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#### Advantage 1 is Accountability

#### Accountability mechanisms that constrain the executive prevent drone overuse in Pakistan and Yemen---drones are key to stability but overuse is counterproductive

Benjamin R. Farley 12, JD from Emory University School of Law, former Editor-in-Chief of the Emory International Law Review, “Drones and Democracy: Missing Out on Accountability?” Winter 2012, 54 S. Tex. L. Rev. 385, lexis

Effective accountability mechanisms constrain policymakers' freedom to choose to use force by increasing the costs of use-of-force decisions and imposing barriers on reaching use-of-force decisions. The accountability mechanisms discussed here, when effective, reduce the likelihood of resorting to force (1) through the threat of electoral sanctioning, which carries with it a demand that political leaders explain their resort to force; (2) by limiting policymakers to choosing force only in the manners authorized by the legislature; and (3) by requiring policymakers to adhere to both domestic and international law when resorting to force and demanding that their justifications for uses of force satisfy both domestic and international law. When these accountability mechanisms are ineffective, the barriers to using force are lowered and the use of force becomes more likely.¶ Use-of-force decisions that avoid accountability are problematic for both functional and normative reasons. Functionally, accountability avoidance yields increased risk-taking and increases the likelihood of policy failure. The constraints imposed by political, supervisory, fiscal, and legal accountability "make[] leaders reluctant to engage in foolhardy military expeditions... . If the caution about military adventure is translated into general risk-aversion when it comes to unnecessary military engagements, then there will likely be a distributional effect on the success rates of [democracies]." n205 Indeed, this result is predicted by the structural explanation of the democratic peace. It also explains why policies that rely on covert action - action that is necessarily less constrained by accountability mechanisms - carry an increased risk of failure. n206 Thus, although accountability avoidance seductively holds out the prospect of flexibility and freedom of action for policymakers, it may ultimately prove counterproductive.¶ In fact, policy failure associated with the overreliance on force - due at least in part to lowered barriers from drone-enabled accountability avoidance - may be occurring already. Airstrikes are deeply unpopular in both Yemen n207 and Pakistan, n208 and although the strikes have proven critical [\*421] to degrading al-Qaeda and associated forces in Pakistan, increased uses of force may be contributing to instability, the spread of militancy, and the failure of U.S. policy objectives there. n209 Similarly, the success of drone [\*422] strikes in Pakistan must be balanced against the costs associated with the increasingly contentious U.S.-Pakistani relationship, which is attributable at least in part to the number and intensity of drone strikes. n210 These costs include undermining the civilian Pakistani government and contributing to the closure of Pakistan to NATO supplies transiting to Afghanistan, n211 thus forcing the U.S. and NATO to rely instead on several repressive central Asian states. n212 Arguably the damage to U.S.-Pakistan relations and the destabilizing influence of U.S. operations in Yemen would be mitigated by fewer such operations - and there would be fewer U.S. operations in both Pakistan and Yemen if U.S. policymakers were more constrained by use-of-force accountability mechanisms.¶ From a normative perspective, the freedom of action that accountability avoidance facilitates represents the de facto concentration of authority to use force in the executive branch. While some argue that such concentration of authority is necessary or even pragmatic in the current international environment, 168 it is anathema to the U.S. constitutional system. Indeed, the founding generation’s fear of foolhardy military adventurism is one reason for the Constitution’s diffusion of use-of-force authority between the Congress and the President. 169 That generation recognized that a President vested with an unconstrained ability to go to war is more likely to lead the nation into war.

#### Judicial review is key to prevent mistakes – executive targeting decisions are inevitably flawed

Tiberiu Dragu 13, Assistant Prof in the Dept of Politics at NYU, PhD in Poli Sci from Stanford University, and Oliver Board, associate in the Corporate Department of Wachtell, Lipton, Rosen & Katz, former Assistant Prof of Economics at the University of Pittsburgh, D.Phil. in Economics from the University of Oxford, J.D. from NYU School of Law, “On Judicial Review in a Separation of Powers System,” June 3 2013, https://files.nyu.edu/tcd224/public/papers/judicial.pdf

Our analysis has relevance for existing debates on the scope of judicial review in the context of terrorism prevention. The polemic whether drone strikes and other counterterrorism policies should be subjected to judicial oversight is framed as a tradeoff between the legal accountability benefits of judicial oversight and the public policy harms of reviewing expert counterterrorism policy by non-expert judges. But starting the debate on these terms already assumes that (non-expert) judicial review can only have a negative effect on (expert) governmental policy. As such, it glosses over the prior question of what is the effect of legal review on the information available for counterterrorism policy-making. To answer this question one needs to assess the counterfactual of how informed counterterrorism policy decisions are in the absence of judicial review as compared to the scenario in which a court can review the legality of those policies. Our game-theoretical analysis provides this counterfactual analysis, an otherwise difficult task to effect, and thus contributes to the current debates regarding the appropriateness of judicial review in the context of terrorism prevention. It suggests that judicial checks can lead to more informed counterterrorism policy-making if one considers the internal structure of the executive and the electoral incentives of the president, conditions which we discuss in more detail below.¶ First, the argument that judicial review of drone strikes, and counterterrorism policy more generally, has a detrimental effect on expert policy-making overlooks the internal ecology of the executive branch. When asserting the superior expertise of the executive branch, scholars and commentators treat the executive as a unitary actor, or perhaps consider its internal structure to be incidental to the expertise rationale for limiting judicial review. However, as the description of the drone policy suggests, there is a separation between expertise and policy-making: the president (and his closest advisers) decides on counterterrorism policy, while lower-level bureaucrats provide the expertise and intelligence to make informed decisions. This separation of expertise from policy-making is not unique to counterterrorism. Rather this is a general fact of modern-day government, and scholars of bureaucratic politics, going back to Max Weber, have attempted to unravel its myriad implications for democratic governance (Rourke 1976; Wilson 1991).¶ Second, the president, like all elected representatives, is a politician making choices under the pressure of re-election and public opinion, and such incentives are going to shape his counterterrorism choices. When it comes to the electoral incentives of public officials, scholars have noted that the political costs of not reacting aggressively enough in matters of terrorism prevention and national security are going to be higher than the costs of overreaction (Cole 2008; Fox and Stephenson 2011; Ignatieff 2004; Richardson 2006; Swire 2004). This observation implies that the president and other elected officials have an electoral bias to engage in counterterrorism policies that are more aggressive than what would be necessary on the basis of available information regarding the terrorist threat.36 Inside accounts of the decision-making process within executive branch (Goldsmith 2007), empirical analyses (Merolla and Zechmeister 2009), and newspaper reports,37 they all document such electoral incentives to appear tough on terrorism. The former Vice-President Dick Cheney forcefully depicts this electoral bias in his articulation of the so-called one percent doctrine, which states that if there was even a one percent chance of terrorists getting a weapon of mass destruction, then the executive must act as if it were a certainty (Suskind 2007). In Cheney's view, “it is not about analysis; it's about our response... making suspicion, not evidence, the new threshold for action."38 The run-up to the invasion in Iraq provides a stark illustration of the one percent doctrine in action, the conflict between intelligence officials and policy-makers, and the issue of politicized expertise in the context of national security (Pillar 2011).¶ Our results suggest that (non-expert) judicial review has the potential to induce more informed counterterrorism decisions when the president makes security policy under the veil of public expectations to respond forcefully to terrorist threats. Courts are not immune to public opinion, of course, but precisely because judges are not elected, they are more insulated from public opinion than elected officials. This implies that, all else equal, the courts are less likely to prefer counterterrorism measures that respond to public expectations to be tough on terrorism. Under these conditions,39 our theory suggests a mechanism by which counterterrorism policy-making with judicial oversight can be superior to counterterrorism policy-making without it, even if courts are relatively ill-equipped to review executive decisions. Judicial review can serve as a commitment device to better align the preferences of policymakers with their experts, with the effect of inducing more information for counterterrorism decisions. This observation is missing from current public and scholarly discussions about the role of judicial review in the context of drone strikes and other counterterrorism policies. As such, our analysis has policy implications for ongoing debates on how to design the institutional structure of liberal governments when the social objective is terrorism prevention.

#### Opposing authors force a false choice by only arguing against total bans on drones---reform through external oversight solves all status quo problems---executive actions aren’t accountable

Conor Friedersdorf 13, staff writer at The Atlantic, where he focuses on politics and national affairs, March 27th, 2013, "Let's Make Drone Strikes Safe, Legal, and Rare,"www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2013/03/lets-make-drone-strikes-safe-legal-and-rare/274399/

Plenty of pundits on the left and right still support targeted killing, as do voters, military brass, think-tank fellows, and Congressional majorities. It is nevertheless worth giving the issue another look, because the Obama Administration's apologists seldom acknowledge the strongest arguments against our particular drone policy. Their rhetoric, however effective, depends on a subtle, sometimes unconscious evasion. It's surprisingly easy for an interested observer to be led astray.¶ Can you spot the problem in the following arguments? Joshua Foust acknowledges that unmanned aerial vehicles sometimes terrorize and kill innocents, but asks, "Is there a better alternative to drone strikes for counterterrorism in northwest Pakistan?" He concludes that, in the short run, there simply isn't.\* "The targets of drone strikes in Pakistan sponsor insurgents in the region that kill U.S. soldiers and destabilize the Pakistani state," he writes. "They cannot simply be left alone to continue such violent attacks."¶ Says David Frum, defending the extrajudicial killing of American citizens, "The practical alternative to drones isn't jury trials. It's leaving U.S. passport carrying terrorists alone unharmed to execute their plans." Max Boot in Commentary agrees that citizens are fair game. "Given the need to continue these drone strikes," he argues, "it would be silly and self-destructive to grant certain al-Qaeda figures immunity just because they happen to have American citizenship."¶ In a Los Angeles Times op-ed defending drones, international law professor Michael W. Lewis writes that there are "four obvious options" for dealing with Taliban or Al Qaeda in tribal areas of Pakistan: accept their presence, send the Pakistani military to attack them, send in American ground troops, or his preference, which is armed drones. "Any alternative use of force against Taliban or Al Qaeda forces would be likely to cause many more civilian casualties," he concludes.¶ Implicit in each argument is a false choice. The authors all write here as if America must persist with our drone policy as it is or else forever ground our fleet.\* They're arguing against the proposition that there should be no drones at all. None treat seriously the alternative that the vast majority of drone critics advocate: a reformed drone program that operates legally, morally, and prudently. In 2009, President Obama criticized his predecessor for establishing "an ad hoc legal approach for fighting terrorism" that was neither effective nor sustainable -- a framework that "failed to rely on our legal traditions and time-tested institutions, and that failed to use our values as a compass." Going forward, he said, America's war against Al Qaeda must proceed "with an abiding confidence in the rule of law and due process; in checks and balances and accountability."¶ Most drone critics demand no more than that Obama live up to the standards he articulated. They aren't against keeping armed drones in our arsenal; they're against giving them to the CIA, an opaque intelligence agency that is prone to abusing the power to kill in secret and has no obligation to follow the rules of engagement that constrain the U.S. military.¶ They aren't against killing Al Qaeda members with Hellfire missiles; they're against a process for identifying Al Qaeda terrorists or "associated forces" that equates being accused with being guilty.¶ They aren't against killing American citizens who join the enemy; they're against the extrajudicial killing of Americans merely accused of doing so, especially when conducted in secret, far from any battlefield, with no evidence or defense presented, and no mechanism for accountability if a mistake is made.¶ They aren't against rules permitting certain enemies to be targeted and killed; they're against secret rules written by compromised political appointees and withheld from the crucible of public discourse.¶ In short, most drone critics aren't opposed to armed, unmanned aerial vehicles in general, but to specific features of the targeted-killing program that make it imprudent and immoral. Precisely because it is so difficult to argue that armed drones are always indefensible, Obama defenders often speak out as if against that straw man. As a result, fewer Americans grapple with the more persuasive argument that Obama's specific drone campaign is indefensible, for a much more legally, morally, and prudentially sound drone program could replace it. That's the tragedy and travesty of this whole picture -- many of the problems with the U.S. drone program could be mitigated through straightforward reforms. And those reforms ought to be imposed by Congress, not adopted in secret by an executive branch that has the prerogative to reverse itself in secret or grant itself exceptions.

#### Scenario 1 is Yemen

#### Unaccountable drone strikes strengthen AQAP and destabilize Yemen

Jacqueline Manning 12, Senior Editor of International Affairs Review, December 9 2012, “Free to Kill: How a Lack of Accountability in America’s Drone Campaign Threatens U.S. Efforts in Yemen,” http://www.iar-gwu.org/node/450

Earlier this year White House counter-terrorism advisor, John Brennan, named al-Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula (AQAP) in Yemen the greatest threat to the U.S. Since 2009, the Obama administration has carried out an estimated 28 drone strikes and 13 air strikes targeting AQAP in Yemen, while the Yemeni Government has carried out 17 strikes, and another five strikes cannot be definitively attributed to either state . There is an ongoing debate over the effectiveness of targeted killings by drone strikes in the fight against al-Qaeda. However, what is clear is that the secrecy and unaccountability with which these drone strike are being carried out are undermining U.S. efforts in Yemen.¶ The drone campaign in Yemen is widely criticized by human rights activists, the local population and even the United Nations for its resulting civilian casualties. It is also credited with fostering animosity towards the U.S. and swaying public sentiment in Yemen in favor of AQAP. The long-term effects, as detailed by a 2012 report by the Center for Civilians in Conflict, seem to be particularly devastating. The resulting loss of life, disability, or loss of property of a bread-winner can have long-term impacts, not just on an individual, but on an entire family of dependents.¶ The effectiveness of drone technology in killing al-Qaeda militants, however, cannot be denied. Targeted killings by drone strikes have eliminated several key AQAP members such as Anwar al-Awlaki, Samir Khan, Abdul Mun’im Salim al Fatahani, and Fahd al-Quso . Advocates of the counterterrorism strategy point out that it is much less costly in terms of human lives and money than other military operations.¶ While there are strong arguments on both sides of the drone debate, both proponents and critics of targeted killings of AQAP operatives by drones agree that transparency and accountability are needed.¶ Authorizing the CIA to carry out signature strikes is of particular concern. In signature strikes, instead of targeting individual Al Qaeda leaders, the CIA targets locations without knowing the precise identity of the individuals targeted as long as the locations are linked to a “signature” or pattern of behavior by Al Qaeda officials observed over time. This arbitrary method of targeting often results in avoidable human casualties.¶ Secrecy surrounding the campaign often means that victims and families of victims receive no acknowledgement of their losses, much less compensation. There are also huge disparities in the reported number of deaths. In addition, according to The New York Times, Obama administration officials define “militants” as “all military-age males in a strike zone...unless there is explicit intelligence posthumously proving them innocent” This definition leads to a lack of accountability for those casualties and inflames anti-American sentiment.¶ In a report submitted to the UN Human Rights Council, Ben Emmerson, special rapporteur on the promotion and protection of human rights while countering terrorism, asserted that, "Human rights abuses have all too often contributed to the grievances which cause people to make the wrong choices and to resort to terrorism….human rights compliant counter-terrorism measures help to prevent the recruitment of individuals to acts of terrorism." There is now statistical evidence that supports this claim. A 2010 opinion poll conducted by the New America Foundation in the Federally Administered Tribal Areas (FATA) of Pakistan, where U.S. drone strikes have been carried out on a much larger scale, shows an overwhelming opposition to U.S. drone strikes coupled with a majority support for suicide attacks on U.S. forces under some circumstances.¶ It is clear that the drone debate is not simply a matter of morality and human rights; it is also a matter of ineffective tactics. At a minimum the U.S. must implement a policy of transparency and accountability in the use of drones. Signature strikes take unacceptable risks with innocent lives. Targets must be identified more responsibly, and risks of civilian casualties should be minimized. When civilian casualties do occur, the United States must not only acknowledge them, but also pay amends to families of the victims.

#### Strengthened AQAP undermines the Saudi regime

Colonel Hassan Abosaq 12, US Army War College, master of strategic studies degree candidate, 2012, "The Implications of Unstable on Saudi Arabia," Strategy Research Project, www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?Location=U2&doc=GetTRDoc.pdf&AD=ADA560581

AQAP has been vociferous in its opposition to the Saudi regime, and is likely to continue targeting the Kingdom, particularly its oil installations and members of the royal family. In August 2009, an AQAP member attempted to assassinate Prince Mohammed bin Naif, the Saudi Assistant Interior Minister for security affairs. The prince’s attacker was trained in and launched his attack from Yemen, confirming to the Saudis that instability in Yemen poses a security threat to Saudi Arabia. A strengthened AQAP in Yemen is certain to try to put pressure on Saudi Arabia and to strike Saudi targets. AQAP’s military chief, Qasin al-Raymi, warned the Saudi Leadership in July 2011 that they are still regarded as apostates. And he specifically placed King Abdullah, the late Crown Prince Sultan, Interior Minister Prince Naif, and his son Mohammed Bin Naif on the target list.21 In March 2010, Saudi Arabia foiled several planned attacks on oil installation with the arrest of more than 100 suspected al-Qaeda militants. The arrests included 47 Saudis, 51 Yemenis, a Somali, a Bangladeshi, and an Eritrean.22 The wider domestic strife in Yemen has provided AQAP with some breathing space. More worrisome for Saudi Arabia is the increased lawlessness within Yemen. Not only does this provide the space that al-Qaeda needs to regroup, train, recruit, but it also deflects the state resources away from counterterrorism operations. Saudi Arabia has for years been working to infiltrate al-Qaeda in its unstable neighbor to south, Yemen. Saudi Arabia has also been giving Yemen a great deal of assistance to counterterrorism and it is worrying to the Saudis to see all of that assistance diverted from the purposes for which it was intended. In June 2011, AQAP leaped into the security vacuum created by Yemen’s political volatility, and 63 al-Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula fighters escaped from a Yemeni prison.23 This exemplifies how Yemeni instability emboldens this lethal al-Qaeda affiliate. As the Yemeni military consolidates its strength in an attempt to maintain state control and fight two insurgencies and oppress the protesters, AQAP has further expanded its safe haven in the country’s interior, further increasing their operational capacity. This organization has not only attacked police, foreigners, and diplomatic missions within the country, but also served as a logistic base for acts of terrorism abroad. Yemen also has become the haven for jihad militants not just from Yemen and Saudi Arabia, but from all over the world which includes some Arabs, Americans, Europeans, Africans and others. Al-Qaeda camps, where terrorists from all over the world train are also situated in Yemen. The growing anarchy and al-Qaeda presence could spill over into Saudi Arabia.

#### That destabilizes the Middle East

Anthony Cordesman 11, Arleigh A. Burke Chair in Strategy at CSIS, former director of intelligence assessment in the Office of the Secretary of Defense, former adjunct prof of national security studies at Georgetown, PhD from London University, Feb 26 2011, “Understanding Saudi Stability and Instability: A Very Different Nation,” http://csis.org/publication/understanding-saudi-stability-and-instability-very-different-nation

History scarcely means we can take Saudi stability for granted. Saudi Arabia is simply too critical to US strategic interests and the world. Saudi petroleum exports play a critical role in the stability and growth of a steadily more global economy, and the latest projections by the Department of Energy do not project any major reductions in the direct level of US dependence on oil imports through 2025.¶ Saudi Arabia is as important to the region’s security and stability as it is to the world’s economy. It is the key to the efforts of the Gulf Cooperation Council to create local defenses, and for US strategic cooperation with the Southern Gulf states. It plays a critical role as a counterbalance to a radical and more aggressive Iran, it is the source of the Arab League plan for a peace with Israel, and it has become a key partner in the war on terrorism. The US strategic posture in the Middle East depends on Saudi Arabia having a friendly and moderate regime.

#### Global nuke war

Primakov 9 [September, Yevgeny, President of the Chamber of Commerce and Industry of the Russian Federation; Member of the Russian Academy of Sciences; member of the Editorial Board of Russia in Global Affairs. This article is based on the scientific report for which the author was awarded the Lomonosov Gold Medal of the Russian Academy of Sciences in 2008, “The Middle East Problem in the Context of International Relations”]

The Middle East conflict is unparalleled in terms of its potential for spreading globally. During the Cold War, amid which the Arab-Israeli conflict evolved, the two opposing superpowers directly supported the conflicting parties: the Soviet Union supported Arab countries, while the United States supported Israel. On the one hand, the bipolar world order which existed at that time objectively played in favor of the escalation of the Middle East conflict into a global confrontation. On the other hand, the Soviet Union and the United States were not interested in such developments and they managed to keep the situation under control. The behavior of both superpowers in the course of all the wars in the Middle East proves that. In 1956, during the Anglo-French-Israeli military invasion of Egypt (which followed Cairo’s decision to nationalize the Suez Canal Company) the United States – contrary to the widespread belief in various countries, including Russia – not only refrained from supporting its allies but insistently pressed – along with the Soviet Union – for the cessation of the armed action. Washington feared that the tripartite aggression would undermine the positions of the West in the Arab world and would result in a direct clash with the Soviet Union. Fears that hostilities in the Middle East might acquire a global dimension could materialize also during the Six-Day War of 1967. On its eve, Moscow and Washington urged each other to cool down their “clients.” When the war began, both superpowers assured each other that they did not intend to get involved in the crisis militarily and that that they would make efforts at the United Nations to negotiate terms for a ceasefire. On July 5, the Chairman of the Soviet Government, Alexei Kosygin, who was authorized by the Politburo to conduct negotiations on behalf of the Soviet leadership, for the first time ever used a hot line for this purpose. After the USS *Liberty* was attacked by Israeli forces, which later claimed the attack was a case of mistaken identity, U.S. President Lyndon Johnson immediately notified Kosygin that the movement of the U.S. Navy in the Mediterranean Sea was only intended to help the crew of the attacked ship and to investigate the incident. The situation repeated itself during the hostilities of October 1973. Russian publications of those years argued that it was the Soviet Union that prevented U.S. military involvement in those events. In contrast, many U.S. authors claimed that a U.S. reaction thwarted Soviet plans to send troops to the Middle East. Neither statement is true. The atmosphere was really quite tense. Sentiments both in Washington and Moscow were in favor of interference, yet both capitals were far from taking real action. When U.S. troops were put on high alert, Henry Kissinger assured Soviet Ambassador Anatoly Dobrynin that this was done largely for domestic considerations and should not be seen by Moscow as a hostile act. In a private conversation with Dobrynin, President Richard Nixon said the same, adding that he might have overreacted but that this had been done amidst a hostile campaign against him over Watergate. Meanwhile, Kosygin and Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko at a Politburo meeting in Moscow strongly rejected a proposal by Defense Minister Marshal Andrei Grechko to “demonstrate” Soviet military presence in Egypt in response to Israel’s refusal to comply with a UN Security Council resolution. Soviet leader Leonid Brezhnev took the side of Kosygin and Gromyko, saying that he was against any Soviet involvement in the conflict. The above suggests an unequivocal conclusion that control by the superpowers in the bipolar world did not allow the Middle East conflict to escalate into a global confrontation. After the end of the Cold War, some scholars and political observers concluded that a real threat of the Arab-Israeli conflict going beyond regional frameworks ceased to exist. However, in the 21st century this conclusionno longer conforms to the realit**y**. The U.S. military operation in Iraq has changed the balance of forces in the Middle East. The disappearance of the Iraqi counterbalance has brought Iran to the fore as a regional power claiming a direct role in various Middle East processes. I do not belong to those who believe that the Iranian leadership has already made a political decision to create nuclear weapons of its own. Yet Tehran seems to have set itself the goal of achieving a technological level that would let it make such a decision (the “Japanese model”) under unfavorable circumstances. Israel already possesses nuclear weapons and delivery vehicles. In such circumstances, the absence of a Middle East settlement opens a dangerous prospect ofa nuclear collision in the region, which would have catastrophic consequences for the whole world**.** The transition to a multipolar world has objectively strengthened the role of states and organizations that are directly involved in regional conflicts, which increases the latter’s danger and reduces the possibility of controlling them. This refers, above all, to the Middle East conflict. The coming of Barack Obama to the presidency has allayed fears that the United States could deliver a preventive strike against Iran (under George W. Bush, it was one of the most discussed topics in the United States). However, fears have increased that such a strike can be launched *Yevgeny Primakov* 1 3 2 RUSSIA IN GLOBAL AFFAIRS VOL. 7 • No. 3 • JULY – SEPTEMBER• 2009 by Israel, which would have unpredictable consequences for the region and beyond. It seems that President Obama’s position does not completely rule out such a possibility.

#### Scenario 2 is Pakistan

#### Overuse of drones in Pakistan empowers militants and destabilizes the government

Michael J Boyle 13, Assistant Professor of Political Science at La Salle University, former Lecturer in International Relations and Research Fellow at the Centre for the Study of Terrorism and Political Violence at the University of St Andrews, PhD from Cambridge University, January 2013, “The costs and consequences of drone warfare,” International Affairs 89: 1 (2013) 1–29, <http://www.chathamhouse.org/sites/default/files/public/International%20Affairs/2013/89_1/89_1Boyle.pdf>

The escalation of drone strikes in Pakistan to its current tempo—one every few days—directly contradicts the long-term American strategic goal of boosting the capacity and legitimacy of the government in Islamabad. Drone attacks are more than just temporary incidents that erase all traces of an enemy. They have lasting political effects that can weaken existing governments, undermine their legitimacy and add to the ranks of their enemies. These political effects come about because drones provide a powerful signal to the population of a targeted state that the perpetrator considers the sovereignty of their government to be negligible. The popular perception that a government is powerless to stop drone attacks on its territory can be crippling to the incumbent regime, and can embolden its domestic rivals to challenge it through violence. Such continual violations of the territorial integrity of a state also have direct consequences for the legitimacy of its government. Following a meeting with General David Petraeus, Pakistani President Asif Ali Zardari described the political costs of drones succinctly, saying that ‘continuing drone attacks on our country, which result in loss of precious lives or property, are counterproductive and difficult to explain by a democratically elected government. It is creating a credibility gap.’75 Similarly, the Pakistani High Commissioner to London Wajid Shamsul Hasan said in August 2012 that¶ what has been the whole outcome of these drone attacks is that you have directly or indirectly contributed to destabilizing or undermining the democratic government. Because people really make fun of the democratic government—when you pass a resolution against drone attacks in the parliament and nothing happens. The Americans don’t listen to you, and they continue to violate your territory.76¶ The appearance of powerlessness in the face of drones is corrosive to the appearance of competence and legitimacy of the Pakistani government. The growing perception that the Pakistani civilian government is unable to stop drone attacks is particularly dangerous in a context where 87 per cent of all Pakistanis are dissatisfied with the direction of the country and where the military, which has launched coups before, remains a popular force.77

#### Pakistan instability causes loose nukes and Indian intervention --- goes nuclear

Michael O’Hanlon 5, senior fellow with the Center for 21st Century Security and Intelligence and director of research for the Foreign Policy program at the Brookings Institution, visiting lecturer at Princeton University, an adjunct professor at Johns Hopkins University, and a member of the International Institute for Strategic Studies

PhD in public and international affairs from Princeton, Apr 27 2005, “Dealing with the Collapse of a Nuclear-Armed State: The Cases of North Korea and Pakistan,” http://www.princeton.edu/~ppns/papers/ohanlon.pdf

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

#### Extinction

Greg Chaffin 11, Research Assistant at Foreign Policy in Focus, July 8, 2011, “Reorienting U.S. Security Strategy in South Asia,” online: http://www.fpif.org/articles/reorienting\_us\_security\_strategy\_in\_south\_asia

A nuclear conflict in the subcontinent would have disastrous effects on the world as a whole. In a January 2010 paper published in Scientific American, climatology professors Alan Robock and Owen Brian Toon forecast the global repercussions of a regional nuclear war. Their results are strikingly similar to those of studies conducted in 1980 that conclude that a nuclear war between the United States and the Soviet Union would result in a catastrophic and prolonged nuclear winter, which could very well place the survival of the human race in jeopardy. In their study, Robock and Toon use computer models to simulate the effect of a nuclear exchange between India and Pakistan in which each were to use roughly half their existing arsenals (50 apiece). Since Indian and Pakistani nuclear devices are strategic rather than tactical, the likely targets would be major population centers. Owing to the population densities of urban centers in both nations, the number of direct casualties could climb as high as 20 million. ¶ The fallout of such an exchange would not merely be limited to the immediate area. First, the detonation of a large number of nuclear devices would propel as much as seven million metric tons of ash, soot, smoke, and debris as high as the lower stratosphere. Owing to their small size (less than a tenth of a micron) and a lack of precipitation at this altitude, ash particles would remain aloft for as long as a decade, during which time the world would remain perpetually overcast. Furthermore, these particles would soak up heat from the sun, generating intense heat in the upper atmosphere that would severely damage the earth’s ozone layer. The inability of sunlight to penetrate through the smoke and dust would lead to global cooling by as much as 2.3 degrees Fahrenheit. This shift in global temperature would lead to more drought, worldwide food shortages, and widespread political upheaval.

#### Advantage 2 is Norms

#### Failure to adopt rules for US drones sets an abusive international precedent----magnifies every impact by causing global instability and collapse of interstate relations

Kristen Roberts 13, news editor for National Journal, master's in security studies from Georgetown University, master's degree in journalism from Columbia University, March 21st, 2013, "When the Whole World Has Drones," National Journal, www.nationaljournal.com/magazine/when-the-whole-world-has-drones-20130321

To implement this covert program, the administration has adopted a tool that lowers the threshold for lethal force by reducing the cost and risk of combat. This still-expanding counterterrorism use of drones to kill people, including its own citizens, outside of traditionally defined battlefields and established protocols for warfare, has given friends and foes a green light to employ these aircraft in extraterritorial operations that could not only affect relations between the nation-states involved but also destabilize entire regions and potentially upset geopolitical order.¶ Hyperbole? Consider this: Iran, with the approval of Damascus, carries out a lethal strike on anti-Syrian forces inside Syria; Russia picks off militants tampering with oil and gas lines in Ukraine or Georgia; Turkey arms a U.S.-provided Predator to kill Kurdish militants in northern Iraq who it believes are planning attacks along the border. Label the targets as terrorists, and in each case, Tehran, Moscow, and Ankara may point toward Washington and say, we learned it by watching you. In Pakistan, Yemen, and Afghanistan.¶ This is the unintended consequence of American drone warfare. For all of the attention paid to the drone program in recent weeks—about Americans on the target list (there are none at this writing) and the executive branch’s legal authority to kill by drone outside war zones (thin, by officials’ own private admission)—what goes undiscussed is Washington’s deliberate failure to establish clear and demonstrable rules for itself **that would at minimum** create a globally relevant standard **for delineating between legitimate and rogue uses of one of the most awesome military robotics capabilities of this generation.**

#### And it makes great power war inevitable by tempting leaders to use drones too often---causes escalation---traditional checks don’t apply

Eric Posner 13, a professor at the University of Chicago Law School, May 15th, 2013, "The Killer Robot War is Coming," Slate, www.slate.com/articles/news\_and\_politics/view\_from\_chicago/2013/05/drone\_warfare\_and\_spying\_we\_need\_new\_laws.html

Drones have existed for decades, but in recent years they have become ubiquitous. Some people celebrate drones as an effective and humane weapon because they can be used with precision to slay enemies and spare civilians, and argue that they pose no special risks that cannot be handled by existing law. Indeed, drones, far more than any other weapon, enable governments to comply with international humanitarian law by avoiding civilian casualties when attacking enemies. Drone defenders also mocked Rand Paul for demanding that the Obama administration declare whether it believed that it could kill people with drones on American territory. Existing law permits the police to shoot criminals who pose an imminent threat to others; if police can gun down hostage takers and rampaging shooters, why can’t they drone them down too?¶ While there is much to be said in favor of these arguments, drone technology poses a paradox that its defenders have not confronted. Because drones are cheap, effective, riskless for their operators, and adept at minimizing civilian casualties, governments may be tempted to use them too frequently.¶ Indeed, a panic has already arisen that the government will use drones to place the public under surveillance. Many municipalities have passed laws prohibiting such spying even though it has not yet taken place. Why can’t we just assume that existing privacy laws and constitutional rights are sufficient to prevent abuses?¶ To see why, consider U.S. v. Jones, a 2012 case in which the Supreme Court held that the police must get a search warrant before attaching a GPS tracking device to a car, because the physical attachment of the device trespassed on property rights. Justice Samuel Alito argued that this protection was insufficient, because the government could still spy on people from the air. While piloted aircraft are too expensive to use routinely, drones are not, or will not be. One might argue that if the police can observe and follow you in public without obtaining a search warrant, they should be able to do the same thing with drones. But when the cost of surveillance declines, more surveillance takes place. If police face manpower limits, then they will spy only when strong suspicions justify the intrusion on targets’ privacy. If police can launch limitless drones, then we may fear that police will be tempted to shadow ordinary people without good reason.¶ Similarly, we may be comfortable with giving the president authority to use military force on his own when he must put soldiers into harm’s way, knowing that he will not risk lives lightly. Presidents have learned through hard experience that the public will not tolerate even a handful of casualties if it does not believe that the mission is justified. But when drones eliminate the risk of casualties, the president is more likely to launch wars too often.¶ The same problem arises internationally. The international laws that predate drones assume that military intervention across borders risks significant casualties. Since that check normally kept the peace, international law could give a lot of leeway for using military force to chase down terrorists. But if the risk of casualties disappears, then nations might too eagerly attack, resulting in blowback and retaliation. Ironically, the reduced threat to civilians in tactical operations could wind up destabilizing relationships between countries, including even major powers like the United States and China, making the long-term threat to human life much greater.¶ These three scenarios illustrate the same lesson: that law and technology work in tandem. When technological barriers limit the risk of government abuse, legal restrictions on governmental action can be looser. When those technological barriers fall, legal restrictions may need to be tightened.

#### These conflicts go nuclear --- wrecks global stability

Michael J Boyle 13, Assistant Professor of Political Science at La Salle University, former Lecturer in International Relations and Research Fellow at the Centre for the Study of Terrorism and Political Violence at the University of St Andrews, PhD from Cambridge University, January 2013, “The costs and consequences of drone warfare,” International Affairs 89: 1 (2013) 1–29, http://www.chathamhouse.org/sites/default/files/public/International%20Affairs/2013/89\_1/89\_1Boyle.pdf

A second consequence of the spread of drones is that many of the traditional concepts which have underwritten stability in the international system will be radically reshaped by drone technology. For example, much of the stability among the Great Powers in the international system is driven by deterrence, specifically nuclear deterrence.135 Deterrence operates with informal rules of the game and tacit bargains that govern what states, particularly those holding nuclear weapons, may and may not do to one another.136 While it is widely understood that nuclear-capable states will conduct aerial surveillance and spy on one another, overt military confrontations between nuclear powers are rare because they are assumed to be costly and prone to escalation. One open question is whether these states will exercise the same level of restraint with drone surveillance, which is unmanned, low cost, and possibly deniable. States may be more willing to engage in drone overflights which test the resolve of their rivals, or engage in ‘salami tactics’ to see what kind of drone-led incursion, if any, will motivate a response.137 This may have been Hezbollah’s logic in sending a drone into Israeli airspace in October 2012, possibly to relay information on Israel’s nuclear capabilities.138 After the incursion, both Hezbollah and Iran boasted that the drone incident demonstrated their military capabilities.139 One could imagine two rival states—for example, India and Pakistan—deploying drones to test each other’s capability and resolve, with untold consequences if such a probe were misinterpreted by the other as an attack. As drones get physically smaller and more precise, and as they develop a greater flying range, the temptation to use them to spy on a rival’s nuclear programme or military installations might prove too strong to resist. If this were to happen, drones might gradually erode the deterrent relationships that exist between nuclear powers, thus magnifying the risks of a spiral of conflict between them.

#### Credible external oversight is key---leads to international modeling and allows the US to effectively crack down on other abusive drone programs

Omar S. Bashir 12, is a Ph.D. candidate in the Department of Politics at Princeton University and a graduate of the Department of Aeronautics and Astronautics at MIT, September 24th, 2012, "Who Watches the Drones?" Foreign Affairs,www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/138141/omar-s-bashir/who-watches-the-drones

Further, the U.S. counterterrorism chief John Brennan has noted that the administration is "establishing precedents that other nations may follow." But, for now, other countries have no reason to believe that the United States carries out its own targeted killing operations responsibly. Without a credible oversight program, those negative perceptions of U.S. behavior will fill the vacuum, and an anything-goes standard might be the result. U.S. denunciations of other countries' programs could come to ring hollow. ¶ If the United States did adopt an oversight system, those denunciations would carry more weight. So, too, would U.S. pressure on other states to adopt similar systems: just as suspicions grow when countries refuse nuclear inspection, foreign governments that turned down invitations to apply a proven system of oversight to their own drone campaigns would reveal their disregard for humanitarian concerns.

#### Now is key to shape international norms and only the US can lead---lack of rules undermines all other norms on violence

James Whibley 13, received a M.A. in International Relations from Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand, February 6th, 2013 "The Proliferation of Drone Warfare: The Weakening of Norms and International Precedent," Georgetown Journal of International Affairs,journal.georgetown.edu/2013/02/06/the-proliferation-of-drone-warfare-the-weakening-of-norms-and-international-precedent-by-james-whibley/

While drone advocates such as Max Boot argue that other countries are unlikely to follow any precedents about drone use established by America, power has an undeniable effect in establishing which norms are respected or enforced. America used its power in the international system after World War 2 to embed norms about human rights and liberal political organization, not only in allies, but in former adversaries and the international system as a whole. Likewise, the literature on rule-oriented constructivism presents a powerful case that norms have set precedents on the appropriate war-fighting and deterrence policies when using weapons of mass destruction and the practices of colonialism and human intervention. Therefore, drones advocates must consider the possible **unintended consequences of lending legitimacy to the** unrestricted use of drones. However, with the Obama administration only now beginning to formulate rules about using drones and seemingly uninterested in restraining its current practices, the US may miss an opportunity to entrench international norms about drone operations.¶ If countries begin to follow the precedent set by the US, there is also the risk of weakening pre-existing international norms about the use of violence. In the summer 2000 issue of International Security, Ward Thomas warned that, while the long-standing norm against assassination has always been less applicable to terrorist groups, the targeting of terrorists is, “likely to undermine the norm as a whole and erode the barriers to the use of assassination in other circumstances.” Such an occurrence would represent a deleterious unintended consequence to an already inhumane international system, justifying greater scrutiny of the drone program.¶ Realism cautions scholars not to expect ethical behaviour in international politics. Yet, the widespread use of drones by recent administrations with little accountability and the lack of any normative framework about their deployment on the battlefield could come to be seen as a serious strategic error and moral failing. If the Obama administration was nervous about leaving an amorphous drone policy to a possible Romney Presidency, then surely China or Russia possessing such a program would be terrifying.

#### That prevents heg decline and allows the US to set global drones norms that prevent the worst consequences of use

Michael J Boyle 13, Assistant Professor of Political Science at La Salle University, former Lecturer in International Relations and Research Fellow at the Centre for the Study of Terrorism and Political Violence at the University of St Andrews, PhD from Cambridge University, January 2013, “The costs and consequences of drone warfare,” International Affairs 89: 1 (2013) 1–29, http://www.chathamhouse.org/sites/default/files/public/International%20Affairs/2013/89\_1/89\_1Boyle.pdf

In his second term, President Obama has an opportunity to reverse course and establish a new drones policy which mitigates these costs and avoids some of the long-term consequences that flow from them. A more sensible US approach would impose some limits on drone use in order to minimize the political costs and long-term strategic consequences. One step might be to limit the use of drones to HVTs, such as leading political and operational figures for terrorist networks, while reducing or eliminating the strikes against the ‘foot soldiers’ or other Islamist networks not related to Al-Qaeda. This approach would reduce the number of strikes and civilian deaths associated with drones while reserving their use for those targets that pose a direct or imminent threat to the security of the United States. Such a self-limiting approach to drones might also minimize the degree of political opposition that US drone strikes generate in states such as Pakistan and Yemen, as their leaders, and even the civilian population, often tolerate or even approve of strikes against HVTs. Another step might be to improve the levels of transparency of the drone programme. At present, there are no publicly articulated guidelines stipulating who can be killed by a drone and who cannot, and no data on drone strikes are released to the public.154 Even a Department of Justice memorandum which authorized the Obama administration to kill Anwar al-Awlaki, an American citizen, remains classified.155 Such non-transparency fuels suspicions that the US is indifferent to the civilian casualties caused by drone strikes, a perception which in turn magnifies the deleterious political consequences of the strikes. Letting some sunlight in on the drones programme would not eliminate all of the opposition to it, but it would go some way towards undercutting the worst conspiracy theories about drone use in these countries while also signalling that the US government holds itself legally and morally accountable for its behaviour.156¶ A final, and crucial, step towards mitigating the strategic consequences of drones would be to develop internationally recognized standards and norms for their use and sale. It is not realistic to suggest that the US stop using its drones altogether, or to assume that other countries will accept a moratorium on buying and using drones. The genie is out of the bottle: drones will be a fact of life for years to come. What remains to be done is to ensure that their use and sale are transparent, regulated and consistent with internationally recognized human rights standards. The Obama administration has already begun to show some awareness that drones are dangerous if placed in the wrong hands. A recent New York Times report revealed that the Obama administration began to develop a secret drones ‘rulebook’ to govern their use if Mitt Romney were to be elected president.157 The same logic operates on the international level. Lethal drones will eventually be in the hands of those who will use them with fewer scruples than President Obama has. Without a set of internationally recognized standards or norms governing their sale and use, drones will proliferate without control, be misused by governments and non-state actors, and become an instrument of repression for the strong. One remedy might be an international convention on the sale and use of drones which could establish guidelines and norms for their use, perhaps along the lines of the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons (CCW) treaty, which attempted to spell out rules on the use of incendiary devices and fragment-based weapons.158 While enforcement of these guidelines and adherence to rules on their use will be imperfect and marked by derogations, exceptions and violations, the presence of a convention may reinforce norms against the flagrant misuse of drones and induce more restraint in their use than might otherwise be seen. Similarly, a UN investigatory body on drones would help to hold states accountable for their use of drones and begin to build a gradual consensus on the types of activities for which drones can, and cannot, be used.159 As the progenitor and leading user of drone technology, the US now has an opportunity to show leadership in developing an international legal architecture which might avert some of the worst consequences of their use.¶ If the US fails to take these steps, its unchecked pursuit of drone technology will have serious consequences for its image and global position. Much of American counterterrorism policy is premised on the notion that the narrative that sustains Al-Qaeda must be challenged and eventually broken if the terrorist threat is to subside over the long term. The use of drones does not break this narrative, but rather confirms it. It is ironic that Al-Qaeda’s image of the United States—as an all-seeing, irreconcilably hostile enemy who rains down bombs and death on innocent Muslims without a second thought—is inadvertently reinforced by a drones policy that does not bother to ask the names of its victims. Even the casual anti-Americanism common in many parts of Europe, the Middle East and Asia, much of which portrays the US as cruel, domineering and indifferent to the suffering of others, is reinforced by a drones policy which involves killing foreign citizens on an almost daily basis. A choice must be made: the US cannot rely on drones as it does now while attempting to convince others that these depictions are gross caricatures. Over time, an excessive reliance on drones will deepen the reservoirs of anti-US sentiment, embolden America’s enemies and provide other governments with a compelling public rationale to resist a US-led international order which is underwritten by sudden, blinding strikes from the sky. For the United States, preventing these outcomes is a matter of urgent importance in a world of rising powers and changing geopolitical alignments. No matter how it justifies its own use of drones as exceptional, the US is establishing precedents which others in the international system—friends and enemies, states and non-state actors—may choose to follow. Far from being a world where violence is used more carefully and discriminately, a drones-dominated world may be one where human life is cheapened because it can so easily, and so indifferently, be obliterated with the press of a button. Whether this is a world that the United States wants to create—or even live in—is an issue that demands attention from those who find it easy to shrug off the loss of life that drones inflict on others today.

#### Decline of US leadership causes global conflict

Zhang and Shi 11 Yuhan Zhang is a researcher at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Washington, D.C.; Lin Shi is from Columbia University. She also serves as an independent consultant for the Eurasia Group and a consultant for the World Bank in Washington, D.C., 1/22, “America’s decline: A harbinger of conflict and rivalry”, http://www.eastasiaforum.org/2011/01/22/americas-decline-a-harbinger-of-conflict-and-rivalry/

This does not necessarily mean that the US is in systemic decline, but it encompasses a trend that appears to be negative and perhaps alarming. Although the US still possesses incomparable military prowess and its economy remains the world’s largest, the once seemingly indomitable chasm that separated America from anyone else is narrowing. Thus, the global distribution of power is shifting, and the inevitable result will be a world that is less peaceful, liberal and prosperous, burdened by a dearth of effective conflict regulation. Over the past two decades, no other state has had the ability to seriously challenge the US military. Under these circumstances, motivated by both opportunity and fear, many actors have bandwagoned with US hegemony and accepted a subordinate role. Canada, most of Western Europe, India, Japan, South Korea, Australia, Singapore and the Philippines have all joined the US, creating a status quo that has tended to mute great power conflicts. However, as the hegemony that drew these powers together withers, so will the pulling power behind the US alliance. The result will be an international order where power is more diffuse, American interests and influence can be more readily challenged, and conflicts or wars may be harder to avoid. As history attests, power decline and redistribution result in military confrontation. For example, in the late 19th century America’s emergence as a regional power saw it launch its first overseas war of conquest towards Spain. By the turn of the 20th century, accompanying the increase in US power and waning of British power, the American Navy had begun to challenge the notion that Britain ‘rules the waves.’ Such a notion would eventually see the US attain the status of sole guardians of the Western Hemisphere’s security to become the order-creating Leviathan shaping the international system with democracy and rule of law. Defining this US-centred system are three key characteristics: enforcement of property rights, constraints on the actions of powerful individuals and groups and some degree of equal opportunities for broad segments of society. As a result of such political stability, free markets, liberal trade and flexible financial mechanisms have appeared. And, with this, many countries have sought opportunities to enter this system, proliferating stable and cooperative relations. However, what will happen to these advances as America’s influence declines? Given that America’s authority, although sullied at times, has benefited people across much of Latin America, Central and Eastern Europe, the Balkans, as well as parts of Africa and, quite extensively, Asia, the answer to this question could affect global society in a profoundly detrimental way. Public imagination and academia have anticipated that a post-hegemonic world would return to the problems of the 1930s: regional blocs, trade conflicts and strategic rivalry. Furthermore, multilateral institutions such as the IMF, the World Bank or the WTO might give way to regional organisations. For example, Europe and East Asia would each step forward to fill the vacuum left by Washington’s withering leadership to pursue their own visions of regional political and economic orders. Free markets would become more politicised — and, well, less free — and major powers would compete for supremacy. Additionally, such power plays have historically possessed a zero-sum element. In the late 1960s and 1970s, US economic power declined relative to the rise of the Japanese and Western European economies, with the US dollar also becoming less attractive. And, as American power eroded, so did international regimes (such as the Bretton Woods System in 1973). A world without American hegemony is one where great power wars re-emerge, the liberal international system is supplanted by an authoritarian one, and trade protectionism devolves into restrictive, anti-globalisation barriers. This, at least, is one possibility we can forecast in a future that will inevitably be devoid of unrivalled US primacy.

#### Lack of norms causes Chinese drone aggression in maritime disputes---that increases tensions

Shawn Brimley 13, Ben FitzGerald, and Ely Ratner, vice president, director of the Technology and National Security Program, and deputy director of the Asia Program at the Center for a New American Security, 9/17/13, The Drone War Comes to Asia, Foreign Policy, <http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2013/09/17/the_drone_war_comes_to_asia?page=full>

It's now been a year since Japan's previously ruling liberal government purchased three of the Senkaku Islands to prevent a nationalist and provocative Tokyo mayor from doing so himself. The move was designed to dodge a potential crisis with China, which claims "indisputable sovereignty" over the islands it calls the Diaoyus.¶ Disregarding the Japanese government's intent, Beijing has reacted to the "nationalization" of the islands by flooding the surrounding waters and airspace with Chinese vessels in an effort to undermine Japan's de facto administration, which has persisted since the reversion of Okinawa from American control in 1971. Chinese incursions have become so frequent that the Japanese Air Self-Defense Forces (JASDF) are now scrambling jet fighters on a near-daily basis in response.¶ In the midst of this heightened tension, you could be forgiven for overlooking the news early in September that Japanese F-15s had again taken flight after Beijing graciously commemorated the one-year anniversary of Tokyo's purchase by sending an unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV) toward the islands. But this wasn't just another day at the office in the contested East China Sea: this was the first known case of a Chinese drone approaching the Senkakus.¶ Without a doubt, China's drone adventure 100-miles north of the Senkakus was significant because it aggravated already abysmal relations between Tokyo and Beijing. Japanese officials responded to the incident by suggesting that Japan might have to place government personnel on the islands, a red line for Beijing that would have been unthinkable prior to the past few years of Chinese assertiveness.¶ But there's a much bigger and more pernicious cycle in motion. The introduction of indigenous drones into Asia's strategic environment -- now made official by China's maiden unmanned provocation -- will bring with it additional sources of instability and escalation to the fiercely contested South and East China Seas. Even though no government in the region wants to participate in major power war, there is widespread and growing concern that military conflict could result from a minor incident that spirals out of control.¶ Unmanned systems could be just this trigger. They are less costly to produce and operate than their manned counterparts, meaning that we're likely to see more crowded skies and seas in the years ahead. UAVs also tend to encourage greater risk-taking, given that a pilot's life is not at risk. But being unmanned has its dangers: any number of software or communications failures could lead a mission awry. Combine all that with inexperienced operators and you have a perfect recipe for a mistake or miscalculation in an already tense strategic environment. ¶ The underlying problem is not just the drones themselves. Asia is in the midst of transitioning to a new warfighting regime with serious escalatory potential. China's military modernization is designed to deny adversaries freedom of maneuver over, on, and under the East and South China Seas. Although China argues that its strategy is primarily defensive, the capabilities it is choosing to acquire to create a "defensive" perimeter -- long-range ballistic and cruise missiles, aircraft carriers, submarines -- are acutely offensive in nature. During a serious crisis when tensions are high, China would have powerful incentives to use these capabilities, particularly missiles, before they were targeted by the United States or another adversary. The problem is that U.S. military plans and posture have the potential to be equally escalatory, as they would reportedly aim to "blind" an adversary -- disrupting or destroying command and control nodes at the beginning of a conflict.¶ At the same time, the increasingly unstable balance of military power in the Pacific is exacerbated by the (re)emergence of other regional actors with their own advanced military capabilities. Countries that have the ability and resources to embark on rapid modernization campaigns (e.g., Japan, South Korea, Indonesia) are well on the way. This means that in addition to two great powers vying for military advantage, the region features an increasingly complex set of overlapping military-technical competitions that are accelerating tensions, adding to uncertainty and undermining stability.¶ This dangerous military dynamic will only get worse as more disruptive military technologies appear, including the rapid diffusion of unmanned and increasingly autonomous aerial and submersible vehicles coupled with increasingly effective offensive cyberspace capabilities.¶ Of particular concern is not only the novelty of these new technologies, but the lack of well-established norms for their use in conflict.¶ Thankfully, the first interaction between a Chinese UAV and manned Japanese fighters passed without major incident. But it did raise serious questions that neither nation has likely considered in detail. What will constrain China's UAV incursions from becoming increasingly assertive and provocative? How will either nation respond in a scenario where an adversary downs a UAV? And what happens politically when a drone invariably falls out of the sky or "drifts off course" with both sides pointing fingers at one another? Of most concern, how would these matters be addressed during a crisis, with no precedents, in the context of a regional military regime in which actors have powerful incentives to strike first?¶ These are not just theoretical questions: Japan's Defense Ministry is reportedly looking into options for shooting down any unmanned drones that enter its territorial airspace.¶ Resolving these issues in a fraught strategic environment between two potential adversaries is difficult enough; the United States and China remain at loggerheads about U.S. Sensitive Reconnaissance Operations along China's periphery. But the problem is multiplying rapidly. The Chinese are running one of the most significant UAV programs in the world, a program that includes Reaper- style UAVs and Unmanned Combat Aerial Vehicles (UCAVs); Japan is seeking to acquire Global Hawks; the Republic of Korea is acquiring Global Hawks while also building their own indigenous UAV capabilities; Taiwan is choosing to develop indigenous UAVs instead of importing from abroad; Indonesia is seeking to build a UAV squadron; and Vietnam is planning to build an entire UAV factory.¶ One could take solace in Asia's ability to manage these gnarly sources of insecurity if the region had demonstrated similar competencies elsewhere. But nothing could be further from the case. It has now been more than a decade since the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) and China signed a declaration "to promote a peaceful, friendly and harmonious environment in the South China Sea," which was meant to be a precursor to a code of conduct for managing potential incidents, accidents, and crises at sea. But the parties are as far apart as ever, and that's on well-trodden issues of maritime security with decades of legal and operational precedent to build upon.¶ It's hard to be optimistic that the region will do better in an unmanned domain in which governments and militaries have little experience and where there remains a dearth of international norms, rules, and institutions from which to draw.¶ The rapid diffusion of advanced military technology is not a future trend. These capabilities are being fielded -- right now -- in perhaps the most geopolitically dangerous area in the world, over (and soon under) the contested seas of East and Southeast Asia. These risks will only increase with time as more disruptive capabilities emerge. In the absence of political leadership, these technologies could very well lead the region into war.

#### Causes US-Sino nuclear war

Max Fisher 11, foreign affairs writer and editor for the Atlantic, MA in security studies from Johns Hopkins, Oct 31 2011, “5 Most Likely Ways the U.S. and China Could Spark Accidental Nuclear War,” http://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2011/10/5-most-likely-ways-the-us-and-china-could-spark-accidental-nuclear-war/247616

Neither the U.S. nor China has any interest in any kind of war with one other, nuclear or non-nuclear. The greater risk is an accident. Here's how it would happen. First, an unforeseen event that sparks a small conflict or threat of conflict. Second, a rapid escalation that moves too fast for either side to defuse. And, third, a mutual misunderstanding of one another's intentions.¶ This three-part process can move so quickly that the best way to avert a nuclear war is for both sides to have absolute confidence that they understand when the other will and will not use a nuclear weapon. Without this, U.S. and Chinese policy-makers would have to guess -- perhaps with only a few minutes -- if and when the other side would go nuclear. This is especially scary because both sides have good reason to err on the side of assuming nuclear war. If you think there's a 50-50 chance that someone is about to lob a nuclear bomb at you, your incentive is to launch a preventative strike, just to be safe. This is especially true because you know the other side is thinking the exact same thing. In fact, even if you think the other side probably won't launch an ICBM your way, they actually might if they fear that you're misreading their intentions or if they fear that you might over-react; this means they have a greater incentive to launch a preemptive strike, which means that you have a greater incentive to launch a preemptive strike, in turn raising their incentives, and on and on until one tiny kernel of doubt can lead to a full-fledged war that nobody wants.¶ The U.S. and the Soviet Union faced similar problems, with one important difference: speed. During the first decades of the Cold War, nuclear bombs had to be delivered by sluggish bombers that could take hours to reach their targets and be recalled at any time. Escalation was much slower and the risks of it spiraling out of control were much lower. By the time that both countries developed the ICBMs that made global annihilation something that could happen within a matter of minutes, they'd also had a generation to sort out an extremely clear understanding of one another's nuclear policies. But the U.S. and China have no such luxury -- we inherited a world where total mutual destruction can happen as quickly as the time it takes to turn a key and push a button.¶ The U.S. has the world's second-largest nuclear arsenal with around 5,000 warheads (first-ranked Russia has more warheads but less capability for flinging them around the globe); China has only about 200, so the danger of accidental war would seem to disproportionately threaten China. But the greatest risk is probably to the states on China's periphery. The borders of East Asia are still not entirely settled; there are a number of small, disputed territories, many of them bordering China. But the biggest potential conflict points are on water: disputed naval borders, disputed islands, disputed shipping lanes, and disputed underwater energy reserves. These regional disputes have already led to a handful of small-scale naval skirmishes and diplomatic stand-offs. It's not difficult to foresee one of them spiraling out of control. But what if the country squaring off with China happens to have a defense treaty with the U.S.?¶ There's a near-infinite number of small-scale conflicts that could come up between the U.S. and China, and though none of them should escalate any higher than a few tough words between diplomats, it's the unpredictable events that are the most dangerous. In 1983 alone, the U.S. and Soviet Union almost went to war twice over bizarre and unforeseeable events. In September, the Soviet Union shot down a Korean airliner it mistook for a spy plane; first Soviet officials feared the U.S. had manufactured the incident as an excuse to start a war, then they refused to admit their error, nearly pushing the U.S. to actually start war. Two months later, Soviet spies misread an elaborate U.S. wargame (which the U.S. had unwisely kept secret) as preparations for an unannounced nuclear hit on Moscow, nearly leading them to launch a preemptive strike. In both cases, one of the things that ultimately diverted disaster was the fact that both sides clearly understood the others' red lines -- as long as they didn't cross them, they could remain confident there would be no nuclear war.¶ But the U.S. and China have not yet clarified their red lines for nuclear strikes. The kinds of bizarre, freak accidents that the U.S. and Soviet Union barely survived in 1983 might well bring today's two Pacific powers into conflict -- unless, of course, they can clarify their rules. Of the many ways that the U.S. and China could stumble into the nightmare scenario that neither wants, here are five of the most likely. Any one of these appears to be extremely unlikely in today's world. But that -- like the Soviet mishaps of the 1980s -- is exactly what makes them so dangerous.

#### The United States Federal Government should create a statutory cause of action for damages for those unlawfully injured by targeted killing operations or their heirs.

#### Solvency

#### The plan establishes legal norms and ensures compliance with the laws of war

Jonathan Hafetz 13, Associate Prof of Law at Seton Hall University Law School, former Senior Staff Attorney at the ACLU, served on legal teams in multiple Supreme Court cases regarding national security, “Reviewing Drones,” 3/8/2013, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/jonathan-hafetz/reviewing-drones\_b\_2815671.html

The better course is to ensure meaningful review after the fact. To this end, Congress should authorize federal damages suits by the immediate family members of individuals killed in drone strikes.¶ Such ex post review would serve two main functions: providing judicial scrutiny of the underlying legal basis for targeted killings and affording victims a remedy. It would also give judges more leeway to evaluate the facts without fear that an error on their part might leave a dangerous terrorist at large.¶ For review to be meaningful, judges must not be restricted to deciding whether there is enough evidence in a particular case, as they would likely be under a FISA model. They must also be able to examine the government's legal arguments and, to paraphrase the great Supreme Court chief justice John Marshall, "to say what the law is" on targeted killings.¶ Judicial review through a civil action can achieve that goal. It can thus help resolve the difficult questions raised by the Justice Department white paper, including the permissible scope of the armed conflict with al Qaeda and the legality of the government's broad definition of an "imminent" threat.¶ Judges must also be able to afford a remedy to victims. Mistakes happen and, as a recent report by Columbia Law School and the Center for Civilians in Conflict suggests, they happen more than the U.S. government wants to acknowledge.¶ Errors are not merely devastating for family members and their communities. They also increase radicalization in the affected region and beyond. Drone strikes -- if unchecked -- could ultimately create more terrorists than they eliminate.¶ Courts should thus be able to review lethal strikes to determine whether they are consistent with the Constitution and with the 2001 Authorization for Use of Military Force, which requires that such uses of force be consistent with the international laws of war. If a drone strike satisfies these requirements, the suit should be dismissed.

#### Cause of action creates a deterrent effect that makes officials think twice about drones---drawbacks of judicial review don’t apply

Stephen I. Vladeck 13, Professor of Law and Associate Dean for Scholarship at American University Washington College of Law, senior editor of the peer-reviewed Journal of National Security Law and Policy, Supreme Court Fellow at the Constitution Project, and fellow at the Center on National Security at Fordham University School of Law, JD from Yale Law School, Feb 27 2013, “DRONES AND THE WAR ON TERROR: WHEN CAN THE U.S.TARGET ALLEGED AMERICAN TERRORISTS OVERSEAS?” Hearing Before the House Committee on the Judiciary, http://www.lawfareblog.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/02/Vladeck-02272013.pdf

At first blush, it may seem like many of these issues would be equally salient in the context of after-the-fact damages suits. But as long as such a regime was designed carefully and conscientiously, I believe that virtually all of these concerns could be mitigated. ¶ For starters, retrospective review doesn’t raise anywhere near the same concerns with regard to adversity or judicial competence. With respect to adversity, presumably those who are targeted in an individual strike could be represented as plaintiffs in a post-hoc proceeding, whether through their next friend or their heirs. And as long as they could state a viable claim for relief, it’s difficult to see any pure Article III problem with such a suit for retrospective relief.¶ As for competence, judges routinely review whether government officers acted in lawful self-defense under exigent circumstances (this is exactly what the Supreme Court’s 1985 decision in Tennessee v. Garner20 contemplates, after all). And if the Guantánamo litigation of the past five years has shown nothing else, it demonstrates that judges are also more than competent to resolve not just whether individual terrorism suspects are who the government says they are (and thus members of al Qaeda or one of its affiliates), but to do so using highly classified information in a manner that balances—albeit not always ideally—the government’s interest in secrecy with the detainee’s ability to contest the evidence against him.21 Just as Guantánamo detainees are represented in their habeas proceedings by security-cleared counsel who must comply with court-imposed protective orders and security procedures,22 so too, the subjects of targeted killing operations could have their estates represented by security-cleared counsel, who would be in a far better position to challenge the government’s evidence and to offer potentially exculpatory evidence / arguments of their own. And although the Guantánamo procedures have been developed by courts on an ad hoc basis (a process that has itself been criticized by some jurists), 23 Congress might also look to provisions it enacted in 1996 in creating the little-known Alien Terrorist Removal Court, especially 8 U.S.C. § 1534,24 as a model for such proceedings. ¶ More to the point, it should also follow that courts would be far more able as a practical matter to review the relevant questions in these cases after the fact. Although the pure membership question can probably be decided in the abstract, it should stand to reason that the imminence and infeasibility-of-capture issues will be much easier to assess in hindsight—removed from the pressures of the moment and with the benefit of the dispassionate distance that judicial review provides. To similar effect, whether the government used excessive force in relation to the object of the attack is also something that can only reasonably be assessed post hoc.¶ In addition to the substantive questions, it will also be much easier for courts to review the government’s own internal procedures after they are employed, especially if the government itself is already conducting after-action reviews that could be made part of the (classified) record in such cases. Indeed, the government’s own analysis could, in many cases, go a long way toward proving the lawfulness vel non of an individual strike.¶ As I mentioned before, there would still be a host of legal doctrines that would likely get in the way of such suits. Just to name a few, there is the present (albeit, in my view, unjustified) hostility to judicially inferred causes of actions under Bivens; the state secrets privilege;and sovereign and official immunity doctrines. But I am a firm believer that, except where the President himself is concerned (where there’s a stronger argument that immunity is constitutionally grounded),25 each of these concerns can be overcome by statute—as at least some of them arguably have been in the context of the express damages actions provided for under FISA. 26 So long as Congress creates an express cause of action for nominal damages, and so long as the statute both (1) expressly overrides state secrets and immunity doctrines; and (2) replaces them with carefully considered procedures for balancing the secrecy concerns that would arise in many—if not most—of these cases, these legal issues would be vitiated. Moreover, any concerns about exposing to liability government officers who acted in good faith and within the scope of their employment can be ameliorated by following the model of the Westfall Act, and substituting the United States as the proper defendant in any suit arising out of such an operation.27¶ Perhaps counterintuitively, I also believe that after-the-fact judicial review wouldn’t raise anywhere near the same prudential concerns as those noted above. Leaving aside how much less pressure judges would be under in such cases, it’s also generally true that damages regimes don’t have nearly the same validating effect on government action that ex ante approval does. Otherwise, one would expect to have seen a dramatic upsurge in lethal actions by law enforcement officers after each judicial decision refusing to impose individual liability arising out of a prior use of deadly force. So far as I know, no such evidence exists.¶ Of course, damages actions aren’t a perfect solution here. It’s obvious, but should be said anyway, that in a case in which the government does act unlawfully, no amount of damages will make the victim (or his heirs) whole. It’s also inevitable that, like much of the Guantánamo litigation, most of these suits would be resolved under extraordinary secrecy, and so there would be far less public accountability for targeted killings than, ideally, we might want. Some might also object to this proposal as being unnecessary—that, given existing criminal laws and executive orders, there is already a sufficiently clear prohibition on unlawful strikes to render any such damages regime unnecessarily superfluous. ¶ At least as to this last objection, it bears emphasizing that the existing laws depend entirely upon the beneficence of the Executive Branch, since they assume both that the government will (1) willfully disclose details of unlawful operations rather than cover them up; and (2) prosecute its own in cases in which they cross the line. Given both prior practice and unconfirmed contemporary reports of targeted killing operations that appear to raise serious legality issues, such as “signature strikes,” it doesn’t seem too much of a stretch to doubt that these remedies will prove sufficient.¶ In addition, there are two enormous upsides to damages actions that, in my mind, make them a least-worst solution—even if they are deeply, fundamentally flawed:¶ First, if nothing else, the specter of damages, even nominal damages, should have a deterrent effect on future government officers, such that, if a targeted killing operation ever was carried out in a way that violated the relevant legal rules, there would be liability—and, as importantly, precedent—such that the next government official in a similar context might think twice, and might make sure that he’s that much more convinced that the individual in question is who the government claims, and that there’s no alternative to the use of lethal force. Second, at least where the targets of such force are U.S. citizens, I believe that there is a non-frivolous argument that the Constitution may even compel at least some form of judicial process. 28 Compared to the alternatives, nominal damages actions litigated under carefully circumscribed rules of secrecy may be the only way to balance all of the relevant private, government, and legal interests at stake in such cases.¶ \* \* \*¶ In his concurrence in the Supreme Court’s famous decision in the Steel Seizure case, Justice Frankfurter suggested that “The accretion of dangerous power does not come in a day. It does come, however slowly, from the generative force of unchecked disregard of the restrictions that fence in even the most disinterested assertion of authority.”¶ 29 It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that targeted killing operations by the Executive Branch present the legislature with two realistic choices: Congress could accept with minimal scrutiny the Executive Branch’s claims that these operations are carried out lawfully and with every relevant procedural safeguard to maximize their accuracy—and thereby open the door to the “unchecked disregard” of which Justice Frankfurter warned. Or Congress could require the government to defend those assertions in individual cases before a neutral magistrate invested with the independence guaranteed by the Constitution’s salary and tenure protections. So long as the government’s interests in secrecy are adequately protected in such proceedings, and so long as these operations really are consistent with the Constitution and laws of the United States, what does the government have to hide?

## 2AC

### T

#### Restriction means limit---includes conditions

CAA 8,COURT OF APPEALS OF ARIZONA, DIVISION ONE, DEPARTMENT A, STATE OF ARIZONA, Appellee, v. JEREMY RAY WAGNER, Appellant., 2008 Ariz. App. Unpub. LEXIS 613

P10 The term "restriction" is not defined by the Legislature for the purposes of the DUI statutes. See generally A.R.S. § 28-1301 (2004) (providing the "[d]efinitions" section of the DUI statutes). In the absence of a statutory definition of a term, we look to ordinary dictionary definitions and do not construe the word as being a term of art. Lee v. State, 215 Ariz. 540, 544, ¶ 15, 161 P.3d 583, 587 (App. 2007) ("When a statutory term is not explicitly defined, we assume, unless otherwise stated, that the Legislature intended to accord the word its natural and obvious meaning, which may be discerned from its dictionary definition.").

P11 The dictionary definition of "restriction" is "[a] limitation or qualification." Black's Law Dictionary 1341 (8th ed. 1999). In fact, "limited" and "restricted" are considered synonyms. See Webster's II New Collegiate Dictionary 946 (2001). Under these commonly accepted definitions, Wagner's driving privileges were "restrict[ed]" when they were "limited" by the ignition interlock requirement. Wagner was not only [\*7] statutorily required to install an ignition interlock device on all of the vehicles he operated, A.R.S. § 28-1461(A)(1)(b), but he was also prohibited from driving any vehicle that was not equipped with such a device, regardless whether he owned the vehicle or was under the influence of intoxicants, A.R.S. § 28-1464(H). These limitations constituted a restriction on Wagner's privilege to drive, for he was unable to drive in circumstances which were otherwise available to the general driving population. Thus, the rules of statutory construction dictate that the term "restriction" includes the ignition interlock device limitation.

#### A restriction on war powers authority limits Presidential discretion---we meet

Jules Lobel 8, Professor of Law at the University of Pittsburgh  Law School, President of the Center for Constitutional Rights, represented members of Congress challenging assertions of Executive power to unilaterally initiate warfare, “Conflicts Between the Commander in Chief and Congress: Concurrent Power  over the Conduct of War,” Ohio State Law Journal, Vol 69, p 391, 2008, http://moritzlaw.osu.edu/students/groups/oslj/files/2012/04/69.3.lobel\_.pdf

So too, the congressional power to declare or authorize war has been long held to permit Congress to authorize and wage a limited war—“limited in place, in objects, and in time.” 63 When Congress places such restrictions on the President’s authority to wage war, it limits the President’s discretion to conduct battlefield operations. For example, Congress authorized President George H. W. Bush to attack Iraq in response to Iraq’s 1990 invasion of Kuwait, but it confined the President’s authority to the use of U.S. armed forces pursuant to U.N. Security Council resolutions directed to force Iraqi troops to leave Kuwait. That restriction would not have permitted the President to march into Baghdad after the Iraqi army had been decisively ejected from Kuwait, a limitation recognized by President Bush himself.64

####  Judicial review is a statutory restriction

Mortenson 11, Julian Davis Assistant Professor, University of Michigan Law School, “Review: Executive Power and the Discipline of History Crisis and Command: The History of Executive Power from George Washington to George W. Bush John Yoo. Kaplan, 2009. Pp vii, 524,” Winter 2011, University of Chicago Law Review 78 U. Chi. L. Rev. 377

At least two of Yoo's main examples of presidential power are actually instances of presidential deference to statutory restrictions during times of great national peril. The earliest is Washington's military suppression of the Whiskey Rebellion (III, pp 66-72), a domestic disturbance that Americans viewed as implicating adventurism by European powers and threatening to dismember the new nation. n60 The Calling Forth Act of 1792 n61 allowed the President to mobilize state militias under federal control, but included a series of mandatory procedural checks--including judicial [\*399] approval--that restricted his ability to do so. n62 Far from defying these comprehensive restrictions at a moment of grave crisis, Washington satisfied their every requirement in scrupulous detail. He issued a proclamation ordering the Whiskey Rebels to disperse. n63 When they refused to do so, he submitted a statement to Justice James Wilson of the Supreme Court describing the situation in Pennsylvania and requesting statutory certification. n64 Only when Wilson issued a letter precisely reciting the requisite statutory language (after first requiring the President to come back with authentication of underlying reports and verification of their handwriting n65) did Washington muster the troops. n66 Washington's compliance with statutory restrictions on his use of force continued even after his forces were in the field. Because Congress was not in session when he issued the call-up order, Washington was authorized by statute to mobilize militias from other states besides Pennsylvania--but only "until the expiration of thirty days after the commencement of the ensuing [congressional] session." n67 When it became clear that the Pennsylvania campaign would take longer than that, Washington went back to Congress to petition for extension of the statutory time limit that would otherwise have required him to [\*400] disband his troops. n68 Far from serving as an archetypal example of presidential defiance, the Whiskey Rebellion demonstrates exactly the opposite. FDR's efforts to supply the United Kingdom's war effort before Pearl Harbor teach a similar lesson. During the run-up to America's entry into the war, Congress passed a series of Neutrality Acts that supplemented longstanding statutory restrictions on providing assistance to foreign belligerents. Despite these restrictions, FDR sent a range of military assistance to the future Allies. n69 Yoo makes two important claims about the administration's actions during this period. First, he claims the administration asserted that "[a]ny statutory effort by Congress to prevent the President from transferring military equipment to help American national security would be of 'questionable constitutionality'" (III, p 300). Second, he suggests that American military assistance in fact violated the neutrality statutes (III, pp 295-301, 310, 327-28).

#### So is ex post review

ECHR 91,European Court of Human Rights, Decision in Ezelin v. France, 26 April 1991, http://www.bailii.org/eu/cases/ECHR/1991/29.html

The main question in issue concerns Article 11 (art. 11), which provides:¶ "1. Everyone has the right to freedom of peaceful assembly and to freedom of association with others, including the right to form and to join trade unions for the protection of his interests.¶ 2. No restrictions shall be placed on the exercise of these rights other than such as are prescribed by law and are necessary in a democratic society in the interests of national security or public safety, for the prevention of disorder or crime, for the protection of health or morals or for the protection of the rights and freedoms of others. ..."¶ Notwithstanding its autonomous role and particular sphere of application, Article 11 (art. 11) must, in the present case, also be considered in the light of Article 10 (art. 10) (see the Young, James and Webster judgment of 13 August 1981, Series A no. 44, p. 23, § 57). The protection of personal opinions, secured by Article 10 (art. 10), is one of the objectives of freedom of peaceful assembly as enshrined in Article 11 (art. 11).¶ A. Whether there was an interference with the exercise of the freedom of peaceful assembly¶ In the Government’s submission, Mr Ezelin had not suffered any interference with the exercise of his freedom of peaceful assembly and freedom of expression: he had been able to take part in the procession of 12 February 1983 unhindered and to express his convictions publicly, in his professional capacity and as he wished; he was reprimanded only after the event and on account of personal conduct deemed to be inconsistent with the obligations of his profession.¶ The Court does not accept this submission. The term "restrictions" in paragraph 2 of Article 11 (art. 11-2) - and of Article 10 (art. 10-2) - cannot be interpreted as not including measures - such as punitive measures - taken not before or during but after a meeting (cf. in particular, as regards Article 10 (art. 10), the Handyside judgment of 7 December 1976, Series A no. 24, p. 21, § 43, and the Müller and Others judgment of 24 May 1988, Series A no. 133, p. 19, § 28).

#### Ground---ex ante is illegal and always loses to the ex post CP

Bloomberg 13, Bloomberg Editorial Board, Feb 18 2013, “Why a ‘Drone Court’ Won’t Work,” http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2013-02-18/why-a-drone-court-won-t-work.html

As for the balance of powers, that is where we dive into constitutional hot water. Constitutional scholars agree that the president is sworn to use his “defensive power” to protect the U.S. and its citizens from any serious threat, and nothing in the Constitution gives Congress or the judiciary a right to stay his hand. It also presents a slippery slope: If a judge can call off a drone strike, can he also nix a raid such as the one that killed Osama bin Laden? If the other branches want to scrutinize the president’s national security decisions in this way, they can only do so retrospectively.

#### Obama administration interprets targeted killings to include signature strikes

Michael Carbone 12, Manager of Tech Policy and Programs at Access, an international human rights organization, 10/30/12, “US Covert "Targeted Killing" Policy in Pakistan,” <http://www.wanderlust.im/goodies/2012/11/Michael-Carbone-US-Covert-Targeted-Killing-Policy-in-Pakistan.pdf>

As the Bush Administration described in a 2004 Defense Science Board review for the Secretary of Defense, countries whose citizens express dislike for the US Government often do so because they dislike the US policies implemented in those countries—that is, 'they do not hate us for our values, but because of our policies" [4, 46]. One set of policies that is particularly unpopular in Pakistan is the US covert1 drone2 program [23, 26]. By focusing on some of the policies that currently define "targeted killing" by drone-“signature strikes", "double taps", and unique interpretations of the definition of militants and the laws of war by the Obama Administration-I will examine the discrepancies between local and US perceptions of the program [23, 26]. Through analyzing these policies we can better understand the backlash they have in Pakistan and some of the ways they may be counterproductive for the US's strategic goals in the region.

### Case

#### Lack of rules causes Chinese drone aggression in maritime disputes---that increases tensions

Christopher Bodeen 13, writer for the Huffington Post, May 3rd, 2013, "China's Drone Program Appears To Be Moving Into Overdrive," Huffington Post, www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/05/03/china-drone-program\_n\_3207392.html

BEIJING -- Determined to kill or capture a murderous Mekong River drug lord, China's security forces considered a tactic they'd never tried before: calling a drone strike on his remote hideaway deep in the hills of Myanmar.¶ The attack didn't happen – the man was later captured and brought to China for trial – but the fact that authorities were considering such an option cast new light on China's unmanned aerial vehicle program, which has been quietly percolating for years and now appears to be moving into overdrive.¶ Chinese aerospace firms have developed dozens of drones, known also as unmanned aerial vehicles, or UAVs. Many have appeared at air shows and military parades, including some that bear an uncanny resemblance to the Predator, Global Hawk and Reaper models used with deadly effect by the U.S. Air Force and CIA. Analysts say that although China still trails the U.S. and Israel, the industry leaders, its technology is maturing rapidly and on the cusp of widespread use for surveillance and combat strikes.¶ "My sense is that China is moving into large-scale deployments of UAVs," said Ian Easton, co-author of a recent report on Chinese drones for the Project 2049 Institute security think tank.¶ China's move into large-scale drone deployment displays its military's growing sophistication and could challenge U.S. military dominance in the Asia-Pacific. It also could elevate the threat to neighbors with territorial disputes with Beijing, including Vietnam, Japan, India and the Philippines. China says its drones are capable of carrying bombs and missiles as well as conducting reconnaissance, potentially turning them into offensive weapons in a border conflict.¶ China's increased use of drones also adds to concerns about the lack of internationally recognized standards for drone attacks. The United States has widely employed drones as a means of eliminating terror suspects in Pakistan and the Arabian Peninsula.¶ "China is following the precedent set by the U.S. The thinking is that, `If the U.S. can do it, so can we. They're a big country with security interests and so are we'," said Siemon Wezeman, a senior fellow at the arms transfers program at the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute in Sweden, or SIPRI.¶ "The justification for an attack would be that Beijing too has a responsibility for the safety of its citizens. There needs to be agreement on what the limits are," he said.¶ Though China claims its military posture is entirely defensive, its navy and civilian maritime services have engaged in repeated standoffs with ships from other nations in the South China and East China seas. India, meanwhile, says Chinese troops have set up camp almost 20 kilometers (12 miles) into Indian-claimed territory.

### Exec CP

#### Exec fiat is a voter---aff authors assume the exec WON’T act---no comparative lit kills aff ground and real world education

Richard H. Pildes 13, J.D. candidate at NYU school of law, and Samuel Issacharoff, J.D. candidate at NYU school of law, June 1st, 2013, "Drones and the Dilemma of Modern Warfare,"lsr.nellco.org/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1408&context=nyu\_plltwp

As with all use of lethal force, there must be procedures in place to maximize the likelihood of correct identification and minimize risk to innocents. In the absence of form al legal processes, sophisticated institutional entities engaged in repeated, sensitive actions – including the military – will gravitate toward their own internal analogues to legal process, even without the compulsion or shadow of formal judicial review. This is the role of bureaucratic legalism 63 in developing sustained institutional practices, even with the dim shadow of unclear legal commands. These forms of self- regulation are generated by programmatic needs to enable the entity’s own aims to be accomplished effectively; at times, that necessity will share an overlapping converge with humanitarian concerns to generate internal protocols or process-like protections that minimize the use of force and its collateral consequences, in contexts in which the use of force itself is otherwise justified. But because these process-oriented protections are not codified in statute or reflected in judicial decisions, they typically are too invisible to draw the eye of constitutional law scholars who survey these issues from much higher levels of generality.

#### Not solvency---February memo proves

Glenn Greenwald 13, J.D. from NYU, award-winning journalist, February 5th, 2013, "Chilling legal memo from Obama DOJ justifies assassination of US citizens," The Guardian, www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2013/feb/05/obama-kill-list-doj-memo

This memo is not a judicial opinion. It was not written by anyone independent of the president. To the contrary, it was written by life-long partisan lackeys: lawyers whose careerist interests depend upon staying in the good graces of Obama and the Democrats, almost certainly Marty Lederman and David Barron. Treating this document as though it confers any authority on Obama is like treating the statements of one's lawyer as a judicial finding or jury verdict.¶ Indeed, recall the primary excuse used to shield Bush officials from prosecution for their crimes of torture and illegal eavesdropping: namely, they got Bush-appointed lawyers in the DOJ to say that their conduct was legal, and therefore, it should be treated as such. This tactic - getting partisan lawyers and underlings of the president to say that the president's conduct is legal - was appropriately treated with scorn when invoked by Bush officials to justify their radical programs. As Digby wrote about Bush officials who pointed to the OLC memos it got its lawyers to issue about torture and eavesdropping, such a practice amounts to:¶ "validating the idea that obscure Justice Department officials can be granted the authority to essentially immunize officials at all levels of the government, from the president down to the lowest field officer, by issuing a secret memo. This is a very important new development in western jurisprudence and one that surely requires more study and consideration. If Richard Nixon and Ronald Reagan had known about this, they could have saved themselves a lot of trouble."¶ Life-long Democratic Party lawyers are not going to oppose the terrorism policies of the president who appointed them. A president can always find underlings and political appointees to endorse whatever he wants to do. That's all this memo is: the by-product of obsequious lawyers telling their Party's leader that he is (of course) free to do exactly that which he wants to do, in exactly the same way that Bush got John Yoo to tell him that torture was not torture, and that even it if were, it was legal.¶ That's why courts, not the president's partisan lawyers, should be making these determinations. But when the ACLU tried to obtain a judicial determination as to whether Obama is actually authorized to assassinate US citizens, the Obama DOJ went to extreme lengths to block the court from ruling on that question. They didn't want independent judges to determine the law. They wanted their own lawyers to do so.¶ That's all this memo is: Obama-loyal appointees telling their leader that he has the authority to do what he wants. But in the warped world of US politics, this - secret memos from partisan lackeys - has replaced judicial review as the means to determine the legality of the president's conduct.

#### Legitimizes violent unilateralism internationally

Ralph Nader 12, consumer advocate, lawyer, and author, Dec 1 2012, “Reining in Obama and His Drones,” http://www.truthdig.com/report/item/reining\_in\_obama\_and\_his\_drones\_20121201/

Critics point out how many times in the past that departments and agencies have put forth misleading or false intelligence, from the Vietnam War to the arguments for invading Iraq, or have missed what they should have predicted such as the fall of the Soviet Union. This legacy of errors and duplicity should restrain presidents who execute, by ordering drone operators to push buttons that target people thousands of miles away, based on secret, so-called intelligence.¶ Mr. Obama wants, in Mr. Fein’s view, to have “his secret and unaccountable predator drone assassinations to become permanent fixtures of the nation’s national security complex.” Were Obama to remember his constitutional law, such actions would have to be constitutionally authorized by Congress and subject to judicial review.¶ With his Attorney General Eric Holder maintaining that there is sufficient due process entirely inside the Executive Branch and without Congressional oversight or judicial review, don’t bet on anything more than a more secret, violent, imperial presidency that shreds the Constitution’s separation of powers and checks and balances.¶ And don’t bet that other countries of similar invasive bent won’t remember this green-light on illegal unilateralism when they catch up with our drone capabilities.

#### Other countries won’t believe us---external verification key

Philip Alston 11, John Norton Pomeroy Professor of Law at the NYU School of Law, former UN Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions, “The CIA and Targeted Killings Beyond Borders,” 2011, 2 Harv. Nat'l Sec. J. 283, lexis

Before moving to consider the Obama administration's approach to these issues, it is important to underscore the fact that we are talking about two different levels of accountability. The first is that national procedures must meet certain standards of transparency and accountability in order to meet existing international obligations. The second is that the national procedures must themselves be sufficiently transparent to international bodies as to permit the latter to make their own assessment of the extent to which the state concerned is in compliance with its obligations. In other words, even in situations in which states argue that they put in place highly impartial and reliable accountability mechanisms, the international community cannot be expected to take such assurances on the basis of faith rather than of convincing information. Assurances offered by other states accused of transgressing international standards would not be accepted by the United States in the absence of sufficient information upon the basis of which some form of verification is feasible. Since the 1980s, the phrase "trust but verify" n104 has been something of a mantra in the arms control field, but it is equally applicable in relation to IHL and IHRL. The United States has consistently demanded of other states that they demonstrate to the international community the extent of their compliance with international standards. A great many examples could be cited, not only from the annual State Department reports on the human rights practices of other states, but also from a range of statements by the President and the Secretary of State in relation to countries like Egypt, Libya, and Syria in the context of the Arab Spring of 2011.

#### It’s a rubber stamp

Ilya Somin 13, Professor of Law at George Mason University, “Hearing on ‘Drone Wars: The Constitutional and Counterterrorism Implications of Targeted Killing’: Testimony before the United States Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on the Constitution, Civil Rights, and Human Rights”, April 23, http://www.law.gmu.edu/assets/files/faculty/Somin\_DroneWarfare\_April2013.pdf

But any internal executive process has the flaw that it could always be overriden by the president, and possibly other high-ranking executive branch officials. Moreover, lower- level executive officials might be reluctant to veto drone strikes supported by their superiors, either out of careerist concerns, or because administration officials are naturally likely to share the ideological and policy priorities of the president. An external check on targeting reduces such risks. External review might also enhance the credibility of the target-selection process with informed opinion both in the United States and abroad.

#### Obvi the executive can’t create a cause of action

Eric A. Posner 7, the Kirkland & Ellis Professor of Law, University of Chicago Law School; and Adrian Vermuele, Professor of Law, Harvard Law School, 2007, “The Credible Executive,” https://lawreview.uchicago.edu/sites/lawreview.uchicago.edu/files/uploads/74.3/74\_3\_Posner\_Vermeule.pdf

For completeness, we mention that the well-motivated executive might in principle subject himself to legal liability for actions or outcomes that only an ill-motivated executive would undertake. Consider the controversy surrounding George W. Bush’s telecommunications surveillance program, which the president has claimed covers only communications in which one of the parties is overseas, not domesticto-domestic calls.103 There is widespread suspicion that this claim is false.104 In a recent poll, 26 percent of respondents believed that the National Security Agency listens to their calls.105 The credibility gap arises because it is difficult in the extreme to know what exactly the Agency is doing, and what the costs and benefits of the alternatives are.

Here the credibility gap might be narrowed by creating a cause of action, for damages, on behalf of anyone who can show that domesticto-domestic calls were examined.106 Liability would be strict, because a negligence rule—whether the Agency exerted reasonable efforts to avoid examining the communication—requires too much information for judges, jurors, and voters to evaluate, and would just reproduce the monitoring problems that gave rise to the credibility gap in the first place. Strict liability, by contrast, would require a much narrower factual inquiry. Crucially, a commitment to strict liability would only be made by an executive who intended to minimize the incidence of (even unintentional and nonnegligent) surveillance of purely domestic communications.

However, there are legal and practical problems here, perhaps insuperable ones. Legally, it is hardly clear that the president could, on his own authority, create a cause of action against himself or his agents to be brought in federal court. It is well within presidential authority to create executive commissions for hearing claims against the United States, for disbursing funds under benefit programs, and so on; but the problem here is that there might be no pot of money from which to fund damages. The so-called Judgment Fund, out of which damages against the executive are usually paid, is restricted to statutorily specified lawsuits.107 Even so, statutory authorization for the president to create the strict liability cause of action would be necessary,108 as we discuss shortly.109 Practically, it is unclear whether government agents can be forced to “internalize costs” through money damages in the way that private parties can, at least if the treasury is paying those damages.110 And if it is, voters may not perceive the connection between governmental action and subsequent payouts in any event.

### Norms CP

#### US must lead first or norms

Micah Zenko 13, CFR Douglas Dillon Fellow in the Center for Preventive Action, PhD in Political Science from Brandeis University, “Reforming U.S. Drone Strike Policies,” CFR Special Report 65, January 2013

History shows that how states adopt and use new military capabilities is often influenced by how other states have—or have not—used them in the past. Furthermore, norms can deter states from acquiring new technologies.72 Norms—sometimes but not always codified as legal regimes—have dissuaded states from deploying blinding lasers and landmines, as well as chemical, biological, and nuclear weapons. A well-articulated and internationally supported normative framework, bolstered by a strong U.S. example, can shape armed drone proliferation and employment in the coming decades. Such norms would not hinder U.S. freedom of action; rather, they would internationalize already-necessary domestic policy reforms and, of course, they would be acceptable only insofar as the limitations placed reciprocally on U.S. drones furthered U.S. objectives. And even if hostile states do not accept norms regulating drone use, the existence of an international normative framework, and U.S. compliance with that framework, would preserve Washington’s ability to apply diplomatic pressure. Models for developing such a framework would be based in existing international laws that emphasize the principles of necessity, proportionality, and distinction—to which the United States claims to adhere for its drone strikes—and should be informed by comparable efforts in the realms of cyber and space.¶ In short, a world characterized by the proliferation of armed drones—used with little transparency or constraint—would undermine core U.S. interests, such as preventing armed conflict, promoting human rights, and strengthening international legal regimes. It would be a world in which targeted killings occur with impunity against anyone deemed an “enemy” by states or nonstate actors, without accountability for legal justification, civilian casualties, and proportionality. Perhaps more troubling, it would be a world where such lethal force no longer heeds the borders of sovereign states. Because of drones’ inherent advantages over other weapons platforms, states and nonstate actors would be much more likely to use lethal force against the United States and its allies.

#### Only judicial review offsets cognitive biases and is credible---psychology proves

Cassandra Burke Robertson 12, Associate Professor, Case Western Reserve University School of Law, 2012, “ARTICLE: DUE PROCESS IN THE AMERICAN IDENTITY,” Alabama Law Review, 64 Ala. L. Rev. 255, p. lexis

As a policy matter, offering a heightened level of due process may have positive effects. First, it better accounts for the true costs and benefits of counterterrorism practices, offsetting cognitive biases that affect this calculation. Second, it also likely increases the perceived legitimacy of U.S. government action--at least when such action does not violate individuals' sense of identity. Finally, heightened due process can also reconcile deontological and consequentialist views of due process and preserve the centrality of process in the American identity.¶ Providing a higher level of due process can guard against cognitive biases that cause us to overestimate the risks of events that are catastrophic and outside our direct control--two hallmarks of the terrorist threat. n154 First, the risk of a terrorist strike is perceived as a more short-term and immediate risk than the potential harm to judicial process in the long run, and "in a period of crisis, long-term costs are easily overshadowed by perceived short-term gains." n155 Second, the terrorist threat raises existential fears--it "threatens to change the way we experience our lives, draining meaning from relationships of trust and community, and coloring life with the awful hues of suspicion, intimidation, and fear." n156 Thus, we are predisposed to misjudge the risk of terrorism in a due process calculus, and as a result, "we have all too often" realized only with hindsight that we overestimated the potential emergency "after civil liberties have been sacrificed at the altar of national security." n157 By maintaining and even increasing traditional elements of procedural due process, we may offset [\*285] this cognitive bias to some degree by forcing a more reasoned analysis of long-term risks. n158¶ In addition to guarding against cognitive bias, heightened due process may also increase institutional legitimacy over time. This benefit would not be immediate; nevertheless, as Professor Lawrence Solum has noted, even a consequentialist approach to due process need not confine itself to a calculation of only the most obvious or short-term costs and benefits. n159 Instead, it should account for more far-reaching effects, including political legitimacy. n160 And a respect for procedural justice, in particular, can increase institutional legitimacy; as scholars have noted, "procedural fairness plays a key role in shaping the legitimacy that citizens grant to government authority." n161¶ Institutional legitimacy can have significant value in the fight against terrorism. n162 When institutions have a high level of political legitimacy, they possess "a reservoir of goodwill that allows the institutions of government to go against what people may want at the moment without suffering debilitating consequences." n163 Without this reservoir, governments must spend additional resources to monitor compliance and to create incentives for desired behavior. n164 But with such a reservoir, it is easier to encourage global cooperation in specific counterterrorism initiatives and to foster "the development of international legal norms against terrorism." n165¶ This legitimacy benefit only accrues when procedures comport with identity, however. n166 It has long been noted that fair procedures can improve participants' reactions to decisional outcomes--that is, even when [\*286] those decisions go against them, the existence of fair procedures minimizes people's negative reaction. n167 Recently, however, work in experimental psychology has revealed an exception to this "fair process effect"; namely, when individuals "have their identity violated by a decision outcome," they "will be motivated to find flaws in the procedure to justify being upset about the decision outcome." n168 That is, "if a decision damages a central part of an individual (i.e., one's identity), it is unlikely that providing a voice or having consistent procedures can remedy the situation." n169¶ This "identity violation effect" suggests that in considering whether to increase reliance on traditional mechanisms of judicial due process, we should explicitly consider questions of identity. The recent data on public opinion may indicate that a majority of Americans do not currently feel that counterterrorism policy violates their sense of identity. For some, in fact, extending due process to accused terrorists may violate their sense of self. n170¶ But for that portion of the population who opposes such tactics, the identity violation effect may come into play when considering executive-branch alternatives to judicial process. To the extent that extrajudicial counterterrorism measures violate some individuals' sense of what it means to be American, it may be impossible to persuade them that alternative processes such as military commissions or executive-branch level review of targeted killings offer sufficient protection. Indeed, those who oppose such procedures often frame their objections in terms of identity, suggesting that the identity violation effect is felt at least by a significant minority. n171 Even without a majority, this group can have a significant impact on public policy, especially in influencing others who attach both a "due process" and "strength" meaning to the American identity but who have found the "strength" meaning to be more salient up till now. n172¶ As a policy matter, a legal doctrine of due process will be most robust when it is informed by sociological realities as well as political realities. n173 Due process serves a truth-seeking function and protects against the abuse of governmental power. n174 But it also serves a political role "designed to engage the litigant qua citizen in an important governmental institution for [\*287] deciding rights." n175 This political function can only work effectively if our due process rights conform to our national identity.¶ A fundamental reliance on due process--even to the detriment of competing goals such as access to justice--is woven into the fabric of both American law and American identity. n176 This Article has argued that such considerations already run through the public dialogue regarding counterterrorism policy, albeit often at an unacknowledged and unconscious level. n177 Those implicit considerations should be made explicit and brought to the forefront of public debate.¶ CONCLUSION¶ Due process is a fundamental American value, and it is a value that deserves a role in the national debate over security. Perhaps harkening back to Immanuel Kant, the protagonists in Real Genius responsible for stopping the weapon deployment repeated the catchphrase "It's a moral imperative!" n178 In the debate over due process in the war on terror, however, commentators have frequently merged the moral view with the legal. This blending is understandable; although due process is a legal doctrine with consequentialist roots, it is also a deontological value with a significant place in the American identity.¶ Separating these strands in the public debate on the war on terror can facilitate the conscious consideration of our national identity. In turn, this explicit recognition of the intertwining of identity and policy can create the opportunity to intentionally shape this identity. As Professor (now Legal Adviser to the State Department) Harold Koh has noted, "national identities are not givens, but rather, socially constructed products of learning, knowledge, cultural practices, and ideology." n179 Reinforcing a deontological commitment to an identity founded on the rule of law--and to judicial process as an expression of that commitment--helps to create such a social construction by establishing "a shared cultural belief" that people can "take . . . for granted as a necessary and proper aspect of their [\*288] society." n180 In order to do so, however, we must broaden the discussion beyond the legality of the policies--or even their instrumental value--and move the discussion into an examination of more fundamental questions of who we are as a nation and who we want to be.

#### Ex post review creates a credible signal of compliance that restrains future executives

Kwame Holman 13, congressional correspondent for PBS NewsHour; citing Rosa Brooks, Prof of Law at Georgetown University Law Center, former Counselor to the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy, former senior advisor at the US Dept of State, “Congress Begins to Weigh In On Drone Strikes Policy,” http://www.pbs.org/newshour/rundown/2013/04/congress-begins-to-weigh-in-on-drone-strikes-policy.html

While some experts have argued for court oversight of drone strikes before they're carried out, Brooks sides with those who say that would be unwieldy and unworkable.¶ Brooks says however an administration that knows its strikes could face court review after the fact -- with possible damages assessed -- would be more responsible and careful about who it strikes and why.¶ "If Congress were to create a statutory cause of action for damages for those who had been killed in abusive or mistaken drone strikes, you would have a court that would review such strikes after the fact. [That would] create a pretty good mechanism that would frankly keep the executive branch as honest as we hope it is already and as we hope it will continue to be into administrations to come," Brooks said.¶ "It would be one of the approaches that would go a very long way toward reassuring both U.S. citizens and the world more generally that our policies are in compliance with rule of law norms."

### Budget DA

#### Won’t pass---no compromise

Ana Radelat 9-20, September 20th, 2013, "Budget showdown could put Connecticut House delegation in a tight spot," www.ctmirror.org/story/2013/09/20/budget-showdown-could-put-connecticut-house-delegation-tight-spot

Washington – It was easy for the members of Connecticut’s House delegation, all Democrats, to vote against a bill Thursday that would avert a government shutdown for a few months, but defund Obamacare.¶ But their next vote on the budget won’t be as easy.¶ That’s because the lawmakers may have to eventually decide whether to vote for a bill that leaves Obamacare alone, but continues the so-called "sequester" spending cuts that threaten the state's defense industry and nick many social programs.¶ “I think it’s going to be a very tough moment for us,” said Rep. Joe Courtney, D-2nd District. ¶ House Republicans Friday voted on a continuing resolution that would fund the government until Dec. 15, giving lawmakers more time to work on a budget. But the resolution would also defund the Affordable Care Act, and the Democratic–controlled Senate won’t have it.¶ Rep. Joe Courtney, D-2nd District, predicts "A very tough moment for us."¶ So unless Congress agrees on a way to keep funding it -- a prospect partisan fighting seems to have made impossible -- the federal government will have to shut down most of its operations Oct. 1. ¶ "Any House bill that defunds Obamacare is dead,” Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid, D-Nev., said at a press briefing Thursday.¶ That leaves Congress in gridlock, which more and more seems to be its normal state.¶ Since the Senate is expected to strip out the Affordable Care Act provision before it votes on the continuing resolution next week and sends it back to the House, the question becomes what comes next.¶ House Speaker John Boehner, R-Ohio, must decide whether to schedule a vote on that Senate bill -- or more likely a compromise that would include some spending cuts the Senate now opposes -- and hope a bipartisan group of House members, including some Connecticut lawmakers, votes for it. Or Boehner could reject the notion of any compromise with the Senate and allow the government to shut down.

#### Won’t pass Senate

Scott Neuman 9-20, Digital News writer and editor, September 20th, 2013, "House GOP Votes to Fund Government, Kill Obamacare," NPR www.npr.org/blogs/thetwo-way/2013/09/20/224422562/house-gop-votes-to-fund-government-kill-obamacare

The Republican-controlled House has voted to keep the government funded but its "continuing resolution" comes with a poison pill to defund the Affordable Care Act that Democrats have vowed is dead on arrival in the Senate.¶ On a nearly straight party vote, House lawmakers voted 230 to 189 to approve the stopgap funding resolution, which would keep the government operating until Dec. 15. , North Carolina's Mike McIntyre and Jim Matheson of Utah voted for the measure. A single Republican, Rep. Scott Rigell of Virginia, voted against it.¶ "The American people don't want the government shut down and they don't want Obamacare," Speaker John Boehner said shortly after the vote.¶ Majority Leader Eric Cantor of Virginia said the president's signature health care measure "will harm the economy" and that it's now "the Senate's responsibility to follow the House lead."¶ "Republicans want to play games of brinkmanship on the budget and the debt limit even though the foreseeable consequence will be plummeting stock markets and businesses freezing their hiring," said Rep. Nita Lowey of New York, the top Democrat on the appropriations committee.¶ The stalemate means both sides remain at square one on preventing a government shutdown — due in just 10 days unless the partisan divide can be breached.¶ As Morning Edition, the most likely scenario now is that "the Senate will take up the spending bill, restore the Obamacare funding and send it back to the House. Tag, you're it."

#### Obama will veto

Michael A. Memoli 9-20, September 20th, 2013, "House vote to set the stage on government shutdown," LA Times, www.latimes.com/nation/politics/politicsnow/la-na-pn-house-healthcare-vote-20130920,0,936870.story

If the House vote is successful Friday, the Senate will begin its debate on the measure Tuesday. Democrats in the Senate have mocked Republicans for what they call the party's obsession with repeal efforts, and they vowed to simply return a "clean" funding bill to the House next week.¶ "In case there's any shred of doubt in the minds of our House counterparts, I want to be absolutely crystal clear: Any bill that defunds Obamacare is dead, dead. It's a waste of time," Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-Nev.) told reporters.¶ Though Democrats control 54 seats, including those of two independents, Cruz has vowed to use "any procedural means necessary" to force Democrats to adopt the House measure in full. But Obama could still veto such a bill if it were to emerge from Congress.

#### No impact---there’ll be pressure to take action to avoid long-term impacts

Laura Matthews 13, January 22nd, 2013, "What Would Happen if the US Debt Ceiling Isn't Extended?" International Business Times, www.ibtimes.com/what-would-happen-if-us-debt-ceiling-isnt-extended-1031412

Political historian Thomas Whalen believes another credit downgrade need not happen this time. “It’s unnecessary,” Whalen, a professor at Boston University, said. “It’s a self-imposed economic crisis. It doesn’t need to happen.”¶ According to Whalen, a U.S. default is a scenario no one wants to think about, because if push comes to shove, U.S. financial institutions -- many of which support the Republicans -- will react.¶ "There's too much at stake," he said.¶ When asked how inaction on the debt ceiling could affect the wallets of ordinary Americans, Ron Haskins, a former White House and congressional advisor on welfare issues, sees two problems.¶ In the short-term, the impact won’t be so immediate if the Treasury doesn’t pay its bills on time. However, Haskins said payments would stop for people like defense contractors. The bigger impact, according to Haskins, who is now a senior fellow at Brookings, would be on U.S. interest rates.¶ “Our rates are low, and, if they go up, that would affect the market, impacting home sales and credit cards,” he said. “Interest rates are front and center for anyone with interest in America's debt.”¶ The U.S. Senate hasn’t approved a budget since 2009 and has been using “continuing resolutions” to sustain the flow of money that enables the government to keep functioning. Republicans are hoping that including language in the debt-ceiling measure that forces Senate Democrats to come up with a formal budget or go without a paycheck will up the pressure.¶ ¶ A government shutdown could affect teachers, health care workers and fire fighters, Haskins said. But he doesn’t believe that if this should happen, the shutdown would be for long enough to affect life and property greatly.¶ “If you close the government, it won’t last that long,” he said. “The pressure will be enormous. It won’t be long enough to have all these long-term impacts.”

#### No impact---empirically proven

Andrew Taylor 9-19, Associated Press, “Here's the truth: The government doesn't shut down,” http://www.tri-cityherald.com/2013/09/19/2581831/heres-the-truth-the-government.html

WASHINGTON — Here's the truth about a government "shutdown." The government doesn't shut down.¶ So the world won't end if a dysfunctional Washington can't find a way to pass a funding bill before the new budget year begins on Oct. 1.¶ Social Security checks will still go out. Troops will remain at their posts. Doctors and hospitals will get their Medicare and Medicaid reimbursements. In fact, virtually every essential government agency, like the FBI, the Border Patrol and the Coast Guard, will remain open. Furloughed federal workers probably would get paid, eventually. Transportation Security Administration officers would continue to man airport checkpoints.¶ But lurking around the corner is far bigger danger: Sometime in late October or early November the government could run out of cash. The U.S. would be unable to pay all of its bills in full and on time for the first time in history if it couldn't borrow more money.¶ While the Treasury Department probably would make interest payments to bondholders to prevent a catastrophic default on the debt, it wouldn't be able to make other payments on time, which would mean delays in Social Security benefits and in paychecks for federal workers and troops in the field.¶ Americans would feel the pain.¶ To prevent a "shutdown," Congress must pass a temporary spending bill before Oct. 1. To prevent a default, it must raise the $16.7 trillion cap on government borrowing.¶ Averting a shutdown is supposed to be easy. There hasn't been one since the 1995-96 battle in which President Bill Clinton bested Newt Gingrich and his band of budget-slashing conservatives. This time, the conservatives want to hold government-funding hostage in order to derail the implementation of President Barack Obama's law to make people buy health insurance. GOP leaders want to avoid a shutdown and are trying to finesse a solution.¶ Raising the debt limit is typically more difficult, but it has always been done because the possible consequences of default are so dire: upheaval in financial markets, a spike in U.S. borrowing costs and a host of delayed payments to both individual Americans and businesses. Under current estimates, the "X date" by which the government can't meet all of its payments would come in the latter half of October or early November. So Congress needs to act by mid-October to be safe.¶ In the separate case of a shutdown, fewer than half of the 2.1 million federal workers subject to it would be forced off the job if the Obama administration follows the rules followed by previous Presidents Ronald Reagan, George H.W. Bush and Clinton. That's not counting about 500,000 Postal Service employees or 1.4 million uniformed military personnel who would be exempt.¶ The rules for who works and who doesn't date back to the early 1980s and haven't been significantly modified since. The Obama administration re-issued the guidance on Wednesday.¶ The air traffic control system, food inspection, Medicare, veterans' health care and many other essential government programs would run as usual. The Social Security Administration would not only send out benefits but would continue to take applications. The Postal Service, which is self-funded, would keep delivering the mail. The Federal Emergency Management Agency could continue to respond to disasters at the height of hurricane season.¶ The Washington Monument would be closed. But it's been closed anyway since an earthquake in 2011.¶ Museums along the National Mall would close, too. National parks would be closed to visitors, a loss often emphasized in shutdown discussions.¶ The Capitol would remain open, however. Congress is deemed essential, despite its abysmal poll ratings.¶ From a practical perspective, shutdowns usually aren't that big a deal. They happened every year when Jimmy Carter was president, averaging 11 days each. During President Reagan's two terms, there were six shutdowns, typically just one or two days apiece. Deals got cut. Everybody moved on.¶ In 1995-96, however, shutdowns morphed into political warfare, to the dismay of Republicans who thought they could use them to drag Clinton to the negotiating table on a balanced budget plan.¶ Republicans took a big political hit, but most Americans suffered relatively minor inconveniences like closed parks and delays in processing passport applications. Some 2,400 workers cleaning up toxic waste sites were sent home, and there were short delays in processing veterans' claims.¶ Under a precedent-setting memorandum by Reagan budget chief David Stockman, federal workers are exempted from furloughs if their jobs are national security-related or if they perform essential activities that "protect life and property."

#### Global economy’s resilient---learned lessons from ‘08

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

It is equally possible, however, that a renewed crisis would trigger a renewed surge in policy coordination. As John Ikenberry has observed, “the complex interdependence that is unleashed in an open and loosely rule-based order generates some expanding realms of exchange and investment that result in a growing array of firms, interest groups and other sorts of political stakeholders who seek to preserve the stability and openness of the system.”103 The post-2008 economic order has remained open, entrenching these interests even more across the globe. Despite uncertain times, the open economic system that has been in operation since 1945 does not appear to be closing anytime soon.

#### Obama won’t fight the plan

Kwame Holman 13, congressional correspondent for PBS NewsHour; citing Rosa Brooks, Prof of Law at Georgetown University Law Center, former Counselor to the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy, former senior advisor at the US Dept of State, “Congress Begins to Weigh In On Drone Strikes Policy,” http://www.pbs.org/newshour/rundown/2013/04/congress-begins-to-weigh-in-on-drone-strikes-policy.html

In an October 2012 interview, Mr. Obama said of the drone program, "we've got to ... put a legal architecture in place, and we need Congressional help in order to do that, to make sure that not only am I reined in but any president's reined in, in terms of some of the decisions that we're making."¶ The president has not taken up the drone issue in public again but White House press secretary Jay Carney, asked Wednesday about the drone hearing, said, "We have been in regular contact with the committee. We will continue to engage Congress...to ensure our counterterrorism efforts are not only consistent with our laws and system of checks and balances, but even more transparent to the American people and the world."¶ And after the hearing, Brooks, too, sounded optimistic.¶ "My own sense is that the executive branch is open to discussion of some kind of judicial process," she said.¶ While some experts have argued for court oversight of drone strikes before they're carried out, Brooks sides with those who say that would be unwieldy and unworkable.¶ Brooks says however an administration that knows its strikes could face court review after the fact -- with possible damages assessed -- would be more responsible and careful about who it strikes and why

### Flex DA

#### Restrictions inevitable---the aff prevents haphazard ones which are worse

Benjamin Wittes 9, senior fellow and research director in public law at the Brookings Institution, is the author of Law and the Long War: The Future of Justice in the Age of Terror and is also a member of the Hoover Institution's Task Force on National Security and Law, “Legislating the War on Terror: An Agenda for Reform”, November 3, Book, p. 17

A new administration now confronts the same hard problems that plagued its ideologically opposite predecessor, and its very efforts to turn the page on the past make acute the problems of institutionalization. For while the new administration can promise to close the detention facility at Guantanamo Bay and can talk about its desire to prosecute suspects criminally, for example, it cannot so easily forswear noncriminal detention. While it can eschew the term "global war on terror," it cannot forswear those uses of force—Predator strikes, for example—that law enforcement powers would never countenance. Nor is it hastening to give back the surveillance powers that Congress finally gave the Bush administration. In other words, its very efforts to avoid the Bush administrations vocabulary have only emphasized the conflicts hybrid nature—indeed- emphasized that the United States is building something new here, not merely applying something old.¶ That point should not provoke controversy. The evidence that the United States is fumbling toward the creation of hybrid institutions to handle terrorism cases is everywhere around us. U.S. law, for example, now contemplates extensive- probing judicial review of detentions under the laws of war—a naked marriage of criminal justice and wartime traditions. It also contemplates warrantless wiretapping with judicial oversight of surveillance targeting procedures—thereby mingling the traditional judicial role in reviewing domestic surveillance with the vacuum cleaner-type acquisition of intelligence typical of overseas intelligence gathering. Slowly but surely, through an unpredictable combination of litigation, legislation, and evolutionary developments within executive branch policy, the nation is creating novel institutional arrangements to authorize and regulate the war on terror. The real question is not whether institutionalization will take place but whether it will take place deliberately or haphazardly, whether the United States will create through legislation the institutions with which it wishes to govern itself or whether it will allow an endless sequence of common law adjudications to shape them.¶ The authors of the chapters in this book disagree about a great many things. They span a considerable swath of the U.S. political spectrum, and they would no doubt object to some of one another's policy prescriptions. Indeed, some of the proposals are arguably inconsistent with one another, and it will be the very rare reader who reads this entire volume and wishes to see all of its ideas implemented in legislation. What binds these authors together is not the programmatic aspects of their policy prescriptions but the belief in the value of legislative action to help shape the contours of the continuing U.S. confrontation with terrorism. That is, the authors all believe that Congress has a significant role to play in the process of institutionalization—and they have all attempted to describe that role with reference to one of the policy areas over which Americans have sparred these past several years and will likely continue sparring over the next several

#### The aff is key middle ground---total flex causes worse decision-making in crises

Deborah N. Pearlstein 9, lecturer in public and international affairs, Woodrow Wilson School of Public & International Affairs, July 2009, "Form and Function in the National Security Constitution," Connecticut Law Review, 41 Conn. L. Rev. 1549, lexis nexis

It is in part for such reasons that studies of organizational performance in crisis management have regularly found that "planning and effective [\*1604] response are causally connected." n196 Clear, well-understood rules, formalized training and planning can function to match cultural and individual instincts that emerge in a crisis with commitments that flow from standard operating procedures and professional norms. n197 Indeed, "the less an organization has to change its pre-disaster functions and roles to perform in a disaster, the more effective is its disaster [sic] response." n198 In this sense, a decisionmaker with absolute flexibility in an emergency-unconstrained **by protocols or plans-may be** systematically more prone to error **than a decision-maker who is in some way compelled to follow procedures and guidelines, which have incorporated professional expertise, and which are set as effective constraints in advance**.¶ **Examples of excessive flexibility producing adverse consequences are ample**. Following Hurricane Katrina, one of the most important lessons independent analysis drew from the government response was the extent to which the disaster was made worse as a result of the lack of experience and knowledge of crisis procedures among key officials, the absence of expert advisors **replacing those rules with more than the most general guidance about custodial intelligence collection.** available to key officials (including the President), and the failure to follow existing response plans or to draw from lessons learned from simulations conducted before the fact. n199 Among the many consequences, [\*1605] basic items like food, water, and medicines were in such short supply that local law enforcement (instead of focusing on security issues) were occupied, in part, with breaking into businesses and taking what residents needed. n200¶ Or **consider the widespread abuse of prisoners at U.S. detention facilities such as** Abu Ghraib. Whatever the theoretical merits of applying coercive interrogation in a carefully selected way against key intelligence targets, n201 the systemic torture and abuse of scores of detainees was an outcome no one purported to seek. There is substantial agreement among security analysts of both parties that the prisoner abuse scandals have produced predominantly negative consequences for U.S. national security. n202 While there remain important questions about the extent to which some of the abuses at Abu Ghraib were the result of civilian or senior military command actions or omissions, one of the too often overlooked findings of the government investigations of the incidents is the unanimous agreement that the abuse was (at least in part) the result of structural organization failures n203 -failures that one might expect to [\*1606] produce errors either to the benefit or detriment of security.¶ In particular, military investigators looking at the causes of Abu Ghraib cited vague guidance, as well as inadequate training and planning for detention and interrogation operations, as key factors leading to the abuse. Remarkably, "pre-war planning [did] not include[] planning for detainee operations" in Iraq. n204 Moreover, **investigators cited failures at the policy level- decisions to lift existing detention and interrogation strictures without** n205 As one Army General later investigating the abuses noted: "**By October 2003, interrogation policy in Iraq had changed three times in less than thirty days and it became very confusing as to what techniques could be employed and at what level non-doctrinal approaches had to be approved**." n206 It was thus unsurprising that detention and interrogation operations were assigned to troops with grossly inadequate training in any rules that were still recognized. n207 The uncertain effect of broad, general guidance, coupled [\*1607] with the competing imperatives of guidelines that differed among theaters of operation, agencies, and military units, caused serious confusion among troops and led to decisionmaking that it is overly kind to call arbitrary. n208¶ Would the new functionalists disagree with the importance of government planning for detention operations in an emergency surrounding a terrorist nuclear attack? Not necessarily. Can an organization anticipate and plan for everything? Certainly not. But **such findings should at least** call into question the inclination to simply maximize flexibility **and discretion in an emergency, without, for example, structural incentives that might ensure the engagement of professional expertise**. n209 Particularly if one embraces the view that the most potentially damaging terrorist threats are nuclear and biological terrorism, involving highly technical information about weapons acquisition and deployment, a security policy structure based on nothing more than general popular mandate and political instincts is unlikely to suffice; a structure that systematically excludes knowledge of and training in emergency response will almost certainly result in mismanagement. n210 In this light, a general take on role effectiveness might suggest favoring a structure in which the engagement of relevant expertise in crisis management is required, leaders have incentives to anticipate and plan in advance for trade-offs, and [\*1608] organizations are able to train subordinates to ensure that plans are adhered to in emergencies. Such structural constraints could help increase the likelihood that something more than arbitrary attention has been paid **before transcendent priorities are overridden.**

#### Oversight stops arbitrariness, not flex

Stephen Holmes 9, Walter E. Meyer Professor of Law, New York University School of Law, “The Brennan Center Jorde Symposium on Constitutional Law: In Case of Emergency: Misunderstanding Tradeoffs in the War on Terror”, April, California Law Review, 97 Calif. L. Rev. 301, Lexis

Concerted efforts to shirk and deflect responsibility, moreover, provide an illuminating context in which to reconsider Vice President Dick Cheney's mantra, "The risks of inaction are far greater than the risk of action." n41 The risks of inaction, in Cheney's worldview, are the risks of being "strangled by law," n42 in Jack Goldsmith's phrase, of being hamstrung by due process of law and constitutional checks and balances. Cheney's warnings about the hazards of failing to act, therefore, suggest that the metaphor of a tradeoff between liberty and security is not as anti-dogmatic and anti-hysterical as one might have initially thought. Behind the associated images of balances and scales, we find in fact that a spurious urgency is being invoked to justify a psychological or ideological unwillingness to submit proposed policies to a nonpartisan and professionally conducted cost-benefit analysis. This is the ultimate paradox of the anti-liberal approach to national security. The misleading hypothesis of a tradeoff between liberty and security has been used, surreptitiously, to prevent the application of cost-benefit thinking to alternative proposals for managing [\*321] the risk of terrorism, including nuclear terrorism.¶ Cheney's maxim about the risks of inaction escapes being false only by being meaningless. Given the scarcity of resources, every action is an inaction; heightening security in one respect opens up security vulnerabilities along other dimensions. For example, assigning the majority of the CIA's Arabic speakers to Iraq means withdrawing them from other missions; if the attention of high-level officials is devoted to one problem, it will not be devoted to another.¶ And here is another familiar example. American intelligence agencies reportedly hesitate to hire native Farsi-or Pashto-or Arabic-speaking agents because the best-qualified candidates have relatives in Muslim countries, where reliable background checks are difficult to carry out. n43 This is a serious problem because only CIA and FBI agents fluent in these languages are capable of recruiting and handling informants. n44 This example, too, illustrates that the real tradeoffs in the war on terror do not involve a sacrifice of liberty for security, but rather a willingness to increase one risk in order to reduce another risk. In this case, American intelligence has to run the risk of hiring compromised personnel n45 in order to reduce the risk of failing to understand the enemy. The tradeoffs necessary in the war on terror, as I have been arguing, almost always involve this sort of gamble. The question is: who has the right to choose the set of security risks that we, as a country, would be better off running?¶ Policymakers misunderstand worst-case reasoning when they use it to hide from themselves and others the opportunity costs of their risky choices. The commission of this elementary fallacy by Vice President Cheney and other architects of the U.S. response to 9/11 has been extensively documented by Ron Suskind. n46 Allocating national-security resources without paying attention to opportunity costs is equivalent to spending binges under soft budget constraints, an arrangement notorious for its unwelcome consequences. One cannot reasonably multiply "the magnitude of possible harm from an attack" (for example, a nuclear sneak attack by al Qaeda using WMD supplied by Saddam Hussein) by the low "probability of such an attack" n47 and then conclude that one must act immediately to preempt that remote threat without [\*322] first scanning the horizon and inquiring about other low-probability catastrophic events that are equally likely to occur. One cannot say that a one-percent possibility of a terrifying Saddam-Osama WMD handoff justifies placing seventy percent of our national-security assets in Iraq. But this seems to be how the Bush administration actually "reasoned," perhaps because of its go-it-alone fantasies, as if scarce resources were not a problem. Or, perhaps those responsible for national security during the Bush years succumbed to commission bias, namely, the overpowering feeling, in the wake of a devastating attack, that inaction is intolerable. This uncontrollable urge to act is often experienced in emergencies, namely, in situations where decision makers need to do something but do not know what to do.¶ Among President Bush's many unfortunate bequests to President Obama is the desperate "readiness" problem that afflicts the American military, overstretched in Iraq and Afghanistan and therefore unprepared to meet a third crisis elsewhere in the world. This problem was a direct result of the Bush administration's failure to take scarcity of resources and opportunity costs into account. What secret and unaccountable executive action made possible, it turns out, was not flexible adaptation to the demands of the situation but rather profligacy, arbitrariness and a failure to set priorities in a semi-rational way. Defenders of the half-truth that the capacity to adapt is increased when rules are bent or broken seem to have a weak grasp of the elementary distinction between flexibility and arbitrariness.¶ The Founders, by contrast, understood quite well the difference between the flexible and the arbitrary. The ground rules for decision making that they built into the American constitutional structure were meant to maximize the first while minimizing the second. From their perspective, therefore, the question "Can there be too much power to fight terrorism?" is poorly formulated. The right question to ask is: can there be too much arbitrary executive action in the United States' armed struggle with al Qaeda, potentially wasting scarce resources that could be more usefully deployed in another way? And the answer to this second question is obviously "yes."

#### Aff still allows rapid response to crises---insularity causes worse decisions

Deborah N. Pearlstein 9, lecturer in public and international affairs, Woodrow Wilson School of Public & International Affairs, July 2009, "Form and Function in the National Security Constitution," Connecticut Law Review, 41 Conn. L. Rev. 1549, lexis nexis

2. Unity and Insularity¶ As the new functionalists correctly anticipate, organization theorists have also recognized that strict bureaucratic control, intense socialization, and a highly developed sense of organizational culture can not only make rapid action possible**, but also ensure adherence to an identified, overarching priority**. n211 Indeed, it follows from the prior section that if formal rules and training are important, some significant level of control is absolutely necessary lest one risk effective top-down compliance.¶ At the same time, however, **institutions such as the military (and arguably aspects of the intel**ligence **community) that are defined by such insular organizational cultures have some** important disadvantages. n212 The exceptional degree of control such organizations exercise over their members has been used both to advance an organization's official goals, and to pursue the more self- serving or alternative goals of its leaders. **Members' intense organizational loyalty can foster** excessive secrecy and disdain for outside expertise**,** inhibiting the flow of information **both within and from outside the institution, and skewing attention to organizational priorities.** n213 **Especially when coupled with political incentives that impact governmental organizations, such features can** limit the institution's ability to take corrective action **or learn from past organizational mistakes**. n214¶ The post-9/11 context is rife with examples of such pathologies in organizations responsible for counterterrorism operations. Consider the U.S. response to the anthrax mailings of late 2001, which came at a time of already heightened vigilance against terrorist attack. After federal [\*1609] investigators concluded that the anthrax attacks were most likely launched by "U.S. nationals, almost certainly ones with experience in and access to the U.S. biodefense program and its facilities," and after they discovered that major U.S. biodefense facilities had been working with anthrax (including weapons-grade powder) for decades, military and intelligence agencies continued to withhold critical information from other federal agencies about the facilities and employees involved in such programs. This hamstrung post-attack efforts to identify the likely source of the attack, and therefore the likelihood of subsequent additional attacks from the same source. n215¶ Such behavior echoes that described by **the 9/11 Commission investigators studying the September 11th attacks** **themselves.** n216 Among other things, investigators concluded that one of the key problems leading to the failure to avert the attacks (despite increasingly alarming warnings) was the dearth of information sharing inside the intelligence and security communities. n217 Information was overly compartmentalized, "stove-piped" to too few decisionmakers, hidden by one executive agency from another and by one branch of government from another, and limited in its relevance and accuracy from an absence of oversight and competing analysis. n218 Such findings also emerge from studies of the generally effective Japanese response to the sarin gas attacks on the Tokyo subway system. Essential to the Japanese government's response was "a willingness to prioritize cooperation over interagency or intergovernment competition." n219 In all of these cases, it may well be that such behavior could be addressed by different incentive structures. But in the absence of such guidance, it was the organizations instinctive (and structural) insularity that prevailed.¶ The counterproductive effect of such pathologies can infect more than just real- time responsiveness; it inhibits error correction over time-a [\*1610] feature that theorists identify as central in explaining the success of those organizations that have operated effectively in chronically unpredictable environments. n220 In the nuclear safety context, for example, Scott Sagan showed that Americans had been at **greater risk than once thought from accidents involving the U.S. nuclear weapons** arsenal-threats ranging from pilot error, malfunctioning computer warnings, the miscalculation of an individual officer, and a host of other seemingly inconceivable mistakes n221 -in part because actors at every organizational level had incentives to cover up safety problems, "in order to protect the reputation of the institution." n222 While it was perhaps "not surprising that the military commands that are responsible for controlling nuclear forces would create a veil of safety to manage their image in front of the [P]resident, the Congress, and the public," Sagan found that concern for the effect of revealing mistakes skewed assessments at all levels, "influenc[ing] the reporting of near-accidents by operators, the beliefs of organizational historians about what is acceptable to record, and the public interpretation of events by senior authorities." n223 Particularly in operations where failure, when it does occur, can come at an extraordinarily high price, there is a premium on gaining (and implementing) as much insight as possible from those failures that do occur. n224¶ One finds a strikingly similar pattern in the conduct of organizations responsible for the detentions at Abu Ghraib, where organizational loyalty and a cultural disinclination to share negative information conspired to prevent the correction of systemic error. n225 In some cases, soldiers reported direct pressure to withhold unfavorable information. n226 More generally, investigators found agreement among commanders and enlisted personnel at Abu Ghraib that the early reports by outside monitors of [\*1611] serious abuses by soldiers at the facility were simply impossible to believe. n227 As General Fay's later investigation found:¶ Within this investigation's timeframe, . . . the [independent International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC)] visited Abu Ghraib three times, notifying [the joint task force in charge] twice of their visit results, describing serious violations of international Humanitarian Law and of the Geneva Conventions. In spite of the ICRC's role as independent observers, there seemed to be a consensus among personnel at Abu Ghraib that the allegations were not true. Neither the leadership, nor [the joint task force in charge] made any attempt to verify the allegations. n228

### Israel DA

#### Worst relations crisis in 35 years

Barak Ravid 11, Hareetz, "Israel envoy: US ties at their lowest ebb in 35 years", <http://www.haaretz.com/print-edition/news/israel-envoy-u-s-ties-at-their-lowest-ebb-in-35-years-1.264758>

Israel's ambassador to the United States, Michael Oren, has told the country's diplomats there that U.S.-Israeli relations face their worst crisis in 35 years, despite attempts by Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu's office to project a sense of "business as usual."¶ Oren was speaking to the Israeli consuls general in a conference call on Saturday night.¶ Netanyahu consulted Sunday with the forum of seven senior cabinet ministers over a list of demands that U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton made in a telephone conversation Friday.¶ Clinton harshly criticized the announcement last week of plans to expand the Ramat Shlomo neighborhood in East Jerusalem while U.S. Vice President Joe Biden was visiting Israel.¶ Haaretz has learned that Clinton's list includes at least four steps the United States expects Netanyahu to carry out to restore confidence in bilateral relations and permit the resumption of peace talks with the Palestinians.¶ 1. Investigate the process that led to the announcement of the Ramat Shlomo construction plans in the middle of Biden's visit. The Americans seek an official response from Israel on whether this was a bureaucratic mistake or a deliberate act carried out for political reasons. Already on Saturday night, Netanyahu announced the convening of a committee to look into the issue.¶ 2. Reverse the decision by the Jerusalem District Planning and Building Committee to approve construction of 1,600 new housing units in Ramat Shlomo.¶ 3. Make a substantial gesture toward the Palestinians enabling the renewal of peace talks. The Americans suggested that hundreds of Palestinian prisoners be released, that the Israel Defense Forces withdraw from additional areas of the West Bank and transfer them to Palestinian control, that the siege of the Gaza Strip be eased and further roadblocks in the West Bank be removed.¶ 4. Issue an official declaration that the talks with the Palestinians, even indirect talks, will deal with all the conflict's core issues - borders, refugees, Jerusalem, security arrangements, water and settlements.¶ Two advisers of the prime minister, Yitzhak Molcho and Ron Dermer, held marathon talks Sunday with senior White House officials in Washington and U.S. Mideast envoy George Mitchell and his staff to try to calm the situation. Mitchell will return to Israel Tuesday and expects to hear if Netanyahu intends to take the proposed steps.¶ At the beginning of Sunday's cabinet meeting, Netanyahu tried to convey a message that there was no crisis in relations with the United States. But he sent precisely the opposite message to Oren in Washington.¶ In Oren's Saturday conference call with the Israeli consuls general, he said that the current crisis was the most serious with the Americans since a confrontation between Henry Kissinger and Yitzhak Rabin in 1975 over an American demand for a partial withdrawal from the Sinai Peninsula.

#### Making US drone policy more open lines us up with Israeli practices

NDN 13, No Drones Network, ""Targeted Killing" - The Heart of the U.S.-Israel Relationship", February 26, nodronesnetwork.blogspot.com/2013/02/targeted-killing-heart-of-us-israel.html#event

Amos Guiora, an Israeli "counter-terrorism expert," held forth on the difference between "good" targeted killing -- i.e. the kind Israeli practices (!) -- and "bad" targeted killing -- namely, the kind the Obama administration carries out.¶ Ostensibly, the talk was about the fact that the Obama administration is taking too many liberties with its "secret kill lists." Much mention was made of the secret legal memo justifying the Obama killings. (You can download the secret memo here.) On its surface, the talk was disguised to be "critical" of what the U.S. is doing.

#### Israel likes judicial review

Kent Roach 13, Professor of Law and Prichard-Wilson Chair of Law and Public Policy at the University of Toronto, editor-in-chief of the Criminal Law Quarterly, “Managing secrecy and its migration in a post-9/11 world,” Ch 8 in Secrecy, National Security And The Vindication Of Constitutional Law, ed. David Cole, Federico Fabbrini, and Arianna Vedaschi, google books

Secret evidence is used by the US military and the CIA in decisions about targeted killing. Attorney General Holder has stressed that the evidence supporting such decisions is carefully reviewed within the government and has argued that the process satisfies due process because due process need not be judicial process.11 The problem with this approach is that it requires people to trust the government that the secret evidence has been thoroughly tested and vetted even though the executive has an incentive to err on the side of security. In contrast to the Israeli courts, American courts have taken a hands-off approach to review of targeted killing.12 The Israeli courts have in one prominent case reviewed targeted killings and have stressed the importance of both ex ante and ex post review within the military and involving the courts.13 To be sure, Israel has not gone as far as the United Kingdom in giving security cleared special advocates access to secret information, but it has provided a process that goes beyond the executive simply reviewing itself. The Obama administration does not seem to think that anyone could seriously challenge the legitimacy of their attempts to keep strategic military information behind targeted killings secret. In a sense, this is a return to a Cold War strategy where the need to preserve secrets from the other side was widely accepted. What has changed since 9;11, however, is that terrorism as opposed to invasion or nuclear war is widely accepted as the prime threat to national security. Terrorism is seen by many as a crime and the use of war-like secrecy is much more problematic in responding to a crime than to a threat of invasion or nuclear war. Hence, the legitimacy of the US’s use of secrets to kill people in its controversial war against al Qaeda has been challenged. It may become a liability in the US’s dealings with the Muslim world.

No strikes- Rohani’s election changes motivation

Kambiz Foroohar 6/17/13 journalist for Bloomberg, 6/17/13, "Rohani Victory May Curb Support for Israeli Attack on Iran," Bloomberg, http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2013-06-16/rohani-victory-may-undermine-support-for-israeli-attack-on-iran.html

¶ Iranian President-Elect Hassan Rohani’s vow to improve ties with the world carried him to a surprise first-round win. It also may have rewound the clock on a potential military strike against his country over its nuclear program.¶ “Those advocating an attack on Iran have been dealt a setback,” said Suzanne Maloney, a senior fellow at the Brookings Institution’s Saban Center for Middle East Policy in Washington. “The chances of an attack on Iran are even more remote than they have been in many years.”¶ While Supreme Leader Ali Khamenei, 73, retains the power over national security, especially the nuclear program, past presidents have been able to influence the tone of foreign policy. The departure of President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, whose anti-Israel rhetoric and questioning of the Holocaust made Iran a pariah and helped prompt more sanctions, removes a lightning rod for global scorn.¶ Western countries signaled an interest in engaging with Rohani. The British Foreign Office urged him to set a new course for Iran, and the European Union’s foreign policy chief Catherine Ashton said she hoped his victory will lead to a “swift diplomatic solution” to the standoff over the nuclear program.¶ The question is whether Rohani will have influence beyond changing the image Iran presents to the world.¶ “Ahmadinejad was a figure everyone loves to hate,” said Gerald Steinberg, professor of political science at Bar Ilan University in Ramat Gan, Israel. “Rohani is more sophisticated and a softer face of the same Iranian leadership.”¶

## To summarize, the general policy of targeting terrorists appears to be defensible in principle in terms of legality, morality and effectiveness. However, some specific targetings have been indefensible and should be prevented from recurring. Critics focus on the indefensible cases and insist that these are best prevented by condemning the general policy. States which target terrorists and their defenders have insisted that self-defense provides a blanket justification for targeting operations. The result has been a stalemate over terrorist targeting harmful to both the prosecution of the war on terror and the credibility of international law. Yet neither advocates nor critics of targeting appear to have a viable strategy for resolving the impasse. A final issue which urgently demands attention, therefore, is whether there are any plausible prospects for a coherent and principled political compromise over the issue of targeting terrorists.¶ Conclusion: the Possibility of Principled Compromise ¶ This final section offers a brief case that there is room for a principled comftarpromise between critics and advocates of targeting terrorists. The argument is by example—a short illustration of one promising possibility. It will not satisfy everyone, but I suggest that it has the potential to resolve the most compelling concerns on both sides.¶ The most telling issues raised by critics of targeting fall into three categories: (1) the imperative need to establish that targets are combatants; (2) the need in attacking combatants to respect the established laws of war; and (3) the overwhelming imperative to avoid civilian casualties. The first issue seems to demand an authoritative judicial determination that could only be answered by a competent court. The second issue requires the openly avowed and consistent implementation of targeting according to standards accepted in international law—a requirement whose fulfillment would best be assured through judicial oversight. The third issue calls for independent evaluation of operations to assure that standards of civilian protection are robustly upheld, a role that could be effectively

## 1AR

#### Syria decks cred specifically in Context of Iran

George Condon 9/5/13, National Journal, Marvin Kalb, James Clark Welling Fellow at The George Washington University and a member of Atlantic Community Advisory Board, Guest Scholar in Foreign Policy at The Brookings Institution, was the Shorenstein Center's Founding Director and Edward R. Murrow Professor of Press and Public Policy at Harvard, “What Obama's Gamble on Syria Means for Challenging Iran,” http://www.nationaljournal.com/magazine/what-obama-s-gamble-on-syria-means-for-challenging-iran-20130905

Marvin Kalb, author of The Road to War, a study of presidential use of force, agrees that Obama is setting no precedent in asking for congressional authorization. But Kalb is baffled by the way the president has gone about this. Obama is “building a new kind of precedent by first putting the world on notice that he has the authority to attack Syria and an attack is imminent—and then putting this projected attack on hold while he gets Congress to authorize it,” Kalb told National Journal. “He has, with this approach, reduced the power of a president’s word and America’s credibility in the troubled Middle East.” Residents of that volatile region are “scratching their heads” and asking, “What’s he really up to?” Kalb said, adding, “He is absolutely producing problems with respect to Iran.” Even before this, skepticism abounded that Obama meant what he had said about preventing Iran from gaining nuclear capability. “Now, the doubts have multiplied considerably,” Kalb said. No one can be sure how the president will respond to any evidence on Iran. Will he, as he is doing on Syria, ask Congress for authorization to strike Iran? Or will he, as he did in Libya, bypass Congress and act on his own authority?

#### No US or Israel strike on Iran---their evidence ignores Israel’s true motives

Zarrabi 11—conducted lectures and seminars on international affairs, particularly in relation to Iran, with focus on US/Iran issues. President, regional chapter of World Affairs Council of San Diego. Author of 2 books about Iran. (Kam, CRYING WOLF, AGAIN?, 9 June 2011, [www.payvand.com/news/11/jun/1118.html](http://www.payvand.com/news/11/jun/1118.html))

Portrayal of Iran as a marketable international threat has been serving the interests of the Israeli regimes, as well as quite arguably those of the United States, the latter worth more careful examination. Israel's agendas are quite straightforward and easy to understand:

Israel intends to remain the sole regional superpower.

Israel must enjoy the unwavering financial, diplomatic and military support of the United States for its very survival.

Israel has no intention of giving the Palestinians any level of meaningful autonomy or nationhood, or give up a square inch of territory in the occupied areas or in East Jerusalem.

Israel intends to remain a "Jewish" state at any cost.

The United States has also involvements in the region that cannot be downplayed or ignored:

With the ongoing military operations in Iraq, Afghanistan and Pakistan, and the explosive developments in Yemen, Bahrain, Syria and possibly Saudi Arabia, America's military presence in the Middle East region, particularly in the Persian Gulf, must and shall continue.

The proverbial Military Industrial Complex and its contributions to the economy of the nation cannot be exaggerated. Unlike the human costs of war, the material losses turn into gains by America's own manufacturing industries, not to mention the tens or hundreds of billions of dollars worth of mostly second hand or nearly obsolete hardware sold to the oil-rich Arab states who are "supposedly" in danger of some Iranian assault. Of course, they know full well that Iran poses no physical threat to their kingdoms, but they have no option but to accept America's offer, as their very survival against their own people depends on the American military and diplomatic support. The Saudis, the purchasers of some 100 billion dollars worth of American arms are, for example, quite vulnerable to internal uprisings by their disenfranchised citizenry.

Last but not least is the need for a strong American presence in the region to monitor and, if necessary, to prevent or buffer a potential Israeli adventurism against Iran, which would have catastrophic results all around.

Both the Israelis and the Americans realize that any attack on Iran would be ill advised, not only because it would not have the advertised desired effects or, worse yet, the fact that it would promote more aggressive militarization by the Iranians, but because it would cause major adverse ripples throughout the region with global economic repercussions. Both Israel and the Unites States also know that the mere portrayal of Iran as a regional or even a global threat plays the intended role, much more safely and effectively than would Iran as a real threat.

It has, therefore, been the policy to keep this negative portrayal convincingly alive, to which end the Iranian regime itself has been contributing significantly, albeit by default!

There have been numerous occasions, from the initial American attack against Al-Gha'eda and Taliban bases in Afghanistan and the establishment of the Karzai government, to the IAEA nuclear negotiations with Iran during the El Baradei leadership of that United Nations' agency, that the "problems" with Iran could have been resolved, leading to a rapprochement between the United States and Iran. Each time a hand was stretched from either side, some unexpected, or actually quite expected, excuse blocked the path to such an opening. Examples are far too numerous to recount here. The obvious lack of interest by the United States to negotiate the way to a rapprochement was interpreted quite correctly by the Iranian regime as a clear indication that, short of total capitulation, something that the Iranians would never be expected to submit to, there was nothing Iran could reasonably do to remedy its negative portrayal.

This, and the repeated open threats of violation of Iran's territorial integrity and regime change, as well as the admitted and undeniable acts of infiltration and sabotage fomented by the Israeli and American agencies, played into the hands of Iran's hardliners to further strengthen their position as the guardians of the nation. The result, as though well plotted in advance, has been a continuous postponement of democratic reforms toward moderation and opening, and the resulting public dissatisfaction with more restrictive sociopolitical environment. The increasing economic sanctions spearheaded by the United States, mostly on behest of the Israeli powerhouses, have been adding to the internal problems the Iranian regime has been trying to cope with.

It has been my long-term belief that the detrimental effects of America's Iran policies for America's own interests must be well known by the American policy makers. I have to, therefore, conclude that it is a lack of ability, rather than the absence of desire, in the part of the Administration, from the office of the President on down to the US Congress, that the nation's best strategic interests in the Middle East are being compromised for the dictates of America's true enemy who has been parading as a friend and as an inseparable ally.

Many Middle East analysts, among whom Professor Seyed Mohammad Marandi of the University of Tehran, who in his latest article appearing in CASMII website, blames poor intelligence and reliance on dubious sources for a misperception of Iranian affairs. I, however, am of the opinion that those in the know in the State Department, from Hillary Clinton on down to the CIA and NSC staff advising her, do understand the situation on the ground, but are forced to resort to diplomatic hypocrisy and propaganda routines to cover up the system's inability to override the influence of special interest groups and lobbies that have a stranglehold on the nation's Middle East policy apparatus.

As I look at the status quo, I do not see any prospects for change looming on a visible horizon when it comes to this one-sided parasitic relationship. The best interests of both the United States and Iran have been suffering because of the toxins injected into the system by this parasite.

As the new threats of an attack on Iran, this time supposedly between June and September this year, loom larger, I have little doubt that the goal posts will be pushed back once again. As I have said, Iran as an existing threat serves the purpose much better than a friendly or a defeated Iran. An existing regional pariah serves Israel's interests and agendas perfectly well.

The only hope for a change in this ongoing macabre theatrical scenario is for some other regional actor to replace Iran convincingly enough to satisfy the ticket holders to this drama. I believe the script is actually undergoing changes in that direction.

There are enough military and civilian brains here to realize that a change in the status quo must be initiated sooner rather than later. My prediction is that Pakistan, a real nuclear-armed state with tribal factions that are not under the control of a viable central government and who are known for their vehement anti West and anti American sentiments can take up Iran's role as a regional pariah quite convincingly. It seems to be heading that way. Give it two to three years, and a great sea changes might be taking place in the region, especially with respect to a rapprochement with Iran, with prospects of positive developments within the Islamic Republic as tensions ease.

Meanwhile, Israel can use its time-tested tactics of keeping the United States on edge by feinting its intentions of a preemptive strike against Iran, in order to blackmail and extort more military and financial support from its big benefactor and to further postpone any prospects of a compromise with regard to its Palestinian dilemmas.

#### Doesn’t apply to ex post

Ahmad Chehab 11, Georgetown University Law Center Spring, 2011 Wayne Law Review 57 Wayne L. Rev. 335, “THE BUSH AND OBAMA ADMINISTRATIONS' INVOCATION OF THE STATE SECRET PRIVILEGE IN NATIONAL SECURITY LITIGATION: A PROPOSAL FOR ROBUST JUDICIAL REVIEW,” lexis nexis

Part IV proposes several possible methods of examining the reliability and merit of SSP usage in national security litigation. Steering clear of the overly deferential approach often afforded to presidential invocations of purported privilege, this Note argues for a judicial balancing test that affords greater consideration to the interests of the plaintiffs. The central argument is that the SSP should not be able to shield constitutionally troubling presidential actions from public accountability and judicial redress. n40 Federal judges should not assume that the Executive Branch holds an advantage over the judiciary with respect to information access; the possibility that information can be passed through to the judge, combined with the potential for new information to emerge in the adversarial process, renders this inquiry manageable in many if not most instances. Special expertise is more likely to matter in the context of predictive policy or political strategic decisions than in the context of retrospective fact-finding adjudication, which is often the context in which national security litigation appears. In litigation in which the SSP is invoked, federal courts are often called on to adjudicate how a specific governmental policy that is widely acknowledged to exist has resulted in some sort of concrete damage toward a particular litigant or class of litigants.

#### Plan solves kick-out

Micah Zenko 13, CFR Douglas Dillon Fellow in the Center for Preventive Action, PhD in Political Science from Brandeis University, “Reforming U.S. Drone Strike Policies,” CFR Special Report 65, January 2013

The choice the United States faces is not between unfettered drone use and sacrificing freedom of action, but between drone policy reforms by design or drone policy reforms by default. Recent history demonstrates that domestic political pressure could severely limit drone strikes in ways that the CIA or JSOC have not anticipated. In support of its counterterrorism strategy, the Bush administration engaged in the extraordinary rendition of terrorist suspects to third countries, the use of enhanced interrogation techniques, and warrantless wiretapping. Although the Bush administration defended its policies as critical to protecting the U.S. homeland against terrorist attacks, unprecedented domestic political pressure led to significant reforms or termination. Compared to Bush-era counterterrorism policies, drone strikes are vulnerable to similar—albeit still largely untapped—moral outrage, and they are even more susceptible to political constraints because they occur in plain sight. Indeed, a negative trend in U.S. public opinion on drones is already apparent. Between February and June 2012, U.S. support for drone strikes against suspected terrorists fell from 83 percent to 62 percent—which represents less U.S. support than enhanced interrogation techniques maintained in the mid-2000s.65 Finally, U.S. drone strikes are also widely opposed by the citizens of important allies, emerging powers, and the local populations in states where strikes occur.66 States polled reveal overwhelming opposition to U.S. drone strikes: Greece (90 percent), Egypt (89 percent), Turkey (81 percent), Spain (76 percent), Brazil (76 percent), Japan (75 percent), and Pakistan (83 percent).67 ¶ This is significant because the United States cannot conduct drone strikes in the most critical corners of the world by itself. Drone strikes require the tacit or overt support of host states or neighbors. If such states decided not to cooperate—or to actively resist—U.S. drone strikes, their effectiveness would be immediately and sharply reduced, and the likelihood of civilian casualties would increase. This danger is not hypothetical. In 2007, the Ethiopian government terminated its U.S. military presence after public revelations that U.S. AC-130 gunships were launching attacks from Ethiopia into Somalia. Similarly, in late 2011, Pakistan evicted all U.S. military and intelligence drones, forcing the United States to completely rely on Afghanistan to serve as a staging ground for drone strikes in Pakistan. The United States could attempt to lessen the need for tacit host-state support by making significant investments in armed drones that can be flown off U.S. Navy ships, conducting electronic warfare or missile attacks on air defenses, allowing downed drones to not be recovered and potentially transferred to China or Russia, and losing access to the human intelligence networks on the ground that are critical for identifying targets.¶ According to U.S. diplomats and military officials, active resistance— such as the Pakistani army shooting down U.S. armed drones— is a legitimate concern. In this case, the United States would need to either end drone sorties or escalate U.S. military involvement by attacking Pakistani radar and antiaircraft sites, thus increasing the likelihood of civilian casualties.68 Beyond where drone strikes currently take place, political pressure could severely limit options for new U.S. drone bases. For example, the Obama administration is debating deploying armed drones to attack al-Qaeda in the Islamic Maghreb (AQIM) in North Africa, which would likely require access to a new airbase in the region. To some extent, anger at U.S. sovereignty violations is an inevitable and necessary trade-off when conducting drone strikes. Nevertheless, in each of these cases, domestic anger would partially or fully abate if the United States modified its drone policy in the ways suggested below.