### PLAN

#### 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 Political Question Doctrine Adv

#### Advantage \_\_ : Groupthink

#### Congress is currently denied standing in war powers suits due to overbroad application of the political question doctrine--- this gives the prez carte blanche to define her own authority

Zeisberg 2013 (Mariah Zeisberg, assistant professor of political science at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, “War Powers: The Politics of Constitutional Authority,” http://press.princeton.edu/titles/10034.html)

In early 2012 President Quaddafi’s suppression of popular uprisings in Libya began to arouse concern domestically and abroad. Attention began to focus on what, if any, the us response would be. By late February the un security Council adopted a resolution expressing “grave concern” about Libya, and the us senate unanimously approved a resolution call- ing for the security Council to impose a Libyan no-fly zone.1 By March, the security Council had authorized member states to use force to pro- tect Libyan civilians, and the house simmered with dispute about the president’s constitutional war authority.2 on March 18 President Obama deployed troops to Libya.¶ The president’s domestic authority to intervene in Libya was conditioned by two authoritative texts: the us Constitution, which grants him the power to command the military, and Congress the power to declare war; and the War Powers resolution of 1973 (WPR), which creates procedural and reporting requirements for deployments. The WPR declares that presidents may introduce us armed forces into “hostilities” “only pursuant to (1) a declaration of war, (2) specific statutory authorization, or (3) a national emergency created by attack upon the united states.”3 With none of these conditions in place, the president’s legal authority to intervene in Libya under the WPR was suspect from the beginning.4 nonetheless, the WPR’s procedural requirements created a set of structured expectations about how the branches would respond to one an- other over the Libyan incursion. on March 21 obama reported to Con- gress “consistent with the War Powers resolution.”5 When US military operations continued past the time horizons of the WPR, still without legislative authorization, members of Congress challenged the president’s constitutional and statutory faithfulness.6¶ instead of either challenging the constitutionality of the WPR, or dis- continuing operations, the executive branch argued that the deployments did not amount either to “hostilities” or to “war in the constitutional sense.” By early June, a restive house resolved that the Libyan mission had not been legislatively authorized and stated the legislature’s preroga- tive to withdraw funding.7 hundreds of senators and representatives ex- pressed constitutional concerns, but this did not translate into a willing- ness to either authorize or shut down operations.8¶ the legislature’s challenge and the president’s response constitute a revealing window into characteristic features of a constitutional war powers debate. Consider first that the debate was nowhere judicialized. Members of the house sued the president, but the us District Court threw the case out, noting its “frustration” at being asked to hear the case given long-standing precedent.9 this controversy would be decided through nonjudicial politics. indeed, the politics of the moment were on vivid display in the reasoning of three prominent executive branch officials— President Obama, Vice President Biden, and secretary of state Clinton— all of whom argued that this use of the military was constitutional, but all of whom, when they were Democratic senators challenging a republican president, had emphasized the importance of legislative authorization for war.10¶ the debate pivoted around the meaning of “war”—in the language of the office of Legal Counsel (oLC), “war for constitutional purposes.”11 Despite air strikes and remote drones, the administration claimed that the Libyan intervention was neither “war” nor “hostilities.”12 President Obama interpreted the meaning of “war” and “hostilities” not through international law, or judicial precedent, or close readings of the Constitu- tion’s text. rather, the administration invoked policy concerns, structural and governance reasons, and historic precedent. state Department legal advisor Harold Koh told Congress that it should interpret the WPR’s language in light of the security consequences of their chosen readings, emphasizing that a “mechanical reading of the statute could lead to un- intended automatic cutoffs . . . where more flexibility is required.”13 the administration described the importance of us intervention for regional security, for un and nato credibility, for humanitarian needs, and for international alliances, especially given the foreign policy imperatives of the arab spring. The OLC made these policy reasons one element of a constitutional test, arguing that the president’s war authority depended upon whether the intervention served “sufficiently important national interests.”14

#### The plan establishes that war powers suits are justiciable as a separation of powers dispute

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.

#### Fosters balanced judicial dynamism that checks asymmetric power distribution without destroying the PQD

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.

#### Removing justiciability limitations 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.

#### Every conflict is more likely to go nuclear without judicial checks

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.

#### Sole authority over nukes makes nuclear war inevitable

Wilbur 2009 (E. Packer Wilbur, member of the Dean’s International Council, The Harris School of Public Policy Studies, The University of Chicago and a former member of the Dean’s Council, The John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University, December 29, 2009, “Presidential Authority to Launch a Nuclear Attack,” http://epwilbur.com/wp-content/uploads/2009/12/Presidential-Power-nuclear-article2.pdf)

With a single order and acting by himself, the President of the United ¶ States has the power to dispatch dozens and possibly hundreds of nuclear missiles.¶ The US has approximately 2,200 nuclear warheads available for immediate ¶ use on intercontinental ballistic missiles, submarines and aboard aircraft or ¶ stored at heavy bomber bases. As far as I can determine through ¶ discussions with former officials and through reviewing non-classified ¶ materials, the President can order the deployment of these weapons without any limitation and without consultation with any other person.¶ The only check on this authority is the possibility that one or more ¶ individuals in the chain of command will disobey the order. Because the chain of events from authorization to launch can happen almost instantaneously, there may be very little time for intervention. Under the ¶ present “launch on warning” command system a President, advised of a ¶ possible attack, has just a few minutes to make the decision to launch, ¶ delay or stand down. A launch could be authorized even if there is no warning of an actual, suspected or impending attack. There are carefully devised safeguards in place to prevent accidental or unauthorized use of these weapons but the authority of the President appears to be unlimited. In the 1960’s (and possibly even now) that ¶ authority was actually “pre-delegated” under specified emergency ¶ conditions to military commanders so that they could use pre-distributed ¶ authorization codes to order a rapid nuclear response to an attack. ¶ It is marginally, if cold-bloodedly, comforting to think that the lives lost will ¶ be somewhere else, but what if this single command could bring ¶ destruction to Chicago, Charlotte or Cheyenne or to dozens of other US ¶ cities large or small? Our own self interest assigns maximum value to our ¶ own lives and to the lives of those close to us, but is a human life here ¶ really worth more than a human life somewhere else?¶ Of course, any attack initiated by us is very likely to bring secondary effects and retaliation to the continental US. Airborne radioactive smoke, soot and ¶ dust could sweep quickly across continents and back to us. Retaliation by those we target could result in an unlimited and uncontrolled escalation. Throughout our history, Presidents have become physically incapacitated. ¶ President Woodrow Wilson had two disabling strokes in 1919 and his ¶ disability was shielded by his wife and close advisors. His Vice President ¶ was not allowed to visit him until their last day in office. Several Presidents ¶ have had fatal heart attacks and strokes. President John Kennedy was ¶ sometimes heavily medicated due to various infirmities and several of our ¶ former presidents were, on occasion, intemperate drinkers. President ¶ Reagan was seriously wounded in an assassination attempt but remained ¶ officially in charge. After he left office, he was diagnosed with Alzheimer’s ¶ disease and there is no way of knowing whether the disease began while ¶ he was still in office.¶ Presidents, like the rest of us, get tired, angry, ill, and depressed. They can be impaired by medication or alcohol. Illnesses can be stealthy like Alzheimer’s or a brain tumor or insanity; there is sometimes no clear ¶ dividing line between normal and impaired. Since we are flesh and blood, ¶ our brains operating through chemical and electrical synapses and our ¶ genetic structure the result of continuing evolution, we cannot claim to be ¶ wholly logical or rational. Violence and aggression may be built into our design. It seems self evident that no single person should have the power to order massive and instantaneous worldwide loss of life. Other nuclear nations have similarly flawed systems of nuclear authorization which need revision to provide additional safeguards. Clearly, any changes in these systems will have to be initiated and led by the United States. At the same time, no ¶ one nation, including our own, wants to be the first to reduce its ability to ¶ respond quickly to an attack.¶ Our own system was carefully constructed at the dawn of the nuclear age ¶ to deal with the exigencies of the Cold War. It may or may not have been appropriate then. Half a century later, it is time for us to rethink these ¶ policies.

#### 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.

### 1AC Negligence Doctrine Advantage

#### Advantage \_\_ : Negligence Doctrine

#### 2010 NPR continued Bush-era negligence doctrine of nuclear retaliation in response to a nuclear terror attack

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.

#### Last year’s update to the NPR reaffirmed offensive use against terrorist threats

Weiss 2013 (Peter Weiss, President Emeritus of the Lawyers Committee on Nuclear Policy, July 10, 2013, “Obama Sharpens His Nuclear Posture,” Other Words, http://otherwords.org/obama-sharpens-his-nuclear-posture/)

A new Pentagon document indicates that contingent plans for the use of nuclear weapons are being made, with the self-evidently impossible task of minimizing collateral damage.¶ Soon after President Barack Obama began his first term, he called for a world free of nuclear weapons. His address, which quickly became known as Obama’s Prague Speech, helped him win the 2009 Nobel Peace Prize.¶ Then, he dropped the ball.¶ The Pentagon finally followed up in late June with a strange document that fails to explain how Obama intends to make progress toward full nuclear disarmament.¶ Even though the Report on Nuclear Employment Strategy of the United States doesn’t do that, it still should have been news. Instead, the mainstream media took a pass.¶ In the past, these documents, the last of which the Pentagon issued in 2010, were called “Nuclear Posture Reviews.” They focused largely on the role of nuclear weapons for deterrence. Now for the first time the word “employment” — another word for “use” — is in the title.¶ Is this a not-so-subtle way of telling our enemies, actual and potential, that we are not afraid to use these weapons of mass annihilation?¶ To drive home that point, the report states that, while the “2010 Nuclear Posture Review established the (Obama) administration’s goal of making deterrence of a nuclear attack the sole purpose of U.S. nuclear weapons…we cannot adopt such a policy today.”¶ Instead, this report explains, “the new guidance re-iterates the intention to work towards that goal over time.”¶ What are the other purposes of U.S. nuclear weapons besides trying to stop nuclear attacks by others?¶ Alas, the report doesn’t really say. Instead, it vaguely states that while the threat of global nuclear war has become remote since the Cold War ended, the risk of nuclear attack has increased.¶ Presumably, this refers to nuclear weapons in the hands of terrorists rather than governments. But it doesn’t explain how U.S. nuclear weapons could be “employed” to deter the use of nuclear weapons by, for instance, al-Qaeda.

#### Calculated ambiguity undermines U.S. credibility on terrorism--- failure to follow through would collapse deterrence

Fisher 2007 (Uri Fisher, PhD candidate in the Department of Political Science at the University of Colorado, February 2007, “Deterrence Terrorism and American Values, Homeland Security Affairs,” http://www.hsaj.org/?fullarticle=3.1.4)

Currently, the U.S. maintains a position of “calculated ambiguity” on how it will respond to a CBRN attack on its soil or against its interests abroad. The doctrine of calculated ambiguity garnered support when the Bush administration purportedly deterred Saddam Hussein from using biological or chemical weapons against U.S. forces during the first Gulf War in 1991. Secretary of State James Baker delivered a note to Iraq’s Foreign minister Tariq Aziz that cautioned Hussein that any use of these weapons could result in U.S. nuclear reprisals. The unclassified version of the 2002 National Security Presidential Directive (NSPD) 17 declares that the U.S. will reserve the right to respond with “overwhelming force” and keep open “all of its options” to a CBRN attack on the U.S., its interests, or its allies. In 2003, The Washington Times reported that the classified version of NSPD 17 made the willingness of the U.S. to respond with nuclear weapons to a CBRN attack more explicit. 14 Nevertheless, the U.S. is deliberately vague about its plans to respond to a CBRN attack. The strategic rationale for maintaining this ambiguity is to keep open a broad range of response options and approach potential events on a case-by-case basis. The vagueness of U.S. reprisal plans, however, does not support deterrence. The credibility of U.S. threats to retaliate suffers as a result of this ambiguity. While the use of language such as “overwhelming force” connotes a severe retaliation, this lack of clarity is not the best way to solidify the belief among terrorist-supporting regimes that their behavior puts them at severe risk. As one author notes, “Frequently, the bigger and more indiscriminate the threat, the less believable it is in the eyes of the target audience.” 15¶ In order to establish a deterrent mechanism that will dissuade rogue states from supporting terrorist organizations, the U.S. must develop a strong declaratory policy that clearly communicates a threat of punishment for those states that provide CBRN materials to terrorists. Strategies for dealing with rogue states assisting terrorist organizations that are severe and target assets of value to the regime will best reinforce deterrent mechanisms. As Ian Lesser argues, for deterrence to be viable against rogue regimes, the threat of retaliation for supporting or sheltering terrorist organizations must be both “massive” and “personal to the leadership.” 16 The U.S. policy of calculated ambiguity reinforces many of the internationally held stereotypes of the U.S. that negatively affect its ability to establish a credible deterrent threat. By avoiding direct language, the U.S. appears irresolute, noncommittal, and perhaps overly sensitive to public opinion.

#### Failure to back up the threat would cause cascading deterrence failure--- bluffing outweighs resolve--- best multivariate studies prove

Sartori 2005 (Anne Sartori, Associate Professor of Political Science and Managerial Economics and Decision Sciences at Northwestern University, 2005, “Deterrence by diplomacy,” Princeton UP, pp. 105-109)

If my reputational argument is correct, the specification that I used¶ earlier is correct, and one that includes these two reputations variables¶ is not quite appropriate, because it includes two proxy variables for the¶ same concept—the defender’s reputation for honccty.3 Nevertheless, one might expect both reputations variables to have negative effects on deterrence failure, since they both are measures of reputations for honesty. One¶ also might expect both reputations variables to have positive effects on the¶ defender’s decision to defend if deterrence fails, since a defender is more¶ likely to follow through on its threats when it has a reputation for honesty.¶ I estimate the effects of these variables in a multivariate model as¶ described earlier, correcting for nonrandom selection and including the¶ natural ln of the balance of forces in the equation. ¶ Both of these reputational variables have the effects implied by my theory, as table 4.12 shows.¶ In the table, the second column shows the implication of deterrence theory’s reputational argument, the third column shows the implication of¶ my argument, and the fourth shows the estimated effect. (All results are¶ corrected for selection bias, though the table does not show the selection¶ estimates.) As the table shows, the challenger is less likely to attack .u¶ defender with either kind of reputation for honesty than a defender with¶ a reputation for bluffing. A defender with either kind of reputation for¶ honesty is more likely to follow through on its threats, as is predicted by¶ lily theory—and not by deterrence theory’s reputational argument.¶ These findings show that reputations for honesty—as distinct from rep¶ utations for resolve—affect the course of international disputes. If reputations for honesty did not matter, one would not expect the “rep (honesty¶ minus resolve)” variable to have a negative effect on deterrence failure. II¶ anything. the reputations for resolve argument suggests that this variable ¶ should have a positive effect on deterrence failure; its posited effect on¶ the effect on the defender’s decision to light if deterrence fails is tindear¶ Ilw findings do nor show that reputations for resolve—as distinct from¶ reputations for honesty—have an independent effect. The effects of the¶ variable rcp honesty/resolve” can be explained by either theory because¶ the ‘Rep resolve” variable captures situations that could lead to a repu¶ tartan for resolve and could lead to a reputation for honesty. Moreover,¶ one of the implications of the reputations for resolve” argument is contradicted by the data: a challenger is less likely to attack a defender if the,¶ defender recently has acquiesced or had no dispute. Thus, the findings suggest either that both types of reputations affect the course of international disputes or that only reputations for honesty have an effect.¶ Some readers might argue that the variable “Rep (honesty itiinu¶ resolve)” does capture some instances of reputations for resolve, 4IiI¶ rrary to my earlier argument. That is, a defender that has no dispute in¶ the present period already is more likely to have a reputation for resolve¶ it may have no dispute because challengers hesitate to threaten a stat.¶ that they consider resolute. While there are not enough cases to break¶ the reputational variable down further, I have lonc one more check: I have¶ operationalized reputations for honesty in such a way that a defender sali¶ have a repLltati(m for honesty if it used dipmlomacy. If honesty in a previous¶ dispute when it was a challenger, lii this opetatuinaluiatuin, a state thai¶ is, at present, a defender has more ot a reputation for honesty if it was¶ a potential challenger in its previous dispute and it chose not to threaten¶ the use of force. This behavior does flot indicate that the state is a res¶ olute type. The results that ¡ discuss here are robust to this alternative¶ specification.¶ My robustness checks suggest that the defender’s reputation for honesty¶ matters, whether or flot a reputation for resolve also does so. However,¶ the results do not constitute definitive proof for at least two reasons. First,¶ when I do include both in the same equation, the estimate of the effect¶ of a reputation for honesty that comes from acquiescence or not having a¶ dispute on the defender’s decision to follow through on its threats is small¶ and imprecise. The estimate suggests that the effect is positive, hut does¶ not show with much certainty that there is no effect. The estimare of the¶ effect on the challenger’s decision, however, is large and precise. Second,¶ as I mentioned earlier, it is nor really appropriate to test my theory using¶ two proxy variables for reputations for honesty, rather than one variable¶ that measures these reputations.¶ In sum, reputations for honesty and reputations for resolve arc over¶ lapping concepts and are therefore difficult to distinguish empirically.¶ Nevertheless, the data suggest that my measure of reputations for hon¶ esty is capturing something different from deterrence theory’s concept of¶ reputations For resolve.¶ This work is not intended as a definitive test of the importance of repura.¶ lions for resolve. As T argued in chapter .3, it is theoretically quite possible¶ that states do acquire both types of reputations. More work remains ro¶ be done ro empirically evaluate the importance of reputations for resolve.¶ The implications of the model that I discuss at the beginning of the chapter¶ arc borne our by the data, when I analyze the data in a number of different¶ ways. The defender is more likely to succeed in deterring an attack, and¶ more likely ro follow through il deterrence fails, when it has a reputation¶ for honesty. This result is quite robust to alternative specifications and is¶ unlikely to he produced by two leading alternative explanations.¶ Ci INCLUSION¶ The empirical analyses in this chapter reveal two facts: when a state has a¶ reputation for honesty, it is substantially more likely to attain deterrence¶ success; when it has a reputation for bluffing, it is substantially more¶ likely to hack down if its threats fails to deter an attack. The second fact¶ explains the first. Defenders’ deterrent threats are more likely to succeed¶ (challengers arc less likely to attack alter hearing them) when they have¶ reputations for honesty precisely because defenders with reputations for honesty are more likely to mean what they say. Thus, as I suggested¶ earlier, a reputation for honesty helps the defender communicate that¶ it is willing to fight, but this ability comes at a cost: the defender must¶ actually be willing to fight more often if deterrence Fails in order to obtain¶ this greater credibility.¶ Earlier in this text, I argued that diplomacy often works because of¶ the existence of reputations for bluffing and for honesty in the international system. States often use their diplomacy honestly in order Ic) avoid¶ reputations for bluffing. Because so much of diplomacy is honest, states¶ often believe each others diplomacy so diplomacy can be an effective¶ tool of state.¶ The empirical analyses in this chapter corroborate that states’ decisions¶ about escalating international disputes are influenced heavily by whether¶ or not the defender recently has been seen as using its diplomacy hon¶ estly. This evidence suggests that the explanation of diplomacy this book¶ provides is a useful otie: diplomacy works, in part, because it is valuable;¶ slates have an incentive to use it honestly today in order to preserve their¶ ability to use it in the future.

#### 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.

#### Terrorists are actively seeking nuclear material and they have the capability to steal, manufacture, and detonate a makeshift bomb

Bunn et al. 2013 (Matthew Bunn, Professor of the Practice of Public Policy at Harvard Kennedy School and Co-Principal Investigator of Project on Managing the Atom at Harvard University’s Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs; Vice Admiral Valentin Kuznetsov (retired Russian Navy). Senior research fellow at the Institute for U.S. and Canadian Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Senior Military Representative of the Russian Ministry of Defense to NATO from 2002 to 2008; Martin Malin. Executive Director of the Project on Managing the Atom at the Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs; Colonel Yuri Morozov (retired Russian Armed Forces). Professor of the Russian Academy of Military Sciences and senior research fellow at the Institute for U.S. and Canadian Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences, chief of department at the Center for Military-Strategic Studies at the General Staff of the Russian Armed Forces from 1995 to 2000; Simon Saradzhyan. Fellow at Harvard University’s Belfer Center for Science and Internation- al Affairs, Moscow-based defense and security expert and writer from 1993 to 2008.; William Tobey. Senior fellow at Harvard University’s Belfer Center for Science and Interna- tional Affairs and director of the U.S.-Russia Initiative to Prevent Nuclear Terrorism, deputy administrator for Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation at the U.S. National Nuclear Security Administration from 2006 to 2009; Colonel General Viktor Yesin (retired Russian Armed Forces). Leading research fellow at the Institute for U.S. and Canadian Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences and advisor to commander of the Strategic Missile Forces of Russia, chief of staff of the Strategic Missile Forces from 1994 to 1996; Major General Pavel Zolotarev (retired Russian Armed Forces). Deputy director of the In- stitute for U.S. and Canadian Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences, head of the Infor- mation and Analysis Center of the Russian Ministry of Defense from1993 to 1997, section head - deputy chief of staff of the Defense Council of Russia from 1997 to 1998, September 2013, “Steps to Prevent Nuclear Terrorism: Recommendations Based on the U.S.-Russia Joint Threat Assessment,”Belfer Center, online)

In 2011, Harvard’s Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs and the Russian Academy of Sciences’ Institute for U.S. and Canadian Studies published “The U.S. – Russia Joint Threat Assessment on Nuclear Terrorism.” The assessment analyzed the means, motives, and access of would-be nuclear terrorists, and concluded that the threat of nuclear terrorism is urgent and real.¶ The Washington and Seoul Nuclear Security Summits in 2010 and 2012 established and demonstrated a consensus among political leaders from around the world that nuclear terrorism poses a serious threat to the peace, security, and prosperity of our planet. For any country, a terrorist attack with a nuclear device would be an immediate and catastrophic disaster, and the negative effects would reverberate around the world far beyond the location and moment of the detona- tion.¶ Preventing a nuclear terrorist attack requires international cooperation to secure nuclear materi- als, especially among those states producing nuclear materials and weapons. As the world’s two greatest nuclear powers, the United States and Russia have the greatest experience and capabili- ties in securing nuclear materials and plants and, therefore, share a special responsibility to lead international efforts to prevent terrorists from seizing such materials and plants.¶ The depth of convergence between U.S. and Russian vital national interests on the issue of nuclear security is best illustrated by the fact that bilateral cooperation on this issue has contin- ued uninterrupted for more than two decades, even when relations between the two countries occasionally became frosty, as in the aftermath of the August 2008 war in Georgia.¶ Russia and the United States have strong incentives to forge a close and trusting partnership to prevent nuclear terrorism and have made enormous progress in securing fissile material both at home and in partnership with other countries. However, to meet the evolving threat posed by those individuals intent upon using nuclear weapons for terrorist purposes, the United States and Russia need to deepen and broaden their cooperation.¶ The 2011 “U.S. - Russia Joint Threat Assessment” offered both specific conclusions about the nature of the threat and general observations about how it might be addressed. This report builds on that foundation and analyzes the existing framework for action, cites gaps and deficiencies, and makes specific recommendations for improvement.¶ “The U.S. – Russia Joint Threat Assessment on Nuclear Terrorism” (The 2011 report executive summary):¶ • Nuclear terrorism is a real and urgent threat. Urgent actions are required to reduce the risk.¶ The risk is driven by the rise of terrorists who seek to inflict unlimited damage, many of whom have sought justification for their plans in radical interpretations of Islam; by the spread of information about the decades-old technology of nuclear weapons; by the increased availability of weapons-usable nuclear materials; and by globalization, which makes it easier to move people, technologies, and materials across the world.¶ • Making a crude nuclear bomb would not be easy, but is potentially within the capabilities of a technically sophisticated terrorist group, as numerous government studies have confirmed. Detonating a stolen nuclear weapon would likely be difficult for terrorists to accomplish, if the weapon was equipped with modern technical safeguards (such as the electronic locks known as Permissive Action Links, or PALs). Terrorists could, however, cut open a stolen nuclear weapon and make use of its nuclear material for a bomb of their own.¶ • The nuclear material for a bomb is small and difficult to detect, making it a major challenge to stop nuclear smuggling or to recover nuclear material after it has been stolen. Hence, a pri- mary focus in reducing the risk must be to keep nuclear material and nuclear weapons from being stolen by continually improving their security, as agreed at the Nuclear Security Sum- mit in Washington in April 2010.¶ • Al-Qaeda has sought nuclear weapons for almost two decades. The group has repeatedly attempted to purchase stolen nuclear material or nuclear weapons, and has repeatedly attempted to recruit nuclear expertise. Al-Qaeda reportedly conducted tests of conventional explosives for its nuclear program in the desert in Afghanistan. The group’s nuclear ambitions continued after its dispersal following the fall of the Taliban regime in Afghanistan. Recent writings from top al-Qaeda leadership are focused on justifying the mass slaughter of civilians, including the use of weapons of mass destruction, and are in all likelihood intended to provide a formal religious justification for nuclear use.¶ • While there are significant gaps in coverage of the group’s activities, al-Qaeda appears to have been frustrated thus far in acquiring a nuclear capability; it is unclear whether the the group has acquired weapons-usable nuclear material or the expertise needed to make such material into a bomb. Furthermore, pressure from a broad range of counter-terrorist actions probably has reduced the group’s ability to manage large, complex projects, but has not eliminated the danger. However, there is no sign the group has abandoned its nuclear ambi- tions. On the contrary, leadership statements as recently as 2008 indicate that the intention to acquire and use nuclear weapons is as strong as ever.¶ • Terrorist groups from the North Caucasus have in the past planned to seize a nuclear submarine armed with nuclear weapons; have carried out reconnaissance on nuclear weapon storage sites; and have repeatedly threatened to sabotage nuclear facilities or to use radiological “dirty bombs.” In recent years, these groups have become more focused on an extreme Is- lamic objective which might be seen as justifying the use of nuclear weapons. These groups’ capabilities to manage large, complex projects have also been reduced by counter-terrorist actions, though they have demonstrated a continuing ability to launch devastating attacks in Moscow and elsewhere in the Russian heartland. • The Japanese terror cult Aum Shinrikyo pursued nuclear weapons in the early 1990s,¶ but appears to have abandoned this interest. Few other groups have shown sustained inter-¶ est in acquiring nuclear weapons. There is precedent to suggest that extremist groups such¶ as Lashkar-e-Taiba or Jaish-e-Mohammed might cooperate with al-Qaeda (or that al-Qaeda and North Caucasus groups might cooperate) in pursuit of a nuclear bomb, as the Indonesian group Jemaah Islamiya (JI) rendered substantial assistance to al-Qaeda’s anthrax project from roughly 1998 to 2001.¶ • Cooperation between Russia and the United States, the two countries with the largest nuclear stockpiles and the most extensive experience in cooperation to improve nuclear security and interdict nuclear smuggling, is particularly important in reducing the danger nuclear terrorism could pose to the security of those two countries and the world.¶ • International intelligence and law-enforcement cooperation targeted on countering nuclear smuggling and identifying and stopping terrorist nuclear plots are also important steps to reduce the danger of nuclear terrorism.

#### Negative authors miscalculate terrorist capabilities--- err aff

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 noteliminate 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 of loose nuclear material 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.

#### Plan prevents nuclear retaliation--- Creates Congressional check on the executive that prevents nuke use--- Aff’s Constitutional ruling in favor of Congress independently strengthens deterrence

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.

#### Solves the bluff

Ullman 1972 (Richard Ullman, July 1972, Professor of International Relations @ Princeton University, Foreign Affairs, Vol. 50 Issue 4, “NO FIRST USE OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS,” Ebsco)

An alternative to a fiat "no-first-use" declaration, at least for the United States, might come through congressional legislation stipulating that the President, as Commander in Chief of the armed forces, may not initiate the use of nuclear weapons without receiving prior congressional authorization. Congress now has before it so-called War Powers legislation stipulating that in the absence of a formal declaration of war the President may not engage the armed forces in military operations for more than 30 days without specific congressional authorization. This draft legislation is premised upon the assumption that the "collective judgment" of Congress and the President should apply to the “initiation" and the "continuation" of hostilities. Senator Fulhright, Congressman Dellums, and others (including the Federation of American Scientists, one of the most active lobbying groups in the arms-control area) have pointed out that just as Congress should be concerned to limit the power of the President to sustain hostilities without its approval, so it should also limit his power to escalate them across the threshold from conventional to nuclear weapons. They are seeking to amend the War Powers legislation to that effect."In many respects the effects of this proposed legislation would be similar to those of an orthodox commitment to "no first use."Nuclear threats would be inappropriate. Force deployments might reflect the assumption that the United States would not initiate the use of nuclear weapons. Just as in the case of a "no first-use" commitment, U.S. ability to respond to a nuclear attack, and therefore the efficacy of the U.S. nuclear deterrent, would be undiminished. The granting of congressional authorization, should it take place, would be equivalent to a formal announcement rescinding a prior "no-first-use" commitment, unilateral or multilateral. Such authorization (or the rescinding of a prior “no-first-use" commitment) would, in fact, constitute in itself an important diplomatic instrument. It would convey to an adversary the seriousness with which Washington viewed a threat, and its willingness to risk nuclear war in response. In this respect congressional authorization (or the public rescinding of "no first use") would be akin to the "demonstration use" which figures in some war-fighting scenarios, when one party to a conflict explodes a nuclear weapon in a manner which inflicts no damage but nevertheless conveys resolve.