# \*\*1AC\*\*

**1AC: Blowback**

**Contention 1 is Blowback:**

**US legitimacy has been severely damaged by detention—ending use of military commissions is key to reverse negative perceptions**

**Carson 10** (Carlissa, Judge Advocate, US Army Reserves; former US Army Military Intelligence Officer. J.D., Emory University School of Law, Spring 2010, "Yes We Can Revise the Current Military Commission System, but Why?" Connecticut Journal of International Law, Lexis)

Conclusion President Obama recently has taken a step towards the preservation of human rights through deciding to revise some provisions of the 2006 MCA and to use federal courts to try some detainees (e.g., Khalid Sheikh Mohammad). **Given that current military commissions still fail to address all of the human rights violations present in previous commissions, the US has not yet reached its final destination.** Even though the US Constitution allows our President broad war-making powers, the US is not immune to the provisions and prohibitions set forth in international treaties and customary international law. Customary international law and the treaties the US has signed and ratified undoubtedly bind the nation. n326 Even the Supreme Court has consistently held that international law is an important part of US law. n327 **The US failure to adhere to international law is detrimental in several respects. This is especially true today given the US's increasingly negative reputation in the international community. One can look to the widening political gap between the US and Europe** as an example. **n328 As the US's reputation diminishes, so does its power to negotiate and garner much needed support from other nations.** Moreover, **the presence of contrasting definitions and applications of the law governing detention and trial of detainees worldwide is dangerous. If the US, as the most powerful nation in the world, does not adhere to international law, what states will?** [\*430] In short, **failure to adhere to international law, especially concerning human rights, may provide fertile ground for the development of permanent blemishes on the US's reputation as a leader** in the realm of human rights. **Given that the use of military commissions is unnecessarily unfair and unlawful, their use should cease.** The US, while fighting terrorism, must not forget that it is not helpful to ignore international law and succumb to using the techniques implemented by our enemies, the terrorists. **The very reason we are fighting terrorism is to preserve rights such as human dignity, which should be inherent in a democratic society. The US must adopt detention and trial procedures that are in accordance with both domestic US and international bodies of law**, for these are the foundation upon which the US stands. "This is the destiny of democracy-it does not see all means as acceptable, and the ways of its enemies are not always open before it." n329 **Use of** courts-martial and/or **regularly constituted courts,** while imperfect, nonetheless **would bring the US into conformity with the principles of international law.** Perhaps if current procedures are brought into conformity with international law, UN Special Rapporteur Martin Scheinin will no longer have reason to wear a frown on flights back from Guantanamo Bay.

**Legitimacy is crucial to sustainable and effective US hegemony—judicial review is key**

**Knowles 9** [Spring, 2009, Robert Knowles is a Acting Assistant Professor, New York University School of Law, “American Hegemony and the Foreign Affairs Constitution”, ARIZONA STATE LAW JOURNAL, 41 Ariz. St. L.J. 87]

**American unipolarity has created a challenge for realists. Unipolarity was thought to be inherently unstable because other nations, seeking to protect their own security**, form alliances to counter-balance the leading state. n322 **But no nation or group of nations has yet attempted to challenge America's military predominance**. n323 Although some realists predict that [\*140] counter-balancing will occur or is already in some ways occurring, n324 William Wohlforth has offered a compelling explanation for why true counter-balancing, in the traditional realist sense, will probably not happen for decades. n325 American unipolarity is unprecedented. n326 First, **the United States is geographically isolated from other potential rivals**, who are located near one another in Eurasia. n327 **This mutes the security threat that the U.S. seems to pose while increasing the threats that potential rivals seem to pose to one another**. n328 Second, **the U.S. far exceeds the capabilities of all other states in every aspect of power** - military, economic, technological, and in terms of what is known as "soft power." **This advantage "is larger now than any analogous gap in the history of the modern state system."** n329 Third, **unipolarity is entrenched as the status quo** for the first time since the seventeenth century, multiplying free rider problems for potential rivals and rendering less relevant all modern previous experience with balancing. n330 Finally, the potential rivals' possession of nuclear weapons makes the concentration of power in the United States appear less threatening. A war between great powers in today's world is very unlikely. n331 These factors make the current system much more stable, peaceful and durable than the past multi-polar and bipolar systems in which the United States operated for all of its history until 1991. **The lack of balancing means that the U**nited **S**tates, **and by extension the executive branch, faces** much **weaker external constraints on its exercise of power** than in the past. n332 Therefore, **the internal processes of the U.S. matter now more than any other nations' have in history**. n333 And **it is these internal processes**, as much as external developments, **that will determine the durability of American unipolarity. As one realist scholar has argued, the U.S. can best ensure the [\*141] stability of this unipolar order by ensuring that its predominance appears legitimate**. n334 **Hegemonic orders take on hierarchical characteristics**, with the preeminent power having denser political ties with other nations than in a unipolar order. n335 **Stability in hegemonic orders is maintained in part through security guarantees and trade relationships that result in economic specialization** among nations. n336 For example, if Nation X's security is supplied by Hegemon Y, Nation X can de-emphasize military power and focus on economic power. In a hegemonic system, **the preeminent state has "the power to shape the rules of international politics according to its own interests."** n337 **The hegemon**, in return, **provides public goods for the system as a whole**. n338 **The hegemon possesses** not only superior command of military and economic resources but "**soft" power, the ability to guide other states' preferences and interests.** n339 **The durability and stability of hegemonic orders depends on other states' acceptance of the hegemon's role. The hegemon's leadership must be seen as legitimate.** n340 [\*142] **The U**nited **S**tates **qualifies as a global hegemon**. In many ways, **the U.S. acts as a world government**. n341 **It provides public goods for the world**, such as security guarantees, the protection of sea lanes, and support for open markets. n342 After World War II, the U.S. forged a system of military alliances and transnational economic and political institutions - such as the United Nations, NATO, the International Monetary Fund, and the World Bank - that remain in place today. The U.S. provides security for allies such as Japan and Germany by maintaining a strong military presence in Asia and Europe. n343 Because of its overwhelming military might, the U.S. possesses what amounts to a "quasi-monopoly" on the use of force. n344 This prevents other nations from launching wars that would tend to be truly destabilizing. Similarly, **the United States provides a public good through its efforts to combat terrorism** and confront - even through regime change - rogue states. n345 **The U**nited **S**tates also **provides a public good through its promulgation and enforcement of international norms. It exercises a dominant influence on the definition of international law because it is the largest "consumer" of such law and the only nation capable of enforcing it on a global scale.** n346 The U.S. was the primary driver behind the establishment of the United Nations system and the development of contemporary treaties and institutional regimes to effectuate those treaties in both public and private international law. n347

Moreover, **controlling international norms are** [\*143] sometimes **embodied in the U.S. Constitution and domestic law rather than in treaties or customary international law.** For example, **whether terrorist threats will be countered effectively depends "in large part on U.S. law regarding armed conflict, from rules that define the circumstances under which the President can use force to those that define the proper treatment of enemy combatants.**" n348 **These public goods provided by the United States stabilize the system by legitimizing it and decreasing resistance to it.** **The transnational** political and economic **institutions created by the U**nited **S**tates **provide other countries with informal access to policymaking and tend to reduce resistance to American hegemony, encouraging others to "bandwagon"** with the U.S. rather than seek to create alternative centers of power. n349 American hegemony also coincided with the rise of globalization - the increasing integration and standardization of markets and cultures - which tends to stabilize the global system and reduce conflict. n350 **The legitimacy of American hegemony is strengthened and sustained by the democratic and accessible nature of the U.S. government. The American constitutional separation of powers is an international public good. The risk that it will hinder the ability of the U.S. to act swiftly, coherently or decisively** in foreign affairs **is counter-balanced by the benefits it provides in permitting foreigners multiple points of access to the government**. n351 Foreign nations and citizens lobby Congress and executive branch agencies in the State, Treasury, Defense, and Commerce Departments, where foreign policy is made. n352 They use the media to broadcast their point of view in an effort to influence the opinion of decision-makers. n353 Because the United States is a nation of immigrants, many American citizens have a specific interest in the fates of particular countries and form "ethnic lobbies" for the purpose of affecting foreign policy. n354 **The courts,** too, **are accessible to foreign nations and non-citizens. The Alien Tort Statute is emerging as an** [\*144] **important vehicle for adjudicating tort claims among non-citizens in U.S. courts.** n355 Empires are more complex than unipolar or hegemonic systems. Empires consist of a "rimless-hub-and-spoke structure," with an imperial core - the preeminent state - ruling the periphery through intermediaries. n356 The core institutionalizes its control through distinct, asymmetrical bargains (heterogeneous contracting) with each part of the periphery. n357 Ties among peripheries (the spokes) are thin, creating firewalls against the spread of resistance to imperial rule from one part of the empire to the other. n358 The success of imperial governance depends on the lack of a "rim." n359 Stability in imperial orders is maintained through "divide and rule," preventing the formation of countervailing alliances in the periphery by exploiting differences among potential challengers. n360 Divide-and-rule strategies include using resources from one part of the empire against challengers in another part and multi-vocal communication - legitimating imperial rule by signaling "different identities ... to different audiences." n361 Although the U.S. has often been labeled an empire, the term applies only in limited respects and in certain situations. Many foreign relations scholars question the comparison. n362 However, the U.S. does exercise informal imperial rule when it has routine and consistent influence over the foreign policies of other nations, who risk losing "crucial military, economic, or political support" if they refuse to comply. n363 The "Status of Force Agreements" ("SOFAs") that govern legal rights and responsibilities of U.S. military personnel and others on U.S. bases throughout the world are typically one-sided. n364 And the U.S. occupations in Iraq and Afghanistan had a strong imperial dynamic because those regimes depended on American support. n365 [\*145] But the management of empire is increasingly difficult in the era of globalization. Heterogeneous contracting and divide-and-rule strategies tend to fail when peripheries can communicate with one another. The U.S. is less able control "the flow of information ... about its bargains and activities around the world." n366 In late 2008, negotiations on the Status of Force Agreement between the U.S. and Iraq were the subject of intense media scrutiny and became an issue in the presidential campaign. n367 Another classic imperial tactic - the use of brutal, overwhelming force to eliminate resistance to imperial rule - is also unlikely to be effective today. The success of counterinsurgency operations depends on winning a battle of ideas, and collateral damage is used by violent extremists, through the Internet and satellite media, to "create widespread sympathy for their cause." n368 The abuses at Abu Ghraib, once public, harmed America's "brand" and diminished support for U.S. policy abroad. n369 Imperial rule, like hegemony, depends on maintaining legitimacy.B. Constructing a Hegemonic Model International relations scholars are still struggling to define the current era. The U.S.-led international order is unipolar, hegemonic, and, in some instances, imperial. In any event, this order diverges from traditional realist assumptions in important respects. It is unipolar, but stable. It is more hierarchical. The U.S. is not the same as other states; it performs unique functions in the world and has a government open and accessible to foreigners. And the stability and legitimacy of the system depends more on successful functioning of the U.S. government as a whole than it does on balancing alliances crafted by elite statesmen practicing realpolitik. "World power politics are shaped primarily not by the structure created by interstate anarchy but by the foreign policy developed in Washington." n370 These differences require a new model for assessing the institutional competences of the executive and judicial branches in foreign affairs. [\*146] One approach would be to adapt an institutional competence model using insights from a major alternative theory of international relations - liberalism. Liberal IR theory generally holds that internal characteristics of states - in particular, the form of government - dictate states' behavior, and that democracies do not go to war against one another. n371 Liberalists also regard economic interdependence and international institutions as important for maintaining peace and stability in the world. n372 Dean Anne-Marie Slaughter has proposed a binary model that distinguishes between liberal, democratic states and non-democratic states. n373 Because domestic and foreign issues are "most convergent" among liberal democracies, Slaughter reasons, the courts should decide issues concerning the scope of the political branches' powers. n374 With respect to non-liberal states, the position of the U.S. is more "realist," and courts should deploy a high level of deference. n375 One strength of this binary approach is that it would tend to reduce the uncertainty in foreign affairs adjudication. Professor Nzelibe has observed that it would put courts in the difficult position of determining which countries are liberal democracies. n376 But even if courts are capable of making these determinations, they would still face the same dilemmas adjudicating controversies regarding non-liberal states. Where is the appropriate boundary between foreign affairs and domestic matters? How much discretion should be afforded the executive when individual rights and accountability values are at stake? To resolve these dilemmas, an institutional competence model should be applicable to foreign affairs adjudication across the board. In constructing a new realist model, it is worth recalling that the functional justifications for special deference are aimed at addressing problems of a particular sort of role effectiveness - which allocation of power among the branches will best achieve general governmental effectiveness in foreign affairs. In the twenty-first century, **America's global role has changed, and the best means of achieving effectiveness in foreign affairs have changed as well. The international realm remains highly political** - if not as much as in the past - but **it is American politics that matters most.** If the U.S. is truly an empire - [\*147] and in some respects it is - the problems of imperial management will be far different from the problems of managing relations with one other great power or many great powers. Similarly, **the management of hegemony or unipolarity requires a different set of competences.** Although American predominance is recognized as a salient fact, there is no consensus among realists about the precise nature of the current international order. n377 The hegemonic model I offer here adopts common insights from the three IR frameworks - unipolar, hegemonic, and imperial - described above. First, the "hybrid" hegemonic model assumes that the goal of U.S. foreign affairs should be the preservation of American hegemony, which is more stable, more peaceful, and better for America's security and prosperity, than the alternatives. **If the United States were to withdraw from its global leadership role, no other nation would be capable of taking its place. n378 The result would be radical instability and a greater risk of major war**. n379 In addition, the United States would no longer benefit from the public goods it had formerly produced; as the largest consumer, it would suffer the most. Second, the hegemonic model assumes that **American hegemony is unusually stable and durable**. n380 As noted above, **other nations have many incentives to continue to tolerate the current order**. n381 And although other nations or groups of nations - China, the European Union, and India are often mentioned - may eventually overtake the United States in certain areas, such as manufacturing, **the U.S. will remain dominant in most measures of capability for decades.** According to 2007 estimates, the U.S. economy was projected to be twice the size of China's in 2025. n382 **The U.S. accounted for half of the world's military spending in 2007 and holds enormous advantages in defense technology that far outstrip would-be competitors. n383 Predictions of American decline are not new, and they have thus far proved premature.** n384 [\*148] Third, **the hegemonic model assumes that preservation of American hegemony depends not just on power, but legitimacy. n385 All three IR frameworks for describing predominant states - although unipolarity less than hegemony or empire - suggest that legitimacy is crucial to the stability and durability of the system.** **Although empires and predominant states in unipolar systems can conceivably maintain their position through the use of force, this is much more likely to exhaust the resources of the predominant state and to lead to counter-balancing or the loss of control. n386 Legitimacy as a method of maintaining predominance is far more efficient.** The hegemonic model generally values courts' institutional competences more than the anarchic realist model. **The courts' strengths in offering a stable interpretation of the law, relative insulation from political pressure, and power to bestow legitimacy are important for realizing the functional constitutional goal of effective U.S. foreign policy.** This means that courts' treatment of deference in foreign affairs will, in most respects, resemble its treatment of domestic affairs. Given the amorphous quality of foreign affairs deference, this "domestication" reduces uncertainty. **The increasing boundary problems caused by the proliferation of treaties and the infiltration of domestic law by foreign affairs issues are lessened by reducing the deference gap**. And **the dilemma caused by the need to weigh different functional considerations** - liberty, accountability, and effectiveness - **against one another is made less intractable because it becomes part of the same project that the courts constantly grapple with in adjudicating domestic disputes.**

**Hegemony solves conflicts that cause extinction**

Thomas P.M. **Barnett,** chief analyst, Wikistrat, “The New Rules: Leadership Fatigue Puts U.S. and Globalization, at Crossroads,” WORLD POLITICS REVIEW, 3—7—**11**, www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/8099/the-new-rules-leadership-fatigue-puts-u-s-and-globalization-at-crossroads

Events in Libya are a further reminder for **Americans** that we **stand at a crossroads in our continuing evolution as the** world's sole full-service **superpower.** Unfortunately, we are increasingly seeking change without cost, and shirking from risk because we are tired of the responsibility. We don't know who we are anymore, and our president is a big part of that problem. Instead of leading us, he explains to us. Barack Obama would have us believe that he is practicing strategic patience. But many experts and ordinary citizens alike have concluded that he is actually beset by strategic incoherence -- in effect, a man overmatched by the job. It is worth first examining the larger picture: We live in a time of arguably the greatest structural change in the global order yet endured, with this historical moment's most amazing feature being its relative and absolute lack of mass violence. That is something to consider when Americans contemplate military intervention in Libya, because if we do take the step to prevent larger-scale killing by engaging in some killing of our own, we will not be adding to some fantastically imagined global death count stemming from the ongoing "megalomania" and "evil" of American "empire." We'll be engaging in the same sort of system-administering activity that has marked our stunningly successful stewardship of global order since World War II. Let me be more blunt: **As the guardian of globalization, the U.S. military has been the greatest force for peace the world has ever known. Had America been removed from the global dynamics** that governed the 20th century, the mass murder never would have ended. Indeed, it's entirely conceivable **there would now be no** identifiable **human civilization left, once nuclear weapons entered the killing equation. But the world did not keep sliding down** that path of **perpetual war**. Instead**, America** stepped up and **changed everything by ushering in** our now-perpetual **great-power peace. We introduced** the international liberal trade order known as **globalization** and played loyal Leviathan over its spread. **What resulted was the collapse of empires, an explosion of** **democracy**, the **persistent spread of** **human rights, the liberation of women, the doubling of life expectancy, a roughly 10-fold increase in adjusted global GDP and a profound and persistent reduction in battle deaths from state-based conflicts.** That is what American "hubris" actually delivgered. Please remember that the next time some TV pundit sells you the image of "unbridled" American military power as the cause of global disorder instead of its cure. With self-deprecation bordering on self-loathing, we now imagine a post-American world that is anything but. Just watch who scatters and who steps up as the Facebook revolutions erupt across the Arab world. While we might imagine ourselves the status quo power, we remain the world's most vigorously revisionist force. As for the sheer "evil" that is our military-industrial complex, again, let's examine what the world looked like before that establishment reared its ugly head. The last great period of global structural change was the first half of the 20th century, a period that saw a death toll of about 100 million across two world wars. That comes to an average of 2 million deaths a year in a world of approximately 2 billion souls. Today, with far more comprehensive worldwide reporting, researchers report an average of less than 100,000 battle deaths annually in a world fast approaching 7 billion people. Though admittedly crude, these **calculations suggest a 90 percent absolute drop and a 99 percent relative drop in deaths due to war**. We are clearly headed for a world order characterized by multipolarity, something the American-birthed system was designed to both encourage and accommodate. But given how things turned out the last time we collectively faced such a fluid structure, we would do well to keep U.S. power, in all of its forms, deeply embedded in the geometry to come. To continue the historical survey, after salvaging Western Europe from its half-century of civil war, the U.S. emerged as the progenitor of a new, far more just form of globalization -- one based on actual free trade rather than colonialism. America then successfully replicated globalization further in East Asia over the second half of the 20th century, setting the stage for the Pacific Century now unfolding.

**Indefinite detention increases terrorism—multiple mechanisms**

Martin **Scheinin**, Professor, International Law, “Should Human Rights Take a Back Seat in Wartime?” REAL CLEAR WORLD, interviewed by Casey L. Coombs, 1—11—**12**, www.realclearworld.com/articles/2012/01/11/national\_defense\_authorization\_act\_scheinin\_interview-full.html, accessed 8-21-13.

CLC: As a world leader and active promoter of universal human rights, **the practice of indefinite detention without charge would** seem to **clash with U.S. ideals**. Could you comment on this contradiction? MS: **One of the main lessons learned in the** international **fight against terrorism is that counter-terrorism professionals** have gradually **come to learn and admit that human rights violations are not an acceptable shortcut** in an effective fight against terrorism. **Such measures** tend to **backfire in multiple ways**. **They** result in legal problems by **hamper**ing **prosecution, trial and punishment**. **The use of torture is a clear example** here. **They** also tend to **alienate** the **communities with which authorities should be working** in order **to** detect and **prevent terrorism**. And **they add to causes of terrorism,** both **by perpetuating "root causes" that involve the alienation of communities and by providing "triggering causes" through which bitter individuals** make the morally inexcusable decision to **turn to** methods of **terrorism.** The NDAA is just one more step in the wrong direction, by aggravating the counterproductive effects of human rights violating measures put in place in the name of countering terrorism. CLC: Does the NDAA afford the U.S. a practical advantage in the fight against terrorism? Or might the law undermine its global credibility? MS: **It is hard to see any practical advantage gained through the NDAA**. It is just another form of what I call symbolic legislation, enacted because the legislators want to be seen as being "tough" or as "doing something." The law is written as just affirming existing powers and practices and hence not providing any meaningful new tools in the combat of terrorism. By constraining the choices by the executive, **it** nevertheless **hampers e**ffective counter-terrorism work, including criminal investigation and prosecution, as well as **international counter-terrorism cooperation**, markedly in the issue of closing the Guantanamo Bay detention facility. Hence, **it carries the risk of distancing** the **U**nited **S**tates **from its closest allies and the international community generally**. And of course **these kinds of** legal **provisions are** always **open for bad faith copying by repressive governments that will use them for their own political purposes**.

**Al Qaeda is still a major threat—predictions of decline are premature and false**

**Sinai 13** (Joshua, JINSA Fellow, Washington, DC-based consultant on national security studies, focusing primarily on terrorism, counterterrorism, and homeland security, 3-11-13, “Al Qaeda Threat to U.S. Not Diminished, Data Indicates” The Jewish Institute for National Security Affairs) http://www.jinsa.org/fellowship-program/joshua-sinai/al-qaeda-threat-us-not-diminished-data-indicates#.UbaiWvmsiSo

**Conventional wisdom holds that the threat** to America **posed by al Qaeda** and its affiliates **is greatly diminished** compared to 9/11. Today, it is claimed, al Qaeda is less well organized, with many of its top leaders eliminated, and is so broken into geographically disparate franchises that it is unable to recruit, train, and deploy a specialized cell to carry out a comparable catastrophic attack against America. The fact that no al Qaeda terrorist attacks have been carried out in America over the last two years, while some 20 individuals have plotted to carry out attacks but were arrested and convicted during the pre-incident phases, is seen as evidence that this terrorist threat is decreasing domestically. Therefore, according to this thesis, security authorities should prepare for more numerous and frequently occurring but low casualty attacks mounted by less well-trained and capable homegrown operatives, particularly by what are termed "lone wolves." **When a more complete compilation of all the components** involved in terrorism **are taken into account, however, the magnitude of the threat becomes much clearer and includes a higher likelihood of attempts to carry out catastrophic attacks as well as evidence that al Qaeda continues to recruit and prepare terrorist operatives in the United States.** Downplaying the terrorist threat posed by al Qaeda and its affiliates also has significant political implications due in part to the more than $70 billion that is spent annually on America's domestic counterterrorism programs (with larger amounts expended for overseas operations), all of which need to be continuously justified as cost effective by Administration planners and Congressional appropriators. Such **purported decline in al Qaeda attacks domestically**, however, **is** now **being seized upon by those who favor reduced government funding for counterterrorism programs, including weakening the USA PATRIOT Act**, to support their position that a reduced threat requires reduced funding and resources. **When the trajectory of attacks by al Qaeda and its associates over the years are carefully studied,** however, **certain patterns recur.** Specifically, **every time the threat is underplayed, it is invariably followed by a major attack. In the months leading up to the November 2012 elections, the media was filled with pronouncements that al Qaeda's threat had greatly diminished** as a result of the elimination of its leadership and the reduced operational role over attacks by what is termed "al Qaeda Central" in Pakistan's tribal areas. **While accurate on one level, this did not stop al Qaeda and its affiliates from continuing to launch major terrorist attacks, including** that by its Libyan affiliate against the U.S. consulate in **Benghazi** on September 11, 2012, which led to severe political repercussions for the Administration for its unpreparedness to anticipate such an attack. **This was followed by** the launching of **the devastating cross-border attack against the natural gas facility in eastern Algeria** in mid-January by another al Qaeda affiliate in Mali. **Thirty-six foreign workers were murdered in that attack, which, again, was unanticipated.** Moreover, **the fact that a catastrophic attack against America comparable to 9/11 has not occurred over the past 11 years should not suggest that a future one is not being planned. In summer 2006, al Qaeda-linked operatives in London plotted to detonate liquid explosives on board 10 transatlantic airliners flying from the UK to America and Canada. In** September **2009**, Najibullah **Zazi and his associates were arrested for plotting to conduct a suicide bombing attack against the New York City subway system. On Christmas Day, 2009,** Umar Farouk **Abdulmutallab failed to detonate plastic explosives while on board an airliner heading to Detroit.** Anwar al Awlaki, a former American extremist cleric, reportedly masterminded Abdulmutallab's operation. Awlaki was killed in a drone attack in Yemen on September 30, 2011. The killings of al Awlaki and Samir Khan, another American extremist who had made his way to Yemen in 2009, could well trigger a catastrophic attack by al Qaeda to avenge their deaths. **The recent capture of** Osama **Bin Laden's son-in-law**, Sulaiman abu Ghaith, and the decision to try him in New York City, **is also likely to trigger a major revenge attack against America.** Finally, **organizing catastrophic terrorist attacks requires** extensive **planning, funding and preparation. A terrorist group that feels** itself **strong will take its time to carefully plan a few but devastating attacks**, while a group that regards itself as weak may feel compelled to carry out frequent, but low-casualty attacks to demonstrate its continued relevancy. Some **incident databases, such as** a recent compilation of **data about American al Qaeda terrorists by the UK-based Henry Jackson Society, only account for completed attacks** and convictions of those arrested. **If such counting is expanded to include other factors**, however, then **the overall threat becomes much more severe. Other factors**, therefore, **should include** the **potential consequences of** the **thwarted attacks** had they not been prevented, **the number of radicalized Americans** who travel overseas to join al Qaeda-affiliated insurgencies, and the extent of radicalized activity by al Qaeda's American sympathizers in jihadi website forums and chatrooms. **A more complete accounting of the threat will** now **reveal that the supportive extremist infrastructure for al Qaeda in America is actually not diminishing and that the purported "lone wolf" actors have actual ties to al Qaeda operatives overseas. We should not,** therefore, also **be misled into complacency if catastrophic attacks by al Qaeda do not occur for lengthy periods. Nor so by the comforting but false sense of security that comes with believing that "lone wolf" attacks** in the United States **are not a product of al Qaeda** recruitment and support. It is also possible, nevertheless, that **al Qaeda's terrorist planners are considering both types of attacks, infrequent catastrophic and frequent low casualty. This may explain why al Qaeda's propaganda organs are calling on its radicalized followers in the West to take matters into their own hands and embark on any sort of attacks that may be feasible at the moment, but with further surprise attacks of a catastrophic nature still ahead.**

**Terrorists will obtain nuclear weapons—multiple potential sources**

**Neely 13** (Meggaen, research intern for the Project on Nuclear Issues, 3-21-13, "Doubting Deterrence of Nuclear Terrorism" Center for Strategic and International Studies) csis.org/blog/doubting-deterrence-nuclear-terrorism

**The risk that terrorists will set off a nuclear weapon on U.S. soil is disconcertingly high.** While a terrorist organization may experience difficulty constructing nuclear weapons facilities, **there is significant concern that terrorists can obtain a nuclear weapon or nuclear materials.** The fear that **an actor could steal a nuclear weapon** or fissile material **and transport it to the U**nited **S**tates has long-existed. It takes a great amount of time and resources (including territory) to construct centrifuges and reactors to build a nuclear weapon from scratch. **Relatively easily-transportable nuclear weapons**, however, **present one opportunity to terrorists.** For example, **exercises similar to the recent Russian movement of nuclear weapons from munitions depots to storage sites may prove attractive targets. Loose nuclear materials pose a second opportunity. Terrorists could use them to create a crude nuclear weapon similar to the gun-type design of Little Boy. Its simplicity** – two subcritical masses of highly-enriched uranium – **may make it attractive to terrorists.** While such a weapon might not produce the immediate destruction seen at Hiroshima, the radioactive fall-out and psychological effects would still be damaging. These two opportunities for terrorists differ from concerns about a “dirty bomb,” which mixes radioactive material with conventional explosives.

**Nuke terror causes extinction—equals a full-scale nuclear war**

Owen B. **Toon 7**, chair of the Department of Atmospheric and Oceanic Sciences at CU-Boulder, et al., April 19, 2007, “Atmospheric effects and societal consequences of regional scale nuclear conflicts and acts of individual nuclear terrorism,” online: http://climate.envsci.rutgers.edu/pdf/acp-7-1973-2007.pdf

To an increasing extent, **people are congregating in the world’s great urban centers, creating megacities with populations exceeding 10 million individuals**. At the same time, **advanced technology has designed nuclear explosives of such small size they can be easily transported in a car**, small plane or boat **to the heart of a city**. We demonstrate here that **a single detonation in the 15 kiloton range can produce urban fatalities approaching one million** in some cases, **and casualties exceeding one million**. Thousands of small weapons still exist in the arsenals of the U.S. and Russia, and there are at least six other countries with substantial nuclear weapons inventories. In all, thirty-three countries control sufficient amounts of highly enriched uranium or plutonium to assemble nuclear explosives. A conflict between any of these countries involving 50-100 weapons with yields of 15 kt has the potential to create fatalities rivaling those of the Second World War. Moreover, **even a single surface nuclear explosion**, or an air burst in rainy conditions, **in a city center is likely to cause the entire metropolitan area to be abandoned at least for decades** owing to infrastructure damage and radioactive contamination. As the aftermath of hurricane Katrina in Louisiana suggests, **the economic consequences of even a localized nuclear catastrophe would most likely have severe national and international economic consequences**. Striking effects result even from relatively small nuclear attacks because low yield detonations are most effective against city centers where business and social activity as well as population are concentrated. Rogue nations and **terrorists would be most likely to strike there**. Accordingly, an organized **attack on the U.S. by a small nuclear state, or terrorists** supported by such a state, **could generate casualties comparable to those** once **predicted for a full-scale nuclear “counterforce” exchange in a superpower conflict**. Remarkably, the **estimated quantities of smoke generated by attacks totaling about one megaton of nuclear explosives could lead to significant global climate perturbations** (Robock et al., 2007). While we did not extend our casualty and damage predictions to include potential medical, social or economic impacts following the initial explosions, such analyses have been performed in the past for large-scale nuclear war scenarios (Harwell and Hutchinson, 1985). Such a study should be carried out as well for the present scenarios and physical outcomes.

**Russia’s rule of law deficit undermines cooperation and internal stability—plan is key to restoring our credibility to deal with this issue**

Sarah E. **Mendelson**, Director, Human Rights and Security Initiative, Center for Strategic and International Studies, “U.S.-Russian Relations and the Democracy and Rule of Law Deficit,” CENTURY FOUNDATION REPORT, 20**09**, p. 3-4.

Since the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991, every U.S. administration has considered Russia’s political trajectory a national security concern. Based on campaign statements and President Barack Obama’s early personnel choices, this perspective likely will affect policy toward Russia in some way for the foreseeable future. **While** the **Obama** administration **plans to cooperate with Moscow** on a number of issues, **it will find that Russia’s** current **deficit in** the areas of **democracy and the rule of law complicate the relationship and** may, in some cases, **undermine** attempts at **engagement.** The organizers of the Century Foundation Russia Working Group have labeled this policy problem “coping with creeping authoritarianism.” Results from nearly a dozen large, random sample **surveys** in Russia since 2001 that examine the views and experiences of literally thousands of Russians, combined with other research and newspaper reporting, all s**uggest the current democracy and rule of law deficit is** rather **stark**. The deficit does not diminish the importance of Russia in international affairs, nor is it meant to suggest the situation is unique to Russia. The internal conditions of many states have negative international security implications. As Europeans repeatedly pointed out during the administration of George W. Bush, **U.S. departures from the rule of law made the** **U**nited **S**tates **increasingly problematic as a global partner**, whether through the use of force in Iraq or the manner in which the United States pursued and handled terrorist suspects. In fact, **coping with authoritarian trends in Russia** (and elsewhere) **will involve changes in U.S. policies** that have, on the surface, nothing to do with Russia. Bush administration **counterterrorism policies that authorized torture, indefinite detention** of terrorist suspects, and the rendering of detainees to secret prisons and Guantánamo **have had numerous negative unintended consequences** for U.S. national security, **including serving as a recruitment tool** for al Qaeda and insurgents in Iraq. Less often recognized, **these policies also have undercut** whatever **leverage the** **U**nited **S**tates **had, as well as limited the effectiveness of American decision-makers, to push back on authoritarian policies adopted by,** among others, the **Putin** administration. At its worst, **American departures from the rule of law** may **have enabled abuse inside Russia.** These departures certainly left human rights defenders isolated. **Repairing the damage to U.S. soft power and reversing the departure from human rights norms** that characterized the Bush administration’s counterterrorism policies **will provide the** Obama **administration strategic and moral authority and improve the ability of the United States to work with allies. It also can have positive consequences for Obama’s Russia policy.** The **changes** that **need to be made in U.S.** counterterrorism **policies**, however politically sensitive, **are** somewhat more **straightforward** than the adjustments that must be made to respond to the complex issues concerning Russia. The Obama administration must determine how best to engage Russian leaders and the population on issues of importance to the United States, given Russia’s poor governance structures, the stark drop in oil prices, Russia’s continued aspirations for great power status, and the rather serious resentment by Russians concerning American dominance and prior policies. The policy puzzle, therefore, is how to do all this without, at the same time, sacrificing our values and undercutting (yet again) U.S. soft power. This report assesses the political dynamics that have shaped Russia’s authoritarian drift, briefly addresses a few of the ways in which they matter for U.S. policy, and suggests several organizing principles to help the Obama administration manage this critical relationship. Possible approaches include working closely with Europe on a joint approach to Russia, accurately anticipating the unintended consequences of U.S. policy in one realm (such as Kosovo) for Russia policy, and embracing the rights of states to choose their own security alliances. A final important principle relates to U.S. engagement with Russians beyond the Kremlin. President Obama should speak directly to the Russian people, engaging in a manner that respects their interests and desires, but also reflects the core values of the Obama administration; that is, “reject[s] as false the choice between our safety and our ideals.”6 The Obama administration also should endorse a platform and a process for a renewed dialogue between U.S. and Russian civil society. the VIew from the KremlIn Two interactive dynamics over the past several years have shaped the dominant approach by the Russian government to the outside world: the United States declined as a world power, and at the same time, the Russian state accumulated massive wealth from high gas and oil prices. Following what many in the Russian elite view as the “humiliation” of the 1990s, by 2008, Russia was no longer a status quo power. Instead, revisionist in nature, Russian authorities focused on the restoration of great power status.7 Fueled by petrodollars, the government tackled this project in numerous ways, including military exercises around the globe, soft power projects such as a twenty-four-hour-a-day English language cable news station, “think tanks” in New York and Paris, and perhaps most important, gas and oil distribution systems meant to make Russia a central player in energy security for decades to come.8 This restoration project undoubtedly will be slowed by the current financial crisis and drop in oil revenues, but the building blocks remain in place. As the restoration project evolved, the Putin administration increasingly challenged aspects of the post–World War II and post–cold war legal, security, and economic architecture, and suggested the need for new arrangements. Many in the Russian elite seemed to view the changes that have occurred in Europe over the past twenty years, such as the enlargement of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and the European Union (EU), as illegitimate, driven not by the choices of local governments or populations, but by the will of Washington. Nostalgia for the Soviet era, a related sentiment, is widely shared, and is an important source of former president and now Prime Minister Vladimir Putin’s popularity.9 Some experts even suggest that many in Russia’s governing structures believe that Europe whole and free—that is, post–cold war Europe—is not in the security interest of Russia. The Carnegie Moscow Center’s Lilya Shevtsova has labeled this view “great power nationalism” and observes that the “Putin-Medvedev-Lavrov doctrine” derives from the premise that Russia seeks to contain the West—while the West is busy trying not to offend Russia.10 Some other studies suggest that Russian policymakers have attempted, in fact, to divide the United States from Europe, and generally have preferred bilateral to multilateral engagement.11 At the United Nations, Russia, together with China, repeatedly has challenged international responses to gross human rights violations in Burma, Darfur, and Zimbabwe, and it has engaged in systematic efforts to undermine the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe’s (OSCE) election monitoring efforts and the Council of Europe’s human rights monitoring.12 Meanwhile, Russian leaders seem to believe the current European security arrangements are soft commitments, ripe for renegotiation and restructuring. President Dmitri Medvedev has, in fact, called for a new “collective security arrangement,” at the same time reintroducing the concept of spheres of influence.13 All of these actions taken together, along with the decline in U.S. soft power, have looked at times as if some in the Russian government were trying to reset the table on human rights and international law, exporting its democracy and rule of law deficit abroad. How best can the United States, together with Europe, respond to this situation? Two additional dynamics are relevant: Russian internal weaknesses, both political and economic, but also the degree to which the Russian authorities’ assessment of the condition of the international system is correct. For example, in August 2008, Russian government officials fecklessly deployed human rights and international law rhetoric to justify the Russian use of force in South Ossetia—was that just a murky reflection of the current deeply inconsistent international order?14 Will that calculation be challenged by the Obama administration? How can it do so effectively? Will we see a new era of more robust international organizations, underpinned by respect for human rights and international law? If not, will we be in for a period of serious instability in Europe, along Russia’s borders? russIa’s democracy and rule oflaw defIcIt What makes these questions so pressing is the reality that American and European political strategy dating back to the early 1990s of integrating Russia into the Euro-Atlantic community and thus encouraging democratic development has largely failed. By 2009, Vladimir Putin’s policies have systematically closed off nearly all legitimate structures for voicing opposition. Many nongovernmental organizations are under daily pressure from the authorities.15 The parliament is dominated by a government-run party, United Russia, and outcomes of local and national elections are controlled by the authorities. The government controls national television. The few critically minded journalists that exist routinely are threatened or are under constant surveillance by the authorities, and twenty murders of journalists since 2000 have gone unsolved.16 One small newspaper known for its criticism of Kremlin policies has seen four of its journalists killed in recent years. At a minimum, the authorities have presided over an era of impunity, and at worst, some fear government authorities may have been directly involved in these deaths.17 Meanwhile, the democratic political opposition is extremely marginal and dysfunctional—irrespective of whatever government pressures are brought to bear on it. Russia has no leading liberal figures that might emerge as national leaders at present. In years past, the fighting among liberal parties was legendary, and led to multiple fratricidal losses in single-mandate districts, as liberal parties ran against one another—back when there were competitive elections for parliamentary seats.18 Today, it is unclear when or how the democratic opposition will repair itself. Yet, as political space has shrunk steadily in the past ten years, the majority of Russians do not appear to mind. In terms of the younger generation, the conventional wisdom that wealth would lead to a demand for democracy has not been borne out; only about 10 percent of survey respondents could be considered strongly supportive of democracy, while most are ambivalent. In the early 1990s, many in the West assumed that the older Soviet generation would be replaced eventually by a younger, pro-Western, pro-democratic generation. Experts and policymakers alike assumed this succession would be a natural course of events, like gravity. A similar conventional wisdom about the younger generation in Russia continues. It holds that iPods, lattes, skateboards, and other artifacts of Western consumer culture will translate into a desire for independent media, justice, and human rights. In 2005 and 2007, in an environment of steadily shrinking political space, a study based at the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) explored how young Russians viewed Soviet history and Stalin. Our nationally representative surveys of 16-to- 29-year-old Russians suggested that, despite economic prosperity, most young people gravitated enthusiastically to Vladimir Putin’s ideological platform of revisionist history and nostalgia. The narrative advanced by the government concerning recent history quite simply resonated with this younger generation. In both surveys, a majority believed that Stalin did more good than bad and that the collapse of the Soviet Union was the greatest geopolitical catastrophe of the twentieth century. These findings undoubtedly reflected coordinated strategic communications efforts by government authorities, including support of a teacher’s guide rewriting Soviet history, downplaying the deaths of millions of citizens, and effacing historical memory. These actions facilitated Russia’s authoritarian trend.19 In sum, the Russian middle class and support for authoritarian governance coexist. The tacit bargain of the past decade, however, in which dissenters were punished but Russians’ pocketbooks grew, may now be threatened by the international economic crisis. Oil prices plunged from a high of $147 a barrel in July 2008 to about $40 a barrel in December 2008. If the price of oil stays low, the lubricating effect of oil and gas revenues may well dry up, laying bare Russia’s dysfunctional state institutions and challenging the authorities’ ability to govern. Economic hardship and poor governance seem, at least anecdotally, to correlate with an increase in public protest and nervousness on the part of the ruling authorities.20 Perhaps, in the long run, the mix of economic hard times and poor governance will stimulate a greater demand for democracy and the rule of law in Russia, as citizens grow unhappy with state institutions that do not function and link that dysfunction to poor governance. In the near term, we can expect growth in nationalism and xenophobia. 21 To be sure, the democracy and rule of law deficit and the growth in nationalism pose problems primarily for Russians. In the twenty-first century, independent investigative journalism and the legitimate use of courts for prosecution are necessary to fight corruption. Today, Russia is plagued by corruption, and the Russian authorities dominate both television and court decisions.22 Independent newspapers and Internet sites exist, but journalists who have engaged in investigative journalism have been killed or live under threat.23 In a state where the rule of man predominates, the population experiences the police as predatory rather than protective. Torture in police stations is said to be common and police officers who have been rotated through Chechnya are said to be especially abusive.24 In a 2004 CSIS survey of 2,400 Russians ages 16 to 65, 41 percent of respondents feared arbitrary arrest by the police.25 In a 2007 CSIS survey of 2,000 Russians ages 16 to 29, 62 percent of respondents fully or partially distrusted the police.26 While one cannot make direct comparisons for methodological reasons, it is worth bearing in mind a recent study of attitudes toward police in China, where only 25 percent reported distrust.27 Undoubtedly, the democracy and rule of law deficit varies regionally, but it is particularly worrisome in the southern regions of Russia. The government’s approach to what it perceives as widespread radical Islamic sentiment in the North Caucasus has increased violence rather than contained it. Between May 1 and August 31, 2008, there were at least 282 incidents, and between September 1 and December 31, 2008 there were at least 333.28 When the situation is at its most dire, the Russian government appears not to control this part of its territory. Many experts worry that there will be war in the North Caucasus in 2009, or possibly that, south of the border, a Russian-Georgia war will break out again.29 That prognosis may be overly gloomy, but violence is clearly on the rise and the socioeconomic conditions in the region are dire. why It matters What does any of this have to do with the Obama administration? The democracy and rule of law deficit in Russia has a range of security and human rights implications for the United States and our allies in Europe. For example, the Obama administration comes to office with a number of arms control goals. These plans may be complicated by the absence of Russian military reform that, in turn, correlates with abuse inside the army. (They are also complicated by continued government reliance on nonconventional forces: in September 2008, President Medvedev committed to modernizing the nuclear arsenal.30) Serious, joint counterterrorism efforts with the United States, Europe, and Russia are likely to remain illusive as long as the police and security services are corrupt and abusive, and the media, a potential source to expose that corruption, is largely controlled by the government. Even at the nongovernmental, track-two level, it is now difficult to have the sort of transatlantic policy dialogue on terrorism that has been common among other nations and societies since 2001.31 The most dire evidence suggests that security service personnel or contractors have been deployed abroad, in European cities, to eliminate Kremlin enemies. In the most famous example, British authorities have sought the extradition from Moscow of former KGB bodyguard and current Duma member Andrew Lugovoi for the murder by Polonium poisoning of Alexander Litvinenko in London in November 2006.32 Kremlin proxies, such as Chechnya’s Ramzan Kadyrov, may have agents doing the same on his behalf on the streets of Austria, also with apparent impunity.33 At a minimum, the Russian authorities seem to have drawn a red line at additional enlargement of Euro-Atlantic organizations. Instead of allowing states and societies to decide for themselves what alliances and security or economic arrangements they want, Russian officials speak of “zones of interest” and “neutral” spaces—presumably such as Ukraine. In the worst case scenario, the Kremlin might decide to probe the resolve of existing NATO and EU security commitments. Presumably, this realization led General James Craddock to request that NATO begin defense planning for the Baltic states.34 Some believe, although the evidence is not clear, that the May 2007 cyber attack on Estonian government agencies, banks, newspapers, and other organizations was a first probe by the Russian government.35 In the August 2008 war in Georgia, for which all sides deserve some blame, experts saw evidence of additional Russian government cyber attacks and a prime example of blatant disregard for international law as the Russian government sought to change an internationally recognized border by force.36 Meanwhile, existing Euro-Atlantic organizations are negatively and directly affected by Russia’s democracy and rule of law deficit. In recent years, the European Court of Human Rights has heard far more cases from Russia than any other country, effectively substituting for Russia’s domestic judiciary. Some European human rights lawyers argue that this situation is severely undermining the court’s efficacy and ability to handle cases from a broad range of countries. Moreover, the Russian government increasingly has failed to compensate victims or their families, apparently now risking its expulsion from the Council of Europe.37 According to numerous OSCE officials, the Kremlin has waged a systematic campaign to undercut the organization’s various monitoring efforts.38 The emergent norm of international election observation has been undermined by the Kremlin’s attempts to legitimize fraudulent elections at home and in neighboring states, supporting a wave of authoritarian governments in this region.39 an obama strategy The unprecedented economic crisis and wars in Iraq and Afghanistan dominate the initial agenda of the Obama administration. Worries over another Israeli Palestinian war, relations with Iran, nuclear proliferation, and the status of al Qaeda are somewhere next on the list of serious security challenges. Russia is, of course, on the list, as was made clear by Vice President Joseph Biden’s speech in Munich, Secretary of State Hillary Clinton’s meeting with Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov in Geneva, the April London meeting and the July Moscow summit with President Obama and President Medvedev. The Obama administration appears keen not to let U.S.-Russia policy drift as it did in the Bush administration, and the Obama team is moving quickly to establish the organizing principles that would drive policy and guide how it copes with the political realities of Russia today, and seeking opportunities to change the relationship. As a guide to coping with creeping authoritarianism, and for planning purposes, **the Obama administration** reasonably **can** (1) assume that Russia will continue, in the near term, on an authoritarian trajectory while at the same time, try to **encourage** President **Medvedev toward more openness and engagement**; (2) consider that Russia’s political regime may grow more brittle and thus potentially more fragile, rather than more robust and invulnerable; (3) propose and prepare for joint cooperation with Moscow on a number of issues, but anticipate that these plans could be overwhelmed by internal dynamics in Russia; and (4) understand and prepare for that which is difficult to anticipate, such as the depth and length of the economic crisis, and the potential divisions within Russian leadership that might emerge over a range of issues such as whether and how to cooperate with the United States and how to address the effects of the crisis, including the use of force against civilians to stop public protest.40 The ability of any U.S. administration to shape what happens inside Russia has long been exaggerated and misunderstood. The impact of foreign assistance clearly matters to those individuals who receive funds and technical training, but recent evidence suggests that **how the U**nited **S**tates **conducts itself in the world has far more weight in terms of its ability to bolster or undermine democracy, human rights and the rule of law in other countries.**41 For example, **U.S. noncompliance with human rights norms and laws has enabled**, although not caused, **Russia’s authoritarian drift. Therefore, a robust and comprehensive effort to opt back in to international legal frameworks will have important knock-on effects for our relations with Russia, in addition to bolstering our ability to work with allies. The United States needs to shape the larger policy context in a positive, rather than a negative, way. 42 An array of** **new U.S. policies unrelated to Russia (such as** **closing Guantánamo, ending detention without charge**, and halting unlawful interrogation of terror suspects) **can help restore U.S. soft power, as well as repair the international architecture that Russia** (correctly) **views as weak and that it** (regrettably) **seeks to replace. If the United States once again is associated with justice** instead of injustice, **it will do much to shore up human rights activists inside Russia. It will also challenge core assumptions that have taken hold within the Russian elite about the hypocrisy and weakness of democracy and human rights norms within the international system.**

**Continued human rights violations risk a Russian revolution**

Harlan **Ullman**, senior advisor, Atlantic Council, “The Third Russian Revolution,” UPI, 6—12—**13**, www.upi.com/Top\_News/Analysis/Outside-View/2013/06/12/Outside-View-The-third-Russian-Revolution/UPI-84461371009900/, accessed 8-7-13.

**Make no mistake: On the current trajectory, Russia won't be immune to** many of the **forces that provoked** the so-called colored **revolutions in** adjacent states and even **the** misnomered **Arab Awakening. A third Russian revolution is unfolding.** The only questions are when will that revolution reach a critical mass and, most importantly, will the forces of autocracy or pluralism carry the day? Russia, of course, experienced two revolutions in the 20th century. The Kaiser's Germany provoked the first by sending Lenin from Switzerland to Russia in the famous sealed train in 1917. That led to the undoing of the tsar and the Kerensky government as well as the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk that ended the war with Germany and allowed the Bolsheviks to sweep away the opposition. The second revolution came about in some seven decades later. The causes were a corrupt and fundamentally dishonest political system kept in place by a disciplined central leadership and dictatorship of the party. But that required able or at least competent leadership. Instead, the ruling Politburo became a genitocracy headed by sick, old men. Leonid Brezhnev took years to die and was replaced by two even less well general secretaries. In the mid-1970s, CIA Director William Colby repeatedly predicted Brezhnev's pending demise. It wasn't until 1982 that Colby's forecast came true. In the succession process, a few younger members were elevated to the Politburo. Because of the succession of antiquated leaders, Mikhail Gorbachev found himself moving from post to post from his appointment to the Politburo in 1979. In each post, he realized that the Soviet Union was an empty shell and each department was grossly mismanaged and underperforming. Six years later, when he became general secretary, Gorbachev was determined to save the Soviet Union and modernize the failing system. Gorbachev's tools were glasnost (openness) and perestroika (restructuring). The floodgates of reform were fully opened and the old and unworkable system couldn't resist them. By 1991, the Soviet Union was no more. In the two decades since, Vladimir **Putin has emerged as the Ironman of Russia.** In the process, **Russia has been** described and **viewed by many as a kleptocracy ruled by the few who have pillaged national wealth** for their own benefits. Under what Republicans and Democrats alike in the United States see as a government of and by thugs, **human rights have been violated; dissidents and members of the media arrested; and opponents of the Kremlin subjected to purges and show trials leading to long prison sentences.** Russia's immediate neighbors are fearful of the return of the aggressive Russian bear anxious to spread its influence through manipulating its oil and natural gas reserves for political purposes and through military maneuvers designed to intimidate. Further, cyberattacks, principally against Estonia, reinforce this perception of a neo-Soviet Union under the leadership of former KGB Colonel Putin. And Putin's commitment to far greater military spending as well as unwillingness to accept NATO's missile defenses raises sinister possibilities. **Within Russia, discontent** on the part of many Russians **is waxing. Outright theft on the part of oligarchs has gone too far. Persecution** of political **opposition is particularly vexing**. And **the health and longevity of a declining population** reflects more than excesses of consumption of vodka and harsh winters. Indeed, as a buffer to Putin's intent to ramp up his military, the Kremlin faces a very limiting factor: 90 percent of all Russian youth are unfit for military service. Unfortunately, the West in general and the United States in particular have never been very good at Kremlinology (or indeed in understanding many foreign cultures). **Whether Putin is aware of the ticking time bomb over which he presides or not, Russia is still very important to Western interests**. Syria and Iran are two major crises where Russian support could be important.

**That causes miscalc and nuclear war**

**Pry 99** (Peter Vincent, Former US Intelligence Operative, War Scare: U.S.-Russia on the Nuclear Brink, netlibrary)

**Russian internal troubles**—such as a leadership crisis, coup, or civil war—**could aggravate Russia’s fears of foreign aggression and lead to a miscalculation of U.S. intentions and to nuclear overreaction**. While this may sound like a complicated and improbable chain of events, **Russia’s story** in the 1990s **is one long series of domestic crises that have all too often been the source of nuclear close calls.** The war scares of August 1991 and October 1993 arose out of coup attempts. The civil war in Chechnya caused a leadership crisis in Moscow, which contributed to the nuclear false alarm during Norway’s launch of a meteorological rocket in January 1995. Nuclear war arising from Russian domestic crises is a threat the West did not face, or at least faced to a much lesser extent, during the Cold War. **The** Russian **military’s continued fixation on surprise-attack scenarios into the 1990s, combined with Russia’s deepening internal problems, has created a situation in which the U**nited **S**tates **might find itself the victim of a preemptive strike for no other reason than a war scare born of Russian domestic troubles.** At least in nuclear confrontations of the 1950s–1970s—during the Berlin crisis, Cuban missile crisis, and 1973 Middle East war—both sides knew they were on the nuclear brink. There was opportunity to avoid conflict through negotiation or deescalation. The nuclear war scares of the 1980s and 1990s have been one-sided Russian affairs, with the West ignorant that it was in grave peril.

**Leaves earth uninhabitable**

**Starr 10**—Director of Clinical Laboratory Science Program @ University of Missouri [Steven Starr (Senior scientist @ Physicians for Social Responsibility.), “The climatic consequences of nuclear war,” *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, 12 March 2010, Pg. http://www.thebulletin.org/web-edition/op-eds/the-climatic-consequences-of-nuclear-war]

This isn't a question to be avoided. Recent **scientific studies have found that a war** fought **with** the deployed **U.S. and Russian nuclear arsenals would leave Earth** virtually **uninhabitable**. In fact, **NASA computer models have shown that** **even a "successful" first strike** **by Washington or Moscow would inflict catastrophic environmental damage that would make agriculture impossible** and cause mass starvation. Similarly, in the January Scientific American, Alan Robock and Brian Toon, the foremost experts on the climatic impact of nuclear war, warn that the environmental consequences of a "regional" nuclear war would cause a global famine that could kill one billion people.

**1AC: Judiciary**

**Boumediene upheld the deference doctrine—by failing to specify a remedy, the courts have cemented executive power**

**Scheppele 12** (Kim, Professor of Sociology and Public Affairs in the Woodrow Wilson School, Director of the Program in Law and Public Affairs, Princeton University, January 2012, "The New Judicial Deference" Boston University Law Review, Lexis)

The majority in Boumediene had indeed found that the political branches had designed a system that violated the Constitution. **The majority in Boumediene hardly looked deferential**, at least when one examines the reasoning. **But the signature element of the new judicial deference is that the Court does not defer in principle; it defers in practice.** The petitioners won the right to have a regular court hear their habeas petitions. But what should such a court say about the Guantanamo detentions after this case? The majority frankly admitted that "our opinion does not address the content of the law that governs petitioners' detention. That is a matter yet to be determined." n294 So, **while the Court appeared to take seriously the years of delay in granting the petitioners any independent review of the bases for their detention, the Court would still not explain when and by what evidentiary standard detention would be permissible. That required more litigation. And that process would require more time, which would in turn allow the executive to detain the petitioners longer.**

**Problems in civil-military relations are likely to reach crisis proportions in 2014—now is key to reverse the trend**

**Munson 12** (Peter, Marine officer, author, and Middle East specialist, 11-12-12, "A Caution on Civil-Military Relations" Small Wars Journal) smallwarsjournal.com/jrnl/art/a-caution-on-civil-military-relations

This brief post represents only a few quickly dashed thoughts in the hope of getting something on paper that might morph into a longer and more useful essay on civil-military relations. I believe that **civil-military relations in the U**nited **S**tates **are deeply troubled.** The issues are lurking mostly in the background right now. On the surface, our leadership—civilian and military—has been able to negotiate some relatively complex rapids without any of the major drama that has cropped up in the past. The falling out between Truman and MacArthur comes to mind. Nonetheless, there are serious background **issues that will only get worse in 2014** and beyond. There are several reasons for concern. The all-volunteer force has fought two brutal wars for over a decade while a (guilty or thankful) American population has stood by with very little involvement. There have been no war bonds, no victory gardens, no bandage wrapping drives, no air raid drills—nothing to make them feel a part of the conflict other than the human interest stories about killed and wounded veterans and the once-nightly footage of shattered HMMWVs and burning convoys. This has created an inequality in experience and sacrifice that the public has generally attempted to repay through extreme deference and ever-multiplying shows of thankfulness, the likes of which have never been seen in American society. Part of this is as a corrective to the disgraceful treatment of our Vietnam veterans, to be sure, but it has consequences nonetheless. In the face of such an inequality of experience and service and in such a deferential environment, **public criticism of the military is all too easily dismissed as unpatriotic.** Not only is this foil used to deflect criticism, but its threat deters many from bringing up much needed commentary and dissent. Likewise, **unquestioning support of the military** plays no small factor in **mak**ing **any discussion of rationalizing military budgets and targeting wasteful military spending difficult, if not impossible.** Late addition: This dynamic plays out in media coverage of the military, as well, leading to an insufficient criticality, or at least a lack of perspective, in much coverage. At worst, the media becomes a propaganda arm or engages in a cult of hero worship that perpetuates the dynamics above. As this coverage creates narratives that impact critical national security decisions, it likewise skews civil-military relations. The media is a central part of any civil-military dynamic in a democracy, providing the information that informs public discourse and shapes the decision-making space. If the media is incapable of being a relatively objective arbiter, this contributes to a flawed civil-military dynamic. The military, itself, has internalized much of this adulation. When ushered to the front of boarding lines at the airport, offered discounts at a myriad of establishments, proffered all sorts of swag at any number of appreciation venues, and even venerated daily on cable news with the incredibly self-centered practice of surprise homecomings, it is difficult for members **of the military not to fall victim to a culture of creeping narcissism.** Faced with lengthy, rapid fire deployments that placed some military members away from the stabilizing influences of family and normality for years of their lives, the military itself had to play up a narrative of sacrifice and exceptionalism to help keep the trains running. This narrative was drummed into the military and reinforced by its members who saw themselves deploying again and again as society stayed home and placed them on a pedestal. This is not to say that the sacrifice was insignificant, but to acknowledge that there were second order effects of the adulation. Even within the military, there was a significant inequality in hardships faced, from “FOBbits” with daily access to all the comforts of home to infantrymen living in squalor and under the constant threat of not only death, but horrific dismemberment. This additional dynamic, as an aside, has led to a significant insecurity on the part of some (but surely not most or all) of those servicemembers who operated in support roles. You can see it in those who make cryptic references to their “special operations” background or play up training that they never rightfully received. You see, even within the military there is a distinct hierarchy of who has truly “been there and done that” and those who feel they must insinuate that they did. I may be wrong, but I get the sense that the post-WWII culture just assumed that everyone had done their part and little need be said about it. In all, **this adds up to a military that** at least in part **feels it has earned entitlement, that it deserves the deferential treatment** it receives, and that America needs to sacrifice to provide for the military—whether that be benefits or budget outlays. **This is an incredibly dangerous cultural artifact**, especially in light of the coming period of adjustment. **As America’s involvement in Afghanistan winds down and as the nation is forced to adjust to new fiscal realities, the military will face a time of significant adjustment and** likely **austerity. A military with an entitled culture and** an **inability to countenance searing introspection will be unable to properly adjust** to these new realities and will fail to make the necessary reforms, corrections, and resets that the strategic situation demands. More critically, the prospects for **an unfavorable outcome in Afghanistan, coupled with significant budget cuts, will open the door for a “knife in the back” narrative that might argue that the civilian politicians and the American public “lost” the conflict** by giving up on the great sacrifice and heroic efforts of the American military there and, furthermore, the government then slashed the military budget (and perhaps restructured some entitlements) betraying a military charged with facing a plethora of threats around the world. **Such a narrative would be** dangerous—**poisonous—for civil-military relations**. In this it is important to recognize that our political institutions are undergoing a crisis of their own. Trust in government is at its lowest ebb in recent history. Political polarization is at its highest mark since the Great Depression. **Demographic and economic pressures will multiply in coming years** not only on the US, but more significantly on its key allies in Europe. The world will see a significant transformation of its power structure in the coming decades, all of **which will put great strain on the country’s civil-military relations. Thus, it is of critical importance that we** discuss, address, and **correct any flaws in this dynamic now before they reach crisis proportions in the years to come.**

**Judicial deference is responsible for the split—a less deferential role for the courts is necessary to restore balance in civil-military relations**

**Mazur 10** (Diane, Professor of Law, University of Florida Levin College of Law, "A More Perfect Military: How the Constitution Can Make Our Military Stronger" Oxford University Press, Print)

One of the ways the doctrine of **judicial deference has left a scar on civil-military relations** is **by changing how civilian government manages the military advice it receives**. I don't meant to suggest this is a new problem for civilian control of the military—President Harry Truman certainly struggled to manage the military advice offered by General Douglas MacArthur during the Korean War1—but **judicial deference has contributed to a more pervasive problem broadly affecting the way civilians engage with information from military sources.** Strictly speaking, judicial deference in military affairs applies only when constitutional or legal issues are in play. When the question is whether a particular military policy or plan of action is a wise or prudent thing to do, and not whether it is constitutional or lawful, courts have no role in answering the question and judicial deference is irrelevant. However, **because judicial deference has expanded beyond an abstract legal theory into a more general way of thinking** about military affairs, **it has come to have an** indirect **effect on all forms of military decision making by civilian officials. Deference in a strictly legal sense is only a part of the broad cultural deference on military issues we have adopted since the end of the Vietnam War. We** consistently **discourage civilians from serious engagement with military issues**. Wc assume most civilians arc incapable of understanding the military and have little to add to the conversation. We suspect they have not earned the right to speak about military affairs, even though at some level we must know civilian engagement is necessary in a system built on civilian control of the military. There is always a risk that asking too many questions will be interpreted as a lack of support for the military, and so the easier path is often to endorse whatever appears to be the consensus "military" position on an issue, whether or not the consensus position is actually helpful to the military. **Our inclination toward deference in matters involving the military is so strong that military advice can sometimes carry the power of a military veto when the advice becomes part of public debate. Few government officials want to be in the position of asking for the military's viewpoint on an issue and then choosing a policy direction inconsistent with that viewpoint.** As a result, civilians may package or present military advice in a way that mis-lcadingly removes any conflict with civilian policy preference, ensuring at least the appearance of a deferential attitude. The "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" debate offered a good example of this phenomenon. Congress put on what were essentially "show hearings" to create the appearance of unified military opposition to gay citizens in military service. I don't doubt that in 1993 military opposition outweighed military support, but the hearings were carefully scrubbed of any military expertise from the minority viewpoint. The military's increasing political partisanship also plays an important role in how we characterize and respond to military advice, and there may be no better example of why political partisanship is damaging to military professionalism. At the same time civilians have an incentive to package military opinion selectively for favorable effect, the military may also feel an obligation to shape the advice it gives (or to withhold contrary opinions) in an effort to be loyal to a particular political interest. Political partisanship within the military imposes great pressure on military professionals to produce advice supportive of its political allegiance. At the very least, there will always be an air of uncertainty as to whether military advice has been tainted by a desire to either support or undercut the commander in chief or the Congress. Even the general public responds to military advice differently depending on whether the advice matches expectations about the military's presumed political allegiance. When military officials were uncooperative to the point of being insubordinate and refused to seriously consider how to implement President Clinton's proposal to end sexual orientation discrimination in the military, most people believed they were simply following their professional obligation to give civilian leaders candid military advice. We are so comfortable with the idea of military testimony running counter to policy preferences of the Democratic Party that no one objected when General Colin Powell gave a speech at the Naval Academy encouraging midshipmen to resign if they believed they could not morally serve in a military that also permitted gay people to serve." That's not advice, that's insubordination. On the other hand, when military advice upsets the careful civil-military consensus we usually construct for public consumption and also runs counter to the military's expected political allegiances, people take notice and ask whether the military has violated its ethical obligation of subordination to civilian control. The recent example of note occurred when General Eric Shinseki, the Army chief of staff, responded to a question during a Senate hearing asking how large a force would be necessary to maintain public order in Iraq following an invasion. This was information Congress needed to know in order to carry out its constitutional responsibilities to declare war and fund military operations. Shinseki responded with a significantly higher number than the administration's party line, and it began a debate among civil-military experts that continues today. A scries of essays in the professional journal Armed Forces and Society examined the controversy,5 and one author seriously argued Shinseki had a professional obligation to answer in a way that would protect the president from the perception he might be acting against military advice, or at least without a consensus military opinion.'1 Our system of civilian control of the military included, according to this argument, an obligation on the part of military professionals to adjust their advice to shore up civilian policy preferences. I have a feeling, however, the same ethical argument would not have been made on behalf of a Democratic Party commander in chief. The solution is both simple to understand and difficult to achieve. **If we were more comfortable with open engagement and conversation about military advice—if we were more comfortable with robust, messy debate about military issues—it would not be so important to shape or distort military advice to match civilian preferences. If we were more comfortable with military viewpoints, and believed we could invite them, consider them, weigh their strengths and weaknesses, balance them against other nonmilitary concerns, and then, if necessary, make a decision inconsistent with those viewpoints, our civil-military relations would be much healthier.** This is the same dynamic that inhibits a healthy civil-military exchange in judicial settings. We believe the system cannot tolerate the complexity or the inconvenience of real information, and so we construct a system specifically designed to generate a false consensus—the doctrine of judicial deference—so we can all feel better about making military decisions.

**Civilian control key to military effectiveness—solves array of existential threats**

Dr. Mackubin Thomas **Owens**, Professor, National Security Affairs, “What Military Officers Need to Know About Civil-Military Relations,” NAVAL WAR COLLEGE REVIEW v. 65 n. 2, Spring 20**12**, p. 81-82.

The combination of **c**ivil-**m**ilitary **r**elations patterns and service doctrines **affect military effectiveness**. In essence, the ultimate test of a civil-military relations pattern is how well it contributes to the effectiveness of a state's military, especially at the level of strategic assessment and strategy making. (50) However, Richard **Kohn** has explicitly called into question the effectiveness of the American military in this realm, especially with regard to the planning and conduct of operations other than those associated with large-scale conventional war. "Nearly twenty years after the end of the Cold War, the American military, financed by more money than the entire rest of the world spends on its armed forces, failed to defeat insurgencies or fully suppress sectarian civil wars in two crucial countries, each with less than a tenth of the U.S. population, after overthrowing those nations' governments in a matter of weeks." (51) He **attributes** this **lack of effectiveness to** a **decline in** the **military**'s professional **competence** with regard to strategic planning. "In effect, in the most important area of professional expertise--the connecting of war to policy, of operations to achieving the objectives of the nation--the American military has been found wanting. The excellence of the American military in operations, logistics tactics, , weaponry, and battle has been manifest for a generation or more. Not so with strategy." (52) This phenomenon manifests itself, he argues, **in** recent **failure to adapt to a** changing **security environment in which** the **challenges to global stability are** "less from massed armies than from **terrorism; economic** and particularly financial **instability; failed states; resource scarcity** (particularly **oil and** potable **water**); pandemic **disease; climate change**; and international crime in the form of piracy, smuggling, narcotics trafficking, and other forms of organized lawlessness." He observes that this decline in strategic competence has occurred during a time in which the U.S. military exercises enormous influence in the making of foreign and national security policies. He echoes the claim of Colin Gray: "All too often, **there is a black hole where** American **strategy ought to reside**." (53) Is there something inherent in **current U.S. civil-military affairs** that **accounts for this failure** of strategy? The failure of American civil-military relations to generate strategy can be attributed to the confluence of three factors. The first of these is the continued dominance within the American system of what Eliot Cohen has called the "normal" theory of civil-military relations, the belief that there is **a clear line of demarcation** between civilians who determine the goals of the war and the uniformed military who then conduct the actual fighting. Until President George W. Bush abandoned it when he overruled his commanders and embraced the "surge" in Iraq, the normal theory has been the default position of most presidents since the Vietnam War. Its longevity is based on the idea that the failure of Lyndon Johnson and Robert McNamara to defer to an autonomous military realm was the cause of American defeat in Vietnam. The normal theory can be traced to Samuel Huntington's The Soldier and the State, in which he sought a solution to the dilemma that lies at **the heart of civil-military relations**--**how to guarantee civilian control** of the military while still ensuring the ability of the uniformed military to provide security. His solution was a mechanism for creating and maintaining a professional, apolitical military establishment, which he called "objective control." Such a professional military would focus on defending the United States but avoid threatening civilian control. (54) But as Cohen has pointed out, the normal theory of civil-military relations often has not held in practice. Indeed, such storied democratic war leaders as Winston Churchill and Abraham Lincoln "trespassed" on the military's turf as a matter of course, influencing not only strategy and operations but also tactics. The **reason that civilian leaders cannot simply leave the military to its own devices** during war **is that war is an iterative process** involving the interplay of active wills. What appears to be the case at the outset of the war may change as the war continues, modifying the relationship between political goals and military means. The fact remains that wars are not fought for their own purposes but to achieve policy goals set by the political leadership of the state. The second factor, strongly reinforced by the normal theory of civil-military relations, is the influence of the uniformed services' organizational cultures. Each military service is built around a "strategic concept" that, according to Samuel Huntington, constitutes "the fundamental element of a military service," the basic "statement of [its] role ... or purpose in implementing national policy." (55) A clear strategic concept is critical to the ability of a service to organize and employ the resources that Congress allocates to it. It also largely determines a service's organizational culture. Some years ago, the late Carl Builder of the RAND Corporation wrote The Masks of War, in which he demonstrated the importance of the organizational cultures of the various military services in creating their differing "personalities," identities, and behaviors. His point was that each service possesses a preferred way of fighting and that "the unique service identities ... are likely to persist for a very long time." (56)

**Judicial deference justifies military medical and bioweapons research**

**Parasidis 12** (Efthimios, Assistant Professor of Law, Center for Health Law Studies, Saint Louis University School of Law, 2012, "Justice and Beneficence in Military Medicine and Research" Ohio State Law School, Lexis)

The military has long nurtured a culture and identity that is fundamentally distinct from civil society, n522 and **the U.S.** **government has a history of bending** [\*792] **and breaking the law during times of war.** n523 **While the military has traditionally enjoyed great deference from civilian courts** in the United States, n524 military discipline and **national security interests should not grant government officials carte blanche to violate fundamental human rights.** n525 To the contrary, Congress and the courts should work to ensure that military and intelligence agencies remain subordinate to the democratic rule of law. n526 The motto of the American military physician is "to conserve the fighting force," yet **the last decade has seen a notable shift in emphasis to enhancing the fighting force through novel applications of biomedical enhancements.** n527 The nefarious **conduct of military officials during** the course of the **mustard gas, radiation, biological warfare, and psychotropic drug experiments provides ample evidence of the "lies** and half-truths" that **the DoD has utilized in the name of national security.** n528 Indeed, the Army Inspector General has acknowledged the "inadequacy of the Army's institutional memory" regarding experimental research. n529 **When one considers socio-economic dimensions of the armed forces, this history of neglect has served to further societal inequalities.** n530 As a judge on the Sixth Circuit, and former Commander in Chief [\*793] of the Ohio National Guard explains, "in a democracy **we have far more to fear from the lack of military accountability than from the lack of military** discipline **or aggressiveness**." n531

**That risks bioweapons use—theft, arms racing, tradeoff**

H. Patricia **Hynes**, retired Professor, Environmental Health, Boston University, “Biological Weapons: Bargaining with the Devil,” TRUTHOUT, 8—18—**11**, http://www.truth-out.org/news/item/2693:biological-weapons-bargaining-with-the-devil

The bullish climate of the "war on terrorism" set off a massive flow of federal funding for research on live, virulent bioweapons' organisms (also referred to as biodefense, bioterrorism and biosafety organisms) to federal, university and private laboratories in rural, suburban and urban areas. Among the federal agencies building or expanding biodefense laboratories are the Departments of Defense (DoD), Homeland Security, State and Agriculture; the Environmental Protection Agency; and the National Institutes of Health (NIH). A new network, comprised of two large national biowarfare laboratories at BU and University of Texas, Galveston medical centers, more than a dozen small regional laboratories and ten Regional Centers of Excellence for Biodefense and Emerging Infectious Diseases Research, was designed for funding by the National Institute for Allergy and Infectious Diseases, a division of NIH. The validation offered by the federal health research agency for ramped-up biological warfare research is the dual use of the research results: "better vaccines, diagnostics and therapeutics against bioterrorist agents but also for coping with naturally occurring disease." Today, in dozens of newly sprung laboratories, **research on the most lethal** bacteria and **viruses** with no known cure **is being conducted in an atmosphere of secrecy**, with hand-picked internal review boards and little, if any, public oversight or accountability. Fort Detrick, Maryland, a longstanding military base and major government research facility, is the site of the largest biodefense lab being built in the United States. Here, **biowarfare pathogens will be created**, including new genetically engineered viruses and bacteria, in order **to simulate** potential **bioweapons attacks** by terrorist groups. Novel, lethal organisms and methods of delivery in biowarfare will be tested, all rationalized by the national security need to study them and develop a figurative bioshield against them. In fact, Fort Detrick's research agenda - modifying and dispersing lethal and genetically modified organisms - has "unmistakable hallmarks of an offensive weapons program" ... "in essence **creating new threats that we're going to have to defend ourselves against" - threats from accidents, theft of organisms and stimulus of a bioarms race**.(3) Between 2002 and 2009, approximately 400 facilities and 15,000 people were handling biological weapons agents in sites throughout the country, in many cases unbeknownst to the local community. The marathon to spend nearly $60 billion since 2002 on biological weapons research has raised serious concerns for numerous scientists and informed public critics. Among these are: runaway biodefense research without an assessment of biowarfare threat and the need for this research; (See the Sunshine Project web site for the most comprehensive map of biodefense research sites through 2008 in the United States ) militarization of biological research and the risk of provoking a biological arms race; neglect of vital public health research as a tradeoff for enhanced biodefense research; lack of standardized safety and security procedures for high-risk laboratories; increased risk of accident and intentional release of lethal organisms with the proliferation of facilities and researchers in residential communities; lack of transparency and citizen participation in the decision-making process; and vulnerability of environmental justice (i.e., low income and minority) communities to being selected for the location of these high-risk facilities. Is this federal research agenda "the biological equivalent of our misadventure in Iraq?" An expert on biological weapons at the University of California Davis, Mark Wheelis, contends that a "mass-casualty bioterrorist attack" is unlikely and that "**plastering the country" with bioweapons laboratories leaves the country with a weakened public health research infrastructure and,** thus, **less secure. The** Government Accounting Office (GAO) and many others have drawn the same conclusion. In May 2009, a study of security in DoD biodefense laboratories determined that the **security systems of high biocontainment laboratories cannot protect against theft of bioweapons agents**. Soon after, a Washington Post story revealed that an inventory of potentially deadly pathogens at the government's premier bioweapons research laboratory at Fort Detrick, Maryland, uncovered that more than 9,000 vials were missing. In testimony to a House Committee hearing on the proliferation of bioweapons laboratories, Nancy Kingsbury of the GAO revealed that expansion of bioweapons laboratories has been "so uncoordinated that no federal agency knows how many exist"; nor, she added, is there any sense among federal agencies of how many are needed, of their operational safety and of the cumulative risks they pose to the public. Keith Rhodes, the GAO's chief technologist, testified in the same October 2007 Congressional hearing "'we are at greater risk today' of an infectious disease epidemic because of the great increase in biolaboratories and the absence of oversight they receive." As many have gravely observed, the biodefense build-up means a huge number of people has access to extremely lethal material.

**Bioweapons cause extinction**

Anders **Sandberg** et al., James Martin Research Fellow, Future of Humanity Institute, Oxford University, "How Can We Reduce the Risk of Human Extinction?" BULLETIN OF THE ATOMIC SCIENTISTS, 9-9-**08**, http://www.thebulletin.org/web-edition/features/how-can-we-reduce-the-risk-of-human-extinction, accessed 5-2-10.

The risks from anthropogenic hazards appear at present larger than those from natural ones. Although great progress has been made in reducing the number of nuclear weapons in the world, humanity is still threatened by the possibility of a global thermonuclear war and a resulting nuclear winter. We may face even greater risks from emerging technologies. **Advances in synthetic biology might make it possible to engineer pathogens capable of extinction-level pandemics**. **The knowledge, equipment, and materials needed to engineer pathogens are more accessible than those needed to build nuclear weapons. And unlike other weapons, pathogens are self-replicating, allowing a small arsenal to become exponentially destructive. Pathogens have been implicated in the extinctions of many wild species**. Although most pandemics "fade out" by reducing the density of susceptible populations, pathogens with wide host ranges in multiple species can reach even isolated individuals**. The intentional or unintentional release of engineered pathogens with high transmissibility, latency, and lethality might be capable of causing human extinction**. While such an event seems unlikely today, the likelihood may increase as biotechnologies continue to improve at a rate rivaling Moore's Law.

**Court action on detention is key to challenge the deference doctrine**

**Masur 05** (Jonathan, Law clerk for Posner, JD from Harvard, "A Hard Look or a Blind Eye: Administrative Law and Military Deference" Hastings Law Journal, Lexis)

In evidence is a court that instinctively views military action as judicially incomprehensible and legally untouchable. To the Fourth Circuit, law cannot bend the exigent realities of war to its constraining will because it cannot extract necessary factual clarity from amidst the "murkiness and chaos"; courts would thus be well-advised to remain outside the fray. n320 It is this judicial predilection that necessitates firm proof of dissimilitude between military and criminal detention. **When military operations assume the form and function of typical law enforcement acts, courts become hard-pressed to justify their abstention** from the rule-of-law constitutional questions that form the core of their juridical task. Despitea body of Supreme Court administrative law doctrine counseling judicial intervention into areas of executive expertise, and despite the principle that courts must act to vindicate the rule of law even [\*519] in fields of overwhelming executive or legislative authority, **Article III courts have come to view military questions as a taxonomic grouping they are simply incapable of navigating. Yet in this legal area** (as in most others), **doctrinal facts ought to drive psychological attitudes. Military cases do not always hold the threat of substantially greater national peril, nor offer more pressing exigencies, nor present more intractable** fact or policy **questions** than do typical administrative law adjudications. **Courts that remain unafraid to pass on the factual rationality of highway safety regulations** that may affect tens of thousands of lives each year **should hold no** particular impressionistic **aversion towards inquiring into the legality of detentions** or secretive hearings. There, the danger of a judicial misstep remains speculative precisely because courts have refused to put the Administration to its proofs. Moreover, **courts** themselves **possess responsibility for enforcing the legal limitations that exist to bind administrative actors. To leave wartime cases exclusively in the hands of the Executive Branch in the name of** "comity" or "**deference" would be to reduce fundamental constitutional guarantees to mere precatory language,** slaves to the vicissitudes of the executive expediency they were meant to curb. Lower courts need not shrink from validating the rule of law in cases that bear such resemblance to the administrative law doctrines with which they are familiar. If they continue to do so, **the Supreme Court must act to reconstitute wartime doctrine** along existing precedential lines, **lest the U**nited **S**tates **reap the consequences of this** unfortunate, self-conscious **judicial hand-washing.** Conclusion **Over the past three years, the "War on Terror" has become as much a legal strategy as a military operation.** Incursions abroad have been matched by informational blackouts at home. International manhunts for suspected terrorists are coupled with detention of American citizens. Constitutional rights have been eroded by a torrent of ostensibly security-enhancing measures, and aggrieved individuals have turned to the courts for redress, just as they did six decades ago when the Japanese population of the West Coast was interned in the name of national defense. Yet **courts have behaved solicitously** not towards claims of constitutional deprivations, but rather **towards governmental declarations of necessity and authority** over the lives and rights of the citizenry in wartime. In particular, **courts have overwhelmingly deferred to the executive branch** regarding the assertions of fact that form the factual predicates for governmental actions. Deference has come according to two rationales: first, the President's unique constitutional role as guarantor of national security, and second, the Executive's [\*520] superior institutional expertise in wartime matters. **In awarding deference** on these grounds, **the judiciary has ignored the operation of the Constitution** and laws as contemporaneous structural constraints on executive military action. The President and the military hold only the authority vested in them by the Constitution or by law. Action outside of those legal boundaries is by definition unconstitutional and unauthorized. Similarly, the Bill of Rights enshrines individual freedoms that executive action, even if otherwise lawful, cannot infringe. Moreover, **many cases implicating national security turn on issues of individual statutory and constitutional rights - such as the lawfulness of detention** or free speech rights such as access to information - that form the archetypal bailiwick of civilian tribunals. Thus, **even in wartime circumstances there is often constitutional and statutory law to apply, law to which courts must hold the Executive** and the legislature. As courts have nearly unanimously recognized, **it is emphatically the province of the judiciary to vindicate the rule of law by demanding that government bodies remain within circumscribed boundaries.** It is in this respect that administrative law can usefully inform the adjudication of wartime cases. Administrative law jurisprudence developed to address the particular problems presented by executive branch agencies possessing tremendous institutional expertise and resources and specially empowered by Congress to manage technically difficult subject matter. So-called "military" cases come to Article III courts within precisely the same jurisprudential framework as civilian administrative ones: courts must determine the degree to which they should defer to the legal or factual allegations of an expert, empowered executive branch organization. Despite the obvious considerations favoring substantial administrative deference, the Supreme Court's modern administrative law jurisprudence stands for the principle that adherence to the rule of law demands that courts meaningfully scrutinize administrative determinations of fact. The Court has recognized that enforcement of a legal stricture is toothless without a concomitant inquiry into that stricture's factual predicate. It has therefore insisted upon "substantial evidence" in support of agency judgments before affirming them and required courts to perform "rationality review" of agency policy decisions to ensure that agencies have considered all available alternatives and reached logical conclusions from available information. The rule-of-law principles that motivate judicial scrutiny of administrative determinations compel similar treatment for the claims of fact proffered by the military in the interest of surmounting constitutional restraints. The reasons that courts advance in defense of their acquiescence in wartime circumstances are logically unconvincing. [\*521] **The military matters that have come before the judiciary are neither more judicially inscrutable nor more legally intractable than the administrative issues upon which hard look and substantial evidence review were founded. If military cases present greater national dangers - a question that can hardly be answered accurately without judicial review in the first instance - than their civilian counterparts, they also threaten more dramatic erosions of civil and constitutional rights**. Courts cannot continue to invoke "national security" as a shibboleth absolving them from their responsibility, exemplified within the principles of administrative law, to examine especially those actions taken by broadly empowered, highly experienced executive bodies. On September 22, 2004, almost three years after Yaser Esam Hamdi was taken into custody by American forces in Afghanistan, and nearly three months after the Supreme Court had ruled that he could not be held indefinitely without some nature of adjudicative process, the United States Department of Justice decided that Hamdi's "intelligence value had been exhausted" and agreed to release him, provided he never again set foot in the United States. n321 Nineteen days later, Hamdi was placed on a flight bound for Saudi Arabia. n322 What justification the United States military believed it possessed for holding Hamdi may never be known; one can only presume that it would not have withstood even the limited scrutiny the Supreme Court had prescribed. Hamdi's release completed the military's circular narrative: it was the executive branch that chose to incarcerate Hamdi; it was the executive branch that unilaterally chose to release him; and it appears that the executive branch never ceased believing that it alone held the authority to make these decisions. Yaser **Hamdi**, Jose **Padilla, and** all American **citizens** bearing constitutional rights **are entitled to a government that operates by law and logic, not by executive fiat. Courts must act to vindicate the rule of law if such a government is to persevere.**

**Plan is key to domestic and international rule of law—modeling**

Michael P. **Scharf** et al., Counsel of Record, Brief of the Public International Law & Policy Group as Amicus Curiae in Support of the Petitioners, Jamal Kiyemba, et. Al., v. Barack H. Obama, et al., SCOTUS, No. 08-1234, 12—**09**, p. 3-8.

**The precedent of this Court has a significant impact on rule of law in foreign states**. **Foreign governments, in particular foreign judiciaries, notice and follow the example set by the U.S. in upholding the rule of law**. **As foreign** governments and **judiciaries grapple with** new and challenging issues associated with **upholding the rule of law during times of conflict, U.S. leadership on the primacy of law during the war on terror is particularly important**. **Recent decisions of this Court have reaffirmed the primacy of rule of law** in the U.S. during the war on terror. As relates to the present case, a number of this Court’s decisions, most notably **Boumediene** v. Bush, 128 S.Ct. 2229 (2008**), have established clear precedent that** Guantanamo detainees **have a right to** petition for **habeas corpus relief. Despite a clear holding** from this Court in Boumediene, the **Court of Appeals sought** in Kiyemba v. Obama **to narrow Boumediene** **to such a degree as to render this Court’s ruling hollow**. 555 F.3d 1022 (D.C. Cir. 2009). **The** present **case is** thus **a test of both the substance of the right granted in Boumediene and the role of this Court in ensuring faithful implementation of its prior decisions**. Although this Court’s rulings only have the force of law in the U.S., **foreign governments will take note of the decision** in the present case **and use the precedent set by this Court to guide their actions in times of conflic**t. PILPG has advised over two dozen foreign states on peace negotiations and post-conflict constitution drafting, as well as all of the international war crimes tribunals. Through providing pro bono legal assistance to foreign governments and judiciaries, **PILPG has observed the important role this Court and U.S. precedent serve in promoting rule of law in foreign states.** In Uganda, for example, the precedent established by this Court in Hamdan v. Rumsfeld, 548 U.S. 557 (2006), and Boumediene, influenced judges and legislators to incorporate the principles of judicial review and enforceability in their domestic war crimes bill. In Nepal, this Court has served as a model for the nascent judiciary. In Somaliland, the government relied heavily on U.S. terrorism legislation when drafting terrorism legislation for the region. And in the South Sudan peace process, the Sudan People’s Liberation Movement/Army (SPLM/A), the leading political party in the Government of Southern Sudan, relied on U.S. precedent to argue for the primacy of law and the importance of enforceability of previous adjudicative decisions in the Abyei Arbitration, one of the most important and contentious issues in the ongoing implementation of the peace agreement**. Foreign judges also follow the work of this Court closely**. In a number of the judicial training programs PILPG has conducted, **foreign judges have asked PILPG detailed questions about the role of this Court in upholding rule of law during the war on terror**. **A review of foreign precedent confirms how closely foreign judges follow this Court**. **In numerous foreign states, and in the international war crimes tribunals, judges regularly cite the precedent of this Court to establish their own legitimacy, to shore up judicial authority against overreaching by powerful executives, and to develop a strong rule of law within their own legal systems.** **Given the significant influence of this Court on foreign governments and judiciaries**, a decision in Kiyemba **implementing Boumediene will reaffirm this Court’s leadership in upholding the rule of law and promote respect for rule of law in foreign states during times of conflict**. ARGUMENT I. KIYEMBA v. OBAMA IS A TEST OF SUPREME COURT LEADERSHIP IN UPHOLDING RULE OF LAW IN TIMES OF CONFLICT **The precedent set by the Supreme Court** in the present case **will have a significant impact on the development of rule of law in foreign states. Foreign judicial, executive, and parliamentary bodies closely follow the work of this Court, and this Court’s previous decisions related to the war on terror have shaped how foreign states uphold the rule of law** in times of conflict. **Foreign governments and judiciaries** will **review** this Court’s **decision** in the present case in light of those previous decisions. **A decision** in the present case **implementing previous decisions of this Court granting habeas rights to Guantanamo detainees is an opportunity for this Court to reaffirm to foreign governments that the U.S. is a leader and role model in upholding the rule of law during times of conflict**. **Recent Supreme Court precedent established a clear role for the primacy of law in the U.S. war on terror**. In particular, this Court’s landmark decision in **Boumediene highlighted the critical role of the judiciary in a system dedicated to the rule of law, as well as the “indispensable” role of habeas corpus as a “time tested” safeguard of liberty.** Boumediene v. Bush, 128 S.Ct. 2229, 2247, 2259 (2008). **Around the globe, courts and governments took note of this Court’s** stirring **words:** “**Security subsists, too**, in **fidelity to freedom’s first principles. Chief among these are freedom from arbitrary and unlawful restraint** and the personal liberty **that is secured by adherence to the separation of powers**. It is from these principles that the judicial authority to consider petitions for habeas corpus relief derives.” Id. at 2277. In contrast to the maxim silent enim leges inter arma (in times of conflict the law must be silent), this Court affirmed in Boumediene that “[t]**he laws and Constitution are designed to survive, and remain in force, in extraordinary times. Liberty and security can be reconciled**, and in our system they are reconciled within the framework of the law.” Id. Boumediene held that the detainees in the military prison at Guantanamo Bay are “entitled to the privilege of habeas corpus to challenge the legality of their detentions.” Id. at 2262. Inherent in that privilege is the right to a remedy if the detention is found to be unlawful. In the present case, the Petitioners, who had been found not to be enemy combatants, sought to exercise their privilege of habeas corpus. The Executive Branch conceded that there was no legal basis to continue to detain the Petitioners, that years of diligent effort to resettle them elsewhere had failed, and that there was no foreseeable path of release. The District Court implemented Boumediene, ordering that the Petitioners be brought to the courtroom to impose conditions of release. In re Guantanamo Bay Detainee Litigation, 581 F. Supp. 2d 33, 42-43 (D.C. Cir. 2008). The Court of Appeals reversed, with the majority concluding that the judiciary had no “power to require anything more” than the Executive’s representations that it was continuing efforts to find a foreign country willing to admit Petitioners. Kiyemba v. Obama, 555 F.3d 1022, 1029 (D.C. Cir. 2009). **The Court of Appeals’ decision effectively narrowed Boumediene to such a degree that it rendered the ruling hollow**. Circuit Judge Rogers recognized this in her dissent, opining that the majority’s analysis “was not faithful to Boumediene.” Id. at 1032 (Roberts, J., dissenting). Given the Court of Appeals’ attempt to narrow Boumediene, Kiyemba v. Obama is a test of this Court’s role in upholding the primacy of law in times of conflict. A decision in favor of the Petitioners in Kiyemba will reaffirm this Court’s leadership in upholding the rule of law and promote respect for rule of law in foreign states during times of conflict.

**Rule of law solves war—multiple triggers**

**Feldman ‘8** [Noah Feldman, a contributing writer for the magazine, is a law professor at Harvard University and an adjunct senior fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations, “When Judges Make Foreign Policy”, NEW YORK TIMES, 9—25—08, www.nytimes.com/2008/09/28/magazine/28law-t.html]

Looking at today’s problem through the lens of our great constitutional experiment, it emerges that there is no single, enduring answer to which way the Constitution should be oriented, inward or outward. The truth is that we have had an inward- and outward-looking Constitution by turns, depending on the needs of the country and of the world. Neither the text of the Constitution, nor the history of its interpretation, nor the deep values embedded in it justify one answer rather than the other. In the face of such ambiguity, the right question is not simply in what direction does our Constitution look, but where do we need the Constitution to look right now? Answering this requires the Supreme Court to think in terms not only of principle but also of policy: to weigh national and international interests; and to exercise fine judgment about how our Constitution functions and is perceived at home and abroad. The conservative and liberal approaches to legitimacy and the rule of law need to be supplemented with a healthy dose of real-world pragmatism. In effect, the fact that the Constitution affects our relations with the world requires the justices to have a foreign policy of their own. On the surface, it seems as if such inevitably political judgments are not the proper province of the court. If assessments of the state of the world are called for, shouldn’t the court defer to the decisions of the elected president and Congress? Aren’t judgments about the direction of our country the exclusive preserve of the political branches? Indeed, the **Supreme Court** does need to be limited to its proper role. But when it comes to our **engagement with the world,** that role **involves taking a stand, not stepping aside.** The reason for this is straightforward: the court is in charge of interpreting the Constitution, and the Constitution plays a major role in shaping our engagement with the rest of the world. The court therefore has no choice about whether to involve itself in the question of which direction the Constitution will face; it is now unavoidably involved. Even choosing to defer to the other branches of government amounts to a substantive stand on the question. That said, **when the court exercises its own independent political judgment, it** still **does so in a distinctively legal way.**For one thing, the court can act only through deciding the cases that happen to come before it, and the court is limited to using the facts and circumstances of those cases to shape a broader constitutional vision. The court also speaks in the idiom of law — which is to say, of regular rules that apply to everyone across the board. It cannot declare, for instance, that only this or that detainee has rights. It must hold that the same rights extend to every detainee who is similarly situated. **This**, too, **is an effective constraint on the way the court exercises** its policy **judgment.** Indeed, it is this very regularity that gives its decisions legitimacy as the product of judicial logic and reasoning. Why We Need More Law, More Than Ever So what do we need the Constitution to do for us now? The answer, I think, is that the Constitution must be read to help us remember that while the war on terror continues, we are also still in the midst of a period of rapid globalization. An enduring lesson of the Bush years is the extreme difficulty and cost of doing things by ourselves. **We need to build and rebuild alliances — and law has** historically **been** one of **our best tool**s for doing so. In our present precarious situation, **it would be a** terrible **mistake to abandon our** historic **position of leadership in the g**lobal **spread of** the **rule of law. Our leadership matters** for reasons both universal and national. Seen from the perspective of the world, **the fragmentation of power** after the cold war **creates new dangers** of disorder that need to be mitigated by the sense of regularity and predictability **that only the rule of law can provide. Terrorists need to be deterred. Failed states need to be brought under the umbrella of international organizations so they can govern themselves. And economic interdependence demands coordination, so that the collapse of one does not become the collapse of all**. From a national perspective, our interest is less in the inherent value of advancing individual rights than in claiming that our allies are obligated to help us by virtue of legal commitments they have made. The Bush administration’s lawyers often insisted that lawwas a tool of the weak, and that therefore as a strong nation we had no need to engage it. But this notion of “lawfare” as a threat to the United States is based on a misunderstanding of the very essence of how law operates. **Law** comes into being and is sustained not because the weak demand it but because it is a tool of the powerful — as it has been for the United States since World War II at least. The reason those with power prefer law to brute force is that it **regularizes and legitimates the exercise of authority. It is easier and cheaper to get the compliance of weaker** people or **states by promising them rules** and a fair hearing **than by threatening them constantly with force.** After all, if those wielding power really objected to the rule of law, they could abolish it, the way dictators and juntas have often done the world over.

**1AC: Plan**

**Plan: The United States federal judiciary should rule that individuals indefinitely detained under the War Powers authority of the President of the United States must be tried by an existing Article III court or be released within a reasonable, specified time period.**

**1AC: Solvency**

**Contention 3 is Solvency:**

**Action by the judiciary is key**

**Feldman 13** (Noah, professor of Constitutional and International Law at Harvard, “Obama Can Close Guantanamo: Here’s How,” Bloomberg, May 7, 2013, http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2013-05-07/obama-has-leverage-to-get-his-way-on-guantanamo.html)

**Faced with a standoff between two branches, the system allows an orderly answer: turning to the** third branch, the **courts, to resolve the conflict. Since 2003, the Supreme Court has taken an interest in Guantanamo, deciding on the statutory and constitutional rights extended there, and vetting procedures for detainee hearings and trials.** Along the way, it has shown an equal-opportunity willingness to second-guess the executive -- as when President George W. Bush denied hearings to detainees -- and Congress, which passed a law denying habeas corpus to the prisoners. How could the court get involved? The first step would be for the Obama administration to show some of the legal self-confidence it did in justifying drone strikes against U.S. citizens or in ignoring the War Powers Resolution in the Libya military intervention. Likewise, it could assert a right of control over where the detainees should be held. And if the president’s lawyers are worried about Bush-style assertions of plenary executive power (which, for the record, didn’t concern them when it came to drones or Libya), there is a path they could follow that would hew closer to their favored constitutional style. Geneva Conventions **The reasoning could look like this:** The president’s war power must be exercised pursuant to the laws of war embodied in the Geneva Conventions. And though Guantanamo once conformed to those laws -- as the administration asserted in 2009 -- it no longer does. The conditions are too makeshift to manage the continuing prisoner resistance, and **indefinite detention in an indefinite war with no enemy capable of surrendering is pressing on the bounds of lawful POW detention.** Congress doesn’t have the authority to force the president to violate the laws of war. Yet by blocking Obama from closing Guantanamo, that is just what Congress is doing. What’s more, he has the inherent authority to ensure that we are complying with our treaty obligations. This argument isn’t a certain winner. And there would still be the problem of whether the president could put the detainees in an existing prison. But at least spelling this out would put the fear of God into Congress. Continued congressional resistance would also trigger a court case. The president could have a tough time convincing five justices. According to the framework developed by Justice Robert Jackson in the Truman-era steel seizure case, and used today by the courts, the president’s power is at its “lowest ebb” when Congress has expressly barred him from acting. But even at ebb tide there is still an ocean, and **lots of things Congress can’t stop the president from doing. Complying with** his **legal obligations should surely be at the top of the list.** The Supreme Court might want to duck this controversial issue. But **there is a precedent for the court wading in where Congress is blocking necessary action. In the Cold War, lawful racial segregation in the U.S. became costly as a matter of foreign relations.** President Harry **Truman desegregated the military, but he lacked the authority to overturn state-based discrimination.** The Senate filibuster, originally born of slavery, ensured that Congress wouldn’t pass a civil-rights bill that could have solved the problem. **That left the high court -- which gave us Brown v. Board** of Education. And in that case, the U.S. -- as friend of the court -- quoted Secretary of State Dean Acheson to the effect that segregation was being used as propaganda by the Soviet Union. It is absurd that the commander in chief can’t do what he believes is in the country’s national interests when it comes to detainees. Win, lose or draw, it is time to get around Congress. And if ordinary politics won’t do the trick, **going to the courts may be the best option -- because it is the only one.**

**Mandating release is crucial—any alternative leaves the judiciary powerless and fails to rectify injustice**

**Stanton 10** (Caroline Wells, J.D. at Georgetown Law, Summer 2010, "Rights and Remedies: Meaningful Habeas Corpus in Guantanamo" Georgetown Journal of Legal Ethics, Lexis)

**The** inclusion of the **Suspension Clause** in the Constitution **was meant to preserve the common law tradition of protection against the Executive, and the ability of the petitioner to force the Executive to justify detention** or release the petitioner. **In 2008, the Supreme Court held that these protections had "full effect" in Guantanamo.** n105 **Because the writ of habeas** corpus **is both a statement of the rights of the individual and the means by which he can enforce a remedy, the denial of access to a remedy has resulted in a de facto suspension of the writ at Guantanamo. Without the power to order a remedy, the Court lacks the power to enforce the right, and it becomes no right at all.** **"Without a remedy, judicial decisions are merely advisory opinions, hypothetical undertakings with no practical effect" n106 that are unlikely to present any significant limitation on the government's ability to restrict individual liberty.** **While some argue that our Constitutional system contains instances in which certain rights lack enforceable remedies, it would be anathema to our understandings of judicial review and individual liberty to accept that the executive and the courts can concede that detention is unlawful, but the courts lack the power to grant release.** The Court has deemed the ability to order release the "Constitutionally required remedy," and by denying Guantanamo petitioners a remedy to enforce the writ, **the D.C. Circuit has circumvented Boumediene and denied Guantanamo petitioners full habeas rights.** The Government has simply substituted the plenary power of immigration for MCA § 7--the net effect of which is the same--petitioners are denied release from unlawful detention. **Because rights are only as meaningful as the remedies available to enforce them, extending a right of habeas without also extending the right to order a remedy to end the unlawful imprisonment has resulted in a de facto suspension of the writ.** n107 The extension of habeas to Guantanamo has become meaningless. If the Suspension Clause truly has "full effect" in Guantanamo, the denial of a remedy constitutes a suspension of habeas and the elimination of a fundamental protection to ensure personal liberty. **The Government has raised concerns that permitting the courts to craft remedies directing transfer to particular countries and restricting transfer to others would set a dangerous precedent of allowing the judiciary to direct the executive's foreign relations.** n108 **But appropriately crafting the judicial remedy,** [\*905] **rather than denying it all together, can sufficiently avoid this peril. The courts need not issue detailed release orders; they simply need to issue a traditional habeas order requiring release within a specified time period.** n109 **Such an order would likely "induce" the Executive to quickly effectuate transfer** in almost every case where it was safe. n110 Indeed, the Government has shown that it will respond to judicial pressure to effectuate transfer. In Ali Ahmed v. Obama, the petitioner was abruptly transferred ngs indicated the judge was "losing patience with the delay in complying with her order." n111 The Executive is apt to respond to judicial pressure because if the Government is unable to repatriate detainees within the time period specified, the court could order the release of detainees within the United States, while still permitting the government to transfer detainees as soon as such transfer becomes possible. n112 Notably, the government's success in obtaining resettlement offers for the Kiyemba petitioners did not come until after the Supreme Court granted cert and judicial review appeared imminent. n113 The appropriate remedy in this case is no different than that offered in Clark and Zadvydas: the Government is entitled to a reasonable, specified period of time to effectuate the Court's order, and then the detainee is entitled to release wherever the Executive may accomplish it. Such a remedy would give the Executive fair notice of the potential consequence of failure to transfer, while at the same time protecting the detainee's liberty.

**Prosecution in federal courts solves best—multiple reasons, experts agree**

Oona **Hathaway**, Professor, International Law, Yale Law School, Samuel Adelsberg, Spencer Amdur, Philip Levitz, Freya Pitts and Sirine Shebaya, “The Power to Detain: Detention of Terrorism Suspects after 9/11,” YALE JOURNAL OF INTERNATIONAL LAW v. 38, Winter 20**13**, p. 161-167.

The United States is still actively engaged in hostilities with global terrorist organizations, but there are indications that "we're within reach of strategically defeating al-Qaeda." n227 This development, combined with the growing distance from the national trauma of September 11, has reinvigorated the debate surrounding the detention and prosecution of suspected terrorists both outside of and within the United States. Even though Congress has recently expanded military detention and prosecution, n228 **prosecution in federal court offers several key advantages over law-of-war detention, including predictability, legitimacy, greater cooperation** by defendants and international partners, **and flexibility**. n229 These advantages have led a diverse set of actors - from current Department of Defense and counterterrorism officials, n230 to [\*162] former Bush Administration officials, n231 to the Washington Post editorial board n232 - to support the prosecution and detention of individuals through the federal courts, despite Congress's recently expressed preference for law-of-war detention. **In some cases, prosecution in federal court is the only available option for prosecuting an accused terrorist. Federal antiterrorism statutes are extensive and provide statutory authority to prosecute individuals who are** part of or **supporting terrorist groups without direct ties to** forces associated with **al-Qaeda or the Taliban** (and therefore outside the scope of the 2001 AUMF or the NDAA), n233 **and independently operating terrorists** who are inspired by, but are not part of or associated with, al-Qaeda or the Taliban. **n234 These** **statutes also reach persons** or citizens **who, because they are apprehended in the U**nited **S**tates, **cannot be tried under the MCA**. The following sections discuss the contours and limitations of such criminal prosecution and detention in the terrorism context. Even where detention under the law of war is available, **the criminal justice system offers** some **key advantages** **for** the **detention and prosecution of suspected terrorists.** We thus aim here to offer a correction to the recent trend toward favoring law-of-war detention over criminal prosecution and detention. **In the vast majority of cases, criminal prosecution** and detention **is the most effective and legitimate way to address the terrorist threat.** A. The Advantages of Criminal Prosecution and Detention The least contested bases for detention authority in any context are post-conviction criminal detention and pre-verdict detention for those who pose a risk of flight. It is often assumed that such criminal detention is ill-suited to terrorists. However, with very little fanfare, **federal district court dockets have been flush with terrorism cases over the past decade. Strikingly, efforts to measure the conviction rate in these cases place it between 86 and 91 percent.** n235 Far from being ineffective, then, **trying suspected terrorists in criminal courts is remarkably effective. It also offers** the **advantages** of predictability, legitimacy, and strategic benefits in the fight against terrorism. **1. Predictability Post-conviction detention of terrorists after prosecution in federal court provides predictability that is currently absent in the military commission system. Federal** district **courts have years of experience trying complex cases and convicting dangerous criminals, including international terrorists, and the rules are well established and understood. The current military commission system**, on the other hand, **is** a **comparatively untested** adjudicatory regime. n236 As already noted, **conviction rates in terrorism trials have been close to ninety percent** since 2001, and those rates have remained steady in the face of large increases in the number of prosecutions. **The military commissions,** by contrast, **have** - as of this writing - **convicted seven people** since 2001, five of whom pled guilty. n237 Charges have been dropped against several defendants, n238 [\*164] and other defendants have been charged but not tried. n239 The commission procedures have been challenged at every stage, and it is unclear what final form they will ultimately take. Even their substantive jurisdiction remains unsettled. In October 2012, the Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit overturned Salim Hamdan's military commission conviction for providing material support to terrorism. n240 The Court held that the Military Commissions Act of 2006, which made material support for terrorism a war crime that could be prosecuted in the commissions, was not retroactively applicable to Hamdan's conduct prior to enactment of the statute. n241 Moreover, the Court explained that material support for terrorism was not a recognized war crime under international law. n242 As a result, his conviction for material support for terrorism in the commission could not stand. n243 It is uncertain how this will affect other trials of detainees, but this decision clearly illustrates the unsettled nature of the commissions. n244 **2. Legitimacy** **Federal courts are** also generally **considered more legitimate than military commissions. The stringent procedural protections reduce the risk of error and generate trust and legitimacy**. n245 **The federal courts**, for example, **provide** more **robust hearsay protections** than the commissions. n246 In addition, **jurors are** [\*165] **ordinary citizens, not U.S. military personnel**. Indeed, **some of the weakest procedural protections in the military commission system have been successfully challenged as unconstitutiona**l. n247 **Congress and the Executive have responded to these legal challenges - and to criticism of the commissions from around the globe - by significantly strengthening the commissions' procedural protections. Yet the remaining gaps - along with** what many regard as **a tainted history - continue to raise doubts about the fairness and legitimacy of the commissions.** The current commissions, moreover, have been active for only a short period - too brief a period for doubts to be confirmed or put to rest. n248 **Federal criminal procedure**, on the other hand, **is well-established and widely regarded as legitimate. Legitimacy of the trial process is important** not only to the individuals charged but also **to the fight against terrorism.** As several successful habeas corpus petitions have demonstrated, **insufficient procedural protections create a real danger of erroneous imprisonment** for extended periods. n249 **Such errors can generate resentment and distrust of the U**nited **S**tates **that undermine** the **effectiveness of counterterrorism efforts.** Indeed, evidence suggests that **populations are more likely to cooperate in policing when they believe they have been treated fairly.** n250 The understanding that a more legitimate detention regime will be a more effective one is reflected in recent statements from the Department of Defense and the White House. n251 **3. Strategic Advantages There is clear evidence that other countries recognize and respond to the difference in legitimacy between civilian and military courts and that they are**, indeed, **more willing to cooperate with U.S. counterterrorism efforts when terrorism suspects are tried in the criminal justice system. Increased international cooperation is** therefore **another advantage of criminal prosecution.** Many **key U.S. allies have been unwilling to cooperate in cases involving law-of-war detention** or prosecution **but have cooperated in criminal** [\*166] **prosecutions.** In fact, **many U.S. extradition treaties, including those with allies such as India and Germany, forbid extradition when the defendant will not be tried in a criminal court.** n252 This issue has played out in practice several times. An al-Shabaab operative was extradited from the Netherlands only after assurances from the United States that he would be prosecuted in criminal court. n253 Two similar cases arose in 2007. n254 In perhaps the most striking example, five terrorism suspects - including Abu Hamza al-Masr, who is accused of providing material support to al-Qaeda by trying to set up a training camp in Oregon and of organizing support for the Taliban in Afghanistan - were extradited to the United States by the United Kingdom in October 2012. n255 The extradition was made on the express condition that they would be tried in civilian federal criminal courts rather than in the military commissions. n256 And, indeed, both the European Court of Human Rights and the British courts allowed the extradition to proceed after assessing the protections offered by the U.S. federal criminal justice system and finding they fully met all relevant standards. n257 An insistence on using military commissions may thus hinder extradition and other kinds of international prosecutorial cooperation, such as the sharing of testimony and evidence. Finally, **the criminal justice system is simply a more agile and versatile prosecution forum. Federal jurisdiction offers an extensive variety of antiterrorism statutes that can be marshaled to prosecute terrorist activity committed outside the U**nited **S**tates, **and subsequently to detain those who are convicted.** n258 **This greater variety of offenses** - military commissions can only [\*167] punish an increasingly narrow set of traditional offenses against the laws of war n259 - **offers prosecutors important flexibility.** For instance, **it might be very difficult to prove al-Qaeda membership in an MCA prosecution or a law-of-war habeas proceeding; but if the defendant has received training at a terrorist camp** or participated in a specific terrorist act, **federal prosecutors may convict under various statutes tailored to more specific criminal behavior.** n260 In addition, military commissions can no longer hear prosecutions for material support committed before 2006. n261 Due in part to the established track record of the federal courts, **the federal criminal justice system also allows for more flexible interactions between prosecutors and defendants. Proffer and plea agreements are powerful incentives for defendants to cooperate, and often lead to valuable intelligence-gathering, producing more intelligence over the course of prosecution**. n262

**Obama will comply—the Court has the final word**

Joe **Meacham,** executive editor, Random House, “Why Obama Shouldn’t Declare War on Supreme Court,” TIME, 4—2—**12**, http://ideas.time.com/2012/04/02/why-obama-shouldnt-declare-war-on-the-supreme-court/

With the Supreme Court weighing the constitutionality of a central element of President Obama’s comprehensive health care reform, there’s a lot of talk (in the places where people talk about such things, usually unburdened by responsibility or firsthand knowledge) of making the court an issue in the campaign if it were to rule against the White House. But here is a pretty good rule of thumb for Democratic Presidents: if it didn’t work for Franklin D. Roosevelt, who won four terms and a World War, it probably won’t work for you either. In one of the rare political debacles of his long life, FDR overreached after his landslide win against Alf Landon in 1936. (Roosevelt carried every state, save for Maine and Vermont.) A largely conservative Supreme Court had already struck down key parts of New Deal legislation, and there was the threat of more anti-Roosevelt decisions to come. And so FDR proposed a plan that would have enabled him to appoint additional justices in an attempt to shift the court’s political orientation. The effort failed, miserably. Justified or not, **the Supreme Court has** a kind of **sacred status in American life**. For whatever reason, **Presidents can safely run against Congress**, and vice versa, **but** I think **there is an inherent popular aversion to assaults on the court itself**. Perhaps **it has to do with an instinctive belief that life needs umpires**, even ones who blow calls now and then. Ironies abound. One of the great partisans of the early republic, John Marshall, created an ethos around the court that has largely protected it (even from itself) from successful partisan attack. **Even when it makes bad law (Bush v. Gore), it has the last word**. **Even when it makes decisions that enrage vast swaths of** politically, culturally and religiously motivated **citizens** (Roe v. Wade), **it** basically **has the last word**. (If you disagree with this example, ask yourself how successful pro-lifers have been in amending the Constitution over the past 40 years.) It has had the grimmest of hours (Dred Scott v. Sandford) and the finest (Brown v. Board of Education). The court is, of course, a political institution. In no way is it a clinically impartial tribunal, for virtually every decision requires an application of values and an assessment in light of experience. “Activist judges” tend to be judges who make decisions with which you disagree. Wise Presidents have learned that taking the court on directly rarely turns out well. Thomas Jefferson cordially hated his cousin Marshall, but even Jefferson trod carefully as he repealed John Adams’ extension of Federalist judicial power. “John Marshall has made his decision,” Andrew Jackson is alleged to have said after a Cherokee case. “Now let him enforce it.” The showdown between Marshall and Jackson over the fate of Native Americans, however, was much more subtle on both sides, with Marshall characteristically taking care not to force an existential crisis with the executive branch. Segregationist Southerners may have put up billboards urging the impeachment of Earl Warren in the 1950s, but the chief justice’s job — and his place in history — was never in actual jeopardy. On a human level, Presidents who have to fight and claw their way to shape public opinion, pass legislation and then try to implement their policies must be mightily tempted to make a hostile Supreme Court a target to energize the base. But history shows that Obama should resist the temptation. There are subtle ways to make the point about a given court’s seeming hostility to your agenda and still win over highly informed independents in swing states who tend to decide elections. The big thing experience shows is that you should not declare war on the court. More in sadness than in anger, just mention the issues on which you feel stymied by the justices. From health care to campaign finance, those independent voters will get the message without being frightened off by an unsettling rhetorical attack on the judiciary. That’s what FDR got wrong. Obama may well have a chance to get it right.

**Court involvement key to setting precedent that checks abuses**

**Pearlstein 03** [Deborah N., Deputy Director of the U.S. Law and Security Program at the Lawyers Committee for Human Rights, and a Visiting Fellow at the Stanford University Center for Democracy, Development and the Rule of Law, “The Role of the Courts in Protecting Civil Liberties and Human Rights for the Post-9/11 United States”, 2nd Pugwash Workshop on Terrorism: External and Domestic Consequences of the War on Terrorism, http://www.pugwash.org/reports/nw/terrorism2003-pearlstein.htm]

**In each** of the **historical examples** just given, **the judiciary** **ultimately played a critical role in evaluating the legality of executive action**. In the Civil War case, Lambdin Milligan, who had led armed uprisings against Union forces in Indiana, appealed his military tribunal prosecution to the U.S. Supreme Court. In Ex Parte Milligan (1865), the U.S. Supreme Court held Milligan's military prosecution unconstitutional, holding that as long as the civilian "courts are open and their process unobstructed, . . . they can never be applied to civilians in states which have upheld the authority of the government." In Ex Parte Quirin (1942), the Supreme Court reviewed the military prosecution of the German army spies for violations of the laws of war and concluded that it was within the executive's power**.** Unlike the civilian subject to military justice in Ex Parte Milligan, the Quirin defendants were members of the army of a nation with which the United States was in declared war. And critically, Congress had expressly authorized military commission trials for the offenses for which they were accused. The Supreme Court likewise upheld the exclusion of Japanese-Americans from their homes in Korematsu v. United States (1944), explaining: "Korematsu was not excluded from the military area because of hostility to him or his race. He was excluded because we are at war with the Japanese Empire, because the properly constituted military authorities feared an invasion of our West Coast and felt constrained to take proper security measures, and finally, because Congress, reposing its confidence in this time of war in our military leaders - as inevitably it must - determined that they should have the power to do just this." As these examples demonstrate, the U.S. Supreme Court has not always acted to enforce positive legal protections in favor of the individual against the government's exercise of 'wartime' power. Nonetheless**, the Court's structural involvement conveyed a critical political message that executive power remained subject to the rule of law.** In addition**, the Court's** published majority **opinions clarified the nature of the executive action** taken in response to perceived wartime threats, **providing a basis for comparative analysis of subsequent executive conduct**. In vigorous and public dissenting opinions accompanying each decision, minority justices gave expression to the strong opposing arguments on the resolution of the legal questions presented. Perhaps most important, the judicial decisions provided Congress, legal scholars, and the American public a means for understanding and, in the relative calm of post-war decision-making, for reevaluating the political wisdom of the challenged actions. Thus, for example, a federal court eventually granted a writ of coram nobis in Mr. Korematsu's case as a result of executive misrepresentations. (Korematsu v. United States (N.D. Cal. 1984)). In 1971, to rein in what was by then broadly recognized as executive excesses, Congress passed 18 U.S.C. § 4001(a), providing: "No citizen shall be . . . detained by the United States except pursuant to an Act of Congress." And in 1988, Congress awarded reparations to the remaining survivors and descendants of those interned during World War II as a result of the military exclusion order.

**Risk of nuclear terrorism is real and high now**

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

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

# \*\*2AC\*\*

**GSPEC: 2AC**

**Judicial restriction means to reduce the scope of**

**Newman 8** (Pauline, Judge @ UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT, 545 F.3d 943; 2008 U.S. App. LEXIS 22479; 88 U.S.P.Q.2D (BNA) 1385; 2008-2 U.S. Tax Cas. (CCH) P50,621, IN RE BERNARD L. BILSKI and RAND A. WARSAW, lexis)

Id. at 315 (quoting U.S. Const., art. I, §8). The Court referred to the use of "any" in Section 101 ("Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process . . . or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title"), and reiterated that the statutory language shows that **Congress "plainly contemplated that the patent laws would be given wide scope**." Id. at 308. **The Court referred to the legislative intent to include within the scope of Section 101 "anything under the sun that is made by man**," id. at 309 (citing S. Rep. 82-1979, at 5; H.R. Rep. 82-1923, at 6 (1952)), **and stated that the unforeseeable future should not be inhibited by judicial restriction** **of the "broad general language" of Section 101**: A rule that unanticipated inventions are without protection would conflict with the core concept of the patent law that anticipation undermines patentability. Mr. Justice Douglas reminded that the [\*981] inventions most benefiting mankind are those that push back the frontiers of chemistry, physics, and the like. Congress employed broad general language in [\*\*103] drafting §101 precisely because such inventions are often unforeseeable.

### Test Case Fiat: 2AC

#### We Meet: there are lots of test cases on the docket

Oona **Hathaway**, Professor, International Law, Yale Law School, Samuel Adelsberg, Spencer Amdur, Philip Levitz, Freya Pitts and Sirine Shebaya, “The Power to Detain: Detention of Terrorism Suspects after 9/11,” YALE JOURNAL OF INTERNATIONAL LAW v. 38, Winter 20**13**, p. 124.

U.S. counterterrorism operations today are being carried out on an unprecedented scale. Since the attacks of September 11, 2001, a key element of these counterterrorism operations has been the detention of suspected terrorists. As of mid-2012, the United States held 168 terrorism suspects at Guantánamo Bay, Cuba,1 and roughly three thousand in Afghanistan.2 Even after transferring most of the Afghan detainees to Afghan control in September 2012, the United States arranged to “maintain control over dozens of foreign detainees in Afghanistan for the indefinite future.”3 **The docket of the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit continues to be filled with cases filed by detainees challenging detentions** that, in some cases, are entering a second decade.4 Meanwhile, Congress and the President have repeatedly sparred over detention-related issues, including the scope of military commissions set up to try law-of-war detainees, the transfer of detainees held abroad to prisons within the United States, the propriety of prosecuting terrorism suspects in U.S. federal courts, and the unlimited detention of terrorism suspects without trial.5 Yet the sources of the U.S. government’s authority to detain suspected terrorists, and the limitations on that authority, remain ill-defined

**Cases are always available**

J. Craig **Youngblood &** Parker C. **Folse** III, attorneys, GOVERNING THROUGH COURTS, ed. Gambitta, May, & Foster, 19**81**, p. 38.

That this case was decided inthis way at this time should not be suprising. Four days earlier, the court had announced in Michael that a minimally intrusive warrantless nonborder search need be supported only by reasonable suspicion. In order to maintain the long-standing distinction between border searches and nonborder searches, the court very logically held in Sandler that a minimally intrusive warrantless border search was valid on only mere suspicion. **The significance of this case is that once again there was no need for the court to wait any great period of time for the appropriate vehicle through which to announce the new policy rule. The court was able to pick one case from the many relevant-issue cases flowing constantly past the courthouse gates. Even when it was necessary to pcik two cases, each of which involved a distinct yet related social issue, there was no problem with the court’s capacity to set its own agenda for decisionmaking. This capability qualifies significantly Horowitz’s thesis that courts can control their calendars but not their agendas** (1977: 39). It is very much an overstatement to contend, as does Horowitz (1977: 38) that “[t]he passivity of the judicial process… makes the sequencing of judicially ordered change dependent on the capricious timing of litigants rather than the planning of a public body.

**Drone Shift DA: 2AC**

**Prosecuting terrorists solves drone shift**

Craig **Whitlock 13**, Washington Post, "Renditions continue under Obama, despite due-process concerns", January 1, articles.washingtonpost.com/2013-01-01/world/36323571\_1\_obama-administration-interrogation-drone-strikes

The three European men with Somali roots were arrested on a murky pretext in August as they passed through the small African country of Djibouti. But the reason soon became clear when they were visited in their jail cells by a succession of American interrogators.¶ U.S. agents accused the men — two of them Swedes, the other a longtime resident of Britain — of supporting al-Shabab, an Islamist militia in Somalia that Washington considers a terrorist group. Two months after their arrest, the prisoners were secretly indicted by a federal grand jury in New York, then clandestinely taken into custody by the FBI and flown to the United States to face trial.¶ The secret arrests and detentions came to light Dec. 21 when the suspects made a brief appearance in a Brooklyn courtroom.¶ The men are the latest example of how the Obama administration has embraced rendition — the practice of holding and interrogating terrorism suspects in other countries without due process — despite widespread condemnation of the tactic in the years after the Sept. 11, 2001, attacks.¶ Renditions are taking on renewed significance because the administration and **Congress have not reached agreement on a consistent legal pathway for apprehending terrorism suspects** overseas **and bringing them to justice**.¶ Congress has thwarted President Obama’s pledge to close the military prison at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, and has created barriers against trying al-Qaeda suspects in civilian courts, including new restrictions in a defense authorization bill passed last month. The White House, meanwhile, has resisted lawmakers’ efforts to hold suspects in military custody and try them before military commissions.¶ **The** impasse and **lack of detention options**, critics say, **have led to a de facto policy** under which the administration finds it easier **to kill terrorism suspects**, **a key reason for the surge of U.S. drone strikes in Pakistan, Yemen and Somalia**. Renditions, though controversial and complex, represent one of the few alternatives.

### JCS Recommend CP: 2AC

**The Joint Chiefs already said they want Guantanamo closed – proves the counterplan doesn’t cause action**

**Burns, 8** (Robert, AP Military writer, Joint Chiefs Chairman: Close Guantanamo, January 13, 2008, Online, Huffington Post, [http://www.huffingtonpost.com/huff-wires/20080113/guantanamo-joint-chiefs/#](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/huff-wires/20080113/guantanamo-joint-chiefs/), accessed 7/23/13) PE

**The chief of the U.S. military said Sunday he favors closing the prison here as soon as possible because he believes negative publicity worldwide about treatment of terrorist suspects has been** "pretty **damaging**" to the image of the United States. **"I'd like to see it shut down,"** Adm. Mike **Mullen** **said** in an interview with three reporters who **toured the detention center** with him on his first visit since becoming chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff **last October**. His visit came two days after the sixth anniversary of the prison's opening in January 2002. He stressed that a closure decision was not his to make and that he understands there are numerous complex legal questions the administration believes would have to be settled first, such as where to move prisoners. The admiral also noted that some **of Guantanamo Bay**'s prisoners are deemed high security threats. During a tour of Camp Six, which is a high-security facility holding about 100 prisoners, Mullen got a firsthand look at some of the cells; one prisoner glared at Mullen through his narrow cell window as U.S. officers explained to the Joint Chiefs chairman how they maintain almost-constant watch over each prisoner.

 **“Resolved” doesn’t lock the aff into “certainty”:**

**Merriam Webster ‘9** (http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/resolved)

# Main Entry: 1re·solve # Pronunciation: \ri-ˈzälv, -ˈzȯlv also -ˈzäv or -ˈzȯv\ # Function: verb # Inflected Form(s): **resolved**; re·solv·ing 1 : to become separated into component parts; also : to become reduced by dissolving or analysis 2 : **to** form a resolution : determine 3 : **consult, deliberate**

**Neither does “should”**

**Encarta** World English Dictionary 200**5** (http://encarta.msn.com/encnet/features/dictionary/DictionaryResults.aspx?refid=1861735294)

expressing conditions or consequences: **used to express the conditionality of an occurrence and suggest it is not a given, or to indicate the consequence of something that might happen** ( used in conditional clauses )

**And resolved doesn’t mean immediate**

Online Plain Text English **Dictionary ‘9** (http://www.onelook.com/?other=web1913&w=Resolve)

**Resolve**: “To form a purpose; **to make a decision**; especially, to determine **after reflection**; as, to resolve on a better course of life.”

#### Military is developing chemical soldiers

Parasidis 12 (Efthimios, Assistant Professor of Law, Center for Health Law Studies, Saint Louis University School of Law, 2012, "Justice and Beneficence in Military Medicine and Research" Ohio State Law School, Lexis)

The United States military has a long and checkered history of experimental research involving human subjects. It has sponsored clandestine projects that examined if race influences one's susceptibility to mustard gas, n1 the extent to which radiation affects combat effectiveness, n2 and whether psychotropic drugs could be used to facilitate interrogations or develop chemical weapons. n3 In each of these experiments, the government deliberately violated legal requirements and ethical norms that govern human-subjects research and failed to provide adequate follow-up medical care or compensation for those who suffered adverse health effects. In defending its decisions, the government argued that the studies and research methods were necessary to further the strategic advantage of the United States. n4 The military's contemporary research program is motivated by the same rationale. As the U.S. Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) explains, its goal is to "create strategic surprise for U.S. adversaries by maintaining the technological superiority of the U.S. military." n5 Current research sponsored by DARPA and the U.S. Department of Defense (DoD) [\*725] aims to ensure that soldiers have "no physical, physiological, or cognitive limitations." n6 The research includes drugs that keep soldiers awake for seventy-two hours or more, a nutraceutical that fulfills a soldier's dietary needs for up to five days, a vaccine that eliminates intense pain within seconds, and sophisticated brain-to-computer interfaces. n7 The military's emphasis on neuroscience is particularly noteworthy, with recent annual appropriations of over $ 350 million for cognitive science research. n8 Projects include novel methods of scanning a soldier's brain to ascertain physical, intellectual, and emotional states, as well as the creation of electrodes that can be implanted into a soldier's brain for purposes of neuroanalysis and neurostimulation. n9 One of the goals of the research is to create a means by which a soldier's subjective experience can be relayed to a central command center, and, in turn, the command center can respond to the soldier's experience by stimulating brain function for both therapeutic and enhancement purposes. n10 For example, the electrodes can be used to activate brain function that can help heal an injury or keep a soldier alert during difficult moments. n11 Another goal is to create a "connected consciousness" whereby a soldier can interact with machines, access information from the Internet, or communicate with other humans via thought alone. n12

#### Chemical soldiers cause extinction and destroy value to life

Deubel 13 (Paula, Professor Gabriel has held positions at the Brookings Institution, the Army Intelligence School, the Center for the Study of Intelligence at the CIA, and at the Walter Reed Army Institute of Research, Department of Combat Psychiatry, in Washington. 3-25-13, "The Psychopath Wars: Soldiers of the Future?" Suite 101) suite101.com/article/the-psychopath-wars-soldiers-of-the-future-a366977 \*\*evidence is gender modified\*\*

According to Dr. Richard A. Gabriel in his fascinating book, No More Heroes, the sociopathic personality can keep his or her psyche intact even under extremely pathological conditions, while the sane will eventually break down under guilt, fear, or normal human repulsion. Chemical Soldiers Richard A. Gabriel (military historian, retired U.S. army officer and former professor at the U.S. Army War College) describes socio/psychopaths as people without conscience, intellectually aware of what harm they might do to another living being, but unable to experience corresponding emotions. This realization, Gabriel claims, has led the military establishments of the world to discover a drug banishing fear and emotion in the soldier by controlling ~~his~~ [their] brain chemistry. In order for soldiers to ideally function in modern war ~~he~~ [they] should first be reconstructed to become what could be defined as mentally ill. “We may be rushing headlong into a long, dark chemical night from which there will be no return,” warns Gabriel. If these efforts succeed (as it appears they can) a chemically induced zombie would be born, a psychopathic-type being who would function (at least temporarily) without any human compassion and whose moral conscience would not exist to take responsibility for his actions. “Man’s [Humankind’s] nature would be altered forever,” he adds, “and it would cost him his [us our] soul.” As incredible and futuristic as that sounds, the creation of such a drug is apparently already well underway in the world’s military research labs; Gabriel reports such research centers already exist in the United States, Russia, and Israel. Since all emotions are based in anxiety, it appears the eradication of it (perhaps through a variant of the anti-anxiety medication Busbirone) may create soldiers who become more efficient killing machines. Futuristic Warfare Gabriel writes further about the possible nightmarish future of modern warfare: “The standards of normal sane men will be eroded, and soldiers will no longer die for anything understandable or meaningful in human terms. They will simply die, and even their own comrades will be incapable of mourning their deaths […] The battlefields of the future will witness a clash of truly ignorant armies, armies ignorant of their own emotions and even of the reasons for which they fight.” (Operation Enduring Valor, Richard A. Gabriel) This would strip a person of his core identity and all of his humanity. Whether or not the soldier would knowingly take part in this experience is unknown, but during the 1991 Persian Gulf War, one could almost easily imagine that this conscience-killing pill had already been swallowed. Psychopathic Behavior During War During the 1991 Iraq war a pilot interviewed on European television callously remarked ambushing Iraqis was “like waiting for the cockroaches to come out so we could kill them." Other U.S. pilots compared killing human beings to “shooting turkey” or like “attacking a farm after someone had opened a sheep stall.” This same lack of empathy can be seen in Iraq’s Abu Graib prison scandal (2004) where U.S. soldiers were shown seemingly to enjoy torture, as well as more recent photos of military men posing with dead Afghans (first published in Germany's Der Spiegel magazine); more gruesome photos were later published in Rolling Stone before the U.S. Army censored all the remaining damning material from public view. No More Heroes warns that modern warfare will become increasingly difficult for sane men to endure. The combat punch of man’s weapons has increased over 600% since World War II. These weapons are highly technical. High Explosive Plastic Tracers (HEP-T) send fragments of metal through enemy tanks and into humans at speeds faster than the speed of sound. The Starlight Scope is able to differentiate between males and females by computing differences in body heat given off by pelvic areas. The Beehive artillery ammunition (filled with three-inch long nail-like steel needles) is capable of pinning victims to trees. The world has a nightmare arsenal of terrible weapons advanced beyond the evolution of our morality.

**Court Controversies Now: F/L**

#### Multiple significant rulings coming now

Bomboy 3-5-14 (Scott, staff writer, "Four big Supreme Court decisions on the radar" Constitution Daily) blog.constitutioncenter.org/2014/03/four-big-supreme-court-decisions-on-the-radar/

As the Supreme Court continues a busy week, Court watchers are wondering if a significant case from last fall could be announced in the next few weeks. 20050422114651!US\_Supreme\_Court\_BuildingOf the 22 cases argued at the Supreme Court in October and November, 17 cases have already been decided. But four of the remaining five cases from that time period are consider major cases, which have received considerable attention in the press and in the legal and academic worlds. The Justices will announce at least one opinion today, and one of the major cases could be announced. By this time last year, the Court had already decided two high-profile cases from that term. On February 19, 2013, the Justices ruled in Florida v. Harris and on February 26, the Court decided Clapper v. Amnesty International. In the Harris case, the Court considered if police officers could search a motor vehicle for drugs once a properly trained police dog “alerted” to a smell on a vehicle. Justice Elena Kagan wrote in a unanimous opinion that police could use the dog in a vehicle search in a public area. In Clapper v. Amnesty International, the Court considered if the respondents, including journalists, had standing under Article III of the Constitution to challenge the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (or FISA). The Court, in a 5-4 decision, agreed with the federal government’s claims that the respondents’ fears were based on speculation. But the Court didn’t rule on the constitutionality of FISA. Later in March 2013, the Court decided another major case: Florida v. Jardines. In that decision, Justice Antonin Scalia wrote the majority opinion in a 5-4 decision, which ruled against the use of a police dog to sniff out drugs at a residence as a Fourth Amendment violation. This year, four big cases from the October/November sessions remain undecided. McCutcheon v. FEC was heard on October 8, 2013. The basic question in front of the Court in McCutcheon is what restrictions the Constitution allows the government to put on spending in federal elections. The Court might reconsider restrictions on campaign contributions in general, too, in a McCutcheon ruling, so the fate of the 1976 Buckley ruling is also in doubt. The second case is Schuette v. Coalition to Defend Affirmative Action, which was heard on October 15, 2013. The Schuette case challenges the constitutionality of a Michigan initiative prohibiting affirmative action programs from being employed in the state. In November, the Court also heard arguments in Town of Greece v. Galloway, where the Justices will decide whether a town council’s practice of beginning its legislative meetings with a prayer session violates the First Amendment’s Establishment Clause. It also heard another significant case in early November about international treaties and the 10th amendment: Bond v. the United States. The big picture issue in the Bond case is the possible fate of a landmark 1920 Supreme Court decision: Missouri v. Holland. The Holland decision gave Congress the power to pass laws to carry out the U.S. government’s obligations under international treaties.

**Court Politics DA: 2AC**

**Empirics prove the Court doesn’t consider capital**

**Schauer 04** [Frederick, Law prof at Hravard, “Judicial Supremacy and the Modest Constitution”, California Law Review, July, 92 Cal. L. Rev. 1045, ln //uwyo-kn]

Examples of the effects of judicial supremacy hardly occupy the entirety of constitutional law. As the proponents of popular constitutionalism properly claim, it is simply not plausible to argue that all of the Supreme Court's decisions are counter-majoritarian, nor that the Court is unaware of the potential repercussions if a high percentage of its decisions diverges too dramatically from the popular or legislative will. Nevertheless, **there is no indication that the Court uses its vast repository of political capital only to accumulate more** political capital, and in many areas judicial supremacy has made not just a short-term difference, but a long-term difference as well. Perhaps most obvious is school prayer. For over forty years the Court has persisted in its view that organized prayer in public schools is impermissible under the Establishment Clause 59 despite the fact that public opinion is little more receptive to that view now than it was in 1962. 60 So too with flag burning, where the Court's decisions from the late 1960s 61 to the present have remained dramatically divergent from public and legislative opinion. 62 Or consider child pornography, where the Court's decision in Ashcroft v. Free Speech Coalition 63 flew in the face of an overwhelming congressional majority approving the extension of existing child pornography laws to virtual child pornography. Similarly, in the regulation of "indecency," **the Court has spent well over a decade repeatedly striking down acts of Congress that enjoyed overwhelming public and** [\*1059] **congressional support**. 64 Most dramatic of all, however, is criminal procedure, where the Supreme Court's decision in Dickerson v. United States, 65 invalidating a congressional attempt to overrule Miranda v. Arizona, 66 underscores the persistent gap in concern for defendants' rights between Congress and the public, on the one hand, and the Supreme Court, on the other.

**Winners win**

**Law 09** (David, Professor of Law and Professor of Political Science, Washington University in St. Louis, Georgetown Law Journal, March 2009, 97 Geo. L.J. 723; “A Theory of Judicial Power and Judicial Review,” Lexis, rwg)

Part IV of this Article discusses a counterintuitive implication of a coordination-based account of judicial power. **Conventional wisdom suggests that courts secure compliance with their decisions by drawing upon their store of legitimacy, which is undermined by decisions that are unpopular, controversial, or lack intellectual integrity. n25 Part IV argues that precisely the opposite is true: an unpopular or unpersuasive decision can, in fact, enhance a court's power in future cases, as long as it is obeyed. Widespread compliance with a decision that is controversial,** unpopular, or unpersuasive **serves only to strengthen the widely held expectation that others comply with judicial decisions. This expectation, in turn, is self-fulfilling**: those who expect others to comply with a court's decisions will find it strategically prudent to comply themselves, and the aggregate result will, in fact, be widespread compliance. Part IV illustrates these strategic insights--and the Supreme Court's apparent grasp of them--by contrasting [\*734] Bush v. Gore n26 with Brown v. Board of Education n27 and Cooper v. Aaron. n28

**Issues are compartmentalized**

**Redish and Cisar 91** prof law @ Northwestern and Law clerk to US Court of Appeals, 1991

(MARTIN H. REDISH, prof law and public policy @ Northwestern; ELIZABETH J. CISAR, Law Clerk to Chief Judge William Bauer, United States Court of Appeals, Seventh Circuit, Dec 1991, “CONSTITUTIONAL PERSPECTIVES: ARTICLE: "IF ANGELS WERE TO GOVERN" \*: THE NEED FOR PRAGMATIC FORMALISM IN SEPARATION OF POWERS THEORY.”41 Duke L.J. 449)

**Choper's assumption that the judiciary's institutional capital is transferable from structural cases to individual rights cases is no more credible**. Common sense should tell us that **the public's reaction to con- troversial individual rights cases**-for example, cases **concerning abor- tion**,240 school prayer,241 busing,242 **or criminal defendants' rights**243- **will be based largely, if not exclusively, on the basis of its feelings con- cerning those particular issues. It is unreasonable to assume that the public's acceptance or rejection of these individual rights rulings would somehow be affected by anything the Court says about wholly unrelated structural issues.**

**Decision is announced in May, after the DA**

**SCOTUS 12** (Supreme Court of the United States, 7/25/2012 “The Court and Its Procedures,”

http://www.supremecourt.gov/about/procedures.aspx, Accessed 7/25/2012, rwg)

**The Court maintains this schedule each Term until all cases ready for submission have been heard and decided. In May and June the Court sits only to announce orders and opinions.** The Court recesses at the end of June, but the work of the Justices is unceasing. During the summer they continue to analyze new petitions for review, consider motions and applications, and must make preparations for cases scheduled for fall argument.

**Public supports the plan**

**Reuters 13** (Quoting John McCain, Republican Senator, 6-9-13, "Support growing to close Guantanamo prison: senator" Reuters) www.reuters.com/article/2013/06/09/us-usa-obama-guantanamo-idUSBRE9580BL20130609

Republican Senator John **McCain said** on Sunday **there is increasing public support for closing the military prison at Guantanamo** Bay, Cuba, and moving detainees to a facility on the U.S. mainland. **"There's renewed impetus. And I think that most Americans are more ready," McCain**, who went to Guantanamo last week with White House chief of staff Denis McDonough and California Democratic Senator Dianne Feinstein, **told CNN's "State of the Union" program. McCain**, a senior member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, **said he and fellow Republican Senator** Lindsey **Graham,** of South Carolina, **are working with** the **Obama** administration **on plans that could relocate detainees** to a maximum-security prison in Illinois. "We're going to have to look at the whole issue, including giving them more periodic review of their cases," McCain, of Arizona, said. President Barack **Obama has pushed to close Guantanamo**, saying in a speech in May it "has become a symbol around the world for an America that flouts the rule of law."

**That boosts capital**

**Durr et al 2K** (Robert, “Ideological Divergence and Public Support for the Supreme Court,”, American Journal of Political Science, Volume 44, No. 4, October, p. 775)

We expect our improve measure of aggregate Supreme Court support will be useful to other students of the Court. Unlike support for other institutions, interest in Supreme Court support is driven not by a hypothesized electoral linkage, but by the expectation that **the Court** necessarily **depends on public support as a source of** institutional legitimacy and **political capital. The level of support the Court enjoys has long been viewed as a crucial resource**, both by helping engender a positive response to the Court’s decisions and by encouraging the successful execution of its proclamations, necessarily carried out by other actors and institutions (Caldeira 1986).

#### Timeframe is 200 years and adaptation solves

**Mendelsohn 9** – Robert O. Mendelsohn 9, the Edwin Weyerhaeuser Davis Professor, Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies, Yale University, June 2009, “Climate Change and Economic Growth,” online: <http://www.growthcommission.org/storage/cgdev/documents/gcwp060web.pdf>

These statements are largely alarmist and misleading. Although climate change is a serious problem that deserves attention, society’s immediate behavior has anextremely low probabilityof leading tocatastrophic consequences. The science and economics of climate change is quite clear that emissions over the next few decades will lead to only mild consequences. The severe impacts predicted by alarmists require a century (or two in the case of Stern 2006) of no mitigation. Many of the predicted impacts assume there will be no or little adaptation. The net economic impacts from climate change over the next 50 years will be small regardless. Most of the more severe impacts will take more than a century or even a millennium to unfold and many of these “potential” impacts will never occur because people will adapt. It is not at all apparent that immediate and dramatic policies need to be developed to thwart long‐range climate risks. What is needed are long‐run balanced responses.

**PQD DA: 2AC**

**The PQD is already dead in the realm for foreign policy**

**Skinner 8/23**, Professor of Law at Willamette

(13, Gwynne, Misunderstood, Misconstrued, and Now Clearly Dead: The 'Political Question Doctrine' in Cases Arising in the Context of Foreign Affairs, papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=2315237)

Lower federal courts often erroneously cite the “political question doctrine” to dismiss as nonjusticiable individual rights claims arising in foreign or military affairs contexts, a trend that has increased since the 1962 case of Baker v. Carr. Similarly, lower courts have begun citing “special factors counselling hesitation” when dismissing constitutional claims (“Bivens claims”) in similar contexts, inappropriately treating “special factors” as a nonjusticiability doctrine. Lower federal courts should not cite either doctrine as a reason to avoid adjudicating individual rights claims arising **in the context of foreign or military affairs**. Rather, lower federal **courts should adjudicate these claims** on their merits **by deciding whether the political branch at issue had the power under the Constitution to act as it did. Doing so is consistent with the manner in which the Supreme Court has approached these types of cases for over 200 years. The Court affirmed this approach in the 2012 case of Zivotofsky v. Clinton, a case in which the Court once and for all rung the death knell for the application of the “political question doctrine”** as a nonjusticiability doctrinein cases involving individual rights – even those arising **in a foreign policy context.** In fact, **a historical review of Supreme Court cases demonstrates that the Supreme Court has never applied the** so-called “**political question doctrine**” as a true nonjusticiable doctrine **to dismiss individual rights claims** (and arguably, not to any claims at all), **even those arising in the context of foreign or military affairs**. This includes the seminal “political question” case of Marbury v. Madison. Rather, **the Supreme Court has almost always rejected the “political question doctrine” as a basis to preclude adjudication of individual rights claims, even in the context of foreign or military affairs**. Moreover, the Supreme Court has consistently admonished lower courts regarding the importance of the judiciary branch’s adjudication of individual rights claims, even in such contexts.13 That is not to say that from time to time the Court has not cited a “political question doctrine” in certain of its cases. However, a close review of those cases demonstrates that rather than dismissing such claims in those cases as “nonjusticiable,” the Court in fact adjudicated the claims by finding that either the executive or Congress acted constitutionally within their power or discretion. Moreover, **the post-9/11 Supreme Court cases of Hamdi** v. Rumsfeld, **Rasul** v. Bush, **and** Bush v. **Boumediene, in which the Supreme Court consistently found that the political branches overstepped their constitutional authority, clarified that the doctrine should not be used to dismiss** individual rights claims as nonjusticiable**, even those arising in a foreign or military affairs context. In case there remained any doubt, the Supreme Court in Zivotofsky rejected the “political question doctrine**” as a nonjusticiability doctrine, at least in the area individual rights, if not altogether. The Court found the case, involving whether the parents of a boy born in Jerusalem had the right to list Israel as his place of birth pursuant to a Congressional statute, was justiciable.17 The Court addressed the real issue, which was whether Congress had the authority to trump the President over whether Israel could be listed as the country of birth on passports where a person was born in Jerusalem, notwithstanding the President’s sole authority to recognize other governments. 18 In ruling as it did, the Court stayed true to many of its earlier cases involving “political questions” by adjudicating the claim through deciding whether one of the political branches took action that was within its constitutional authority. **In the case, the Court showed its willingness to limit the power of the President in the area of foreign affairs** rather than finding the claim nonjusticiable.

**No link to PQD**

**Roberts 09** (Caprice, Visiting Professor of Law, The Catholic University of America; Professor of Law, West Virginia University, Fall 2009, "Rights, Remedies, And Habeas Corpus--The Uighurs, Legally Free While Actually Imprisoned" Georgetown Immigration Law Journal, Lexis)

We no doubt live in interesting times. Extraordinary times may well call for extraordinary measures by the political branches of government. **The** [\*30] **federal judiciary may find it prudent to give the political branches wide berth, but it should not turn a blind eye. An ongoing violation of an applicable constitutional right should not go unreviewed and unremedied lightly. The federal courts at issue grappled in good faith with vexing issues raised by the Uighurs' allegations. Ultimately, the highest court to pass on the matter determined that it was powerless to resolve the case or remedy the wrong.** n212 In this section, I maintain that **the federal judiciary is not powerless, despite the potential political question. The federal judiciary possesses the authority under Article III of the Constitution to hear the Uighurs' case, which is otherwise justiciable**. Prudential reasons exist for finding that the case poses a nonjusticiable political question, but the context and rights at stake outweigh those prudential reasons. **Federal courts should lean towards accepting jurisdiction in cases like the Uighurs', because two political branches of government have acted in concert to threaten core constitutional rights.** Alternatively, the Executive exceeded limitations imposed by Congress and operated at the Executive's "lowest ebb" of power. n213 Certainly one political branch, Congress, may serve as an effective check on another political branch, the Executive. Given the pressures of the global war on terror, Congress has often not served as a meaningful check on potential abuses of presidential power. It is in these moments that judicial review is all the more essential. In fact, **judicial review should be exercised unless constitutionally prohibited. Of all the traditional justifications for the political question doctrine, the one with the strongest constitutional force is the textual commitment ground.** Although the immigration cases rely on this ground (as well as others), they differ from traditional political question cases because the text of the Constitution does not explicitly commit exclusion of aliens to the political branches. Rather, the power stems from extra-constitutional sources such as the implied and inherent powers as sovereign. **If the commitment stems from implied powers, the political question doctrine may be inapplicable under a strict construction of the textual commitment factor. The doubt presented by this gray area may mean declining jurisdiction is not required.** Other political question rationales, including judicial functionality and interbranch respect, suggest moving cautiously, but not halting all review.

#### naval power resilient

Greg **Grant**, military.com associate editor, 2-20-**2009**, “CSBA’s $20 billion a Year Shipbuilding Plan,” DoD Buzz, <http://www.dodbuzz.com/2009/02/20/csbas-20-billion-a-year-shipbuilding-plan/>

To begin with, Work says, the U.S. Navy is in far better condition than many believe. Alarmists who say U.S. naval power is in serious decline perform a rather dishonest counting of the current number of ships and compare that to the 1980s “600 ship Navy” standard. A more honest net assessment compares the size and combat power of the Navy to potential contemporary competitors, which paints a very different picture. Counting those ships that can “perform naval fire and maneuver,” including submarines and aviation platforms, the Navy has 203 warships. The Russian and Chinese navies combined operate 215 warships, so the U.S. has close to the “two navy standard” the Royal Navy aimed to maintain in its heyday. Measuring fleet tonnage displacement, the best proxy for measuring a fleet’s overall combat capability, the U.S. Navy enjoys a “13-Navy standard” over the world’s next biggest navies. Because the U.S. Navy early on shifted to vertical launch magazines, it carries far more missiles, 7,804 in 75 warships, than any other navy, adding up to a “twenty-navy firepower standard.” The Navy enjoys a very high operational tempo that is unmatched by any other nation. The fleet is transforming to a “collaborative battle network” force that will integrate aerial and sea drones, satellites, seabed sensors into an unmatched command and control system. The Navy can also count on the naval power of its closest ally: the U.S. Coast Guard, with 160 cutters and 800 small craft, a force ideally suited for engaging partner navies. Then there are the 10 carrier air wings, naval special warfare units, P-8A Poseidon Multi-Mission aircraft, aerial drones and 569 MH-60 helicopters. The MH-60s are the “small craft” of the U.S. Navy, faster than any ship, able to patrol vast areas and armed with torpedoes or Hellfire missiles. The Navy doesn’t need to worry about losing global maritime supremacy anytime soon, so Work says, the focus should be less about ship numbers and more on how the Navy fits into the national strategy and how to maintain naval dominance going forward in the face of technological advances in precision weapons and targeting. The biggest challenge the fleet will face in the future isn’t that some nation (China) might build a blue water fleet to challenge the Navy on the open ocean, as that would play to our naval and air strengths. Rather, its what Work calls “land based maritime reconnaissance-strike complexes,” land based anti-ship missiles of ever greater range, accuracy, maneuverability and number. The idea of parking carriers offshore and launching sustained air strikes is no longer valid, or at least won’t be very soon. The key parameter in future wars, conducted both from the air and sea, will be range, Work says. The Navy must fight outside the range of an enemy’s anti-air and anti ships missiles, or at least outside the missile salvo fire range. Another evolving challenge is ever more sophisticated undersea combat systems, drones, sonar systems and advanced submarines.

#### budget cuts thump

**CSBA**, Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments, 3/12/’**12**

(<http://www.csbaonline.org/2012/03/12/analysis-dod-budget-will-severely-constrain-army-marine-vehicle-modernization/>)

The Army and Marine Corps will be in the market for a new generation of ground vehicles soon. But acquisition officials there should think hard before they buy, according to Dr. Andrew Krepinevich, the president of the Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments (listen to interview) The modernization of Army and Marine Corps ground vehicles is the subject of a recent CSBA report, “The Road Ahead: Future Challenges and Their Implications for Ground Vehicle Modernization.” Krepinevich and his co-author, Eric Lindsey, wrote that the while both services are in the early stages of vehicle modernization, those efforts “will be severely constrained by the budget cuts looming over the Department of Defense.”

#### navy won’t be deployed, if it does it will be delayed

Watts 12

Robert, graduate of the Coast Guard Academy, Captain Watts has served six sea tours with the Navy and Coast Guard, most recently commanding USCGC Steadfast (WMEC 623). A qualified Surface Warfare Officer and Cutterman, he holds advanced degrees from the Naval War College, Old Dominion University, American Military University, and the Naval Postgraduate School, and he is currently a doctoral candidate at the Royal Military College of Canada (War Studies). The New Normalcy-Sea Power and Contingency Operations in the Twenty-First Century

http://www.usnwc.edu/getattachment/87e866a1-24dd-4e91-9ffa-cb0f64f15144/The-New-Normalcy--Sea-Power-and-Contingency-Operat.aspx

The inherent mobility of sea power means largely what it does in the traditional role—modern technology allows global reach in three dimensions and almost instant operational coordination worldwide. But the primary barrier to mobility in crisis-contingency operations is not technological. If mobility is to be exercised, ships must actually sail, and it is here—in the commitment of resources to a crisis —that things become culturally problematic. Despite the need, the answer to a crisis contingency is not always to employ sea power immediately. This cultural hesitancy has two aspects. The first is so deeply ingrained in the American psyche that it is more a matter of legend than of practical discussion. The United States has a long-standing tradition of rejecting the use of military forces in the domestic context, a rejection that dates back to the Revolution. It was codified in law with the passing of the Posse Comitatus Act of 1878, which directs that military forces (specifically the U.S. Army) cannot engage in domestic law enforcement.18 The legislation is often misinterpreted as meaning that any domestic use of military forces is illegal; that is not the case, but it is nevertheless widely believed in both civilian and military 56 NAVAL WAR COLLEGE REVIEW circles.19 Thus before naval forces can be committed to a crisis, a comprehensive legal review is often demanded, something that takes time—time that is usually not available. Another cultural barrier arises from service ethos. Bluntly, warships are designed and train to fight. In the modern high-tech era, naval warfare is a very specific (and expensive) proposition. It demands very sophisticated and specialized equipment. The radar on an Aegis cruiser, for example, is exceptionally good at tracking and destroying enemy aircraft—but only that. In a crisis contingency that marginalizes that purpose of a platform’s defining systems, the purpose of the platform itself could be called into question. According to this logic, if a vessel is employed (albeit successfully) for a purpose for which it is not designed, the door is opened for its increasing use for that purpose and not its proper one. In the grand scheme of things, warships used for other purposes are not training for war; in the short term this leads to a loss of readiness for combat, while in the longer term it could mean the elimination of platforms altogether in favor of others more suitable for noncombat missions. Although this seems to be a largely philosophical argument, in a shrinking budget environment it is not without a certain politically compelling logic. The effects of these factors are not insignificant. In recent crisis contingencies (the mass migration operations of 1994 and Katrina) the arrival of naval vessels was delayed while legal and operational impact issues were addressed, in the Katrina case so long as to become a national embarrassment.20 Bureaucratic reasons, not materiel, were the culprits, ultimately to the detriment of the response. Hesitancy can be fatal in an operation requiring rapid response, and culture and bureaucracy can conspire to encourage just that.

# \*\*1AR\*\*

### Asia War D

**No Asian war or instability**

**Bitzinger 9** (Richard A. Bitzinger, Senior Fellow at the S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies and Barry Desker, Dean of the S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies and Director of the Institute of Defense and Strategic Studies, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore, 2009. Survival vol. 50 no. 6, “Why East Asian War is Unlikely,” p. Proquest)

**Yet despite all these potential crucibles of conflict, the Asia-Pacific, if not an area of serenity and calm, is certainly more stable than one might expect.** To be sure, there are separatist movements and internal struggles, particularly with insurgencies, as in Thailand, the Philippines and Tibet. Since the resolution of the East Timor crisis, however, the region has been relatively free of open armed warfare. **Separatism remains a challenge, but the break-up of states is unlikely. Terrorism is a nuisance, but its impact is contained. The North Korean nuclear issue**, while not fully resolved**, is at least moving toward a conclusion with the likely denuclearisation of**

 **the peninsula. Tensions between China and Taiwan**, while always just beneath the surface, **seem unlikely to erupt in open conflict any time soon, especially given recent Kuomintang Party victories in Taiwan and efforts by Taiwan and China to re-open informal channels of consultation as well as institutional relationships between organisations responsible for cross-strait relations.** And while in Asia there is no strong supranational political entity like the European Union, **there are many multilateral organisations and international initiatives dedicated to enhancing peace and stability, including the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) forum**, the Proliferation Security Initiative and the Shanghai Co-operation Organisation. In Southeast Asia, countries are united in a common geopolitical and economic organisation – the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (**ASEAN) – which is dedicated to peaceful economic, social and cultural development, and to the promotion of regional peace and stability**. ASEAN has played a key role in conceiving and establishing broader regional institutions such as the East Asian Summit, ASEAN+3 (China, Japan and South Korea) and the ASEAN Regional Forum. **All this suggests that war in Asia – while not inconceivable – is unlikely.**

**No impact to South China Sea conflict**

**Goldstein, 2011,** Lyle, associate professor in the China Maritime Studies Institute at the U.S. Naval War College in Newport, R.I. He is co-editor of the recent volumes China, the United States and 21st-Century Sea Power: Defining a Maritime Security Partnership and Chinese Aerospace Power: Evolving Maritime Roles. “The South China Sea's Georgia Scenario,” <http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2011/07/11/the_south_china_seas_georgia_scenario?page=0,2>

The brutal truth, however, is **that Southeast Asia matters not a whit in the global balance of power. Most of the region comprises small, poor countries of no consequence** whatsoever, but the medium powers in the region, such as Vietnam, Indonesia, and Australia will all naturally and of their own accord stand up against a potentially more aggressive China. **If China and Vietnam go to war over some rocks in the ocean, they will inevitably both suffer a wide range of deleterious consequences, but it will have only a marginal impact on U.S. national security.** True, these sea

are critical to **the Japanese and South Korean economies, but both of these states are endowed with large and capable fleets -- yet another check on Beijing's ambitions.China, moreover, is all too aware of what happened to Georgia in 2008**. In that unfortunate case, the United States showered a new ally with high-level attention and military advisors. But when Russian tanks rolled in, effectively annexing a large section of the country and utterly destroying Tbilisi's armed forces, **Washington's response amounted to a whimper: There was, in the end, no appetite for risking a wider conflict** with Moscow over a country of marginal strategic interest. The lessons for Southeast Asia should be clear. Washington must avoid the temptation -- despite local states cheering it on at every opportunity -- to overplay its hand**. The main principle guiding U.S. policy regarding the South China Sea has been and should remain nonintervention.** Resource disputes are inherently messy and will not likely be decided by grand proclamations or multilateral summitry. Rather, progress will be a combination of backroom diplomacy backed by the occasional show of force by one or more of the claimants. In fact, **Beijing's record of conflict resolution over the last 30 years is rather encouraging: China has not resorted to a major use of force since 1979.**

**ONE, it’s resilient**

**Rodrik ‘9** Dani Rodrik, Rafiq Hariri Professor of International Political Economy at the John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University. “The Myth of Rising Protectionism”. 2009. http://relooney.fatcow.com/0\_New\_5973.pdf

**The reality is that the international trade regime has passed its greatest test since the Great Depression with flying colors. Trade economists who complain about minor instances of protectionism sound like a child whining about a damaged toy in the wake of an earthquake that killed thousands. Three things explain this remarkable resilience : ideas, politics , and institutions** . **Economists have been extraordinarily successful in conveying their message to policymakers** – even if ordinary people still regard imports with considerable suspicion. **Nothing reflects this better than how “protection” and “protectionists” have become terms of derision**. After all, governments are generally expected to provide protection to its citizens. But **if you say that you favor protection from imports , you are painted into a corner with** Reed **Smoot and** Willis C. **Hawley**, authors of the infamous 1930 US tariff bill. But **economists’ ideas would not have gone very far without significant changes in the underlying configuration of political interests in favor of open trade. For every worker and firm affected adversely by import competition, there is one or more worker and firm expecting to reap the benefits of access to markets abroad. T**

**he latter have become increasingly vocal and powerful, often represented by large multinational corporations**. In his latest book, Paul Blustein recounts how a former Indian trade minister once asked his American counterpart to bring him a picture of an American farmer: “I have never actually seen one,” the minister quipped. “I have only seen US conglomerates masquerading as farmers.” But **the relative docility of rank-and-file workers on trade issues must ultimately be attributed to** something else altogether: **the safety nets erected by the welfare state. Modern industrial societies now have a wide array of social protections** – unemployment compensation, adjustment assistance, and other labor-market tools, as well as health insurance and family support – **that mitigate demand for cruder forms of protection**. The welfare state is the flip side of the open economy. **If the world has not fallen off the protectionist precipice during the crisis, as it did during the 1930’s, much of the credit must go the social programs** that conservatives and market fundamentalists would like to see scrapped. The battle against trade protection has been won – so far. But, before we relax, let’s remember that we still have not addressed the central challenge the world economy will face as the crisis eases: the inevitable clash between China’s need to produce an ever-growing quantity of manufactured goods and America’s need to maintain a smaller current-account deficit. Unfortunately, there is little to suggest that policymakers are yet ready to confront this genuine threat.

**Heg—Navy--Ext 2--Budget Cuts 2NC**

**No money means no new modernization**

**Murdoch**, senior advisor, Sayler, and Crotty, research associates – CSIS, 10/18/**’12**

(Clark, Kelley, and Ryan, “The Defense Budget’s Double Whammy: Drawing Down While Hollowing Out from Within,” <http://csis.org/files/publication/121018_Murdoch_DefenseBudget_Commentary.pdf>)

Thus, **this drawdown will be much more serious** than those of years past. Why? **Because** the aggregate impact of **inflation in the cost of personnel, health care**, operations and maintenance (**O&M**), **and acquisitions results in a defense dollar that “buys” less** and less **capability.** This **internal cost inflation is driving DoD toward a zero-sum trade-off between personnel end-strength and modernization** (see Figure 2). **Among the largest contributors to** internal cost **inflation is the military personnel** (including health care) **account.** As DoD’s own “Defense Budget Priorities and Choices: January 2012” has noted, “**the cost of military personnel has grown at an unsustainable rate** over the last decade…Within the base budget alone…personnel **costs increased by nearly 90 percent** or about 30 percent above inflation [since 2001], **while the number of** military **personnel** has **increased** by **only** about **3 percent.”** Operations and maintenance (**O&M**) **costs have** similarly **ballooned** over the past few decades. The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) reports in “Long-Term Implications of the 2012 Future Years Defense Program” that O&M costs per active-duty service member doubled from $55,000 to $105,000 (in constant 2012 dollars) between 1980 and 2001. These costs rose to $147,000 in DoD’s 2012 base-budget request and were projected to “grow at more than one and one-half times the historical (pre-2001) rate through the Future Years Defense Program (FYDP) period, reaching $161,000 in 2016.” While the rate of growth is expected to slow beyond 2016, CBO expects per capita O&M costs to reach $209,000 by 2030. In combination, **inflation in these accounts will squeeze out all funding for** modernization (**procurement** and **research**, **development, test, and evaluation** [RDT&E]) **in 2020**, as depicted in Figure 2, if current trends are allowed to continue. **This will**, in the absence of extensive reform, **force DoD to choose between** sustaining **end-strength and** sustaining **modernization**. It cannot do both. The Zero-Sum Trade-Off The CSIS study team calculates that **restoring modernization’s share of the** FY2021 defense **budget** to 32 percent (the level of effort in the FY2001 budget) **would require cutting end-strength** **by 455,000** active-duty service members, leaving the services with an end-strength of 845,000 (see Figure 3). **This** zero-sum trade-off **will produce** far more **severe** and **disruptive consequences** than is generally recognized by the department, **requiring**, **at** the very **least, a wholesale recalibration** **of** U.S. **defense strategy and** force **posture.** The Squeeze on Discretionary Spending **This choice between modernization and end-strength will** almost certainly **remain even if sequestration is averted** by congressional action. This is because **discretionary spending tradespace** (**for both** defense and nondefense **accounts**) **is being squeezed out by mandatory spending**—which includes spending on **veteran benefits, income security, social security, Medicare, and Medicaid**—and interest payments. And given Democratic aversion to entitlement cuts and Republican antipathy to tax increases, **the defense budget**, which constitutes 54 percent of discretionary spending, **will** likely be forced to **absorb additional reductions under any scenario.** (Estimates of the scale of alternatives to sequestration range from a total of $1 trillion to $1.5 trillion. Senate Armed Services Committee chairman Carl Levin has suggested that an additional $100 billion reduction over 10 years would be “realistic”.) **Regardless of** the distribution of **any cuts**, however, **mandatory spending and interest payments are expected to consume the entirety of the U.S. budget by 2036, leaving no discretionary tradespace for** either **defense** or nondefense accounts (see Figure 4).

**Military will run out of cash—means zero new platforms or programs**

**Spring,** research fellow in national security – Heritage, 12/21/’**11**

(Baker, “An Unacceptable Squeeze on Defense Modernization”)

**Following the** enactment of the **Budget Control Act** earlier this year, the **budget for** the **core defense** program **is already** operating **under stringent** spending **caps. At the same time**, per capita **expenditures for** paying military **personnel and operating** the force **are** high and **growing rapidly.** Under these circumstances, **funding for** the procurement of **new weapons** and **equipment** and for **research and development** on new defense technologies **will be squeezed to a dangerous degree.** A Looming Disaster for the Military and U.S. Security Both the **Obama** Administration **and Congress will be tempted to leave** the **defense spending caps in place**—if not to go to even lower caps—**now that** the **sequestration** process **could be applied to the defense budget** under the Budget Control Act. This is a result of the failure of the Joint Select Committee on Deficit Reduction (“super committee”) to agree on an alternative deficit-reduction plan and adopt a policy of “people over platforms” in slicing up the defense budget pie. Given the uncertainties in the application of the sequestration process, it is impossible to calculate precisely how much more the modernization accounts will be squeezed if that process kicks in. Suffice it to say that the problem is likely to become dramatically worse. **The implications of the coming squeeze on defense modernization** under the existing spending caps **should cause great alarm** for all concerned, particularly **since it comes on the heels of the “procurement holiday”** of the 1990s. **The result will be a military that lacks** the **modern weapons and equipment** it needs, loses its technological edge over future enemies, **and finds itself dependent on a seriously eroded defense industrial base.** Congress will have to take two essential steps to avoid a disastrous outcome for the military and U.S. security. First, it will have to increase the existing caps on spending for the core defense program and find savings elsewhere in the federal budget to offset this change, in accordance with Heritage’s December 5 recommendations.[1] Second, it will have to take steps to constrain per capita growth in the cost of compensating military personnel. **The Sources of the Modernization Squeeze** There are two sources of the squeeze on military modernization. First, the **Budget Control Act** has established caps on spending for national security and discretionary spending over the next 10 years that translate into inadequate defense budgets under any circumstance. These **caps will constitute top-down pressure** on the modernization accounts (procurement and research and development) within the defense budget. **This** top-down pressure **will be accompanied by** significant **pressure from underneath by growth in** both the overall and per capita **costs of** compensating military **personnel**. These increasing costs are largely **driven by** the array of defined **benefits** offered by the Department of Defense to military service members and their dependents, which fall mostly in the areas of military **retirement and health care.** These would be more effective and efficient if they were converted to defined-contribution plans. According to the Department of Defense (DOD), its overall **military manpower costs will rise** from roughly $148 billion today to more than $160 billion in fiscal year (FY) 2016. This increase will come **in spite of** proposed **reductions in the number of people serving** in the active-duty military. Although the number of active-duty military personnel is projected to drop by about 5 percent from FY 2012 through FY 2016, military personnel spending will rise, thanks to growing per capita compensation costs. Per capita compensation for active-duty personnel is projected to rise by more than 13 percent during the same five-year period. The reduction in the number of active-duty military personnel, as currently projected by the Obama Administration, will create a force that is too small to defend the vital interests of the United States. The Heritage Foundation has recommended that this reduction not be imposed. Accordingly, DOD’s projection of total military manpower costs is well below what is prudent. It is also appropriate to point out that while, according to the Congressional Budget Office, the overall per capita costs for operation and maintenance will come down with the withdrawal of U.S. forces from Iraq and Afghanistan, the per capita costs for operations and maintenance within the core defense program will continue to rise as well. The Scope of the Modernization Squeeze **As a result of the twin pressures** of the estimated spending caps on the core defense program derived from the Budget Control Act—**which** still **excludes the** more stringent caps that would **result** from the imposition **of** a partial or full **sequestration** under the Act—and the rising cost of military compensation, the level of funding for **military modernization will** necessarily **fall to unacceptably low levels.** (See chart.) Under this scenario, funding for defense modernization within the core defense program (defined as the sum of DOD’s procurement account and research, development, test, and evaluation account) could fall to roughly $145 billion in current dollars in FY 2016. By way of comparison, $188.4 billion was to go to these accounts under President Obama’s original budget request for FY 2012. Thus, **the level of modernization funding is estimated to decline by about $43 billion** in current dollars, **or 23 percent**, over the four-year period. In terms of inflation-adjusted dollars, the decline will be roughly $54 billion (in FY 2012 dollars), or about 29 percent. In other words, President Obama’s original request for the core DOD budget would have devoted roughly 34 percent of that budget to modernization. By 2016, modernization funding could fall to about 26 percent of total DOD funding for its core program. When these comparisons are expanded to provide a broader perspective, the situation becomes even more alarming. For example, the Department of Defense spent more than $226 billion on modernization in FY 1985 (in FY 2012 dollars). This was 39 percent of the total DOD budget. That means **DOD could be on a path to cutting modernization’s share of its total budget to little more than one-half of what it was in FY 1985.**