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### 1AC – Executive Overreach

#### CONTENTION 1: OVERREACH

#### *Scenario A: Targeted Strikes*

#### US policy creates a borderless global war---the lack of statutory limits triggers unnecessary attacks

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

Recent statements by administration officials suggest that while, as a matter of law, the United States continues to press a broad definition of the enemy force, its actions, as a matter of policy, are more restrained. Specifically, it focuses its targeted-killing operations on those who pose a "significant threat" n57 and only as a matter of last resort. In the words of John Brennan, the United States does not seek to kill every al Qaeda member, but instead focuses its efforts on "disrupting ... plans and ... plots before they come to fruition," n58 and limits lethal strikes to situations in which it is the "only recourse" against the threat. n59 Brennan cites operational leaders, [\*1186] operatives in the midst of training for an attack, and persons who possess unique operational skills that are being leveraged for an attack. n60 But no binding limits have yet been articulated, and it is not clear that they exist. n61 Are the examples of possible targets exclusive or merely illustrative? How far along does the attack planning need to be? Is mere agreement to plot or plan enough? In what situations is lethal targeting considered the "only recourse"?¶ Of note, recent reporting suggests that the United States has launched at least one drone strike near Sana'a, the capital of Yemen, in a region readily accessible to law enforcement officials, thereby casting doubt on official assertions that lethal targeting is used as a measure of last resort, when capture is not feasible. n62 Moreover, "signature strikes" reportedly were approved for use in Yemen in 2012, allowing the targeting of individuals or groups based on their pattern of activities without knowing the specific targets' identities or roles in the organization - a practice that seems to belie a policy of individualized assessments of "significant threat." n63

#### Congressional inaction has made this a defining policy doctrine---expansive executive authority triggers overreach

Maxwell 12 - Colonel and Judge Advocate, U.S. Army, 1st Quarter 2012, “TARGETED KILLING, THE LAW, AND TERRORISTS: FEELING SAFE?,” Joint Force Quarterly, p. 123-130, Mark David Maxwell.

In the wake of the attacks by al Qaeda on September 11, 2001, an analogous phenomenon of feeling safe has occurred in a recent U.S. national security policy: America’s explicit use of targeted killings to eliminate terrorists, under the legal doctrines of self-defense and the law of war. Legal scholars define targeted killing as the use of lethal force by a state4 or its agents with the intent, premeditation, and deliberation to kill individually selected persons who are not in the physical custody of those targeting them.5 In layman’s terms, targeted killing is used by the United States to eliminate individuals it views as a threat.6 Targeted killings, for better or for worse, have become “a defining doctrine of American strategic policy.”7 Although many U.S. Presidents have reserved the right to use targeted killings in unique circumstances, making this option a formal part of American foreign policy incurs risks that, unless adroitly controlled and defined in concert with Congress, could drive our practices in the use of force in a direction that is not wise for the long-term health of the rule of law. This article traces the history of targeted killing from a U.S. perspective. It next explains how terrorism has traditionally been handled as a domestic law enforcement action within the United States and why this departure in policy to handle terrorists like al Qaeda under the law of war—that is, declaring war against a terrorist organization—is novel. While this policy is not an ill-conceived course of action given the global nature of al Qaeda, there are practical limitations on how this war against terrorism can be conducted under the orders of the President. Within the authority to target individuals who are terrorists, there are two facets of Presidential power that the United States must grapple with: first, how narrow and tailored the President’s authority should be when ordering a targeted killing under the rubric of self-defense; and second, whether the President must adhere to concepts within the law of war, specifically the targeting of individuals who do not don a uniform. The gatekeeper of these Presidential powers and the prevention of their overreach is Congress. The Constitution demands nothing less, but thus far, Congress’s silence is deafening.

#### That lowers the threshold for use for US policymakers

Rosa Brooks 13, Prof of Law @ Georgetown University Law Center, Bernard L. Schwartz Senior Fellow, New America Foundation, 4/23/13, The Constitutional and Counterterrorism Implications of Targeted Killing, http://www.judiciary.senate.gov/pdf/04-23-13BrooksTestimony.pdf

But the advantages of drones are as overstated and misunderstood as the problems they pose — and in some ways, their very perceived advantages cause new problems. Drone technologies temptingly lower or disguise the costs of lethal force, but their availability can blind us to the potentially dangerous longer - term costs and consequences of our strategic choices. Armed drones lower the perceived costs of using lethal force in at least three ways. First, drones reduce the dollar cost of using lethal force inside foreign countries. 13 Most drones are economical compared with the available alternatives. 14 Manned aircraft, for instance, are quite expensive: 15 Lockheed Martin's F - 22 fighter jets cost about $150 million each; F - 35s are $90 million; and F - 16s are $55 million. But the 2011 price of a Reaper drone was approximately $28.4 million, while Predator drones cost only about $5 million to make. 16 As with so many things, putting a dollar figure on drones is difficult; it depends what costs are counted, and what time frame is used. Nevertheless, drones continue to be perceived as cheaper by government decision - makers. Second, relying on drone strikes rather than alternative means reduces the domestic political costs of using lethal force. Sending manned aircraft or special operations forces after a suspected terrorist places the lives of U.S. personnel at risk, and full - scale invasions and occupations endanger even more American lives. In contrast, using armed drones eliminates all short - term risks to the lives of U.S. personnel involved in the operations. Third, by reducing accidental civilian casualties, 17 precision drone technologies reduce the perceived moral and reputational costs of using lethal force. The US government is extraordinarily concerned about avoiding unnecessary civilian casualties, and rightly so. There are moral and legal reasons for this concern, and there are also pragmatic reasons: civilian casualties cause pain and resentment within local populations and host - country governments and alienate the international community It is of course not a bad thing to possess military technologies that are cost little, protect American lives and enable us to minimize civilian casualties. When new technologies appear to reduce the costs of using lethal force, however, the threshold for deciding to use lethal force correspondingly drops, and officials will be tempted to use lethal force with greater frequency and less wisdom.¶ Over the last decade, we have seen US drone strikes evolve from a tool used in extremely limited circumstances to go after specifically identified high - ranking al Qaeda officials to a tool relied on in an increasing number of countries to go after an eternally lengthening list of putative bad actors, with increasingly tenuous links to grave or imminent threats to the United States. Some of these suspected terrorists have been identified by name and specifically targeted, while others are increasingly targeted on the basis of suspicious behavior patterns. Increasingly, drones strikes have targeted militants who are lower and lower down the terrorist food chain, 18 rather than terrorist masterminds. 19 Although drone strikes are believed to have killed more than 3,000 people since 2004, 20 analysis by the New America Foundation and more recently by a the McClatchy newspaper s suggests that only a small fraction of the dead appear to have been so - called "high - value targets." 21 What’s more, drone strikes have spread ever further from "hot" battlefields, migrating from Pakistan to Yemen to Somalia (and perhaps to Mali 22 and the Philippines as well). 23

#### That makes great power war inevitable---causes escalation as traditional checks don’t apply

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

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

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

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

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

#### *Scenario B – Detention*

**Lack of limits on the executive detention make overreach inevitable--- radicalizes foreign populations---codification is critical to set the precedent**

Matthew C **Waxman 9**, Professor of Law; Faculty Chair, Roger Hertog Program on Law and National Security, Legislating the War on Terror: An Agenda for Reform”, November 3, Book, p. 59-61

Besides posing risks to liberty, administrative detention can also be counterproductive from the security standpoint. Again, the substantive criteria of detention law may help mitigate the risk. Historically, detention policies— especially those viewed as overbroad by the communities in which they were implemented— have sometimes proven ill-suited to combating terrorism and radicalization of individuals or communities. The British government learned painfully that internment of suspected Northern Ireland terrorists was viewed among some communities as a form of collective punishment that fueled violent nationalism and helped dry up the supply of community informants. 54 And in Iraq and Afghanistan, though the circumstances are exceptional because combat still rages there, detention has played an important role in neutralizing threats to coalition forces, but it has also contributed to anticoalition radicalization, especially when it is perceived as being used indiscriminately.¶ One role that well-crafted definitional criteria can play is in **mitigat**ing an **executive’s propensity to overuse the power to detain.** Observers from both the right and the left worry correctly that in the face of terrorist threats the executive is likely to push detention powers to or even past their outer bounds in order to prevent catastrophe as well as to head off any political backlash for having failed to take sufficient action. 56 Such **overbroad use of detention risks** further **radicalizing** and **alienating communities** from which terrorists are **likely to emerge** or whose **assistance is vital** in identifying or penetrating extremist groups. Moreover, several important studies of counterterrorism strategy have emphasized the need to target coercive policies, including **military** **and** **law enforcement efforts**, **narrowly** precisely to avoid playing into al Qaeda propaganda efforts to **aggregate local grievances into a common global movement**. 57 These are fundamentally policy, not legal, problems, and they will require sound executive judgment no matter what the legal regime looks like. But once the role of detention is firmly situated in a broader counterterrorism strategy that seeks to balance the many competing policy priorities, a carefully drawn administrative **detention statute** can help **mitigate long-term strategic damage** from the propensity to **overreach in the short term**. ¶ The danger that administrative detention poses to liberty and security points against emphasizing deterrence or information gathering as its primary strategic purpose. Virtually any very dangerous terrorist or supporter of terrorism that the government could hope to deter through detention would be deterred already by the threat of criminal prosecution or military attack or would be sufficiently committed to violent extremism to render the marginal deterrent threat of administrative detention negligible. 58 As for information gathering, an administrative detention law premised on detaining individuals with valuable knowledge regardless of whether they have engaged in nefarious activities sets a precedent that is too easily abused or overused **at home or abroad.** Information gathering, including through lawful interrogation, will undoubtedly be a strong motive for almost any administrative detention scheme, and an individual’s knowledge of terrorist planning or operations could be a reason not to release the person if he or she has been validly detained on other grounds. 59 But using a person’s suspected knowledge alone as the basis for detention, completely delinking detention from the individual’s voluntary and purposeful actions, cuts even deeper into traditional civil liberties principles and safeguards than most other reasons for administrative detention. 60 A detention law that allows incarceration based on knowledge could also perversely deter individuals with important information from coming forward voluntarily to the government.

**Current detention wrecks** **US rule of law legitimization**

David **Welsh 11**, J.D. from the University of Utah, “Procedural Justice Post-9/11: The Effects of Procedurally Unfair Treatment of Detainees on Perceptions of Global Legitimacy”, http://law.unh.edu/assets/images/uploads/publications/unh-law-review-vol-09-no2-welsh.pdf

The Global War on Terror 1 has been ideologically framed as a struggle between the principles of freedom and democracy on the one hand and tyranny and extremism on the other. 2 Although this war has arguably led to a short-term disruption of terrorist threats such as al-Qaeda, it **has** also **damaged America’s image** both at home and **abroad**. 3 **Throughout the world**, there is a **growing consensus** that **America has “a lack of credibility as a** fair and just **world leader**.” 4 The perceived legitimacy of the United States in the War on Terror is critical because terrorism is not a conventional threat that can surrender or can be defeated in the traditional sense. Instead, this battle **can only be won through legitimizing** the **rule of law** and **undermining** the use of **terror as a means** of political influence. 5 ¶ Although a variety of political, economic, and security policies have negatively impacted the perceived legitimacy of the United States, one of **the most damaging has been the detention**, treatment, and trial (or in many cases the lack thereof) **of suspected terrorists**. While many scholars have raised constitutional questions about the legality of U.S. detention procedures, 6 this article offers a psychological perspective of legitimacy in the context of detention.

**Plan’s key to legitimize the rule of law---uncertainty risks global instability**

Robert **Knowles 9**, Acting Assistant Professor, New York University School of Law, Spring, “Article: American Hegemony and the Foreign Affairs Constitution”, 41 Ariz. St. L.J. 87, Lexis

**The hegemonic model** also **reduces the need for executive branch flexibility**, and the institutional competence terrain shifts toward the courts. The stability of the current U.S.-led international system **depends on the ability of the U.S. to govern effectively**. Effective governance **depends on**, among other things, **predictability**. n422 G. John Ikenberry analogizes America's hegemonic position to that of a "giant corporation" seeking foreign investors: "The rule of law and the institutions of policy making in a democracy are the political equivalent of corporate transparency and [\*155] accountability." n423 **Stable** interpretation of the **law** **bolsters the stability of the system** because other nations will know that they can rely on those interpretations and that there will be at least some degree of enforcement by the United States. At the same time, the separation of powers serves the global-governance function by reducing the ability of the executive branch to make "abrupt or aggressive moves toward other states." n424¶ The Bush Administration's detainee policy, for all of its virtues and faults, was an exceedingly aggressive departure from existing norms, and was therefore bound to generate intense controversy. It was formulated quickly, by a small group of policy-makers and legal advisors without consulting Congress and over the objections of even some within the executive branch. n425 Although the Administration invoked the law of armed conflict to justify its detention of enemy combatants, it did not seem to recognize limits imposed by that law. n426 Most significantly, it designed the detention scheme around interrogation rather than incapacitation and excluded the detainees from all legal protections of the Geneva Conventions. n427 It declared all detainees at Guantanamo to be "enemy combatants" without establishing a regularized process for making an individual determination for each detainee. n428 And when it established the military commissions, also without consulting Congress, the Administration denied defendants important procedural protections. n429¶ In an anarchic world characterized by great power conflict, one could make the argument that the executive branch requires maximum flexibility to defeat the enemy, who may not adhere to international law. Indeed, the precedents relied on most heavily by the Administration in the enemy combatant cases date from the 1930s and 1940s - a period when the international system was radically unstable, and the United States was one of several great powers vying for advantage. n430 But during that time, the executive branch faced much more exogenous pressure from other great powers to comply with international law in the treatment of captured enemies. If the United States strayed too far from established norms, it would risk retaliation upon its own soldiers or other consequences from [\*156] powerful rivals. Today, there are no such constraints: enemies such as al Qaeda are not great powers and are not likely to obey international law anyway. **Instead, the danger is that American rule-breaking will set a pattern** of rule-breaking **for the world, leading to instability**. n431 America's military predominance enables it to set the rules of the game. **When the U.S. breaks its own rules, it loses legitimacy**.

#### Democratic liberalism is backsliding now---the US model of an unrestrained executive causes collapse

Larry **Diamond 9**, Professor of Political Science and Sociology @ Stanford, “The Impact of the Global Financial Crisis on Democracy”, Presented to the SAIS-CGD Conference on New Ideas in Development after the Financial Crisis, Conference Paper that can be found on his Vita

Concern about the future of democracy is further warranted by the gathering signs of a **democratic recession**, even before the onset of the global economic recession. During the past decade, the global expansion of democracy has essentially leveled off and hit an equilibrium While freedom (political rights and civil liberties) continued to expand throughout the post-Cold War era, that progress also halted in 2006, and 2007 and 2008 were the worst consecutive years for freedom since the end of the Cold War, with the number of countries declining in freedom greatly outstripping the number that improved. Two-thirds of all the breakdowns of democracy since the third wave began in 1974 have occurred in the last nine years, and in a number of strategically important states like Russia, Nigeria, Venezuela, Pakistan and Thailand. Many of these countries have not really returned to democracy. And **a number of countries linger in a twilight zone between democracy and authoritarianism**. While normative support for democracy has grown around the world, it remains in many countries, tentative and uneven, or is even eroding under the weight of growing public cynicism about corruption and the self-interested behavior of parties and politicians. Only about half of the public, on average, in Africa and Asia meets a rigorous, multidimensional test of support for democracy. Levels of distrust for political institutions—particularly political parties and legislatures, and politicians in general—are very high in Eastern Europe and Latin America, and in parts of Asia. In many countries, 30-50 percent of the public or more is willing to consider some authoritarian alternative to democracy, such as military or one-man rule. And where governance is bad or elections are rigged and the public cannot rotate leaders out of power, skepticism and defection from democracy grow. Of the roughly 80 new democracies that have emerged during the third wave and are still standing, probably **close to three-quarters are insecure and could run some risk of reversal during adverse** global and domestic **circumstances**. Less at risk—and probably mostly consolidated—are the more established developing country democracies (India, Costa Rica, Botswana, Mauritius), and the more liberal democracies of this group: the ten postcommunist states that have been admitted to the EU; Korea and Taiwan; Chile, Uruguay, Panama, Brazil, probably Argentina; a number of liberal island states in the Caribbean and Pacific. This leaves about 50 democracies and near democracies—including such big and strategically important states as Turkey, Ukraine, Indonesia, the Philippines, South Africa, certainly Pakistan and Bangladesh, and possibly even Mexico—where **the survival of constitutional rule cannot be taken for granted.** In some of these countries, like South Africa, the demise of democracy would probably come, if it happened, not as a result of a blatant overthrow of the current system, **but rather via a gradual executive strangling of** political **pluralism and freedom**, or a steady decline in state capacity and political order due to rising criminal and ethnic violence. Such circumstances would also swallow whatever hopes exist for the emergence of genuine democracy in countries like Iraq and Afghanistan and for the effective restoration of democracy in countries like Thailand and Nepal.

#### US detention policy is key---it has justified democratic backsliding globally

CJA 4 The Center for Justice and Accountability, Amici Curiae in support of petitioners in Al Odah et al. v USA, "Brief of the Center for Justice and Accountability, the International League for Human Rights, and Individual Advocates for the Independence of the Judiciary in Emerging Democracies," 3-10, Lexis

While much of the world is moving to adopt the institutions necessary to secure individual rights, many still regularly abuse these rights. One of the hallmarks of tyranny is the lack of a strong and independent judiciary. Not surprisingly, where countries make the sad transition to tyranny, one of the first victims is the judiciary. Many of the rulers that go down that road justify their actions on the basis of national security and the fight against terrorism, and, disturbingly, many claim to be modeling their actions on the United States. Again, a few examples illustrate this trend. In Peru, one of former President Alberto Fujimori’s first acts in seizing control was to assume direct executive control of the judiciary, claiming that it was justified by the threat of domestic terrorism. He then imprisoned thousands, refusing the right of the judiciary to intervene. International Commission of Jurists, Attacks on Justice 2000-Peru, August 13, 2001, available at ttp://www.icj.org/news.php3?id\_article=2587&lang=en (last visited Jan. 8, 2004). In Zimbabwe, President Mugabe’s rise to dictatorship has been punctuated by threats of violence to and the co-opting of the judiciary. He now enjoys virtually total control over Zimbabweans' individual rights and the entire political system. R.W. Johnson, Mugabe’s Agents in Plot to Kill Opposition Chief, Sunday Times (London), June 10, 2001; International Commission of Jurists, Attacks on Justice 2002— Zimbabwe, August 27, 2002, available at http://www.icj.org/news.php3?id\_article=2695〈=en (last visited Jan. 8, 2004). While Peru and Zimbabwe represent an extreme, the independence of the judiciary is under assault in less brazen ways in a variety of countries today. A highly troubling aspect of this trend is the fact that in many of these instances those perpetuating the assaults on the judiciary have pointed to the United States’ model to justify their actions. Indeed, many have specifically referenced the United States’ actions in detaining persons in Guantánamo Bay. For example, Rais Yatim, Malaysia's "de facto law minister" explicitly relied on the detentions at Guantánamo to justify Malaysia's detention of more than 70 suspected Islamic militants for over two years. Rais stated that Malyasia's detentions were "just like the process in Guantánamo," adding, "I put the equation with Guantánamo just to make it graphic to you that this is not simply a Malaysian style of doing things." Sean Yoong, "Malaysia Slams Criticism of Security Law Allowing Detention Without Trial," Associated Press, September 9, 2003 (available from Westlaw at 9/9/03 APWIRES 09 :34:00). Similarly, when responding to a United States Government human rights report that listed rights violations in Namibia, Namibia's Information Permanent Secretary Mocks Shivute cited the Guantánamo Bay detentions, claiming that "the US government was the worst human rights violator in the world." BBC Monitoring, March 8, 2002, available at 2002 WL 15938703. Nor is this disturbing trend limited to these specific examples. At a recent conference held at the Carter Center in Atlanta, President Carter, specifically citing the Guantánamo Bay detentions, noted that the erosion of civil liberties in the United States has "given a blank check to nations who are inclined to violate human rights already." Doug Gross, "Carter: U.S. human rights missteps embolden foreign dictators," Associated Press Newswires, November 12, 2003 (available from Westlaw at 11/12/03 APWIRES 00:30:26). At the same conference, Professor Saad Ibrahim of the American University in Cairo (who was jailed for seven years after exposing fraud in the Egyptian election process) said, "Every dictator in the world is using what the United States has done under the Patriot Act . . . to justify their past violations of human rights and to declare a license to continue to violate human rights." Id. Likewise, Shehu Sani, president of the Kaduna, Nigeriabased Civil Rights Congress, wrote in the International Herald Tribune on September 15, 2003 that "[t]he insistence by the Bush administration on keeping Taliban and Al Quaeda captives in indefinite detention in Guantánamo Bay, Cuba, instead of in jails in the United States — and the White House's preference for military tribunals over regular courts — helps create a free license for tyranny in Africa. It helps justify Egypt's move to detain human rights campaigners as threats to national security and does the same for similar measures by the governments of Ivory Coast, Cameroon and Burkina Faso." Available at http://www.iht.com/ihtsearch.php?id=109927&owner=(IHT)&dat e=20030121123259. In our uni-polar world, the United States obviously sets an important example on these issues. As reflected in the foundational documents of the United Nations and many other such agreements, the international community has consistently affirmed the value of an independent judiciary to the defense of universally recognized human rights. In the crucible of actual practice within nations, many have looked to the United States model when developing independent judiciaries with the ability to check executive power in the defense of individual rights. Yet others have justified abuses by reference to the conduct of the United States. Far more influential than the words of Montesquieu and Madison are the actions of the United States. This case starkly presents the question of which model this Court will set for the world.

**Democratic backsliding causes great power war**

Azar **Gat 11**, the Ezer Weizman Professor of National Security at Tel Aviv University, 2011, “The Changing Character of War,” in The Changing Character of War, ed. Hew Strachan and Sibylle Scheipers, p. 30-32

Since 1945, the decline of major great power war has deepened further. Nuclear weapons have concentrated the minds of all concerned wonderfully, but no less important have been the institutionalization of free trade and the closely related process of rapid and sustained economic growth throughout the capitalist world. The communist bloc did not participate in the system of free trade, but at least initially it too experienced substantial growth, and, unlike Germany and Japan, it was always sufﬁciently large and rich in natural resources to maintain an autarky of sorts. With the Soviet collapse and with the integration of the former communist powers into the global capitalist economy, the prospect of a major war within the developed world seems to have become very remote indeed. This is one of the main sources for the feeling that war has been transformed: its geopolitical centre of gravity has shifted radically. The modernized, economically developed parts of the world constitute a ‘zone of peace’. War now seems to be conﬁned to the less-developed parts of the globe, the world’s ‘zone of war’, where countries that have so far failed to embrace modernization and its pacifying spin-off effects continue to be engaged in wars among themselves, as well as with developed countries.¶ While the trend is very real, one wonders if the near disappearance of armed conﬂict within the developed world is likely to **remain as stark** as it has been since the collapse of communism. The post-Cold War moment may turn out to be a **ﬂeeting** one. The probability of major wars within the developed world remains low—because of the factors already mentioned: increasing wealth, economic openness and interdependence, and nuclear deterrence. But the deep sense of change prevailing since 1989 has been based on the far more radical notion that the triumph of capitalism also spelled the irresistible ultimate victory of democracy; and that in an afﬂuent and democratic world, major conﬂict no longer needs to be feared or seriously prepared for. This notion, however, is **fast eroding** with the return of capitalist non-democratic great powers that have been absent from the international system since 1945. Above all, there is the formerly communist and fast industrializing authoritarian-capitalist China, whose massive growth represents the greatest change in the global balance of power. Russia, too, is retreating from its postcommunist liberalism and assuming an increasingly authoritarian character.¶ Authoritarian capitalism may be **more viable than people tend to assume**. 8 The communist great powers failed even though they were potentially larger than the democracies, because their economic systems failed them. By contrast, the capitalist authoritarian/totalitarian powers during the ﬁrst half of the twentieth century, Germany and Japan, particularly the former, were as efﬁcient economically as, and if anything more successful militarily than, their democratic counterparts. They were defeated in war mainly because they were too small and ultimately succumbed to the exceptional continental size of the United States (in alliance with the communist Soviet Union during the Second World War). However, the new non-democratic powers are both large and capitalist. China in particular is the largest player in the international system in terms of population and is showing spectacular economic growth that within a generation or two is likely to make it a true non-democratic superpower.¶ Although the return of capitalist non-democratic great powers does not necessarily imply open conﬂict or war, it might indicate that the democratic hegemony since the Soviet Union’s collapse could be **short-lived** and that **a universal ‘democratic peace’ may still be far off**. The new capitalist authoritarian powers are deeply integrated into the world economy. They partake of the development-open-trade-capitalist cause of peace, but not of the liberal democratic cause. Thus, it is crucially important that any protectionist turn in the system is avoided so as to prevent a grab for markets and raw materials such as that which followed the disastrous slide into imperial protectionism and conﬂict during the ﬁrst part of the twentieth century. Of course, the openness of the world economy does not depend exclusively on the democracies. In time, China itself might become more protectionist, as it grows wealthier, its labour costs rise, and its current competitive edge diminishes.¶ With the possible exception of the sore Taiwan problem, China is likely to be less restless and revisionist than the territorially conﬁned Germany and Japan were. Russia, which is still reeling from having lost an empire, may be more problematic. However, as China grows in power, it is likely to become more assertive, ﬂex its muscles, and behave like a superpower, even if it does not become particularly aggressive. The democratic and non-democratic powers may coexist more or less peacefully, albeit warily, side by side, armed because of mutual fear and suspicion, as a result of the so-called ‘security dilemma’, and against worst-case scenarios. But there is also the prospect of more antagonistic relations, accentuated ideological rivalry, **potential and actual conﬂict,** intensiﬁed arms races, and even new cold wars, with spheres of inﬂuence and opposing coalitions. Although great power relations will probably vary from those that prevailed during any of the great twentieth-century conﬂicts, as conditions are never quite the same, they may vary less than seemed likely only a short while ago.

### 1AC – Allied Coop

#### CONTENTION 2: Allied Coop

**European allies will insist on a policy that limits operations to declared zones of conflict with criminal prosecutions elsewhere---failure to codify US policy and build enduring norms risks executive overreach**

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 debate has largely devolved into an either-or dichotomy, even while security and practical considerations demand more nuanced practices. Thus, the **U**nited **S**tates, supported by a vocal group of scholars, including Professors Jack Goldsmith, Curtis Bradley, and Robert Chesney, has long asserted that it is at war with al Qaeda and associated groups. Therefore, it can legitimately detain without charge - and kill - al Qaeda members and their associates **wherever they are** found, subject of course to additional law-of-war, constitutional, and sovereignty constraints. n9 Conversely, European [\*1170] allies, supported by an equally vocal group of scholars and human rights advocates, assert that the **U**nited **S**tates is engaged in a conflict with al Qaeda only in specified regions, and that the United States' authority to employ law-of-war detention and lethal force extends only to **those particular zones**. n10 In all other places, al Qaeda and its associates should be subject to [\*1171] law enforcement measures, as governed by international human rights law and the domestic laws of the relevant states. n11 Recent statements by **U**nited **S**tates officials suggest an attempt to mediate between these two extremes, at least for purposes of targeted killing, and **as a matter of policy, not law**. While continuing to assert a global conflict with al Qaeda, official statements have limited the defense of out-of-conflict zone targeting operations to high-level leaders and others who pose a "significant" threat. n12 In the words of President Obama's then-Assistant for Homeland Security and Counterterrorism, John O. Brennan, the United States does not seek to "eliminate every single member of al-Qaida in the world," but instead conducts targeted strikes to mitigate "actual[,] ongoing threats." n13 That said, the **U**nited **S**tates continues to suggest that it can, as a matter of law, "take action" against anyone who is "part of" al Qaeda or associated forces - a very broad category of persons - **without any explicit geographic limits.** n14 The stakes are high. If the United States were permitted to launch a drone strike against an alleged al Qaeda operative in Yemen, why not in London - so long as the United States had the United Kingdom's consent and was confident that collateral damage to nearby civilians would be minimal (thereby addressing sovereignty and proportionality concerns)? There are many reasons why such a scenario is unlikely, but the **U**nited [\*1172] **S**tates has yet to assert **any limiting principle** that would, as a matter of law, prohibit such actions. And in fact, the United States did rely on the laws of war to detain a U.S. citizen picked up in a Chicago airport for almost four years. n15 Even if one accepts the idea that the United States now exercises its asserted authority with appropriate restraint, what is to prevent **Russia**, for example, from asserting that it is engaged in an armed conflict with Chechens and that it can target or detain, without charge, an alleged member of a Chechen rebel group wherever he or she is found, including possibly in the United States? Conversely, it cannot be the case - as the extreme version of the territorially restricted view of the conflict suggests - that an enemy with whom a state is at war can merely cross a territorial boundary in order to plan or plot, free from the threat of being captured or killed. In the London example, law enforcement can and should respond effectively to the threat. n16 But there also will be instances in which the enemy escapes to an effective safe haven because the host state is unable or unwilling to respond to the threat (think Yemen and Somalia in the current conflict), capture operations are infeasible because of conditions on the ground (think parts of Yemen and Somalia again), or criminal prosecution is not possible, at least in the short run. This Article proposes a way forward - offering a new legal framework for thinking about the geography of the conflict in a way that better mediates the multifaceted liberty, security, and foreign policy interests at stake. It argues that the jus ad bellum questions about the geographic borders of the conflict that have dominated much of the literature are the wrong questions to focus on. Rather, it focuses on jus in bello questions about the conduct of hostilities. This Article assumes that the conflict extends to **wherever the enemy threat is found**, but argues for **more stringent rules of conduct outside zones of active hostilities**. Specifically, it proposes a series of substantive and procedural rules designed to limit the use of lethal targeting [\*1173] and detention outside zones of active hostilities - subjecting their use to an **individualized threat finding**, a **least-harmful-means test**, and **meaningful procedural safeguards**. n17 The Article does not claim that existing law, which is uncertain and contested, dictates this approach. (Nor does it preclude this approach.) Rather, the Article explicitly recognizes that the set of current rules, developed mostly in response to state-on-state conflicts in a world without drones, fails to address adequately the complicated security and liberty issues presented by conflicts between a state and mobile non-state actors in a world where technological advances allow the state to track and attack the enemy wherever he is found. New rules are needed. Drawing on evolving state practice, underlying principles of the law of war, and prudential policy considerations, the Article proposes a set of such rules for conflicts between states and transnational non-state actors - rules designed both to promote the state's security and legitimacy and to protect against the erosion of individual liberty and the rule of law. The Article proceeds in four parts. Part I describes how the legal framework under which the United States is currently operating has generated legitimate concerns about the creep of war. This Part outlines how the U.S. approach over the past several years has led to a polarized debate between opposing visions of a territorially broad and territorially restricted conflict, and how both sides of the debate have failed to [\*1174] acknowledge the legitimate substantive concerns of the other. Part II explains why a territorially broad conflict can and should distinguish between zones of active hostilities and elsewhere, thus laying out the broad framework under which the Article's proposal rests. Part III details the proposed zone approach. It distinguishes zones of active hostilities from both peacetime and lawless zones, and outlines the enhanced substantive and procedural standards that ought to apply in the latter two zones. Specifically, Part III argues that outside zones of active hostilities, law-of-war detention and use of force should be employed **only in exceptional situations,** subject to an individualized threat finding, least-harmful-means test, and meaningful procedural safeguards. n18 This Part also describes how such an approach maps onto the conflict with al Qaeda, and is, at least in several key ways, **consistent with the approach** **already taken** by the **U**nited **S**tates as a matter of policy. Finally, Part IV explains how such an approach ought to apply not just to the current conflict with al Qaeda but to other conflicts with transnational non-state actors in the future, as well as self-defense actions that take place outside the scope of armed conflict. It concludes by making several recommendations as to how this approach should be incorporated into U.S. and, ultimately, international law. The Article is United States-focused, and is so for a reason. To be sure, other states, most notably Israel, have engaged in armed conflicts with non-state actors that are dispersed across several states or territories. n19 But the **U**nited **S**tates is the first state to self-consciously declare itself at war with a non-state terrorist organization that **potentially spans the globe**. Its **actions and asserted authorities** in response to this threat **establish a reference point** for state practice that will **likely be mimicked by others** and inform the development of **c**ustomary **i**nternational **l**aw.

**Alignment with allies brings detention policy into compliance with laws--- makes criminal prosecutions effective outside zones of conflict**

**Hathaway 13**, Gerard C. and Bernice Latrobe Smith Professor of International Law

Yale Law School); Samuel Adelsberg (J.D. candidate at Yale Law School); Spencer Amdur (J.D. candidate at Yale Law School); Freya Pitts (J.D. candidate at Yale Law School); Philip Levitz (J.D. from Yale Law School); and Sirine Shebaya (J.D. from Yale Law School), “The Power To Detain: Detention of Terrorism Suspects After 9/11”, The Yale Journal of International Law, Vol. 38, 2013.

There is clear evidence that other countries **recognize** and respond to **the difference in legitimacy** **between civilian and military courts** and that they are, indeed, more **willing to cooperate with U.S.** **counterterrorism efforts** when terrorism suspects are tried in the **c**riminal **j**ustice **s**ystem. Increased international cooperation is therefore another advantage of criminal prosecution.¶ Many key U.S. allies have been unwilling to cooperate in cases involving **l**aw-**o**f-**w**ar detention or prosecution but have cooperated in criminal [\*166] prosecutions. In fact, many U.S. extradition treaties, including those with allies such as India and Germany, forbid extradition when the defendant will not be tried in a criminal court. n252 This issue has played out in practice several times. An al-Shabaab operative was extradited from the Netherlands only after assurances from the United States that he would be prosecuted in criminal court. n253 Two similar cases arose in 2007. n254 In perhaps the most striking example, five terrorism suspects - including Abu Hamza al-Masr, who is accused of providing material support to al-Qaeda by trying to set up a training camp in Oregon and of organizing support for the Taliban in Afghanistan - were extradited to the United States by the **U**nited **K**ingdom in October 2012. n255 The extradition was made on the express condition that they would be tried in civilian federal criminal courts rather than in the military commissions. n256 And, indeed, both the **E**uropean **C**ourt of **H**uman **R**ights and the British courts allowed the extradition to proceed after assessing the protections offered by the U.S. **federal criminal justice system** and finding they fully met all relevant standards. n257 An insistence on using military commissions may thus **hinder extradition** and other kinds of international prosecutorial cooperation, such as the sharing of testimony and evidence.¶ Finally, the **c**riminal **j**ustice **s**ystem is simply a more agile and versatile prosecution forum. Federal jurisdiction offers an extensive variety of antiterrorism statutes that can be marshaled to prosecute terrorist activity committed outside the United States, and subsequently to detain those who are convicted. n258 This greater variety of offenses - military commissions can only [\*167] punish an increasingly narrow set of traditional offenses against the laws of war n259 - offers prosecutors important flexibility. For instance, it might be very difficult to prove al-Qaeda membership in an MCA prosecution or a law-of-war habeas proceeding; but if the defendant has received training at a terrorist camp or participated in a specific terrorist act, federal prosecutors may convict under various statutes tailored to more specific criminal behavior. n260 In addition, military commissions can no longer hear prosecutions for material support committed before 2006. n261 Due in part to the established track record of the federal courts, the federal criminal justice system also allows for more flexible interactions between prosecutors and defendants. Proffer and plea agreements are **powerful incentives for defendants to cooperate**, and often lead to **valuable intelligence-gathering**, producing more intelligence over the course of prosecution. n262

**That solves safe havens and extradition to the US court system**

David S. Kris 11 – Former Assistant Attorney General for National Security at the U.S. Department of Justice, Law Enforcement as a Counterterrorism Tool, Assistant Attorney General for National Security at the U.S. Department of Justice, from March 2009 to March 2011, Journal of Security Law & Policy, Vol5:1. 2011, http://jnslp.com//wp-content/uploads/2011/06/01\_David-Kris.pdf

Finally, the **c**riminal **j**ustice **s**ystem may help us **obtain important cooperation from other countries**. That **cooperation may be necessary** if we want to detain suspected terrorists¶ or otherwise accomplish our national¶security objectives. Our federal courts are well-respected internationally.¶ They are well-established, formal legal mechanisms that allow the transfer of terrorism suspects to the United States¶ for trial in federal court, and for¶ the provision of information to assist¶ in law enforcement investigations –¶ i.e., extradition and mutual legal assistance treaties (MLATs). **Our allies around the world are comfortable with these mechanisms**, as well as with more informal procedures that are often used to provide assistance to the United States in law enforcement matters, whether relating to terrorism or¶ other types of cases. Such cooperation can be critical to the success of a prosecution, and in some cases can be **the only way in which we will gain** **custody of a suspected terrorist** who has broken our laws.¶ 184¶ In contrast, many of our **key** **allies around the world** are **not willing to cooperate** with or support our efforts to hold suspected terrorists in **law of war detention** or to **prosecute them in military commissions**. While we hope that over time they will grow more supportive of these legal¶ mechanisms, at present many countries would not extradite individuals to the United States for military commission proceedings or law of war¶ detention. Indeed, some of our extradition treaties explicitly forbid extradition to the United States where the person will be tried in a forum other than a criminal court. For example, our treaties with Germany¶ (Article 13)¶ 185¶ and with Sweden (Article V(3))¶ 186¶ expressly forbid extradition¶ when the defendant will be tried in¶ an “extraordinary” court, and the¶ understanding of the Indian government pursuant to its treaty with the¶ United States is that extradition is available only for proceedings under the¶ ordinary criminal laws of the requesting state.¶ 187¶ More generally, the¶ doctrine of dual criminality – under which extradition is available only for¶ offenses made criminal in both countries – and the relatively common¶ exclusion of extradition for military offenses not also punishable in civilian¶ court may also limit extradition outside the criminal justice system.¶ 188¶ Apart¶ from extradition, even where we already have the terrorist in custody, many countries will not provide testimony, other information, or assistance in support of law of war detention or a military prosecution, either as a matter¶ of national public policy or under other provisions of some of our MLATs.¶ 189¶ These concerns are not hypothetical. During the last Administration,¶ the United States was obliged to give¶ assurances against the use of military¶ commissions in order to obtain extradition of several terrorism suspects to¶ the United States.¶ 190¶ There are a number of terror suspects currently in foreign custody who **likely would not be extradited** to the United States by¶ foreign nations if they faced military tribunals.¶ 191¶ In some of these cases, it might be necessary for the foreign nation **to release these suspects** if they cannot be extradited because they do¶ not face charges pending in the¶ foreign nation.

**Obama overreach triggers end of allied intel cooperation and dooms NATO**

Tom **Parker 12**, Former Policy Dir. for Terrorism, Counterterrorism and H. Rts. at Amnesty International, U.S. Tactics Threaten NATO, September 17, <http://nationalinterest.org/commentary/us-tactics-threaten-nato-7461>

A growing chasm in operational practice is opening up between the **U**nited **S**tates and its allies in NATO. This rift is **putting the Atlantic alliance at risk**. Yet no one in Washington seems to be paying attention. The escalating use of **u**nmanned **a**erial **v**ehicle**s** to **strike terrorist suspects** in an increasing number of operational environments from the Arabian Peninsula to Southeast Asia, **coupled** with the continued use of military commissions and **indefinite** **detention**, is driving a wedge between the **U**nited **S**tates and its allies. Attitudes across the Atlantic are hardening fast. This isn’t knee-jerk, man-on-the-street anti-Americanism. European governments that have tried to turn a blind eye to U.S. counterterrorism practices over the past decade are now **forced to pay attention by their own courts**, which will **restrict cooperation in the future**.As recently as last month, the German federal prosecutor’s office opened a probe into the October 2010 killing of a German national identified only as “Buenyamin E.” in a U.S. drone strike in Pakistan. There are at least four other similar cases involving German nationals and several reported strikes involving legal residents of the United Kingdom. In March, Polish prosecutors charged the former head of Polish intelligence, Zbigniew Siemiatkowski, with “unlawfully depriving prisoners of the their liberty” because of the alleged role he played in helping to establish a CIA secret prison in northeastern Poland in 2002–2003. Last December, British Special Forces ran afoul of the UK courts for informally transferring two Al Qaeda suspects detained in Iraq, Yunus Rahmatullah and Amanatullah Ali, to U.S. forces. The British government has been instructed to recover the men from U.S. custody or face legal sanctions that could result in two senior ministers being sent to prison. Perhaps the most dramatic example illustrating the gap that has opened up between the United States and its European allies concerns the 2009 in absentia conviction of twenty-three U.S. agents in an Italian court for the role they played in the extraordinary rendition of radical Imam Hassan Mustafa Osama Nasr from Milan to Cairo. Britain, Poland, Italy and Germany are among America’s closest military partners. Troops from all four countries are currently serving alongside U.S. forces in Afghanistan, but they are now operating within a **very different set of constraints than their U.S. counterparts**. The **E**uropean **C**ourt of **H**uman **R**ights established its jurisdiction over stabilization operations in Iraq, and by implication its writ extends to Afghanistan as well. The British government has lost a series of cases before the court relating to its operations in southern Iraq. This means that concepts such as the right to life, protection from arbitrary punishment, remedy and due process apply in areas under the effective control of European forces. Furthermore, the possibility that **intel**ligence provided by any of America’s European allies could be used to target a terrorism suspect in Somalia or the Philippines for a lethal drone strike now **raises serious criminal liability issues** for the Europeans. The **U**nited **S**tates conducts such operations under the legal theory that it is in an international armed conflict with Al Qaeda and its affiliates that can be pursued anywhere on the globe where armed force may be required. But **not one other member of NATO shares this legal analysis**, which flies in the face of established international legal norms. The United States may have taken issue with the traditional idea that wars are fought between states and not between states and criminal gangs, but its allies have not. The heads of Britain’s foreign and domestic **intel**ligence services have been surprisingly open about the “inhibitions” that this growing divergence has caused the transatlantic special relationship, telling Parliament that it has become an **obstacle to intelligence sharing**. European attitudes are not going to change—the European Court of Human Rights is now deeply embedded in European life, and individual European governments cannot escape its oversight no matter how well disposed they are to assist the United States. The United States has bet heavily on the efficacy of a new array of counterterrorism powers as the answer to Al Qaeda. In doing so it has evolved a concept of operations that has much more in common with the approach to terrorist threats taken by Israel and Russia than by its European partners. There has been little consideration of the wider strategic cost of these tactics, even as the Obama administration doubles down and extends their use. Meanwhile, some of America’s oldest and closest allies are beginning to place **more** and more **constraints on working with U.S. forces**. NATO cannot conduct military operations under two competing legal regimes for long. Something has to give—and **it may just be the Atlantic alliance**.

**Effective intel sharing is key to NATO effectiveness and Special Ops**

Martin J. **Ara 11,** Lieutenant, United States Navy M.S., London School of Economics, AND Thomas Brand Lieutenant, Colonel, German Army B.S., University of the German Federal Armed Forces Munich, , AND Brage Andreas Larssen, Major, Norwegian Army B.S., Norwegian Military Academy, Oslo, December 2011, “HELP A BROTHER OUT: A CASE STUDY IN MULTINATIONAL INTELLIGENCE SHARING, NATO SOF,” <http://www.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/a556078.pdf>

\*Note: SOF = Special Operation Forces

NATO’s essential purpose is to safeguard the freedom and security of all its members via political and military means in accordance with the North Atlantic Treaty and the principles of the United Nations Charter.3 “There is a common perspective among a variety of defense and security establishments around the world that the nature of the current and future security environment we face presents complex and irregular challenges that are not readily apparent and are difficult to anticipate.”4 SOF is being singled out and recognized as a key component of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) alliance in the fight against contemporary and future threats, because SOF is “ideally suited to [the] ambiguous and dynamic irregular environment” facing NATO.5¶ SOF has traditionally been considered a national asset. NATO had no history of utilizing SOF in the Alliance when NATO nations first assumed responsibility for the conflicts in the Balkans. However the lessons learned during those conflicts were not applied due to a lack of a central NATO SOF entity until the NATO Riga summit of 2006. On December 22, 2006, Admiral William McRaven was appointed Director of the NATO SOF Coordination Center (NSCC) and ordered to start the transformation process. Three years later, on March 1, 2010, the NATO SOF Headquarters (NSHQ) was formally established as a three-star headquarters within the Alliance in Mons, Belgium.6¶ According to its mission statement, the purpose of NSHQ is twofold. First, it must optimize the employment of SOF by the Alliance. NSHQ further describes this as “the intention to make the employment of SOF as perfect, efficient, and effective as possible, so as to deliver to the Alliance a highly agile Special Operations capability across the range of military operations.”7 Second, it must provide a command capability when so directed by Supreme Allied Commander Europe (SACEUR). NSHQ further describes this as “the ability to deploy a robust C4I capability and enablers for the support and employment of SOF in NATO operations.”8 To be able to carry out successful special operations in support of the current and future operating environments, the Alliance needs adequate interoperability, command and control, and intelligence structures. ¶ Even **amongst the closest** **allies**, **challenges in intelligence sharing remain**. During the early years of Operation Iraqi Freedom, British operators were denied access to intelligence fused by the U.S. that the British had gathered themselves. The issue became so contentious that it had to be raised by British and Australian Prime Ministers with the U.S. President to be resolved.9 Having realized that intelligence sharing is always a compromise between the need to share and the need to protect (even with the best-designed organizations, much less a large, multinational, bureaucratic organization), the NSHQ has developed an innovative approach to solving its intelligence deficiencies. It has created its own organic intelligence collection, analysis, and exploitation capability. It has also acquired its own equipment and created a robust NATO SOF training facility and training program to supplement intelligence flow to NATO SOF forces.!¶ B. BACKGROUND ¶ Special operations often test the limits of both equipment and personnel. This extremity introduces a significant degree of uncertainty or “fog of war.” Success in special operations dictates that the **uncertainty** associated with the enemy, weather, and terrain **must be minimized** through access to **best available intelligence**.10 Most special operations conducted nationally benefit from access to the best national intelligence available. However, because of classification issues, special operations by international coalitions often lack access to the best available intelligence. This absence increases the likelihood of operational failure and further risks the personal safety of the operators. ¶ NATO (and many of the individual member states) foresees a future threat environment shaped by unconventional threats such as transnational crime, terrorist attacks, and the proliferation of **w**eapons of **m**ass **d**estruction.11 There are so many similarities in threats projected by the NATO member states and by official NATO strategy it is easy to conclude that a common enemy exists: transnational problems require transnational solutions. The complexities in the international order and the “significant challenges to the intelligence system [that] arise in targeting groups such as al-Qaeda due to their networked and volatile structure”12 make multinational intelligence sharing requisite. There is much to gain from multinational cooperation. The expected continued decline in military budgets and limited SOF human resources make burden-sharing and proper division of labor even more appropriate. ¶ C. PURPOSE AND SCOPE ¶ Intelligence is a decisive factor, sometimes **the decisive factor**, in special operations. As such, the NSHQ’s ultimate success will rely on its ability to solve some of the perennial problems related to intelligence sharing within coalitions. The newly established NSHQ in Mons, Belgium serves as an excellent testing ground to analyze SOF intelligence sharing issues within a coalition. NSHQ is attempting to streamline and optimize the intelligence available to NATO SOF units.

#### NATO prevents global nuclear war

Brzezinski 9 (Zbigniew, former U.S. National Security Adviser, Sept/Oct 2009, “An Agenda for NATO,” Foreign Affairs, 88.5, Ebsco)

NATO's potential is not primarily military. Although NATO is a collective-security alliance, its actual military power comes predominantly from the United States, and that reality is not likely to change anytime soon. NATO's real power derives from the fact that it combines the United States' military capabilities and economic power with Europe's collective political and economic weight (and occasionally some limited European military forces). Together, that combination makes NATO globally significant. It must therefore remain sensitive to the importance of safeguarding the geopolitical bond between the United States and Europe as it addresses new tasks. The basic challenge that NATO now confronts is that there are historically unprecedented risks to global security. Today's world is threatened neither by the militant fanaticism of a territorially rapacious nationalist state nor by the coercive aspiration of a globally pretentious ideology embraced by an expansive imperial power. The paradox of our time is that the world, increasingly connected and economically interdependent for the first time in its entire history, is experiencing intensifying popular unrest made all the more menacing by the growing accessibility of weapons of mass destruction -- not just to states but also, potentially, to extremist religious and political movements. Yet there is no effective global security mechanism for coping with the growing threat of violent political chaos stemming from humanity's recent political awakening. The three great political contests of the twentieth century (the two world wars and the Cold War) accelerated the political awakening of mankind, which was initially unleashed in Europe by the French Revolution. Within a century of that revolution, spontaneous populist political activism had spread from Europe to East Asia. On their return home after World Wars I and II, the South Asians and the North Africans who had been conscripted by the British and French imperial armies propagated a new awareness of anticolonial nationalist and religious political identity among hitherto passive and pliant populations. The spread of literacy during the twentieth century and the wide-ranging impact of radio, television, and the Internet accelerated and intensified this mass global political awakening. In its early stages, such new political awareness tends to be expressed as a fanatical embrace of the most extreme ethnic or fundamentalist religious passions, with beliefs and resentments universalized in Manichaean categories. Unfortunately, in significant parts of the developing world, bitter memories of European colonialism and of more recent U.S. intrusion have given such newly aroused passions a distinctively anti-Western cast. Today, the most acute example of this phenomenon is found in an area that stretches from Egypt to India. This area, inhabited by more than 500 million politically and religiously aroused peoples, is where NATO is becoming more deeply embroiled. Additionally complicating is the fact that the dramatic rise of China and India and the quick recovery of Japan within the last 50 years have signaled that the global center of political and economic gravity is shifting away from the North Atlantic toward Asia and the Pacific. And of the currently leading global powers -- the United States, the EU, China, Japan, Russia, and India -- at least two, or perhaps even three, are revisionist in their orientation. Whether they are "rising peacefully" (a self-confident China), truculently (an imperially nostalgic Russia) or boastfully (an assertive India, despite its internal multiethnic and religious vulnerabilities), they all desire a change in the global pecking order. The future conduct of and relationship among these three still relatively cautious revisionist powers will further intensify the strategic uncertainty. Visible on the horizon but not as powerful are the emerging regional rebels, with some of them defiantly reaching for nuclear weapons. North Korea has openly flouted the international community by producing (apparently successfully) its own nuclear weapons -- and also by profiting from their dissemination. At some point, its unpredictability could precipitate the first use of nuclear weapons in anger since 1945. Iran, in contrast, has proclaimed that its nuclear program is entirely for peaceful purposes but so far has been unwilling to consider consensual arrangements with the international community that would provide credible assurances regarding these intentions. In nuclear-armed Pakistan, an extremist anti-Western religious movement is threatening the country's political stability. These changes together reflect the waning of the post-World War II global hierarchy and the simultaneous dispersal of global power. Unfortunately, U.S. leadership in recent years unintentionally, but most unwisely, contributed to the currently threatening state of affairs. The combination of Washington's arrogant unilateralism in Iraq and its demagogic Islamophobic sloganeering weakened the unity of NATO and focused aroused Muslim resentments on the United States and the West more generally.

**NATO creates global security hubs that prevents Gulf of Guinea attacks**

Frederick **Kempe 12**, President and CEO of the Atlantic Council, "How NATO can revitalize its role", May 16, blogs.reuters.com/thinking-global/2012/05/16/how-nato-can-revitalize-its-role/

However, beneath the third agenda item – partnerships – lies a potential revolution in how the world’s most important security alliance may operate globally in the future beside other regional organizations – and at the request of the United Nations. At a time of euro zone crisis, U.S. political polarization and global uncertainty, it provides a possible road map for “enlarging the West” and its community of common values and purpose. “NATO is now a hub for a global network of security partners which have served alongside NATO forces in Afghanistan, Libya and Kosovo,” Obama and Rasmussen agreed.¶ As America’s willingness and capability to act unilaterally declines, any U.S. president will find himself increasingly drawn to NATO as an even more vital tool for foreign and defense policy – against a host of global threats ranging from Syrian upheavals and **North Korean nuclear** weapons to cyber attacks and piracy. The problem, however, is that NATO members more often than not won’t be located where they are most needed. Or due to lack of political will or inadequate military muscle, many NATO members may not have the capability to intervene. That means **regional partners will be increasingly necessary** to provide both the credibility and resources for the most likely future operations.¶ Although many experts, including then-Secretary of Defense Robert Gates, opposed NATO’s 2011 intervention in Libya, the operation’s ultimate success provides something of a model for this sort of future. NATO operated alongside key regional and European non-alliance partners within NATO structures – with the blessing of the Arab League and the United Nations Security Council. The alliance – and by extension the United States – achieved its objectives with no allied casualties, minor collateral damage and limited U.S. engagement. The war lasted seven months and cost the alliance just $1.2 billion, the equivalent of one week of operations in Afghanistan.¶ Such situations never repeat themselves precisely. Should NATO ultimately be involved in Syria, for example, regional engagement would likely be far greater. In a North Korean scenario, it is hard to imagine any response that wouldn’t be coordinated with America’s Asia-Pacific allies and China. Regarding maritime security, the NATO countries involved and local partners would shift given the threat, whether off the Gulf of Guinea or the Straits of Hormuz. What’s clear is that for the model of NATO at the hub of a global security network, the alliance will need to become more flexible and adaptable – and to build a broader and deeper array of global partnerships.¶ The expected discussions of NATO leaders this weekend about how best to wind down their decade-long Afghan military operation and about how to maintain sufficient defense capabilities, despite growing budget cuts, risk leaving the impression of an alliance in retrenchment or decline. That’s hardly an inspiring or helpful message for a U.S. president heading home to Chicago at the beginning of his re-election campaign.¶ By contrast, NATO’s efforts to broaden and deepen cooperation with capable partner nations can be rolled out as a pro-active, forward-looking initiative that has NATO going on offense for a new era. So that no one misses his notion of NATO at the core of a global security network, President Obama and his allies will stage an unprecedented summit meeting with 13 partner nations – from South Korea, Japan, New Zealand and Australia in Asia-Pacific to Jordan, Morocco, Qatar and the United Arab Emirates in the Middle East and North Africa. Also present will be five European states that aren’t members of the alliance but routinely contribute to alliance activities – Austria, Finland, Sweden and Switzerland.¶ What they’ll be trying to do is give teeth to an agenda for NATO that I first saw discussed in detail by former National Security Adviser Zbigniew Brzezinski in a major Foreign Affairs article in October 2009. He argued against those who wished to expand NATO into a global alliance of democracies. He said that would dilute the crucial importance of the U.S.-European connection, which still accounts for half of the world’s economy, and that none of the world’s rising powers would be likely to accept membership in a global NATO. An ideologically defined democratic alliance would needlessly draw institutional lines between the U.S. and, for example, China.¶ “NATO, however, has the experience, the institutions, and the means to eventually become the hub of a globe-spanning web of various regional cooperative-security undertakings among states with the growing power to act,” he wrote. “In pursuing that strategic mission, NATO would not only be preserving transatlantic political unity; it would also be responding to the twenty-first century’s novel and increasingly urgent security agenda.”

#### Piracy in the Gulf kills global trade

**ICG 12** International Crisis Group, "The Gulf of Guinea: The New Danger Zone", December 12, www.crisisgroup.org/en/regions/africa/central-africa/195-the-gulf-of-guinea-the-new-danger-zone.aspx

Within a decade, **the Gulf of Guinea has become** one of **the most dangerous maritime area**s **in the world**. Maritime insecurity is a major regional problem that is compromising the development of this strategic economic area and **threatening maritime trade** in the short term and the stability of coastal states in the long term. Initially taken by surprise, the region’s governments are now aware of the problem and the UN is organising a summit meeting on the issue. In order to avoid violent transnational crime destabilising the maritime economy and coastal states, as it has done on the East African coast, these states must fill the security vacuum in their territorial waters and provide a collective response to this danger. Gulf of Guinea countries must press for dynamic cooperation between the Economic Community of Central African States (ECCAS) and the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), take the initiative in promoting security and adopt a new approach based on improving not only security but also economic governance.¶ The recent discovery of offshore hydrocarbon deposits has increased the geostrategic importance of the Gulf of Guinea. After long neglecting their maritime zones, Gulf of Guinea states are now aware of their weakness. On the international front, renewed Western interest in the region is accompanied by similar interest from emerging nations. In this context, the rise in maritime crime has increased collective concern in a region where, for decades, the problems of sovereignty and territorial control have only been posed on dry land.

**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**.

### 1AC – Solvency

#### CONTENTION 3: SOLVENCY

**Failure to codify existing policy into law risks spreading executive targeted killings and indefinite detention---plan’s key**

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

Fifth, and critically, while the **U**nited **S**tates might be confident that it will exercise its authorities responsibly, it **cannot assure that other states will** follow suit. What is to prevent Russia, for example, from asserting that [\*1233] it is engaged in an armed conflict with Chechen rebels, and can, consistent with the law of war, **kill** **or** **detain** any person **anywhere** in the world which it deems to be a "functional member" of that rebel group? Or **Turkey** from doing so with respect to alleged "functional members" of **Kurdish rebel groups?** If such a theory ultimately resulted in the targeted killing or detaining without charge of an American citizen, the United States would have few principled grounds for objecting.¶ Capitalizing on **the** strategic **benefits of restraint**, the **U**nited **S**tates should **codify into law** what is **already**, in many key respects, **national policy**. As a first step, the President should sign an Executive order requiring that out-of-battlefield target and capture operations be based on individualized threat assessments and subject to a least-harmful-means test, clearly articulating the standards and procedures that would apply. As a next step, Congress should mandate the creation of a review system, as described in detail in this Article. In doing so, **the U**nited **S**tates will **set an important example**, one that **can become a building block upon which to develop an international consensus** as to **the rules that apply to detention** and **targeted killings** **outside the conflict zone**.

**Drone prolif is inevitable but US action creates credibility necessary to build strong norms against reckless use---preserves basing access and precedent**

Micah **Zenko 13**, Douglas Dillon fellow in the Center for Preventive Action @ C.F.R., Council Special Report No. 65, January, 2013, Reforming U.S. Drone Strike Policies, Douglas Dillon fellow in the Center for Preventive Action at the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR). Previously, he worked for five years at the Harvard Kennedy School, i.cfr.org/content/publications/attachments/Drones\_CSR65.pdf

The second major risk is that of proliferation. Over the next decade, the U.S. near-monopoly on drone strikes will erode as more countries develop and hone this capability. The advantages and effectiveness of drones in attacking hard-to-reach and time-sensitive targets are compelling many countries to indigenously develop or explore purchasing unmanned aerial systems. In this uncharted territory, U.S. policy provides a **powerful precedent** for other states and nonstate actors that will increasingly deploy drones with potentially dangerous ramifications. Reforming its practices could allow the **U**nited **S**tates to regain moral authority in dealings with other states and **credibly engage** with the international community to shape norms for responsible drone use.¶ The current trajectory of U.S. drone strike policies is unsustainable. **Without reform from within**, drones risk **becom**ing an unregulated, unaccountable vehicle for states to deploy lethal force with impunity. Consequently, the **U**nited **S**tates should more fully explain and reform aspects of its policies on drone strikes in nonbattlefield settings by ending the controversial practice of “signature strikes”; limiting targeted killings to leaders of transnational terrorist organizations and individuals with direct involvement in past or ongoing plots against the United States and its allies; and clarifying rules of the road for drone strikes in nonbattlefield settings. Given that **the U**nited **S**tates is currently the only country—other than the United Kingdom in the traditional battlefield of Afghanistan and perhaps Israel—to use drones to attack the sovereign territory of another country, it has a **unique opportunity** and responsibility to engage relevant international actors and **shape development of a normative framework for acceptable use of drones.** ¶ Although reforming U.S. drone strike policies will be difficult and will require sustained high-level attention to balance transparency with the need to protect sensitive intelligence sources and methods, it would serve U.S. national interests by ¶ - allowing policymakers and diplomats to paint a more accurate portrayal of drones to counter the myths and misperceptions that currently remain unaddressed due to secrecy concerns;¶ - placing the use of drones as a counterterrorism tactic on a more **legitimate and defensible footing with domestic and international audiences**;¶ - increasing the likelihood that the United States will sustain the international tolerance and cooperation **required to carry out future drone strikes**, such as **intelligence support** and **host-state basing rights**;¶ - **exerting a normative influence on the policies** and actions **of other states**; and¶ - providing current and future U.S. administrations with the **requisite political leverage** to **shape and promote responsible use of drones** by other states and nonstate actors.¶ As Obama administration officials have warned about the proliferation of drones, “If we want other nations to use these technologies responsibly, we must use them responsibly.”4

**A flexible zone of conflict regime enhances legitimacy, solves criminal justice prosecution outside zones and preserves the use of emergency measures as a last resort against imminent threats**

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

As these cases recognize, the existence of war like conditions in one part of the world **should not** lead to a relaxation of the substantive and procedural standards embodied in peacetime rules elsewhere. In some areas, intense fighting can create conditions that often make it impracticable, if not impossible, to apply ordinary peacetime rules. Such situations justify resort to more expedient wartime rules. By contrast, in areas where ordinary institutions are functioning, domestic police are effectively maintaining law and order, and communication and transportation networks are undisturbed, the exigent circumstances **justifying the reliance on law-of-war tools are typically** **absent**. n88 In those areas, the peacetime standards - which themselves reflect a careful balancing of liberty and security interests - serve the important functions of **minimizing error and abuse** and **enhancing the legitimacy** of the state's actions. These standards should be respected **absent exigent circumstances that justify an exception** Second, the notion of a global conflict clashes with the legitimate and reasonable expectations of persons residing in a peacetime zone. These expectations matter. The corollary - **the requirement of fair notice - is perhaps the primary factor that distinguishes a law-abiding government from a lawless dictatorship**. Its importance is emphasized time and time again in both U.S. constitutional law and international law doctrines. It sets boundaries on substantive rights, n89 is key to choice of law questions, n90 and is the core of procedural-rights protections in both domestic and international law. n91¶ Legal scholars, policymakers, and state actors are embroiled in a heated debate about whether the conflict with al Qaeda is concentrated within specific geographic boundaries or extends to wherever al Qaeda members and associated forces may go. The United States' **expansive view of** the **conflict**, coupled with its broad definition of the enemy, has led to a legitimate concern about the **creep of war**. Conversely, the European and human rights view, which confines the conflict to a limited geographic region, ignores the potentially global nature of the threat and unduly constrains the state's ability to respond. Neither the law of international armed conflict (governing conflicts between states) nor the law of noninternational armed conflict (traditionally understood to govern intrastate conflicts) provides the answers that are so desperately needed.¶ The zone approach proposed by this Article **fills the** international **law gap**, effectively mediating the multifaceted liberty and security interests at stake. It recognizes the broad sweep of the conflict, but distinguishes between zones of active hostilities and other areas in determining which rules apply. Specifically, it offers a set of standards that would both **limit and legitimize** the use of out-of-battlefield targeted killings and law of war-based detentions, subjecting their use to an individualized threat assessment, a least-harmful-means test, and significant procedural safeguards. This [\*1234] approach **confines** the use of out-of-battlefield targeted killings and detention without charge **to extraordinary situations** in which the security of the state so demands. It thus limits the use of force as a first resort, protects against the unnecessary erosion of peacetime norms and institutions, and safeguards individual liberty. At the same time, the zone approach ensures that the state can effectively respond to grave threats to its security, wherever those threats are based.¶ The **U**nited **S**tates has already adopted a number of policies that distinguish between zones of active hostilities and elsewhere, implicitly recognizing the importance of this distinction. By adopting the proposed framework **as a matter of law**, the United States can begin to **set the standards** and build an **international consensus** as to the rules that ought to apply, not only to this conflict, but **to future conflicts**. The likely reputational, security, and foreign policy gains make acceptance of this framework a worthy endeavor.

**Declaration of the territorial limits of detention and targeted strikes triggers US restraint and solves safe havens**

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

This Article suggests a more nuanced, albeit still imperfect, approach: If the fighting is sufficiently widespread throughout the state, then the zone of active hostilities extends to the state's borders. If, however, hostilities are concentrated only in certain regions within a state, then the zone will be geographically limited to those administrative areas or provinces in which there is actual fighting, a significant possibility of fighting, or preparation for fighting. This test is fact-intensive and will depend on both the conditions on the ground and preexisting state and administrative boundaries. It remains somewhat arbitrary, of course, to link the zone of hostilities to nation-state boundaries or administrative regions within a state when neither the state itself nor the region is a party to the conflict and when the non-state party lacks explicit ties to the state or region at issue. This proposed framework inevitably will incorporate some areas into the zone of active hostilities in which the key triggering factors - sustained, overt hostilities - are not present. But such boundaries, **even if** **overinclusive or artificial**, provide **the most accurate means available of identifying the zone of active hostilities**, at least over the short term. Over the long term, it would be preferable for the belligerent state to declare particular areas to be within the zone of active hostilities, either through an official pronouncement by the state party to the conflict or via a resolution by the Security Council or a regional security body. **A public declaration would provide explicit notice** as to the existence and **parameters of the zone of active hostilities, thereby reducing uncertainty as to which legal rules apply**. Such declarations would allow for public debate and **diplomatic pressure** in the event of disagreement. Furthermore, the belligerent states could **then define the zone with greater nuance**, which would better [\*1209] reflect the actual fighting than would preexisting state or administrative boundaries. n138 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.B. B. Setting the Standards **L**aw-**o**f-**w**ar detention and lethal targeting outside a zone of active hostilities should be limited, not categorically prohibited. It should be focused on those threats that are **clearly tied to the zone of** active **hostilities** and other significant and ongoing threats that **cannot be adequately addressed through other means**. Moreover, a heightened quantum of **info**rmation and other procedural requirements should apply, given the possibility and **current practice of ex ante deliberation and review**. Pursuant to these guiding principles, this Section proposes the adoption of an individualized threat requirement, a least-harmful-means test, and meaningful procedural safeguards for lethal targeting and law-of-war detention that take place outside zones of active hostilities.

**Failure to codify limits sets precedent for strikes and the erosion of rule of law ---Congress key**

**Maxwell 12** - Colonel and Judge Advocate, U.S. Army, 1st Quarter 2012, “TARGETED KILLING, THE LAW, AND TERRORISTS: FEELING SAFE?,” Joint Force Quarterly, p. 123-130, Mark David Maxwell.

Once a state demonstrates membership in an organized armed group, the members can be presumed to be a continuous danger. **Because this danger is worldwide**, the state can now act in areas **outside** the traditional **zones of conflict**. It is the individual’s conduct over time—**regardless of location**— that gives him the status. Once the status attaches, the member of the organized armed group can be targeted. ¶ Enter Congress ¶ The weakness of this theory is that **it is not codified in U.S. law**; it is merely the extrapolation of international theorists and organizations. The **only entity under the Constitution** that can frame and settle Presidential power regarding the enforcement of international norms is **Congress**. As the check on executive power, Congress must amend the AUMF to **give the executive a statutory roadmap that articulates when force is appropriate** and under what circumstances the President can use targeted killing. This would be the needed endorsement from Congress, the other political branch of government, to clarify the U.S. position on its use of force regarding targeted killing. For example, it would spell out the limits of American lethality once an individual takes the status of being a member of an organized group. Additionally, **statutory clarification** will **give other states a roadmap** for the contours of what constitutes anticipatory self-defense and the **proper conduct of the military** under the law of war.¶ Congress should also require that the President brief it on the decision matrix of articulated guidelines before a targeted killing mission is ordered. As Kenneth Anderson notes, “[t]he point about briefings to Congress is partly to allow it to exercise its democratic role as the people’s representative.”74¶ The desire to feel safe is understandable. The consumers who buy SUVs are not buying them to be less safe. Likewise, the champions of targeted killings want the feeling of safety achieved by the elimination of those who would do the United States harm. But allowing the President to order **targeted killing without congressional limits** means the President can manipulate force in the name of national security without **tethering it to** the law advanced by international **norms**. The potential consequence of such **unilateral executive action** is that it gives other states, such as **North Korea** and **Iran**, the **customary precedent to do the same**. Targeted killing **might be required in certain circumstances**, but if the guidelines are debated and understood, the decision can be executed **with** the full faith of the people’s representative, **Congress**. When the decision is made **without Congress**, the result might make the United States feel safer, but the process **eschews** what gives a state its greatest safety: the **rule of law**.

### Plan

#### The United States Federal Government should restrict the President's war making authority by limiting targeted killing and detention without charge within conflict zones to declared territories and by statutory codification of executive branch review policy for those practices; and in addition, by limiting targeted killing and detention without charge outside conflict zones to reviewable operations guided by an individualized threat requirement, a least-harmful-means test, a feasibility test for criminal prosecution, procedural safeguards, and by statutory codification of executive branch review policy for those practices.

**2AC**

**Overreach**

**We solve GITMO**

Anthony L. **Kimery 9**, Homeland Security Today's Online Editor and Online Media Division manager, draws on 30 years of experience and extensive contacts as he investigates homeland security, counterterrorism and border security, citing Glenn Sulmasy, first permanent commissioned military law professor at the Coast Guard Academy, where he is a Professor of Law teaching international, constitutional, and criminal law, "The Case For A 'National Security Court'", December 3, [www.hstoday.us/blogs/the-kimery-report/blog/the-case-for-a-national-security-court/a9333d82c11cecd35e74c8c0b65c2698.html](http://www.hstoday.us/blogs/the-kimery-report/blog/the-case-for-a-national-security-court/a9333d82c11cecd35e74c8c0b65c2698.html)

The “decision has been made” to close GITMO and bring the five key 9/11 defendants to New York to be tried in civilian criminal court, “and it was made on information most people do not have access to – so, it seems something had to be done and there were two options, military commissions or civilian courts,” Sulmasy told HSToday.us. “But now, the real issue that will emerge is what to do in the future – for the 75 or so detainees whom it appears cannot be tried in either of those venues as well as those in Bagram and the future, inevitable captures during this generational war. Now that the detention facility at GITMO apparently will not close on time, it seems now – more than ever before – is the best time for Congress to step up, hold hearings, and look at the possibility of having to only use one of two paradigms and look toward embracing the third way – the National Security Court system.”¶ Reiterating what he urged in his book, Sulmasy told said “Congress can and should take a long, hard, look, hold hearings, and truly examine what is in the best interest of the nation … We need comprehensive and long term changes in the detention policies of the United States and this, despite some disappointment that [GITMO] won't close on time, does open the door for **Congress to step up to the plate** and **answer the call for real reform** and properly balance national security and human rights."¶ “I firmly believe this needs to be reviewed and acted upon sooner than later,” Sulmasy said, noting that “to do otherwise, to let the GITMO issue continue to fester, is to simply exacerbate unnecessary criticism of the US and to further negatively impact the greater War on al Qaeda.”

**Allies**

**AT: Gulf of Guinea D**

**Gulf of Guinea is distinct from their piracy D about Somalia---more violent and new attacks destroy the global economy**

**Nelson 12** Rick "Ozzie", Director of the Homeland Security and CT Program at the CSIS, "An Emerging Threat? Piracy in the Gulf of Guinea", August 8, csis.org/publication/emerging-threat-piracy-gulf-guinea

A1: **The Gulf of Guinea is, in many ways, a perfect incubator for piracy**, providing both resources and safe haven. Surrounded by some of Africa’s most proficient oil producers, including Nigeria, Angola, Gabon, Ghana, and Equatorial Guinea, **the Gulf is a major transit route for oil tankers on their way to international markets**. These tankers have proven valuable prey for pirates. Unlike Somali pirates, who focus on the ransom of captured crew members, pirates in the Gulf of Guinea derive much of their income from the theft of oil. These pirates will frequently hijack a tanker, siphon the oil to another vessel, and later resell it on the local black market. In addition to the hijacking of cargo ships containing goods such as cocoa and minerals, this steady supply of tankers provides pirates in the Gulf a lucrative source of income.¶ In addition to serving as a source of revenue, the under-governed states surrounding the Gulf provide pirates ready safe haven from which to operate, both on land and at sea. Faced with widespread poverty, rampant corruption, and an inability to fully control their territory, many of these nations rank among the most dysfunctional in the world. As a result, criminal elements—including but not limited to pirates—have little difficulty establishing and maintaining on-shore bases where they can plan and launch operations. Further, given that many of the states surrounding the Gulf lack significant maritime capabilities, there are few local forces available to combat piracy at sea. Even when states such as Nigeria are able to implement maritime counter-piracy initiatives, many pirates simply move their operations to the waters of weaker states such as Benin. This easy access to sanctuary, as well as the steady flow of oil through the region, has allowed piracy to flourish in the Gulf.¶ Q2: What is the impact of this piracy?¶ A2: The international community has increasingly taken note of piracy in the Gulf of Guinea due to the growing threat this activity represents, not only to the lives of sailors, but to both **the regional and global economy**. Due to the fact that they derive their profits from the sale of oil and other goods rather than the ransoming of hostages, **pirates in the Gulf of Guinea have proven to be significantly more violent than their Somali counterparts**. Vessels are frequently sprayed with automatic weapons fire, and the murder of crew members is not uncommon. **Recent events indicate that these pirates are even willing to attack vessels** with security personnel aboard, evidenced by the recent killing of two Nigerian sailors guarding an oil barge. Given that pirates are now adopting heavier weapons and more sophisticated tactics, **this violence is** only **likely to increase**.¶ Beyond the bloodshed, the expansion of piracy in the Gulf of Guinea poses a dire threat to local economies, potentially undermining what little stability currently exists in the region. Oil revenue, which many countries in the region rely upon, is seriously threatened by pirate activity; 7 percent of Nigeria’s oil wealth is believed lost due to such criminality. Additionally, instability in the Gulf has sharply decreased revenue collected from trade; Benin, whose economy depends on taxing ships entering the port of Cotonou, has experienced a 70 percent decline in shipping activity due to piracy. Furthermore, as piracy drives up insurance premiums for international shipping companies, the price of imported goods in the region could spike, further imperiling local economies**. If these local economies falter, development and stability in the region could quickly deteriorate**.¶ However, the effects of piracy in the Gulf could well extend far beyond Africa, with potential ramifications for the **larger global economy** and the United States in particular. The estimated 3 million barrels of oil produced daily by the nations around the Gulf ultimately feed the North American and European markets. Nigeria alone is the fifth-largest supplier of oil to the United States and by 2015 could account for a quarter of U.S. oil consumption. However, given the rate at which attacks on oil tankers are increasing, the ability of these nations to reliably provide oil to the international market could be in question. Early 2012 saw a doubling in the number of attacks on oil tankers, with as many as eight hijackings in a month. **If this dramatic trend continues, the flow of oil from the Gulf of Guinea to the U**nited **S**tates and the West **could slow considerably**.¶ Q3: What steps are being taken to address this threat?¶ A3: Recognizing the burgeoning threat, a variety of international and local actors have begun efforts to address piracy in the Gulf of Guinea. The United States has supplied over $35 million to train and equip local forces to combat piracy, while the United Nations has called for a regional summit to coordinate a comprehensive counter-piracy strategy for the Gulf. Such a strategy will prove essential to addressing the challenges of piracy, given the ability of pirates to relocate quickly when counter-piracy pressure in one area becomes too great. Regional and international actors can look to the Strait of Malacca, where a number of nations coordinated joint counter-piracy operations and shared intelligence, for an example of successful cooperative efforts to curtail piracy. However, given the limited capacity of many regional actors, increased logistical, material, and intelligence **support from international partners will be vital to these efforts**. International and regional actors have an opportunity to address the growing threat of piracy in the Gulf of Guinea, but only if they act together.

**Solvency**

Alt to drones is less force not more

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

Finally, a number of experts have argued that drone strikes are not only effec - tive but even morally required, because they cause fewer civilian casualties than air strikes or ground operations in combat zones. 67 Contrasting the relative precision of drone warfare to indiscriminate attacks such as the firebombing of Dresden during the Second World War, Henry A. Crumpton, former deputy chief of the CIA’s counterterrorism centre, concluded that drones are a morally superior, even humane, form of warfare. 68 Others have made the counterfactual argument: that far more US and allied troops and Afghan civilians would have been killed over time through enemy attacks and normal NATO ground and air operations if the high-level militants killed by the drone strikes had not been removed from the battlefield. 69 Referring either to real casualties or to casualties prevented by keeping hardened terrorists off the battlefield, many experts have argued that drones are more attractive, and morally defensible, than aerial bombardments or ground military operations.¶ On this point, the distinction between drone strikes inside and outside a theatre of active combat becomes relevant. One could plausibly argue that drone strikes are a more humane option for active theatres of war, where the alternatives— such as air strikes or ground operations—may kill more civilians. 70 In this respect, the Pentagon-run drone programme in Afghanistan might be morally justifiable if the alternatives—such as US air strikes or Afghan ground operations—were worse from the vantage point of non-combatant casualties. At least in the first instance, this is an empirical question. If it is true that drones kill fewer Afghan civilians than NATO air strikes, it would be hard to argue that air strikes should be employed in preference to drones in active theatres of war, although hard questions would remain about the procedures and standards for selecting targets for those strikes. 71 Yet this comparison breaks down when applied to the CIA-run drone programme operating in countries where the United States is not at war. In these cases, the comparison to normal war-fighting **is fallacious**: the alternative to drones in Pakistan, Yemen, Somalia and elsewhere **is not** American-led **ground operations or air strikes**. The US is not formally at war with any of these states and is not legally entitled to use ground forces or air strikes on their territory (though this has not stopped the US from launching periodic air strikes in the past). The realistic alternatives to drones in these cases range from diplomatic pressure to capacity-building to even covert operations, all of which were employed to some benefit prior to the Obama administration’s escalation of drone strikes in 2009. In countries such as Pakistan, Yemen and Somalia, a **c**ost–**b**enefit **a**nalysis of drones has to be measured against these **plausible alternatives**, not against options that are neither realistic nor legally permitted outside a war zone. In these cases, drones are likely to be found wanting. It is hard to argue, for example, that drone strikes will consistently be more effective and kill fewer civilians than carefully constructed covert operations against HVTs. It is also hard to argue that drone strikes consti - tute a durable or long-term strategy in countries where there is a pressing need for capacity-building, especially in policing and intelligence work. The cost–benefit analysis for drones in these cases needs to be measured against these less violent alternatives, not against extreme examples from wartime like **the firebombing of Dresden.**

**T**

**2AC T – Subsets**

**We meet:**

**Plan’s TK restriction meets prohibition**

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

Of course, there are a number of possible ways to define the threat. For lethal targeting, I suggest two such categories: (1) those involved in the active planning or operationalization of specific, imminent, and externally focused attacks, regardless of their relative hierarchical position in the organization; and (2) operational leaders who present a significant, ongoing, and externally focused threat, even if they are not implicated in the planning of a specific, imminent attack. n141 The first definition is a conduct-based test that **prohibits** [\*1211] the use of lethal force absent a specific, imminent, and significant threat. The second definition encompasses those who pose a continuous and significant threat given their leadership roles within an organization. n142 Whether an individual meets this threat requirement depends on the individual's role within the organization, his capacity to operationalize an attack, and the degree to which the threat is externally focused. For example, an al Shabaab operational leader, whose attacks are focused on the internal conflict between al Shabaab and Somalia's Transnational Federal Government, would not qualify as a legitimate target in the separate conflict between the United States and al Qaeda, even if he had demonstrated associations with al Qaeda. He might, however, be a legitimate target if he were involved in the planning of externally focused attacks and had demonstrated the capacity and will to operationalize the attacks. n143¶ Such **restrictions** serve the important purpose of **limiting** state **authority** to target and kill to instances in which the individual poses an active, ongoing, and significant threat. The low-level foot soldier who is found thousands of miles from the hot conflict zone **could not be targeted** unless involved in the planning or preparation of a specific, imminent attack. Even mid-level operatives, such as the prototypical terrorist recruiter, would be off-limits, unless they were plotting, or recruiting for, a specific, imminent attack. n144 Such recruiters could, however, be prosecuted for providing material support to a terrorist organization. n145

**Plan’s detention restriction meets prohibition**

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

For detention, I suggest the same standards that apply to lethal targeting, as well as a third category of fighters whose actions are clearly linked to the zone of active hostilities. Under this standard, a low-level al Qaeda or Taliban foot soldier who is fleeing from or believed to be traveling in and out of the active conflict zone in Afghanistan could be subject to law-of-war detention. n147 However, once circumstances change, and the active conflict zone **becomes a latent conflict zone**, then this **justification** **for** law-of-war **detention disappears**. n148 Unless the detainee presents either a specific, imminent, and significant threat or the kind of ongoing, significant threat high-level leaders pose that would justify his continued detention, he would need to be either transferred to a third party government, released, or prosecuted - just as occurred with the detainees in U.S. custody in Iraq and is expected to eventually occur with respect to detainees in United States' custody in Afghanistan. n149

**C/I – Substantial means a large amount**

**Dictionary.com 12**

sub·stan·tial   [suhb-stan-shuhl] Show IPA adjective 1. of ample or considerable amount, quantity, size, etc.: a substantial sum of money.

 **“In” means within**

**Dictionary.Com** – No specific Date Included

Updated in 2013 but no specific date given, <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/in>

In [in] preposition, adverb, adjective, noun, verb, inned, in•ning.¶ preposition¶ 1.¶ (used to indicate inclusion within space, a place, or limits): walking in the park.¶ 2.¶ (used to indicate inclusion within something abstract or immaterial): in politics; in the autumn.¶ 3.¶ (used to indicate inclusion within or occurrence during a period or limit of time): in ancient times; a task done in ten minutes.¶ 4.¶ (used to indicate limitation or qualification, as of situation, condition, relation, manner, action, etc.): to speak in a whisper; to be similar in appearance.¶ 5.¶ (used to indicate means): sketched in ink; spoken in French.¶ 6.¶ (used to indicate motion or direction from outside to a point within) into: Let's go in the house.¶ 7.¶ (used to indicate transition from one state to another): to break in half.¶ 8.¶ (used to indicate object or purpose): speaking in honor of the event.

**C/I --- Restriction is limitation, NOT prohibition**

**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 Executive CP (Top Shelf)**

**CP alienates allies**

**Schwarz 7** senior counsel, and Huq, associate counsel at the Brennan Center for Justice at NYU School of Law,(Frederick A.O., Jr., partner at Cravath, Swaine & Moore, chief counsel to the Church Committee, and Aziz Z, former clerk for the U.S. Supreme Court, Unchecked and Unbalanced: Presidential Power in a Time of Terror, p. 201)

The Administration insists that its plunge into torture, its lawless spying, and its lock-up of innocents have made the country safer. Beyond mere posturing, they provide little evidence to back up their claims. Executive unilateralism not only undermines the delicate balance of our Constitution, but also lessens our human liberties and hurts vital counterterrorism campaigns. How? Our reputation has always mattered. In 1607, Massachusetts governor John Winthrop warned his fellow colonists that because they were a "City on a Hill," "the eyes of all people are upon us."4 Thomas Jefferson began the Declaration of Independence by invoking the need for a "decent respect to the opinions of mankind:' In today's battle against stateless terrorists, who are undeterred by law, morality, or the mightiest military power on earth, **our reputation matters greatly**.¶ Despite its military edge, the United States cannot force needed aid and cooperation from allies. Indeed, our status as lone superpower means that **only by persuading** other nations and their citizens—that our values and interests align with theirs, and so merit support, can America maintain its influence in the world. Military might, even extended to the globe's corners, is **not a sufficient condition** for achieving America's safety or its democratic ideals at home. To be "dictatress of the world," warned John Quincy Adams in 1821, America "would be no longer the ruler of her own spirit." A national security policy **loosed from the bounds of law**, and conducted at the **executive's discretion**, will unfailingly **lapse into hypocrisy** and mendacity that **alienate our allies** and corrode the vitality of the world's oldest democracy.5

**Exec fiat is a voter---avoids the core topic question by fiating away Obama’s behavior in the squo---no comparative lit means the neg wins every debate**

**Internal fixes aren’t credible**

Jack **Goldsmith 13**, Henry L. Shattuck Professor at Harvard Law School, May 1 2013, “How Obama Undermined the War on Terror,” <http://www.newrepublic.com/article/112964/obamas-secrecy-destroying-american-support-counterterrorism>

For official secrecy abroad to work, the secrets must be kept at home as well. In speeches, interviews, and leaks, Obama's team has **tried to explain** why its operations abroad are lawful and prudent. But to comply with rules of classified information and covert action, the explanations are conveyed in limited, abstract, and often awkward terms. They usually raise more questions than they answer—and secrecy rules often **preclude** the administration from responding to follow-up questions, criticisms, and charges. ¶ As a result, much of what the administration says about its secret war—about civilian casualties, or the validity of its legal analysis, or the quality of its **internal deliberations**—seems incomplete, **self-serving, and** ultimately **non-credible**. These trust-destroying tendencies are exacerbated by its persistent resistance to transparency demands from Congress, from the press, and from organizations such as the aclu that have sought to know more about the way of the knife through Freedom of Information Act requests.¶ A related sin is the Obama administration's surprising failure to secure formal congressional support. Nearly every element of Obama's secret war rests on laws—especially the congressional authorization of force (2001) and the covert action statute (1991)—designed for different tasks. The administration could have worked with Congress to update these laws, thereby forcing members of Congress to accept responsibility and take a stand, and putting the secret war on a firmer political and legal foundation. But doing so would have required extended political efforts, public argument, and the possibility that Congress might not give the president precisely what he wants.¶ The administration that embraced the way of the knife in order to lower the political costs of counterterrorism abroad found it easier to avoid political costs at home as well. But this choice deprived it of the many benefits of public argumentation and congressional support. What Donald Rumsfeld said self-critically of Bush-era unilateralism applies to Obama's unilateralism as well: it fails to "take fully into account the broader picture—the complete set of strategic considerations of a president fighting a protracted, unprecedented and unfamiliar war for which he would need sustained domestic and international support." ¶ Instead of seeking contemporary congressional support, the administration has relied mostly on government lawyers' secret interpretive extensions of the old laws to authorize new operations against new enemies in more and more countries. The administration has great self-confidence in the quality of its stealth legal judgments. But as the Bush administration learned, secret legal interpretations are invariably more persuasive within the dark circle of executive branch secrecy than when exposed to public sunlight. On issues ranging from proper targeting standards, to the legality of killing American citizens, to what counts as an "imminent" attack warranting self-defensive measures, these secret legal interpretations—so reminiscent of the Bushian sin of unilateral legalism—have been less convincing in public, further **contributing to** presidential **mistrust**.¶ Feeling the heat from these developments, President Obama promised in his recent State of the Union address "to engage with Congress to ensure not only that our targeting, detention, and prosecution of terrorists remains consistent with our laws and system of checks and balances, but that our efforts are even more transparent to the American people and to the world." So far, this promise, like similar previous ones, remains unfulfilled. ¶ The administration has floated the idea of "[shifting] the CIA's lethal targeting program to the Defense Department," as The Daily Beast reported last month. Among other potential virtues, this move might allow greater public transparency about the way of the knife to the extent that it would eliminate the covert action bar to public discussion. But JSOC's non-covert targeted killing program is no less secretive than the CIA's, and its congressional oversight is, if anything, less robust. ¶ A bigger problem with this proposed fix is that it contemplates executive branch **reorganization** **followed**, in a best-case scenario, **by** **more** executive branch **speeches** and testimony about what it is doing in its stealth war. The proposal **fails to grapple** altogether with the **growing mistrust** of the administration's oblique representations about secret war. The president **cannot establish trust** in the way of the knife through internal moves and more words. Rather, he must take advantage of the **s**eparation **o**f **p**owers. Military detention, military commissions, and warrantless surveillance became more legitimate and less controversial during the Bush era because **adversarial branches** of government assessed the president's policies before altering and then approving them. President Obama should ask Congress to do the same with the way of the knife, even if it means that secret war abroad is harder to conduct.

**Congress necessary to prevent 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**.

**Links to Ptix**

**Links to politics through bypassing debate**

Billy **Hallowell 13**, writer for The Blaze, B.A. in journalism and broadcasting from the College of Mount Saint Vincent in Riverdale, New York and an M.S. in social research from Hunter College in Manhattan, “HERE’S HOW OBAMA IS USING EXECUTIVE POWER TO BYPASS LEGISLATIVE PROCESS” Feb. 11, 2013, <http://www.theblaze.com/stories/2013/02/11/heres-how-obamas-using-executive-power-to-bylass-legislative-process-plus-a-brief-history-of-executive-orders/>

“In an era of polarized parties and a fragmented Congress, the opportunities to legislate are few and far between,” Howell said. “So presidents have powerful incentive to go it alone. And they do.”¶ **And the political opposition howls.**¶ Sen. Marco Rubio, R-Fla., a possible contender for the Republican presidential nomination in 2016, said that on the gun-control front in particular, Obama is “abusing his power by imposing his policies via executive fiat instead of allowing them to be debated in Congress.”¶ The Republican reaction is to be expected, said John Woolley, co-director of the American Presidency Project at the University of California in Santa Barbara.¶ “For years **there has been a growing concern about unchecked executive power**,” Woolley said. “It tends to have a partisan content, with contemporary complaints coming from the incumbent president’s opponents.”

**AT: Michaels Mech**

**Guts transparency – President will obscure the mechanisms of self-constraint**

**Michaels 11** - Professor of Law @ UCLA

The (Willingly) Fettered Executive: Presidential Spinoffs in National Security Domains and Beyond

Jon D. Michaels, University of California, Los Angeles - School of Law, May 19, 2011, Virginia Law Review, Vol. 97, No. 4, pp. 801-898, 2011, UCLA School of Law Research Paper No. 11-23, Lexis

In all, the In-Q-Tel and CFIUS examples compel us to reconsider the relationship between institutional design and legal and political accountability. Indeed, they suggest a new template, a way of understanding and reconfiguring regulatory space deprived of [\*898] the traditional mechanisms employed to ensure reasoned and reasonable public administration. As such, the case studies pose a real challenge **to the dominant understandin**g of the Executive as power-aggrandizing. Yet, in marking that challenge, we ought not lose sight of the subtlety with which that challenge is presented. Indeed, the fact that the Executive seemingly **takes pains to obscure the** acts and mechanisms **of** **self-constraint** itself pays fealty to the durability and resonance of **that dominant understanding**.

**Transferring enforcement power to Congress doesn’t capture the benefits of Congressional action alone**

**Michaels 11** - Professor of Law @ UCLA

The (Willingly) Fettered Executive: Presidential Spinoffs in National Security Domains and Beyond

Jon D. Michaels, University of California, Los Angeles - School of Law, May 19, 2011, Virginia Law Review, Vol. 97, No. 4, pp. 801-898, 2011, UCLA School of Law Research Paper No. 11-23, Card in Footnote 290, Lexis

n290. See Graham & Marchick, supra note 27, at 123-40; Zaring, supra note 70, at 99, 102. As noted above, when Congress passed FINSA in 2007, it imposed on CFIUS new reporting requirements. David Zaring views Congress's more muscular oversight role as providing a limitation on Executive discretion: "In a world where scholars bemoan the lack of oversight of the executive's national security determinations by the coordinate branches, CFIUS may offer a way forward." Zaring, supra note 70, at 101. To the extent Zaring is correct in terms of muscular legislative oversight, it remains contestable whether congressional involvement is truly accountability-reinforcing and law-promoting so much as it is introducing opportunities for political grandstanding **at the last possible moment**. In some ways, Congress would simply be engaging in the same type of political grandstanding that marked the pre-Exon-Florio days, when CFIUS members **had no legal authority** and thus would resort to public bickering. See supra notes 73-74 and accompanying text. When Congress does intervene, it likely does not do so as a deliberative body. Rather, the intervention will be by select members, any one of whom - perhaps a backbencher or a member representing a district potentially adversely affected economically by the deal's consummation - can stir up enough trouble to scare off the parties to the deal. Once the specter of **a national-security threat is raised** in a public forum, it becomes difficult for other elected representatives **to do anything but join the chorus** in opposing the transaction. This is what happened with the Dubai Ports deal. No one in Congress **wanted to seem soft on national security**, even though CFIUS considered the deal so innocuous as not to warrant the full, forty-five day investigation. See David S. Cloud & David E. Sanger, Action on Port Deals Fails to Sway Critics, N.Y. Times, Feb. 25, 2006, at A10 (noting the political pressure on members of Congress, once opposition to a deal arises, to join suit); Sheryl Gay Stolberg, How a Business Deal Became a Big Liability for Republicans in Congress, N.Y. Times, Feb. 27, 2006, at A14 (same); Jonathan Weisman, Port Deal to Have Broader Review: Dubai Firm Sought U.S. Security Probe, Wash. Post, Feb. 27, 2006, at A1 (reporting that in response to congressional pressure CFIUS would conduct its forty-five day investigation); supra note 57 and accompanying text; see also Robert J. Samuelson, The Dangers of Ports (and Politicians), Wash. Post, Mar. 14, 2006, at A19 (criticizing "grandstanding" by "self-indulgent" members of Congress). The heated rhetoric in Congress, not to mention the fact that these sensitive deals are especially susceptible to being undone by even minority opposition, makes legislative involvement a potentially dangerous tool; cf. Cuellar, supra note 170, at 660 n.274 (indicating that congressional committees are not necessarily representative of the legislative bodies from which they are drawn); Mashaw, supra note 4, at 152-53 (describing Congress's parochialism as making it particularly susceptible to being dominated by special interests); Strauss, supra note 205, at 594 ("Congressional oversight can be just as political as presidential oversight and, with 535 members of Congress, much more complicated.").

**DA**

**2AC Circumvention DA**

**Obama believes he is constrained by statute – won’t circumvent**

Saikrishna **Prakash 12,** professor of law at the University of Virginia and Michael Ramsey, professor of law at San Diego, “The Goldilocks Executive” Feb, SSRN

We accept that the President’s lawyers search for legal arguments to justify presidential action, that they find the President’s policy preferences legal more often than they do not, and that the President sometimes disregards their conclusions. But the close attention the Executive pays to legal constraints suggests that the President (who, after all, is in a good position to know) **believes** himself constrained by **law**. Perhaps Posner and Vermeule believe that the President is mistaken. But we think, to the contrary, it represents the President’s **recognition of** the various **constraints** we have listed, and his **appreciation** that attempting to operate **outside the bounds of law** would **trigger censure from Congress, courts, and the public**.

**No circumvention – review mechanism distributes power and insulates from pressure**

**Siegel 12** - Senior Editor for UCLA Law Review, UCLA Law Review, April, 2012, 59 UCLA L. Rev. 1076Reconciling Caperton and Citizens United: When Campaign Spending Should Compel Recusal of Elected Officials, Samuel P. Siegel

BIO: \* AUTHOR Samuel P. Siegel is a Senior Editor for UCLA Law Review

The influence of campaign expenditures is further lessened when an adjudicatory decision is made by a **group of executive officials**, even if each of those officials is directly accountable to the elected official. For example, the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States - comprised of top-ranking officials from various executive departments n258 - is a body authorized by Congress to screen and investigate foreign-investment proposals "to determine the effects of the transaction on the national security of the United States," n259 negotiate mitigation agreements with foreign investors to minimize national security concerns, n260 and, should mitigation efforts fail, recommend to the president that she block the [\*1119] deal, n261 powers that are "like individual adjudications (or quasi-adjudications)." n262 Yet the very fact that a committee, rather than a single officer, exercises this adjudicatory power **insulates its decisions from presidential control**: "With a single agency, the President could credibly threaten to remove or otherwise pressure or discipline that agency's Secretary or Administrator. **But there is strength in numbers**." n263 Thus, **even within a unitary executive**, such a structure **would likely temper** the **influence** that campaign expenditures would have on the outcome of an adjudication.

**Fiat solves– Only link warrant assumes President will veto & that Congress solves**

**Baron** et al **8** – Prof of Law @ Harvard & Lederman, Vsting Prof @ Georgetown Law Center

Harvard Law Review, vol 121, no 4, Feb 2008, THE COMMANDER IN CHIEF AT THE LOWEST EBB — A CONSTITUTIONAL HISTORY, http://www.scribd.com/doc/142282896/Barron-Lederman2

Congress's capacity to effectively check such defiance will be comparatively weak. After all, the President **can veto** any effort to legislatively respond to defiant actions, and impeachment is neither an easy nor an attractive remedy. The prior practice we describe, therefore, could over time become a faint memory, recalled only for the proposition that it is anachronistic, unsuited for what are thought to be the unique perils of the contemporary world. Were this to happen it would represent an unfortunate development in the constitutional law of war powers. Thus, it is incumbent upon **legislators** to **challenge efforts to bring about such a change**. Moreover, executive branch actors, particularly those attorneys helping to assure that the President takes care the law is faithfully executed, should not abandon two hundred years of historical practice too hastily. At the very least, they should resist the urge to continue to press the new and troubling claim that the President is entitled to unfettered discretion in the conduct of war.

**No circumvention for military adjudication**

**A) Their link author votes aff**

**Baron** et.al. **8** – Prof of Law @ Harvard & Lederman, Vsting Prof @ Georgetown Law Center

Harvard Law Review, vol 121, no 4, Feb 2008, THE COMMANDER IN CHIEF AT THE LOWEST EBB — A CONSTITUTIONAL HISTORY, http://www.scribd.com/doc/142282896/Barron-Lederman2

However, even if Congress cannot transfer military discretion from the President to one of his subordinates, the contours of a principle of presidential superintendence over discretionary military decisions have **historically been limited in important respects**. Each of the branches has long accepted, for example, that Congress can provide for courts-martial to have a decisive role, even countermanding the President’s judgments, in some personnel questions, including dismissal from the service. 660 This example is representative of what appears to be a more general consensus understanding among the branches — unchallenged until the George W. Bush Administration — that if Congress establishes a substantive standard for wartime executive detention, Congress can also decide that the President’s adherence to such standards may be assessed by an adjudicatory tribunal. As cases from Brown , Milligan , and Youngstown to Rasul and Hamdan appear to demonstrate, **Congress can empower the federal courts** to **adjudicate cases challenging the Executive’s exercise of war powers** (for example, on petitions for habeas corpus, including those filed by alleged enemy detainees), and to issue orders **compelling the President to comply** with statutory and treaty-based (and constitutional) mandates. Such an understanding has obvious echoes in the **longstanding doctrine**, exemplified in Humphrey’s Executor v. United States , 661 that executive constitutional prerogatives are **less seriously implicated** where **adjudicatory** (rather than purely “executive”) **functions** are exercised free from presidential control, **even within the executive branch**. In other, non-military contexts the Court has more recently pulled back from the task of strictly distinguishing between “quasi-judicial” and “purely executive” functions and officers. 662 Nevertheless, there are strong indications that in the context of the Commander in Chief’s preclusive prerogative of military superintendence, **an “adjudicatory**” **exception persists**, although its contours are far from clear. 663

**B) The plan is fundamentally adjudicatory**

**Issacharoff** et.al. **’13** - Sudler Family Professor of Constitutional Law, N.Y.U. School of Law

6-1-2013, Drones and the Dilemma of Modern Warfare, New York University Public Law and Legal Theory Working Papers. Paper 404, Samuel Issacharoff & Richard H. Pildes

http://lsr.nellco.org/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1408&context=nyu\_plltwp

We are at the early stages of a profound but partial transformation regarding the legitimate use of military force: An emerging imperative **increasingly requires adjudicative**-like **individualized** **judgments** about the particular responsibility of specific individual "enemies" before military force can legitimately be used against them. This is a transformation from the traditional status-based or group-based justifications for use of force against "the enemy" to a more act-based or individuated justification for when force is legitimate. This change is being propelled by a combination of the inherent structural differences between the nature of insurgent, guerilla, and terrorist groups today (the principal targets of military force by democratic forces in today's world) and the conventional armies of the past; by technological changes that enable far more discriminating deployments of force; and by the post-World War II emergence of a more general humanitarian sensibility among Western democracies, at least. This change is already beginning to be reflected in the evolving military practices of dominant states. Military practice and moral arguments about this change will move far more quickly than legal change, but to extent, this transformation is also beginning to be reflected in the domestic law of some states and in arguments about obligations under international law. Military practice, perceptions of morality, and legal obligation will mutually influence each other as this transformation unfolds. The ramifications of this emerging imperative to individuate enemy responsibility are wide-ranging.

**Congress solves circumvention---raises political costs**

Ilya **Somin 11**, Professor of Law at George Mason University School of Law, June 21 2011, “Obama, the OLC, and the Libya Intervention,” http://www.volokh.com/2011/06/21/obama-the-olc-and-the-libya-intervention/

But I am more skeptical than Balkin that illegal presidential action can be constrained through better consultation with legal experts within the executive branch. The fact is that the president can almost always find respectable lawyers within his administration who will tell him that any policy he really wants to undertake is constitutional. Despite the opposition of the OLC, Obama got the view he wanted from the White House Counsel and from State Department Legal Adviser Harold Koh. Bush, of course, got it from within the OLC itself, in the form of John Yoo’s “torture memo.” This isn’t just because administration lawyers want to tell their political masters what they want to hear. It also arises from the understandable fact that administrations tend to appoint people who share the president’s ideological agenda and approach to constitutional interpretation. By all accounts, John Yoo was and is a true believer in nearly unlimited wartime executive power. He wasn’t simply trying to please Bush or Dick Cheney.¶ Better and more thorough consultation with executive branch lawyers can prevent the president from undertaking actions that virtually all legal experts believe to be unconstitutional. But on the many disputed questions where there is no such consensus, the president will usually be able find administration lawyers who will tell him what he wants to hear. To his credit, Ackerman is aware of this possibility, and recommends a creative institutional fix in his recent book: a new quasi-independent tribunal for assessing constitutional issues within the executive branch. I am somewhat skeptical that his approach will work, and it may well require a constitutional amendment to enact. I may elaborate these points in a future post, if time permits.¶ Regardless, for the foreseeable future, the main constraints on unconstitutional presidential activity **must come from outside the executive branch** – that is, **from Congress**, the courts, and public opinion. These constraints are highly imperfect. But they **do impose genuine costs** on **presidents who cross the line**. Ackerman cites the Watergate scandal, Iran-Contra and the “torture memo” as examples of the sorts of abuses of executive power that need to be restricted. True enough. But it’s worth remembering that Nixon was forced to resign over Watergate, Reagan paid a high political price for Iran-Contra, and the torture memo was a public relations disaster for Bush, whose administration eventually ended up withdrawing it (thanks in large part to the efforts of Jack Goldsmith). On the other side of the ledger, Bill Clinton paid little price for waging an illegal war in Kosovo, though he avoided it in part by keeping that conflict short and limited. It remains to be seen whether President Obama will suffer any political damage over Libya.

**Obama won’t circumvent---empirics prove**

Michael A. **Cohen 12**, is a fellow at the Century Foundation, “The Imperial Presidency: Drone Power and Congressional Oversight,” July 24, <http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/12194/the-imperial-presidency-drone-power-and-congressional-oversight>

Ironically, however, the administration stands on firmer legal ground here than it did on Libya. It has used the Authorization of Military Force (AUMF) granted in 2001 by Congress to justify nearly every aspect of these operations, including targeted killing campaigns carried out by both the military and the CIA, and the continued detention of prisoners in Guantanamo Bay and Afghanistan. As Yale Law School professor Bruce Ackerman told me, “The AUMF was a response to a real problem, namely the attacks of Sept. 11. It is now being transformed into a tool for fighting a 100-year war against terrorists.”¶ ¶ In a sense we are witnessing a perfect storm of executive branch power-grabbing: a broad authorization of military force giving the president wide-ranging discretion to act, combined with a set of tools -- drones, special forces and cyber technology -- that allows him to do so in unprecedented ways. And since few troops are put in harm’s way, there is barely any public scrutiny.¶ ¶ Congress has the ability to stop these excesses. On Libya, it possessed the power to turn off the financial spigot and cut off funding, and indeed, there was a tepid effort in the House of Representatives to do so. On the AUMF, Congress could simply repeal it or more realistically modify it to take into account the new battlefields in the war on terror. Finally, it could conduct greater oversight, in particular public hearings, of how the executive branch is utilizing military force. But not only has Congress not taken these steps, in deliberations over the National Defense Authorization Act earlier this year, it tried to expand the AUMF. On the use of drones and targeted killings, Congress has made little effort to demand greater information from the White House and has not held any public hearings on either of these issues. As Micah Zenko recently noted, claims “that congressional oversight of targeted killings exclusively by the intelligence committees in closed sessions is adequate” are “indefensible.”¶ The reasons for congressional abdication are legion. Partisanship plays an important role. For example, from 2001 to 2006, Republicans largely abstained from overseeing a Republican White House’s wars in Iraq and Afghanistan.¶ Since a Democrat became president, however, congressional oversight and scrutiny of the administration in terms of foreign policy has remained underwhelming, if not nearly as bad. Meanwhile, **the White House has treated Congress dismissively** and even with contempt. **Historically, strong institutional prerogatives have been a check on such parochialism** -- think William Fulbright and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee’s apostasy on Vietnam or even the bipartisan Iran-Contra hearings in the 1980s. Today, however, few in Congress have shown much interest in upholding even its most basic foreign policy responsibilities. Quite simply, there are no Frank Churches or even Russ Feingolds in Congress anymore. ¶ ¶ But there are also serious institutional obstacles to enhanced congressional scrutiny. Writing in the Harvard National Security Journal (.pdf), Andru Wall argues that much of the problem with congressional oversight can be traced to an antiquated understanding of how national security operations are actually carried out. At a time of greater interagency cooperation and coordination between the military and intelligence agencies, Congress still sees these functions as somehow discrete.¶ As Greg Miller noted in the Washington Post in December, “Within 24 hours of every CIA drone strike, a classified fax machine lights up in the secure spaces of the Senate Intelligence Committee, spitting out a report on the location, target and result. The outdated procedure reflects the agency’s effort to comply with Title 50 requirements that Congress be provided with timely, written notification of covert action overseas. There is no comparable requirement in Title 10, and the Senate Armed Services Committee can go days before learning the details of JSOC strikes. Neither panel is in a position to compare the CIA and JSOC kill lists or even arrive at a comprehensive understanding of the rules by which each is assembled.”¶ In addition, oversight responsibilities are often bifurcated by separate authorization and appropriation processes. The 9/11 Commission recommended ending this dysfunctional arrangement among intelligence committees and creating a single joint intelligence committee with both authorizing and appropriating responsibilities. Nearly 10 years later, it still hasn’t happened.¶ ¶ If history is any guide, **so long as Congress fails to hold the president’s feet to the fire, the executive branch will take on more responsibilities** that are outside the purview of Congress’ prying eyes. Ackerman called such “legislative irresponsibility and executive unilateralism” a self-perpetuating phenomenon that is a “recurrent dynamic in presidential systems.” With the lack of any strong institutional pride in Congress, an executive branch that for obvious reasons prefers less oversight and the advent of new tools for fighting America’s wars, this situation is likely to get worse before it gets better, if it ever does.

**No circumvention---DC court decision**

Ed **Morrissey 13**, Hot Air, "DC circuit slaps Obama administration for refusing to follow statutory law", August 14, hotair.com/archives/2013/08/14/dc-circuit-slaps-obama-administration-for-refusing-to-follow-statutory-law/

Could the Yucca Mountain case put the White House in a vise on the ObamaCare mandates? The DC Circuit Court of Appeals ruled yesterday that the Obama administration cannot ignore statutory law that requires the completion of the licensing process for the controversial nuclear storage site in Nevada, including a final decision on approval. The Obama administration had avoided complying with the federal law that designated Yucca Mountain as a repository for nuclear waste:¶ In a rebuke to the Obama administration, a federal appeals court ruled Tuesday that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has been violating federal law by delaying a decision on a proposed nuclear waste dump in Nevada.¶ By a 2-1 vote, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia ordered the commission to complete the licensing process and approve or reject the Energy Department’s application for a never-completed waste storage site at Nevada’s Yucca Mountain.¶ In a sharply worded opinion, the court said the nuclear agency was “simply flouting the law” when it allowed the Obama administration to continue plans to close the proposed waste site 90 miles northwest of Las Vegas. The action goes against a federal law designating Yucca Mountain as the nation’s nuclear waste repository.¶ “**The president may not decline to follow a statutory mandate or prohibition simply because of policy objections**,” Judge Brett M. Kavanaugh wrote in a majority opinion, which was joined Judge A. Raymond Randolph. Chief Judge Merrick B. Garland dissented.¶ As Glenn Reynolds wrote, “Seems like **this might apply in quite a few situations**.” The Obama administration has decided to ignore statutory language in the Affordable Care Act in order to delay enforcement of the employer mandate, out-of-pocket caps on insurance, and a few other aspects of the law it champions to this day. The Yucca Mountain case provides a similar scenario, and at least at the moment, legal precedent that would likely apply to an appeal of the waivers unilaterally imposed by President Obama.¶ The appeals court explicitly stated that a failure to bind a President to the statute has important implications for the principle of limited government — and so does the ObamaCare case. Once Congress passes a bill and a President signs it, it becomes binding law — **binding on the President** as well as everyone else. In order to “waive” a mandate at this point, Obama has to go back to Congress and ask them to modify the statute accordingly. Obama won’t do that because the House will insist on rolling back all of the mandates at the same time, and the Senate might actually go along with that approach after the serial disaster that this rollout has produced.¶ Instead, the formal constitutional-law scholar has convinced himself that statutes don’t apply to the President. The DC court of appeals has just given Obama a basic lesson in constitutional law, one that stretches from the Nevada mountainside to the doors of HHS. Perhaps the House might think about filing suit under this precedent to force Obama to come back to Congress.

**AT: Heg**

**Plan solves heg**

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

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

**2AC Debt Ceiling**

**Won’t pass---GOP spending cuts strategy at 1 PM today**

**Bloomberg 10-3** – Bloomberg News, 12:43PM ET, 10/3/13, “Republicans Said to Plan Debt-Limit Measure Amid Shutdown,” http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2013-10-03/republicans-said-to-plan-debt-limit-measure-amid-shutdown.html

House Majority Leader Eric Cantor of Virginia indicated that Republicans and Democrats should negotiate their differences on government spending and increasing the nation’s borrowing authority at one time.

Republicans want to “sit down and talk to resolve our differences” on both issues, Cantor told reporters today at the U.S. Capitol.

House Republican leaders are weighing their next move in a standoff that has shut down the government and risks a U.S. default in two weeks.

They plan to bring up a measure to raise the U.S. debt-limit as soon as next week as part of a new attempt to force President Barack Obama to negotiate on the budget, according to three people with knowledge of the strategy.

The approach would merge the disputes over ending the partial government shutdown and raising the debt ceiling into one fiscal fight.

“I’d like to get one agreement and be done,” House Majority Whip Kevin McCarthy told reporters yesterday without offering details.

Cantor didn’t provide details on when Republicans will introduce a measure to raise the debt ceiling. Leaders will meet with rank-and-file members behind closed doors tomorrow morning to discuss the next move.

No Incentive

Republican leaders are attempting to pair their party’s priorities with a debt-limit increase, a plan they shelved last month to focus on a stopgap measure to fund the government in the new fiscal year. The goal is to have a bill ready in the coming days, even without resolving the partial government shutdown, according to a Republican lawmaker and two leadership aides who asked not to be identified to discuss the strategy.

There’s no incentive for the Republican-controlled House to take up a Senate-passed short-term measure without add-ons because many lawmakers don’t yet feel the effects of the government shutdown now in its third day, the people said.

**Obama’s already negotiating and the GOP demanded new cuts---markets already perceive default as likely which means they’ve factored in their impacts**

Peter **Schroeder 10-3**, The Hill, “GOP puts new price on debt hike (Video),” http://thehill.com/homenews/news/326271-gop-puts-new-price-on-debt-hike#ixzz2gh1fRpw7

GOP puts new price on debt hike (Video)

Rank-and-file members want Speaker John Boehner (R-Ohio) to return to the so-called “Boehner Rule,” which they say means any debt limit hike must be matched by an equal amount of spending cuts.

An earlier GOP measure to raise the debt ceiling included a host of GOP priorities, including defunding ObamaCare and constructing the Keystone XL pipeline, but not dollar-for-dollar spending cuts.

Now, as it looks increasingly like the government shutdown fight will be paired with raising the debt ceiling, Republicans are pushing hard for a strong opening bid and are adamant that changes to entitlement programs be included in any final deal.

“The American people are realizing that spending has got to be brought under control,” said Rep. Marsha Blackburn (R-Tenn.). “I want three dollars’ worth of cuts for any dollar [of debt limit increase.]”

Washington is struggling to find a way out of the standoff over the government shutdown with the Oct. 17 deadline for raising the debt ceiling fast approaching.

The earlier GOP plan has been shelved, but a spokesman for Boehner on Wednesday said it technically met the Boehner Rule when taking into account both cuts and economic growth.

Rep. Kevin Brady (R-Texas), who released an economic report touting the benefits of the earlier plan, told The Hill on Wednesday that his colleagues are looking for more “meaningful” cuts, particularly on entitlements.

“It’s very much in play,” he said of the dollar-for-dollar approach. “Discretionary savings were modest but important, but really to get a handle on our finances, we’ve got to really start to save the entitlements.”

Asked what he wants on the debt ceiling deal, Rep. Marlin Stutzman (R-Ind.) quickly replied, “dollar-for-dollar cuts.”

“We’ve got to start getting control of our spending,” he added. “I’d like to see us even address entitlement programs.”

In private, many in the financial industry are growing increasingly concerned about a possible default, given the broad gap between the two parties and the shrinking timeline for action.

President Obama has repeatedly said he will not negotiate over raising the debt limit even as he called congressional leaders to the White House on Wednesday to discuss both the shutdown and debt ceiling.

Some speculate stocks must crash to get the sides to compromise.

“People are willing to risk it all, the credibility of the country … for political reasons,” said one banking lobbyist. “You let the market fall by 400 or 500 points and watch the constituent calls start to come in.”

The president huddled Wednesday with the heads of the nation’s largest financial institutions, who reiterated their concern over using the debt limit as a political tool.

“Individual members of our group represent every point on the political spectrum,” Goldman Sachs head Lloyd Blankfein told reporters after the private meeting. “You can litigate these policy issues, you can re-litigate these policy issues in a public forum, but they shouldn’t use the threat of causing the U.S. to fail on its obligation to repay debt as a cudgel.”

Republicans have long argued they have public opinion on their side in the debt fight, but a new poll released Wednesday by CNN/ORC International found that a majority of the public believe failing to raise the debt limit would be a bad thing for the nation. Only 38 percent said it would be a positive.

A Quinnipiac University poll released one day earlier found 64 percent opposed blocking a debt-limit boost, while 27 percent favored it.

Those results suggest a significant shift from earlier polling, which typically found a large number of Americans opposed to hiking the borrowing limit. A Sept. 13 poll from NBC News and The Wall Street Journal found twice as many Americans opposed a debt limit boost than supported it.

Republicans insist they will have leverage in the debt-ceiling talks with the White House.

**PC low and fails for fiscal fights**

Greg **Sargent 9-12**, September 12th, 2013, "The Morning Plum: Senate conservatives stick the knife in House GOP leaders," Washington Post, factiva

All of this underscores a basic fact about this fall's fiscal fights: Far and away **the dominant factor** shaping how they play out will be the divisions among Republicans. There's a great deal of chatter (see Senator Bob Corker for one of the most absurd examples yet) to the effect that **Obama's mishandling of Syria has diminished his standing on Capitol Hill and will weaken him in coming fights**. But those battles at bottom will be about whether the Republican Party can resolve its **internal differences**. Obama's "standing" with Republicans -- if it even could sink any lower -- is **utterly irrelevant to that question**.¶ The bottom line is that, when it comes to how aggressively to prosecute the war against Obamacare, **internal GOP differences may be unbridgeable**. Conservatives have adopted a deliberate strategy of deceiving untold numbers of base voters into believing Obamacare will be stopped outside normal electoral channels. Central to maintaining this fantasy is the idea that any Republican leader who breaks with this sacred mission can only be doing so because he or she is too weak and cowardly to endure the slings and arrows that persevering against the law must entail. GOP leaders, having themselves spent years feeding the base all sorts of lies and distortions about the law, are now desperately trying to inject a does of reality into the debate by pointing out that the defund-Obamacare crusade is, in political and practical terms alike, insane. But it may be too late. The time for injecting reality into the debate has long since passed.

**Plan boosts Obama’s capital**

Douglas **Kriner 10**, Assistant Profess of Political Science at Boston University, After the Rubicon: Congress, Presidents, and the Politics of Waging War, p. 59-60

Presidents and politicos alike have long recognized Congress's ability to reduce the political costs that the White House risks incurring by pursuing a major military initiative. While declarations of war are all but extinct in the contemporary period, Congress has repeatedly moved to authorize presidential military deployments and consequently to tie its own institutional prestige to the conduct and ultimate success of a military campaign. Such authorizing legislation, even if it fails to pass both chambers, creates a sense of **shared legislative-executive responsibility** for a military action's success and provides the president with **considerable political support** for his chosen policy course.34 Indeed, the desire for this political cover—and not for the constitutional sanction a congressional authorization affords—has historically motivated presidents to seek Congress's blessing for military endeavors. For example, both the elder and younger Bush requested legislative approval for their wars against Iraq, while assiduously maintaining that they possessed sufficient independent authority as commander in chief to order the invasions unilaterally.35 This fundamental tension is readily apparent in the elder Bush's signing statement to HJ Res 77, which authorized military action against Saddam Hussein in January of 1991. While the president expressed his gratitude for the statement of congressional support, he insisted that the resolution was not needed to authorize military action in Iraq. "As I made clear to congressional leaders at the outset, my request for congressional support did not, and my signing this resolution does not, constitute any change in the long-standing positions of the executive branch on either the President's constitutional authority to use the Armed Forces to defend vital U.S. interests or the constitutionality of the War Powers Resolution."36

**All their link args are non-unique**

**NPR 9/21**, “Have Obama's Troubles Weakened Him For Fall's Fiscal Fights?” http://www.ideastream.org/news/npr/224494760

President Obama has had a tough year. He **failed** to pass gun legislation. Plans for an immigration overhaul have **stalled** in the House. He barely escaped what would have been a humiliating rejection by Congress on his plan to strike Syria.¶ Just this week, his own Democrats forced Larry Summers, the president's first choice to head the Federal Reserve, to withdraw.¶ Former Clinton White House aide Bill Galston says all these issues have **weakened the unity of the president's coalition.**¶"It's not a breach, but there has been some real tension there," he says, "and that's something that neither the president nor congressional Democrats can afford as the budget battle intensifies."¶ Obama is now facing showdowns with the Republicans over a potential government shutdown and a default on the nation's debt. On Friday, the House voted to fund government operations through mid-December, while also defunding the president's signature health care law — a position that's bound to fail in the Senate.¶ As these fiscal battles proceed, **Republicans have been emboldened by the president's recent troubles**, says former GOP leadership aide Ron Bonjean.

**Obama will unilaterally resolve the crisis if Congress fails---game theory proves**

**IHT 10-4** – International Herald Tribune, 10/4/13 edition, “White House has options if impasse arises on debt ceiling,” p. lexis

As a result, economists and investors have quietly begun to explore the options the White House might have in the event Congress fails to act.

The most widely discussed strategy would be for President Barack Obama to invoke authority under the 14th Amendment and essentially order the federal government to keep borrowing, an option that was endorsed by former President Bill Clinton during an earlier debt standoff in 2011.

And in recent days, prominent Democrats like Senator Max Baucus, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, and Representative Nancy Pelosi, the House minority leader, have urged the White House to seriously consider such a route, even if it might provoke a threat of impeachment from House Republicans and ultimately require the Supreme Court to rule on its legitimacy.

Other potential October surprises range from the logistically forbidding, like prioritizing payments, issuing i.o.u.'s or selling off gold and other assets, to more fanciful ideas, like minting a trillion-dollar platinum coin.

So far, administration officials have continued to insist that there is no plausible alternative to congressional action on the debt limit.

In December 2012, Jay Carney, the White House spokesman, flatly renounced the 14th Amendment option, saying: ''I can say that this administration does not believe that the 14th Amendment gives the president the power to ignore the debt ceiling - period.'' And on Wednesday, a senior administration lawyer said that remained the administration's view.

Still, some observers outside government in Washington and on Wall Street, citing an approach resembling game theory, suggest that the president's position is more tactical than fundamental, since raising the possibility of a way out for the White House like the constitutional gambit would take the heat off Republicans in Congress to act on their own before the Oct. 17 deadline.

''If a default is imminent, the option of raising the debt limit by executive fiat has to be on the table,'' said Greg Valliere, chief political strategist at Potomac Research. ''Desperate times require desperate measures.''

Some professional investors echoed his view, which is a reason Wall Street remains hopeful that the economic and financial disaster a government default could usher in will be avoided.

''At the end of the day if there is no action and the United States has a default looming, I think President Obama can issue an executive order authorizing the Treasury secretary to make payments,'' said David Kotok, chief investment officer of Cumberland Advisors in Sarasota, Florida, which has just over $2 billion under management. ''There's always been more flexibility in the hands of Treasury than they've acknowledged.''

According to some legal theorists, the president could essentially ignore the debt limit imposed by Congress, because the 14th Amendment states that the ''validity of the public debt of the United States, authorized by law,'' including debts like pensions and bounties to suppress insurrections, ''shall not be questioned.''

**Winner’s win**

**Hirsh 13** Michael, chief correspondent for National Journal; citing Ornstein, a political scientist and scholar at the American Enterprise Institute and Bensel, gov’t prof at Cornell, "There's No Such Thing as Political Capital", 2/7, [www.nationaljournal.com/magazine/there-s-no-such-thing-as-political-capital-20130207](http://www.nationaljournal.com/magazine/there-s-no-such-thing-as-political-capital-20130207)

But the abrupt emergence of the immigration and gun-control issues illustrates how suddenly shifts in mood can occur and how political interests can align in new ways just as suddenly. Indeed, the pseudo-concept of political capital masks a larger truth about Washington that is kindergarten simple: You just don’t know what you can do until you try. Or as Ornstein himself once wrote years ago, “**Winning wins**.” In theory, and in practice, depending on Obama’s handling of any particular issue, even in a polarized time, he could still deliver on a lot of his second-term goals, depending on his skill and the breaks. Unforeseen catalysts can appear, like Newtown. Epiphanies can dawn, such as when many Republican Party leaders suddenly woke up in panic to the huge disparity in the Hispanic vote.¶ Some political scientists who study the elusive calculus of how to pass legislation and run successful presidencies say that political capital is, at best, an empty concept, and that almost nothing in the academic literature successfully quantifies or even defines it. “It can refer to a very abstract thing, like a president’s popularity, but there’s no mechanism there. That **makes it** kind of **useless**,” says Richard Bensel, a government professor at Cornell University. Even Ornstein concedes that the calculus is far more complex than the term suggests**. Winning on one issue often changes the calculation for the next issue; there is never any known amount of capital**. “The idea here is, if an issue comes up where the conventional wisdom is that president is not going to get what he wants, and he gets it, then each time that happens, it changes the calculus of the other actors” Ornstein says. “If they think he’s going to win, they may change positions to get on the winning side**. It’s a bandwagon effect**.”

**AT: Econ Impact**

**No debt ceiling impact, Min predates the first default---US not key to global**

Tom **Raum 11**, AP, “Record $14 trillion-plus debt weighs on Congress”, Jan 15, <http://www.mercurynews.com/news/ci_17108333?source=rss&nclick_check=1>

Democrats have use doomsday rhetoric about a looming government shutdown and comparing the U.S. plight to financial crises in Greece and Portugal. **It's all a bit of a stretch**. "We can't do as the Gingrich crowd did a few years ago, close the government," said Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-Nev.), referring to government shutdowns in 1995 when Georgia Republican Newt Gingrich was House speaker. But those shutdowns had nothing to do with the debt limit. They were caused by failure of Congress to appropriate funds to keep federal agencies running. And there are many temporary **ways around the debt limit**. Hitting it does not automatically mean a default on existing debt. It only stops the government from new borrowing, forcing it to rely on other ways to finance its activities. In a 1995 debt-limit crisis, Treasury Secretary Robert Rubin borrowed $60 billion from federal pension funds to keep the government going. It wasn't popular, but it helped get the job done. A decade earlier, James Baker, President Ronald Reagan's treasury secretary, delayed payments to the Civil Service and Social Security trust funds and used other bookkeeping tricks to keep money in the federal till. Baker and Rubin "found money in pockets no one knew existed before," said former congressional budget analyst Stanley Collender. Collender, author of "Guide to the Federal Budget," cites a slew of other things the government can do to delay a crisis. They include leasing out government-owned properties, "the federal equivalent of renting out a room in your home," or slowing down payments to government contractors. Now partner-director of Qorvis Communications, a Washington consulting firm, Collender said such **stopgap measures buy the White House time** to resist GOP pressure for concessions. "My guess is **they can go months** after the debt ceiling is not raised and still be able to come up with the cash they need. But at some point, it will catch up," and raising the debt limit will become an imperative, he suggested.

**Add-Ons**

**Cyber Add-On**

**Kempe says NATO intel coop is necessary to prevent cyber attack**

**Nuclear war**

**Tilford 12** Robert, Graduate US Army Airborne School, Ft. Benning, Georgia, “Cyber attackers could shut down the electric grid for the entire east coast” 2012, <http://www.examiner.com/article/cyber-attackers-could-easily-shut-down-the-electric-grid-for-the-entire-east-coa>

To make matters worse a cyber attack that can take out a civilian power grid, for example could also cripple the U.S. military.¶ The senator notes that is that the same power grids that supply cities and towns, stores and gas stations, cell towers and heart monitors also power “every military base in our country.”¶ “Although bases would be prepared to weather a short power outage with backup diesel generators, within hours, not days, fuel supplies would run out”, he said.¶ Which means military **command and control centers could go dark**.¶ Radar systems that detect air threats to our country **would shut Down completely**.¶ “Communication between commanders and their troops would also go silent. And many weapons systems would be left without either fuel or electric power”, said Senator Grassley.¶ “So in a few short hours or days, the mightiest military in the world would be left scrambling to maintain base functions”, he said.¶ We contacted the Pentagon and officials confirmed the threat of a cyber attack is something very real.¶ Top national security officials—including the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, the Director of the National Security Agency, the Secretary of Defense, and the CIA Director— have said, “preventing a cyber attack and improving the nation’s electric grids is among the most urgent priorities of our country” (source: Congressional Record).¶ So how serious is the Pentagon taking all this?¶ Enough to start, or end a war over it, for sure (see video: Pentagon declares war on cyber attacks http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=\_kVQrp\_D0kY&feature=relmfu ).¶ A cyber attack today against the US could very well be seen as an “Act of War” and could be met with a “full scale” US military response.¶ That could include the use **of “nuclear weapons**”, if authorized by the President.

# 1AR

**AT: NSA Thumper**

**Their spy scandal argument is wrong**

James **Gadea 13**, Policy Mic, "NSA Spying On the EU is Completely OK", July, www.policymic.com/articles/52279/nsa-spying-on-the-eu-is-completely-ok

Going forth, it is clear that while the NSA's PRISM programs can be debated, the surveillance of allies is something that is a necessary duty of the American intelligence community. Keeping tabs on allies is necessary for the upkeep of comprehensive security of our country, and it does not encounter questions of unconstitutionality as citizen surveillance does. While the American relationship with its allies may be damaged, the actions taken by the U.S. are justified. **Europe, as an ally, will not abandon the U.S. for these actions, and** while the alliance may cool for awhile, **the EU will see the positive aims of the NSA in due time**.

**Obama Won’t Circumvent**

**Obama will comply**

David J **Barron 8**, Professor of Law at Harvard Law School and Martin S. Lederman, Visiting Professor of Law at the Georgetown University Law Center, “The Commander in Chief at the Lowest Ebb -- A Constitutional History”, Harvard Law Review, February, 121 Harv. L. Rev. 941, Lexis

In addition to offering important guidance concerning the congressional role, our historical review also illuminates the practices of the President in creating the constitutional law of war powers at the "lowest ebb." Given the apparent advantages to the Executive of possessing preclusive powers in this area, it is tempting to think that Commanders in Chief would always have claimed a unilateral and unregulable authority to determine the conduct of military operations. And yet, as we show, for most of our history, the presidential practice was otherwise. Several of our most esteemed Presidents - Washington, Lincoln, and both Roosevelts, among others - never invoked the sort of preclusive claims of authority that some modern Presidents appear to embrace without pause. In fact, no Chief Executive did so in any clear way until the onset of the Korean War, even when they confronted problematic restrictions, some of which could not be fully interpreted away and some of which even purported to regulate troop deployments and the actions of troops already deployed.¶ Even since claims of preclusive power emerged in full, the practice within the executive branch has waxed and waned. No consensus among modern Presidents has crystallized. Indeed, rather than denying the authority of Congress to act in this area, some modern Presidents, like their predecessors, have acknowledged the constitutionality of legislative regulation. They have therefore concentrated their efforts on making effective use of other presidential authorities and institutional [\*949] advantages to shape military matters to their preferred design. n11 In sum, there has been much less executive assertion of an inviolate power over the conduct of military campaigns than one might think. And, perhaps most importantly, until recently **there has been** almost **no** actual **defiance of statutory limitations** predicated on such a constitutional theory.¶ This repeated, though not unbroken, deferential executive branch stance is not, we think, best understood as evidence of the timidity of prior Commanders in Chief. Nor do we think it is the accidental result of political conditions that just happened to make it expedient for all of these Executives to refrain from lodging such a constitutional objection. This consistent pattern of executive behavior is more accurately viewed as reflecting **deeply rooted norms and understandings** of how the Constitution structures conflict between the branches over war. In particular, this well-developed executive branch practice appears to be premised on the assumption that the constitutional plan requires the nation's chief commander to guard his supervisory powers over the military chain of command jealously, to be willing to act in times of exigency if Congress is not available for consultation, and to use the very powerful weapon of the veto to forestall unacceptable limits proposed in the midst of military conflict - but that otherwise, the Constitution **compels** the Commander in Chief to **comply with legislative restrictions**.¶ In this way, the founding legal charter itself exhorts the President to justify controversial military judgments to a sympathetic but sometimes skeptical or demanding legislature and nation, not only for the sake of liberty, but also for effective and prudent conduct of military operations. Justice Jackson's famous instruction that "with all its defects, delays and inconveniences, men have discovered no technique for long preserving free government except that the Executive be under the law, and that the law be made by parliamentary deliberations" n12 continues to have a strong pull on the constitutional imagination. n13 What emerges from our analysis is **how much pull** it seemed to [\*950] have on the executive branch itself for most of our history of war powers development.

#### Obama won’t circumvent the plan---recent DC Circuit ruling

Joel B. **Pollak 13**, "Nuclear Fallout: Yucca Decision Could Affect Immigration, Obamacare", August 14, www.breitbart.com/Big-Government/2013/08/14/Nuclear-Fallout-Yucca-Decision-Affects-Immigration-Obamacare

The Obama administration suffered a setback Tuesday when the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals ruled against it over the issue of nuclear waste storage at Yucca Mountain, Nevada, which President Barack Obama opposes. Though the ruling re-opens the issue, and provoked bipartisan backlash from Nevada Senators Harry Reid (D) and Dean Heller (R), **the bigger impact is the fallout the decision may have for the White House on other issues**.¶ In his decision, Judge Brett Kavanaugh, a George W. Bush appointee, held that the Obama administration and federal agencies **could not ignore their statutory duty**, under the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1983, to issue a final decision on the Yucca issue within three years. The Obama administration simply ignored that duty because of policy objections, Kavanaugh held, and therefore had failed to show the "constitutional respect owed to Congress."¶ While a President may refuse to obey a statutory mandate if he has a constitutional objection to it, or if Congress has failed to appropriate the funds necessary to carry it out, **he may not do so simply because he has a different opinion**:

Marked

"[T]he President may not decline to follow a statutory mandate or prohibition simply because of policy objections," Kavanaugh said, referring to Article II of the Constitution and Supreme Court precedent.¶ **That holding could be relevant to several other issues** on which President Obama has decided to flout federal statutes. In 2012, after Congress refused to pass the "Dream Act" to ease immigration laws for illegal aliens brought to the country as children, Obama announced that he would direct federal agencies not to enforce existing immigration laws against them. That decision is already the subject of a lawsuit by ICE agents.¶ Kavanaugh noted that the Constitution protects the President's prosecutorial discretion, but that applies only to the decision to enforce a law, **not the decision to follow it.** The ICE agents are suing on the grounds that the new Obama administration policy goes so far that it effectively violates existing immigration law.

**AT: Emergency Exception Kill Solvency**

**Courts 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**.

**Util**

**Maximizing all lives is the only way to affirm equality**

**Cummiskey 90** – Professor of Philosophy, Bates (David, Kantian Consequentialism, Ethics 100.3, p 601-2, p 606, jstor)

We must not obscure the issue by characterizing this type of case as the sacrifice of individuals for some abstract "social entity." It is not a question of some persons having to bear the cost for some elusive "overall social good." Instead, the question is whether some persons must bear the inescapable cost for the sake of other persons. Nozick, for example, argues that "to use a person in this way does not sufficiently respect and take account of the fact that he is a separate person, that his is the only life he has."30 Why, however, is this not equally true of all those that we do not save through our failure to act? By emphasizing solely the one who must bear the cost if we act, one fails to sufficiently respect and take account of the many other separate persons, each with only one life, who will bear the cost of our inaction. In such a situation, what would a conscientious Kantian agent, an agent motivated by the unconditional value of rational beings, choose? We have a duty to promote the conditions necessary for the existence of rational beings, but both choosing to act and choosing not to act will cost the life of a rational being. Since the basis of Kant's principle is "rational nature exists as an end-in-itself' (GMM, p. 429), the reasonable solution to such a dilemma involves promoting, insofar as one can, the conditions necessary for rational beings. If I sacrifice some for the sake of other rational beings, I do not use them arbitrarily and I do not deny the unconditional value of rational beings. **Persons** may **have "dignity**, an unconditional and incomparable value" that transcends any market value (GMM, p. 436), **but**, as rational beings, persons **also** have **a fundamental equality which dictates that some must** sometimes **give way for the sake of others.** The formula of the end-in-itself thus does not support the view that we may never force another to bear some cost in order to benefit others. If one focuses on the equal value of all rational beings, then equal consideration dictates that one sacrifice some to save many. [continues] According to Kant, the objective end of moral action is the existence of rational beings. Respect for rational beings requires that, in deciding what to do, one give appropriate practical consideration to the unconditional value of rational beings and to the conditional value of happiness. Since agent-centered constraints require a non-value-based rationale, the most natural interpretation of the demand that one give equal respect to all rational beings

lead to a consequentialist normative theory. We have seen that there is no sound Kantian reason for abandoning this natural consequentialist interpretation. In particular, a consequentialist interpretation does not require sacrifices which a Kantian ought to consider unreasonable, and it does not involve doing evil so that good may come of it. It simply requires an uncompromising commitment to the equal value and equal claims of all rational beings and a recognition that, in the moral consideration of conduct, one's own subjective concerns do not have overriding importance.

**Politics**

**Won’t Pass**

**Obama’s already negotiating and the GOP demanded new cuts---markets already perceive default as likely which means they’ve factored in their impacts**

Peter **Schroeder 10-3**, The Hill, “GOP puts new price on debt hike (Video),” http://thehill.com/homenews/news/326271-gop-puts-new-price-on-debt-hike#ixzz2gh1fRpw7

GOP puts new price on debt hike (Video)

Rank-and-file members want Speaker John Boehner (R-Ohio) to return to the so-called “Boehner Rule,” which they say means any debt limit hike must be matched by an equal amount of spending cuts.

An earlier GOP measure to raise the debt ceiling included a host of GOP priorities, including defunding ObamaCare and constructing the Keystone XL pipeline, but not dollar-for-dollar spending cuts.

Now, as it looks increasingly like the government shutdown fight will be paired with raising the debt ceiling, Republicans are pushing hard for a strong opening bid and are adamant that changes to entitlement programs be included in any final deal.

“The American people are realizing that spending has got to be brought under control,” said Rep. Marsha Blackburn (R-Tenn.). “I want three dollars’ worth of cuts for any dollar [of debt limit increase.]”

Washington is struggling to find a way out of the standoff over the government shutdown with the Oct. 17 deadline for raising the debt ceiling fast approaching.

The earlier GOP plan has been shelved, but a spokesman for Boehner on Wednesday said it technically met the Boehner Rule when taking into account both cuts and economic growth.

Rep. Kevin Brady (R-Texas), who released an economic report touting the benefits of the earlier plan, told The Hill on Wednesday that his colleagues are looking for more “meaningful” cuts, particularly on entitlements.

“It’s very much in play,” he said of the dollar-for-dollar approach. “Discretionary savings were modest but important, but really to get a handle on our finances, we’ve got to really start to save the entitlements.”

Asked what he wants on the debt ceiling deal, Rep. Marlin Stutzman (R-Ind.) quickly replied, “dollar-for-dollar cuts.”

“We’ve got to start getting control of our spending,” he added. “I’d like to see us even address entitlement programs.”

In private, many in the financial industry are growing increasingly concerned about a possible default, given the broad gap between the two parties and the shrinking timeline for action.

President Obama has repeatedly said he will not negotiate over raising the debt limit even as he called congressional leaders to the White House on Wednesday to discuss both the shutdown and debt ceiling.

Some speculate stocks must crash to get the sides to compromise.

“People are willing to risk it all, the credibility of the country … for political reasons,” said one banking lobbyist. “You let the market fall by 400 or 500 points and watch the constituent calls start to come in.”

The president huddled Wednesday with the heads of the nation’s largest financial institutions, who reiterated their concern over using the debt limit as a political tool.

“Individual members of our group represent every point on the political spectrum,” Goldman Sachs head Lloyd Blankfein told reporters after the private meeting. “You can litigate these policy issues, you can re-litigate these policy issues in a public forum, but they shouldn’t use the threat of causing the U.S. to fail on its obligation to repay debt as a cudgel.”

Republicans have long argued they have public opinion on their side in the debt fight, but a new poll released Wednesday by CNN/ORC International found that a majority of the public believe failing to raise the debt limit would be a bad thing for the nation. Only 38 percent said it would be a positive.

A Quinnipiac University poll released one day earlier found 64 percent opposed blocking a debt-limit boost, while 27 percent favored it.

Those results suggest a significant shift from earlier polling, which typically found a large number of Americans opposed to hiking the borrowing limit. A Sept. 13 poll from NBC News and The Wall Street Journal found twice as many Americans opposed a debt limit boost than supported it.

Republicans insist they will have leverage in the debt-ceiling talks with the White House.

**Their internal link ev is from June and says if the GOP forces a confrontation over spending cuts, that’s sufficient to trigger their impact---that’s exactly what’s happening**

**Fox 10-2** – Fox News, 10/2/13, “Think the budget impasse is bad? Wait until the debt-ceiling battle,” http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2013/10/02/think-budget-impasse-is-bad-wait-until-debt-ceiling-battle/

The financial markets are already starting to get the jitters over the prospect of a debt-ceiling showdown. A similar stand-off in 2011, combined with the shaky state of America's finances, contributed to the first-ever U.S. credit downgrade. Washington would risk another, and worse, if officials cannot come to an agreement by an Oct. 17 deadline.

"There is a consensus that we shouldn't do anything that hurts this recovery that is a little bit shallow, not very well established, and is quite vulnerable. And the shutdown of the government but particularly a failure to raise the debt ceiling would accomplish that," Goldman Sachs CEO Lloyd Blankfein said, after a meeting at the White House with other executives. "There is precedent for a shutdown. There is no precedent for default."

The debt-ceiling debate is now the backdrop to virtually all discussions about how to resolve the current impasse over the budget. While the federal government can limp along with fewer workers and fewer services, a failure to raise the debt ceiling could cause shockwaves.

The Dow Jones Industrial Average took a dive Wednesday morning amid concerns over the deadlock in Washington. President Obama, meanwhile, met with the CEOs of major banks to discuss both the partial shutdown and the debate over the debt ceiling.

Obama has invited congressional leaders from both parties to meet at the White House at 5:30 p.m. ET on Wednesday, where both those topics will be on the table.

Obama and others warn that a failure to raise the debt ceiling would have consequences that ripple through the economy.

"It would be far more dangerous than a government shutdown -- as bad as a shutdown is. It would be an economic shutdown," the president said Monday.

The worst-case scenario is a default on U.S. debt, though there are other ramifications short of that that would also impact Americans. The government would be forced to make strategic decisions about what to spend limited money on, so many government functions could once again be suspended. Further, interest rates could rise, jacking up the cost of student loans, mortgages and other loans. That's to say nothing of the impact on the stock market, and Americans' retirement accounts.

Some Republicans want to use the debt-ceiling vote to extract additional concessions, much of which pertain to cutting spending.

"I'm not going to raise the debt ceiling yet again without addressing why we're in debt," Sen. Lindsey Graham, R-S.C., told Fox News. He and other Republicans argue that these spending cuts are critical in order to bring the federal budget back to a sustainable level and, ultimately, start to reverse the seemingly inexorable rise of the national debt.

Some Republicans, though, also want to use the debt-ceiling vote to extract concessions over ObamaCare. From their standpoint, it's for the good of the economy.

**Neither side will blink---shutdown proves GOP will allow a default over delaying Obamacare**

**NYT 10-2** – “Obama Says He Won’t Negotiate Until Government Reopens,” http://www.nytimes.com/news/fiscal-crisis/2013/10/02/obama-says-he-wont-negotiate-until-government-reopens/

In their first meeting since a budget impasse shuttered many federal operations, President Obama told Republican leaders on Wednesday that he would negotiate with them only after they agreed to the financing needed to reopen the government and also to an essential increase in the nation’s debt limit, without add-ons.

The president’s position reflected the White House view that the Republicans’ strategy is failing.

The meeting at the White House, just over an hour long, ended without any resolution. As they left, Republican and Democratic leaders separately reiterated their contrary positions to waiting reporters. The House speaker, John A. Boehner, Republican of Ohio, said that Mr. Obama “will not negotiate,” while Senator Harry Reid, Democrat of Nevada and the Senate’s majority leader, said that Democrats would agree to spending at levels already passed by the House. “My friend John Boehner cannot take ‘yes’ for an answer,.” he said.

The meeting was the first time that the president linked the two actions that he and a divided Congress are fighting over this month: a budget for the fiscal year that began on Tuesday, and an increase in the debt ceiling by Oct. 17, when the Treasury Department will otherwise breach its authority to borrow the money necessary to cover the nation’s existing obligations to citizens, contractors and creditors.

Only when those actions are taken, Mr. Obama said, would he agree to revive bipartisan talks toward a long-term budget deal addressing the growing costs of Medicare and Medicaid and the inadequacy of federal tax revenues.

While the lack of a budget forced the government shutdown this week, failure to raise the debt limit would have worse repercussions, threatening America’s credit rating with a globe-shaking default and risking an economic relapse at home. Yet the refusal of the Republican-led House earlier this week to approve government funding until Mr. Obama agrees to delay his signature health-care law – a non-negotiable demand, he has said – raised fears from Washington to Wall Street that Republicans likewise would carry out their threat to withhold approval for an increase in the debt ceiling.

**No Impact – XO Solves**

**Obama executive order solves**

Joe **Weisenthal 9/30**, Executive Editor for Business Insider, “It Increasingly Looks Like Obama Will Have To Raise The Debt Ceiling All By Himself,” <http://www.businessinsider.com/it-increasingly-looks-like-obama-will-have-to-raise-the-debt-ceiling-all-by-himself-2013->9

With no movement on either side and the debt ceiling fast approaching, there's increasing talk that the solution will be for Obama to issue an e**x**ecutive **o**rder and require the Treasury to continue paying U.S. debt holders even if the debt ceiling isn't raised.¶ Here's Greg Valliere at Potomac Research:¶ HOW DOES THIS END? What worries many clients we talk with is the absence of a clear end-game. We think three key elements will have to be part of the final outcome: First, a nasty signal from the stock market. Second, a daring move from Barack Obama to raise the debt ceiling by executive order if default appears to be imminent. Third, a capitulation by Boehner, ending the shut-down and debt crisis in an arrangement between a third of the House GOP and virtually all of the Democrats. ¶ Valliere isn't the only one seeing this outcome.¶ Here's David Kotok at Cumberland Advisors:¶ We expect this craziness to last into October and run up against the debt limit fight. In the final gasping throes of squabbling, **we expect** President Obama to use the President Clinton designed e**x**ecutive **o**rder strategy so that the US doesn’t default. There will then ensue a protracted court fight leading to a Supreme Court decision. The impasse may go that far. This is our American way. “Man Plans and God Laughs” says the Yiddish Proverb.¶ Indeed, back in 2011, Bill Clinton said he'd raise the debt ceiling by invoking the 14th Amendment rather than negotiate with the House GOP.¶ This time around, again, Clinton is advising Obama to **call the GOP's bluff.**

**Debt Ceiling Not K to Econ**

**Most qualed ev agrees**

Emil **Henry 13**, former assistant Treasury secretary, January 21st, 2013, “Amid the Debt-Ceiling Debate, Overblown Fears of Default,” <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424127887323442804578235970716809666.html>

These concerns can be largely addressed by legislation or pre-emptive action by the private sector. For example, the first line of defense against default of interest or principal on our debt is legislation, such as that proposed in the Full Faith and Credit Act of 2011 by Sen. Pat Toomey (R., Pa.), which prioritizes payments of interest and principal before other government expenditures. We can afford this commitment because interest payments for 2013 are projected by the Congressional Budget Office to be 7% of tax receipts, **meaning 93% of the government's revenues can be deployed elsewhere**. Even with this legislation, however, there is further risk of principal default. Namely, once the ceiling is hit, the government will still need to issue new Treasury debt to retire maturing debt—and in large quantities. In 2013, the Treasury will need to issue about $3 trillion to refund maturing securities. A failed auction or the mass refusal of investors to roll over T-bills (a "buyer's strike") might trigger a default. Yet if the Treasury found itself in the highly unlikely position where no amount of interest-rate increase could create a clearing price for a successful auction, Congress always has the ability to raise the ceiling at any time and for any amount. And, as a last resort, if Congress were recalcitrant in such a difficult circumstance, **the Federal Reserve would be well within its mandate to intervene to provide liquidity by purchasing securities.** The Fed has purchased some $2 trillion of Treasury securities since the financial crisis began in 2007, and it owns more than a trillion dollars in non-Treasury securities that could be partially monetized. Treasury Secretary Timothy Geithner has warned of another form of technical default saying legislation would "not protect from nonpayment the other obligations of the United States, such as military and civilian salaries, tax refunds, contractual payments to individuals and businesses for services and goods, and many others" whose nonpayment would compromise the government's credit-worthiness. To this I suggest an ancient remedy: Figure it out, just as the private sector does when times are difficult. Rationalize bloated agencies. Eliminate duplicative programs. Reduce salaries. Initiate a hiring freeze. Negotiate with vendors to make payments over time. And if these are not workable solutions as Mr. Geithner implies, then he or his successor should come before Congress and explain why they are not. Republicans will listen. They too have no interest in an economic Armageddon. Regarding Social Security payments, there are typically timing differences between the receipt of tax revenues and the payment of entitlement expenses implying the potential for delayed checks. Legislation could allow for temporary increases in the debt ceiling to cover these timing differences and prevent delay. Some Wall Street firms warn of entangling complexities in the market for Treasury securities. They worry that the heightened risk of default will cause funds to divest themselves of Treasurys in such scale as to create mass dislocation. They also worry that the $4 trillion "repo" market, where Treasurys are the preferred collateral, would see rates rise to the extent Treasurys are seen as more risky. Banks might then redeploy capital away from lending to support the additional margin required by the market, thus hurting the economy. These may be reasonable concerns but House Republicans should recognize them as worries of an establishment with, first and foremost, a bottom line to protect. In the summer of 2011, amid great uncertainty over the debt ceiling and ultimately a downgrade by Standard & Poor's to AA+ from AAA, there was similar fear and divestitures of Treasurys, but markets functioned nonetheless. Interest rates even declined as the market continued to adorn U.S. Treasurys with the halo of being safe relative to other sovereign debt.