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## Overreach

#### Yes ME war---D too old

Michael Singh 11, Washington Institute director, 9/22, “What has really changed in the Middle East?”, http://shadow.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2011/09/22/what\_has\_really\_changed\_in\_the\_middle\_east

Third, and most troubling, the Middle East is likely to be a more dangerous and volatile region in the future. For the past several decades, a relatively stable regional order has prevailed, centered around Arab-Israeli peace treaties and close ties between the United States and the major Arab states and Turkey. The region was not conflict-free by any means, and Iran, Iraq, and various transnational groups sought to challenge the status quo, albeit largely unsuccessfully. Now, however, the United States appears less able or willing to exercise influence in the region, and the leaders and regimes who guarded over the regional order are gone or under pressure. Sensing either the need or opportunity to act autonomously, states like Turkey, Saudi Arabia, and Iran are increasingly bold, and all are well-armed and aspire to regional leadership. Egypt, once stabilized, may join this group. While interstate conflict is not inevitable by any means, the risk of it has increased and the potential brakes on it have deteriorated. Looming over all of this is Iran's quest for a nuclear weapon, which would shift any contest for regional primacy into overdrive.

### SOF budget

#### No special forces cuts

Andrei Akulov 13, journalist, “Special Operations Forces,” Before It’s News, 10-21-13, http://beforeitsnews.com/international/2013/10/special-operations-forces-2470642.html

The Special Operations Command (SOCOM) is scheduled for more spending and personnel increases while the rest of the military looks to be making cuts subject to sequester that SOF are exempt from as an elite component. The end strength has grown to almost 70,000 to add countless private support personnel to it. The number of commandos has doubled since 9/11, and their budget tripled — from $3.5 billion to $10.5 billion. The trend will likely continue. Special forces operations have become commonplace during the height of the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq. It’s not short targeted combat raids only – over the last decade the forces have been more frequently assigned long-term missions meant to train and build local security forces around the world – acting as an important foreign policy tool.

**SOF Good---Bioterror**

**Special ops key to solve bioterror**

Jim **Thomas 13**, Vice President and Director of Studies at the Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments, and Chris Dougherty is a Research Fellow at the Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments, 2013, “BEYOND THE RAMPARTS THE FUTURE OF U.S. SPECIAL OPERATIONS FORCES,” http://www.csbaonline.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/05/SOF-Report-CSBA-Final.pdf

Although nuclear weapons tend to dominate public discourse about WMD threats, bioterrorism also presents a threat that could have consequences on a massive scale. Further, the barriers to developing a bio-weapons capability may be lower. As former Secretary of the Navy Richard Danzig has argued, relative to nuclear programs and materials, biological materials are easier to obtain, conceal, and transport. Biological weapons development programs are also much harder to detect. 202 The indiscriminate mass effects of bio-weapons would have great appeal for many terrorist groups, who may be far less concerned over the prospect of blowback than state actors. Additionally, while traditional chemical weapons are less suited for mass casualty attacks than either nuclear or biological weapons, legacy chemical weapon stockpiles in unstable countries like Syria and Libya pose the danger that desperate rulers will use these capabilities in a last-ditch attempt to save their regime, or that the weapons will fall into the hands of rebel forces, including VENs.203 SOF can contribute to counter-WMD e􀌆orts across every line of operation. ¶ The global CT network SOF have built over the last decade could be repurposed over the ne􀁛t decade to become a global counter-WMD network, applying the same logic that it takes a network to defeat a network. SOF could also have critical responsibilities in the detection and disruption of WMD programs.20􀀗 SOF’s traditional special reconnaissance (SR) skills could help locate or probe suspected WMD sites. Given the e􀁛traordinary measures states and terrorist organizations will take to conceal their WMD programs from traditional overhead intelligence collection systems and international inspectors, clandestine or covert SR would o􀌆er one of the most e􀌆ective means of detecting a program or assessing its maturity. Operating under the authorities of other agencies, SOF could conduct preventive direct-action missions to disrupt development programs, help gain access to an enemy’s military communications networks, or infiltrate heavily guarded WMD facilities. During a con􀃀ict, SOF could conduct surgical strikes against WMD facilities and delivery systems in concert with precision airpower. SOF could also work by, with, and through partner forces to conduct these missions, as foreign nationals may have greater access to target facilities.

**Extinction**

**Mhyrvold 13** Nathan, Began college at age 14, BS and Masters from UCLA, Masters and PhD, Princeton “Strategic Terrorism: A Call to Action,” Working Draft, The Lawfare Research Paper Series

Research paper NO . 2 – 2013

As horrible as this would be, such a pandemic is by no means the worst attack one can imagine, for several reasons. First, most of the classic bioweapons are based on 1960s and 19**70s** **technology** because the 1972 treaty halted bioweapons development efforts in the United States and most other Western countries. Second, the Russians, although solidly committed to biological weapons long after the treaty deadline, were never on the cutting edge of biological research. Third and most important, the science and technology of molecular biology have made enormous advances**, utterly transforming the field** in the last few decades. High school biology students routinely perform molecular-biology manipulations that would have been impossible even for the best superpower-funded program back in the heyday of biological-weapons research. The biowarfare methods of the 1960s and 1970s are now as antiquated as the lumbering mainframe computers of that era. **Tomorrow’s terrorists will have vastly more deadly bugs to choose from.** Consider this sobering development: in 2001, Australian researchers working on mousepox, a nonlethal virus that infects mice (as chickenpox does in humans), accidentally discovered that a simple genetic modification transformed the virus.10, 11 Instead of producing mild symptoms, the new virus killed 60% of even those mice already immune to the naturally occurring strains of mousepox. The new virus, moreover, was unaffected by any existing vaccine or antiviral drug. A team of researchers at Saint Louis University led by Mark Buller picked up on that work and, by late 2003, found a way to improve on it: Buller’s variation on mousepox was 100% lethal, although his team of investigators also devised combination vaccine and antiviral therapies that were partially effective in protecting animals from the engineered strain.12, 13 Another saving grace is that the genetically altered virus is no longer contagious. Of course, it is quite possible that future tinkering with the virus will change that property, too. Strong reasons exist to believe that the genetic modifications Buller made to mousepox would work for other poxviruses and possibly for other classes of viruses as well. Might the same techniques allow chickenpox or another poxvirus that infects humans to be turned into a 100% lethal bioweapon, perhaps one that is resistant to any known antiviral therapy? I’ve asked this question of experts many times, and no one has yet replied that such a manipulation couldn’t be done. This case is just one example. Many more are pouring out of scientific journals and conferences every year. Just last year, the journal Nature published a controversial study done at the University of Wisconsin–Madison in which virologists enumerated the changes one would need to make to a highly lethal strain of bird flu to make it easily transmitted from one mammal to another.14 **Biotechnology** is advancing so rapidly that it is hard to keep track of all the new potential threats. Nor is it clear that anyone is even trying. In addition to lethality and drug resistance, many other parameters can be played with, given that the infectious power of an epidemic depends on many properties, including the length of the latency period during which a person is contagious but asymptomatic. Delaying the onset of serious symptoms allows each new case to spread to more people and thus makes the virus harder to stop. This dynamic is perhaps best illustrated by HIV , which is very difficult to transmit compared with smallpox and many other viruses. Intimate contact is needed, and even then, the infection rate is low. The balancing factor is that HIV can take years to progress to AIDS , which can then take many more years to kill the victim. What makes HIV so dangerous is that infected people have lots of opportunities to infect others. This property has allowed HIV to claim more than 30 million lives so far, and approximately 34 million people are now living with this virus and facing a highly uncertain future.15 A virus genetically engineered to infect its host quickly, to generate symptoms slowly—say, only after weeks or months—and to spread easily through the air or by casual contact **would be vastly more devastating than HIV** . It could silently penetrate the population to unleash its deadly effects suddenly. This type of epidemic would be almost impossible to combat because most of the infections would occur before the epidemic became obvious. A technologically sophisticated terrorist group could develop such a virus and kill a large part of humanity with it. Indeed, **terrorists may not have to develop it themselves: some scientist may do so first and publish the details.** Given the rate at which biologists are making discoveries about viruses and the immune system, at some point **in the near future**, **someone may create artificial pathogens that could drive the human race to extinction.** Indeed, a detailed species-elimination plan of this nature was openly proposed in a scientific journal. The ostensible purpose of that particular research was to suggest a way to extirpate the malaria mosquito, but similar techniques could be directed toward humans.16 When I’ve talked to molecular biologists about this method, they are quick to point out that it is slow and easily detectable and could be fought with biotech remedies. If you challenge them to come up with improvements to the suggested attack plan, however, they have plenty of ideas. **Modern biotechnology will soon be capable, if it is not already, of bringing about the demise of the human race**— **or at least** of killing a sufficient number of people to end high-tech civilization and set humanity back 1,000 years or more. That terrorist groups could achieve this level of technological sophistication may seem far-fetched, but keep in mind that it takes only a handful of individuals to accomplish these tasks. Never has lethal power of this potency been accessible to so few, so easily. Even more dramatically than nuclear proliferation, modern biological science has frighteningly undermined the correlation between the lethality of a weapon and its cost, a fundamentally stabilizing mechanism throughout history. Access to extremely lethal agents—lethal enough to exterminate Homo sapiens—**will be available to anybody with a solid background in biology, terrorists included.**

## Allies

### NATO – Trade/Cyber AO

#### Interoperability within NATO ensures global trade and prevents cyber attacks

Jamie Shea 12, Deputy Assistant Secretary General for Emerging Security Challenges, "Keeping NATO Relevant", April 19, carnegieendowment.org/2012/04/19/keeping-nato-relevant/acl9#

At the same time, the national security strategies of the NATO allies underline the extent to which they are currently preoccupied with regional crises, preventing global proliferation, dismantling terrorist networks, preserving their trade routes and access to raw materials, and integrating the rising global powers into a rules-based international system. If NATO is decreasingly responsive to this global agenda, or is focused only on contingencies requiring major military mobilization, such as those that Article 5 was traditionally intended to address, there is a risk of a disconnect between NATO-Brussels and the policy and resource decisions taken in NATO capitals or in other institutions like the EU.¶ SLIMMING DOWN AND STAYING RELEVANT¶ NATO’s core challenge for the next decade will be to slim down while retaining the capability to handle the global security agenda of its members. This is still possible, and NATO’s new Strategic Concept certainly provides the doctrinal basis. But words do not automatically lead to actions.¶ To succeed, the Alliance will need to be serious about three things: demonstrating real capability to counter the new security challenges; harmonizing allied positions on potential or actual regional crises; and binding the maximum number of its partners in North Africa, the Middle East, and the Asia-Pacific region into a structured security community through consultations, training, and interoperability. As NATO builds down, it will need to make sure that it does not sacrifice the structures and people that allow it to deliver on these three tasks and that make the Alliance more than just a multinational military headquarters for “when all else has failed” responses.¶ Because the new security challenges are often civilian in nature (90 percent of cyberspace is owned by the private sector) and because they are often managed by ministries of the interior, the police, or specialized government agencies, some have questioned NATO’s role and relevance. It is also not easy for an organization that has traditionally taken on the major role and responsibility in a crisis (Bosnia, Kosovo, Afghanistan, Libya) or has not been involved at all (Iraq, North Korea, Syria) to adapt to being a partial or supporting actor. There are a large number of agencies involved in a cyber, terrorism, or energy incident and the military role is only one of many that need to be brought into play, and with varying degrees of importance as the crisis develops. But because NATO cannot always be the complete solution does not mean that its role is symbolic, provided that the Alliance identifies the aspect of the issue that corresponds to its essentially military capabilities and crisis-management mechanisms.¶ Countering New Security Challenges¶ All future conflicts will have a cyber dimension, whether in stealing secrets and probing vulnerabilities to prepare for a military operation or in disabling crucial information and command and control networks of the adversary during the operation itself. Consequently, NATO’s future military effectiveness will be closely linked to its cyber-defense capabilities; in this respect, there is also much that NATO can do to help allies improve their cyber forensics, intrusion detection, firewalls, and procedures for handling an advanced persistent attack, such as that which affected Estonia in 2007.¶ The Alliance can also help to shape the future cyber environment by promoting information sharing and confidence-building measures among its partners and, in a longer-term perspective, other key actors, such as Brazil, China, and India. This is a field where the military is clearly ahead in many key technical areas. NATO already has one of the most capable computer incident response centers around and one of the best systems for exchanging and assessing intelligence on cyber threats. NATO must first establish its credibility in this area by bringing all of its civilian and military networks under centralized protection by the end of 2012, but it would not make sense to leave NATO’s role in cyber defense there. It can be a center of excellence for exercises, best practice, stress testing, and common standards for both allies and partners.¶ Of course, NATO will have work to do in order to be an effective player in the cyber field, along with other emerging threats. It will need to go beyond its traditional stakeholders in the allied foreign and defense ministries and build relationships with ministries of the interior, intelligence services, customs, and government crisis-management cells (such as COBRA in the United Kingdom). It will also need to step up its cooperation with industry (which is still in the lead for most of the analysis of cyber malware) and also with private security companies that will be playing an increasing role in cyber defense, protection of critical infrastructure, and protection of shipping from pirates.¶ This field is the very expression of security policy in the twenty-first century, in which industry will not just provide equipment but entire security management services to the armed forces. Private contractors will be firmly embedded in every level of defense ministries as well as the armed forces and security agencies. Many of the security functions traditionally performed by governments will be subcontracted to private companies—from physical protection to malware analysis, intelligence and early warning, and logistics. Accordingly, NATO must learn how to work more productively with them.¶ Given the exponential growth in malware and hacking skills, the cyber threat is the most pressing challenge; but there are others too that NATO can readily handle. For instance, using its Special Forces Headquarters at Allied Command Operations to train and set common standards for special forces with centralized air lift, or monitoring emerging technologies so that NATO can better exploit both existing and future disruptive technologies and counter the use of asymmetric methods by its adversaries. Yet another is the protection of critical infrastructure and supply lines for energy and raw materials, especially in the maritime domain where 90 percent of global trade takes place. Key choke points are especially vulnerable to piracy or threats of closure during crises and war. Related areas are the protection against chemical, biological, or radiological agents and training armed forces to cope with extreme weather conditions and natural disasters resulting from climate change.¶ The difference between these emerging challenges and what NATO encountered in the past is that they cannot be deterred. Cyber attacks, terrorism, supply shortages, and natural disasters will all occur. So a key new role of NATO is to help develop the societal resilience to cope with these new types of attacks, to plug vulnerabilities, and to build in the redundant back-up capabilities to allow societies to recover quickly.¶ But again, while NATO’s military organization and capabilities can be a useful first or second responder, they will need to be coordinated with domestic police, health, and emergency management agencies and organizations like the EU. So NATO’s progress in practically embracing the new challenges will depend upon its capacity for effective networking. This is where civilian-military exercises involving NATO and the EU, and NATO and the civilian crisis-management agencies, can help the Alliance to better prepare and understand the different structures and procedures used by its member nations.

#### Trade solves nuclear war

Michael J. **Panzner 8**, faculty at the New York Institute of Finance, 25-year veteran of the global stock, bond, and currency markets who has worked in New York and London for HSBC, Soros Funds, ABN Amro, Dresdner Bank, and JPMorgan Chase, Financial Armageddon: Protect Your Future from Economic Collapse, Revised and Updated Edition, p. 136-138

Continuing calls for curbs on the flow of finance and trade will inspire the United States and other nations to spew forth **protectionist legislation** like the notorious Smoot-Hawley bill. Introduced at the start of the Great Depression, it triggered a series of tit-for-tat economic responses, which many commentators believe helped turn a serious economic downturn into a **prolonged** and **devastating global disaster**, But if history is any guide, those lessons will have been long forgotten during the next collapse. Eventually, fed by a mood of desperation and growing public anger, restrictions on trade, finance, investment, and immigration will almost certainly intensify. ¶ Authorities and ordinary citizens will likely scrutinize the cross-border movement of Americans and outsiders alike, and lawmakers may even call for a general crackdown on nonessential travel. Meanwhile, many nations will make transporting or sending funds to other countries exceedingly difficult. As desperate officials try to limit the fallout from decades of ill-conceived, corrupt, and reckless policies, they will introduce controls on foreign exchange, foreign individuals and companies seeking to acquire certain American infrastructure assets, or trying to buy property and other assets on the (heap thanks to a rapidly depreciating dollar, will be stymied by limits on investment by noncitizens. Those efforts will cause spasms to ripple across economies and markets, disrupting global payment, settlement, and clearing mechanisms. All of this will, of course, continue to undermine business confidence and consumer spending.¶ In a world of lockouts and lockdowns, any link that transmits systemic financial pressures across markets through arbitrage or portfolio-based risk management, or that allows diseases to be easily spread from one country to the next by tourists and wildlife, or that otherwise facilitates unwelcome exchanges of any kind will be viewed with suspicion and dealt with accordingly.¶ The rise in isolationism and protectionism will bring about ever more heated arguments and **dangerous confrontations** over shared sources of oil, gas, and other key commodities as well as factors of production that must, out of necessity, be acquired from less-than-friendly nations. Whether involving raw materials used in strategic industries or basic necessities such as food, water, and energy, efforts to secure adequate supplies will take increasing precedence in a world where demand seems constantly out of kilter with supply. Disputes over the misuse, overuse, and pollution of the environment and natural resources will become more commonplace. Around the world, such tensions will give rise to **full-scale military encounters,** often with minimal provocation.¶ In some instances, economic conditions will serve as a convenient pretext for conflicts that stem from cultural and religious differences. Alternatively, nations may look to divert attention away from domestic problems by channeling frustration and populist sentiment toward other countries and cultures. Enabled by cheap technology and the waning threat of American retribution, **terrorist groups** will likely boost the frequency and scale of their horrifying attacks, bringing the threat of random violence to a whole new level.¶ Turbulent conditions will encourage aggressive saber rattling and interdictions by rogue nations running amok. Age-old clashes will also take on a new, more healed sense of urgency. China will likely assume an increasingly **belligerent posture** toward **Taiwan**, while Iran may embark on overt colonization of its neighbors in the Mideast. Israel, for its part, may look to draw a dwindling list of allies from around the world into a growing number of conflicts. Some observers, like John Mearsheimer, a political scientist at the University of Chicago, have even speculated that an "intense confrontation" between the United States and China is "inevitable" at some point.¶ More than a few disputes will turn out to be almost wholly ideological. Growing cultural and religious differences will be transformed from wars of words to battles soaked in blood. Long-simmering resentments could also degenerate quickly, spurring the basest of human instincts and triggering genocidal acts. **Terrorists** employing **biological or nuclear weapons** will vie with conventional forces using jets, cruise missiles, and bunker-busting bombs to cause widespread destruction. Many will interpret stepped-up conflicts between Muslims and Western societies as the beginnings of a **new world war**.

#### Cyber causes nuclear war

Jason Fritz 9, Former Captain of the U.S. Army, July, Hacking Nuclear Command and Control, www.icnnd.org/Documents/Jason\_Fritz\_Hacking\_NC2.doc

The US uses the two-man rule to achieve a higher level of security in nuclear affairs. Under this rule two authorized personnel must be present and in agreement during critical stages of nuclear command and control. The President must jointly issue a launch order with the Secretary of Defense; Minuteman missile operators must agree that the launch order is valid; and on a submarine, both the commanding officer and executive officer must agree that the order to launch is valid. In the US, in order to execute a nuclear launch, an Emergency Action Message (EAM) is needed. This is a preformatted message that directs nuclear forces to execute a specific attack. The contents of an EAM change daily and consist of a complex code read by a human voice. Regular monitoring by shortwave listeners and videos posted to YouTube provide insight into how these work. These are issued from the NMCC, or in the event of destruction, from the designated hierarchy of command and control centres. Once a command centre has confirmed the EAM, using the two-man rule, the Permissive Action Link (PAL) codes are entered to arm the weapons and the message is sent out. These messages are sent in digital format via the secure Automatic Digital Network and then relayed to aircraft via single-sideband radio transmitters of the High Frequency Global Communications System, and, at least in the past, sent to nuclear capable submarines via Very Low Frequency (Greenemeier 2008, Hardisty 1985). The technical details of VLF submarine communication methods can be found online, including PC-based VLF reception. Some reports have noted a Pentagon review, which showed a potential “electronic back door into the US Navy’s system for broadcasting nuclear launch orders to Trident submarines” (Peterson 2004). The investigation showed that cyber terrorists could potentially infiltrate this network and **insert false orders for launch.** The investigation led to “elaborate new instructions for validating launch orders” (Blair 2003). Adding further to the concern of cyber terrorists seizing control over submarine launched nuclear missiles; The Royal Navy announced in 2008 that it would be installing a Microsoft Windows operating system on its nuclear submarines (Page 2008). The choice of operating system, apparently based on Windows XP, is not as alarming as the advertising of such a system is. This may attract hackers and narrow the necessary reconnaissance to learning its details and potential exploits. It is unlikely that the operating system would play a direct role in the signal to launch, although this is far from certain. Knowledge of the operating system may lead to the insertion of malicious code, which could be used to gain accelerating privileges, tracking, valuable information, and deception that could subsequently be used to initiate a launch. Remember from Chapter 2 that the UK’s nuclear submarines have the authority to launch if they believe the central command has been destroyed.¶ Attempts by cyber terrorists to create the illusion of a decapitating strike could also be used to engage fail-deadly systems. Open source knowledge is scarce as to whether Russia continues to operate such a system. However evidence suggests that they have in the past. Perimetr, also known as Dead Hand, was an automated system set to launch a mass scale nuclear attack in the event of a decapitation strike against Soviet leadership and military.¶ In a crisis, military officials would send a coded message to the bunkers, switching on the dead hand. If nearby ground-level sensors detected a nuclear attack on Moscow, and if a break was detected in communications links with top military commanders, the system would send low-frequency signals over underground antennas to special rockets. Flying high over missile fields and other military sites, these rockets in turn would broadcast attack orders to missiles, bombers and, via radio relays, submarines at sea. Contrary to some Western beliefs, Dr. Blair says, many of Russia's nuclear-armed missiles in underground silos and on mobile launchers can be fired automatically. (Broad 1993)¶ Assuming such a system is still active, cyber terrorists would need to create a crisis situation in order to activate Perimetr, and then fool it into believing a decapitating strike had taken place. While this is not an easy task, the information age makes it easier. Cyber reconnaissance could help locate the machine and learn its inner workings. This could be done by targeting the computers high of level official’s—anyone who has reportedly worked on such a project, or individuals involved in military operations at underground facilities, such as those reported to be located at Yamantau and Kosvinksy mountains in the central southern Urals (Rosenbaum 2007, Blair 2008)¶ Indirect Control of Launch¶ Cyber terrorists could cause incorrect information to be transmitted, received, or displayed at nuclear command and control centres, or shut down these centres’ computer networks completely. In 1995, a Norwegian scientific sounding rocket was mistaken by Russian early warning systems as a nuclear missile launched from a US submarine. A radar operator used Krokus to notify a general on duty who decided to alert the highest levels. Kavkaz was implemented, all three chegets activated, and the countdown for a nuclear decision began. It took eight minutes before the missile was properly identified—a considerable amount of time considering the speed with which a nuclear response must be decided upon (Aftergood 2000).¶ Creating a false signal in these early warning systems would be relatively easy using computer network operations. The real difficulty would be gaining access to these systems as they are most likely on a closed network. However, if they are transmitting wirelessly, that may provide an entry point, and information gained through the internet may reveal the details, such as passwords and software, for gaining entrance to the closed network. If access was obtained, a false alarm could be followed by something like a DDoS attack, so the operators believe an attack may be imminent, yet they can no longer verify it. This could add pressure to the decision making process, and if coordinated precisely, could appear as a first round EMP burst. Terrorist groups could also attempt to launch a non-nuclear missile, such as the one used by Norway, in an attempt to fool the system. The number of states who possess such technology is far greater than the number of states who possess nuclear weapons. Obtaining them would be considerably easier, especially when enhancing operations through computer network operations. Combining traditional terrorist methods with cyber techniques opens opportunities neither could accomplish on their own. For example, radar stations might be more vulnerable to a computer attack, while satellites are more vulnerable to jamming from a laser beam, thus together they deny dual phenomenology. Mapping communications networks through cyber reconnaissance may expose weaknesses, and automated scanning devices created by more experienced hackers can be readily found on the internet.¶ Intercepting or spoofing communications is a highly complex science. These systems are designed to protect against the world’s most powerful and well funded militaries. Yet, there are recurring gaffes, and the very nature of asymmetric warfare is to bypass complexities by finding simple loopholes. For example, commercially available software for voice-morphing could be used to capture voice commands within the command and control structure, cut these sound bytes into phonemes, and splice it back together in order to issue false voice commands (Andersen 2001, Chapter 16). Spoofing could also be used to escalate a volatile situation in the hopes of starting a nuclear war. “ [they cut off the paragraph] “In June 1998, a group of international hackers calling themselves Milw0rm hacked the web site of India’s Bhabha Atomic Research Center (BARC) and put up a spoofed web page showing a mushroom cloud and the text “If a nuclear war does start, you will be the first to scream” (Denning 1999). Hacker web-page defacements like these are often derided by critics of cyber terrorism as simply being a nuisance which causes no significant harm. However, web-page defacements are becoming more common, and they point towards alarming possibilities in subversion. During the 2007 cyber attacks against Estonia, a counterfeit letter of apology from Prime Minister Andrus Ansip was planted on his political party website (Grant 2007). This took place amid the confusion of mass DDoS attacks, real world protests, and accusations between governments.

## T

### 2AC T – Restrictions = Prohibition

#### C/I --- Restriction is limitation, NOT prohibition – their def from City of Northglenn

CAC 12 COURT OF APPEAL OF CALIFORNIA, SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, Plaintiff and Respondent, v. ALTERNATIVE MEDICINAL CANNABIS COLLECTIVE et al., Defendants and Appellants, DIVISION ONE, 207 Cal. App. 4th 601; 143 Cal. Rptr. 3d 716; 2012 Cal. App. LEXIS 772

We disagree with County that in using the phrases “further restrict the location or establishment” and “regulate the location or establishment” in [\*615] section 11362.768, subdivisions (f) and (g), the Legislature intended to authorize local governments to ban all medical marijuana dispensaries that are otherwise “authorized by law to possess, cultivate, or distribute medical marijuana” (§ 11362.768, subd. (e) [stating scope of section's application]); the Legislature did not use the words “ban” or “prohibit.” Yet County cites dictionary definitions of “regulate” (to govern or direct according to rule or law); “regulation” (controlling by rule or restriction; a rule or order that has legal force); “restriction” (a limitation or qualification, including on the use of property); “establishment” (the act of establishing or state or condition of being established); “ban” (to prohibit); and “prohibit” (to forbid by law; to prevent or hinder) to attempt to support its interpretation. County then concludes that “the ordinary meaning [\*\*\*23] of the terms, ‘restriction,’ ‘regulate,’ and ‘regulation’ are consistent with a ban or prohibition against the opening or starting up or continued operation of [a medical marijuana dispensary] storefront business.” We disagree.¶CA(9)(9) The ordinary meanings of “restrict” and “regulate” suggest a degree of control or restriction falling short of “banning,” “prohibiting,” “forbidding,” or “preventing.” Had the Legislature intended to include an outright ban or prohibition among the local regulatory powers authorized in section 11362.768, subdivisions (f) and (g), it would have said so. Attributing the usual and ordinary meanings to the words used in section 11362.768, subdivisions (f) and (g), construing the words in context, attempting to harmonize subdivisions (f) and (g) with section 11362.775 and with the purpose of California's medical marijuana [\*\*727] statutory program, and bearing in mind the intent of the electorate and the Legislature in enacting the CUA and the MMP, we conclude that HN21Go to this Headnote in the case.the phrases “further restrict the location or establishment” and “regulate the location or establishment” in section 11362.768, subdivisions (f) and (g) do not authorize a per se ban at the local level. The Legislature [\*\*\*24] decided in section 11362.775 to insulate medical marijuana collectives and cooperatives from nuisance prosecution “solely on the basis” that they engage in a dispensary function. To interpret the phrases “further restrict the location or establishment” and “regulate the location or establishment” to mean that local governments may impose a blanket nuisance prohibition against dispensaries would frustrate both the Legislature's intent to “[e]nhance the access of patients and caregivers to medical marijuana through collective, cooperative cultivation projects” and “[p]romote uniform and consistent application of the [CUA] among the counties within the state” and the electorate's intent to “ensure that seriously ill Californians have the right to obtain and use marijuana for medical purposes” and “encourage the federal and state governments to implement a plan to provide for the safe and affordable distribution of marijuana to all patients in medical need of marijuana.”

## CP

### 2AC Quantum of Info

#### The CP’s standard is actually less restrictive than the status quo---clear and convincing evidence is a lower standard of certainty than “beyond a reasonable doubt”

Geoffrey S. Corn 12, Associate Professor of Law at South Texas College of Law, Winter 2012, “ARTICLE: Targeting, Command Judgment, and a Proposed Quantum of Information Component: A FOURTH AMENDMENT LESSON IN CONTEXTUAL REASONABLENESS,” Brooklyn Law Review, 77 Brooklyn L. Rev. 437

The discussion above demonstrates that in the U.S. criminal investigation context, the amount of certainty a government agent must possess before depriving a person of liberty is contingent on the liberty interest at stake. The highest quantum of proof -- proof beyond a reasonable doubt -- is required before an individual can be convicted of a crime and deprived of his life or freedom through incarceration or [\*473] execution. n156 Probable cause, on the other hand, is a much lower standard and requires only a reasonable belief to justify the search or seizure of property or a person. n157 Although less common in the criminal procedure context, there are two additional quanta relevant to the analysis here -- a preponderance of the evidence and clear and convincing evidence. Both of these quanta fall between proof beyond a reasonable doubt and reasonable suspicion on the quanta continuum. The following chart illustrates this continuum:



Preponderance of the evidence falls fourth on the continuum under clear and convincing and above probable cause. It is defined in federal jury instructions for civil law suits as evidence sufficient to prove that something is more likely so than not so. In other words, a preponderance of the evidence means such evidence as, when considered and compared with that opposed to it, has more convincing force and produces in your minds belief that what is sought to be proved is more likely true than not true. n164

The preponderance of evidence standard is used to protect civil interests. n165

Clear and convincing evidence is the standard of proof that falls above a preponderance of the evidence and under beyond a reasonable doubt on the continuum of proof. The clear and convincing standard is used to protect an "important individual interest in civil cases." n166 It applies when "the interests at stake . . . are deemed to be more substantial than mere loss of money," n167 such as where the state is attempting to terminate parental rights n168 or where civil commitment is sought because of mental illness. n169

In Addington v. Texas, the Supreme Court determined that "clear and convincing evidence" was the appropriate standard for civil commitment. In that case, Addington's mother petitioned the court to have her son indefinitely committed to a state mental hospital after he was arrested for "assault by threat against his mother." n170 At the time, only a preponderance of the evidence was required to civilly commit someone under state law. n171 The defendant argued that, as in criminal law, indefinite civil incarceration demanded proof beyond a reasonable doubt of the conditions necessary for commitment. n172 The Court began by stating that "in considering [\*475] what standard should govern in a civil commitment proceeding, we must assess both the extent of the individual's interest in not being involuntarily confined indefinitely and the state's interest in committing the emotionally disturbed." n173 The Court noted that the state has a legitimate interest in providing care for the mentally ill. It also noted that "at one time or another every person exhibits some abnormal behavior which might be perceived by some as symptomatic of a mental or emotional disorder, but which is in fact within a range of conduct that is generally acceptable." n174

The Court ultimately determined that it was because of the second category -- the abnormal behavior that is actually acceptable -- that a preponderance of the evidence was not a sufficient level of proof. However, for the Court, proof beyond a reasonable doubt was too strict a standard given the limitations of psychiatric diagnoses. The Court stated,

Finally, the initial inquiry in a civil commitment proceeding is very different from the central issue in either a delinquency proceeding or a criminal prosecution. In the latter cases the basic issue is a straightforward factual question -- did the accused commit the act alleged? There may be factual issues to resolve in a commitment proceeding, but the factual aspects represent only the beginning of the inquiry. Whether the individual is mentally ill and dangerous to either himself or others and is in need of confined therapy turns on the meaning of the facts which must be interpreted by expert psychiatrists and psychologists. Given the lack of certainty and the fallibility of psychiatric diagnosis, there is a serious question as to whether a state could ever prove beyond a reasonable doubt that an individual is both mentally ill and likely to be dangerous. n175

The Court held that the middle standard -- clear and convincing evidence -- was the appropriate standard for cases involving civil commitment. n176

The various quantum of information standards in the judicial context, as well as the burden of proof standards, find an appropriate place in American jurisprudence based on the gravity of the interest threatened. Courts have recognized that finding an appropriate framework often depends on recognizing the realities of the contexts in which the threatened deprivation takes place, and the ability of the state to protect its interests in that situation. Because targeting decisions are made in myriad [\*476] contexts -- where the state interest, the ability of the state to protect its interest, and the threatened deprivation are always different -- the rubric for assessing targeting decisions should change to reflect these changing contexts.

#### This fails---establishing the CP’s framework flouts international law---states have an obligation to refrain from targeting if there’s any reasonable doubt that the target is legitimate

Adil Ahmad Haque 12, Associate Professor of Law, Rutgers School of Law, November 2012, “ARTICLE: KILLING IN THE FOG OF WAR,” Southern California Law Review, 86 S. Cal. L. Rev. 63

First, Corn is wrong to think that the required level of certainty that an individual is liable to attack varies with the different legal bases of liability to attack (membership in an armed force, direct participation in hostilities, and continuous combat function). Of course, generally it will prove easier to satisfy the required level of certainty while fighting a uniformed enemy than while fighting a nonuniformed enemy or while targeting individuals based on their present conduct rather than their organizational role. But the required level of certainty remains the same for each category of liability.

Second, the reasonable suspicion and preponderance of the evidence standards that Corn endorses are inadequate. For example, if you are fighting a uniformed enemy but cannot tell whether a particular individual is wearing a uniform (because it is too dark, or the individual is too far, or your view is obstructed) it would be wrong to kill that individual merely because you reasonably suspect that the individual is a uniformed soldier. If you reasonably suspect that individual is liable to attack then you should investigate further. But, if you cannot reasonably conclude or believe the individual is liable to attack, then you must hold your fire.

Similarly, if your unit takes small-arms fire and you see an individual running away, it would be wrong to kill that individual even if it is slightly more probable that the individual fired at you and is retreating from the engagement (activities which would constitute participation in hostilities) than it is that the individual did nothing and is simply fleeing to relative safety. As we saw in Part IV.C, above the minimum threshold of reasonable belief, the required level of certainty must vary with the magnitude of the threat and reflect the moral asymmetry between killing and letting die.

Finally, Corn writes that international law does not clearly permit the use of armed force outside an area of active hostilities or against members of organized armed groups who perform a continuous combat function but are not currently directly participating in hostilities.111 Strangely, Corn does not conclude that states should refrain from such attacks until their legality is clearly established, but instead concludes that such attacks may be carried out if it is beyond reasonable doubt that the targeted individuals perform a continuous combat function.112 Conceptually, Corn is wrong to think that factual certainty can compensate for legal uncertainty. Substantively, Corn offers the wrong argument for the right conclusion. Individuals outside an area of active hostilities generally pose no immediate threat. Based on the arguments of the previous section, we can conclude that such individuals generally may be attacked only if there is conclusive reason to believe that they are liable to be killed. Contrary to Corn’s view, the same high standard applies both inside and outside areas of active hostilities. In particular, this high standard applies to targeted killing operations directed at all low-level and most mid-level insurgents.

#### That means the CP actively violates IHL---any doubt about combatant status triggers an obligation to refrain from force---the CP relaxes that standard

Adil Ahmad Haque 12, Associate Professor of Law, Rutgers School of Law, November 2012, “ARTICLE: KILLING IN THE FOG OF WAR,” Southern California Law Review, 86 S. Cal. L. Rev. 63

What should you do? How certain must you be that the individuals in question are opposing combatants, rather than civilians, before using deadly force? What precautions must you take, what information must you seek, and what risks must you accept in order to reduce the risk of mistakenly killing civilians? How can the law of armed conflict, as well as the rules of engagement promulgated by your armed forces, provide better guidance to you as you make such determinations?

The urgency and importance of such questions are particularly clear in irregular, asymmetric armed conflicts in which state armed forces face nonuniformed adversaries intermingled with civilian populations. Indeed, recent scholarship suggests that as many as seven out of ten civilian deaths caused by U.S. forces in planned military operations result from a failure to verify that the target of the operation is military rather than civilian. n4 Finally, the advent of UAVs creates an unprecedented opportunity to submit target verification to determinate, morally defensible legal rules.

To provide moral and legal guidance to participants in contemporary conflicts, this Article deploys concepts and theories drawn from the law of armed conflict, decision theory, criminal law, and moral philosophy. It is, in that sense, a work of both intradisciplinary and interdisciplinary legal scholarship.

As Part II explains, under the law of armed conflict ("LOAC"), also known as international humanitarian law ("IHL"), soldiers are not free to shoot first and ask questions later. On the contrary, soldiers must distinguish between combatants and civilians; do everything feasible to verify that the individuals they target are combatants and not civilians; consider individuals to be civilians in cases of doubt; and hold their fire if it becomes apparent that a targeted individual is a civilian. However, as the International Committee for the Red Cross ("ICRC") - a leading expositor of IHL - has commented, "the various provisions are relatively imprecise and are open to a fairly broad margin of judgment." n5 In the absence of clear legal rules, the ICRC, as well as leading states, scholars, and practitioners, embrace what I will call the "Balancing Approach," according to which the required level of certainty and the required level of risk vary with the [\*67] balance of military and humanitarian considerations. As the balance tips in favor of humanitarian considerations, the required levels of certainty and risk rise; as the balance tips in favor of military considerations, the required levels of certainty and risk fall.

### 2AC Safehavens DA

#### Civilian trials and interrogation solve terrorism---equally as good

Mary Ellen O'Connell 13, University of Notre Dame, Robert and Marion Short Chair in Law and Research Professor of International Dispute Resolution at the Kroc Institute for International Peace studies, Testimony to the COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES PROTECTING U.S. CITIZENS' CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS DURING THE WAR ON TERROR, http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/CHRG-113hhrg81173/html/CHRG-113hhrg81173.htm

Ms. O'Connell. Mr. Chairman--Mr. Chairman, my husband was a military interrogator for 11 years, and so I'm very well informed about the difference between FBI interrogations, civilian interrogation and military interrogation, and sad to say, I think this issue has just been overblown and misunderstood by people.¶ Excellent FBI interrogators, as I think Professor Chesney indicated, can do an extremely good job, just as good as military interrogators, within civilian system. It is--I'm not quite sure how we've gotten on this wrong track, but remember when Abdulmutallab was arrested in Detroit, he was interrogated by excellent interrogators who had the training, the skills, the background knowledge, the language, et cetera, to get a great deal of information about the motivations, the connections, et cetera of Mr. Abdulmutallab. So, instead of focusing on, well, shouldn't we do this experimental thing and for people arrested within the United States, where there is no ongoing armed conflict, into the military system, let's focus on doing the best we can to make sure that our civilian law enforcement authorities have the skills and access that they need to have.¶ And in this case, with Mr. Tsarnaev, I really think we should be looking at what happened before the Boston bombing. Why didn't the FBI have good contacts with Russia so that we had better information about these individuals before the tragedy? And that's where I think we should be focusing. Sadly, I believe we've been distracted by thinking about Guantanamo Bay and military custody and so forth. We've taken our eyes off the prize of really doing what will succeed in preventing these kinds of tragedies, and that's good international police cooperation with the best people, best skills, knowledge, language, et cetera

#### Plan avoids safehavens

Jennifer Daskal 13, Fellow and Adjunct Professor, Georgetown Center on National Security and the Law, University of Penn L. Rev., THE GEOGRAPHY OF THE BATTLEFIELD: A FRAMEWORK FOR DETENTION AND TARGETING OUTSIDE THE "HOT" CONFLICT ZONE, April, 161 U. Pa. L. Rev. 1165, Lexis

Some likely will object that such an official designation would recreate the same **safe havens** that this proposal seeks to avoid. But a **critical difference** exists between a territorially restricted framework that effectively **prohibits** reliance on law-of-war tools outside of specific zones of active hostilities and a **zone approach** that merely imposes **heightened procedural and substantive standards on the use of such tools**. **Under the zone approach, the non-state enemy is not free from attack or capture**; rather, the belligerent state simply must **take greater care to ensure that the target meets** the **enhanced criteria** described in Section III.

#### Declaration options solve for zone expansion when needed but also prevent collapse of barriers to use

Daskal 13 - Fellow and Adjunct Professor, Georgetown Center on National Security and the Law

University of Penn L. Rev., THE GEOGRAPHY OF THE BATTLEFIELD: A FRAMEWORK FOR DETENTION AND TARGETING OUTSIDE THE "HOT" CONFLICT ZONE, April, 2013, 161 U. Pa. L. Rev. 1165, Lexis

Linking the zone of active hostilities primarily to the duration and intensity of the fighting and to states' own proclamations suffers, however, from an inherent circularity. A state can itself create a zone of active hostilities by ratcheting up violence or issuing a declaration of intent, thereby making previously unlawful actions lawful. n134¶ It is impossible to fully address this concern. The problem can, however, be significantly reduced by insisting on strict compliance with the law-of-war principles of distinction and proportionality and by vigorously punishing states for acts of aggression. n135 There will, of course, be disagreement as to whether a state's escalation of a certain conflict constitutes aggression, particularly given underlying disagreements about who qualifies as a lawful target. The zone approach is helpful in this regard as well: it narrows the range of disagreement by demanding heightened substantive standards as to who qualifies as a legitimate target outside the zones of active hostilities. Under the zone approach, the escalation of force must be aimed at a narrower set of possible military targets until the increased use of force is sufficiently intense and pervasive enough to create a new zone of active hostilities.

#### Corn’s wrong---no operational clarity issues and other states prove feasibility

Ryan Goodman 13, Professor of Law at NYU, "Goodman Responds to Corn, Blank, Jenks, and Jensen on Capture-Instead-of-Kill", February 26, [www.lawfareblog.com/2013/02/goodman-responds-to-corn-blank-jenks-and-jensen-on-capture-instead-of-kill/](http://www.lawfareblog.com/2013/02/goodman-responds-to-corn-blank-jenks-and-jensen-on-capture-instead-of-kill/)

Finally, I must address CBJJ’s contention that my position would be impractical if applied in military operations. This is an odd contention for a few reasons. First, as CBJJ admit, the US government already adopts the standard as a matter of policy preference in our armed conflict with Al Qaeda and associated forces. Second, as they admit, the US government adopts a “feasibility of capture” standard as a legal constraint in targeting members of Al Qaeda and associated forces who are US citizens. Third, as CBJJ acknowledge, other states’ armed forces (e.g., Israel) operate with a lesser evil rule in their asymmetric wars with terrorists groups. Colombia is a prominent example of a state that has, in fact, directly incorporated the ICRC Guidance in their asymmetric armed conflict with a terrorist group. Perhaps CBJJ conclude that my position is impractical because they misconstrue what it is (see Part I above).

#### Corn agrees---the plan is a mitigation measure that is necessary to resolve backlash, not “arbitrary geographic limitation” they assume

Geoffrey Corn 13, South Texas College of Law, Professor of Law and Presidential Research Professor, J.D, Geography of Armed Conflict: Why it is a Mistake to Fish for the Red Herring http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=2179720

This does not mean that the uncertainties created by the intersection of threat-based scope and TAC are insignificant. To the contrary, extending the concept of armed conflict to a transnational non-State opponent has resulted in significant discomfort related to the assertion of State military power. But attempting to decouple the permissible geography of armed conflict from threat driven strategy by imposing some arbitrary legal limit on the geographic scope of TAC is an unrealistic and ultimately futile endeavor. Other solutions to these uncertainties must be pursued—solutions that mitigate the perceived over-breadth of authority associated with TAC. As explained below, these solutions should focus on four considerations:¶ (1) managing application of the inherent right of self-defense when it results in action within the sovereign territory of a non-consenting State;¶ (2) adjusting the traditional targeting methodology to account for the increased uncertainties associated with TAC threat identification;¶ (3) considering the feasibility of a “functional hors de combat” test to account for incapacitating enemy belligerents incapable of offering hostile resistance; and¶ (4) continuing to enhance the process for ensuring that preventive detention of captured belligerent operatives does not become unjustifiably protracted in duration.¶ This essay does not seek to develop each of these mitigation measures in depth. Instead, it proposes that focusing on these (and perhaps other innovations in existing legal norms) is a more rational approach to mitigating the impact of TAC than imposing an arbitrary geographic scope limitation. Other scholars have already begun to examine some of these concepts, a process that will undoubtedly continue in the future. Whether these innovations take the form of law or policy is another complex question, which should be the focus of exploration and debate. In short, rejecting the search for geographic limits on the scope of TAC should not be equated with ignorance of the risks attendant with this broad conception of armed conflict. Instead, it must be based on the premise that even if such a limit were proposed, it would ultimately prove ineffective in preventing the conduct of operations against transnational non-State threats where the State concludes such operations will produce a decisive effect. Instead, focusing on the underlying issues themselves and considering how the law might be adjusted to account for actual or perceived authority over-breadth is a more pragmatic response to these concerns.¶ A. Jus ad Bellum and the Authority to Take the Fight to the Enemy¶ One example of proposals to mitigate the risk of over-breadth associated with TAC is the “unable or unwilling” test highlighted by the scholarship of Professor Ashley Deeks.53 Deeks proposes a methodology for balancing a State’s inherent right to defend itself against transnational non-State threats and the sovereignty of other States where threat operatives are located. Because the law of neutrality cannot provide the framework for balancing these interests (as it does in the context of international armed conflicts), Deeks acknowledges that some other framework is necessary to limit resort to military force outside “hot zones,” even when justified as a measure of national self-defense. The test she proposes seeks to limit selfhelp uses of military force to situations of absolute necessity by imposing a set of conditions that must be satisfied to provide some objective assurance that the intrusion into another State’s territory is a genuine measure of last resort.54 This is pure lex lata,55 so is Deeks, to an extent. However, Deeks, having served in the Department of State Legal Advisor’s Office, recognizes that if TAC is a reality (which it is for the United States), these innovations are necessary to ensure it does not result in unjustifiably overbroad U.S. military action.¶ B. Target Identification and Engagement¶ This is precisely the approach that should be considered in the jus in bello branch of conflict regulation to achieve an analogous balance between necessity and risk during the execution of combat operations. Even assuming the “unable or unwilling” test effectively limits the exercise of national selfdefense in response to transnational terrorism, it in no way mitigates the risks associated with the application of combat power once an operation is authorized.¶ The in bello targeting framework is an obvious starting point for this type of exploration of the concept and its potential adjustment.56 Indeed, it seems increasingly apparent that while TAC suggests a broad scope of authority to employ combat power in a LOAC framework with no geographic constraint, the consternation generated by this effect is a result of the uncertainty produced by the complexity of threat recognition. This consternation is most acute in relation to three aspects of action to incapacitate terrorist belligerent operatives: the relationship between threat recognition and the authority to kill as a measure of first resort (the difficulty of applying the principle of distinction when confronting irregular enemy belligerent forces); the pragmatic illogic of asserting the right to kill as a measure of first resort to an individual subject to capture with virtually no risk to U.S. forces; and the ability to apply this targeting authority against unconventional enemy operatives located outside of “hot zones”.57¶ These concerns flow from the intersection of a battlespace that is functionally unrestricted by geography and the unconventional nature of the terrorist belligerent operative. The combined effect of these factors is a target identification paradigm that defies traditional threat recognition methodologies: no uniform, no established doctrine, no consistent locus of operations, and dispersed capabilities.58 It is certainly true that threat identification challenges are in no way unique to TAC; threat identification has always been difficult, especially in the context of “traditional” noninternational armed conflicts involving unconventional belligerent opponents. Yet, when this threat recognition uncertainty was confined to the geography of one State, it was never perceived to be as problematic as it is in the context of TAC. This is perplexing. In both contexts, the unconventional nature of the enemy increases the risk of mistake in the target selection and engagement process.59 Thus, employing the same approach is completely logical.¶ Two factors appear to provide an explanation for the increased concern over the threat identification uncertainty in the context of TAC. One of these is beyond the scope of “mitigation solutions,” while the other is not. The first is the increased public awareness and interest in both the legal authority to use military force and the legality of the conduct of hostilities, a factor that inevitably increases the scrutiny on military power under the rubric of TAC. This pervasive and intense interest in and legal critique of military operations associated with what is euphemistically called the war on terror is truly unprecedented. In this “lawfare” environment, it is unsurprising that government action that deprives individuals of life as a measure of first resort or subjects them to preventive detention that may last a lifetime—often impacting individuals located far beyond a “hot zone” of armed hostilities—generates intense legal scrutiny.60 This factor, whether a net positive or negative, is a reality that is unlikely to abate in the foreseeable future.¶ In an article published in the Brooklyn Law Review, I proposed a sliding quantum of information related to the assessment of targeting legality based on relative proximity to a “hot zone.”62 In essence, I proposed that when conducting operations against unconventional non-State operatives, the reasonableness of a target legality judgment requires increased informational certainty the more attenuated the nominated target becomes to a zone of traditional combat operations. The concept was proposed as a measure to mitigate the increased risk of targeting error when engaging an unconventional belligerent operative in an area that itself does not indicate belligerent activity. Jennifer Daskal offers a similar proposal in her article, The Geography of the Battlefield.63 Daskal presents a more comprehensive approach to adjusting the traditional targeting framework when applied to the TAC context. Both of these articles seek to mitigate the consequence of applying broad LOAC authority against a dispersed and unconventional enemy; both methods that should continue to be explored.¶ [Note: This clarifies Corn is talking about proposals that seek to legally limit TAC authority (transnational armed conflict) – that is referring to the “armed conflict” legal apparatus that regulates the US armed conflict against AQ, which allows for the use of force and what not. If the US did legally confine the armed conflict, then law enforcement and human rights law would apply outside of the battlefield. Clearly, that is not the plan, as we only add a mitigation measure to a single armed conflict operation.]

### AT: Terror DA

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

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

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

### 2AC LOAC DA

#### Legal uncertainty is already hurting clarity and effectiveness

Wolff Heintschel von Heinegg 11, Prof of Public International Law at the Europa-Universität Viadrina in Frankfurt, Germany, “Asymmetric Warfare: How to Respond?” International Law Studies - Volume 87

There may be situations, however, that do not qualify as an armed conflict even though armed forces are engaged inmilitary operations against “asymmetric actors.” While the law of armed conflict will not be applicable in such circumstances, this does not mean that public international law is silent on the matter. For instance, counter-piracy operations are governed by the law of the sea or, as in the case of piracy off the coast of Somalia, by applicable UN Security Council resolutions.2 Very often international human rights law—though contained in a regional convention— will play an important role.3 Counterterrorism operations may also be based onUN Security Council resolutions or on the inherent right of self-defense.4 It needs to be emphasized with regard to the latter, however, that States have not yet agreed upon the criteria that give rise to the right. Because of the variety of regimes thatmay be applicable, the armed forces deployed to counterterrorism operations all too often lack the legal clarity and legal security that are of vital importance for the success of contemporary military operations.

#### Blurring now

Laurie Blank 12, Director, International Humanitarian Law Clinic, Emory Law School, Targeted Strikes: The Consequences of Blurring the Armed Conflict and Self-Defense Justifications, http://www.wmitchell.edu/lawreview/Volume38/documents/11.BlankFINAL.pdf

For the past several years, the United States has relied on both armed conflict and self-defense as legal justifications for targeted strikes outside of the zone of active combat in Afghanistan. A host of interesting questions arise from both the use of targeted strikes and the expansive U.S. justifications for such strikes, including the use of force in self-defense against non-state actors, the use of force across state boundaries, the nature and content of state consent to such operations, the use of targeted killing as a lawful and effective counterterrorism measure, and others.7 Furthermore, each of the justifications—armed conflict and self-defense—raises its own challenging questions regarding the appropriate application of the law and the parameters of the legal paradigm at issue. For example, if the existence of an armed conflict is the justification for certain targeted strikes, the immediate follow-on questions include the determination of a legitimate target within an armed conflict with a terrorist group and the geography of the battlefield. Within the self-defense paradigm, key questions include the very contours of the right to use force in self-defense against individuals and the implementation of the concepts of necessity and imminence, among many others. However, equally fundamental questions arise from the use of both justifications at the same time, without careful distinction delimiting the boundaries between when one applies and when the other applies. From the perspective of the policymaker, the use of both justifications without further distinction surely offers greater flexibility and potential for action in a range of circumstances.8 To the extent such flexibility does not impact the implementation of the relevant law or hinder the development and enforcement of that law in the future, it may well be an acceptable goal. In the case of targeted strikes in the current international environment of armed conflict and counterterrorism operations occurring at the same time, however, the mixing of legal justifications raises significant concerns about both current implementation and future development of the law. One overarching concern is the conflation in general of jus ad bellum and jus in bello. The former is the law governing the resort to force—sometimes called the law of self-defense—and the latter is the law regulating the conduct of hostilities and the protection of persons in conflict—generally called the law of war, the law of armed conflict, or international humanitarian law. International law reinforces a strict separation between the two bodies of law, ensuring that all parties have the same obligations and rights during armed conflict to ensure that all persons and property benefit from the protection of the laws of war. For example, the Nuremberg Tribunal repeatedly held that Germany’s crime of aggression neither rendered all German acts unlawful nor prevented German soldiers from benefitting from the protections of the jus in bello.9 More recently, the Special Court for Sierra Leone refused to reduce the sentences of Civil Defense Forces fighters on the grounds that they fought in a “legitimate war” to protect the government against the rebels.10 The basic principle that the rights and obligations of jus in bello apply regardless of the justness or unjustness of the overall military operation thus remains firmly entrenched. Indeed, if the cause at arms influenced a state’s obligation to abide by the laws regulating the means and methods of warfare and requiring protection of civilians and persons hors de combat, states would justify all departures from jus in bello with reference to the purported justness of their cause. The result: an invitation to unregulated warfare.11

#### Unconstrained geographic war destroys LOAC now, no UQ – plan solves

Sasha Radin 13, Visiting Research Scholar at the Naval War College, Newport Rhode Island; PhD candidate, Asia Pacific Centre for Military Law, University of Melbourne Law School, Global Armed Conflict? The Threshold of Extraterritorial Non-International Armed Conflicts, www.usnwc.edu/getattachment/311c6f17-ee69-4870-a00d-b7d845e4387c/Global-Armed-Conflict--The-Threshold-of-Extraterri.aspx

State sovereignty was another impetus for creating the requirement that the hostilities reach a certain level of intensity before LOAC could apply. States wanted to limit the involvement of outside States in their domestic affairs. This objective must, therefore, be seen in light of the fact that the types of conflicts envisioned were mainly internal armed conflicts. In an extraterritorial NIAC context, the reluctance of the State party to the conflict to be subject to interference from other States in its internal affairs largely disappears.150 Neither internal disturbances nor the conflict itself takes place in their own territory.¶ Does it matter in terms of what LOAC requires for its application that it is the State not party to the conflict whose territorial integrity is infringed? In other words, could this geographic shift in where the hostilities occur affect one of the original underlying reasons for the existence of the threshold? In contrast to the previous two points (whether the violence undertaken by various armed groups may be conglomerated and whether the distribution of violence over space means that it does not reach the sufficient level of intensity), this point questions whether the level of intensity customarily required for internal armed conflicts is the same for extraterritorial conflicts.¶ It may be argued that the territorial State (i.e., the State in which an extraterritorial NIAC physically takes place) has an interest in trying to prevent incursions into its sovereignty, even though it may not be a party to that NIAC. An incursion by an outside State in order to fight an armed group would likely have implications for the “uninvolved” territorial State. For instance, such an action could be an indication that the territorial State is not able to maintain its own security—an image that States usually take pains to avoid. Or, the territorial State may be concerned that the outside State might gain control or influence within their State.¶ The implications this shift might have on establishing the threshold of an extraterritorial armed conflict are not clear. At the very least, the reassignment of which State’s sovereignty is affected indicates that issues arising from the shifted location of the conflict warrant further examination. Therefore, even if one accepts the premise that NIACs may exist extraterritorially, the fact that the law was designed for a different context presents challenges in determining the existence of an armed conflict.¶ VI. GEOGRAPHIC BOUNDARIES OF EXISTING ARMED CONFLICTS¶ The removal of territorial boundaries from a system based on these physical limits raises the related question of where LOAC may be applied once the law of armed conflict has been triggered. Limited discussion has arisen previously on this issue in the context of purely internal conflicts. However, the main controversy surfaces today specifically with regard to individuals affiliated with an organized armed group located in a second State (“outside of an active battlefield”151). The unease of some commentators that the world could become a battlefield reappears here.¶ Because NIAC law was designed for internal application, its extraterritorial parameters are not clear. Two main options have been discussed for how to deal with this challenge. One proposes that the geographic application of LOAC is limited to the area of hostilities. The other maintains that once an armed conflict exists the law may extend beyond the immediate zone of hostilities. This latter approach has been interpreted by some to suggest that the law applies to the parties to the conflict wherever they may be located.¶ The first proposal, suggesting that LOAC would not apply at a distance from wherever the hostilities were taking place,152 may seem logical on its face, but lacks a legal basis. Jurisprudence from the ICTY dealing with the geographic scope of Common Article 3 within a State contradicts this interpretation, providing that “international humanitarian law continues to apply . . . in the case of internal conflicts . . . [to] the whole territory under the control of a party, whether or not actual combat takes place there.”153 The ICTY case law has generally been interpreted by other bodies to mean that Common Article 3 applies to the entire country in which a conflict is taking place, regardless of where hostilities occur.154 This language has been repeatedly upheld by subsequent ICTY and ICTR judgments.155 In the absence of explicit treaty law or customary international law, this jurisprudence could be said to have relevance when it comes to interpreting the geographic contours of internal conflicts.¶ Resort to the object and purpose of the law also supports application of the law beyond areas of hostilities. One of the law’s fundamental purposes is to ensure protection of individuals once in the hands of the enemy. To interpret the law as only applying to areas of combat would reduce the protection afforded to some of the most vulnerable, who may be located at a distance from active hostilities.¶ Finally, the text of AP II can be turned to for some guidance, even though the types of conflicts under discussion here are those with a lower threshold. AP II explicitly provides that it applies to “to all persons affected by an armed conflict.”156 This indicates that although AP II limits its applicability to the State in which the conflict is taking place,157 its application is not restricted to areas of active hostilities.158¶ The second approach considers that once an armed conflict exists LOAC applies beyond the area of active hostilities.159 It is argued that this is the more defensible position of the two. Although this view does not find an explicit basis in treaty law, it is difficult to find justification within the existing law for restricting the application of LOAC to a certain region once an armed conflict exists. In addition, the ICTY and ICTR case law just noted could be said to indirectly support this position in that it interprets the application of the law as extending beyond the combat zones. However, too much reliance on this jurisprudence is misguided as it still depends on State boundaries. For example, if one accepts that the armed conflict in Afghanistan has spilled over into Pakistan, does Common Article 3 then apply throughout the country of Pakistan?¶ The view that LOAC applies beyond the area of active hostilities leads to the question of whether anything restricts the geographic application of LOAC. One approach is to interpret the ICTY case law as literally referring to the areas where the parties to the conflict have control.160 Under such a view, NIAC law would only apply to the territory under control of the Pakistani Taliban (and other armed groups) in the North-West Frontier Province. This construction, however, presents hurdles.161 First, what is meant by control?162 Second, if it is territorial control that is envisioned, the majority of commentators and jurisprudence view the control of territory by an armed group as an indicator for the applicability of Common Article 3, rather than an obligation.163 It would not make sense to require territorial control by an armed group in order to determine the reach of an armed conflict within a country, but not to require territorial control for the existence of an armed conflict.164 Third, taken to its extreme this interpretation illogically suggests that if neither party controls territory, then LOAC does not apply,165 leading to the possibility that LOAC would not apply precisely where the battle rages.¶ The U.S. government position that LOAC is not geographically constrained with regard to individual members of a party to a conflict166 has engendered criticism.167 However, it is a defensible stance if one has already accepted that the territorial boundaries of States do not limit LOAC’s application. The bigger issue seems to be that the law was not designed for extraterritorial application. As such, should the view that territorial boundaries are not relevant to LOAC’s application gain force, it may be that the law will develop in a clearer and more nuanced manner.168 Notwithstanding the lack of clarity with regard to this issue, significant restrictions on the use of force against an individual located at a distance from hostilities in a second country already exist. Perhaps most importantly, the question only arises in the first place if an armed conflict exists between the State using force and the armed group against which the force is directed (which includes establishing that the group to which the individual belongs is an identifiable party). Second, and crucially, the separate question then arises of whether an individual is targetable (either by virtue of the membership approach or because s/he is directly participating in hostilities).169 This includes determining that the individual in question has a sufficient nexus to the ongoing armed conflict.170¶ Should those conditions be fulfilled, then the constraints within LOAC still apply (such as all of the rules pertaining to the principles of distinction and proportionality), as would the country’s domestic law and human rights law to the degree that it interacts with LOAC. It is likely that if the occurrence were far from active hostilities the latter two bodies of law would play a greater role. Issues of State sovereignty could, and often do, present one of the greatest limitations on action. Therefore, it is not the case that force may be used anywhere in the world at any time against parties to the conflict once an armed conflict exists.¶ VII. CONCLUSION¶ In conclusion, the general trend today is that some extraterritorial conflicts may qualify as NIACs, despite the fact that they are not geographically confined to a single State. This interpretation recognizes that to artificially restrict the law in a way that does not reflect either the realities on the ground or the purpose of the law itself is counterproductive. However, because the existing law was not designed for extraterritorial conflicts, challenges arise in its application.¶ The issue of links between armed groups in NIACs is an area where the law may need reinterpretation or development. Analogies with other areas of the law do not lead to more clarity. The tenuous suggestion that in order to fulfill the intensity requirement not only should the affiliated armed group be organized and part of an identifiable party, but also that the group’s actions and goals should constitute a threat to the opposing party carries with it practical problems. Specifically, it could be difficult to ascertain both the threat and which members of an armed group are actually participating in actions that are part of the global conflict, as opposed to part of a separate internal conflict.¶ Determining whether amassing violence that is diffused over distances may fulfill the intensity requirement is another example of how the geographic extension of the law’s application may present difficulties. It has been argued here that taking into account the underlying purpose of the law, the violence must reach a certain level of intensity within a geographic region for an armed conflict to exist. When the violence is spread out geographically, such that in an individual country the law enforcement regimes may function, it is difficult to view the intensity requirement as being met. However, as with links, this issue is far from resolved.¶ The third principal challenge resulting from the extraterritorial application of NIAC law is that a reassignment of sovereignty occurs. It is unclear if this shift might impact on how States perceive the threshold of the existence of an armed conflict.¶ Once the existence of an armed conflict has been established, a separate issue arises as to the geographic boundaries of that conflict. This impacts the controversial question of when an individual may be targeted or detained if located in another country away from the main battlefield. Here too, because the law was originally intended to apply within State boundaries, very little guidance exists. It is argued that as the law currently stands, once an armed conflict exists LOAC applies to the parties to the conflict wherever they may be located, but that other restraints within LOAC and jus ad bellum limit its application. In particular, the question of whether an armed conflict exists in the first place is not self-evident. The debate on who can be targeted and when applies both to internal NIACs and extraterritorial NIACs. It may be that additional stipulations will be considered necessary as the law develops given the lack of State boundaries and the distance from an active battlefield. However, currently the law does not require this. Finally, the restrictions found in jus ad bellum curtail action that may be taken.¶ Therefore, to erase territorial boundaries from the equation entirely when establishing the existence of an armed conflict raises challenges to the structure of the law and some of its underlying purposes. Certain obstacles may prompt clarification in the law; others may remain as limitations on the law’s application. As a consequence, it is not clear where the bar for the application of Common Article 3, and thus LOAC, lies, particularly when applied to conflicts that spread across multiple countries. Some States want to ensure that they have sufficient flexibility to deal with these circumstances. Other States (as well as organizations and commentators) are concerned that the law may be interpreted too permissively and ultimately be abused. A balance must be found in the solution to these issues.

### AT: Military Tech

#### Drone norms solve future tech better – that’s Roberts

#### Super long TF

#### Doesn’t get to extinction --- their card doesn’t come close

## DA

### 2AC Haphazard Restrictions Inevitable

#### Restrictions inevitable---only a question of whether they are deliberate or haphazard

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 years.

### 2AC Flex DA

#### Only codification prevents Court evisceration of War Powers

Benjamin Wittes 8, Senior Fellow in Governance Studies at the Brookings Institution, co-founder and editor-in-chief of the Lawfare blog, member of the Hoover Institution’s Task Force on National Security Law, Law and the Long War: The Future of Justice in the Age of Terror, google books

What the Supreme Court has done is carve itself a seat at the table. It has intimated, without ever deciding, that a constitutional basis for its actions exists—in addition to the statutory bases on which it decided the cases—meaning that its authority over overseas detentions may be an inherent feature of judicial power, not a policy question on which the legislature and executive can work their will. Whether the votes exist on the court to go this extra step we will find out soon enough. But the specter of a vastly different judicial posture in this area now haunts the executive branch—one in which the justices assert an inherent authority to review executive detention and interrogation practices, divine rights to apply with that jurisdiction based on due process and vaguely worded international humanitarian law principles not clearly implemented in U.S. law, and allow their own power to follow the military’s anywhere in the world. Such a posture would constitute an earthquake in the relationships among all three branches of government, and the doctrinal seeds for it have all been planted. Whether they ultimately take root depends on factors extrinsic to the war on terror—particularly the future composition of a Supreme Court now closely divided on these questions. It will also pivot on the manner in which the political branches posture the legal foundations of the war in the future. Building a strong legislative architecture now may be the only way to avert a major expansion of judicial power over foreign policy and warfare.

#### Plan preserves flexibility and operational capacity

Daskal 13 - Fellow and Adjunct Professor, Georgetown Center on National Security and the Law

University of Penn L. Rev., THE GEOGRAPHY OF THE BATTLEFIELD: A FRAMEWORK FOR DETENTION AND TARGETING OUTSIDE THE "HOT" CONFLICT ZONE, April, 2013, 161 U. Pa. L. Rev. 1165, Lexis

Conversely, some object to the use of courts or court-like review as stymying executive power in wartime, and interfering with the President's Article II powers. n183 According to this view, it is dangerous - and potentially unconstitutional - to require the President's wartime targeting decisions to be subject to additional reviews. These concerns, however, can be dealt with through emergency authorization mechanisms, the possibility of a presidential override, and design details that protect against ex ante review of operational decisionmaking. The adoption of an Article II review board, rather than an Article III-FISC model, further addresses some of the constitutional concerns.¶ Some also have warned that there may be no "case or controversy" for an Article III, FISC-like court to review, further suggesting a preference for an Article II review board. n184 That said, similar concerns have been raised with respect to FISA and rejected. n185 Drawing heavily on an analogy to courts' roles in issuing ordinary warrants, the Justice Department's Office of Legal Counsel concluded at the time of enactment that a case and controversy existed, even though the FISA applications are made ex parte. n186 [\*1224] Here, the judges would be issuing a warrant to kill rather than surveil. While this is significant, it should not fundamentally alter the legal analysis. n187 As the Supreme Court has ruled, killing is a type of seizure. n188 The judges would be issuing a warrant for the most extreme type of seizure. n189¶ It is also important to emphasize that a reviewing court or review board would not be "selecting" targets, but determining whether the targets chosen by executive branch officials met substantive requirements - much as courts do all the time when applying the law to the facts. Press accounts indicate that the United States maintains lists of persons subject to capture or kill operations - lists created in advance of specific targeting operations and reportedly subject to significant internal deliberation, including by the President himself. n190 A court or review board could be incorporated into the existing ex ante decisionmaking process in a manner that would avoid interference with the conduct of specific operations - reviewing the target lists but leaving the operational details to the operators. As suggested above, emergency approval mechanisms could and should be available to deal with exceptional cases where ex ante approval is not possible. n191

#### Congress makes deterrence credible

Matthew C. Waxman 8/25, Professor of Law, Columbia Law School; Adjunct Senior Fellow for Law and Foreign Policy, Council on Foreign Relations, “The Constitutional Power to Threaten War”, Forthcoming in Yale Law Journal, vol. 123 (2014), 2013, PDF

A second argument, this one advanced by some congressionalists, is that stronger legislative checks on presidential uses of force would improve deterrent and coercive strategies by making them more selective and credible. The most credible U.S. threats, this argument holds, are those that carry formal approval by Congress, which reflects strong public support and willingness to bear the costs of war; requiring express legislative backing to make good on threats might therefore be thought to enhance the potency of threats by encouraging the President to seek congressional authorization before acting.181 A frequently cited instance is President Eisenhower’s request (soon granted) for standing congressional authorization to use force in the Taiwan Straits crises of the mid- and late-1950s – an authorization he claimed at the time was important to bolstering the credibility of U.S. threats to protect Formosa from Chinese aggression.182 (Eisenhower did not go so far as to suggest that congressional authorization ought to be legally required, however.) “It was [Eisenhower’s] seasoned judgment … that a commitment the United States would have much greater impact on allies and enemies alike because it would represent the collective judgment of the President and Congress,” concludes Louis Fisher. “Single-handed actions taken by a President, without the support of Congress and the people, can threaten national prestige and undermine the presidency. Eisenhower’s position was sound then. It is sound now.”183 A critical assumption here is that legal requirements of congressional participation in decisions to use force filters out unpopular uses of force, the threats of which are unlikely to be credible and which, if unsuccessful, undermine the credibility of future U.S. threats.¶ A third view is that legal clarity is important to U.S. coercive and deterrent strategies; that ambiguity as to the President’s powers to use force undermines the credibility of threats. Michael Reisman observed, for example, in 1989: “Lack of clarity in the allocation of competence and the uncertain congressional role will sow uncertainty among those who depend on U.S. effectiveness for security and the maintenance of world order. Some reduction in U.S. credibility and diplomatic effectiveness may result.”184 Such stress on legal clarity is common among lawyers, who usually regard it as important to planning, whereas strategists tend to see possible value in “constructive ambiguity”, or deliberate fudging of drawn lines as a negotiating tactic or for domestic political purposes.185 A critical assumption here is that clarity of constitutional or statutory design with respect to decisions about force exerts significant effects on foreign perceptions of U.S. resolve to make good on threats, if not by affecting the substance of U.S. policy commitments with regard to force then by pointing foreign actors to the appropriate institution or process for reading them.

# 1AR

## Solvency

### AT: Circumvention

#### Formalization prevents circumvention

Daskal 13 - Fellow and Adjunct Professor, Georgetown Center on National Security and the Law

University of Penn L. Rev., THE GEOGRAPHY OF THE BATTLEFIELD: A FRAMEWORK FOR DETENTION AND TARGETING OUTSIDE THE "HOT" CONFLICT ZONE, April, 2013, 161 U. Pa. L. Rev. 1165, Lexis

The objections to such a proposal are many. In the context of proposed courts to review the targeting of U.S. citizens, for example, some have argued that such review would serve merely to institutionalize, legitimize, and expand the use of targeted drone strikes. n177 But this ignores the reality of their continued use and expansion and imagines a world in which targeted [\*1222] killings of operational leaders of an enemy organization outside a zone of active conflict is categorically prohibited (an approach I reject n178). If states are going to use this extraordinary power (and they will), there ought to be a clear and transparent set of applicable standards and mechanisms in place to ensure thorough and careful review of targeted-killing decisions. The formalization of review procedures - along with clear, binding standards - will help to avoid ad hoc decisionmaking and will ensure consistency across administrations and time.

#### Review will keep the exception narrow

Emily Hartz 13, professor of law at the University of Southern Denmark, 2013, "From the American Civil War to the War on Terror Three Models of Emergency Law in the United States Supreme Court"link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1007%2F978-3-642-32633-2.pdf

While it can be argued that the extralegal model does play some role in the Prize Cases as well as in Hirabayashi and Korematsu, all three cases also illustrate that whenever the question of extralegal emergency powers has come up, the Court has struggled not to sanction the extralegal model as a general principle. Rather than admitting expansive executive powers, the Court has aimed to tie its decision closely to the particular facts at hand and avoided general embracements of broad executive war powers.

## Allies

### AT: NSA

#### NSA scandal won’t taint relations---even if it’s never ending

David Francis 11/4, The Fiscal Times, "Why Europe Won't Punish the U.S. over NSA Scandal", 2013, www.thefiscaltimes.com/Articles/2013/11/04/Why-Europe-Won-t-Punish-US-over-NSA-Scandal

At this point, the National Security Agency spying scandal seems never-ending. It’s been ongoing since June, when the first of Edward Snowden’s stolen documents was made public. Each time it appears to be dying, another round of documents appear and the scandal lives on.¶ The latest series of leaks is perhaps the most serious. Less than two weeks ago, on the eve of a European Union summit in Brussels, reports emerged that the NSA had been spying on European leaders, including German Chancellor Angela Merkel.¶ The outcry from the German public and politicians continues to this day. German officials have demanded and been granted meetings with high-level Obama administration officials to complain about the spying and Merkel called President Obama to voice her displeasure with the practice.¶ Hans-Christian Stroebele, a legislator for the Germany's opposition Greens party, said that Snowden might be called to testify in a German investigation into NSA practices.¶ "He made it clear he knows a lot and that as long as the National Security Agency blocks investigations, he is essentially prepared to come to Germany and give testimony, but the conditions must be discussed," Stroebele, who met with Snowden in Russia last week, said.¶ Similar anger has been expressed around the European continent. Some are saying that irreparable damage has been done to the relationship between the United States and its European partners.¶ But is this truly the case? Expressing anger over NSA practices is one thing; actually making policy changes because of the behavior is entirely another. A close examination of statements made by European officials shows their tone softening.¶ There is not likely to be any long-term fallout in two key areas: economic negotiations over a $287 billion EU/U.S. trade pact are going to continue, and intelligence is still likely to pass back and forth across the Atlantic. The only real damage has been to the standing of the United States with the European public and fringe lawmakers.

## Overreach

### Norms Work – Social Sciences

#### Norms are a key---social science

John Vasquez 9, Thomas B. Mackie Scholar of International Relations and Professor of Political Science at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, PhD in Poli Sci from Syracuse University, “Peace,” Chapter 8 in The War Puzzle Revisited, p 298-299, google books

Wallensteen’s examination of the characteristics of particularist periods provides significant additional evidence that the steps-to-war analysis is on the right track. Realist practices are associated with war, and peaceful systems are associated with an emphasis on other practices. Peaceful systems are exemplified by the use of practices like buffer states, compensation, and concerts of power that bring major states together to form a network of institutions that provide governance for the system. The creation of rules of the game that can handle certain kinds of issues – territorial and ideological questions – and/or keep them off the agenda seems to be a crucial variable in producing peace.¶ Additional evidence on the import of rules and norms is provided in a series of studies by Kegley and Raymond (1982, 1984, 1986, 1990) that are operationally more precise than Wallensteen’s (1984) analysis. Kegley and Raymond provide evidence that when states accept norms, the incidence of war and military confrontation is reduced. They find that peace is associated with periods in which alliance norms are considered binding and the unilateral abrogation of commitments and treaties illegitimate. The rules imposed by the global political culture in these periods result in fewer militarized disputes and wars between major states. In addition, the wars that occur are kept at lower levels of severity, magnitude, and duration (i.e. they are limited wars).¶ Kegley and Raymond attempt to measure the extent to which global cultural norms restrain major states by looking at whether international law and commentary on it sees treaties and alliances as binding. They note that there have been two traditions in international law – pacta sunt servanda, which maintains that agreements are binding, and clausa rebus sic stantibus, which says that treaties are signed “as matters stand” and that any change in circumstances since the treaty was signed permits a party to withdraw unilaterally. One of the advantages the Kegley-Raymond studies have over Wallensteen (1984) is that they are able to develop reliable measures of the extent to which in any given half-decade that tradition in international law emphasizes the rebus or pacta sunt servanda tradition. This indicator is important not only because it focuses in on the question of unilateral actions, but because it can serve as an indicator of how well the peace system is working. The pacta sunt servanda tradition implies a more constraining political system and robust institutional context which should provide an alternative to war.¶ Kegley and Raymond (1982: 586) find that in half-decades (from 1820 to 1914) when treaties are considered non-binding (rebus), wars between major states occur in every half-decade (100 percent), but when treaties are considered binding (pacta sunt servanda), wars between major states occur in only 50 percent of the half-decades. The Cramer’s V for this relationship is .66. When the sample is expanded to include all states in the central system, Cramer’s V is 0.44, indicating that global norms have more impact on preventing war between major states. Nevertheless, among central system states between 1820 and 1939, war occurred in 93 percent of the half-decades where the rebus tradition dominated and in only 60 percent of the half-decades where the pacta sunt sevanda tradition dominated.¶ In a subsequent analysis of militarized disputes from 1820 to 1914, Kegley and Raymond (1984: 207-11) find that there is a negative relationship between binding norms and the frequency and scope of disputes short of war. In periods when the global culture accepts the pacta sunt servanda tradition as the norm, the number of military disputes goes down and the number of major states involved in a dispute decreases. Although the relationship is of moderate strength, it is not eliminated by other variables, namely alliance flexibility. As Kegley and Raymond (1984: 213) point out, this means “that in periods when the opportunistic renunciation of commitments” is condoned, militarized disputes are more likely to occur and to spread. The finding that norms can reduce the frequency and scope of disputes is significant evidence that rules can permit actors to successfully control and manage disputes so that they are not contagious and they do not escalate to war. These findings are consistent with Wallensteen’s (1984) and suggest that one of the ways rules help prevent war is by reducing, limiting, and managing disputes short of war.

#### Norm setting is effective---their author

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.

## Flex DA

### Link Turn

#### Constraints improve decision-making

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 **c**ost-**b**enefit **a**nalysis. 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 **op**portunity **costs into account**. What **secret and unaccountable exec**utive **action made possible**, it turns out, was **not flex**ible

 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 flex**ibility **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 exec**utive **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."**

### No Impact

#### No flex impact
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Here it is worth reviewing the positions Yoo advocated while in the executive branch and since, and their consequences in the "war on terror." At every turn, Yoo has sought to exploit the "flexibility" he finds in the Constitution to advocate an approach to the "war on terror" in which legal limits are either interpreted away or rejected outright. Just two weeks after the September 11 attacks, Yoo sent an extensive memo to Tim Flanigan, deputy White House counsel, arguing that the President had unilateral authority to use military force not only against the terrorists responsible for the September 11 attacks but against terrorists anywhere on the globe, with or without congressional authorization.¶ Yoo followed that opinion with a series of memos in January 2002 maintaining, against the strong objections of the State Department, that the Geneva Conventions should not be applied to any detainees captured in the conflict in Afghanistan. Yoo argued that the president could unilaterally suspend the conventions; that al-Qaeda was not party to the treaty; that Afghanistan was a "failed state" and therefore the president could ignore the fact that it had signed the conventions; and that the Taliban had failed to adhere to the requirements of the Geneva Conventions regarding the conduct of war and therefore deserved no protection. Nor, he argued, was the president bound by customary international law, which insists on humane treatment for all wartime detainees. Relying on Yoo's reasoning, the Bush administration claimed that it could capture and detain any person who the president said was a member or supporter of al-Qaeda or the Taliban, and could categorically deny all detainees the protections of the Geneva Conventions, including a hearing to permit them to challenge their status and restrictions on inhumane interrogation practices.¶ Echoing Yoo, Alberto Gonzales, then White House counsel, argued at the time that one of the principal reasons for denying detainees protection under the Geneva Conventions was to "preserve flexibility" and make it easier to "quickly obtain information from captured terrorists and their sponsors." When CIA officials reportedly raised concerns that the methods they were using to interrogate high-level al-Qaeda detainees -- such as waterboarding -- might subject them to criminal liability, Yoo was again consulted. In response, he drafted the August 1, 2002, torture memo, signed by his superior, Jay Bybee, and delivered to Gonzales. In that memo, Yoo "interpreted" the criminal and international law bans on torture in as narrow and legalistic a way as possible; his evident purpose was to allow government officials to use as much coercion as possible in interrogations.¶ Yoo wrote that threats of death are permissible if they do not threaten "imminent death," and that drugs designed to disrupt the personality may be administered so long as they do not "penetrate to the core of an individual's ability to perceive the world around him." He said that the law prohibiting torture did not prevent interrogators from inflicting mental harm so long as it was not "prolonged." Physical pain could be inflicted so long as it was less severe than the pain associated with "serious physical injury, such as organ failure, impairment of bodily function, or even death."¶ Even this interpretation did not preserve enough executive "flexibility" for Yoo. In a separate section of the memo, he argued that if these loopholes were not sufficient, the president was free to order outright torture. Any law limiting the president's authority to order torture during wartime, the memo claimed, would "violate the Constitution's sole vesting of the Commander-in-Chief authority in the President."¶ Since leaving the Justice Department, Yoo has also defended the practice of "extraordinary renditions," in which the United States has kidnapped numerous "suspects" in the war on terror and "rendered" them to third countries with records of torturing detainees. He has argued that the federal courts have no right to review actions by the president that are said to violate the War Powers Clause. And he has defended the practice of targeted assassinations, otherwise known as "summary executions."¶ In short, the flexibility Yoo advocates allows the administration to lock up human beings indefinitely without charges or hearings, to subject them to brutally coercive interrogation tactics, to send them to other countries with a record of doing worse, to assassinate persons it describes as the enemy without trial, and to keep the courts from interfering with all such actions.¶

 Has such flexibility actually aided the U.S. in dealing with terrorism? In all likelihood, the policies and attitudes Yoo has advanced have made the country less secure. The abuses at Guantánamo and Abu Ghraib have become international embarrassments for the United States, and by many accounts have helped to recruit young people to join al-Qaeda. The U.S. has squandered the sympathy it had on September 12, 2001, and we now find ourselves in a world perhaps more hostile than ever before.¶ With respect to detainees, thanks to Yoo, the U.S. is now in an untenable bind: on the one hand, it has become increasingly unacceptable for the U.S. to hold hundreds of prisoners indefinitely without trying them; on the other hand our coercive and inhumane interrogation tactics have effectively granted many of the prisoners immunity from trial. Because the evidence we might use against them is tainted by their mistreatment, trials would likely turn into occasions for exposing the United States' brutal interrogation tactics. This predicament was entirely avoidable. Had we given alleged al-Qaeda detainees the fair hearings required by the Geneva Conventions at the outset, and had we conducted humane interrogations at Guantánamo, Abu Ghraib, Camp Mercury, and elsewhere, few would have objected to the U.S. holding some detainees for the duration of the military conflict, and we could have tried those responsible for war crimes. What has been so objectionable to many in the U.S. and abroad is the government's refusal to accept even the limited constraints of the laws of war.¶ The consequences of Yoo's vaunted "flexibility" have been self-destructive for the U.S. -- we have turned a world in which international law was on our side into one in which we see it as our enemy. The Pentagon's National Defense Strategy, issued in March 2005, states,¶ "Our strength as a nation state will continue to be challenged by those who employ a strategy of the weak, using international fora, judicial processes, and terrorism."¶ The proposition that judicial processes -- the very essence of the rule of law -- are to be dismissed as a strategy of the weak, akin to terrorism, suggests the continuing strength of Yoo's influence. When the rule of law is seen simply as a device used by terrorists, something has gone perilously wrong. Michael Ignatieff has written that "it is the very nature of a democracy that it not only does, but should, fight with one hand tied behind its back. It is also in the nature of democracy that it prevails against its enemies precisely because it does." Yoo persuaded the Bush administration to untie its hand and abandon the constraints of the rule of law. Perhaps that is why we are not prevailing.