper covert operations unit**. Moreover, the present formula of a high tech marriage between secret intelligence – primarily technical collection – and remote action (drones) is not a robust covert action capability either. It is attractive. Much like reconnaissance satellites, such mechanisms can be managed and budgeted with some ease, and have a certain apparent responsiveness. But that does not make them supple instruments, nor does such activity amount to a covert operation. **At the core, it is a conventional military action.** The Pakistanis today complain of a drone campaign out of control and they are right. **When the drones are striking, on average, every three days, that is aerial interdiction, not a targeted covert operation**. CIA lawyers insist that every individual drone target is selected from careful accumulation of evidence resulting in a proposal to neutralize, put in a memorandum and approved at a high level. That is not possible, given the number of targets struck, without expanding the target set far beyond the top levels of adversary leadership. Former CIA Director Panetta has affirmed that al Qaeda activists still in the region number only forty to fifty persons. By Pakistani accounts, most Predators now strike much lower level operatives, and of the Taliban, not al Qaeda. This follows perfectly from the fact that the top leaders have learned to exercise complete communications security, while CIA high technology surveillance depends on those data to acquire the targets. The drones are fishing, and the big fish are not biting. The bin Laden attack – apart from potential controversies about his assassination, or U.S. relations with Pakistan – shows that old school methods still work. Someone off the grid could be hunted down and dealt with. But the momentum of the technologically-driven covert operation has arguably reached the point of no return. **This is not an intelligence approach; it is a military one**. Today’s CIA is increasingly an auxiliary of the U.S. military. Since the 1990-1991 Persian Gulf war, and the Somali and Bosnian peacemaking operations that followed, the Pentagon has made increasing demands for improved national intelligence “support to military operations.” Larger numbers of military personnel have been seconded to the CIA, and military culture increasingly pervades the Agency. **The support has become the operation.** Director Panetta’s predecessor was an Air Force general. His successor is an Army general. Support for military operations has involved a learning curve, but increasingly the intelligence agencies are cast as adjuncts to the military. The high “operational tempo” demanded by Director Michael Hayden, Panetta’s predecessor, in fact required the CIA to work more like the military, discarding careful intelligence work in favor of “actionable intelligence,” further emphasizing technical collection programs. Under Director David Petraeus, another general, it is a safe prediction that this trend will continue. Under Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld, the Pentagon moved strongly to supplant CIA operations. Under the slogan “military preparation of the battlefield,” the U.S. Special Operations Command tried to recruit agents, conduct operations, and do all manner of things traditionally reserved to the clandestine service. Secretary of Defense Robert Gates cut back some of those efforts and negotiated with the CIA regarding the roles and missions of each. Needless to say **this has been made easier as the agency became more militarized.** In Presidents’ Secret Wars, written amid the excesses of Reagan-era covert operations, I argued for vesting authority for the covert operations function within the Department of Defense (DoD). That was partly a matter of the DoD providing more of the full-service covert operations panoply within its Special Operations Forces – a point illustrated by the bin Laden attack – and partly a reflection of the sense that military regulations should ensure more proper legal controls. In Safe for Democracy, written in 2006, I was not so confident, and argued for preserving the main lines of covert operations authority within the CIA. But the CIA was guilty of excesses in the struggle against terrorism and has become excessively militarized, while the military remains as clumsy as ever. Today I am not comfortable with either solution. The presumptive authority for covert operations remains where it has been, with the CIA, but the Agency has become militarized, has **lost skills**, and still lacks a proper mechanism for cost-benefit analysis. **Covert capability needs to rebuild tradecraft, refine its decision devices, and be placed within a proper legal framework.** This brings us to the final, legal questions. I have consistently held, and still do, that no legal authority for covert operations exists under the U.S. Constitution. The underpinning for presidential approval of covert operations rests entirely on the ambiguous “such other functions” clause of the National Security Act of 1947. The CIA’s own General Counsel concluded on multiple occasions that covert operations did not fall within the scope of that language. Should the President instead rely upon his authority as Commander in Chief of the armed forces, the problem is that the CIA is not an “armed force.” Even if it were, the President would then have to be deemed to be acting under the provisions of the War Powers Resolution of 1973. This requires congressional approval of an action within sixty to ninety days. We can debate whether Congress has abdicated its responsibilities for enforcement of this statute, but the fact remains that it is the law of the land. Alternatively, were the CIA to be construed as an unofficial armed force for the purpose of conducting paramilitary action – which is, after all, an act of force – then the Constitution (Article I, Section 8) expressly reserves to the Congress all authority to issue “Letters of Marque.” The eighteenth century equivalent of grants of unofficial combatant status, given to privateers, Letters of Marque authorize the use of force by private individuals (read CIA operatives). The system of “presidential findings” (“Memoranda of Notification”) that exists today was cobbled together through the 1970s and 1980s by a Congress anxious to assert some sort of oversight and an Executive eager to avoid it. These presidential findings are functional equivalents of Letters of Marque. Since statutory law does not and cannot supersede the Constitution, the current system still fails to meet constitutional requirements. Congress and the Executive spent more than a decade from the 1980s into the 1990s fighting each other to regularize the format and content of presidential findings, which became a staple of congressional oversight debates. The wounds had barely healed when, after 9/11, the Bush administration further exploited the presidential finding system regarding non-covert operations matters (National Security Agency telephone monitoring) as covered by the system, by manipulating questions of what legislators (“Big Eight,” “Big Four,” the intelligence oversight committees, no one?) had to be informed on particular issues, and by continuing to dispute the issue left outstanding in the 1990s – what constituted “current” notification. The proper constitutional solution under Article I, Section 8, is to craft a mechanism for congressional approval of presidential findings. That would locate responsibility squarely and settle the matter of definitions. Congress would be entitled to whatever information is required to reach its decisions, and its affirmative action would give covert operations a degree of **political cover** they presently lack. **The legitimate vehicle for the expression of this formula is a CIA charter**, or more precisely a charter covering the intelligence community as a whole. **Charter legislation is the place to reframe all the questions of regulation and responsibility for various aspects of intelligence agency roles and missions that have been raised here and in other recent assessments of covert operations**. Congress and the Executive failed to reach agreement on intelligence charter legislation during the Carter administration. It is long overdue, and its necessity has only been confirmed by recent excesses.

#### Doesn’t solve CIA tradeoff – they’ll circumvent without statutory clarification

**Harris 05** – (2005, Grant, JD candidate at time of publication, expected same year, post-graduation: Special Assistant to the President and Senior Director for African Affairs, former Deputy Chief of Staff and Counselor to Susan E. Rice, the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations and a member of President Obama’s Cabinet, “The CIA Mandate and the War on Terror,” Yale Law & Policy Review Vol. 23:529, 2005)

The thousands of pages of reports and recommendations made by the various commissions of the 1970s suggest that the vague terminology of the CIA mandate was an important cause of CIA abuses perpetrated during the Cold War. **The lack of clear boundaries of authority** provided no clear guideposts to prevent good-faith efforts to protect the nation's security from crossing the line to become overzealous and unnecessarily infringe civil liberties. Similarly, **statutory ambiguity provided fertile ground for political abuse of the Agency** at the behest of the highest levels of government. The abuses were caused by a mix of convenient and disingenuous interpretations of the CIA mandate and outright violations of the law. For these reasons, clarified statutory limits as proposed in Part IV of this Note would provide better boundaries for well-intentioned activities as well as a more **meaningful shield** by which the CIA could ward off bad-faith directives intended to serve personal or political ends.

Vague statutory language proved all too malleable in the face of the nation's overriding fear of communism. The drive to win the Cold War and undefined prohibitions with ambiguous parameters opened the door to **creative interpretations of authority**. CIA excesses during the Cold War were excused if not encouraged by the drive to defeat communism, which emanated from the country's highest levels of political leadership. This created a situation of lax oversight of CIA activities and a "climate of tolerance" in which there was a "let them do what they need to do to get the job done" ethic in place from the passage of the National Security Act in 1947 until the congressional inquiries ofthe 1970s.64

Such a national security environment allowed the CIA to justify domestic and law enforcement activities through alternating overly narrow and overly broad interpretations of its ambiguous statutory mandate. The executive branch "interpreted foreign intelligence broadly" to include domestic intelligencegathering programs directed at U.S. nationals designed "to determine foreign influence on dissident domestic groups. "65 The same activity was also condoned by a "narrow[]" CIA interpretation of "internal security functions," despite the fact that "history indicates that at the time of enactment of the National Security Act, threats to 'internal security' were widely understood to include domestic groups with foreign connections" and "[t]here is no evidence that by 194 7 these investigations were considered foreign intelligence. "66 The Agency later used an expansive interpretation of the DCI's obligation to protect "sources and methods" as an additional statutory justification for operations targeting domestic groups "whose activities, including demonstrations, have potential, however remote, for creating threats to CIA installations, recruiters, or contractors."67

#### Statutory change coming now. Means CP links to politics and would have zero case solvency. Gets overridden immediately. Only fiatting congressional implementation can solve the aff

**Schmitt, 1/16** (Eric, Congress Restricts Drones Program Shift, New York Times, http://www.nytimes.com/2014/01/17/us/politics/congress-restricts-drones-program-shift.html?\_r=0)

WASHINGTON — In an unusual move, Congress is placing restrictions on the Obama administration’s plan to shift responsibility for armed drones more toward the military and away from the C.I.A., congressional and administration officials said Thursday. Lawmakers inserted wording into a classified annex to the $1.1 trillion federal budget approved by Congress this week that would make it more difficult to transfer control over the drone campaign or the authority to carry out strikes. The scope of the restrictions remained unclear because of their classification. But the provision does not appear to entirely block a shift described last May by administration officials as a ramification of President Obama’s intention to move the country off a decade-long war footing. Lawmakers allowed the president to waive the constraints under certain circumstances or to permit the transfer if the administration certifies that the military meets certain standards in drone operations, congressional aides said Thursday. Even before the new provision in the budget bill, administration and congressional officials said the schedule for shifting control to the military was being revised — if not shelved. “D.O.D. has some work to do,” a senior House Intelligence Committee staff aide said Thursday, referring to the Department of Defense. “It’s a lot more challenging than they thought.”

#### Future presidents prevent solvency

Harvard Law Review 12, "Developments in the Law: Presidential Authority," Vol. 125:2057, www.harvardlawreview.org/media/pdf/vol125\_devo.pdf

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

### Politics

#### CIR not key to economy

Mike **Flynn 13**, Breitbart reporter, July 13, "White House Oversells Economic Benefits of Immigration Reform," www.breitbart.com/Big-Government/2013/07/13/white-house-oversells-economic-benefits-of-immigration-reform

On Saturday, President Obama used his weekly radio address to tout the economic benefits of passing the Senate immigration reform bill. On Wednesday, the White House issued a report saying the immigration reform bill would both trim the deficit and boost the economy over the next two decades. Even accepting the Administration's numbers at face-value, the report shows how little would be gained economically from reform in the long-term. In the short-term, however, there are some very real costs ignored by the White House.¶ The White House report draws heavily from a CBO analysis on the economic impact of the Senate bill, released in mid-June. The CBO estimates that, under the Senate bill, in 20 years, the nation's GDP would be $1.4 trillion higher than it otherwise would be if the bill didn't pass. The Administration claims the bill will grow the economy by 5.4% in that time-frame. ¶ Which sounds impressive, until one realizes that we are talking about a 20 year window here. An incremental growth of 5% over two decades isn't exactly an economic bonanza. In that time-span the US economy will generate $300-500 trillion in total economic impact. An extra few trillion is at the margins or the margins.¶ Worse, the economic benefits the CBO estimates will accrue only begin at least a decade after enactment. Through 2031, Gross National Product, which measures the output of US residents and firms, would be lower than it otherwise would be. In ten years, the per capita GNP would be almost 1% lower than without the Senate bill. ¶ The CBO analysis also shows that average wages of American workers would be lower than they otherwise would be through at least the first 10 years of the law's enactment. The unemployment rate would also rise for the first decade, due to a large increase in the labor force.¶ Supporters and opponents of immigration reform both overstate its economic impact. In a nation of more than 300 million people and a $16 trillion economy, any economic impact is going to be felt at the margins. The CBO, however, finds that, for at least a decade, the economic effects of the Senate bill are negative at the margins. After 2 decades, the CBO says the effects become positive at the margin. ¶ A decade of relatively worse economic performance to secure marginally better performance 20 years from now is not an obviously good bargain. One can make many argument in favor of immigration reform. Economic growth, however, seems a very weak one.

#### No meaningful bill will pass – it’ll only militarize the border

Rogers, 1/24 reporter in TIME's Washington bureau; A native of Maryland, he graduated from Vanderbilt University (Alex “Is There Any Hope for Immigration Reform on the Hill?” http://swampland.time.com/2014/01/24/is-there-any-hope-for-immigration-reform-on-the-hill/#ixzz2rLyS5Gn5)

Former New York City mayor Michael Bloomberg, former Commerce Secretary Carlos Gutierrez, and the Republican governor of Michigan Rick Snyder are speaking at the National Press Club Friday to tout the economic case for passage of immigration reform. It’s the first in a series of exchanges coming this winter as the parties jockey for position on immigration ahead of the 2014 midterms. Speaker of the House John Boehner will announce broad Republican “principles” in the upcoming weeks. On Tuesday, the President will give his State of the Union with undocumented immigrants in the audience. But while optimism is high—the President reportedly told Senate Democrats he expects the Republican-controlled House will pass “something”—experience suggests that, at most, only border security will see Congressional approval this year. There are two reasons to think House Republicans won’t support a bill resolving the legal status of illegal immigrants in 2014, despite the fact that they pledged to “embrace and champion comprehensive immigration reform” after their 2012 presidential nominee, Mitt Romney, lost the Hispanic demographic two to one. First, House Republicans don’t need to tackle the hard issues of immigration reform to keep the chamber. Democrats need to win 42 of 43 competitive races to take over the House, according to the Cook Political Report, and Republicans might even gain a few seats in the wake of the ObamaCare rollout fiasco. Next year, with no congressional election, could provide a better political environment for House Republicans. The second reason is that the right wing of the House Republican conference has yet to embrace reform, and there is little indication that Speaker John Boehner will rebuff them as he has conservative outside groups. In fact, it is President Obama who has moved towards Republicans, accepting in November their “step-by-step” or “piecemeal” approach, on condition that all of the steps—border security, high-tech and agriculture worker visas, a path to legality, etc.—get done. Republicans have not committed to such a compromise, and for now they’re avoiding the question. When asked if he supported a path to citizenship or legal status for illegal immigrants, Rep. Steve Scalise, the chairman of a broad conservative coalition, the Republican Study Committee, told TIME, “I support legislation that would finally secure our border… I think that was probably the biggest flaw of the Senate bill,” Scalise added. “It just assumes everybody wants to come here and get legal status to go and be a registered voter. And that’s just not the case.” When pressed about what to do with the current 11 million illegal immigrants within America’s borders, Scalise advocated for reforming visa laws for both high-skilled and low-skilled workers. He said the current program “forces a lot of people to come here illegally, who would otherwise come here to work legally, and then go back home.” Addressing the visa system may be a way to strike a compromise, but previous attempts at the House have proven to be extremely partisan. Both agricultural and high-tech visa bills passed out of committee in 2013 failed to garner Democratic support. Other House Republicans have advocated for a path to legal status for illegal immigrants, most recently the GOP whip, Rep. Kevin McCarthy (R-Calif.), who reaffirmed his support this week. Other members of the leadership agree, and Budget Committee Chairman Paul Ryan (R-Wisc.) and House Judiciary Committee Chairman Bob Goodlatte (R-Va.) have taken the mantle on finding undocumented immigrants a path to legal status. But several other Republicans who were initially involved in finding a solution, including Reps. Ted Poe (R-Texas), Trey Gowdy (R-S.C.), and Raul Labrador (R-Ind.), have become embittered with the President and will remain hard pressed to come around.

#### TPA first

**Parnes, 1/21/14** (Arnie, “Obama: Give me fast track trade” The Hill,

<http://thehill.com/homenews/administration/195858-white-house-works-to-convince-dems-to-give-obama-fast-track-on-trade>

The White House is making a major push to convince Congress to give the president trade promotion authority (TPA), which would make it easier for President Obama to negotiate pacts with other countries. A flurry of meetings has taken place in recent days since legislation was introduced to give the president the authority, with U.S. Trade Representative Mike Froman meeting with approximately 70 lawmakers on both sides of the aisle in the House and Senate. White House chief of staff Denis McDonough has also been placing calls and meeting with top Democratic lawmakers in recent days to discuss trade and other issues. Republicans have noticed a change in the administration’s interest in the issue, which is expected to be a part of Obama’s State of the Union address in one week. While there was “a lack of engagement,” as one senior Republican aide put it, there is now a new energy from the White House since the bill dropped. The effort to get Congress to grant Obama trade promotion authority comes as the White House seeks to complete trade deals with the European Union, and a group of Asian and Latin American countries as part of the Trans-Pacific Partnership, or TPP. The authority would put time limits on congressional consideration of those deals and prevent the deals from being amended by Congress. That would give the administration more leverage with trading partners in its negotiations. The trade push dovetails with the administration’s efforts to raise the issue of income inequality ahead of the 2014 midterm elections. The White House is pressing Republicans to raise the minimum wage and extend federal unemployment benefits. The difference is, on the minimum wage hike and unemployment issue, Obama has willing partners in congressional Democrats and unions, who are more skeptical of free trade. Republicans are more the willing partner on backing trade promotion authority. Legislation introduced last week to give Obama trade promotion authority was sponsored by House Ways and Means Committee Chairman Dave Camp (R-Mich.) and Senate Finance Committee Chairman Max Baucus (D-Mont.), as well as Sen. Orrin Hatch (R-Utah), the ranking member on Finance. No House Democrats are co-sponsoring the bill, however, and Rep. Sandy Levin (D-Mich.), the Ways and Means Committee ranking member, and Rep. Charles Rangel (D-N.Y.), the panel’s former chairman, have both criticized it. They said the legislation doesn’t give enough leverage and power to Congress during trade negotiations. Getting TPA passed would be a major victory for the administration, and one that would please business groups, but the White House will first have to convince Democrats to go along with it. One senior administration official said the White House has been in dialogue with lawmakers on both sides of the aisle “with a real focus on Democrats” to explain TPA and take into account their concerns. “Any trade matter presents challenges,” the senior administration official said, adding that White House officials are “devoted” to working with members on the issue. The Democratic opposition makes it highly unlikely the trade promotion authority bill, in its current form at least, will go anywhere. One big problem is that it was negotiated by Baucus, who is about to leave the Senate to become ambassador to China. Baucus will be replaced by Sen. Ron Wyden (Ore.), who is said to disagree with the approach taken by his predecessor. Democratic aides predict the legislation, which Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-Nev.) called “controversial” last week, would have to be completely redone to gain traction among lawmakers in their party.

#### Political capital theory is wrong, winners win

**Hirsch ‘2-7-13** (“There’s No Such Thing as Political Capital”, Michael Hirsh February 7, 2013, former foreign editor and chief diplomatic correspondent for Newsweek. He is currently a senior editor in the magazine's Washington bureau. He is a lecturer and has appeared numerous times as a commentator on Fox News, CNN, MSNBC, National Public Radio,. Hirsh was co-winner of the Overseas Press Club award for best magazine reporting from abroad in 2001 for "prescience in identifying the al Qaeda threat half a year before September 11 and for Newsweek's coverage of the war on terror, which also won a National Magazine Award, http://www.nationaljournal.com/magazine/there-s-no-such-thing-as-political-capital-20130207)

**There’s No Such Thing as Political Capital**

The idea of political capital—or mandates, or momentum—is so poorly defined that presidents and pundits often get itwrong. On Tuesday, in his State of the Union address, President Obama will do what every president does this time of year. For about 60 minutes, he will lay out a sprawling and ambitious wish list highlighted by gun control and immigration reform, climate change and debt reduction. In response, the pundits will do what they always do this time of year: They will talk about how unrealistic most of the proposals are, discussions often informed by sagacious reckonings of how much “political capital” Obama possesses to push his program through. Most of **this** talk **will have no bearing on what actually happens** over the next four years. Consider this: Three months ago, just before the November election, if someone had talked seriously about Obama having enough political capital to oversee passage of both immigration reform and gun-control legislation at the beginning of his second term—even after winning the election by 4 percentage points and 5 million votes (the actual final tally)—this person would have been called crazy and stripped of his pundit’s license. (It doesn’t exist, but it ought to.) In his first term, in a starkly polarized country, the president had been so frustrated by GOP resistance that he finally issued a limited executive order last August permitting immigrants who entered the country illegally as children to work without fear of deportation for at least two years. Obama didn’t dare to even bring up gun control, a Democratic “third rail” that has cost the party elections and that actually might have been even less popular on the right than the president’s health care law. And yet, for reasons that have very little to do with Obama’s personal prestige or popularity—variously put in terms of a “mandate” or “political capital”—chances are fair that both will now happen. What changed? In the case of gun control, of course, it wasn’t the election. It was the horror of the 20 first-graders who were slaughtered in Newtown, Conn., in mid-December. The sickening reality of little girls and boys riddled with bullets from a high-capacity assault weapon seemed to precipitate a sudden tipping point in the national conscience. One thing changed after another. Wayne LaPierre of the National Rifle Association marginalized himself with poorly chosen comments soon after the massacre. The pro-gun lobby, once a phalanx of opposition, began to fissure into reasonables and crazies. Former Rep. Gabrielle Giffords, D-Ariz., who was shot in the head two years ago and is still struggling to speak and walk, started a PAC with her husband to appeal to the moderate middle of gun owners. Then she gave riveting and poignant testimony to the Senate, challenging lawmakers: “Be bold.” As a result, momentum has appeared to build around some kind of a plan to curtail sales of the most dangerous weapons and ammunition and the way people are permitted to buy them. It’s impossible to say now whether such a bill will pass and, if it does, whether it will make anything more than cosmetic changes to gun laws. But one thing is clear: The political tectonics have shifted dramatically in very little time. Whole new possibilities exist now that didn’t a few weeks ago. Meanwhile, the Republican members of the Senate’s so-called Gang of Eight are pushing hard for a new spirit of compromise on immigration reform, a sharp change after an election year in which the GOP standard-bearer declared he would make life so miserable for the 11 million illegal immigrants in the U.S. that they would “self-deport.” But this turnaround has very **little to do with Obama’s personal influence**—his political mandate, as it were. It has almost entirely to do with just two numbers: 71 and 27. That’s 71 percent for Obama, 27 percent for Mitt Romney, the breakdown of the **Hispanic vote** in the 2012 presidential election. Obama drove home his advantage by giving a speech on immigration reform on Jan. 29 at a Hispanic-dominated high school in Nevada, a swing state he won by a surprising 8 percentage points in November. But the movement on immigration has mainly come out of the Republican Party’s recent introspection, and the realization by its more thoughtful members, such as Sen. Marco Rubio of Florida and Gov. Bobby Jindal of Louisiana, that without such a shift the party may be facing demographic death in a country where the 2010 census showed, for the first time, that white births have fallen into the minority. It’s got nothing to do with Obama’s political capital or, indeed, Obama at all. The point is not that “political capital” is a meaningless term. Often it is a synonym for “mandate” or “momentum” in the aftermath of a decisive election—and just about every politician ever elected has tried to claim more of a mandate than he actually has. Certainly, Obama can say that because he was elected and Romney wasn’t, he has a better claim on the country’s mood and direction. Many pundits still defend political capital as a useful metaphor at least. “It’s an unquantifiable but meaningful concept,” says Norman Ornstein of the American Enterprise Institute. “You can’t really look at a president and say he’s got 37 ounces of political capital. But the fact is, it’s a concept that matters, if you have popularity and some momentum on your side.” The real problem is that the idea of political capital—or mandates, or momentum—is so poorly defined that presidents and pundits often get it wrong. “Presidents usually over-estimate it,” says George Edwards, a presidential scholar at Texas A&M University. “The best kind of political capital—some sense of an electoral mandate to do something—is very rare. It almost never happens. In 1964, maybe. And to some degree in 1980.” For that reason, political capital is a concept that misleads far more than it enlightens. It is distortionary. It conveys the idea that we know more than we really do about the ever-elusive concept of political power, and it discounts the way unforeseen events can suddenly change everything. Instead, it suggests, erroneously, that a political figure has a concrete amount of political capital to invest, just as someone might have real investment capital—that a particular leader can bank his gains, and the size of his account determines what he can do at any given moment in history. Naturally, any president has practical and electoral limits. Does he have a majority in both chambers of Congress and a cohesive coalition behind him? Obama has neither at present. And unless a surge in the economy—at the moment, still stuck—or some other great victory gives him more momentum, it is inevitable that the closer Obama gets to the 2014 election, the less he will be able to get done. Going into the midterms, Republicans will increasingly avoid any concessions that make him (and the Democrats) stronger. But the abrupt emergence of the immigration and gun-control issues illustrates how suddenly shifts in mood can occur and how political interests can align in new ways just as suddenly. Indeed, **the pseudo-concept of political capital masks a larger truth** about Washington that is kindergarten simple: You just don’t know what you can do until you try. Or **as Ornstein himself once wrote years ago**, “**Winning wins.”** In theory, and in practice, depending on Obama’s handling of any particular issue, even in a polarized time, he could still deliver on a lot of his second-term goals, depending on his skill and the breaks. Unforeseen catalysts can appear, like Newtown. Epiphanies can dawn, such as when many Republican Party leaders suddenly woke up in panic to the huge disparity in the Hispanic vote. Some **political scientists** **who study** the elusive calculus of **how to pass legislation** and run successful presidencies **say** that **political capital is**, at best, **an empty concept**, and that **almost nothing in** the **academic literature** **successfully quantifies** or even defines **it**. “It can refer to a very abstract thing, like a president’s popularity, but there’s no mechanism there. That makes it kind of **useless**,” says Richard Bensel, a government professor at Cornell University. Even Ornstein concedes that the calculus is far more complex than the term suggests. **Winning** on one issue often **changes the** **calculation** for the next issue; there is never any known amount of capital. “The idea here is, if an issue comes up where **the conventional wisdom is that president is not going to get what he wants**, and [they]he gets it, then each time that happens, it **changes the calculus** of the **other actors**” Ornstein says. “If they think he’s going to win, they may **change positions to get on the winning side**. **It’s a bandwagon effect**.” ALL THE WAY WITH LBJ Sometimes, a clever practitioner of power can get more done just because [they’re]he’s aggressive and knows the hallways of Congress well. Texas A&M’s Edwards is right to say that the outcome of the 1964 election, Lyndon Johnson’s landslide victory over Barry Goldwater, was one of the few that conveyed a mandate. But one of the main reasons for that mandate (in addition to Goldwater’s ineptitude as a candidate) was President Johnson’s masterful use of power leading up to that election, and his ability to get far more done than anyone thought possible, given his limited political capital. In the newest volume in his exhaustive study of LBJ, The Passage of Power, historian Robert Caro recalls Johnson getting cautionary advice after he assumed the presidency from the assassinated John F. Kennedy in late 1963. Don’t focus on a long-stalled civil-rights bill, advisers told him, because it might jeopardize Southern lawmakers’ support for a tax cut and appropriations bills the president needed. “One of the wise, practical people around the table [said that] the presidency has only a certain amount of coinage to expend, and you oughtn’t to expend it on this,” Caro writes. (Coinage, of course, was what political capital was called in those days.) Johnson replied, “Well, what the hell’s the presidency for?” Johnson didn’t worry about coinage, and he got the Civil Rights Act enacted, along with much else: Medicare, a tax cut, antipoverty programs. He appeared to understand not just the ways of Congress but also the way to maximize the momentum he possessed in the lingering mood of national grief and determination by picking the right issues, as Caro records. “Momentum is not a mysterious mistress,” LBJ said. “It is a controllable fact of political life.” Johnson had the skill and wherewithal to realize that, at that moment of history, he could have unlimited coinage if he handled the politics right. He did. (At least until Vietnam, that is.)

**Plan boosts Obama’s capital**

Douglas **Kriner 10**, Assistant Profess of Political Science at Boston University, After the Rubicon: Congress, Presidents, and the Politics of Waging War, p. 59-60

Presidents and politicos alike have long recognized Congress's ability to reduce the political costs that the White House risks incurring by pursuing a major military initiative. While declarations of war are all but extinct in the contemporary period, Congress has repeatedly moved to authorize presidential military deployments and consequently to tie its own institutional prestige to the conduct and ultimate success of a military campaign. Such authorizing legislation, even if it fails to pass both chambers, creates a sense of **shared legislative-executive responsibility** for a military action's success and provides the president with **considerable political support** for his chosen policy course.34 Indeed, the desire for this political cover—and not for the constitutional sanction a congressional authorization affords—has historically motivated presidents to seek Congress's blessing for military endeavors. For example, both the elder and younger Bush requested legislative approval for their wars against Iraq, while assiduously maintaining that they possessed sufficient independent authority as commander in chief to order the invasions unilaterally.35 This fundamental tension is readily apparent in the elder Bush's signing statement to HJ Res 77, which authorized military action against Saddam Hussein in January of 1991. While the president expressed his gratitude for the statement of congressional support, he insisted that the resolution was not needed to authorize military action in Iraq. "As I made clear to congressional leaders at the outset, my request for congressional support did not, and my signing this resolution does not, constitute any change in the long-standing positions of the executive branch on either the President's constitutional authority to use the Armed Forces to defend vital U.S. interests or the constitutionality of the War Powers Resolution."36

#### NSA thumps the disad or disproves the logic of the link.

Feaver 1/17/14

Peter, Foreign Policy, “Obama Finally Joins the Debate He Called For,” http://shadow.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2014/01/17/obama\_finally\_joins\_the\_debate\_he\_called\_for

Today President Barack Obama finally **joins the national debate he called for** a long time ago but then abandoned: the debate about how best to balance national security and civil liberty. As I outlined in NPR's scene-setter this morning, this debate is a **tricky** one for a president who wants to lead from behind. The public's view shifts markedly in response to perceptions of the threat, so a political leader who is only following the public mood will **crisscross himself repeatedly**. Changing one's mind and shifting the policy is not inherently a bad thing to do. There is no absolute and timeless right answer, because this is about trading off different risks. The risk profile itself shifts in response to our actions. When security is improving and the terrorist threat is receding, one set of trade-offs is appropriate. When security is worsening and the terrorist threat is worsening, another might be. It is likely, however, that the optimal answer is not the one advocated by the most fringe position. A National Security Agency (NSA) hobbled to the point that some on the far left (and, it must be conceded, the libertarian right) are demanding would be a mistake that the country would regret every bit as much as we would regret an NSA without any checks or balances or constraints. Getting this right will require **inspired and active political leadership.** **To date**, Obama has preferred to stay far removed from the debate swirling around the Snowden leaks. This president relishes opportunities to spend **political capital** on behalf of policies that disturb Republicans, but, as former Defense Secretary Robert Gates's memoir details, Obama **has** been very reluctant to expend **political capital** on behalf of national security policies that disturb his base. Today Obama is finally engaging. It will be interesting to see how he threads the political needle and, just as importantly, how much political capital he is willing to spend in the months ahead to defend his policies.

### 2AC

#### Plan makes intelligence more effective – that is a bigger internal into effective warfighting

**Elder, 12** (Gregory Elder works in the Defense Intelligence Agency. He has advanced degrees in Strategy and Policy and Ethnic Political Violence. His essay “Guns, Gas, and Lost Opportunities” won the 2004 US Army Strategic Landpower Award. “Intelligence in War: It Can Be Decisive Winning with Intelligence.” <https://www.cia.gov/library/center-for-the-study-of-intelligence/csi-publications/csi-studies/studies/vol50no2/html_files/Intelligence_War_2.htm>)

Force and its employment are significant in driving outcomes in combat. However, it is operational and tactical intelligence, not necessarily numbers, technology, or tactics, that can have the most decisive impact on how forces are employed and how success is achieved in wartime operations. History repeatedly has demonstrated that numerically inferior forces, armed with less capable technologies, can win when leaders are armed with accurate intelligence they believe they can act upon. Such intelligence can be a force multiplier. Therefore, considering the value of force employment, technology, and mass without placing a corresponding value on intelligence is a mistake. In this article I explore the role of tactical and operational intelligence in dictating force employment schemes and as a decisive element in five strategically significant battles— the First Battle of Bull Run (1861), Tannenberg (1914), Midway (1942), Inchon (1950), and the Israeli air strike initiating the Six-Day War in 1967—and I will demonstrate that it was neither technology nor material superiority that won the day, but accurate, timely, actionable intelligence, combined with leaders willing to treat intelligence as a primary factor in deciding outcomes. In each case, intelligence gave commanders the knowledge of the battlefield (battlespace awareness) and the understanding of their foe to focus their forces at the right place and time to win when, in all probability, they should have been defeated. Certainly ADM Chester Nimitz, faced with the job of reversing the losses at Pearl Harbor, would have disputed RADM Thomas A. Brooks’ assertion that intelligence is a secondary factor in war, as would General P. T. Beauregard, who, in 1861, faced the grim possibility of losing the first major battle of the Civil War.[4] [Top of Page] The Battle of Bull Run: 21 July 1861 The battle may be most renowned for the last minute heroics of General “Stonewall” Jackson on Henry House Hill, which led to the rout of the Union army, but the Confederates were able to employ the forces needed to win at Bull Run because they had created, months earlier, an intricate spy network in Washington, DC. By the time the fledgling Union Army had organized itself for its first major campaign into Virginia, its troop strengths, dispositions, and plans had long been compromised. Said Beauregard, commanding Confederate forces in northern Virginia, “I was almost as well advised of the strength of the hostile army in my front as its commander.”[5] In May 1861, just weeks after the announcement of the fall of Fort Sumter, a spy in the quartermaster office of the US War Department had begun recruiting a ring of Confederate sympathizers in the nation’s capital. Among these were bankers, clerks, couriers, housewives, and Rose Greenhow, proprietor of a respectable salon frequented by senior government and military officials. While the network mobilized, a Union force of nearly 36,000 was organizing and training just across the Potomac River. Its commander, General Irvin McDowell, was under pressure from Lincoln to strike the Confederates at the earliest possible date. While the Union Army was concentrated, Confederate forces were split, with 21,000 stationed at Manassas Junction under Beauregard, and 12,800 under General Joseph E. Johnston near Harper’s Ferry. Combined, the Confederate troops still numbered fewer than the Federals, and divided, they stood little chance against a concerted Union offensive. Yet, authorities in Richmond, worried about a Federal incursion down the Shenandoah Valley by a force of 18,000 at Harpers Ferry, had told Beauregard he could unite the two armies only if an attack was imminent. Thus, a McDowell move toward Manassas would spark a race in which Johnston would have to rush to Beauregrad’s aid across piedmont terrain and with limited railroad access. His ability to win this race was possible only if he received timely, detailed, and believable intelligence indicating when, where, and with what forces McDowell would strike. Beauregard’s fate rested in the hands of a few neophyte clandestine agents. On 10 July the network demonstrated its worth, as Rose Greenhow sent word that “McDowell has certainly been ordered to advance on the sixteenth.”[6] This intelligence, however, proved insufficient to start the race. President Davis denied requests to authorize relocation of Johnston’s army. Beauregard, fearing the worst, sent a plea to Greenhow for intelligence reconfirming the date and planned movement of Union forces. On 16 July, she sent word that the Federal forces would move out that very day, marching from Arlington to Manassas, via Centreville, a distance of only 20 miles. This information immediately made its way to Richmond. Consequently, orders were dispatched that night directing Johnston to move south in haste and unite with Beauregard’s forces on the Bull Run. First Battle of Bull Run McDowell began his march on the 16th, as Greenhow had reported, crossed the Bull Run at Sudley Ford on the 21st, and attacked the Confederate left flank on Matthews Hill. Fighting raged throughout the day, and Beauregard’s forces were driven back to Henry Hill. Defeat seemed imminent. Late in the afternoon, however, Johnston’s reinforcements, having arrived via rail at Manassas Junction the night before, made their way to the battle and broke the Union right flank. What seemed a victory for the Federals rapidly deteriorated into a disorganized retreat. And while it was Jackson’s brigade under Johnston’s command that turned the tide of a hard fought battle, it was espionage that provided alternatives to Confederate political and military decisionmakers, allowing them to concentrate their forces and demonstrate that they could defeat the Union in a major engagement. Victory was not certain—defeat was avoided only as a result of the decision to reinforce Beauregard. In What If?, Stephen Sears suggests that without a geographic point at which to regroup, the Confederate Army might have dissolved and the rebellion ended in its first year if the Union had won that day.[7] Intelligence in this case gave the Confederates several advantages. First, with reliable information on the Union order of battle and strategy, they were able to split their smaller forces to defend the Shenandoah Valley and to maintain a check on McDowell’s army. Second, because of the existence of timely indicators and warning, it was inconceivable that the Federals could execute a surprise attack against the Confederates; agents were able to provide fresh, corroborated information on everything the Federals did. Finally, Beauregard knew the strength of his opponent and the route of attack and, therefore, had the ability to consolidate and position his forces on the most advantageous ground. This was all the more important as McDowell had a well-developed concept of operations and superior numbers. Yet force alone cannot win the day. [Top of Page] Battle of Tannenberg: 23–30 August 1914 The Battle of Tannenberg was one of the largest, yet least known, strategically decisive victories in modern warfare. Its outcome allowed the Germans to recover momentum after their loss at the Battle of the Marne on the Western Front, to save Prussia from the Russians, to defeat three successive Russian armies, and to deal the first of several blows leading to the Treaty of Brest Litovsk and the Russian Revolution in 1917. Of the roughly 150,000 Russian soldiers who fought in the battle of Tannenberg, some 30,000 were killed or wounded and another 95,000 captured. The Germans suffered fewer than 20,000 casualties, captured more than 500 guns, and filled dozens of trains with captured equipment for transport to Germany. After losing at Tannenberg, the Russian army could not muster enough offensive strength to re-enter Germany again until World War II. It was nothing short of a complete victory for Germany, and it came in large part because of the German Army’s successful use of intelligence. Modifying the Schlieffen Plan at the outset of the war, Germany sent only one army, the Eighth, to the Eastern Front to face the presumed, slow-to-mobilize Russian armies. Misperceiving how quickly the Russians could bring their forces to bear, the Eighth quickly found itself facing two Russian armies—the First moving west into Prussia, and the Second driving northwest from southern Prussia. While the German Eighth Army was comparable in size to each of the Russian armies, it could not face a combined assault. Battle of Tannenberg The Russian First Army struck first and won a victory at the Battle of Gumbinnen on 20 August 1914. It did not seize the initiative, however, choosing instead to wait until the Second Army could move north to catch the Germans in a pincer. This gave Helmuth von Moltke, the German Chief of Staff in Berlin, time to replace the commander of the Eighth Army, General Maximilian von Prittwitz, with Generals Paul von Hindenburg and Erich Ludendorff, and to regroup. Rather than concede Prussia to the Russians or potentially face another defeat at the hands of the First Army, Ludendorff looked south for an opening to attack the Russian Second Army. He authorized the movement of a corps from Gumbinnen south via railroad to attack the Second Army’s left flank. He also considered marching the bulk of his remaining forces south to envelop the right flank—this, however, would leave northern Prussia exposed to the First Army. Shifting fronts would be risky. While both side’s staffs planned for the coming great battle, a secret war was waged behind the scenes by cryptologists. Early in the days of radio communications, neither side was particularly astute in communications security, and both exposed their vulnerabilities over the airwaves. But the poorly educated and trained Russian cryptologists were unable even to master their simple cipher system and, in the case of the First Army, did not use a communications code. This led to frequent lapses in security and resulted in operators repeatedly resending messages, often uncoded, in plain language. The result was a windfall of intelligence for the Germans. Intercepting Russian communications, German cryptologists deduced troop strengths and movement schedules, picked up orders, and, most importantly, messages between the First and Second Armies that showed how poorly the two were coordinating their efforts.[8] While the German staff can be credited with developing the concept of operations that would lead to victory in the engagement, it was communications intelligence that provided a clear picture of the battlefield, or in today’s parlance, the battlespace awareness. As the single German corps under General Hermann von Francois began its attack against the exposed left flank of the Second Army on 27 August, two particularly important unencrypted communications transmitted by the Russian First and Second Armies were intercepted.[9] The first, sent by General Paul von Rennenkampf, commander of the First Army, revealed the distance between the two armies and that Rennenkampf needed at least three days before his army could join the Second Army in attacking the Germans. This suggested to Ludendorff that he need not worry about First Army assistance to the Second or exploitation of the gap created by his own army’s movement south. The second intercept, a communiqué from the Second Army, provided a complete description of its dispositions and planned route of attack to the north. As important as the first, this gave Ludendorff the foreknowledge he needed to achieve surprise and a concentration of force against an exposed adversary. As the bulk of the German Eighth Army advanced on the right flank of the Russian’s Second Army and the Russians’ plight became apparent, German cryptologists began intercepting pleas for assistance, as well as orders from General Zhilinski, overall commander of Russian forces, directing the First Army to move northwest, away from Second Army—a clear sign that the Russian leaders did not have a clear understanding of German dispositions or just how precarious Second Army’s situation was. This knowledge emboldened the Germans. With the two corps from Gumbinnen and Francois’ corps to the south, the German forces swept around the Second Army and on 29 August completed the encirclement that would spell its demise. By destroying Second Army with relatively little loss, Hindenburg and Ludendorff could turn north against the First Army and a newly formed army, the Tenth. These were defeated at the Battle of First and Second Masurian Lakes and effectively destroyed Russia’s capacity for carrying out offensive operations against Germany. Intelligence at Tannenberg did not win the battle, but it did play a decisive role in dictating the way the Germans employed their units against a force that was, overall, larger than theirs. German leaders had a thorough understanding of their adversary’s capabilities, schedules, and concept of operations, and this knowledge allowed them to exploit Russian vulnerabilities and defeat them in detail. Thus, if “[O]nly numbers can annihilate,” as suggested by Lord Nelson, the successful exploitation of intelligence in this case demonstrates that they need not be superior numbers.[10] [Top of Page] The Battle of Midway: 4-7 June 1942 Midway was one of the decisive battles of history. The loss of her fleet carrier force deprived Japan of the initiative; henceforward she was on the defensive—attempting to hold the great spread of the Southern Resources Area and contiguous regions she had so handily won.… Two basic factors led to the result: first and foremost, the American knowledge of the Japanese secret codes, which presented Nimitz with an accurate picture of Japanese intentions and dispositions. —R. Earnest and Trevor Dupuy[11] As with battles on land, intelligence can drive the employment schemes necessary for a leader to win against superior odds at sea. Midway, a battle in which intelligence allowed the United States to spring a trap against what the Japanese had planned as their own ambush, resulted in an immediate shift in the balance of sea power in the Pacific. The Japanese Navy, which had a fleet of six carriers before the battle, lost four at Midway, and it lost the bulk of its trained pilots and hundreds of aircraft. While the United States would lose one carrier, it was left with five spread throughout the world. Thirteen more were under construction. Yamamoto believed that for Japan to win the war it would need to destroy the carriers early.[12] Due in large part to the foresight provided by US naval intelligence, he failed. Following the victory at Pearl Harbor, Japanese strategists had different conceptions about how to proceed in the war in the Pacific. However, James Doolittle’s carrier strike on Tokyo in April 1942 gave impetus to the argument that what was needed was the destruction of America’s carrier fleet. In considering the options, Yamamoto believed that the United States, whose naval order of battle in the Pacific after the Pearl Harbor strike was significantly less than that of Japan, would not risk a major fleet engagement for anything other than defense of a vital target. Midway fit this bill.[13] Were the Japanese to take Midway, they would threaten not only the Hawaiian Islands, but they could use Midway as a springboard for attacks on the continental United States. As such, a direct attack against Midway would force the US hand. In this, Yamamoto was right. Meanwhile, the United States was facing its own strategic dilemmas. Having lost so much of its fleet at Pearl Harbor, it had only limited options. First, the United States was committed to a defensive war in the Pacific—they had to react to Japanese actions, and, second, since they were committed to defend the Hawaii-Australia line with inferior numbers and weapons, the only real chance for success was to concentrate their forces at the right place at the right time.[14] To succeed, therefore, foreknowledge of the Japanese plans was vital. And if the US command had it, it could compensate for the disproportionately large force that Japan could bring to bear. And foreknowledge the US Navy had. Since World War I, the Navy had placed a good deal of effort into developing a strong communications intelligence capability. Its OP-20-G Navy Radio Intelligence Section had over the years garnered a number of successes, including breaking many of the Japanese Navy’s codes. While diverted from conducting operational intelligence prior to Pearl Harbor, OP-20-G had reestablished its functional capabilities by March 1942 and was reporting daily on hundreds of Japanese naval intercepts.[15] The Japanese, like the Russians before Tannenberg, committed the egregious error of having to resend messages because command elements used outdated code books—US cryptologists had the benefit of capturing transmissions in both old and new codes, thereby providing multiple opportunities to mine transmissions for useful intelligence. OP-20-G’s successful reporting of Japanese naval movements prior to the Battle of the Coral Sea, which ADM Nimitz had used to determine what forces to commit, bolstered its credibility. Even as the Coral Sea engagement was being waged, intercepts strongly suggested a major Japanese combined, amphibious buildup. Naval intelligence determined in early May the composition of Japanese forces, where they were staging, and their operational schedules.[16] The precise location of attack, however, was more difficult to surmise because the codes for Japanese geographic designators remained unknown. Nimitz believed the Japanese would strike Oahu; others felt the target was the US West Coast. OP-20-G, though, reasoned that the target was Midway. In order to validate their position, the cryptologists successfully used a ruse to get the Japanese to reveal their target. The idea was to send a message, via the cable to Midway, to the Commanding Officer of the Naval Base instructing him to “…send a plain language message to Com 14 (Commandant 14th Naval District) stating in effect, that the distillation plant had suffered a serious casualty and that fresh water was urgently needed—to which Com 14 would reply, (also in plain language), that water barges would be sent, under tow, soonest.[17] Soon after that message was sent, a Japanese message was intercepted noting that “AF is short of water.” OP-20-G was able to report to Admiral Nimitz that the objective was, indeed, Midway. By the time the Japanese changed their cipher codes on 28 May, it was too late. Having been provided Yamamoto’s strategy, order of battle, transit dates, and carrier strike point, Nimitz had what he needed to commit his forces to battle. Rather than fall into a Japanese trap, Nimitz could set one himself by concentrating his forces against an unsuspecting enemy. Deploying three carriers north of Midway to lie in wait, Nimitz had nearly evened the odds. On 2 June 1942, with a good understanding of the general whereabouts of the Japanese fleet—a result of communications intercepts from the Japanese carriers—a US Navy patrol aircraft located and maintained regular contact with it.[18] In the ensuing battle, US intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance allowed for the coup de main on 4 June when dive-bomber squadrons from the carriers caught the Japanese completely by surprise, sinking the carriers Akagi, Kaga, and Hiryu. Having gained the advantage, US forces traded blows, sinking the Hiryu, while losing Yorktown. In addition to the lost four carriers, three Japanese battleships were damaged, two heavy cruisers sunk and three more damaged, and several destroyers and auxiliary ships were sunk. But, what if in mid-May 1942, a Japanese sailor, after transcribing a radio message he had just intercepted from Midway Island, had turned to his superior to ask, “Why are they broadcasting this message in the clear?”… A simple question, heightened alertness, and suddenly what historians have often described as the decisive US advantage in the close-run Battle of Midway might well have become the Japanese side’s key to a great victory in the central Pacific, dramatically altering the course of the Second World War.[19] Keegan’s analysis of the battle in Intelligence and War stresses that even with all the intelligence that Nimitz had, and while striking a sizable blow to the Japanese, it had nearly been a major US defeat: [M]idway demonstrates that even possession of the best intelligence does not guarantee victory…. A little less intuition by McClusky of Bombing 6, a little more intellectual resolution by Nagumo, and it would have been the carriers of TF 16 and 17, not those of Yamamoto’s Mobile Force, which would have been left burning and bereft in the bright waters of the Pacific on 4 June 1942.[20] This conclusion misses the point. Battle is always risky and can be swayed one way or another by sheer chance. Yet the US Navy would never have had the opportunity at Midway to avoid the Japanese trap and to concentrate its forces in a surprise attack against an adversary with numerical superiority had it not been for operational and tactical intelligence of the kind it received. “Armed with the support of excellent communications intelligence and of his superiors in Washington, CINCPAC was able to satisfy all three of Clausewitz’s ‘principles of warfare’: decision, concentration, and offensive action.”[21] Foreknowledge, not willpower, was the most decisive factor at Midway. [Top of Page] Inchon Landing: 15 September 1950 The first three examples illustrate how intelligence can help lead to victory through clandestine intelligence operations designed to provide indications and warning information of impending attacks or operations. Another way is through the support intelligence gives to planning, when it provides information on the adversary’s capabilities and vulnerabilities—in today’s terminology “intelligence preparation of the battlespace.” “Intelligence reduces the unknowns that planners must face and forms the basis for both deliberate and crisis action planning,” the Naval Doctrinal Publication points out.[22] In the case of the amphibious assault at Inchon, an attack that led to the collapse of the North Korean army and the taking of some 125,000 prisoners, intelligence gathering and planning allowed US forces to overcome geographic disadvantages and take the enemy by surprise. On 25 June 1950 four columns of North Korean infantry and tanks under the command of Marshal Choe Yong Gun surprised the world by driving south and pushing South Korean and contingents of US forces to the southeast corner of the Korean peninsula. While winning a series of tactical successes, the North was unable to gain its strategic objective— command of all Korea—and was faced with the proposition of using all its remaining forces against the last allied forces holding the Pusan perimeter. Through August and into September, the North threw 13 infantry and two armored divisions (98,000 men) at the Allies, necessitating the commitment of all UN reserves. And while the North suffered horrendous casualties, its tenacious attacks and acceptance of losses suggested a stronger force than they had. General MacArthur, the supreme allied commander in Korea, considered a major counterstroke to catch Choe’s forces in a net. This would involve a two-pronged attack in which an amphibious landing would be made on the west coast. The amphibious assault was designed to sever Choe’s lines of communication and retreat and would be coupled with a break-out from the Pusan perimeter. Two questions, however, had to be answered: (1) Where should the landing occur? and (2) What forces could the enemy bring to bear when it began? The intelligence community set about answering these questions. After a prototypical Intelligence Preparation of the Battlespace, General Douglas MacArthur decided that naval forces could dramatically alter the course of the war by seizing Inchon, a major port on Korea’s Yellow Sea coast. Possession of Inchon would enable the allies to recapture a key air base, and mount a major ground offensive on Seoul which would cut off North Korean forces in the south.[23] Inchon, however, was not ideal. The 45-mile-long approach from the open ocean to the landing area would be complicated by tides— which caused the water’s depth in the landing area to recede to dangerously low depths—and the proximity of several small islands occupied by North Korean forces. To be successful, the Allies would need to clear the islands, intelligence would need to be collected on water depths, and enemy troop strengths in the surrounding area ascertained. In addition, a forward reconnaissance element would need to be in place to provide eyes and ears to the Marines assigned to the assault. The assignment fell to a Naval Intelligence officer attached to the ROK Navy, LT Eugene Clark. Clark, a veteran of the OSS, recruited local fishermen and partisans for his team. Deployed on the 26th of August, he and his team silenced opposition on most of the islands by 8 September and began a thorough reconnaissance of approaches and Inchon itself.[24] Particularly crucial to success was the assessment of the depths and advice to planners on where and when to strike. Clark and a companion measured tides and found that the mud flats initially selected for the attack were not suitable to withstand the weight of fully armed marines. This critical piece of what today would be known as measurements and signatures intelligence (MASINT) averted what could have been a disaster, as the landing plans were modified to account for the findings. Clark and his men also held key positions up to the morning of the attack and lit beacons to guide the lead elements of the assault force. While Clark was providing on-site intelligence, planners were aided by imagery and human intelligence. Aerial photographs and reports from former inhabitants were used in shaping the operational plans for the amphibious task force commander, RADM James Doyle and his staff. Taken with Clark’s information, “intelligence helped Admiral Doyle select the best water approach, set the time for the amphibious assaults, and identify the North Korean Army line of communication as a critical vulnerability.”[25] Additionally, the intelligence estimates suggested that the North did not have forces enough in the area to offer significant resistance to the landing or to the recapture of Seoul.[26] With a full understanding of what he faced, MacArthur told the Joint Chiefs of Staff that he could conduct a successful amphibious operation. Meanwhile, he and his staff developed a concept of operations that would allow for concentration of force, and surprise, against a most vulnerable enemy point. This comprehensive planning bore fruit on 15 September, when the allied amphibious task force launched its initial assault from the sea. By the 19th, the 1st Marine Division seized the air base at Kimpo and began the assault on Seoul. U.S. Army troops pushed out from the Inchon beachhead and on the 27th linked up with their comrades advancing north from the Pusan perimeter. Two days later, the Marines captured Seoul. Thus, by skillfully incorporating intelligence into operational planning, in a little more than two weeks, allied forces were able to oust the invaders from the Republic of Korea.[27] The role of intelligence in the Inchon landing is significant if for no other reason than it shows how central it is to planning a victorious campaign. Intelligence at Inchon was not happenstance, like the discovery of Lee’s lost orders before Antietam, but a conscious and necessary task assigned by leadership; before MacArthur could determine how to employ his forces, he first had to know whether he could attack or not and where he could attack if it was possible. By emphasizing intelligence, MacArthur conducted a masterful offensive and avoided an American Gallipoli. [Top of Page] The Six-Day War: 5 June 1967 Israeli intelligence was outstanding, having pinpointed the location of every Egyptian squadron, revealed the layout of every air base, and mastered every detail of Egyptian Air Force operational procedure…. During the course of the morning, the Israelis struck 18 of Egypt’s Air Force bases, cratering runways, blowing up aircraft, and destroying support facilities. The Egyptians lost over 300 of their 420 combat aircraft, and 100 of their 350 qualified combat pilots. —Kenneth Pollack[28] Israeli intelligence was, indeed, outstanding in the Six-Day War. It demonstrated how strategic intelligence can be used in conjunction with operational intelligence to provide senior decisionmakers information necessary to make well-informed national security decisions and to give leaders opportunities to mitigate the numerical superiority of an adversary. Yet, just as Israeli intelligence in this case can be viewed as an example of how intelligence operations should be conducted, Egypt’s poor intelligence opened the door to its own defeat. In 1967, Israel faced a monumental security task: defense of the nation against several Arab armed forces that, when combined, held an advantages of two to one in manpower, two to one in tanks, seven to one in artillery, three to one in aircraft, and four to one in warships. On its southern border, Israel had roughly 70,000 troops in the Sinai against Egypt’s 100,000; 700 tanks against 950; and it had to distribute its 200 aircraft across all fronts while facing Egypt’s concentrated 430.[29] Nor could Israel count on technological superiority to overcome the odds. Israeli intelligence, for example, had scored a coup by obtaining a MiG-21 fighter from an Iraqi defector, and it had determined that Egypt’s MiGs were better than all but their Mirage aircraft. Egyptian artillery was superior, and their T-55 tanks were more capable than the majority of Israel’s tanks.[30] And while Israeli forces were better trained, had superior leadership, and had a far more flexible doctrine, Egypt’s army could boast that the majority of its soldiers were combat veterans. Israel faced a similar situation to its north, against Syria and Lebanon, and to its east, against Jordan. Finally, Israel faced a hostile international community; the United States was an ally but eager to avoid any spark that could ignite a conflict with Egypt’s ally, the Soviet Union. Events began spinning into war in November 1966, with the signing of an Egyptian and Syrian alliance, and led to an Egyptian threat to use force on 18 May 1967. Egypt had mobilized its military and announced combat readiness in the Sinai, followed on the 23rd by a closure of the Straits of Tiran, blockading the Israeli port of Eliat. Israel took these acts, particularly the blockade, to be cause for war. Further, Israeli intelligence was able to verify that Egypt had plans for an attack, code named Asad, on Eliat and other targets in the Negev on the 27th. This revelation was passed to the United States, which placed sufficient pressure on the Soviet Union and Egypt to force a cancellation of the attack.[31] But all other diplomatic efforts failed, and the Israelis confronted the decision of (1) preempting their enemies’ first strikes; (2) allowing themselves to be hit first by a numerically stronger adversary; or (3) continuing an unacceptable status quo. Israel chose to attack first. A preemptive strike against the Arabs had always been a major part of the Israeli concept of operations, but it was their military intelligence, under the command of the bright and aggressive Aharon Yariv, that proved decisive. ‘Know your enemy’ was not, Yariv told his heads of departments, merely a figure of speech; it had to be taken literally. It was not enough to know Arab strategy on the grand scale; Yariv wanted to know everything about every Arab unit down to the menus served in the sergeants’ mess.[32] And, quite literally, Israeli intelligence had a clearer picture of the Egyptian order of battle and capabilities than did Egypt’s own commanders. In the two-years before the Six-Day War, Yariv not only set about knowing the whereabouts of every Arab air base, but also having each inspected. Israeli intelligence officers, often working as chefs or coopting Egyptian soldiers, provided a complete picture of the EAF, including: the whereabouts of every aircraft and name/information on the pilot; the name, background, status, and schedule of every base commander; schedules and turnovers of Egyptian radar controllers; reveille and morning schedules for the pilots and ground crews; the complete Egyptian battle codes and communications networks; and when senior air officials would be absent from their commands, and unable to direct operations.[33] From this information, Israeli intelligence developed a precise targeting package. It knew when the EAF would be most vulnerable–when the aircraft would be most exposed; when the pilots would be slowest in getting to their aircraft for flight operations; and when leadership would be unable to provide direction. With comparable intelligence on Egypt’s land forces and effectiveness, Yariv believed that Israel could not conceivably lose the war. “So finely tuned was his intelligence apparatus that he was able to predict an outcome which was to astonish the world when it was all over.”[34] Coupled with military operational intelligence, the Israeli Mossad—its state intelligence agency—had developed relationships with foreign governments and intelligence agencies that provided new and corroborated strategic and tactical intelligence before the war. The relationship with the United States, in particular, served a critical role before the preemptive strike by making clear to both the CIA and Pentagon that war was inevitable and getting tacit buy-in on the plan. “The United States understood Israel’s reasoning and did not object to the preemptive attack. Amit’s (head of the Mossad) achievement in secret diplomacy was built upon the international intelligence links which the Mossad had worked so hard to foster for years.”[35] Knowing that the United States would not condemn the attack and armed with an exceptionally well-developed plan, Israeli leaders authorized the use of force, thus seizing the initiative from their adversaries. The preemptive air strike proved decisive. The attack caught the Egyptian Air Force with its commander, General Mahmud, out of contact with his forces. “In his absence, the EAF was paralyzed. Without specific authorization, the vast majority of Egypt’s air force officers, from air sector commanders all the way down to pilots, were uwilling to take even the most obvious emergency procedures.”[36] Only eight MiGs got into the air to defend their airfields; every one was shot down. The airfields that were undamaged in the initial strikes managed to get only 20 aircraft into the air, all of which were either shot down or crashed when they could find no undamaged airstrips to which to return. All told, three-quarters of the EAF was destroyed in the first hours of the war. Intelligence had paved the way for the Israeli Air Force to win one of the most lopsided victories in history. But credit for Israel’s success cannot be explained by its intelligence alone; indicators and warning should have prepared the Egyptians for what was to come. As Kenneth Pollack contends, “There was a colossal failure on the part of Cairo’s intelligence services to provide the Egyptian military with the information required to fight Israel.” He notes that Egyptian intelligence: was biased to the political climate and, therefore, did not provide clear and decisive analysis on whether Israel was going to attack; issued reports to commanders that changed daily and were often contradictory; provided no credible intelligence on Israel’s order of battle, effectiveness, doctrine, or planned strategy; had no intelligence on where Israeli forces were and, to the extent that it had information, fell victim to Israel’s denial and deception campaign; and did not understand the concept of flexibility stressed by the Israeli military in conducting joint and independent operations.[37] As a result of these failings, even had Egypt’s military been better trained and led, it was at a significant disadvantage from the outset. Once combat began, Egyptian forces had no understanding of where Israel would strike, with what force, in what manner, with what tactics or effect, over what duration, or with what objective—in short, they were blind. [Top of Page] Conclusion Kimmel stood by the window of his office at the submarine base, his jaw set in stony anguish. As he watched the disaster across the harbor unfold with terrible fury, a .50-caliber machine gun bullet crashed through the glass. It brushed the admiral before it clanged to the floor. It cut his white jacket and raised a welt on his chest. “It would have been merciful had it killed me.” —RADM Edwin Layton[38] The great military victory we achieved in Desert Storm and the minimal losses sustained by U.S. and Coalition forces can be directly attributed to the excellent intelligence picture we had on the Iraqis. —General H. Norman Schwarzkopf III, U.S. Army[39] Battle is a physical activity and requires force. And yet, to speak of force without associating a corresponding value to intelligence is akin to speaking of a boxer without eyes or a brain. Additionally, “employment of force” is hollow without an understanding of where, in what conditions and geography, and against whom to employ force. Success in the physical act of battle requires well-trained soldiers who are properly equipped, led by strong leadership willing to use force against a clear objective, employing it correctly, and sacrificing when necessary. But it also requires foresight, analysis, eyes and ears, and the development of a playbook on how to win—it takes intelligence. Therefore, just as Keegan correctly states that “Knowledge of what the enemy can do and of what he intends is never enough to ensure security,” so too, having superior forces equipped with better technology is no insurance for victory when opposing an enemy that invests in intelligence.[40] Absolute power does not win absolutely. None of the battles described were won by intelligence alone—victory was achieved by the application of force. However, in each case, the victor could only employ the forces necessary to achieve victory through the advantage of foreknowledge. What would have happened, for instance, had Jackson not reached Bull Run in time to “stand like a Stonewall”? How would Germany have fared had it been faced with defeat on the Eastern Front just one month after the initiation of hostilities in 1914? How would Nimitz have handled the Japanese attack on Midway had he not known in advance of the trap? How successful would the Inchon landings have been if intelligence had not warned of the mud flats on the approaches to the proposed landing sites? And, how much longer and precarious would the 1967 war have been had Israel’s intelligence not warned of the impending Arab attack, or had it not expended so much effort in knowing every detail of its adversaries force composition? Intelligence “failures,” too, tell of the significance intelligence plays. Pearl Harbor, Tet, or, for that matter, the attacks of September 11th, do not diminish the importance of intelligence but rather demonstrate the impact of not placing sufficient emphasis on it. Britain’s failed intelligence and misunderstanding regarding Japan’s military capabilities prior to 1942, for example, doomed its army of some 146,000 in Singapore to a crushing defeat at the hands of only 35,000.[41] History abounds with such examples. As in the past, intelligence will continue to play a vital role in future conflicts. As General Hugh Shelton, former chairman of the joint chiefs of staff, noted in 2000: “Successful employment of modern weapons systems, new operational concepts, and innovative combat techniques— particularly those involving forces that are lighter, faster, more agile, and more lethal—also depends on rapid, precise, accurate, and detailed intelligence.”[42] It behooves the planner, the operator, political and military leadership, and members of the Intelligence Community to understand this and not relegate intelligence to a secondary status as authors such as John Keegan suggest. The strongest boxer cannot defeat the foe he hasn’t studied or cannot see.

#### Congress makes deterrence credible

Matthew C. **Waxman 8/25**, Professor of Law, Columbia Law School; Adjunct Senior Fellow for Law and Foreign Policy, Council on Foreign Relations, “The Constitutional Power to Threaten War”, Forthcoming in Yale Law Journal, vol. 123 (2014), 2013, PDF

A second argument, this one advanced by some congressionalists, is that stronger legislative checks on presidential uses of force would improve deterrent and coercive strategies by making them more selective and credible. The most credible U.S. threats, this argument holds, are those that carry formal approval by Congress, which reflects strong public support and willingness to bear the costs of war; requiring express legislative backing to make good on threats might therefore be thought to enhance the potency of threats by encouraging the President to seek congressional authorization before acting.181 A frequently cited instance is President Eisenhower’s request (soon granted) for standing congressional authorization to use force in the Taiwan Straits crises of the mid- and late-1950s – an authorization he claimed at the time was important to bolstering the credibility of U.S. threats to protect Formosa from Chinese aggression.182 (Eisenhower did not go so far as to suggest that congressional authorization ought to be legally required, however.) “It was [Eisenhower’s] seasoned judgment … that a commitment the United States would have much greater impact on allies and enemies alike because it would represent the collective judgment of the President and Congress,” concludes Louis Fisher. “Single-handed actions taken by a President, without the support of Congress and the people, can threaten national prestige and undermine the presidency. Eisenhower’s position was sound then. It is sound now.”183 A critical assumption here is that legal requirements of congressional participation in decisions to use force filters out unpopular uses of force, the threats of which are unlikely to be credible and which, if unsuccessful, undermine the credibility of future U.S. threats.¶ A third view is that legal clarity is important to U.S. coercive and deterrent strategies; that ambiguity as to the President’s powers to use force undermines the credibility of threats. Michael Reisman observed, for example, in 1989: “Lack of clarity in the allocation of competence and the uncertain congressional role will sow uncertainty among those who depend on U.S. effectiveness for security and the maintenance of world order. Some reduction in U.S. credibility and diplomatic effectiveness may result.”184 Such stress on legal clarity is common among lawyers, who usually regard it as important to planning, whereas strategists tend to see possible value in “constructive ambiguity”, or deliberate fudging of drawn lines as a negotiating tactic or for domestic political purposes.185 A critical assumption here is that clarity of constitutional or statutory design with respect to decisions about force exerts significant effects on foreign perceptions of U.S. resolve to make good on threats, if not by affecting the substance of U.S. policy commitments with regard to force then by pointing foreign actors to the appropriate institution or process for reading them.
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#### Turn – CP is uncredible since the executive is perceived as uncredile – that collapses CP solvency – perm resovles that because with a statutory clarification it bolsters legitimacy

Jack Goldsmith 13, Henry L. Shattuck Professor at Harvard Law School, May 1 2013, “How Obama Undermined the War on Terror,” <http://www.newrepublic.com/article/112964/obamas-secrecy-destroying-american-support-counterterrorism>

For official secrecy abroad to work, the secrets must be kept at home as well. In speeches, interviews, and leaks, Obama's team has tried to explain why its operations abroad are lawful and prudent. But to comply with rules of classified information and covert action, the explanations are conveyed in limited, abstract, and often awkward terms. They usually raise more questions than they answer—and secrecy rules often preclude the administration from responding to follow-up questions, criticisms, and charges. ¶ As a result, much of what the administration says about its secret war—about civilian casualties, or the validity of its legal analysis, or the quality of its internal deliberations—seems incomplete, self-serving, and ultimately non-credible. These trust-destroying tendencies are exacerbated by its persistent resistance to transparency demands from Congress, from the press, and from organizations such as the aclu that have sought to know more about the way of the knife through Freedom of Information Act requests.¶ A related sin is the Obama administration's surprising failure to secure formal congressional support. Nearly every element of Obama's secret war rests on laws—especially the congressional authorization of force (2001) and the covert action statute (1991)—designed for different tasks. The administration could have worked with Congress to update these laws, thereby forcing members of Congress to accept responsibility and take a stand, and putting the secret war on a firmer political and legal foundation. But doing so would have required extended political efforts, public argument, and the possibility that Congress might not give the president precisely what he wants.¶ The administration that embraced the way of the knife in order to lower the political costs of counterterrorism abroad found it easier to avoid political costs at home as well. But this choice deprived it of the many benefits of public argumentation and congressional support. What Donald Rumsfeld said self-critically of Bush-era unilateralism applies to Obama's unilateralism as well: it fails to "take fully into account the broader picture—the complete set of strategic considerations of a president fighting a protracted, unprecedented and unfamiliar war for which he would need sustained domestic and international support." ¶ Instead of seeking contemporary congressional support, the administration has relied mostly on government lawyers' secret interpretive extensions of the old laws to authorize new operations against new enemies in more and more countries. The administration has great self-confidence in the quality of its stealth legal judgments. But as the Bush administration learned, secret legal interpretations are invariably more persuasive within the dark circle of executive branch secrecy than when exposed to public sunlight. On issues ranging from proper targeting standards, to the legality of killing American citizens, to what counts as an "imminent" attack warranting self-defensive measures, these secret legal interpretations—so reminiscent of the Bushian sin of unilateral legalism—have been less convincing in public, further contributing to presidential mistrust.¶ Feeling the heat from these developments, President Obama promised in his recent State of the Union address "to engage with Congress to ensure not only that our targeting, detention, and prosecution of terrorists remains consistent with our laws and system of checks and balances, but that our efforts are even more transparent to the American people and to the world." So far, this promise, like similar previous ones, remains unfulfilled. ¶ The administration has floated the idea of "[shifting] the CIA's lethal targeting program to the Defense Department," as The Daily Beast reported last month. Among other potential virtues, this move might allow greater public transparency about the way of the knife to the extent that it would eliminate the covert action bar to public discussion. But JSOC's non-covert targeted killing program is no less secretive than the CIA's, and its congressional oversight is, if anything, less robust. ¶ A bigger problem with this proposed fix is that it contemplates executive branch reorganization followed, in a best-case scenario, by more executive branch speeches and testimony about what it is doing in its stealth war. The proposal fails to grapple altogether with the growing mistrust of the administration's oblique representations about secret war. The president cannot establish trust in the way of the knife through internal moves and more words. Rather, he must take advantage of the separation of powers. Military detention, military commissions, and warrantless surveillance became more legitimate and less controversial during the Bush era because adversarial branches of government assessed the president's policies before altering and then approving them. President Obama should ask Congress to do the same with the way of the knife, even if it means that secret war abroad is harder to conduct.

#### Combination of both shileds the link to the net benefit because obama still retains credibility given he is clarifying authority

Eric A. Posner + and Adrian Vermeule ++, + Kirkland & Ellis Professor of Law, The University of Chicago Law School, ++ Professor of Law, Harvard Law School. Copyright (c) 2007 University of Chicago, University of Chicago Law Review Summer, 2007, 74 U. Chi. L. Rev. 865

With discretion comes distrust. n2 Voters and legislators grant the executive discretion, through action or inaction, and increase executive discretion during emergencies, because they believe that the benefits of doing so outweigh the risks of executive abuse. n3 By the same token, political actors will attempt to constrain the executive, or will simply fail to grant powers they otherwise would have preferred to grant, where they believe that the risks and harms of abuses outweigh any benefits in security or other goods. The fear of executive abuse arises from many sources, but the basic problem is uncertainty about the executive's motivations. The executive may, for example, be a power maximizer, intent on using legal or factual discretion to harm political opponents and cement his political position, or that of his political party; or he may be an empire builder, interested in expanding his turf at the expense of other institutions.

Where the executive is indeed ill motivated in any of these ways, constraining his discretion (more than the voters would otherwise choose) may be sensible. But the executive may not be ill motivated at all. Where the executive is in fact a faithful agent, using his increased discretion to promote the public good according to whatever conception of the public good voters hold, then constraints on executive discretion are all cost and no benefit. Voters, legislators, and judges know that different executive officials have different motivations. Not all presidents are power maximizers or empire builders. n4 Of course, the executive need not be pure of heart; his devotion to the public interest may in turn be based on concern for the judgment of history. But so long as that motivation makes him a faithful agent of the principal(s), he counts as well motivated.¶ The problem, however, is that the public has no simple way to know which type of executive it is dealing with. An ill-motivated executive will just mimic the statements of a well-motivated one, saying [\*867] the right things and offering plausible rationales for policies that outsiders, lacking crucial information, find difficult to evaluate -- policies that turn out not to be in the public interest. The ability of the ill-motivated executive to mimic the public-spirited executive's statements gives rise to the executive's dilemma of credibility: the well-motivated executive has no simple way to identify himself as such. Distrust causes voters (and the legislators they elect) to withhold discretion that they would like to grant and that the well-motivated executive would like to receive. Of course, the ill-motivated executive might also want discretion. The problem is that voters who would want to give discretion (only) to the well-motivated executive may choose not to do so, because they are not sure what type he actually is. The risk that the public and legislators will fail to trust a well-motivated president is just as serious as the risk that they will trust an ill-motivated president, yet legal scholars have felled forests on the second topic while largely neglecting the first. n5¶ Our aim in this Article is to identify this dilemma of credibility that afflicts the well-motivated executive and to propose mechanisms for ameliorating it. We focus on emergencies and national security but cast the analysis within a broader framework. Our basic claim is that the credibility dilemma can be addressed by executive signaling. Without any new constitutional amendments, statutes, or legislative action, law and executive practice already contain resources to allow a well-motivated executive to send a credible signal of his motivations, committing to use increased discretion in public-spirited ways. By tying [\*868] policies to institutional mechanisms that impose heavier costs on ill-motivated actors than on well-motivated ones, the well-motivated executive can credibly signal his good intentions and thus persuade voters that his policies are those that voters would want if fully informed. We focus particularly on mechanisms of executive self-binding that send a signal of credibility by committing presidents to actions or policies that only a well-motivated president would adopt.¶ The discussion is structured as follows. Part I lays out examples of the credibility dilemma, both historical and recent. Part II analyzes the credibility dilemma through the lens of principal-agent theory. Part III examines the attempted Madisonian solution to the credibility dilemma and explains why it is a failure, for the most part. Part IV suggests a series of mechanisms for credibly demonstrating the executive's good intentions. These mechanisms include independent commissions within the executive branch; bipartisanship in appointments to the executive branch, or more broadly the creation of domestic coalitions of the willing; the related tactic of counterpartisanship, or choosing policies that run against the preferences of the president's own party; commitments to multilateral action in foreign policy; increasing the transparency of the executive's decisionmaking processes; and a regime of strict liability for executive abuses. Not all of these mechanisms succeed, and some of them succeed under some conditions but fail under others.¶ Credibility is but one good that trades off against other goods, even from the standpoint of the well-motivated executive. The main cost of credibility is that it diminishes the president's control over policymaking. In Part IV, we attempt to identify the conditions under which one or the other mechanism can produce credibility benefits greater than the resulting costs.¶ I. Examples¶ Presidents always have some credibility, at least at the start of their term. People do not vote for candidates whom they do not believe, and so the winning candidate brings to the office some amount of credibility, which he may further enhance over time by keeping his promises or making predictions that are proven correct by events. Having built up capital, some presidents find it useful to engage in deception, and some have gotten away with it, at least in the short term. Prominent examples include FDR's claim during the 1940 election that he was determined to keep the United States out of war; n6 Eisenhower's [\*869] denial that U-2 spy planes overflew the Soviet Union; n7 (probably) Johnson's description of the Gulf of Tonkin incident; n8 Nixon's statements about military action relating to Cambodia; n9 (probably) Reagan's claim that he was unaware of the arms-for-hostages scheme; n10 and Clinton's denial that he had had a sexual relationship with Monica Lewinsky. n11 But deception is potentially a costly strategy, because revelation of the deception damages the president's credibility, making it more difficult for him to achieve his next set of goals.¶ For this reason, we focus on historical cases where the president avoids deception, where in fact he makes a true or roughly true statement about circumstances that the public cannot directly evaluate, but has trouble persuading the public to believe him. In these cases, the president needs to use mechanisms that enhance his credibility or, if he cannot, finds himself unable to act. We offer examples to illustrate the credibility dilemma, to illustrate a range of solutions to the dilemma -- some successful, some otherwise -- and to show that the mechanisms we will propose in Part IV have historical analogues or precedents.¶ A. FDR: The Nazi Threat¶ Franklin Delano Roosevelt understood the threat posed by Nazi Germany to the United States' long-term interests long before the U.S. public did. The public was preoccupied with the Great Depression and had powerful isolationist representatives in Congress. Because of popular sentiment, FDR could not commit U.S. military assistance to Britain and France, even after Germany invaded France and began [\*870] bombing London. n12 Marginal economic and military assistance could take place only through complicated subterfuges and was in any event of minimal value.¶ Even after Japan bombed Pearl Harbor and Nazi Germany declared war on the U.S., FDR had to move cautiously. The public supported war, but sought war primarily with Japan, while FDR correctly believed that Germany posed a greater threat to the United States than Japan did. In FDR's view, Japan could be, and should be, dealt with after the Atlantic alliance against Germany was solidified. Thus, although FDR had popular support on one level, he needed to devise ways to ensure support for his particular war aims and strategies, whose particular justifications would always remain at least partially obscure to the public. One of FDR's tactics for generating support was to invite prominent Republicans into his cabinet. For example, Henry Stimson was given the post of Secretary of War, and Frank Knox was made the Secretary of the Navy. n13 Provided with inside information, they would be able to blow the whistle if U.S. war strategy departed too much from what they believed was the public interest. But, as internationalists, they would also support the war.¶ B. Truman: Scaring Hell out of the Country¶ The Soviet Union had been the United States' ally during World War II, and many people, including FDR, expected or hoped that it would cooperate with the United States after the war as well. That the Soviet Union would have aggressive rather than pacific designs only gradually dawned on U.S. elites. By 1946, skepticism about Soviet motives was widespread in the U.S. government, but the U.S. public still labored under more genial impressions fostered by wartime propaganda. To counter the growing Soviet threat, President Harry S. Truman resolved to expend U.S. treasure to rebuild the economies of France, West Germany, Britain, and other potential allies, and to bind them together in a military defense pact. The former would require a lot of money; the latter would require the stationing of U.S. troops abroad. The U.S. public, however, was traditionally isolationist, and wished to enjoy the victory and the peace. n14 How could Truman persuade [\*871] the public that further sacrifice and foreign entanglements would be necessary to defend U.S. interests against a former ally?¶ Truman apparently could not simply explain to the public that the Soviet threat justified the Marshall Plan and North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the United States' first permanent foreign military alliance. The problem was that the public had no way to evaluate the Soviet threat. The U.S.S.R. had not actually used military force against U.S. troops, as the Japanese had five years earlier at Pearl Harbor. The Soviet Union was instead supporting communist insurgencies in Greece and Turkey, interfering in politics in Italy, violating its promise to respect democratic processes in Poland, engaging in espionage, and so forth. Experienced and perceptive observers saw a threat, but, generally speaking, the public was in no position to do so.¶ To enhance the credibility of his claims about the Soviet threat, Truman did two things. First, he recast the threat as an ideological challenge. Truman gave the threat an ideological dimension, deliberately "scaring hell out of the country." n15 Second, he made an alliance with a powerful Republican senator, Arthur Vandenberg, who could assure Truman that the Republicans would not object to his policies as long as he consulted them and allowed them some influence. As a former isolationist, Vandenberg's endorsement of Truman's policy of engagement must have enhanced the credibility of Truman's claims about the Soviet threat. n16¶ Both of these strategies succeeded, but neither was costless. Truman's characterization of the Soviet threat as an ideological challenge may have led to the McCarthy era and suppressed public debate about foreign policy. Truman's alliance with the Republicans meant, of course, that he would have less freedom of action. n17 [\*872] ¶ C. Bush I versus Bush II: The Iraqi Threat¶ George H.W. Bush and George W. Bush both went to war with Iraq, but they faced different threats and chose different responses. George H.W. Bush sought to drive Iraqi military forces out of Kuwait. His problem was persuading the U.S. public that a U.S. military response was justified. In retrospect, it might seem that he was clearly right, but at the time most experts believed that that a great number of U.S. troops would be killed. n18 This was the expected cost of a military response. On the benefit side, Bush could appeal to the sanctity of sovereign borders, but public sympathy for the rich Kuwaitis was limited. The United States' real concern was that Iraq would, with Kuwait's oil fields, become wealthy and powerful enough to expand its control over the region, threaten Saudi Arabia, dominate the Persian Gulf's oil reserves, and pose a long-term threat to the Western economies and the United States' influence in the Middle East. But all of these concerns are rather abstract, and it was never obvious that the public would accept this case. Indeed, the congressional authorization to use military force was far from unanimous in the House of Representatives. n19¶ The credibility of Bush's claims, however, was greatly aided by international support. The public support of nations with divergent interests showed that Bush's claim about the internationally destabilizing effects of Saddam Hussein's invasion was real and not imagined. Thus any claim that a U.S. military invasion was solely in Bush's partisan political interests, or in the interests mainly of oil companies, was seriously weakened. Formal United Nations approval and the military assistance of foreign states -- which was of mainly political, not military significance -- further solidified Bush's credibility. n20¶ Surface similarities aside, George W. Bush faced a different kind of threat. He feared that Saddam Hussein had weapons of mass destruction (WMDs), which he would give or sell to terrorist groups like al Qaeda. It was more difficult for George W. Bush to prove that Saddam had WMDs than for his father to prove that Saddam was a threat to the region, because any WMDs were hidden on Saddam's territory [\*873] while the invasion of Kuwait could be observed by all. George W. Bush followed the same strategy that his father did, albeit somewhat less enthusiastically: to enlist international support in order to bolster the credibility of his claim that Saddam continued to pose a major threat to U.S. and Western interests. But George W. Bush failed to persuade foreign countries that Saddam posed a great enough threat to justify a military invasion (although they largely agreed that he either had or probably had WMDs), and he did not obtain significant international support. n21 Ironically, George W. Bush, unlike his father, had strong congressional support, in part because opposition to the first war turned out to be a political liability, and the costs of the first war (unlike the second war) turned out to be minimal.¶ D. Clinton: Wag the Dog¶ Long before the attacks of September 11, 2001, the U.S. government understood that al Qaeda posed a threat to U.S. interests. The CIA had established a bin Laden office in 1996, and the Clinton administration was trying to develop an effective counterterrorism strategy. n22 In 1998, al Qaeda blew up U.S. embassies in Kenya and Tanzania, whereupon Clinton ordered cruise missile strikes on targets in Afghanistan and Sudan. Just three days earlier, however, Clinton had announced on national television that he had had an affair with Monica Lewinsky. Opponents charged that he ordered the strikes in order to distract the public from his domestic problems. n23 This came to be known as the Wag the Dog strategy after a movie that featured a similar subterfuge. n24 [\*874] ¶ Clinton's credibility problem was more acute than that of earlier presidents. FDR, Truman, and George H.W. Bush (as well as, later, George W. Bush) might embark on foreign adventures in order to enhance their prestige or to pay off interest groups or to distract the public from domestic problems. George W. Bush, for example, has been repeatedly accused of manipulating terrorism warnings in order to improve poll results or electoral outcomes. n25 But only in Clinton's case was it necessary for him to make an important and visible decision about foreign policy in the midst of a personal scandal in which he admitted that he engaged in deceit, with the result that his ability to conduct an effective terrorism defense was hampered by doubts about his credibility. n26 A more aggressive response to al Qaeda would have to wait until after September 11, 2001.¶ II. Theory¶ A. The Problem¶ The examples we discussed have a common structure: a nation or group, like Nazi Germany, the Soviet Union, Iraq, or al Qaeda, poses a threat to U.S. interests. The threat is widely understood at a general level but the public does not understand important details: why the threat exists, its magnitude, what programs will best address it. The president believes that a particular program -- NSA surveillance, unlimited detention, military preparation -- is necessary and desirable for countering the threat, and let us assume that he is correct. At the same time, the program could be misused in various ways. It could be used to enhance the power of the president at the expense of legitimate political opponents; to pay off the president's supporters at the expense of the general public; or to spark an emotional but short-lived surge of patriotism that benefits the president during an important election but does not enhance security. The president can announce the [\*875] program and justify it in general terms, but he cannot design the program in such a way that its dangers to legitimate political opposition can be eliminated. n27 As a result, his claim that the program will be used only for national security, and not to enhance his power at the expense of political opponents, or to benefit allies, may not be believed.¶ Consider, for example, the policy of detaining suspected members of al Qaeda without charging them and without providing them with a trial. The public understands that al Qaeda poses a threat to national security but lacks the information necessary to evaluate the detention policy. The public does not know the magnitude of the continuing threat from al Qaeda: it might be the case that the group has focused its attention on foreign targets, that it no longer has the capacity to launch attacks on U.S. soil, that greater international cooperation and intelligence sharing has significantly reduced the threat, and so forth. The public also does not know whether the detainees are important members of al Qaeda, foot soldiers, or unconnected to al Qaeda; whether the dangerous detainees could be adequately incapacitated or deterred through regular criminal processes; whether the Bush administration obtains valuable intelligence from the detainees, as it claims, or not; whether the detainees are treated well or harshly; and numerous other relevant factors. Some of the relevant variables are public, but most are not; those that are public are nonetheless extremely difficult to evaluate. Consider the ambiguity over whether the suicides at Guantanamo Bay in June 2006 were driven by despair and harsh treatment, or were the result of a calculated effort by martyr-seeking Jihadists to score a propaganda coup. n28 As a general matter, the public does not even know whether the absence of major terrorist attacks on U.S. soil since September 11, 2001 resulted from the Bush administration's detention policy, at least partly resulted from this policy, occurred for reasons entirely independent of this policy such as (say) the military attack on Afghanistan, or occurred despite the detention policy, which, by alienating potential allies, perversely made a further attack more likely than it would otherwise have been.¶ Described in this manner, the president's credibility problem is the result of an agency relationship, where the president is the agent and the public is the principal. In agency models, the agent has the power to engage in an action that benefits or harms a principal. In a [\*876] typical version of these models, the principal first hires the agent and instructs the agent to engage in high effort rather than shirk. The agent then chooses whether to engage in high effort or shirk. High effort by the agent increases the probability that the principal will receive a high payoff, but some randomness is involved, so that the link between the agent's effort and the principal's payoff is stochastic rather than certain. If the agent's behavior can be observed and proven before a court, then the simple solution is for the two parties to enter a contract requiring the agent to engage in high effort. If the agent's behavior cannot be observed, then a contract requiring high effort is unenforceable, and instead the principal and agent might enter a contract that makes the agent's compensation a function of the principal's payoff. This gives the agent an incentive to use high effort, though depending on various conditions, this incentive might be weak. n29¶ Less important than the details of the agency model, and its various solutions, is the way that it clarifies the basic problem. The president is the agent and the public is the principal (sometimes we will think of the legislature as the principal, bracketing questions of agency slack between voters and legislators). The public cares about national security but also cares about civil liberties and the well-being of potential targets of the war on terror; its optimal policy trades off these factors. However, the public cannot directly choose the policy; instead, it delegates that power to the government and, in particular, the president. The president knows the range of options available, their likely effects, their expected costs and benefits -- thanks to the resources and expertise of the executive branch -- and so, if he is well motivated, he will choose the best measures available.¶ Thus a well-motivated executive, in our sense, is an executive who chooses the policies that voters would choose if they knew what the executive knows. n30 This definition does not require that the president's deeper motives be pure. For our purposes, a well-motivated president may be concerned with his historical reputation in the long run, as many presidents are. Because presidents know that in the long run most or all of their currently private information will be revealed, n31 a [\*877] concern with the judgment of history pushes presidents to make the decisions that future generations, knowing what the president knows now, will approve. To be sure, the concern with historical reputation is not perfectly congruent with doing what the current generation would approve of (with full information), because different generations have different values, as in the case of civil rights. The convergence is substantial, however, compared to far more harmful motivations a president might have, such as short-term empire-building or partisan advantage. Presidents with a concern for their long-run reputation may not be disinterested leaders, but they approach the ideal of faithful agency more closely than do presidents with no such concern.¶ We also assume that the voters' ultimate preferences are fixed, so we put aside the possibility of presidential leadership that changes bedrock public values. However, voters' derived preferences may change as their information changes, and this further blurs the significance of changing public values over time. On this view, there is still scope for leadership, in the sense that a well-motivated president might choose a policy inconsistent with voters' current ill-informed preferences, but consistent with the new preferences voters will form as their information changes, perhaps as a result of the policy itself. FDR's behavior just before World War II is the model for presidential leadership in this sense. n32¶ As this discussion suggests, the well-motivated executive may or may not keep campaign promises, or adopt popular policies. All depends on circumstances -- on what the public would approve, if it knew what the president knows. A public that would condemn the president's policy P might, if it knew more, approve of P. The well-motivated president will want to adopt P in such circumstances, and will then face the problem of credibly signaling to the public that he favors the policy for good reasons that he cannot directly convey. Furthermore, we assume that the well-motivated executive will collect an optimal amount of information -- up to the point where the marginal benefits of further information gathering equal the marginal costs. n33 This does not mean [\*878] that the well-motivated executive always gets the facts right; he may turn out to be wrong. But it does mean that greater accuracy would not have been cost justified.¶ Against this benchmark of faithful agency, the problem is that a given president's motivations may or may not be faithful, and the public knows this. The public fears that, for various reasons, the president might choose policies that diverge from the public's optimal policies. These include:¶ 1. The president cares more about national security (or more about civil liberties, but we will, for simplicity, assume the former) than the public does. His "preferences" are different from those of the public.¶ 2. The president cares very little about national security and civil liberties; he mainly cares about maximizing his political power and, more broadly, political success -- success for himself, his party, or his chosen successor. With a view to political power and success, the president might maximize the probability of electoral success by favoring particular interest groups, voting blocs, or institutions at the expense of the public, or by adopting policies that are popular in the short term, as far as the next election cycle, but that are harmful in the long term, along with rhetoric that confuses and misleads.¶ The public knows that the president might have these or other harmful motivations, so when the president claims, for example, that a detention policy is essential to the war on terror but at the same time is not excessively harsh given its benefits, the public simply does not know whether to believe him.¶ Crucially, the risk that the public will fail to trust a well-motivated president is just as serious as the risk that it will trust an ill-motivated one. Imagine that a well-motivated president chooses the optimal policies. No terrorist attack occurs before the next election, but the public does not know whether this is because the president chose the optimal policies, the president chose bad policies and was merely lucky (as the terrorists for internal reasons chose to focus on foreign targets), or the president chose effective but excessively harsh policies. In the election, the public therefore has no particular reason to vote for this president and could easily vote him out of office and replace him with a worse president. A president who cares about electoral [\*879] success might therefore not choose the optimal policies, and even a well-motivated president might be reluctant to choose the optimal policies because of the risk that the public will misinterpret them and replace him with an ill-motivated president. Presidents need public support even when they do not face reelection; they need the public to prod Congress to provide the president with funds for his programs and statutory authorization when necessary. A well-motivated president will abandon optimal policies if he cannot persuade the public that they are warranted.¶ As we noted earlier, legal scholars rarely note the problem of executive credibility, preferring to dwell on the problem of aggrandizement by ill-motivated presidents. Ironically, this assumption that presidents seek to maximize power has obscured one of the greatest constraints on aggrandizement, namely, the president's own interest in maintaining his credibility. Neither a well-motivated nor an ill-motivated president can accomplish his goals if the public does not trust him. n34 This concern with reputation may put a far greater check on the president's actions than do the reactions of the other branches of the government.¶ B. Solutions¶ The literature on agency models and optimal contracting provides clues for solving the problem of executive credibility. This literature gives two basic pieces of advice. n35 The first piece of advice is to align preferences. An employer will do better if her employees obtain utility from doing whatever actions benefit the employer. Suppose, for example, an employer seeks to hire someone to build furniture in a factory. The pay is good enough to attract job candidates who do not enjoy building furniture, but clearly the employer does better by hiring people who like working with their hands, and take pleasure in constructing a high-quality product, than by hiring people who do not like working with their hands. We say that the first type of person has a preference for building high-quality furniture; this person is less likely to shirk than the other type of person.¶ In order to align preferences, employers can use various types of screening mechanisms or selection mechanisms that separate the good [\*880] types and the bad types. n36 An old idea is that job candidates who completed a training program -- here, in carpentry -- are more likely good types than job candidates who did not complete such a program. The reason is not that the training program improves skills, though it might, but that a person who enjoys carpentry is more likely to enter and complete such a program than a person who does not -- the program, in terms of time and effort, is less burdensome for the former type of person. The employer could use other mechanisms as well, of course. She could ask for evidence that the job candidate pursues woodworking as a hobby in his free time, or, simply, that he has held other jobs in similar factories, or jobs that involve carpentry or furniture construction. Another important screening mechanism is to compensate employees partly through in-kind components or earmarked funds that are worth more to good types than to bad types. In university settings, academic compensation is partly composed of research budgets that cannot be spent on personal consumption and that are worth more to good types (researchers) than to bad types (shirkers). n37¶ The second piece of advice is to reward and sanction. This is not as simple as giving the employee a bonus if she constructs good furniture and firing her if she does not; recall that we assume that the employer does not directly observe the quality of the agent's action. Consider the following version of our example. The employees both design and construct furniture; "high-quality" furniture is both made well and pleasing to the public, so that it sells well. The employer cannot tell by looking at a piece of furniture whether it is high quality, because she does not know the tastes of the public. An employee who uses a high level of effort is more likely to produce furniture that sells well, but an employee can in good faith misjudge public taste and produce furniture that sells poorly. Similarly, an employee who uses a low level of effort is less likely to produce furniture that sells well but nonetheless may succeed at times. Since the employer cannot observe the quality of the furniture, she cannot make the wage a function of its quality; if she pays a flat wage, then the employee does not have an incentive to engage in a high level of effort, because that involves more personal cost without producing any reward.¶ The main solution is to make the employee's compensation a function, in part, of the quantity of the sales of the goods that the employee [\*881] produces. The quantity of sales, unlike the quality of the furniture, is observable. If the pay is properly determined, then the employee will engage in a high level of effort because the expected gains from high sales exceed the cost of high effort. How closely pay should be correlated with sales depends on how risk averse the employee is, and it may be necessary, for ordinary people who are generally risk averse, to pay them at least a little even if sales are low, and somewhat more if sales are high.¶ An enormous literature develops and qualifies these results, and we will refer to relevant parts of it later as necessary rather than try to summarize it here. n38 For now, we want to briefly point out the relevance of these solutions to our problem of executive credibility.¶ The preference-alignment solution has clear applicability to the problem of executive credibility. To be sure, elections and other democratic institutions help ensure that the president's preferences are not too distant from those of the public, but they are clearly not sufficient to solve the executive credibility problem. Elections will never create perfect preference alignment, for well-known reasons, and in any event the well-motivated executive will do what the public would want were it fully informed, not what maximizes the chances of electoral success in the short run. Furthermore, we do not consider credibility-generating mechanisms that would require new constitutional or statutory provisions; of course, the president has little or no power to redesign electoral rules in order to enhance his credibility. We will instead focus, in Part IV, on how the president might use the existing electoral system to enhance his credibility in indirect ways -- by appointing subordinates, advisors, and commission members, and by supporting certain types of candidacies for electoral office.¶ The reward-and-sanction solution also is applicable to the problem of executive credibility, but we think it is of less importance and we will not address it in any detail. The problem that most concerns us -- threats to national security -- typically does not produce a clear outcome while the president is still in office. As noted above, Bush's war-on-terror policies might be optimal, insufficient, or excessive; we will not know for many years. And the public cannot enter a contract with the president that provides that he will receive a bonus if national security is enhanced and will be sanctioned if it is not enhanced. Consequently, Bush cannot enter a contract with the public that rewards him if his policies are good and punishes him if they are bad. [\*882] ¶ However, some signaling mechanisms have a reward-or-sanction component. A good job applicant can distinguish herself from a bad job applicant by agreeing to a compensation scheme that good types value and bad types disvalue. For example, if a good type of employee discounts future payoffs less than bad types, then good types will accept deferred compensation (such as pension contributions) that bad types reject. n39 Similarly, a well-motivated president can distinguish himself from an ill-motivated president by binding himself to a policy position that an ill-motivated president would reject -- for example, deficit reduction programs or Social Security reform that would mainly benefit future generations, long after the president leaves office. However, a president, unlike an ordinary employee, cannot bind himself by a judicially enforceable contract; therefore, this mechanism can work only if the president can engage in self-binding through informal means, as we will discuss below. n40¶ Note that either a well-motivated actor or an ill-motivated actor might use strategic devices to enhance her credibility. A bad actor might, for example, take actions to enhance the credibility of his threats. In a standard illustration, the "chicken" game occurs when two drivers race toward each other and the loser is the one who swerves to avoid death. In that game, each driver is threatening to drive straight, and the winner will be the one who can make his threat credible, because the other driver will then know that the only choice is to swerve or die. Credibility is a valuable adjunct to many different motivations, not just to socially beneficial ones.¶ But this is a different type of credibility problem than the one we are interested in. In the class of problems we address, the problem that faces the well-motivated actor is that others cannot distinguish or sort him at a glance from ill-motivated actors. "Bad types" can mimic "good types" through low-cost imitation and by saying all the right things. The good type needs some device whereby he can credibly signal that he is a good type. The only effective device, in general, is for the good type to undertake an action that imposes greater costs on bad types than on good types. If third parties understand the cost structure of the action, then this separates the two types, because the bad type's strategy of costlessly imitating the good type no longer works. In employment screening, for example, both the lazy worker and the hard worker will claim to be a hard worker. The employer might prefer candidates with good references, or an advanced degree, [\*883] on the theory that obtaining those things will be easier for the good type than the bad type.¶ Let us provide a little more structure to our analysis before describing our preferred mechanisms. Suppose that the president must choose a policy that will affect national security and civil liberties; this might include asking Congress to authorize him to engage in conduct like wiretapping or the use of military force. He makes this choice at the start of his first term, and the actual effect of his choice -- on national security and civil liberties -- will not be revealed to the public until after the next election. Terrorist attacks during the first term do not necessarily prove that he chose the wrong policies; nor does the absence of terrorist attacks during the first term prove that he chose the right policies. Only later will it become clear whether the president chose the optimal policies, perhaps many decades later. Thus, the public must vote for or against the president on the basis of the policy choice itself, not on the basis of its effect on their well-being. For expository convenience, we will assume that the president actually does make the optimal policy choice and that his problem is one of convincing the public that he has done so. Presidents who, for whatever reason, knowingly choose policies that the public would reject (if fully informed) obviously do not want to convince the public that this is what they are doing.¶ Our focus, then, is how the president who chooses the optimal policy, given the information available to him and the relevant institutional constraints, might use some additional mechanism to enhance the credibility of his claim that he chose the best policy. In the next Part, we will address why our current Madisonian system does not already solve the problem of executive credibility. In Part IV, we will analyze some mechanisms by which presidents can bootstrap themselves into credibility.¶ III. Madisonian Monitoring¶ In the standard separation of powers theory attributed to Madison, the executive's credibility dilemma is ameliorated by the separation of powers and institutional competition, which produce monitoring or oversight of executive discretion. Although the Madisonian system is not usually justified as a means of enhancing the executive's credibility, that is a byproduct of the system: if checks and balances discourage ill-motivated persons from running for office, or force them to adopt public-spirited policies once in office, then the executive's claims about his policies will be credible. Congressional and judicial oversight of executive action, on this account, will ensure that the executive exercises discretion only as directed by voter-principals, [\*884] acting through legislators who are simultaneously agents (of the voters) and principals (of the executive).¶ This account is no longer adequate, if it ever was. Legislators and judges are, for the most part, unable to effectively oversee or monitor the executive, especially in the domains of foreign policy and national security. As a result, they are forced to make the difficult choice of granting discretion that an ill-motivated executive would abuse, or withholding discretion that a well-motivated executive would use for good.¶ We do not suggest that the Madisonian system has entirely failed, only that it has partly failed, and that to the extent it has failed the executive's credibility dilemma becomes more acute. We will examine some of the principal institutional problems, beginning with legislative oversight and then turning to the courts.¶ A. Congress¶ In the Madisonian vision, legislators are simultaneously principals of the president, who is supposed to execute the statutes that legislators enact, and are also institutional competitors of the president, who has freestanding constitutional powers beyond the execution of statutes. Voters elect legislators, who either transmit voters' exogenously determined policy preferences to the executive through statutes or (in a deliberative conception of Madisonianism) refine public preferences through reasoned discussion and then instruct the executive accordingly. n41 We are agnostic on the question of whether the preference-based or deliberative version of the Madisonian vision is more persuasive, or exegetically more faithful to the Madison of the Federalist Papers. In either case, what matters here is that the combination of principal-agent relationships with institutional rivalry is supposed to produce valuable byproducts for the polity as a whole. Legislators have an interest in monitoring the president, not only to ensure that he faithfully executes the statutes they enact, but also to ensure that executive power does not swell beyond its constitutionally prescribed bounds and destroy the separation of legislative and executive powers.¶ Whether or not this picture was ever realistic, it is no longer so today. Many institutional factors hamper effective legislative monitoring of executive discretion. Consider the following problems. [\*885] ¶ 1. Information asymmetries.¶ Monitoring the executive requires expertise in the area being monitored. In many cases, Congress lacks the information necessary to monitor discretionary policy choices by the executive. Although the committee system has the effect, among others, of generating legislative information and expertise, n42 and although Congress has a large internal staff, there are domains in which no amount of legislative expertise suffices for effective oversight. Prime among these are areas of foreign policy and national security. Here legislative expertise is beside the point, because the legislature lacks the raw information that experts need to make assessments.¶ The problem would disappear if legislators could cheaply acquire information from the president, but they cannot. One obstacle is a suite of legal doctrines protecting executive secrecy and creating deliberative privileges n43 -- doctrines which may or may not be justified from some higher-order systemic point of view as means for producing optimal deliberation within the executive branch. Although such privileges are waivable, the executive often fears to set a bad institutional precedent. Another obstacle is the standard executive claim that Congress leaks like a sieve, so that sharing secret information with legislators will result in public disclosure. The credibility dilemma becomes most acute when, as in the recent controversy over surveillance by the National Security Agency, the executive claims that the very scope or rationale of a program cannot be discussed with Congress, because to do so would vitiate the very secrecy that makes the program possible and beneficial. In any particular case the claim might be right or wrong; legislators have no real way to judge, and they know that the claim might be made either by a well-motivated executive or an ill-motivated executive, albeit for very different reasons.¶ 2. Collective action problems.¶ Executive officials worry that, with many legislators on select intelligence committees, someone is bound to leak and it will be difficult to pinpoint the source. Aware of the relative safety that the numbers give them, leakers are all the more bold. This is an example of a larger problem, arising from the fact that there are many more legislators than top-level executive officials. Compared to the executive branch, [\*886] Congress finds it more costly to coordinate and to undertake collective action (such as the detection and punishment of leakers). To be sure, the executive too is a "they," not an "it." Much of what presidents do is to arbitrate internal conflicts among executive departments and to try to aggregate competing views into coherent policy over time. As a comparative matter, however, the contrast is striking: the executive can act with much greater unity, force, and dispatch than can Congress, which is chronically hampered by the need for debate and consensus among large numbers. This comparative advantage is a principal reason why Congress enacts broad delegating statutes in the first place, especially in domains touching on foreign policy and national security. In these domains, and elsewhere, the very conditions that make delegation attractive also hamper congressional monitoring of executive discretion under the delegation.¶ There may or may not be offsetting advantages to Congress's large numbers; perhaps the very size and heterogeneity of Congress make it a superior deliberator, whereas the executive branch is prone to suffer from various forms of groupthink. n44 But there are clear disadvantages to large numbers, insofar as monitoring executive discretion is at issue. From the standpoint of individual legislators, monitoring is a collective good. If rational and self-interested, each legislator will attempt to free-ride on the production of this good, and monitoring will be inefficiently underproduced. n45 More broadly, the institutional prerogatives of Congress are also a collective good. n46 Individual legislators may or may not be interested in protecting the institution of Congress or the separation of legislative from executive power; much depends on legislators' time horizons or discount rate, the expected longevity of a legislative career, and so forth. But it is clear that protection of legislative prerogatives will be much less in an institution composed of hundreds of legislators coming and going than if Congress were a single person. [\*887] ¶ 3. "Separation of parties, not powers." n47¶ Congress is, among other things, a partisan institution. Political scientists debate whether it is principally a partisan institution, or even exclusively so. n48 But Madison arguably did not envision partisanship in anything like its modern sense. n49 Partisanship undermines the separation of powers during periods of unified government. n50 Where the same party controls both the executive branch and Congress, real monitoring of executive discretion rarely occurs, at any rate far less than in an ideal Madisonian system. Partisanship may enhance monitoring during periods of divided government, as one house of Congress, say, investigates a president of the other party. However, monitoring is arguably most necessary during periods of unified government, because Congress is most likely to enact broad delegations when the President holds similar views; n51 and in such periods monitoring is least likely to occur. n52 The Congress of one period may partially compensate by creating institutions to ensure bipartisan oversight in future periods -- consider the statute that gives a partisan minority of certain congressional committees power to subpoena documents from the executive, albeit only nonprivileged documents n53 -- but these are palliatives. Under unified government, congressional leaders of the [\*888] same party as the president have tremendous power to frustrate effective oversight by the minority party.¶ 4. The limits of congressional organization.¶ Congress as a collective body has attempted, in part, to overcome these problems through internal institutional arrangements. Committees and subcommittees specialize in a portion of the policy space, such as the armed forces or homeland security, thereby relieving members of the costs of acquiring and processing information (at least if the committee itself maintains a reputation for credibility). n54 Intelligence committees hold closed sessions and police their members to deter leaks (although the sanctions that members of Congress can apply to one another are not as strong as the sanctions a president can apply to a leaker in the executive branch). Large staffs, both for committees and members, add expertise and monitoring capacity. And interest groups can sometimes be counted upon to sound an alarm when the executive harms their interests. n55¶ Overall, however, these arrangements are not fully adequate, especially in domains of foreign policy and national security, where the scale of executive operations is orders of magnitude larger than the scale of congressional operations. Congress's whole staff, which must (with the help of interest groups) monitor all issues, runs to some 30,000 persons. n56 As of 2005, the executive branch had some 2.6 million civilian employees, n57 in addition to almost 1.4 million in the active armed forces. n58 The sheer mismatch between the scale of executive operations and the congressional capacity for oversight, even aided by interest groups or by leakers within the bureaucracy, is daunting. Probably Congress is already at or near the limits of its monitoring capacity at its current size and budget. [\*889] ¶ 5. Congressional motivation and credibility.¶ Like the executive, Congress has a credibility problem. Members of Congress may be well motivated or ill motivated; the public does not know. Thus, when Congress passes a resolution criticizing presidential action or refuses to delegate power that he seeks, observers do not know whether Congress or the president is right. Ill-motivated members of Congress will constrain public-spirited presidents; thus the Madisonian cure for the problem of executive credibility could be worse than the disease.¶ Even if members of Congress are generally well motivated, Congress has a problem of institutional credibility that the president lacks. Although a voter might trust the member of Congress for whom she voted because she knows about his efforts on his district's behalf, she will usually know nothing about other members of Congress, so when her representative is outvoted, she might well believe that the other members are ill motivated. And, with respect to her own representative, he will often lack credibility compared to the president because he has much less information. Further, the reputation of congressional leaders is only very loosely tied to the reputation of the institution, while there is a closer tie between the president's reputation and the presidency. As a result, Congress is likely to act less consistently than the president, further reducing its relative credibility. Congressional lack of credibility undermines its ability to constrain the president: Congress can monitor the president and tell the public that the president has acted properly or improperly, but if the public does not believe Congress, then Congress's power to check the president is limited.¶ We neither make, nor need to make, any general empirical claim that Congress has no control over executive discretion. That is surely not the case; there is a large debate, or set of related debates, about the extent of congressional dominance. n59 We have reviewed the institutional problems piecemeal; perhaps some of them are mutually offsetting, although we do not see any concrete examples. Our assertion is just that there is at least a real gap, and during emergencies and wars [\*890] an even larger gap, between the extent of executive discretion and legislative capacity for monitoring. It is hard to say how great that gap is, but we know of no one who thinks it is nonexistent. Within that gap, the dilemma of executive credibility arises. To the extent that legislators cannot monitor the executive's exercise of discretion, they must either withhold discretion from an executive who might be well motivated, or grant discretion to an executive who might be ill motivated.¶ B. Courts¶ Similar problems afflict judicial oversight of the executive.¶ 1. Information asymmetries.¶ The gap between the executive and the judiciary, in information and expertise, is even wider than between the executive and Congress. Whereas many legislators have a narrowly defined field of policy expertise, particularly in the House, federal judges are mostly generalists, barring a few specialized courts. Furthermore, the partial insulation from current politics that federal judges enjoy, by virtue of life tenure and salary protection, brings with it a kind of informational impoverishment. n60 Legislators, who must please other people at least some of the time, interact with the outside world far more systematically than generalist judges, whose main source of information is the briefs and arguments of litigants. The credibility dilemma thus appears quite acutely in judicial proceedings. When the executive says that resolving a plaintiff's claim would require disclosure of "state secrets," n61 with dangerous consequences for national security, judges know that either an ill-motivated or a well-motivated executive might be making the claim and that they have no easy means to assess whether the claim is credible.¶ 2. Collective action problems and decentralization.¶ If congressional monitoring of executive discretion is hampered by collective action problems, judicial monitoring is hampered by a [\*891] similar condition, the decentralized character of the federal judiciary. The judiciary really is a "they," not an "it," and is decentralized along mainly geographic lines. Different judges on different courts will have different prior estimates of the executive's credibility, and hence different views of the costs and benefits of oversight and of the appropriate level of monitoring. The Supreme Court is incapable of fully resolving these structural conflicts. Because the Court presides over a large institutional system and lacks the capacity to review more than a fraction of cases submitted to it, its role is restricted by necessity to the declaration of general principles of law and episodic, ad hoc intervention in the system. n62¶ 3. The legitimacy deficit.¶ In the federal system, appointed judges are not overtly partisan, though they are sometimes covertly so. n63 The very condition that enables this relative lack of overt politicization -- that federal judges are, at least in one familiar conception, legal technocrats appointed for their expertise rather than elected on a partisan basis -- also creates a serious legitimacy deficit for the judiciary, understanding legitimacy in a strictly sociological sense. n64 Aroused publics concerned about issues such as national security sometimes have little tolerance for robust judicial oversight of executive discretion, which can always be condemned as "activism" by "unelected judges." This charge sometimes succeeds and sometimes fails, but for the judges it is always a concern that acts as a drag on attempts to monitor executive behavior.¶ 4. Judicial credibility.¶ Judges rely on executive officials to carry out their orders and Congress to fund them, and thus ultimately rely on the public to impose sanctions on the political branches when the political branches do not obey a court order. But the public will support the judiciary [\*892] only if the public believes that the judiciary is well motivated rather than ill motivated. Such is often the case, but the credibility of judges is not infinite. n65 Lingering public suspicion of elite decisionmaking places a cap on judicial credibility, and indeed the evidence suggests that judges are often motivated by ideology, at least when it comes to opinion assignment. n66 Thus, in extreme cases, as between a presidential determination that an emergency requires a course of action and a judge's claim to the contrary, the public might well believe the president. n67¶ Here too, we do not claim that judicial oversight is a total failure. Doctrinal lawyers focus, sometimes to excess, on a handful of great cases in which judges have checked or constrained discretionary executive action, even in domains involving foreign policy or national security. Cases such as Youngstown, n68 the Pentagon Papers case, n69 and recently Hamdan n70 head this list. Undoubtedly, however, there is a [\*893] large gap between executive discretion and judicial capacities, or even between executive discretion and the sum of congressional and judicial capacities working in tandem. In times of emergency, especially, both Congress and the judiciary defer to the executive. n71 Legislators and judges understand that the executive's comparative institutional advantages in secrecy, force, and unitariness are all the more useful during emergencies, so that it is worthwhile transferring more discretion to the executive even if it results in an increased risk of executive abuse. The result is that cases such as the ones we have listed are the exception, not the rule, at least during the heat of the emergency.¶ C. The Madisonian System and the Well-Motivated Executive¶ The Madisonian system of oversight has not totally failed. Sometimes legislators overcome the temptation to free ride; sometimes they invest in protecting the separation of powers or legislative prerogatives. Sometimes judges review exercises of executive discretion, even during emergencies. But often enough, legislators and judges have no real alternative to letting executive officials exercise discretion unchecked. The Madisonian system is a partial failure; compensating mechanisms must be adopted to fill the area of slack, the institutional gap between executive discretion and the oversight capacities of other institutions. Again, the magnitude of this gap is unclear, but plausibly it is quite large; we will assume that it is.¶ It is often assumed that this partial failure of the Madisonian system unshackles and therefore benefits ill-motivated executives. This is grievously incomplete. The failure of the Madisonian system harms the well-motivated executive as much as it benefits the ill-motivated one. Where Madisonian oversight fails, the well-motivated executive is a victim of his own power. Voters, legislators, and judges will be wary of granting further discretion to an executive whose motivations are uncertain and possibly nefarious. The partial failure of Madisonian oversight thus threatens a form of inefficiency, a kind of contracting failure that makes potentially everyone, including the voters, worse off.¶ Our central question, then, is what the well-motivated executive can do to solve or at least ameliorate the problem. The solution is for the executive to complement his (well-motivated) first-order policy goals with second-order mechanisms for demonstrating credibility to other actors. We thus do not address the different question of what voters, legislators, judges, and other actors should do about an execu [\*894] tive who is ill motivated and known to be so. That project involves shoring up or replacing the Madisonian system to block executive dictatorship. Our project is the converse of this, and involves finding new mechanisms to help the well-motivated executive credibly distinguish himself as such.¶ IV. Executive Signaling: Law and Mechanisms¶ We suggest that the executive's credibility problem can be solved by second-order mechanisms of executive signaling. In the general case, well-motivated executives send credible signals by taking actions that are more costly for ill-motivated actors than for well-motivated ones, thus distinguishing themselves from their ill-motivated mimics. Among the specific mechanisms we discuss, an important subset involves executive self-binding, whereby executives commit themselves to a course of action that would impose higher costs on ill-motivated actors. Commitments themselves have value as signals of benign motivations.¶ This departs from the usual approach in legal scholarship. Legal theory has often discussed self-binding by "government" or government officials. In constitutional theory, it is often suggested that constitutions represent an attempt by "the people" to bind "themselves" against their own future decisionmaking pathologies, or relatedly, that constitutional prohibitions represent mechanisms by which governments commit themselves not to expropriate investments or to exploit their populations. n72 Whether or not this picture is coherent, n73 it is not the question we examine here, although some of the relevant considerations are similar. n74 We are not concerned with binding the president so that he cannot abuse his powers, but with how he might bind himself or take other actions that enhance his credibility, so that he can generate support from the public and other members of the government. [\*895] ¶ Furthermore, our question is subconstitutional: it is whether a well-motivated executive, acting within an established set of constitutional and statutory rules, can use signaling mechanisms to generate public trust. Accordingly, we proceed by assuming that no constitutional amendments or new statutes will be enacted. Within these constraints, what can a well-motivated executive do to bootstrap himself to credibility? The problem for the well-motivated executive is to credibly signal his benign motivations. In general, the solution is to engage in actions that are less costly for good types than for bad types.¶ We begin with some relevant law, then examine a set of possible mechanisms -- emphasizing both the conditions under which they might succeed and the conditions under which they might not -- and conclude by examining the costs of credibility.¶ A. A Preliminary Note on Law and Self-Binding¶ Many of our mechanisms are unproblematic from a legal perspective, as they involve presidential actions that are clearly lawful. But a few raise legal questions; in particular, those that involve self-binding. n75 Can a president bind himself to respect particular first-order policies? With qualifications, the answer is yes, at least to the same extent that a legislature can. Formally, a duly promulgated executive rule or order binds even the executive unless and until it is validly abrogated, thereby establishing a new legal status quo. n76 The legal authority to establish a new status quo allows a president to create inertia or political constraints that will affect his own future choices. In a practical sense, presidents, like legislatures, have great de facto power to adopt policies that shape the legal landscape for the future. A [\*896] president might commit himself to a long-term project of defense procurement or infrastructure or foreign policy, narrowing his own future choices and generating new political coalitions that will act to defend the new rules or policies.¶ More schematically, we may speak of formal and informal means of self-binding:¶ 1. The president might use formal means to bind himself. This is possible in the sense that an executive order, if otherwise valid, legally binds the president while it is in effect and may be enforced by the courts. It is not possible in the sense that the president can always repeal the executive order if he can bear the political and reputational costs of doing so.¶ 2. The president might use informal means to bind himself. This is not only possible but frequent and important. Issuing an executive rule providing for the appointment of special prosecutors, as Nixon did, is not a formal self-binding. n77 However, there may be large political costs to repealing the order. This effect does not depend on the courts' willingness to enforce the order, even against Nixon himself. Court enforcement makes the order legally binding while it is in place, but only political and reputational enforcement can protect it from repeal. Just as a dessert addict might announce to his friends that he is going on a no-dessert diet in order to raise the reputational costs of backsliding and thus commit himself, so, too, the executive's issuance of a self-binding order can trigger reputational costs. In such cases, repeal of an executive order may be seen as a breach of faith even if no other institution ever enforces it.¶ In what follows, we will invoke both formal and informal mechanisms. For our purposes, the distinction between the authority to engage in de jure self-binding (legally limited and well-defined) and the power to engage in de facto self-binding (broad and amorphous) is secondary. So long as policies are deliberately chosen with a view to generating credibility, and do so by constraining the president's own future choices in ways that impose greater costs on ill-motivated [\*897] presidents than on well-motivated ones, it does not matter whether the constraint is formal or informal.¶ B. Mechanisms¶ What signaling mechanisms might a well-motivated executive adopt to credibly assure voters, legislators, and judges that his policies rest on judgments about the public interest, rather than on power maximization, partisanship, or other nefarious motives?¶ 1. Intrabranch separation of powers.¶ In an interesting treatment of related problems, Neal Katyal suggests that the failure of the Madisonian system counsels "internal separation of powers" within the executive branch. n78 Abdication by Congress means that there are few effective checks on executive power; second-best substitutes are necessary. Katyal proposes some mechanisms that would be adopted by Congress, such as oversight hearings by the minority party, but his most creative proposals are for arrangements internal to the executive branch, such as redundancy and competition among agencies, stronger employment protections for civil servants, and internal adjudication of executive controversies by insulated "executive" decisionmakers who resemble judges in many ways. n79¶ Katyal's argument is relevant because the mechanisms he discusses might be understood as signaling devices, but his overall approach is conceptually flawed on two grounds. First, the assumption that second-best constraints on the executive should reproduce the Madisonian separation of powers within the executive branch is never defended. The idea seems to be that this is as close as we can get to the first-best, while holding constant everything else in our constitutional order. But the general theory of second-best states that approaching as closely as possible to the first-best will not necessarily be the preferred strategy; n80 the best approach may be to adjust matters on other margins as well, in potentially unpredictable ways. If the Madisonian system has failed in the ways Katyal suggests, the best compensating [\*898] adjustment might be, for all we know, to switch to a parliamentary system. (We assume that no large scale changes of this sort are possible, whereas Katyal seemingly assumes that they are, or at least does not make clear his assumptions in this regard.) Overall, Katyal's view has a kind of fractal quality; each branch should reproduce within itself the very same separation of powers structure that also describes the whole system, but it is not explained why the constitutional order should be fractal.¶ Second, Katyal's proposals for internal separation of powers are self-defeating: the motivations that Katyal ascribes to the executive are inconsistent with the executive adopting or respecting the prescriptions Katyal recommends. n81 Katyal never quite says so explicitly, but he clearly envisions the executive as a power-maximizing actor, in the sense that the president seeks to remove all constraints on his current choices. n82 Such an executive would not adopt or enforce the internal separation of powers to check himself. Executive signaling is not, even in principle, a solution to the lack of constraints on a power-maximizing executive in the sense Katyal implicitly intends. Although an ill-motivated executive might bind himself to enhance his strategic credibility, as explained above, he would not do so in order to restore the balance of powers. Nor is it possible, given Katyal's premise of legislative passivity or abdication, that Congress would force the internal separation of powers on the executive. In what follows, we limit ourselves to proposals that are consistent with the motivations, beliefs, and political opportunities that we ascribe to the well-motivated executive, to whom the proposals are addressed. This limitation ensures that the proposals are not self-defeating, whatever their other drawbacks.¶ The contrast here must not be drawn too simply. A well-motivated executive, in our sense, would attempt to increase his power if fully informed voters would want him to do so. The very point of demonstrating credibility is to allow voters and legislators to increase the discretionary authority of the executive, where all will be made better off by doing so. Scholars such as Katyal, who implicitly distrust the executive, however, do not subscribe to this picture of executive motivations. Rather, they see the executive as an unfaithful agent of the voters; the executive attempts to maximize his power even where fully informed [\*899] voters would prefer otherwise. An actor of that sort will have no incentive to adopt proposals intended to constrain that sort of actor.¶ 2. Independent commissions.¶ We now turn to some conceptually coherent mechanisms of executive signaling. Somewhat analogously to Katyal's idea of the internal separation of powers, a well-motivated executive might establish independent commissions to review policy decisions, either before or after the fact. Presidents do this routinely, especially after a policy has had disastrous outcomes, but sometimes beforehand as well. Independent commissions are typically blue-ribbon and bipartisan. n83¶ We add to this familiar process the idea that the President might gain credibility by publicly committing or binding himself to give the commission authority on some dimension. For example, the president might publicly promise to follow the recommendations of such a commission, or to allow the commission to exercise de facto veto power over a policy decision before it is made, or might promise before the policy is chosen that the commission will be given power to review its success after the fact. To be sure, there will always be some wiggle room in the terms of the promise, but that is true of almost all commitments, which raise the costs of wiggling out even if they do not completely prevent it.¶ Consider whether George W. Bush's credibility would have been enhanced had he appointed a blue-ribbon commission to examine the evidence for weapons of mass destruction in Iraq before the 2003 invasion, and publicly promised not to invade unless the commission found substantial evidence of their existence. Bush would have retained his preexisting legal authority to order the invasion even if the commission found the evidence inadequate, but the political costs of doing so would have been large. Knowing this, and knowing that Bush [\*900] shared that knowledge, the public could have inferred that Bush's professed motive -- elimination of weapons of mass destruction -- was also his real motive. Public promises that inflict reputational costs on badly motivated behavior help the well-motivated executive to credibly distinguish himself from the ill-motivated one.¶ The more common version of this tactic is to appoint commissions after the relevant event, as George W. Bush did to investigate the faulty reports by intelligence agencies that Iraq possessed weapons of mass destruction. n84 If the president appoints after-the-fact commissions, the commissions can enhance his credibility for the next event -- by showing that he will be willing, after that event, to subject his statements to scrutiny by public experts. Here, however, the demonstration of credibility is weaker, because there is no commitment to appoint any after-the-fact commissions in the future, but merely a plausible inference that the president's future behavior will track his past behavior.¶ 3. Bipartisan appointments.¶ In examples of the sort just mentioned, the signaling arises from public position-taking. The well-motivated executive might produce similar effects through appointments to office. n85 A number of statutes require partisan balance on multimember commissions; presidents might approve them because they allow the president to commit to a policy that legislators favor, thus encouraging legislators to increase the scope of the delegation in the first place. n86 For similar reasons, presidents may consent to restrictions on the removal of agency officials, [\*901] because the restriction enables the president to commit to giving the agency some autonomy from the president's preferences. n87¶ Similar mechanisms can work even where no statutes are in the picture. As previously mentioned, during World War II, FDR appointed Republicans to important cabinet positions, making Stimson his Secretary of War. n88 Clinton appointed William Cohen, a moderate Republican, as Secretary of Defense in order to shore up his credibility on security issues. Bipartisanship of this sort might improve the deliberation that precedes decisions, by impeding various forms of herding, cascades, and groupthink; n89 however, we focus on its credibility-generating effects. By (1) expanding the circle of those who share the president's privileged access to information, (2) ensuring that policy is partly controlled by officials whose preferences differ from the president's, and (3) inviting a potential whistleblower into the tent, bipartisanship helps to dispel the suspicion that policy decisions rest on partisan motives or extreme preferences, which in turn encourages broader delegations of discretion from the public and Congress.¶ A commitment to bipartisanship is only one way in which appointments can generate credibility. Presidents might simply appoint a person with a reputation for integrity, as when President Nixon appointed Archibald Cox as special prosecutor (although plausibly Nixon did so because he was forced to do so by political constraints, rather than as a tactic for generating credibility). A person with well-known preferences on a particular issue, even if not of the other party or widely respected for impartiality, can serve as a credible whistleblower on that issue. Thus presidents routinely award cabinet posts to leaders of subsets of the president's own party, leaders whose preferences are known to diverge from the president's on the subject. One point of this is to credibly assure the relevant interest groups that the president will not deviate (too far) from their preferences.¶ More generally, the decision by presidents to bring into their administrations members of other parties, or persons with a reputation for bipartisanship and integrity, illustrates the formation of domestic [\*902] coalitions of the willing. Presidents can informally bargain around the formal separation of powers n90 by employing subsets of Congress, or of the opposing party, to generate credibility while maintaining a measure of institutional control. FDR was willing to appoint Knox and Stimson, but not to give the Republicans in Congress a veto. Truman was willing to ally with Arthur Vandenberg but not with all the Republicans; Clinton was willing to appoint William Cohen but not Newt Gingrich. George W. Bush likewise made a gesture towards credibility by briefing members of the Senate Intelligence Committee -- including Democrats -- on the administration's secret surveillance program(s), which provided a useful talking point when the existence of the program(s) was revealed to the public.¶ 4. Counter-partisanship.¶ Related to bipartisanship is what might be called counter-partisanship: presidents have greater credibility when they choose policies that cut against the grain of their party's platform or their own presumed preferences. n91 Only Nixon could go to China, and only Clinton could engineer welfare reform. Voters and publics rationally employ a political heuristic: the relevant policy, which voters are incapable of directly assessing, must be highly beneficial if it is chosen by a president who is predisposed against it by convictions or partisan loyalty. n92 Accordingly, those who wish to move U.S. terrorism policy towards greater security and less liberty might do well to support the election of a Democrat. n93 By the same logic, George W. Bush is widely suspected [\*903] of nefarious motives when he rounds up alleged enemy combatants, but not when he creates a massive prescription drug benefit.¶ Counter-partisanship can powerfully enhance the president's credibility, but it depends heavily on a lucky alignment of political stars. A peace-loving president has credibility when he declares a military emergency but not when he appeases; a belligerent president has credibility when he offers peace but not when he advocates military solutions. A lucky nation has a well-motivated president with a belligerent reputation when international tensions diminish (Ronald Reagan) and a president with a pacific reputation when they grow (Abraham Lincoln, who opposed the Mexican War). But a nation is not always lucky.¶ 5. Transparency.¶ The well-motivated executive might commit to transparency as a way to reduce the costs to outsiders of monitoring his actions. n94 The FDR strategy of inviting potential whistleblowers from the opposite party into government is a special case of this; the implicit threat is that the whistleblower will make public any evidence of partisan motivations. The more ambitious case involves actually exposing the executive's decisionmaking processes to observation. To the extent that an ill-motivated executive cannot publicly acknowledge his motivations or publicly instruct subordinates to take them into account in decisionmaking, transparency will tend to exclude those motivations from the decisionmaking process. The public will know that only a well-motivated executive would promise transparency in the first place, and the public can therefore draw an inference to credibility.¶ Credibility is especially enhanced when transparency is effected through journalists with reputations for integrity or with political [\*904] preferences opposite to those of the president. Thus, George W. Bush gave Bob Woodward unprecedented access to White House decisionmaking and perhaps even to classified intelligence, n95 with the expectation that the material would be published. This sort of disclosure to journalists is not real-time transparency -- no one expects meetings of the National Security Council to appear on C-SPAN -- but the anticipation of future disclosure can have a disciplining effect in the present. By inviting this disciplining effect, the administration engages in signaling in the present through (the threat of) future transparency.¶ There are complex tradeoffs here, because transparency can have a range of harmful effects. As far as process is concerned, decisionmakers under public scrutiny may posture for the audience, may freeze their views or positions prematurely, and may hesitate to offer proposals or reasons for which they can later be blamed if things go wrong. n96 As for substance, transparency can frustrate the achievement of programmatic or policy goals themselves. Where security policy is at stake, secrecy is sometimes necessary to surprise enemies or to keep them guessing. Finally, one must take account of the incentives of the actors who expose the facts -- especially journalists who might reward sources who give them access by portraying their decisionmaking in a favorable light. n97¶ We will take up the costs of credibility shortly. n98 In general, however, the existence of costs does not mean that the credibility-generating mechanisms are useless. Quite the contrary: where the executive uses such mechanisms, voters and legislators can draw an inference that the executive is well motivated, precisely because the existence [\*905] of costs would have given an ill-motivated executive an excuse not to use those mechanisms.¶ 6. Multilateralism.¶ Another credibility-generating mechanism for the executive is to enter into alliances or international institutions that subject foreign policy decisions to multilateral oversight. Because the information gap between voters and legislators, on the one hand, and the executive on the other, is especially wide in foreign affairs, there is also wide scope for suspicion and conspiracy theories. If the president undertakes a unilateral foreign policy, some sectors of the domestic public will be suspicious of his motives. All recent presidents have faced this problem. In the case of George W. Bush, as we suggested, many have questioned whether the invasion of Iraq was undertaken to eliminate weapons of mass destruction, or to protect human rights, or instead to safeguard the oil supply, or because the president has (it is alleged) always wanted to invade Iraq because Saddam Hussein attempted to assassinate his father. n99 In the case of Bill Clinton, some said that the cruise missile attack on Osama bin Laden's training camp in Afghanistan was a "wag the dog" tactic intended to distract attention from Clinton's impeachment. n100¶ A public commitment to multilateralism can close or narrow the credibility gap. Suppose that a group of nations have common interests on one dimension -- say, security from terrorism or from proliferation of nuclear weapons -- but disparate interests on other dimensions -- say, conflicting commercial or political interests. Multilateralism can be understood as a policy that in effect requires a supermajority vote -- or even a unanimous vote -- of the group to license intervention. The supermajority requirement ensures that only interventions promoting the security interest common to the group will be approved, while interventions that promote some political agenda not shared by the requisite supermajority will be rejected. Knowing this, domestic audiences can infer that interventions that gain multilateral approval do not rest on disreputable motives.¶ It follows that multilateralism can be either formal or informal. Action by the United Nations Security Council can be taken only under formal voting rules that require unanimous agreement of the permanent members. n101 Informally, in the face of increasing tensions [\*906] with Iran, George W. Bush's policy has included extensive multilateral consultations and a quasicommitment not to intervene unilaterally. Knowing that his credibility is thin after Iraq, Bush has presumably adopted this course in part to reassure domestic audiences that there is no nefarious motive behind an intervention, should one occur.¶ It also follows that multilateralism and bipartisan congressional authorization may be substitutes, in terms of generating credibility. In both cases the public knows that the cooperators -- partisan opponents or other nations, as the case may be -- are unlikely to share any secret agenda the president may have. The substitution, however, is only partial; as we suggested in Part III, the Madisonian emphasis on bipartisan authorization has proven insufficient. The interests of parties within Congress diverge less than do the interests of different nations, which makes the credibility gain greater under multilateralism. In eras of unified government, the ability of the president's party to put a policy through Congress without the cooperation of the other party (ignoring the threat of a Senate filibuster, a weapon that the minority party often hesitates to wield) often undermines the policy's credibility even if members of the minority go along. After all, the minority members may be going along precisely because they anticipate that opposition is fruitless, in which case no inference about the policy's merits should be drawn from their approval. Moreover, even a well-motivated president may prefer, all else equal, to generate credibility through mechanisms that do not involve Congress, if concerned about delay, leaks, or obstruction by small legislative minorities. Thus Truman relied on a resolution of the United Nations Security Council n102 rather than congressional authorization to prosecute the Korean War.¶ The costs of multilateralism are straightforward. Multilateralism increases the costs of reaching decisions, because a larger group must coordinate its actions, and increases the risks of false negatives -- failure to undertake justified interventions. A president who declines to bind himself through multilateralism may thus be either ill motivated and desirous of pursuing an agenda not based on genuine security [\*907] goals, or well motivated and worried about the genuine costs of multilateralism. As usual, however, the credibility-generating inference holds asymmetrically: precisely because an ill-motivated president may use the costs of multilateralism as a plausible pretext, a president who does pursue multilateralism is more likely to be well motivated.¶ 7. Legal liability.¶ For completeness, we mention that the well-motivated executive might in principle subject himself to legal liability for actions or outcomes that only an ill-motivated executive would undertake. Consider the controversy surrounding George W. Bush's telecommunications surveillance program, which the president has claimed covers only communications in which one of the parties is overseas, not domestic-to-domestic calls. n103 There is widespread suspicion that this claim is false. n104 In a recent poll, 26 percent of respondents believed that the National Security Agency listens to their calls. n105 The credibility gap arises because it is difficult in the extreme to know what exactly the Agency is doing, and what the costs and benefits of the alternatives are.¶ Here the credibility gap might be narrowed by creating a cause of action, for damages, on behalf of anyone who can show that domestic-to-domestic calls were examined. n106 Liability would be strict, because a negligence rule -- whether the Agency exerted reasonable efforts to avoid examining the communication -- requires too much information for judges, jurors, and voters to evaluate, and would just reproduce the monitoring problems that gave rise to the credibility gap in the first place. Strict liability, by contrast, would require a much narrower factual inquiry. Crucially, a commitment to strict liability would only be made by an executive who intended to minimize the incidence of (even unintentional and nonnegligent) surveillance of purely domestic communications. [\*908] ¶ However, there are legal and practical problems here, perhaps insuperable ones. Legally, it is hardly clear that the president could, on his own authority, create a cause of action against himself or his agents to be brought in federal court. It is well within presidential authority to create executive commissions for hearing claims against the United States, for disbursing funds under benefit programs, and so on; but the problem here is that there might be no pot of money from which to fund damages. The so-called Judgment Fund, out of which damages against the executive are usually paid, is restricted to statutorily specified lawsuits. n107 Even so, statutory authorization for the president to create the strict liability cause of action would be necessary, n108 as we discuss shortly. n109 Practically, it is unclear whether government agents can be forced to "internalize costs" through money damages in the way that private parties can, at least if the treasury is paying those damages. n110 And if it is, voters may not perceive the connection between governmental action and subsequent payouts in any event.¶ 8. The news conference.¶ Presidents use news conferences to demonstrate their mastery of the details of policy. Many successful presidents, like FDR, conducted numerous such conferences. n111 Ill-motivated presidents will not care [\*909] about policy if their interest is just holding power for its own sake. Thus, they would regard news conferences as burdensome and risky chores. The problem is that a well-motivated president does not necessarily care about details of policy, as opposed to its broad direction, and journalists might benefit by tripping up a president in order to score points. Reagan, for example, did not care about policy details, but is generally regarded as a successful president. n112 To make Reagan look good, his handlers devoted considerable resources trying to prepare him for news conferences, resources that might have been better used in other ways. n113¶ 9. "Precommitment politics." n114¶ We have been surveying mechanisms that the well-motivated executive can employ once in office. However, in every case the analysis can be driven back one stage to the electoral campaign for executive office. During electoral campaigns, candidates for the presidency take public positions that partially commit them to subsequent policies, by raising the reputational costs of subsequent policy changes. Under current law, campaign promises are very difficult to enforce in the courts. n115 But even without legal enforcement, position-taking helps to separate the well-motivated from the ill-motivated candidate, because the costs to the former of making promises of this sort are higher. To be sure, many such promises are vacuous, meaning that voters will not sanction a president who violates them, but some turn out to have real [\*910] force, as George H.W. Bush discovered when he broke his clear pledge not to raise taxes. n116¶ 10. The possibility of statutory commitments.¶ So far, we have proceeded on the austere assumption that no constitutional or statutory changes are allowed. We have confined ourselves to credibility-generating mechanisms that arise by executive signaling -- commitments that the executive could initiate by legal order or by public position-taking, without the permission of other institutions.¶ However, this restriction may stack the deck too heavily against the solutions we suggest. A central example of the credibility problem, after all, arises when voters and legislators want to enact statutes transferring further discretion to a well-motivated executive, but are not sure that that is the sort of executive they are dealing with. In such cases, there is no reason to exclude the possibility that the executive might ask Congress to provide him with statutory signaling mechanisms that he would otherwise lack. In the surveillance example, Congress is currently considering amendments to relevant statutes. n117 It is easy to imagine a well-motivated executive proposing that Congress explicitly ratify his authority to examine overseas communications, while also proposing -- as a demonstration of credibility -- that the ratification be bundled with oversight mechanisms, review by an independent agency or special court, or a statutory cause of action imposing strict liability for prohibited forms of surveillance.¶ C. The Costs of Credibility¶ The mechanisms we have discussed generate credibility, which is a benefit for voters and legislators who would like to increase the discretion of the well-motivated executive. What of the cost side? In each case, there are costs to generating credibility, although the character and magnitude of the costs differ across mechanisms.¶ Signaling is by definition costly. The presence of a cost is what distinguishes ill-motivated mimics, who are unwilling to incur the cost, from genuine good types. In this context, the inherent costliness of signaling means that the president must use time or resources to establish credibility with the public when, if voters were perfectly informed, that time and those resources could be expended directly on [\*911] determining and implementing policy. But costs can be reflected in more subtle ways as well. Many of these mechanisms rely on the participation of agents who themselves may be ill motivated. Whistleblowers can leak information in order to damage the administration or cry wolf when there is no partisanship, merely substantive disagreement. Journalists might produce images distorted by their own biases and strategic agendas. Miscellaneous costs arise in other ways as well. Multilateralism raises decision costs, transparency can harm deliberation, and so on. n118¶ Often the basic tradeoff facing presidents is that credibility is gained at the expense of control. Mechanisms such as creating independent commissions and pursuing multilateralism illustrate that to gain credibility, presidents must surrender part of their control over policy choices, partially constraining executive discretion in the present in return for more trust, which will then translate into more discretion in the future. The loss of control is a cost, even to the well-motivated executive. To be sure, the well-motivated executive may be more willing than the ill-motivated one to trade some loss of present control for increased future discretion, if the ill-motivated executive tends to be myopic or to discount the future more heavily. However, it is not clear that is so -- many terrifying dictators have been quite far-sighted -- and in any event everything depends upon the particulars of the case.
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It is not hard to think of situations where congressional consent cannot be obtained in time to act. Time for congressional deliberation, which leads only to passivity and isolation and not smarter decisions, will come at the price of speed and secrecy.¶
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The president also has additional constitutional authority anytime to use force to protect the Unites States, either in self-defense or because he believes that it's in our national security interest. So if President Obama concludes that it's necessary to carry out a drone strike against a terror suspect, but that individual does not fall into the categories covered by the AUMF, he would have additional constitutional authority. But this administration has taken great pains to emphasize that it has been relying on congressional grant of authority rather than the president's own constitutional authority to conduct most of its counterterrorism operations. It has wanted to do that to contrast itself with the Bush administration, which had, at least early in its tenure, relied heavily on the president's constitutional authority. It's not clear though, at this point, given how old and somewhat limited the AUMF is, if the Obama administration has now been forced to rely on constitutional powers for certain drone strikes. It appears to many observers that the administration may be stretching the limits of the AUMF by targeting people who were not responsible for 9/11 or who were not affiliated or associated co-belligerents with those who carried out 9/11. In theory, could the president always claim constitutional authority with regard to these strikes? Although, as you pointed out, the administration is obviously loath to do that. This administration is already finding that 95 percent of its counterterrorism policies, and the legal basis therefore, are the same as the Bush administration's. Absolutely. I think the issue is, in this administration, political. This administration is already finding that 95 percent of its counterterrorism policies, and the legal basis therefore, are the same as the Bush administration's. It came into office with both domestic and international supporters expecting that it would change all of those policies. So one area where it really has been loath to act like the Bush administration is to rely heavily on the president's constitutional authority. We simply don't know whether they are doing it, but politically I'm sure that administration officials would be very reluctant to have to acknowledge that they are acting outside of the grant given to them by Congress.