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#### Drone policy sets a dangerous legal precedent – leads to global conflict escalation – especially in Asia

Taylor, 11/10/13 [Guy, “U.S. intelligence warily watches for threats to U.S. now that 87 nations possess drones”, http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2013/nov/10/skys-the-limit-for-wide-wild-world-of-drones/?page=all]

The age of the drone is here, and U.S. intelligence agencies are warily monitoring their proliferation around the globe. China uses them to spy on Japan near disputed islands in Asia. Turkey uses them to eyeball Kurdish activity in northern Iraq. Bolivia uses them to spot coca fields in the Andes. Iran reportedly has given them to Syria to monitor opposition rebels. The U.S., Britain and Israel are the only nations to have fired missiles from remote-controlled drones, but the proliferation of unmanned aerial vehicles has become so prevalent that U.S. intelligence sources and private analysts say it is merely a matter of time before other countries use the technology. “People in Washington like to talk about this as if the supposed American monopoly on drones might end one day. Well, the monopoly ended years ago,” said Peter W. Singer, who heads the Center for 21st Century Security and Intelligence at the Brookings Institution. What’s worse, clandestine strikes carried out by Washington in far-flung corners of the world have set a precedent that could be ugly. Mr. Singer said as many as 87 nations possess some form of drones and conduct various kinds of surveillance either over their own territories or beyond. Among those 87, he said, 26 have either purchased or developed drones equivalent in size to the MQ-1 Predator — the model made by San Diego-based General Atomics. While American Predators and their updated sister, the MQ-9 Reaper, are capable of carrying anti-armor Hellfire missiles, the clandestine nature of foreign drone programs makes it difficult to determine how many other nations have armed drones. Defense industry and other sources who spoke with The Washington Times said 10 to 15 nations are thought to be working hard on doing just that, and China and Iran are among those with the most advanced programs. “Global developments in the UAV arena are being tracked closely,” said one U.S. intelligence official, who spoke with The Times on the condition of anonymity. “Efforts by some countries to acquire armed UAV systems are concerning, not least because of the associated proliferation risk.” Other sources said that while the international media have focused on the controversy and political backlash associated with civilian casualties from U.S. drone strikes in Pakistan, Yemen and Somalia, Washington’s unprecedented success with the technology — both in targeting and killing suspected terrorists — has inspired a new kind of arms race. “It’s natural that other nations and non-state actors, seeing the many ways the U.S. has leveraged the technology, are keen to acquire remotely piloted aircraft,” said Lt. Gen. Robert P. Otto, Air Force deputy chief of staff for intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance. Race to the skies The number of nations possessing drones nearly doubled from 41 to 76 from 2005 to 2011, according to a report last year by the Government Accountability Office, which highlighted the fact that U.S. companies are no longer alone in manufacturing and marketing the technology. “Many countries acquired their UAVs from Israel,” said the report. It said Germany, France, Britain, India, Russia and Georgia have either leased or purchased Israeli drones, including the Heron, a model that many foreign militaries see as a good alternative to the American-made Predators and Reapers. A report this year by Teal Group, a Virginia-based aerospace and defense industry analysis corporation, said UAVs have come to represent the “most dynamic growth sector” of the global aerospace industry, with spending on drones projected to more than double from roughly $5.2 billion a year today to more than $11 billion in 2022. China is widely seen as a potential powerhouse in the market. Chinese companies have “marketed both armed drones and weapons specifically designed for UAV use,” said Steven J. Zaloga, a top analyst at Teal Group. “It’s a case where if they don’t have the capability today, they’ll have it soon.” Although there is concern in Washington that China will sell the technology to American adversaries, sources say, the U.S. also is pushing ahead with development of its own secretive “next generation” drones. Today’s models emerged in the post-9/11 era of nonconventional conflict — a time when American use of both weaponized and surveillance-only drones has been almost exclusively over chaotic patches of the planet void of traditional anti-aircraft defenses. With little or no need to hide, relatively bulky drones such as the MQ-1 Predator dominated the market. But the “big secret,” Mr. Zaloga said, “is that the U.S. is already working on both armed and unarmed UAVs that can operate in defended airspace.” Another factor likely to fuel the proliferation of armed drones, he said, centers on a global push to make “very small weapons” that can be tailored to fit smaller aircraft. This matters because of the roughly 20,000 drones now in existence, only about 350 are large enough to carry the slate of weapons on the current market. “What the new munitions will do is mean that if you’re operating the smaller UAVs, you’ll be able to put weapons on them,” said Mr. Zaloga. “And those smaller UAVs are being manufactured now by quite a few countries.” In the wrong hands? One serious concern in Washington is that smaller drones could be used by groups such as al Qaeda or Hezbollah, the Iran-backed militant and political organization based in Lebanon that is engaged in a protracted war with Israel. The U.S. intelligence official who spoke with The Times on the condition of anonymity said it is “getting easier for non-state actors to acquire this technology.” Hezbollah leader Hassan Nasrallah made headlines by claiming his group flew a drone into Israeli airspace last year, after Israel announced that it had shot a UAV out of the sky. Although Mr. Nasrallah said the drone was made in Iran and assembled in Lebanon, little is known about precisely what type it was — or whether it was armed. Armed or not, U.S. officials are wary. “No one is turning a blind eye to the growing use of surveillance-only UAV systems — including by non-state actors — even if these systems have a host of beneficial civil applications,” said the official who spoke with The Times. “One problem is that countries may perceive these systems as less provocative than armed platforms and might use them in cross-border operations in a way that actually stokes regional tension.” That appears to be happening in Asia, where Japan recently threatened to shoot down Chinese drones flying near the disputed Senkaku Islands in the East China Sea. Northeast Asian countries are likely to invest heavily in drone technology, said Patrick M. Cronin, senior director of the Asia-Pacific Security Program at the Center for a New American Security in Washington. “But even before these investments are manifested in wider deployments, Japan will be relying on UAVs for wider and better surveillance, particularly around its southwest island chain, while China will be using them to variably challenge Japanese administrative control and, indirectly, pressure the United States to restrain its ally,” said Mr. Cronin. “This vital new technology is improving situational awareness. But, paradoxically, if used more offensively the same technology may also accelerate a maritime crisis in the East or even South China Sea.” U.S. precedents Others say the U.S. and its closest allies have set a precedent with clandestine drone strikes in foreign lands. Although British forces have carried out hundreds of drone strikes in Afghanistan and Israel has used drone-fired missiles to kill suspected terrorists in Egypt’s Sinai Peninsula, as well as Islamic militants in Gaza, the most widespread use has been directed by the U.S. military and CIA. In addition to strikes in Libya and Somalia, the U.S. has carried out more than 375 strikes in Pakistan and as many as 65 in Yemen over the past nine years, according to the London-based Bureau of Investigative Journalism. The concern, said the Brookings Institution’s Mr. Singer, is that adversaries will point to U.S. behavior as an excuse for carrying out cross-border targeting of “high-value” individuals. “That’s where you have the problem,” he said. “Turkey carries out a strike in northern Iraq and then cites U.S. precedent in Pakistan to justify it. Or Iran carries out a drone strike inside Syria that the Syrian government says it’s fine with because it’s a lawless area where what they call ‘terrorists’ are hanging out, and then they throw the precedent back at the U.S. “That would make it sticky for us,” said Mr. Singer. “That’s not the broader norm we want out there.”

#### Those deterrence breakdowns escalate

Boyle, 13 [“The costs and consequences of drone warfare”, MICHAEL J. BOYLE, International Affairs 89: 1 (2013) 1–29, assistant professor of political science at LaSalle University]

The emergence of this arms race for drones raises at least five long-term strategic consequences, not all of which are favourable to the United States over the long term. First, it is now obvious that other states will use drones in ways that are inconsistent with US interests. One reason why the US has been so keen to use drone technology in Pakistan and Yemen is that at present it retains a substantial advantage in high-quality attack drones. Many of the other states now capable of employing drones of near-equivalent technology—for example, the UK and Israel—are considered allies. But this situation is quickly changing as other leading geopolitical players, **such as Russia and China**, are beginning rapidly **to develop and deploy drones** for their own purposes. While its own technology still lags behind that of the US, Russia has spent huge sums on purchasing drones and has recently sought to buy the Israeli-made Eitan drone capable of surveillance and firing air-to-surface missiles.132 China has begun to develop UAVs for reconnaissance and combat and has several new drones capable of long-range surveillance and attack under development.133 China is also planning to use unmanned surveillance drones to allow it to monitor the disputed East China Sea Islands, which are currently under dispute with Japan and Taiwan.134 Both Russia and China will pursue this technology and develop their own drone suppliers which will sell to the highest bidder, presumably with fewer export controls than those imposed by the US Congress. Once both governments have equivalent or near-equivalent levels of drone technology to the United States, they will be similarly tempted to use it for surveillance or attack in the way the US has done. Thus, through its own over-reliance on drones in places such as Pakistan and Yemen, the US may be hastening the arrival of a world where its qualitative advantages in drone technology are eclipsed and where this technology will be used and sold by rival Great Powers whose interests do not mirror its own. A second consequence of the spread of drones is that many of the traditional concepts which have underwritten stability in the international system will be radically reshaped by drone technology. For example, much of the stability among the Great Powers in the international system is driven by deterrence, specifically nuclear deterrence.135 Deterrence operates with informal rules of the game and tacit bargains that govern what states, particularly those holding nuclear weapons, may and may not do to one another.136 While it is widely understood that nuclear-capable states will conduct aerial surveillance and spy on one another, overt military confrontations between nuclear powers are rare because they are assumed to be costly and prone to escalation. One open question is whether these states will exercise the same level of restraint with drone surveillance, which is unmanned, low cost, and possibly deniable. States may be more willing to engage in drone overflights which test the resolve of their rivals, or engage in ‘salami tactics’ to see what kind of drone-led incursion, if any, will motivate a response.137 This may have been Hezbollah’s logic in sending a drone into Israeli airspace in October 2012, possibly to relay information on Israel’s nuclear capabilities.138 After the incursion, both Hezbollah and Iran boasted that the drone incident demonstrated their military capabilities.139 One could imagine two rival states—for example, India and Pakistan—deploying drones to test each other’s capability and resolve, with untold consequences if such a probe were misinterpreted by the other as an attack. As drones get physically smaller and more precise, and as they develop a greater flying range, the temptation to use them to spy on a rival’s nuclear programme or military installations might prove too strong to resist. If this were to happen, drones might gradually erode the deterrent relationships that exist between nuclear powers, thus magnifying the risks of a spiral of conflict between them. Another dimension of this problem has to do with the risk of accident. Drones are prone to accidents and crashes. By July 2010, the US Air Force had identified approximately 79 drone accidents.140 Recently released documents have revealed that there have been a number of drone accidents and crashes in the Seychelles and Djibouti, some of which happened in close proximity to civilian airports.141 The rapid proliferation of drones worldwide will involve a risk of accident to civilian aircraft, possibly producing an international incident if such an accident were to involve an aircraft affiliated to a state hostile to the owner of the drone. Most of the drone accidents may be innocuous, but some will carry strategic risks. In December 2011, a CIA drone designed for nuclear surveillance crashed in Iran, revealing the existence of the spying programme and leaving sensitive technology in the hands of the Iranian government.142 The expansion of drone technology raises the possibility that some of these surveillance drones will be interpreted as attack drones, or that an accident or crash will spiral out of control and lead to an armed confrontation.143 An accident would be even more dangerous if the US were to pursue its plans for nuclear-powered drones, which can spread radioactive material like a dirty bomb if they crash.144 Third, lethal drones create the possibility that the norms on the use of force will erode, creating a much more dangerous world and pushing the international system back towards the rule of the jungle. To some extent, this world is already being ushered in by the United States, which has set a dangerous precedent that a state may simply kill foreign citizens considered a threat without a declaration of war. Even John Brennan has recognized that the US is ‘establishing a precedent that other nations may follow’.145 **Given this precedent**, there is nothing to stop other states from following the American lead and using drone strikes to eliminate potential threats. Those ‘threats’ need not be terrorists, but could be others— dissidents, spies, even journalists—whose behaviour threatens a government. One danger is that drone use might undermine the normative prohibition on the assassination of leaders and government officials that most (but not all) states currently respect. A greater danger, however, is that the US will have normalized murder as a tool of statecraft and created a world where states can increasingly take vengeance on individuals outside their borders without the niceties of extradition, due process or trial.146 As some of its critics have noted, the Obama administration may have created a world where states will find it easier to kill terrorists rather than capture them and deal with all of the legal and evidentiary difficulties associated with giving them a fair trial.147 Fourth, there is a distinct danger that the world will divide into two camps: developed states in possession of drone technology, and weak states and rebel movements that lack them. States with recurring separatist or insurgent problems may begin to police their restive territories through drone strikes, essentially containing the problem in a fixed geographical region and engaging in a largely punitive policy against them. One could easily imagine that China, for example, might resort to drone strikes in Uighur provinces in order to keep potential threats from emerging, or that Russia could use drones to strike at separatist movements in Chechnya or elsewhere. Such behaviour would not necessarily be confined to authoritarian governments; it is equally possible that Israel might use drones to police Gaza and the West Bank, thus reducing the vulnerability of Israeli soldiers to Palestinian attacks on the ground. The extent to which Israel might be willing to use drones in combat and surveillance was revealed in its November 2012 attack on Gaza. Israel allegedly used a drone to assassinate the Hamas leader Ahmed Jabari and employed a number of armed drones for strikes in a way that was described as ‘unprecedented’ by senior Israeli officials.148 It is not hard to imagine Israel concluding that drones over Gaza were the best way to deal with the problem of Hamas, even if their use left the Palestinian population subject to constant, unnerving surveillance. All of the consequences of such a sharp division between the haves and have-nots with drone technology is hard to assess, but one possibility is that governments with secessionist movements might be less willing to negotiate and grant concessions if drones allowed them to police their internal enemies with ruthless efficiency and ‘manage’ the problem at low cost. The result might be a situation where such conflicts are contained but not resolved, while citizens in developed states grow increasingly indifferent to the suffering of those making secessionist or even national liberation claims, including just ones, upon them. Finally, drones have the capacity to strengthen the surveillance capacity of both democracies and authoritarian regimes, with significant consequences for civil liberties. In the UK, BAE Systems is adapting military-designed drones for a range of civilian policing tasks including ‘monitoring antisocial motorists, protesters, agricultural thieves and fly-tippers’.149 Such drones are also envisioned as monitoring Britain’s shores for illegal immigration and drug smuggling. In the United States, the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) issued 61 permits for domestic drone use between November 2006 and June 2011, mainly to local and state police, but also to federal agencies and even universities.150 According to one FAA estimate, the US will have 30,000 drones patrolling the skies by 2022.151 Similarly, the European Commission will spend US$260 million on Eurosur, a new programme that will use drones to patrol the Mediterranean coast.152 The risk that drones will turn democracies into ‘surveillance states’ is well known, but the risks for authoritarian regimes may be even more severe. Authoritarian states, particularly those that face serious internal opposition, may tap into drone technology now available to monitor and ruthlessly punish their opponents. In semi-authoritarian Russia, for example, drones have already been employed to monitor pro-democracy protesters.153 One could only imagine what a truly murderous authoritarian regime—such as Bashar al-Assad’s Syria—would do with its own fleet of drones. The expansion of drone technology may make the strong even stronger, thus **tilting the balance of power in authoritarian regimes** **even more decisively towards** those who wield the coercive instruments of power and against those who dare to challenge them. Conclusion Even though it has now been confronted with blowback from drones in the failed Times Square bombing, the United States has yet to engage in a serious analysis of the strategic costs and consequences of its use of drones, both for its own security and for the rest of the world. Much of the debate over drones to date has focused on measuring body counts and carries the unspoken assumption that if drone strikes are efficient—that is, low cost and low risk for US personnel relative to the terrorists killed—then they must also be effective. This article has argued that such analyses are operating with an attenuated notion of effectiveness that discounts some of the other key dynamics—such as the corrosion of the perceived competence and legitimacy of governments where drone strikes take place, growing anti-Americanism and fresh recruitment to militant networks—that reveal the costs of drone warfare. In other words, the analysis of the effectiveness of drones takes into account only the ‘loss’ side of the ledger for the ‘bad guys’, without asking what America’s enemies gain by being subjected to a policy of constant surveillance and attack. In his second term, President Obama has an opportunity to reverse course and establish a new drones policy which mitigates these costs and avoids some of the long-term consequences that flow from them. A more sensible US approach would impose some limits on drone use in order to minimize the political costs and long-term strategic consequences. One step might be to limit the use of drones to HVTs, such as leading political and operational figures for terrorist networks, while reducing or eliminating the strikes against the ‘foot soldiers’ or other Islamist networks not related to Al-Qaeda. This approach would reduce the number of strikes and civilian deaths associated with drones while reserving their use for those targets that pose a direct or imminent threat to the security of the United States. Such a self-limiting approach to drones might also minimize the degree of political opposition that US drone strikes generate in states such as Pakistan and Yemen, as their leaders, and even the civilian population, often tolerate or even approve of strikes against HVTs. Another step might be to improve the levels of transparency of the drone programme. At present, there are no publicly articulated guidelines stipulating who can be killed by a drone and who cannot, and no data on drone strikes are released to the public.154 Even a Department of Justice memorandum which authorized the Obama administration to kill Anwar al-Awlaki, an American citizen, remains classified.155 Such non-transparency fuels suspicions that the US is indifferent to the civilian casualties caused by drone strikes, a perception which in turn magnifies the deleterious political consequences of the strikes. Letting some sunlight in on the drones programme would not eliminate all of the opposition to it, but it would go some way towards undercutting the worst conspiracy theories about drone use in these countries while also signalling that the US government holds itself legally and morally accountable for its behaviour.156 A final, and crucial, step towards mitigating the strategic consequences of drones would be to develop internationally recognized standards and norms for their use and sale. It is not realistic to suggest that the US stop using its drones altogether, or to assume that other countries will accept a moratorium on buying and using drones. **The genie is out of the bottle**: drones will be a fact of life for years to come. What remains to be done is to ensure that their use and sale are transparent, regulated and consistent with internationally recognized human rights standards. The Obama administration has already begun to show some awareness that drones are dangerous if placed in the wrong hands. A recent New York Times report revealed that the Obama administration began to develop a secret drones ‘rulebook’ to govern their use if Mitt Romney were to be elected president.157 The same logic operates on the international level. Lethal drones will eventually be in the hands of those who will use them with fewer scruples than President Obama has. Without a set of internationally recognized standards or norms governing their sale and use, drones will proliferate without control, be misused by governments and non-state actors, and become an instrument of repression for the strong. One remedy might be an international convention on the sale and use of drones which could establish guidelines and norms for their use, perhaps along the lines of the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons (CCW) treaty, which attempted to spell out rules on the use of incendiary devices and fragment-based weapons.158 While enforcement of these guidelines and adherence to rules on their use will be imperfect and marked by derogations, exceptions and violations, the presence of a convention may reinforce norms against the flagrant misuse of drones and induce more restraint in their use than might otherwise be seen. Similarly, a UN investigatory body on drones would help to hold states accountable for their use of drones and begin to build a gradual consensus on the types of activities for which drones can, and cannot, be used.159 As the progenitor and leading user of drone technology, the US now has an opportunity to show leadership in developing an international legal architecture which might avert some of the worst consequences of their use.

#### Asian conflict escalates due to drone use

**Brimley et al, 13** \*vice president \*\*AND director of the Technology and National Security Program \*\*\*AND deputy director of the Asia Program at the Center for a New American Security (Shawn Brimley, Ben Fitzgerald, and Ely Ratner, 17 September 2013, “The Drone War Comes to Asia,” http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2013/09/17/the\_drone\_war\_comes\_to\_asia?page=0,1)//CC

In the midst of this heightened tension, you could be forgiven for overlooking the news early in September that Japanese F-15s had again taken flight after Beijing graciously commemorated the one-year anniversary of Tokyo's purchase by sending an unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV) toward the islands. But this wasn't just another day at the office in the contested East China Sea: this was the first known case of a Chinese drone approaching the Senkakus. Without a doubt, China's drone adventure 100-miles north of the Senkakus was significant because it aggravated already abysmal relations between Tokyo and Beijing. Japanese officials responded to the incident by suggesting that Japan might have to place government personnel on the islands, a red line for Beijing that would have been unthinkable prior to the past few years of Chinese assertiveness. But there's a much bigger and more pernicious cycle in motion. The introduction of indigenous drones into Asia's strategic environment -- now made official by China's maiden unmanned provocation -- will bring with it additional sources of instability and escalation to the fiercely contested South and East China Seas. Even though no government in the region wants to participate in major power war, there is widespread and growing concern that military conflict could result from a minor incident that spirals out of control. Unmanned systems could be just this trigger. They are less costly to produce and operate than their manned counterparts, meaning that we're likely to see more crowded skies and seas in the years ahead. UAVs also tend to encourage greater risk-taking, given that a pilot's life is not at risk. But being unmanned has its dangers: any number of software or communications failures could lead a mission awry. Combine all that with inexperienced operators and you have a perfect recipe for a mistake or miscalculation in an already tense strategic environment. The underlying problem is not just the drones themselves. Asia is in the midst of transitioning to a new warfighting regime with serious escalatory potential. China's military modernization is designed to deny adversaries freedom of maneuver over, on, and under the East and South China Seas. Although China argues that its strategy is primarily defensive, the capabilities it is choosing to acquire to create a "defensive" perimeter -- long-range ballistic and cruise missiles, aircraft carriers, submarines -- are acutely offensive in nature. During a serious crisis when tensions are high, China would have powerful incentives to use these capabilities, particularly missiles, before they were targeted by the United States or another adversary. The problem is that U.S. military plans and posture have the potential to be equally escalatory, as they would reportedly aim to "blind" an adversary -- disrupting or destroying command and control nodes at the beginning of a conflict. At the same time, the increasingly unstable balance of military power in the Pacific is exacerbated by the (re)emergence of other regional actors with their own advanced military capabilities. Countries that have the ability and resources to embark on rapid modernization campaigns (e.g., Japan, South Korea, Indonesia) are well on the way. This means that in addition to two great powers vying for military advantage, the region features an increasingly complex set of overlapping military-technical competitions that are accelerating tensions, adding to uncertainty and undermining stability. This dangerous military dynamic will only get worse as more disruptive military technologies appear, including the rapid diffusion of unmanned and increasingly autonomous aerial and submersible vehicles coupled with increasingly effective offensive cyberspace capabilities. Of particular concern is not only the novelty of these new technologies, but the lack of well-established norms for their use in conflict. Thankfully, the first interaction between a Chinese UAV and manned Japanese fighters passed without major incident. But it did raise serious questions that neither nation has likely considered in detail. What will constrain China's UAV incursions from becoming increasingly assertive and provocative? How will either nation respond in a scenario where an adversary downs a UAV? And what happens politically when a drone invariably falls out of the sky or "drifts off course" with both sides pointing fingers at one another? Of most concern, how would these matters be addressed during a crisis, with no precedents, in the context of a regional military regime in which actors have powerful incentives to strike first? These are not just theoretical questions: Japan's Defense Ministry is reportedly looking into options for shooting down any unmanned drones that enter its territorial airspace. Resolving these issues in a fraught strategic environment between two potential adversaries is difficult enough; the United States and China remain at loggerheads about U.S. Sensitive Reconnaissance Operations along China's periphery. But the problem is multiplying rapidly. The Chinese are running one of the most significant UAV programs in the world, a program that includes Reaper- style UAVs and Unmanned Combat Aerial Vehicles (UCAVs); Japan is seeking to acquire Global Hawks; the Republic of Korea is acquiring Global Hawks while also building their own indigenous UAV capabilities; Taiwan is choosing to develop indigenous UAVs instead of importing from abroad; Indonesia is seeking to build a UAV squadron; and Vietnam is planning to build an entire UAV factory. One could take solace in Asia's ability to manage these gnarly sources of insecurity if the region had demonstrated similar competencies elsewhere. But nothing could be further from the case. It has now been more than a decade since the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) and China signed a declaration "to promote a peaceful, friendly and harmonious environment in the South China Sea," which was meant to be a precursor to a code of conduct for managing potential incidents, accidents, and crises at sea. But the parties are as far apart as ever, and that's on well-trodden issues of maritime security with decades of legal and operational precedent to build upon. It's hard to be optimistic that the region will do better in an unmanned domain in which governments and militaries have little experience and where there remains a dearth of international norms, rules, and institutions from which to draw. The rapid diffusion of advanced military technology is not a future trend. These capabilities are being fielded -- right now -- in perhaps the most geopolitically dangerous area in the world, over (and soon under) the contested seas of East and Southeast Asia. These risks will only increase with time as more disruptive capabilities emerge. In the absence of political leadership, these technologies could very well lead the region into war.

#### Goes nuclear

**Goldstein, 13** – Avery, David M. Knott Professor of Global Politics and International Relations, Director of the Center for the Study of Contemporary China, and Associate Director of the Christopher H. Browne Center for International Politics at the University of Pennsylvania (“First Things First: The Pressing Danger of Crisis Instability in U.S.-China Relations,” International Security, vol. 37, no. 4, Spring 2013, Muse //Red)

Two concerns have driven much of the debate about international security in the post-Cold War era. The first is the potentially deadly mix of nuclear proliferation, rogue states, and international terrorists, a worry that became dominant after the terrorist attacks against the United States on September 11, 2001.1 The second concern, one whose prominence has waxed and waned since the mid-1990s, is the potentially disruptive impact that China will have if it emerges as a peer competitor of the United States, challenging an international order established during the era of U.S. preponderance.2 Reflecting this second concern, some analysts have expressed reservations about the dominant post-September 11 security agenda, arguing that China could challenge U.S. global interests in ways that terrorists and rogue states cannot. In this article, I raise a more pressing issue, one to which not enough attention has been paid. For at least the next decade, while China remains relatively weak, the gravest danger in Sino-American relations is the possibility the two countries will find themselves in **a crisis** that **could escalate to open military conflict.** In contrast to the long-term prospect of a new great power rivalry between the United States and China, which ultimately rests on debatable claims about the intentions of the two countries and uncertain forecasts about big shifts in their national capabilities, the danger of instability in a crisis involving these two nuclear-armed states is a tangible, near-term concern.3 Even if the probability of such a war-threatening crisis and its escalation to the use of significant military force is low, the **potentially catastrophic consequences** of this scenario provide good reason for analysts to better understand its dynamics and for policymakers to fully consider its implications. Moreover, events since 2010—especially those relevant to disputes in the East and South China Seas—suggest that **the danger of a military confrontation** in the Western Pacific **that could lead to a U.S.-China standoff may be on the rise.** In what follows, I identify not just pressures to use force preemptively that pose the most serious risk should a Sino-American confrontation unfold, but also related, if slightly less dramatic, incentives to initiate the limited use of force to gain bargaining leverage—a second trigger for potentially devastating instability during a crisis.4 My discussion proceeds in three sections. The first section explains why, during the next decade or two, a serious U.S.-China crisis may be more likely than is currently recognized. The second section examines the features of plausible Sino-American crises that may make them so dangerous. The third section considers general features of crisis stability in asymmetric dyads such as the one in which a U.S. superpower would confront an increasingly capable but still thoroughly overmatched China—the asymmetry that will prevail for at least the next decade. This more stylized discussion clarifies the inadequacy of focusing one-sidedly on conventional forces, as has much of the current commentary about the modernization of China's military and the implications this has for potential conflicts with the United States in the Western Pacific,5 or of focusing one-sidedly on China's nuclear forces, as a smaller slice of the commentary has.6 An assessment considering the interaction of conventional and nuclear forces indicates why **escalation resulting from crisis instability remains a devastating possibility.** Before proceeding, however, I would like to clarify my use of the terms "crisis" and "instability." For the purposes of this article, I define a crisis as a confrontation between states involving a serious threat to vital national interests for both sides, in which there is the expectation of a short time for resolution, and in which there is understood to be a sharply increased risk of war.7 This definition distinguishes crises from many situations to which the label is sometimes applied, such as more protracted confrontations; sharp disagreements over important matters that are not vital interests and in which military force seems irrelevant; and political disputes involving vital interests, even those with military components, that present little immediate risk of war.8 I define instability as the temptation to resort to force in a crisis.9 Crisis stability is greatest when both sides strongly prefer to continue bargaining; instability is greatest when they are strongly tempted to resort to the use of military force. Stability, then, describes a spectrum—from one extreme in which neither side sees much advantage to using force, through a range of situations in which the balance of costs and benefits of using force varies for each side, to the other extreme in which the benefits of using force so greatly exceed the costs that striking first looks nearly irresistible to both sides. Although the incentives to initiate the use of force may not reach this extreme level in a U.S. China crisis, the capabilities that the two countries possess raise concerns that escalation pressures will exist and that they may be highest **early in a crisis**, compressing the time frame for diplomacy to avert military conflict.

#### Only judicial review builds sustainable norms

Wexler, 13 [The Role of the Judicial Branch during the Long War: Drone Courts, Damage Suits, and FOIA Requests, Lesley Wexler, Professor of Law and Thomas A. Mengler Faculty Scholar, 3rd Speaker and semifinalist 1998 National Debate Tournament, p. SSRN]

The current practice of using drones to engage in overseas killings raises difficult legal ques-tions with incredibly high stakes. The fate of potential targets and collateral damage hangs in the balance along with grave concerns about national and foreign security. Over the past decade, expansive deference to the executive branch has allowed a substantial increase in the number and rate of drone strikes. The use of drones for targeted killing is becoming a regular tool of the U.S. government and perhaps will become so for other governments as well. What role, if any, do courts have to play in regulating this practice? Critics of the status quo would like greater transparency and accountability in regards to tar-geted killings. In addition to constitutional concerns, some worry the executive branch is violating International Humanitarian Law (IHL). They want the executive branch to reveal its legal under-standings of IHL. They also seek greater information regarding review processes for targeted kill-ings as to both prospective listings and retrospective assessments of compliance. These skeptics contend that the lack of judicial oversight and the opacity of the government’s legal position risks the deaths of innocent foreign civilians, violates democratic accountability norms, erodes our compliance reputation with allies, and helps recruit a new generation of anti-American insurgents. Even if the current approach is lawful, many worry about future administrations or other governments that may adopt drone strikes without sufficient IHL protections. As this chapter describes, some of these critics have proposed the use of courts to foster either transparency or accountability or both. In contrast, many, including the executive and judicial branches themselves, believe that the judicial role regarding drone strikes and targeted killings should be a minimal one. They suggest that an active court reviewing names of those to be targeted, providing damages to victims of un-lawful strikes, or demanding agencies declassify information on drone strikes would compromise an effective strategy in the war on terror. They fear judicial intervention would pose great danger to U.S. soldiers, foreign civilians, and in worst case scenarios, to U.S. citizens at home without en-hancing IHL compliance. In particular, executive branch officials have argued that greater transpar-ency may compromise intelligence efforts, provide targets with additional opportunities to act stra- 3 tegically, and sour relations with states currently willing to provide sub rosa permission for strikes. Meanwhile, these court opponents suggest that sufficient internal and congressional oversight can prevent unlawful activity. They also push back on the opacity charge by noting the information pro-vided through a series of high-level administration speeches and unacknowledged leaks. The U.S. judiciary itself is often reluctant to aggressively intervene in national security mat-ters and other legal issues arising out of armed conflicts. Federal courts frequently employ a variety of procedural postures and substantive doctrines to avoid deciding live IHL controversies. But the judicial branch sometimes surprises, as when the Supreme Court spoke to detention policy and its relationship to IHL in the trio of war on terror cases Hamdi,1 Hamdan,2 and Boumediene.3 U.S. courts might look to other countries, like Israel, whose courts have ruled on targeted killings and issued guidelines informed by IHL to govern future behavior.4 This chapter suggests the judiciary may play an important role in the debate over the execu-tive branch’s decisions regarding IHL even if it declines to speak to the substance of such cases. First, advocates may use courts as a visible platform in which to make their arguments and spur conversations about alternative, non-judicially mandated transparency and accountability measures. As they did with the trio of detention cases, advocates can leverage underlying constitutional con-cerns about the treatment of citizens to stimulate interest in the larger IHL issues. Second, litigants may use courts to publicize and pursue Freedom of Information (FOIA) requests and thus enhance transparency. Even if courts decline to grant FOIA requests, the lawsuits can generate media atten-tion about what remains undisclosed. Third, and **most** robustly, Congress may pass legislation that would facilitate either prospective review of kill lists through a so-called drone court or remove procedural barriers to retrospective damage suits for those unlawfully killed by a drone strike. Even the threat of such a judicial role may influence executive branch behavior.

#### Drone court key

Chow, 13 [Droning On: The Need to Establish a New Norm, Eugene K. Chow Former Executive Editor, Homeland Security NewsWire, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/eugene-k-chow/establish-new-constitutional-norm\_b\_2683131.html]

Contrary to what some have argued that the president requires full and unadjudicated control of the CIA's drone program for the swift execution of military operations to safeguard the nation, the proposed drone court or some form of Congressional oversight would not necessarily slow down the government's ability to wage war. Before that fateful button is pressed and Hellfire missiles go streaking toward an enemy combatant, thousands of [hu]man-hours are poured into gathering intelligence, assessing threats, and monitoring their movements. In all that time building up to that final moment, why can we not spare a few extra minutes for a Congressional committee, a judge, or a panel to determine if an American ought to be killed or not? Let us remember that the measure of a democratic society is not how it treats its best, but its worst. In the war against violent extremism, our government has already established a precedent for additional oversight. Following the Hamdi v. Rumsfeld decision, the Pentagon created Combatant Status Review Tribunals to determine if captured enemies on the battlefield had been properly designated as "enemy combatants." So it is not a question of whether the government can establish additional layers of oversight to ensure transparency, accountability, and the protection of Constitutional rights, but rather do we have the will. Now that a perpetual war, waged on an omnipresent battlefield, and drones capable of automatically monitoring every single moving object within 65 square miles and firing death-dealing missiles with a click of the button have become commonplace - it is high time we put into place laws and parameters that clearly define this new norm.

#### It’s reverse causal: formal agreements are only effective if driven by US precedent

Robert Farley 11, assistant professor at the Patterson School of Diplomacy and International Commerce at the University of Kentucky, Over the Horizon: U.S. Drone Use Sets Global Precedent, October 12, http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/10311/over-the-horizon-u-s-drone-use-sets-global-precedent

Is the world about to see a "drone race" among the United States, China and several other major powers? Writing in the New York Times, Scott Shane argued that just such an arms race is already happening and that it is largely a result of the widespread use of drones in a counterterror role by the United States. Shane suggests that an international norm of drone usage is developing around how the United States has decided to employ drones. In the future, we may expect that China, Russia and India will employ advanced drone technologies against similar enemies, perhaps in Xinjiang or Chechnya. Kenneth Anderson agrees that the drone race is on, but disagrees about its cause, arguing that improvements in the various drone component technologies made such an arms race inevitable. Had the United States not pursued advanced drone technology or launched an aggressive drone campaign, some other country would have taken the lead in drone capabilities. So which is it? Has the United States sparked a drone race, or was a race with the Chinese and Russians inevitable? While there's truth on both sides, on balance Shane is correct. **Arms races don't just "happen"** because of outside technological developments. Rather, they are embedded in political dynamics associated with public perception, international prestige and bureaucratic conflict. China and Russia pursued the development of drones before the United States showed the world what the Predator could do, but they are pursuing capabilities more vigorously because of the U.S. example. Understanding this is necessary to developing expectations of what lies ahead as well as a strategy for regulating drone warfare. States run arms races for a variety of reasons. The best-known reason is a sense of fear: The developing capabilities of an opponent leave a state feeling vulnerable. The Germany's build-up of battleships in the years prior to World War I made Britain feel vulnerable, necessitating the expansion of the Royal Navy, and vice versa. Similarly, the threat posed by Soviet missiles during the Cold War required an increase in U.S. nuclear capabilities, and so forth. However, states also "race" in response to public pressure, bureaucratic politics and the desire for prestige. Sometimes, for instance, states feel the need to procure the same type of weapon another state has developed in order to maintain their relative position, even if they do not feel directly threatened by the weapon. Alternatively, bureaucrats and generals might use the existence of foreign weapons to argue for their own pet systems. **All of these reasons** share common characteristics, however: They are both social and strategic, and they depend on the behavior of other countries. Improvements in technology do not make the procurement of any given weapon necessary; rather, geostrategic interest creates the need for a system. So while there's a degree of truth to Anderson's argument about the availability of drone technology, he ignores the degree to which dramatic **precedent can affect state policy**. The technologies that made HMS Dreadnought such a revolutionary warship in 1906 were available before it was built; its dramatic appearance nevertheless transformed the major naval powers' procurement plans. Similarly, the Soviet Union and the United States accelerated nuclear arms procurement following the Cuban Missile Crisis, with the USSR in particular increasing its missile forces by nearly 20 times, partially in response to perceptions of vulnerability. So while a drone "race" may have taken place even without the large-scale Predator and Reaper campaign in Pakistan, Yemen and Somalia, the extent and character of the race now on display has been driven by U.S. behavior. Other states, observing the effectiveness -- or at least the capabilities -- of U.S. drones will work to create their own counterparts with an enthusiasm that **they would not have had in absence of the U.S. example**. What is undeniable, however, is that we face a drone race, which inevitably evokes the question of arms control. Because they vary widely in technical characteristics, appearance and even definition, drones are poor candidates for "traditional" arms control of the variety that places strict limits on number of vehicles constructed, fielded and so forth. Rather, to the extent that any regulation of drone warfare is likely, it will come through treaties limiting how drones are used. Such a treaty would require either deep concern on the part of the major powers that advances in drone capabilities threatened their interests and survival, or widespread revulsion among the global public against the practice of drone warfare. The latter is somewhat more likely than the former, as drone construction at this point seems unlikely to dominate state defense budgets to the same degree as battleships in the 1920s or nuclear weapons in the 1970s. However, for now, drones are used mainly to kill unpleasant people in places distant from media attention. So creating the public outrage necessary to force global elites to limit drone usage may also prove difficult, although the specter of "out of control robots" killing humans with impunity might change that. P.W. Singer, author of "Wired for War," argues that new robot technologies will require a new approach to the legal regulation of war. Robots, both in the sky and on the ground, not to mention in the sea, already have killing capabilities that rival those of humans. Any approach to legally managing drone warfare will likely come as part of a more general effort to regulate the operation of robots in war. However, even in the unlikely event of global public outrage, any serious effort at regulating the use of drones will require **U.S. acquiescence**. Landmines are a remarkably unpopular form of weapon, but the United States continues to resist the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention. If the United States sees unrestricted drone warfare as being to its advantage -- and it is likely to do so even if China, Russia and India develop similar drone capabilities -- then even global outrage may not be sufficient to make the U.S. budge on its position. This simply reaffirms the original point: Arms races don't just "happen," but rather are a direct, if unexpected outcome of state policy. Like it or not, the behavior of the United States right now is structuring how the world will think about, build and use drones for the foreseeable future. Given this, U.S. policymakers should perhaps devote a touch more attention to the precedent they're setting.

### Adv 2

#### Advantage 2 Accountability

#### Ex ante review key to accountable and legitimate targeted killing

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

The relevance of these precedents to the targeting of citizens is clear: the constitutional right to due process is alive and well--regardless of geographic location. We now turn to what type of process is due.

III. BRING IN THE COURTS: BRINGING JUDICIAL LEGITIMACY TO TARGETED KILLINGS

The function of this Article is not to argue that targeted killing should be removed from the toolbox of American military options. Targeted killing as a military tactic is here to stay. n34 Targeting strikes have robust bipartisan political support and have become an increasingly relied upon weapon as the United States decreases its presence in Iraq and Afghanistan. n35 The argument being asserted here, therefore, is that in light of the protections the Constitution affords U.S. citizens, there must be a degree of inter-branch process when the government targets such individuals.

The current intra-executive process afforded to U.S. citizens is not only unlawful, but also dangerous. n36 Justice O'Connor acknowledged the danger inherent in exclusively intra-branch process in Hamdi when she asserted that an interrogator is not a neutral decision-maker as the "even purportedly fair adjudicators are disqualified by their interest in the controversy." n37 In rejecting the government's argument that a "separation of powers" analysis mandates a heavily circumscribed role for the courts in these circumstances, Justice O'Connor contended that, in times of conflict, the Constitution "most assuredly envisions a role for all three branches when individual liberties are at stake." n38 Similarly, Justice Kennedy was unequivocal in Boumediene about the right of courts to enforce the Constitution even in times of war. Quoting Chief Justice Marshall in Marbury v. Madison, n39 Kennedy argued that holding "that the political branches may switch the constitution on or off at will would lead to a regime in which they, not this Court, say 'what the law is.'" n40 This sentiment is very relevant to our targeted killing analysis: in the realm of targeted killing, where the deprivation is of one's life, the absence of any "neutral decision-maker" outside the executive branch is a clear violation of due process guaranteed by the Constitution.

Justices O'Connor and Kennedy are pointing to a dangerous institutional tension inherent in any intra-executive process regime. Targeting decisions are no different; indeed, the goal of those charged with targeting citizens like al-Awlaki is not to strike a delicate balance between security [\*444] and liberty but rather, quite single-mindedly, to prevent attacks on the United States. n41 In describing the precarious nature of covert actions, James Baker, a distinguished military judge, noted, "the twin necessities of secrecy and speed may pull as they do against the competing interests of deliberate review, dissent, and informed accountable decision-making." n42 While Judge Baker concluded that these risks "magnify the importance of a meaningful process of ongoing executive appraisal," he overlooked the institutional tension, seized upon by Justices O'Connor and Kennedy, which would preclude the type of process that he was advocating. n43

Although there may be a role for Congress in such instances, a legislative warrant for specific cases would likely be cumbersome, carry significant security risks, and may violate the spirit of the Bill of Attainder Clause, which prohibits the legislature from performing judicial or executive functions. The current inter-branch process for covert actions, in which the President must make a finding and notify the leaders of Congress and the intelligence committees, is **entirely ex post** and also has not been proven to provide a meaningful check on executive power. n44 Moreover, most politicians are unqualified to make the necessary legal judgments that these situations require.

Solutions calling for the expatriation of citizens deemed to be terrorists are fraught with judicial complications and set very dangerous precedents for citizenship revocation. n45 **Any post-deprivation process**, such as a Bivens-style action, for a targeted attack would also be problematic. n46 Government officials charged with carrying out these attacks might be hesitant to do so if there were a threat of prosecution. Moreover, post-deprivation process for a target would be effectively meaningless in the wake of a **successful** attack.

 [\*445] Rather, as recognized by the Founders in the Fourth Amendment, balancing the needs of security against the imperatives of liberty is a traditional role for judges to play. Two scholars of national security law recently highlighted the value of judicial inclusion in targeting decisions: "Judicial control of targeted killing could increase the accuracy of target selection, reducing the danger of mistaken or illegal destruction of lives, limbs, and property. Independent judges who double-check targeting decisions could catch errors and cause executive officials to **avoid making them** in the first place." n47 Judges are both knowledgeable in the law and accustomed to dealing with sensitive security considerations. These qualifications make them ideal candidates to ensure that the executive exercises constitutional restraint when targeting citizens.

Reforming the decision-making process for executing American citizens to allow for judicial oversight would restore the separation of powers framework envisioned by the Founders and increase democratic legitimacy by placing these determinations on **steadier constitutional ground**. For those fearful of judicial encroachment on executive war-making powers, there is a strong argument that this will actually strengthen the President and empower him to take decisive action without worrying about the judicial consequences. As Justice Kennedy put it, "the exercise of [executive] powers is vindicated, not eroded, when confirmed by the Judicial Branch." n48 Now, we will turn to what this judicial involvement would look like.

#### Drones key to legitimacy

Kennedy, 13 [“Drones: Legitimacy and Anti-Americanism”, Greg Kennedy is a Professor of Strategic Foreign Policy at the Defence Studies Department, King's College London, based at the Joint Services Command and Staff College, Defence Academy of the United Kingdom, in Shrivenham, Parameters 42(4)/43(1) Winter-Spring 2013]

The exponential rise in the use of drone technology in a variety of military and non-military contexts represents a real challenge to the framework of established international law and it is both right as a matter of principle, and inevitable as a matter of political reality, that the international community should now be focusing attention on the standards applicable to this technological development, particularly its deployment in counterterrorism and counter-insurgency initiatives, and attempt to reach a consensus on the legality of its use, and the standards and safeguards which should apply to it.4 deliver deadly force is taking place in both public and official domains in the United States and many other countries.5 The four key features at the heart of the debate revolve around: who is controlling the weapon system; does the system of control and oversight violate international law governing the use of force; are the drone strikes proportionate acts that provide military effectiveness given the circumstances of the conflict they are being used in; and does their use violate the sovereignty of other nations and allow the United States to disregard formal national boundaries? Unless these four questions are dealt with in the near future the impact of the unresolved legitimacy issues will have a number of repercussions for American foreign and military policies: “Without a new doctrine for the use of drones that is understandable to friends and foes, the United States risks achieving near-term tactical benefits in killing terrorists while incurring potentially significant longer-term costs to its alliances, global public opinion, the war on terrorism and international stability.”6 This article will address only the first three critical questions. The question of who controls the drones during their missions is attracting a great deal of attention. The use of drones by the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) to conduct “signature strikes” is the most problematic factor in this matter. Between 2004 and 2013, CIA drone attacks in Pakistan killed up to 3,461—up to 891 of them civilians.7 Not only is the use of drones by the CIA the issue, but subcontracting operational control of drones to other civilian agencies is also causing great concern.8 Questions remain as to whether subcontractors were controlling drones during actual strike missions, as opposed to surveillance and reconnaissance activities. Nevertheless, the intense questioning of John O. Brennan, President Obama’s nominee for director of the CIA in February 2013, over drone usage, the secrecy of their controllers and orders, and the legality of their missions confirmed the level of concern America’s elected officials have regarding the legitimacy of drone use. Furthermore, perceptions and suspicions of illegal clandestine intelligence agency operations, already a part of the public and official psyche due to experiences from Vietnam, Iran-Contra, and Iraq II and the weapons of mass destruction debacle, have been reinforced by CIA management of drone capability. Recent revelations about the use of secret Saudi Arabian facilities for staging American drone strikes into Yemen did nothing to dissipate such suspicions of the CIA’s lack of legitimacy in its use of drones.9 The fact that the secret facility was the launching site for drones used to kill American citizens Anwar al-Awlaki and his son in September 2011, both classified by the CIA as al-Qaeda-linked threats to US security, only deepened such suspicions. Despite the fact that Gulf State observers and officials knew about American drones operating from the Arabian peninsula for years, the existence of the CIA base was not openly admitted in case such knowledge should “ . . . damage counter-terrorism collaboration with Saudi Arabia.”10 The fallout from CIA involvement and management of drone strikes prompted Senator Dianne Feinstein, Chairwoman of the Senate Intelligence Committee, to suggest the need for a court to oversee targeted killings. Such a body, she said, would replicate the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court, which oversees eavesdropping on American soil.11 Most importantly, such oversight would go a long way towards allaying fears of the drone usage lacking true political accountability and legitimacy. In addition, as with any use of force, drone strikes in overseas contingency operations can lead to increased attacks on already weak governments partnered with the United States. They can lead to retaliatory attacks on local governments and may contribute to local instability. Those actions occur as a result of desires for revenge and frustrations caused by the strikes. Feelings of hostility are often visited on the most immediate structures of authority—local government officials, government buildings, police, and the military.12 It can thus be argued that, at the strategic level, drone strikes are fuelling anti-American resentment among enemies and allies alike. Those reactions are often based on questions regarding the legality, ethicality, and operational legitimacy of those acts to deter opponents. Therefore, specifically related to the reaction of allies, the military legitimacy question arises if the use of drones endangers vital strategic relationships.13 One of the strategic relationships being affected by the drone legitimacy issue is that of the United States and the United Kingdom. Targeted killing, by drone strike or otherwise, is not the sole preserve of the United States. Those actions, however, **attract more negative attention** to the United States due to its prominence on the world’s stage, its declarations of support for human rights and democratic freedoms, and rule-of-law issues, all which appear violated by such strikes. This complexity and visibility make such targeted killings important for Anglo-American strategic relations because of the closeness of that relationship and the perception that Great Britain, therefore, condones such American activities. Because the intelligence used in such operations is seen by other nations as a shared Anglo-American asset, the use of such intelligence to identify and conduct such killings, in the opinion those operations.14 Finally, the apparent gap between stated core policies and values and the ability to practice targeted killings appears to be a starkly hypocritical and deceitful position internationally, a condition that once again makes British policymakers uncomfortable with being tarred by such a brush.15 The divide between US policy and action is exacerbated by drone technology, which makes the once covert practice of targeted killing commonplace and undeniable. It may also cause deep-rooted distrust due to a spectrum of legitimacy issues. Such questions will, therefore, undermine the US desire to export liberal democratic principles. Indeed, it may be beneficial for Western democracies to achieve adequate rather than decisive victories, thereby setting an example of restraint for the international order.16 The United States must be willing to engage and deal with drone-legitimacy issues across the entire spectrum of tactical, operational, strategic, and political levels to ensure its strategic aims are not derailed by operational and tactical expediency.

#### Heg without legitimacy causes violent transitions—voluntary limits on power maintain relative stability

Martin Griffiths January **2004**; Associate Professor and Head of School at School of Government and International Relations, Griffith University (coincidence, as it turns out) “BEYOND THE BUSH DOCTRINE: AMERICAN HEGEMONY AND WORLD ORDER” AUSTRALASIAN JOURNAL OF AMERICAN STUDIES www.anzasa.arts.usyd.edu.au/a.j.a.s/Articles/1\_04/Griffiths.pdf‎

In international relations, an established hegemony helps the cause of international peace in a number of ways. First, a hegemon deters renewed military competition and provides general security through its preponderant power. Second, a hegemon can, if it chooses, strengthen international norms of conduct. Third, a hegemon’s economic power serves as the basis of a global lending system and free trade regime, providing economic incentives for states to cooperate and forego wars for resources and markets. Such was the nature of British hegemony in the nineteenth century, hence the term Pax Britannica. After the Second World War, the United States has performed the roles that Britain once played, though with an even greater preponderance of power. Thus, much of the peace between democracies after World War Two can be explained by the fact that the political-military hegemony of the United States has helped to create a security structure in Europe and the Pacific conducive to peaceful interaction. Today, American hegemony is tolerated by many states in Europe and Asia, **not because the United States is particularly liked**, but because of the perception that its absence might result in aggression by aspiring regional hegemons. However, Chalmers Johnson has argued that this is a false perception promoted from Washington to silence demands for its military withdrawal from Japan and South Korea.8 It is true that hegemonic stability theory can be classified as belonging in the realist tradition because of its focus on the importance of power structures in international politics. The problem is that power alone cannot explain why some states choose to follow or acquiesce to one hegemon while vigorously opposing and forming counter-alliances against another hegemon. Thus when international relations theorists employ the concept of hegemonic stability, they supplement it with the concept of legitimacy.9 Legitimacy in international society refers simply to the perceived justice of the international system. As in domestic politics, legitimacy is a notoriously difficult factor to pin down and measure. Still, one **cannot do away with the concept**, since it is clear that all political orders rely to some extent on consent in addition to coercion. Hegemony without legitimacy is insufficient to deter violent challenges to the international order, and may provoke attempts to build counter-alliances against the hegemon. Hegemonic authority which accepts the principle of the independence of states and treats states with a relative degree of benevolence is more easily accepted. The legitimacy of American hegemony during the cold war was facilitated by two important characteristics of the era. First, the communist threat (whether real or imaginary) disguised the tension between the United States’ promotion of its own interests and its claim to make the world safe for capitalism.10 Second, American hegemony managed to combine economic liberalism between industrialised states with an institutional architecture (the Bretton Woods system) that moderated the volatility of transaction flows across borders. It enabled governments to provide social investments, safety nets and adjustment assistance at the domestic level.11 In the industrialised world, this grand bargain formed the basis of the longest and most equitable economic expansion in human history, from the 1950s to the 1980s. And it provided the institutional foundation for the newest wave of globalisation, which began not long thereafter and is far broader in scope and deeper in reach than its nineteenth century antecedent. The system that the United States led the way in creating after 1945 has fared well because the connecting and restraining aspects of democracy and institutions reduce the incentives for Western nations to engage in strategic rivalry or balance against American hegemony. The strength of this order is attested to by the longevity of its institutions, alliances and arrangements, based on their legitimacy in the eyes of the participants. Reacting against the closed autarchic regions that had contributed to the world depression and split the globe into competing blocs before the war, the United States led the way in constructing a post-war order that was based on economic openness, joint management of the Western political-economic order, and rules and institutions that were organised to support domestic economic stability and social security.12 This order in turn was built around a basic bargain: the hegemonic state obtains commitments from secondary states to participate in the international order, and the hegemon in return **places limits on the exercise of its power**. The advantage for the weak state is that it does not fear domination or abandonment, reducing the incentive to balance against the hegemon, and the leading state does not need to use its power to actively enforce order and compliance. It is these restraints on both sides and the willingness to participate in this mutual accord that explains the longevity of the system, even after the end of the cold war. But as the founder and defender of this international order, the United States, far from being a domineering hegemon, was a reluctant superpower.

#### That prevents great power war, economic collapse, and global governance failures

**Thayer 13**—PhD U Chicago, former research fellow at Harvard Kennedy School’s Belfer Center, political science professor at Baylor (Bradley, professor in the political science department at Baylor University, “Humans, Not Angels: Reasons to Doubt the Decline of War Thesis”, International Studies Review Volume 15, Issue 3, pages 396–419, September 2013, dml)

Accordingly, while Pinker is sensitive to the importance of power in a domestic context—the Leviathan is good for safety and the decline of violence—he neglects the role of power in the international context, specifically he neglects US power as a force for stability. So, if a liberal Leviathan is good for domestic politics, a liberal Leviathan should be as well for international politics. The primacy of the United States provides the world with that liberal Leviathan and has four major positive consequences for international politics (Thayer 2006). In addition to ensuring the security of the United States and its allies, American primacy within the international system causes many positive outcomes for the world. The first has been a more peaceful world. During the Cold War, US leadership reduced friction among many states that were historical antagonists, most notably France and West Germany. Today, American primacy and the security blanket it provides reduce nuclear proliferation incentives and help keep a number of complicated relationships stable such as between Greece and Turkey, Israel and Egypt, South Korea and Japan, India and Pakistan, Indonesia and Australia. Wars still occur where Washington's interests are not seriously threatened, such as in Darfur, but a Pax Americana does reduce war's likelihood—**particularly the worst form—great power wars.** Second, American power gives the United States the ability to spread democracy and many of the other positive forces Pinker identifies. Doing so is a source of much good for the countries concerned as well as the United States because liberal democracies are more likely to align with the United States and be sympathetic to the American worldview. In addition, once states are governed democratically, the likelihood of any type of conflict is significantly reduced. This is not because democracies do not have clashing interests. Rather, it is because they are more transparent, more likely to want to resolve things amicably in concurrence with US leadership. Third, along with the growth of the number of democratic states around the world has been the growth of the global economy. With its allies, the United States has labored to create an economically liberal worldwide network characterized by free trade and commerce, respect for international property rights, mobility of capital, and labor markets. The economic stability and prosperity that stems from this economic order is a global public good. Fourth, and finally, the United States has been willing to use its power not only to advance its interests but to also promote the welfare of people all over the globe. The United States is the earth's leading source of positive externalities for the world. The US military has participated in over 50 operations since the end of the Cold War—and most of those missions have been humanitarian in nature. Indeed, the US military is the earth's “911 force”—it serves, de facto, as the world's police, the global paramedic, and the planet's fire department. There is no other state, group of states, or international organizations that can provide these global benefits. Without US power, the liberal order created by the United States will end just as assuredly. But, the waning of US power, at least in relative terms, introduces additional problems for Pinker concerning the decline of violence in the international realm. Given the importance of the distribution of power in international politics, and specifically US power for stability, there is reason to be concerned about the future as the distribution of relative power changes and not to the benefit of the United States.

#### Formal judicial oversight key – balances resolve with restraint

NYT, 10 [“Lethal Force under Law”, New York Times, <http://www.nytimes.com/2010/10/10/opinion/10sun1.html>]

The drone program has been effective, killing more than 400 Al Qaeda militants this year alone, according to American officials, but fewer than 10 noncombatants. But assassinations are a grave act and subject to abuse — and imitation by other countries. The government needs to do a better job of showing the world that it is acting in strict compliance with international law. The United States has the right under international law to try to prevent attacks being planned by terrorists connected to Al Qaeda, up to and including killing the plotters. But it is not within the power of a commander in chief to simply declare anyone anywhere a combatant and kill them, without the slightest advance independent oversight. The authorization for military force approved by Congress a week after 9/11 empowers the president to go after only those groups or countries that committed or aided the 9/11 attacks. The Bush administration’s distortion of that mandate led to abuses that harmed the United States around the world. The issue of who can be targeted applies directly to the case of Anwar al-Awlaki, an American citizen hiding in Yemen, who officials have admitted is on an assassination list. Did he inspire through words the Army psychiatrist who shot up Fort Hood, Tex., last November, and the Nigerian man who tried to blow up an airliner on Christmas? Or did he actively participate in those plots, and others? The difference is crucial. If the United States starts killing every Islamic radical who has called for jihad, there will be no end to the violence. American officials insist that Mr. Awlaki is involved with actual terror plots. But human rights lawyers working on his behalf say that is not the case, and have filed suit to get him off the target list. The administration wants the case thrown out on state-secrets grounds. The Obama administration needs to go out of its way to demonstrate that it is keeping its promise to do things differently than the Bush administration did. It must explain how targets are chosen, demonstrate that attacks are limited and are a last resort, and allow independent authorities to oversee the process. PUBLIC GUIDELINES The administration keeps secret its standards for putting people on terrorist or assassination lists. In March, Harold Koh, legal adviser to the State Department, said the government adheres to international law, attacking only military targets and keeping civilian casualties to an absolute minimum. “Our procedures and practices for identifying lawful targets are extremely robust,” he said in a speech, without describing them. Privately, government officials say no C.I.A. drone strike takes place without the approval of the United States ambassador to the target country, the chief of the C.I.A. station, a deputy at the agency, and the agency’s director. So far, President Obama’s system of command seems to have prevented any serious abuses, but the approval process is entirely within the administration. After the abuses under President Bush, the world is not going to accept a simple “trust us” from the White House. There have been too many innocent people rounded up for detention and subjected to torture, too many cases of mistaken identity or trumped-up connections to terror. Unmanned drones eliminate the element of risk to American forces and make it seductively easy to attack. The government needs to make public its guidelines for determining who is a terrorist and who can be targeted for death. It should clearly describe how it follows international law in these cases and list the internal procedures and checks it uses before a killing is approved. That can be done without formally acknowledging the strikes are taking place in specific countries. LIMIT TARGETS The administration should state that it is following international law by acting strictly in self-defense, targeting only people who are actively planning or participating in terror, or who are leaders of Al Qaeda or the Taliban — not those who raise funds for terror groups, or who exhort others to acts of terror. Special measures are taken before an American citizen is added to the terrorist list, officials say, requiring the approval of lawyers from the National Security Council and the Justice Department. But again, those measures have not been made public. Doing so would help ensure that people like Mr. Awlaki are being targeted for terrorist actions, not their beliefs or associations. A LAST RESORT Assassination should in every case be a last resort. Before a decision is made to kill, particularly in areas away from recognized battlefields, the government needs to consider every other possibility for capturing the target short of lethal force. Terrorists operating on American soil should be captured using police methods, and not subject to assassination. If practical, the United States should get permission from a foreign government before carrying out an attack on its soil. The government is reluctant to discuss any of these issues publicly, in part to preserve the official fiction that the United States is not waging a formal war in Pakistan and elsewhere, but it would not harm that effort to show the world how seriously it takes international law by making clear its limits. INDEPENDENT OVERSIGHT Dealing out death requires additional oversight outside the administration. Particularly in the case of American citizens, like Mr. Awlaki, the government **needs to employ some** due process before depriving someone of life. It would be logistically impossible to conduct a full-blown trial in absentia of every assassination target, as the lawyers for Mr. Awlaki prefer. But judicial review could still be employed. The government could establish a court like the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court, which authorizes wiretaps on foreign agents inside the United States. Before it adds people to its target list and begins tracking them, the government could take its evidence to this court behind closed doors — along with proof of its compliance with international law — and get the equivalent of a judicial warrant in a timely and efficient way. Congressional leaders are secretly briefed on each C.I.A. attack, and say they are satisfied with the information they get and with the process. Nonetheless, that process is informal and could be changed at any time by this president or his successors. Formal oversight is a better way of demonstrating confidence in American methods. Self-defense under international law not only shows the nation’s resolve and power, but sends a powerful message to other countries that the United States couples drastic action with careful judgment.

#### External court review maintains legitimacy – key to global stability

Knowles, 9 [Robert, Assistant Professor, NYU Law, “Article: American Hegemony and the Foreign Affairs Constitution”, 41 Ariz. St. L.J. 87, p. lexis]

The hegemonic model also reduces the need for executive branch flexibility, and the institutional competence terrain shifts toward the courts. The stability of the current U.S.-led international system depends on the ability of the U.S. to govern effectively. Effective governance depends on, among other things, predictability. n422 G. John Ikenberry analogizes America's hegemonic position to that of a "giant corporation" seeking foreign investors: "The rule of law and the institutions of policy making in a democracy are the political equivalent of corporate transparency and [\*155] accountability." n423 Stable interpretation of the law bolsters the stability of the system because other nations will know that they **can rely on** those **interpretations** and that there will be at least some degree of enforcement by the United States. At the same time, the separation of powers serves the global-governance function by reducing the ability of the executive branch to make "abrupt or aggressive moves toward other states." n424 The Bush Administration's detainee policy, for all of its virtues and faults, was an exceedingly aggressive departure from existing norms, and was therefore bound to generate intense controversy. It was formulated quickly, by a small group of policy-makers and legal advisors without consulting Congress and over the objections of even some within the executive branch. n425 Although the Administration invoked the law of armed conflict to justify its detention of enemy combatants, it did not seem to recognize limits imposed by that law. n426 Most significantly, it designed the detention scheme around interrogation rather than incapacitation and excluded the detainees from all legal protections of the Geneva Conventions. n427 It declared all detainees at Guantanamo to be "enemy combatants" without establishing a regularized process for making an individual determination for each detainee. n428 And when it established the military commissions, also without consulting Congress, the Administration denied defendants important procedural protections. n429 In an anarchic world characterized by great power conflict, one could make the argument that the executive branch requires maximum flexibility to defeat the enemy, who may not adhere to international law. Indeed, the precedents relied on most heavily by the Administration in the enemy combatant cases date from the 1930s and 1940s - a period when the international system was radically unstable, and the United States was one of several great powers vying for advantage. n430 But during that time, the executive branch faced much more exogenous pressure from other great powers to comply with international law in the treatment of captured enemies. If the United States strayed too far from established norms, it would risk retaliation upon its own soldiers or other consequences from [\*156] powerful rivals. Today, there are no such constraints: enemies such as al Qaeda are not great powers and are not likely to obey international law anyway. Instead, the danger is that American rule-breaking will set a pattern of rule-breaking for the world, leading to instability. n431 America's military predominance enables it to set the rules of the game. **When the U.S. breaks its own rules,** it loses legitimacy. The Supreme Court's response to the detainee policy enabled the U.S. government as a whole to hew more closely to established procedures and norms, and to regularize the process for departing from them. After Hamdi, n432 the Department of Defense established a process, the CSRTs, for making an individual determination about the enemy combatant status of all detainees at Guantanamo. After the Court recognized habeas jurisdiction at Guantanamo, Congress passed the DTA, n433 establishing direct judicial review of CSRT determinations in lieu of habeas. Similarly, after the Court declared the military commissions unlawful in Hamdan, n434 this forced the Administration to seek congressional approval for commissions that restored some of the rights afforded at courts martial. n435 In Boumediene, the Court rejected the executive branch's foreign policy arguments, and bucked Congress as well, to restore the norm of habeas review. n436 Throughout this enemy combatant litigation, it has been the courts' relative insulation from politics that has enabled them to take the long view. In contrast, the President's (and Congress's) responsiveness to political concerns in the wake of 9/11 has encouraged them to depart from established norms for the nation's perceived short-term advantage, even at the expense of the nation's long-term interests. n437 As Derek Jinks and Neal Katyal have observed, "treaties are part of [a] system of time-tested standards, and this feature makes the wisdom of their judicial interpretation manifest." n438 At the same time, the enemy combatant cases make allowances for the executive branch's superior speed. The care that the Court took to limit the issues it decided in each case gave the executive branch plenty of time to [\*157] arrive at an effective detainee policy. n439 Hamdi, Rasul, and Boumediene recognized that the availability of habeas would depend on the distance from the battlefield and the length of detention. n440 The enemy combatant litigation also underscores the extent to which the classic realist assumptions about courts' legitimacy in foreign affairs have been turned on their head. In an anarchic world, legitimacy derives largely from brute force. The courts have no armies at their disposal and look weak when they issue decisions that cannot be enforced. n441 But in a hegemonic system, where governance depends on voluntary acquiesnce, the courts have a greater role to play. Rather than hobbling the exercise of foreign policy, the courts are a key form of "soft power." n442 As Justice Kennedy's majority opinion observed in Boumediene, **courts can** bestow **external** legitimacy on the acts of the political branches. n443 Acts having a basis in law are almost universally regarded as more legitimate than merely political acts. Most foreign policy experts believe that the Bush Administration's detention scheme "hurt America's image and standing in the world." n444 The restoration of habeas corpus in Boumediene may help begin to counteract this loss of prestige. Finally, the enemy combatant cases are striking in that they embrace a role for representation-reinforcement in the international realm. n445 Although defenders of special deference acknowledge that courts' strengths lie in protecting the rights of minorities, it has been very difficult for courts to protect these rights in the face of exigencies asserted by the executive branch in foreign affairs matters. This is especially difficult when the minorities are alleged enemy aliens being held outside the sovereign territory of the United States in wartime. In the infamous Korematsu decision, another World War II-era case, the Court bowed to the President's factual assessment of the emergency justifying detention of U.S. citizens of Japanese ancestry living in the United States. n446 In Boumediene, the Court [\*158] pointedly declined to defer to the executive branch's factual assessments of military necessity. n447 The court may have recognized that a more aggressive role in protecting the rights of non-citizens was required by American hegemony. In fact, the arguments for deference with respect to the rights of non-citizens are even weaker because aliens lack a political constituency in the United States. n448 This outward-looking form of representation-reinforcement serves important functions. It strengthens the legitimacy of U.S. hegemony by establishing equality as a benchmark and reinforces the sense that our constitutional values reflect universal human rights. n449 Conclusion When it comes to the constitutional regime of foreign affairs, geopolitics has always mattered. Understandings about America's role in the world have shaped foreign affairs doctrines. But the classic realist assumptions that support special deference do not reflect the world as it is today. A better, more realist, approach looks to the ways that the courts can reinforce and legitimize America's leadership role. The Supreme Court's rejection of the government's claimed exigencies in the enemy combatant cases strongly indicates that the Judiciary is becoming reconciled to the current world order and is asserting its prerogatives in response to the fewer constraints imposed on the executive branch. In other words, the courts are moving toward the hegemonic model. In the great dismal swamp that is the judicial treatment of foreign affairs, this transformation offers hope for clarity: the positive reality of the international system, despite terrorism and other serious challenges, permits the courts to reduce the "deference gap" between foreign and domestic cases.

#### Intra-executive processes cause operational error

Chehab, 12 [Ahmad, Georgetown University Law Center, Retrieving the Role of Accountability in the Targeted Killings Context: A Proposal for Judicial Review]

The practical, pragmatic justification for the COAACC derives largely from considering social psychological findings regarding the skewed potential associated with limiting unchecked decision-making in a group of individuals. As an initial point, psychologists have long pointed out how individuals frequently fall prey to cognitive illusions that produce systematic errors in judgment.137 People simply do not make decisions by choosing the optimal outcome from available alternatives, but instead employ shortcuts (i.e., heuristics) for convenience.138 Cognitive biases like groupthink can hamper effective policy deliberations and formulations.139 Groupthink largely arises when a group of decision-makers seek conformity and agreement, thereby avoiding alternative points of view that are critical of the consensus position.140 This theory suggests that some groups—particularly those characterized by a strong leader, considerable internal cohesion, internal loyalty, overconfidence, and a shared world view or value system—suffer from a deterioration in their capacity to engage in critical analysis.141 Many factors can affect such judgment, including a lack of crucial information, insufficient timing for decision-making, poor judgment, pure luck, and/or unexpected actions by adversaries.142 Moreover, decision-makers inevitably tend to become influenced by irrelevant information,143 seek out data and assessments that confirm their beliefs and personal hypotheses notwithstanding contradictory evidence,144 and “[i]rrationally avoid choices that represent extremes when a decision involves a trade-off between two incommensurable values.”145 Self-serving biases can also hamper judgment given as it has been shown to induce well-intentioned people to rationalize virtually any behavior, judgment or action after the fact.146 The confirmation and overconfidence bias, both conceptually related to groupthink, also result in large part from neglecting to consider contradictory evidence coupled with an irrational persistence in pursuing ideological positions divorced from concern of alternative viewpoints.147 Professor Cass Sunstein has described situations in which groupthink produced poor results precisely because consensus resulted from the failure to consider alternative sources of information.148 The failures of past presidents to consider alternative sources of information, critically question risk assessments, ensure neutral-free ideological sentiment among those deliberating,149 and/or generally ensure properly deliberated national security policy has produced prominent and devastating blunders,150 including the Iraq War of 2003,151 the Bay of Pigs debacle in the 1960’s,152 and the controversial decision to wage war against Vietnam.153 Professor Sunstein also has described the related phenomenon of “group polarization,” which includes the tendency to push group members toward a “more extreme position.”154 Given that both groupthink and group polarization can lead to erroneous and ideologically tainted policy positions, the notion of giving the President unchecked authority in determining who is eligible for assassination can only serve to increase the likelihood for committing significant errors.155 The reality is that psychological mistakes, organizational ineptitude, lack of structural coherence and other associated deficiencies are inevitable features in Executive Branch decision-making. D. THE NEED FOR ACCOUNTABILITY CHECKS To check the vices of groupthink and shortcomings of human judgment, the psychology literature emphasizes a focus on accountability mechanisms in which a better reasoned decision-making process can flourish.156 By serving as a constraint on behavior, “accountability functions as a critical norm-enforcement mechanism—the social psychological link between individual decision makers on the one hand and social systems on the other.”157 Such institutional review can channel recognition for the need by government decision-makers to be more self-critical in policy targeted killing designations, more willing to consider alternative points of view, and more willing to anticipate possible objections.158 Findings have also shown that ex ante awareness can lead to more reasoned judgment while also preventing tendentious and ideological inclinations (and political motivations incentivized and exploited by popular hysteria and fear).159 Requiring accounting in a formalized way prior to engaging in a targeted killing—by providing, for example, in camera review, limited declassification of information, explaining threat assessments outside the immediate circle of policy advisors, and securing meaningful judicial review via a COAACC-like tribunal—can promote a more reliable and informed deliberation in the executive branch. With process-based judicial review, the COAACC could effectively reorient the decision to target individuals abroad by examining key procedural aspects—particularly assessing the reliability of the “terrorist” designation—and can further incentivize national security policy-makers to engage in more carefully reasoned choices and evaluate available alternatives than when subject to little to no review.

#### Ex ante key – FISA critics miss the mark

Guiora, 12 [Targeted Killing: When Proportionality Gets All Out of Proportion, Amos N. Guiora. Professor of Law, S.J. Quinney College of Law, University of Utah, p. SSRN]

The unitary executive theory aggressively articulated, and implemented, by the Bush Administration has been adopted in toto by the Obama Administration. While the executive clearly prefers to operate in a vacuum, the question whether that most effectively ensures effective operational counterterrorism is an open question. The advantage of institutionalized, process-based input into executive action prior to decision implementation is worthy of discussion in operational counterterrorism. The solution to this search for an actionable guideline is the **strict scrutiny standard.** What is strict scrutiny, and how is it to be implemented in the context of operational counterterrorism? Why is there a need, if at all, for an additional standard articulating self-defense? The strict scrutiny standard would enable operational engagement of a non-state actor predicated on intelligence information that would meet admissibility standards akin to a court of law. The strict scrutiny test seeks to strike a balance **enabling the state to act sooner** but subject to significant restrictions. The ability to act sooner is limited, however, by the requirement that intelligence information must be reliable, viable, valid, and corroborated. The strict scrutiny standard proposes that for states to act as early as possible in order to prevent a possible terrorist attack the information must meet admissibility standards similar to the rules of evidence. The intelligence must be reliable, material, and probative. The proposal is predicated on the understanding that while states need to engage in operational counterterrorism, mistakes regarding the correct interpretation and analysis of intelligence information can lead to tragic mistakes. Adopting admissibility standards akin to the criminal law minimizes operational error. Rather than relying on the executive branch making decisions in a “closed world” devoid of oversight and review, the intelligence information justifying the proposed action must be submitted to a court that would ascertain the information’s admissibility. The discussion before the court would necessarily be conducted ex parte; however, the process of preparing and submitting available intelligence information to a court would significantly contribute to minimizing operational error that otherwise would occur. The logistics of this proposal are far less daunting than might seem—the court before which the executive would submit the evidence is the FISA Court. Presently, FISA Court judges weigh the reliability of intelligence information in determining whether to grant government ex parte requests for wire-tapping warrants. Under this proposal, judicial approval is necessary prior to undertaking a counterterrorism operation predicated solely on intelligence information. The standard the court would adopt in determining the information’s reliability is the same applied in the traditional criminal law paradigm. The intelligence must be reliable, material, and probative. While the model is different—a defense attorney cannot question state witnesses—the court will assume a dual role. In this dual role capacity the court will cross-examine the representative of the intelligence community and subsequently rule as to the information’s admissibility. While some may suggest that the FISA court is largely an exercise in “rubber-stamping,” the importance of the proposal is in requiring the government to present the available information to an independent judiciary as a precursor to engaging in operational counterterrorism. The call is complicated: the United States is a nation based on democratic values rooted in ethics and morals; yet, when push comes to shove the United States does not always act in accordance with these articulated principles. The vision of a “city upon a hill,” articulated by Puritan settler John Winthrop and subsequently referenced by President Ronald Reagan, 9 has been called into question by certain U.S. counterterrorism measures. This is not the first time that American responses in the face of crisis (whether real or perceived) have reflected “over-board” and “over-broad” approaches.10

#### Op error strengthens armed insurgencies

Mayer 9 (Jane, critically acclaimed author and staff writer for the New Yorker, “The Predator War,” The New Yorker, 10-26, http://www.newyorker.com/reporting/2009/10/26/091026fa\_fact\_mayer)

Indeed, the history of targeted killing is marked by errors. In 1973, for example, Israeli intelligence agents murdered a Moroccan waiter by mistake. They thought that he was a terrorist who had been involved in slaughtering Israeli athletes at the Munich Olympics, a year earlier. And in 1986 the Reagan Administration attempted to retaliate against the Libyan leader Muammar Qaddafi for his suspected role in the deadly bombing of a disco frequented by American servicemen in Germany. The U.S. launched an air strike on Qaddafi’s household. The bombs missed him, but they did kill his fifteen-month-old daughter. The C.I.A.’s early attempts at targeting Osama bin Laden were also problematic. After Al Qaeda blew up the U.S. Embassies in Tanzania and Kenya, in August, 1998, President Bill Clinton retaliated, by launching seventy-five Tomahawk cruise missiles at a site in Afghanistan where bin Laden was expected to attend a summit meeting. According to reports, the bombardment killed some twenty Pakistani militants but missed bin Laden, who had left the scene hours earlier. The development of the Predator, in the early nineteen-nineties, was supposed to help eliminate such mistakes. The drones can hover above a target for up to forty hours before refuelling, and the precise video footage makes it much easier to identify targets. But the strikes are only as accurate as the intelligence that goes into them. Tips from informants on the ground are subject to error, as is the interpretation of video images. Not long before September 11, 2001, for instance, several U.S. counterterrorism officials became certain that a drone had captured footage of bin Laden in a locale he was known to frequent in Afghanistan. The video showed a tall man in robes, surrounded by armed bodyguards in a diamond formation. At that point, drones were unarmed, and were used only for surveillance. “The optics were not great, but it was him,” Henry Crumpton, then the C.I.A.’s top covert-operations officer for the region, told Time. But two other former C.I.A. officers, who also saw the footage, have doubts. “It’s like an urban legend,” one of them told me. “They just jumped to conclusions. You couldn’t see his face. It could have been Joe Schmo. Believe me, no tall man with a beard is safe anywhere in Southwest Asia.” In February, 2002, along the mountainous eastern border of Afghanistan, a Predator reportedly followed and killed three suspicious Afghans, including a tall man in robes who was thought to be bin Laden. The victims turned out to be innocent villagers, gathering scrap metal. In Afghanistan and Pakistan, the local informants, who also serve as confirming witnesses for the air strikes, are notoriously unreliable. A former C.I.A. officer who was based in Afghanistan after September 11th told me that an Afghan source had once sworn to him that one of Al Qaeda’s top leaders was being treated in a nearby clinic. The former officer said that he could barely hold off an air strike after he passed on the tip to his superiors. “They scrambled together an élite team,” he recalled. “We caught hell from headquarters. They said ‘Why aren’t you moving on it?’ when we insisted on checking it out first.” It turned out to be an intentionally false lead. “Sometimes you’re dealing with tribal chiefs,” the former officer said. “Often, they say an enemy of theirs is Al Qaeda because they just want to get rid of somebody. Or they made crap up because they wanted to prove they were valuable, so that they could make money. You couldn’t take their word.” The consequences of bad ground intelligence can be tragic. In September, a nato air strike in Afghanistan killed between seventy and a hundred and twenty-five people, many of them civilians, who were taking fuel from two stranded oil trucks; they had been mistaken for Taliban insurgents. (The incident is being investigated by nato.) According to a reporter for the Guardian, the bomb strike, by an F-15E fighter plane, left such a tangle of body parts that village elders resorted to handing out pieces of unidentifiable corpses to the grieving families, so that they could have something to bury. One Afghan villager told the newspaper, “I took a piece of flesh with me home and I called it my son.” Predator drones, with their superior surveillance abilities, have a better track record for accuracy than fighter jets, according to intelligence officials. Also, the drone’s smaller Hellfire missiles are said to cause far less collateral damage. Still, the recent campaign to kill Baitullah Mehsud offers a sobering case study of the hazards of robotic warfare. It appears to have taken sixteen missile strikes, and fourteen months, before the C.I.A. succeeded in killing him. During this hunt, between two hundred and seven and three hundred and twenty-one additional people were killed, depending on which news accounts you rely upon. It’s all but impossible to get a complete picture of whom the C.I.A. killed during this campaign, which took place largely in Waziristan. Not only has the Pakistani government closed off the region to the outside press; it has also shut out international humanitarian organizations like the International Committee for the Red Cross and Doctors Without Borders. “We can’t get within a hundred kilometres of Waziristan,” Brice de la Vingne, the operational coördinator for Doctors Without Borders in Pakistan, told me. “We tried to set up an emergency room, but the authorities wouldn’t give us authorization.” A few Pakistani and international news stories, most of which rely on secondhand sources rather than on eyewitness accounts, offer the basic details. On June 14, 2008, a C.I.A. drone strike on Mehsud’s home town, Makeen, killed an unidentified person. On January 2, 2009, four more unidentified people were killed. On February 14th, more than thirty people were killed, twenty-five of whom were apparently members of Al Qaeda and the Taliban, though none were identified as major leaders. On April 1st, a drone attack on Mehsud’s deputy, Hakimullah Mehsud, killed ten to twelve of his followers instead. On April 29th, missiles fired from drones killed between six and ten more people, one of whom was believed to be an Al Qaeda leader. On May 9th, five to ten more unidentified people were killed; on May 12th, as many as eight people died. On June 14th, three to eight more people were killed by drone attacks. On June 23rd, the C.I.A. reportedly killed between two and six unidentified militants outside Makeen, and then killed dozens more people—possibly as many as eighty-six—during funeral prayers for the earlier casualties. An account in the Pakistani publication The News described ten of the dead as children. Four were identified as elderly tribal leaders. One eyewitness, who lost his right leg during the bombing, told Agence France-Presse that the mourners suspected what was coming: “After the prayers ended, people were asking each other to leave the area, as drones were hovering.” The drones, which make a buzzing noise, are nicknamed machay (“wasps”) by the Pashtun natives, and can sometimes be seen and heard, depending on weather conditions. Before the mourners could clear out, the eyewitness said, two drones started firing into the crowd. “It created havoc,” he said. “There was smoke and dust everywhere. Injured people were crying and asking for help.” Then a third missile hit. “I fell to the ground,” he said. The local population was clearly angered by the Pakistani government for allowing the U.S. to target a funeral. (Intelligence had suggested that Mehsud would be among the mourners.) An editorial in The News denounced the strike as sinking to the level of the terrorists. The Urdu newspaper Jang declared that Obama was “shutting his ears to the screams of thousands of women whom your drones have turned into dust.” U.S. officials were undeterred, continuing drone strikes in the region until Mehsud was killed. After such attacks, the Taliban, attempting to stir up anti-American sentiment in the region, routinely claims, falsely, that the victims are all innocent civilians. In several Pakistani cities, large protests have been held to decry the drone program. And, in the past year, perpetrators of terrorist bombings in Pakistan have begun presenting their acts as “revenge for the drone attacks.” In recent weeks, a rash of bloody assaults on Pakistani government strongholds has raised the spectre that formerly unaligned militant groups have joined together against the Zardari Administration. David Kilcullen, a counter-insurgency warfare expert who has advised General David Petraeus in Iraq, has said that the propaganda costs of drone attacks have been disastrously high. Militants have used the drone strikes to denounce the Zardari government—a shaky and unpopular regime—as little more than an American puppet. A study that Kilcullen co-wrote for the Center for New American Security, a think tank, argues, “Every one of these dead non-combatants represents an alienated family, a new revenge feud, and more recruits for a militant movement that has grown exponentially even as drone strikes have increased.” His co-writer, Andrew Exum, a former Army Ranger who has advised General Stanley McChrystal in Afghanistan, told me, “Neither Kilcullen nor I is a fundamentalist—we’re not saying drones are not part of the strategy. But we are saying that right now they are part of the problem. If we use tactics that are killing people’s brothers and sons, not to mention their sisters and wives, we can work at cross-purposes with insuring that the tribal population doesn’t side with the militants. Using the Predator is a tactic, not a strategy.” Exum says that he’s worried by the remote-control nature of Predator warfare. “As a military person, I put myself in the shoes of someone in fata”—Pakistan’s Federally Administered Tribal Areas—“and there’s something about pilotless drones that doesn’t strike me as an honorable way of warfare,” he said. “As a classics major, I have a classical sense of what it means to be a warrior.” An Iraq combat veteran who helped design much of the military’s doctrine for using unmanned drones also has qualms. He said, “There’s something important about putting your own sons and daughters at risk when you choose to wage war as a nation. We risk losing that flesh-and-blood investment if we go too far down this road.”

#### The impact is Middle East War and Pakistani collapse

Hussain 13 (Nazia, research scholar at the Terrorism, Transnational Crime and Corruption Center and a doctoral student at George Mason University, “Pakistan's Jihadi Problem and the Middle East,” Middle East Institute, 4-11, <http://www.mei.edu/content/pakistans-jihadi-problem-and-middle-east>)

Jihadi groups in Pakistan pose grave threats to the stability of the country and the surrounding region. Their operations and influence have extended from beyond the tribal areas to Pakistan’s cities. Along with countries such as Syria and Iraq, Pakistan has become a theater of doctrinal differences between Shia and Sunni Muslims, signifying that rifts between local groups have become linked to the wider violent sectarianism in the Middle East. This evolving composition of the “Jihadi problem” in Pakistan demonstrates that while jihadi groups may be based locally, their outlook is becoming increasingly transnational, and directly linked with the Middle East and the various conflicts raging within the region. The jihadi groups, mainly Tehreek-e-Taliban Pakistan (TTP) have become powerful enough to extend influence from beyond the tribal areas to major urban centers. Not only have they been operating in Quetta and Peshawar for some time, they are disbursing justice and instilling a reign of fear in Karachi, a city which contributes a quarter of Pakistan’s GDP. At the political level, this ease of functioning in Karachi is important as it means that they are in the process of displacing political parties such as Muttahida Qaumi Movement (MQM), Pakistan Peoples Party (PPP), and Awami National Party (ANP), thereby constricting political space for Pakistanis. In an open letter to Pakistanis, the TTP called upon them to boycott the elections as it would only mean a continuation of Western-style corrupt governance, but if they had to attend any political gatherings, to avoid those held by MQM, ANP, and PPP. The threats have worked to the effect that the secular ANP, which to date has represented Pashtuns in Pakistan, has been forced to go door-to-door for political canvassing, instead of holding political rallies. In Punjab, the sectarian Lashkar-e-Jhangvi (LeJ) has secured a political alliance with the ruling party of Pakistan Muslim League-Nawaz faction (PML-N), highlighting that it not only has a constituency that will vote for it, but also has political sway to forge a partnership with the ruling party. These developments point out that jihadi and sectarian groups have begun to command popular respect, and cannot be considered merely as foot soldiers of jihad that can be controlled by the state machinery. Slowly but surely, they are carving constituencies of support, instilling fear, or both, among the people of Pakistan. Adding to the conundrum, the ongoing Shia-Sunni conflict in the Middle East has spilled over into Pakistan. The trend of wreaking revenge on Pakistan’s Shia minority for ideological reasons as well as for the tactical purpose of avenging the suffering of Sunnis at the hands of the Alawite regime in Syria and the slights suffered under the Shia government in Iraq is disturbing. It manifests the fact that religious motivations of local sectarian groups are aligning with the interests of transnational entities such as Al Qaeda that believe in creating unrest in the already turbulent Syria and Iraq. Since the1980s, doctrinal differences between Sunnis and Shias have become a full-blown conflict in Pakistan. The country also has become a theater of competing ideologies of Sunni and Shia Islam, especially after the revolution in neighboring Iran. As a US diplomatic cable published by Wikileaks noted, an estimated $100 million a year from donors from the Gulf was supporting some of the hardline religious seminaries that have been responsible in creation of an extremist recruitment network in Punjab province. Vali Nasr traces the genesis of this problem in his book, The Shia Revival (p.160–162), pointing out that, ‘In the 1980s and the1990s, South Asia in general and Pakistan in particular served as the main battleground of the Saudi-Iranian and Sunni-Shia conflict. India and Pakistan were far more vulnerable to Shia assertiveness than the Arab countries...Pakistan was where Iran focused its attention first. There, as contrasted with the situation along the Iran-Iraq border, it would not be conventional war but rather ideological campaigns and sectarian inspired civil violence that would decide the outcome…The more aggressively Iran tried to influence the Shias of India and Pakistan, the more the Sunni ulama in those countries became determined to respond. After Iran organized Shia youth into student associations and supported the formation of a Pakistani Shia party modeled after Lebanon’s Amal, the Sunnis **began to form sectarian militias recruited from madrassas across the country**, including those that had been set up in the Pashtun region along the Afghan border to train fighters for the war against the Soviet Union. These militias enjoyed the backing not only of Islamabad but also of Riyadh and even for a time of Baghdad, as all three regimes saw Iranian influence in Pakistan as a strategic threat.” From the days of foreign governments supporting various factions to the use of the jihadi groups in India and Afghanistan, the situation has become even more complex. Different jihadi groups have not only become interlinked with each other for operational ease, they also share the goal of establishing an Islamic caliphate in Pakistan and beyond. In that respect, the dream of making Pakistan a truly Islamic state has become even more elusive. It can be argued that what these groups aspire for, in its distorted version, is striking at the heart of the ideological confusion that surrounded Pakistan and the possible role of Islam in its polity and society. Over the years, successive governments dabbled with the idea of finding a place for Islam in the new republic, but none did this more systematically than General Zia-ul-Haq. Not only was the use of Islam a useful tool to dilute the impact of populist appeal of Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto, it also provided a newborn constituency of Islamists and ulama to the Zia government. The new constituency of Islamists in Pakistan was further strengthened by support during the Afghan jihad days. The historical genesis of the jihadi groups is useful to understand, as it paints them as more than miscreants contributing to chaos in Pakistan, but more so, as people whose thinking and operations have been in the making for years. These groups, by their very actions, question the role of Islam ― and what version of Islam at that ― in the state of Pakistan. Furthermore, in their conception of Pakistan as an Islamic caliphate, and their worldview of not tolerating Shia interpretations of Islam, their actions are synchronizing with the current plight of Sunni brethren in the Middle East. In conclusion, the jihadi problem poses an existential problem not only in terms of the future of, and the role of Islam (and dominant interpretation of religion) in Pakistan, but is also connected to the Sunni-Shia conflict in the Middle East, as demonstrated in Iraq and Syria, and which threatens to affect other countries in the region as well. For policy makers in Pakistan and elsewhere, it is important to understand the nature of the “jihadi problem” as beyond the debate of terrorism and counterterrorism, and law and the absence of the rule of law. Hypothetically, neither can all Shias leave Pakistan, nor all extremist groups tried in courts of law. Instead, it is necessary to understand the multidimensional “jihadi problem” confronting Pakistan and the region. The links between national and transnational issues need to be recognized, in order to collaborate with Middle Eastern countries in preventing a Shia-Sunni conflagration that spans the length and breadth of the Muslim world. Lastly, policy makers should take into account the Pakistani people, who, if their loyalties are transferred to actors other than the state, can be the country’ undoing, or if their energies are harnessed, can provide the opportunity to turn things around. Pakistan needs to spend more on social sectors,[1] as well as improve governance throughout the country. **If the government will not cater to the needs of the people, they will have no option but to seek sustenance from actors who will. That could prove** tragic **for Pakistan and dangerous for its immediate neighbors and the international community**.

#### Goes nuclear

Michael O’Hanlon 5, senior fellow with the Center for 21st Century Security and Intelligence and director of research for the Foreign Policy program at the Brookings Institution, visiting lecturer at Princeton University, an adjunct professor at Johns Hopkins University, and a member of the International Institute for Strategic Studies
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Were Pakistan to collapse, it is unclear what the United States and like-minded states would or should do. As with North Korea, it is highly unlikely that “surgical strikes” to destroy the nuclear weapons could be conducted before extremists could make a grab at them. The United States probably would not know their location – at a minimum, scores of sites controlled by Special Forces or elite Army units would be presumed candidates – and no Pakistani government would likely help external forces with targeting information. The chances of learning the locations would probably be greater than in the North Korean case, given the greater openness of Pakistani society and its ties with the outside world; but U.S.-Pakistani military cooperation, cut off for a decade in the 1990s, is still quite modest, and the likelihood that Washington would be provided such information or otherwise obtain it should be considered small. If a surgical strike, series of surgical strikes, or commando-style raids were not possible, the only option would be to try to restore order before the weapons could be taken by extremists and transferred to terrorists. The United States and other outside powers might, for example, respond to a request by the Pakistani government to help restore order. Given the embarrassment associated with requesting such outside help, the Pakistani government might delay asking until quite late, thus complicating an already challenging operation. If the international community could act fast enough, it might help defeat an insurrection. Another option would be to protect Pakistan’s borders, therefore making it harder to sneak nuclear weapons out of the country, while only providing technical support to the Pakistani armed forces as they tried to quell the insurrection. Given the enormous stakes, the United States would literally have to do anything it could to prevent nuclear weapons from getting into the wrong hands. India would, of course, have a strong incentive to ensure the security of Pakistan’s nuclear weapons. It also would have the advantage of proximity; it could undoubtedly mount a large response within a week, but its role would be complicated to say the least. In the case of a dissolved Pakistani state, India likely would not hesitate to intervene; however, in the more probable scenario in which Pakistan were fraying but not yet collapsed, India’s intervention could unify Pakistan’s factions against the invader, even leading to the deliberate use of Pakistani weapons against India. In such a scenario, with Pakistan’s territorial integrity and sovereignty on the line and its weapons put into a “use or lose” state by the approach of the Indian Army, nuclear dangers have long been considered to run very high.

### Plan

#### The United States Federal Government should establish a limited ex ante judicial review process for targeted killing by drones.

### Solvency

#### Our procedural safeguard is key to minimize error and establish a credible signal

Somin, 13 [Ilya Somin Professor of Law HEARING ON “DRONE WARS: THE CONSTITUTIONAL AND COUNTERTERRORISM IMPLICATIONS OF TARGETED KILLING” TESTIMONY BEFORE THE UNITED STATES SENATE JUDICIARY SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE CONSTITUTION, CIVIL RIGHTS, AND HUMAN RIGHTS April 23, 2013]

In my view, the use of targeted killings by drones is not inherently illegal or immoral. It is a legitimate weapon of war in the struggle against al Qaeda and associated terrorist groups. However, serious constitutional and other problems arise if the US government fails to take proper care to ensure that the use of drones is strictly limited to legitimate terrorist targets. These dangers are likely to be at their most severe in the admittedly rare cases involving American citizens. I would urge the Subcommittee and Congress generally to consider adopting procedural safeguards that would minimize the likelihood of erroneous or illegal drone strikes. One proposal that deserves serious consideration is the establishment of an independent court that would oversee drone strikes in advance. 2 I. WHY TARGETED KILLING IS NOT INHERENTLY ILLEGAL OR IMMORAL. The Authorization for the Use of Military Force enacted by Congress on September 14, 2001 authorizes the president to “use all necessary and appropriate force against those nations, organizations, or persons he determines planned, authorized, committed, or aided the terrorist attacks that occurred on September 11, 2001, or harbored such organizations or persons, in order to prevent any future acts of international terrorism against the United States by such nations, organizations or persons.”1 This is generally understood as creating a legal state of war between the United States and Al Qaeda and its allies. The Supreme Court has recognized this, describing the conflict we are engaged in as “the war with al Qaeda.”2 Similarly, President Obama, like President George W. Bush before him, has emphasized that “we are indeed at war with Al Qaeda and its affiliates.”3 Thus, all three branches of government have recognized that a state of war exists, and that therefore the United States is entitled to use all measures normally permitted in warfare against its enemies. In wartime, the individualized targeting of an enemy commander is surely both legal and moral. During World War II, for example, the United States targeted Japanese Admiral Isoruku Yamamoto, and the British and Czechs successfully targeted German SS General Reinhard Heydrich.4 Few if any serious commentators claim that these operations and others like them were either illegal or morally dubious. If it is permissible to individually target a uniformed enemy officer, such as Admiral Yamamoto in World War II, it is surely legitimate to do the same to the leader of a terrorist organization. Indeed, it would be perverse if terrorist leaders enjoyed greater protection against targeting than uniformed military officers. Unlike the latter, terrorists do not even pretend to obey the laws of war. And they deliberately endanger civilians by choosing not to wear distinctive uniforms. To give terrorists greater protection against targeted killing than that enjoyed by uniformed military personnel would in effect reward and incentivize illegal behavior that endangers innocent civilians by making it harder to distinguish them from combatants. In some ways, individual targeting of terrorist leaders is actually more defensible than mass targeting of their underlings. Leaders usually bear greater moral and legal responsibility for the activities of their groups than do low-level members. And, at least in some cases, individual targeting of leaders is less likely to inflict collateral damage on civilians than conventional attacks on groups. This analysis does not change if the enemy leader happens to be an American citizen. Surely the targeting of Admiral Yamamoto would not have become illegal or immoral if he had acquired dual US citizenship while living in the United States during the 1920s. As Justice Sandra Day O’Connor noted in her majority opinion for the Supreme Court in Hamdi v. Rumsfeld, “[a] citizen, no less than an alien, can be part of or supporting forces hostile to the United States or coalition partners and engaged in an armed conflict against the United States.”5 Benjamin Wittes of the Brookings Institution correctly points out that “Americans have fought in foreign armies against their country in numerous armed conflicts in the past, and their citizenship has never relieved them of the risks of that belligerency.”6 Most obviously, nearly all the combatants arrayed against US forces in the Civil War were American citizens. Yet that did not prevent the Union Army from targeting them with lethal force or make it illegal to do so. Giving American citizens who join terrorist organizations blanket immunity from individual targeting is also problematic because it would increase terrorists’ incentives to recruit Americans. Obviously, a terrorist leader who is immune from individually targeted attack can be more effective than one who is not. There is also no reason to believe that the use of drones for such targeting raises any greater moral or legal problems than the use of conventional weapons such as air strikes, attacks by ground forces, or artillery. Drones can, of course, be used in ways that are illegal, unethical, or unwise. For example, they could be used to deliberately target civilians. But the same is true of virtually every other weapon of war. Given the existence of a state of war, I believe that the Obama administration was correct to conclude in its recently released White Paper that it is legal for the government to target US citizens who are “senior operational leader[s] of al-Qa’ida or an associated force.”7 Some critics of the Administration White Paper focus on the possible weaknesses of the memo’s three additional requirements for the targeted killing of a US citizen: that “(1) an informed, high-level official of the US government has determined that the targeted individual poses an imminent threat of violent attack against the United States, (2) capture is infeasible and the United States continues to monitor whether capture becomes feasible, and (3) the operation would be conducted in a manner consistent with applicable law of war principles.”8 Law Professor Gerard Magliocca, for example, argues that “[t]he White Paper says that a citizen is eligible for death-by-drone when ‘an informed, high-level, official of the U.S. government has determined that the targeted individual poses an imminent threat of violent attack against the United States.’ In my opinion, this threshold is too low.”9 But the “imminent threat” test applies only to people located outside the United States who are “senior operational leaders of al-Qa’ida or an associated force,” not to just anyone who “an informed...official” believes to be a threat.10 In other words, the requirements that the target pose an “imminent threat” and cannot be captured are in addition to the requirement that he be a senior leader of Al Qaeda or one of its “associated forces.” Once this key point is recognized, many of the objections to the memo are weakened. Indeed, a senior al Qaeda leader likely qualifies as a legitimate target even if he does not pose an “imminent threat.” It was surely permissible to target Admiral Yamamoto even if the US did not have any proof that he was planning “imminent” military operations against US forces. The fact that he was a top enemy commander in an ongoing war was enough. Here as elsewhere, there is no good reason to give terrorist leaders greater immunity from attack than that enjoyed by uniformed military officers. Even when the use of targeted killing is both legal and moral, it is not always prudent and wise. In, many cases, it might be desirable to refrain from otherwise unproblematic strikes in order to avoid antagonizing civilian populations in the relevant region, or for other strategic reasons. Such considerations are extremely important, but probably best left to those with greater expertise on the relevant issues than I possess. I note them here only to emphasize that I do not claim that the US government should indiscriminately resort to the use of targeted killing in every instance where it might be legally permissible to do so. To the contrary, a prudent government should exercise great caution in ordering such operations. II. THE TARGETING DILEMMA. Although the targeting of genuine al Qaeda leaders is legally and morally unproblematic, the administration’s policy of targeted killing still raises serious questions. The key issue is whether we are following rigorous enough procedures to ensure that the people targeted by drone strikes really are members of terrorist organizations at war with the United States. A. Choosing Targets. Unfortunately, identifying al Qaeda leaders is a far more difficult task than identifying enemy officers in a conventional war. Precisely because terrorists do not wear uniforms and often do not have a clear command structure, it is easy to make mistakes. And where US citizens are involved, there is the danger that the government will target someone merely because that person is a political enemy of the current administration. Even if officials are acting entirely in good faith, there is still a serious risk that innocent people will be targeted in error. The DOJ White Paper does not even consider the question of how we decide whether a potential target really is a terrorist leader or not. But that is the most difficult and dangerous issue that must be considered. The problem is not an easy one. On the one hand, war cannot wait on elaborate judicial processes. And we usually cannot give a potential target an opportunity to contest his designation in court without tipping him off. On the other hand, it is both dangerous and legally problematic to give the president and his subordinates unconstrained power to designate American citizens as “terrorist leaders” and then target them at will. A drone strike aimed at American citizen without adequate evidence showing that he or she is a terrorist combatant raises serious constitutional problems. In particular, it is likely to violate the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment, which forbids government deprivation of “life, liberty, or property without due process of law.”11 Legal scholars and jurists have spilled many barrels of ink debating the exact meaning of these words. But at the very least, they surely prevent the executive from unilaterally ordering the death of American citizen without at least some substantial proof that he is an enemy combatant, and perhaps an independent judicial determination thereof.12 As the Supreme Court has recognized, the Bill of Rights protects American citizens overseas, as well as domestically.13 Whether non-citizens are also entitled to the protection of the Due Process Clause when targeted beyond the boundaries of the United States is more disputable. Even though the text of the Amendment extends to all “persons,” some historical evidence suggests that the Due Process Clause was originally understood as not applying to foreigners outside US jurisdiction.14 The risk of either inadvertent or deliberate targeting of innocent people is heightened by the growing scale of targeted killing over the last several years. According to leading counterterrorism expert Peter Bergen, the Obama Administration conducted 283 drone strikes in Pakistan alone between 2009 and late 2012, more than six times as many as in the years of the George W. Bush administration.15 These strikes go well beyond targeting “senior” terrorists. Indeed, only 13% of them succeeded in killing a terrorist or “militant” leader.16 A recent analysis of government documents obtained by McClatchy Newspapers suggests that the vast majority of drone strikes under the Obama administration have been aimed at low-level al Qaeda and Taliban members.17 During a 12 month period ending in September 2011, McClatchy estimates that drone strikes in Pakistan killed some 482 people, of which only 8 were “senior al Qaida leaders” and 265 were low-level “militants.”18 Low- level terrorists and their allies are still legitimate targets. But the extension of the targeted killing program to cover such minor figures necessarily heightens the risk of error and abuse. A related challenge is the extension of targeted killings to cover radical Islamist groups that have few or no ties to al Qaeda or the Taliban. The AUMF only authorizes military action against “those nations, organizations, or persons he determines planned, authorized, committed, or aided the terrorist attacks that occurred on September 11, 2001, or harbored such organizations or persons.”19As Harvard Law School Professor and former head of the Office of Legal Counsel Jack Goldsmith points out, the AUMF “is a tenuous foundation for military action against newly threatening Islamist terrorist groups … that have ever-dimmer links to the rump al-Qaeda organization.”20 The difficulty of determining which groups are closely enough affiliated with al Qaeda to be covered by the AUMF also heightens the danger of error and abuse in target selection. In this testimony, I do not address the special issues raised by the potential use of targeted killings on American soil. But I agree with Attorney General Eric Holder’s recent statement indicating that the president does not “have the authority to use a weaponized drone to kill an American not engaged in combat on American soil.”21 B. Possible Institutional Safeguards. One partial solution to the problem of target selection would be to require officials to get advance authorization for targeting a United States citizen from a specialized court, similar to the FISA Court, which authorizes intelligence surveillance warrants for spying on suspected foreign agents in the United States. The specialized court could act faster than ordinary courts do and without warning the potential target, yet still serve as a check on unilateral executive power. In the present conflict, there are relatively few terrorist leaders who are American citizens. Given that reality, we might even be able to have more extensive judicial process than exists under FISA. Professor Amos Guiora of the University of Utah, a leading expert on legal regulation of counterterrorism operations with extensive experience in the Israeli military, has developed a proposal for a FISA-like oversight court that deserves serious consideration by this subcommittee, and Congress more generally.22 The idea of a drone strike oversight court has also been endorsed by former Secretary of Defense Robert Gates, who served in that position in both the Obama and George W. Bush administrations. Gates emphasizes that “some check 7 on the president’s ability to do this has merit as we look to the long-term future,” so that the president would not have the unilateral power of “being able to execute” an American citizen.23 We might even consider developing a system of judicial approval for targeted strikes aimed at non-citizens. The latter process might have to be more streamlined than that for citizens, given the larger number of targets it would have to consider. But it is possible that it could act quickly enough to avoid compromising operations, while simultaneously acting as a check on abusive or reckless targeting. However, the issue of judicial review for strikes against non-citizens is necessarily more difficult than a court that only covers relatively rare cases directed at Americans. Alternatively, one can envision some kind of more extensive due process within the executive branch itself, as advocated by Neal Katyal of the Georgetown University Law Center.24 But any internal executive process has the flaw that it could always be overriden by the president, and possibly other high-ranking executive branch officials. Moreover, lower-level executive officials might be reluctant to veto drone strikes supported by their superiors, either out of careerist concerns, or because administration officials are naturally likely to share the ideological and policy priorities of the president. An external check on targeting reduces such risks. External review might also enhance the credibility of the target-selection process with informed opinion both in the United States and abroad. Whether targeting decisions are made with or without judicial oversight, there is also an important question of burdens of proof. How much evidence is enough to justify classifying you or me as a senior Al Qaeda leader? The administration memo does not address that crucial question either. Obviously, it is unrealistic to hold military operations to the standards of proof normally required in civilian criminal prosecutions. But at the same time, we should be wary of giving the president unfettered power to order the killing of citizens simply based on his assertion that they pose a threat. Amos Guiora suggests that an oversight court should evaluate proposed strikes under a “strict scrutiny standard” that ensures that strikes are only ordered based on intelligence that is “reliable, material and probative.”25 It is difficult for me to say whether this standard of proof is the best available option. But the issue is a crucial one that deserves further consideration. Ideally, we need a standard of proof rigorous enough to minimize reckless or abusive use of targeted killing, but not so high as to preclude its legitimate use. Neither judicial review nor any other oversight system can completely eliminate all errors from the system. Given the limitations of intelligence and the fallibility of human decision-makers, some mistakes are probably inevitable. The only way avoid all error is to ban targeted killing entirely. But that approach might actually lead to greater loss of innocent life overall, by making it more difficult to combat terrorism and by incentivizing policymakers to use military tactics that often cause greater loss of life than targeted drone strikes. What we can hope to achieve is an oversight system that greatly diminishes the risk of serious abuse: targeted killings that are undertaken recklessly or - worse still – for the deliberate purpose of eliminating people who do not pose any genuine threat, but are merely attacked because they are critics of the government, or otherwise attracted the wrath of policymakers. Overall, we should seek to establish procedural safeguards that provide a check on executive discretion without miring the process in prolonged litigation that makes it impossible to conduct operations in “real time.” We cannot achieve anything approaching perfection. But it is reasonable to hope that we can improve on the status quo. Judicial oversight can help ensure that we are targeting the right individuals. But courts are less likely to be effective in addressing the problem of defining the range of groups that we are at war with. Our enemies probably are not limited to individuals formally affiliated with al Qaeda, since that organization has a variety of allies that support it. But the AUMF is not broad enough to cover all radical Islamist groups everywhere, nor is it desirable that we wage war against all of them. Ultimately, only Congress can properly clarify the scope of the conflict we are engaged in. Like many commentators and legal scholars across the political spectrum, I hope that Congress enacts a framework statute defining the scope of the War on Terror, and regulating the use of targeted killing, including appropriate procedural safeguards. So far, however, it has not chosen to do. It may take a highly visible disaster such as the deliberate or clearly reckless targeting of an obviously innocent person, to stimulate appropriate legislative action. At that point, it may be too late to reverse either the resulting harm to innocent people or the damage to the public image and foreign policy interests of the United States. But I very much hope that such a conjecture is unduly pessimistic.

#### Limited drone court is the only effective balancing mechanism

Weinberger, 13 [Dr. Weinberger is Associate Professor in the Department of Politics & Government at the University of Puget Sound, <https://blogs.commons.georgetown.edu/globalsecuritystudiesreview/2013/05/07/enemies-among-us-the-targeted-killing-of-american-members-of-al-qaeda-and-the-need-for-congressional-leadership/>]

Several people have voiced objections to the creation of a FISA-style “drone court.” One worries that a court of “generalist federal judges” will lack “national security expertise,” “are not accustomed to ruling on lightning-fast timetables,” and should not be able to involve themselves in “questions about whether to target an individual for assassination by a drone strike.”[22] Another writes that, “the determination of whether a person is a combatant to judicial review would seem to rather clearly violate the separation of powers requirements in the Constitution,” as in Ex Parte Milligan, the Supreme Court ruled that the congressional war power “extends to all legislation essential to the prosecution of the war…except such as interferes with the command of the forces and the conduct of campaigns,” which includes, the author argues, the “sole authority to determine who the specific combatants are when conducting a campaign.”[23] While in a traditional war such objections are almost certainly correct, in the context of the Hamdi decision and with the unconventional nature of the armed conflict against al Qaeda, they become less compelling. First, if properly defined, the new court could be limited solely to questions of eligibility, not the decision of whether and when to conduct a drone strike. The court would carry out a function quite similar to the FISA courts, judging whether the Executive Branch has sufficient evidence to support its claim that a citizen has become a senior operational member of a group covered under the AUMF and 2012 NDAA. This would differ little from the FISA courts’ assessments of Executive Branch requests to wiretap individuals believed to be agents of a foreign power without a warrant. Second, given the definition of imminent threat in the Department of Justice’s white paper – a definition that incorporates “considerations of the relevant window of opportunity, the possibility of reducing collateral damage to civilians, and the likelihood of heading off future disastrous attacks on Americans”[24] – such eligibility decisions are not likely to be made in the moments immediately prior to a drone strike. Rather, eligibility decisions are likely made in the process of long investigations and in light of much intelligence. Finally, while Anthony Arend is almost certainly correct that in nearly every other incidence of armed conflict, Congress would not be permitted to involve itself in determinations of who is and who is not an eligible target for the American military, as Hamdi makes clear, the armed conflict against al Qaeda is not like every other armed conflict. The Supreme Court has already inserted a judicial proceeding into the determination of whether an American citizen seized on the battlefield is actually an enemy combatant and therefore eligible for indefinite detention, a determination that traditionally has been solely within the purview of executive power. It would be counterintuitive – to say the least – if an American citizen could be killed, but not detained, without judicial involvement. Terrorism is, without question, a serious threat to the security of the United States. President Obama is currently employing military force under a legal authority granted by Congress in the 2001 AUMF and in Section 1021 of the 2012 NDAA. That legal authority gives the president the power to determine which groups are affiliated with al Qaeda, to identify American citizens who have assumed senior operational roles within those groups, and to kill those citizens through drone strikes or other means. However, while Congress may have given the president the power to order targeted killings, that does not mean that Congress cannot or should not alter the scope of that authority. Congress’s fundamental tasks are to define the contours of the American legal sphere, to determine the legal status of American citizens before the Executive Branch, and to protect the rights of U.S. citizens. America’s war against terrorism has produced myriad challenges to the civil liberties of American citizens: from the warrantless wiretapping program under President Bush to the military detention without trial of Yasir Hamdi to the targeted killing of Anwar al-Awlaki, the rights of American citizens have been tested as never before. If an opportunity exists to clarify and define that balance without unduly interfering with the president’s war powers, it should be taken. But that requires Congress to put aside its traditional reluctance to interfere with the conduct of military campaigns and exercise its own war powers. Unfortunately, Congress does not possess a stellar track record on this issue. Perhaps by using the Hamdi decision to point the way, Congress can be encouraged to step up to define and protect the most elemental right of all **–** the right not to be killed by one’s government without judicial involvement.

#### Ex ante review key to improve targeting and legitimize the program

McKelvey, 11 [Benjamin, JD Candidate, Senior Editorial Board, Vanderbilt Journal of Transnational Law, “Due Process Rights and the Targeted Killing of Suspected Terrorists: The Unconstitutional Scope of Executive Killing Power,” Vanderbilt Journal of Transnational Law, November, 44 VAND. J. TRANSNAT'L L. 1353, <http://www.vanderbilt.edu/jotl/2012/06/due-process-rights-and-the-targeted-killing-of-suspected-terrorists-the-unconstitutional-scope-of-executive-killing-power/>]

A. Option One: Congress Could Pass Legislation to Establish Screening and Oversight of Targeted Killing As the Aulaqi case demonstrates, any resolution to the problem of targeted killing would require a delicate balance between due process protections and executive power.204 In order to accomplish this delicate balance, Congress can pass legislation modeled on the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA) that establishes a federal court with jurisdiction over targeted killing orders, similar to the wiretapping court established by FISA.205 There are several advantages to a legislative solution. First, FISA provides a working model for the judicial oversight of real-time intelligence and national security decisions that have the potential to violate civil liberties.206 FISA also effectively balances the legitimate but competing claims at issue in Aulaqi: the sensitive nature of classified intelligence and national security decisions versus the civil liberties protections of the Constitution.207 A legislative solution can provide judicial enforcement of due process while also respecting the seriousness and sensitivity of executive counterterrorism duties.208 In this way, congress can alleviate fears over the abuse of targeted killing without interfering with executive duties and authority. Perhaps most importantly, a legislative solution would provide the branches of government and the American public with a clear articulation of the law of targeted killing.209 The court in Aulaqi began its opinion by explaining that the existence of a targeted killing program is no more than media speculation, as the government has neither confirmed nor denied the existence of the program.210 Congress can acknowledge targeted killing in the light of day while ensuring that it is only used against Americans out of absolutenecessity.211 Independent oversight would promote the use of all peaceful measures before lethal force is pursued.212 i. FISA as an Applicable Model FISA is an existing legislative model that is applicable both in substance and structure.213 FISA was passed to resolve concerns over civil liberties in the context of executive counterintelligence.214 It is therefore a legislative response to a set of issues analogous to the constitutional problems of targeted killing.215 FISA also provides a structural model that could help solve the targeted killing dilemma.216 The FISA court is an example of a congressionally created federal court with special jurisdiction over a sensitive national security issue.217 Most importantly, FISA works. Over the years, the FISA court has proven itself capable of handling a large volume of warrant requests in a way that provides judicial screening without diminishing executive authority.218 Contrary to the DOJ’s claims in Aulaqi, the FISA court proves that independent judicial oversight is institutionally capable of managing real-time executive decisions that affect national security.219 The motivation for passing FISA makes this an obvious choice for a legislative model to address targeted killing. With FISA, Congress established independent safeguards and a form of oversight in response to President Nixon’s abusive wiretapping practices.220 The constitutional concern in FISA involved the violation of Fourth Amendment privacy protections by excessive, unregulated executivepower.221 Similarly, the current state of targeted killing law allows for executive infringement on Fifth Amendment due process rights. Although there is no evidence of abusive or negligent practices of targeted killing, the main purpose of congressional intervention is to ensure that targeted killing is conducted only in lawful circumstances after a demonstration of sufficient evidence. Finally, a FISA-style court is a potentially effective possibility because it would provide ex ante review of targeted killing orders, and the pre-killing stage is the only stage during which judicial review would be meaningful.222 In the context of targeted killing, due process is not effective after the decision to deprive an American of life has already been carried out. Pre-screening targeted killing orders is a critical component of judicial oversight. Currently, this screening is conducted by a team of attorneys at the CIA.223 Despite assurances that review of the evidence against potential targets is rigorous and careful, due process is best accomplished through independent judicial review.224 The FISA court provides a working model for judicial review of real-time requests related to national security.225 FISA also established the requisite level of probable cause for clandestine wiretapping and guidelines for the execution and lifetime of the warrant, whereas the legal standards used by the CIA’s attorneys are unknown.226 The only meaningful way to ensure that Americans are not wrongfully targeted with lethal force is to screen the evidence for the decision and to give ultimate authority to an impartial judge with no institutional connection to the CIA.

#### Executive lead role spurs mistrust and global opposition

Goldsmith, 13 [May 1st, Jack Goldsmith teaches at Harvard Law School and is a member of the Hoover Institution Task Force on National Security and Law. He is the author, most recently, of Power and Constraint, How Obama Undermined the War on Terror http://www.newrepublic.com/article/112964/obamas-secrecy-destroying-american-support-counterterrorism]

And so Barack Obama greatly expanded the secret war that George W. Bush began. In the fall of 2009, Obama approved a "long list" of new CIA paramilitary operation proposals, as well as CIA requests for more armed drones, more spies, and larger targeting areas in Pakistan. "The CIA gets what it wants," said the president, approving the CIA requests, and conveying what Mazzetti thinks was his first-term attitude toward the Agency. The Department of Defense also got most of what it wanted. Obama approved an initiative by General David Petraeus to expand "military spying activities throughout the Muslim world," and gave special operations forces "even broader authorities to run spying missions across the globe" than they possessed under the Bush administration. Mazzetti describes Obama's souped-up secret war as "the way of the knife," a reference to Obama counterterrorism czar (and now CIA director) John Brennan's claim that the administration had replaced the "hammer" of large deployments with the "scalpel" of secret pinpoint missions. Its most famous use was the Abbottabad raid to kill bin Laden. But its most enduring legacy is Obama's significant expansion of the CIA and JSOC drone-strike campaign against Al Qaeda and affiliates, especially in Pakistan and Yemen. In 2009, the Obama administration conducted more drone strikes in those countries than the Bush administration had done in the seven years after 9/11; and to date, it has conducted almost nine times more drone strikes there than its predecessor. The administration's most controversial drone strike came against an American citizen, Anwar al-Awlaki, a leader of Al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula, the Yemeni organization responsible for the failed Detroit "underwear bomb" attack on Christmas in 2009 and other attempted attacks against the United States. Government lawyers gave the green light to kill al-Awlaki in 2010, but the administration had no idea where in Yemen he was. By 2011, the CIA and JSOC both had spies on the ground in Yemen and were "running two distinct drone wars," with different targeting lists, from bases in Saudi Arabia (for the CIA) and Ethiopia and Djibouti (for JSOC). In the fall of 2011, in part because of prior JSOC targeting mistakes and in part because of the CIA's extraordinary successes in Pakistan, Obama tasked the CIA alone with finding and killing al-Awlaki. On September 30, a CIA Reaper drone fired on a convoy near the Saudi Arabian desert and completed the mission. At the end of president Obama's first term, Mazzetti remarks, Americans seemed "little concerned about their government's escalation of clandestine warfare." By that point Obama's way of the knife had both decimated the senior leadership of Al Qaeda and reversed the Republicans' traditional advantage on national security. "Ask Osama bin Laden and the 22 out of 30 top Al Qaeda leaders who have been taken off the field whether I engage in appeasement," said the boastful president in December 2011, flicking away Republican charges that he was soft on terrorism. "Or whoever is left out there, ask them about that," he added. But in the last few months the Obama administration's secret war—and especially its drone program—have come under attack on multiple fronts. In 2011, The Washington Post reported the CIA's counterterrorism chief bragging of his Al Qaeda strikes that "we are killing these sons of bitches faster than they can grow them now." It is unclear whether this statement is true today. The core Al Qaeda organization appears debilitated. But its affiliate organizations are operating in Somalia, Yemen, and Iraq. And powerful new affiliates appear to be springing up elsewhere, including Al Qaeda in the Islamic Maghreb in post-Qaddafi North Africa, and the Al Nusra Front in revolutionary Syria. Secrecy is the essence of the type of war that Obama has chosen to fight. In this light, questions about the strategic success of Obama's drone campaign, and his secret war more generally, are growing. "We cannot kill our way to victory," former Congresswoman Jane Harman, who was a member of the House Intelligence Committee, testified in a counterterrorism hearing last month. General Stanley McChrystal, who presided over JSOC from 2003 to 2008, made a similar point in a recent interview in Foreign Affairs. The "danger of special operating forces," he noted, is that "you get this sense that it is satisfying, it's clean, it's low risk, it's the cure for most ills." But history provides no example of "a covert fix that solved a complex problem," he continued, adding that a too-heavy reliance on drone strikes is also "problematic" because "it's not a strategy in itself; it's a short-term tactic." One reason McChrystal questions the strategic efficacy of heavy reliance on drones is that "inhabitants of that area and the world have significant problems watching Western forces, particularly Americans, conduct drone strikes inside the terrain of another country." Last summer, Pew Research reported "considerable opposition" in "nearly all countries," and especially in predominantly Muslim countries, to Obama's drone program. It also found that Lebanon, Egypt, Jordan, and Pakistan now had a less favorable attitude toward the United States than at the end of the Bush administration. And a Gallup poll in February found that 92 percent of the people in Pakistan disapprove of the American leadership and 4 percent approve—historically bad numbers for the United States that are largely attributable to the way of the knife. These are discouraging numbers for a president who hoped to diminish the terrorism threat by establishing "a new beginning between the United States and Muslims ... based upon mutual interest and mutual respect," as Obama said in Cairo in 2009. The president added in that speech that the United States during the Bush era had acted "contrary to our ideals," and he pledged to "change course." But as the polls abroad show, Obama's change of course has not made the world think better of American ideals. Ben Emmerson, a United Nations special rapporteur on counter-terrorism and human rights, recently suggested that some American drone attacks might be war crimes. Since he launched an investigation in January, he has noted that most nations "heavily disput[e]" the legal theory underlying Obama's stealth wars, and concluded that American drone strikes violate Pakistan's sovereignty, contrary to international law. Most Americans are little interested in the popularity abroad of the way of the knife. To date, they very strongly support what they know about the president's drone campaign against foreign terrorist suspects. Support for targeting American citizens such as Anwar al-Awlaki, however, has dropped, and the focus on American citizens is affecting other elements of the way of the knife. In large part this has resulted from the administration's stilted explanations about the legal limits on killing Americans and the secret processes for placing American suspects on target lists. When a less-than-convincing Justice Department white paper on the topic leaked to the press in February, it stoked suspicions that the administration had big plans and something to hide. Questions grew when the administration continued to withhold legal memos from Congress, and when John Brennan danced around the issue during his confirmation hearings to be director of the CIA. Senator Rand Paul then cleverly asked Brennan whether the president could order a drone to kill a terrorist suspect inside the United States. When Brennan and Attorney General Eric Holder seemed to prevaricate, Paul conducted his now-famous filibuster. "I cannot sit at my desk quietly and let the president say that he will kill Americans on American soil who are not actively attacking the country," Paul proclaimed. The president never said, or suggested, any such thing. But with trust in Obama falling fast, Paul was remarkably successful in painting the secret wars abroad as a Constitution-defying threat to American citizens at home. Paul's filibuster attracted attention to the issue of drone attacks on Americans in the homeland. A more serious challenge to the president comes from growing concerns, including within his own party, about the legal integrity of his secret wars abroad. Anne-Marie Slaughter, a former senior official in Obama's State Department, recently gainsaid "the idea that this president would leave office having dramatically expanded the use of drones—including [against] American citizens—without any public standards and no checks and balances." Many in Congress want to increase the transparency of the processes and legal standards for placing a suspect (especially an American) on a targeting list, to tighten those legal standards (perhaps by recourse to a "drone court"), and to establish a more open accounting of the consequences (including civilian casualties) from the strikes. "This is now out in the public arena, and now it has to be addressed," Senator Dianne Feinstein, a Democrat, recently said. Others in Congress worry about the obsolescence of the legal foundation for the way of the knife: the congressional authorization, in 2001, of force against Al Qaeda. "I don't believe many, if any, of us believed when we voted for [the authorization] that we were voting for the longest war in the history of the United States and putting a stamp of approval on a war policy against terrorism that, 10 years plus later, we're still using," said Senator Richard Durbin, also a Democrat, in a Wall Street Journal interview. "What are the checks and balances of the system?" he asked. Senator John McCain, who led bipartisan efforts against what he saw as Bush-era legal excesses, is now focusing similar attention on Obama. "I believe that we need to revisit this whole issue of the use of drones, who uses them, whether the CIA should become their own air force, what the oversight is, [and] what the legal and political foundations [are] for this kind of conflict," he said last month. These are unhappy developments for the president who in his first inaugural address pledged with supercilious confidence that, unlike his predecessor, he would not expend the "rule of law" for "expedience's sake." Obama reportedly bristles at the legal and political questions about his secret war, and the lack of presidential trust that they imply. "This is not Dick Cheney we're talking about here," he recently pleaded to Democratic senators who complained about his administration's excessive secrecy on drones, according to Politico. And yet the president has ended up in this position because he committed the same sins that led Cheney and the administration in which he served to a similar place. The first sin is an extraordinary institutional secrecy that Obama has long promised to reduce but has failed to. In part this results from any White House's inevitable tendency to seek maximum protection for its institutional privileges and prerogatives. The administration's disappointing resistance to sharing secret legal opinions about the secret war with even a small subset of Congress falls into this category. Much of what the administrat-ion says about its secret war seems incomplete, self-serving, and ultimately non-credible. But the point goes deeper, for secrecy is the essence of the type of war that Obama has chosen to fight. The intelligence-gathering in foreign countries needed for successful drone strikes there cannot be conducted openly. Nor can lethal operations in foreign countries easily be acknowledged. Foreign leaders usually insist on non-acknowledgment as a condition of allowing American operations in their territories. And in any event, an official American confirmation of the operations might spark controversies in those countries that would render the operations infeasible. The impossible-to-deny bin Laden raid was a necessary exception to these principles, and the United States is still living with the fallout in Pakistan. 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 oftheseparation 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. Administration officials resist this route because they worry about the outcome of the public debate, and because the president is, as The Washington Post recently reported, "seen as reluctant to have the legislative expansion of another [war] added to his legacy." But the administration can influence the outcome of the debate only by engaging it. And as Mazzetti makes plain, the president's legacy already includes the dramatic and unprecedented unilateral expansion of secret war. What the president should be worried about for legacy purposes is that this form of warfare, for which he alone is today responsible, is increasingly viewed as illegitimate.

#### Legal constraints key—codified clarity key to norms

HRI, 11 [Human Rights Institute, Targeting Operations with Drone Technology: Humanitarian Law Implications Background Note for the American Society of International Law Annual Meeting Human Rights Institute, Columbia Law School March 25, 2011, p. online]

While they disagree on important legal issues, critics and proponents alike share at least one significant concern: drones may be the future of warfare, and the U.S. may soon find itself “on the other end of the drone,” as other governments and armed non-state groups develop drone technology. Yet **discussions of** the **legal constraints lag behind** the rapid advances in technological capability and deployment. Even those who believe that the U.S. government’s use of drone technology is carefully calibrated to adhere to applicable law worry that other governments or non-state groups will cite the U.S. government’s silence on legal questions as justification to shirk from transparency about their practice or even openly flout the law. In this paper, we describe three questions arising from the U.S. government’s use of drone technology, focusing on ambiguities in the government’s position which scholars have debated: the scope of the armed conflict; who may be targeted; and the legal and policy implications of who conducts the targeting. These questions stem not so much from drone technology itself, but from the kind of warfare for which the U.S. is currently using drones. Scholars and experts have sharply disagreed about the answers to these questions, but it is telling that a core set of issues has emerged as the shared focus for individuals from across the ideological spectrum. Ambiguity on these core issues exists despite **the Administration’s efforts** to establish the legality of targeting practices—most notably, State Department Legal Adviser Harold Koh’s address at the 2010 annual meeting of the American Society of International Law. Some scholars laud Koh’s speech as divorcing the Administration from an approach that invokes the privileges of the law of war while dismissing the relevance of it duties and restraints. Observers have recognized that Koh’s address reflects the Administration’s desire to legitimize its policy through forthrightness about the constraints imposed by law. However, scholars disagree about the functional difference between the paradigm of the “global war against terrorism” and the Administration’s articulation, in a variety of fora, of an armed conflict against al Qaeda, the Taliban and associated forces. Some observers have argued that without further explanation, the Administration’s position confirms the relevancy of humanitarian law but leaves unanswered questions fundamental to assessing the legality of U.S. practice. We agree that where significant ambiguity exists, it leaves the U.S. government vulnerable to challenges about the sincerity of its commitment to the rule of law. In the near future, ambiguity may also weaken the government’s ability to argue for constraints on the practice of less law-abiding states. Clarity about U.S. legal standards and policy, as we describe in this paper, would not require disclosure of classified information about who is targeted, or intelligence sources and methods. We recognize that rules of engagement are classified and vary based on the theater of combat. Instead, we encourage clarification of the existence or character of legal justifications TARGETING WITH DRONE TECHNOLOGY: HUMANITARIAN LAW IMPLICATIONS HUMAN RIGHTS INSTITUTE, COLUMBIA LAW SCHOOL 3 and standards, and generic procedural safeguards, about which scholars and experts have debated. To be sure, not all the scholars and observers whose views we present believe that the government needs to disclose more information about its legal standards and procedures. Some have objected to court scrutiny of the government’s standards or justifications. Many observers are concerned that further government clarification would require divulging sensitive information, or at least information that the government has not historically made public. They point to the extent to which the questions we raise involve not just legal standards, but policy determinations. These observers’ concerns, and countervailing concerns about the expansive or unbounded scope of the armed conflict referenced by the Administration, require further discussion—one we attempt to set the foundation for, by identifying particular areas of ambiguity and debate. For some issues, scholars disagree with each others’ characterization of the government’s position. For other issues, they agree that the government’s position is unknown. On still other issues, the question of the government’s position is relegated to the background in favor of a highly contested debate among scholars and practitioners about the relevance of the law or the practicability of a legal standard. Yet in each case, disagreement among scholars underscores the need for clarity about the U.S. government’s position. U.S. legal standards and policies are a necessary starting point

for discussions among scholars, yet they are such a “moving target”—or simply a target in the fog—that discussions can be expected to devolve to speculation. Disagreement among scholars, to some degree, reflects a necessarily myopic understanding of government policy. At least to that extent, the government non-disclosure may undermine the robustness of debate among scholars and practitioners about humanitarian law standards, and effectively halt sound legal analysis of U.S. practice. Limiting scholarly debate would be detrimental to the development of clear legal standards that aid, rather than undermine, U.S. armed forces charged with conducting targeting operations. Insofar as government non-disclosure prevents public or legal accountability, it also undermines the U.S. government’s message to the international community, so evident in Koh’s ASIL speech, of commitment to the rule of law.

## 2ac

### AT: T Restriction

#### We meet – contextual ev

Guiora, 12 [Amos, Professor of Law, SJ Quinney College of Law, University of Utah, author of numerous books dealing with military law and national security including Legitimate Target: A Criteria-Based Approach to Targeted Killing, “Drone Policy: A Proposal Moving Forward,” <http://jurist.org/forum/2013/03/amos-guiora-drone-policy.php>]

To re-phrase, this strict scrutiny test seeks to strike a balance by enabling the state to act sooner but subjecting that action to significant restrictions. This paradigm would be predicated on narrow definitions of imminence and legitimate targets. Rather than enabling the consequences of the DOJ memo, the strict scrutiny test would ensure implementation of person-specific operational counterterrorism. That is the essence of targeted killing conducted in accordance with the rule of law and morality in armed conflict.

#### Restrict doesn’t mean prohibit

**Coffey, 82** - US Circuit Judge, dissenting (VICTOR D. QUILICI, ROBERT STENGL, et al., GEORGE L. REICHERT, and ROBERT E. METLER, Plaintiffs-Appellants, v. VILLAGE OF MORTON GROVE, et al., Defendants-Appellees Nos. 82-1045, 82-1076, 82-1132 UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT 695 F.2d 261; 1982 U.S. App. LEXIS 23560, lexis)

Pursuant to section 83, a municipality can enact an ordinance reasonably restricting or confining the use and possession of firearms. A municipality can also require registration of firearm ownership. What the legislature has authorized is limited regulation of firearm possession by local units of government, but not prohibition. Section 83 does not allow a municipality such as Morton Grove to categorically prohibit handgun possession. [\*\*35] To limit or restrict involves a circumscription which falls far short of an absolute prohibition.

"The words 'prohibit' and 'restrict' are not synonymous. They are not alike in their meaning in their ordinary use . . . . 'To restrict is to restrain within bounds; to limit; to confine and does not mean to destroy or prohibit.'"

### AT: Boot

#### Drones good not unique, proves the internal link and impact are empirically denied

Ackerman, 12/31/13 [President Barack Obama’s mid-year decision to wind down drone, Spencer, The Guardian news, <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2013/dec/31/deaths-drone-strikes-obama-policy-change>]

President Barack Obama’s mid-year decision to wind down drone strikes has accounted for a lower number of deaths resulting from such actions in 2013, newly compiled data indicates. Sifting through the estimates of three non-governmental organizations, the Council on Foreign Relations scholar Micah Zenko published on Tuesday a tally of drone strikes in Pakistan, Yemen and Somalia, the central theaters of deadly and formally undeclared counterterrorism operations run in official secrecy. While specific figures are difficult to narrow down and even harder to verify, the number of strikes, almost exclusively by drones, declined in 2013, as did the casualties they caused. Between the three countries, there were around 55 strikes this year, a substantial drop from the roughly 92 in 2012. In 2013 the strikes killed up to 271 people, down from an estimate of between 505 and 532 in 2012. Approximately one in every nine to 10 deaths is a civilian. The data comes from estimates compiled by the New America Foundation, the Long War Journal and the Bureau of Investigative Journalism. Yet attempts to correlate the decline in strikes to a decline in specific threats are blocked by secrecy, diplomatic contingency and political convenience, Zenko said. With the drawdown of the US wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, Zenko said, “there has never been more available, both dedicated US and leased, satellite bandwidth; never been more strike drones available; and there’s more people who can watch full-motion video [for targeting]. There has never been more assets available to kill people and strikes are going down. There’s been a policy decision, and I think they’ve been correct to emphasize that.” A number of counterterrorism scholars consider 2013 to have been a good year for terrorist groups that claim to be motivated by Islam. Daveed Gartenstein-Ross of the conservative Foundation for the Defense of Democracies cited a “regeneration” for al-Qaida – although the regeneration Gartenstein-Ross cited occurred among “affiliate” groups of varying connection to the organization that attacked the US on 9/11, and in places mostly outside the reach of drones, such as Mali, Libya, Syria and Iraq. The exception is Somalia, where al-Shabab, an Islamist militia that formally joined al-Qaida in 2012, launched a handful of terrorist attacks in the capital, Mogadishu, and a dramatic, deadly assault on Kenya’s Westgate mall in September that killed 70 people. The US responded with what is believed to be the only missile strike of the year, apparently launched from a drone in October and leaving two dead. 'They have not opened a new front' But despite the strength of groups believed to be aligned with al-Qaida, observers are yet to see an affiliated rise in either the groups’ sophistication or ability and ambition to attack the US at home. US officials and sympathetic analysts in 2013 talked more of threats to “US interests” than threats to the American people. The only domestic attack in 2013 that might be considered jihadism came at the Boston marathon in April, from two brothers with no known connection to any terrorist organization. The actual threat posed by jihadist terrorism in 2013 remains the subject of fierce and unresolved debate. In May, Obama signaled a discomfort with the rise in drone strikes that have become synonymous with his stewardship of counterterrorism, during a speech at the National Defense University. While Obama did not pledge to end the strikes – and indeed sharply defended them – he placed new emphasis on avoiding them. Zenko said the available data did not show “big changes pre-speech or post-speech”, but did indicate that the strikes had, at least temporarily, stopped proliferating. “To their credit, they have not opened a new front in Syria, Iraq or North Africa,” Zenko said. While the strikes did not end after the speech, there was an increase in raids, from Libya to Somalia, conducted by elite troops and the CIA and aiming to capture terrorist operatives rather than kill them. Administration officials have stopped short of declaring such raids a policy shift – either because no such shift occurred or because the veil of secrecy surrounding drone strikes prevents such a declaration. The data also points to other patterns that cut against the Obama administration’s typical contention that the strikes kill senior terrorist leaders, the standard the president set in the president's May speech. In tribal Pakistan, the initial front of US drone strikes, there was a steep rise in strikes in 2010 and a continued high rate in 2011, followed by a decline in 2012 and a steeper decline in 2013. The pattern fits the rise and fall of the US troop surge in neighboring Afghanistan, suggesting that the strikes in Pakistan had more to do with protecting nearby US troops than killing al-Qaida’s top operatives. Zenko gave Obama “a lot of credit” for acknowledging the so-called “force protection” component of the Pakistan strikes in his May speech – a detail that got little media attention. “No longer was there just the nonsense of a significant, imminent threat to the homeland,” Zenko said. There is no comparable US troop presence in Yemen, but strikes in Yemen, a relative rarity before the 2010 rise of al-Qaida’s local affiliate, swelled to more than 40 in 2012, before dropping off this year to around 26. The drop occurred despite a highly-publicized threat warning in the summer, attributed to the group, that prompted the closure of regional US diplomatic facilities and a temporary rise in strikes on Yemen. When Zenko took a closer look at local announcements of Yemen strikes by the US-sponsored security departments, he said, he found them typically attributed to reports of threats to the Yemeni military or police; generic “threat warnings”; or to US diplomats. While government statements on counterterrorism provide no guarantee of truth, those in Yemen rarely had to do with attempts on the United States. Counterterrorism run amok? Protest against US drone attacks People burn a mock US flag during a protest against US drone attacks in Pakistan. Photograph: STR/EPA As with Guantánamo Bay and bulk surveillance by the National Security Agency, drone strikes have become an international symbol of US counterterrorism efforts run amok. The new government of Pakistan has made the strikes a point of diplomatic contention with Washington, although the country's security services have facilitated them in the past. In Yemen, where the government is more openly aligned with the US on counterterrorism, anger about and fear of drones have become a cultural phenomenon, as a local activist testified to the Senate in the spring, citing parents who used threats of the drones to discipline misbehaving children. In October, the United Nations special rapporteur investigating drone strikes, Ben Emmerson, cited 33 cases in which drone strikes, mostly by the US, killed civilians and potentially violated international law. Emmerson called on the US government to lift the veil of secrecy surrounding the strikes, which are conducted by the CIA and the military’s Joint Special Operations Command, an elite force that has even fewer requirements to brief legislators than does the CIA. Obama’s speech in May did not yield greater transparency on what the administration has called “targeted killing”. That, Zenko said, obscured an analysis of the 2013 frequency of “signature strikes”, the most notorious of US counterterrorism efforts: operations that kill not specific, known terrorists but individuals, often “military aged males”, believed to fit a pattern of terrorist behavior. “They can’t say they’re stopping signature strikes,” Zenko said, “because it acknowledges they’ve done them.”

#### Not zero sum – drones don’t trade off with boots on the ground

Alan W. **Dowd**, writer on National Defense, Foreign Policy, and International Security, Winter-Spring **2013**, “Drone Wars: Risks and Warnings,” Strategic Studies Institute, http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pubs/parameters/Issues/WinterSpring\_2013/1\_Article\_Dowd.pdf

As Michael Ignatieff asked in 2000, years before the drone war began, “If war becomes unreal to the citizens of modern democracies, will they care enough to restrain and control the violence exercised in their name . . . if they and their sons and daughters are spared the hazards of combat?”29 That question is directly linked to policymakers in the drone age. The risks policymakers take with UCAVs are greater because the accountability is less than with manned aircraft. After all, the loss of a drone is the loss of nothing more than metal. “More willing to lose is more willing to use,” as Daniel Haulman of the Air Force Historical Research Agency puts it.30 Yet as America’s deepening involvement in Yemen underscores, drones may actually make boots-on-the-ground intervention more likely. To identify new targets and authenticate existing targets for the drone war, Washington has quietly sent US troops into Yemen. According to unnamed military officials, the contingent of American troops is growing.31 As the troops identify targets, they become targets. Thus, far from preventing more direct and riskier forms of military engagement, drones are encouraging such engagement—even as many of their operators paradoxically carry out their lethal missions from the safety of bases in Nevada or New Mexico

#### Tradeoff already happened – there is a preference against drones now

Naureen **Shah et al**, Acting Director of the Human Rights Clinic and Associate Director of the Counterterrorism and Human Rights Project, Human Rights Institute at Columbia Law School, **2012**, “The Civilian Impact of Drones: Unexamined Costs, Unanswered Questions,” Center for Civilians in Conflict, http://civiliansinconflict.org/uploads/files/publications/The\_Civilian\_Impact\_of\_Drones\_w\_cover.pdf

The Obama Administration has recognized the importance of pursuing alternatives to lethal targeting, as reflected in its repeatedly stated preference against killing in favor of capture operations.395 In an April 2012 speech, counterterrorism adviser John Brennan emphasized that the Administration prefers capture because it “allows us to gather valuable intelligence” and carries the potential to prosecute detainees in federal courts or military commissions.396 Moreover, Attorney General Eric Holder has described the preference for capture where feasible as—at least for US citizens—a matter of due process and legal requirement. 397 Conflictingly, in leaks, some Administration officials have noted that capture is not feasible because there is “nowhere to put them”—that in practice, there is no detention option.398 The stated US preference against lethal targeting is consonant with the principle of humanity, a requirement of the laws of war. The principle of humanity does not expressly require capture attempts, but involves a “complex assessment” of whether “the precise amount of force” used causes “no more death, injury, or destruction be caused than is actually necessary for the accomplishment of a legitimate military purpose in the prevailing circumstances.”399 The aim of the principle of humanity is “to avoid error, arbitrariness, and abuse.”400 In this sense, the principle of humanity is a corollary of human rights principles that deprivation of the right to life must not be arbitrary: that there must be a valid reason for using force, and that it must not be greater than absolutely necessary.401

### AT: Terrorism

#### No risk of nuclear terrorism---too many obstacles

John J. Mearsheimer 14, R. Wendell Harrison Distinguished Service Professor of Political Science at the University of Chicago, “America Unhinged”, January 2, nationalinterest.org/article/america-unhinged-9639?page=show

Am I overlooking the obvious threat that strikes fear into the hearts of so many Americans, which is terrorism? Not at all. Sure, the United States has a terrorism problem. But it is a minor threat. There is no question we fell victim to a spectacular attack on September 11, but it did not cripple the United States in any meaningful way and another attack of that magnitude is highly unlikely in the foreseeable future. Indeed, there has not been a single instance over the past twelve years of a terrorist organization exploding a primitive bomb on American soil, much less striking a major blow. Terrorism—most of it arising from domestic groups—was a much bigger problem in the United States during the 1970s than it has been since the Twin Towers were toppled.¶ What about the possibility that a terrorist group might obtain a nuclear weapon? Such an occurrence would be a game changer, but the chances of that happening are virtually nil. No nuclear-armed state is going to supply terrorists with a nuclear weapon because it would have no control over how the recipients might use that weapon. Political turmoil in a nuclear-armed state could in theory allow terrorists to grab a loose nuclear weapon, but the United States already has detailed plans to deal with that highly unlikely contingency.¶ Terrorists might also try to acquire fissile material and build their own bomb. But that scenario is extremely unlikely as well: there are significant obstacles to getting enough material and even bigger obstacles to building a bomb and then delivering it. More generally, virtually every country has a profound interest in making sure no terrorist group acquires a nuclear weapon, because they cannot be sure they will not be the target of a nuclear attack, either by the terrorists or another country the terrorists strike. Nuclear terrorism, in short, is not a serious threat. And to the extent that we should worry about it, the main remedy is to encourage and help other states to place nuclear materials in highly secure custody.

#### No retaliation—definitely no escalation

**Mueller 5** (John, Professor of Political Science – Ohio State University, Reactions and Overreactions to Terrorism, <http://polisci.osu.edu/faculty/jmueller/NB.PDF>)

However, history clearly demonstrates that overreaction is not necessarily inevitable. Sometimes, in fact, leaders have been able to restrain their instinct to overreact. Even more important, **restrained reaction--or even capitulation to terrorist acts--has often proved to be entirely acceptable politically**. That is, there are many instances where leaders did nothing after a terrorist attack (or at least refrained from overreacting) and did not suffer politically or otherwise. Similarly, after an unacceptable loss of American lives in Somalia in 1993, Bill Clinton responded by withdrawing the troops without noticeable negative impact on his 1996 re-election bid. Although Clinton responded with (apparently counterproductive) military retaliations after the two U.S. embassies were bombed in Africa in 1998 as discussed earlier, his administration did not have a notable response to terrorist attacks on American targets in Saudi Arabia (Khobar Towers) in 1996 or to the bombing of the U.S.S. Cole in 2000, and these non-responses never caused it political pain. George W. Bush's response to the anthrax attacks of 2001 did include, as noted above, a costly and wasteful stocking-up of anthrax vaccine and enormous extra spending by the U.S. Post Office. However, beyond that, it was the same as Clinton's had been to the terrorist attacks against the World Trade Center in 1993 and in Oklahoma City in 1995 and the same as the one applied in Spain when terrorist bombed trains there in 2004 or in Britain after attacks in 2005: the dedicated application of police work to try to apprehend the perpetrators. This approach was politically acceptable even though the culprit in the anthrax case (unlike the other ones) has yet to be found. The demands for retaliation may be somewhat more problematic in the case of suicide terrorists since the direct perpetrators of the terrorist act are already dead, thus sometimes impelling a vengeful need to seek out other targets. Nonetheless, the attacks in Lebanon, Saudi Arabia, Great Britain, and against the Cole were all suicidal, yet no direct retaliatory action was taken. **Thus, despite short-term demands that some sort of action must be taken**, experience suggests politicians can often successfully ride out this demand after the obligatory (and inexpensive) expressions of outrage are prominently issued.

#### The plan only results in a minimal change to the amount of strikes, but averts a wider public and allied backlash that kills the program

Johnson, 13 [Jeh, former Pentagon General Counsel, 3/18/13, “Keynote address at the Center on National Security at Fordham Law School: A “Drone Court”: Some Pros and Cons,” <http://www.lawfareblog.com/2013/03/jeh-johnson-speech-on-a-drone-court-some-pros-and-cons/>]

The problem is that the American public is suspicious of executive power shrouded in secrecy. In the absence of an official picture of what our government is doing, and by what authority, many in the public fill the void **by envisioning the worst**. They see dark images of civilian and military national security personnel in the basement of the White House – acting, as Senator Angus King put it, as “prosecutor, judge, jury and executioner” — going down a list of Americans, deciding for themselves who shall live and who shall die, pursuant to a process and by standards no one understands. Our government, in speeches given by the Attorney General,[2] John Brennan,[3] Harold Koh,[4] and myself,[5] makes official disclosures of large amounts of information about its efforts, and the legal basis for those efforts, but it is never enough, because the public doesn’t know what it doesn’t know, but knows there are things their government is still withholding from them. The revelation 11 days ago that the executive branch does not claim the authority to kill an American non-combatant – something that was not, is not, and should never be an issue – is big news, and trumpeted as a major victory for congressional oversight. A senator who filibusters the government’s secrecy is compared in iconic terms to Jimmy Stewart. At the same time, through continual unauthorized leaks of sensitive information, our government looks to the American public as undisciplined and hypocritical. One federal court has characterized the government’s position in FOIA litigation as “Alice in Wonderland,”[6] while another, this past Friday, referred to it as “neither logical nor plausible.”[7] An anonymous, unclassified white paper leaked to NBC News prompts more questions than it answers. Our government finds itself in a lose-lose proposition: it fails to officially confirm many of its counterterrorism successes, and fails to officially confirm, deny or clarify unsubstantiated reports of civilian casualties. Our government’s good efforts for the safety of the people risks an erosion of support by the people. It is in this atmosphere that the idea of a national security court as a solution to the problem — an idea that for a long time existed only on the margins of the debate about U.S. counterterrorism policy but is now entertained by more mainstream thinkers such as Senator Diane Feinstein and a man I respect greatly, my former client Robert Gates – has gained momentum. To be sure, a national security court composed of a bipartisan group of federal judges with life tenure, to approve targeted lethal force, would bring some added levels of credibility, independence and rigor to the process, and those are worthy goals. In the eyes of the American public, judges are for the most part respected for their independence. In the eyes of the international community, a practice that is becoming increasingly controversial would be placed on a more credible footing. A national security court would also help answer the question many are asking: what do we say to other nations who acquire this capability? A group of judges to approve targeted lethal force would set a standard and an example. Further, as so-called “targeted killings” become more controversial with time, I believe there are some decision-makers within the Executive Branch who actually wouldn’t mind the added comfort of judicial imprimatur on their decisions. But, we must be realistic about the degree of added credibility such a court can provide. Its proceedings would necessarily be ex parte and in secret, and, like a FISA court, I suspect almost all of the government’s applications would be granted, because, like a FISA application, the government would be sure to present a compelling case. So, at the same time the New York Times editorial page promotes a FISA-like court for targeted lethal force, it derides the FISA court as a “rubber stamp” because it almost never rejects an application.[[8]](file:///%5C%5Cfpfgsc01%5Cfiles%5Cusers%5Cbwittes%5CDownloads%5CJohnson%20speech%20at%20Fordham%20LS.docx#_ftn8) How long before a “drone court” operating in secret is criticized in the same way?

#### Allied and public backlash kills the program – the plan is a key middle path

Zenko, 13 [Micah, fellow in the Center for Preventive Action (CPA) at the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR). Previously, he worked for five years at the Harvard Kennedy School and in Washington, DC, at the Brookings Institution, Congressional Research Service, and State Department's Office of Policy Planning, Council Special Report No. 65, January 2013, “U.S. Drone Strike Policies”, i.cfr.org/content/publications/attachments/Drones\_CSR65.pdf‎]

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

#### Operations link arg wrong

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

National Security Concerns A major concern for the military and intelligence community would likely be **the effect** of the CTRC **on operational freedom** of movement. Assessing the effect on targeting operations is difficult, as little is known publicly about the current procedures used for targeting individuals.79 For the military and the CIA, every indication, both from press and government accounts, suggests that there are very rigorous controls on the targeting process, though intra-executive in nature.80 For example, according to one press account, an individual can only become a military target when his enemy status is confirmed by “two verifiable human sources” and “substantial additional evidence.”81 Moreover, according to publicly released documents, before every operation, the military undergoes a “Joint Targeting Cycle” which requires (1) identification of the military objective of an operation, (2) target development and prioritization, (3) capabilities analysis, (4) commander’s decision and force assignment, (5) mission planning and force exe-cution, and (6) assessment.82 Before an attack, the military must “engage the intelligence community (IC) and other organizations’ subject-matter experts (SMEs) to establish a reasonable level of confidence in a candidate target’s functional characterization based on a review of the supporting intelligence” 83 and perform a collateral damage assessment.84 Although not as public, the CIA apparently also has robust internal targeting procedures. Former CIA Director Leon Panetta apparently approved each strike, “sometimes reversing his decision or reauthorizing a target if the situation on the ground change[d].”85 According to one journalistic account, “[a] look at the bureaucracy behind the operations reveals that it is multilayered and methodical, run by a corps of civil servants who carry out their duties in a professional manner.”86 Lawyers draft cables based on available intelligence to justify targeting an individual. These cables are known to be “legalistic and carefully argued, often running up to five pages.”87 The purpose of surveying the known targeting procedures is to demonstrate that there is already a rigorous intra-executive process in place, and therefore much of the information required for CTRC approval is already being accumulated. Many, if not most, targeting operations involve long term efforts to locate specific individuals. For example, al-Awlaki was initially approved for targeted killing in April 2010, but was not killed until nearly a year and half later. There is already a list of prioritized targets, known as the Joint Integrated Prioritized Target List (JIPTL), who “can be captured or killed at any time.”88 Any citizen on that list could be put through the GTP with hearings before the CTRC. The CTRC would be a novel structure—one thatThe CTRC would be a novel structure—one that the military and the CIA would likely and understandably perceive as a judicial impediment to their mission of protecting national security. This Article does not make the claim that the CTRC would have no operational effect. Rather, it will and it should. That effect will force the military and the CIA to think carefully before targeting U.S. citizens. However, the operational effect can and will be mitigated to protect national security. For those operations where the time horizon is more condensed—in such a way as to make formal GTP hearings before the CTRC impossible—there is the emergency mechanism. Importantly, independent judicial review over targeting, while novel in the American context, has already been implemented in Israel, a country that faces serious security exigencies as well.89 While the CTRC may present certain operational challenges, the value of American citizenship is worth the cost in operational efficiency. Due process guarantees more than classified memos exchanged between executive branch lawyers. It guarantees a substantive check on the executive branch before it targets one of its own citizens.

### Solvency

#### Yes judges

Chesney, 13 [Bobby Chesney is the Charles I. Francis Professor in Law at the University of Texas School of Law, as well as a non-resident Senior Fellow of the Brookings Institution. His scholarship encompasses a wide range of issues relating to national security and the law, including detention, targeting, prosecution, covert action, and the state secrets privilege; most of it is posted here.Professor UT, A FISC for Drone Strikes? A Few Points to Consider…, <http://www.lawfareblog.com/2013/02/a-fisc-for-drone-strikes-a-few-points-to-consider/>]

Are Judges Interested? Some judges want absolutely nothing to do with this. Not that this is dispositive. But I was struck by what recently-retired District Judge John Robertson (D.D.C.) had to say when this came up at an ABA panel we were on a few months ago (the audio is here, and the statement came toward the very end if I recall correctly). Though very much a judge associated with the view that the judiciary plays a critical role in checking the executive in national security-related litigation (the topic of our panel), he made very clear his hostility to the idea of judicial involvement in death warrants. (And that’s without considering the possibility of warrant-issuing judges finding themselves the object of suit or prosecution abroad.) Of course, other judges could feel differently. But at any rate, the anecdote contributes to my next point…

#### Obama won’t backlash

CS Monitor, 13 [Would a US 'drone court' to authorize drone strikes be a good idea? (+video)<http://www.csmonitor.com/USA/DC-Decoder/2013/0524/Would-a-US-drone-court-to-authorize-drone-strikes-be-a-good-idea-video>]

Among the striking moments in President Obama’s national security speech this week, in which he argued it's time to wean America off its nation-at-war mentality, was his apparent receptiveness to the idea of establishing a “drone court" as a check on the use of those weapons. stories Called “kill courts” by critics, the proceedings in these proposed courtrooms would determine whom US forces can legally kill via drone strikes. They presumably would operate much the way that Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA) courts do now. Since 1978, these courts have been convened secretly to approve government wiretapping operations on US soil. Until recently, drone strikes rose steadily under Mr. Obama. In 2010, there were 122 of them in Pakistan, killing some 849 people, according to a report by the New America Foundation, a Washington, D.C., think tank. In 2012, such strikes in Pakistan dropped to 50, killing about 306 people. Civilian casualties as a result of drone attacks have also been reduced, according to the foundation. “That is partly the result of a sharply reduced number of drone strikes in Pakistan – 12 so far in 2013, compared with a record 122 in 2010 – and also more precise targeting,” according to its report. The casualty rate for civilians and “unknowns” – in other words, people who are not identified definitively as either militants or civilians – was roughly 40 percent under President George W. Bush. It is now 16 percent, according to the foundation. The proliferation of drone strikes in recent years prompts a much greater need for oversight, say critics of the drone program, echoing warnings against what Obama characterized on Thursday as a “boundless war on terror.” “Perpetual war – through drones or special forces or troops deployments – will prove self-defeating and alter our country in troubling ways,” Obama said. He nonetheless defended drone strikes as pivotal to eliminating Al Qaeda leaders. Looking into the future, Obama opened the door to the possibility of a “drones court” to increase oversight of the weapons' use. “The establishment of a special court to evaluate and authorize lethal action has the benefit of bringing a third branch of government into the process,” he said in his speech. But he also sounded a cautionary note, saying such a court would raise "constitutional issues about presidential and judicial authority.” The courts could help increase accountability, as will having more drone strikes under the auspices of the US military, rather than under the Central Intelligence Agency – **a change the White House has indicated it** will **make**. "It puts drone targeting within a well-established process, with rules of engagement, legal review, oversight, and a post-strike review process," says Mark Jacobson, senior transatlantic fellow at the German Marshall Fund of the United States.

#### Political pressures ensure compliance

Stephen I. Vladeck 9, Professor of Law and Associate Dean for Scholarship at American University Washington College of Law, senior editor of the peer-reviewed Journal of National Security Law and Policy, Supreme Court Fellow at the Constitution Project, and fellow at the Center on National Security at Fordham University School of Law, JD from Yale Law School, 3-1-2009, “The Long War, the Federal Courts, and the Necessity / Legality Paradox,” http://digitalcommons.wcl.american.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1002&context=facsch\_bkrev

Moreover, even if one believes that suspensions are unreviewable, there is a critical difference between the Suspension Clause and the issue here: at least with regard to the former, there is a colorable claim that the Constitution itself ousts the courts from reviewing whether there is a “Case[ ] of Rebellion or Invasion [where] the public Safety may require” suspension––and even then, only for the duration of the suspension.179 In contrast, Jackson’s argument sounds purely in pragmatism—courts should not review whether military necessity exists because such review will lead either to the courts affirming an unlawful policy, or to the potential that the political branches will simply ignore a judicial decision invalidating such a policy.180 Like Jackson before him, Wittes seems to believe that the threat to liberty posed by judicial deference in that situation pales in comparison to the threat posed by judicial review. ¶ The problem is that such a belief is based on a series of assumptions that Wittes does not attempt to prove. First, he assumes that the executive branch would ignore a judicial decision invalidating action that might be justified by military necessity.181 While Jackson may arguably have had credible reason to fear such conduct (given his experience with both the Gold Clause Cases182 and the “switch in time”),183 a lot has changed in the past six-and-a-half decades, to the point where I, at least, cannot imagine a contemporary President possessing the political capital to squarely refuse to comply with a Supreme Court decision. But perhaps I am naïve.184

### AT: CP

#### It certainly links to politics

Gregory S. McNeal 3/5/13 (Pepperdine University School of Law, "Targeted Killing and Accountability" [http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=1819583)](http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1819583%29)

There may be a deeper problem with congressional oversight of targeted killings. It simply lacks a sufficiently numbered constituency that is impacted by the program.460 More pointedly, are the issues in the targeted killing policy important enough for any individual member of Congress to take steps to change the policy? Will a member lose their seat over a failure to provide greater due process protections or more reliable targeting information in the kill-list creation process? Or is it more likely that they will lose their seat if they champion the cause of potential targets and one of those targets is not struck but subsequently carries out an attack? That is the political calculus facing policymakers and in that calculus, it seems difficult to justify changing targeting absent some clear benefit to national security or some clear political gain in a congressman’s home district. Moreover, even if individual policymakers agree that the policy should be changed, they may face substantial hurdles in their attempts to convince congressional leaders (who drive the legislative agenda) that the policy should be overhauled.461

#### And warfighting

Omar S. Bashir 12, Ph.D. candidate in the Department of Politics at Princeton University and a graduate of the Department of Aeronautics and Astronautics at MIT, 9/24/12, "Who Watches the Drones?" Foreign Affairs,www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/138141/omar-s-bashir/who-watches-the-drones

First, imagine that the government opted for full transparency in its drone programs. That would certainly make the government more accountable, with no special oversight system needed. Officials would release all the necessary information for citizens to assess the ethics of the programs themselves. This would include answers to such questions as: What crimes have targeted individuals allegedly committed? What threats do they pose? Who else might be harmed in a drone attack? How feasible are non-lethal options such as capture? In practice, though, full transparency is neither morally nor strategically ideal. For one, the government has a duty to protect its civilian informants, so there is risk in revealing the government's sources of information. And potential targets could adjust their behaviors were capture proposals to be debated openly. That would make it all the more difficult for the government to use non-lethal options to round up suspects. ¶ So how much transparency is enough? How can citizens know that the state is not overselling the sensitivity of details that it chooses to withhold? This central dilemma has not been resolved. Well-intentioned legal efforts undertaken by the ACLU and others to force openness about the drone program have only led the government to dig in its heels. It refuses to formally declassify even widely known facets of its operations, let alone release new details. The refusal is absurd on the surface, but it fits into an understandable strategy. Washington does not believe that limited declassifications would appease drone skeptics. As Jack Goldsmith, the Harvard law professor, has explained, Washington fears a slippery slope toward full transparency in the courts that might render one of its most potent counterterrorism weapons unusable.

#### The CP collapses intel gathering --- sources dry up --- destroys the heart of counter-terror policy

Delery Et.al. ’12 - Principal Deputy, Assistant Attorney General, Civil Division, DOJ

Principal Deputy, Assistant Attorney General, Civil Division, STUART F. DELERY

Defendants' Motion to Dismiss, United States' Statement of Interest, Case 1:12-cv-01192-RMC Document 18 Filed 12/14/12 Page 1 of 58, UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, 12/14/2012

Third. Plaintiffs' claims raise the specter of disclosing classified intelligence information in open court. The D.C. Circuit has recognized that "the difficulties associated with subjecting allegations involving CIA operations and covert operatives to judicial and public scrutiny" are pertinent to the special factors analysis. Wilson, 535 F.3d at 710. In such suits, "'even a small chance that some court will order disclosure of a source's identity could well impair intelligence gathering and cause sources to close up like a clam."'1 Id. (quoting Tenet v. Doe, 544 U.S. 1,11 (2005)). And where litigation of a plaintiffs allegations "would inevitably require an inquiry into "classified information that may undermine ongoing covert operations,"\* special factors apply. Wilson, 535 F.3d at 710 (quoting Tenet, 544 U.S. at 11). See also Vance, 2012 WL 5416500 at "8 ("When the state-secrets privilege did not block the claim, a court would find it challenging to prevent the disclosure of secret information.11); Lebron, 670 F.3d at 554 (noting that the "chilling effects on intelligence sources of possible disclosures during civil litigation and the impact of such disclosures on military and diplomatic initiatives at the heart of counterterrorism policy1' are special factors); Arar, 585 F.3d at 576 (holding that the risk of disclosure of classified information is a special factor in the "extraordinary rendition" context).

#### No link

Kwoka 11 (Lindsay, J.D. Candidate – University of Pennsylvania Law School, “Trial by Sniper: The Legality of Targeted Killing in the War on Terror,” University of Pennsylvania Journal of Constitutional Law, October, 14 U. Pa. J. Const. L. 301, Lexis)

Furthermore, as noted above, the concerns about minimizing the disclosure of state secrets would be alleviated by permitting only the decisionmaker to review the evidence. The hearing would be conducted privately and the information would be conveyed on a "need-to-know" basis only. Thus the confidentiality problems associated with affording suspected terrorists a full jury trial are not present in a process where the judge reviews the evidence in confidence.

#### Doesn’t solve Intel errors – Guiora says court key to actionable intel

Cullen, 07 [THE ROLE OF TARGETED KILLING IN THE CAMPAIGN AGAINST TERRORBY COLONEL PETER M. CULLEN United States Army, p. US Army War College]

Conclusion The long-term success or failure of targeted killing as a component of the campaign against terror will depend on two capabilities in which the U.S. has been deficient to date: first, obtaining actionable intelligence to identify and locate targets and second, winning the information war to persuade the domestic and international communities of the legality, morality, and effectiveness of such operations. The U.S. is expending considerable resources to improve its intelligence systems, but much more needs to be done to enhance our information operations capabilities. The U.S. cannot afford to take a passive posture citing operational security and allow critics to dominate the debate and characterize the tactic as extrajudicial killings or assassinations. The U.S. must aggressively explain the strong legal and moral bases for the policy and assure the world community that the tactic is invoked sparingly and only when no other reasonable alternatives are available to prevent the target from threatening the U.S. and innocent civilians. It must be clearly demonstrated that all reasonable efforts are made to minimize collateral damage and, where it does occur, responsibility rests with the terrorists who operate out of civilian areas. All of this requires a more transparent policy on targeted killing in which there is public confidence in its checks and balances to ensure proper targeting decisions are being made. If targeted killing operations are supported by a comprehensive information operations strategy and are professionally executed using timely and accurate intelligence, they will become an even more potent weapon against transnational terrorism.

#### Can’t solve – no institutionalized enforcement mechanism

**Blank, 12 -** Director, International Humanitarian Law Clinic, Emory Law School (Laurie, “TARGETED STRIKES: THE CONSEQUENCES OF BLURRING THE ARMED CONFLICT AND SELF-DEFENSE JUSTIFICATIONS,” 38 Wm. Mitchell L. Rev. 1655 lexis)

Finally, effective implementation of and compliance with the law, whether the LOAC, the law of self-defense, or human rights law, depends on regular and respected mechanisms for enforcement. In the arena of international law, both formal (courts and tribunals) and informal (public opinion, response from other states) enforcement have value and effect. Any judicial body determining the lawfulness of state action or the criminal responsibility of individuals must first determine the applicable law in order to reach an appropriate result. n141 When the legal regimes become blurred through repeated conflation, application of the law and thus enforcement will be hampered. The resulting consequence, of course, is that a lack of effective enforcement then undermines effective implementation of the law and protection of persons in the future. These problems often are highlighted in the more informal enforcement arena of media reporting, public opinion, advocacy reports, and other responses, where disputes over applicable law and appropriate analyses abound. When international or nongovernmental organization reports produce primarily disputes over which law is applied - rather than how the law is applied to the facts on the ground - the debate becomes centered on the law and legal disputes rather than on the victims, the perpetrators, and how to prevent legal violations in the future. The blurring of lines between armed conflict and self-defense takes these challenges to another level as well, however, creating a situation in which independent analysts may have difficulty identifying the key pieces of information necessary to an effective examination of the legality of the state's policies and actions.

#### CP locks in squo

McNeal 13, Associate Professor of Law, Pepperdine University, 3/5/13, “Targeted Killing and Accountability,” <http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1819583>, Gregory McNeal

The transparency related accountability reforms specified above have the ability to expose wrongdoing; however that’s not the only goal of accountability. Accountability is also designed to deter wrongdoing. By exposing governmental activity, transparency oriented reforms can influence the behavior of all future public officials—to convince them to live up to public expectations 527 The challenge associated with the reforms articulated above is a bias towards the status quo.528 Very few incentives exist for elected officials to exercise greater oversight over targeted killings and interest group advocacy is not as strong in matters of national security and foreign affairs as it is in domestic politics.529

####  Doesn’t solve statutory clarification or clarity

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

The weakness of this theory is that it is not codified in U.S. law; it is merely the extrapolation of international theorists and organizations. The only entity under the Constitution that can frame and settle Presidential power regarding the enforcement of international norms is Congress. As the check on executive power, Congress must amend the AUMF to give the executive a statutory roadmap that articulates when force is appropriate and under what circumstances the President can use targeted killing. This would be the needed endorsement from Congress, the other political branch of government, to clarify the U.S. position on its use of force regarding targeted killing. For example, it would spell out the limits of American lethality once an individual takes the status of being a member of an organized group. Additionally, statutory clarification will give other states a roadmap for the contours of what constitutes anticipatory self-defense and the proper conduct of the military under the law of war. Congress should also require that the President brief it on the decision matrix of articulated guidelines before a targeted killing mission is ordered. As Kenneth Anderson notes, “[t]he point about briefings to Congress is partly to allow it to exercise its democratic role as the people’s representative.”74 The desire to feel safe is understandable. The consumers who buy SUVs are not buying them to be less safe. Likewise, the champions of targeted killings want the feeling of safety achieved by the elimination of those who would do the United States harm. But allowing the President to order targeted killing without congressional limits means the President can manipulate force in the name of national security without tethering it to the law advanced by international norms. The potential consequence of such unilateral executive action is that it gives other states, such as North Korea and Iran, the customary precedent to do the same. Targeted killing might be required in certain circumstances, but if the guidelines are debated and understood, the decision can be executed with the full faith of the people’s representative, Congress. When the decision is made without Congress, the result might make the United States feel safer, but the process eschews what gives a state its greatest safety: the rule of law.

#### Media spin trumps solvency – executive can’t respond to follow-up questions – crushes legitimacy

Goldsmith 13 (Jack, Henry L. Shattuck Professor – Harvard Law School, “The Intersection of Vague Disclosure and Reduced Drone Strikes,” Lawfare, 5-27, <http://www.lawfareblog.com/2013/05/the-intersection-of-vague-disclosure-and-reduced-drone-strikes/>)

The major challenge to legitimating the shadow war against terrorists is that the Executive branch is hand-tied by its own secrecy rules, and cannot **disclose** what it is doing to permit Congress and the American people to judge whether it approves. Even Executive branch officials who want to be open about what is going on (as I believe the President and many of his national security officials want to be) are prevented by secrecy rules from being entirely candid. Officials convey information in what I recently described as “limited, abstract, and often awkward terms” that “usually raise more questions than they answer,” a problem exacerbated by the fact that “secrecy rules often preclude the administration from responding to follow-up questions, criticisms, and charges.” Disclosures **designed to enhance** trust can end deepening mistrust, especially when journalists start reporting on events that don’t fit the administration’s narrative, and the administration cannot (perhaps because of secrecy rules, perhaps because the truth is uncomfortable) respond fully. This dynamic is made worse by the fact that partial disclosures are greeted for demands for more disclosures that the government simply cannot abide.

This is starting to happen with the abstractions that the President used to describe his ostensible curtailment of the war. Ryan Goodman and Sarah Knuckey have a careful analysis of the speech that note its ambiguities and uncertainties on the geographical scope of the war, the continued use of signature strikes, the meaning of non-feasible captures as prerequisite for strikes, whether Americans “not specifically targeted” (in the President’s words) were targeted as part of a signature strike or some other reason that prevented the president from describing their deaths as accidental, whether any member of a terrorist organization or only its leaders are targetable, and the crucial meaning of phrases like “near certainly,” “imminence,” and “associated forces.” Goodman and Knuckey conclude that these ambiguities and uncertainties make it “impossible for the public to, in the President’s words: “make informed decisions and hold the Executive Branch accountable,” and note that “until the White House releases the legal memos that explain its understanding of such terms and its legal justification for the drone program more broadly[,] there is reason to remain deeply skeptical.” Along similar lines, Lesley Clark and Jonathan S. Landay at McClatchy compare the President’s speech with past administration speeches and conclude that the speech might imply an expansion of drone killings.

Pushing in the other direction, however, is the reality that drone strikes (and their consequences) are in some senses verifiable, and the rate of strikes in both Pakistan and Yemen have dropped this year (and having been dropping for a few years in Pakistan). In the end, the credibility of the government’s new standards might turn **less on the President’s words**, which by themselves cannot establish credibility, but rather on how he is perceived to use drones (and other forms of fire) in fact. It does not follow, of course, that reduced drone strikes mean that the new standards have bite, or are constraining. As David Cole notes in a good if perhaps-too-hopeful NYRB essay:

[The reduction in drone strikes] may reflect a diminishing number of appropriate targets. It may suggest that the administration has for some time been employing more restrictive standards. Or it may reflect increasing acceptance of the view that drone strikes have become counterproductive—a point made publically by former counterterrorism intelligence chief Dennis Blair and retired General Stanley McChrystal, who headed the US forces in Afghanistan.

### AT: Immigration

#### Relations are inevitable regardless of government ties

Mathai 12(Ranjan is the Foreign Secretary of India, 2012, “India's foreign secretary addresses Washington,”http://www.indusbusinessjournal.com/ME2/dirmod.asp?sid=&nm=&type=Publishing&mod=Publications%3A%3AArticle&mid=8F3A7027421841978F18BE895F87F791&tier=4&id=E3E6AF44D3C44BED9F987F95ECDD2066)

However, given our different circumstances, history, location and levels of development, we will occasionally have differing perspectives and policies. But, this can be a source of great value and strength in our dialogue; and, it also enables us to work together for a broad global consensus on issues of common interest. But, for that, we should attach real value to each other's perspectives and appreciate each other's interest and sensitivities; and, when we differ, we should be able to speak candidly and respectfully to each other, and **insulate the vast common ground** between us **from** the **differences in our relationship**. We must remember that while we may have occasionally different perspectives, **we are also united by a fundamental stake in each other’s success**, because in succeeding individually, we can advance our common interests and inspire a world mirrored in our ideals. And, **even if our** two **governments did nothing**, it would still be an extraordinary relationship, because of the growing ties of kinship between our people and the vitality of private partnerships of enterprise, innovation, research and education across every field of human endeavor. But, I believe that we have the political momentum, public goodwill, a comprehensive architecture of engagement, comfort and confidence in the relationship, the experience of bold and ambitious undertakings, a proven capacity to work through challenges and, as we have seen in recent years, a growing habit of taking tangible steps on a regular basis to advance our cooperation. So, as I look ahead, we will continue to consolidate and affirm our strategic partnership, by completing existing projects and focusing on the wealth of new opportunities that we have. We should continue to stay in close touch on the current challenges in the world, in our neighborhood and beyond. And, we should, above all, continue to strengthen and expand the long-term strategic framework of our relationship, so that we can fully harness the boundless opportunities that this relationship has for our people and the substantial benefit that it can bring to this world.

#### Relations are useless

Tellis 5 (Ashley, senior associate at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, specializing in international security, defense, and Asian strategic issues. 11/16/05 “The U.S.-India ''Global Partnership'': How Significant for American Interests? ““<http://www.carnegieendowment.org/publications/index.cfm?fa=view&id=17693>)

Several practical implications, which ought to be of significance to the Congress as it ponders the U.S.-Indian civilian nuclear agreement, flow from these realities. To begin with, the strengthening U.S.-Indian relationship does not imply that New Delhi will become a formal alliance partner of Washington at some point in the future. It also does not imply that India will invariably be an uncritical partner of the United States in its global endeavors. India’s large size, its proud history, and its great ambitions, ensure that it will likely march to the beat of its own drummer, at least most of the time. The first question, for the Congress in particular and for the United States more generally, therefore, ought not to be, “What will India do for us?”—as critics of the civilian nuclear agreement often assert. Rather, the real question ought to be, “Is a strong, democratic, (even if perpetually) independent, India in American national interest?” If, as I believe, this is the fundamental question and if, as I further believe, the answer to this question is “Yes,” then the real discussion about the evolution of the U.S.-Indian relationship ought to focus on how the United States can assist the growth of Indian power, and how it can do so at minimal cost (if that is relevant) to any other competing national security objectives.

#### Not top of agenda

Legislation won’t reach the floor until June and the vote won’t be until the election

**Shear, 1/1/14** (Michael, New York Times, “Boehner Is Said to Back Change on Immigration” <http://www.nytimes.com/2014/01/02/us/politics/boehner-is-said-to-back-change-on-immigration.html?_r=0>)

Advocates for an immigration overhaul will start 2014 with a race against the election-season clock and a new campaign aimed at forcing action on Capitol Hill. Civil disobedience demonstrations are planned in Washington and elsewhere. Business groups are readying lobbying blitzes on Capitol Hill. Labor leaders and evangelical ministers are considering more hunger fasts to dramatize what they say is the urgent need to prevent deportations. The most likely legislative approach, according to lawmakers, White House officials and activists, is a push to pass legislation in the House by May or June — after most Republican lawmakers are through with their primary campaigns — with the goal of reaching a compromise that Mr. Obama could sign before the 2014 midterm election campaigns intensify next fall.

#### Election and unemployment thumps

**Fox News, 1/5/14** (“Hill Democrats, Republicans set 2014 agendas with midterm elections in mind”

<http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2014/01/05/hill-democrats-and-republicans-set-2014-agendas-with-midterm-elections-in-mind/>

Congressional Democrats and Republicans sharpened their political knives Sunday as lawmakers return to Washington this week to begin executing legislative agendas designed to help their respective parties in the November elections. The first major battle will likely be over restoring long-term unemployment benefits, with Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid scheduled to hold a preliminary vote Monday on the issue. “The first thing we want to get done is extend unemployment benefits,” he told Fox News on Sunday. The benefits were not included in a two-year budget deal Congress reached before adjourning for winter break, but not before House Leader John Boehner, R-Ohio, made clear the money will not be restored unless offset but other spending cuts. The White House is also applying pressure on congressional Republicans, issuing a statement on New Year’s Day that said President Obama supports the bipartisan Senate bill to reinstate benefits for the 1.3 million Americans who lost the insurance in the new budget deal. Other Republicans have hinted they might go along with extending benefits if they win spending cuts from Reid elsewhere to pay for them. "If the senator comes up with any kind of a reasonable idea to offset the $26 billion, I think that he might find some people that are willing to talk to him," Rep. Matt Salmon, R-Ariz., said on CBS’ “Face the Nation.” Obama has already scheduled a White House event on Tuesday with some whose benefits expired at the end of December. "Instead of punishing families who can least afford it, Republicans should make it their New Year's resolution to do the right thing and restore this vital economic security for their constituents right now," Obama said Saturday in his weekly radio and Internet address. The fight is part of a large, emerging issue for Democrats and now Republicans across the country, closing the so-called income inequality gap. On Sunday, Florida GOP Sen. Marco Rubio released a YouTube video in which he challenged “a big-government war on poverty” and announced his coming initiatives to address the issue, including repealing ObamaCare. “What our nation needs is a real agenda that helps people acquire the skills they need to lift themselves out of poverty and to pursue the American dream,” Rubio says in the video. To be sure, Republicans returning to Capitol Hill intend to focus on every facet of Obama's signature health care law, trying to capitalize on its failed rollout last year as they defend their House majority and try to seize control of the Senate. Majority Leader Eric Cantor last week outlined the GOP-led House’s legislative agenda, leading with legislation that addresses the security of personal data for ObamaCare enrollees. “The American people have witnessed the Obama administration failing in its attempts to fix a health care law that is broken and cannot be fixed,” the Virginia Republican said. Cantor cited as other top legislative priorities the EPA regulatory process and Iran’s nuclear program, which he called “one of the most significant national security threats facing the United States.” It’s unclear whether the House will tackle major legislation to overhaul immigration laws. Advocates remain hopeful. But some House Republicans still resist any legislation, fearing it would lead to a final bill that includes a path to citizenship for the estimated 11 million immigrants living in the country illegally. Democrats will also press to raise the federal minimum wage from $7.25 an hour. Sen. Chuck Schumer, D-N.Y., told ABC's "This Week" that he is unsure whether Democrats can cobble together 60 votes needed Monday to overcome a procedural hurdle en route to the upper chamber passing the unemployment package. However, he vowed Democrats would “come back at this issue” if they failed at first to get the votes. He also said his party would prefer to pass the proposal without cutting elsewhere, as has been the case for previous extensions. But he told reporters Sunday he would listen to GOP suggestions. Reid bristled at the idea of offsets. “We have never offset emergency spending, that's foolish,” he told Fox News. “We've reduced the debt by $3 trillion. Let's start helping the middle class. The rich are getting richer, the poor are getting poorer.” Such rancor ruled in the first session of the 113th Congress with few bills passed and sent to the president. The combination of divided government and the upcoming elections stand as an obstacle to major legislation in the second session, counting down to November when all 435 House seats and 35 Senate seats will be on the ballot.

#### Won’t pass

**Rojas, 12/30/13 -** Immigration and Emerging Communities Reporterfor Southern California Public Radio (Leslie, “Immigration issues to watch in 2014” <http://www.scpr.org/blogs/multiamerican/2013/12/30/15492/immigration-top-stories-to-watch-in-2014/>)

A year ago, advocates, politicos and pundits were speculating as to whether 2013 would be the year that the political winds finally favored a major immigration overhaul, the first since 1986. Republicans were smarting from the losses they took in the November 2012 election, with Latino and Asian voters stepping up in record numbers to hand a re-election victory to President Obama. But some veteran immigration watchers who had been down this path in 2006 and 2007 weren't so sure - and they were right. While the Senate passed a sweeping bill in June, which included a path to U.S. citizenship for unauthorized immigrants, House Republicans simply couldn't get behind it. Plans for a bipartisan House bill crumbled. The Senate plan stalled in the House and the rest is, well, recent political history. Fast-forward to the end of the year: Republican House Speaker John Boehner has dropped hints that he'll push the House on immigration reform in 2014. But what the House votes on might look quite different from what Senate supporters of a comprehensive reform plan envisioned. "We're likely to see bills that deal with specific components, like the Dream Act, high-skilled visas, and probably a bill that passes the House, or is at least proposed in the House, that would propose legalization for undocumented immigrants without a pathway to citizenship," said Karthick Ramakrishnan, a UC Riverside political scientist who studies immigration. This could even make for strange bedfellows, political observers say, as advocates push for a halt to deportations and Republicans float legal status without a path to citizenship. But compromises will most likely only go so far. President Obama and other immigration reform supporters have said they're willing to consider the piecemeal approach that House Republicans favor. But only if these piecemeal bills address key provisions of the Senate bill - and a path to U.S. citizenship is the key provision of the Senate bill. Without it, it's hard to count on much Senate support. As for the political winds, if the timing wasn't right for a broader proposal to succeed in 2013, when might it be? The short answer: 2014. But it's an election year, so don't hold your breath. There will also be other high-priority distractions in the coming year, like a debt ceiling redux. Where does this leave any kind of significant immigration legislation? "There's a small possibility after the election, in the lame duck session," said Louis DeSipio, a political scientist and immigration expert at UC Irvine. "But I would only expect action if Republicans lose more than they did in 2012, and that does not seem to be a likely outcome." On that note, the Republican Party has been making a concerted effort to reach to Latino voters in the wake of 2012. But the truth is that many House GOP members are secure in their districts without these voters, at least so far. Which means that it may take a little longer for a major immigration overhaul to go the distance.

#### Their ev is aspirational, not realistic

**Friedman, 1/5/14** (Dan, New York Daily News, “Gridlock in Congress expected to worsen with midterm elections looming” <http://www.nydailynews.com/news/national/congressional-gridlock-expected-worsen-article-1.1566718>)

With midterm elections looming and the two major parties at loggerheads over just about everything, the gridlock expected this year could make 2013 seem like the good old days. “I can’t imagine Congress doing much more than nominations and (annual) appropriations bills,” said Jim Manley, a former top aide to Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-Nev.). There appears to be little chance lawmakers will enact new gun controls or pass meaningful immigration reform. And the likelihood Democrats will realize their goal of raising the minimum wage and renewing benefits for the long-term unemployed don’t seem much better. Congressional negotiators have a good chance to cut a deal early this year on a long-delayed farm bill impacting agriculture policy and food stamps. And a bipartisan budget agreement that President Obama signed in December is expected to ease passage of spending bills and, at least, avert another government shutdown in 2014. Sen. Chuck Schumer (D-N.Y.), a lead author of the Senate-passed immigration-reform bill, said he hopes recent cooperation “will lead the way to more in 2014, including the passage of immigration reform through the House.” But many lawmakers privately see little chance for the passage of major immigration reform. House Republicans are too concerned about primary challenges from Tea Party-backed opponents to support back any bill that includes a potential path to citizenship for undocumented immigrants. Norm Ornstein, a congressional scholar at the American Enterprise Institute, said it is conceivable lawmakers will pass “one or two” notable bills, “but you would have to be truly outside the normal range of optimism to imagine this being a probability.”

#### GOP blocks immigration—if it overcomes that, its Boehner’s internal decision

Michael Tomasky, 1/2/13, Immigration, Round 2: Still a Reach, www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2014/01/02/immigration-round-2-still-a-reach.html

The Times is all excited this morning that John Boehner has hired a staffer who used to be John McCain's top immigration aide. This means, the paper reports, that Boehner is serious about immigration reform and fully prepared to tell the tea party to go stuff it. Boehner would not try to ram through the Senate bill passed last year, which is still alive this year, i.e., for the remainder of the session of Congress during which it was passed. Rather, says the Times, he'd break it into smaller pieces and see if he could get those through: most notably, a possible path to citizenship for young people who came to the country illegally as children with their parents. Obviously, **this is well short of the broader Senate bill provisions**, which include a path to citizenship for everyone. I still think even these provisions will be too much for the House GOP, but the X factor here, which the Times doesn't get into, is whether this is Boehner's last year as speaker. He's not going to say of course, because as soon as he says it, he loses whatever tenuous power over his people he has. But if he has decided in his mind that he's not going to run for speaker again, then he may well allow something to pass the House with lots of Democratic votes and just a handful of Republican ones. Under that circumstance, immigration reforms could pass the House, and maybe even some fairly progressive ones, if Boehner ends up being in a position where he needs the Latino caucus more than the tea party caucus. But more broadly, this is going to be a year, is it not, of continual struggle between the conservatives and the radicals, culminating in the handful of primary elections in which radical challengers are running against conservative incumbents. So **I don't see much reason to think that** any **immigration reform will be anything other than** ferociously controversial **within the GOP**. The only question now is whether Boehner has the onions to sidestep the radicals. Yes, he said last year that they'd "lost all credibility," a phrase on which many are placing a great deal of optimism. But **we've heard** that **Beltway optimism before**. I'm still skeptical that he'd want an immigration bill to pass with the backing of only a minority of his caucus, because it would infuriate and energize the rabid wing of the base in advance of the by-elections. So maybe the answer is a lame-duck session--he passes immigration with 180 Democratic votes and 40 Republican ones and then says "Thanks, I'm retiring." I suppose there'd be more disgraceful ways for him to go.

#### PC not key

Greg **Sargent 13**, "Syria won't make GOP's immigration problem go "poof" and disappear ; Syria or no Syria, Republicans will still pay the same price among Latinos if they kill reform," 9/12, Washington Post, Factiva

But when it comes to immigration -- as with this fall's fiscal fights -- **that question is largely irrelevant**. Obama's "standing" or "strength" with regard to Congress won't play any significant role in determining whether immigration reform happens. That, too, is a question that turns only on whether Republicans resolve their differences over it.¶ Immigration reform's fate, at bottom, **rests solely on** **whether Republicans decide it needs to pass** for the long term good of the party. **Either they will decide killing reform is too risky**, because it will lock in anti-GOP hostility among Latinos for a generation or more. **Or they will decide passing reform won't do enough to win over Latinos,** given their disagreement with the GOP on other issues, and that the downsides of alienating the base aren't worth the potential upsides. **Neither** the fact that Congress is distracted by **Syria, nor Obama's short term dip in popularity or standing** or whatever you want to call it, will have anything whatsoever to do with that decision. Nor will Latino reaction to the GOP's eventual decision. Does anyone imagine that if Republicans kill reform, Latinos will somehow see the Syria debate -- or, even more ludicrously, Beltway-generated ideas about Obama's "standing" -- as mitigating factors?

#### No PC

**Boyer, 12/31/13 -** White House correspondent for The Washington Times(Dave, Washington Times, “TRICKY DICK: Only Nixon less popular than President Obama in Year 5” <http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2013/dec/30/with-sagging-polls-barack-obama-follows-george-wbu/?page=all>)

Mr. Obama’s job-approval ratings in most polls this month were 40 percent or lower, down from 54 percent at the start of the year and the lowest of his presidency. Mr. Bush’s popularity in December 2005 stood at 43 percent, down from a high of 57 percent near the beginning of his second term and less than half the 90 percent-plus approval ratings in the days after the Sept. 11 attacks. Only Watergate-plagued Richard Nixon had a worse rating than Mr. Obama at the same point of his presidency, in 1973. Although presidents tend to lose some public approval after winning second terms, Mr. Obama’s numbers slipped more quickly than most others. “The history of the presidency is like an hourglass with the sand running out,” said Stephen Hess, a presidential historian at the left-leaning Brookings Institution. “There is a little bump up at the start of the fifth year, and then the downward trend continues. The problem here is that Obama had such a terrible fifth year. He blew that one opportunity he had to put some things together.” Almost from the moment of his reelection, Mr. Obama was sidetracked by scandals including the Internal Revenue Service targeting of conservative groups and revelations of widespread spying by the National Security Agency. In October came the hapless launch of the Obamacare website and the public’s realization that Mr. Obama didn’t tell the truth when he assured consumers that they could keep their health insurance policies if that’s what they preferred. The president’s broken promise damaged his credibility and was chosen by an independent fact-checking group as the biggest political lie of 2013. Asked about his plummeting numbers at a Dec. 20 news conference, Mr. Obama took refuge in the answer of all elected officials whose ratings are down: He is not worried about polls. “I have now been in office five years, close to five years, was running for president for two years before that, and we have had ups and we have had downs,” Mr. Obama said. “I took this job to deliver for the American people, and I knew and will continue to know that there are going to be ups and downs on it.” Political fallout Mr. Obama doesn’t have to face the ballot again, but many Democrats are openly worried that his low popularity numbers could drag down the party in the November midterm elections and could hand control of both houses of Congress to Republicans. A CNN/ORC poll released Dec. 20 found that Mr. Obama’s approval rating had dropped to 41 percent, matching an all-time low in the survey. CNN polling director Keating Holland said the president had lost significant support among women and young people, two voting blocs largely responsible for his 2012 re-election victory over Republican Mitt Romney. The CNN poll found that the rise in disapproval of the president came equally from the right and the left of the political spectrum. Mr. Bush said upon his re-election in 2004 that he intended to spend the political capital he had earned. But with the troubled war in Iraq and a failed push to partially privatize Social Security, he lost popularity rapidly and never regained it. Mr. Obama hopes to change his fortunes with a shake-up of senior White House staff, including the hiring of former Bill Clinton aide John Podesta, but Mr. Hess said the moves are unlikely to reverse the downward trend. “There’s always some ‘savior of the week’ that comes in from the outside,” Mr. Hess said. “It doesn’t usually work that way and there’s no reason to think it will in this case. You face the midterm election, which presidents always lose some seats.”

#### Obama’s PC fails – won’t spend it

**Benac, 12/30/13 –** Associated Press (Nancy, “Obama's Presidency Beset by Fits, Starts in Year 5” <http://abcnews.go.com/Politics/wireStory/obamas-presidency-beset-fits-starts-year-21365716?singlePage=true>)

The 2014 midterm elections give Obama his best opportunity to rebound. But Democrats, who just weeks ago saw an opportunity to retake the House after Republicans got blamed for the government shutdown, now fret about the health care law's ongoing problems and may be content to just keep control of the Senate. There's a certain irony in Obama's success depending on Congress, a body with whom he has had a lukewarm partnership. Lawmakers from both parties say Obama doesn't talk to them much, nor do his aides. Letters go unanswered. Policies come out of the blue. Social interactions are few. Both sides wistfully recall the voluble Clinton, who figured out how to craft deals with Republicans on welfare reform and other agenda items after the GOP took control of the House and made big gains in the Senate two years into his presidency. Sen. Tom Coburn, an Oklahoma Republican who worked with Obama when he was a senator and still considers the president a friend, says flatly: "He's flunked in terms of relations with Congress." "If you know him personally, he's a very likable person," says Coburn. "But it's different than with most other presidents in terms of having relationships with Congress. ... There's a lack of a personal touch." Of course, the president's tepid relationship with Congress is hardly his fault alone. The tea party forces that pulled House Republicans to the right in recent years made it difficult for the GOP to reach agreement with Democrats on much of anything, and produced the showdown over the president's health care law that spawned the government shutdown. Obama did attempt to improve relations with Republicans earlier this year, holding a few dinners with GOP lawmakers. His chief of staff, Denis McDonough, has been widely praised by Republicans for being a frequent visitor to Capitol Hill. But some lawmakers say that's as far as the outreach goes. Sen. John McCain, the Arizona Republican who ran against Obama in 2008 but has since tried to work with him on immigration and the budget, said no one from the White House legislative affairs staff has ever called him or come to his office just to chat. ——— What does it matter if Obama doesn't buddy up to his former colleagues? He needs those relationships to advance his agenda in Congress. And the strained ties with legislators are emblematic of a broader problem for Obama rooted in his tendency to keep a tight inner circle. "Instead of going out and talking to his enemies, making friends and schmoozing, or banging heads together with them or whatever, you can see that the man is diffident — deeply, deeply diffident about the kinds of politicking that are necessary to build consensus," says Nigel Nicholson, a professor at the London Business School who has written a book about leadership in which Obama is a frequent topic. The president has been getting plenty of that kind of advice in recent weeks. Critics called for a sweeping shakeup of his White House inner circle. Even his allies called for someone — anyone — to be fired for the health care failures. Obama has responded in his typically restrained fashion. No one has lost a job over the massive health care screw-up, though the White House hasn't ruled that out. And while the president is doing some minor shuffling in the West Wing, he's largely bringing in people he already knows. To critics, the limited staff changes smack of a White House that doesn't fully understand the depths of its problems. But presidential friend Ron Kirk said they are indicative of Obama's "fairly dispassionate temperament," which allows him to hold steady in the face of adversity. "He understands that overreacting to any one development in the moment is not the best way to achieve a long-term and stable objective," said Kirk, who served as U.S. trade representative in Obama's first term.

### AT: Tea Party

#### Silver concedes

Silver, 13 [Nathaniel Read "Nate" Silver is an American statistician and writer who analyzes in-game baseball activity and elections. He is currently the editor-in-chief of ESPN's FiveThirtyEight blog and a Special Correspondent for ABC News. June 11, 2013, 538 – NYT, Domestic Surveillance Could Create a Divide in the 2016 Primaries, <http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2013/06/11/domestic-surveillance-could-create-a-divide-in-the-2016-primaries/?_r=0>, jj]

A poll released on Monday by the Pew Research Center and The Washington Post found a partisan shift in the way Americans view the National Security Agency’s domestic surveillance programs. In the survey, slightly more Democrats than Republicans said they found it acceptable for the N.S.A. to track Americans’ phone records and e-mails if the goal is to prevent terrorism. By comparison, when Pew Research asked a similar question in 2006, Republicans were about twice as likely as Democrats to support the N.S.A.’s activities. The poll is a reminder that many Americans do not hold especially firm views on some issues and instead may adapt them depending on which party controls the executive branch. When it comes to domestic surveillance, a considerable number of Democrats seem willing to support actions under President Obama that they deemed unacceptable under George W. Bush, while some Republicans have shifted in the opposite direction. What may be just as significant is the way in which attitudes toward the security state could split voters and elected officials within each party — possibly creating a wedge issue in both party primaries in 2016. Politicians who are normally associated with being on the far left and the far right may find common cause with grass-roots voters in their objection to domestic surveillance programs, fighting against a party establishment that is inclined to support them. Take, for example, the House’s vote in May 2011 to extend certain provisions of the Patriot Act — including the so-called library records provision that the government has used to defend the legality of sweeping searches of telephone and e-mail records. The bill passed with 250 yes votes in the House against 153 no votes, receiving more of its support from Republicans. (In the Senate, the bill passed, 72-23, winning majority support from both parties.) However, the House vote was not well described by a traditional left-right political spectrum. In the chart below, I’ve sorted the 403 members of the House who voted on the bill from left to right in order of their overall degree of liberalism or conservatism, as determined by the statistical system DW-Nominate. Members of the House who voted for the bill are represented with a yellow stripe in the chart, while those who voted against it are represented in black. The no votes are concentrated at the two ends of the spectrum. The 49 most liberal members of the House (all Democrats) who voted on the bill each voted against it. But so did 14 of the 21 Republicans deemed to be the most conservative by DW-Nominate. By contrast, 46 of the 50 most moderate Republicans voted for the Patriot Act extension, as did 38 of the 50 most moderate Democrats. Perhaps, you might object, a one-dimensional spectrum doesn’t do a very good job of capturing all the nuances of what it means to be liberal or conservative in America today. In considering the surveillance state, for example, Republicans must weigh their traditional support for aggressive antiterrorism policies against their distrust of government, while Democrats must weigh their trust of Mr. Obama, who so far has been unapologetic for the N.S.A.’s actions, against their concern about civil liberties violations. Or more broadly, what about libertarians who take conservative views on economic policy but liberal views on social policy — or conservative Democrats who support the welfare state but not policies like gay marriage? Where are they represented on the spectrum? I am sympathetic toward these objections as a theoretical matter. Without making this too much of an editorial comment, I find the platforms of both parties to be lacking in philosophical cohesion — why, for example, should views on abortion have much to do with preferences on tax policy? But when it comes to American political parties and their representatives in Congress, partisanship tends to dominate all other considerations. National Journal has a different system for ranking members of Congress from liberal to conservative. It is somewhat less statistically rigorous than DW-Nominate’s system, but it does have the advantage of breaking votes down into three categories: those on economic, social and foreign policy. The correlations between the three policy areas are very high (specifically, they are about 0.9, where 1 would represent a perfect correlation). Members of Congress who take conservative views on economic policy tend almost always to take conservative views on social policy and foreign policy as well, while members who are liberal on one set of issues tend to cast liberal votes on almost all other issues. This does leave the question of how liberal and conservative policy stances are defined. (Support for gun rights, for example, is generally seen as socially conservative rather than socially liberal, even though socially liberal stances are often thought of as promoting the rights of individuals against communities or governments.) Nevertheless, for members of Congress today, a vote on any one issue is highly predictable based upon his votes on other issues. There are extremely few mavericks in Congress who vote on each issue on an independent and nonpartisan basis. DW-Nominate uses a different method to classify Congressional votes. Instead of assigning a subjective definition to each vote as liberal or conservative, it instead uses an automated process called optimal classification. The goal of this process is essentially to explain the highest number of Congressional votes based on a one-dimensional scale, regardless of the content of the legislation that comprises it. Whichever votes are not well explained by this first dimension are then explained by additional dimensions. The process is more intuitive than it might sound. For example, during the 1960s, Congressional votes on civil rights policy toward African-Americans were not very strongly correlated with votes on other types of political issues. (For instance, Southern Democrats were often staunchly opposed to civil rights for blacks while casting very liberal votes on the welfare state.) Thus, you needed at least two dimensions to describe Congressional voting patterns in a reasonably comprehensive way. In recent years, however, this has been much less of a problem: the one-dimensional spectrum explains about 95 percent of Congressional voting, and votes on economic, social and foreign policy are highly correlated. But a few votes still fall outside of the spectrum — the 2011 vote on the Patriot Act among them. If the second dimension no longer represents a distinction between economic and social policy, then what does it reflect? The authors of DW-Nominate are interpreting it to measure a distinction between what they call “establishment” members of Congress and “outsiders.” Here at FiveThirtyEight, I have sometimes used the same labels when describing the ideological space occupied by different candidates during the presidential primaries. Some candidates, like Mitt Romney, run as insider or establishment politicians, offering some iteration of what they say are tried-and-true solutions, while others run as insurgents or outsiders, submitting a more profound critique of politics as usual and claiming they will topple an unacceptable status quo. In general, those politicians who rate as insurgents or outsiders are on the wings of the liberal-conservative scale. The Tea Party, Occupy Wall Street and Ron Paul movements probably all fit into the outsider or insurgent category, for example, even though they inhabit vastly different spaces on the traditional left-right political spectrum. Conversely, moderates in both parties tend to score as establishment politicians. There aren’t very many “radical centrist” members of Congress who offer a pronounced critique of the status quo while also coming down somewhere in the middle on most policy issues. In the case of the Patriot Act vote, the establishment-outsider axis makes nearly as much difference as the liberal-conservative or Democratic-Republican scales. Among the so-called establishment members of the House who voted on the bill, 78 percent voted to extend the Patriot Act, while only 41 percent of the so-called outsiders did, according to DW-Nominate’s classifications. You can find similar patterns in certain votes on policy toward the financial sector — for example, during the various bailout votes that were cast toward the end of 2008. More recently, votes on the federal debt ceiling have taken on some of the same contours. What is the link between the financial votes and those on the surveillance state? In both cases, members of Congress were asked to trust the assertions of elites that significant harms would result if the bills were not enacted: terrorist acts in the event that the Patriot Act was not extended, or financial calamity in the event that the bailout was not passed or the debt ceiling was not raised. As a matter of practice (but not necessarily theory), convincing someone that a future crisis must be averted requires a higher level of persuasion than making the case for a policy that is claimed to ameliorate some extant problem. Members of Congress who are members of their party establishments might be more inclined to trust testimony from financial or national security elites, and therefore might have been easier to pitch on these bills. We should be careful about extrapolating the voting behavior of Congress to policy views among the general public. But as I have suggested, the establishment-outsider divide can loom large in presidential primaries. Particularly within the Republican Party, rank-and-file voters have increasingly lukewarm views of the party leadership. But Democrats will also face a primary after Mr. Obama’s tenure in office. Highly liberal, activist voters who might ordinarily be inclined to critique the status quo could face some awkward questions given that the status quo has featured a Democratic president. Debates on domestic surveillance could serve as proxy battles for these intraparty factions. Senator Rand Paul of Kentucky, perhaps along with other Republican candidates, could use his opposition to surveillance programs to help consolidate the support of libertarian and Tea Party voters, at the risk of alienating national security conservatives. Democratic candidates who criticize the Patriot Act or the N.S.A.’s actions will be finding fault with policies that Mr. Obama has defended – and Mr. Obama will very likely remain quite popular among Democrats three years from now.

#### <Their evidence ends>

Precisely because public opinion on domestic **surveillance** policy is malleable (as evidenced by the Pew survey), it may **come to take on symbolic power**. How inclined will Democrats be to support policies that they might otherwise oppose because Mr. Obama pledges that the N.S.A. is using the information it collects appropriately? How much are Republicans willing to believe national security officials appointed by Mr. Obama — defending policies that were often first enacted under Mr. Bush? How does someone in either party weigh the desire to prevent terrorist attacks against the image of a bureaucrat snooping through his in-box? The phrase “trust in government” is often invoked in a political context, but its meaning is usually metaphorical, referring to how much a voter might prefer public-sector decisions to those that might be left to the private sector or to individuals. Here, it means something rather more literal: do you trust officials within the government to carry out their national security mission without abusing their powers? Do you trust them when they say that the trade-off between security and liberty is worthwhile — especially when many of the threats they claim to be preventing are based on classified information that you aren’t privy to? In some ways, it may prove invigorating to have a political debate that does not break down all that neatly into the usual partisan camps. And because they create as many fractures across the parties as between them, the recent N.S.A. disclosures might not have all that much effect, for instance, on Mr. Obama’s approval ratings or the Congressional elections next year.

#### Decline doesn’t cause war

Daniel W. Drezner 12, Professor, The Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University, October 2012, “The Irony of Global Economic Governance: The System Worked,” <http://www.globaleconomicgovernance.org/wp-content/uploads/IR-Colloquium-MT12-Week-5_The-Irony-of-Global-Economic-Governance.pdf>

The final outcome addresses a dog that hasn’t barked: the effect of the Great Recession on cross-border conflict and violence. During the initial stages of the crisis, multiple analysts asserted that the financial crisis would lead states to increase their use of force as a tool for staying in power.37 Whether through greater internal repression, diversionary wars, arms races, or a ratcheting up of great power conflict, there were genuine concerns that the global economic downturn would lead to an increase in conflict. Violence in the Middle East, border disputes in the South China Sea, and even the disruptions of the Occupy movement fuel impressions of surge in global public disorder. ¶ The aggregate data suggests otherwise, however. The Institute for Economics and Peace has constructed a “Global Peace Index” annually since 2007. A key conclusion they draw from the 2012 report is that “The average level of peacefulness in 2012 is approximately the same as it was in 2007.”38 Interstate violence in particular has declined since the start of the financial crisis – as have military expenditures in most sampled countries. Other studies confirm that the Great Recession has not triggered any increase in violent conflict;

the secular decline in violence that started with the end of the Cold War has not been reversed.39 Rogers Brubaker concludes, “the crisis has not to date generated the surge in protectionist nationalism or ethnic exclusion that might have been expected.”40¶ None of these data suggest that the global economy is operating swimmingly. Growth remains unbalanced and fragile, and has clearly slowed in 2012. Transnational capital flows remain depressed compared to pre-crisis levels, primarily due to a drying up of cross-border interbank lending in Europe. Currency volatility remains an ongoing concern. Compared to the aftermath of other postwar recessions, growth in output, investment, and employment in the developed world have all lagged behind. But the Great Recession is not like other postwar recessions in either scope or kind; expecting a standard “V”-shaped recovery was unreasonable. One financial analyst characterized the post-2008 global economy as in a state of “contained depression.”41 The key word is “contained,” however. Given the severity, reach and depth of the 2008 financial crisis, the proper comparison is with Great Depression. And by that standard, the outcome variables look impressive. As Carmen Reinhart and Kenneth Rogoff concluded in This Time is Different: “that its macroeconomic outcome has been only the most severe global recession since World War II – and not even worse – must be regarded as fortunate.”42

#### Too far away

**Klimas, 12/30/13** (Jacqueline, “GOP gains preferred status in voter polls” Washington Times, factiva)

It's too early to use the poll results as good predictions of winners and losers on Election Day, especially because of evolving situations such as the Obamacare rollout. "You can't use polls to predict election results a year from now any more than you can use Weather.com to decide if you should bring an umbrella that day," said Christy Setzer, a Democratic consultant. "Trend lines are more important than any one poll: If voters' feelings about Obamacare are down six months from now, that will say more than a snapshot two months after the rollout." Republicans hold a 17-seat majority in the House and would need to win six seats from Democrats to win control of the Senate. Some Democrats in traditionally red states, including Sen. Mary L. Landrieu of Louisiana and Sen. Mark L. Pryor of Arkansas, are up for re-election.

#### Congressional races decided by local issues not national

**Stanage, 1/2/14** (Niall, “Dems can't count on economy to save them in midterm elections”

Read more: http://thehill.com/blogs/on-the-money/economy/194213-obama-dems-cant-count-on-economy-to-save-them-in-midterms#ixzz2prBc6Fee

President Obama and Democrats might not be able to rely on the economic recovery to bolster their chances in November’s midterm elections. Even though there has been a raft of positive economic news recently, experts in crucial battleground states caution that other issues, notably ObamaCare, could loom even larger than the economy. They also add that congressional races, whether for the House or Senate, could swing as easily on local priorities as on broader questions of the national economy. And in some cases, the local economic story is different from the emerging national trend.

#### Tea Party inevitable, many other issues matter more than the plan and the moderate GOP is the same as the Tea Party

**Skocpol, 14 -** Harvard Government and Sociology professor (Theda, Democracy Journal, “Why the Tea Party’s Hold Persists” Winter, <http://www.democracyjournal.org/31/why-the-tea-partys-hold-persists.php>)

Other optimists placed greater emphasis on the supposed new will of business interests and Republican Party elders to recapture party control. Offering reassurance, supporters of Republican Speaker of the House John Boehner told the pre-eminent inside-the-Beltway gossip site Politico that their guy was more effectively in charge of his raucous GOP caucus following the shutdown debacle. Karl Rove vowed to block far-right Tea Party challengers in GOP primaries, and the Chamber of Commerce started to make noises about supporting some supposed “moderates” against Tea Party candidates in 2014 GOP primaries. But we have heard all this before. The Tea Party was supposed to be dead and the GOP on the way to moderate repositioning after Obama’s victory and Democratic congressional gains in November 2012. Yet less than a year after post-election GOP soul searching supposedly occurred, radical forces pulled almost all GOP

House and Senate members into at least going along with more than two weeks of extortion tactics to try to force President Obama and Senate Democrats to gut the Affordable Care Act and grant a long laundry list of other GOP priorities suspiciously similar to the platform on which the party had run and lost in 2012. The Tea Party’s hold on the GOP persists beyond each burial ceremony. In 2011, Vanessa Williamson and I published our book The Tea Party and the Remaking of Republican Conservatism, which used a full panoply of research—from interviews and local observations to media and website analysis and tracking of national surveys—to explain the dynamics of this radical movement. We showed how bottom-up and top-down forces intersect to give the Tea Party both leverage over the Republican Party and the clout to push national politics sharply to the right. At the grassroots, volunteer activists formed hundreds of local Tea Parties, meeting regularly to plot public protests against the Obama Administration and place steady pressure on GOP organizations and candidates at all levels. At least half of all GOP voters sympathize with this Tea Party upsurge. They are overwhelmingly older, white, conservative-minded men and women who fear that “their country” is about to be lost to mass immigration and new extensions of taxpayer-funded social programs (like the Affordable Care Act) for low- and moderate-income working-aged people, many of whom are black or brown. Fiscal conservatism is often said to be the top grassroots Tea Party priority, but Williamson and I did not find this to be true. Crackdowns on immigrants, fierce opposition to Democrats, and cuts in spending for the young were the overriding priorities we heard from volunteer Tea Partiers, who are often, themselves, collecting costly Social Security, Medicare, and veterans benefits to which they feel fully entitled as Americans who have “paid their dues” in lifetimes of hard work. On the other end of the organizational spectrum, big-money funders and free-market advocacy organizations used angry grassroots protests to expand their email lists and boost longstanding campaigns to slash taxes, shrink social spending, privatize Medicare and Social Security, and eliminate or block regulations (including carbon controls). In 2009, groups such as FreedomWorks, Americans for Prosperity, the Club for Growth, and Tea Party Express (a renamed conservative GOP political action committee) leapt on the bandwagon; more recently, the Senate Conservative Action Fund and Heritage Action have greatly bolstered the leveraging capacities of the Tea Party as a whole. Elite activities ramped up after many Tea Party legislators were elected in 2010. Here is the key point: Even though there is no one center of Tea Party authority—indeed, in some ways because there is no one organized center—the entire gaggle of grassroots and elite organizations amounts to a pincers operation that wields money and primary votes to exert powerful pressure on Republican officeholders and candidates. Tea Party influence does not depend on general popularity at all. Even as most Americans have figured out that they do not like the Tea Party or its methods, Tea Party clout has grown in Washington and state capitals. Most legislators and candidates are Nervous Nellies, so all Tea Party activists, sympathizers, and funders have had to do is recurrently demonstrate their ability to knock off seemingly unchallengeable Republicans (ranging from Charlie Crist in Florida to Bob Bennett of Utah to Indiana’s Richard Lugar). That grabs legislators’ attention and results in either enthusiastic support for, or acquiescence to, obstructive tactics. The entire pincers operation is further enabled by various right-wing tracking organizations that keep close count of where each legislator stands on “key votes”—including even votes on amendments and the tiniest details of parliamentary procedure, the kind of votes that legislative leaders used to orchestrate in the dark. The 2010 elections were a high watermark for Tea Party funders and voters. Amid intense public frustration at the slow economic recovery, only two of five U.S. voters went to the polls. The electorate skewed toward older, whiter, wealthier conservatives; and this low turnout allowed fired-up Tea Party Republicans to score many triumphs in the House and state legislatures. And the footholds gained are not easily lost. Once solid blocs of Tea Party supporters or compliant legislators are ensconced in office, outside figures like Dick Armey of FreedomWorks (in 2011) and Jim DeMint of Heritage Action (in 2013) appoint themselves de facto orchestrators, taking control away from elected GOP leaders John Boehner and Mitch McConnell. In the latest such maneuver during the summer of 2013, radical-right Texas Senator Ted Cruz put himself forward as a bold Tea Party strategist calling for a renewed all-out crusade to kill Obamacare long after it was assured survival by the Supreme Court and the 2012 presidential election. With his strong ties to far-right funders and ideologues, plus a self-assured, even arrogant, pugnaciousness that thrills much of the GOP electorate, Cruz could direct a chunk of House Republicans to pressure a weak Boehner into proceeding with the government shutdown and debt brinkmanship. Apologists say Boehner was “reluctant,” but what difference does that make? He went along. After the immediate effort flopped and caused most Americans to further sour on Republicans, Cruz remained unbowed. And why not? After all, Cruz gained near-total name recognition and sky-high popularity among Tea Party voters. He now appears regularly on television, and his antics have allowed elite Tea Party forces to lock in draconian reductions in federal spending for coming rounds of budget struggles. Americans may resent the Tea Party, but they are also losing ever more faith in the federal government—a big win for anti-government saboteurs. Popularity and “responsible governance” are not the goals of Tea Party forces, and such standards should not be used to judge the accomplishments of those who aim to undercut, block, and delay—even as Tea Party funders remain hopeful about holding their own or making further gains in another low-turnout midterm election in November 2014. The bottom line is sobering. Anyone concerned about the damage Tea Party forces are inflicting on American politics needs to draw several hard-headed conclusions. For one, at least three successive national election defeats will be necessary to even begin to break the determination and leverage of Tea Party adherents. Grassroots Tea Partiers see themselves in a last-ditch effort to save “their country,” and big-money ideologues are determined to undercut Democrats and sabotage active government. They are in this fight for the long haul. Neither set of actors will stand down easily or very soon. Also worth remembering is that “moderate Republicans” barely exist right now. Close to two-thirds of House Republicans voted against bipartisan efforts to reopen the federal government and prevent U.S. default on loan obligations, and Boehner has never repudiated such extortionist tactics. Tea Partiers may not call for another shutdown right away, but they will continue to be able to draw most GOP legislators and leaders into aggressive efforts to obstruct and delay. In the electorate, moreover, more than half of GOP voters sympathize with the Tea Party and cheer on obstructionist tactics, and the remaining Republicans and Republican-leaning independents are disorganized and divided in their views of the likes of Ted Cruz.
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### AT: solvency

#### We still solve

Goldsmith, 13 [\*Henry L. Shattuck Professor of Law, Harvard Law School. Since some of the matters under discussion here occurred in the George W. Bush administration, I should note that I served in that administration as Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legal Counsel (2003-2004) and as Special Counsel to the General Counsel (2002-2003). Thanks to Professor John Manning and Claire Guehenno for discussion and assistance.A Reply to Professor Katyal Jack Goldsmith Responding to Neal Kumar Katyal, Stochastic Constraint, 126 Harv. L. Rev. 990 (2013), http://www.harvardlawreview.org/issues/126/february13/forum\_1004.php]

Power and Constraint is a response to the conventional wisdom, widespread in the legal academy, that in the national security context we live "in an age after the separation of powers, and the legally con-strained executive is now a historical curiosity."1 The book argues, to the contrary, that the executive branch under two post-9/11 terror presidencies has been deeply constrained by law (and politics). It shows how Congress and the courts — traditionally weak checks on wartime presidents — pushed back hard against Presidents Bush and Obama and imposed unprecedented restrictions. It further shows that these traditional forces were supplemented by a vigorous press aided by advances in digital technology; by lawyers, inspectors general, and other "watchers" deployed in novel ways inside the presidency; and by consequential nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) that brought successful campaigns and lawsuits against the presidency. These forces together generated information about what the presidency was doing in its secret wars, forced it to explain its actions, and often changed the President's desired course (and imposed significant constraints) when his explanations failed to persuade.2 The central normative claim in Power and Constraint is that contemporary checks on the presidency helped achieve national consensus — as a matter of law and policy — about the President's proper counterterrorism powers and in the process legitimated them.3 Power and Constraint distinguishes this claim from the normative question of whether the checks produce optimal presidential constraint and optimal counterterrorism policies, issues about which the book is agnostic. There is much to admire in our constitutional system, but whether it achieves optimal counterterrorism constraints and policies depends on facts we do not (and cannot) know and on contested normative judgments.4 Professor Neal Katyal has written a thoughtful review of my book that takes issue with both its descriptive and normative arguments. I am grateful for this opportunity to respond. I. Ex Ante Versus Ex Post Checks And Balances Katyal claims that "traditional" or "Madisonian" checks and balances5 operate as ex ante limits on the president that "constrained [the President] at the outset instead of down the road."6 He contrasts this supposedly traditional approach with the "newfangled checks and balances"7 described in Power and Constraint, which he says involve "ex post scrutiny"of the presidency.8 This description — both of what the Framers envisioned and the way modern checks and balances work — is inaccurate. Katyal’s notion of ex ante checks is that each branch (most notably the Executive) should respect the constitutional and other legal limits on their power before acting, and that ex post action by the other branches should be exceptional. But neither Madison nor the framers generally believed that the President (or the other branches) would be constrained through ex ante constraints alone, or even primarily. Madison believed that the solution "for maintaining in practice the necessary partition of power among the several departments" was to "contriv[e] the interior structure of the government as that its several constituent parts may, by their mutual relations, be the means of keeping each other in their proper places."9 As the highlighted phrases from The Federalist No. 51 demonstrate, Madison viewed checks and balances as a process of dynamic interaction between the branches. Other passages in The Federalist No. 51 make plain that this dynamic interaction involved a heavy dose of reactive (in Katyal's terms, ex post) measures against the usurping branch. "[T]he great security against a gradual concentration of the several powers in the same department, consists in giving to those who administer each department the necessary constitutional means and personal motives to resist encroachments of the others," Madison noted.10 "[T]he constant aim is to divide and arrange the several offices in such a manner as that each may be a check on the other," he added.11 And most famously, Madison said: "Ambition must be made to counteract ambition."12 Resisting encroachments, checking other branches, counteracting ambition — all of these famous ideas suggest that Madison contemplated the branches having the interest and the power to push back against a usurping branch when it overreached. Using Katyal's terms, Madison emphasized the need for ex post checks. Even this way of putting things is misleading. When Katyal talks about ex post and ex ante checks, he means checks after and before presidential action, respectively. But of course the President and the other branches are always in an ex post and ex ante situation at the same time. When the President uses force abroad without congressional authorization (or takes any other potentially controversial executive action), he assesses the expected reaction of the other branches based in part on their past actions, including statutes and judicial precedents. Such actions show how the other branches reacted to similar situations in the past and how they explained what they thought would be lawful or appropriate in the future. Sometimes the President declines to act because he anticipates, based on these factors (ex ante checks), a reaction from the other branches that makes the action unattractive. And sometimes he acts and the other branches push back to defeat or limit his action (an ex post check). Madison of-ten talked in terms of ex post checks, but he surely realized that ex post checks would have ex ante effects on the presidency.13 The same point holds for what Katyal says are "Goldsmith's ex post checks,"14 but which in reality are our nation's system of constitutional checks that have simultaneous ex post and ex ante elements. Presidents Bush and Obama acted in the face of prior laws and precedents that informed what they believed was the scope of possible and appropriate presidential action. When their actions (such as the Bush administration's black site and interrogation program) or threatened actions (such as the Obama administration's threat to close the U.S. Naval Station at Guantanamo Bay) were deemed by the other branches to go too far, those branches pushed back using what in Katyal's terms would be ex post action. But the novel forms of constraint and ac-countability that grew up after 9/11 also have ex ante effects on the presidency going forward.15 The real distinguishing feature of the modern separation of powers is not ex post checks, but rather the gargantuan array of eyeballs gazing at the presidency, in secret and in public, and forming what Power and Constraint describes as a "presidential synopticon."16 In the presidential synopticon, many actors inside and outside the executive branch watch what it is doing, often say "no" to proposed action, force it to account for actions taken, and alter its actions if they disapprove — all with simultaneous ex ante and ex post effects. II. Normative Claims Katyal worries that the checks and balances described in Power and Constraint are less effective than traditional checks and balances in controlling the presidency.17 This claim is premised on the confusion about ex ante and ex post checks noted above, but also suffers from other difficulties. The presidential synopticon was born in response to Nixon's imperial presidency but did not come to maturity until after 9/11.18 It was first instituted because the presidency was deemed too large, too powerful, and too secretive to be monitored and held accountable by Congress and the courts acting alone. And it grew significantly in power and scope after 9/11 "because of extensive concerns about excessive presidential power in an indefinite and unusually secretive war fought among civilians, not just abroad but at home as well."19 The reticulate system of laws that today govern national security, the literally thousands of national security lawyers who ensure compliance with these laws, the array of powerful and effectively independent inspectors general and compliance officers, the mass of reporting and related disclosure requirements, a robust press and FOIA regime, aggressive NGOs, and much more are all a response to fears of a too-big, too-potent presidency. These institutions are a supplement and spur to congressional and judicial review, not a substitute for them. Katyal suggests that the presidency would be more accountable and more constrained without these actors assisting Congress and courts.20 But he never explains why or how that is so, and it is hard to see how he might be right. Katyal makes much of the President's "huge first-mover advantage."21 But the inferences he draws from this undoubtedly true premise are wrong. The framers cherished this quality in the powerful presidency they purposefully created. "Energy in the executive is a leading character in the definition of good government," noted Alexander Hamilton in The Federalist No. 70.22 The energetic presidency can become a usurping one, of course, and that is where constitutional checks come in to play. What Katyal overlooks —surprisingly, since he argued vigorously against excessive legal constraints on the national security presidency as Deputy and Acting Solicitor General23 — is the possibility of an insufficiently energetic or overly constrained presidency, such as the ones we had on 9/11 or during the nearly successful attack by underwear bomber Umar Farouk Abdulmutallab over Detroit in December 2009.24 Katyal focuses exclusively on whether the president is adequately checked. But Congress and courts might go too far in checking the presidency, as I suspect Katyal thinks happened when Congress limited President Obama's discretion over Guantanamo Bay detainees.25 The hard issue for normative separation of powers is not simply how to constrain the presidency, but how to ensure that the presidency and other branches are adequately restrained and empowered. A related point is that the President's first-mover advantage does not, as Katyal thinks, inevitably lead to more presidential power. Sometimes it does. But sometimes the first move overreaches, inviting constraints that narrow presidential power from the original baseline.26 Katyal's simplistic discussion of ex ante constraints on the presidency minimizes the difficulties of identifying and enforcing such constraints. It also overlooks the many realities about how the branches interact in practice and the contingencies that unfold without warning in a complex world. And it suffers from its failure to provide or grapple with the normative criteria for optimal presidential constraint. The identification of such criteria is among the hardest problem in normative theories about separation of powers, and is almost certainly unsolvable in general terms.27 The optimal level of presidential constraint — in national security and other contexts — is elusive because it depends on ever-changing and sometimes unknowable facts (about, for example, the nature of the threat or the efficacy of particular counterterrorism policies), as well as contested normative judgments (about, for example, what the Constitution permits or what morality requires). Katyal assumes away these difficulties but his argument depends on his ability to answer them. Power and Constraint is agnostic about whether our separation of powers system produces such optimal constraints. It argues that the presidential synopticon pushed back against perceived extremes in the two post-9/11 presidencies and helped to achieve national consensus and legitimation. But it emphasizes, "To say that the presidential [ac-countability system] helped generate a consensus about the counterterrorism policies the President can legitimately use does not, unfortunately, mean that it generated the right policies — the ones best designed to prevent terrorist attacks while at the same time preserving other values as much as possible."28 Optimal policies and optimal constraints are fluid, contextual, contested, and ever-changing because the facts and normative intuitions that underlie them are fluid, contextual, contested, and ever-changing.29 This fluidity of facts and norms, and the related inability to specify static optimal constraints on presidential power, are the main reasons why, as chapter 8 of Power and Constraint argues, the nation is destined to continue its cycle of under- and over-reaction to the terrorist threat. Katyal's hopeful plea to get constraints right ex ante is unrealistic and is belied by our constitutional history.30 This sounds like a discouraging conclusion, but it should not be: "While it is difficult to make firm conclusions about optimal counterterrorism policies and their associated accountability mechanisms, the experiences of the last decade provide a second-order solace."31 The second-order solace is that "[t]he presidential synopticon incessantly generates new information about the terror threat and the appropriateness and efficacy of counterterrorism measures to meet this threat, and our flexible political and legal institutions respond relatively quickly to this information."32 As Arthur Schlesinger put the point, the signal virtue of our constitutional separation of powers is not that it generates perfect policies but rather that it embodies "the vital mechanism of self-correction" — the ability to generate new information about government action over time and to shape that action in ways that reflect the approval of the other institutions of government and of the American people.33 We can expect no more.

### AT: Legitimacy

#### Material power’s irrelevant---lack of legitimacy makes heg ineffective

Barak Mendelsohn 10, assistant professor of political science at Haverford College and a senior fellow of FPRI. Author of Combating Jihadism: American Hegemony and Interstate Cooperation in the War on Terrorism, June 2010, “The Question of International Cooperation in the War on Terrorism”, http://www.fpri.org/enotes/201006.mendelsohn.cooperationwarterror.html

Going against common conceptions, I argue that the United States sought to advance more than what it viewed as simply its own interest. The United States stands behind multiple collaborative enterprises and should be credited for that. Nevertheless, sometimes it has overreached, sought to gain special rights other states do not have, or presented strategies that were not compatible with the general design of the war on terrorism, to which most states subscribed. When it went too far, the United States found that, while secondary powers could not stop it from taking action, they could deny it legitimacy and make the achievement of its objectives unattainable. Thus, despite the common narrative, U.S. power was successfully checked, and the United States found the limitations of its power, even under the Bush administration. Defining Hegemony Let me begin with my conception of hegemony. While the definition of hegemony is based on its material aspects—the preponderance of power—hegemony should be understood as a part of a social web comprised of states. A hegemon relates to the other states in the system not merely through the prism of power balances, but through shared norms and a system of rules providing an umbrella for interstate relations. Although interstate conflict is ubiquitous in international society and the pursuit of particularistic interests is common, the international society provides a normative framework that restricts and moderates the hegemon's actions. This normative framework accounts for the hegemon's inclination toward orderly and peaceful interstate relations and minimizes its reliance on power. A hegemon’s role in the international community relies on legitimacy. Legitimacy is associated with external recognition of the hegemon’s right of primacy, not just the fact of this primacy. States recognize the hegemon’s power, but they develop expectations that go beyond the idea that the hegemon will act as it wishes because it has the capabilities to do so. Instead, the primacy of the hegemon is manifested in the belief that, while it has special rights that other members of the international society lack, it also has a set of duties to the members of the international society. As long as the hegemon realizes its commitment to the collective, its position will be deemed legitimate. International cooperation is hard to achieve. And, in general, international relations is not a story of harmony. A state’s first inclination is to think about its own interests, and states always prefer doing less over doing more. The inclination to pass the buck or to free ride on the efforts of others is always in the background. If a hegemon is willing to lead in pursuit of collective interests and to shoulder most of the burden, it can improve the prospects of international cooperation. However, even when there is a hegemon willing to lead a collective action and when states accept that action is needed, obstacles may still arise. These difficulties can be attributed to various factors, but especially prominent is the disagreement over the particular strategy that the hegemon promotes in pursuing the general interest. When states think that the strategy and policies offered by the hegemon are not compatible with the accepted rules of “rightful conduct” and break established norms, many will disapprove and resist. Indeed, while acceptance of a hegemon’s leadership in international society may result in broad willingness to cooperate with the hegemon in pursuit of shared interests it does not guarantee immediate and unconditional compliance with all the policies the hegemon articulates. While its legitimacy does transfer to its actions and grants some leeway, that legitimacy does not justify every policy the hegemon pursues—particularly those policies that are not seen as naturally deriving from the existing order. As a result, specific policies must be legitimated before cooperation takes place. This process constrains the hegemon’s actions and prevents the uninhibited exercise of power.

#### Brooks and Wohlforth are wrong about everything

Loomis, 08 [LEVERAGING LEGITIMACY IN SECURING U.S. LEADERSHIP NORMATIVE DIMENSIONS OF HEGEMONIC AUTHORITY A Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences of Georgetown University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Government, August 4, 2008]

Questioning Illegitimacy Costs: The Brooks-Wohlforth Challenge A nuanced perspective that avoids taking a paradigmatic position on the question of legitimacy costs is that recently advanced by Stephen Brooks and William Wohlforth.24 Brooks and Wohlforth focus their argument on the impact of U.S. unilateralism and insist that current international relations theory simply does not support an academic claim that U.S. unilateral behavior negatively impacts U.S. interests in the divergent ways that Neorealism, Neoliberal Institutionalism, and Constructivism predicts. United States unilateralism is a prime candidate for conduct perceived to be illegitimate and thus is a good test for my argument that perceived illegitimacy degrades U.S. influence. Given the extensiveness of U.S. power, the exaggerated levels of alarm that U.S. unilateralism presumably has generated, and the extent to which legal and social norms proscribe unilateral behavior, it is widely expected that U.S. unilateralism has a particularly strong deteriorating effect on U.S. authority. Brooks and Wohlforth conclude that the empirical evidence and the logical sequence of each of the three mainstream traditions of international relations theory provide insufficient evidence that the United States faces tangible costs as a result of unilateral behavior. Their analysis, however, suffers from a misspecification of the “costs” that they are looking for in response to U.S. unilateralism. Because the heart of their argument is that the costs of unilateral behavior are relatively low, a close inspection of the contours of these costs is required to evaluate their claim. First, challenging the Realist critique of U.S. unilateralism, the authors propose that balancing behavior against the United States is an expected cost of U.S. unilateralism. They conclude that because balancing is not observable, there are no tangible costs. Yet given the vastness of U.S. military preponderance, balancing is unlikely irrespective of U.S. behavior. Yet despite the fact that balancing is remote considering its short-term futility, the absence of balancing is not a fair test of the costs of illegitimate behavior. They do point to resistance strategies of key European states—notably Germany and France—as a form of “soft balancing”, but they suggest that this behavior was the result of German and French domestic politics and had little to do with unilateralism of the United States. Yet they do not make clear why ally domestic opposition to U.S. behavior, which restricts ally behavior vis-àvis U.S. requests, should not be considered a cost of U.S. unilateralism. This oversight is particularly problematic in cases in which domestic opposition generates real costs for the United States. Furthermore, irrespective of the fact that this behavior would be difficult to characterize as acts of balancing (soft or hard) in the definition they provide, their restriction of authority costs to balancing-type behavior renders an analysis of the impact of perceived illegitimacy incomplete.25 Second, Brooks and Wohlforth suggest that the paucity of evidence that unilateral behavior resulted in a major reduction in efficiency gains predicted in the neoliberal literature undermines the institutionalist critique of unilateralism. For one thing, they argue, there is no clear consensus in the literature on the impact of unilateral behavior on U.S. bargaining leverage. In addition, they argue, much of this literature is heavily empirical and devoid of theoretical content. Furthermore, the costs of multilateral action are significant and must be considered against the professed gains of multilateral coordination. Lastly, they suggest that the claim that the United States suffers from bad-faith behavior vis-à-vis institutional engagement is entangled with the emerging literature on reputation effects, which is, in their words, “woefully underdeveloped”.26 In sum, in their view, the theoretical and empirical evidence is insufficiently robust to identify the precise costs that the U.S. faces as a result of a unilateral foreign policy. It is not so much that the institutionalist literature is incorrect on the subject, but that the research agenda is incomplete. Yet by missing the costs in the form of degraded authority, they are prevented from assessing the full range of effects that U.S. unilateralism triggers. Third, Brooks and Wohlforth raise doubts about the constructivist argument that U.S. unilateralism degrades the legitimacy of the architecture of international order—an order from which the United States directly benefits—requiring increased U.S. costs for continued maintenance of the existing order. In establishing the contours of constructivism, they restrict this school of thought to its emphasis on the habituation of international rules, consistent with James March and Johan Olsen’s suggestion that a “logic of appropriateness” shapes decision-making processes.27 Brooks and Wohlforth then challenge constructivist 26 Brooks and Wohlforth, "International Relations Theory and the Case against Unilateralism," 516. 27 March and Olsen, Rediscovering Institutions : The Organizational Basis of Politics, 23. 24 claims that unilateral behavior toward Iraq in 2003 will generate unacceptable costs by suggesting there were other degrading effects of the onset of the Iraq war besides the fact that it was largely unilateral. Their criticism here, too, fails to explore the full range of authority costs, and thus fails to undermine the essential core of my argument. First, the argument I am advancing suggests that ideational factors—perceived fidelity to widely accepted international norms— influence decisions to resist U.S. authority. While legitimacy is widely considered to be the realm of constructivist scholarship, as discussed above, its effects are not dependent on the socialization effects and subsequent internalization of those norms. The argument here is that states can choose to comply with normative influences as a matter of strategic choice, which bypasses the centrality of identity transformation often identified with constructivists (and presumed by Brooks and Wohlforth as forming the outer boundary of constructivist thought). The main reason the Brooks and Wohlforth critique is unconvincing with respect to the constructivist expectation of legitimacy costs again turns on the subject of costs. They argue that because constructivist scholarship fails to satisfactorily answer three entangled complexities—that some forms of unilateralism are more costly than others, compensating strategies may mollify the possible costs, and unilateralism can shape the normative landscape to the hegemon’s advantage—constructivism cannot establish any generalities regarding the legitimacy effects of unilateralism with any degree of confidence. The problem is not that constructivist arguments about unilateralism are wrong, but rather that the scope 25 conditions have not been sufficiently specified. As a result, they argue, the constructivist perspective is deprived of analytical leverage. The 2003 Iraq war is a single data point, they suggest, exhibiting many features that may have degraded U.S. legitimacy. Here their entire argument hangs on the fact that constructivism has not provided sufficient purchase beyond the case of Iraq. How can one be certain that it was unilateralism that had the effect that constructivists now claim in retrospect? This question is valid. Yet in making this case they admit that “many other aspects of the (Iraq) case… are obviously corrosive of legitimacy.”28 Limiting constructivist arguments to unilateralism may be overly restrictive, but according to Brooks’ and Wohlforth’s own standards, the soil is fertile for new work on the broader question of the costs of perceived illegality and illegitimacy. It is on this broader question that this dissertation seeks to provide insight. Brooks and Wohlforth ultimately conclude that academic criticisms of President Bush’s unilateral policies were motivated largely by the substance of the policies (on which academia traditionally has little to offer), but focused on procedural issues (on which it does). They call for increased attention to clarifying the distinction between criticisms of substance and of procedure. In one respect, this dissertation is an answer to their skepticism that international relations scholarship has much to offer in terms of generalities around unilateralism. I am seeking to expand the specification of the independent variable beyond unilateral behavior to include the character of U.S. foreign policy, measured by its normative 28 Brooks and Wohlforth, "International Relations Theory and the Case against Unilateralism," 518. 26 consistency with international standards regulating the use of force. This should help satisfy the criticism that the outcome of unilateralism is under-determined.

### AT: Terror

#### Ayson is not an impact card

**Ayson 10** (Robert, Professor of Strategic Studies, Director of Strategic Studies: New Zealand, Senior Research Associate with Oxford’s Centre for International Studies. “After a Terrorist Nuclear Attack: Envisaging Catalytic Effects. Studies in Conflict and Terrorism, Volume 33, Issue 7, July 2010, pages 571-593)

Some possibilities, however remote, do suggest themselves. For example, how might the United States react if it was thought or discovered that the ﬁssile material used in the act of nuclear terrorism had come from Russian stocks, 40 and if for some reason Moscow denied any responsibility for nuclear laxity? The correct attribution of that nuclear material to a particular country might not be a case of science ﬁction given the observation by Michael May et al. that while the debris resulting from a nuclear explosion would be “spread over a wide area in tiny fragments, its radioactivity makes it detectable, identiﬁable and collectable, and a wealth of information can be obtained from its analysis: the efﬁciency of the explosion, the materials used and, most important . . . some indication of where the nuclear material came from.” 41 Alternatively, if the act of nuclear terrorism came as a complete surprise, and American ofﬁcials refused to believe that a terrorist group was fully responsible (or responsible at all) suspicion would shift immediately to state possessors. Ruling out Western ally countries like the United Kingdom and France, and probably Israel and India as well, authorities in Washington would be left with a very short list consisting of North Korea, perhaps Iran if its program continues, and possibly Pakistan. But at what stage would Russia and China be deﬁnitely ruled out in this high stakes game of nuclear Cluedo? In particular, if the act of nuclear terrorism occurred against a backdrop of existing tension in Washington’s relations with Russia and/or China, and at a time when threats had already been traded between these major powers, would ofﬁcials and political leaders not be tempted to assume the worst? Of course, the chances of this occurring would only seem to increase if the United States was **already** involved **in** some sort of limited **armed conﬂict with Russia** and/or China, or if they were confronting each other from a distance in a proxy war, as unlikely as these developments may seem at the present time. The reverse might well apply too: should a nuclear terrorist attack occur in Russia or China during a period of heightened tension or even limited conﬂict with the United States, could Moscow and Beijing resist the pressures that might rise domestically to consider the United States as a possible perpetrator or encourager of the attack?

**[Impact card begins, usually]**

Washington's early response to a terrorist nuclear attack on its own soil might also raise the possibility of an unwanted (and nuclear aided) confrontation with Russia and/or China. For example, in the noise and confusion during the immediate aftermath of the terrorist nuclear attack, the U.S. president might be expected to place the country's armed forces, including its nuclear arsenal, on a higher stage of alert. In such a tense environment, when careful planning runs up against the friction of reality, it is just possible that Moscow and/or China might mistakenly read this as a sign of U.S. intentions to use force (and possibly nuclear force) against them. In that situation, the temptations to preempt such actions might grow, although it must be admitted that any preemption would probably still meet with a devastating response. As part of its initial response to the act of nuclear terrorism (as discussed earlier) Washington might decide to order a significant conventional (or nuclear) retaliatory or disarming attack against the leadership of the terrorist group and/or states seen to support that group. Depending on the identity and especially the location of these targets, Russia and/or China might interpret such action as being far too close for their comfort, and potentially as an infringement on their spheres of influence and even on their sovereignty. One far-fetched but perhaps not impossible scenario might stem from a judgment in Washington that some of the main aiders and abetters of the terrorist action resided somewhere such as Chechnya, perhaps in connection with what Allison claims is the “Chechen insurgents' … long-standing interest in all things nuclear.”42 American pressure on that part of the world would almost certainly raise alarms in Moscow that …might require a degree of advanced consultation from Washington that the latter found itself unable or unwilling to provide.

 There is also the question of how other nuclear-armed states respond to the act of nuclear terrorism on another member of that special club. It could **reasonably be expected** that following a nuclear terrorist attack on the United States, both Russia and China would extend **immediate sympathy and support** to Washington and would work alongside the United States in the Security Council. But there is just a chance, albeit a slim one, where the support of Russia and/or China is less automatic in some cases than in others. For example, what would happen if the United States wished to discuss its right to retaliate against groups based in their territory? If, for some reason, Washington found the responses of Russia and China deeply underwhelming, (neither “for us or against us”) might it also suspect that they secretly were in cahoots with the group, increasing (again perhaps ever so slightly) the chances of a major exchange. If the terrorist group had some connections to groups in Russia and China, or existed in areas of the world over which Russia and China held sway, and if Washington felt that Moscow or Beijing were placing a curiously modest level of pressure on them, what conclusions might it then draw about their culpability? If Washington decided to use, or decided to threaten the use of, nuclear weapons, the responses of Russia and China would be crucial to the chances of avoiding a more serious nuclear exchange. They might surmise, for example, that while the act of nuclear terrorism was especially heinous and demanded a strong response, the response simply had to remain below the nuclear threshold. It would be one thing for a non-state actor to have broken the nuclear use taboo, but an entirely different thing for a state actor, and indeed the leading state in the international system, to do so. If Russia and China felt sufﬁciently strongly about that prospect, there is then the question of what options would lie open to them to dissuade the United States from such action: and as has been seen over the last several decades, the central dissuader of the use of nuclear weapons by states has been the threat of nuclear retaliation.

### AT: Turns Heg

#### No high skilled worker shortage

The Lowell Sun February 24, 2013 “Skills gap? It may just be all a myth” http://www.lowellsun.com/business/ci\_22658197/skills-gap-it-may-just-be-all-myth

I am sure many of you are familiar with the widespread view of a mismatch between workforce skills and the requirements of the American labor market. Even in our community, which has a relatively low unemployment rate, complaints are heard that employers cannot find the skilled workers needed to support demand. Nationally, industries in science and technology especially complain they cannot find the workers with the right skills in the United States.¶ However, according to professor Peter Cappelli of the Wharton School of Business, this may be largely a myth. His well-researched book, "Why Good People Can't find Jobs," describes how companies succeed and fail in finding and retaining talent. He concluded that most of the hardest positions to fill, technicians and skilled trades people, for example, can only be learned on the job. Meanwhile, more technical professionals, such as engineers and accounting/finance people, learn skills in a classroom.¶ Cappelli claims there is a major disconnect between senior executives and the managers who actually do the hiring. He insists that while executives grouse about a lack of talent, hiring managers complain about lack of work ethic and lack of on-the-job experience -- two factors that cannot be blamed on schools.¶ So what is going on? Cappelli maintains that many of today's employed would have difficulty landing a similar job now because of a dysfunctional hiring process in which filling a job vacancy is similar¶ Advertisement¶ to replacing a part in a washing machine. That is, the candidate must fit the job perfectly, not unlike a machine part, or the business can't function. The problem with this approach is no perfect fit exists between applicants and job requirements. In fact, there is no need for a perfect fit because there are multiple ways and multiple tasks upon which a company can get the job done properly.¶ There are often many options for filling a position. Unfortunately, common sense is exactly what many software-based hiring systems lack. In many applicant-screening programs, there is an over-reliance on automated keyword searches of résumés, rejecting those that are not precise matches with the job criteria. Many programs simply reject qualified candidates who may not fit one minor or vague requirement built into the résumé-rejection capabilities of the software.¶ Cappelli also points out that more discriminatory software exists that adds weight to job criteria, enabling vigilant human-resource professionals to pick those candidates who most closely fit the needs of the hiring manager. Unfortunately, as Cappelli notes, companies have dramatically downsized their HR departments because with so many layoffs companies had a large pool of skilled workers from which to choose, significantly reducing the need for HR professionals.¶ HR departments added a "reality-testing" component to the hiring process, ensuring that the criteria for hiring would more accurately meet the real needs of the firm. Today, a list of criteria would simply be downloaded onto an applicant processing system and the software would do the rest, filtering out very viable candidates in an effort to find the perfect job prospect.¶ Another factor he addresses concerns wages. Surveys suggest that many firms are simply not offering market-based wages. As a result, while these firms can find viable candidates, they will only hire at below-market wages. This is not because of a lack of trained people. Unfortunately, few companies are willing to admit that their inability to find candidates relates more to their wage scales rather than the supply of workers.

### AT: Relations

#### Relations are compartmentalized

**Jha 12** (Saurav studied economics at Presidency College, Calcutta, and Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi. He writes and researches on global energy issues and clean energy development in Asia. 2012, “U.S.-India Relations: Case-by-Case Basis, With No Guarantees,” http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/11428/u-s-india-relations-case-by-case-basis-with-no-guarantees)

The defense relationship between the U.S. and India will also follow this pattern. When it came to India’s multirole combat fighter purchase, New Delhi simply did not find enough value in the U.S. offers, given Washington’s monitoring and support regimes. However, that did not rule out almost $10 billion in purchases of support and transport aircraft from Boeing and Lockheed Martin. Moving forward, the defense relationship will continue to see steady progress in many areas, **coinciding with disappointments** in others. By contrast, the nuclear relationship is proving to be the biggest hurdle to seamless dialogue. America’s mostly Japanese-owned nuclear industry is livid about the “poison pill” supplier liability clause built into India’s recent nuclear liability law. Unlike France and Russia’s state-owned nuclear suppliers, which enjoy sovereign guarantees, American companies have to pay closer attention to the letter of the law when engaging in overseas nuclear business. This led to American accusations that New Delhi has undermined U.S. nuclear companies, even though Washington took the lead in securing the Nuclear Suppliers Group waiver that opened India’s civil nuclear sector to global trade. For India, these charges are juxtaposed against domestic public suspicion of U.S. suppliers, born out of the experience of the Bhopal disaster. Moreover, the recent introduction of a stricter enrichment and reprocessing (ENR) regime by the NSG is seen by the Indian side as a tactic by Washington to make it budge on the liability framework. Taken together, these factors trace the outlines an Indo-U.S. relationship that is **not a single monolithic entity**, but rather a collection of interwoven interests. In this context, rhetorical narratives portraying India as either an essential partner in balancing a rising China or a reflexive contrarian have **little relevance**. The substance of the relationship will be found somewhere in between, depending on both sides’ interests and the prevailing circumstances.

### 1ar thumper

#### Immigration won’t be for months and health care thumps

**MarketWatch, 1/3/14** (“Immigration bills may take months to hit House floor” <http://blogs.marketwatch.com/capitolreport/2014/01/03/immigration-bills-may-take-months-to-hit-house-floor/>)

The House doesn’t appear to be in a big hurry to get to immigration reform in 2014.

In a memo to House Republicans on Friday, Majority Leader Eric Cantor said bills about the hot-button issue of an immigration overhaul may be brought to the floor “over the next few months.”

President Barack Obama has made immigration reform a priority and House Speaker John Boehner has signaled that he will back some changes to the system. The technology industry has also thrown its weight behind an overhaul. Facebook CEO Mark Zuckerberg recently called immigration “one of the biggest civil rights issues of our time.”

Item No. 1 on Cantor’s agenda is another attack on President Barack Obama’s health-care law. “We will remain vigilant in our oversight as our committees aim to hold the administration responsible for its failures in implementing their signature piece of legislation,” he writes. Cantor said Thursday that the House will consider legislation beefing up security requirements for Obamacare’s health-insurance exchanges.

#### It will be a partisan battle

**Mentel, 12/29/13** (Thomas, “Congress Fails to Extend Unemployment Benefits” <http://wallstcheatsheet.com/stocks/congress-fails-to-extend-unemployment-benefits.html/>)

The discussion over reinstating the long-term unemployment benefits early next year is expected to be a partisan battle between Democrats and Republicans who have opposing arguments about the program’s merits. Democrats argue that the loss of unemployment benefits will negatively affect the economy, holding the belief that the increase in consumer spending offsets the $25 billion that it would cost to extend the program for one full year. But Republicans believe that the program can act as a disincentive for job hunting and is not necessary as the economy improves and unemployment numbers trend downwards. Despite the arguments between Democrats and Republicans over the necessity of the unemployment benefits program, congressional Republicans have indicated that they are willing to extend the program if Democrats make spending concessions in other areas of the budget. On Friday, President Obama called Senator Jack Reed (D-RI) and Senator Dean Heller (R-NV) to lend his support for their proposal to extend unemployment benefits another three months. Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid has indicated that the topic will be a top priority when Congress returns from break in early January.