## 1AC

### Plan

#### Plan:  The United States Federal Judiciary should conduct judicial ex post review of United States’ targeted killing operations, with liability falling on the government for any constitutional violation, on the grounds that the political question doctrine should not bar justiciability of cases against the military.

### Allies

#### Advantage 1 is Allied Cooperation –

#### U.S. drone policy is more important than the spying and data scandal to European partners – it threatens the trans-atlantic relationship

Dworkin 7/17/13 (Anthony, Senior Policy Fellow at the European Council on Foreign Relations, “Actually, drones worry Europe more than spying” <http://globalpublicsquare.blogs.cnn.com/2013/07/17/actually-drones-worry-europe-more-than-spying/>)

Relations between the United States and Europe hit a low point following revelations that Washington was spying on European Union buildings and harvesting foreign email messages. Behind the scenes, though, it is not data protection and surveillance that produces the most complications for the transatlantic intelligence relationship, but rather America's use of armed drones to kill terrorist suspects away from the battlefield. Incidents such as the recent killing of at least 17 people in Pakistan are therefore only likely to heighten European unease. In public, European governments have displayed a curiously passive approach to American drone strikes, even as their number has escalated under Barack Obama’s presidency. Many Europeans believe that the majority of these strikes are unlawful, but their governments have maintained an uneasy silence on the issue. This is partly because of the uncomfortable fact that information provided by European intelligence services may have been used to identify some targets. It is also because of a reluctance to accuse a close ally of having violated international law. And it is partly because European countries have not worked out exactly what they think about the use of drones and how far they agree within the European Union on the question. Now, however, Europe’s muted stance on drone strikes looks likely to change. Why? For one thing, many European countries are now trying to acquire armed drones themselves, and this gives them an incentive to spell out clearer rules for their use. More importantly, perhaps, Europeans have noticed that drones are proliferating rapidly, and that countries like China, Russia and Saudi Arabia are soon likely to possess them. There is a clear European interest in trying to establish some restrictive standards on drone use before it is too late. For all these reasons, many European countries are now conducting internal reviews of their policy on drones, and discussions are also likely to start at a pan-European level. But as Europeans begin to articulate their policy on the use of drones, a bigger question looms. Can Europe and the United States come together to agree on when drone strikes are permissible? Until now, that would have seemed impossible. Since the September 11 attacks, the United States has based its counterterrorism operations on the claim that it is engaged in a worldwide armed conflict with al Qaeda and associated forces — an idea that President Obama inherited from President George W. Bush and has been kept as the basis for an expanded drone strike campaign. European countries have generally rejected this claim. However, the changes to American policy that President Obama announced in May could open the way to at least the possibility of a dialogue. Obama suggested that he anticipated a time in the not-too-distant future when the armed conflict against al Qaeda might come to an end. More substantially, he made clear that his administration was in the process of switching its policy so that, outside zones of hostilities, it would only use drone strikes against individuals who posed a continuing and imminent threat to the U.S. That is a more restrictive standard than the claim that any member of al Qaeda or an associated force could lawfully be killed with a drone strike at any time. European countries might be more willing to accept an approach based on this kind of “self-defense” idea. However, there remain some big stumbling blocks. First, a good deal about Obama’s new standards is still unclear. How does he define a “zone of hostilities,” where the new rules will not apply? And what is his understanding of an “imminent” threat? European countries are likely to interpret these key terms in a much narrower way than the United States. Second, Obama’s new approach only applies as a policy choice. His more expansive legal claims remain in the background so that he is free to return to them if he wishes. But if the United States is serious about working toward international standards on drone strikes, as Obama and his officials have sometimes suggested, then Europe is the obvious place to start. And there are a number of steps the administration could take to make an agreement with European countries more likely. For a start, it should cut back the number of drone strikes and be much more open about the reasons for the attacks it conducts and the process for reviewing them after the fact. It should also elaborate its criteria for determining who poses an imminent threat in a way that keeps attacks within tight limits. And, as U.S. forces prepare to withdraw from Afghanistan in 2014, it should keep in mind the possibility of declaring the war against al Qaeda to be over. All this said, Europe also has some tough decisions to make, and it is unclear whether European countries are ready to take a hard look at their views about drone strikes, addressing any weaknesses or inconsistencies in their own position. If they are, the next few years could offer a breakthrough in developing international standards for the use of this new kind of weapon, before the regular use of drones spreads across the globe.

#### Accountability over standards of imminence are impossible from executive internal measures – no one trusts Obama on drones – only the plans court action solves

Goldsmith 13 (Jack Goldsmith teaches at Harvard Law School and is a member of the Hoover Institution Task Force on National Security and Law, “How Obama Undermined the War on Terror,” http://www.newrepublic.com/article/112964/obamas-secrecy-destroying-american-support-counterterrorism)

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

#### Unrestrained drone policy results in collapse of NATO

Parker 9/17/12 (Tom, former policy director for Terrorism, Counterterrorism and Human Rights at Amnesty International USA. He is also a former officer in the British Security Service (MI5), “U.S. Tactics Threaten NATO” <http://nationalinterest.org/commentary/us-tactics-threaten-nato-7461?page=1>)

A growing chasm in operational practice is opening up between the United States and its allies in NATO. This rift is putting the Atlantic alliance at risk. Yet no one in Washington seems to be paying attention. The escalating use of unmanned aerial vehicles to strike terrorist suspects in an increasing number of operational environments from the Arabian Peninsula to Southeast Asia, coupled with the continued use of military commissions and indefinite detention, is driving a wedge between the United States and its allies. Attitudes across the Atlantic are hardening fast. This isn’t knee-jerk, man-on-the-street anti-Americanism. European governments that have tried to turn a blind eye to U.S. counterterrorism practices over the past decade are now forced to pay attention by their own courts, which will restrict cooperation in the future. As recently as last month, the German federal prosecutor’s office opened a probe into the October 2010 killing of a German national identified only as “Buenyamin E.” in a U.S. drone strike in Pakistan. There are at least four other similar cases involving German nationals and several reported strikes involving legal residents of the United Kingdom. In March, Polish prosecutors charged the former head of Polish intelligence, Zbigniew Siemiatkowski, with “unlawfully depriving prisoners of the their liberty” because of the alleged role he played in helping to establish a CIA secret prison in northeastern Poland in 2002–2003. Last December, British Special Forces ran afoul of the UK courts for informally transferring two Al Qaeda suspects detained in Iraq, Yunus Rahmatullah and Amanatullah Ali, to U.S. forces. The British government has been instructed to recover the men from U.S. custody or face legal sanctions that could result in two senior ministers being sent to prison. Perhaps the most dramatic example illustrating the gap that has opened up between the United States and its European allies concerns the 2009 in absentia conviction of twenty-three U.S. agents in an Italian court for the role they played in the extraordinary rendition of radical Imam Hassan Mustafa Osama Nasr from Milan to Cairo. Britain, Poland, Italy and Germany are among America’s closest military partners. Troops from all four countries are currently serving alongside U.S. forces in Afghanistan, but they are now operating within a very different set of constraints than their U.S. counterparts. The European Court of Human Rights established its jurisdiction over stabilization operations in Iraq, and by implication its writ extends to Afghanistan as well. The British government has lost a series of cases before the court relating to its operations in southern Iraq. This means that concepts such as the right to life, protection from arbitrary punishment, remedy and due process apply in areas under the effective control of European forces. Furthermore, the possibility that intelligence provided by any of America’s European allies could be used to target a terrorism suspect in Somalia or the Philippines for a lethal drone strike now raises serious criminal liability issues for the Europeans. The United States conducts such operations under the legal theory that it is in an international armed conflict with Al Qaeda and its affiliates that can be pursued anywhere on the globe where armed force may be required. But not one other member of NATO shares this legal analysis, which flies in the face of established international legal norms. The United States may have taken issue with the traditional idea that wars are fought between states and not between states and criminal gangs, but its allies have not. The heads of Britain’s foreign and domestic intelligence services have been surprisingly open about the “inhibitions” that this growing divergence has caused the transatlantic special relationship, telling Parliament that it has become an obstacle to intelligence sharing. European attitudes are not going to change—the European Court of Human Rights is now deeply embedded in European life, and individual European governments cannot escape its oversight no matter how well disposed they are to assist the United States. The United States has bet heavily on the efficacy of a new array of counterterrorism powers as the answer to Al Qaeda. In doing so it has evolved a concept of operations that has much more in common with the approach to terrorist threats taken by Israel and Russia than by its European partners. There has been little consideration of the wider strategic cost of these tactics, even as the Obama administration doubles down and extends their use. Meanwhile, some of America’s oldest and closest allies are beginning to place more and more constraints on working with U.S. forces. NATO cannot conduct military operations under two competing legal regimes for long. Something has to give—and it may just be the Atlantic alliance.

#### NATO prevents global nuclear war

Zbigniew Brzezinski 9, former U.S. National Security Adviser, Sept/Oct 2009, “An Agenda for NATO,” Foreign Affairs, 88.5, EBSCO

NATO's potential is not primarily military. Although NATO is a collective-security alliance, its actual military power comes predominantly from the United States, and that reality is not likely to change anytime soon. NATO's real power derives from the fact that it combines the United States' military capabilities and economic power with Europe's collective political and economic weight (and occasionally some limited European military forces). Together, that combination makes NATO globally significant. It must therefore remain sensitive to the importance of safeguarding the geopolitical bond between the United States and Europe as it addresses new tasks. The basic challenge that NATO now confronts is that there are historically unprecedented risks to global security. Today's world is threatened neither by the militant fanaticism of a territorially rapacious nationalist state nor by the coercive aspiration of a globally pretentious ideology embraced by an expansive imperial power. The paradox of our time is that the world, increasingly connected and economically interdependent for the first time in its entire history, is experiencing intensifying popular unrest made all the more menacing by the growing accessibility of weapons of mass destruction -- not just to states but also, potentially, to extremist religious and political movements. Yet there is no effective global security mechanism for coping with the growing threat of violent political chaos stemming from humanity's recent political awakening. The three great political contests of the twentieth century (the two world wars and the Cold War) accelerated the political awakening of mankind, which was initially unleashed in Europe by the French Revolution. Within a century of that revolution, spontaneous populist political activism had spread from Europe to East Asia. On their return home after World Wars I and II, the South Asians and the North Africans who had been conscripted by the British and French imperial armies propagated a new awareness of anticolonial nationalist and religious political identity among hitherto passive and pliant populations. The spread of literacy during the twentieth century and the wide-ranging impact of radio, television, and the Internet accelerated and intensified this mass global political awakening. In its early stages, such new political awareness tends to be expressed as a fanatical embrace of the most extreme ethnic or fundamentalist religious passions, with beliefs and resentments universalized in Manichaean categories. Unfortunately, in significant parts of the developing world, bitter memories of European colonialism and of more recent U.S. intrusion have given such newly aroused passions a distinctively anti-Western cast. Today, the most acute example of this phenomenon is found in an area that stretches from Egypt to India. This area, inhabited by more than 500 million politically and religiously aroused peoples, is where NATO is becoming more deeply embroiled. Additionally complicating is the fact that the dramatic rise of China and India and the quick recovery of Japan within the last 50 years have signaled that the global center of political and economic gravity is shifting away from the North Atlantic toward Asia and the Pacific. And of the currently leading global powers -- the United States, the EU, China, Japan, Russia, and India -- at least two, or perhaps even three, are revisionist in their orientation. Whether they are "rising peacefully" (a self-confident China), truculently (an imperially nostalgic Russia) or boastfully (an assertive India, despite its internal multiethnic and religious vulnerabilities), they all desire a change in the global pecking order. The future conduct of and relationship among these three still relatively cautious revisionist powers will further intensify the strategic uncertainty. Visible on the horizon but not as powerful are the emerging regional rebels, with some of them defiantly reaching for nuclear weapons. North Korea has openly flouted the international community by producing (apparently successfully) its own nuclear weapons -- and also by profiting from their dissemination. At some point, its unpredictability could precipitate the first use of nuclear weapons in anger since 1945. Iran, in contrast, has proclaimed that its nuclear program is entirely for peaceful purposes but so far has been unwilling to consider consensual arrangements with the international community that would provide credible assurances regarding these intentions. In nuclear-armed Pakistan, an extremist anti-Western religious movement is threatening the country's political stability. These changes together reflect the waning of the post-World War II global hierarchy and the simultaneous dispersal of global power. Unfortunately, U.S. leadership in recent years unintentionally, but most unwisely, contributed to the currently threatening state of affairs. The combination of Washington's arrogant unilateralism in Iraq and its demagogic Islamophobic sloganeering weakened the unity of NATO and focused aroused Muslim resentments on the United States and the West more generally.

#### Courts don’t leak intel methods or classified information—this fear has been repeatedly dispelled by hundreds of successfully tried terrorism cases

Jaffer-director ACLU’s National Security Project-12/9/08 <http://www.salon.com/2008/12/09/guantanamo_3/> Don’t replace the old Guantánamo with a new one

The contention that the federal courts are incapable of protecting classified information — “intelligence sources and methods,” in the jargon of national security experts — is another canard. When classified information is at issue in federal criminal prosecutions, a federal statute — the Classified Information Procedures Act (CIPA) — generally permits the government to substitute classified information at trial with an unclassified summary of that information. It is true that CIPA empowers the court to impose sanctions on the government if the substitution of the unclassified summary for the classified information is found to prejudice the defendant, and in theory such sanctions can include the dismissal of the indictment. In practice, however, sanctions are exceedingly rare, and of the hundreds of terrorism cases that have been prosecuted over the last decade, none has been dismissed for reasons relating to classified information. Proponents of new detention authority, including Waxman and Wittes, invoke the threat of exposing “intelligence sources and methods” as a danger inherent to terrorism prosecutions in U.S. courts, but the record of successful prosecutions provides the most effective rebuttal.

#### No over-deterrence of military operations- government liability is rooted in the FTCA and it avoids the chilling associated with individual liability.

Kent, Constitutional Law prof, 13 (Andrew, Faculty Advisor-Center on National Security at

Fordham Law School, prof @ Fordham University School of Law- constitutional law, foreign relations law, national security law, federal courts and procedure, “ARE DAMAGES DIFFERENT?: BIVENS AND NATIONAL SECURITY,” October 8, <http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2330476>) \*\* Evidence is gender paraphrased

Because of sovereign immunity, federal officials are sued under Bivens in their so-called personal rather than official capacities.43 In theory, persons injured by actions of a federal official could also seek compensation by suing the agent’s employer, the United States Government for damages, but the sovereign immunity of the federal government blocks this route.44 The Federal Tort Claims Act (FTCA), originally enacted in 1946 and frequently amended since,45 effects a partial waiver of sovereign immunity by allowing suits directly against the federal government instead of officers (who might be judgment proof) and making the United States liable for injuries caused by the negligent or wrongful act or omission of any federal employee acting within the scope of ~~his~~ employment, in accordance with the law of the state where the act or omission occurred.46 Under the Westfall Act of 1988, the FTCA is the exclusive remedy for torts committed by federal officials within the scope of their employment, except for suits brought for violations of the Constitution.47 In other words, state law tort claims against individual official defendants are now generally barred. The Supreme Court takes the prospect of individual liability in damages for officials very seriously and has crafted immunity doctrines to soften the blow. The Court’s rulings provide the President of the United States and certain classes of officials defined functionally—prosecutors doing prosecutorial work, legislators legislating, judges doing judicial work and certain persons performing “quasijudicial” functions—with absolute immunity from money damages suits, generally for the reason that such suits would be likely to be frequent, frequently meritless, and uniquely capable of disrupting job performance.48 All other government officials are entitled to only “qualified immunity” from money damages suits. Under the qualified immunity doctrine, officials are liable only when they violate “clearly established” federal rights, that is, when “[t]he contours of [a] right [are] sufficiently clear that every reasonable official would have understood that what ~~he is~~ [they are] doing violates that right.”49 Because qualified immunity is not just a defense to liability but also “a limited entitlement not to stand trial or face the other burdens of litigation,”50 the Court’s doctrine encourages speedy resolution of immunity questions by judges. The policy reasons for the Court’s active protection of federal officials through a robust immunity doctrine, including fear of dampening the zeal with which officials perform their jobs because of fear of personal liability, are discussed below in Section V.A.

#### Commanders are adapting to litigation to maintain unit cohesion – they will instill the rule of law to lower level officers in order to build a stable chain of command

Dunlap 9 (Charles J., Major General, USAF, is Deputy Judge Advocate General, Headquarters U.S. Air Force, “Lawfare: A Decisive Element of 21st-Century Conflicts?” Joint Force Quarterly – issue 54, 3d

 quarter 2009, www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA515192‎)

Of course, the availability of expert legal advice is absolutely necessary in the age of lawfare. The military lawyers (judge advocates) responsible for providing advice for combat operations need schooling not only in the law, but also in the characteristics of the weapons to be used, as well as the strategies for their employment. Importantly, commanders must make it unequivocally clear to their forces that they intend to conduct operations in strict adherence to the law. Helping commanders do so is the job of the judge advocate. Assuring troops of the legal and moral validity of their actions adds to combat power. In discussing the role of judge advo- cates, Richard Schragger points out: Instead of seeing law as a barrier to the exercise of the clients power, [military lawyers] understand the law as a prerequisite to the meaning- ful exercise of power.... Law makes just wars possible by creating a well-defined legal space within which individual soldiers can act without resorting to their own personal moral codes}\* That said, commanders should aim not to have a judge advocate at the elbow of every rifleman, but rather to imbue troops with the right behaviors so they instinctively do the right thing on the battlefield. The most effective way is to carefully explain the enemy's lawfare strategies and highlight the pragmatic, real-world impact of Abu Ghraib-type incidents on the overall success of the mission. One of the most powerful motivators of troop conduct is the desire to enhance the security of fellow soldiers. Making the connection between adherence to law and troop safety is a critical leader- ship task. Integral to defensive lawfare operations is the education of the host nation population and, in effect, the enemy themselves. In many 21\*-century battlespaces, these audiences are not receptive to what may appear as law imposed by the West. In 1999, for example, a Chinese colonel famously argued that China was "a weak country, so do we need to fight according to your rules? No. War has rules. but those rules arc set by the West……[I]f you use those rules, then weak countries have no chance." To counter such beliefs, it is an essential lawfare technique to look for touchstones within the culture of the target audience. For example, in the early 1990s, the International Committee of the Red Cross produced an illustrated paperback that matched key provi- sions of the Geneva Convention "with bits of traditional Arab and Islamic wisdom!\*" Such innovations ought to be reexamined, along with creative ideas that would get the messages to the target audience. One way might be to provide audio cassettes in local languages that espouse what arc really Geneva Convention values in a context and manner that tit with community religious and cultural imperatives. The point is to delegitimize the enemy in the eyes of the host nation populace. This is most effectively accomplished when respected indigenous authorities lead the effort. Consider Thomas Friedman's favor- able assessment to the condemnation by Indian Muslim leaders to the November 2008 Mumbai attacks: The only effective way to stop (terrorism) is tor "the village"—the Muslim community itself— to say "no more" When a culture and a faith community delegitimize this kind of behavior, openly, loudly and consistently, it is more impor- tant than metal detectors or extra police.\* Moreover, it should not be forgotten that much of the success in suppressing violence in Iraq was achieved when Sunnis in Anbar Province and other areas realized that al Qaeda operatives were acting contrary to Iraqi, and indeed Islamic, sensibilities, values, and law. It also may be possible to use educa- tional techniques to change the attitudes of enemy lighters as well. Finally, some critics believe that "lawfare\* is a code to condemn anyone who attempts to use the courts to resolve national security issues. For example, lawyer-turned- journalist Scott Horton charged in the luly 2007 issue ot Harper's Magazine that "lawfare theorists\* reason that lawyers who present war-related claims in court "might as well be terrorists themselves."™ Though there are those who object to the way the courts have been used by some litigants.\*0 it is legally and morally wrong to paint anyone legitimately using legal processes as the "enemy." Indeed, the courageous use of the courts on behalf of unpopular clients, along with the insistence that even our vilest enemies must be afforded due process of law. is a deeply embedded American value, and the kind of principle the Armed Forces exist to preserve. To be clear, recourse to the courts and other legal processes is to be encouraged: if there are abuses, the courts are well equipped to deal with them. It is always better to wage legal battles, however vicious, than it is to fight battles with the lives of young Americans. Lawfare has become such an indel- ible feature of 21st-century conflicts that commanders dismiss it at their peril. Key leaders recognize this evolution. General James Jones. USMC (Ret.), the Nation's new National Security Advisor, observed several years ago that the nature of war has changed. "It's become very legalistic and very complex." he said, adding that now "you have to have a lawyer or a dozen."\*' Lawfare. of course, is about more than lawyers, it is about the rule of law and its relation to war. While it is true, as Professor Eckhardt maintains, that adherence to the rule of law is a "center of gravity" for democratic societ- ies such as ours—and certainly there arc those who will try to turn that virtue into a vulnerability—we still can never forget that it is also a vital source of our great strength as a nation." We can—and must—meet the chal- lenge of lawfare as effectively and aggressively as we have met every other issue critical to our national security.

### Political Question Doctrine

#### Invocation of the political question doctrine in national security contexts unravels attempts to apply civilian justice to the military—line drawing fails, only a clear signal solves

Vladeck 12 (Stephen, Professor of Law and Associate Dean for Scholarship, American University,

Washington College of Law, “THE NEW NATIONAL SECURITY CANON,” June 14, http://www.aulawreview.org/pdfs/61/61-5/Vladeck.website.pdf)

But if what in fact has taken place over the last decade is a testament to a longer-term pattern, one that neither the political branches nor the Supreme Court disrupt in the near future, then we must confront a more alarming possibility: that as these “national security”-based exceptions increasingly become the rule in contemporary civil litigation against government officers—whether with regard to new “special factors” under Bivens, new bases for contractor preemption under Boyle, proliferation of the political question doctrine, or even more expansive reliance upon the qualified immunity defense—the line between the unique national security justifications giving rise to these cases and ordinary civil litigation will increasingly blur. Thus, wherever one comes down on the virtues and vices of this new national security canon, perhaps the most important point to take away is the need to carefully cabin its scope. Otherwise, exceptions articulated in the guise of such unique fact patternss could serve more generally to prevent civil liability for government misconduct and to thereby dilute the effectiveness of judicial review as a deterrent for any and all unlawful government action—not just those actions undertaken in ostensibly in defense of the nation.

#### And, the plan’s repudiation of the PQD will not be limited to targeted killing—judges will be able to apply that rationale in future cases

Tokaji 12 (Daniel, Professor in Law at The Ohio State University Michael E. Moritz College of Law, with Owen Wolfe†, BAKER, BUSH, AND BALLOT BOARDS: THE FEDERALIZATION OF ELECTION ADMINISTRATION, <http://law.case.edu/journals/lawreview/documents/62CaseWResLRev4.3.Tokaji.pdf>)

Bush can be understood as the new Baker, in the sense that it opened the federal courts to election administration litigation, just as its predecessor opened the federal courts to districting litigation. So as to avoid any misunderstanding, let us first state two qualifications to this claim. First, we are not talking about citation counts. Baker has been cited many times by the Supreme Court and the lower courts in subsequent years.49 By contrast, the Supreme Court has been exceedingly reluctant to cite Bush v. Gore, and there are not a huge number of lower court cases that have cited the case either.50 Second, we are not talking about the intent of the Supreme Court, which was quite different in these two sets of cases. The Baker Court was quite conscious of the fact that it was opening the door, if not the floodgates, to litigation over legislative districts.51 The Bush Court, by contrast, seemed intent on shutting the door behind it, by limiting the principle upon which it sought to rely. This is most clearly evident in the Court’s statement that: Our consideration is limited to the present circumstances, for the problem of equal protection in election processes generally presents many complexities. The question before the Court is not whether local entities, in the exercise of their expertise, may develop different systems for implementing elections.52 Some commentators have criticized these sentences for being unprincipled, in the sense of declaring a rule of law good for one day only.53 We disagree. What the Court did instead was to (1) assert an equal protection principle established by cases like Baker and Reynolds, variously characterized as “equal weight” to each vote and “equal dignity” to each voter and as valuing one person’s vote over another by "arbitrary and disparate treatment";54 (2) apply this principle to a new context, namely the recounting of punch card ballots in the State of Florida;55 and (3) conclude that this process contravened this basic equal protection principle, without clearly specifying its precise boundaries.56 In other words, the Court applied an established principle to a new area of law without specifying the precise legal test or how it will apply to future cases.57 The wording may be different, but the mode of analysis is not that unusual. In this respect. Bush bears comparison to what the Court did when it decided Baker and later Reynolds. The Court was certainly aware that it was entering the political thicket in Baker.58 It may have had a general rule of law in mind, but it did not specify its precise boundaries. And while Reynolds (like Bush) relies on a vaguely stated principle of law, variously defined as "one person, one vote"59 and an "equally effective voice in the election of members of [the] state legislature,"60 it too does not define the exact boundaries of this principle. The Court in Reynolds was aware that it was entering a new area without precisely specifying the bounds of the new equal protection rule it articulated. This is evident in Chief Justice Earl Warren's notes on the case. These notes, in the Chiefs handwriting, include thirty- four numbered, single sentence points on seven sheets of paper.61 The first reads: "There can be no formula for determining whether equal protection has been afforded."62 Another note, number twenty, reads: "Cannot set out all possibilities in any given case."63 In other words, the Court that decided Baker and Reynolds—like the Court that decided Bush—rested on a somewhat imprecisely stated principle, allowing for refinement in future cases presenting different facts. This also shows up in Chief Justice Warren’s opinion for the Reynolds majority, which declines to say exactly how close to numerical equality districts much be: For the present, we deem it expedient not to attempt to spell out any precise constitutional tests. . . . Developing a body of doctrine on a case-by-case basis appears to us to provide the most satisfactory means of arriving at detailed constitutional requirements in the area of state legislative apportionment.64 And later: We do not consider here the difficult question of the proper remedial devices which federal courts should utilize in state legislative apportionment cases. Remedial techniques in this new and developing area of the law will probably often differ with the circumstances of the challenged apportionment and a variety of local conditions.65 The similarity to Bush’s language is striking—and given that Reynolds is one of just four equal protection cases cited in Bush, 66 one wonders whether it was conscious. The Court stated a broad principle, declined to state precisely the test it was applying, and bracketed other cases presenting different circumstances, reserving them for another day. Of course, the Reynolds Court did provide some clarity in the one person, one vote cases that followed. So far, the current Court has failed to provide comparable clarity for election administration cases since Bush. And, in fact, in the most prominent election administration case to have arisen since then, Crawford v. Marion County Election Board, 67 the Court did not cite Bush at all. Again, we are not arguing that there is an exact parallel between Baker and Bush. Our claim is more modest: that there is an important similarity between the two cases in that both set the stage for an increased federal role in their respective realms, redistricting and election administration. While the Supreme Court has avoided Bush v. Gore like the plague—as others have noted, it has become the Voldemort of Supreme Court cases, “the case that must not be named”68—that does not mean the case has been without an impact. Indeed, the Supreme Court’s clear distrust of state institutions in Bush69 (which is also implicit in Baker) has apparently trickled down to the rest of the federal courts, who are now taking a more active role in state election disputes. As Professor Samuel Issacharoff has put it, Bush v. Gore declared that “federal courts were open for business when it came to adjudicating election administration claims.”70 Lower courts “relaxed rules regarding standing, ripeness, and . . . justiciability”71 in order to hear more election disputes. They allowed these cases to go to the front of the queue, often deciding them on an expedited basis in the weeks preceding an election. In some areas, like voting technology, election litigation led to changes in how elections are run, even in the absence of a binding decision on the merits.72

#### Scenario 1- Civil Military Relations

#### Judicial review and ending deference is key to CMR- executive and congressional action is not sufficient to check the military

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)

In February 1958, Army Master Sergeant James B. Stanley, who was stationed at Fort Knox, Kentucky, volunteered to participate in a program to test the effectiveness of protective clothing and equipment against chemical warfare. Unknown to Stanley, he was secretly administered four doses of LSD as part of an Army plan to study the effects of the drug on human subjects. Stanley then allegedly began suffering from hallucinations and periods of memory loss and incoherence, which impaired his ability to perform military service and which led to his discharge from the Army and later a divorce from his wife. He discovered what he had undergone when the Army sent him a letter soliciting his cooperation in a study of the long-term effects of LSD on "'volunteers who participated' in the 1958 tests." After exhausting his administrative remedies, Stanley filed suit against the government in federal district court. 81 Stanley argued that in this case, his superiors might not have been superior military officers, as in Chappell, but rather civilians, and further that his injuries were not incident to military service, as in Feres, because his injuries resulted from secret experimentation. The federal district and appellate courts held that Stanley was not preempted by United States v. Chappell in asserting a claim under Bivens by limiting Chappell to bar actions against superior officers for wrongs that involve direct orders in the performance of military duties. In other words, the lower courts limited the reach of Chappell to only matters involving the performance of military duties and the discipline and order necessary to carry out such orders, which did not include surreptitious testing of dangerous drugs on military members. 82 The Supreme Court summarily disregarded the lower courts' attempt to differentiate the instant case from precedent because Stanley was on active duty and was participating in a "bona fide" Army program, therefore, his injuries were incident to service. With regard to the attempt to differentiate his case from Chappell, the Supreme Court conceded that some of the language in Chappell focusing on the officer-subordinate relationship would not apply to Stanley's case, but nevertheless ruled that the basis for Feres also applied and controlled in Bivens actions. Accordingly, the test was not [\*219] so much that an officer-subordinate relationship was involved, but rather an "incident to service" test. 83 The Court thus transplanted the Feres doctrine to govern and limit Bivens actions by military members. In overturning the lower courts' ruling, the Supreme Court again discussed the special factors that mandate hesitation of judicial interference. They also discussed the explicit constitutional assignment of responsibility to Congress of maintaining the armed forces in ruling that even this most egregious misconduct and complete lack of concern of human rights is not a basis upon which the pl–aintiff can seek damages in a court of law. Based upon this case and previous cases, military members are totally extricated from the general population and are subject to a lower standard that is not even contemplated for the remaining citizenry in matters of constitutional import. The Court expressly declined to adopt a test that would determine whether a case is cognizable based upon military discipline and decision making. Believing that such a test would be an intrusion of judicial inquiry into military matters, thereby causing problems by making military officers liable for explaining in court proceedings the details of their military commands and disrupting "the military regime," the Court adopted a virtual blanket of protection for military commanders. Because Congress had not invited judicial review by passing a statute authorizing such a suit by a military member, the Court was not going to intrude into military affairs left to the discretion of Congress. 84 In essence, the Court has constructed a military exception to the Constitution. Had the Court actually reviewed the facts presented by the cases discussed above, applied the tests that are normally applied to the type of cases presented, and then ruled in favor the military, they possibly still could have been criticized, but at least respected for actually conducting a meaningful judicial review of the presented cases. Completely changing constitutional principles in order to provide great deference with little to no inquiry is an abdication of the Court's responsibility and surrenders the rights of military members to the complete subjugation by Congress and the President. The question now presented is whether such an exception is appropriate in terms of civil-military relations. [\*220] The Efficacy of a Military Exception To The Constitution In Civil-Military Relations Does the lack of judicial protection strengthen or erode democratic civilian control at a time when some commentators express concern over the state of civil-military relations? The current hands-off approach by the judiciary in cases concerning or impacting military affairs presents a paradoxical dilemma for civil-military relations. Did the framers of the Constitution intend to establish civilian control over the military by giving plenary authority to two branches of the government to the exclusion of the third branch? 85 Can the military develop its own professionalism, which is essential to an objective civilian control, if the military is totally removed from society's system of judicial protection? Are the Foxes Going To Take Care Of The Hens When The Farmer Is Not Watching? On one hand, the eschewal of becoming involved in military affairs through judicial review of lawsuits concerning the military more completely subordinates the military to the constitutional authority of Congress and the President and, in essence, creates a "split Constitution." 86 The Congress and President thus can control the military virtually without concern about judicial interference, which will occur only under the most egregious circumstances, and can be assured that the military will not attempt to overturn their decisions and orders through judicial review 87 After all, should not the judiciary trust the Congress, a co-equal branch of government sworn, as is the judiciary, to uphold the Constitution? 88 On the other hand, the Constitution establishes certain basic rights for all Americans, regardless of position within society. In fact, the Constitution and laws that support the Constitution serve as the ultimate protector for the weakest of society who have no other means by which to thwart infringement of their rights. By the U.S. Supreme Court stating that the military is a separate society with specialized and complex concerns, and that the Constitution grants plenary authority over the military to the legislative and executive branches, military members are excluded from the protection of a society that depends upon their service. Moreover, they [\*221] are left to the mercy of a power that can act with impunity, notwithstanding Supreme Court prescription that the Congress and the President fulfill their awesome positions of trust in upholding the Constitution and subordinate laws to the greatest extent possible while acting to protect our national security through military affairs. By excluding military members from the same protections that their civilian counterparts enjoy, military members are subject to a much more severe form of government that does not contain the checks and balances that restrict government infringement upon rights. Would it indeed be so bad if the judiciary reviewed and decided lawsuits brought by military members on their merits? Would such oversight be an unreasonable intrusion wreaking havoc in the minds of military leaders? Have any such problems evolved in the federal government in the civilian sector where employees may file suits against the government in court? Empowering Objective Control By Removing Judicial Oversight The increase of the power exercised by the legislative and executive branches of our federal government by the decrease in the power of review by the judicial branch supports Professor Huntington's model of objective civilian control. 89 Rather than making the military a mirror of the state, such as in subjective control, the removal of judicial oversight provides the military with the autonomy to control their profession. At the same time, the total dependence of the military upon their civilian and military leaders as judge and jury creates an independent military sphere. Nevertheless, Huntington completely ignores the role of the judiciary in civil-military relations. Even when he addresses the separation of powers, which traditionally includes the relationship of the judiciary to the other branches, he only examines the role of the executive branch vis-a-vis the legislative branch. 90 The weakening of the influence of the judiciary over matters concerning the military produces an equivalent concomitant strengthening of the two primary branches of government charged with establishing, maintaining, and running the armed forces. More than merely strengthening the control by Congress and the President over the military, 91 the judiciary, in its current position, protects ~~her [\*222] sister~~ branches of government from outside interference of those who want to change or affect the military, such as those who seek judicial overturn of the DoD homosexual conduct policy, and from inside interference of those who seek to challenge the authority of their superiors. 92 In this vein, the judicial self-restraint in becoming an ombudsman for aggrieved military members who seek either damages, redress, or reversal of orders can be argued to produce a correlating increase in the strictness of good order and discipline of the armed forces. 93 Dissension is reduced to the point of a member either accepting the supremacy of those superior or separating from the military service for which they volunteered. The unquestioning loyalty produced squelches dissension within the military ranks and portrays the military as a single unit of uniformity committed to serving without question the national civilian leadership, thereby preserving the delicate balance between freedom and order. 94 In a speech on the Bill of Rights and the military at the New York University Law School in 1962, then-Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, Earl Warren, discussed how our country was created in the midst of deep and serious distrust of standing military forces. He then described the debate on how best to preserve civilian control of the military in the Constitution so that the military could never reverse its subordination to civilian authority. Finally, he declared that the military has embraced this concept as part of our rich tradition that "must be regarded as an essential constituent of the fabric of our political life." 95 Former Chief Justice Warren was correct that the military culture in the United States is completely imbued with the idea of civilian control. Recent events strongly evidence this core understanding of military members. When the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, General Fogelman, resigned from his position and retired because of a disagreement with the civilian Secretary of the Air Force over appropriate action to take in a particular case, he did so because he could do nothing else in protest. There is no doubt that Congress maintains and regulates the armed forces and that the President is Commander-in-Chief. Unfortunately, civilian control of the military has been confused with the non-interference with Presidential and Congressional control of the military, yet the Supreme Court is no less "civilian" than these other branches. Ironically, because of the [\*223] extensive delegation of authority from Congress and the President to the military hierarchy, the military itself has become all powerful in relation to its members. Unless the judiciary branch becomes involved, there is no civilian oversight of the military in the way it treats its members. This important civilian check on the military has been forfeited by the Court. With these realizations, the judiciary is wrong in avoiding inquiry into cases brought by military members. The military is not a complex, separate and distinct society. If it were, the danger of losing control would be greater. By characterizing it as such and giving the military leadership complete reign over subordinates in all matters, the judiciary ignores their responsibility to provide a check to military commanders and balance the rights of those subject to orders, which if not followed may lead to criminal charges. 96 A professional military, as envisioned by our nation's leaders and written about by Professor Huntington, can operate efficiently in a system that allows judicial review of actions brought by military members. Their professionalism will deter wrongs and will accept responsibility when wrongs are committed. Removing the military from the society that they serve by denying them judicial protection alienates the military and frustrates those who have no protection from wrongs other than the independent judiciary. The proper role of the judiciary in civil-military relations is to ensure that neither the legislative branch, the executive branch, nor the military violate their responsibility to care for and treat fairly the sons and daughters of our nation who volunteer for military service. When federal prisoners can file lawsuits for often frivolous reasons, but military members cannot enter a courtroom after being subjected to secret experimentation with dangerous, illegal drugs, something is wrong. When military members cannot seek redress even for discrimination or injury caused by gross negligence, civil-military relations suffer because the judiciary is not ensuring that the balance of power is not being abused.

CMR erosion collapses hegemony

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, “An Isolated Military as a Threat to Military Legitimacy,” http://militarylegitimacyreview.com/?page\_id=159)

The legitimacy of the US military depends upon civil-military relations. In Iraq and Afghanistan conflicting religions and cultures have presented daunting challenges for the US military since mission success in counterinsurgency (COIN) operations depends upon public support in those hostile cultural environments; and even in the US, civil-military relations are fragile since the military is an authoritarian regime within a democratic society. This cultural dichotomy within our society creates the continuing potential for conflict between authoritarian military values and more libertarian civilian values that can undermine military legitimacy, especially when there are fewer bridges between the military and the civilian population it serves. The US military is a shield that protects our national security, but it can also be a sword that threatens our national security. After all, the US military controls the world’s most destructive weaponry. Our Founding Fathers understood this danger and provided for a separation of powers to prevent a concentration of power in the military. Still, if the US military were ever to become isolated from the civilian population it serves, then civil-military relations would deteriorate and US security would be at risk. Richard Cohen has opined that we are slowly but inexorably moving toward an isolated military: The military of today is removed from society in general. It is a majority white and, according to a Heritage Foundation study, disproportionately Southern. New England is underrepresented, and so are big cities, but the poor are no longer cannon fodder – if they ever were – and neither are blacks. We all fight and die just about in proportion to our numbers in the population. The all-volunteer military has enabled America to fight two wars while many of its citizens do not know of a single fatality or even of anyone who has fought overseas. This is a military conscripted by culture and class – induced, not coerced, indoctrinated in all the proper cliches about serving one’s country, honored and romanticized by those of us who would not, for a moment, think of doing the same. You get the picture. Talking about the picture, what exactly is wrong with it? A couple of things. First, this distant Army enables us to fight wars about which the general public is largely indifferent. Had there been a draft, the war in Iraq might never have been fought – or would have produced the civil protests of the Vietnam War era. The Iraq debacle was made possible by a professional military and by going into debt. George W. Bush didn’t need your body or, in the short run, your money. Southerners would fight, and foreigners would buy the bonds. For understandable reasons, no great songs have come out of the war in Iraq. The other problem is that the military has become something of a priesthood. It is virtually worshipped for its admirable qualities while its less admirable ones are hardly mentioned or known. It has such standing that it is awfully hard for mere civilians – including the commander in chief – to question it. Dwight Eisenhower could because he had stars on his shoulders, and when he warned of the military-industrial complex, people paid some attention. Harry Truman had fought in one World War and John Kennedy and Gerald Ford in another, but now the political cupboard of combat vets is bare and there are few civilian leaders who have the experience, the standing, to question the military. This is yet another reason to mourn the death of Richard Holbrooke. He learned in Vietnam that stars don’t make for infallibility, sometimes just for arrogance. (Cohen, How Little the US Knows of War, Washington Post, January 4, 2011) The 2010 elections generated the usual volume of political debate, but conspicuously absent were the two wars in which US military forces have been engaged for ten years. It seems that dissatisfaction with the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan has caused the American public to forget them and those military forces left to fight them. A forgotten military can become an isolated military with the expected erosion of civil-military relations. But the forgotten US military has not gone unnoticed: Tom Brokaw noted that there have been almost 5,000 Americans killed and 30,000 wounded, with over $1 trillion spent on the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, with no end in sight. Yet most Americans have little connection with the all-volunteer military that is fighting these wars. It represents only one percent of Americans and is drawn mostly from the working class and middle class. The result is that military families are often isolated “…in their own war zone.” (See Brokaw, The Wars that America Forgot About, New York Times, October 17, 2010) Bob Herbert echoed Brokaw’s sentiments and advocated reinstating the draft to end the cultural isolation of the military. (Herbert, The Way We Treat Our Troops, New York Times, October 22, 2010) In another commentary on the forgotten military, Michael Gerson cited Secretary of Defense Robert Gates who warned of a widening cultural gap between military and civilian cultures: “There is a risk over time of developing a cadre of military leaders that politically, culturally and geographically have less and less in common with the people they have sworn to defend.” Secretary Gates promoted ROTC programs as a hedge against such a cultural divide. Gerson concluded that the military was a professional class by virtue of its unique skills and experience: “They are not like the rest of America—thank God. They bear a disproportionate burden, and they seem proud to do so. And they don’t need the rest of society to join them, just to support them.” (Gerson, The Wars We Left Behind, Washington Post, October 28, 2010) The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral Mike Mullen, has seconded the observations of Secretary Gates and warned of an increasingly isolated military and “…a potentially dangerous gulf between the civilian world and men and women in uniform.” Mullen explained, “To the degree that we are out of touch I believe is a very dangerous force.” And he went on to observe that “Our audience, our underpinnings, our authority, everything we are, everything we do, comes from the American people…and we cannot afford to be out of touch with them.” (Charley Keyes, Joint Chiefs Chair Warns of Disconnect Between Military and Civilians, CNN.com, January 10, 2011) Gerson’s observation that the military are not like the rest of Americans goes to the heart of the matter. An isolated military that exacerbates conflicting military and civilian values could undermine civil-military relations and threaten military legitimacy. The potential for conflicting values is evident in the article by Kevin Govern on Higher Standards of Honorable Conduct Reinforced: Lessons (Re) Learned from the Captain Honors Incident (see article posted under this section) which highlights the “exemplary conduct” standard for military personnel and the need to enforce the unique standards of exemplary conduct to maintain good order and discipline in the military. The communal and authoritarian military values inherent in the standards of exemplary conduct often clash with more libertarian civilian values; but in the past that clash has been moderated by bridges between the military and civilian cultures, most notably provided by the draft, the National Guard and reserve components. The draft is gone and the National Guard and reserve components are losing ground in an all-volunteer military that is withdrawing from Iraq and Afghanistan. The Reserve Officer Training Program (ROTC) has provided most civilian-soldier leaders for the US military in the past, but it is doubtful that will continue in the future. If Coleman McCarthy speaks for our best colleges and universities, then ROTC is in trouble and so are civil-military relations: These days, the academic senates of the Ivies and other schools are no doubt pondering the return of military recruiters to their campuses. Meanwhile, the Pentagon, which oversees ROTC programs on more than 300 campuses, has to be asking if it wants to expand to the elite campuses, where old antipathies are remembered on both sides. It should not be forgotten that schools have legitimate and moral reasons for keeping the military at bay, regardless of the repeal of “don’t ask, don’t tell.” They can stand with those who for reasons of conscience reject military solutions to conflicts. ROTC and its warrior ethic taint the intellectual purity of a school, if by purity we mean trying to rise above the foul idea that nations can kill and destroy their way to peace. If a school such as Harvard does sell out to the military, let it at least be honest and add a sign at its Cambridge front portal: Harvard, a Pentagon Annex. (Coleman McCarthy, Don’t ask, don’t tell has been repealed. ROTC still shouldn’t be on campus, Washington Post, December 30, 2010) McCarthy’s attitude toward ROTC reflects a dangerous intellectual elitism that threatens civil-military relations and military legitimacy. But there are also conservative voices that recognize the limitations of ROTC and offer alternatives. John Lehman, a former Secretary of the Navy, and Richard Kohn, a professor of military history at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, don’t take issue with McCarthy. They suggest that ROTC be abandoned in favor of a combination of military scholarships and officer training during summers and after graduation: Rather than expanding ROTC into elite institutions, it would be better to replace ROTC over time with a more efficient, more effective and less costly program to attract the best of America’s youth to the services and perhaps to military careers. Except from an economic perspective, ROTC isn’t efficient for students. They take courses from faculty almost invariably less prepared and experienced to teach college courses, many of which do not count for credit and cover material more akin to military training than undergraduate education. Weekly drills and other activities dilute the focus on academic education. ROTC was begun before World War I to create an officer corps for a large force of reservists to be mobilized in a national emergency. It has outgrown this purpose and evolved into just another source of officers for a military establishment that has integrated regulars and reservists into a “total force” in which the difference is between part-time and full-time soldiering. The armed services should consider a program modeled in part on the Marine Platoon Leaders Corps to attract the nation’s most promising young people. In a national competition similar to ROTC scholarships, students should be recruited for four years of active duty and four years of reserve service by means of all-expenses-paid scholarships to the college or university of their choice. Many would no doubt take these lucrative grants to the nation’s most distinguished schools, where they would get top-flight educations and could devote full attention on campus to their studies. Youths would gain their military training and education by serving in the reserve or National Guard during college (thus fulfilling their reserve obligation). Being enlisted would teach them basic military skills and give them experience in being led before becoming leaders themselves. As reservists during college, they would be obligated to deploy only once, which would not unduly delay their education or commissioned service. They could receive their officer education at Officer Candidate School summer camps or after graduation from college. This program could also be available to those who do not win scholarships but are qualified and wish to serve. Such a system would cost less while attracting more, and more outstanding, youth to military service, spare uniformed officers for a maxed-out military establishment, and reconnect the nation’s leadership to military service – a concern since the beginning of the all-volunteer armed force. (Lehman and Kohn, Don’t expand ROTC. Replace it. Washington Post, January 28, 2011) The system proposed by Lehman and Kohn would preserve good civil-military relations only if it could attract as many reserve component (civilian-soldier) military officers as has ROTC over the years. Otherwise the demise of ROTC will only hasten the isolation of the US military. As noted by Richard Cohen, Tom Brokaw, Bob Herbert, Michael Gerson, Secretary of Defense Bill Gates and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs Admiral Mike Mullen, the increasing isolation of the US military is a real danger to civil-military relations and military legitimacy. The trends are ominous: US military forces are drawing down as they withdraw from Iraq and Afghanistan and budget cuts are certain to reduce both active and reserve components, with fewer bridges to link a shrinking and forgotten all-volunteer military to the civilian society it serves. The US has been blessed with good civil-military relations over the years, primarily due to the many civilian-soldiers who have served in the military. But with fewer civilian-soldiers to moderate cultural differences between an authoritarian military and a democratic society, the isolation of the US military becomes more likely. Secretary Gates and Admiral Mullen were right to emphasize the danger of an isolated military, but that has not always been the prevailing view. In his classic 1957 work on civil-military relations, The Soldier and the State, Samuel Huntington advocated the isolation of the professional military to prevent its corruption by civilian politics. It is ironic that in his later years Huntington saw the geopolitical threat environment as a clash of civilizations which required military leaders to work closely with civilians to achieve strategic political objectives in hostile cultural environments such as Iraq and Afghanistan. (see discussion in Barnes, Military Legitimacy: Might and Right in the New Millennium, Frank Cass, 1996, at pp 111-115) Today, the specter of an isolated military haunts the future of civil-military relations and military legitimacy. With fewer civilian-soldiers from the National Guard and Reserve components to bridge the gap between our military and civilian cultures, an all-volunteer professional military could revive Huntington’s model of an isolated military to preserve its integrity from what it perceives to be a morally corrupt civilian society. It is an idea that has been argued before. (see Robert L. Maginnis, A Chasm of Values, Military Review (February 1993), cited in Barnes, Military Legitimacy: Might and Right in the New Millennium, Frank Cass, 1996, at p 55, n 6, and p 113, n 20) The military is a small part of our population—only 1 percent—but the Department of Defense is our largest bureaucracy and notorious for its resistance to change. Thomas Jefferson once observed the need for such institutions to change with the times: “Laws and institutions must go hand in hand with the progress of the human mind. As that becomes more developed, more enlightened, as new discoveries are made, new truths disclosed, and manners and opinions change with the change of circumstance, institutions must advance also, and keep pace with the times.” Michael Gerson noted that the military remains a unique culture of warriors within a civilian culture, and that “it is not like the rest of America.” For that reason a forgotten and isolated military with values that do not keep pace with changing times and circumstances and conflict with civilian values would not only be a threat to military legitimacy but also be a threat to our individual freedom and democracy. In summary, the US military is in danger of becoming isolated from the civilian society it must serve. Military legitimacy and good civil-military relations depend upon the military maintaining close bonds with civilian society. In contemporary military operations military leaders must be both diplomats as well as warriors. They must be effective working with civilians in domestic and foreign emergencies and in civil-military operations such as counterinsurgency and stability operations, and they must be combat leaders who can destroy enemy forces with overwhelming force. Diplomat-warriors can perform these diverse leadership roles and maintain the close bonds needed between the military and civilian society. Such military leaders can help avoid an isolated military and insure healthy civil-military relations.

Loss of mission effectiveness risks multiple nuclear wars

Kagan and O’Hanlon 7 Frederick, resident scholar at AEI and Michael, senior fellow in foreign policy at Brookings, “The Case for Larger Ground Forces”, April 2007, http://www.aei.org/files/2007/04/24/20070424\_Kagan20070424.pdf

We live at a time when wars not only rage in nearly every region but threaten to erupt in many places where the current relative calm is tenuous. To view this as a strategic military challenge for the United States is not to espouse a specific theory of America’s role in the world or a certain political philosophy. Such an assessment flows directly from the basic bipartisan view of American foreign policy makers since World War II that overseas threats must be countered before they can directly threaten this country’s shores, that the basic stability of the international system is essential to American peace and prosperity, and that no country besides the United States is in a position to lead the way in countering major challenges to the global order. Let us highlight the threats and their consequences with a few concrete examples, emphasizing those that involve key strategic regions of the world such as the Persian Gulf and East Asia, or key potential threats to American security, such as the spread of nuclear weapons and the strengthening of the global Al Qaeda/jihadist movement. The Iranian government has rejected a series of international demands to halt its efforts at enriching uranium and submit to international inspections. What will happen if the US—or Israeli—government becomes convinced that Tehran is on the verge of fielding a nuclear weapon? North Korea, of course, has already done so, and the ripple effects are beginning to spread. Japan’s recent election to supreme power of a leader who has promised to rewrite that country’s constitution to support increased armed forces—and, possibly, even nuclear weapons— may well alter the delicate balance of fear in Northeast Asia fundamentally and rapidly. Also, in the background, at least for now, Sino Taiwanese tensions continue to flare, as do tensions between India and Pakistan, Pakistan and Afghanistan, Venezuela and the United States, and so on. Meanwhile, the world’s nonintervention in Darfur troubles consciences from Europe to America’s Bible Belt to its bastions of liberalism, yet with no serious international forces on offer, the bloodletting will probably, tragically, continue unabated. And as bad as things are in Iraq today, they could get worse. What would happen if the key Shiite figure, Ali al Sistani, were to die? If another major attack on the scale of the Golden Mosque bombing hit either side (or, perhaps, both sides at the same time)? Such deterioration might convince many Americans that the war there truly was lost—but the costs of reaching such a conclusion would be enormous. Afghanistan is somewhat more stable for the moment, although a major Taliban offensive appears to be in the offing. Sound US grand strategy must proceed from the recognition that, over the next few years and decades, the world is going to be a very unsettled and quite dangerous place, with Al Qaeda and its associated groups as a subset of a much larger set of worries. The only serious response to this international environment is to develop armed forces capable of protecting America’s vital interests throughout this dangerous time. Doing so requires a military capable of a wide range of missions—including not only deterrence of great power conflict in dealing with potential hotspots in Korea, the Taiwan Strait, and the Persian Gulf but also associated with a variety of Special Forces activities and stabilization operations. For today’s US military, which already excels at high technology and is increasingly focused on re-learning the lost art of counterinsurgency, this is first and foremost a question of finding the resources to field a large-enough standing Army and Marine Corps to handle personnel intensive missions such as the ones now under way in Iraq and Afghanistan. Let us hope there will be no such large-scale missions for a while. But preparing for the possibility, while doing whatever we can at this late hour to relieve the pressure on our soldiers and Marines in ongoing operations, is prudent. At worst, the only potential downside to a major program to strengthen the military is the possibility of spending a bit too much money. Recent history shows no link between having a larger military and its overuse; indeed, Ronald Reagan’s time in office was characterized by higher defense budgets and yet much less use of the military, an outcome for which we can hope in the coming years, but hardly guarantee. While the authors disagree between ourselves about proper increases in the size and cost of the military (with O’Hanlon preferring to hold defense to roughly 4 percent of GDP and seeing ground forces increase by a total of perhaps 100,000, and Kagan willing to devote at least 5 percent of GDP to defense as in the Reagan years and increase the Army by at least 250,000), we agree on the need to start expanding ground force capabilities by at least 25,000 a year immediately. Such a measure is not only prudent, it is also badly overdue.

#### Advantage \_\_\_\_\_ is Warming –

#### The political question doctrine is killing climate litigation now

Koshofer 10/1/13 (Warren A., partner in the law firm of Michelman & Robinson, LLP and a member of the firm’s commercial and business litigation department, “Defending Climate Change Liability” <http://www.rmmagazine.com/2013/10/01/defending-climate-change-liability/>)

For almost a decade now, plaintiffs have tried to sue various industries for damages resulting from greenhouse gas emissions and climate change. In staving off such claims, defendants have employed two formidable primary defenses rooted in the doctrines of standing and political question. Through use of these and other defenses, defendants have been able to prevail time and again in climate change liability-related litigation. Flowing from Article III of the U.S. Constitution, the doctrine of standing limits the jurisdiction of federal courts to cases that, by necessity, must include: 1) an injury in fact to the plaintiff, 2) that was caused by the defendant, and 3) that is capable of being redressed by the court. If any of the conditions are not present, the plaintiff does not have standing to sue the defendant. The doctrine of standing thus focuses on whether there is a proper plaintiff before the court. The focus of the political question doctrine is different; it addresses whether a plaintiff presents a claim that can be adjudicated by the court without interfering with the business of any other branch or department of the U.S. government. Setting the stage for a defense rooted in the political question doctrine in climate change-related litigation was the 2007 U.S. Supreme Court decision in Massachusetts v. EPA. In that case, the Supreme Court ruled that the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is authorized to regulate greenhouse gas emissions through the Clean Air Act. Consequently, courts have since used the political question doctrine to bar plaintiff’s liability claims for damages allegedly resulting from climate change. For example, in 2011, the Supreme Court held in American Electric Power v. Connecticut that corporations cannot be sued for damages allegedly resulting from greenhouse gas emissions because, among other reasons, the Clean Air Act delegates the management of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gas emissions to the EPA. Among the more noteworthy of the climate change litigation cases is Comer v. Murphy Oil. Brought by plaintiffs in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina, Mississippi Gulf residents sued numerous energy companies alleging that their emissions of greenhouse gases exacerbated the severity of the hurricane. The district court dismissed the case, finding that the plaintiffs had no standing to bring the claims, which ranged from public and private nuisance to trespass and negligence to fraudulent misrepresentation and conspiracy. The plaintiffs tried to re-file the case, but it was dismissed by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit in May. The Supreme Court is currently considering a petition to review the case, but it is widely believed that there is little likelihood of the petition being granted. Part of this belief is rooted in the Supreme Court’s treatment of a another climate change litigation case. In Native Village of Kivalina v. ExxonMobil Corp., the Alaskan shore village of Kivalina sued a group of energy companies operating in the region, alleging that their greenhouse gas emissions were causing polar ice to melt, sea levels to rise and the shoreline land of the village to erode at a rapid pace. Similar to the Comer decision in 2012, a district court held that the plaintiffs lacked standing because they could not demonstrate that any of their alleged injuries could be traced back to the defendants’ actions. The U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit agreed, and also addressed the political question doctrine defense, ruling that, based on the Supreme Court precedent set in American Electric Power v. Connecticut, “We need not engage in complex issue and fact-specific analysis in this case, because we have direct Supreme Court guidance that has already determined that Congress has directly addressed the issue of domestic greenhouse gas emissions from stationary sources and has therefore displaced federal common law.” By all accounts, then, it seems the defendants in climate change litigation will continue to prevail in court. The bad news for defendants, however, is that climate change-related litigation still exists, and it is expensive to defend. Once named in climate change-related litigation, a defendant often turns to its commercial general liability insurer for defense and indemnification. The trouble is that the allegations made in climate change-related litigation do not always trigger an insurer’s defense and indemnification duties.

#### Climate change litigation is key to solving global warming – 3 warrants

Flynn 13 (James, J.D. Candidate, 2013, Georgia State University College of Law; Assistant Legislation Editor, Georgia State University Law Review; Visiting Student, Florida State University College of Law, “CLIMATE OF CONFUSION: CLIMATE CHANGE LITIGATION IN THE WAKE OF AMERICAN ELECTRIC POWER V. CONNECTICUT”, lexis, accessed 1/5/2014)

2. Turning Up the Heat on Congress: Litigating to Legislate The only solution to anthropogenic global warming is a concerted global effort. 264 Such an effort cannot succeed without the leadership, or at least support, of the United States. 265 Real change in the United States requires comprehensive legislation that covers all facets of global warming: greenhouse gas emissions, land use, efficiency, and sustainable growth. In addition to maximizing time until the EPA either issues regulations or is prevented from doing so by Congress, litigation advances the goal of such comprehensive legislation in three ways. First, litigation keeps the pressure on fossil fuel companies and other large emitters. Comprehensive legislation is a near impossibility as long as the largest contributors to global greenhouse gas emissions are able to exert powerful control over the nation's [\*862] energy policy and the climate change discussion. 266 While the companies have the financial resources to battle in court, it is imperative that advocates and states make them do so. One need only look at the tobacco litigation of the 1960s through the 1990s to understand that success against a major industry is possible. 267 Here, though, the stakes are even higher. The chances of obtaining a largescale settlement from the fossil fuel industry is likely smaller now that the Court has ruled that some federal common law nuisance claims are displaced, because lower courts may hold that nuisance claims for money damages are also displaced. 268 However, advocates of climate change legislation should keep trying to obtain such a settlement through other tort remedies. A substantially damaging settlement may encourage fossil fuel companies to reposition their assets into more sustainable technologies to avoid more settlements, thus minimizing future emissions. Alternatively, if the fossil fuel companies feel threatened enough, they may begin to use their clout to persuade Congress to pass comprehensive legislation to protect their industry from such wide-ranging suits. 269 Second, litigation keeps the issue in the public consciousness during a time when the media is failing at its responsibilities to the public. 270 The media's coverage of climate change has been both inadequate and misleading. 271 Indeed, some polls suggest Americans [\*863] believe less in climate change now than just a few years ago. 272 Litigation, especially high-profile litigation, forces the issue into the public sphere, even though it may receive a negative connotation in the media. The more the public hears about the issue, the greater chance that people will demand their local and state politicians take action. Finally, litigation sends a clear message to Congress that simple appeasements will not suffice. 273 Comprehensive legislation is needed--legislation that mandates consistently declining emissions levels while simultaneously propping up replacement sources of energy. 274 Fill-in measures, like the EPA's authority to regulate emissions from power plants, are not sufficient. Humans need energy, and there can be no doubt that we must strike a balance between energy needs and risks to the environment. Catastrophic climate change, however, is simply a risk that we cannot take; it overwhelms the short-term benefits we receive from the burning of fossil fuels. 275 Advocates and states must demonstrate to Congress [\*864] through continuing litigation that the issue is critical and that plaintiffs like those in Kivalina and Comer are suffering genuine losses that demand redress that current statutes do not currently provide. CONCLUSION American Electric proved less important for the precedent it set than for the questions it left unanswered. While courts wrestled over standing, the political question doctrine, and displacement in climate change nuisance cases in the years preceding American Electric, the Supreme Court relied only on the clear displacement path illuminated by its earlier decision in Massachusetts. While the decision in American Electric narrowed the litigation options that climate change advocates have at their disposal, it subtly sent a message to Congress that greater federal action is needed. In writing such a narrow ruling, Justice Ginsburg also sent a message to states and advocates--whether intentionally or not--that climate change litigation is not dead. Until Congress enacts comprehensive climate change legislation, global warming lawsuits will, and must, continue.

#### And climate litigation solves internationally – produces international norms and cooperation

Long 8 (Andrew Long, Professor of Law @ Florida Coastal School of Law “International Consensus and U.S. Climate Change Litigation,” 33 Wm. & Mary Envtl. L. & Pol'y Rev. 177)

1. Enhancing U.S. International Leadership In a time of unfavorable global opinion toward the United States, explicit judicial involvement with international norms will move the United States **closer to the international community** by acknowledging the relevance of international environmental norms for our legal system. As in other contexts, explicit **judicial internalization of climate change norms would "build**[ ] **U.S. 'soft power,**' [enhance] its moral authority, and strengthen[ ] U.S. capacity for global leadership"2 °3 on climate change, and other global issues. More specifically, domestic judicial consideration of the global climate regime would reaffirm that although the United States has rejected Kyoto, we take the obligation to respect the global commons seriously by recognizing that obligation as a facet of the domestic legal system. U.S. courts' overall failure to interact with the international climate regime, as in other issue areas, has "serious consequences for their roles in international norm creation."2" As judicial understandings of climate change law converge, the early and consistent contributors to the transnational judicial dialogue will likely play the strongest role in shaping the emerging international normative consensus.2"' As Justice L'Heureux- Dube of the Canadian Supreme Court noted in an article describing the decline of the U.S. Supreme Court's global influence, "[decisions which look only inward ... have less relevance to those outside that jurisdiction." °6 Thus, if U.S. courts hope to participate in shaping the normative position on climate change adopted by judiciaries throughout the world, explicit recognition of the relationship between domestic and international law is vital. With climate change in particular, norm development through domestic application should be an important aspect of global learning. The problem requires a global solution beyond the scope of any prior multilateral environmental agreements. This provides a situation in which U.S. judicial reasoning in applying aspects of climate regime thinking to concrete problems will fall into fertile international policy soil. Accordingly, the recognition of international norms in **domestic climate change litigation may play a strengthening role in the perception of U.S. leadership**, encourage U.S. development and exportation of effective domestic climate strategies, and promote international agreements that will enhance consistency with such approaches. In short, explicit judicial discussion of international climate change norms as harmonious with U.S. law can **enhance U.S. ability to regain** a **global leadership** position on the issue and, thereby, more significantly shape the future of the international climate regime. 2. Promoting the Effectiveness of the International Response Along with promoting U.S. interests and standing in the international community, climate change litigation has a direct role to play in developing the international regime if courts directly engage that regime." 7 Just as the United States as an actor may benefit from acknowledging and applying international norms, the regime in which the actions occur will benefit through application and acceptance. Indeed, a case such as Massachusetts v. EPA that directly engages only domestic law can nonetheless be understood to impact international lawmaking by considering its actors."' More important, however, will be cases in which the domestic judiciary gives life to international agreements through direct engagement-a "role [that] is particularly important as a check on the delegitimization of international legal rules that are not enforced."" 9 Assuming, as we must in the arena of climate change, that international law can only effect significant changes in behavior through penetration of the domestic sphere, domestic litigation that employs international law not only provides an instance in which the international appears effective but, more importantly, molds it into a shape that will enable further use in domestic cases or suggest necessary changes internationally. By engaging the international, domestic cases can also provide articulation for the norms that have emerged. The precise meaning of the UNFCCC obligation that nations take measures must be hammered out on the ground. In the United States, if Congress has not acted, it is appropriate for the courts to begin this process by measuring particular actions against the standard. 3. Encouraging Consistency in Domestic Law and Policy In the absence of national climate change law and policy, explicit discussion of international sources and norms in litigation will provide a well-developed baseline for a uniform judicial approach in the domestic realm. This could occur both within and beyond the United States. Within the United States, bringing international environmental law into the mix of judicial reasoning would provide common grounding that unifies the decisions and begins to construct a more systematic preference for development of an effective legal response to international threats. Specifically, if an international climate change norm is found relevant to interpretation of a domestic statute, reference will be appropriate to that norm when future questions of interpretation of the domestic statute arise.210 Thus, to the extent that climate change cases rely upon consensus concerning the scientific evidence of climate change, future cases should use that consensus as a measuring stick for claims of scientific uncertainty.2n The same can occur with norm development. For example, had the Court in Massachusetts tied its jurisdictional or substantive holding to an identifiable norm, the opinion would have greater clarity and value as a precedent in other contexts within the United States. Outside the United States, this approach would provide value to other, more transnationally oriented domestic courts.212 This would serve a norm entrepreneurship function and likely increase agreement among domestic courts on how to approach climate change issues raised under statutes designed for other purposes. 4. Enabling a Check at the Domestic-International Interface Finally, climate change litigation has something to offer for the growth of administrative law at the interface of domestic and international law. At least two points are noteworthy. First, U.S. courts can serve a unique function of providing legal accountability for U.S. failure to honor its UNFCCC commitments.213 Although this might be achieved implicitly, arguably the approach of Massachusetts, doing so explicitly would provide a check of a different magnitude. An explicit check here would serve the purposes identified above, as well as offering the practical benefit of increasing compliance. The dualist tradition, and perhaps concerns of domestic political backlash, weigh against grounding a decision solely in the UNFCC. However, looking to it as a major point in a narrative defining the development of a partly domestic obligation to take national action for the redress of climate change would serve the same beneficial purpose. This approach has the advantage of building a significant bridge over the dualist divide between domestic and international law without ripping the Court's analysis from traditional, dualist moorings. Pg. 212-216

#### Climate change ends all life – runaway climate hothouse earth.

Farley 2010

John, Professor of physics and astronomy @ UNLV, Monthly Review Vol 62 issue 4 september 2010 <http://monthlyreview.org/2010/09/01/our-last-chance-to-save-humanity>

If the sea level rises 70 meters (250 feet), it would not extinguish all human life. After all, hominids have existed on earth for several million years, and homo sapiens more than a hundred thousand, surviving numerous ice ages, during which ice sheets a mile thick covered areas that came to be Boston and New York City. But the world population during the last ice age, ten thousand years ago, has been estimated at five million. It is now six billion. It is human civilization that is unlikely to survive a flooding catastrophe. According to the penultimate chapter, The Venus Syndrome, it might be even worse. Hansen posits a possible future earth, in which a “runaway greenhouse effect” takes over: anthropogenic global warming from greenhouse gases causes increased water vapor in the atmosphere, which in turn causes further warming. The methane clathrate deposits are destabilized, releasing vast amounts of methane in the atmosphere. The oceans become acidified by dissolution of carbon dioxide from the atmosphere. This could eliminate all life on Earth. This is speculation, of course. But Venus, the planet most similar to earth, has a very strong greenhouse effect, much stronger than earth’s. In the absence of atmospheric greenhouse gases, the surface temperature of the earth would be -18°C (0°F). The actual observed temperature of the Earth is 15°C (59°F). Thus, the greenhouse effect on the Earth raises the temperature by 33°C (59°F). On Venus, the surface temperature, in the absence of the greenhouse effect, would be -41°C (-42°F), well below the melting point of ice. A very strong greenhouse effect raises the surface temperature to the observed temperature of 464°C (867°F). The greenhouse effect on Venus is a staggering 505°C (909°F), creating a planetary surface hot enough to melt lead (!!), which requires “only” 327°C (621°F).

#### Warming is real and anthropogenic, need to cut emissions adaptation can’t solve. Our science is watertight and theirs is garbage.

Harvey 2013

Fiona, Guardian Environment Reporter, IPCC climate report: human impact is 'unequivocal', September 27 2013, http://www.theguardian.com/environment/2013/sep/27/ipcc-climate-report-un-secretary-general

World leaders must now respond to an "unequivocal" message from climate scientists and act with policies to cut greenhouse gas emissions, the United Nations secretary-general urged on Friday. Introducing a major report from a high level UN panel of climate scientists, Ban Ki-moon said, "The heat is on. We must act." The world's leading climate scientists, who have been meeting in all-night sessions this week in the Swedish capital, said there was no longer room for doubt that climate change was occurring, and the dominant cause has been human actions in pouring greenhouse gases into the atmosphere. In their starkest warning yet, following nearly seven years of new research on the climate, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) said it was "unequivocal" and that even if the world begins to moderate greenhouse gas emissions, warming is likely to cross the critical threshold of 2C by the end of this century. That would have serious consequences, including sea level rises, heatwaves and changes to rainfall meaning dry regions get less and already wet areas receive more. In response to the report, the US secretary of state, John Kerry, said in a statement: "This is yet another wakeup call: those who deny the science or choose excuses over action are playing with fire." "Once again, the science grows clearer, the case grows more compelling, and the costs of inaction grow beyond anything that anyone with conscience or commonsense should be willing to even contemplate," he said. He said that livelihoods around the world would be impacted. "With those stakes, the response must be all hands on deck. It's not about one country making a demand of another. It's the science itself, demanding action from all of us. The United States is deeply committed to leading on climate change." In a crucial reinforcement of their message – included starkly in this report for the first time – the IPCC warned that the world cannot afford to keep emitting carbon dioxide as it has been doing in recent years. To avoid dangerous levels of climate change, beyond 2C, the world can only emit a total of between 800 and 880 gigatonnes of carbon. Of this, about 530 gigatonnes had already been emitted by 2011. That has a clear implication for our fossil fuel consumption, meaning that humans cannot burn all of the coal, oil and gas reserves that countries and companies possess. As the former UN commissioner Mary Robinson told the Guardian last week, that will have "huge implications for social and economic development." It will also be difficult for business interests to accept. The central estimate is that warming is likely to exceed 2C, the threshold beyond which scientists think global warming will start to wreak serious changes to the planet. That threshold is likely to be reached even if we begin to cut global greenhouse gas emissions, which so far has not happened, according to the report. Other key points from the report are: • Atmospheric concentrations of carbon dioxide, methane and nitrous oxide are now at levels "unprecedented in at least the last 800,000 years." • Since the 1950's it's "extremely likely" that human activities have been the dominant cause of the temperature rise. • Concentrations of CO2 and other greenhouse gases in the atmosphere have increased to levels that are unprecedented in at least 800,000 years. The burning of fossil fuels is the main reason behind a 40% increase in C02 concentrations since the industrial revolution. • Global temperatures are likely to rise by 0.3C to 4.8C, by the end of the century depending on how much governments control carbon emissions. • Sea levels are expected to rise a further 26-82cm by the end of the century. • The oceans have acidified as they have absorbed about a third of the carbon dioxide emitted. Thomas Stocker, co-chair of the working group on physical science, said the message that greenhouse gases must be reduced was clear. "We give very relevant guidance on the total amount of carbon that can't be emitted to stay to 1.5 or 2C. We are not on the path that would lead us to respect that warming target [which has been agreed by world governments]." He said: "Continued emissions of greenhouse gases will cause further warming and changes in all components of the climate system. Limiting climate change will require substantial and sustained reductions of greenhouse gas emissions." Though governments around the world have agreed to curb emissions, and at numerous international meetings have reaffirmed their commitment to holding warming to below 2C by the end of the century, greenhouse gas concentrations are still rising at record rates. Rajendra Pachauri, chair of the IPCC, said it was for governments to take action based on the science produced by the panel, consisting of thousands of pages of detail, drawing on the work of more than 800 scientists and hundreds of scientific papers. The scientists also put paid to claims that global warming has "stopped" because global temperatures in the past 15 years have not continued the strong upward march of the preceding years, which is a key argument put forward by sceptics to cast doubt on climate science. But the IPCC said the longer term trends were clear: "Each of the last three decades has been successively warmer at the Earth's surface than any preceding decade since 1850 in the northern hemisphere [the earliest date for reliable temperature records for the whole hemisphere]." The past 15 years were not such an unusual case, said Stocker. "People always pick 1998 but [that was] a very special year, because a strong El Niño made it unusually hot, and since then there have been some medium-sized volcanic eruptions that have cooled the climate." But he said that further research was needed on the role of the oceans, which are thought to have absorbed more than 90% of the warming so far. The scientists have faced sustained attacks from so-called sceptics, often funded by "vested interests" according to the UN, who try to pick holes in each item of evidence for climate change. The experts have always known they must make their work watertight against such an onslaught, and every conclusion made by the IPCC must pass scrutiny by all of the world's governments before it can be published. Their warning on Friday was sent out to governments around the globe, who convene and fund the IPCC. It was 1988 when scientists were first convened for this task, and in the five landmark reports since then the research has become ever clearer. Now, scientists say they are certain that "warming in the climate system is unequivocal and since 1950 many changes have been observed throughout the climate system that are unprecedented over decades to millennia." That warning, from such a sober body, hemmed in by the need to submit every statement to extraordinary levels of scrutiny, is the starkest yet. "Heatwaves are very likely to occur more frequently and last longer. As the earth warms, we expect to see currently wet regions receiving more rainfall, and dry regions receiving less, although there will be exceptions," Stocker said. Qin Dahe, also co-chair of the working group, said: "As the ocean warm, and glaciers and ice sheets reduce, global mean sea level will continue to rise, but at a faster rate than we have experienced over the past 40 years." Prof David Mackay, chief scientific adviser to the Department of Energy and Climate Change, said: "The far-reaching consequences of this warming are becoming understood, although some uncertainties remain. The most significant uncertainty, however, is how much carbon humanity will choose to put into the atmosphere in the future. It is the total sum of all our carbon emissions that will determine the impacts. We need to take action now, to maximise our chances of being faced with impacts that we, and our children, can deal with. Waiting a decade or two before taking climate change action will certainly lead to greater harm than acting now."

#### Warming will happen faster than they think, makes adaptation impossible and extinction likely.

Jamail 2013

Dahr, independent journalist, is the author of the just-published Beyond the Green Zone: Dispatches from an Unembedded Journalist in Occupied Iraq, citing tons of super qualified people, “The Great Dying” redux? Shocking parallels between ancient mass extinction and climate change, Salon, December 2013, http://www.salon.com/2013/12/17/the\_great\_dying\_redux\_shocking\_parallels\_between\_ancient\_mass\_extinction\_and\_climate\_change\_partner/

Climate-change-related deaths are already estimated at five million annually, and the process seems to be accelerating more rapidly than most climate models have suggested. Even without taking into account the release of frozen methane in the Arctic, some scientists are already painting a truly bleak picture of the human future. Take Canadian Wildlife Service biologist Neil Dawe, who in August told a reporter that he wouldn’t be surprised if the generation after him witnessed the extinction of humanity. All around the estuary near his office on Vancouver Island, he has been witnessing the unraveling of “the web of life,” and “it’s happening very quickly.” “Economic growth is the biggest destroyer of the ecology,” Dawe says. “Those people who think you can have a growing economy and a healthy environment are wrong. If we don’t reduce our numbers, nature will do it for us.” And he isn’t hopeful humans will be able to save themselves. “Everything is worse and we’re still doing the same things. Because ecosystems are so resilient, they don’t exact immediate punishment on the stupid.” The University of Arizona’s Guy McPherson has similar fears. “We will have very few humans on the planet because of lack of habitat,” he says. Of recent studies showing the toll temperature increases will take on that habitat, he adds, “They are only looking at CO2 in the atmosphere.” Here’s the question: Could some version of extinction or near-extinction overcome humanity, thanks to climate change — and possibly incredibly fast? Similar things have happened in the past. Fifty-five million years ago, a five degree Celsius rise in average global temperatures seems to have occurred in just 13 years, according to a study published in the October 2013 issue of the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. A report in the August 2013 issue of Science revealed that in the near-term Earth’s climate will change 10 times faster than at any other moment in the last 65 million years. “The Arctic is warming faster than anywhere else on the planet,” climate scientist James Hansen has said. “There are potential irreversible effects of melting the Arctic sea ice. If it begins to allow the Arctic Ocean to warm up, and warm the ocean floor, then we’ll begin to release methane hydrates. And if we let that happen, that is a potential tipping point that we don’t want to happen. If we burn all the fossil fuels then we certainly will cause the methane hydrates, eventually, to come out and cause several degrees more warming, and it’s not clear that civilization could survive that extreme climate change.” Yet, long before humanity has burned all fossil fuel reserves on the planet, massive amounts of methane will be released. While the human body is potentially capable of handling a six to nine degree Celsius rise in the planetary temperature, the crops and habitat we use for food production are not. As McPherson put it, “If we see a 3.5 to 4C baseline increase, I see no way to have habitat. We are at .85C above baseline and we’ve already triggered all these self-reinforcing feedback loops.” He adds: “All the evidence points to a locked-in 3.5 to 5 degree C global temperature rise above the 1850 ‘norm’ by mid-century, possibly much sooner. This guarantees a positive feedback, already underway, leading to 4.5 to 6 or more degrees above ‘norm’ and that is a level lethal to life. This is partly due to the fact that humans have to eat and plants can’t adapt fast enough to make that possible for the seven to nine billion of us — so we’ll die.” If you think McPherson’s comment about lack of adaptability goes over the edge, consider that the rate of evolution trails the rate of climate change by a factor of 10,000, according to a paper in the August 2013 issue of Ecology Letters. Furthermore, David Wasdel, director of the Apollo-Gaia Project and an expert on multiple feedback dynamics, says, “We are experiencing change 200 to 300 times faster than any of the previous major extinction events.” Wasdel cites with particular alarm scientific reports showing that the oceans have already lost 40% of their phytoplankton, the base of the global oceanic food chain, because of climate-change-induced acidification and atmospheric temperature variations. (According to the Center for Ocean Solutions: “The oceans have absorbed almost one-half of human-released CO2 emissions since the Industrial Revolution. Although this has moderated the effect of greenhouse gas emissions, it is chemically altering marine ecosystems 100 times more rapidly than it has changed in at least the last 650,000 years.”) “This is already a mass extinction event,” Wasdel adds. “The question is, how far is it going to go? How serious does it become? If we are not able to stop the rate of increase of temperature itself, and get that back under control, then a high temperature event, perhaps another 5-6 degrees [C], would obliterate at least 60% to 80% of the populations and species of life on Earth.”

#### And we're reaching a tipping point, uncontrolled warming will annihilate all life if we allow the oceans to continue absorbing CO2.

Reuters 2010 "Oceans Choking on CO2, Face Deadly Changes: Study" http://www.reuters.com/article/idUSTRE65H0LI20100618?feedType=RSS&feedName=environmentNews&utm\_source=feedburner&utm\_medium=feed&utm\_campaign=Feed%3A+reuters%2Fenvironment+%28News+%2F+US+%2F+Environment%29

Oceans were rapidly warming and acidifying, water circulation was being altered and dead zones within the ocean depths were expanding, said the report. There has also been a decline in major ocean ecosystems like kelp forests and coral reefs and the marine food chain was breaking down, with fewer and smaller fish and more frequent diseases and pests among marine organisms. "If we continue down this pathway we get into conditions which have no analog to anything we've experienced," said Hoegh-Guldberg, director of the Global Change Institute at The University of Queensland. Hoegh-Guldberg said oceans were the Earth's "heart and lungs", producing half of the world's oxygen and absorbing 30 percent of man-made carbon dioxide. "We are entering a period in which the very ocean services upon which humanity depends are undergoing massive change and in some cases beginning to fail," said Hoegh-Guldberg. "Quite plainly, the Earth cannot do without its ocean. This is further evidence that we are well on the way to the next great extinction event." More than 3.5 billion people depend on the ocean for their primary source of food and in 20 years this number could double, the report's authors say. The world's climate has remained stable for several thousand years, but climate change in the past 150 years is now forcing organisms to change rapidly -- changes that through evolution would normally take a long time, said the report. "We are becoming increasingly certain that the world's marine ecosystems are approaching tipping points. These tipping points are where change accelerates and causes unrelated impacts on other systems," said co-author marine scientist John F. Bruno at the University of North Carolina. Last week, the head of the United Nations Environment Program, Achim Steiner, said it was crucial the world responded to the loss of coral reefs, forests and other ecosystems "that generate multi-trillion dollar services that underpin all life-including economic life-on Earth".

#### Litigation is sufficient to solve effective energy regulation on carbon emissions

Osofsky 11 (Hari M., Ph.D. in Law @ the University of Minnesota Law School, “The Role of Climate Change Litigation in Establishing the Scale of Energy Regulation,” Annals of the Association of American Geographers, 101:4, 775-782)

Implications of Rescaling Through Litigation for the Challenges of Energy Regulation This section draws from the legal dynamic federal- ism literature and the geography literature on scale to explore how the rescaling function of climate change litigation can assist with energy' regulation's challenges. These two streams of scholarship have significant syn- ergies. The dynamic federalism literature argues that models that create more fluid allocation of regulatory authority grapple with complex problems like energy and climate change more effectively than rigid demar- cations do (Osofsky 2005; Engel 2006; Ruhl and Sab- man 2010). The geography literature focusing on issues of fixity and fluidity in scale engages the complex re- lationships that cross-cut particular levels (Delaney C\* Leitner 1997; Swyngedouw 1997; Brenner 1998; Cox 1998; Judd 1998; Smith 1998; Martin 1999; Paasi 2004; Wood 2005; Osofsky 2009, 2010a). Cox's exploration of a network theory of scale, in particular, helps to cap- ture the dynamic nature of relationships among the ties to a particular level and movement among levels (Cox 1998; Osofsky 2009). These dual insights regarding the need for fluid reg- ulatory approaches and the cross-scalar quality of be- havior taking place at particular levels illuminate the role that this litigation does and can play in advanc- ing more effective energy regulation. First, litigation provides a mechanism for bringing greater fluidity into legal interactions, which helps create needed move- ment across scales and spaces (Osofsky 2009, 2010a). Although the four case examples varied significantly, they all provided opportunities for scalar contestation among a wide range of actors and a moment at which legal scale disputes were resolved. Although this reso- lution might not always favor the proregulatory stance, as it did in these four cases, litigation's opportunity for contestation helps to overcome the scalar and spatial fixity of law that makes effective energy regulation so difficult. Second, the lawsuits allow for simultaneous inter- actions within and across levels of governance. In so doing, they create regulatory diagonals that assist in reordering a landscape dominated by horizontal inter- actions at a particular level and vertical interactions among key actors and institutions at different levels. As the four case examples demonstrate, these diag- onal interactions vary in different lawsuits and over time along the dimensions of size (large vs. small), axis (vertical vs. horizontal), hierarchy (top-down vs. bottom-up), and cooperativeness (cooperation vs. con- flict). For example, the first two conflicts evolved from small-scale actors uniting horizontally and pushing in a conflictual fashion vertically from the bottom up for legal change into larger scale, top-down, coopera- tive policy scheme (Osofsky forthcoming). This evolv- ing diagonal regulatory function makes these lawsuits a helpful tool in crafting more effective cross-cutting regulation. Moreover, the fluidity and diagonal interactions that these lawsuits bring to energy' regulation have broader implications for future executive and legislative action. The Obama administration has continuing opportu- nities as it attempts to green energy policy to create lawmaking processes that maximize fluidity and possi- bilities for diagonal interactions. It has already made strides on this score, such as through the process it used to craft the National Program or through the Clean Energy Leadership Group the EPA has established, but further opportunities abound (Osofsky forthcoming). Law and geography analyses, like the one in this arti- cle, help to frame how such approaches might be crafted most effectively within the constraints of law's fixity. Geography's deep engagement of fixity and fluidity, to- gether with dynamic federalism's rigorous exploration of institutional possibilities, can provide the basis for creative, cross-cutting policy approaches that engage the complexities of scale. Such creativity is needed in the face of the significant challenges facing green energy regulation.

## 2AC

### Case

#### Ethical policymaking requires calculation of consequences

Gvosdev 5 – Rhodes scholar, PhD from St. Antony’s College, executive editor of The National Interest (Nikolas, The Value(s) of Realism, SAIS Review 25.1, pmuse)

As the name implies, realists focus on promoting policies that are achievable and sustainable. In turn, the morality of a foreign policy action is judged by its results, not by the intentions of its framers. A foreign policymaker must weigh the consequences of any course of action and assess the resources at hand to carry out the proposed task. As Lippmann warned, Without the controlling principle that the nation must maintain its objectives and its power in equilibrium, its purposes within its means and its means equal to its purposes, its commitments related to its resources and its resources adequate to its commitments, it is impossible to think at all about foreign affairs.8 Commenting on this maxim, Owen Harries, founding editor of The National Interest, noted, "This is a truth of which Americans—more apt to focus on ends rather than means when it comes to dealing with the rest of the world—need always to be reminded."9 In fact, Morgenthau noted that "there can be no political morality without prudence."10 This virtue of prudence—which Morgenthau identified as the cornerstone of realism—should not be confused with expediency. Rather, it takes as its starting point that it is more moral to fulfill one's commitments than to make "empty" promises, and to seek solutions that minimize harm and produce sustainable results. Morgenthau concluded: [End Page 18] Political realism does not require, nor does it condone, indifference to political ideals and moral principles, but it requires indeed a sharp distinction between the desirable and the possible, between what is desirable everywhere and at all times and what is possible under the concrete circumstances of time and place.11 This is why, prior to the outbreak of fighting in the former Yugoslavia, U.S. and European realists urged that Bosnia be decentralized and partitioned into ethnically based cantons as a way to head off a destructive civil war. Realists felt this would be the best course of action, especially after the country's first free and fair elections had brought nationalist candidates to power at the expense of those calling for inter-ethnic cooperation. They had concluded—correctly, as it turned out—that the United States and Western Europe would be unwilling to invest the blood and treasure that would be required to craft a unitary Bosnian state and give it the wherewithal to function. Indeed, at a diplomatic conference in Lisbon in March 1992, the various factions in Bosnia had, reluctantly, endorsed the broad outlines of such a settlement. For the purveyors of moralpolitik, this was unacceptable. After all, for this plan to work, populations on the "wrong side" of the line would have to be transferred and resettled. Such a plan struck directly at the heart of the concept of multi-ethnicity—that different ethnic and religious groups could find a common political identity and work in common institutions. When the United States signaled it would not accept such a settlement, the fragile consensus collapsed. The United States, of course, cannot be held responsible for the war; this lies squarely on the shoulders of Bosnia's political leaders. Yet Washington fell victim to what Jonathan Clarke called "faux Wilsonianism," the belief that "high-flown words matter more than rational calculation" in formulating effective policy, which led U.S. policymakers to dispense with the equation of "balancing commitments and resources."12 Indeed, as he notes, the Clinton administration had criticized peace plans calling for decentralized partition in Bosnia "with lofty rhetoric without proposing a practical alternative." The subsequent war led to the deaths of tens of thousands and left more than a million people homeless. After three years of war, the Dayton Accords—hailed as a triumph of American diplomacy—created a complicated arrangement by which the federal union of two ethnic units, the Muslim-Croat Federation, was itself federated to a Bosnian Serb republic. Today, Bosnia requires thousands of foreign troops to patrol its internal borders and billions of dollars in foreign aid to keep its government and economy functioning. Was the aim of U.S. policymakers, academics and journalists—creating a multi-ethnic democracy in Bosnia—not worth pursuing? No, not at all, and this is not what the argument suggests. But aspirations were not matched with capabilities. As a result of holding out for the "most moral" outcome and encouraging the Muslim-led government in Sarajevo to pursue maximalist aims rather than finding a workable compromise that could have avoided bloodshed and produced more stable conditions, the peoples of Bosnia suffered greatly. In the end, the final settlement was very close [End Page 19] to the one that realists had initially proposed—and the one that had also been roundly condemned on moral grounds.

### 2AC Restriction

#### We meet – question of the resolution isn’t that we reduce drone strikes or targeted killing

#### Interp – 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.

#### C/I --- Restriction is limitation

CAC 12,COURT OF APPEAL OF CALIFORNIA, SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, Plaintiff and Respondent, v. ALTERNATIVE MEDICINAL CANNABIS COLLECTIVE et al., Defendants and Appellants, DIVISION ONE, 207 Cal. App. 4th 601; 143 Cal. Rptr. 3d 716; 2012 Cal. App. LEXIS 772

We disagree with County that in using the phrases “further restrict the location or establishment” and “regulate the location or establishment” in [\*615] section 11362.768, subdivisions (f) and (g), the Legislature intended to authorize local governments to ban all medical marijuana dispensaries that are otherwise “authorized by law to possess, cultivate, or distribute medical marijuana” (§ 11362.768, subd. (e) [stating scope of section's application]); the Legislature did not use the words “ban” or “prohibit.” Yet County cites dictionary definitions of “regulate” (to govern or direct according to rule or law); “regulation” (controlling by rule or restriction; a rule or order that has legal force); “restriction” (a limitation or qualification, including on the use of property); “establishment” (the act of establishing or state or condition of being established); “ban” (to prohibit); and “prohibit” (to forbid by law; to prevent or hinder) to attempt to support its interpretation. County then concludes that “the ordinary meaning [\*\*\*23] of the terms, ‘restriction,’ ‘regulate,’ and ‘regulation’ are consistent with a ban or prohibition against the opening or starting up or continued operation of [a medical marijuana dispensary] storefront business.” We disagree.¶CA(9)(9) The ordinary meanings of “restrict” and “regulate” suggest a degree of control or restriction falling short of “banning,” “prohibiting,” “forbidding,” or “preventing.” Had the Legislature intended to include an outright ban or prohibition among the local regulatory powers authorized in section 11362.768, subdivisions (f) and (g), it would have said so. Attributing the usual and ordinary meanings to the words used in section 11362.768, subdivisions (f) and (g), construing the words in context, attempting to harmonize subdivisions (f) and (g) with section 11362.775 and with the purpose of California's medical marijuana [\*\*727] statutory program, and bearing in mind the intent of the electorate and the Legislature in enacting the CUA and the MMP, we conclude that HN21Go to this Headnote in the case.the phrases “further restrict the location or establishment” and “regulate the location or establishment” in section 11362.768, subdivisions (f) and (g) do not authorize a per se ban at the local level. The Legislature [\*\*\*24] decided in section 11362.775 to insulate medical marijuana collectives and cooperatives from nuisance prosecution “solely on the basis” that they engage in a dispensary function. To interpret the phrases “further restrict the location or establishment” and “regulate the location or establishment” to mean that local governments may impose a blanket nuisance prohibition against dispensaries would frustrate both the Legislature's intent to “[e]nhance the access of patients and caregivers to medical marijuana through collective, cooperative cultivation projects” and “[p]romote uniform and consistent application of the [CUA] among the counties within the state” and the electorate's intent to “ensure that seriously ill Californians have the right to obtain and use marijuana for medical purposes” and “encourage the federal and state governments to implement a plan to provide for the safe and affordable distribution of marijuana to all patients in medical need of marijuana.”

#### Their interpretation is flawed

#### A. Over limits-The core cases on the topic all revolve around regulating executive behavior not banning specific policies. Their interpretation would eliminate the role of most topic literature across the areas.

#### B. Affirmative Ground-Ban specific policies like drones are dead in the water to any type of agent counterplan. You should err affirmative because the range of good affirmatives is very small this year and the negative is strapped with an arsenal of generics.

#### ---Reasonability-competing interpretations causes substance crowd by encouraging debate over Topicality instead of war powers. Good is good enough when the topic is already limited by areas and our affirmative is squarely located in the literature over how to limit executive authority.

### 2AC Targeted Killing Word PIC

#### Counterplan is plan plus – means it’s not competitive – it’s not an opportunity cost to plan – j that’s bad- justifies any counterplan

#### We should continue to speak the word and tie it to violence—sanitizing the word is exactly what the military-industrial complex wants you to do.

Whittle 13 (Richard, Senior Scholar of International Security Studies at the Wilson Center, DON’T SAY ‘DRONES,’ Beg Drone Makers, Aug 14, http://breakingdefense.com/2013/08/14/dont-say-drones-beg-drone-makers/)

When you read or hear the word “drone,” is your first thought, “killer robot?” The leaders of the drone industry fear it is, which is why they’re hoping to persuade the news media to stop using a nice, clear, five-letter English word and instead clutter their reports with eye-glazing acronyms such as UAS, UAV, RPA or some such. (Yes, that was an editorial comment.) How seriously do drone makers take this issue? Journalists logging onto the Wifi in the Media Room at the Association of U~~nmanned~~ Vehicle Systems International conference in Washington this week had to use this password: “DONTSAYDRONES.” AUVSI, the Air Force, the Navy, the Army and many defense industry leaders just hate the word “drones.” The Media Room Wifi login password, clearly, was a clever — but feeble — attempt to condition the media to drop a word whose primary definition used to be “lazy male bee” but today is a popular synonym for ~~unmanned~~ aircraft. The trade group and many of its members prefer the terms “unmanned aerial systems” (UAS) or “unmanned aerial vehicles” (UAV) or “remotely piloted aircraft” (RPA) or, as they’re officially known in Europe, “remotely piloted aircraft systems” (RPAS) “The average person on the street, and even intelligent and informed people, when they think of the word ‘drone,’ they think of the military, they think hostile, they think weaponized, they think large and they think autonomous,” argues AUVSI’s president, Michael Toscano, especially after several years of Code Pink protests against drone strikes. That connotation is not only inaccurate but damaging, he told me, to a nascent industry whose products range in size from aircraft as big as an airliner to aerial vehicles that can fit in the palm of your hand, and whose potential peaceful uses far outnumber their role in combat operations and CIA targeted killings. Show a person a range of photos of unmanned aircraft, however, and “if you say the word ‘drone,’ 80 percent will pick the picture of a Predator – that’s what’s wrong,” Toscano said, referring to the General Atomics MQ-1, the first armed UAS used in combat and the CIA’s favorite weapon in the U.S. war with Al Qaeda and the terrorist group’s allies.

####  ---The net benefit is inevitable --- The counterplan cannot remove “targeted killing” from the national vocabulary when it’s used so much by the Executive. Alternate causalities overwhelm any uniqueness or solvency for their impact.

#### ---Affirmative solves the net benefit.

#### (A.) Reduces the scope and application of targeted killing

#### (B.) Structural hospitality induces linguistic hospitality --- Reality shapes discourse, not the other way around.

Roskoski & Peabody 1991

Matthew, Joe, “A Linguistic and Philosophical Critique of Language ‘Arguments,’” http://debate.uvm.edu/Library/ DebateTheoryLibrary/Roskoski&Peabody-LangCritiques

The first is that the hypothesis is phrased as a philosophical first principle and hence would not have an objective referent. The second is there would be intrinsic problems in any such test. The independent variable would be the language used by the subject. The dependent variable would be the subject's subjective reality. The problem is that the dependent variable can only be measured through self- reporting, which - naturally - entails the use of language. Hence, it is impossible to separate the dependent and independent variables. In other words, we have no way of knowing if the effects on "reality" are actual or merely artifacts of the language being used as a measuring tool. The second reason that the hypothesis is flawed is that there are problems with the causal relationship it describes. Simply put, it is just as plausible (in fact infinitely more so) that reality shapes language. Again we echo the words of Dr. Rosch, who says: {C}ovariation does not determine the direction of causality. On the simplest level, cultures are very likely to have names for physical objects which exist in their culture and not to have names for objects outside of their experience. Where television sets exists, there are words to refer to them. However, it would be difficult to argue that the objects are caused by the words. The same reasoning probably holds in the case of institutions and other, more abstract, entities and their names. (Rosch 264).

#### ---Don’t evaluate low risk net benefits.

#### (A.) Discourages topic education by incentivizing pics with unpredictable net benefits to moot the aff like plan minus a penny.

#### (B.) Infinitely regressive --- Justifies absurd risk calculations that detract from real world policy analysis.

#### ---Permutation --- Do the Counterplan.

#### ---Word PICs are a voting issue.

#### (A.) Unpredictable --- Justifies infinite amount of unpredictable counterplans that detract from topic specific education --- Everything from read the plan in pictures to the ‘the pic’ becomes fair game.

#### (B.) Destroys real world education and advocacy skills by encouraging petty politics that fracture leftist coalitions.

Churchill 1996

Ward, Keetoowah Cherokee, 25+ year member of the American Indian Movement and prof of Indigenous Studies at University of Colorado Boulder. From a Native Son, pg. 460

There can be little doubt that matters of linguistic appropriateness and precision are of serious and legitimate concern. By the same token, however, it must be conceded that such preoccupations arrive at a point of diminishing return. After that, they degenerate rapidly into liabilities rather than benefits to comprehension. By now, it should be evident that much of what is mentioned in this article falls under the latter category; it is, by and large, inept, esoteric, and semantically silly, bearing no more relevance in the real world than the question of how many angels can dance on the head of a pin. Ultimately, it is a means to stultify and divide people rather than stimulate and unite them. Nonetheless, such “issues” of word choice have come to dominate dialogue in a significant and apparently growing segment of the Left. Speakers, writers, and organizers or persuasions are drawn, with increasing vociferousness and persistence, into heated confrontations, not about what they’ve said, but about how they’ve said it. Decisions on whether to enter into alliances, or even to work with other parties, seem more and more contingent not upon the prospect of a common agenda, but upon mutual adherence to certain elements of a prescribed vernacular. Mounting quantities of a progressive time, energy, and attention are squandered in perversions of Mao’s principle of criticism/self-criticism – now variously called “process,” “line sharpening,” or even ‘struggle” – in which there occurs a virtually endless stream of talk about how to talk about “the issues.” All of this happens at the direct expense of actually understanding the issues themselves, much less doing something about them. It is impossible to escape the conclusion that the dynamic at hand adds up to a pronounced avoidance syndrome, a masturbatory ritual through which an opposition nearly paralyzed by its own deeply felt sense of impotence pretends to be engaged in something “meaningful.” In the end, it reduces to a tragic delusion at best, cynical game playing or intentional disruption at worst. With this said, it is only fair to observe that it’s high time to get off this nonsense, and on with the real work of effecting positive social change.

#### (C.) Reading the net benefit alone solves their offense --- Still allows for effective comparison while preserving competitive equity.

### 2AC Legal Studies

#### Permutation non mututally exclusive

#### The forum of college debate is vitally important for creating effective forms of public deliberation necessary to challenge illegitimate national security policy-switch side debate is intrinsically linked to this process.

Kurr-Ph.D. student Communication, Penn State-9/5/13

Bridging Competitive Debate and Public Deliberation on Presidential War Powers

http://public.cedadebate.org/node/14

The second major function concerns the specific nature of deliberation over war powers. Given the connectedness between presidential war powers and the preservation of national security, deliberation is often difficult. Mark Neocleous describes that when political issues become securitized; it “helps consolidate the power of the existing forms of social domination and justifies the short-circuiting of even the most democratic forms.” (2008, p. 71). Collegiate debaters, through research and competitive debate, serve as a bulwark against this “short-circuiting” and help preserve democratic deliberation. This is especially true when considering national security issues. Eric English contends, “The success … in challenging the dominant dialogue on homeland security politics points to efficacy of academic debate as a training ground.” Part of this training requires a “robust understanding of the switch-side technique” which “helps prevent misappropriation of the technique to bolster suspect homeland security policies” (English et. al, 2007, p. 224). Hence, competitive debate training provides foundation for interrogating these policies in public. Alarmism on the issues of war powers is easily demonstrated by Obama’s repeated attempts to transfer detainees from Guantanamo Bay. Republicans were able to launch a campaign featuring the slogan, “not in my backyard” (Schor, 2009). By locating the nexus of insecurity as close as geographically possible, the GOP were able to instill a fear of national insecurity that made deliberation in the public sphere not possible. When collegiate debaters translate their knowledge of the policy wonkery on such issues into public deliberation, it serves to cut against the alarmist rhetoric purported by opponents. In addition to combating misperceptions concerning detainee transfers, the investigative capacity of collegiate debate provides a constant check on governmental policies. A new trend concerning national security policies has been for the government to provide “status updates” to the public. On March 28, 2011, Obama gave a speech concerning Operation Odyssey Dawn in Libya and the purpose of the bombings. Jeremy Engels and William Saas describe this “post facto discourse” as a “new norm” where “Americans are called to acquiesce to decisions already made” (2013, p. 230). Contra to the alarmist strategy that made policy deliberation impossible, this rhetorical strategy posits that deliberation is not necessary. Collegiate debaters researching war powers are able to interrogate whether deliberation is actually needed. Given the technical knowledge base needed to comprehend the mechanism of how war powers operate, debate programs serve as a constant investigation into whether deliberation is necessary not only for prior action but also future action. By raising public awareness, there is a greater potential that “the public’s inquiry into potential illegal action abroad” could “create real incentives to enforce the WPR” (Druck, 2010, p. 236). While this line of interrogation could be fulfilled by another organization, collegiate debaters who translate their competitive knowledge into public awareness create a “space for talk” where the public has “previously been content to remain silent” (Engels & Saas, 2013, p. 231). Given the importance of presidential war powers and the strategies used by both sides of the aisle to stifle deliberation, the import of competitive debate research into the public realm should provide an additional check of being subdued by alarmism or acquiescent rhetorics. After creating that space for deliberation, debaters are apt to influence the policies themselves. Mitchell furthers, “Intercollegiate debaters can play key roles in retrieving and amplifying positions that might otherwise remain sedimented in the policy process” (2010, p. 107). With the timeliness of the war powers controversy and the need for competitive debate to reorient publicly, the CEDA/Miller Center series represents a symbiotic relationship that ought to continue into the future. Not only will collegiate debaters become better public advocates by shifting from competition to collaboration, the public becomes more informed on a technical issue where deliberation was being stifled. As a result, debaters reinvigorate debate.

#### --Pragmatic policy-focused approach is critical to productive change---the alt can’t wish away the law

William J. Novak 8, Associate Professor of History at the University of Chicago and Research Professor at the American Bar Foundation, “The Myth of the “Weak” American State”, June, http://www.history.ucsb.edu/projects/labor/speakers/documents/TheMythoftheWeakAmericanState.pdf

There is an alternative. In the early twentieth century, amid a first wave of nation- state and economic consolidation and assertiveness, American social science generated some fresh ways of looking at power in all its guises—social, economic, political, and legal. Overshadowed to some extent by exuberant bursts of American exceptionalism that greeted confrontations with totalitarianism and then terrorism, the pragmatic, critical, and realistic appraisal of American power is worth recovering. From Lester Frank Ward and John Dewey to Ernst Freund and John Commons to Morris Cohen and Robert Lee Hale, early American socioeconomic theorists developed a critique of a thin, private, and individualistic conception of American liberalism and interrogated the location, organization, and distribution of power in a modernizing United States. All understood the problem of power in America as complex and multifaceted, not simple or one-dimensional, especially as it concerned the relationship of state and civil society. Rather than spend endless time debating the proper definition of law or the correct empirical measure of the state, they concentrated instead on detailed investigations of power in action in the everyday practices and policies that constituted American public life. Rather than confine the examination of power to the abstract realm of political theory or the official political acts of elites, electorates, interest groups, or social movements, these analysts instead embraced a more capacious conception of governance as “an activity which is apt to appear whenever men are associated together.”35 More significantly, these political and legal realists never forgot, amid the rhetoric of law and the pious platitudes that routinely flow from American political life, the very real, concrete consequences of the deployment of legal and political power. They never forgot the brutal fact that Robert Cover would later state so provocatively at the start of his article “Violence and the Word” that legal and political interpretation take place “in a field of pain and death.” 36 The real consequences of American state power are all around us. In a democratic republic, where force should always be on the side of the governed, writing the history of that power has never been more urgent.

#### --No alternative to the law/legal system---its comparatively best for social justice

Jerold S. Auerbach 83, Professor of History at Wellesley, “Justice Without Law?”, 1983, p. 144-146

As cynicism about the legal system increases, so does enthusiasm for alternative dispute-settlement institutions. The search for alternatives accelerates, as Richard Abel has suggested, "when some fairly powerful interest is threatened by an increase in the number or magnitude of legal rights.\*'6 Alternatives are designed to provide a safety valve, to siphon discontent from courts. With the danger of political confrontation reduced, the ruling power of legal institutions is preserved, and the stability of the social system reinforced. Not incidentally, alternatives prevent the use of courts for redistributive purposes in the interest of equality, by consigning the rights of disadvantaged citizens to institutions with minimal power to enforce or protect them. It is, therefore, necessary to beware of the seductive appeal of alternative institutions. They may deflect energy from political organization by groups of people with common grievances; or discourage effective litigation strategies that could provide substantial benefits. They may, in the end, create a two-track justice system that dispenses informal "justice" to poor people with "small" claims and "minor" disputes, who cannot afford legal services, and who are denied access to courts. (Bar associations do not recommend that corporate law firms divert their clients to mediation, or that business deductions for legal expenses—a gigantic government subsidy for litigation—be eliminated.) Justice according to law will be reserved for the affluent, hardly a novel development in American history but one that needs little encouragement from the spread of alternative dispute-settlement institutions.¶ It is social context and political choice that determine whether courts, or alternative institutions, can render justice more or less accessible—and to whom. Both can be discretionary, arbitrary, domineering—and unjust. Law can symbolize justice, or conceal repression. It can reduce exploitation, or facilitate it. It can prohibit the abuse of power, or disguise abuse in procedural forms. It can promote equality, or sustain inequality. Despite the resiliency and power of law, it seems unable to eradicate the tension between legality and justice: even in a society of (legal) equals, some still remain more equal than others. But diversion from the legal system is likely to accentuate that inequality. Without legal power the imbalance between aggrieved individuals and corporations, or government agencies, cannot be redressed. In American society, as Laura Nader has observed, "disputing without the force of law ... [is| doomed to fail."7 Instructive examples document the deleterious effect of coerced informality (even if others demonstrate the creative possibilities of indigenous experimentation). Freed slaves after the Civil War and factory workers at the turn of the century, like inner-city poor people now, have all been assigned places in informal proceedings that offer substantially weaker safeguards than law can provide. Legal institutions may not provide equal justice under law, but in a society ruled by law it is their responsibility.¶ It is chimerical to believe that mediation or arbitration can now accomplish what law seems powerless to achieve. The American deification of individual rights requires an accessible legal system for their protection. Understandably, diminished faith in its capacities will encourage the yearning for alternatives. But the rhetoric of "community" and "justice" should not be permitted to conceal the deterioration of community life and the unraveling of substantive notions of justice that has accompanied its demise. There is every reason why the values that historically are associated with informal justice should remain compelling: especially the preference for trust, harmony, and reciprocity within a communal setting. These are not, however, the values that American society encourages or sustains; in their absence there is no effective alternative to legal institutions.¶ The quest for community may indeed be "timeless and universal."8 In this century, however, the communitarian search for justice without law has deteriorated beyond recognition into a stunted off-shoot of the legal system. The historical progression is clear: from community justice without formal legal institutions to the rule of law, all too often without justice. But injustice without law is an even worse possibility, which misguided enthusiasm for alternative dispute settlement now seems likely to encourage. Our legal culture too accurately expresses the individualistic and materialistic values that most Americans deeply cherish to inspire optimism about the imminent restoration of communitarian purpose. For law to be less conspicuous Americans would have to moderate their expansive freedom to compete, to acquire, and to possess, while simultaneously elevating shared responsibilities above individual rights. That is an unlikely prospect unless Americans become, in effect, un-American. Until then, the pursuit of justice without law does incalculable harm to the prospect of equal justice.

#### --Permute—do the plan and \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ <criticize the law in other areas>

#### --Critical legal philosophy is non-empirical, cherry-picked garbage

John Stick 86, Assistant Professor of Law at Tulane University School of Law, “Can Nihilism Be Pragmatic?”, Harvard Law Review, Vol. 100, No. 2 (Dec., 1986), pp. 332-401, JSTOR

This Article examines the relationship between the critical legal nihilists and the philosophers they rely upon for support. The nihilists' use of philosophy is important, because their critique is at bottom conceptual and not empirical. Legal nihilists do not study the work of large numbers of practicing attorneys or judges to discover the extent of agreement about whether particular legal arguments are valid. Instead, they parse the words of theorists and appellate judges to discover contradictions and opposed values. This selective parsing of the language of a few theorists and judges (neglecting the hundreds of thousands of practicing attorneys) is itself far from adequate empirical technique. More important, the nihilists' leap from the general inconsistencies they discover to a claim that law does not follow standards of rationality is unconvincing without philosophical argument. Nihilists rarely attempt to supply that argument themselves; if they feel any need of further discussion they usually rely upon theorists outside the discipline of law.9 ¶ This Article demonstrates that the nihilists misuse much of the philosophy they attempt to appropriate. In order to focus the discussion, this Article concentrates on one comprehensive statement of nihilism and the major intellectual influences upon it. The best and most complete exposition of the nihilist critique of law was written by Joseph Singer in a recent article in the Yale Law Journal.10 His article is the most philosophically sophisticated and judicious work to date. Singer states that he relies heavily on the analysis of the philosophers Richard Bernstein, Michael Sandel, and Roberto Unger,11 but he acknowledges that he owes his greatest intellectual debt to Richard Rorty, 12 a scholar who identifies his own position with pragmatism. 13 I focus on the relationship between Singer and Rorty not only because Singer claims that Rorty has had the greatest influence on his thought, but also because Rorty is the closest in spirit to Singer.14 For example, Bernstein,15 Sandel,16 and Unger17 all allow rationality and shared values larger roles in political and moral argument than does Rorty. If Singer is too much of an irrationalist for Rorty, then a fortiori Singer is too much of an irrationalist for the others. 18

### 2AC Nihilism

#### 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.

#### ---No link and turn --- Challenging non-consensual suffering allows for spiritual fulfillment.

Baxi 1998

Upendra, Law @ Warwick, 8 Transnat'l L. & Contemp. Probs. 125

Even so, one may distinguish here the pursuit of suffering as an aspect of a self-chosen exercise of human rights norms and standards (that is, practices of sado-masochism within the human right to "privacy," assuring a right to self-exploitation by way of "victimless crime") from non-consensual and therefore illegitimate orders of pain and suffering imposed by the civil society and the state. Responsible and responsive relativism must be confronted with a human rights ethic that teaches us that the buying and selling of women as chattels in the marketplace, harnessing children in blood sports (like camel riding), or the conscription of children into state armies or mercenary forces is not justified by any serious understanding of culture or tradition. What we need, is a human rights-responsive and responsible relativism, one that interrogates the "contemporary" human rights paradigm in its endless renegotiations of its own foundations. [98](https://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=0d2195b40e75597e7e88b8f213d36bbd&docnum=11&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtb-zSkAW&_md5=cd42fa5ee7edefc190eb0ab254e20c5f&focBudTerms=AUTHOR%20%28Baxi%29AND%20right%21&focBudSel=all" \l "n98" \t "_self) This is, as yet, not in sight. The moral invention of the past half-century of human rights theory and practice consists in contesting human suffering here-and-now, and the nirvana that contemporary human rights seek is therefore sometimes said to suffer from a relatively impoverished cosmology. However, human rights activism has its own dharma, which is the performance of righteous deeds (karma) which, too, earn merit (punnya) to redeem the "soul."

#### Even if we can’t end all suffering all the time – we should still take practical action against it. Their alternative makes violence inevitable

Porter, 2006 (Elisabeth, Head Professor at the School of International Studies at the University of South Australia, “Can Politics Practice Compassion?” Hypatia, Vol 21 Issue 4, Project Muse)

Compassionate, Wise Responses Third, in addition to attentiveness and listening, compassionate responses should be part of political practices. While clearly there are limits on the extent to which we really can identify with others' suffering, the politically compassionate react with feelings whenever we hear of suffering and with practical responses whenever possible. Admittedly, we prioritize instances of those who are closest to us or instances that, for various reasons, move us emotionally. Political care is the hallmark of a decent society that accepts the moral responsibility to protect the dignity of all citizens and persons within its borders. Political care is the demonstration of compassionate decency by committed citizens, political representatives, and political leaders who collectively strive for an inclusive polity that is responsive to peoples' needs. While this perspective strives to improve the well-being of all people, not only women, it is distinctively feminist in stressing the relational aspects of politics and in building on women's traditional experience of compassionate care. For example, despite the awful situation in detention camps in Australia, the suggestion by men and women to accommodate people in community housing while their claims are processed is ignored, yet clearly is a viable compassionate alternative. Those with power to make decisions have a responsibility to examine how they contribute to political structures that exclude, marginalize, and cause suffering. The capacity for feeling pain at the distress of others and imaginatively responding draws us together in communities. Yet we often avoid being emotionally outraged at injustice because if we are moved by compassion it compels us to act. We cannot always act; we all have limited resources. However, as Naomi Klein argues, we should "refuse to engage in a calculus of suffering" (Klein 2002, 148). Klein is responding to claims from the Left that the post-9/11 outpouring of compassion was disproportionate and, given the atrocities happening elsewhere in the world, racist. Her response is valid. Anyone who claims to be compassionate and abhors injustice and suffering should not be miserly in their compassion. "Surely the challenge is to attempt to increase the global reserves of compassion rather than parsimoniously police them" (Klein 2002, 148). Kathleen Barry (2002) also argues for the importance of "non-selective compassion." By this, she means that the lesson we should learn from 9/11 is attentiveness to the plight of all who are victims through no fault of their own. For people living in occupied territories, areas of armed conflict, or violently divided societies, everyday life is full of terror, fear, violence, shootings, and bombings. For asylum seekers living in detention camps, everyday life also is miserable. Whenever we feel some of their pain, we empathetically imagine a little of what it might be like to be a sufferer because of political harshness, and we have begun the process of compassion. Whenever governments, states, and international organizations resist revenge attacks, preemptive strikes, and state-sponsored terrorism, or refuse to sell arms, they move closer to some understanding of what minimizing suffering entails. A humane yet rigorous asylum policy can balance state security and the need to protect borders, with human security and the need to protect refugee conventions. If prime ministers, presidents, military advisers, and the UN Security Council were to take these arguments about political compassion seriously, the idea of "collateral damage," the dismissal of deaths of innocent civilians in war as inevitable would be so morally abhorrent that it would act to deter war. However, these arguments also have massive implications for justifying careful intervention in the name of compassion to alleviate suffering where there is genocide and "ethnic cleansing," as Rwanda and Bosnia taught the international community in different ways during the late twentieth century and as the Democratic Republic of Congo and Darfur, Sudan, present today. In order actually to relieve suffering and respond to needs, attentiveness to suffering, active listening, and wise, compassionate responses are required at all political levels. Such responses require a change of political heart that leads to corresponding humane policies. Considerable political will is needed for the realization of compassionate politics.[End Page 117]

#### “No value to life” doesn’t outweigh---prioritize existence because value is subjective

Torbjörn Tännsjö 11, the Kristian Claëson Professor of Practical Philosophy at Stockholm University, 2011, “Shalt Thou Sometimes Murder? On the Ethics of Killing,” online: http://people.su.se/~jolso/HS-texter/shaltthou.pdf

I suppose it is correct to say that, if Schopenhauer is right, if life is never worth living, then according to utilitarianism we should all commit suicide and put an end to humanity. But this does not mean that, each of us should commit suicide. I commented on this in chapter two when I presented the idea that utilitarianism should be applied, not only to individual actions, but to collective actions as well.¶ It is a well-known fact that people rarely commit suicide. Some even claim that no one who is mentally sound commits suicide. Could that be taken as evidence for the claim that people live lives worth living? That would be rash. Many people are not utilitarians. They may avoid suicide because they believe that it is morally wrong to kill oneself. It is also a possibility that, even if people lead lives not worth living, they believe they do. And even if some may believe that their lives, up to now, have not been worth living, their future lives will be better. They may be mistaken about this. They may hold false expectations about the future.¶ From the point of view of evolutionary biology, it is natural to assume that people should rarely commit suicide. If we set old age to one side, it has poor survival value (of one’s genes) to kill oneself. So it should be expected that it is difficult for ordinary people to kill themselves. But then theories about cognitive dissonance, known from psychology, should warn us that we may come to believe that we live better lives than we do.¶ My strong belief is that most of us live lives worth living. However, I do believe that our lives are close to the point where they stop being worth living. But then it is at least not very far-fetched to think that they may be worth not living, after all. My assessment may be too optimistic.¶ Let us just for the sake of the argument assume that our lives are not worth living, and let us accept that, if this is so, we should all kill ourselves. As I noted above, this does not answer the question what we should do, each one of us. My conjecture is that we should not commit suicide. The explanation is simple. If I kill myself, many people will suffer. Here is a rough explanation of how this will happen: ¶ ... suicide “survivors” confront a complex array of feelings. Various forms of guilt are quite common, such as that arising from (a) the belief that one contributed to the suicidal person's anguish, or (b) the failure to recognize that anguish, or (c) the inability to prevent the suicidal act itself. Suicide also leads to rage, loneliness, and awareness of vulnerability in those left behind. Indeed, the sense that suicide is an essentially selfish act dominates many popular perceptions of suicide. ¶ The fact that all our lives lack meaning, if they do, does not mean that others will follow my example. They will go on with their lives and their false expectations — at least for a while devastated because of my suicide. But then I have an obligation, for their sake, to go on with my life. It is highly likely that, by committing suicide, I create more suffering (in their lives) than I avoid (in my life).

#### Focus on preserving life is the best way to access what they claim is key to value

Etzioni, 2007 (Amitai, Ph.D. in Sociology from Berkeley, professor of international affairs at The George Washington University, Security First, pp. pp. 7-8)

The better that life is protected, the stronger the support is for nonsecurity rights—and not the other way around, as has been suggested by many supporters of the drive for global democratization, as well as by those who argue that regime change is required to make nations into peaceful mem­bers of the international community. A review of public opinion polls concerning attitudes toward civil liberties following 9 / 11 indicates that shortly after al-Qaeda's attack on America, nearly 70 percent of the public was strongly inclined to give up various constitutionally protected rights in order to prevent further attacks. However, as no new attacks occurred on American territory and a sense of security gradually was restored, as revealed by the return of passengers to air traffic, support for rights increased. By 2004-05, about 70 percent of Americans were more concerned with protecting civil rights than with enhancing security. (Granted, the polls are not fully comparable.)10 Along the same lines, if an American city were wiped out tomorrow in a nuclear terrorist attack, rights would surely be suspended on a large scale (as the writ of habeas corpus was suspended in the United Kingdom at the height of the Nazi attacks, and in the United States during the Civil War). In short, this evidence, too, shows that the better that security is protected, the more secure are our other rights. The same relationship between the right to security and all other rights was evident during the period in which violent crime rates were very high in major American cities. For instance, when Los Angeles po­lice chief Daryl Gates suggested that the riots following the Rodney King verdict might have been stopped had police officers "gone down there and shot a few people," many sympathized with his viewpoint." In recent years, as violent crime has significantly declined in American cities, a police chief who favored a policy that disregarded rights in such a sum­mary way would likely be dismissed before the day was over. The safer that people are, the more concerned they will be for their other rights. Finally, evidence shows that liberal-democratic regimes have been undermined primarily by their failure to provide for basic public needs, such as security, and not by the gradual erosion of legal-political rights, as is so often assumed. The main case in point is the Weimar Republic. From the extensive literature written on the question of what caused the fall of the Weimar Republic and the rise of the Third Reich, it is reason­able to conclude that liberal democracy lost legitimacy because it failed to address peoples' need for physical and economic security.'2 Another example is post-Soviet Russia. Although Russia has never met the standards of a liberal democracy, a good part of what was achieved under Mikhail Gorbachev and Boris Yeltsin has gradually been eroded as Russians responded to their alarmingly high levels of crime. President Vladimir Putin, who has been moving his government in a strongly au­thoritarian direction, is widely regarded in Russia not as too powerful but as not powerful enough, because many still believe, and believe correctly, that basic security is lacking. In short, moral arguments and empirical evidence support the same proposition: in circumstances under which a full spectrum of rights can­not be advanced simultaneously—a common situation—basic security must lead.