# 1AC

The United States federal judiciary should restrict the war powers authority of the President of the United States to introduce nuclear armed forces into hostilities against a government for inadvertently releasing nuclear material used in an attack against the United States or its allies without Congressional approval.

**1AC Negligence Adv--- RU + Pak**

**Nuclear terror is inevitable**

**Jaspal 2012** (Zafar Nawaz Jaspal, Associate Professor at the School of Politics and International Relations, Quaid-i-Azam University, Islamabad, Pakistan “Nuclear/Radiological Terrorism: Myth or Reality?”, Journal of Political Studies, Vol. 19, Issue - 1, 2012, 91:111)

The **misperception, miscalculation and** above all **ignorance** of the ruling elite **about security puzzles are perilous for the national security of a state**. Indeed, **in an age of transnational terrorism and unprecedented dissemination of dualuse nuclear technology, ignoring nuclear terrorism threat is an imprudent policy choice**. The **incapability** of terrorist organizations **to engineer fissile material does not eliminate** completely **the possibility of nuclear terrorism**. At the same time, **the absence of an example** or precedent of a nuclear/ radiological terrorism **does not qualify the assertion that the** nuclear/radiological **terrorism ought to be remained a myth**. Farsighted rationality obligates that **one should not miscalculate transnational terrorist groups — whose behavior suggests that they have a death wish — of acquiring nuclear**, radiological, chemical and biological **material producing capabilities**. In addition, one could be sensible about the published information that **huge amount of nuclear material is spread around the globe**. According to estimate **it is enough to build more than 120,000 Hiroshima-sized nuclear bombs** (Fissile Material Working Group, 2010, April 1). The alarming fact is that **a few storage sites** of nuclear/radiological materials **are inadequately secured and continue to be accumulated in unstable regions** (Sambaiew, 2010, February). Attempts at stealing fissile material had already been discovered (Din & Zhiwei, 2003: 18). **Numerous evidences confirm that terrorist groups had aspired to acquire fissile material for their terrorist acts**. Late Osama **bin Laden**, the founder of al Qaeda **stated that acquiring nuclear weapons was a“religious duty**” (Yusufzai, 1999, January 11). The IAEA also reported that “al-Qaeda was actively seeking an atomic bomb.” Jamal Ahmad al-Fadl, a dissenter of Al Qaeda, in his trial testimony had “revealed his extensive but unsuccessful efforts to acquire enriched uranium for al-Qaeda” (Allison, 2010, January: 11). On November 9, 2001, Osama bin Laden claimed that “we have chemical and nuclear weapons as a deterrent and if America used them against us we reserve the right to use them (Mir, 2001, November 10).” On May 28, 2010, Sultan Bashiruddin Mahmood, a Pakistani nuclear scientist confessed that he met Osama bin Laden. He claimed that “I met Osama bin Laden before 9/11 not to give him nuclear know-how, but to seek funds for establishing a technical college in Kabul (Syed, 2010, May 29).” He was arrested in 2003 and after extensive interrogation by American and Pakistani intelligence agencies he was released (Syed, 2010, May 29). Agreed, Mr. Mahmood did not share nuclear know-how with **Al Qaeda**, but his meeting with Osama establishes the fact that the terrorist organization **was in contact with nuclear scientists**. Second, **the terrorist group has sympathizers in the nuclear scientific bureaucracies**. It also authenticates bin Laden’s Deputy Ayman Zawahiri’s claim which he made in December 2001: “If you have $30 million, go to the black market in the central Asia, contact any disgruntled Soviet scientist and a lot of dozens of smart briefcase bombs are available (Allison, 2010, January: 2).” **The covert meetings between nuclear scientists and al Qaeda members could not be interpreted as idle threats** and thereby the threat of nuclear/radiological terrorism is real. The 33Defense Secretary Robert Gates admitted in 2008 that “what keeps every senior government leader awake at night is the thought of a terrorist ending up with a weapon of mass destruction, especially nuclear (Mueller, 2011, August 2).” Indeed, **the nuclear deterrence strategy cannot deter the transnational terrorist syndicate from** **nuclear**/radiological terrorist **attacks**. Daniel Whiteneck pointed out: “**Evidence suggests**, for example, **that al Qaeda** might not only use WMD simply to demonstrate the magnitude of its capability but that it **might actually welcome the escalation of a strong U.S. response, especially if it included catalytic effects on governments** and societies in the Muslim world. **An adversary that prefers escalation regardless of the consequences cannot be deterred**” (Whiteneck, 2005, Summer: 187) Since taking office, President Obama has been reiterating that “nuclear weapons represent the ‘gravest threat’ to United States and international security.” While realizing that the US could not prevent nuclear/radiological terrorist attacks singlehandedly, he launched 47an international campaign to convince the international community about the increasing threat of nuclear/ radiological terrorism. He stated on April 5, 2009: “**Black market trade in nuclear secrets and nuclear materials abound**. The technology to build a bomb has spread. Terrorists are determined to buy, build or steal one. **Our efforts to contain these dangers are centered on a global non-proliferation regime, but as more** people and nations **break the rules, we could reach the point where the center cannot hold** (Remarks by President Barack Obama, 2009, April 5).” He added: “**One terrorist with one nuclear weapon could unleash massive destruction**. Al Qaeda has said it seeks a bomb and that it would have no problem with using it. And we know that there is unsecured nuclear material across the globe” (Remarks by President Barack Obama, 2009, April 5). In July 2009, at the G-8 Summit, President Obama announced the convening of a Nuclear Security Summit in 2010 to deliberate on the mechanism to “secure nuclear materials, combat nuclear smuggling, and prevent nuclear terrorism” (Luongo, 2009, November 10). President Obama’s nuclear/radiological threat perceptions were also accentuated by the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) Resolution 1887 (2009). The UNSC expressed its grave concern regarding ‘the threat of nuclear terrorism.” It also recognized the need for all States “to take effective measures to prevent nuclear material or technical assistance becoming available to terrorists.” The UNSC Resolution called “for universal adherence to the Convention on Physical Protection of Nuclear Materials and its 2005 Amendment, and the Convention for the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism.” (UNSC Resolution, 2009) The United States Nuclear Posture Review (NPR) document revealed on April 6, 2010 declared that “**terrorism and proliferation are far greater threats to the United States and international stability**.” (Security of Defence, 2010, April 6: i). **The United States declared that it reserved the right to“hold fully accountable” any state or group “that supports or enables terrorist efforts to obtain** or use **weapons of mass destruction, whether by facilitating, financing, or providing expertise or safe haven for such efforts** (Nuclear Posture Review Report, 2010, April: 12)”. This declaration underscores the possibility that **terrorist groups could acquire fissile material from the rogue states.**

**Latest IAEA assessment concludes the risk is underestimated**

**Sturdee 2013** (Simon Sturdee, AFP reporter, July 1, 2013, “UN atomic agency sounds warning on 'nuclear terrorism',” Fox News, http://www.foxnews.com/world/2013/07/01/un-atomic-agency-sounds-warning-on-nuclear-terrorism/#ixzz2dsmqwOk3)

**The head of the UN atomic agency warned** Monday **against complacency in preventing "nuclear terrorism"**, saying progress in recent years should not lull the world into a false sense of security.¶ "Much has been achieved in the past decade," Yukiya Amano of the International Atomic Energy Agency told a gathering in Vienna of some 1,200 delegates from around 110 states including 35 ministers to review progress on the issue.¶ "Many countries have taken effective measures to prevent theft, sabotage, unauthorised access, illegal transfer, or other malicious acts involving nuclear or other radioactive material. Security has been improved at many facilities containing such material."¶ Partly as a result, he said, "**there has not been a terrorist attack involving nuclear or other radioactive material**."¶ "**But this must not lull us into a false sense of security.** If a 'dirty bomb' is detonated in a major city, or sabotage occurs at a nuclear facility, the consequences could be devastating.¶ **"Nuclear terrorism" comprises three main risks: an atomic bomb, a "dirty bomb"** -- conventional explosion spreading radioactive material -- **and an attack on a nuclear plant.¶** The first, using weapons-grade uranium or plutonium, is generally seen as "low probability, high consequence" -- very difficult to pull off but for a determined group of extremists, not impossible.¶ **There are hundreds of tonnes of weapons-usable plutonium and uranium** -- a grapefruit-sized amount is enough for a crude nuclear weapon that would fit in a van -- **around the world.¶ A "dirty bomb"** -- a "radiological dispersal device" or RDD -- **is much easier but would be hugely less lethal. But it might still cause mass panic.¶** "If the Boston marathon bombing (in April this year) had been an RDD, the trauma would be lasting a whole lot longer," Sharon Squassoni from the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) told AFP.¶ **Last year alone, the IAEA recorded 17 cases of illegal possession and attempts to sell nuclear materials and 24 incidents of theft or loss.** And **it says this is the "tip of the iceberg".¶ Many cases have involved former parts of the Soviet Union**, for example Chechnya, Georgia and Moldova -- where in 2011 several people were arrested trying to sell weapons-grade uranium -- but not only.¶ **Nuclear materials that could be used in a "dirty bomb" are also used in hospitals, factories and university campuses** and are therefore seen as easy to steal.¶ **Major international efforts have been made since the end of the Soviet Union in 1991 and the September 11, 2001 attacks** in the United States **to prevent nuclear material falling into the wrong hands.¶** US President Barack Obama hosted a summit in 2010 on the subject which was followed by another one in Seoul last year. A third is planned in The Hague in March.¶ A report issued in Vienna on Monday to coincide with the start of the meeting by the Arms Control Association and the Partnership for Global Security said **decent progress had been made but that "significant" work remained.¶** Ten countries have eliminated their entire stockpiles of weapons-grade uranium, many reactors producing nuclear medicines were using less risky materials and smuggling nuclear materials across borders, for example from Pakistan, is harder, it said.¶ But **some countries still do not have armed guards at nuclear power plants, security surrounding nuclear materials in civilian settings is often inadequate and there is a woeful lack of international cooperation and binding global rules.**¶ "**We are still a long way from having a unified regime**, a unified understanding of the threat and a way to address it," Michelle Cann, co-author of the report, told AFP.

**Undetected entry through ports is highly likely**

**Gilbert 2013** (Holly Gilbert, May 29, 2013, “Risk of Nuclear Materials Being Smuggled Through Ports Should Be Taken Seriously, Say Experts,” Security Management, http://www.securitymanagement.com/news/risk-nuclear-materials-being-smuggled-through-ports-should-be-taken-seriously-say-experts-00125)

**The threat of** harmful **nuclear material entering the United States through the nation’s ports is a very real one**, but international cooperation and technological solutions can help better secure our waterways against that threat. That was the subject of a panel discussion titled “Nuclear Terrorism: What’s at Stake?” hosted by the American Security Project in Washington, D.C. on Tuesday.¶ Dr. Stephen Flynn, a professor at Northeastern University and former president of the Center for National Policy, said that **smuggling through shipping containers is already happening on a daily basis, which demonstrates the possibility of a nuclear device, planted by terrorists, to go undetected. “You name the contraband, and it is [already] flowing through the system, whether it's knockoff products on the low end, to the movement of large sums of cash, to narcotics, to every form of weapons short of nuclear weapons**, in terms of what we’ve found there,” he said. “**The bottom line is the system remains highly vulnerable for folks to move things because it’s essentially an honor system, and it’s an honor system of enormous size.”¶** The enormity of that so-called “honor system” has only grown over the years. In 2003, the world's ports moved 300 million TDU’s, the metric unit used for weighing containerized cargo. In 2006, 400 million TDU’s were moved; last year, that number was 580 million TDU’s.¶ Because of the large number of containers that go through ports, the system is set up to allow companies to earn trusted status and have their containers go through on an expedited basis. Flynn said he was convinced that **if and when nuclear material enters the U.S. through a port, “it will come through a trusted shipper....” because those containers go through less scrutiny.**

**Detonation is easy**

**Bunn 2010** (Matthew Bunn, Professor of Practice at Harvard University's John F. Kennedy School of Government, April 2010, “Securing the Bomb 2010,” NTI, http://www.nti.org/media/pdfs/Securing\_The\_Bomb\_2010.pdf?\_=1317159794)

**Repeated assessments by the U.S. government** and other governments **have ¶ concluded that it is plausible that a sophisticated terrorist group could make ¶ a crude nuclear explosive—capable of ¶ destroying the heart of a major city**—if ¶ they got enough plutonium or HEU. **A ¶ “gun-type” bomb made from HEU**, in ¶ particular, **is basically a matter of slamming two pieces of HEU together at high ¶ speed.** An “implosion-type” bomb—in ¶ which precisely arranged explosives crush ¶ nuclear material to a much higher density, ¶ setting off the chain reaction—would be ¶ substantially more difficult for terrorists ¶ to accomplish, but is still plausible, particularly if they got knowledgeable help ¶ (as they have been actively attempting to ¶ do).12 **One study** by the now-defunct congressional Office of Technology Assessment ¶ **summarized the technical reality: “A small group of people, none of whom have ever had access to the classified literature, could possibly design and build a crude nuclear explosive device... Only modest machine-shop facilities that could be contracted for without arousing suspicion would be required.”**13 Indeed, even before ¶ the revelations from Afghanistan, **U.S. intelligence concluded that “fabrication of at ¶ least a ‘crude’ nuclear device was within ¶ al-Qa’ida’s capabilities**, if it could obtain ¶ fissile material.”14¶ It is important to understand that **making ¶ a crude, unsafe, unreliable bomb of uncertain yield that might be carried in the ¶ back of a large van is a dramatically simpler task than designing and building a ¶ safe, secure, reliable, and efficient weapon ¶ deliverable by a ballistic missile**, which ¶ a state might want to incorporate into its ¶ arsenal. Terrorists are highly unlikely to ¶ ever be able to make a sophisticated and ¶ efficient weapon, a task that requires a ¶ substantial nuclear weapons enterprise—¶ but they may well be able to make a crude ¶ one. **Their task would be easier if they ¶ managed to recruit experts with experience in key aspects of a national nuclear ¶ weapons program.¶** Nuclear weapons themselves generally ¶ have substantial security measures and would be more difficult to steal than nuclear materials. **If terrorists** nevertheless ¶ **managed to steal an assembled nuclear ¶ weapon** from a state, there is a significant ¶ risk that **they might figure out how to set ¶ it off**—though this, too, would in most ¶ cases be a difficult challenge for a terrorist ¶ group.15 Many modern U.S. and Russian ¶ nuclear weapons are equipped with sophisticated electronic locks, known in the ¶ United States as “permissive action links” ¶ or PALs, intended to make it difficult to ¶ detonate the weapon without inserting an ¶ authorized code, which terrorists might ¶ find very difficult to bypass. **Some weapons**, however, **are either not equipped ¶ with PALs or are equipped with older ¶ versions that lack some of the highestsecurity features** (such as “limited try” ¶ features that would permanently disable ¶ the weapon if the wrong code is inserted ¶ too many times or attempts are made to ¶ bypass the lock).16 Many nuclear weapons also have safety features designed to prevent the weapon from detonating unless it ¶ had gone through its expected flight to its ¶ target—such as intense acceleration followed by unpowered flight for a ballistic ¶ missile warhead—and these would also ¶ have to be bypassed, if they were present, ¶ for terrorists to be able to make use of an ¶ assembled nuclear weapon they acquired.¶ **If they could not figure out how to detonate a stolen weapon, terrorists might ¶ choose to remove its nuclear material ¶ and fashion a new bomb.** Some modern, ¶ highly efficient designs might not contain ¶ enough material for a crude, inefficient ¶ terrorist bomb; but **multistage thermonuclear weapons, with nuclear material in ¶ both the “primary”** (the fission bomb that ¶ sets off the fusion reaction) **and the “secondary”** (where the fusion takes place) ¶ probably **would provide sufficient material.** In any case, terrorists in possession ¶ of a stolen nuclear weapon would be in a ¶ position to make fearsome threats, for no ¶ one would know for sure whether they ¶ could set it off.

**Nuclear terrorism in and of itself does not pose an existential threat to survival**

**Wolfe 2009** (Kavan Wolfe, a Canadian author, IT consultant, June 25, 2009, “Imaginary Existential Threats”, http://thewaronbullshit.com/2009/06/25/exaggerated\_threats/)

Without venturing into the absurd, **the realistic worse case for terrorism is a single nuclear detonation in a major city. If optimally placed, this might kill hundreds of thousand or even a few million people. That would be bad. Extremely bad. However, it is not the end of humanity. Humanity would go on. Japan went on after Hiroshima and Nagasaki were bombed at the end of WWII.** The modern world would go on after the bombing of another major city.

**However, Obama will authorize nuclear retaliation against negligent states--- NPR explicitly says so**

**Beljac 2010** (Marko Beljac, PhD at Monash University, Teaches at LaTrobe University and the University of Melbourne, August 17, 2010, National Research Council Report on Nuclear Forensics Exposes the Soft Underbelly of Deterrence Policy, Nuclear Resonances, http://scisec.net/?p=435)

Before looking at this issue it would pay to have a look at the Obama administration's policy on the deterrence of nuclear terrorism. **The Obama policy, which essentially reaffirms Bush era policy, was articulated in the 2010 Nuclear Posture Review. The 2010 NPR states that the US will, ...hold fully accountable any state, terrorist group, or other non-state actor that supports or enables terrorist efforts to obtain or use weapons of mass destruction, whether by facilitating, financing, or providing expertise or safe haven for such efforts...**  The **use of nuclear weapons are not excluded**. In addition, contrary to the National Research Council report, the 2010 NPR states ...In addition, the United States and the international community have improving but currently insufficient capabilities to detect, interdict, and defeat efforts to covertly deliver nuclear materials or weapons—and if an attack occurs, to respond to minimize casualties and economic impact as well as to attribute the source of the attack and take strong action... The above statement encompasses nuclear forensics. The NPR recognises that nuclear forensics is “currently insufficient”, but nonetheless these capabilities are “improving.” That doesn't square with the National Research Council finding that “in some respects” forensic capabilities are “deteriorating.” Given current trends, furthermore, nuclear forensic capabilities will further “decline.” The US deterrence posture is robust, but the nuclear forensic capabilities needed to match declaratory policy are not sufficient and might well decline further, a point to which we return. It is not easy from the above to appreciate just how robust US nuclear deterrence policy is. It is not just that a deliberate transfer of nuclear materials by a state to a terrorist group is being deterred through the threat of nuclear attack. **The Bush-Obama policy adopts what is called a “negligence doctrine.” If a state is negligent in its oversight of nuclear materials, and should a terrorist group acquire nuclear materials due to such negligence, then a nuclear attack upon the negligent state falls within the ambit of the policy. This is what that seemingly innocuous word, “enables”, in the NPR deterrence policy refers to.** In the lexicon of US counter-terrorism policy “enables” has a pretty precise meaning. This meaning encompasses negligence. I will have more discussion of this in my book. **A negligence doctrine is pretty extreme. Such a policy leaves open any state to nuclear attack if the US decides that that state was negligent in its oversight over nuclear materials.**

**Causes nuclear war with Russia and collapses Pakistan**

**Knopf 2010** (Jeffrey Knopf, Ph.D., Political Science from Stanford University as well as an MA from Stanford and a BA from Harvard University, April 2010, “The Fourth Wave in Deterrence Research,” Contemporary Security Policy, Vol.31, No.1)

**Although many analysts want to hold accountable any state that becomes a source¶ of nuclear materials, deciding what type of retaliation to threaten** if a state’s materials¶ are employed by terrorists **has proven a thorny issue. There has been willingness to¶ contemplate a nuclear response**, but little support for mandating that retaliation must¶ be nuclear even in cases of intentional transfer. Many analysts simply note that the US¶ response could be either nuclear or non-nuclear without specifying any scenario in¶ which it should automatically be nuclear.110¶ The main reason for hesitation is that **there are good reasons not to threaten¶ nuclear strikes against certain states whose ﬁssile materials might not be completely¶ secure, including Russia and Pakistan. Russia could launch extensive nuclear¶ counter-strikes in response, while the United States has viewed Pakistan as an ally,¶ if an ambivalent one, and would not want to lose its cooperation in ﬁghting al Qaeda and the Taliban.** Even against states that are hostile to the United States and¶ unable to strike back in kind, **nuclear retaliation could be seen as excessive by the¶ international community and lead to a loss of support for the United States.** This¶ would especially be true if leakage were inadvertent rather than deliberate. For¶ these reasons, Corr advocates threatening weaker states with a conventional invasion¶ to impose regime change rather than nuclear retaliation.111 In contrast, Whiteneck¶ claims it makes sense to leave the nuclear option on the table because, after Iraq, US conventional capabilities are stretched thin and the threat to invade and occupy¶ another country might lack credibility.112¶ There are also situations in which even conventional military retaliation might be¶ counterproductive. For example, actors in Pakistan’s tribal regions unhappy with¶ government efforts to crack down on them might try to provoke US military¶ strikes on Pakistan that would help them topple the central government.113 Given¶ the wide range of scenarios that could lead to terrorists obtaining nuclear materials¶ and the political complications that would follow explicitly threatening countries¶ like Russia or Pakistan, the majority of analysts recommend a declaratory posture¶ of calculated ambiguity.114 Even Phillips, despite expressing doubt about whether¶ intentional WMD transfers can be deterred, advocates a ‘broadly scoped, operationally ambiguous declaratory policy’.115 By this, he means that all options, including¶ nuclear retaliation, should be on the table, but the exact nature of the military¶ response should not be speciﬁed in advance. This declaratory posture would also¶ leave open the precise level of proof the United States would require. Because of¶ the inherent uncertainties in attribution, Phillips and other analysts recommend that¶ the United States declare it will not necessarily require deﬁnitive attribution before¶ responding.116

**Russia nuke war causes extinction**

**Bostrum 2002** (Nick Bostrum, Professor of Philosophy at Yale, “Existential Risks: Analyzing Human Extinction Scenarios and Related Hazards,” 2002, http://goo.gl/rmQyl)

A much greater existential risk emerged with the build-up of nuclear arsenals in the US and the USSR. **An all-out nuclear war was a possibility with both a substantial probability and with consequences that might have been persistent enough to qualify as global and terminal.** There was a real worry among those best acquainted with the information available at the time that a **nuclear Armageddon would occur and that it might annihilate our species or permanently destroy human civilization.[4] Russia and the US retain large nuclear arsenals** that could be used in a future confrontation, either accidentally or deliberately. There is also a risk that other states may one day build up large nuclear arsenals. Note however that **a smaller nuclear exchange,** between India and Pakistan for instance, **is not an existential risk, since it would not destroy or thwart humankind’s potential permanently.** Such a war might however be a local terminal risk for the cities most likely to be targeted. Unfortunately, we shall see that nuclear Armageddon and comet or asteroid strikes are mere preludes to the existential risks that we will encounter in the 21st century.

**Pakistan collapse causes global nuclear war**

**Pitt 2009** (William Pitt, New York Times and internationally bestselling author of two books: "War on Iraq: What Team Bush Doesn't Want You to Know" and "The Greatest Sedition Is Silence.", May 8, 2009, “Unstable Pakistan Threatens the World,” http://www.arabamericannews.com/news/index.php?mod=article&cat=commentary&article=2183)

But a suicide bomber in Pakistan rammed a car packed with explosives into a jeep filled with troops today, killing five and wounding as many as 21, including several children who were waiting for a ride to school. Residents of the region where the attack took place are fleeing in terror as gunfire rings out around them, and government forces have been unable to quell the violence. Two regional government officials were beheaded by militants in retaliation for the killing of other militants by government forces. As familiar as this sounds, it did not take place where we have come to expect such terrible events. This, unfortunately, is a whole new ballgame. It is part of another conflict that is brewing, one which puts what is happening in Iraq and Afghanistan in deep shade, and which represents a grave and growing threat to us all. Pakistan is now trembling on the edge of violent chaos, and is doing so with nuclear weapons in its hip pocket, right in the middle of one of the most dangerous neighborhoods in the world. The situation in brief: Pakistan for years has been a nation in turmoil, run by a shaky government supported by a corrupted system, dominated by a blatantly criminal security service, and threatened by a large fundamentalist Islamic population with deep ties to the Taliban in Afghanistan. All this is piled atop an ongoing standoff with neighboring India that has been the center of political gravity in the region for more than half a century. **The fact that Pakistan,** and **India,** and **Russia, and China all possess nuclear weapons and share the same space means any** ongoing or escalating **violence** over there **has the real potential to crack open the** very **gates of Hell itself**. Recently, the Taliban made a military push into the northwest Pakistani region around the Swat Valley. According to a recent Reuters report: The (Pakistani) army deployed troops in Swat in October 2007 and use d artillery and gunship helicopters to reassert control. But insecurity mounted after a civilian government came to power last year and tried to reach a negotiated settlement. A peace accord fell apart in May 2008. After that, hundreds — including soldiers, militants and civilians — died in battles. Militants unleashed a reign of terror, killing and beheading politicians, singers, soldiers and opponents. They banned female education and destroyed nearly 200 girls' schools. About 1,200 people were killed since late 2007 and 250,000 to 500,000 fled, leaving the militants in virtual control. Pakistan offered on February 16 to introduce Islamic law in the Swat valley and neighboring areas in a bid to take the steam out of the insurgency. The militants announced an indefinite cease-fire after the army said it was halting operations in the region. President Asif Ali Zardari signed a regulation imposing sharia in the area last month. But the Taliban refused to give up their guns and pushed into Buner and another district adjacent to Swat, intent on spreading their rule. The United States, already embroiled in a war against Taliban forces in Afghanistan, must now face the possibility that **Pakistan could collapse under the mounting threat of Taliban forces** there. Military and diplomatic advisers to President Obama, uncertain how best to proceed, now face one of the great nightmare scenarios of our time. "Recent militant gains in Pakistan," reported The New York Times on Monday, "have so alarmed the White House that the national security adviser, Gen. James L. Jones, described the situation as 'one of the very most serious problems we face.'" "Security was deteriorating rapidly," reported The Washington Post on Monday, "particularly in the mountains along the Afghan border that harbor al-Qaeda and the Taliban, intelligence chiefs reported, and there were signs that those groups were working with indigenous extremists in Pakistan's populous Punjabi heartland. The Pakistani government was mired in political bickering. The army, still fixated on its historical adversary India, remained ill-equipped and unwilling to throw its full weight into the counterinsurgency fight. But despite the threat the intelligence conveyed, Obama has only limited options for dealing with it. Anti-American feeling in Pakistan is high, and a U.S. combat presence is prohibited. The United States is fighting Pakistan-based extremists by proxy, through an army over which it has little control, in alliance with a government in which it has little confidence." It is believed Pakistan is currently in possession of between 60 and 100 nuclear weapons. Because Pakistan's stability is threatened by the wide swath of its population that shares ethnic, cultural and religious connections to the fundamentalist Islamic populace of Afghanistan, fears over what could happen to those nuclear weapons if the Pakistani government collapses are very real. "As the insurgency of the Taliban and Al Qaeda spreads in Pakistan," reported the Times last week, "**senior American officials** say they **are increasingly concerned about** new vulnerabilities for **Pakistan's nuclear arsenal,** including the potential for militants to snatch a weapon in transport or to insert sympathizers into laboratories or fuel-production facilities. In public, the administration has only hinted at those concerns, repeating the formulation that the Bush administration used: that it has faith in the Pakistani Army. But that cooperation, according to officials who would not speak for attribution because of the sensitivity surrounding the exchanges between Washington and Islamabad, has been sharply limited when the subject has turned to the vulnerabilities in the Pakistani nuclear infrastructure." "The prospect of turmoil in Pakistan sends shivers up the spines of those U.S. officials charged with keeping tabs on foreign nuclear weapons," reported Time Magazine last month. "Pakistan is thought to possess about 100 — the U.S. isn't sure of the total, and may not know where all of them are. Still, if Pakistan collapses, the U.S. military is primed to enter the country and secure as many of those weapons as it can, according to U.S. officials. Pakistani officials insist their personnel safeguards are stringent, but a sleeper cell could cause big trouble, U.S. officials say." In other words, a shaky Pakistan spells trouble for everyone, especially if America loses the footrace to secure those weapons in the event of the worst-case scenario. **If Pakistani militants ever succeed in toppling the government**, several very dangerous events could happen at once. **Nuclear-armed India could be galvanized into military action** of some kind, **as could** nuclear-armed **China or** nuclear-armed **Russia.** If the Pakistani government does fall, and all those Pakistani nukes are not immediately accounted for and secured, the specter (or reality) of **loose nukes** falling into the hands of terrorist organizations could **place the entire world on a collision course with unimaginable disaster**. We have all been paying a great deal of attention to Iraq and Afghanistan, and rightly so. The developing situation in Pakistan, however, needs to be placed immediately on the front burner. The Obama administration appears to be gravely serious about addressing the situation. So should we all.

**Aff solves--- Congress won’t authorize nuclear retaliation--- failure to clarify authority now causes crisis of legitimacy whether we actually retaliate or not**

**Hemesath 2000** (Paul A. Hemesath, J.D./M.S.F.S. Georgetown University Law Center, School of Foreign Service, August 2000, “Who's Got the Button? Nuclear War Powers Uncertainty in the Post-Cold War Era,” Georgetown Law Journal, lexis)

Assuming a greater frequency and intensity of terrorist activity, the Executive may be faced with more opportunities to use force against increasingly tenacious and deadly opponents. 167 The present hypothetical, portraying a President who wishes to carry out a nuclear reprisal on terrorists in Afghanistan, represents a situation not altogether removed from the realities of the current state of the world. 168 As noted, **the use of nuclear arms to advance foreign policies has** [\*2497] **been contemplated and actually threatened in the past. 169** Although their use seems inconceivable in the near future, **the vicissitudes of world power struggles, the election of a rogue President, 170 or a reign of terrorism that infuriates the American public 171 are all factors that could plausibly lead to a threshold consideration of a U.S. nuclear offensive.** 172¶ Declining effectiveness of nuclear deterrence may also alter U.S. willingness to use nuclear weapons against its enemies. **The perceived need to strike with nuclear force is theoretically increased over time by the fact that deterrence effectiveness is diminished by its non-use as a punishment mechanism.** In this case, **the fact that the United States has abstained from using its nuclear arsenal over the last fifty years tends to decrease the perceived credibility of a U.S. promise to carry out a nuclear threat.** 173 Thus, as time goes on, **the temptation to bolster the credibility of a nuclear threat may increase**, if only slightly.**¶** Although these factors do not suggest the **certainty, or even the probability, of an offensive use of nuclear weapons on the part of the United States, the mere possession of such weapons and the unwillingness to renounce first-use, demands that responsible politicians, jurists, and academicians take serious notice of the constitutional limits applied to the use of nuclear weapons.¶ B.** ASSUMING A BIFURCATION OF LEADERSHIP¶ **Although congressional opposition to an executive decision to use nuclear weapons is not automatic, it reasonably can be anticipated** that a great number of congressmen would oppose such an action on a variety of grounds. Especially since the end of the Cold War, **the Executive has faced various levels of congressional opposition for actions far less fraught with international political** [\*2498] **implications, loss of life, and moral uncertainty.** 175 Thus, in the event that the Executive considers the use of a nuclear weapon, it is possible, if not likely, that Congress will wish to take part in the decision, utilizing the arguments described in Part I of this Note as a basis for its participation.**¶** Of course, should Congress approve the Executive's decision, actively or silently, to use the nuclear option, the crisis would go the way of so many other unchallenged presidential uses of force--as further evidence for the customary war power of the Executive. 176 However, **given the emotionally charged nature of nuclear issues and the congressional realization that such an approval would give the appearance of consent to an expanded grant of nuclear decisionmaking to the Executive, it is unlikely that Congress would approve such usage either actively or through silence.** 177 Rather, **an institutionally interested legislature would attempt to assert its power so as not to be completely subsumed by the powers of the Commander in Chief, the President. The resulting difference in opinion**, because of its probable seriousness and constitutional controversy, **may lead to a dangerous crisis.¶** C. CONSTITUTIONAL CRISIS?¶ In the event of a scenario where the nation is faced with a nuclear decision, **the absence of clear constitutional authority will ensure a crisis of constitutional dimensions.** 178 In the present hypothetical, **the Executive would be girded by the customary authority of some 200 non-congressionally approved uses of force**, the untested powers of the Commander in Chief, and the de facto power created by being the physical possessor of launch codes necessary for the final triggering of a nuclear attack. 179 **The Congress**, on the other hand, **would possess the authority provided by an uncertain constitutional interpretation of the War Powers Clause**, the ambiguous sui generis status of nuclear weapons, 180 and the changing nature of a post-Cold War geopolitical structure, as well as the moral arguments militating against the use of nuclear weapons. 181¶ Although these positions would make for fascinating oral argument before the Supreme Court in times of peace, **they constitute a harrowing threat to the legitimacy of the decision if conducted in the throes of a nuclear crisis.** One would predict that in such a scenario the Congress, for lack of an effective remedy, 182 would go to the courts to seek enforcement of an arguable, but well [\*2499] supported, constitutional prerogative. Under the status quo, the results of such a venture into the lower judiciary would be unpredictable and, based on the lack of controlling precedent or constitutional authority, subject to extreme controversy.¶ In the case of an offensive nuclear attack, **the importance of a coherent and legitimate decision cannot be overestimated.** Even with the force of a congressional declaration of war, Harry **Truman still faced critics that questioned the sagacity of his atomic decision in World War II.** 183 Although the wisdom of any nuclear use may always remain open to criticism, **the legality of such a decision should be beyond reproach.** As previously noted, the potentially "unlimited costs" of a nuclear war are extremely difficult to fathom, both physically and politically. 184 **A legitimate decision to utilize a nuclear weapon thus requires a high level of legality and consensus--two qualities that cannot be attained with a Congress plausibly asserting the nonexistence of the Executive's very constitutional authority to carry out the act.**

**Negligence doctrine incentivizes nuclear terror--- gives them political support for high magnitude attacks**

**Beljac 2008** (Marko Beljac, PhD at Monash University, February 8, 2008, “Pakistan and the prospects for nuclear terrorism,” Australian Policy Online, http://apo.org.au/commentary/pakistan-and-prospects-nuclear-terrorism)

**One disturbing option that has been** opened up by nuclear forensics and has been **seriously considered in the White House is the promulgation of a “negligence doctrine”** to deter nuclear terrorism. The idea here is that if a state were to lose control over fissile materials or nuclear weapons through “negligence,” and these materials were stolen and used in a nuclear explosive device by a terrorist group, then the United States would hold such a state “responsible” for the terrorist attack and strike back with nuclear weapons.¶ **The possibility of such a nuclear strike, it’s argued, would deter “negligence.”** But the concept makes “negligence” sound like a conscious choice made at the very highest policy levels, which it need not be. Sometimes at US nuclear weapons plants people have been caught sleeping on the job but surely the negligence doctrine would not apply if Bin Laden got his nuclear device because of a Homer Simpson.¶ **In reality, a “negligence doctrine” would make an act of nuclear terrorism more likely. Jihadi groups like Al Qaeda are revolutionary** - or, more accurately, counter-revolutionary - **vanguards who see their main strategic task as mobilising a dissatisfied but apathetic population.** In this sense they have been highly influenced by Lenin and the Bolsheviks. **It is not hard to see how a “negligence doctrine,” rather than deterring nuclear terrorism, would actually encourage Jihadi groups to attempt to get their hands on the necessary fissile materials for a nuclear device because the prospect of a US nuclear counter-strike on such obviously immoral grounds would enrage, and hopefully radicalise, the entire Islamic world.**

**Nuclear terrorists cannot be deterred**

**Van de Velde 2010** (James Van de Velde, Associate for the consulting firm, Booz Allen Hamilton, has over 20 years of experience in academia, intelligence collection and analysis, political, counter terrorism and proliferation analysis, and national security affairs. He is a former White House Appointee under President George H.W. Bush Sr., Yale University lecturer and residential college dean, State Department Foreign Service Officer and naval intelligence reserve officer, 2010, “The Impossible Challenge of Deterring ‘Nuclear Terrorism’ by Al Qaeda,” Studies in Conﬂict & Terrorism, 33:682–699, EBSCO; the more you know: http://www.nytimes.com/2013/06/05/nyregion/james-van-de-velde-from-pariah-back-to-pillar.html?\_r=0)

Conclusion¶ **Al Qaeda continues to represent a worldwide threat to the United States and its allies. It continues to plot terrorist acts against the West and aspires to acquire** or develop **w**eapons¶ of **m**ass **d**estruction, **which it very well might use against the West without hesitation. Despite much intellectual effort, there remain some inescapable truths regarding Al Qaeda’s interest in attacking the West with a nuclear weapon:** **• The United States cannot** likely **persuade** the irredeemable **jihadists that it is not at war with Islam. • Acquiring a WMD is not categorically forbidden by Islam. •** Ayman al-Zawahiri may have claimed on 2 March 2008, that the practical use of a¶ WMD would be to deter eWestern aggression, but **there is no discernable Al Qaeda WMD employment doctrine. The United States has no idea when, where, or why Al Qaeda might use an IND** (Improvised Nuclear Device). And a decision to use¶ such a weapon will be inﬂuenced by such factors as how and where the weapon¶ was acquired, by whom, who controls it, and the weapon type (IND vs. a stolen¶ state-weapon).¶ **The West ought, therefore, to characterize those irredeemably committed to acquiring a nuclear weapon as irrational, apocalyptic, and dangerous—ﬁrst and foremost because they are!** The “center of gravity” in the war with Al Qaeda is the worldwide ﬁght over Al Qaeda¶ ‘s legitimacy and Muslim perceptions of the West. The best and perhaps only means,¶ therefore, to deter Al Qaeda’s use of a nuclear weapon in particular is to treat it as an¶ insurgency and defeat the group by starving it of recruits. The goal must be to defeat and¶ end Al Qaeda legitimacy and recruitment, since an insurgency is defeated when no one (or¶ very few) join it.

### 1AC PQD Adv

#### The plan modifies the political question doctrine to recognize Congressional standing in WPR suits

Hemesath 2000 (Paul A. Hemesath, J.D./M.S.F.S. Georgetown University Law Center, School of Foreign Service, August 2000, “Who's Got the Button? Nuclear War Powers Uncertainty in the Post-Cold War Era,” Georgetown Law Journal, lexis)

The Campbell case was then considered by the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit where the three judge panel wrote three conflicting concurrences, each explicating its own view of standing, justiciability, and the role of the courts in the war powers debate. 151 Judge Silberman authored the opinion for the court, with three separate concurrences filed by Judges Randolph, Tatel, and Silberman himself. The court's opinion rejected Campbell's claim based on a lack of standing. 152 Specifically, the court held that as long as the claim is susceptible to a political solution, the court would not intervene because the Congress's vote would not have been nullified per the Coleman exception. 153 Political solutions suggested by the court included [\*2495] a direct vote against military involvement, suspension of war funds, and impeachment of the President. 154 In his concurrence, Judge Silberman attempted to foreclose future congressional lawsuits regarding the war powers by applying political question doctrine and arguing that neither the War Powers Resolution nor the Constitution offer a judicially discoverable standard for judging the question of war. 155 Thus, according to Judge Silberman, the Congress is not able to rely on the judiciary as an arbiter of the war powers--regardless of the existence of standing in a future case.¶ Judge Silberman's concurrence was not persuasive to his brethren on the bench. Although Judge Randolph also rejected the Campbell claim based on standing, his concurrence suggestively hinted that a judicial determination of the war powers "must therefore be put off for still another day." 156 Randolph based his limited holding on the Coleman nullity standard. He observed that, since the Congress never actively voted against military involvement and the President had exercised only limited force, 157 the President's actions had not yet constituted a nullification, and thus Representative Campbell lacked standing based on the holdings of Raines and Coleman. 158 Randolph's concurrence would thus leave the door open for future congressional suits based on presidential acts that conflict with a majority vote forbidding further military action.¶ Judge Tatel, in his concurrence, agreed with Judge Silberman that Raines precluded standing in this case, but went on to disagree with Judge Silberman's analysis regarding the nonjusticiability of the war question. 159 According to Judge Tatel, the judiciary has enjoyed a long history of war powers determination. 160 His concurrence is dramatically punctuated with a reference to Marbury v. Madison, stating that "[it] is emphatically the province and duty of the judicial department to say what the law is." 161 With that, Judge Tatel's opinion strongly suggests that the war powers may find some way to judicial resolution, if not under the facts in Campbell. 162¶ The result of this fractured, and at times contentious, decision is yet more uncertainty for the war powers authority. In Campbell, the Congress was handed a mismatched pair of left-handed scissors to cut through a veritable Gordian knot of concurrences. Of particular concern is the absence of a clear standard regarding the Coleman nullity exception. Although Judge Silberman identified three legislative remedies that were not exhausted, the opinion itself and the dissonance of the concurrences leaves no indication whether all three of these [\*2496] legislative remedies--a majority vote against military action, an appropriations freeze, and impeachment--must be undermined before the court can decide the war powers issue on the merits. The difficulty of this proposition is revealed when applied to the facts of the present hypothetical, in which the Congress has already voted against military action and the stockpiled nuclear weapons in question require no additional appropriations for launch. 163 In such a scenario, two out of three of Judge Silberman's political remedies--an affirmative resolution against military action and an appropriations freeze 164 --would provide no relief. The final option of impeachment is all that would remain. 165 Whether the existence of this final option would be a sufficient political remedy to deny congressional standing is unclear from the decision. 166 As a result, the root of the war powers question, particularly in regard to the congressionally opposed launch of a stockpiled nuclear weapon, remains unresolved.¶ IV. CONSEQUENCES OF AMBIGUITY: CONSTITUTIONAL UNCERTAINTY AND ILLEGITIMACY¶ The uncertainty of a divided nuclear war powers regime may be more than an academic bogeyman invented for the amusement of professors and theoreticians. Indeed, assuming the likelihood of a conflict that confronts the Executive with a nuclear option, the ambiguity of the status quo has the potential to create a severe and untimely constitutional rift between the Congress and the President. Furthermore, if the Executive is able to act on its wishes to launch a nuclear weapon despite legal controversy, the uncertainty of its constitutional authority will haunt and delegitimize such a decision for generations to come.

#### Shifts to judicial dynamism--- makes room for judicial review when Congress is prevented from checking the prez by saying that’s NOT a political question

Roberts 2009 (Caprice L. Roberts, Associate Dean of Faculty Research & Development and Professor of Law, West Virginia University, Spring 2009, “ALTERNATIVE VISIONS OF THE JUDICIAL ROLE: Asymmetric World Jurisprudence,” Seattle University Law Review, Lexis)

The Supreme Court has not clarified whether the political question doctrine is a constitutional or a prudential restraint. 54 In its modern form, the political question doctrine is primarily prudential for two reasons. First, almost all of the judicially created political question factors have no constitutional grounding. Second, the motivations for all but one of the factors include prudential considerations such as judicial (i) competency, (ii) functionality and administration, (iii) legitimacy, (iv) reputation, and (v) comity toward the political branches. Such prudential concerns serve important justifications for jurisdiction-limiting devices of the federal judiciary. This Article maintains, however, that the political question limitation on jurisdiction, as primarily prudential, should not serve as an insurmountable barrier when the federal judiciary is needed to address an asymmetric threat to the balance of powers.¶ The modern political question doctrine does not clearly emanate from the Constitution. Article III sets forth the cases and controversies over which federal court jurisdiction is proper. The Article does not exclude political question matters. Article III does not utter the words "political question" or allude to such a prohibition. There is no laundry list of excluded matters in general or specific terms. For example, Article III does not state that the federal judiciary cannot exercise jurisdiction over Senate impeachment trial proceedings of a federal judge. 55 Further, the Court has not developed the political question doctrine as an interpretation of Article III's confinement of judicial power to "cases" and "controversies." Nevertheless, even where jurisdictional and other justiciability requirements are met, the Court has declined to review particular constitutional challenges to governmental action. The Court determines that the political branches, legislative and executive, should resolve these cases. Accordingly, the Court deems these cases nonjusticiable on the basis of the political question doctrine.¶ The political question doctrine exists as a conventional tool for the federal judiciary's limitations on jurisdiction. The limiting doctrines of justiciability include the prohibition on advisory opinions, standing, ripeness, mootness, and political question. 56 Most of these doctrines are not absolute conceptually. For example, ripeness represents the notion of [\*585] "not yet," the case is not ready for adjudication; mootness represents the notion of "too late," the controversy is no longer justiciable. 57 Even standing, which communicates "not you," implies that the Court would hear the action if brought by a proper plaintiff rather than that the Court will "never" hear the controversy. 58 The political question doctrine, however, if deemed applicable by the Court, means the Court will never hear the case. 59 The Court has found jurisdiction to be inappropriate pursuant to the political question doctrine in cases involving the following areas: foreign affairs, 60 the impeachment process, 61 the republican form of government clause, and the electoral process. 62¶ By not hearing constitutional challenges that the Court deems non-reviewable political questions, is the Court abdicating its duty? The answer depends on whether one views the political question doctrine as stemming from a constitutional command, prudential considerations, or both. Although Article III does not exclude political question cases from federal judicial power, another source for a constitutional constraint is the separation of powers. The structure of the Constitution divides power in a tripartite fashion between the legislative, executive, and judicial branches, and dictates that one branch not encroach upon another. Accordingly, if the matter is textually committed to a branch other than the judiciary, the Court must stay its hand. 63 Even granting that certain political question cases are nonreviewable as a separation-of-powers command, the Court has extended the political question doctrine well beyond the constitutional prohibition.¶ The expansion of the doctrine includes largely prudential concerns regarding judicial functionality and legitimacy. These concerns morph into judicially created, clunky factors. It is difficult to predict their application, but the purpose is apparently to give the Court an avenue to [\*586] defer to the political process as a matter of wise judicial administration and interbranch comity. The modern political question doctrine, as enunciated by the Supreme Court, includes additional factors--any one of which may result in the Court declining review:¶ . "lack of judicially discoverable and manageable standards for resolving it";¶ . "impossibility of deciding without an initial policy determination of a kind clearly for nonjudicial discretion";¶ . "impossibility of a court's undertaking independent resolution without expressing lack of respect due coordinate branches of government";¶ . "unusual need for unquestioning adherence to a political decision already made"; and¶ . "potentiality of embarrassment from multifarious pronouncements by various departments on one question." 64¶ In Marbury v. Madison, Chief Justice Marshall narrowly articulated non-reviewable political questions as cases centering on the Executive's exercise of discretion; he explicitly excluded political questions raising individual constitutional rights. 65 In its modern form, the political question doctrine extends far beyond Chief Justice Marshall's vision. The doctrine notably covers cases in which individuals raise concrete constitutional injury.¶ In 1993, for example, former federal Judge Walter Nixon raised a constitutional challenge to the Senate's impeachment proceedings against him. 66 He sought to challenge a Senate rule allowing a committee of Senators to hear evidence against an impeached individual and report to the full Senate. Nixon claimed the rule violated the Impeachment Trial Clause, Article I, Section 3, clause six, which authorizes the Senate to "try" all impeachments. 67 The Court found the challenge to be a nonjusticiable political question because the issue involved "a textually demonstrable constitutional commitment of the issue to a coordinate political department" and "a lack of judicially discoverable and manageable standards for resolving it." 68 Thus, the Court denied itself the power to hear the case.¶ [\*587] The Court's reasoning, however, is questionable. Viewing these two political question factors as linked, 69 the Court reasoned that the Constitution's text--"try" and "sole"--demonstrated the textual commitment of authority to the Senate and the word "try" lacked manageable standards for judicial resolution. 70 The latter issue evidences a prudential concern. The Court also found further prudential support, "counsel[ing] against justiciability," based on "the lack of finality and the difficulty of fashioning relief." 71 The only arguable constitutional basis for declining review is the notion that the Constitution's text commits the issue exclusively to the Senate and that review by the judicial branch therefore would violate the text and the separation of powers. The Court's constitutional interpretation that the text precludes judicial review, even if the Senate has the sole authority to try impeachments, does not show bullet-proof logic.¶ Justice White's concurring opinion poses a reasonable, persuasive interpretation of the constitutional text--Article I does not render "final responsibility for interpreting the scope and nature" of the impeachment power to the Senate. 72 Accordingly, although the Constitution authorizes the Senate "the power to try impeachments," neither the text nor the history negates judicial review authority. 73 On the merits, Justice White concluded that the Senate had met its constitutional obligation to try Nixon. 74 The Nixon case did not occur in asymmetric times and thus did not warrant federal judicial action in order to check joint action of the political branches as discussed below. Accordingly, prudential reasons such as proper judicial functioning and legitimacy may still have warranted the Court's finding of nonjusticiability. A finding of justiciability, coupled with Justice White's recommended substantive ruling, however, would not have disrespected the Senate or impermissibly encroached into its sphere of power.¶ Regardless of disagreements about the proper application of the political question doctrine in any given case, the doctrine maintains its resiliency as a limiting device. Scholarly and judicial support for the political question doctrine stems from a concern about the federal judiciary's delicate institutional legitimacy. 75 Federal court legitimacy [\*588] has evolved far from its fragile roots. Critics of the political question doctrine discredit this faulty assumption and maintain that any invocation of the political question doctrine threatens the federal judiciary's duty to exercise judicial review when it matters most. 76 This threat is arguably at its greatest when individuals claim concrete violations of constitutional rights based upon political branches exceeding their authority in concert. 77¶ Assuming the Court is not yet convinced or prepared to eliminate the political question doctrine, it should lean toward embracing, rather than avoiding, certain confrontations posed in asymmetric times. This shift should occur even for cases evidencing separation-of-powers tensions. In fact, the possibility of interbranch conflict may make judicial review all the more imperative. The following Part articulates a standard by which the Court may determine when judicial review matters most, when the Court should review even a political question.¶ V. A THEORY OF JUDICIAL NONABDICATION IN ASYMMETRICAL TIMES¶ In asymmetrical times, the Court should pay particularly close attention when the Executive exerts increased power and Congress acquiesces. Specifically, when the other two branches of government are in agreement, there may be a heightened need for judicial review to protect constitutional rights and ensure proper checks and balances. This more watchful eye would not focus, however, on every occasion when the President signs a federal bill into law. Instead, the need for the judiciary's higher vigilance arises when the political branches jointly exert power in the name of exigency borne of crisis.¶ Alexander Bickel's "passive virtues" conception empowers the Supreme Court. 78 It empowers the Court not to act. It encourages the Court to avoid jurisdiction and decline review in the name of prudence. Its underlying principles--discretion and prudence--support the prudential, rather than constitutional, conclusion of the political question doctrine. Further, the underlying principles condone avoidance, [\*589] especially if separation-of-powers tensions are fierce. I posit that, for a certain class of fierce cases, the Court should lean toward reviewing the case.¶ Regarding the Supreme Court's role, Justice Brandeis once commented, "The most important thing we do is not doing." 79 Justice Breyer echoed this principle to no avail in his impassioned dissent in Bush v. Gore when he urged that it was a mistake to take the case. 80 The validity of this bold endorsement of restraint may often be in the eye of the beholder--depending on one's satisfaction with the outcome in a given case. No doubt there are times when it is critical that the Court stay its hand, but at other grave times it may be critical that the Court act rather than abstain. The difficult issue is when.¶ Certain components of the Constitution are purposefully broad to allow the flexibility necessary for an evolving democracy. The parameters of the separation-of-powers boundaries, for example, are not explicitly described in the Constitution. As Justice Jackson suggested in his concurrence in Youngstown, 81 formalism and categorical imperatives tend not to serve consciously inserted constitutional ambiguities in the separation-of-powers structure. He aptly reasoned,¶ As to whether there is imperative necessity for such powers, it is relevant to note the gap that exists between the President's paper powers and his real powers. The Constitution does not disclose the measure of the actual controls wielded by the modern presidential office. That instrument must be understood as an Eighteenth-Century sketch of a government hoped for, not as a blueprint of the Government that is. Vast accretions of federal power, eroded from that reserved by the States, have magnified the scope of presidential activity. Subtle shifts take place in the centers of real power that do not show on the face of the Constitution. 82¶ Accordingly, the proper sphere of each branch is not fixed in Justice Jackson's conception; rather, each branch must retain flexibility to adapt to the posture taken by the other branches. 83¶ Justice Jackson's sentiments apply to the ongoing global war on terror. Although he maintained that the Executive power is greatest when the action receives express congressional approval and lowest [\*590] when the action is in contravention of legislative proscription, 84 he also understood that meaningful congressional oversight might not exist. 85 Specifically, Justice Jackson recognized that the President's powers include the ability of persuasion over those designed to serve as checks on executive power: "By his prestige as head of state and his influence upon public opinion he exerts a leverage upon those who are supposed to check and balance his power which often cancels their effectiveness." 86¶ Times of crisis stimulate expedited, significant political action. The intensity of the crisis may dilute the ability of one political branch to check the other. For example, Professor Amanda Frost examines former President George W. Bush's repeated utilization of the state secrets privilege as a means for dismissal of civil cases challenging the constitutionality of executive action, 87 and she recommends that where "Congress is unable or unwilling to take on [oversight], then the judiciary's role in checking executive power is paramount." 88 Notably, she further advises, "[c]ourts should be particularly hesitant to forgo jurisdiction when the executive is seeking an across-the-board dismissal of all cases challenging particular executive branch programs, because such claims implicate Congress's constitutional authority, as well as the courts'." 89 Although Professor Frost addresses only the executive assertion of state secrets privilege, her focal point shows a prime example of possible congressional acquiescence in executive action that should warrant a heightened judicial responsibility to review the action. I argue that acquiescence occurs when "Congress appears unwilling or unable to inquire into the legality of executive conduct." 90 The lack of political oversight in conjunction with the gravity and sweep of the Executive's stance (i.e., dismissal of all cases) warrants judicial oversight. In such circumstances, the Court should reserve the possibility of judicial review, even when, ordinarily, a doctrine of restraint might dictate otherwise.

#### This is key to avert executive groupthink

Marshall 2008 (William P. Marshall, Kenan Professor of Law, University of North Carolina, “ELEVEN REASONS WHY PRESIDENTIAL POWER INEVITABLY EXPANDS AND WHY IT MATTERS,” Boston University Law Review, http://www.bu.edu/law/central/jd/organizations/journals/bulr/documents/MARSHALL.pdf)

The expansion of presidential power is also a product of executive branch ¶ lawyering. Because of justiciability limitations, many of the questions ¶ surrounding the scope of presidential power, such as war powers,38 never reach ¶ the courts.39 In these circumstances, the Department of Justice (DOJ) and its ¶ Office of Legal Counsel (OLC), the division that is charged with advising the ¶ President as to the scope of his or her powers, are the final legal authorities¶ opining on these issues.40¶ This means, in effect, that the executive branch is the final judge of its own ¶ authority. Not surprisingly, this dynamic leads to broad interpretations of executive power for a variety of reasons.41 To begin with, the President, ¶ simply by his power of appointment, can assure that his Attorney General ¶ views the primary duty of the office is to empower the administration and not ¶ to some abstract, dispassionate view of the law.42 President Kennedy selected ¶ his brother to be Attorney General, President Nixon his campaign manager. ¶ Neither appointment, I suspect, was based on the desire to have a recalcitrant¶ DOJ. Moreover, even when the President chooses a person renowned for her ¶ independence, the pressures to bend to the President’s will are considerable. ¶ Not only does the Attorney General act under the threat of removal, but she is ¶ likely to feel beholden to the President and bound, at least in part, by personal ¶ loyalty.43¶ Some might argue that even if the Attorney General may be overly ¶ susceptible to the influence of the President who appointed her, the same ¶ should not be true of the career legal staff of the DOJ, many of whom see their ¶ role as upholding the Constitution rather than implementing any President’s ¶ specific agenda. But the ability of the line lawyers at DOJ to effectively check ¶ executive branch power may be more illusory than real. First, the lawyers in ¶ the DOJ are likely to have some disposition in favor of the government if only ¶ because their clients are the President and the executive branch.44 Second, ¶ those DOJ lawyers who are hired for their ideological and political support of ¶ the President will likely have little inclination to oppose the President’s ¶ position in any case. Third, as a recent instance at DOJ demonstrates, the ¶ President’s political appointees can always remove or redeploy staff attorneys if they find them too independent.45 Fourth, even if some staff lawyers have ¶ initial resistance to the President’s position, the internal pressures created by ¶ so-called “group-think” may eventually take over.46 The ability of a staff ¶ attorney to withstand the pressures of her peers in adhering to legal principle in ¶ the face of arguments based on public safety or national security can often be ¶ tenuous, particularly when the result of nay-saying may lead the lawyer to ¶ exile in a less attractive assignment. ¶ To be sure, the DOJ has, at times, viewed itself as a truly independent voice. ¶ Attorney General Edward Bates, appointed by Lincoln reportedly stated that it ¶ was his duty “to uphold the Law and to resist all encroachments, from ¶ whatever quarter of mere will and power.”47 Robert H. Jackson, in contrast, ¶ looking back from the perch of a Supreme Court Justice, saw his role as the ¶ Attorney General during the Roosevelt Administration otherwise, describing in ¶ one case the opinion he offered as Attorney General as “partisan advocacy.”48¶ But whatever the views of those individuals holding the position of Attorney ¶ General, those views are, at best, only of secondary importance. Far more ¶ important are the views of the Presidents who appoint the Attorneys General,¶ and in this respect the positions of the occupants of the White House have been consistent. As one study states, “[t]he President expects his Attorney General . ¶ . . to be his advocate rather than an impartial arbiter, a judge of the legality of ¶ his action.”49 Under such a system, the pressure for DOJ to develop expansive ¶ interpretations of presidential power is inexorable.

#### Inevitable crises and black swans will test Obama--- sound policy responses key to prevent escalation

Indyk 2013 (Martin S. Indyk, president and director of the Foreign Policy Program, is currently on a leave of absence serving as the U.S. special envoy for the Israeli-Palestinian negotiations. During the Clinton administration Indyk served as U.S. ambassador to Israel, assistant secretary of state for Near East affairs, and as special assistant to the president and senior director for Near East and South Asia on the U.S. National Security Council, January 18, 2013, “Over the Horizon,” Brookings, http://www.brookings.edu/research/opinions/2013/01/18-five-global-crises-obama-indyk)

U.S. President Barack Obama begins his second term at a critical moment in world affairs -- al Qaeda raising its head in North Africa, President Bashar al-Assad possibly preparing to use chemical weapons in Syria, Iran moving toward the nuclear weapons threshold, and tensions rising in Asia. An unstable world promises to present the president with many challenges in the next four years, and his advisors are already grappling with how to confront them.¶ Some looming challenges -- like the America's debt or China's rise -- have been the focus of a good deal of attention. However, low-probability but high-impact "black-swan" events could also define Obama's second term, diverting the president from his intended foreign-policy agenda. These events would be so catastrophic that he needs to take steps now to minimize the risk that they might occur.¶ Here are some of the black swans that could upend the Obama administration's agenda over the next four years:¶ Confrontation over Korea¶ There is a serious risk of an acute U.S.-China confrontation over -- or even a direct military conflict on -- the Korean Peninsula. The North Korean regime is facing an existential internal crisis. Under such conditions, it is prone to lashing out at neighboring states or engaging in other forms of risky behavior. Although it seems strong, it is also dependent on China's support and vulnerable to quick-onset instability. If Washington and Beijing fail to coordinate and communicate before a collapse begins, we could face the possibility of a U.S.-China confrontation of almost unimaginable consequences.¶ The Obama administration has sought to sharpen Pyongyang's choices, pushing it to recognize that it can't have nuclear weapons and genuine national strength. To reduce the risks of a confrontation with China over the possibility of a North Korean collapse, the administration should pursue four objectives with Beijing. The countries should disclose information on the location, operation, and capabilities of each other's military forces that could soon intervene in North Korea; share intelligence on the known or suspected location of North Korea's weapons-of-mass-destruction assets; initiate planning for the evacuation of foreign citizens in South Korea; and discuss possible measures to avoid an acute humanitarian disaster among North Korean citizens seeking to flee.¶ Chaos in Kabul¶ As the 2014 transition to a radically diminished U.S. presence in Afghanistan approaches, the United States will leave behind a perilous security situation, a political system few Afghans see as legitimate, and a likely severe economic downturn. Obama has not yet specified how many U.S. troops will remain in Afghanistan after the transition, but he has made it very clear -- including during the recent visit by President Hamid Karzai -- that troop levels will be in the low thousands and that their functions will be restricted to very narrow counterterrorism and training missions. He also conditioned any continuing U.S. troop presence in Afghanistan on the signing of a status of forces agreement that grants immunity to U.S. soldiers, a condition that the Afghan government may find difficult to swallow.¶ Although a massive security deterioration, including the possibility of civil war, is far from inevitable, it is a real possibility. Such a meltdown would leave the administration with few policy options, severely compromising America's ability to protect its interests in the region.¶ A major security collapse in Afghanistan would, in all likelihood, initially resemble the early 1990s pattern of infighting between ethnic groups and local power brokers, rather than the late 1990s, when a Taliban line of control moved steadily north. The extent of violence and fragmentation would depend on whether the Afghan army and police force splintered.¶ Even then, the Afghan government may have enough strength to hold Kabul, major cities, and other parts of Afghanistan. The Taliban would easily control parts of the south and east, while fighting could break out elsewhere among members of a resurrected Northern Alliance or among Durrani Pashtun power brokers. But ethnic fighting could eventually explode even on the streets of Kabul, where Pashtuns harbor resentments about the post-2001 influx of Tajiks that changed land distribution in the capital. In the event of massive instability, a military coup is also a possibility, particularly if the 2014 presidential election is seen as illegitimate.¶ An unstable Afghanistan will be like an ulcer bleeding into Pakistan. It will further distract Pakistan's leaders from tackling their country's internal security, economic, energy, and social crises, and stemming the radicalization of Pakistani society. These trends, needless to say, will adversely affect U.S. interests.¶ Even though U.S. leverage in Afghanistan diminishes daily, decisions made in Washington still critically affect Afghanistan's future. The Obama administration can mitigate risks by withdrawing at a judicious pace -- one that doesn't put an unbearable strain on Afghanistan's security capacity. It should also continue to provide security assistance, define negotiations with the Taliban and Afghan government as a broader reconciliation process, and encourage good governance.¶ Camp David Collapse¶ Since the collapse of Hosni Mubarak's regime in Egypt, the United States has been resolutely focused on maintaining the Egypt-Israel peace treaty, which serves as a cornerstone of stability for the region, an anchor for U.S. influence in the Middle East, and a building block for efforts at Arab-Israeli coexistence. Happily, Egyptian President Mohamed Morsy has signaled his willingness to set aside the Muslim Brotherhood's ideological opposition and most Egyptians' hostility to Israel. Several factors, however, could still destabilize the situation, including terrorist attacks in Sinai or from Gaza, the collapse of the Palestinian Authority, and populist demands to break relations with Israel.¶ If Morsy were to ditch this peace treaty, it would represent a profound strategic defeat for the United States in the Middle East and could threaten a regional war. The United States should continue its policy of conditional engagement with Morsy's government and, in particular, deepen its security cooperation and coordination. It should also develop a new modus vivendi with Egyptian and Israeli partners through cooperation over common concerns in Sinai and Gaza that would advance the sustainability of the peace treaty.¶ Revolution in China¶ While China continues on its path of growth and seeming political confidence, a number of problems lie beneath the surface of its apparent success. A sense of political uncertainty -- as well as a fear of sociopolitical instability -- is on the rise. Many in the country worry about environmental degradation, health hazards, and all manner of public safety problems. These pitfalls could trigger any number of major crises: slowed economic growth, widespread social unrest, vicious political infighting among the elite, rampant official corruption, and heightened Chinese nationalism in the wake of territorial disputes. In this rapidly modernizing but still oligarchic one-party state, it is not hard to see how such a crisis could take the form of a domestic revolution or foreign war.

#### Without judicial checks groupthink makes all those go nuclear

Adler 2008 (David Gray Adler, professor of Political Science at Idaho State University, June 1, 2008, “The Judiciary and Presidential Power in Foreign Affairs: A Critique,” http://www.freerangethought.com/index.php?option=com\_content&task=blogsection&id=6&Itemid=41)

{1}The unmistakable trend toward executive domination of U.S. foreign affairs in the past sixty years represents a dramatic departure from the basic scheme of the Constitution.[1] The constitutional blueprint assigns to Congress senior status in a partnership with the President to conduct foreign policy. It also gives Congress the sole and exclusive authority over the ultimate foreign relations power: the authority to initiate war. The President is vested with modest authority in this realm and is clearly only of secondary importance. In light of this constitutional design, commentators have wondered at the causes and sources of this radical shift in foreign affairs powers from Congress to the President.[2]¶ {2}Although a satisfactory explanation for the radical shift in power is perhaps elusive, the growth of presidential power in foreign relations has fed considerably on judicial decisions that are doubtful and fragile. An exhaustive explanation, which has so far escaped the effort of others, is beyond the scope of this article. The aim of the first section is to examine the judiciary's contribution to executive hegemony in the area of foreign affairs as manifested in Supreme Court rulings regarding executive agreements, travel abroad, the war power, and treaty termination.¶ {3} In the second section of this article, I provide a brief explanation of the policy underlying the Constitutional Convention's allocation of foreign affairs powers and argue that those values are as relevant and compelling today as they were two centuries ago. In the third section, I contend that a wide gulf has developed in the past fifty years between constitutional theory and governmental practice in the conduct of foreign policy. The Court has greatly facilitated the growth of presidential power in foreign affairs in three interconnected but somewhat different ways by: (1) adhering to the sole-organ doctrine as propounded in the 1936 case of United States v. Curtiss-Wright Export Corp., (2) invoking the political question doctrine and other nonjusticiable grounds, and (3) inferring congressional approval of presidential action by virtue of congressional inaction or silence.[3] I then offer an explanation of the Court's willingness to increase presidential foreign affairs powers well beyond constitutional boundaries. For a variety of reasons, the Court views its role in this area as a support function for policies already established. In this regard the judiciary has become an arm of the executive branch. Finally, I conclude with the argument that to maintain the integrity of the Constitution, the Court must police constitutional boundaries to ensure that fundamental alterations in our governmental system will occur only through the process of constitutional amendment. The judicial branch may not abdicate its function "to say what the law is."[4]¶ The Constitution and the Conduct of Foreign Policy¶ {4} The Constitution envisions the conduct of foreign policy as a partnership between the President and Congress. Perhaps surprisingly, the Constitution assigns Congress the role of senior partner. This assignment reflects, first, the overwhelming preference of both the framers at the Constitutional Convention and the ratifiers in state conventions for collective decision-making in both foreign and domestic affairs. Second, this assignment of powers reflects their equally adamant opposition to unilateral executive control of U.S. foreign policy. This constitutional arrangement is evidenced by specific, unambiguous textual language, almost undisputed arguments by framers and ratifiers, and by logical-structural inferences from the doctrine of separation of powers.[5]¶ {5} The constitutional assignment of powers, moreover, is compelling and relevant for twentieth century America for at least three reasons. First, separation of powers issues are perennial, for they require consideration of the proper repository of power. Contemporary questions about the allocation of power between the President and Congress in foreign affairs are largely the same as those addressed two centuries ago. Second, the logic of collective decisionmaking in the realm of foreign relations is as sound today as it was in the founding period. Third, although the world and the role of the United States in international relations have changed considerably over the past 200 years, most questions of foreign affairs still involve routine policy formulation and do not place a premium on immediate responsive action.¶ {6} The preference for collective, rather than individual, decisionmaking runs throughout those provisions of the Constitution that govern the conduct of foreign policy. Congress, as a collective governing body, derives broad and exclusive powers from Article I to regulate foreign commerce and to initiate all hostilities on behalf of the United States, including war. As Article II indicates, the President shares with the Senate the treaty-making power and the power to appoint ambassadors. Only two powers in foreign relations are assigned exclusively to the President. First, he is commander-in-chief, but he acts in this capacity by and under the authority of Congress. As Alexander Hamilton and James Iredell argued, the President, in this capacity, is merely first admiral or general of the armed forces, after war has been authorized by Congress or in the event of a sudden attack against the United States.[6] Secondly, the President has the power to receive ambassadors. Hamilton, James Madison, and Thomas Jefferson agreed that this clerk-like function was purely ceremonial in character. Although this function has come to entail recognition of states at international law, which carries with it certain legal implications, this founding trio contended that the duty of recognizing states was more conveniently placed in the hands of the executive than in the legislature.[7] These two powers exhaust the textual grant of authority to the President regarding foreign affairs jurisdiction. The President's constitutional authority pales in comparison to the powers of Congress.¶ {7} This Constitutional preference for shared decisionmaking is emphasized again in the construction of the shared treaty power: "He shall have Power, by and with the Advice and consent of the Senate, to make Treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur."[8] The compelling simplicity and clarity of the plain words of this clause leave no room to doubt its meaning.[9] There is no other clause that even intimates a presidential power to make agreements with foreign nations. Therefore, as Hamilton argued, the treaty power constitutes the principal vehicle for conducting U.S. foreign relations.[10] In fact, there was no hint at the Constitutional Convention of an exclusive Presidential power to make foreign policy. To the contrary, all the arguments of the framers and ratifiers were to the effect that the Senate and President, which Hamilton and Madison described as a "fourth branch of government" in their capacity as treaty maker,[11] are to manage concerns with foreign nations.[12] While a number of factors contributed to this decision,[13] the pervasive fear of unbridled executive power loomed largest.[14] Hamilton's statement fairly represents these sentiments:¶ The history of human conduct does not warrant that exalted opinion of human nature which would make it wise in a nation to commit interests of so delicate and momentous a kind, as those which concern its intercourse with the rest of the world, to the sole disposal of a magistrate created and circumstanced as would be a President of the United States.[15]¶ {8} The widespread fear of executive power that precluded presidential control of foreign policy also greatly influenced the Convention's design of the War Clause. Article I, section 8, paragraph 11 states: "The Congress shall have Power . . . To declare War."[16] The plain meaning of the clause is buttressed by the unanimous agreement among both framers and ratifiers that Congress was granted the sole and exclusive authority to initiate war. The warmaking power, which was viewed as a legislative power by Madison and Wilson, among others, was specifically withheld from the President.[17] James Wilson, second only to Madison as an architect of the Constitution, summed up the values and concerns underlying the war clause for the Pennsylvania Ratifying Convention:¶ This system will not hurry us into war; it is calculated to guard against it. It will not be in the power of a single body of men, to involve us in such distress; for the important power of declaring war is vested in the legislature at large. This declaration must be made with the concurrence of the House of Representatives; from this circumstance we may draw a certain conclusion that nothing but our national interest can draw us into war.[18]¶ No member of the Constitutional Convention and no member of any state ratifying convention ever attributed a different meaning to the War Clause.[19]¶ {9} This undisputed interpretation draws further support from early judicial decisions, the views of eminent treatise writers, and from nineteenth-century practice. I have discussed these factors elsewhere; here the barest review must suffice.[20] The meaning of the War Clause was put beyond doubt by several early judicial decisions. No court since has departed from this early view. In 1800, in Bas v. Tingy, the Supreme Court held that it is for Congress alone to declare either an "imperfect" (limited) war or a "perfect" (general) war.[21] In 1801, in Talbot v. Seeman, Chief Justice John Marshall, a member of the Virginia Ratifying Convention, stated that the "whole powers of war [are], by the Constitution of the United States, vested in [C]ongress. . . ."[22] In Little v. Barreme, decided in 1804, Marshall concluded that President John Adams' instructions to seize ships were in conflict with an act of Congress and were therefore illegal.[23] In 1806, in United States v. Smith, the question of whether the President may initiate hostilities was decided by Justice William Paterson, riding circuit, who wrote for himself and District Judge Tallmadge: "Does he [the President] possess the power of making war? That power is exclusively vested in Congress . . . It is the exclusive province of Congress to change a state of peace into a state of war."[24] In 1863, the Prize Cases presented the Court with its first opportunity to consider the power of the President to respond to sudden attacks.[25] Justice Robert C. Grier delivered the opinion of the Court:¶ By the Constitution, Congress alone has the power to declare a natural or foreign war . . . If a war be made by invasion of a foreign nation, the President is not only authorized but bound to resist force, by force. He does not initiate the war, but is bound to accept the challenge without waiting for any special legislative authority. And whether the hostile party be a foreign invader, or States organized in rebellion, it is none the less a war, although the declaration of it be "unilateral."[26]¶ These judicial decisions established the constitutional fact that it is for Congress alone to initiate hostilities, whether in the form of general or limited war; the President, in his capacity as commander-in-chief, is granted only the power to repel sudden attacks against the United States.[27]¶ {10} The Convention's attachment to collective judgment and its decision to create a structure of shared power in foreign affairs provided, in the words of Wilson, "a security to the people," for it was a cardinal tenet of republican ideology that the conjoined wisdom of many is superior to that of one.[28] The emphasis on group decisionmaking came, of course, at the expense of unilateral executive authority. This hardly posed a difficult choice, however; for the framers and ratifiers held a pervasive distrust of executive power, a deeply held suspicion that dated to colonial times.[29] As a result of this aversion to executive authority, the Convention placed control of foreign policy beyond the unilateral capacity of the President. Furthermore, as Madison said, the Convention "defined and confined" the authority of the President so that a power not granted could not be assumed.[30]¶ {11} The structure of shared powers in foreign relations serves to deter abuse of power, misguided policies, irrational action, and unaccountable behavior.[31] As a fundamental matter, emphasis on joint policymaking permits the airing of sundry political, social, and economic values and concerns. Such a structure wisely ensures that the ultimate policies will not merely reflect the private preferences or the short-term political interests of the President.[32]¶ {12} Of course, this arrangement has come under fire in the postwar period on a number of policy grounds. Some have argued, for example, that fundamental political and technological changes in the character of international relations and the position of the United States in the world have rendered obsolete an eighteenth century document designed for a peripheral, small state in the European system of diplomatic relations. Moreover, it has been asserted that quick action and a single, authoritative voice are necessary to deal with an increasingly complex, interdependent, and technologically linked world capable of almost instantaneous massive destruction. Extollers of presidential dominance also have contended that only the President has the qualitative information, the expertise, and the capacity to act with the necessary dispatch to conduct U.S. foreign policy.[33]¶ {13} These policy arguments have been reviewed, and discredited, elsewhere; space limitations here permit only a brief commentary.[34] Above all else, the implications of U.S. power and action in the twentieth century have brought about an even greater need for institutional accountability and collective judgment than existed two hundred years ago. The devastating, incomprehensible destruction of nuclear war and the possible extermination of the human race demonstrate the need for joint participation in any decision to initiate war. Moreover, most of the disputes at stake between the executive and legislative branches in foreign affairs have virtually nothing to do with the need for rapid response to crisis. Rather, they are concerned only with routine policy formulation and execution, a classic example of the authority exercised under the separation of powers doctrine.[35]¶ {14} Nevertheless, these joint functions have been fused by the executive branch and have become increasingly unilateral, secretive, insulated from public debate, and hence unaccountable.[36] In the wake of Vietnam, Watergate, and the Iran-contra scandal, unilateral executive behavior has become ever more difficult to defend. Scholarly appraisals have destroyed arguments about intrinsic executive expertise and wisdom in foreign affairs and the alleged superiority of information available to the President.[37] Moreover, the inattentiveness of presidents to important details and the effects of "groupthink" that have dramatized and exacerbated the relative inexperience of various presidents in international relations have also devalued the extollers' arguments. Finally, foreign policies, like domestic policies, are reflections of values. Against the strength of democratic principles, recent occupants of the White House have failed to demonstrate the superiority of their values in comparison to those of the American people and their representatives in Congress.¶ {15} The assumption of foreign affairs powers by recent presidents represents a fundamental alteration of the Constitution that is both imprudent and dangerous. We turn now to an examination of the judiciary's contribution to executive hegemony in foreign affairs.

#### Second term appointments leave Obama especially susceptible to groupthink

Ignatius 2013 (David Ignatius, February 22, 2013, “Out: Team of rivals. In: Obama’s guys.,” Washington Post, http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/david-ignatius-in-obamas-new-cabinet-rivals-out-loyalists-in/2013/02/22/13f2f27e-7c73-11e2-82e8-61a46c2cde3d\_story.html)

During President Obama’s first term, there was hidden friction between powerful Cabinet secretaries and a White House that wanted control over the foreign-policy process. Now Obama has assembled a new team that, for better or worse, seems more likely to follow the White House lead.¶ The first term featured the famous “team of rivals,” people with heavyweight egos and ambitions who could buck the White House and get away with it. Hillary Clinton and Bob Gates were strong secretaries of state and defense, respectively, because of this independent power. Leon Panetta had similar stature as CIA director, as did David Petraeus, who became CIA director when Panetta moved to the Pentagon.¶ The new team has prominent players, too, but they’re likely to defer more to the White House. Secretary of State John Kerry has the heft of a former presidential candidate, but he has been a loyal and discreet emissary for Obama and is likely to remain so. Chuck Hagel, who will probably be confirmed next week as defense secretary, is a feisty combat veteran with a sometimes sharp temper, but he has been damaged by the confirmation process and will need White House cover.¶ John Brennan, the nominee for CIA director, made a reputation throughout his career as a loyal deputy. This was especially true these past four years, when he carried the dark burden of counterterrorism policy for Obama.¶ It’s a Washington truism that every White House likes Cabinet consensus and hates dissent. But that’s especially so with Obama’s team, which has centralized national security policy to an unusual extent. This starts with national security adviser Tom Donilon, who runs what his fans and critics agree is a “tight process” at the National Security Council (NSC). Donilon was said to have been peeved, for example, when a chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff insisted on delivering a dissenting view to the president.¶ This centralizing ethos will be bolstered by a White House team headed by Denis McDonough, the new chief of staff, who is close to Obama in age and temperament. Tony Blinken, who was Vice President Biden’s top aide, has replaced McDonough as NSC deputy director, and State Department wunderkind Jacob Sullivan, who was Clinton’s most influential adviser, is expected to replace Blinken. That’s lot of intellectual firepower for enforcing a top-down consensus.¶ The real driver, obviously, will be Obama, and he has assembled a team with some common understandings. They share his commitment to ending the war in Afghanistan and avoiding new foreign military interventions, as well as his corresponding belief in diplomatic engagement. None has much experience managing large bureaucracies. They have independent views, to be sure, but they owe an abiding loyalty to Obama.¶ In Obama’s nomination of people skeptical about military power, you can sense a sharp turn away from his December 2009 decision for a troop surge in Afghanistan. The White House felt jammed by the military’s pressure for more troops, backed by Gates and Clinton. Watching Obama’s lukewarm support for the war after 2009, one suspected he felt pushed into what he eventually concluded was a mistake. Clearly, he doesn’t intend to repeat that process.¶ Obama’s choice for CIA director is also telling. The White House warily managed Petraeus, letting him run the CIA but keeping him away from the media. In choosing Brennan, the president opted for a member of his inner circle with whom he did some of the hardest work of his presidency. Brennan was not a popular choice at the CIA, where some view him as having been too supportive of the Saudi government when he was station chief in Riyadh in the 1990s; these critics argue that Brennan didn’t push the Saudis hard enough for intelligence about the rising threat of Osama bin Laden. But agency officials know, too, that the CIA prospers when its director is close to the president, which will certainly be the case with Brennan and Obama.¶ Obama has some big problems coming at him in foreign policy, starting with Syria and Iran. Both will require a delicate mix of pressure and diplomacy. To get the balance right, Obama will need a creative policy debate where advisers “think outside the box,” to use the management cliche.¶ Presidents always say that they want that kind of open debate, and Obama handles it better than most. But by assembling a team where all the top players are going in the same direction, he is perilously close to groupthink.

#### Internal checks fail--- Syria proves

Moghaddam, prof of psychology at Gtown, 9/3 (Fathali M. Moghaddam, Ph.D., professor in the Department of Psychology and the director of the Conflict Resolution Program, Department of Government at Georgetown University, September 3, 2013, “Groupthink, Syria, and President Obama,” Psychology Today, http://www.psychologytoday.com/blog/the-psychology-dictatorship/201309/groupthink-syria-and-president-obama)

Irrespective of what your position is on the possible US strike against Syria, you have to admit the situation is ‘lose-lose’ for the US. So the dictator Assad has killed hundreds of his people using chemical weapons, and the US is going to punish Assad by killing more Syrians. The US strike will not be designed to change the regime, but only to ‘punish’. In the course of this punishment, more ordinary Syrians will be killed, many more will lose limbs and homes. Note to readers: limbs and homes are not replaced in this part of the world. Once lost, they are gone forever. There is no insurance or government support that serves as ‘back up’ to regain lost limbs and homes.¶ But what about the idea that Assad will be so weakened by the ‘punishment’, that he will fall and be replaced? Well, as things stand, thanks in part to the policies of Saudi Arabia and our other ‘dictator friends’ in the region, the replacement government in Syria will consist of Islamic fanatics who see the United States as their number one enemy. Yes, we can have Assad, who hates us, or Islamic Fanatics, who hate us. Which do you prefer?¶ How did President Obama, a highly intelligent person with degrees from the best universities in the world, come to this situation? I see President Obama and his advisers as very well intentioned. The major problem is that they, like all other educated politicians, have read about groupthink, a kind of thinking that takes place when the need for ‘getting along’ in a decision making group overcomes a critical and realistic assessment of the situation, but assume that they themselves are immune. Of course THEY are not subject to groupthink, so they assume - unfortunately for the world.¶ The Achilles Heel of politicians, even the smartest ones, is that they do not take the steps that are necessary to overcome groupthink – such as including critical outside voices in their discussions, especially the ones leading to historic decisions.¶ So, here we are in a lose-lose situation, again. President Obama can gain a political victory by getting Congressional approval and launching a ‘limited’ strike on Syria, but the larger war is not being won. Whoever is in the White House needs to do more to overcome groupthink, not just by being intelligent enough to read and discuss the research, but by being street-smart enough to take the practical steps needed to avoid lose-lose situations – like our current situation vis-à-vis Syria.

# 2AC

### Negligence

#### Mueller is wrong

Allison 2007 Graham Allison, Director – Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs, Professor of Government, and Faculty Chair of the Dubai Initiative – Harvard University’s Kennedy School of Government, “Symposium: Apocalypse When?”, The National Interest, November / December 2007, Lexis

MUELLER IS entitled to his opinion that the threat of nuclear proliferation and nuclear terrorism is "exaggerated" and "overwrought." But analysts of various political persuasions, in and out of government, are virtually unanimous in their judgment to the contrary. As the national-security community learned during the Cold War, risk = likelihood x consequences. Thus, even when the likelihood of nuclear Armageddon was small, the consequences were so catastrophic that prudent policymakers felt a categorical imperative to do everything that feasibly could be done to prevent that war. Today, a single nuclear bomb exploding in just one city would change our world. Given such consequences, differences between a 1 percent and a 20 percent likelihood of such an attack are relatively insignificant when considering how we should respond to the threat. Richard Garwin, a designer of the hydrogen bomb who Enrico Fermi once called "the only true genius I had ever met", told Congress in March that he estimated a "20 percent per year probability [of a nuclear explosion-not just a contaminated, dirty bomb-a nuclear explosion] with American cities and European cities included." My Harvard colleague Matthew Bunn has created a model in the Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science that estimates the probability of a nuclear terrorist attack over a ten-year period to be 29 percent-identical to the average estimate from a poll of security experts commissioned by Senator Richard Lugar in 2005. My book, Nuclear Terrorism, states my own best judgment that, on the current trend line, the chances of a nuclear terrorist attack in the next decade are greater than 50 percent. Former Secretary of Defense William Perry has expressed his own view that my work may even underestimate the risk. Warren Buffet, the world's most successful investor and legendary odds-maker in pricing insurance policies for unlikely but catastrophic events, concluded that nuclear terrorism is "inevitable." He stated, "I don't see any way that it won't happen." To assess the threat one must answer five core questions: who, what, where, when and how? Who could be planning a nuclear terrorist attack? Al-Qaeda remains the leading candidate. According to the most recent National Intelligence Estimate (NIE), Al-Qaeda has been substantially reconstituted-but with its leadership having moved from a medieval Afghanistan to Pakistan-a nation that actually has nuclear weapons. As former CIA Director George J. Tenet's memoir reports, Al-Qaeda's leadership has remained "singularly focused on acquiring WMDs" and that "the main threat is the nuclear one." Tenet concluded, "I am convinced that this is where [Osama bin Laden] and his operatives want to go." What nuclear weapons could terrorists use? A ready-made weapon from the arsenal of one of the nuclear-weapons states or an elementary nuclear bomb constructed from highly enriched uranium made by a state remain most likely. As John Foster, a leading U.S. bomb-maker and former director of the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, wrote a quarter of a century ago, "If the essential nuclear materials are at hand, it is possible to make an atomic bomb using information that is available in the open literature." Where could terrorists acquire a nuclear bomb? If a nuclear attack occurs, Russia will be the most likely source of the weapon or material. A close second, however, is North Korea, which now has ten bombs worth of plutonium, or Pakistan with sixty nuclear bombs. Finally, research reactors in forty developing and transitional countries still hold the essential ingredient for nuclear weapons. When could terrorists launch the first nuclear attack? If terrorists bought or stole a nuclear weapon in good working condition, they could explode it today. If terrorists acquired one hundred pounds of highly enriched uranium, they could make a working elementary nuclear bomb in less than a year. How could terrorists deliver a nuclear weapon to its target? In the same way that illegal items come to our cities every day. As one of my former colleagues has quipped, if you have any doubt about the ability of terrorists to deliver a weapon to an American target, remember: They could hide it in a bale of marijuana.

### PQD

#### Congress is fast --- solves almost any crisis

Drum 2011 – Kevin Drum, Columnist for Mother Jones, “The (Lack of) Power of Congress”, Mother Jones, 3-21, http://www.motherjones.com/kevin-drum/2011/03/lack-power-congress

Rather, there are certain specific areas where Congress has deliberately given up its authority. Warmaking is one. Monetary policy is another. Detailed federal rulemaking is a third. Each has a different justification. In the case of war, the theory is that an active executive needs to act quickly, free of congressional dithering and endless committee hearings. In the case of monetary policy, the theory is that politics will inevitably get in the way of decent policy, so Congress should voluntarily restrain itself. In the case of rulemaking, the theory is that there are simply too many rules and it's impossible in practice for Congress to consider them all.

Each of these theories has problems. With very rare exceptions, there's enough time for Congress to consider a declaration of war. They've shown they can act within a day or two if a situation is especially urgent. In the case of monetary policy, Congress could easily provide more specific direction to the Fed even if they don't intervene in day-to-day open market operations. And Congress, if it wished, could insist that federal rules be bundled into packages and passed only after an up-or-down vote in the House and Senate, no amendments allowed.1

### NMS CP

**Framing: Permutations don’t have to be topical and counterplan competition should be based on the maximum action the CP allows, also cps have to be textually and functionally competitive**

**Perm: Do the counterplan then the plan**

**Time-based competition is bad: shifts debate away from the topic to time-sensitive uniqueness arguments, justifies delay CPs- makes it impossible to be AFF- and discourages argument depth. Also, “immediately” isn’t in the plan text.**

**Perm: do the counterplan**

**Certainty-based competition is bad: makes it impossible to weigh the AFF; there are infinite, unpredictable conditions, shifts debate away from the topic, and “should” does not mean ‘mandatory.’**

**Atlas, 1999** (Collaboration, “Use of shall, should, may can” rd13doc.cern.ch/Atlas/DaqSoft/sde/inspect/shall.html)

shall' describes something that is mandatory. If a requirement uses 'shall', then that requirement \_will\_ be satisfied without fail. Noncompliance is not allowed. Failure to comply with one single 'shall' is sufficient reason to reject the entire product. Indeed, it must be rejected under these circumstances. Examples: "Requirements shall make use of the word 'shall' only where compliance is mandatory." This is a good example. "C++ code shall have comments every 5th line." This is a bad example. Using 'shall' here is too strong. should 'should' is weaker. It describes something that might not be satisfied in the final product, but that is desirable enough that any noncompliance shall be explicitly justified. Any use of 'should' should be examined carefully, as it probably means that something is not being stated clearly. If a 'should' can be replaced by a 'shall', or can be discarded entirely, so much the better.

#### Doesn’t solve PQD

#### Supreme Court key to signaling

Feldman 2008 (Noah Feldman, law professor at Harvard University and an adjunct senior fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations, September 28, 2008, “When Judges Make Foreign Policy,” New York Times, http://www.nytimes.com/2008/09/28/magazine/28law-t.html?pagewanted=all&\_r=0)

Every generation gets the Constitution that it deserves. As the central preoccupations of an era make their way into the legal system, the Supreme Court eventually weighs in, and nine lawyers in robes become oracles of our national identity. The 1930s had the Great Depression and the Supreme Court’s “switch in time” from mandating a laissez-faire economy to allowing New Deal regulation. The 1950s had the rise of the civil rights movement and Brown v. Board of Education. The 1970s had the struggle for personal autonomy and Roe v. Wade. Over the last two centuries, the court’s decisions, ranging from the dreadful to the inspiring, have always reflected and shaped who “we the people” think we are.¶ During the boom years of the 1990s, globalization emerged as the most significant development in our national life. With Nafta and the Internet and big-box stores selling cheap goods from China, the line between national and international began to blur. In the seven years since 9/11, the question of how we relate to the world beyond our borders — and how we should — has become inescapable. The Supreme Court, as ever, is beginning to offer its own answers. As the United States tries to balance the benefits of multilateral alliances with the demands of unilateral self-protection, the court has started to address the legal counterparts of such existential matters. It is becoming increasingly clear that the defining constitutional problem for the present generation will be the nature of the relationship of the United States to what is somewhat optimistically called the international order.

#### Pentagon says no

Bergmann 2010 (Max Bergmann, January 12, 2010, “Shifting Nuclear Strategy To Focus On Nuclear Terrorism,” Think Progress, http://thinkprogress.org/security/2010/01/12/175837/shifting-nuclear-strategy-to-focus-on-nuclear-terrorism/)

And there is the rub – this “additional money” could be shifted from traditional nuclear weapons programs, leading those entrenched in the nuclear bureaucracy within the Pentagon are pushing back. The Cable reported that the Pentagon’s approach to the NPR amounted to stonewalling, “the Pentagon is said to be against reducing the overall U.S. nuclear arsenal.” The Washington Times quoting a conservative Pentagon source:¶ The official said nuclear weapons opponents in the Obama administration are seeking to use the NPR to try to advance the president’s goal of making radical cuts in nuclear weapons. Defense and national security officials are advocating a review that will “defend the country,” the official said.¶ Only to someone so entrenched in a bureaucracy, would an effort to reduce nuclear arsenals and shift our focus to nuclear terrorism constitute “radical.” The only way this would be a “radical” shift is if the President was pushing for unilateral nuclear cuts (which he isn’t) or if it was 1980 and the Soviet Union was still at its zenith. But it is 2010 and the credible threats facing this country don’t involve a nuclear exchange with Russia, but a nuclear terror attack stemming from insecure nuclear stockpiles. 538’s Nate Silver writing in the Wall Street Journal concluded that the hysteria around the underpants bomber was severely misplaced, but that:¶ a more rational anti-terrorism policy would focus resources heavily, perhaps almost exclusively, on threats of nuclear and weapons of mass destruction terror. The good news is that, because it requires so much coordination to acquire fissile material, build a nuclear weapon, and successfully detonate it, the international community has many opportunities to stop such catastrophes before they occur—although Mr. [Graham] Allison and other experts contend that present efforts are inadequate.

#### DOD says no

Bautista 2009 (Cara Bautista, October 15, 2009, “179 Organizations Ask Obama for a Transformational Nuclear Posture Review,” Peace Action West, http://blog.peaceactionwest.org/2009/10/15/179-organizations-ask-obama-for-a-transformational-nuclear-posture-review/)

The letter from organizations is especially important because there are signs of internal divisions within the Obama administration over the direction of the Nuclear Posture Review. In the president’s speech to the U.N. General Assembly, Obama stated that the U.S. “will complete a Nuclear Posture Review that opens the door to deeper cuts and reduces the role of nuclear weapons.” However, entrenched bureaucratic interests at the Department of Defense are pushing to maintain Cold War thinking and policies. At an Air Force Association conference in September, Secretary of Defense Gates spoke in favor of modernizing the U.S. nuclear weapons arsenal, including supporting new warhead designs.

#### That’s decisive--- game over

Nolan 2008 (Janne E. Nolan and James R. Holmes, March/April 2008, “The bureaucracy of deterrence,” The Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, Vol. 64, No. 1, p. 40-43, 55-58)

Only the top leadership of an institution has much chance of instituting ¶ change. That said, the need to exercise ¶ genuine authority and deflate potentially fatal resistance requires leaders ¶ to understand the inner workings of the ¶ institutions they hope to reform. Inserting political appointees gives presidents ¶ the opportunity to institute real change ¶ only if they take an active interest in setting strategic priorities, and if they stand ¶ behind their appointees when resistance ¶ coalesces in the ranks—as it will.¶ Reshaping nuclear strategy is a difficult undertaking, not because the Pentagon is uniquely prone to bureaucratic ¶ politicking, but because it is so big and ¶ consequential. The resources funneled ¶ into defense annually have risen rapidly ¶ in the last three decades. It is difficult for ¶ Congress, let alone the public, to amass ¶ enough expertise to evaluate specific ¶ weapons programs or their price tags. ¶ Legislators seldom immerse themselves ¶ in such details. Along with bigger budget, the Pentagon has gained in relative influence over other parts of the executive ¶ branch as a result of a succession of military interventions, from the Balkans in the ¶ 1990s to Afghanistan and Iraq today.

### Heg DA

#### Aff makes heg sustainable--- legitimacy offsets material decline

Kagan 2004 (Robert Kagan, senior associate at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, January 24, 2004, “A Tougher War For the U.S. Is One Of Legitimacy,” New York Times, http://www.nytimes.com/2004/01/24/books/a-tougher-war-for-the-us-is-one-of-legitimacy.html?pagewanted=all&src=pm)

Today a darker possibility looms. A great philosophical schism has opened within the West, and instead of mutual indifference, mutual antagonism threatens to debilitate both sides of the trans-Atlantic community. Coming at a time in history when new dangers and crises are proliferating, this schism could have serious consequences. For Europe and the United States to decouple strategically has been bad enough. But what if the schism over ''world order'' infects the rest of what we have known as the liberal West? Will the West still be the West?¶ It is the legitimacy of American power and American global leadership that has come to be doubted by a majority of Europeans. America, for the first time since World War II, is suffering a crisis of international legitimacy.¶ Americans will find that they cannot ignore this problem. The struggle to define and obtain international legitimacy in this new era may prove to be among the critical contests of our time, in some ways as significant in determining the future of the international system and America's place in it as any purely material measure of power and influence.¶ Americans for much of the past three centuries have considered themselves the vanguard of a worldwide liberal revolution. Their foreign policy from the beginning has not been only about defending and promoting their material national interests. ''We fight not just for ourselves but for all mankind,'' Benjamin Franklin declared of the American Revolution, and whether or not that has always been true, most Americans have always wanted to believe that it is true. There can be no clear dividing line between the domestic and the foreign, therefore, and no clear distinction between what the democratic world thinks about America and what Americans think about themselves.¶ Every profound foreign policy debate in America's history, from the time when Jefferson squared off against Hamilton, has ultimately been a debate about the nation's identity and has posed for Americans the primal question ''Who are we?'' Because Americans do care, the steady denial of international legitimacy by fellow democracies will over time become debilitating and perhaps even paralyzing.¶ Americans therefore cannot ignore the unipolar predicament. Perhaps the singular failure of the Bush administration is that it has been too slow to recognize this. Mr. Bush and his advisers came to office guided by the narrow realism that dominated in Republican foreign policy circles during the Clinton years. The Clinton administration, Condoleezza Rice, the national security adviser, wrote in a famous essay in January 2000, had failed to focus on the ''national interest'' and instead had addressed itself to ''humanitarian interests'' or the interests of ''the international community.'' The Bush administration, by contrast, would take a fresh look at all treaties, obligations and alliances and re-evaluate them in terms of America's ''national interest.''¶ The notion that the United States could take such a narrow view of its ''national interest'' has always been mistaken. But besides being an analytical error, the enunciation of this ''realist'' approach by the sole superpower in a unipolar era was a serious foreign policy error. The global hegemon cannot proclaim to the world that it will be guided only by its own definition of its ''national interest.''¶ This is precisely what even America's closest friends fear: that the United States will wield its unprecedented vast power only for itself. In her essay, Ms. Rice derided ''the belief that the United States is exercising power legitimately only when it is doing so on behalf of someone or something else.'' But for the rest of the world, what other source of legitimacy can there be? When the United States acts in its own interests, Ms. Rice claimed, as would many Americans, it necessarily serves the interests of everyone.¶ ''To be sure,'' she argued, ''there is nothing wrong with doing something that benefits all humanity, but that is, in a sense, a second-order effect.''¶ But could even America's closest friends ever be persuaded that an America always pursuing its self-interest could be relied upon to serve their interests, too, as some kind of ''second-order effect''?¶ Both the unipolar predicament and the American character require a much more expansive definition of American interests. The United States can neither appear to be acting only in its self-interest, nor can it in fact act as if its own national interest were all that mattered. Even at times of dire emergency, and perhaps especially at those times, the world's sole superpower needs to demonstrate that it wields its great power on behalf of its principles and all who share them.

#### Hegemony solves great power wars

Thayer 2006 (Bradley A. Thayer, Missouri State University Defense and Strategic Studies Institute, November/December, 2006 “In Defense of Primacy,” NATIONAL INTEREST Issue 86)

THROUGHOUT HISTORY, peace and stability have been great benefits of an era where there was a dominant power--Rome, Britain or the United States today. Scholars and statesmen have long recognized the irenic effect of power on the anarchic world of international politics. Everything we think of when we consider the current international order--free trade, a robust monetary regime, increasing respect for human rights, growing democratization--is directly linked to U.S. power. Retrenchment proponents seem to think that the current system can be maintained without the current amount of U.S. power behind it. In that they are dead wrong and need to be reminded of one of history's most significant lessons: Appalling things happen when international orders collapse. The Dark Ages followed Rome's collapse. Hitler succeeded the order established at Versailles. Without U.S. power, the liberal order created by the United States will end just as assuredly. As country and western great Ral Donner sang: "You don't know what you've got (until you lose it)." Consequently, it is important to note what those good things are. In addition to ensuring the security of the United States and its allies, American primacy within the international system causes many positive outcomes for Washington and the world. The first has been a more peaceful world. During the Cold War, U.S. leadership reduced friction among many states that were historical antagonists, most notably France and West Germany. Today, American primacy helps keep a number of complicated relationships aligned--between Greece and Turkey, Israel and Egypt, South Korea and Japan, India and Pakistan, Indonesia and Australia. This is not to say it fulfills Woodrow Wilson's vision of ending all war. Wars still occur where Washington's interests are not seriously threatened, such as in Darfur, but a Pax Americana does reduce war's likelihood, particularly war's worst form: great power wars. Second, American power gives the United States the ability to spread democracy and other elements of its ideology of liberalism: Doing so is a source of much good for the countries concerned as well as the United States because, as John Owen noted on these pages in the Spring 2006 issue, liberal democracies are more likely to align with the United States and be sympathetic to the American worldview.( n3) So, spreading democracy helps maintain U.S. primacy. In addition, once states are governed democratically, the likelihood of any type of conflict is significantly reduced. This is not because democracies do not have clashing interests. Indeed they do. Rather, it is because they are more open, more transparent and more likely to want to resolve things amicably in concurrence with U.S. leadership. And so, in general, democratic states are good for their citizens as well as for advancing the interests of the United States. Critics have faulted the Bush Administration for attempting to spread democracy in the Middle East, labeling such aft effort a modern form of tilting at windmills. It is the obligation of Bush's critics to explain why :democracy is good enough for Western states but not for the rest, and, one gathers from the argument, should not even be attempted. Of course, whether democracy in the Middle East will have a peaceful or stabilizing influence on America's interests in the short run is open to question. Perhaps democratic Arab states would be more opposed to Israel, but nonetheless, their people would be better off. The United States has brought democracy to Afghanistan, where 8.5 million Afghans, 40 percent of them women, voted in a critical October 2004 election, even though remnant Taliban forces threatened them. The first free elections were held in Iraq in January 2005. It was the military power of the United States that put Iraq on the path to democracy. Washington fostered democratic governments in Europe, Latin America, Asia and the Caucasus. Now even the Middle East is increasingly democratic. They may not yet look like Western-style democracies, but democratic progress has been made in Algeria, Morocco, Lebanon, Iraq, Kuwait, the Palestinian Authority and Egypt. By all accounts, the march of democracy has been impressive. Third, along with the growth in the number of democratic states around the world has been the growth of the global economy. With its allies, the United States has labored to create an economically liberal worldwide network characterized by free trade and commerce, respect for international property rights, and mobility of capital and labor markets. The economic stability and prosperity that stems from this economic order is a global public good from which all states benefit, particularly the poorest states in the Third World. The United States created this network not out of altruism but for the benefit and the economic well-being of America. This economic order forces American industries to be competitive, maximizes efficiencies and growth, and benefits defense as well because the size of the economy makes the defense burden manageable. Economic spin-offs foster the development of military technology, helping to ensure military prowess. Perhaps the greatest testament to the benefits of the economic network comes from Deepak Lal, a former Indian foreign service diplomat and researcher at the World Bank, who started his career confident in the socialist ideology of post-independence India. Abandoning the positions of his youth, Lal now recognizes that the only way to bring relief to desperately poor countries of the Third World is through the adoption of free market economic policies and globalization, which are facilitated through American primacy.( n4) As a witness to the failed alternative economic systems, Lal is one of the strongest academic proponents of American primacy due to the economic prosperity it provides. Fourth and finally, the United States, in seeking primacy, has been willing to use its power not only to advance its interests but to promote the welfare of people all over the globe. The United States is the earth's leading source of positive externalities for the world. The U.S. military has participated in over fifty operations since the end of the Cold War--and most of those missions have been humanitarian in nature. Indeed, the U.S. military is the earth's "911 force"--it serves, de facto, as the world's police, the global paramedic and the planet's fire department. Whenever there is a natural disaster, earthquake, flood, drought, volcanic eruption, typhoon or tsunami, the United States assists the countries in need. On the day after Christmas in 2004, a tremendous earthquake and tsunami occurred in the Indian Ocean near Sumatra, killing some 300,000 people. The United States was the first to respond with aid. Washington followed up with a large contribution of aid and deployed the U.S. military to South and Southeast Asia for many months to help with the aftermath of the disaster. About 20,000 U.S. soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines responded by providing water, food, medical aid, disease treatment and prevention as well as forensic assistance to help identify the bodies of those killed. Only the U.S. military could have accomplished this Herculean effort. No other force possesses the communications capabilities or global logistical reach of the U.S. military. In fact, UN peacekeeping operations depend on the United States to supply UN forces. American generosity has done more to help the United States fight the War on Terror than almost any other measure. Before the tsunami, 80 percent of Indonesian public opinion was opposed to the United States; after it, 80 percent had a favorable opinion of America. Two years after the disaster, and in poll after poll, Indonesians still have overwhelmingly positive views of the United States. In October 2005, an enormous earthquake struck Kashmir, killing about 74 000 people and leaving three million homeless. The U.S. military responded immediately, diverting helicopters fighting the War on Terror in nearby Afghanistan to bring relief as soon as possible To help those in need, the United States also provided financial aid to Pakistan; and, as one might expect from those witnessing the munificence of the United States, it left a lasting impression about America. For the first time since 9/11, polls of Pakistani opinion have found that more people are favorable toward the United States than unfavorable, while support for Al-Qaeda dropped to its lowest level. Whether in Indonesia or Kashmir, the money was well-spent because it helped people in the wake of disasters, but it also had a real impact on the War on Terror. When people in the Muslim world witness the U.S. military conducting a humanitarian mission, there is a clearly positive impact on Muslim opinion of the United States. As the War on Terror is a war of ideas and opinion as much as military action, for the United States humanitarian missions are the equivalent of a blitzkrieg.

#### No offshore balancing---- Decline causes numerous nuclear wars

Brzezinski 2012 Zbigniew K. Brzezinski (CSIS counselor and trustee and cochairs the CSIS Advisory Board. He is also the Robert E. Osgood Professor of American Foreign Policy at the School of Advanced International Studies, Johns Hopkins University, in Washington, D.C. He is cochair of the American Committee for Peace in the Caucasus and a member of the International Advisory Board of the Atlantic Council. He is a former chairman of the American-Ukrainian Advisory Committee. He was a member of the Policy Planning Council of the Department of State from 1966 to 1968; chairman of the Humphrey Foreign Policy Task Force in the 1968 presidential campaign; director of the Trilateral Commission from 1973 to 1976; and principal foreign policy adviser to Jimmy Carter in the 1976 presidential campaign. From 1977 to 1981, Dr. Brzezinski was national security adviser to President Jimmy Carter. In 1981, he was awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom for his role in the normalization of U.S.-China relations and for his contributions to the human rights and national security policies of the United States. He was also a member of the President’s Chemical Warfare Commission (1985), the National Security Council–Defense Department Commission on Integrated Long-Term Strategy (1987–1988), and the President’s Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board (1987–1989). In 1988, he was cochairman of the Bush National Security Advisory Task Force, and in 2004, he was cochairman of a Council on Foreign Relations task force that issued the report Iran: Time for a New Approach. Dr. Brzezinski received a B.A. and M.A. from McGill University (1949, 1950) and Ph.D. from Harvard University (1953). He was a member of the faculties of Columbia University (1960–1989) and Harvard University (1953–1960). Dr. Brzezinski holds honorary degrees from Georgetown University, Williams College, Fordham University, College of the Holy Cross, Alliance College, the Catholic University of Lublin, Warsaw University, and Vilnius University. He is the recipient of numerous honors and awards) February 2012 “After America” http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/01/03/after\_america?page=0,0

For if America falters, the world is unlikely to be dominated by a single preeminent successor -- not even China. International uncertainty, increased tension among global competitors, and even outright chaos would be far more likely outcomes. While a sudden, massive crisis of the American system -- for instance, another financial crisis -- would produce a fast-moving chain reaction leading to global political and economic disorder, a steady drift by America into increasingly pervasive decay or endlessly widening warfare with Islam would be unlikely to produce, even by 2025, an effective global successor. No single power will be ready by then to exercise the role that the world, upon the fall of the Soviet Union in 1991, expected the United States to play: the leader of a new, globally cooperative world order. More probable would be a protracted phase of rather inconclusive realignments of both global and regional power, with no grand winners and many more losers, in a setting of international uncertainty and even of potentially fatal risks to global well-being. Rather than a world where dreams of democracy flourish, a Hobbesian world of enhanced national security based on varying fusions of authoritarianism, nationalism, and religion could ensue. RELATED 8 Geopolitically Endangered Species The leaders of the world's second-rank powers, among them India, Japan, Russia, and some European countries, are already assessing the potential impact of U.S. decline on their respective national interests. The Japanese, fearful of an assertive China dominating the Asian mainland, may be thinking of closer links with Europe. Leaders in India and Japan may be considering closer political and even military cooperation in case America falters and China rises. Russia, while perhaps engaging in wishful thinking (even schadenfreude) about America's uncertain prospects, will almost certainly have its eye on the independent states of the former Soviet Union. Europe, not yet cohesive, would likely be pulled in several directions: Germany and Italy toward Russia because of commercial interests, France and insecure Central Europe in favor of a politically tighter European Union, and Britain toward manipulating a balance within the EU while preserving its special relationship with a declining United States. Others may move more rapidly to carve out their own regional spheres: Turkey in the area of the old Ottoman Empire, Brazil in the Southern Hemisphere, and so forth. None of these countries, however, will have the requisite combination of economic, financial, technological, and military power even to consider inheriting America's leading role. China, invariably mentioned as America's prospective successor, has an impressive imperial lineage and a strategic tradition of carefully calibrated patience, both of which have been critical to its overwhelmingly successful, several-thousand-year-long history. China thus prudently accepts the existing international system, even if it does not view the prevailing hierarchy as permanent. It recognizes that success depends not on the system's dramatic collapse but on its evolution toward a gradual redistribution of power. Moreover, the basic reality is that China is not yet ready to assume in full America's role in the world. Beijing's leaders themselves have repeatedly emphasized that on every important measure of development, wealth, and power, China will still be a modernizing and developing state several decades from now, significantly behind not only the United States but also Europe and Japan in the major per capita indices of modernity and national power. Accordingly, Chinese leaders have been restrained in laying any overt claims to global leadership. At some stage, however, a more assertive Chinese nationalism could arise and damage China's international interests. A swaggering, nationalistic Beijing would unintentionally mobilize a powerful regional coalition against itself. None of China's key neighbors -- India, Japan, and Russia -- is ready to acknowledge China's entitlement to America's place on the global totem pole. They might even seek support from a waning America to offset an overly assertive China. The resulting regional scramble could become intense, especially given the similar nationalistic tendencies among China's neighbors. A phase of acute international tension in Asia could ensue. Asia of the 21st century could then begin to resemble Europe of the 20th century -- violent and bloodthirsty. At the same time, the security of a number of weaker states located geographically next to major regional powers also depends on the international status quo reinforced by America's global preeminence -- and would be made significantly more vulnerable in proportion to America's decline. The states in that exposed position -- including Georgia, Taiwan, South Korea, Belarus, Ukraine, Afghanistan, Pakistan, Israel, and the greater Middle East -- are today's geopolitical equivalents of nature's most endangered species. Their fates are closely tied to the nature of the international environment left behind by a waning America, be it ordered and restrained or, much more likely, self-serving and expansionist. A faltering United States could also find its strategic partnership with Mexico in jeopardy. America's economic resilience and political stability have so far mitigated many of the challenges posed by such sensitive neighborhood issues as economic dependence, immigration, and the narcotics trade. A decline in American power, however, would likely undermine the health and good judgment of the U.S. economic and political systems. A waning United States would likely be more nationalistic, more defensive about its national identity, more paranoid about its homeland security, and less willing to sacrifice resources for the sake of others' development. The worsening of relations between a declining America and an internally troubled Mexico could even give rise to a particularly ominous phenomenon: the emergence, as a major issue in nationalistically aroused Mexican politics, of territorial claims justified by history and ignited by cross-border incidents. Another consequence of American decline could be a corrosion of the generally cooperative management of the global commons -- shared interests such as sea lanes, space, cyberspace, and the environment, whose protection is imperative to the long-term growth of the global economy and the continuation of basic geopolitical stability. In almost every case, the potential absence of a constructive and influential U.S. role would fatally undermine the essential communality of the global commons because the superiority and ubiquity of American power creates order where there would normally be conflict. None of this will necessarily come to pass. Nor is the concern that America's decline would generate global insecurity, endanger some vulnerable states, and produce a more troubled North American neighborhood an argument for U.S. global supremacy. In fact, the strategic complexities of the world in the 21st century make such supremacy unattainable. But those dreaming today of America's collapse would probably come to regret it. And as the world after America would be increasingly complicated and chaotic, it is imperative that the United States pursue a new, timely strategic vision for its foreign policy -- or start bracing itself for a dangerous slide into global turmoil.

#### Legitimacy is solves failed states and the environment

Loomis 2008 (Andrew Joseph Loomis, PhD in Government from Georgetown, August 4, 2008, “LEVERAGING LEGITIMACY IN SECURING U.S. LEADERSHIP: NORMATIVE DIMENSIONS OF HEGEMONIC AUTHORITY,” http://repository.library.georgetown.edu/bitstream/handle/10822/553090/loomisAndrewJoseph.pdf?sequence=1)

The results of this study suggest that U.S. authority levels vary with public ¶ perceptions of legitimacy, casting doubt on claims that ideational variables in the form of ¶ international perceptions of the legitimacy of U.S. policy are inconsequential with respect to ¶ the efficacy of U.S. foreign policy and alliance maintenance. These findings suggest that the ¶ United States would strengthen its authority by constructing policy that is sensitive to the ¶ international public voice. The need for allies is self-evident in the turbulent contemporary ¶ environment and most intractable international problems cannot be solved by the United ¶ States alone. Intelligence deficiencies, drug and human trafficking, proliferation of weapons ¶ of mass destruction, failing states, ethnic violence, and environmental catastrophe all ¶ demand joint responses by the world’s most capable countries. The question of what holds ¶ alliances together has immediate importance. The implications of this research suggest the ¶ need for policymakers to reassess the relevance of legitimate behavior and the impact that ¶ administration policy has on U.S. leadership among its allies.

#### Extinction

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

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

#### Extinction

Clark 2006 (Dana Clark, Center for International Environmental Law, and David Downes, US Interior Dept. Policy Analysis Senior Trade Advisor, 2006, What price biodiversity?, http://www.ciel.org/Publications/summary.html)

Biodiversity is the diversity of life on earth, on which we depend for our survival. The variability of and within species and ecosystems helps provide some of our basic needs: food, shelter, and medicine, as well as recreational, cultural, spiritual and aesthetic benefits. Diverse ecosystems create the air we breathe, enrich the soil we till and purify the water we drink. Ecosystems also regulate local and global climate. No one can seriously argue that biodiversity is not valuable.¶ Nor can anyone seriously argue that biodiversity is not at risk. There are over 900 domestic species listed as threatened or endangered under the Endangered Species Act, and 4,000 additional species are candidates for listing. We are losing species as a result of human activities at hundreds of times the natural rate of extinction. The current rate of extinction is the highest since the mass extinction of species that wiped out the dinosaurs millions of years ago.¶ The Economics of Biodiversity Conservation ¶ The question which engenders serious controversy is whether society can afford the costs associated with saving biodiversity. Opponents of biodiversity conservation argue that the costs of protecting endangered species are too high. They complain that the regulatory burden on private landowners is too heavy, and that conservation measures impede development. They seek to override scientific determinations with economic considerations, and to impose cost/benefit analyses on biodiversity policy making.¶ An equally important question, however, is whether we can afford not to save biodiversity. The consequences of losing this critical resource could be devastating. As we destroy species and habitat, we endanger food supplies (such as crop varieties that impart resistance to disease, or the loss of spawning grounds for fish and shellfish); we lose the opportunity to develop new medicines or other chemicals; and we impair critical ecosystem functions that protect our water supplies, create the air we breathe, regulate climate and shelter us from storms. We lose creatures of cultural importance - the bald eagle is an example of the cultural significance of biodiversity and also of the need for strong regulations to protect species from extinction. And, we lose the opportunity for mental or spiritual rejuvenation through contact with nature.

### CMR DA

#### No impact--- their ev is about Abraham Lincoln and says deference is bad

#### Empirically denied – Giardina firing was unprecedented link thumper – proves resilience & the need for the aff

Thomas Gaist 10-19-13

http://www.wsws.org/en/articles/2013/10/19/nuke-o19.html US government, media silent on sacking of top nuclear officers

A report on the firing of Vice Admiral Tim Giardina in the Marine Corps Times noted that such an event “is exceedingly rare and perhaps unprecedented in the history of U.S. Strategic Command, which is responsible for all American nuclear war fighting forces, including nuclear-armed submarines, bombers and land-based missiles.” Speaking to the WSWS, Peter Feaver, Professor of Political Science at Duke University and Director of the Duke Program in American Grand Strategy, observed: “If you look over the last 4-5 years there have been quite a few senior officers who have been relieved for cause, quite a number of those in the last several years… The military has been struggling to come to terms with why there are so many firings.” Feaver’s remarks point to anger in the military over the extraordinary number of high-ranking officers who have been sacked with little or no public explanation. Other top officers removed from command positions under Obama include General James Mattis, Maj. General Mark Gurganus, Maj. General Gregg Sturdevant, General Stanley A. McChrystal and General David Petraeus. McChrystal was removed as commander of US occupation forces in Afghanistan after making fun of Vice President Joe Biden in an interview with Rolling Stone, while Petraeus—a former commander of US forces in Iraq—was replaced, ostensibly due to a sex scandal. Carey was fired by the US Air Force on October 11. He commanded the 20th Air Force, including 450 intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs) in silos across the northern US. Carey was on an unspecified “temporary duty assignment” at the time of the alleged infraction. Though US officials suggested alcohol was involved, they also denied that Carey had an alcohol problem. It remains unclear why he was sacked. Vice Admiral James Giardina was second in command of the US Strategic Command, having previously commanded a squadron of 10 Trident submarines armed with nuclear warheads. He allegedly was dismissed for playing at a casino with $1,500 worth of fake gambling chips.

#### Sequester thumps the internal link credibility

Peter Feaver Monday, October 14, 2013

http://shadow.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2013/10/14/how\_to\_better\_navigate\_the\_coming\_civil\_military\_challenges How to Better Navigate the Coming Civil-Military Challenges

Curiously, Zenko left off what is arguably the most important driver of civil-military tensions, now and especially going forward: the persistent fiscal crisis that has resulted in sequestration. Sequestration was designed to be something so horrible that it never would be implemented. Almost everyone in the Defense Department, whether in or out of uniform, still views it that way. But there is a growing sense that the White House, and the commander in chief in particular, has come to view the first round of sequestration as tolerable. Worse, the president's refusal to negotiate with Republicans has raised fears that perhaps he is willing to prolong sequestration, at least insofar as it applies to the Defense Department. This is a real civil-military problem -- much more consequential than the Obama administration's odd decision to prevent World War II veterans from visiting their open-air monument as a way of ratcheting up pressure on Republicans. Harassing wheelchair vets makes for compelling television, but imposing arbitrary cuts on the order of hundreds of billions of dollars across the FYDP undermines national security. There is no question which hurts civil-military relations more.

#### No link – CMR resilient through honest adverse decisions

Peter Feaver Monday, October 14, 2013

http://shadow.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2013/10/14/how\_to\_better\_navigate\_the\_coming\_civil\_military\_challenges How to Better Navigate the Coming Civil-Military Challenges

Third, while the president is free to decide issues of policy irrespective of the advice he receives from the military, he should take greater pains not to misrepresent what that advice actually is. As far as civil-military relations go, this was Obama's biggest foul in the Syria episode. When Obama decided to reverse course and delay the planned airstrikes, he explicitly claimed that Gen. Martin Dempsey had told him the delay would not matter. Obama and his White House staff went on at some length to justify the decision in Dempsey's counsel, but in doing so they fundamentally misrepresented the content of Dempsey's advice, as Dempsey's subsequent congressional testimony makes clear (see also here). The president's prerogative to overrule his generals is a precious aspect of civilian control. But it will lead to civil-military conflict when the military believes that civilians are not just choosing to go in a direction other than what the military advises, but are actively misleading others about what that advice was in the first place. The more budget cuts require civilians to make painful choices across military programs and choose between competing military counsels, the more important preserving this principle, and all its associated obligations on civilians, will become.

#### Deference kills civil-military relations and separation of power

Gilbert 1998 (Michael H. Gilbert, Lieutenant Colonel USAF Academy; MSBA, Boston University; J.D., McGeorge School of Law; LL.M., Harvard Law School, “The Military and the Federal Judiciary: an Unexplored Part of the Civil-Military Relations Triangle,” USAFA Journal of Legal Studies, Lexis)

The legislative, executive, and judicial branches of the federal government comprise and form a triangle surrounding the military, each branch occupying one side of the civil-military triangle. Commentators have written countless pages discussing, analyzing, and describing the civil-military relationship that the Congress and the President have with the armed forces they respectively regulate and command. Most commentators, however, have neglected to consider the crucial position and role of the federal judiciary. This article examines the relationship between the judiciary and the military in the interest of identifying the role that the judiciary, specifically the United States Supreme Court, plays in civil-military relations.¶ Without an actual, meaningful presence of the judiciary as a leg of the civil-military triangle, the triangle is incomplete and collapses. In its current structure, the judiciary has adopted a non-role by deferring its responsibility to oversee the lawfulness of the other two branches to those branches themselves. This dereliction, which arguably is created by the malfeasance of the United States Supreme Court, has resulted in inherent inequities to the nation, in general, and to service members, in particular, as the federal courts are reluctant to protect even basic civil rights of military members. Judicial oversight is one form of civilian control over the military; abrogating this responsibility is to return power to the military hierarchy that is not meant to be theirs.

#### Legitimacy operational readiness

Knowles 2009 (Robert Knowles, Acting Assistant Professor, New York University School of Law, 41 Ariz. St. L.J. 87 American Hegemony and the Foreign Affairs Constitution)

The hegemonic model also reduces the need for executive branch flexibility, and the institutional competence terrain shifts toward the courts. The stability of the current U.S.-led international system depends on the ability of the U.S. to govern effectively. Effective governance depends on, among other things, predictability.421 G. John Ikenberry analogizes America's hegemonic position to that of a “giant corporation” seeking foreign investors: “The rule of law and the institutions of policy making in a democracy are the political equivalent of corporate transparency and accountability.”422 Stable interpretation of the law bolsters the stability of the system because other nations will know that they can rely on those interpretations and that there will be at least some degree of enforcement by the United States. At the same time, the separation of powers serves the global-governance function by reducing the ability of the executive branch to make “abrupt or aggressive moves toward other states.”423¶ The Bush Administration’s detainee policy, for all of its virtues and faults, was an exceedingly aggressive departure from existing norms, and was therefore bound to generate intense controversy. It was formulated quickly, by a small group of policy-makers and legal advisors without consulting Congress and over the objections of even some within the executive branch.424 Although the Administration invoked the law of armed conflict to justify its detention of enemy combatants, it did not seem to recognize limits imposed by that law.425 Most significantly, it designed the detention scheme around interrogation rather than incapacitation and excluded the detainees from all legal protections of the Geneva Conventions.426 It declared all detainees at Guantánamo to be “enemy combatants” without establishing a regularized process for making an individual determination for each detainee.427 And when it established the military commissions, also without consulting Congress, the Administration denied defendants important procedural protections.428¶ In an anarchic world characterized by great power conflict, one could make the argument that the executive branch requires maximum flexibility to defeat the enemy, who may not adhere to international law. Indeed, the precedents relied on most heavily by the Administration in the enemy combatant cases date from the 1930s and 1940s—a period when the international system was radically unstable, and the United States was one of several great powers vying for advantage.429 But during that time, the executive branch faced much more exogenous pressure from other great powers to comply with international law in the treatment of captured enemies. If the United States strayed too far from established norms, it would risk retaliation upon its own soldiers or other consequences from powerful rivals. Today, there are no such constraints: enemies such as al Qaeda are not great powers and are not likely to obey international law anyway. Instead, the danger is that American rule-breaking will set a pattern of rule-breaking for the world, leading to instability.430 America’s military predominance enables it to set the rules of the game. When the U.S. breaks its own rules, it loses legitimacy.
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#### We control uniqueness – wars are declining now – your theoretical impacts don’t match reality

Marshall and Cole 2009 Monty G. Marshall (Research Professor in the George Mason University School of Public Policy and Director of Research at the Center for Global Policy) and Benjamin R Cole (Hood House Lecturer in International Affairs at the University of New Hampshire, He holds B.A. and M.A. degrees in Political Science from the University of New Hampshire and is completing his doctoral studies in the School of Public Policy at George Mason University) 2009 “Global Report 2009 Conflict, Governance, and State Fragility” pg 7-8, http://www.systemicpeace.org/Global%20Report%202009.pdf

The most encompassing observation that can be made regarding global system performance in regard to the conflict dimension concerns the status of major episodes of political violence (armed conflict). These include societal (civil, ethnic, and communal) and interstate (including independence) warfare.3 The global trend in major armed conflict has continued its dramatic decline during the globalization era both in numbers of states affected by major armed conflicts and in total magnitude (figure 3). According to our calculations, the global magnitude of warfare has decreased by over sixty percent since peaking in the mid-1980s, falling by the end of 2009 to its lowest level since 1960. Societal warfare has been the predominant mode of warfare since the mid-1950s; increasing steeply and steadily through the Cold War period. This steep, linear increase in societal warfare is largely explained by a general tendency toward longer, more protracted, wars during that period; internal wars often receiving crucial military and/or material support from foreign states, in many cases linked to the competing superpowers. In contrast, the rate of onset of new societal wars has remained constant since 1946 to the present with an average of about four new societal wars per year. In contrast, the global trend in interstate warfare has remained at a relatively low level since the end of the Second World War and the establishment of the United Nations Organization (UN). The UN was specially designed to “maintain international peace and security” without “interven[ing] in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state.” Although there was a moderate increase in interstate wars during the latter years of the Cold War, from 1977 to 1987, like civil warfare, interstate warfare has also declined substantially since the end of the Cold War. Of the interstate wars that took place during the Cold War period, many of the most serious were wars of independence fought during the decolonization phase that occurred during the first half of the Cold War period. Of the conventional interstate wars, onsets occurred at the rate of about one event per year, although onsets occurred at about double that rate during the late 1970s and early 1980s. Of sixty seven such wars, three-quarters remained at fairly low levels of violence.

#### Violence is decreasing due to hegemony- DA to the alt

Drezner 2005 Daniel W. Drezner Associate Professor of International Politics at the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy at Tufts University May 25, 2005 “Gregg Easterbrook, war, and the dangers of extrapolation” http://www.danieldrezner.com/archives/002087.html

The University of Maryland studies find the number of wars and armed conflicts worldwide peaked in 1991 at 51, which may represent the most wars happening simultaneously at any point in history. Since 1991, the number has fallen steadily. There were 26 armed conflicts in 2000 and 25 in 2002, even after the Al Qaeda attack on the United States and the U.S. counterattack against Afghanistan. By 2004, Marshall and Gurr's latest study shows, the number of armed conflicts in the world had declined to 20, even after the invasion of Iraq. All told, there were less than half as many wars in 2004 as there were in 1991. Marshall and Gurr also have a second ranking, gauging the magnitude of fighting. This section of the report is more subjective. Everyone agrees that the worst moment for human conflict was World War II; but how to rank, say, the current separatist fighting in Indonesia versus, say, the Algerian war of independence is more speculative. Nevertheless, the Peace and Conflict studies name 1991 as the peak post-World War II year for totality of global fighting, giving that year a ranking of 179 on a scale that rates the extent and destructiveness of combat. By 2000, in spite of war in the Balkans and genocide in Rwanda, the number had fallen to 97; by 2002 to 81; and, at the end of 2004, it stood at 65. This suggests the extent and intensity of global combat is now less than half what it was 15 years ago. Easterbrook spends the rest of the essay postulating the causes of this -- the decline in great power war, the spread of democracies, the growth of economic interdependence, and even the peacekeeping capabilities of the United Nations. Easterbrook makes a lot of good points -- most people are genuinely shocked when they are told that even in a post-9/11 climate, there has been a steady and persistent decline in wars and deaths from wars. That said, what bothers me in the piece is what Easterbrook leaves out. First, he neglects to mention the biggest reason for why war is on the decline -- there's a global hegemon called the United States right now. Easterbrook acknowledges that "the most powerful factor must be the end of the cold war" but he doesn't understand why it's the most powerful factor. Elsewhere in the piece he talks about the growing comity among the great powers, without discussing the elephant in the room: the reason the "great powers" get along is that the United States is much, much more powerful than anyone else. If you quantify power only by relative military capabilities, the U.S. is a great power, there are maybe ten or so middle powers, and then there are a lot of mosquitoes. [If the U.S. is so powerful, why can't it subdue the Iraqi insurgency?--ed. Power is a relative measure -- the U.S. might be having difficulties, but no other country in the world would have fewer problems.] Joshua Goldstein, who knows a thing or two about this phenomenon, made this clear in a Christian Science Monitor op-ed three years ago: We probably owe this lull to the end of the cold war, and to a unipolar world order with a single superpower to impose its will in places like Kuwait, Serbia, and Afghanistan. The emerging world order is not exactly benign – Sept. 11 comes to mind – and Pax Americana delivers neither justice nor harmony to the corners of the earth. But a unipolar world is inherently more peaceful than the bipolar one where two superpowers fueled rival armies around the world. The long-delayed "peace dividend" has arrived, like a tax refund check long lost in the mail. The difference in language between Goldstein and Easterbrook highlights my second problem with "The End of War?" Goldstein rightly refers to the past fifteen years as a "lull" -- a temporary reduction in war and war-related death. The flip side of U.S. hegemony being responsible for the reduction of armed conflict is what would happen if U.S. hegemony were to ever fade away. Easterbrook focuses on the trends that suggest an ever-decreasing amount of armed conflict -- and I hope he's right. But I'm enough of a realist to know that if the U.S. should find its primacy challenged by, say, a really populous non-democratic country on the other side of the Pacific Ocean, all best about the utility of economic interdependence, U.N. peacekeeping, and the spread of democracy are right out the window.

#### No mindless intervention

Mandelbaum 2011 (Michael Mandelbaum, A. Herter Professor of American Foreign Policy, the Paul H. Nitze School of Advanced International Studies, Johns Hopkins University, Washington DC; and Director, Project on East-West Relations, Council on Foreign Relations, “CFR 90th Anniversary Series on Renewing America: American Power and Profligacy,” Jan 2011)

I think it is, Richard. And I think that this period really goes back two decades. I think the wars or the interventions in Somalia, in Bosnia, in Kosovo, in Haiti belong with the interventions in Afghanistan and Iraq, although they were undertaken by different administrations for different reasons, and had different costs. But all of them ended up in the protracted, unexpected, unwanted and expensive task of nation building. Nation building has never been popular. The country has never liked it. It likes it even less now. And I think we're not going to do it again. We're not going to do it because there won't be enough money. We're not going to do it because there will be other demands on the public purse. We won't do it because we'll be busy enough doing the things that I think ought to be done in foreign policy. And we won't do it because it will be clear to politicians that the range of legitimate choices that they have in foreign policy will have narrowed and will exclude interventions of that kind. So I believe and I say in the book that the last -- the first two post-Cold War decades can be seen as a single unit. And that unit has come to an end.

**Threats real and not constructed—rational risk assessment goes aff**

Knudsen 2001 (Olav Knudsen, Political Science Professor at Sodertorn, Post-Copenhagen Security Studies, Security Dialogue)

Moreover, I have a problem with the underlying implication that it is unimportant whether states 'really' face dangers from other states or groups. In the Copenhagen school, threats are seen as coming mainly from the actors' own fears, or from what happens when the fears of individuals turn into paranoid political action. In my view, this emphasis on the subjective is a **misleading conception of threat**, in that it discounts an independent existence for what- ever is perceived as a threat. Granted, political life is often marked by misperceptions, mistakes, pure imaginations, ghosts, or mirages, but such phenomena **do not occur simultaneously** to large numbers of politicians, and **hardly most of the time**. During the Cold War, threats - in the sense of plausible possibilities of danger - referred to 'real' phenomena, and they **refer to 'real' phenomena** now. The objects referred to are often not the same, but that is a different matter. Threats have to be dealt with both ín terms of perceptions and in terms of the phenomena which are perceived to be threatening. The point of Waever’s concept of security is not the potential existence of danger somewhere but the use of the word itself by political elites. In his 1997 PhD dissertation, he writes, ’One can View “security” as that which is in language theory called a speech act: it is not interesting as a sign referring to something more real - it is the utterance itself that is the act.’24 The deliberate disregard of objective factors is even more explicitly stated in Buzan & WaeVer’s joint article of the same year.” As a consequence, the phenomenon of threat is reduced to a matter of pure domestic politics.” It seems to me that the security dilemma, as a central notion in security studies, then loses its foundation. Yet I see that Waever himself has no compunction about referring to the security dilemma in a recent article." This discounting of the objective aspect of threats shifts security studies to insignificant concerns. What has long made 'threats' and ’threat perceptions’ important phenomena in the study of IR is the implication that **urgent action may be required**. Urgency, of course, is where Waever first began his argument in favor of an alternative security conception, because a convincing sense of urgency has been the chief culprit behind the abuse of 'security' and the consequent ’politics of panic', as Waever aptly calls it.” Now, here - in the case of urgency - another baby is thrown out with the Waeverian bathwater. When real situations of urgency arise, those situations are challenges to democracy; they are actually at the core of the problematic arising with the process of making security policy in parliamentary democracy. But in Waever’s world, threats are merely more or less persuasive, and the claim of urgency is just another argument. I hold that instead of 'abolishing' threatening phenomena ’out there’ by reconceptualizing them, as Waever does, we should continue paying attention to them, because **situations with a credible claim to urgency will keep coming back** and then we need to know more about how they work in the interrelations of groups and states (such as civil wars, for instance), not least to find adequate democratic procedures for dealing with them.

#### No impact to threat construction

Kaufman 2009 (Stuart J Kaufman, professor of political science and IR at the University of Deleware, “Narratives and Symbols in Violent Mobilization: The Palestinian-Israeli Case,” Security Studies, 18:3, 400-434)

Even when hostile narratives, group fears, and opportunity are strongly present, war occurs only if these factors are harnessed. Ethnic narratives and fears must combine to create significant ethnic hostility among mass publics. Politicians must also seize the opportunity to manipulate that hostility, evoking hostile narratives and symbols to gain or hold power by riding a wave of chauvinist mobilization. Such mobilization is often spurred by prominent events (for example, episodes of violence) that increase feelings of hostility and make chauvinist appeals seem timely. If the other group also mobilizes and if each side's felt security needs threaten the security of the other side, the result is a security dilemma spiral of rising fear, hostility, and mutual threat that results in violence.¶ A virtue of this symbolist theory is that symbolist logic explains why ethnic peace is more common than ethnonationalist war. Even if hostile narratives, fears, and opportunity exist, severe violence usually can still be avoided if ethnic elites skillfully define group needs in moderate ways and collaborate across group lines to prevent violence: this is consociationalism.17 War is likely only if hostile narratives, fears, and opportunity spur hostile attitudes, chauvinist mobilization, and a security dilemma.

**Value to life is subjective**

Schwartz 2002 (Lisa Schwartz, Chair at the Centre for Health Economics and Policy Analysis, “Medical Ethic: A Case Based Approach,” Chapter 6, www.fleshandbones.com/readingroom/pdf/399.pdf)

The second assertion made by supporters of the quality of life as a criterion for decisionmaking is closely related to the first, but with an added dimension. This assertion suggests that **the determination of the value of the quality of a given life is a subjective determination to be made by the person experiencing that life. The important addition here is that the decision is a personal one that, ideally, ought not to be made externally by another person but internally by the individual involved**. Katherine Lewis made this decision for herself based on a comparison between two stages of her life. So did James Brady. Without this element, decisions based on quality of life criteria lack salient information and the patients concerned cannot give informed consent. **Patients must be given the opportunity to decide for themselves whether they think their lives are worth living** or not. To ignore or overlook patients’ judgement in this matter is to violate their autonomy and their freedom to decide for themselves on the basis of relevant information about their future, and comparative consideration of their past. As the deontological position puts it so well, to do so is to violate the imperative that we must treat persons as rational and as ends in themselves.

#### No spiral of security – states underestimate threats

Schweller 2004 (Randall L. Schweller, Associate Professor in the Department of Political Science at The Ohio State University, 2004 “Unanswered Threats A Neoclassical Realist Theory of Underbalancing,” International Security 29.2 (2004) 159-201, Muse)

Despite the historical frequency of underbalancing, little has been written on the subject. Indeed, Geoffrey Blainey's memorable observation that for "every thousand pages published on the causes of wars there is less than one page directly on the causes of peace" could have been made with equal veracity about overreactions to threats as opposed to underreactions to them.92 Library shelves are filled with books on the causes and dangers of exaggerating threats, ranging from studies of domestic politics to bureaucratic politics, to political psychology, to organization theory. By comparison, there have been few studies at any level of analysis or from any theoretical perspective that directly explain why states have with some, if not equal, regularity underestimated dangers to their survival. There may be some cognitive or normative bias at work here. Consider, for instance, that there is a commonly used word, paranoia, for the unwarranted fear that people are, in some way, "out to get you" or are planning to do one harm. I suspect that just as many people are afflicted with the opposite psychosis: the delusion that everyone loves you when, in fact, they do not even like you. Yet, we do not have a familiar word for this phenomenon. Indeed, I am unaware of any word that describes this pathology (hubris and overconfidence come close, but they plainly define something other than what I have described). That noted, international relations theory does have a frequently used phrase for the pathology of states' underestimation of threats to their survival, the so-called Munich analogy. The term is used, however, in a disparaging way by theorists to ridicule those who employ it. The central claim is that the naïveté associated with Munich and the outbreak of World War II has become an overused and inappropriate analogy because few leaders are as evil and unappeasable as Adolf Hitler. Thus, the analogy either mistakenly causes leaders [End Page 198] to adopt hawkish and overly competitive policies or is deliberately used by leaders to justify such policies and mislead the public. A more compelling explanation for the paucity of studies on underreactions to threats, however, is the tendency of theories to reflect contemporary issues as well as the desire of theorists and journals to provide society with policy- relevant theories that may help resolve or manage urgent security problems. Thus, born in the atomic age with its new balance of terror and an ongoing Cold War, the field of security studies has naturally produced theories of and prescriptions for national security that have had little to say about—and are, in fact, heavily biased against warnings of—the dangers of underreacting to or underestimating threats. After all, the nuclear revolution was not about overkill but, as Thomas Schelling pointed out, speed of kill and mutual kill.93 Given the apocalyptic consequences of miscalculation, accidents, or inadvertent nuclear war, small wonder that theorists were more concerned about overreacting to threats than underresponding to them. At a time when all of humankind could be wiped out in less than twenty-five minutes, theorists may be excused for stressing the benefits of caution under conditions of uncertainty and erring on the side of inferring from ambiguous actions overly benign assessments of the opponent's intentions. The overwhelming fear was that a crisis "might unleash forces of an essentially military nature that overwhelm the political process and bring on a war thatnobody wants. Many important conclusions about the risk of nuclear war, and thus about the political meaning of nuclear forces, rest on this fundamental idea."94 Now that the Cold War is over, we can begin to redress these biases in the literature. In that spirit, I have offered a domestic politics model to explain why threatened states often fail to adjust in a prudent and coherent way to dangerous changes in their strategic environment. The model fits nicely with recent realist studies on imperial under- and overstretch. Specifically, it is consistent with Fareed Zakaria's analysis of U.S. foreign policy from 1865 to 1889, when, he claims, the United States had the national power and opportunity to expand but failed to do so because it lacked sufficient state power (i.e., the state was weak relative to society).95 Zakaria claims that the United States did [End Page 199] not take advantage of opportunities in its environment to expand because it lacked the institutional state strength to harness resources from society that were needed to do so. I am making a similar argument with respect to balancing rather than expansion: incoherent, fragmented states are unwilling and unable to balance against potentially dangerous threats because elites view the domestic risks as too high, and they are unable to mobilize the required resources from a divided society. The arguments presented here also suggest that elite fragmentation and disagreement within a competitive political process, which Jack Snyder cites as an explanation for overexpansionist policies, are more likely to produce underbalancing than overbalancing behavior among threatened incoherent states.96 This is because a balancing strategy carries certain political costs and risks with few, if any, compensating short-term political gains, and because the strategic environment is always somewhat uncertain. Consequently, logrolling among fragmented elites within threatened states is more likely to generate overly cautious responses to threats than overreactions to them. This dynamic captures the underreaction of democratic states to the rise of Nazi Germany during the interwar period.97 In addition to elite fragmentation, I have suggested some basic domestic-level variables that regularly intervene to thwart balance of power predictions.

#### Terrorism studies are epistemologically valid---our authors are self-reflexive

Boyle, 08 – Michael J. Boyle, School of International Relations, University of St. Andrews, and John Horgan, International Center for the Study of Terrorism, Department of Psychology, Pennsylvania State University, April 2008, “A Case Against Critical Terrorism Studies,” Critical Studies On Terrorism, Vol. 1, No. 1, p. 51-64

Jackson (2007c) calls for the development of an explicitly CTS on the basis of what he argues preceded it, dubbed ‘Orthodox Terrorism Studies’. The latter, he suggests, is characterized by: (1) its poor methods and theories, (2) its state centricity, (3) its problem-solving orientation, and (4) its institutional and intellectual links to state security projects. Jackson argues that the major defining characteristic of CTS, on the other hand, should be ‘a skeptical attitude towards accepted terrorism “knowledge”’. An implicit presumption from this is that terrorism scholars have laboured for all of these years without being aware that their area of study has an implicit bias, as well as definitional and methodological problems. In fact, terrorism scholars are not only well aware of these problems, but also have provided their own searching critiques of the field at various points during the last few decades (e.g. Silke 1996, Crenshaw 1998, Gordon 1999, Horgan 2005, esp. ch. 2, ‘Understanding Terrorism’). Some of those scholars most associated with the critique of empiricism implied in ‘Orthodox Terrorism Studies’ have also engaged in deeply critical examinations of the nature of sources, methods, and data in the study of terrorism. For example, Jackson (2007a) regularly cites the handbook produced by Schmid and Jongman (1988) to support his claims that theoretical progress has been limited. But this fact was well recognized by the authors; indeed, in the introduction of the second edition they point out that they have not revised their chapter on theories of terrorism from the first edition, because the failure to address persistent conceptual and data problems has undermined progress in the field. The point of their handbook was to sharpen and make more comprehensive the result of research on terrorism, not to glide over its methodological and definitional failings (Schmid and Jongman 1988, p. xiv). Similarly, Silke's (2004) volume on the state of the field of terrorism research performed a similar function, highlighting the shortcomings of the field, in particular the lack of rigorous primary data collection. A non-reflective community of scholars does not produce such scathing indictments of its own work.
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