## 1AC

### Plan

#### Plan: The United States Federal Judiciary should subject United States’ targeted killing operations to judicial ex post review by allowing a cause of action for damages arising directly out of the constitutional provision allegedly offended, on the basis that special factors do not preclude a right of action.

### Hegemony

#### Domestic and international support for the US drone program is collapsing, threatening to shut it down entirely. Reform is key.

Zenko, CFR Fellow, 13 (Micah, is the Douglas Dillon fellow in the Center for Preventive Action (CPA) at the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR)., “Reforming U.S. Drone Strike Policies,” http://www.cfr.org/wars-and-warfare/reforming-us-drone-strike-policies/p29736)

In his Nobel Peace Prize acceptance speech, President Obama declared: “Where force is necessary, we have a moral and strategic interest in binding ourselves to certain rules of conduct. Even as we confront a vicious adversary that abides by no rules, I believe the United States of America must remain a standard bearer in the conduct of war.”63 Under President Obama drone strikes have expanded and intensified, and they will remain a central component of U.S. counterterrorism operations for at least another decade, according to U.S. officials.64 But much as the Bush administration was compelled to reform its controversial counterterrorism practices, it is likely that the United States will ultimately be forced by domestic and international pressure to scale back its drone strike policies. The Obama administration can preempt this pressure by clearly articulating that the rules that govern its drone strikes, like all uses of military force, are based in the laws of armed conflict and international humanitarian law; by engaging with emerging drone powers; and, most important, by matching practice with its stated policy by limiting drone strikes to those individuals it claims are being targeted (which would reduce the likelihood of civilian casualties since the total number of strikes would significantly decrease). The choice the United States faces is not between unfettered drone use and sacrificing freedom of action, but between drone policy reforms by design or drone policy reforms by default. Recent history demonstrates that domestic political pressure could severely limit drone strikes in ways that the CIA or JSOC have not anticipated. In support of its counterterrorism strategy, the Bush administration engaged in the extraordinary rendition of terrorist suspects to third countries, the use of enhanced interrogation techniques, and warrantless wiretapping. Although the Bush administration defended its policies as critical to protecting the U.S. homeland against terrorist attacks, unprecedented domestic political pressure led to significant reforms or termination. Compared to Bush-era counterterrorism policies, drone strikes are vulnerable to similar—albeit still largely untapped—moral outrage, and they are even more susceptible to political constraints because they occur in plain sight. Indeed, a negative trend in U.S. public opinion on drones is already apparent. Between February and June 2012, U.S. support for drone strikes against suspected terrorists fell from 83 percent to 62 percent—which represents less U.S. support than enhanced interrogation techniques maintained in the mid-2000s.65 Finally, U.S. drone strikes are also widely opposed by the citizens of important allies, emerging powers, and the local populations in states where strikes occur.66 States polled reveal overwhelming opposition to U.S. drone strikes: Greece (90 percent), Egypt (89 percent), Turkey (81 percent), Spain (76 percent), Brazil (76 percent), Japan (75 percent), and Pakistan (83 percent).67 This is significant because the United States cannot conduct drone strikes in the most critical corners of the world by itself. Drone strikes require the tacit or overt support of host states or neighbors. If such states decided not to cooperate—or to actively resist—U.S. drone strikes, their effectiveness would be immediately and sharply reduced, and the likelihood of civilian casualties would increase. This danger is not hypothetical. In 2007, the Ethiopian government terminated its U.S. military presence after public revelations that U.S. AC-130 gunships were launching attacks from Ethiopia into Somalia. Similarly, in late 2011, Pakistan evicted all U.S. military and intelligence drones, forcing the United States to completely rely on Afghanistan to serve as a staging ground for drone strikes in Pakistan. The United States could attempt to lessen the need for tacit host-state support by making significant investments in armed drones that can be flown off U.S. Navy ships, conducting electronic warfare or missile attacks on air defenses, allowing downed drones to not be recovered and potentially transferred to China or Russia, and losing access to the human intelligence networks on the ground that are critical for identifying targets. According to U.S. diplomats and military officials, active resistance— such as the Pakistani army shooting down U.S. armed drones— is a legitimate concern. In this case, the United States would need to either end drone sorties or escalate U.S. military involvement by attacking Pakistani radar and antiaircraft sites, thus increasing the likelihood of civilian casualties.68 Beyond where drone strikes currently take place, political pressure could severely limit options for new U.S. drone bases. For example, the Obama administration is debating deploying armed drones to attack al-Qaeda in the Islamic Maghreb (AQIM) in North Africa, which would likely require access to a new airbase in the region. To some extent, anger at U.S. sovereignty violations is an inevitable and necessary trade-off when conducting drone strikes. Nevertheless, in each of these cases, domestic anger would partially or fully abate if the United States modified its drone policy in the ways suggested below.

#### And, Drones are critical to resolve U.S. military overreach and prevent reductions in power projection capacity

Rushforth 12 (Elinor June, J.D. candidate, University of Arizona, James E. Rogers College of Law, “THERE'S AN APP FOR THAT: IMPLICATIONS OF ARMED DRONE ATTACKS AND PERSONALITY STRIKES BY THE UNITED STATES AGAINST NON-CITIZENS, 2004-2012” Arizona Journal of International and Comparative Law 29 Ariz. J. Int'l & Comp. Law 623, Lexis)

G. Arguments Made by Proponents of the Drone Program The drone program is a fixture in the Obama administration's fight against terror n163 and the moral and legal defense the administration offers serves as an indication that these attacks will continue. n164 Further, proponents of the drone program argue their use reduces risk to U.S. service members, decreases American weariness at foreign intervention, and minimizes civilian casualties during attacks and missions. First, because asymmetric warfare has increased, the United States has sought out creative ways to fight terrorists, insurgents, and asymmetric wars more generally. n165 Despite controversy surrounding the drone program, it allows surveillance and lethal missions without putting U.S. troops in harm's way. n166 This is an almost incontrovertible positive factor when considering American public support for a new and technologically incredible program. n167 Due to the lingering Overseas Contingency Operations, Americans are eager for some good news, and this program can deliver. Drone operators are on the front lines of a new and more sophisticated type of war and the information their surveillance missions provide can prove invaluable to service members on the ground. n168 This dual benefit weighs heavily in favor of drone proliferation. Drones can be [\*649] deployed to survey and attack where it would otherwise be impractical for troops, and a single pilot, to venture. n169 However, the analysis of this benefit must be separated between the two organizations employing drones: the military and the CIA. n170 Drones are used for surveillance and killing by both organizations but usually with different purposes in mind. n171 The military has focused its drones primarily on tactical support of ground forces, n172 either by providing information about enemy tactics or eliminating combatants entrenched in defended positions. n173 The CIA uses drones to eliminate specific targets in remote areas in which conventional U.S. military action would be impossible. n174 During Operation Southern Watch, the military used drones to police no-fly zones in Iraq and they were eventually used to target Iraqi radar systems during the second Iraq War. n175 In Operation Enduring Freedom, the military has expanded its use of armed drones to provide air support to ground operations and to act as "killer scouts." n176 By providing immediate battle damage assessment, drones enable commanders to determine if further action is necessary, and provide a new perspective on the field. n177 In Operation Iraqi Freedom, the armed drone retained and expanded its roles targeting anti-aircraft vehicles, performing as a decoy revealing enemy positions, and aiding in a rescue mission. n178 Based on these successes, military leaders maintain the value of drones. n179 The CIA's use [\*650] of drones facilitates U.S. attacks in environments where it is deemed too dangerous for ground troops to have a physical presence. n180 The ability to protect American lives, keep military costs down, and damage terrorist infrastructure and leadership is central to proponents' view of this program. Second, the American public has grown tired of drawn-out conflicts and foreign intervention, and the drone program offers a more palatable form of foreign involvement. n181 President Obama claims that "it is time to focus on nation-building here at home" and, presumably, the drone program allows the government to operate without deployment of ground troops to areas in which intervention is deemed necessary, be it for humanitarian or military purposes. n182 Lethal operations, surveillance for U.S. military operations, and less costly intervention all become possible when robots are the actual tools. With a weary electorate, the Executive can maintain a presence abroad militarily, while remaining able to argue that its full focus is on protecting and growing our nation at home.

#### And, overreach collapses hegemony through increased isolationism, risking challengers and nuclear war.

Florig, prof International Studies, 10 (Dennis, Professor- Division of International Studies- Hankuk (Korean) University of Foreign Studies, Review of International Studies, vol 36, issue 4, October, 2010, http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=1548783)

IV. Potential Sources of Hegemonic Breakdown and Future Challenges to Hegemony Despite the belief of some in the U.S. in the divine sanction of U.S. hegemony, hegemons do not stand forever any more than the houses of absolute monarchs of earlier ages who claimed celestial legitimation. Theory of hegemonic cycles focuses on the macro-historical process of the rise and decline of hegemonic powers. However, within any one of the long cycles, there are lesser periods of hegemonic weakening and regeneration. The loss of the Vietnam War followed by the oil shock induced recessions of the 1970s and the early 1980s led some to predict the imminent breakdown of U.S. hegemony. The decisive victory in the first Iraq war and the revival of the U.S. economy in the 1990s led others to talk of a second American century. Both were premature. Similarly, the short term outcome of the war in Iraq, whether it is the stabilization of a pro-American regime, the coming to power of a government unfriendly to the U.S. or on-going civil war will almost certainly lead either to new euphoric pronouncements about the 21st century belonging to the U.S. or claims that the end of U.S. hegemony are nigh. Again, either conclusion will most likely be premature. However, the outcome on the main battlefield so far in the Terrorism Wars will indicate much about the future direction of the global system. Hegemonic states and even hegemonic systems do have life spans, however hard it is to gauge them. On the home front, the Iraq War, like the Vietnam War before it, has laid bare one of the key problems of U.S. missionary hegemony—the fervor of elites is not always matched by the willingness of the population to sacrifice. The expansive, messianic conception of the U.S. role in the world predominates in American thinking, but it is not without challenge. The image of the U.S. as a “shining city on a hill” is rarely disputed, but the need for the U.S. to engage in military conflict abroad to spread its principles does come into question when the costs become too high and the benefits are not apparent.24 After World War I the ideology of American mission was not strong enough to overcome the resistance of ordinary citizens at being conscripted to fight in distant conflicts overseas and political elites not yet accommodated to the multilateralism hegemony entails. Thus there was a period of renunciation of hegemonic ambitions. Certainly since World War II the missionary ideology has held sway among policymaking elites. However, the political unpopularity of the long Vietnam War and the second Iraq War show that the average American citizen does not share the elite’s taste for battle overseas if the sacrifice in blood and treasure becomes steep. There is a cycle of hegemonic overreach, political reaction to the costs of failed policies, and then rebuilding of the ideology of messianic intervention. American sense of exceptionalism does not disappear at any time during this process. However, in the reactive part of the cycle the “city on the hill” tends to try to turn inward, wanting more to avoid contamination from the impure world outside than to take on new challenges. But since that conception of America is not adequate to sustain U.S. hegemony, the sense of America’s world historic mission must be painstaking rebuilt through political rhetoric, spoon feeding the mass media the right pictures of the world, and infusing civil society with political messianism. Someday either the overreach may be too costly and/or the public resistance may be too great to effectively rebuild the American missionary ideology. But that day does not seem just around the corner. There is an even larger question than whether the U.S. will remain the hegemonic state within a western dominated system. How long will the West remain hegemonic in the global system?25 Since Spengler the issue of the decline of the West has been debated. It would be hard to question current western dominance of virtually every global economic, political, military, or ideological system today. In some ways the domination of the West seems even more firm than it was in the past because the West is no longer a group of fiercely competing states but a much more cohesive force. In the era of western domination, breakdown of the rule of each hegemonic state has come because of competition from powerful rival western states at the core of the system leading to system-wide war. The unique characteristic of the Cold War and particularly the post-Cold War system is that the core capitalist states are now to a large degree politically united and increasingly economically integrated. In the 21st century, two factors taking place outside the West seem more of a threat to the reproduction of the hegemony of the American state and the western system than conflict between western states: 1. resistance to western hegemony in the Muslim world and other parts of the subordinated South, and 2. the rise of newly powerful or reformed super states. Relations between the core and periphery have already undergone one massive transformation in the 20th century—decolonization. The historical significance of decolonization was overshadowed somewhat by the emergence of the Cold War and the nuclear age. Recognition of its impact was dampened somewhat by the subsequent relative lack of change of fundamental economic relations between core and periphery. But one of the historical legacies of decolonization is that ideological legitimation has become more crucial in operating the global system. The manufacture of some level of consent, particularly among the elite in the periphery has to some degree replaced brute domination. Less raw force is necessary but in return a greater burden of ideological and cultural legitimation is required. Now it is no longer enough for colonials to obey, willing participants must believe. Therefore, cultural and ideological challenges to the foundations of the liberal capitalist world view assume much greater significance. Thus the resurgence of Islamic fundamentalism, ethnic nationalism, and even social democracy in Latin America as ideologies of opposition have increasing significance in a system dependent on greater levels of willing consent. As Ayoob suggests, the sustained resistance within the Islamic world to western hegemony may have a “demonstration effect” on other southern states with similar grievances against the West.26 The other new dynamic is the re-emergence of great states that at one time or another have been brought low by the western hegemonic system. China, in recent centuries low on the international division of labor, was in some ways a classic case of a peripheral state, or today a semi-peripheral state. But its sheer size, its rapid growth, its currency reserves, its actual and potential markets, etc. make it a major power and a potential future counter hegemon. India lags behind China, but has similar aspirations. Russia has fallen from great power to semi-peripheral status since the collapse of the Soviet empire, but its energy resources and the technological skills of its people make recovery of its former greatness possible. No one knows exactly what the resurgence of Asia portends for the future. However, just as half a century ago global decolonization was a blow to western domination, so the shift in economic production to Asia will redefine global power relations throughout the 21st century. Classical theory of hegemonic cycle is useful if not articulated in too rigid a form. Hegemonic systems do not last forever; they do have a life span. The hegemonic state cannot maintain itself as the fastest growing major economy forever and thus eventually will face relative decline against some major power or powers. The hegemon faces recurrent challenges both on the periphery and from other major powers who feel constrained by the hegemon’s power or are ambitious to usurp its place. Techniques of the application of military force and ideological control may become more sophisticated over time, but so too do techniques of guerilla warfare and ideological forms of resistance such as religious fundamentalism, nationalism, and politicization of ethnic identity. World war may not be imminent, but wars on the periphery have become quite deadly, and the threat of the use of nuclear weapons or other WMD by the rising number of powers who possess them looms.

#### And, power projection solves every scenario for extinction

Brzezinski, John Hopkins American Foreign Policy professor, 2012

(Zbigniew, Strategic Vision: America and the Crisis of Global Power, google books, ldg)

An American decline would impact the nuclear domain most profoundly by inciting a crisis of confidence in the credibility of the American nuclear umbrella. Countries like South Korea, Taiwan, Japan, Turkey, and even Israel, among others, rely on the United States’ extended nuclear deterrence for security. If they were to see the United States slowly retreat from certain regions, forced by circumstances to pull back its guarantees, or even if they were to lose confidence in standing US guarantees, because of the financial, political, military, and diplomatic consequences of an American decline, then they will have to seek security elsewhere. That “elsewhere” security could originate from only two sources: from nuclear weapons of one’s own or from the extended deterrence of another power—most likely Russia, China, or India. It is possible that countries that feel threatened by the ambition of existing nuclear weapon states, the addition of new nuclear weapon states, or the decline in the reliability of American power would develop their own nuclear capabilities. For crypto-nuclear powers like Germany and Japan, the path to nuclear weapons would be easy and fairly quick, given their extensive civilian nuclear industry, their financial success, and their technological acumen. Furthermore, the continued existence of nuclear weapons in North Korea and the potentiality of a nuclear-capable Iran could prompt American allies in the Persian Gulf or East Asia to build their own nuclear deterrents. Given North Korea’s increasingly aggressive and erratic behavior, the failure of the six-party talks, and the widely held distrust of Iran’s megalomaniacal leadership, the guarantees offered by a declining America’s nuclear umbrella might not stave off a regional nuclear arms race among smaller powers. Last but not least, even though China and India today maintain a responsible nuclear posture of minimal deterrence and “no first use,” the uncertainty of an increasingly nuclear world could force both states to reevaluate and escalate their nuclear posture. Indeed, they as well as Russia might even become inclined to extend nuclear assurances to their respective client states. Not only could this signal a renewed regional nuclear arms race between these three aspiring powers but it could also create new and antagonistic spheres of influence in Eurasia driven by competitive nuclear deterrence. The decline of the United States would thus precipitate drastic changes to the nuclear domain. An increase in proliferation among insecure American allies and/or an arms race between the emerging Asian powers are among the more likely outcomes. This ripple effect of proliferation would undermine the transparent management of the nuclear domain and increase the likelihood of interstate rivalry, miscalculation, and eventually even perhaps of international nuclear terror. In addition to the foregoing, in the course of this century the world will face a series of novel geopolitical challenges brought about by significant changes in the physical environment. The management of those changing environmental commons—the growing scarcity of fresh water, the opening of the Arctic, and global warming—will require global consensus and mutual sacrifice. American leadership alone is not enough to secure cooperation on all these issues, but a decline in American influence would reduce the likelihood of achieving cooperative agreements on environmental and resource management. America’s retirement from its role of global policeman could create greater opportunities for emerging powers to further exploit the environmental commons for their own economic gain, increasing the chances of resource-driven conflict, particularly in Asia. The latter is likely to be the case especially in regard to the increasingly scarce water resources in many countries. According to the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), by 2025 more than 2.8 billion people will be living in either water-scarce or water-stressed regions, as global demand for water will double every twenty years.9 While much of the Southern Hemisphere is threatened by potential water scarcity, interstate conflicts—the geopolitical consequences of cross-border water scarcity—are most likely to occur in Central and South Asia, the Middle East, and northeastern Africa, regions where limited water resources are shared across borders and political stability is transient. The combination of political insecurity and resource scarcity is a menacing geopolitical combination. The threat of water conflicts is likely to intensify as the economic growth and increasing demand for water in emerging powers like Turkey and India collides with instability and resource scarcity in rival countries like Iraq and Pakistan. Water scarcity will also test China’s internal stability as its burgeoning population and growing industrial complex combine to increase demand for and decrease supply of usable water. In South Asia, the never-ending political tension between India and Pakistan combined with overcrowding and Pakistan’s heightening internal crises may put the Indus Water Treaty at risk, especially because the river basin originates in the long-disputed territory of Jammu and Kashmir, an area of ever-increasing political and military volatility. The lingering dispute between India and China over the status of Northeast India, an area through which the vital Brahmaputra River flows, also remains a serious concern. As American hegemony disappears and **regional competition intensifies**, disputes over natural resources like water have the potential to develop into full-scale conflicts. The slow thawing of the Arctic will also change the face of the international competition for important resources. With the Arctic becoming increasingly accessible to human endeavor, the five Arctic littoral states—the United States, Canada, Russia, Denmark, and Norway—may rush to lay claim to its bounty of oil, gas, and metals. This run on the Arctic has the potential to cause severe shifts in the geopolitical landscape, particularly to Russia’s advantage. As Vladimir Radyuhin points out in his article entitled “The Arctic’s Strategic Value for Russia,” Russia has the most to gain from access to the Arctic while simultaneously being the target of far north containment by the other four Arctic states, all of which are members of NATO. In many respects this new great game will be determined by who moves first with the most legitimacy, since very few agreements on the Arctic exist. The first Russian supertanker sailed from Europe to Asia via the North Sea in the summer of 2010.10 Russia has an immense amount of land and resource potential in the Arctic. Its territory within the Arctic Circle is 3.1 million square kilometers—around the size of India—and the Arctic accounts for 91% of Russia’s natural gas production, 80% of its explored natural gas reserves, 90% of its offshore hydrocarbon reserves, and a large store of metals.11 Russia is also attempting to increase its claim on the territory by asserting that its continental shelf continues deeper into the Arctic, which could qualify Russia for a 150-mile extension of its Exclusive Economic Zone and add another 1.2 million square kilometers of resource-rich territory. Its first attempt at this extension was denied by the UN Commission on the Continental Shelf, but it is planning to reapply in 2013. Russia considers the Arctic a true extension of its northern border and in a 2008 strategy paper President Medvedev stated that the Arctic would become Russia’s “main strategic resource base” by 2020.12 Despite recent conciliatory summits between Europe and Russia over European security architecture, a large amount of uncertainty and distrust stains the West’s relationship with Russia. The United States itself has always maintained a strong claim on the Arctic and has continued patrolling the area since the end of the Cold War. This was reinforced during the last month of President Bush’s second term when he released a national security directive stipulating that America should “preserve the global mobility of the United States military and civilian vessels and aircraft throughout the Arctic region.” The potentiality of an American decline could embolden Russia to more forcefully assert its control of the Arctic and over Europe via energy politics; though much depends on Russia’s political orientation after the 2012 presidential elections. All five Arctic littoral states will benefit from a peaceful and cooperative agreement on the Arctic—similar to Norway’s and Russia’s 2010 agreement over the Barents Strait—and the geopolitical stability it would provide. Nevertheless, political circumstances could rapidly change in an environment where control over energy remains Russia’s single greatest priority. Global climate change is the final component of the environmental commons and the one with the greatest potential geopolitical impact. Scientists and policy makers alike have projected catastrophic consequences for mankind and the planet if the world average temperature rises by more than two degrees over the next century. Plant and animal species could grow extinct at a rapid pace, large-scale ecosystems could collapse, human migration could increase to untenable levels, and global economic development could be categorically reversed. Changes in geography, forced migration, and global economic contraction layered on top of the perennial regional security challenges could create a geopolitical reality of unmanageable complexity and conflict, especially in the densely populated and politically unstable areas of Asia such as the Northeast and South. Furthermore, any legitimate action inhibiting global climate change will require unprecedented levels of self-sacrifice and international cooperation. The United States does consider climate change a serious concern, but its lack of both long-term strategy and political commitment, evidenced in its refusal to ratify the Kyoto Protocol of 1997 and the repeated defeat of climate-change legislation in Congress, deters other countries from participating in a global agreement. The United States is the second-largest global emitter of carbon dioxide, after China, with 20% of the world’s share. The United States is the number one per capita emitter of carbon dioxide and the global leader in per capita energy demand. Therefore, US leadership is essential in not only getting other countries to cooperate, but also in actually inhibiting climate change. Others around the world, including the European Union and Brazil, have attempted their own domestic reforms on carbon emissions and energy use, and committed themselves to pursuing renewable energy. Even China has made reducing emissions a goal, a fact it refuses to let the United States ignore. But none of those nations currently has the ability to lead a global initiative. President Obama committed the United States to energy and carbon reform at the Copenhagen Summit in 2009, but the increasingly polarized domestic political environment and the truculent American economic recovery are unlikely to inspire progress on costly energy issues. China is also critically important to any discussion of the management of climate change as it produces 21% of the world’s total carbon emissions, a percentage that will only increase as China develops the western regions of its territory and as its citizens experience a growth in their standard of living. China, however, has refused to take on a leadership role in climate change, as it has also done in the maritime, space, and cyberspace domains. China uses its designation as a developing country to shield itself from the demands of global stewardship. China’s tough stance at the 2009 Copenhagen Summit underscores the potential dangers of an American decline: no other country has the capacity and the desire to accept global stewardship over the environmental commons. Only a vigorous Unites States could lead on climate change, given Russia’s dependence on carbon-based energies for economic growth, India’s relatively low emissions rate, and China’s current reluctance to assume global responsibility. The protection and good faith management of the global commons—sea, space, cyberspace, nuclear proliferation, water security, the Arctic, and the environment itself—**are imperative to** the long-term growth of the global economy and **the continuation of** basic geopolitical **stability**. But in almost every case, the potential absence of constructive and influential US leadership would fatally undermine the essential communality of the global commons.     The argument that America’s decline would generate global insecurity, endanger some vulnerable states, produce a more troubled North American neighborhood, and make cooperative management of the global commons more difficult is not an argument for US global supremacy. In fact, the strategic complexities of the world in the twenty-first century—resulting from the rise of a politically self-assertive global population and from the dispersal of global power—make such supremacy unattainable. But in this increasingly complicated geopolitical environment, an America in pursuit of a new, timely strategic vision is crucial to helping the world avoid a dangerous slide into international turmoil.

#### Legitimacy of the drone program is critical internal link to drone operations-- key to allied and public support of US leadership.

Kennedy, Foreign Policy prof-Kings College, 13 (Greg, Professor of Strategic Foreign Policy at the Defence Studies Department, King's College London, Drones: Legitimacy and Anti-Americanism, http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pubs/parameters/Issues/WinterSpring\_2013/3\_Article\_Kennedy.pdf)

The current debate over the legitimacy of America’s use of drones to deliver deadly force is taking place in both public and official domains in the United States and many other countries.5 The four key features at the heart of the debate revolve around: who is controlling the weapon system; does the system of control and oversight violate international law governing the use of force; are the drone strikes proportionate acts that provide military effectiveness given the circumstances of the conflict they are being used in; and does their use violate the sovereignty of other nations and allow the United States to disregard formal national boundaries? Unless these four questions are dealt with in the near future the impact of the unresolved legitimacy issues will have a number of repercussions for American foreign and military policies: “Without a new doctrine for the use of drones that is understandable to friends and foes, the United States risks achieving near-term tactical benefits in killing terrorists while incurring potentially significant longer-term costs to its alliances, global public opinion, the war on terrorism and international stability.”6 This article will address only the first three critical questions. The question of who controls the drones during their missions is attracting a great deal of attention. The use of drones by the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) to conduct “signature strikes” is the most problematic factor in this matter. Between 2004 and 2013, CIA drone attacks in Pakistan killed up to 3,461—up to 891 of them civilians.7 Not only is the use of drones by the CIA the issue, but subcontracting operational control of drones to other civilian agencies is also causing great concern.8 Questions remain as to whether subcontractors were controlling drones during actual strike missions, as opposed to surveillance and reconnaissance activities. Nevertheless, the intense questioning of John O. Brennan, President Obama’s nominee for director of the CIA in February 2013, over drone usage, the secrecy of their controllers and orders, and the legality of their missions confirmed the level of concern America’s elected officials have regarding the legitimacy of drone use. Furthermore, perceptions and suspicions of illegal clandestine intelligence agency operations, already a part of the public and official psyche due to experiences from Vietnam, Iran-Contra, and Iraq II and the weapons of mass destruction debacle, have been reinforced by CIA management of drone capability. Recent revelations about the use of secret Saudi Arabian facilities for staging American drone strikes into Yemen did nothing to dissipate such suspicions of the CIA’s lack of legitimacy in its use of drones.9 The fact that the secret facility was the launching site for drones used to kill American citizens Anwar al-Awlaki and his son in September 2011, both classified by the CIA as al-Qaedalinked threats to US security, only deepened such suspicions. Despite the fact that Gulf State observers and officials knew about American drones operating from the Arabian peninsula for years, the existence of the CIA base was not openly admitted in case such knowledge should “ . . . damage counter-terrorism collaboration with Saudi Arabia.”10 The fallout from CIA involvement and management of drone strikes prompted Senator Dianne Feinstein, Chairwoman of the Senate Intelligence Committee, to suggest the need for a court to oversee targeted killings. Such a body, she said, would replicate the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court, which oversees eavesdropping on American soil.11 Most importantly, such oversight would go a long way towards allaying fears of the drone usage lacking true political accountability and legitimacy. In addition, as with any use of force, drone strikes in overseas contingency operations can lead to increased attacks on already weak governments partnered with the United States. They can lead to retaliatory attacks on local governments and may contribute to local instability. Those actions occur as a result of desires for revenge and frustrations caused by the strikes. Feelings of hostility are often visited on the most immediate structures of authority—local government officials, government buildings, police, and the military.12 It can thus be argued that, at the strategic level, drone strikes are fuelling anti-American resentment among enemies and allies alike. Those reactions are often based on questions regarding the legality, ethicality, and operational legitimacy of those acts to deter opponents. Therefore, specifically related to the reaction of allies, the military legitimacy question arises if the use of drones endangers vital strategic relationships.13 One of the strategic relationships being affected by the drone legitimacy issue is that of the United States and the United Kingdom. Targeted killing, by drone strike or otherwise, is not the sole preserve of the United States. Those actions, however, attract more negative attention to the United States due to its prominence on the world’s stage, its declarations of support for human rights and democratic freedoms, and rule-of-law issues, all which appear violated by such strikes. This complexity and visibility make such targeted killings important for Anglo-American strategic relations because of the closeness of that relationship and the perception that Great Britain, therefore, condones such American activities. Because the intelligence used in such operations is seen by other nations as a shared Anglo-American asset, the use of such intelligence to identify and conduct such killings, in the opinion of many, makes Great Britain culpable in the illegality and immorality of those operations.14 Finally, the apparent gap between stated core policies and values and the ability to practice targeted killings appears to be a starkly hypocritical and deceitful position internationally, a condition that once again makes British policymakers uncomfortable with being tarred by such a brush.15 The divide between US policy and action is exacerbated by drone technology, which makes the once covert practice of targeted killing commonplace and undeniable. It may also cause deep-rooted distrust due to a spectrum of legitimacy issues. Such questions will, therefore, undermine the US desire to export liberal democratic principles. Indeed, it may be beneficial for Western democracies to achieve adequate rather than decisive victories, thereby setting an example of restraint for the international order.16 The United States must be willing to engage and deal with drone-legitimacy issues across the entire spectrum of tactical, operational, strategic, and political levels to ensure its strategic aims are not derailed by operational and tactical expediency.

#### Ex Post review of drone strikes would effectively constrain executive action

Jaffer, Director-ACLU Center for Democracy, 13 (Jameel Jaffer, Director of the ACLU's Center for Democracy, “Judicial Review of Targeted Killings,” 126 Harv. L. Rev. F. 185 (2013), http://www.harvardlawreview.org/issues/126/april13/forum\_1002.php)

Since 9/11, the CIA and Joint Special Operations Command (JSOC) have used armed drones to kill thousands of people in places far removed from conventional battlefields. Legislators, legal scholars, and human rights advocates have raised concerns about civilian casualties, the legal basis for the strikes, the process by which the executive selects its targets, and the actual or contemplated deployment of armed drones into additional countries. Some have proposed that Congress establish a court to approve (or disapprove) strikes before the government carries them out. While judicial engagement with the targeted killing program is long overdue, those aiming to bring the program in line with our legal traditions and moral intuitions should think carefully before embracing this proposal. Creating a new court to issue death warrants is more likely to normalize the targeted killing program than to restrain it. The argument for some form of judicial review is compelling, not least because such review would clarify the scope of the government’s authority to use lethal force. The targeted killing program is predicated on sweeping constructions of the 2001 Authorization for Use of Military Force (AUMF) and the President’s authority to use military force in national self-defense. The government contends, for example, that the AUMF authorizes it to use lethal force against groups that had nothing to do with the 9/11 attacks and that did not even exist when those attacks were carried out. It contends that the AUMF gives it authority to use lethal force against individuals located far from conventional battlefields. As the Justice Department’s recently leaked white paper makes clear, the government also contends that the President has authority to use lethal force against those deemed to present “continuing” rather than truly imminent threats.These claims are controversial. They have been rejected or questioned by human rights groups, legal scholars, federal judges, and U.N. special rapporteurs. Even enthusiasts of the drone program have become anxious about its legal soundness. (“People in Washington need to wake up and realize the legal foundations are crumbling by the day,” Professor Bobby Chesney, a supporter of the program, recently said.) Judicial review could clarify the limits on the government’s legal authority and supply a degree of legitimacy to actions taken within those limits. It could also encourage executive officials to observe these limits. Executive officials would be less likely to exceed or abuse their authority if they were required to defend their conduct to federal judges. Even Jeh Johnson, the Defense Department’s former general counsel and a vocal defender of the targeted killing program, acknowledged in a recent speech that judicial review could add “rigor” to the executive’s decisionmaking process. In explaining the function of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court, which oversees government surveillance in certain national security investigations, executive officials have often said that even the mere prospect of judicial review deters error and abuse.

#### Court action is key—using the legal process to protect constitutional rights is critical to counter-terrorism credibility and US soft power.

Sidhu, J.D, 11 (Dawinder S., J.D., The George Washington University; M.A., Johns Hopkins University; B.A., University of Pennsylvania. Mr. Sidhu is an attorney whose primary intellectual focus is the relationship between individual rights and heightened national security concerns, “JUDICIAL REVIEW AS SOFT POWER: HOW THE COURTS CAN HELP US WIN THE POST-9/11 CONFLICT,” NATIONAL SECURITY LAW BRIEF Vol 1, No 1, <http://digitalcommons.wcl.american.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1003&context=nslb>)

The legal principles established by the Framers and enshrined in the Constitution are a source of attraction only if we have meaningfully adhered to them in practice. Part II will posit that the Supreme Court’s robust evaluation of cases in the wartime context suggests that the nation has been faithful to the rule of law even in times of national stress. As support, this part will provide exam- ples of cases involving challenges to the American response to wars both before and after 9/11, the discussion of which will exhibit American respect for the rule of law. While the substantive results of some of these cases may be particularly pleasing to Muslims, for instance the extension of habeas protections to detainees in Guantánamo, 30 this part will make clear that it is the legal process—not substantive victories for one side or against the government—which is the true source of American legal soft power. If it is the case that the law may be an element of soft power conceptually and that the use of the legal process has refl ected this principle in practice, the conclusion argues that it would benefit American national security for others in the world to be made aware of the American constitutional framework and the judiciary’s activities related to the war. Such information would make it more likely that other nations and peoples, especially moderate Muslims, will be attracted to American interests. This Article thus reaches a conclusion that may seem counterintuitive—that the judicial branch, in the performance of its constitutional duty of judicial review, furthers American national secu- rity and foreign policy objectives even when it may happen to strike down executive or legislative arguments for expanded war powers to prosecute the current war on terror and even though the executive and legislature constitute the foreign policy branches of the federal government. In other words, a “loss” for the executive or legislature, may be considered, in truth, a reaffirmation of our constitutional system and therefore a victory for the entire nation in the neglected but necessary post-9/11 war of ideas. 31 As such, it is the central contention of this Article that the judicial branch is a repository of American soft power and thus a useful tool in the post-9/11 conflict

#### Judicial review solves drone overreliance- causes better decision-making while still allowing use of drones

Adelsberg 12 (Samuel S., \* J.D. Candidate 2013, Yale Law School, “Bouncing the Executive's Blank Check: Judicial Review and the Targeting of Citizens” Harvard Law & Policy Review 6 Harv. L. & Pol'y Rev. 437, Lexis)

[\*445] Rather, as recognized by the Founders in the Fourth Amendment, balancing the needs of security against the imperatives of liberty is a traditional role for judges to play. Two scholars of national security law recently highlighted the value of judicial inclusion in targeting decisions: "Judicial control of targeted killing could increase the accuracy of target selection, reducing the danger of mistaken or illegal destruction of lives, limbs, and property. Independent judges who double-check targeting decisions could catch errors and cause executive officials to avoid making them in the first place." n47 Judges are both knowledgeable in the law and accustomed to dealing with sensitive security considerations. These qualifications make them ideal candidates to ensure that the executive exercises constitutional restraint when targeting citizens. Reforming the decision-making process for executing American citizens to allow for judicial oversight would restore the separation of powers framework envisioned by the Founders and increase democratic legitimacy by placing these determinations on steadier constitutional ground. For those fearful of judicial encroachment on executive war-making powers, there is a strong argument that this will actually strengthen the President and empower him to take decisive action without worrying about the judicial consequences. As Justice Kennedy put it, "the exercise of [executive] powers is vindicated, not eroded, when confirmed by the Judicial Branch." n48 Now, we will turn to what this judicial involvement would look like.

### Bivens

#### Advantage two: Bivens

#### The Court is going to rule against al-Aulaki’s Bivens claim, a type of suit that seeks civil damages against constitutional violations from the targeted killing program—this will set a precedent against Bivens application on other national security issues.

Vladeck 12 (Stephen, Al-Aulaqi and the Futility (and Utility) of Bivens Suits in National Security Cases, July 23, http://www.acslaw.org/acsblog/al-aulaqi-and-the-futility-and-utility-of-bivens-suits-in-national-security-cases)

There’s quite a lot to say about the damages suit filed last week by the American Civil Liberties Union and the Center for Constitutional Rights on behalf of the family of Anwar al-Aulaqi and his 16-year-old son Abdulrahman, both of whom were killed (along with a third U.S. citizen) in a pair of drone strikes in Yemen in the fall 0f 2011. And although the suit raises a host of important and thorny legal questions of first impression, including whether a non-international armed conflict existed in Yemen at the time of the strikes and whether a U.S. citizen can claim a substantive due process right not to be collateral damage in an otherwise lawful military operation, I suspect my Lawfare colleague Ben Wittes is quite correct that this case won’t actually resolve any of them. Instead, as Ben suggests, it seems likely that the federal courts will refuse to recognize a “Bivens” remedy — a cause of action for damages arising directly out of the constitutional provision allegedly offended (e.g., the Fifth Amendment’s Due Process Clause), and that the plaintiffs will therefore be unable to state a valid cause of action. As I explain below, such a result would unfortunately perpetuate a fundamental — and increasingly pervasive — misunderstanding of Bivens. Moreover, even if plaintiffs will ultimately lose suits like Al-Aulaqi because of various defenses — including qualified immunity, the state secrets privilege, and the political question doctrine — getting the Bivens question right still matters. To the extent that the specter of judicial review deters governmental misconduct down the road, Bivens suits can and should have a salutary effect on the conduct of U.S. national security policy — so long as they’re properly understood in the first place.

#### Rejecting Bivens suits against the military creates confusion in the case law and lower court splits—setting precedent that Bivens suits are permitted is key to resolve this uncertainty

Loevy 13 (ARTHUR LOEVY, partner Loevy & Loevy, a firm specializing in constitutional and civil rights, with MICHAEL KANOVITZ, Counsel of Record, et al, PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI, DONALD VANCE AND NATHAN ERTEL v.DONALD RUMSFELD, http://cryptome.org/2013/03/vance-ertel-v-rumsfeld.pdf)

The Decision to Bar Civilian Bivens Actions Contradicts Chappell, Stanley, and Saucier As Well As Lower Courts That Allow Civilians to Sue Military Officials for Constitutional Injuries Review is warranted because the decision to bar civilian constitutional claims against military officials contradicts this Court’s precedents that set the bounds of Bivens actions involving the military. It also creates a split among the lower courts, which until now had permitted Bivens actions by American civilians against military personnel. In light of the continual interaction between military and civilians, this Court should immediately address this division among the circuits. 1. The majority below concluded erroneously that Chappell and Stanley compelled its judgment that no American civilian may ever sue a military official for constitutional violations. App. 12a-13a. This conclusion actually contradicts Chappell and Stanley, which simply applied to Bivens the doctrine of Feres v. United States, 340 U.S. 135 (1950). Feres barred recovery under the Federal Tort Claims Act for servicemembers alleging injuries incident to military service, id. at 141; and Chappell and Stanley applied the same restriction to Bivens actions, see Stanley, 483 U.S. at 684; Chappell, 462 U.S. at 305. Both Chappell and Stanley expressly limited their holdings, rejecting a complete bar on all constitutional claims by servicemembers against other military personnel. This Court left servicemembers room to bring constitutional claims against military officials for violations arising outside of military service------i.e., arising in servicemembers’ capacity as civilians. Stanley, 483 U.S. at 681-83; Chappell, 462 U.S. at 304-05. These cases impose no limits on civilian Bivens actions against the military, 4 but instead draw a line between claims of servicemembers and those of civilians. Chappell, 462 U.S. at 303-04 (‘‘[T]his Court has long recognized two systems of justice[:] one for civilians and one for military personnel.’’). The Seventh Circuit contradicts both decisions by disregarding their limitation to intra-military injuries suffered incident to service and by applying them to foreclose relief for civilians. As Judge Williams noted, the majority’s judgment ‘‘goes well beyond what the Supreme Court has expressly identified as a bridge too far.’’ App. 74a. Saucier further illustrates the conflict between this Court’s decisions and the Seventh Circuit’s new bar to civilian Bivens claims. 553 U.S. 194. Saucier was a Bivens action brought by a civilian after Chappell and Stanley, in which the civilian alleged the use of excessive force by a military official. This Court found that the military officer was entitled to qualified immunity but nowhere suggested that civilians cannot bring Bivens claims against military personnel in the first place. Cf. Stanley, 483 U.S. at 684-85 (distinguishing the question of the Bivens cause of action from the immunity inquiry). The Seventh Circuit’s decision conflicts with this Court’s approval of such suits. 2. It is not surprising given these precedents that the lower courts had unanimously permitted civilians to bring Bivens actions against military officials who violated their constitutional rights. Before this case, five courts, including the Seventh Circuit, had taken that position. See Case v. Milewski, 327 F.3d 564, 568-69 (7th Cir. 2003) (considering civilian claim alleging military officers used excessive force); Morgan v. United States, 323 F.3d 776, 780-82 (9th Cir. 2003) (allowing Bivens action for civilian alleging military officers conducted illegal search); Roman v. Townsend, 224 F.3d 24, 29 (1st Cir. 2000) (entertaining Bivens action by civilian against military police); Applewhite v. U.S. Air Force, 995 F.2d 997, 999 (10th Cir. 1993) (considering military officers’ immunity from civilian’s allegations of illegal strip search); Dunbar Corp. v. Lindsey, 905 F.2d 754, 756-63 (4th Cir. 1990) (permitting civilian Bivens action against military officers for deprivation of property). No court had previously barred such claims.5 The judgment below contradicts decisions of the First, Fourth, Ninth, and Tenth Circuits that permit civilian suits against military officers, consistent with Saucier. This conflict and the uncertainty that the judgment below engenders in interactions between military officials and American civilians------whether contractors, military families, or workers on bases------calls for review by this Court.

#### Blocking Bivens remedies under special factors of national security questions is a violation of the Convention Against Torture – the plan is critical to aligning the United States with CAT

Amnesty International 13 (global movement of 3 million people in more than 150 countries and territories, who campaign on human rights. Our vision is for every person to enjoy all the rights enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other international human rights instruments. We research, campaign, advocate and mobilize to end abuses of human rights. Amnesty International is independent of any government, political ideology, economic interest or religion, “USA: Chronicle of Immunity Foretold”, http://www.amnestyusa.org/sites/default/files/amr510032013en.pdf)

INTERNATIONAL LAW AND BEING ECONOMICAL WITH THE TRU TH In fact, the US government has relied on the availability of Bivens claims in cases of government torture to help show that the US is complying with our obligations under the United Nations Convention Against Torture. A United Nations committee overseeing compliance questioned the fact that the United States had enacted virtually no new legislation to implement the Convention Against Torture. The State Department assured the United Nations that the Bivens remedy is available t o victims of torture by US officials Vance v. Rumsfeld , Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals, Judge Hamilton dissenting A “ Bivens ” claim is one brought under a 1971 US Supreme Cour t decision which established that victims of constitutional violations have a ri ght to recover damages in federal court against the official or officials in question even in the absence of a statutory route to remedy passed by Congress. 17 In 2007 the Supreme Court set out a two-step process in Bivens cases. Firstly, it said that the court in question should determine whether any alternative route to remedy exists requiring the judiciary to “refrain from providing a new and freestanding damages remedy”. Secondly, in the absence of an alternative, the cou rt must make “the kind of remedial determination that is appropriate for a common-law t ribunal, paying particular heed to any special factors counselling hesitation before autho rizing a new kind of federal litigation”. 18 The notion of “special factors” requiring judicial “hesitation”, which appeared in the original Bivens ruling, has been successfully used by the Bush and Obama administrations in persuading courts not to create a judicial remedy f or the kind of abuses alleged by detainees in the post 9/11 counter-terrorism context. In this regard, the “special factors” asserted are factors such as national security, intelligence gat hering, waging war, and foreign relations. These broad notions have smothered the pursuit of remedy for abuses committed in the counter-terrorism context like some executive-spun, court-endorsed fire blanket, with the legislature looking away. Even in the absence of a finding of “special factor s”, the court may find the officials in question to be entitled to “qualified immunity” whic h will also block the lawsuit from being allowed to proceed. The doctrine of qualified immunity in US law protects government officials “from liability for civil damages insofar as their conduct does not violate clearly established statutory or constitutional rights of which a reasonable person would have known.” 19 An official’s conduct violates clearly established law “when, at the time of the challenged conduct, the contours of a right are suf ficiently clear that every reasonable official would have understood that what he is doing violates that right.” 20 The Supreme Court has said that qualified immunity “balances two importan t interests – the need to hold public officials accountable when they exercise power irres ponsibly and the need to shield officials from harassment, distraction, and liability when the y perform their duties reasonably.” 21 Given the blocking of lawsuit after lawsuit, as illust rated below, plaintiffs could be forgiven for concluding that the balance is institutionally weighted towards injustice. The right to an effective remedy is recognized in a ll major international and regional human rights treaties, including the International Covena nt on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), ratified by the USA in 1992. Under Article 2.3 of t he ICCPR, any person whose rights under the ICCPR have been violated “shall have an effectiv e remedy, notwithstanding that the violation has been committed by persons acting in a n official capacity”. International law requires that remedies not only be available in the ory, but accessible and effective in practice. 22 The right to an effective remedy can never be derogated from. Even in a state of emergency, “the state party must comply with the fun damental obligation, under article 2, paragraph 3, of the Covenant to provide a remedy th at is effective.” 23 Victims are entitled to equal and effective access to justice; adequate, ef fective and prompt reparation for harm suffered; and access to relevant information concer ning violations and reparation mechanisms. 24 Full and effective reparation includes restitution , compensation, rehabilitation, satisfaction and guarantees of non- repetition. 25 Further, under article 9.5 of the ICCPR, anyone who has been subjected to unlawful d etention must be provided with “an enforceable right to compensation”. The UN Convention against Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (UNCAT) also specifically obliges the US A to “ensure in its legal system that the victim of an act of torture obtains redress and has an enforceable right to fair and adequate compensation including the means for as full rehabi litation as possible.” 26 All four US citizen plaintiffs in the cases outlined in this report have alleged torture and other ill-treatment as well as unlawful detention by the US military. All four lawsuits have been blocked from proceeding before the evidence of the abuses has been scrutinized on the merits, as a result of the USA’s doctrine of qualified immunity or of Bivens “special factors”. The blocking of these lawsuits in this way clearly contravenes the USA’s obligations to provide a remedy under international law. The UN Com mittee against Torture has emphasised that “under no circumstances may arguments of natio nal security be used to deny redress for victims.” 27 The US courts should not therefore be blocking access to a remedy for victims of torture or other ill-treatment based on “special factors” such as national security, intelligence gathering, waging war, and foreign relations

#### And, US non-compliance undermines global enforcement---other countries use as a justification for human rights violations including religious persecution

CVT 13 (Center for Victims of Torture Policy Report: US Bi-Partisan Leadership Against Torture”, April 2013, international nonprofit dedicated to healing survivors of torture and violent conflict. We provide direct care for those who have been tortured, train partners around the world who can prevent and treat torture, and advocate for human rights and an end to torture, http://www.cvt.org/sites/cvt.org/files/downloads/Report\_Bipartisan%20Leadership%20Against%20Torture\_April%202013.pdf)

SPILL-OVER “JUSTIFICATIONS” AND DANGEROUS PRECEDENT When the United States engages in torture and abuse in the name of national security, it provides justifications for other governments and oppressive regimes to do the same against innocent civilians, journalists, democracy activists, people seeking to practice their own religion, and even puts U.S. troops in danger. CVT has seen strikingly similar patterns worldwide among different leaders – left and right- who rationalize the use of torture by dehumanizing the victim, citing national emergencies and security as justification, and assuming an ability to produce a desired outcome through fear and violence. When crises arise that prove beyond the scope of leaders’ imaginations and/or resources, desperate measures are often supposed necessary. Moreover, when the U.S. government openly violated its international legal obligations, it set a dangerous precedent not only on the issue of torture, but for the broader notion that those duties are optional. U.S. government policies and practices weakened international human rights instruments designed to end torture (the CAT and the Geneva Conventions). Flagrant disregard for treaties and conventions that the U.S. has ratified has profound implications for the global community’s efforts to secure support for international norms. By flouting these obligations, the United States also delivered an implicit message that torture, once seen as the tool of despotic regimes, could be shaped to look like legitimate component of a democratic government’s national defense. Furthermore, the United States’ practice of torture places U.S. troops in danger should they be captured. In remarks on the floor of the U.S. Senate, Senator John McCain cautioned, “… if America uses torture, it could someday result in the torture of American combatants.”52 He went on to warn that the United States should “…be careful that we do not set a standard that another country could use to justify their mistreatment of our prisoners.” 53 HEALING FOR TORTURE SURVIVORS AROUND THE WORLD Whenever laws banning torture are upheld, a message is transmitted to repressive governments and victims seeking an end to impunity wherever it exists. Leaders and ordinary citizens learn that, in some places, those who violate human rights are held responsible. By contrast, the cost of impunity for survivors is enormous. For CVT clients, accountability for perpetrators is intertwined with the healing process and their struggle to make sense of their suffering. The recovery process is made more challenging when the person who committed the violence against them still walks free. Any crack in the culture of impunity can bring victims tremendous strength. One CVT client told us about her reaction when she learned of the arrest in Atlanta of an Ethiopian man accused of murder and torture during a dictatorship in the 1970s. Despite the fact that this man was not her perpetrator, she felt empowered, remarking, “Now I know what to do should I come across the man who raped me.” The ripple effect is felt widely. Any progress helps other victims to feel safer wherever they may be living.

#### China uses US double standards on torture to justify human rights violations against the Uighurs in violation of the Convention Against Torture

Kan-Congressional Research Service-10

U. S. -China Counterterrorism Cooperation: Issues for U. S. Policy

http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/terror/RL33001.pdf

Questions concern the U.S. stance on the PRC's policy toward the Uighur (Uyghur) people in the northwestern Xinjiang region that links them to what the PRC calls "terrorist" organizations. Congress has concerns about the human rights of Uighurs. China has accused the United States of using "double standards" in counterterrorism in disagreements over how to handle the Uighurs. Xinjiang has a history of unrest dating back before September 2001. particularly since the unrest in 1990. The PRC charges Uighurs with violent crimes and "terrorism," but Uighurs say they have suffered executions, torture, detentions, harassment, religious persecution, and racial profiling. Human rights and Uighur groups have warned that, after the 9/11 attacks, the PRC shifted to use the international counterterrorism campaign to justify the PRC's long-term cultural, religious, and political repression of Uighurs both in and outside of the PRC.1' Since 2002, the PLA has conducted military exercises in Xinjiang with Central Asian countries and Russia to fight what the PRC calls “East Turkistan terrorists" and what it combines as the threat of "three evil forces" (of separatism, extremism, and terrorism). Critics say China has compelled extraditions of Uighurs for execution and other punishment from countries such as Uzbekistan, KyrgyZStan, Kazahkstan, Nepal, and Pakistan, raising questions about violations of the international legal principle of non-refoulement and the United Nations Convention Against Torture.

#### That destabilizes China and pulls them into war with border states

Clarke, China analyst for the Bureau of Intelligence and Research, 2010 (Christopher, independent China consultant, China analyst for 25 years and head of the China Division of the state departments Bureau of Intelligence and Research, “Xinjiang – Where China’s Worry Intersects the World”, http://yaleglobal.yale.edu/content/xinjiang-where-chinas-worry-intersects-world)

The February 15 killing of militant Uighur leader Abdul Haq al-Turkistani by an American drone in the border regions of Pakistan highlights China’s continued sensitivity about its remote and vulnerable western region, Xinjiang. It also brings into focus the role of the Afghanistan-Pakistan region as an international sanctuary for Islamic militants and the reasons for China’s worries about social stability and potential terrorist threats in Xinjiang. China’s neuralgia about security in Xinjiang will continue – and perhaps even increase – as big power competition for influence and resources in Central Asia and its ties to the rest of the world continue to expand. China’s troubles with the minority Uighurs are not new. But with the break up of the Soviet Union and the rising Islamist Taliban in once Soviet-occupied Afghanistan, the regional dynamic has changed. Since the early 1990s, China has faced recurrent waves of unrest in Xinjiang and widespread acts of violence, some of which seem to have been terrorist acts by disgruntled Uighurs. The 2008 attempted hijacking of an airplane in China by three people armed with flammable liquid was one of the latest – and scariest – examples. There also have been several attacks against perceived Uighur collaborators in China and against Chinese interests outside the country. The capture of Uighurs fighting against coalition forces in Afghanistan, some two dozen of whom were imprisoned in Guantanamo, also indicate that China faces a real threat of terrorist acts against its interests at home and abroad. The Chinese, however, have aroused skepticism by dubiously attributing dozens of explosions and incidents of civil unrest to instigation by “East Turkistan terrorist forces.” Officials, for example, blamed an August 2008 attack on a military police unit out for its morning jog, in which 16 officers were killed, on a Uighur terrorist group, despite the fact that the officers apparently were run down by a truck and attacked by a taxi driver and a vegetable vendor, hardly the modus operandi of a sophisticated terrorist organization. Even last July’s massive race riot in Urumqi – set off by rumors that a Uighur woman had been raped and several Uighur men killed by Han Chinese in far-away Guangdong – was labeled as an “organized, violent action against the public” and an act of terrorism. So, while China does face periodic upsurges in politically motivated violence by Uighurs, one has to ask, why? The answer: Beijing has engaged in a systematic, multi-decade program of marginalizing Uighurs in their own homeland, fostering economic growth that favors the Han majority of eastern China and that encourages the exploitation of Xinjiang’s wealth of natural resources for Han areas. Beijing has organized and encouraged an influx of Han into Xinjiang, changing the ethnic ratio since 1949 from about 5 percent Han to more than 40 percent today. Moreover, Uighur culture and the Muslim religion are contained under tight restrictions. Beijing proudly points out that Xinjiang in recent years has been among the fastest growing economies in the country, with per capita income higher than all regions except China’s southeast coast. Most of that growth, however, has accrued to State-owned enterprises, Han entrepreneurs, or the government; not to Uighurs. And income inequalities there have actually expanded significantly in recent years. The region also suffers from some of the worst environmental degradation in China. It is hardly surprising that frustration occasionally boils over into civil unrest – or that such conditions breed terrorist groups intent on taking action against the regime. That many of China’s problems with terrorism and unrest are largely of its own making has reduced international trust and sympathy for the situation. China’s concerns also have both shaped its approach to the broader region and reduced China’s willingness to cooperate with the US in counter-terrorism, negatively affecting the overall US -China relationship. Xinjiang, more than any other area of China, is strategically vulnerable, partially as a result of its location in one of the most fractious neighborhoods outside the Middle East. Representing one-sixth of China’s territory, Xinjiang is rich in oil, gas, and mineral deposits and contains numerous sensitive military installations, including some of the country’s premier nuclear research and testing facilities. It borders the former Soviet republics of Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, and Tajikistan, all of which are less than politically stable.\* Complicating China’s relations with the Central Asian states is the fact that as many as 500,000 Uighurs – and sizable populations of other Chinese “minorities” – live across relatively porous borders and engage in extensive trade and contacts. Several of these countries contain anti-China Uighur separatist organizations, both peaceful and terrorist. And China is very afraid of the potential contagion of “color revolutions” from Central Asia – like the 2005 “Tulip Revolution” in Kyrgyzstan – destabilizing China’s control in Xinjiang. Uighur activities – including violent attacks – have complicated China’s relations with Turkey, a country with which China seeks closer relations but where public and official sentiment is highly critical of China’s treatment of the ethnically-related Uighurs. To control this potentially chaotic situation and to manage Sino-Russian competition for influence, China launched the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO), which includes Russia, China, the Central Asian republics, and a growing number of observers from around the region. China has pushed hard to keep the focus of the SCO on cooperative activities against the “three evils” of “separatism, fundamentalism, and terrorism,” a fear all the member states have in common. Along some of Xinjiang’s most remote and sensitive borders are Tibet, Afghanistan, Pakistan, and the disputed state of Kashmir – any one of which could quickly embroil China in an international crisis. China also tested its “all-weather” friendship with Pakistan pressuring Islamabad to crackdown on Uighur militants seeking refuge in Pakistan. Pakistan reportedly has responded by sending a number of Uighur militants to China for prosecution. Its recent stepped up attacks on terrorist groups – and especially the killing of Abdul Haq and more than a dozen other Uighur militants – has among other things assuaged relations with China. The US intervention in Afghanistan in October 2001 introduced another variable of vulnerability for China with regard to Xinjiang. In the conflict that followed, global support for Al Qaeda drew in more militants to the region, including some Uighurs (as Abdul Haq’s death proved) but it also changed the strategic landscape for China. The introduction of massive US forces into the region, and especially the use of bases such as Manas in Kyrgyzstan, raised visceral and long-standing fears of encirclement by a hostile US intent on “dividing and Westernizing” China. Beijing has put pressure on Central Asian neighbors to expel or severely limit any US military presence and has refused to allow US forces to use Chinese territory for staging or overflights in the war in Afghanistan. China is also working hard to enhance cooperation with its neighbors on energy exploration, exploitation, and transportation as a way of keeping the US and Russia from monopolizing Central Asia’s voluminous oil and natural gas resources. These competing interests, and the residual worry that the US and Russia seek to supplant or minimize Chinese influence in Central Asia will continue to contribute to Beijing’s neuralgia about assuring stability in its far Western extremity, even if the real terrorist threat to China has diminished.

#### Chinese instability and territorial fragmentation risks CCP collapse and nuclear war

Yee and Storey 2002 (Herbert Yee, Professor of Politics and International Relations at the Hong Kong Baptist University, and Ian Storey, Lecturer in Defence Studies at Deakin University, 2002, The China Threat: Perceptions, Myths and Reality, RoutledgeCurzon, pg 5)

The fourth factor contributing to the perception of a China threat is the fear of political and economic collapse in the PRC, resulting in territorial fragmentation, civil war and waves of refugees pouring into neighbouring countries. Naturally, any or all of these scenarios would have a profoundly negative impact on regional stability. Today the Chinese leadership faces a raft of internal problems, including the increasing political demands of its citizens, a growing population, a shortage of natural resources and a deterioration in the natural environment caused by rapid industrialisation and pollution. These problems are putting a strain on the central government's ability to govern effectively. Political disintegration or a Chinese civil war might result in millions of Chinese refugees seeking asylum in neighbouring countries. Such an unprecedented exodus of refugees from a collapsed PRC would no doubt put a severe strain on the limited resources of China's neighbours. A fragmented China could also result in another nightmare scenario - nuclear weapons falling into the hands of irresponsible local provincial leaders or warlords.'2 From this perspective, a disintegrating China would also pose a threat to its neighbours and the world.

#### Rejecting the “special factors” doctrine would end the case-by-case basis that currently plagues Bivens caselaw.

Pfander and Baltmanis 09 (James E. Pfander, the Owen L. Coon Professor of Law at Northwestern; and David Baltmanis, Law Clerk to the Honorable Paul V. Niemeyer, United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth

Circuit; “Rethinking Bivens: Legitimacy and Constitutional Adjudication,” http://scholarlycommons.law.northwestern.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1181&context=facultyworkingpapers)

By approving of Bivens and making it the exclusive mode for vindicating constitutional rights, Congress has provided a solid legislative foundation for routine recognition of a Bivens remedy. Such congressional ratification, moreover, requires that the Court adjust its approach to the evaluation of constitutional claims for damages. The Court should no longer regard itself as creating rights of action on a case-by-case basis. Rather, the Court should simply recognize that Congress has authorized suits against federal officials for constitutional violations and has foreclosed all alternative remedies. Along with this recognition, the Court should no longer consider the possible existence of state common law remedies as a reason to proceed cautiously. Congress has eliminated the state common law option and has failed to replace it with suits under the FTCA to vindicate constitutional rights. It thus makes little sense for the Court in Wilkie v. Robbins to tout the possible existence of state common law remedies as the basis for proceeding cautiously in the recognition of a Bivens right of action.86 State common law, as such, no longer applies and no longer offers a way to present constitutional claims. One can imagine an argument that the Westfall Act’s reference to actions for violation of the Constitution operates not to approve an all-purpose Bivens action but to codify the case-by-case Bivens calculus that was in place in 1988 when the statute took effect. The text of the Westfall Act provides little basis for such a contention. The statute refers to a “civil action” “brought” against federal officers asserting a claim for “violation of the Constitution.” State common law, as such, no longer applies and no longer offers a way to present constitutional claims. 87 The unqualified references in the statute seemingly authorize the pursuit of all “civil actions[]” that assert constitutional claims, without suggesting that the federal courts may refrain from hearing certain claims. We explain below why Congress may have chosen to switch from the case-by-case approach to a more routinely available right of action. Finally, one can imagine a formal argument that the statute does nothing more than create an exception to the rule of immunity that the Westfall Act adopted to shield federal employees from common law claims. On such a view, the Act creates no affirmative right to sue, but simply prevents the statutory rule of immunity from displacing the Bivens action. As we have seen, however, the Westfall Act goes well beyond conferring a selective grant of immunity on federal officers; it forecloses pursuit of constitutional claims either by action predicated on state common law or by action against the government itself. Read against the backdrop of the wholesale withdrawal of alternative remedies, the saving reference operates less as a modest exception to immunity than as a congressional selection of the Bivens action as the only method individuals were authorized to use in pressing constitutional claims.88 The withdrawal of alternative remedies explains why Congress made the Bivens action routinely available, rather than dependent on case-by-case analysis. In pre-Westfall days, individual litigants had a right to sue federal officers for constitutional torts by relying on common-law theories of liability and filing suit in state court. Such suits were subject to removal and to the assertion of immunity defenses of varying stringency, but the right of action was available as a matter of course (assuming the plaintiff could identify a common law theory of liability).89 Having cut off that routinely available remedy in the Westfall Act, Congress understandably felt some obligation to provide a statutory alternative. The unqualified terms of the resulting ratification of Bivens suggest that the Westfall Act contemplates rights of action as a matter of course. IV. Rethinking Bivens: Toward a New Remedial Calculus Recognition of the routine availability of a Bivens action will require some changes in the way the federal courts approach constitutional litigation. But the adoption of our approach need not threaten a disruptive break with the past or a ruinous expansion of federal official liability. On the view we take in this Essay, the Westfall Act provides, as section 1983 does in suits against state actors, statutory recognition of a right to pursue constitutional tort claims against federal actors. The existence of an all-purpose right to sue federal officers would eliminate the threshold inquiry into the availability of a Bivens right of action. Constitutional litigation would focus instead on the sufficiency of the alleged constitutional violation, the clarity of constitutional rules, and the qualified immunity of government officials. Instead of the somewhat open-ended inquiry into “special factors” that may counsel hesitation, federal courts would conduct a more focused analysis to determine whether an alternative remedial scheme displaces the Bivens remedy, Such an approach would help clarify and simplify constitutional tort litigation without threatening federal officials with novel forms of personal liability or disrupting existing administrative law schemes. As noted earlier, constitutional tort litigation against state actors under section 1983 now proceeds without any threshold inquiry into the existence of a right of action. The Westfall Act suggests that Bivens claims against federal actors should be treated in precisely the same way.90 Such parallel treatment already prevails over a wide swath of constitutional tort law. When the Court defines the elements of a legally sufficient constitutional claim, the definition applies to constitutional claims against both state and federal actors.91 Similarly, the Court refines the rules of qualified immunity, it does so with the recognition that the same rules apply to officers at all levels of government.92 As the Court explained long ago, it would be “untenable to draw a distinction for purposes of immunity law between suits brought against state officials . . . and suits brought directly under the Constitution against federal officials.”93 With the recognition that Congress has approved routine suability under the Westfall Act, distinctions between the right to sue state and federal officials seem equally untenable.94

### CMR 1AC

#### Advantage Two: Civil-military relations

#### Judicial review of the military is collapsing now- judicial deference over targeted killing results in an unchecked executive.

McCormack, law prof-Utah, 13 (Wayne McCormack is the E. W. Thode Professor of Law at the University of Utah S.J. Quinney College of Law, U.S. Judicial Independence: Victim in the “War on Terror”, Aug 20, https://today.law.utah.edu/projects/u-s-judicial-independence-victim-in-the-war-on-terror/)

One of the principal victims in the U.S. so-called “war on terror” has been the independence of the U.S. Judiciary. Time and again, challenges to assertedly illegal conduct on the part of government officials have been turned aside, either because of overt deference to the Government or because of special doctrines such as state secrets and standing requirements. The judiciary has virtually relinquished its valuable role in the U.S. system of judicial review. In the face of governmental claims of crisis and national security needs, the courts have refused to examine, or have examined with undue deference, the actions of government officials. The U.S. Government has taken the position that inquiry by the judiciary into a variety of actions would threaten the safety of the nation. This is pressure that amounts to intimidation. When this level of pressure is mounted to create exceptions to established rules of law, it undermines due process of law. Perhaps one or two examples of Government warnings about the consequences of a judicial decision would be within the domain of legal argument. But a long pattern of threats and intimidation to depart from established law undermines judicial independence. That has been the course of the U.S. “war on terror” for over a decade now. Here are some of the governmental actions that have been challenged and a brief statement of how the Courts responded to Government demands for deference. 1. Guantanamo. In Boumediene v. Bush,1 the Supreme Court allowed the U.S. to detain alleged “terrorists” under unstated standards to be developed by the lower courts with “deference” to Executive determinations. The intimidation exerted on the Court was reflected in Justice Scalia’s injudicious comment that the Court’s decision would “surely cause more Americans to be killed.” 2. Detention and Torture Khalid El-Masri2 claimed that he was detained in CIA “black sites” and tortured – case dismissed under the doctrine of “state secrets privilege.” (SSP) Maher Arar3 is a Canadian citizen who was detained at Kennedy Airport by U.S. authorities, shipped off to Syria for imprisonment and mistreatment, and finally released to Canadian authorities – case dismissed under “special factors” exception to tort actions for violations of law by federal officials – awarded $1 million by Canadian authorities. Jose Padilla4 was arrested deplaning at O’Hare Airport, imprisoned in the U.S. for four years without a hearing and allegedly mistreated in prison – case dismissed on grounds of “good faith” immunity. Binyam Mohamed5 was subjected to “enhanced interrogation techniques” at several CIA “black sites” before being repatriated to England, which awarded him £1 million in damages – U.S. suit dismissed under SSP. 1 553 U.S. 723 (2008). 2 El-Masri v. United States, 479 F.3d 296 (4th Cir. 2007). 3 Arar v. Ashcroft, 414 F. Supp. 2d 250 (E.D.N.Y. 2005), aff’d by 585 F.3d 559 (2009). 4 Padilla v. Yoo, 678 F.3d 748 (9th Cir. 2012). 5 Mohamed v. Jeppesen Dataplan, 614 F.3d 1070 (9th Cir. en banc 2010) damages – U.S. suit dismissed under SSP. 3. Unlawful Detentions Abdullah Al-Kidd6 arrested as a material witness, held in various jails for two weeks, and then confined to house arrest for 15 months – suit dismissed on grounds of “qualified immunity” and apparent validity of material witness warrant. Ali Al-Marri was originally charged with perjury, then detained as an enemy combatant, for a total detention of four years before the Fourth Circuit finally held that he must be released or tried.7 Javad Iqbal8 was detained on visa violations in New York following 9/11 and claimed he was subjected to mistreatment on the basis of ethnic profiling – suit dismissed on grounds that he could not prove Attorney General authorization of illegal practices and court’s unwillingness to divert attention of officials away from national security. Osama Awadallah9 was taken into custody in Los Angeles after his name and phone number were found on a gum wrapper in the car of one of the 9/11 hijackers – charged with perjury before grand jury and held as material witness – Second Circuit reversed district court ruling on abuse of the material witness statute 4. Unlawful Surveillance Amnesty International10 is one of numerous organizations that brought suit believing that its communications, especially with foreign clients or correspondents had been monitored by the National Security Agency – suit dismissed because the secrecy of the NSA spying program made it impossible to prove that any particular person or group had been monitored. The validity of the entire Foreign Surveillance Act (FISA) rests on the “special needs” exception to the Fourth Amendment, a conclusion that was rejected by one district court although accepted by others. 5. Targeted Killing Anwar Al-Awlaki (or Aulaqi)11 was reported by press accounts as having been placed on a “kill list” by President Obama – suit by his father dismissed on grounds that Anwar himself could come forward and seek access to U.S. courts – not only Anwar but his son were then killed in separate drone strikes. 6. Asset Forfeiture 6 Al-Kidd v. Ashcroft, 580 F.3d 949, 951-52 (9th Cir. 2009). 7Al-Marri v. Wright, 487 F.3d 160 (4th Cir. 2007). 8 Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 129 S. Ct. 1937 (2009) 9 United States v. Awadallah, 349 F.3d 42 (2d Cir. 2003); see also In re Grand Jury Material Witness Detention, 271 F. Supp. 2d 1266 (D. Or. 2003); In re Application of U.S. for a Material Witness Warrant, 213 F. Supp. 2d 287 (S.D. N.Y. 2002). 10 Clapper v. Amnesty Int'l USA, 133 S. Ct. 1138 (2013). 11 Al-Aulaqi v. Obama, 727 F. Supp. 2d 1 (D.D.C. 2010) Both Al Haramain Islamic Foundation12 and KindHearts for Charitable Humanitarian Development13 have been found by the Department of Treasury to be fronts for raising money for Hamas, and their assets have been blocked – despite findings of due process violations by the lower courts, the blocking of assets has been upheld on the basis that their support for terrorist activities is public knowledge. Avoiding Accountability The “head in the sand” attitude of the U.S. judiciary in the past decade is a rather dismal record that does not fit the high standard for judicial independence on which the American public has come to rely. Many authors have discussed these cases from the perspective of civil rights and liberties of the individual. What I want to highlight is how undue deference to the Executive in “time of crisis” has undermined the independent role of the judiciary. Torture, executive detentions, illegal surveillance, and now killing of U.S. citizens, have all escaped judicial review under a variety of excuses. To be clear, many of the people against whom these abuses have been levied are, or were, very dangerous if not evil individuals. Khalid Sheikh Muhamed and Anwar al-Aulaqi should not be allowed to roam free to kill innocent civilians. But hundreds of years of history show that there are ways of dealing with such people within the limits of restrained government without resort to the hubris and indignity of unreviewed executive discretion. The turning of blind eyes by many, albeit not all, federal judges is a chapter of this history that will weigh heavily against us in the future. No judge wants to feel responsible for the deaths of innocents. But moral responsibility for death is with those who contribute to the act. Meanwhile the judge has a moral responsibility for abuses by government of which the judiciary is a part. There is nothing “new” in the killing of innocents for religious or political vengeance. This violence has always been with us and will unfortunately continue despite our best efforts to curb it. Pleas for executive carte blanche power are exactly what the history of the writ of habeas corpus were developed to avoid,14 and what many statements in various declarations of human rights are all about. The way of unreviewed executive discretion is the way of tyranny.

#### And, judicial review of the military is critical to balanced civil-military relations- Congress and the Executive cannot check themselves

Gilbert, Lieutenant Colonel, 98 (Michael, Lieutenant Colonel Michael H. Gilbert, B.S., USAF Academy; MSBA, Boston University; J.D., McGeorge School of Law; LL.M., Harvard Law School. He is a member of the State Bars of Nebraska and California. “ARTICLE: The Military and the Federal Judiciary: an Unexplored Part of the Civil-Military Relations Triangle,” 8 USAFA J. Leg. Stud. 197, lexis)

The legislative, executive, and judicial branches of the federal government comprise and form a triangle surrounding the military, each branch occupying one side of the civil-military triangle. Commentators have written countless pages discussing, analyzing, and describing the civil-military relationship that the Congress and the President have with the armed forces they respectively regulate and command. Most commentators, however, have neglected to consider the crucial position and role of the federal judiciary. This article examines the relationship between the judiciary and the military in the interest of identifying the role that the judiciary, specifically the United States Supreme Court, plays in civil-military relations. Without an actual, meaningful presence of the judiciary as a leg of the civil-military triangle, the triangle is incomplete and collapses. In its current structure, the judiciary has adopted a non-role by deferring its responsibility to oversee the lawfulness of the other two branches to those branches themselves. This dereliction, which arguably is created by the malfeasance of the United States Supreme Court, has resulted in inherent inequities to the nation, in general, and to service members, in particular, as the federal courts are reluctant to protect even basic civil rights of military members. Judicial oversight is one form of civilian control over the military; abrogating this responsibility is to return power to the military hierarchy that is not meant to be theirs. [\*198] Under the United States Constitution, Congress has plenary authority over the maintenance and regulation of the armed forces, and the President is expressly made the Commander-in-Chief of the armed forces. The unwillingness of the Court to provide a check and balance on these two equal branches of the federal government creates an area virtually unchallengeable by the public. As a result, a large group of people, members of the military services, lack recourse to address wrongs perpetrated against them by their military and civilian superiors. Ironically, the very men and women dedicating their lives to protect the U.S. Constitution lack many of the basic protections the Constitution affords everyone else in this nation. The weakness in the present system is that the Supreme Court has taken a detour from the Constitution with regard to reviewing military issues under the normally recognized requirements of the Constitution. The federal judiciary, following the lead of the Supreme Court, has created de facto immunity from judicial interference by those who seek to challenge policy or procedure established by the other two branches and the military itself. When the "Thou Shalt Nots" of the Amendments to the Constitution compete with the necessities of the military, the conflict is resolved in favor of the military because it is seen as a separate society based upon the constitutionally granted authority of Congress to maintain and regulate the armed forces. 1 Essentially, the Court permits a separate world to be created for the military because of this regulation, distinguishing and separating the military from society. 2 The Court needs to reexamine their almost complete deference on military matters, which is tantamount to an exception to the Bill of Rights for matters concerning members of the military. Unless the Court begins to provide the oversight that is normally dedicated to many other areas of law fraught with complexity and national importance, judicial review of the military will continue to be relegated to a footnote in the annals of law. Combined with the downsizing and further consequent decline of interaction between the military and general society, 3 this exile from the protection of the Constitution could breed great injustices within the military. Perhaps even more importantly, the military might actually begin to believe that they are indeed second-class citizens, separate from the general [\*199] population, which could create dire problems with civil-military relations that are already the subject of concern by many observers. 4

#### And, domestic protection for the rule of law specifically is critical to the effectiveness of the US CMR model abroad.

Barnes, Retired Colonel, 11 (Rudy Barnes, Jr., BA in PoliSci from the Citadel, Military Awards: Legion of Merit, Meritorious Service Medal, Army Commendation Medal, Army Achievement Medal with Oak Leaf Cluster, Army Reserve Component Achievement Medal, National Defense Service Medal, “Military Legitimacy: Might and Right in the New Millennium”, originally published in 1996, revised Feb 8, 2011, document accessed from: http://militarylegitimacyreview.com/?page\_id=206)

Continuing nation assistance operations have confirmed the importance of human rights and civil-military relations to military legitimacy. Military forces in undemocratic regimes have historically been associated with human rights violations and political oppression. The U.S. has provided security and humanitarian assistance to encourage democratization in many such regimes: first to Latin America in the 1970s and 1980s, and more recently to Eastern Europe and Russia. In most developing countries the military is not separated from domestic politics as in the U.S., and is expected to provide internal as well as external security to the civilian population. This makes it especially important that the requirements of internal security be balanced with the restraint needed to protect human rights. In Latin America the exercise of political power by military forces has had a corrosive influence on military professionalism and civil-military relations. The use of the military to protect or install corrupt regimes has eroded their legitimacy. To build the public support required for military legitimacy, Latin American militaries must limit their political role, constrain the use of force, and focus on improving civil-military relations.21 A joint project between US Army military lawyers and their Peruvian counterparts to promote human rights is discussed in chapter 7. It illustrates how institutionalizing respect for human rights in the military can improve civil-military relations and legitimacy. According to the 1993 UN Truth Commission Report on the civil war in El Salvador the Salvadoran military has a long way to go to achieve legitimacy. The Report indicates gross human rights violations were committed by death squads associated with U.S.-trained military forces. The conviction of two officers for the murder of six Jesuit priests in 1989 was a positive step, but the failure to purge those officers identified with human rights violations indicates military legitimacy remains an elusive goal. In Eastern Europe there have been similar problems with military legitimacy. Promoting the values of democracy, human rights, and the rule of law in former communist countries can contribute to peace, security and military legitimacy in two ways: first, democratic regimes are less likely to misuse their military power than authoritarian regimes; and second, the democratic values of individual liberty and civilian control contribute to better civil-military relations and military professionalism, and professionalism (internal control) is the best defense against the misuse of military power.22 The failure of civil-military relations and military professionalism in the "masterless" armies of the former Yugoslavia has contributed to the unspeakable atrocities in the Bosnian civil war. Better civil-military relations and military professionalism could help protect human rights and prevent the spread of similar violence throughout the region. "Civil-military relations take on a deeper significance and must be viewed as a critical element in the struggle to maintain legitimacy of existing democratic governments as they attempt to deal with the internal and external manifestations of this crisis."23 The future of democracy, human rights, and the rule of law in emerging democracies depends upon better civil-military relations, which will require effective separation of military and political power (ideally civilian control of the military), but this should not preclude domestic military missions with political implications. For U.S. military advisors to help their indigenous counterparts improve civil-military relations, they must understand the requirements and principles of military legitimacy, especially the role of human rights and the rule of law. Civil-military relations in the U.S. There have been important lessons learned in civil-military relations in the U.S. as well as overseas. While they have not involved serious violations of human rights (with the exception of the Indian wars and the Kent State incident) they do provide important lessons in military legitimacy and useful precedents for the future.

#### And, CMR modeling is specifically true for Latin America-- Unchecked military power over terrorism makes US CMR promotion in Latin America fail—sending a model of an independent judiciary is key.

Weeks, prof- political science, 06 (By Gregory Weeks, Assistant Professor of Political Science, University of North Carolina at Charlotte, FIGHTING TERRORISM WHILE PROMOTING DEMOCRACY: COMPETING PRIORITIES IN U.S. DEFENSE POLICY TOWARD LATIN AMERICA,<http://clas-pages.uncc.edu/gregory-weeks/files/2012/04/WeeksG_2006JTWSarticle.pdf>)

There is a growing literature on judicial reform in Latin America, which emphasizes the need for greater access, efficiency, transparency, and independence.38 For democratic civil-military relations, the most important factor is judicial independence. The judicial branch is the main civilian source of accountability for members of the armed forces who have committed crimes against civilians. At the same time, it provides due process to the accused, thus ensuring that they receive a fair trial and maintaining the military's faith in the system. To serve in that role, judges must be independent from outside pressure. It is also necessary for those same soldiers to view the courts as fair and impartial. When the process becomes routinized, then the institution can be considered fully effective. Measuring the effectiveness of the courts is perhaps the most straightforward. In a study of judicial reform in Latin America, William Prillaman argues that independence can be measured by tracking the willingness of courts to rule against the government.39 However, for cases involving members of the military, independence also means ruling against the military leadership. Have soldiers been tried, convicted, and imprisoned for crimes they have committed? Even further, were judges successful in that regard even in the face of military resistance? Especially in the context of countries emerging from authoritarian rule (and even more so when the dictatorship was highly repressive) judges can be harassed, threatened, or even killed, or the civilian government may accept military demands to be left alone, fearing the political (or perhaps even personal) consequences. With some exceptions, judicial systems in Latin American countries have not been successful in addressing crimes committed by the armed forces (or the police). Even in some countries—such as Guatemala-where judges have periodically been able to overcome military pressure, court cases have been accompanied by violence or the threat of it. The worst records have been in Central America and the Andean region, whereas in the southern cone notable advances have been made. Especially in Colombia, but also in Ecuador and Peru, intimidation means that many cases are never investigated and judges are reluctant to hear them. Amnesties blocked civilian courts to a significant degree in Brazil, Chile, and Uruguay. In both Argentina and (surprisingly) Chile, the process of routinization is further advanced than elsewhere, so that when officers are called to testify there is less civil-military conflict than in the past, but this remains exceptional in the region. At the 2004 defense meetings in Ecuador, the Mexican Defense Minister spoke of the Mexican military's more "pro-active" stance in the fighting terrorism, which will certainly raise questions about jurisdiction if officers are implicated in abuses. Apart from interaction on the basis of extradition requests (most prominently in the case of Colombia) the judiciary is not a central issue for U.S. defense policy and it is not raised in the 2000 or 2002 National Security Strategy except for the goal of teaching respect for human rights in U.S. military training programs. Nonetheless, the United States Agency for International Development does provide funding for training and judicial development in general.'"' There are two important ways in which U.S. defense policy affects the judiciary, First, support for the regimes that commit serious abuses almost certainly contributes to a general sense of impunity. This was, of course, particularly true when dictatorships were the norm in the region Second, the militarization of areas deemed havens for terrorism (especially drug traffickers) has increased the number of human rights abuses and, in several countries, has increased pressure on judges not to prosecute (especially in Colombia). Another dilemma for civilian governments in Latin America is the scope of military justice in Latin America. In many countries, civilians can be brought before military courts for a broad range of offenses and officers can often find protection from prosecution by civilian courts. Reform has been slow and uneven."' The Staff Judge Advocate's Office of the United States Southern Command has created programs for military justice, such as in Colombia and Venezuela in 1998."^ The main goal for Colombia was to institutionalize the protection of human rights in military courts, whereas the Venezuelan military wished to reform its system of courts martial. Renewed emphasis on antiterrorism and internal security, however, raises the risk that military judges will try more civilians, who will not enjoy the same rights and privileges as they would in civilian courts. Given the debate over terrorist suspects being held in the United States, Latin American armed forces can easily claim that military courts are more appropriate in the context of the war against terrorism. They can also claim that, given national security concerns, the military should not be held accountable to any courts other than its own. The same arguments were often made during the Cold War. Finally, just as with the legislative branch, the emphasis on military intelligence gathering as an element of anti-terrorist policy reinforces the military's perceived need for secrecy and a minimum of civilian oversight. Even before the attacks on the United States, analysts were noting the "heightened tension between demands for secrecy and the desire for enhanced civil liberties.'"43 A return to Cold War-era notions of national security and secrecy represents an obstacle to the development of an effective judicial branch. In particular, the call for regional sharing of intelligence raises legitimate questions about precisely which judicial bodies would have authority to act in defense of civil liberties. Although leaders—both civilian and military—of numerous Latin American countries have indicated approval of the general idea (and southern cone countries have even broached the issue of a regional military) no specifics have yet been forthcoming. The primary historical parallel would be Operation Condor, the multinational (Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Paraguay, and Uruguay) intelligence system created in 1975 as a way to consolidate anti-communist dictatorships and eliminate political enemies. Although transitions to civilian rule have long taken place, judiciaries remain ill-equipped to confront what would become complex issues of jurisdiction, human rights, and the role military courts. CONCLUSION For civil-military relations to become more democratic in Latin America, it is obviously vital for civilian defense institutions to become stronger. When both civilians and officers view those institutions as legitimate, then the civil-military relationship will become increasingly predictable and differences can be mediated without overt conflict. Defense institutions provide a structure through which civilians and officers can accept each other's expertise and gradually learn that enmity is not always inevitable. This is an especially difficult process in Latin America, where civil-military discord has historically been the norm. The military's historic skepticism of civilian policy makers has, in most countries, solidified the notion that civilians are incapable of handling national defense, while civilians view the armed forces with a suspicion born of military intervention and dictatorship. Therefore, the task of "civilianizing" those institutions is formidable. Beginning in the 1990s, the United States developed a defense policy toward Latin America that, for the first time, emphasized the need for greater civilian expertise and oversight in the region, especially in terms of building more democratic civil-military institutions, which had been sorely lacking in the region. The terrorist attacks of 11 September 2001, however, reoriented U.S. defense policy toward encouraging Latin American militaries to become more involved in intelligence gathering, border patrol and domestic law enforcement, roles that civilians had painstakingly been trying to wrest away from military control. These competing policy goals thus send mixed messages about the real priorities of the U.S. government. Although U.S. policy makers remain focused primarily on the Andean region, it is clear that they view terrorism as a threat in every Latin American country. Furthermore, the main proposed tactic for combating terrorism is increased use of the armed forces in each country, whether it is border patrol, intelligence gathering, fighting guerrillas, or taking over a variety of national police duties. By militarizing policy and emphasizing a largely military response, anti-terrorist initiatives have the strong potential for undermining the stated policy goal of democratizing civil-military institutions in the region. These institutions, which already suffer from a lack of historical effectiveness, have only begun to assert themselves, and these efforts will suffer as a result of a renewed military emphasis on perceived threats to national security.

#### Latin American CMR are key to regional stability.

Hunter, prof of Government, 96 (Wendy Hunter, professor of Government at Berkeley, STATE AND SOLDIER IN LATIN AMERICA Redefining the Military’s Role in Argentina, Brazil, and Chile, http://www.usip.org/sites/default/files/pwks10.pdf)

Recent years have given rise to an intense debate about appropriate roles for Latin America’s armed forces: Should they remain the guardians of political stability, or should they restrict themselves mainly to external defense? The two major challenges for the region’s civilian leaders are to carve out missions for their militaries appropriate to both the security environment of the post–Cold War era and to civil-military relations in a democracy, and to provide ways militaries will effectively adopt these missions. This essay examines efforts to identify such missions and assign them to Latin America’s armed forces. It also analyzes the implications for democracy and civilian control of specific roles for the armed forces that are either under consideration or already under way in Argentina, Brazil, and Chile. These countries’ militaries are the most powerful in the Americas outside of the United States and have also ruled their countries for a lengthy period during the Cold War era. If the region’s civilian governments do little to shape roles for the military that are compatible with democracy and civilian control, the result will be continued military meddling in civilian decision making and inflated defense budgets. This will increase the difficulty of the region’s governments to restructure their economies and free up resources that could be devoted to long-neglected social concerns. If left unattended, poverty and other social problems could well pose long-term risks to political stability as restive segments of these societies lose patience with new democratic institutions. The status of the armed forces also has consequences for regional peace. Whether historical nationalist conflicts will remain at bay depends on how the armed forces in these countries react to efforts to redefine their role vis-à-vis the state and their place in society. Latin America currently has the chance to reshape its political landscape, making it more compatible with sustaining democracy at home and securing peace and security in the region and abroad. The serious implications of civil-military relations merit investigation of where Latin American militaries are headed and what determines the specific paths they take.

#### Latin America instability causes extinction

Manwaring 5 (Max G., Retired U.S. Army colonel and an Adjunct Professor of International Politics at Dickinson College, venezuela’s hugo chávez, bolivarian socialism, and asymmetric warfare, October 2005, pg. PUB628.pdf)

President Chávez also understands that the process leading to state failure is the most dangerous long-term security challenge facing the global community today. The argument in general is that failing and failed state status is the breeding ground for instability, criminality, insurgency, regional conflict, and terrorism. These conditions breed massive humanitarian disasters and major refugee flows. They can host “evil” networks of all kinds, whether they involve criminal business enterprise, narco-trafficking, or some form of ideological crusade such as *Bolivarianismo.* More specifically, these conditions spawn all kinds of things people in general do not like such as murder, kidnapping, corruption, intimidation, and destruction of infrastructure. These means of coercion and persuasion can spawn further human rights violations, torture, poverty, starvation, disease, the recruitment and use of child soldiers, trafficking in women and body parts, trafficking and proliferation of conventional weapons systems and WMD, genocide, ethnic cleansing, warlordism, and criminal anarchy. At the same time, these actions are usually unconfined and spill over into regional syndromes of poverty, destabilization, and conflict.62 Peru’s *Sendero Luminoso* calls violent and destructive activities that facilitate the processes of state failure “armed propaganda.” Drug cartels operating throughout the Andean Ridge of South America and elsewhere call these activities “business incentives.” Chávez considers these actions to be steps that must be taken to bring about the political conditions necessary to establish Latin American socialism for the 21st century.63 Thus, in addition to helping to provide wider latitude to further their tactical and operational objectives, state and nonstate actors’ strategic efforts are aimed at progressively lessening a targeted regime’s credibility and capability in terms of its ability and willingness to govern and develop its national territory and society. Chávez’s intent is to focus his primary attack politically and psychologically on selected Latin American governments’ ability and right to govern. In that context, he understands that popular perceptions of corruption, disenfranchisement, poverty, and lack of upward mobility limit the right and the ability of a given regime to conduct the business of the state. Until a given populace generally perceives that its government is dealing with these and other basic issues of political, economic, and social injustice fairly and effectively, instability and the threat of subverting or destroying such a government are real.64 But failing and failed states simply do not go away. Virtually anyone can take advantage of such an unstable situation. The tendency is that the best motivated and best armed organization on the scene will control that instability. As a consequence, failing and failed states become dysfunctional states, rogue states, criminal states, narco-states, or new people’s democracies. In connection with the creation of new people’s democracies, one can rest assured that Chávez and his Bolivarian populist allies will be available to provide money, arms, and leadership at any given opportunity. And, of course, the longer dysfunctional, rogue, criminal, and narco-states and people’s democracies persist, the more they and their associated problems endanger global security, peace, and prosperity.65

#### Stable CMR is key to check nuclear proliferation and conserves nuclear cooperation efforts in Latin America

Finnochio 2 (Chris James, Lieutenant, United States Navy, “LATIN AMERICAN REGIONAL COOPERATIVE SECURITY: CIVIL-MILITARY RELATIONS AND ECONOMIC INTERDEPENDENCE” <http://www.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/a407008.pdf>)

V. CONCLUSION The Southern Cone developed into a democratic, civilian controlled, economically integrated region, where its members, specifically Argentina and Brazil, exist under the umbrella of cooperative security. The influences of this cooperation, although pervasive do not, as of yet, affect all aspects of the state. Southern Cone militaries, interdependent and collaborative are not integrated, and the proposal for a common defensive force for MERCOSUR by Argentina is potentially decades away from realization. Regardless, the nations of this area have progressed lightyears from their former existence as warring, distrustful neighbors. There is ample evidence to support the notion of an emergent cooperative security zone between Argentina and Brazil. Chapter II presented data showing a paradigm shift in foreign policy, a marked rise in multilateral peacekeeping missions and an increase in security agreements between Argentina and Brazil. Specific national security and foreign policy reversals ushered in the new era of cooperative security: (1) Argentine Presidents Alfonsín and Menem’s foreign policy statements, most critically, that Argentina has no foreign adversaries, and (2) Brazil’s defense industry reductions and foreign policy reversals under Franco and Cardoso, specifically on nuclear cooperation which enhanced regional peace. What then is the cause of this security community? Chapters III and IV addressed potential causes such as civilian control of the military and economic integration 57 respectively. These variables were examined because of their tremendous bearing on foreign policy and the apparent dissent in the literature about their relative significance in contributing to Southern Cone cooperative security. This thesis found that a high degree of military control in a government has adverse effects on regional security. The military mindset is often defensive, even distrustful, and typically aggressive. Interstate cooperation can diminish to the point of non-existence when the government espouses such attitudes because military personnel hold office or exercise a high degree of political control. Surely, this was the case in Latin America up until the 1980s. When the election of civilian leaders coincided with the apparent emergence of regional cooperative security in the Southern Cone, it become increasingly tempting for academics to attribute this to civilian control. While civil-military relations explain why the armed forces were no longer an obstacle to security cooperation, they do not explain civilian motivations for pursuing cooperative security. What were the civilian motivations that coalesced with democratic control of the military in order to increase security cooperation? Economic integration in response to hyperinflation and a shrinking share of the international market explains the civilian impetus toward security cooperation. The most telling example of this was the creation of MERCOSUR. Argentina and Brazil joined Paraguay and Uruguay in signing the Treaty of Asuncion creating the Southern Cone Common Market. The economic hardship of Argentina and Brazil forced the civilian leadership to take a different tact from the nationalistic stance of the former military regime. Chapter IV points out that economic considerations were the impetus behind the integration and that they were responsible for initial steps toward security cooperation and its continued deepening over time. The success of MERCOSUR in turn, has increased activity related to security cooperation. Neighboring countries whose economic fates have become inexorably intertwined realize that they must inhibit military provocation that could cause armed conflict and thereby undermine economic gains (Pion-Berlin 2000, 62). Most succeeding treaties between the two partners serve to deepen economic integration and foster hemispheric peace. Civil-military control and economic integration are not end-states, but rather exist in degrees along a continuum. For civil-military relations, this continuum stretches from total military autonomy, through a gradation of elected civilian leadership with military tutelage, to the aspiration of complete subjugation of the armed forces. Economic integration spans the range from a simple customs union to a common market, absent of any restrictions against member nations (Pion-Berlin 2000, 44). Argentina and Brazil have been and continue to progress along these linear developmental paths. Each continuum of development feeds off and contributes to the progression of the other. The beginnings of Southern Cone regional security rest with the initial diplomatic and political newly elected civilians of Argentina and Brazil. . The desire for economic stability resulted in the creation of the Southern Cone Common Market. Finally, security cooperation stemmed from a need to reduce any potential military threat to economic integration. In Argentina, where a discredited military totally lost public support, security cooperation progressed more rapidly. In Brazil, where the military was still powerful, cooperation moved more slowly. In Argentina, the military suffered two debilitating defeats in the early 1980s. The first was the loss of public support because of the “Dirty War” and the second their defeat by the British in the Falklands/Malvinas War in 1982. The result was twofold. Civilian leaders quickly expanded their influence in government policymaking and the military’s size and political control rapidly shrunk. Military subjugation to civilian control removed the armed forces as an obstacle to security cooperation and the civilian desires to improve the economy motivated the shift in policy toward economic and security cooperation. In Brazil, advances came at a significantly subdued rate, where the military was a principal architect of the transition from authoritarianism to democracy. Success or failure in subjugating the military depends in large part on the negotiations between authoritarian leaders and the emerging democratic opposition during the transition period. Alfred Stepan writes, In a democratic regime the degree of articulated contestation by the military is strongly affected by the extent to which there is intense dispute or substantial agreement between the military and the incoming government concerning a number of issues. When Brazil broke from authoritarian rule, the subsequent years proved difficult for civilian leaders in their effort to check military power. The Brazilian armed forces “succeeded in maintaining their tutelage over some of the political regimes that have arisen from the process of transformation” (Zaverucha, 283). The result, unlike in Argentina where the military lost most, if not all its political power, was a Brazilian military that maintained a prominent role in the formation of government policy. The leaders of the armed forces continued to hold, well after democratization, six seats in the cabinet, as well as positions on the National Security Council and state intelligence agency, and influence with the legislature. The extent of military prerogatives after the democratic transition slowed the pace at which Brazil accepted cooperative security initiatives compared to Argentina. 61 In sum, civilian controls over the military and economic integration are both necessary for a region of cooperative security, and neither of them alone is sufficient. Civilian economic theories and cooperative policy initiatives would never have come to fruition if military autonomy went unbroken because such initiatives ran contradictory to the geopolitical philosophy of the military and their rationale for staying in power. Nevertheless, military subordination alone would not have guaranteed interstate cooperative security for there are numerous nations that exist under democratic civilian control of the military without being members of a regional security block. It is necessary to understand civilian motives for pursuing regional security cooperation. In Argentina and Brazil, civilian leaders sought to cure economic crises through cooperation and integration with their neighbors sharing similar circumstances. ArgentineBrazilian economic integration was a goal pursued by civilian presidents. Cooperative security followed from this same goal as a way to defeat the political opposition to their cooperative theories from geopolitical thinkers, by changing the national mindset and ensuring continued economic success through increased ties and continued communication attributable to economic integration.

#### Cooperative security engagements check nuclear proliferation throughout Latin America and is a model that checks global proliferation

Sanchez 11/16/11 (Alex, Research Fellow @ Council on Hemispheric Affairs “The Unlikely Success: Latin America and Nuclear Weapons” <http://wasanchez.blogspot.com/2011/11/unlikely-success-latin-america-and.html>)

Nuclear Cooperation Even though Latin American states haven’t had a nuclear weapons program in decades, nuclear cooperation does exist. The best example is the creation of the ABACC (Agencia Brasileno-Argentina de Contabilidad y Control de Materiales Nucleares - Brazilian-Argentine Agency for Accounting and Control of Nuclear Materials), which is responsible for overseeing a cooperation agreement initiated in 1991, in which Buenos Aires and Brasilia agreed to commit to using nuclear energy for solely peaceful purposes. In that year, Argentina, Brazil, the ABACC, and the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) signed the Quadripartite Agreement, specifying procedures for IAEA and ABACC for the monitoring and verification of Argentine and Brazilian nuclear installations. (8) Nevertheless, it is worth stating that neither country has signed the additional protocol by the IEAE which gives the international watchdog the right to access information and visit nuclear sites. (9) A 2009 commentary by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, a think tank headquartered in Washington DC, puts the nuclear relations between Brasilia and Buenos Aires into perspective: “Argentina and Brazil are seen as having been successful in turning their nuclear competition into cooperation through mutual confidence. This approach is often considered as a model for other regions where potential nuclear proliferation risks may be perceived. However, it is not yet certain that both countries will become competent partners by taking advantage of their joint strengths. Certain obstacles could endanger this process. Bureaucratic resistance, as well as possible asymmetries of interests and views -especially those related to the possibility of sharing proprietary technology - could upset the internal balance of the agreement and, therefore, its long-term sustainability.” (10) Indeed, while the current levels of nuclear cooperation between Brazil and Argentina are positive, it is important to understand that they are not fault-proof and there is the possibility that cooperation could take a turn for the worst. For example, should inter-state disputes arise, or if military governments appear again, then a worst case scenario could be that nuclear weapons programs could be revisited. In addition Venezuela has had plans for creating its own nuclear energy program with support from Iran. Some analysts have gone as far as arguing that Iranian mining companies currently operating in Venezuela may be trying to find uranium to use in Iran’s nuclear projects. (11) In interviews between the author of this essay and several Latin America military officials, (12) the consensus was that regional governments did not have a problem with Caracas looking to produce nuclear energy, but greater transparency is necessary to maintain inter-state confidence.

#### Global proliferation risk nuclear conflict- new prolif risks theft, unauthorized use, terrorism, and crisis escalation.

Busch, Professor of Government-Christopher Newport, 04 (Nathan, “No End in Sight: The Continuing Menace of Nuclear Proliferation” p 281-314)

Summing Up: Will the Further Spread of Nuclear Weapons Be Better or Worse? This study has revealed numerous reasons to be skeptical that the spread of nuclear weapons would increase international stability by helping prevent conventional and nuclear wars. Because there is reason to suspect that emerging NWSs will not handle their nuclear weapons and fissile materials any better than current NWSs have, we should conclude that the further spread of nuclear weapons will tend to undermine international stability in a number of ways. First, because emerging NWSs will probably rely on inadequate command-and-control systems, the risks of accidental and unauthorized use will tend to be fairly high. Second, because emerging NWSs will tend to adopt systems that allow for rapid response, the risks of inadvertent war will also be high, especially during crisis situations. Third, because emerging NWSs will tend to adopt MPC&A systems that are vulnerable to overt attacks and insider thefts, the further spread of nuclear weapons could lead to rapid, destabilizing proliferation and increased opportunities for nuclear terrorism. Finally, there is reason to question whether nuclear weapons will in fact increase stability. Although nuclear weapons can cause states to be cautious about undertaking actions that can be interpreted as aggressive and can prevent states from attacking one another, this may not always be the case. While the presence of nuclear weapons did appear to help constrain U.S. and Soviet actions during the Cold War, this has generally not held true in South Asia. Many analysts conclude that Pakistan invaded Indian-controlled Kargil in 1999, at least in part, because it was confident that its nuclear weapons would deter a large-scale Indian retaliation. The Kargil war was thus in part caused by the presence of nuclear weapons in South Asia. Thus, the optimist argument that nuclear weapons will help prevent conventional war has not always held true. Moreover, this weakness in the optimist argument should also cause us to question the second part of their argument, that nuclear weapons help prevent nuclear war as well. Conventional wars between nuclear powers can run serious risks of escalating to nuclear war."5 Based on a careful examination of nuclear programs in the United States, Russia, China, India, and Pakistan, as well as preliminary studies of the programs in Iraq, North Korea, and Iran, this book concludes that the optimists' arguments about the actions that emerging NWSs will probably take are overly optimistic. While it is impossible to prove that further nuclear proliferation will necessarily precipitate nuclear disasters, the potential consequences are too severe to advocate nuclear weapons proliferation in hopes that the stability predicted by the optimists will indeed occur.

## 2AC

### 2AC T – Authority

#### We meet-Due process rights are judicial restrictions on executive authority

Al-Aulaqi Motion to Dismiss Memo 2013 (PLAINTIFFS’ OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS’ MOTION TO DISMISS, files February 5, 2013)

Despite Defendants’ attempt to distinguish the habeas cases, Defs. Br. 12, claims alleging

unlawful deprivation of life under the Fifth Amendment’s Due Process Clause are as textually

committed to the courts as claims brought under the Suspension Clause. Both are fundamental

judicial checks on executive authority. Cf. Boumediene v. Bush, 476 F.3d 981, 993 (D.C. Cir.

1997) (rejecting distinction between the Suspension Clause and Bill of Rights amendments

because both are “restrictions on governmental power”), rev’d on other grounds by Boumediene,

553 U.S. 723.

#### We meet-Ex post review is a restriction on targeting killing authority-Ex Ante review increases executive authority and links to all of their ground arguments

Jaffer-Director ACLU Center for Democracy-13 (Jameel Jaffer, Director of the ACLU's Center for Democracy, “Judicial Review of Targeted Killings,” 126 Harv. L. Rev. F. 185 (2013), <http://www.harvardlawreview.org/issues/126/april13/forum_1002.php>)

Since 9/11, the CIA and Joint Special Operations Command (JSOC) have used armed drones to kill thousands of people in places far removed from conventional battlefields. Legislators, legal scholars, and human rights advocates have raised concerns about civilian casualties, the legal basis for the strikes, the process by which the executive selects its targets, and the actual or contemplated deployment of armed drones into additional countries. Some have proposed that Congress establish a court to approve (or disapprove) strikes before the government carries them out. While judicial engagement with the targeted killing program is long overdue, those aiming to bring the program in line with our legal traditions and moral intuitions should think carefully before embracing this proposal. Creating a new court to issue death warrants is more likely to normalize the targeted killing program than to restrain it. The argument for some form of judicial review is compelling, not least because such review would clarify the scope of the government’s authority to use lethal force. The targeted killing program is predicated on sweeping constructions of the 2001 Authorization for Use of Military Force (AUMF) and the President’s authority to use military force in national self-defense. The government contends, for example, that the AUMF authorizes it to use lethal force against groups that had nothing to do with the 9/11 attacks and that did not even exist when those attacks were carried out. It contends that the AUMF gives it authority to use lethal force against individuals located far from conventional battlefields. As the Justice Department’s recently leaked white paper makes clear, the government also contends that the President has authority to use lethal force against those deemed to present “continuing” rather than truly imminent threats. These claims are controversial. They have been rejected or questioned by human rights groups, legal scholars, federal judges, and U.N. special rapporteurs. Even enthusiasts of the drone program have become anxious about its legal soundness. (“People in Washington need to wake up and realize the legal foundations are crumbling by the day,” Professor Bobby Chesney, a supporter of the program, recently said.) Judicial review could clarify the limits on the government’s legal authority and supply a degree of legitimacy to actions taken within those limits. It could also encourage executive officials to observe these limits. Executive officials would be less likely to exceed or abuse their authority if they were required to defend their conduct to federal judges. Even Jeh Johnson, the Defense Department’s former general counsel and a vocal defender of the targeted killing program, acknowledged in a recent speech that judicial review could add “rigor” to the executive’s decisionmaking process. In explaining the function of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court, which oversees government surveillance in certain national security investigations, executive officials have often said that even the mere prospect of judicial review deters error and abuse. But to recognize that judicial review is indispensible in this context is not to say that Congress should establish a specialized court, still less that it should establish such a court to review contemplated killings before they are carried out. First, the establishment of such a court would almost certainly entrench the notion that the government has authority, even far away from conflict zones, to use lethal force against individuals who do not present imminent threats. When a threat is truly imminent, after all, the government will not have time to apply to a court for permission to carry out a strike. Exigency will make prior judicial review infeasible. To propose that a court should review contemplated strikes before they are carried out is to accept that the government should be contemplating strikes against people who do not present imminent threats. This is why the establishment of a specialized court would more likely institutionalize the existing program, with its elision of the imminence requirement, than narrow it. Second, judicial engagement with the targeted killing program does not actually require the establishment of a new court. In a case pending before Judge Rosemary Collyer of the District Court for the District of Columbia, the ACLU and the Center for Constitutional Rights represent the estates of the three U.S. citizens whom the CIA and JSOC killed in Yemen in 2011. The complaint, brought under Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents, seeks to hold senior executive officials liable for conduct that allegedly violated the Fourth and Fifth Amendments. It asks the court to articulate the limits of the government’s legal authority and to assess whether those limits were honored. In other words, the complaint asks the court to conduct the kind of review that many now seem to agree that courts should conduct. This kind of review—ex post review in the context of a Bivens action—could clarify the relevant legal framework in the same way that review by a specialized court could. But it also has many advantages over the kind of review that would likely take place in a specialized court. In a Bivens action, the proceedings are adversarial rather than ex parte, increasing their procedural legitimacy and improving their substantive accuracy. Hearings are open to the public, at least presumptively. The court can focus on events that have already transpired rather than events that might or might not transpire in the future. And a Bivens action can also provide a kind of accountability that could not be supplied by a specialized court reviewing contemplated strikes ex ante: redress for family members of people killed unlawfully, and civil liability for officials whose conduct in approving or carrying out the strike violated the Constitution. (Of course, in one profound sense a Bivens action will always come too late, because the strike alleged to be unlawful will already have been carried out. Again, though, if “imminence” is a requirement, ex ante judicial review is infeasible by definition.) Another advantage of the Bivens model is that the courts are already familiar with it. The courts quite commonly adjudicate wrongful death claims and “survival” claims brought by family members of individuals killed by law enforcement agents. In the national security context, federal courts are now accustomed to considering habeas petitions filed by individuals detained at Guantánamo. They opine on the scope of the government’s legal authority and they assess the sufficiency of the government’s evidence — the same tasks they would perform in the context of suits challenging the lawfulness of targeted killings. While Congress could of course affirm or strengthen the courts’ authority to review the lawfulness of targeted killings if it chose to do so, or legislatively narrow some of the judicially created doctrines that have precluded courts from reaching the merits in some Bivens suits, more than 40 years of Supreme Court precedent since Bivens makes clear that federal courts have not only the authority to hear after-the-fact claims brought by individuals whose constitutional rights have been infringed but also the obligation to do so. Proponents of a specialized targeted killing court are right to recognize that the judiciary has a crucial role to play in articulating and enforcing legal limits on the government’s use of lethal force. Congress need not establish a new court, however, in order for the judiciary to do what the Constitution already empowers and obliges it to do.

#### C/I – Authority is what the president may do not what the president can do

Ellen Taylor 96, 21 Del. J. Corp. L. 870 (1996), Hein Online

The term authority is commonly thought of in the context of the law of agency, and the Restatement (Second) of Agency defines both power and authority.'89 Power refers to an agent's ability or capacity to produce a change in a legal relation (whether or not the principal approves of the change), and authority refers to the power given (permission granted) to the agent by the principal to affect the legal relations of the principal; the distinction is between what the agent can do and what the agent may do.

#### **Ex ante isn’t a real restriction-only ex post is a real limit on authority-turns all their ground arguments**

Hafetz, former ACLU National Security Project attorney, 13 (Jonathan Hafetz, former senior attorney at the ACLU’s National Security Project, a litigation director at NYU’s Brennan Center for Justice, and a John J. Gibbons Fellow in Public Interest and Constitutional Law at Gibbons, P.C, Reviewing Drones, March 8, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/jonathan-hafetz/reviewing-drones_b_2815671.html>)

FISA, however, provides a poor model for court review of drone strikes. Determining whether, and when, to launch a lethal strike can require time-sensitive decision-making ill-suited to careful judicial deliberation. Even if review addresses only the antecedent question of whether to place a person on a "kill list," judges will invariably defer to claims by executive-branch officials about the imminence of a threat and the necessity of a strike. Pre-strike review, moreover, would place judges in the untenable position of having to sign death warrants -- a position judges are likely to resist. Judges, to be sure, make rulings every day with enormous consequences for human life and liberty. But they typically do so only after a trial, where both sides have presented evidence, and not -- as in the case of the FISA court -- in a secret proceeding based solely on the government's evidence. A FISA review model would, in short, risk legitimizing drone strikes without providing any real check on their use. The better course is to ensure meaningful review after the fact. To this end, Congress should authorize federal damages suits by the immediate family members of individuals killed in drone strikes. Such ex post review would serve two main functions: providing judicial scrutiny of the underlying legal basis for targeted killings and affording victims a remedy. It would also give judges more leeway to evaluate the facts without fear that an error on their part might leave a dangerous terrorist at large. For review to be meaningful, judges must not be restricted to deciding whether there is enough evidence in a particular case, as they would likely be under a FISA model. They must also be able to examine the government's legal arguments and, to paraphrase the great Supreme Court chief justice John Marshall, "to say what the law is" on targeted killings. Judicial review through a civil action can achieve that goal. It can thus help resolve the difficult questions raised by the Justice Department white paper, including the permissible scope of the armed conflict with al Qaeda and the legality of the government's broad definition of an "imminent" threat. Judges must also be able to afford a remedy to victims. Mistakes happen and, as a recent report by Columbia Law School and the Center for Civilians in Conflict suggests, they happen more than the U.S. government wants to acknowledge. Errors are not merely devastating for family members and their communities. They also increase radicalization in the affected region and beyond. Drone strikes -- if unchecked -- could ultimately create more terrorists than they eliminate.

### 2AC Apocalyptic Rhetoric

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

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

Yet this argument relies on Schmitt’s controversial model of politics, as outlined eloquently but unconvincingly in his famous Concept of the Political. To be sure, there are intense conflicts in which it is naïve to expect an easy resolution by legal or juridical means. But the argument suffers from a troubling circularity: Schmitt occasionally wants to define “political” conflicts as those irresolvable by legal or juridical devices in order then to argue against legal or juridical solutions to them. The claim also suffers from a certain vagueness and lack of conceptual precision. At times, it seems to be directed against trying to resolve conflicts in the courts or juridical system narrowly understood; at other times it is directed against any legal regulation of intense conflict. The former argument is surely stronger than the latter. After all, legal devices have undoubtedly played a positive role in taming or at least minimizing the potential dangers of harsh political antagonisms. In the Cold War, for example, international law contributed to the peaceful resolution of conflicts which otherwise might have exploded into horrific violence, even if attempts to bring such conflicts before an international court or tribunal probably would have failed.22¶ Second, Schmitt dwells on the legal inconsistencies that result from modifying the traditional state-centered system of international law by expanding protections to non-state fighters. His view is that irregular combatants logically enjoyed no protections in the state-centered Westphalian model. By broadening protections to include them, international law helps undermine the traditional state system and its accompanying legal framework. Why is this troubling? The most obvious answer is that Schmitt believes that the traditional state system is normatively superior to recent attempts to modify it by, for example, extending international human rights protections to individuals against states. 23 But what if we refuse to endorse his nostalgic preference for the traditional state system? Then a sympathetic reading of the argument would take the form of suggesting that the project of regulating irregular combatants by ordinary law must fail for another reason: it rests on a misguided quest to integrate incongruent models of interstate relations and international law. We cannot, in short, maintain core features of the (state-centered) Westphalian system while extending ambitious new protections to non-state actors.¶ This is a powerful argument, but it remains flawed. Every modern legal order rests on diverse and even conflicting normative elements and ideals, in part because human existence itself is always “in transition.” When one examines the so-called classical liberal legal systems of nineteenth-century England or the United States, for example, one quickly identifies liberal elements coexisting uneasily alongside paternalistic and authoritarian (e.g., the law of slavery in the United States), monarchist, as well as republican and communitarian moments. The same may be said of the legal moorings of the modern welfare state, which arguably rest on a hodgepodge of socialist, liberal, and Christian and even Catholic (for example, in some European maternity policies) programmatic sources. In short, it is by no means self-evident that trying to give coherent legal form to a transitional political and social moment is always doomed to fail. Moreover, there may be sound reasons for claiming that the contemporary transitional juncture in the rules of war is by no means as incongruent as Schmitt asserts. In some recent accounts, the general trend towards extending basic protections to non-state actors is plausibly interpreted in a more positive – and by no means incoherent – light.24¶ Third, Schmitt identifies a deep tension between the classical quest for codified and stable law and the empirical reality of a social world subject to permanent change: “The tendency to modify or even dissolve classical [legal] concepts…is general, and in view of the rapid change of the world it is entirely understandable” (12). Schmitt’s postwar writings include many provocative comments about what contemporary legal scholars describe as the dilemma of legal obsolescence. 25 In The Partisan, he suggests that the “great transformations and modifications” in the technological apparatus of modern warfare place strains on the aspiration for cogent legal norms capable of regulating human affairs (17; see also 48–50). Given the ever-changing character of warfare and the fast pace of change in military technology, it inevitably proves difficult to codify a set of cogent and stable rules of war. The Geneva Convention proviso that legal combatants must bear their weapons openly, for example, seems poorly attuned to a world where military might ultimately depends on nuclear silos buried deep beneath the surface of the earth, and not the success of traditional standing armies massed in battle on the open field. “Or what does the requirement mean of an insignia visible from afar in night battle, or in battle with the long-range weapons of modern technology of war?” (17).¶ As I have tried to show elsewhere, these are powerful considerations deserving of close scrutiny; Schmitt is probably right to argue that the enigma of legal obsolescence takes on special significance in the context of rapid-fire social change.26 Unfortunately, he seems uninterested in the slightest possibility that we might successfully adapt the process of lawmaking to our dynamic social universe. To be sure, he discusses the “motorization of lawmaking” in a fascinating 1950 publication, but only in order to underscore its pathological core.27 Yet one possible resolution of the dilemma he describes would be to figure how to reform the process whereby rules of war are adapted to novel changes in military affairs in order to minimize the danger of anachronistic or out-of-date law. Instead, Schmitt simply employs the dilemma of legal obsolescence as a battering ram against the rule of law and the quest to develop a legal apparatus suited to the special problem of irregular combatants.

#### Vote aff despite prior questions—impact timeframe means you gotta act on the best info available

Kratochwil, professor of international relations – European University Institute, 2008 (Friedrich, “The Puzzles of Politics,” pg. 200-213)

The lesson seems clear. Even at the danger of “fuzzy boundaries”, when we deal with “practice” ( just as with the “pragmatic turn”), we would be well advised to rely on the use of the term rather than on its reference (pointing to some property of the object under study), in order to draw the bounds of sense and understand the meaning of the concept. My argument for the fruitful character of a pragmatic approach in IR, therefore, does not depend on a comprehensive mapping of the varieties of research in this area, nor on an arbitrary appropriation or exegesis of any specific and self-absorbed theoretical orientation. For this reason, in what follows, I will not provide a rigidly specified definition, nor will I refer exclusively to some prepackaged theoretical approach. Instead, I will sketch out the reasons for which a pragmatic orientation in social analysis seems to hold particular promise. These reasons pertain both to the more general area of knowledge appropriate for praxis and to the more specific types of investigation in the field. The follow- ing ten points are – without a claim to completeness – intended to engender some critical reflection on both areas. Firstly, a pragmatic approach does not begin with objects or “things” (ontology), or with reason and method (epistemology), but with “acting” (prattein), thereby preventing some false starts. Since, **as historical beings placed in a** specific situations**, we do not have the luxury** of deferring decisions **until we have** found the “truth”, **we have to act and must do so always under time pressures and in the face of incomplete information.** Pre- cisely because the social world is characterised by strategic interactions, what a situation “is”, is hardly ever clear ex ante, because it is being “produced” by the actors and their interactions, and the multiple possibilities are rife with incentives for (dis)information. This puts a premium on quick diagnostic and cognitive shortcuts informing actors about the relevant features of the situ- ation, and on leaving an alternative open (“plan B”) in case of unexpected difficulties. Instead of relying on certainty and universal validity gained through abstraction and controlled experiments, we know that completeness and attentiveness to detail, rather than to generality, matter. To that extent, likening practical choices to simple “discoveries” of an already independently existing “reality” which discloses itself to an “observer” – or relying on optimal strategies – is somewhat heroic. These points have been made vividly by “realists” such as Clausewitz in his controversy with von Bülow, in which he criticised the latter’s obsession with a strategic “science” (Paret et al. 1986). While Clausewitz has become an icon for realists, only a few of them (usually dubbed “old” realists) have taken seriously his warnings against the misplaced belief in the reliability and use- fulness of a “scientific” study of strategy. Instead, most of them, especially “neorealists” of various stripes, have embraced the “theory”-building based on the epistemological project as the via regia to the creation of knowledge. A pragmatist orientation would most certainly not endorse such a position. Secondly, since acting in the social world often involves acting “for” someone, special responsibilities arise that aggravate both the incompleteness of knowledge as well as its generality problem. Since we owe special care to those entrusted to us, for example, as teachers, doctors or lawyers, we cannot just rely on what is generally true, but have to pay special attention to the particular case. Aside from avoiding the foreclosure of options, we cannot refuse to act on the basis of incomplete information or insufficient know- ledge, and the necessary diagnostic will involve typification and comparison, reasoning by analogy rather than generalization or deduction. Leaving out the particularities of a case, be it a legal or medical one, in a mistaken effort to become “scientific” would be a fatal flaw. Moreover, **there still remains the crucial element of “timing” –** of knowing when to act. Students of crises have always pointed out the importance of this factor but, in attempts at building a general “theory” of international politics analogously to the natural sci- ences, such elements are neglected on the basis of the “continuity of nature” and the “large number” assumptions. Besides, “timing” seems to be quite recalcitrant to analytical treatment.

#### Nuclear war must be prohibited absolutely

Kateb, Professor of Politics at Princeton University, ‘92 (George, “The Inner Ocean” p 111-112)

Schell's work attempts to force on us an acknowledgment that sounds far-fetched and even ludicrous, an acknowledgment hat the possibility of extinction is carried by any use of nuclear weapons, no matter how limited or how seemingly rational or seemingly morally justified. He himself acknowledges that there is a difference between possibility and certainty. But in a matter that is more than a matter, more than one practical matter in a vast series of practical matters, in the "matter" of extinction, we are obliged to treat a possibility-a genuine possibility-as a certainty. Humanity is not to take any step that contains even the slightest risk of extinction. The doctrine of no-use is based on the possibility of extinction. Schell's perspective transforms the subject. He takes us away from the arid stretches of strategy and asks us to feel continuously, if we can, and feel keenly if only for an instant now and then, how utterly distinct the nuclear world is. Nuclear discourse must vividly register that distinctiveness. It is of no moral account that extinction may be only a slight possibility. No one can say how great the possibility is, but no one has yet credibly denied that by some sequence or other a particular use of nuclear weapons may lead to human and natural extinction. If it is not impossible it must be treated as certain: the loss signified by extinction nullifies all calculations of probability as it nullifies all calculations of costs and benefits. Abstractly put, the connections between any use of nuclear weapons and human and natural extinction are several. Most obviously, a sizable exchange of strategic nuclear weapons can, by a chain of events in nature, lead to the earth's uninhabitability, to "nuclear winter," or to Schell's "republic of insects and grass." But the consideration of extinction cannot rest with the possibility of a sizable exchange of strategic weapons. It cannot rest with the imperative that a sizable exchange must not take place. A so-called tactical or "theater" use, or a so-called limited use, is also prohibited absolutely, because of the possibility of immediate escalation into a sizable exchange or because, even if there were not an immediate escalation, the possibility of extinction would reside in the precedent for future use set by any use whatever in a world in which more than one power possesses nuclear weapons. Add other consequences: the contagious effect on nonnuclear powers who may feel compelled by a mixture of fear and vanity to try to acquire their own weapons, thus increasing the possibility of use by increasing the number of nuclear powers; and the unleashed emotions of indignation, retribution, and revenge which, if not acted on immediately in the form of escalation, can be counted on to seek expression later. Other than full strategic uses are not confined, no matter how small the explosive power: each would be a cancerous transformation of the world. All nuclear roads lead to the possibility of extinction. It is true by definition, but let us make it explicit: the doctrine of no-use excludes any first or retaliatory or later use, whether sizable or not. No-use is the imperative derived from the possibility of extinction. By containing the possibility of extinction, any use is tantamount to a declaration of war against humanity. It is not merely a war crime or a single crime against humanity. Such a war is waged by the user of nuclear weapons against every human individual as individual (present and future), not as citizen of this or that country. It is not only a war against the country that is the target. To respond with nuclear weapons, where possible, only increases the chances of extinction and can never, therefore, be allowed. The use of nuclear weapons establishes the right of any person or group, acting officially or not, violently or not, to try to punish those responsible for the use. The aim of the punishment is to deter later uses and thus to try to reduce the possibility of extinction, if, by chance, the particular use in question did not directly lead to extinction. The form of the punishment cannot be specified. Of course the chaos ensuing from a sizable exchange could make punishment irrelevant. The important point, however, is to see that those who use nuclear weapons are qualitatively worse than criminals, and at the least forfeit their offices. John Locke, a principal individualist political theorist, says that in a state of nature every individual retains the right to punish transgressors or assist in the effort to punish them, whether or not one is a direct victim. Transgressors convert an otherwise tolerable condition into a state of nature which is a state of war in which all are threatened. Analogously, the use of nuclear weapons, by containing in an immediate or delayed manner the possibility of extinction, is in Locke's phrase "a trespass against the whole species" and places the users in a state of war with all people. And people, the accumulation of individuals, must be understood as of course always indefeasibly retaining the right of selfpreservation, and hence as morally allowed, perhaps enjoined, to take the appropriate preserving steps.

#### Fear of death is necessary to prevent extinction

Beres 96, PhD at Princeton, 96 (Louis Rene, “No Fear, No Trembling Israel, Death and the Meaning of Anxiety,” www.freeman.org/m\_online/feb96/beresn.htm)

Fear of death, the ultimate source of anxiety, is essential to human survival. This is true not only for individuals, but also for states. Without such fear, states will exhibit an incapacity to confront nonbeing that can hasten their disappearance. So it is today with the State of Israel. Israel suffers acutely from insufficient existential dread. Refusing to tremble before the growing prospect of collective disintegration - a forseeable prospect connected with both genocide and war - this state is now unable to take the necessary steps toward collective survival. What is more, because death is the one fact of life which is not relative but absolute, Israel's blithe unawareness of its national mortality deprives its still living days of essential absoluteness and growth. For states, just as for individuals, confronting death can give the most positive reality to life itself. In this respect, a cultivated awareness of nonbeing is central to each state's pattern of potentialities as well as to its very existence. When a state chooses to block off such an awareness, a choice currently made by the State of Israel, it loses, possibly forever, the altogether critical benefits of "anxiety." There is, of course, a distinctly ironic resonance to this argument. Anxiety, after all, is generally taken as a negative, as a liability that cripples rather than enhances life. But anxiety is not something we "have." It is something we (states and individuals) "are." It is true, to be sure, that anxiety, at the onset of psychosis, can lead individuals to experience literally the threat of self-dissolution, but this is, by definition, not a problem for states. Anxiety stems from the awareness that existence can actually be destroyed, that one can actually become nothing. An ontological characteristic, it has been commonly called Angst, a word related to anguish (which comes from the Latin angustus, "narrow," which in turn comes from angere, "to choke.") Herein lies the relevant idea of birth trauma as the prototype of all anxiety, as "pain in narrows" through the "choking" straits of birth. Kierkegaard identified anxiety as "the dizziness of freedom," adding: "Anxiety is the reality of freedom as a potentiality before this freedom has materialized." This brings us back to Israel. Both individuals and states may surrender freedom in the hope of ridding themselves of an unbearable anxiety. Regarding states, such surrender can lead to a rampant and delirious collectivism which stamps out all political opposition. It can also lead to a national self-delusion which augments enemy power and hastens catastrophic war. For the Jewish State, a lack of pertinent anxiety, of the positive aspect of Angst, has already led its people to what is likely an irreversible rendezvous with extinction.

#### Especially true in the context of nuclear weapons---key to change

Krieger 12 David, President of the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation, "Fear of Nuclear Weapons", June 19, www.wagingpeace.org/articles/db\_article.php?article\_id=371

I was recently asked during an interview whether people fear nuclear weapons too much, causing them unnecessary anxiety. The implication was that it is not necessary to live in fear of nuclear weapons.¶ My response was that fear is a healthy mechanism when one is confronted by something fearful. It gives rise to a fight or flight response, both of which are means of surviving real danger.¶ In the case of nuclear weapons, these are devices to be feared since they are capable of causing terrifying harm to all humanity, including one’s family, city and country. If one is fearful of nuclear weapons, there will be an impetus to do something about the dangers these weapons pose to humanity.¶ But, one might ask, what can be done? In reality, there is a limited amount that can be done by a single individual, but when individuals band together in groups, their power to bring about change increases. Individual power is magnified even more when groups join together in coalitions and networks to bring about change.¶ Large numbers of individuals banded together to bring about the fall of the Berlin Wall, the breakup of the Soviet Union and the end of apartheid in South Africa. The basic building block of all these important changes was the individual willing to stand up, speak out and join with others to achieve a better world. The forces of change have been set loose again by the Arab Spring and the Occupy Movement across the globe.¶ When dangers are viewed rationally, there may be good cause for fear, and fear may trigger a response to bring about change. On the other hand, complacency can never lead to change. Thus, while fear may be a motivator of change, complacency is an inhibitor of change. In a dangerous world, widespread complacency should be of great concern. ¶ If a person is complacent about the dangers of nuclear weapons, there is little possibility that he will engage in trying to alleviate the danger. Complacency is the result of a failure of hope to bring about change. It is a submission to despair.¶ After so many years of being confronted by nuclear dangers, there is a tendency to believe that nothing can be done to change the situation. This may be viewed as “concern fatigue.” We should remember, though, that any goal worth achieving is worth striving for with hope in our hearts. A good policy for facing real-world dangers is to never give up hope and never stop trying.

#### Analyzing existential risks is essential for survival

Bostrom 02, Professor of Philosophy at Oxford University and Director of the Future of Humanity Institute, ’2 (Nick, March, “Existential Risks: Analyzing Human Extinction Scenarios and Related Hazards” Journal of Evolution and Technology, Vol 9, http://www.nickbostrom.com/existential/risks.html)

9.6 Maxipok: a rule of thumb for moral action Previous sections have argued that the combined probability of the existential risks is very substantial. Although there is still a fairly broad range of differing estimates that responsible thinkers could make, it is nonetheless arguable that because the negative utility of an existential disaster is so enormous, the objective of reducing existential risks should be a dominant consideration when acting out of concern for humankind as a whole. It may be useful to adopt the following rule of thumb for moral action; we can call it Maxipok: Maximize the probability of an okay outcome, where an “okay outcome” is any outcome that avoids existential disaster. At best, this is a rule of thumb, a prima facie suggestion, rather than a principle of absolute validity, since there clearly are other moral objectives than preventing terminal global disaster. Its usefulness consists in helping us to get our priorities straight. Moral action is always at risk to diffuse its efficacy on feel-good projects[24] rather on serious work that has the best chance of fixing the worst ills. The cleft between the feel-good projects and what really has the greatest potential for good is likely to be especially great in regard to existential risk. Since the goal is somewhat abstract and since existential risks don’t currently cause suffering in any living creature[25], there is less of a feel-good dividend to be derived from efforts that seek to reduce them. This suggests an offshoot moral project, namely to reshape the popular moral perception so as to give more credit and social approbation to those who devote their time and resources to benefiting humankind via global safety compared to other philanthropies. Maxipok, a kind of satisficing rule, is different from Maximin (“Choose the action that has the best worst-case outcome.”)[26]. Since we cannot completely eliminate existential risks (at any moment we could be sent into the dustbin of cosmic history by the advancing front of a vacuum phase transition triggered in a remote galaxy a billion years ago) using maximin in the present context has the consequence that we should choose the act that has the greatest benefits under the assumption of impending extinction. In other words, maximin implies that we should all start partying as if there were no tomorrow. While that option is indisputably attractive, it seems best to acknowledge that there just might be a tomorrow, especially if we play our cards right.

#### 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**.

### 2AC Congress CP

#### --the Detainee Treatment Act proves—the Court explicitly ignores applying congressional remedies

Loevy 13 (ARTHUR LOEVY, partner Loevy & Loevy, a firm specializing in constitutional and civil rights, with MICHAEL KANOVITZ, Counsel of Record, et al, PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI, DONALD VANCE AND NATHAN ERTEL v.DONALD RUMSFELD, http://cryptome.org/2013/03/vance-ertel-v-rumsfeld.pdf)

The majority’s discussion of congressional intent also provoked criticism. Judge Hamilton noted that ‘‘the majority opinion converts the second step of Bivens analysis . . . into a search for evidence that Congress has expressly authorized Bivens actions against U.S. military personnel.’’ App. 51a. Not only had the majority ‘‘brush[ed] over the fact that the [DTA] expressly provides a defense to a civil action’’ for torture, App. 30a (‘‘a strong indication that Congress has not closed the door on judicial remedies,’’ App. 55a), but it ignored completely the State Department’s declaration that Bivens is available to torture victims, App. 31a-32a. Moreover, the majority neglected that Congress has provided aliens tortured abroad a damages action in U.S. courts, and it thus ‘‘attribut[ed] to Congress an intention to deny U.S. civilians a right that Congress has expressly extended to the rest of the world.’’ App. 53a. Judge Hamilton observed, ‘‘Congress has legislated on the assumption that U.S. nationals, at least, should have Bivens remedies against U.S. military personnel in most situations.’’ App. 52a.

### 2AC Deference

#### The only way anyone could sue is by suing the entire DOD – that’s impossible – sovereign immunity and lack of a remedial extension

Rehnquist 01 (Chief Justice Rehnquist, Opinion in: CORRECTIONAL SERVICES CORPORATION,

PETITIONER v. JOHN E. MALESKO, on writ of certiorari to the united states court of appeals for the second circuit, Nov 27, http://www.law.cornell.edu/supremecourt/text/534/61)

In sum, respondent is not a plaintiff in search of a remedy as in Bivens and Davis . Nor does he ~~[~~they] seek a cause of action against an individual officer, otherwise lacking, as in Carlson. Respondent instead seeks a marked extension of Bivens , to contexts that would not advance Bivens’ core purpose of deterring individual officers from engaging in unconstitutional wrongdoing. The caution toward extending Bivens remedies into any new context, a caution consistently and repeatedly recognized for three decades, forecloses such an extension here.

#### We don’t break precedent – Court has specifically avoided setting it in terrorism cases

Ben-Asher, law prof-Pace, 10 (Noa, Legalism and Decisionism in Crisis, http://digitalcommons.pace.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1751&context=lawfaculty

Another Legalist argument for a thick, substantive notion of the rule of law in emergencies has been articulated by Jenny Martinez. She writes, [W]hen multiple decisions from the "war on terror" are put together ... one begins to sense that something noteworthy is afoot. All of the U.S. Supreme Court decisions in the terrorism cases thus far have been focused on questions of process, as have a great many of the lower court decisions.21 Martinez continues, [T]he "war on terror" litigation in U.S. courts has been fixated on process to a degree that is peculiar in both senses of that word-that is, there is a pattern of focus-on-procedure-while-sidestepping-substance that is odd enough to require explanation-and there is something particular about American legal culture at this moment in time that provides at least part of that explanation. 22 Martinez criticizes the judicial side-stepping of substance, arguing that "the focus on process rather than substance comes at a human cost,"2 " and that "the 'war on terror' litigation thus far seems to have resulted in a great deal of process, and not much justice." 24

#### And, Judicial review is consistent with Supreme Court precedent- Bivens and Webster prove

Rathod 09 (Jason, Duke University School of Law, J.D, NOT PEACE, BUT A SWORD: NAVY V. EGAN AND THE CASE AGAINST JUDICIAL ABDICATION IN FOREIGN AFFAIRS, http://scholarship.law.duke.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1447&context=dlj)

IV. REMEDIES The foregoing Parts have stressed the importance of preserving judicial review of security clearance determinations to vindicate constitutional injuries and provide the government with a diverse workforce capable of winning the war on terror. These concerns demand that courts discard their reliance on super-strong deference to the executive in foreign affairs, which denies a forum to plaintiffs raising constitutional claims of discrimination in relation to security clearance denials and revocations. Section A maps out how lower courts can, consistent with existing Supreme Court precedent, reopen independent judicial review of the merits of security clearance determinations to adjudicate a plaintiff’s equal protection constitutional claims. Section B suggests ways in which courts can then make these plaintiffs whole and deter future discriminatory agency rulings while avoiding a chilling effect on agency adjudicators. A. A Roadmap for Courts of Appeals to Adjudicate the Merits of Security Clearance Determinations To escape the current trap of forum foreclosure, circuit courts can draw on the constitutional avoidance doctrine embedded in Webster. 227 Indeed, lower courts in other contexts have relied on Webster to reopen judicial review and the option for Bivens claims when all other options have been foreclosed.228 Circuit courts would be on especially solid ground doing so here because Webster expressly permitted courts to reach the merits of security clearance determinations in relation to sexual orientation discrimination claims.229 It would be supremely puzzling for the Court to sanction such review in the case of homosexuals, but deny it in the case of racial minorities and other groups singled out by Congress for heightened protection. To reopen judicial review here, lower courts can find that Title VII does not preempt equal protection claims because of the serious constitutional doubts that would be raised by denying plaintiffs judicial review for colorable constitutional claims.230

### 2AC Court Politics

#### No link- the plan would likely be a district court ruling

Jaffer, Director-ACLU Center for Democracy, 13 (Jameel Jaffer, Director of the ACLU's Center for Democracy, “Judicial Review of Targeted Killings,” 126 Harv. L. Rev. F. 185 (2013), http://www.harvardlawreview.org/issues/126/april13/forum\_1002.php)

This is why the establishment of a specialized court would more likely institutionalize the existing program, with its elision of the imminence requirement, than narrow it. Second, judicial engagement with the targeted killing program does not actually require the establishment of a new court. In a case pending before Judge Rosemary Collyer of the District Court for the District of Columbia, the ACLU and the Center for Constitutional Rights represent the estates of the three U.S. citizens whom the CIA and JSOC killed in Yemen in 2011. The complaint, brought under Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents, seeks to hold senior executive officials liable for conduct that allegedly violated the Fourth and Fifth Amendments. It asks the court to articulate the limits of the government’s legal authority and to assess whether those limits were honored. In other words, the complaint asks the court to conduct the kind of review that many now seem to agree that courts should conduct. This kind of review—ex post review in the context of a Bivens action—could clarify the relevant legal framework in the same way that review by a specialized court could. But it also has many advantages over the kind of review that would likely take place in a specialized court. In a Bivens action, the proceedings are adversarial rather than ex parte, increasing their procedural legitimacy and improving their substantive accuracy. Hearings are open to the public, at least presumptively. The court can focus on events that have already transpired rather than events that might or might not transpire in the future. And a Bivens action can also provide a kind of accountability that could not be supplied by a specialized court reviewing contemplated strikes ex ante: redress for family members of people killed unlawfully, and civil liability for officials whose conduct in approving or carrying out the strike violated the Constitution. (Of course, in one profound sense a Bivens action will always come too late, because the strike alleged to be unlawful will already have been carried out. Again, though, if “imminence” is a requirement, ex ante judicial review is infeasible by definition.) Another advantage of the Bivens model is that the courts are already familiar with it. The courts quite commonly adjudicate wrongful death claims and “survival” claims brought by family members of individuals killed by law enforcement agents. In the national security context, federal courts are now accustomed to considering habeas petitions filed by individuals detained at Guantánamo. They opine on the scope of the government’s legal authority and they assess the sufficiency of the government’s evidence — the same tasks they would perform in the context of suits challenging the lawfulness of targeted killings. While Congress could of course affirm or strengthen the courts’ authority to review the lawfulness of targeted killings if it chose to do so, or legislatively narrow some of the judicially created doctrines that have precluded courts from reaching the merits in some Bivens suits, more than 40 years of Supreme Court precedent since Bivens makes clear that federal courts have not only the authority to hear after-the-fact claims brought by individuals whose constitutional rights have been infringed but also the obligation to do so.

#### The Court decides each case on the facts, not based on political calculations.

Rosen 12 (Jeffrey, legal affairs editor of The New Republic, “Welcome to the Roberts Court: How the Chief Justice Used Obamacare to Reveal His True Identity,” June 29, http://www.newrepublic.com/blog/plank/104493/welcome-the-roberts-court-who-the-chief-justice-was-all-along#)

Of course, it didn’t all come down to judicial temperament. In the most divisive constitutional cases, the substance of legal arguments will always play a part. Arguments by liberal scholars who care about constitutional text and history, such as Neil Siegel of Duke Law School, were reflected in Chief Justice Roberts’s opinion about the taxing power. Justice Ginsburg’s defense of Congress’s power to pass the mandate under the commerce clause adopted New Textualists arguments by Jack Balkin of Yale Law School about how the framers of Article VI of the Virginia Plan during the Constitutional Convention would have wanted Congress to coordinate economic action in areas where the states were powerless to act on their own. The majority opinion also vindicated Solicitor General Don Verrilli’s decision to emphasize the breadth of Congress’s taxing power. But in the end, there are good arguments on both sides of any constitutional question, and justices have broad discretion to pick and choose among competing legal arguments based on a range of factors—including concerns about text, history, precedent, or institutional legitimacy. The fact that Roberts chose to place institutional legitimacy front and center is the mark of a successful Chief. As Roberts recognized, faith in the neutrality of the law and the impartiality of judges is a fragile thing. When I teach constitutional law, I begin by telling students that they can’t assume that it’s all politics. To do so misses everything that is constraining and meaningful and inspiring about the Constitution as a framework for government. There will be many polarizing decisions from the Roberts Court in the future, and John Roberts will be on the conservative side of many of them. But with his canny performance in the health care case, Roberts has given the country a memorable example of what it means to be a successful Chief Justice.

#### No impact to warming-most recent data proves the c02 escapes

Taylor 11 (James, is a senior fellow for environment policy at the Heartland Institute and managing editor of Environment & Climate News. “New NASA Data Blow Gaping Hole In Global Warming Alarmism” <http://www.forbes.com/sites/jamestaylor/2011/07/27/new-nasa-data-blow-gaping-hold-in-global-warming-alarmism/>)

NASA satellite data from the years 2000 through 2011 show the Earth’s atmosphere is allowing far more heat to be released into space than alarmist computer models have predicted, reports a new study in the peer-reviewed science journal Remote Sensing. The study indicates far less future global warming will occur than United Nations computer models have predicted, and supports prior studies indicating increases in atmospheric carbon dioxide trap far less heat than alarmists have claimed. Study co-author Dr. Roy Spencer, a principal research scientist at the University of Alabama in Huntsville and U.S. Science Team Leader for the Advanced Microwave Scanning Radiometer flying on NASA’s Aqua satellite, reports that real-world data from NASA’s Terra satellite contradict multiple assumptions fed into alarmist computer models. “The satellite observations suggest there is much more energy lost to space during and after warming than the climate models show,” Spencer said in a July 26 University of Alabama press release. “There is a huge discrepancy between the data and the forecasts that is especially big over the oceans.” In addition to finding that far less heat is being trapped than alarmist computer models have predicted, the NASA satellite data show the atmosphere begins shedding heat into space long before United Nations computer models predicted. The new findings are extremely important and should dramatically alter the global warming debate. Scientists on all sides of the global warming debate are in general agreement about how much heat is being directly trapped by human emissions of carbon dioxide (the answer is “not much”). However, the single most important issue in the global warming debate is whether carbon dioxide emissions will indirectly trap far more heat by causing large increases in atmospheric humidity and cirrus clouds. Alarmist computer models assume human carbon dioxide emissions indirectly cause substantial increases in atmospheric humidity and cirrus clouds (each of which are very effective at trapping heat), but real-world data have long shown that carbon dioxide emissions are not causing as much atmospheric humidity and cirrus clouds as the alarmist computer models have predicted. The new NASA Terra satellite data are consistent with long-term NOAA and NASA data indicating atmospheric humidity and cirrus clouds are not increasing in the manner predicted by alarmist computer models. The Terra satellite data also support data collected by NASA’s ERBS satellite showing far more longwave radiation (and thus, heat) escaped into space between 1985 and 1999 than alarmist computer models had predicted. Together, the NASA ERBS and Terra satellite data show that for 25 years and counting, carbon dioxide emissions have directly and indirectly trapped far less heat than alarmist computer models have predicted. In short, the central premise of alarmist global warming theory is that carbon dioxide emissions should be directly and indirectly trapping a certain amount of heat in the earth’s atmosphere and preventing it from escaping into space. Real-world measurements, however, show far less heat is being trapped in the earth’s atmosphere than the alarmist computer models predict, and far more heat is escaping into space than the alarmist computer models predict.

## 1AR

### DA - PQD

#### **Ex post review wouldn’t violate the political question doctrine or cause other branches to go to the court to settle disputes**

Taylor 13 (Paul, is a Senior Fellow, Center for Policy & Research. Focus on national security policy, international relations, targeted killings, and drone operations. “Former DOD Lawyer Frowns on Drone Court,” http://centerforpolicyandresearch.com/2013/03/23/former-dod-lawyer-frowns-on-drone-court/)

First, Johnson notes, as others have, that judges would be loath to issue the equivalent of death warrants, first of all on purely moral grounds, but also on more political grounds. Courts enjoy the highest approval ratings of the three branches of government, yet accepting the responsibility to determine which individuals may live or die, without that individual having an opportunity to appear before the court would simply shift some of the public opprobrium from the Executive to the Judiciary. However, if the court exercised ex post review, it instead would be in its ordinary position of approving or disapproving the Executive’s decisions, not making its decisions for it. Another concern raised by Johnson is that the judges would be highly uncomfortable making such decisions because they would be necessarily involve a secret, purely ex parte process. While courts do this on a daily basis, as when they issue search or arrest warrants, the targeted killing context stands apart in that the judge’s decision would be effectively irreversible. Here again, the use of ex post process would free the courts from this problem, and place it in the executive (which includes the military, incidentally, an organization which deals with this issue as a matter of course).

#### No link, the plan doesn’t violate the political question doctrine, and Guantanimo habeas litigation makes the link non-unique

Vladeck 13 (Steve Vladeck is a professor of law and the associate dean for scholarship at American University Washington College of Law, “Whats Really Wrong With the Targeted Killing White Paper” <http://www.lawfareblog.com/2013/02/whats-really-wrong-with-the-targeted-killing-white-paper/>)

First, many of us who argue for at least some judicial review in this context specifically don’t argue for ex ante review for the precise reasons the white paper suggests. Instead, we argue for ex post review–in the form of damages actions after the fact, in which liability would only attach if the government both (1) exceeded its authority; and (2) did so in a way that violated clearly established law. Whatever else might be said about such damages suits, they simply don’t raise the interference concerns articulated in the white paper, and so one would have expected some distinct explanation for why that kind of judicial review shouldn’t be available in this context. All the white paper offers, though, is its more general allusion to the political question doctrine. Which brings me to… Second, and in any event, the suggestion that lawsuits arising out of targeted killing operations against U.S. citizens raise a nonjusticiable political question is almost laughable–and is the one part of this white paper that really does hearken back to the good ole’ days of the Bush Administration (I’m less sold on any analogy based upon the rest of the paper). Even before last Term’s Zivotofsky decision, in which the Supreme Court went out of its way to remind everyone (especially the D.C. Circuit) of just how limited the political question doctrine really should be, it should’ve followed that uses of military force against U.S. citizens neither “turn on standards that defy the judicial application,” nor “involve the exercise of a discretion demonstrably committed to the executive or legislature.” Indeed, in the context of the Guantánamo habeas litigation, courts routinely inquire into the very questions that might well arise in such a damages suit, e.g., whether there is sufficient evidence to support the government’s conclusion that the target is/was a senior operational leader of al Qaeda or one of its affiliates… Don’t get me wrong: Any suit challenging a targeted killing operation, even a post hoc damages action, is likely to run into a number of distinct procedural concerns, including the difficulty of arguing for a Bivens remedy; the extent to which the state secrets privilege might preclude the litigation; etc. But those are the arguments that the white paper should’ve been making–and not a wholly unnuanced invocation of the political question doctrine in a context in which it clearly does not–and should not–apply.

### K - Perm

#### Perm do both – policy is responsive and even if the alt is coopted it’s the only way to solve.

Kurki 2011

Milja, The Limitations of the Critical Edge: Reflections on Critical and Philosophical IR Scholarship Today, Principal Investigator of ‘Political Economies of Democratisation’, a European Research Council-funded project based at the International Politics Department, Aberystwyth University, Millennium: Journal of International Studies 40(1) 129–146 September 2011

We have yet another call to a new beginning, another meta-theoretical debate for the consumers of international relations theory. This is the easy part, and I support it as far as it goes. However, now it is time to move beyond introductions and openings to concrete applications, to the construction and illustration of viable alternatives. It is important that we proceed in this manner not because these alternatives are necessarily going to be ‘better’, closer to ‘truth’ or more ‘real’ in some sense than prevailing theoretical explanations; but in order to demonstrate the possibility of alternative – possibly, but not necessarily, superior – conceptualisations, that are otherwise widely held to be self-evident by the vast majority of scholars of IR.53 There have been many calls for more critical and philosophical debate in IR; yet, just how critical are all these debates and what effects do they have? What is the purpose of critical IR theory or philosophical reflection, and what is the purpose of the supposed theoretical diversity that the critical voices bring into IR? Many, in my view, misunderstand their purpose. Biersteker summarises my own view perfectly. The point of philosophical reflection and post-positivism, he argues, is not to provide ‘pluralism without purpose, but a critical pluralism, designed to reveal embedded power and authority structures, provoke critical scrutiny of dominant discourses, engage marginalised peoples and perspectives and provide a basis for alternative conceptualisations’.54 There is a purpose to critical theory that needs to be acknowledged, reflected upon and ‘practised’; both inside and outside academia. At present, it seems to me that relatively little such engagement takes place; not because critical theorists are ‘lazy’ or wrong-headed, but because the disciplinary environment and professional structures favour disassociation and depoliticisation even of these strands of thought. Strategic thinking of critical theorists is not missing, but it is oriented in such a way that does not facilitate real-world political changes. In the era of the expansion of the image of homo oeconomicus in academia too, much remains to be done in reinvigorating critical theoretical thought. At present, we have many theoretically sophisticated but practically disinvested scholars. This renders IR, and especially philosophical and critical theory within it, rather useless in challenging global structures and paradigms of domination. But what can we do about this? Arguably, revisions of conceptual categories and their political underpinnings, as well as spaces to think about alternatives, are needed more than ever. But how do we generate them, or, in Cox’s or Murphy’s words, how can IR academics help in generating such alternatives? We can do so in a few ways. We can do so by passing on the torch by continuing to teach critical theory: as Hoffman usefully reminds us, theorising itself (and passing it on through teaching) is a critical practice in itself.55 We can also do so today by continuing to fight the cuts to social science research in universities and the constriction of space for free thought within universities. We can also seek to obtain, but also seek to reshape, the kind of research funding that is provided by funding councils or states. This takes some perseverance, for it is not easy to argue for conceptual or philosophical engagement, let alone critical praxaeology, at a time of crisis or for reform within bureaucratic and conservative structures. Yet, this brings in another core aspect of the challenge faced by critical theorists, which is that we must also seek to engage with the world: to act in it as well as analyse it. We must engage the social groups and NGOs, but also the elites and bureaucrats. We can do so and we must try and do so; partly because these elites (and also NGO elites) are actually more well-meaning and even reflective than many academics give them credit for; and because, in my experience, they are very capable of understanding both the pros and cons, limits and possibilities, of alternative frameworks and actions when concretely presented with them. This is not to say that significant structural and ideological constraints do not exist to generating alternative political scenarios – they do – but the structures are only partly, and in many cases only secondarily, supported, even by governmental or intergovernmental elites. These elites may be a good ally, rather than an enemy, in re-shifting international political and economic paradigms. The result of a new kind of engagement with the empirical and the practical is not necessarily a victory of critical theory; critical theory rarely – indeed never, it would seem – ‘wins’, that much is a clear lesson of history. Yet, it can occasionally activate, motivate and, indeed, ‘enthral’ people, as well as giving them hope and impetus to achieve change. Despite its sceptical outlook, critical and philosophical theory is still valuable in reminding us that, while it does not seem so, we do not live in a world without any alternatives.
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#### General claims don’t take out our specifics---put policy before their prior questions to avoid paralysis

Owen 2002
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Commenting on the ‘philosophical turn’ in IR, Wæver remarks that ‘[a] frenzy for words like “epistemology” and “ontology” often signals this philosophical turn’, although he goes on to comment that these terms are often used loosely.4 However, loosely deployed or not, it is clear that debates concerning ontology and epistemology play a central role in the contemporary IR theory wars. In one respect, this is unsurprising since it is a characteristic feature of the social sciences that periods of disciplinary disorientation involve recourse to reflection on the philosophical commitments of different theoretical approaches, and there is no doubt that such reflection can play a valuable role in making explicit the commitments that characterise (and help individuate) diverse theoretical positions. Yet, such a philosophical turn is not without its dangers and I will briefly mention three before turning to consider a confusion that has, I will suggest, helped to promote the IR theory wars by motivating this philosophical turn. The first danger with the philosophical turn is that it has an inbuilt tendency to prioritise issues of ontology and epistemology over explanatory and/or interpretive power as if the latter two were merely a simple function of the former. But while the explanatory and/or interpretive power of a theoretical account is not wholly independent of its ontological and/or epistemological commitments (otherwise criticism of these features would not be a criticism that had any value), it is by no means clear that it is, in contrast, wholly dependent on these philosophical commitments. Thus, for example, one need not be sympathetic to rational choice theory to recognise that it can provide powerful accounts of certain kinds of problems, such as the tragedy of the commons in which dilemmas of collective action are foregrounded. It may, of course, be the case that the advocates of rational choice theory cannot give a good account of why this type of theory is powerful in accounting for this class of problems (i.e., how it is that the relevant actors come to exhibit features in these circumstances that approximate the assumptions of rational choice theory) and, if this is the case, it is a philosophical weakness—but this does not undermine the point that, for a certain class of problems, rational choice theory may provide the best account available to us. In other words, while the critical judgement of theoretical accounts in terms of their ontological and/or epistemological sophistication is one kind of critical judgement, it is not the only or even necessarily the most important kind. The second danger run by the philosophical turn is that because prioritisation of ontology and epistemology promotes theory-construction from philosophical first principles, it cultivates a theory-driven rather than problem-driven approach to IR. Paraphrasing Ian Shapiro, the point can be put like this: since it is the case that there is always a plurality of possible true descriptions of a given action, event or phenomenon, the challenge is to decide which is the most apt in terms of getting a perspicuous grip on the action, event or phenomenon in question given the purposes of the inquiry; yet, from this standpoint, ‘theory-driven work is part of a reductionist program’ in that it ‘dictates always opting for the description that calls for the explanation that flows from the preferred model or theory’.5 The justification offered for this strategy rests on the mistaken belief that it is necessary for social science because general explanations are required to characterise the classes of phenomena studied in similar terms. However, as Shapiro points out, this is to misunderstand the enterprise of science since ‘whether there are general explanations for classes of phenomena is a question for social-scientific inquiry, not to be prejudged before conducting that inquiry’.6 Moreover, this strategy easily slips into the promotion of the pursuit of generality over that of empirical validity. The third danger is that the preceding two combine to encourage the formation of a particular image of disciplinary debate in IR—what might be called (only slightly tongue in cheek) ‘the Highlander view’—namely, an image of warring theoretical approaches with each, despite occasional temporary tactical alliances, dedicated to the strategic achievement of sovereignty over the disciplinary field. It encourages this view because the turn to, and prioritisation of, ontology and epistemology stimulates the idea that there can only be one theoretical approach which gets things right, namely, the theoretical approach that gets its ontology and epistemology right. This image feeds back into IR exacerbating the first and second dangers, and so a potentially vicious circle arises.