## 1AC – USC Doubles

### 1AC – Executive Overreach

#### CONTENTION 1: OVERREACH

#### *Scenario A: Targeted Strikes*

#### Global prolif of drones is inevitable---the plan establishes norms for restrained use that prevents Mid-East and Indo-Pak war

Kristen Roberts 13, news editor for the National Journal, master in security studies from Georgetown, “When the Whole World Has Drones”, 3/22, <http://www.nationaljournal.com/magazine/when-the-whole-world-has-drones-20130321>

The proliferation of drone technology has moved well beyond the control of the United States government and its closest allies. The aircraft are too easy to obtain, with barriers to entry on the production side crumbling too quickly to place limits on the spread of a technology that promises to transform warfare on a global scale. Already, more than 75 countries have remote piloted aircraft. More than 50 nations are building a total of nearly a thousand types. At its last display at a trade show in Beijing, China showed off 25 different unmanned aerial vehicles. Not toys or models, but real flying machines. It’s a classic and common phase in the life cycle of a military innovation: An advanced country and its weapons developers create a tool, and then others learn how to make their own. But what makes this case rare, and dangerous, is the powerful combination of efficiency and lethality spreading in an environment lacking internationally accepted guidelines on legitimate use. This technology is snowballing through a global arena where the main precedent for its application is the one set by the United States; it’s a precedent Washington does not want anyone following. America, the world’s leading democracy and a country built on a legal and moral framework unlike any other, has adopted a war-making process that too often bypasses its traditional, regimented, and rigorously overseen military in favor of a secret program never publicly discussed, based on legal advice never properly vetted. The Obama administration has used its executive power to refuse or outright ignore requests by congressional overseers, and it has resisted monitoring by federal courts. To implement this covert program, the administration has adopted a tool that lowers the threshold for lethal force by reducing the cost and risk of combat. This still-expanding counterterrorism use of drones to kill people, including its own citizens, outside of traditionally defined battlefields and established protocols for warfare, has given friends and foes a green light to employ these aircraft in extraterritorial operations that could not only affect relations between the nation-states involved but also destabilize entire regions and potentially upset geopolitical order. Hyperbole? Consider this: Iran, with the approval of Damascus, carries out a lethal strike on anti-Syrian forces inside Syria; Russia picks off militants tampering with oil and gas lines in Ukraine or Georgia; Turkey arms a U.S.-provided Predator to kill Kurdish militants in northern Iraq who it believes are planning attacks along the border. Label the targets as terrorists, and in each case, Tehran, Moscow, and Ankara may point toward Washington and say, we learned it by watching you. In Pakistan, Yemen, and Afghanistan. This is the unintended consequence of American drone warfare. For all of the attention paid to the drone program in recent weeks—about Americans on the target list (there are none at this writing) and the executive branch’s legal authority to kill by drone outside war zones (thin, by officials’ own private admission)—what goes undiscussed is Washington’s deliberate failure to establish clear and demonstrable rules for itself that would at minimum create a globally relevant standard for delineating between legitimate and rogue uses of one of the most awesome military robotics capabilities of this generation. THE WRONG QUESTION The United States is the indisputable leader in drone technology and long-range strike. Remote-piloted aircraft have given Washington an extraordinary ability to wage war with far greater precision, improved effect, and fewer unintended casualties than conventional warfare. The drones allow U.S. forces to establish ever greater control over combat areas, and the Pentagon sees the technology as an efficient and judicious force of the future. And it should, given the billions of dollars that have gone into establishing and maintaining such a capability. That level of superiority leads some national security officials to downplay concerns about other nations’ unmanned systems and to too narrowly define potential threats to the homeland. As proof, they argue that American dominance in drone warfare is due only in part to the aircraft itself, which offers the ability to travel great distances and loiter for long periods, not to mention carry and launch Hellfire missiles. The drone itself, they argue, is just a tool and, yes, one that is being copied aggressively by allies and adversaries alike. The real edge, they say, is in the unparalleled intelligence-collection and data-analysis underpinning the aircraft’s mission. “There is what I think is just an unconstrained focus on a tool as opposed to the subject of the issue, the tool of remotely piloted aircraft that in fact provide for greater degrees of surety before you employ force than anything else we use,” said retired Lt. Gen. David Deptula, the Air Force’s first deputy chief of staff for intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance. “I think people don’t realize that for the medium altitude aircraft—the MQ-1 [Predator] and MQ-9 [Reaper] that are generally written about in the press—there are over 200 people involved in just one orbit of those aircraft.… The majority of those people are analysts who are interpreting the information that’s coming off the sensors on the aircraft.” The analysts are part of the global architecture that makes precision strikes, and targeted killing, possible. At the front end, obviously, intelligence—military, CIA, and local—inform target decisions. But in as near-real time as technologically possible, intel analysts in Nevada, Texas, Virginia, and other locations watch the data flood in from the aircraft and make calls on what’s happening on target. They monitor the footage, listen to audio, and analyze signals, giving decision-makers time to adjust an operation if the risks (often counted in potential civilian deaths) outweigh the reward (judged by the value of the threat eliminated). “Is that a shovel or a rifle? Is that a Taliban member or is this a farmer? The way that warfare has advanced is that we are much more exquisite in our ability to discern,” Maj. Gen. Robert Otto, commander of the Air Force Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance Agency, told National Journal at Nellis Air Force Base in Nevada. “We’re not overhead for 15 minutes with a fighter that’s about to run out of gas, and we have to make a decision. We can orbit long enough to be pretty sure about our target.” Other countries, groups, and even individuals can and do fly drones. But no state or group has nearly the sophisticated network of intelligence and data analysis that gives the United States its strategic advantage. Although it would be foolish to dismiss the notion that potential U.S. adversaries aspire to attain that type of war-from-afar, pinpoint-strike capability, they have neither the income nor the perceived need to do so. That’s true, at least today. It’s also irrelevant. Others who employ drones are likely to carry a different agenda, one more concerned with employing a relatively inexpensive and ruthlessly efficient tool to dispatch an enemy close at hand. “It would be very difficult for them to create the global-strike architecture we have, to have a control cell in Nevada flying a plane over Afghanistan. The reality is that most nations don’t want or need that,” said Peter Singer, director of the Brookings Institution’s Center for 21st Century Security and Intelligence and one of the foremost experts in advanced military technology. “Turkey’s not looking to conduct strikes into the Philippines.... But Turkey is looking to be able to carry out long-duration surveillance and potentially strike inside and right on its border.” And that’s a NATO ally seeking the capability to conduct missions that would run afoul of U.S. interests in Iraq and the broader Middle East. Already, Beijing says it considered a strike in Myanmar to kill a drug lord wanted in the deaths of Chinese sailors. What happens if China arms one of its remote-piloted planes and strikes Philippine or Indian trawlers in the South China Sea? Or if India uses the aircraft to strike Lashkar-e-Taiba militants near Kashmir? “We don’t like other states using lethal force outside their borders. It’s destabilizing. It can lead to a sort of wider escalation of violence between two states,” said Micah Zenko, a security policy and drone expert at the Council on Foreign Relations. “So the proliferation of drones is not just about the protection of the United States. It’s primarily about the likelihood that other states will increasingly use lethal force outside of their borders.” LOWERING THE BAR Governments have covertly killed for ages, whether they maintained an official hit list or not. Before the Obama administration’s “disposition matrix,” Israel was among the best-known examples of a state that engaged, and continues to engage, in strikes to eliminate people identified by its intelligence as plotting attacks against it. But Israel certainly is not alone. Turkey has killed Kurds in Northern Iraq. Some American security experts point to Russia as well, although Moscow disputes this. In the 1960s, the U.S. government was involved to differing levels in plots to assassinate leaders in Congo and the Dominican Republic, and, famously, Fidel Castro in Cuba. The Church Committee’s investigation and subsequent 1975 report on those and other suspected plots led to the standing U.S. ban on assassination. So, from 1976 until the start of President George W. Bush’s “war on terror,” the United States did not conduct targeted killings, because it was considered anathema to American foreign policy. (In fact, until as late as 2001, Washington’s stated policy was to oppose Israel’s targeted killings.) When America adopted targeted killing again—first under the Bush administration after the September 11 attacks and then expanded by President Obama—the tools of the trade had changed. No longer was the CIA sending poison, pistols, and toxic cigars to assets overseas to kill enemy leaders. Now it could target people throughout al-Qaida’s hierarchy with accuracy, deliver lethal ordnance literally around the world, and watch the mission’s completion in real time. The United States is smartly using technology to improve combat efficacy, and to make war-fighting more efficient, both in money and manpower. It has been able to conduct more than 400 lethal strikes, killing more than 3,500 people, in Afghanistan, Pakistan, Yemen, Somalia, and North Africa using drones; reducing risk to U.S. personnel; and giving the Pentagon flexibility to use special-forces units elsewhere. And, no matter what human-rights groups say, it’s clear that drone use has reduced the number of civilians killed in combat relative to earlier conflicts. Washington would be foolish not to exploit unmanned aircraft in its long fight against terrorism. In fact, defense hawks and spendthrifts alike would criticize it if it did not. “If you believe that these folks are legitimate terrorists who are committing acts of aggressive, potential violent acts against the United States or our allies or our citizens overseas, should it matter how we choose to engage in the self-defense of the United States?” asked Rep. Mike Rogers, R-Mich., chairman of the House Intelligence Committee. “Do we have that debate when a special-forces team goes in? Do we have that debate if a tank round does it? Do we have the debate if an aircraft pilot drops a particular bomb?” But defense analysts argue—and military officials concede—there is a qualitative difference between dropping a team of men into Yemen and green-lighting a Predator flight from Nevada. Drones lower the threshold for military action. That’s why, according to the Council on Foreign Relations, unmanned aircraft have conducted 95 percent of all U.S. targeted killings. Almost certainly, if drones were unavailable, the United States would not have pursued an equivalent number of manned strikes in Pakistan. And what’s true for the United States will be true as well for other countries that own and arm remote piloted aircraft. “The drones—the responsiveness, the persistence, and without putting your personnel at risk—is what makes it a different technology,” Zenko said. “When other states have this technology, if they follow U.S. practice, it will lower the threshold for their uses of lethal force outside their borders. So they will be more likely to conduct targeted killings than they have in the past.” The Obama administration appears to be aware of and concerned about setting precedents through its targeted-strike program. When the development of a disposition matrix to catalog both targets and resources marshaled against the United States was first reported in 2012, officials spoke about it in part as an effort to create a standardized process that would live beyond the current administration, underscoring the long duration of the counterterrorism challenge. Indeed, the president’s legal and security advisers have put considerable effort into establishing rules to govern the program. Most members of the House and Senate Intelligence committees say they are confident the defense and intelligence communities have set an adequate evidentiary bar for determining when a member of al-Qaida or an affiliated group may be added to the target list, for example, and say that the rigor of the process gives them comfort in the level of program oversight within the executive branch. “They’re not drawing names out of a hat here,” Rogers said. “It is very specific intel-gathering and other things that would lead somebody to be subject for an engagement by the United States government.” BEHIND CLOSED DOORS The argument against public debate is easy enough to understand: Operational secrecy is necessary, and total opacity is easier. “I don’t think there is enough transparency and justification so that we remove not the secrecy, but the mystery of these things,” said Dennis Blair, Obama’s former director of national intelligence. “The reason it’s not been undertaken by the administration is that they just make a cold-blooded calculation that it’s better to hunker down and take the criticism than it is to get into the public debate, which is going to be a hard one to win.” But by keeping legal and policy positions secret, only partially sharing information even with congressional oversight committees, and declining to open a public discussion about drone use, the president and his team are asking the world to just trust that America is getting this right. While some will, many people, especially outside the United States, will see that approach as hypocritical, coming from a government that calls for transparency and the rule of law elsewhere. “I know these people, and I know how much they really, really attend to the most important details of the job,” said Barry Pavel, a former defense and security official in the Bush and Obama administrations who is director of the Brent Scowcroft Center on International Security at the Atlantic Council. “If I didn’t have that personal knowledge and because there isn’t that much really in the press, then I would be giving you a different rendering, and much more uncertain rendering.” That’s only part of the problem with the White House’s trust-us approach. The other resides in the vast distance between the criteria and authorization the administration says it uses in the combat drone program and the reality on the ground. For example, according to administration officials, before a person is added to the targeted strike list, specific criteria should be met. The target should be a 1) senior, 2) operational 3) leader of al-Qaida or an affiliated group who presents 4) an imminent threat of violent attack 5) against the United States. But that’s not who is being targeted. Setting aside the administration’s redefining of “imminence” beyond all recognition, the majority of the 3,500-plus people killed by U.S. drones worldwide were not leaders of al-Qaida or the Taliban; they were low- or mid-level foot soldiers. Most were not plotting attacks against the United States. In Yemen and North Africa, the Obama administration is deploying weaponized drones to take out targets who are more of a threat to local governments than to Washington, according to defense and regional security experts who closely track unrest in those areas. In some cases, Washington appears to be in the business of using its drone capabilities mostly to assist other countries, not to deter strikes against the United States (another precedent that might be eagerly seized upon in the future). U.S. defense and intelligence officials reject any suggestion that the targets are not legitimate. One thing they do not contest, however, is that the administration’s reliance on the post-9/11 Authorization for Use of Military Force as legal cover for a drone-strike program that has extended well beyond al-Qaida in Afghanistan or Pakistan is dodgy. The threat that the United States is trying to deal with today has an ever more tenuous connection to Sept. 11. (None of the intelligence officials reached for this article would speak on the record.) But instead of asking Congress to consider extending its authorization, as some officials have mulled, the administration’s legal counsel has chosen instead to rely on Nixon administration adviser John Stevenson’s 1970 justification of the bombing of Cambodia during the Vietnam War, an action new Secretary of State John Kerry criticized during his confirmation hearing this year. Human-rights groups might be loudest in their criticism of both the program and the opaque policy surrounding it, but even the few lawmakers who have access to the intelligence the administration shares have a hard time coping with the dearth of information. “We can’t always assume we’re going to have responsible people with whom we agree and trust in these positions,” said Sen. Angus King, I-Maine, who sits on the Senate Intelligence Committee. “The essence of the Constitution is, it shouldn’t matter who is in charge; they’re still constrained by principles and rules of the Constitution and of the Bill of Rights.” PEER PRESSURE Obama promised in his 2013 State of the Union to increase the drone program’s transparency. “In the months ahead, I will continue to engage 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,” the president said on Feb. 12. Since then, the administration, under pressure from allies on Senate Intelligence, agreed to release all of the legal memos the Justice Department drafted in support of targeted killing. But, beyond that, it’s not certain Obama will do anything more to shine light on this program. Except in situations where leaks help it tell a politically expedient story of its skill at killing bad guys, the administration has done little to make a case to the public and the world at large for its use of armed drones. Already, what’s become apparent is that the White House is not interested in changing much about the way it communicates strike policy. (It took Sen. Rand Paul’s 13-hour filibuster of CIA Director John Brennan’s nomination to force the administration to concede that it doesn’t have the right to use drones to kill noncombatant Americans on U.S. soil.) And government officials, as well as their surrogates on security issues, are actively trying to squash expectations that the administration would agree to bring the judicial branch into the oversight mix. Indeed, judicial review of any piece of the program is largely off the table now, according to intelligence officials and committee members. Under discussion within the administration and on Capitol Hill is a potential program takeover by the Pentagon, removing the CIA from its post-9/11 role of executing military-like strikes. Ostensibly, that shift could help lift the secret-by-association-with-CIA attribute of the program that some officials say has kept them from more freely talking about the legitimate military use of drones for counterterrorism operations. But such a fix would provide no guarantee of greater transparency for the public, or even Congress. And if the administration is not willing to share with lawmakers who are security-cleared to know, it certainly is not prepared to engage in a sensitive discussion, even among allies, that might begin to set the rules on use for a technology that could upend stability in already fragile and strategically significant places around the globe. Time is running out to do so. “The history of technology development like this is, you never maintain your lead very long. Somebody always gets it,” said David Berteau, director of the International Security Program at the Center for Strategic and International Studies. “They’re going to become cheaper. They’re going to become easier. They’re going to become interoperable,” he said. “The destabilizing effects are very, very serious.” Berteau is not alone. Zenko, of the Council on Foreign Relations, has urged officials to quickly establish norms. Singer, at Brookings, argues that the window of opportunity for the United States to create stability-supporting precedent is quickly closing. The problem is, the administration is not thinking far enough down the line, according to a Senate Intelligence aide. Administration officials “are thinking about the next four years, and we’re thinking about the next 40 years. And those two different angles on this question are why you see them in conflict right now.” That’s in part a symptom of the “technological optimism” that often plagues the U.S. security community when it establishes a lead over its competitors, noted Georgetown University’s Kai-Henrik Barth. After the 1945 bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the United States was sure it would be decades before the Soviets developed a nuclear-weapon capability. It took four years. With drones, the question is how long before the dozens of states with the aircraft can arm and then operate a weaponized version. “Pretty much every nation has gone down the pathway of, ‘This is science fiction; we don’t want this stuff,’ to, ‘OK, we want them, but we’ll just use them for surveillance,’ to, ‘Hmm, they’re really useful when you see the bad guy and can do something about it, so we’ll arm them,’ ” Singer said. He listed the countries that have gone that route: the United States, Britain, Italy, Germany, China. “Consistently, nations have gone down the pathway of first only surveillance and then arming.” The opportunity to write rules that might at least guide, if not restrain, the world’s view of acceptable drone use remains, not least because this is in essence a conventional arms-control issue. The international Missile Technology Control Regime attempts to restrict exports of unmanned vehicles capable of carrying weapons of mass destruction, but it is voluntary and nonbinding, and it’s under attack by the drone industry as a drag on business. Further, the technology itself, especially when coupled with data and real-time analytics, offers the luxury of time and distance that could allow officials to raise the evidentiary bar for strikes—to be closer to certain that their target is the right one. But even without raising standards, tightening up drone-specific restrictions in the standing control regime, or creating a new control agreement (which is never easy to pull off absent a bad-state actor threatening attack), just the process of lining up U.S. policy with U.S. practice would go a long way toward establishing the kind of precedent on use of this technology that America—in five, 10, or 15 years—might find helpful in arguing against another’s actions. A not-insignificant faction of U.S. defense and intelligence experts, Dennis Blair among them, thinks norms play little to no role in global security. And they have evidence in support. The missile-technology regime, for example, might be credited with slowing some program development, but it certainly has not stopped non-signatories—North Korea and Iran—from buying, building, and selling missile systems. But norms established by technology-leading countries, even when not written into legal agreements among nations, have shown success in containing the use and spread of some weapons, including land mines, blinding lasers, and nuclear bombs. Arguably more significant than spotty legal regimes, however, is the behavior of the United States. “History shows that how states adopt and use new military capabilities is often influenced by how other states have—or have not—used them in the past,” Zenko argued. Despite the legal and policy complexity of this issue, it is something the American people have, if slowly, come to care about. Given the attention that Rand Paul’s filibuster garnered, it is not inconceivable that public pressure on drone operations could force the kind of unforeseen change to U.S. policy that it did most recently on “enhanced interrogation” of terrorists. The case against open, transparent rule-making is that it might only hamstring American options while doing little good elsewhere—as if other countries aren’t closely watching this debate and taking notes for their own future policymaking. But the White House’s refusal to answer questions about its drone use with anything but “no comment” ensures that the rest of the world is free to fill in the blanks where and when it chooses. And the United States will have already surrendered the moment in which it could have provided not just a technical operations manual for other nations but a legal and moral one as well.

#### Mid-East conflict causes extinction

Russell 9 James, Senior Lecturer Department of National Security Affairs, Spring, “Strategic Stability Reconsidered: Prospects for Escalation and Nuclear War in the Middle East” Security Studies Center Proliferation Papers, http://www.analyst-network.com/articles/141/StrategicStabilityReconsideredProspectsforEscalationandNuclearWarintheMiddleEast.pdf

Strategic stability in the region is thus undermined by various factors: (1) asymmetric interests in the bargaining framework that can introduce unpredictable behavior from actors; (2) the presence of non-state actors that introduce unpredictability into relationships between the antagonists; (3) incompatible assumptions about the structure of the deterrent relationship that makes the bargaining framework strategically unstable; (4) perceptions by Israel and the United States that its window of opportunity for military action is closing, which could prompt a preventive attack; (5) the prospect that Iran’s response to pre-emptive attacks could involve unconventional weapons, which could prompt escalation by Israel and/or the United States; (6) the lack of a communications framework to build trust and cooperation among framework participants. These systemic weaknesses in the coercive bargaining framework all suggest that escalation by any the parties could happen either on purpose or as a result of miscalculation or the pressures of wartime circumstance. Given these factors, it is disturbingly easy to imagine scenarios under which a conflict could quickly escalate in which the regional antagonists would consider the use of chemical, biological, or nuclear weapons. It would be a mistake to believe the nuclear taboo can somehow magically keep nuclear weapons from being used in the context of an unstable strategic framework. Systemic asymmetries between actors in fact suggest a certain increase in the probability of war – a war in which escalation could happen quickly and from a variety of participants. Once such a war starts, events would likely develop a momentum all their own and decision-making would consequently be shaped in unpredictable ways. The international community must take this possibility seriously, and muster every tool at its disposal to prevent such an outcome, which would be an unprecedented disaster for the peoples of the region, with substantial risk for the entire world.

#### Indo-pak causes extinction

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

The greatest threat to regional security (although curiously not at the top of most lists of U.S. regional concerns) is the possibility that increased India-Pakistan tension will erupt into all-out warthat could quickly escalate into a nuclear exchange. Indeed, in just the past two decades, the two neighbors have come perilously close to war on several occasions. India and Pakistan remain the most likely belligerents in the world to engage in nuclear war. Due to an Indian preponderance of conventional forces, Pakistan would have a strong incentive to use its nuclear arsenal very early on before a routing of its military installations and weaker conventional forces. In the event of conflict, Pakistan’s only chance of survival would be the early use of its nuclear arsenal to inflict unacceptable damage to Indian military and (much more likely) civilian targets. By raising the stakes to unacceptable levels, Pakistan would hope that India would step away from the brink. However, it is equally likely that India would respond in kind, with escalation ensuing. Neither state possesses tactical nuclear weapons, but both possess scores of city-sized bombs like those used on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Furthermore, as more damage was inflicted (or as the result of a decapitating strike), command and control elements would be disabled, leaving individual commanders to respondin an environment increasingly clouded by the fog of war and decreasing the likelihood that either government (what would be left of them) would be able to guarantee that their forces would follow a negotiated settlement or phased reduction in hostilities. As a result any suchconflict would likely continue to escalateuntil one side incurred an unacceptable or wholly debilitating level of injury or exhausted its nuclear arsenal. A nuclear conflict in the subcontinentwould havedisastrous effects on the world as a whole. In a January 2010 paper published in Scientific American, climatology professors Alan Robock and Owen Brian Toon forecast the global repercussionsof a regional nuclear war. Their results are strikingly similar to those of studies conducted in 1980 that conclude that a nuclear war between the United States and the Soviet Union wouldresult in acatastrophic and prolonged nuclear winter,which could very well place the survival of the human race in jeopardy. In their study, Robock and Toon use computer models to simulate the effect of a nuclear exchange between India and Pakistan in which each were to use roughly half their existing arsenals (50 apiece). Since Indian and Pakistani nuclear devices are strategic rather than tactical, the likely targets would be major population centers. Owing to the population densities of urban centers in both nations, the number of direct casualties could climb as high as 20 million. The fallout of such an exchange would not merely be limited to the immediate area. First, the detonation of a large number of nuclear devices would propel as much as seven million metric tons of ash, soot, smoke, and debris as high as the lower stratosphere. Owing to their small size (less than a tenth of a micron) and a lack of precipitation at this altitude, ash particles would remain aloft for as long as a decade, during which time the world would remain perpetually overcast. Furthermore, these particles would soak up heat from the sun, generating intense heat in the upper atmosphere that would severely damage the earth’s ozone layer. The inability of sunlight to penetrate through the smoke and dust would lead toglobal cooling by as much as 2.3 degrees Fahrenheit. This shift in global temperature would lead to more drought, worldwide food shortages, and widespread political upheaval. Although the likelihood of this doomsday scenario remains relatively low, the consequences are dire enough to warrant greater U.S. and international attention. Furthermore, due to the ongoing conflict over Kashmir and the deep animus held between India and Pakistan, it might not take much to set them off. Indeed, following the successful U.S. raid on bin Laden’s compound, several members of India’s security apparatus along with conservative politicians have argued that India should emulate the SEAL Team Six raid and launch their own cross-border incursions to nab or kill anti-Indian terrorists, either preemptively or after the fact. Such provocative action could very well lead to all-out war between the two that couldquickly escalate.

#### 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.

#### Congressional geographic restrictions are key---prevents global war

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to turn now to the legal framework applicable to US drone strikes. Both the United States and the international community have long had rules governing armed conflicts and the use of force in national self-defense. These rules apply whether the lethal force at issue involves knives, handguns, grenades or weaponized drones. When drone technologies are used in traditional armed conflicts—on “hot battlefields” such as those in Afghanistan, Iraq or Libya, for instance – they pose no new legal issues. As Administration officials have stated, their use is subject to the same requirements as the use of other lawful means and methods of warfare.28 But if drones used in traditional armed conflicts or traditional self-defense situations present no “new” legal issues, some of the activities and policies enabled and facilitated by drone technologies pose significant challenges to existing legal frameworks. As I have discussed above, the availability of perceived low cost of drone technologies makes it far easier for the US to “expand the battlefield,” striking targets in places where it would be too dangerous or too politically controversial to send troops. Specifically, drone technologies enable the United States to strike targets deep inside foreign states, and do so quickly, efficiently and deniably. As a result, drones have become the tool of choice for so-called “targeted killing” – the deliberate targeting of an individual or group of individuals, whether known by name or targeted based on patterns of activity, inside the borders of a foreign country. **It is when drones are used in targeted killings outside of traditional or “hot” battlefields that their use challenges existing legal frameworks**. Law is almost always out of date: we make legal rules based on existing conditions and technologies, perhaps with a small nod in the direction of predicted future changes. As societies and technologies change, law increasingly becomes an exercise in jamming square pegs into round holes. Eventually, that process begins to do damage to existing law: it gets stretched out of shape, or broken. Right now, I would argue, US drone policy is on the verge of doing significant damage to the rule of law. A. The Rule of Law At root, the idea of “rule of law” is fairly simple, and well understood by Americans familiar with the foundational documents that established our nation, such as the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. The rule of law requires that governments follow transparent, clearly defined and universally applicable laws and procedures. The goal of the rule of law is to ensure predictability and stability, and to prevent the arbitrary exercise of power. In a society committed to the rule of law, the government cannot fine you, lock you up, or kill you on a whim -- it can restrict your liberty or take your property or life only in accordance with pre-established processes and rules that reflect basic notions of justice, humanity and fairness. Precisely what constitutes a fair process is debatable, but most would agree that at a minimum, fairness requires that individuals have reasonable notice of what constitutes the applicable law, reasonable notice that they are suspected of violating the law, a reasonable opportunity to rebut any allegations against them, and a reasonable opportunity to have the outcome of any procedures or actions against them reviewed by some objective person or body. These core values are enshrined both in the US Constitution and in international human rights law instruments such as the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, to which the United States is a party. In ordinary circumstances, this bundle of universally acknowledged rights (together with international law principles of sovereignty) means it is clearly unlawful for one state to target and kill an individual inside the borders of another state. Recall, for instance, the 1976 killing of Chilean dissident Orlando Letelier in Washington DC. When Chilean government intelligence operatives planted a car bomb in the car used by Letelier, killing him and a US citizen accompanying him, the United States government called this an act of murder—an unlawful political assassination. B. Targeted Killing and the Law of Armed Conflict Of course, sometimes the “ordinary” legal rules do not apply. In war, the willful killing of human beings is permitted, whether the means of killing is a gun, a bomb, or a long-distance drone strike. The law of armed conflict permits a wide range of behaviors that would be unlawful in the absence of an armed conflict. Generally speaking, the intentional destruction of private property and severe restrictions on individual liberties are impermissible in peacetime, but acceptable in wartime, for instance. Even actions that a combatant knows will cause civilian deaths are lawful when consistent with the principles of necessity, humanity, proportionality,29 and distinction.30 It is worth briefly explaining these principles. The principle of necessity requires parties to a conflict to limit their actions to those that are indispensible for securing the complete submission of the enemy as soon as possible (and that are otherwise permitted by international law). The principle of humanity forbids parties to a conflict to inflict gratuitous violence or employ methods calculated to cause unnecessary suffering. The principle of proportionality requires parties to ensure that the anticipated loss of life or property incidental to an attack is not excessive in relation to the concrete and direct military advantage expected to be gained. Finally, the principle of discrimination or distinction requires that parties to a conflict direct their actions only against combatants and military objectives, and take appropriate steps to distinguish between combatants and non-combatants.31 This is a radical oversimplification of a very complex body of law.32 But as with the rule of law, the basic idea is pretty simple. When there is no war -- when ordinary, peacetime law applies -- agents of the state aren't supposed to lock people up, take their property or kill them, unless they have jumped through a whole lot of legal hoops first. When there is an armed conflict, however, everything changes. War is not a legal free-for-all33 -- torture, rape are always crimes under the law of war, as is killing that is willful, wanton and not justified by military necessity34 -- but there are far fewer constraints on state behavior. Technically, the law of war is referred to using the Latin term “lex specialis” – special law. It is applicable in—and only in -- special circumstances (in this case, armed conflict), and in those special circumstances, it supersedes “ordinary law,” or “lex generalis,” the “general law” that prevails in peacetime. We have one set of laws for “normal” situations, and another, more flexible set of laws for “extraordinary” situations, such as armed conflicts. None of this poses any inherent problem for the rule of law. Having one body of rules that tightly restricts the use of force and another body of rules that is far more permissive does not fundamentally undermine the rule of law, as long as we have a reasonable degree of consensus on what circumstances trigger the “special” law, and as long as the “special law” doesn’t end up undermining the general law. To put it a little differently, war, with its very different rules, does not challenge ordinary law as long as war is the exception, not the norm -- as long as we can all agree on what constitutes a war -- as long as we can tell when the war begins and ends -- and as long as we all know how to tell the difference between a combatant and a civilian, and between places where there's war and places where there's no war. Let me return now to the question of drones and targeted killings. When all these distinctions I just mentioned are clear, the use of drones in targeted killings does not necessarily present any great or novel problem. In Libya, for instance, a state of armed conflict clearly existed inside the borders of Libya between Libyan government forces and NATO states. In that context, the use of drones to strike Libyan military targets is no more controversial than the use of manned aircraft. That is because our core rule of law concerns have mostly been satisfied: we know there is an armed conflict, in part because all parties to it agree that there is an armed conflict, in part because observers (such as international journalists) can easily verify the presence of uniformed military personnel engaged in using force, and in part because the violence is, from an objective perspective, widespread and sustained: it is not a mere skirmish or riot or criminal law enforcement situation that got out of control. We know who the “enemy” is: Libyan government forces. We know where the conflict is and is not: the conflict was in Libya, but not in neighboring Algeria or Egypt. We know when the conflict began, we know who authorized the use of force (the UN Security Council) and, just as crucially, we know whom to hold accountable in the event of error or abuse (the various governments involved).35 Once you take targeted killings outside hot battlefields, it’s a different story. The Obama Administration is currently using drones to strike terror suspects in Pakistan, Somalia, Yemen, and –perhaps—Mali and the Philippines as well. Defenders of the administration's increasing reliance on drone strikes in such places assert that the US is in an armed conflict with “al Qaeda and its associates,” and on that basis, they assert that the law of war is applicable -- in any place and at any time -- with regard to any person the administration deems a combatant. The trouble is, no one outside a very small group within the US executive branch has any ability to evaluate who is and who isn’t a combatant. The war against al Qaeda and its associates is not like World War II, or Libya, or even Afghanistan: it is an open-ended conflict with an inchoate, undefined adversary (who exactly are al Qaeda’s “associates”?). What is more, targeting decisions in this nebulous “war” are based largely on classified intelligence reporting. **As a result, Administration assertions** about who is a combatant and what constitutes a threat **are entirely non-falsifiable, because they're based wholly on undisclosed evidence**. Add to this still another problem: most of these strikes are considered covert action, so although the US sometimes takes public credit for the deaths of alleged terrorist leaders, most of the time, the US will not even officially acknowledge targeted killings. This leaves all the key rule-of-law questions related to the ongoing war against al Qaeda and its "associates" unanswered.36 Based on what criteria might someone be considered a combatant or directly participating in hostilities? What constitutes “hostilities” in the context of an armed conflict against a non-state actor, and what does it mean to participate in them? And just where is the war? Does the war (and thus the law of war) somehow "travel" with combatants? Does the US have a “right” to target enemy combatants anywhere on earth, or does it depend on the consent of the state at issue? Who in the United States government is authorized to make such determinations, and what is the precise chain of command for such decisions? I think the rule of law problem here is obvious: when “armed conflict” becomes a term flexible enough to be applied both to World War II and to the relations between the United States and “associates” of al Qaeda such as Somalia’s al Shabaab, the concept of armed conflict is not very useful anymore. And **when we lack clarity and consensus on how to recognize “armed conflict,” we no longer have a clear or principled basis for deciding how to categorize US** t**argeted** k**illing**s. Are they, as the US government argues, legal under the laws of war? Or are they, as some human rights groups have argued, unlawful murder? C. Targeted Killing and the International Law of Self-Defense When faced with criticisms of the law of war framework as a justification for targeted killing, Obama Administration representatives often shift tack, arguing that international law rules on national self-defense provide an alternative or additional legal justification for US targeted killings. Here, the argument is that if a person located in a foreign state poses an "imminent threat of violent attack" against the United States, the US can lawfully use force in self-defense, provided that the defensive force used is otherwise consistent with law of war principles. Like law of war-based arguments, this general principle is superficially uncontroversial: if someone overseas is about to launch a nuclear weapon at New York City, no one can doubt that the United States has a perfect right (and the president has a constitutional duty) to use force if needed to prevent that attack, regardless of the attacker's nationality. But once again, the devil is in the details. To start with, what constitutes an "imminent" threat? Traditionally, both international law and domestic criminal law understand that term narrowly: 37 to be "imminent," a threat cannot be distant or speculative.38 But much like the Bush Administration before it, the Obama Administration has put forward an interpretation of the word “imminent” that bears little relation to traditional legal concepts. According to a leaked 2011 Justice Department white paper39—the most detailed legal justification that has yet become public-- the requirement of imminence "does not require the United States to have clear evidence that a specific attack on U.S. persons and interests will take place in the immediate future." This seems, in itself, like a substantial departure from accepted international law definitions of imminence. But the White Paper goes even further, stating that "certain members of al Qaeda are continually plotting attacks...and would engage in such attacks regularly [if] they were able to do so, [and] the US government may not be aware of all... plots as they are developing and thus cannot be confident that none is about to occur." For this reason, it concludes, anyone deemed to be an operational leader of al Qaeda or its "associated forces" presents, by definition, an imminent threat even in the absence of any evidence whatsoever relating to immediate or future attack plans. In effect, the concept of "imminent threat" (part of the international law relating to self-defense) becomes conflated with identity or status (a familiar part of the law of armed conflict). That concept of imminence has been called Orwellian, and although that is an overused epithet, in this context it seems fairly appropriate. According to the Obama Administration, “imminent” no longer means “immediate,” and in fact the very absence of clear evidence indicating specific present or future attack plans becomes, paradoxically, the basis for assuming that attack may perpetually be “imminent.” The 2011 Justice Department White Paper notes that the use of force in self-defense must comply with general law of war principles of necessity, proportionality, humanity, and distinction. The White Paper offers no guidance on the specific criteria for determining when an individual is a combatant (or a civilian participating directly in hostilities), however. It also offers no guidance on how to determine if a use of force is necessary or proportionate. From a traditional international law perspective, this necessity and proportionality inquiry relates both to imminence and to the gravity of the threat itself, but so far there has been no public Administration statement as to how the administration interprets these requirements. Is any threat of "violent attack" sufficient to justify killing someone in a foreign country, including a U.S. citizen? Is every potential suicide bomber targetable, or does it depend on the gravity of the threat? Are we justified in drone strikes against targets who might, if they get a chance at some unspecified future point, place an IED that might, if successful, kill one person? Ten people? Twenty? 2,000? How grave a threat must there be to justify the use of lethal force against an American citizen abroad -- or against non-citizens, for that matter? As I have noted, it is impossible for outsiders to fully evaluate US drone strikes, since so much vital information remains classified. In most cases, we know little about the identities; activities or future plans of those targeted. Nevertheless, given the increased frequency of US targeted killings in recent years, it seems reasonable to wonder whether the Administration conducts a rigorous necessity or proportionality analysis in all cases. So far, the leaked 2011 Justice Department White Paper represents the most detailed legal analysis of targeted killings available to the public. It is worth noting, incidentally, that this White Paper addresses only the question of whether and when it is lawful for the US government to target US citizens abroad. We do not know what legal standards the Administration believes apply to the targeting of non-citizens. It seems reasonable to assume, however, that the standards applicable to non-citizens are less exacting than those the Administration views as applicable to citizens. Defenders of administration targeted killing policy acknowledge that the criteria for determining how to answer these many questions have not been made public, but insist that this should not be cause for concern. The Administration has reportedly developed a detailed “playbook” outlining the targeting criteria and procedures,40, and insiders insist that executive branch officials go through an elaborate process in which they carefully consider every possible issue before determining that a drone strike is lawful.41 No doubt they do, but this is somewhat cold comfort. Formal processes tend to further normalize once-exceptional activities -- and "trust us" is a rather shaky foundation for the rule of law. Indeed, the whole point of the rule of law is that individual lives and freedom should not depend solely on the good faith and benevolence of government officials. As with law of war arguments, stating that US targeted killings are clearly legal under traditional self-defense principles requires some significant cognitive dissonance. Law exists to restrain untrammeled power. It is no doubt possible to make a plausible legal argument justifying each and every U.S. drone strike -- but this merely suggests that we are working with a legal framework that has begun to outlive its usefulness. The real question isn't whether U.S. drone strikes are "legal." The real question is this: Do we really want to live in a world in which the U.S. government's justification for killing is so malleable? 5. Setting Troubling International Precedents **Here is an a**dditional **reason to worry** about the U.S. overreliance on drone strikes: Other states will follow America's example, and the results are not likely to be pretty. Consider once again the Letelier murder, which was an international scandal in 1976: If the Letelier assassination took place today, the Chilean authorities would presumably insist on their national right to engage in “targeted killings” of individuals deemed to pose imminent threats to Chilean national security -- and they would justify such killings using precisely the same legal theories the US currently uses to justify targeted killings in Yemen or Somalia. We should assume that governments around the world—including those with less than stellar human rights records, such as Russia and China—are taking notice. Right now, the United States has a decided technological advantage when it comes to armed drones, but that will not last long. **We should use this window to advance a robust legal** and normative **framework that will help protect against abuses by those states whose leaders can rarely be trusted**. Unfortunately, we are doing the exact opposite: Instead of articulating norms about transparency and accountability, the United States is effectively handing China, Russia, and every other repressive state a playbook for how to foment instability and –literally -- get away with murder. Take the issue of sovereignty. Sovereignty has long been a core concept of the Westphalian international legal order.42 In the international arena, all sovereign states are formally considered equal and possessed of the right to control their own internal affairs free of interference from other states. That's what we call the principle of non-intervention -- and it means, among other things, that it is generally prohibited for one state to use force inside the borders of another sovereign state. There are some well-established exceptions, but they are few in number. A state can lawfully use force inside another sovereign state with that state's invitation or consent, or when force is authorized by the U.N. Security Council, pursuant to the U.N. Charter,43 or in self-defense "in the event of an armed attack." The 2011 Justice Department White Paper asserts that targeted killings carried out by the United States don't violate another state's sovereignty as long as that state either consents or is "unwilling or unable to suppress the threat posed by the individual being targeted." That sounds superficially plausible, but since the United States views itself as the sole arbiter of whether a state is "unwilling or unable" to suppress that threat, the logic is in fact circular. It goes like this: The United States -- using its own malleable definition of "imminent" -- decides that Person X, residing in sovereign State Y, poses a threat to the United States and requires killing. Once the United States decides that Person X can be targeted, the principle of sovereignty presents no barriers, because either 1) State Y will consent to the U.S. use of force inside its borders, in which case the use of force presents no sovereignty problems or 2) State Y will not consent to the U.S. use of force inside its borders, in which case, by definition, the United States will deem State Y to be "unwilling or unable to suppress the threat" posed by Person X and the use of force again presents no problem. This is a legal theory that more or less eviscerates traditional notions of sovereignty, and has the potential to significantly destabilize the already shaky collective security regime created by the U.N. Charter.44 If the US is the sole arbiter of whether and when it can use force inside the borders of another state, any other state strong enough to get away with it is likely to claim similar prerogatives. And, of course, if the US executive branch is the sole arbiter of what constitutes an imminent threat and who constitutes a targetable enemy combatant in an ill- defined war, why shouldn’t other states make identical arguments—and use them to justify the killing of dissidents, rivals, or unwanted minorities?

#### *Scenario B – Detention*

#### The detention of al-Libi locks in the Warsame model of transfer to civilian court

NYT 10/6/13 BENJAMIN WEISER and ERIC SCHMITT, October 6, 2013, U.S. Said to Hold Qaeda Suspect on Navy Ship, http://www.nytimes.com/2013/10/07/world/africa/a-terrorism-suspect-long-known-to-prosecutors.html?\_r=0

An accused operative for Al Qaeda seized by United States commandos in Libya over the weekend is being interrogated while in military custody on a Navy ship in the Mediterranean Sea, officials said on Sunday. He is expected eventually to be sent to New York for criminal prosecution. The fugitive, known as Abu Anas al-Libi, is seen as a potential intelligence gold mine, possessing perhaps two decades of information about Al Qaeda, from its early days under Osama bin Laden in Sudan to its more scattered elements today.¶ The decision to hold Abu Anas and question him for intelligence purposes without a lawyer present follows a pattern used successfully by the Obama administration with other terrorist suspects, most prominently in the case of Ahmed Abdulkadir Warsame, a former military commander with the Somali terrorist group Shabab. Mr. Warsame was captured in 2011 by the American military in the Gulf of Aden and interrogated aboard a Navy ship for about two months without being advised of his rights or provided a lawyer.¶ After a break of several days, Mr. Warsame was advised of his rights, waived them, was questioned for about a week by law enforcement agents and was then sent to Manhattan for prosecution. “Warsame is the model for this guy,” one American security official said.

#### That will trigger a wave of litigation against military operations

Chesney 13 - Charles I. Francis Professor in Law @ Texas, BEYOND THE BATTLEFIELD, BEYOND AL QAEDA: THE DESTABILIZING LEGAL ARCHITECTURE OF COUNTERTERRORISM, Public Law and Legal Theory Research Paper No. 227, Robert M. Chesney, Also Michigan Law Review, Forthcoming in vol 112, Fall 2013.

Ultimately, the Obama administration settled on a compromise approach in Warsame’s case. On one hand, he was eventually placed on a “kill/capture” list maintained by Joint Special Operations Command (“JSOC”), and when he attempted to cross the Gulf the decision was made to attempt a capture.7 The operation came off in textbook fashion. JSOC operators were watching closely as Warsame proceeded across the Gulf on April 19th, and eventually they seized the vessel without a shot fired.8 For the next two months, moreover, Warsame languished in the brig of the USS Boxer—which happened to be on station in the region as part of an anti-piracy task force—undergoing interrogation in military custody. Before the detention became known to the public, however, and before any possibility of judicial intervention that might put the government’s claim of authority to the test in a formal manner, the administration switched gears. In a rather bold move, it transferred Warsame to civilian custody, flying him to New York City to face criminal charges. This solution rendered the question of authority academic as to Warsame, but it did not make the underlying issues disappear. On the contrary, the domestic political backlash against Warsame’s transfer to civilian custody in New York may well deter the executive branch from charting that same course, and Congress for its part might eventually act to forbid such transfers by statute in the future (for now it has forbidden such transfers only if the detainee is first held at Guantanamo). Yet the Warsame fact pattern, or something like it, is certain to arise again in the future in light of the strategic trends described below. The ultimate lesson of the Warsame scenario is not that hard questions about the authority to use military detention or lethal force in such settings can be avoided, then, but rather that they deserve sustained public attention. In the pages that follow, I explain that the second post-9/11 decade will be increasingly characterized by a kind of “shadow war,” taking place on an episodic basis in locations far removed from zones of conventional combat operations and involving opponents not readily described as members of al Qaeda as such. The legal architecture that developed to a point of seeming stability over the past decade is not well-adapted to this environment, and as time goes by—as new Warsames emerge—the gaps will become increasingly apparent and problematic. \*\*\*Part I below fleshes out my baseline claim that the status quo legal architecture reached a point of apparent stability by the close of the first post-9/11 decade. Political debates still raged, of course, and legal criticism certainly continued in the pages of law reviews and advocacy group briefs. Yet across a range of issues—including the use of military detention at Guantanamo and in Afghanistan, the use of reformed military commissions to prosecute a narrowed set of offenses, and the use of drones to carry out lethal strikes in remote areas—the most striking fact was the emergence of cross-party and cross-branch consensus. The Obama administration famously continued rather than terminated the core elements of various Bush administration counterterrorism programs (not to mention a dramatic expansion of the drone program), and three years’ worth of habeas litigation following the Supreme Court’s famous decision in Boumediene v. Bush served primarily (and quite surprisingly to many) to validate the legal foundation of the detention system. Congress, for its part, first took the lead in reviving the military commission system, and then in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 reinvigorated the 2001 Authorization for Use of Military Force, providing a fresh statutory foundation at least for detention operations. In Part II I make the case that this consensus depended in significant part upon the presence of two factors. First, throughout the first post-9/11 decade there has always been a “hot battlefield” in Afghanistan, an area involving high-intensity, large-footprint conventional combat operations as to which there is no serious dispute that the law of armed conflict (LOAC) applies. This has long provided a center of gravity for the legal debate surrounding the law of counterterrorism, ensuring that there is at least some setting in which LOAC authorities relating to detention and lethal force apply. Insofar as a given fact pattern could be linked back to Afghanistan, therefore, it has been possible to avoid thorny questions regarding the geographic scope of LOAC principles. Notably, the dozens of habeas cases of the first post-9/11 decade— which collectively have played an outsized role in the process of establishing the appearance that the law has stabilized—almost entirely involve direct links to Afghanistan (the sole exception being an al Qaeda detainee captured in the US, whose case rather tellingly produced badly splintered judicial opinions). Second, throughout the same period there also has been at least a working assumption that we can coherently identify the enemy by referring to al Qaeda and the Taliban (along with glancing-but-unelaborated references to the “associated forces” of such groups). Again, the habeas case law has played a critical role in cementing this impression of clarity. In Part III, I demonstrate that both of these stabilizing factors are rapidly eroding in the face of larger strategic trends concerning both al Qaeda and the United States. First, the United States for a host of reasons (fiscal constraints, diplomatic pressure, and a growing sense of policy futility) is accelerating its withdrawal from Afghanistan. Second, the United States simultaneously is shifting to a low-visibility “shadow war” strategy that will rely on Special Operations Forces, CIA paramilitary forces, drones operated by both, proxy forces, and quiet partnerships with foreign security services. Meanwhile, al Qaeda itself has fractured and diffused, both in pursuit of the security that comes from geographic dispersal of personnel into new regions and also in pursuit of a strategic vision that embraces decentralization in the form of relationships with quasi-independent regional organizations that may have independent origins and agendas. As a result, it grows increasingly difficult to speak coherently of “al Qaeda”; the senior leadership of the original network has been decimated, and so-called franchises with uncertain (or no) ties to that leadership not only are proliferating but are rapidly emerging as more significant threats to U.S. national security. The upshot of all this is that there soon will be no undisputed hot battlefield in existence anywhere, while the center of gravity with respect to the use of lethal force will continue to shift to locations like Yemen, Pakistan, and Somalia. Already these unorthodox scenarios are the primary focus for the use of lethal force, and they will similarly be the focus should the United States resume the practice of long-term military detention for new detainees (a distinct possibility in the event of a Romney presidency). Part III also maps the disruptive legal consequences of these strategic trends. My essential point is that the apparent stability of the post-9/11 legal architecture—the semblance that some sort of sustained institutional settlement has occurred—is an illusion. As the second post-9/11 decade progresses, policies associated with drone strikes and detention unquestionably will face increasing legal friction, casting doubt over the legality of the U.S. government use of detention and lethal force in an array of settings. In Part IV, I take up the question whether we really ought to care about all of this and, if so, what if anything can and should be done. We should care, for it will not be possible to simply ride out the increasing legal friction. The current climate of judicial passivity—reflected in the Supreme Court’s unwillingness to reengage with the Guantanamo habeas cases, the unwillingness of the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals to adjudicate habeas petitions arising out of Afghanistan, and the unwillingness of a district judge to adjudicate a suit challenging the planned use of lethal force against an American citizen —will not last. For a host of reasons, a fresh wave of detention litigation concentrating on these very issues is all but guaranteed to arise. It is not beyond the realm of possibility that the judiciary will engage as well in connection with the use of lethal force, moreover, though even if it does not its engagement on detention issues will in any event cast a long shadow over practices relating to lethal force. Bearing all this in mind, I conclude by distinguishing those elements of legal uncertainty that are simply unavoidable (given a pluralistic legal environment in which a host of relevant actors simply do not share common ground with respect to which bodies of law are applicable to these questions and what those bodies of law can fairly be said to require) and those that might usefully be addressed by statutory innovation.

#### Legal challenges are coming now---failure to get out in front of the issue crushes US security strategy---Congress is key

Anderson 9 – Prof. of Law @ American University & Research Fellow @ Hoover, Kenneth Anderson, Professor of Law, Washington College of Law, American University, and Research Fellow, The Hoover Institution, Stanford University and Member of its Task Force on National Security and the Law, 5/11/2009, Targeted Killing in U.S. Counterterrorism Strategy and Law,

http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/papers/2009/5/11%20counterterrorism%20anderson/0511\_counterterrorism\_anderson.pdf

Does this analysis offer any practical policy prescriptions for Congress and the administration? The problem is not so much a need for new legislation to create new structures or new policies. The legislative category in which many instances of targeted killing might take place in the future already exists. The task for Congress and the administration, rather, is instead to preserve a category that is likely to be put under pressure in the future and, indeed, is already seen by many as a legal non-starter under international law. Before addressing what Congress should do in this regard, we might ask from a strictly strategic political standpoint whether, given that the Obama Administration is committed to this policy anyway, whether it is politically prudent to draw public attention to the issue at all. Israeli officials might be threatened with legal action in Spain; but so far no important actor has shown an appetite for taking on the Obama Administration. Perhaps it is better to let sleeping political dogs lie. These questions require difficult political calculations. However, the sources cited above suggest that even if no one is quite prepared at this moment to take on the Obama Administration on targeted killing, the intellectual and legal pieces of the challenge are already set up and on the table. Having asserted certain positions concerning human rights law and its application and the United States having unthinkingly abandoned its self-defense rationale for its policy, the play can be made at any time—at some later time in the Obama Administration or in the next Republican administration, prying apart the “American” position to create a de facto alliance among Democrats and Europeans and thereby undermining the ability of the United States to craft a unified American security strategy. 101 The United States would be best served if the Obama Administration did that exceedingly rare thing in international law and diplomacy: Getting the United States out in front of the issue by making plain the American position, rather than merely reacting in surprise when its sovereign prerogatives are challenged by the international soft-law community.

#### Risks prosecution of key US personnel

McNeal 13, Associate Professor of Law, Pepperdine University, 3/5/13, “Targeted Killing and Accountability,” <http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1819583>, Gregory McNeal

While no American has been prosecuted for participating in drone strikes, the specter of criminal prosecution remains present. For example, a member of the military might be prosecuted pursuant to the UCMJ, while CIA personnel may face trial in a civilian court. “Incidents in Iraq and Afghanistan involving members of the armed forces and private contractors illustrate how this can occur from time to time, as individuals are prosecuted for allegedly killing civilians or prisoners.”434 Title 18 of the U.S. code, at section 2441, establishes jurisdiction over war crimes committed by or against members of the U.S. armed forces or U.S. nationals.435 War crimes are defined as any conduct: (1) defined as a grave breach in any of the international conventions signed at Geneva 12 August 1949, or any protocol to such convention to which the United States is a party; (2) prohibited by Article 23, 25, 27, or 28 of the Annex to the Hague Convention IV, Respecting the Laws and Customs of War on Land, signed 18 October 1907; (3) which constitutes a violation of common Article 3 of the international conventions signed at Geneva, 12 August 1949, or any protocol to such convention to which the United States is a party and which deals with non-international armed conflict; or (4) of a person who, in relation to an armed conflict and contrary to the provisions of the Protocol on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Mines, Booby-Traps and Other Devices as amended at Geneva on 3 May 1996 (Protocol II as amended on 3 May 1996), when the United States is a party to such Protocol, willfully kills or causes serious injury to civilians.436 Thus, Title 18 references and incorporates various aspects of international humanitarian law into domestic law and makes violations of those laws a violation of U.S. criminal law. Similarly, the UCMJ in Article 18 allows for the exercise of jurisdiction over “any person who by the law of war is subject to trial by a military tribunal.”437 Other sources of authority for prosecuting citizens involved in wrongful targeting decisions may include the punitive articles of the UCMJ (such as Article 118 regarding murder). The CIA is not exempt from these prohibitions, as Agency personnel are under an obligation to report any criminal or administrative wrongdoing to the CIA inspector general’s office.438 That office is obligated to refer certain cases to the Department of Justice for prosecution.439 Furthermore, because CIA personnel do not enjoy combatant immunity, they could be prosecuted in the criminal courts of other nation states for their involvement in targeted killing operations.440

#### Even if lawsuits are lost, that crushes special operations

Jack Goldsmith 12, Harvard Law School Professor, focus on national security law, presidential power, cybersecurity, and conflict of laws, Former Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legal Counsel, and Special Counsel to the Department of Defense, Hoover Institution Task Force on National Security and Law, March, Power and Constraint, P. 199-201

For the GTMO Bar and its cousin NGOs and activists, however, the al-Aulaqi lawsuit, like other lawsuits on different issues, was merely an early battle in a long war over the legitimacy of U.S. targeting practices—a war that will take place not just in the United States, but in other countries as well. When the CCR failed to achieve what it viewed as adequate accountability for Bush administration officials in the United States in connection with interrogation and detention practices, it started pursuing, and continues to pursue, lawsuits and prosecutions against U.S. officials in Spain, Germany, and other European countries. "You look for every niche you can when you can take on the issues that you think are important," said Michael Ratner, explaining the CCR's strategy for pursuing lawsuits in Europe.¶ Clive Stafford Smith, a former CCR attorney who was instrumental in its early GTMO victories and who now leads the British advocacy organization Reprieve, is using this strategy in the targeted killing context. "There are endless ways in which the courts in Britain, the courts in America, the international Pakistani courts can get involved" in scrutinizing U.S. targeting killing practices, he argues. "It's going to be the next 'Guantanamo Bay' issue."' Working in a global network of NGO activists, Stafford Smith has begun a process in Pakistan to seek the arrest of former CIA lawyer John Rizzo in connection with drone strikes in Pakistan, and he is planning more lawsuits in the United States and elsewhere against drone operators." "The crucial court here is the court of public opinion," he said, explaining why the lawsuits are important even if he loses. His efforts are backed by a growing web of proclamations in the United Nations, foreign capitals, the press, and the academy that U.S. drone practices are unlawful. What American University law professor Ken Anderson has described as the "international legal-media-academic-NGO-international organization-global opinion complex" is hard at work to stigmatize drones and those who support and operate them."¶ This strategy is having an impact. The slew of lawsuits in the United States and threatened prosecutions in Europe against Bush administration officials imposes reputational, emotional, and financial costs on them that help to promote the human rights groups' ideological goals, even if courts never actually rule against the officials. By design, these suits also give pause to current officials who are considering controversial actions for fear that the same thing might later happen to them. This effect is starting to be felt with drones. Several Obama administration officials have told me that they worry targeted killings will be seen in the future (as Stafford Smith predicts) as their administration's GTMO. The attempted judicial action against Rizzo, the earlier lawsuits against top CIA officials in Pakistan and elsewhere, and the louder and louder proclamations of illegality around the world all of which have gained momentum after al-Aulaqi's killing—are also having an impact. These actions are rallying cries for protest and political pushback in the countries where the drone strikes take place. And they lead CIA operators to worry about legal exposure before becoming involved in the Agency's drone program." We don't know yet whether these forces have affected actual targeting practices and related tactics. But they induce the officials involved to take more caution. And it is only a matter of time, if it has not happened already, before they lead the U.S. government to forgo lawful targeted killing actions otherwise deemed to be in the interest of U.S. national security.

#### JSOC/CIA conflation means prosecution threat ends SOF effectiveness

Thorsten Wetzling 11, non-resident fellow at the Center for Transatlantic Relations at the Paul H. Nitze School of Advanced International Studies (SAIS), PhD in Political Science, “What role for what rule of law in EU-US counterterrorism cooperation?”, <http://transatlantic.sais-jhu.edu/publications/articles/Chapter1_EUISS_ChaillotPaper127_WETZLING.pdf>

While President Obama deserves credit for having abolished the most controversial counterterrorism practice to date (i.e. the ‘enhanced interrogation techniques’ and the extraordinary rendition of terrorist suspects to secret and indeﬁnite detention), his administration currently relies heavily on two practices that also bode rather poorly for the rule of law: capture-or-kill raids and drone strikes against suspected terrorists by poorly overseen CIA and JSOC operatives in various hotspots around the globe. ¶ ‘The individuals targeted are alleged terrorists or others deemed dangerous, and their inclusion on what are known as kill-or-capture lists is based on undisclosed intelligence applied against secretive criteria.’44 This practice45 raises severe doubts on the US’s ‘full respect for our obligations under applicable [...] domestic constitutional law’.46 Philip Alston argues convincingly that the convergence of the CIA (intelligence) and JSOC (military) activities in these raids clearly undermines the effectiveness of the two separate oversight regimes for ‘traditional military activities’ (Title 10 US Code) and covert intelligence activities (Title 50 US code) in the US constitution. The ‘extensive ﬂuidity between the JSOC (DOD) special forces and their CIA counterparts’ makes it ‘virtually impossible for anyone outside the two agencies to know who is in fact responsible in any given context.’47 While there is no room here to spell out the separate oversight regimes for the military and the intelligence services, it should be noted, however, that this intentional double-hatting of CIA and JSOC forces creates de facto accountability gaps. These activities often ‘escape the scrutiny of the intelligence committees, and the congressional defense committees cannot be expected to exercise oversight outside of their jurisdiction’.48

#### SOF key to counter A2/AD capabilities globally---key to effective power projection and U.S. defense alliances

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

The spread of advanced military technologies, such as precision-guided munitions, is enabling a number of countries to construct A2/AD networks that could erode the United States’ ability to project military power into key regions. Nations such as China and Iran are actively seeking to acquire and field A2/AD capabilities, including precision-guided ballistic and cruise missiles, attack submarines, fast-attack craft, anti-satellite (ASAT) weapons, computer-network attack capabilities, advanced fighter aircraft, and integrated air defenses, that may challenge the U.S. military’s ability to project power. The cumulative effect of spreading A2/ AD systems is that the land, air, sea, space, and cyberspace domains will be far less permissive for U.S. military operations. In the face of growing A2/AD threats, the value of low-signature forces capable of operating independently and far forward in denied areas is likely to increase substantially. SOF may offer the most viable ground-force option in future A2/AD environments, either executing direct action against key targets or working by, with, and through partner forces to conduct peripheral campaigns (i.e., operations designed to impose costs and conducted beyond the territory or reach of the enemy). Prior to hostilities, SOF could carry out preparation of the environment (PE) and special reconnaissance (SR) missions. At the outset of hostilities, SOF might serve as an early-entry force to blind or disrupt enemy command, control, communications, computers, intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (C4ISR) networks, thereby enabling higher-signature conventional forces to penetrate A2/AD networks. Inserting or extracting SOF from denied environments, and supporting them once there, will challenge SOF aviation and undersea capabilities. Accordingly, SOF will need stealthy means of insertion from the air and sea. SOF may also need to conduct foreign external defense (FED) missions in states to build their capacity to repel foreign military aggression. This could entail helping key partners to create their own versions of A2/AD networks.¶ The proliferation of WMD and A2/AD capabilities will erode the conventional power-projection capability of not only the United States, but of other countries as well. In the future, states may therefore avoid direct confrontations and be more inclined to use unconventional methods and measures short of war to gain influence and achieve their foreign policy goals. States may also turn to third-party proxies to maintain plausible deniability for their actions. States could engage in influence campaigns and proxy competitions to achieve objectives such as: imposing costs on major competitors, foreclosing opportunities for other countries or non-state actors to gain a foothold in a region, “peeling away” allies or partners from competitors, diverting the attention and resources of competitors (misdirection), conducting cross-border operations against a major power with less risk of confrontation, or controlling (or denying) critical resources and trade routes. SOF will be critical to success in persistent influence campaigns and pro􀁛y competitions. They will need exquisite, local-area expertise and language skills, along with deep, longstanding relationships with key local actors built over time by embedding and living with foreign partner forces. Though SOF already operate in smaller units than GPF, the breadth, specificity, and need to minimize the visibility of these operations will place an emphasis on even smaller SOF teams and single operators working in close collaboration with other government agencies. These four security challenges􀂲coming to the fore during a time of 􀂿scal austerity in the United States and global economic uncertainty􀂲are likely to dominate the national security agenda for decades to come. These challenges are not mutually e􀁛clusive and, in almost every case, the challenges are intertwined with opportunities for SOF to impose costs on U.S. adversaries. Given their global nature, and recognizing the interrelationship between the various challenges and opportunities, SOF are uniquely suited to address them asymmetrically.

#### Solves a laundry list of nuclear conflicts

Mackenzie Eaglen 11, research fellow for national security – Heritage, and Bryan McGrath, former naval officer and director – Delex Consulting, Studies and Analysis, “Thinking About a Day Without Sea Power: Implications for U.S. Defense Policy,” Heritage Foundation

Global Implications. Under a scenario of dramatically reduced naval power, the United States would cease to be active in any international alliances. While it is reasonable to assume that land and air forces would be similarly reduced in this scenario, the lack of credible maritime capability to move their bulk and establish forward bases would render these forces irrelevant, even if the Army and Air Force were retained at today’s levels. In Iraq and Afghanistan today, 90 percent of material arrives by sea, although material bound for Afghanistan must then make a laborious journey by land into theater. China’s claims on the South China Sea, previously disputed by virtually all nations in the region and routinely contested by U.S. and partner naval forces, are accepted as a fait accompli, effectively turning the region into a “Chinese lake.” China establishes expansive oil and gas exploration with new deepwater drilling technology and secures its local sea lanes from intervention. Korea, unified in 2017 after the implosion of the North, signs a mutual defense treaty with China and solidifies their relationship. Japan is increasingly isolated and in 2020–2025 executes long-rumored plans to create an indigenous nuclear weapons capability.[11] By 2025, Japan has 25 mobile nuclear-armed missiles ostensibly targeting China, toward which Japan’s historical animus remains strong. China’s entente with Russia leaves the Eurasian landmass dominated by Russia looking west and China looking east and south. Each cedes a sphere of dominance to the other and remains largely unconcerned with the events in the other’s sphere. Worldwide, trade in foodstuffs collapses. Expanding populations in the Middle East increase pressure on their governments, which are already stressed as the breakdown in world trade disproportionately affects food importers. Piracy increases worldwide, driving food transportation costs even higher. In the Arctic, Russia aggressively asserts its dominance and effectively shoulders out other nations with legitimate claims to seabed resources. No naval power exists to counter Russia’s claims. India, recognizing that its previous role as a balancer to China has lost relevance with the retrenchment of the Americans, agrees to supplement Chinese naval power in the Indian Ocean and Persian Gulf to protect the flow of oil to Southeast Asia. In exchange, China agrees to exercise increased influence on its client state Pakistan. The great typhoon of 2023 strikes Bangladesh, killing 23,000 people initially, and 200,000 more die in the subsequent weeks and months as the international community provides little humanitarian relief. Cholera and malaria are epidemic. Iran dominates the Persian Gulf and is a nuclear power. Its navy aggressively patrols the Gulf while the Revolutionary Guard Navy harasses shipping and oil infrastructure to force Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) countries into Tehran’s orbit. Russia supplies Iran with a steady flow of military technology and nuclear industry expertise. Lacking a regional threat, the Iranians happily control the flow of oil from the Gulf and benefit economically from the “protection” provided to other GCC nations. In Egypt, the decade-long experiment in participatory democracy ends with the ascendance of the Muslim Brotherhood in a violent seizure of power. The United States is identified closely with the previous coalition government, and riots break out at the U.S. embassy. Americans in Egypt are left to their own devices because the U.S. has no forces in the Mediterranean capable of performing a noncombatant evacuation when the government closes major airports. Led by Iran, a coalition of Egypt, Syria, Jordan, and Iraq attacks Israel. Over 300,000 die in six months of fighting that includes a limited nuclear exchange between Iran and Israel. Israel is defeated, and the State of Palestine is declared in its place. Massive “refugee” camps are created to house the internally displaced Israelis, but a humanitarian nightmare ensues from the inability of conquering forces to support them. The NATO alliance is shattered. The security of European nations depends increasingly on the lack of external threats and the nuclear capability of France, Britain, and Germany, which overcame its reticence to military capability in light of America’s retrenchment. Europe depends for its energy security on Russia and Iran, which control the main supply lines and sources of oil and gas to Europe. Major European nations stand down their militaries and instead make limited contributions to a new EU military constabulary force. No European nation maintains the ability to conduct significant out-of-area operations, and Europe as a whole maintains little airlift capacity. Implications for America’s Economy. If the United States slashed its Navy and ended its mission as a guarantor of the free flow of transoceanic goods and trade, globalized world trade would decrease substantially. As early as 1890, noted U.S. naval officer and historian Alfred Thayer Mahan described the world’s oceans as a “great highway…a wide common,” underscoring the long-running importance of the seas to trade.[12] Geographically organized trading blocs develop as the maritime highways suffer from insecurity and rising fuel prices. Asia prospers thanks to internal trade and Middle Eastern oil, Europe muddles along on the largesse of Russia and Iran, and the Western Hemisphere declines to a “new normal” with the exception of energy-independent Brazil. For America, Venezuelan oil grows in importance as other supplies decline. Mexico runs out of oil—as predicted—when it fails to take advantage of Western oil technology and investment. Nigerian output, which for five years had been secured through a partnership of the U.S. Navy and Nigerian maritime forces, is decimated by the bloody civil war of 2021. Canadian exports, which a decade earlier had been strong as a result of the oil shale industry, decline as a result of environmental concerns in Canada and elsewhere about the “fracking” (hydraulic fracturing) process used to free oil from shale. State and non-state actors increase the hazards to seaborne shipping, which are compounded by the necessity of traversing key chokepoints that are easily targeted by those who wish to restrict trade. These chokepoints include the Strait of Hormuz, which Iran could quickly close to trade if it wishes. More than half of the world’s oil is transported by sea. “From 1970 to 2006, the amount of goods transported via the oceans of the world…increased from 2.6 billion tons to 7.4 billion tons, an increase of over 284%.”[13] In 2010, “$40 billion dollars [sic] worth of oil passes through the world’s geographic ‘chokepoints’ on a daily basis…not to mention $3.2 trillion…annually in commerce that moves underwater on transoceanic cables.”[14] These quantities of goods simply cannot be moved by any other means. Thus, a reduction of sea trade reduces overall international trade. U.S. consumers face a greatly diminished selection of goods because domestic production largely disappeared in the decades before the global depression. As countries increasingly focus on regional rather than global trade, costs rise and Americans are forced to accept a much lower standard of living. Some domestic manufacturing improves, but at significant cost. In addition, shippers avoid U.S. ports due to the onerous container inspection regime implemented after investigators discover that the second dirty bomb was smuggled into the U.S. in a shipping container on an innocuous Panamanian-flagged freighter. As a result, American consumers bear higher shipping costs. The market also constrains the variety of goods available to the U.S. consumer and increases their cost. A Congressional Budget Office (CBO) report makes this abundantly clear. A one-week shutdown of the Los Angeles and Long Beach ports would lead to production losses of $65 million to $150 million (in 2006 dollars) per day. A three-year closure would cost $45 billion to $70 billion per year ($125 million to $200 million per day). Perhaps even more shocking, the simulation estimated that employment would shrink by approximately 1 million jobs.[15] These estimates demonstrate the effects of closing only the Los Angeles and Long Beach ports. On a national scale, such a shutdown would be catastrophic. The Government Accountability Office notes that: [O]ver 95 percent of U.S. international trade is transported by water[;] thus, the safety and economic security of the United States depends in large part on the secure use of the world’s seaports and waterways. A successful attack on a major seaport could potentially result in a dramatic slowdown in the international supply chain with impacts in the billions of dollars.[16]

### 1AC – Allied Coop

#### CONTENTION 2: ALLIES

**Allies will insist on a policy that limits operations to zones of active hostilities with criminal prosecutions elsewhere---codification 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, 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---makes criminal justice effective outside zones**

**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.

**Plan prevents end of allied intel cooperation and reinvigorates NATO and EU relations**

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**.

#### NATO prevents global nuclear war

Zbigniew Brzezinski 9, 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.

#### CT violations spill over to end EU relations

Thorsten Wetzling 11, non-resident fellow at the Center for Transatlantic Relations at the Paul H. Nitze School of Advanced International Studies (SAIS), PhD in Political Science, “What role for what rule of law in EU-US counterterrorism cooperation?”, <http://transatlantic.sais-jhu.edu/publications/articles/Chapter1_EUISS_ChaillotPaper127_WETZLING.pdf>

Having said this, it is instructive to recall David Cole’s observation that ‘the rule of law may be tenacious when it is supported, but violations of it that go unaccounted corrode its very foundation’.17 Thus, while a more balanced depiction of ‘compatible’ and ‘incompatible’ counterterrorism practices may be required to substantiate broader claims, it is also true that a few severely misguided counterterrorism practices sufﬁce to discredit the ever-present promise of ‘full respect for our obligations under applicable international and domestic constitutional law’.18 In the light of the potentially contagious effect of individual rule-of-law deviations on the entire collaborative effort, the actual percentage of incompatible practices among the grand total of transatlantic counterterrorism activities appears secondary.

#### EU relations are at a key turning point---cementing strategic partnership prevents extinction

Dr. Yannis A. Stivachtis 10, Director, International Studies Program, Virginia Polytechnic Institute & State University, “THE IMPERATIVE FOR TRANSATLANTIC COOPERATION,” online: http://www.rieas.gr/research-areas/global-issues/transatlantic-studies/78.html

There is no doubt that US-European relations are in a period of transition, and that the stresses and strains of globalization are increasing both the number and the seriousness of the challenges that confront transatlantic relations. ¶ The events of 9/11 and the Iraq War have added significantly to these stresses and strains. At the same time, international terrorism, the nuclearization of North Korea and especially Iran, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMD), the transformation of Russia into a stable and cooperative member of the international community, the growing power of China, the political and economic transformation and integration of the Caucasian and Central Asian states, the integration and stabilization of the Balkan countries, the promotion of peace and stability in the Middle East, poverty, climate change, AIDS and other emergent problems and situations require further cooperation among countries at the regional, global and institutional levels. ¶ Therefore, cooperation between the U.S. and Europe is more imperative than ever to deal effectively with these problems. It is fair to say that the challenges of crafting a new relationship between the U.S. and the EU as well as between the U.S. and NATO are more regional than global, but the implications of success or failure will be global. ¶ The transatlantic relationship is still in crisis, despite efforts to improve it since the Iraq War. This is not to say that differences between the two sides of the Atlantic did not exist before the war. Actually, post-1945 relations between Europe and the U.S. were fraught with disagreements and never free of crisis since the Suez crisis of 1956. Moreover, despite trans-Atlantic proclamations of solidarity in the aftermath of 9/11, the U.S. and Europe parted ways on issues from global warming and biotechnology to peacekeeping and national missile defense. ¶ Questions such as, the future role of NATO and its relationship to the common European Security and Defense policy (ESDP), or what constitutes terrorism and what the rights of captured suspected terrorists are, have been added to the list of US-European disagreements. ¶ There are two reasons for concern regarding the transatlantic rift. First, if European leaders conclude that Europe must become counterweight to the U.S., rather than a partner, it will be difficult to engage in the kind of open search for a common ground than an elective partnership requires. Second, there is a risk that public opinion in both the U.S. and Europe will make it difficult even for leaders who want to forge a new relationship to make the necessary accommodations.¶ If both sides would actively work to heal the breach, a new opportunity could be created. A vibrant transatlantic partnership remains a real possibility, but only if both sides make the necessary political commitment.

#### Extinction

Quammen 12 David, award-winning science writer, long-time columnist for Outside magazine for fifteen years, with work in National Geographic, Harper's, Rolling Stone, the New York Times Book Review and other periodicals, 9/29, “Could the next big animal-to-human disease wipe us out?,” The Guardian, pg. 29, Lexis

Infectious disease is all around us. It's one of the basic processes that ecologists study, along with predation and competition. Predators are big beasts that eat their prey from outside. Pathogens (disease-causing agents, such as viruses) are small beasts that eat their prey from within. Although infectious disease can seem grisly and dreadful, under ordinary conditions, it's every bit as natural as what lions do to wildebeests and zebras. But conditions aren't always ordinary. Just as predators have their accustomed prey, so do pathogens. And just as a lion might occasionally depart from its normal behaviour - to kill a cow instead of a wildebeest, or a human instead of a zebra - so a pathogen can shift to a new target. Aberrations occur. When a pathogen leaps from an animal into a person, and succeeds in establishing itself as an infectious presence, sometimes causing illness or death, the result is a zoonosis. It's a mildly technical term, zoonosis, unfamiliar to most people, but it helps clarify the biological complexities behind the ominous headlines about swine flu, bird flu, Sars, emerging diseases in general, and the threat of a global pandemic. It's a word of the future, destined for heavy use in the 21st century. Ebola and Marburg are zoonoses. So is bubonic plague. So was the so-called Spanish influenza of 1918-1919, which had its source in a wild aquatic bird and emerged to kill as many as 50 million people. All of the human influenzas are zoonoses. As are monkeypox, bovine tuberculosis, Lyme disease, West Nile fever, rabies and a strange new affliction called Nipah encephalitis, which has killed pigs and pig farmers in Malaysia. Each of these zoonoses reflects the action of a pathogen that can "spillover", crossing into people from other animals. Aids is a disease of zoonotic origin caused by a virus that, having reached humans through a few accidental events in western and central Africa, now passes human-to-human. This form of interspecies leap is not rare; about 60% of all human infectious diseases currently known either cross routinely or have recently crossed between other animals and us. Some of those - notably rabies - are familiar, widespread and still horrendously lethal, killing humans by the thousands despite centuries of efforts at coping with their effects. Others are new and inexplicably sporadic, claiming a few victims or a few hundred, and then disappearing for years. Zoonotic pathogens can hide. The least conspicuous strategy is to lurk within what's called a reservoir host: a living organism that carries the pathogen while suffering little or no illness. When a disease seems to disappear between outbreaks, it's often still lingering nearby, within some reservoir host. A rodent? A bird? A butterfly? A bat? To reside undetected is probably easiest wherever biological diversity is high and the ecosystem is relatively undisturbed. The converse is also true: ecological disturbance causes diseases to emerge. Shake a tree and things fall out. Michelle Barnes is an energetic, late 40s-ish woman, an avid rock climber and cyclist. Her auburn hair, she told me cheerily, came from a bottle. It approximates the original colour, but the original is gone. In 2008, her hair started falling out; the rest went grey "pretty much overnight". This was among the lesser effects of a mystery illness that had nearly killed her during January that year, just after she'd returned from Uganda. Her story paralleled the one Jaap Taal had told me about Astrid, with several key differences - the main one being that Michelle Barnes was still alive. Michelle and her husband, Rick Taylor, had wanted to see mountain gorillas, too. Their guide had taken them through Maramagambo Forest and into Python Cave. They, too, had to clamber across those slippery boulders. As a rock climber, Barnes said, she tends to be very conscious of where she places her hands. No, she didn't touch any guano. No, she was not bumped by a bat. By late afternoon they were back, watching the sunset. It was Christmas evening 2007. They arrived home on New Year's Day. On 4 January, Barnes woke up feeling as if someone had driven a needle into her skull. She was achy all over, feverish. "And then, as the day went on, I started developing a rash across my stomach." The rash spread. "Over the next 48 hours, I just went down really fast." By the time Barnes turned up at a hospital in suburban Denver, she was dehydrated; her white blood count was imperceptible; her kidneys and liver had begun shutting down. An infectious disease specialist, Dr Norman K Fujita, arranged for her to be tested for a range of infections that might be contracted in Africa. All came back negative, including the test for Marburg. Gradually her body regained strength and her organs began to recover. After 12 days, she left hospital, still weak and anaemic, still undiagnosed. In March she saw Fujita on a follow-up visit and he had her serum tested again for Marburg. Again, negative. Three more months passed, and Barnes, now grey-haired, lacking her old energy, suffering abdominal pain, unable to focus, got an email from a journalist she and Taylor had met on the Uganda trip, who had just seen a news article. In the Netherlands, a woman had died of Marburg after a Ugandan holiday during which she had visited a cave full of bats. Barnes spent the next 24 hours Googling every article on the case she could find. Early the following Monday morning, she was back at Dr Fujita's door. He agreed to test her a third time for Marburg. This time a lab technician crosschecked the third sample, and then the first sample. The new results went to Fujita, who called Barnes: "You're now an honorary infectious disease doctor. You've self-diagnosed, and the Marburg test came back positive." The Marburg virus had reappeared in Uganda in 2007. It was a small outbreak, affecting four miners, one of whom died, working at a site called Kitaka Cave. But Joosten's death, and Barnes's diagnosis, implied a change in the potential scope of the situation. That local Ugandans were dying of Marburg was a severe concern - sufficient to bring a response team of scientists in haste. But if tourists, too, were involved, tripping in and out of some python-infested Marburg repository, unprotected, and then boarding their return flights to other continents, the place was not just a peril for Ugandan miners and their families. It was also an international threat. The first team of scientists had collected about 800 bats from Kitaka Cave for dissecting and sampling, and marked and released more than 1,000, using beaded collars coded with a number. That team, including scientist Brian Amman, had found live Marburg virus in five bats. Entering Python Cave after Joosten's death, another team of scientists, again including Amman, came across one of the beaded collars they had placed on captured bats three months earlier and 30 miles away. "It confirmed my suspicions that these bats are moving," Amman said - and moving not only through the forest but from one roosting site to another. Travel of individual bats between far-flung roosts implied circumstances whereby Marburg virus might ultimately be transmitted all across Africa, from one bat encampment to another. It voided the comforting assumption that this virus is strictly localised. And it highlighted the complementary question: why don't outbreaks of Marburg virus disease happen more often? Marburg is only one instance to which that question applies. Why not more Ebola? Why not more Sars? In the case of Sars, the scenario could have been very much worse. Apart from the 2003 outbreak and the aftershock cases in early 2004, it hasn't recurred. . . so far. Eight thousand cases are relatively few for such an explosive infection; 774 people died, not 7 million. Several factors contributed to limiting the scope and impact of the outbreak, of which humanity's good luck was only one. Another was the speed and excellence of the laboratory diagnostics - finding the virus and identifying it. Still another was the brisk efficiency with which cases were isolated, contacts were traced and quarantine measures were instituted, first in southern China, then in Hong Kong, Singapore, Hanoi and Toronto. If the virus had arrived in a different sort of big city - more loosely governed, full of poor people, lacking first-rate medical institutions - it might have burned through a much larger segment of humanity. One further factor, possibly the most crucial, was inherent in the way Sars affects the human body: symptoms tend to appear in a person before, rather than after, that person becomes highly infectious. That allowed many Sars cases to be recognised, hospitalised and placed in isolation before they hit their peak of infectivity. With influenza and many other diseases, the order is reversed. That probably helped account for the scale of worldwide misery and death during the 1918-1919 influenza. And that infamous global pandemic occurred in the era before globalisation. Everything nowadays moves around the planet faster, including viruses. When the Next Big One comes, it will likely conform to the same perverse pattern as the 1918 influenza: high infectivity preceding notable symptoms. That will help it move through cities and airports like an angel of death. The Next Big One is a subject that disease scientists around the world often address. The most recent big one is Aids, of which the eventual total bigness cannot even be predicted - about 30 million deaths, 34 million living people infected, and with no end in sight. Fortunately, not every virus goes airborne from one host to another. If HIV-1 could, you and I might already be dead. If the rabies virus could, it would be the most horrific pathogen on the planet. The influenzas are well adapted for airborne transmission, which is why a new strain can circle the world within days. The Sars virus travels this route, too, or anyway by the respiratory droplets of sneezes and coughs - hanging in the air of a hotel corridor, moving through the cabin of an aeroplane - and that capacity, combined with its case fatality rate of almost 10%, is what made it so scary in 2003 to the people who understood it best. Human-to-human transmission is the crux. That capacity is what separates a bizarre, awful, localised, intermittent and mysterious disease (such as Ebola) from a global pandemic. Have you noticed the persistent, low-level buzz about avian influenza, the strain known as H5N1, among disease experts over the past 15 years? That's because avian flu worries them deeply, though it hasn't caused many human fatalities. Swine flu comes and goes periodically in the human population (as it came and went during 2009), sometimes causing a bad pandemic and sometimes (as in 2009) not so bad as expected; but avian flu resides in a different category of menacing possibility. It worries the flu scientists because they know that H5N1 influenza is extremely virulent in people, with a high lethality. As yet, there have been a relatively low number of cases, and it is poorly transmissible, so far, from human to human. It'll kill you if you catch it, very likely, but you're unlikely to catch it except by butchering an infected chicken. But if H5N1 mutates or reassembles itself in just the right way, if it adapts for human-to-human transmission, it could become the biggest and fastest killer disease since 1918. It got to Egypt in 2006 and has been especially problematic for that country. As of August 2011, there were 151 confirmed cases, of which 52 were fatal. That represents more than a quarter of all the world's known human cases of bird flu since H5N1 emerged in 1997. But here's a critical fact: those unfortunate Egyptian patients all seem to have acquired the virus directly from birds. This indicates that the virus hasn't yet found an efficient way to pass from one person to another. Two aspects of the situation are dangerous, according to biologist Robert Webster. The first is that Egypt, given its recent political upheavals, may be unable to staunch an outbreak of transmissible avian flu, if one occurs. His second concern is shared by influenza researchers and public health officials around the globe: with all that mutating, with all that contact between people and their infected birds, the virus could hit upon a genetic configuration making it highly transmissible among people. "As long as H5N1 is out there in the world," Webster told me, "there is the possibility of disaster. . . There is the theoretical possibility that it can acquire the ability to transmit human-to-human." He paused. "And then God help us." We're unique in the history of mammals. No other primate has ever weighed upon the planet to anything like the degree we do. In ecological terms, we are almost paradoxical: large-bodied and long-lived but grotesquely abundant. We are an outbreak. And here's the thing about outbreaks: they **end**. In some cases they end after many years, in others they end rather soon. In some cases they end gradually, in others they end with a crash. In certain cases, they end and recur and end again. Populations of tent caterpillars, for example, seem to rise steeply and fall sharply on a cycle of anywhere from five to 11 years. The crash endings are dramatic, and for a long while they seemed mysterious. What could account for such sudden and recurrent collapses? One possible factor is infectious disease, and viruses in particular.

### 1AC – NEW PLAN

#### The United States Federal Government should restrict the President's war powers authority by

#### - limiting authority for targeted killing and detention without charge in zones of active hostilities to declared areas;

#### - limiting authority for targeted killing and detention without charge outside zones of active hostilities to operations guided by an individualized threat requirement and with procedural safeguards; and

#### - statutory codification of executive branch review policy for these practices.

### 1AC – Solvency

#### CONTENTION 3: SOLVENCY

**Plan’s key to codify existing policy into law---prevents expansive executive targeted killings and indefinite detention**

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**.

**Congressional codification sets a precedent and the prevents the erosion of rule of law**

**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**.

#### The aff solves --- a zone approach is the perfect middle ground that resolves their downsides like circumvention and safe-havens

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

II. A New Approach: Zones of Active Hostilities and Beyond¶ The current debate has resulted in a stalemate, with neither side adequately addressing the legitimate concerns of the other. The notion of an on-off switch, in which the state's ability to go after the enemy is restricted to limited territorial regions, ignores the geographically unbounded nature of a conflict with a transnational non-state actor. Conversely, the notion of an unbounded conflict raises legitimate concerns about the use of force as a first resort and the erosion of peacetime norms in areas far from any recognized "hot" battlefield. What is needed is a new framework of domestic and international law that better balances the multiple security and liberty interests at stake.¶ This Article offers such a framework - one that recognizes the broad scope of the conflict, but distinguishes between zones of active hostilities and elsewhere in setting the procedural and substantive standards for detention and targeting. This framework, which I call the zone approach, accommodates the state's key security interests while also protecting against the erosion of peacetime norms outside zones of active hostilities. It recognizes that rules applicable in wartime - rules that permit killing and [\*1193] detention without charge based on status alone - should be the exception rather than the norm, limited to circumstances in which security so demands.¶ This Part outlines the several normative and practical reasons why the zone approach should be adopted and incorporated into U.S. and, ultimately, international law. Although the analysis focuses primarily on the United States, the arguments as to the benefits of this framework apply equally to any other belligerent state seeking to defeat a transnational non-state enemy.¶ A. Basis for the Distinction¶ There is an intuitive sense that, separate and apart from any sovereignty concerns, the killing or detention of an alleged enemy of the state in a war zone is different from the killing or detention of an alleged enemy in a peaceful zone (think Munich or London), even if the known facts about the enemy's role in the opposing force are the same. Similarly, there is a less intuitive, but equally important, difference between both of those situations and the killing or detention of an alleged enemy in a lawless zone (think Yemen or Somalia). This Section highlights several reasons why these distinctions should be reflected in the law - reasons largely based on the relevant exigency, the importance of notice, and the intrinsic value of cabining war and its permissive use of force and detention without charge.¶ 1. The War Zone Versus the Peaceful Zone¶ The exigencies that justify application of wartime rules simply do not apply outside zones of active hostilities. The Supreme Court recognized this important distinction in Reid v. Covert, n83 in which it ruled that civilians accompanying the armed forces outside a war zone could not be subject to military trial. "The exigencies which have required military rule on the battlefield are not present where no conflict exists. Military trial of civilians "in the field' is an extraordinary jurisdiction and it should not be expanded at the expense of the Bill of Rights." n84 The Reid opinion echoed the reasoning of a case from almost ninety years prior, when the Court ruled that Indiana - which was not the site of any active fighting - could not be subject to martial law during the Civil War: "Martial law cannot arise from a threatened invasion. The necessity must be actual and present; the invasion [\*1194] real, such as effectually closes the courts and deposes the civil administration." n85 Similar reasoning has led courts to conclude that the requisition of property by the United States government is permitted at the "scene of conflict" but not thousands of miles away n86 and that the protections of the Suspension Clause depend to a large extent on whether or not the detainees are held in an "active theater of war." n87¶ As these cases recognize, the existence of warlike 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 [\*1195] 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¶ In places of intense, obvious, and publicly acknowledged fighting, civilians are on notice that they are residing within a zone of conflict. Those who remain within the conflict zone have implicitly accepted some risk, albeit not voluntarily in most cases. They can, at least in theory, take steps to protect themselves and minimize the likelihood of being caught in the crossfire by, when possible, leaving or avoiding areas with the heaviest concentration of fighters or taking extra precautions in conducting their daily activities. n92 Host states are similarly on notice of the likelihood of ongoing hostilities and can take appropriate steps to move their citizens away from areas of intense fighting.¶ [\*1196] By comparison, civilians sitting at an outdoor cafe in Paris are not on notice that they are within the zone of conflict. As a result, there is something intuitively unsettling about the idea that they could be deemed the legitimate collateral damage of a state-sponsored attack. It is precisely this fear of the unpredictable on which terrorists capitalize when they attack unsuspecting civilians. A legal doctrine that allows the state to engage in attacks that may have a similar consequence - even if civilians are not the intended or expected targets of the attacks - raises legitimate concerns.¶ It is, of course, possible to conceive of a new set of rules for this new type of conflict, under which the procedural and substantive requirements of domestic criminal justice systems and human rights norms give way when the non-state enemy crosses into one's jurisdiction. But the idea that a non-state actor could, through its clandestine behavior, trigger the permissive use of killing and detention without charge runs counter to longstanding conceptions of fairness and justice. n93 It essentially allows the terrorist to erode protections of basic rights simply by crossing state lines.¶ Third, the conditions on the ground affect the assumptions as to who qualifies as the enemy. While it may be valid to presume that individuals who attend a training camp and are found in a zone of active hostilities intend to join the fight, the same presumption does not necessarily hold for individuals who are subsequently located thousands of miles away in a zone of relative peace. n94 Absent additional, specific information suggesting that the individual is actively engaged in attack planning or playing a sufficiently important role in the organization so as to pose a significant ongoing threat, the justifications for law-of-war detention or lethal killing (to prevent the return to the battlefield or otherwise eliminate the threat) are questionable. n95 At a minimum, heightened quantum-of-information standards ought to [\*1197] apply to detention and targeting that take place outside a zone of active hostilities. n96¶ 2. The Lawless Zone¶ In practice, the truly contested areas fall somewhere between the obvious warzone and the peacetime zone. The United States is unlikely to begin launching drone strikes in Paris. It is, however, reportedly doing so with increasing frequency in places like Yemen and possibly Somalia n97 - areas that can be loosely characterized as "lawless zones."¶ In some ways, a lawless zone shares attributes with a zone of active hostilities. Domestic law enforcement tends to be largely ineffective or nonexistent, suggesting the need for alternative mechanisms to deal with threats. In many instances (and certainly in much of Yemen as well as Somalia), civilians are on notice that they are living in a conflict zone, even if the main conflict is distinct from the transnational conflict between the state and a non-state entity (e.g., the internal armed conflict between the government and insurgent forces in southern Yemen, and the internal armed conflict between al Shabaab and the Transitional Federal Government in Somalia).¶ Despite these similarities, the lawless zone where a discrete number of non-state actors find sanctuary is analytically distinct from the hot conflict zone where there is overt, active, ongoing fighting between troops on the ground. This is so for two main reasons.¶ First, the existence of a separate, distinct conflict of the type often found in a lawless zone does not provide notice of a conflict between a belligerent state and transnational non–state enemy.

In concrete terms, the existence of a conflict between al Shabaab and the Transitional Federal Government does not provide notice of a conflict between the United States and al Qaeda affiliates reportedly operating in Somalia. This matters for reasons of attribution and accountability. It also affects the degree, if not the fact, of conflict experienced by the civilian population. Imagine if the existence of a lawless zone gave states free rein to unilaterally attack any alleged non–state enemy found therein. Absent any meaningful limits, such a region might be decimated by external attacks. The situation would likely exacerbate the separate conflict, prolong the situation of lawlessness, and make it exceed- ingly difficult for the population properly to identify or take steps to address the source of conflict.98¶ Second, operations in a lawless zone are likely to be limited to targeted and surgical strikes, often with advance planning and little risk to the state's own troops. This is a very different setting than an active battlefield where troops on the ground are exposed to high levels of risk. As is often noted, those engaged in on-the-ground combat should not be required to hold their fire until they conduct a careful evaluation of the threat posed; such a rule would be potentially suicidal. In Yemen and Somalia, by contrast, the United States carefully pinpoints and identifies targets, with little to no danger to its own troops. When engaging in that type of deliberate killing, with negligible risk to one's own forces, there should be a corresponding obligation to take extra precautions to prevent error, overzealousness, and abuse. N99¶ B. Current State Practice¶ Since 2006, the United States has, at least implicitly and as a matter of policy, distinguished between zones of active hostilities and elsewhere. n100 The Bush Administration initially placed a significant number of off-the-battlefield captures into long-term law-of-war detention. Detainees reportedly included persons captured in places as far-flung from the Afghanistan battlefield as Bosnia, Mauritania, and Thailand - as well as the United States. n101 These off-the-battlefield detentions turned out to be highly controversial. They have been the subject of numerous court challenges, [\*1199] international criticism, and endless commentary. n102 Moreover, they raise difficult questions about repatriation - issues with which the United States continues to struggle. n103¶ Beginning in September 2006, the Bush Administration initiated a shift in policy. Largely in response to the Supreme Court's ruling in Hamdan v. Rumsfeld, n104 President Bush announced that he was closing CIA-run black sites, at least temporarily, and ordered the transfer of fourteen long-term CIA detainees to Guantanamo. n105 Subsequently, the number of out-of-battlefield captures transferred to Guantanamo fell to a mere three captures in 2007 n106 and only one capture in 2008. n107 All were described as high-value targets based on alleged links to al Qaeda leadership or involvement in specific terrorist attacks. n108¶ [\*1200] On January 22, 2009, two days after taking office, President Obama declared the permanent shuttering of CIA black sites as well as his plan to close the detention center at Guantanamo Bay. n109 While Guantanamo remains open today, the Obama Administration has committed not to transfer any additional detainees there. n110 Since 2009, Warsame is the only known case of an out-of-battlefield detainee being placed in anything other than very short-term military custody. n111¶ Some have argued that the low number of out-of-battlefield detentions is due in part to the lack of viable locations for holding detainees. But while that may be a factor, it seems that the difficulty of apprehension, the high diplomatic, reputational, and transactional costs of such detentions, and the relative effectiveness of the criminal justice system in responding to threats, are equal - if not more - important factors in limiting the reliance on law-of-war detention. n112¶ As out-of-battlefield detentions have declined, targeted killings reportedly have increased dramatically. n113 The vast majority of these killings appear [\*1201] to have been concentrated in northwest Pakistan - an area that most concede is a spillover of the zone of active hostilities in Afghanistan. n114 A growing number of strikes reportedly have been launched in Yemen as well. n115¶ The Obama Administration also appears to have adopted a distinction between Afghanistan and elsewhere in setting the rules for these strikes. While top administration officials have argued that their military authorities are not restricted to the "hot" battlefield of Afghanistan, they also have argued that "outside of Afghanistan and Iraq" targets are focused on those "who are a threat to the United States, whose removal would cause a significant - even if only temporary - disruption of the plans and capabilities of al-Qa'ida and its associated forces." n116 Whether or not one agrees with the standard employed, it is clear that the administration itself recognizes a distinction between Afghanistan (and, earlier, Iraq) and other areas embroiled in the conflict with al Qaeda. Procedural rules in terms of who must authorize the strike also reportedly vary depending on whether one is operating within Afghanistan and the border regions of Pakistan or elsewhere. n117 While there are good reasons to demand additional safeguards, the [\*1202] United States' own actions already reflect the importance and value of distinguishing between zones of active hostilities and other areas.¶ III. The Specifics: Defining the Zones and Setting the Standards¶ Given the basis for distinguishing between zones of active hostilities and elsewhere, this Part provides the specifics of the proposed approach. It first lays out criteria for distinguishing between a zone of active hostilities and elsewhere by drawing on both existing law and the normative justifications for the distinctions. It then describes the proposed substantive and procedural standards that ought to apply, consistent with the goals of protecting individual liberty, peacetime institutions, and the fundamental security interests of the state.¶ This task is both necessary and inherently difficult. It is an attempt to develop a set of clear standards, or on-off triggers, for a situation in which the gravity, imminence, and likelihood of a threat are dynamic, uncertain, and difficult to categorize. My aim is to propose an initial set of standards that will regulate the use of force and detention without charge outside a zone of active hostilities, consistent with the state's legitimate security needs. The expectation is that debate and discussion will help develop and refine the details over time.¶ A. The Zone of Active Hostilities¶ Commentary, political discourse, court rulings, and academic literature are rife with references to the distinction between the so-called "hot battlefield" and elsewhere. Yet despite the salience of this distinction, there is no commonly understood definition of a "hot battlefield," let alone a common term applied by all. n118 In what follows, I briefly survey the relevant treaty [\*1203] and case law and offer a working definition of what I call the "zone of active hostilities." This definition takes into account such sources of law as well as the normative and practical reasons for this distinction.¶ 1. Treaty and Case Law¶ While not explicitly articulated, the notion of a distinct zone of active hostilities where fighting is underway is implicit in treaty law. The Geneva Conventions, for example, specify that prisoners of war and internees must be moved away from the "combat zone" in order to keep them out of danger, n119 and that belligerent parties must conduct searches for the dead and wounded left on the "battlefield." n120 While there are no explicit definitions provided, the context suggests that these terms refer to those areas where fighting is currently taking place or very likely to occur. The related term "zones of military operations," which is spelled out in a bit more detail in the Commentaries to the Geneva Conventions, is described as covering those areas where there is actual or planned troop movement, even if no active fighting. n121¶ [\*1204] In a variety of contexts, U.S. courts also have opined on whether certain activities fall within or outside of a zone of active hostilities, indicating that the existence and quantity of fighting forces are key. In Hamdi v. Rumsfeld, for example, the Supreme Court observed that the large number of troops on the ground in Afghanistan supported the finding that the United States was involved in "active combat" there. n122 A panel of the D.C. Circuit subsequently noted that the ongoing military campaign by U.S. forces, the attacks against U.S. forces by the Taliban and al Qaeda, the casualties U.S. personnel incurred, and the presence of other non-U.S. troops under NATO command supported its finding that Afghanistan was "a theater of active military combat." n123 Previous cases have similarly used the presence of fighting forces, the actual engagement of opposing forces, and casualty counts to identify a theater of active conflict. n124¶ Conversely, U.S. courts have often assumed that areas in which there is no active fighting between armed entities fall outside of the zone of active hostilities. Thus, the Al-Marri and Padilla litigations were premised on the notion that the two men were outside of the zone of active hostilities when [\*1205] taken into custody in the United States. n125 The central issue in those cases was how much this distinction mattered. n126 The D.C. Circuit in Al Maqaleh similarly distinguished Afghanistan - defined as part of "the theater of active military combat" - from Guantanamo - described as outside of this "theater of war" - presumably because of the absence of active fighting there. n127 In the context of the Guantanamo habeas litigation, D.C. District Court judges have at various times also described Saudi Arabia, Gambia, Zambia, Bosnia, Pakistan, and Thailand as outside an active battle zone. n128¶ In defining what constitutes a conflict in the first place, international courts have similarly looked at the existence, duration, and intensity of the actual fighting. Specifically, in Tadic, the ICTY defined a noninternational armed conflict as involving "protracted armed violence between governmental authorities and organized armed groups." n129 In subsequent cases, the ICTY [\*1206] described the term "protracted armed violence" as turning on the intensity of the violence and encompassing considerations such as "the number, duration, and intensity of individual confrontations; the type of weapons and other military equipment used; the number and calibre of weapons fired; the number of persons and type of forces partaking in the fighting; the number of casualties; [and] the extent of material destruction." n130 Security Council attention is also deemed relevant. n131¶ The International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) has similarly defined noninternational armed conflicts as "protracted armed confrontations" that involve a "minimum level of intensity." n132¶ 2. Identifying the Zone¶ Consistent with treaty and case law, overt and sustained fighting are key factors in identifying a zone of active hostilities. Specifically, the fighting must be of sufficient duration and intensity to create the exigent circumstances that justify application of extraordinary war authorities, to put civilians on notice, and to justify permissive evidentiary presumptions regarding the identification of the enemy. n133 The presence of troops on the [\*1207] ground is a significant factor, although neither necessary nor sufficient to constitute a zone of active hostilities. Action by the Security Council or regional security bodies such as NATO, as well as the belligerent parties' express recognition of the existence of a hot conflict zone, are also relevant.¶ Linking the zone of active hostilities primarily to the duration and intensity of the fighting and to states' own proclamations suffers, however, from an inherent circularity. A state can itself create a zone of active hostilities by ratcheting up violence or issuing a declaration of intent, thereby making previously unlawful actions lawful. n134¶ It is impossible to fully address this concern. The problem can, however, be significantly reduced by insisting on strict compliance with the law-of-war principles of distinction and proportionality and by vigorously punishing states for acts of aggression. n135 There will, of course, be disagreement as to whether a state's escalation of a certain conflict constitutes aggression, particularly given underlying disagreements about who qualifies as a lawful target. The zone approach is helpful in this regard as well: it narrows the range of disagreement by demanding heightened substantive standards as to who qualifies as a legitimate target outside the zones of active hostilities. Under the zone approach, the escalation of force must be aimed at a narrower set of possible military targets until the increased use of force is sufficiently intense and pervasive enough to create a new zone of active hostilities.¶ 3. Geographic Scope of the Zone¶ A secondary question relates to the geographic scope of the zone of active hostilities. In answering the related question of the scope of the overarching armed conflict, the Tadic court defined the conflict as extending throughout the state in which hostilities were conducted (in the case of international armed conflict) n136 and the area over which a party had territorial control (in the case of a noninternational armed conflict that did not extend [\*1208] throughout an entire state). n137 Neither approach, however, maps well onto the practical realities of a transnational conflict between a state and a non-state actor. In many cases, the non-state actor and related hostilities will be concentrated in a small pocket of the state. It would be contrary to the justifications of exigency and proper notice to define the zone of active hostilities as extending to the entire state. A territorial control test also does not make sense when dealing with a non-state actor, such as al Qaeda, which does not exercise formal control over any territory and is driven more by ideology than territorial ambition.¶ 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¶ Law-of-war 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 information 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.

# 2AC

## Overreach

### AT: ME D

#### ME war defense is too old

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

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

**SOF Good---Bioterror**

**Special ops key to solve bioterror**

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

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

**Extinction**

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

Research paper NO . 2 – 2013

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

## Allies

### AT: NATO Useless

#### NATO not dead --- recency

Charles A. Kupchan 13, D.Phil from Oxford in International Affairs, Professor of International Affairs at Georgetown, Whitney H. Shepardson Senior Fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations, 3/6/13, "Why is NATO still needed, even after the downfall of the Soviet Union?," http://www.cfr.org/nato/why-nato-still-needed-even-after-downfall-soviet-union/p30152

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) is an international military alliance that was created to enable its members (the United States, Canada, and their European partners) to counter the threat posed by the Soviet Union. Alliances usually come to an end when the threat that led to their formation disappears. However, NATO defies the historical norm, not only surviving well beyond the Cold War's end, but also expanding its membership and broadening its mission.¶ NATO remains valuable to its members for a number of reasons. The expansion of the alliance has played an important role in consolidating stability and democracy in Central Europe, where members continue to look to NATO as a hedge against the return of a threat from Russia. In this respect, NATO and the European Union have been working in tandem to lock in a prosperous and secure Atlantic community.¶ Meanwhile, NATO has repeatedly demonstrated the utility of its integrated military capability. The alliance used force to end ethnic conflict in the Balkans and played a role in preserving the peace that followed. NATO has sustained a long-term presence in Afghanistan, helping to counter terrorism and prepare Afghans to take over responsibility for their own security. NATO also oversaw the mission in Libya that succeeded in stopping its civil war and removing the Qaddafi regime. All of these missions demonstrate NATO's utility and its contributions to the individual and collective welfare of its members, precisely why they continue to believe in the merits of membership.

### NATO – Trade/Cyber AO

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

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

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

#### Cyber causes nuclear war

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

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

## Solvency

### AT: ZoAH Circumvention

#### No circumvention---there is a zones definition

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

A. The Zone of Active Hostilities Commentary, political discourse, court rulings, and academic literature are rife with references to the distinction between the so-called "hot battlefield" and elsewhere. Yet despite the salience of this distinction, there is no commonly understood definition of a "hot battlefield," let alone a common term applied by all. n118 In what follows, I briefly survey the relevant treaty [\*1203] and case law and offer a working definition of what I call the "zone of active hostilities." This definition takes into account such sources of law as well as the normative and practical reasons for this distinction 1. Treaty and Case Law While not explicitly articulated, the notion of a distinct zone of active hostilities where fighting is underway is implicit in treaty law. The Geneva Conventions, for example, specify that prisoners of war and internees must be moved away from the "combat zone" in order to keep them out of danger, n119 and that belligerent parties must conduct searches for the dead and wounded left on the "battlefield." n120 While there are no explicit definitions provided, the context suggests that these terms refer to those areas where fighting is currently taking place or very likely to occur. The related term "zones of military operations," which is spelled out in a bit more detail in the Commentaries to the Geneva Conventions, is described as covering those areas where there is actual or planned troop movement, even if no active fighting. n121 [\*1204] In a variety of contexts, U.S. courts also have opined on whether certain activities fall within or outside of a zone of active hostilities, indicating that the existence and quantity of fighting forces are key. In Hamdi v. Rumsfeld, for example, the Supreme Court observed that the large number of troops on the ground in Afghanistan supported the finding that the United States was involved in "active combat" there. n122 A panel of the D.C. Circuit subsequently noted that the ongoing military campaign by U.S. forces, the attacks against U.S. forces by the Taliban and al Qaeda, the casualties U.S. personnel incurred, and the presence of other non-U.S. troops under NATO command supported its finding that Afghanistan was "a theater of active military combat." n123 Previous cases have similarly used the presence of fighting forces, the actual engagement of opposing forces, and casualty counts to identify a theater of active conflict. n124 Conversely, U.S. courts have often assumed that areas in which there is no active fighting between armed entities fall outside of the zone of active hostilities. Thus, the Al-Marri and Padilla litigations were premised on the notion that the two men were outside of the zone of active hostilities when [\*1205] taken into custody in the United States. n125 The central issue in those cases was how much this distinction mattered. n126 The D.C. Circuit in Al Maqaleh similarly distinguished Afghanistan - defined as part of "the theater of active military combat" - from Guantanamo - described as outside of this "theater of war" - presumably because of the absence of active fighting there. n127 In the context of the Guantanamo habeas litigation, D.C. District Court judges have at various times also described Saudi Arabia, Gambia, Zambia, Bosnia, Pakistan, and Thailand as outside an active battle zone. n128

## K

### Isaac-Must Read

#### Consequentialism key---alt is complicit with evil

**Isaac 2**—Professor of Political Science at Indiana-Bloomington, Director of the Center for the Study of Democracy and Public Life, PhD from Yale (Jeffery C., Dissent Magazine, Vol. 49, Iss. 2, “Ends, Means, and Politics,” p. Proquest)

As a result, the most important political questions are simply not asked. It is assumed that U.S. military intervention is an act of "aggression," but no consideration is given to the aggression to which intervention is a response. The status quo ante in Afghanistan is not, as peace activists would have it, peace, but rather terrorist violence abetted by a regime--the Taliban--that rose to power through brutality and repression. This requires us to ask a question that most "peace" activists would prefer not to ask: What should be done to respond to the violence of a Saddam Hussein, or a Milosevic, or a Taliban regime? What means are likely to stop violence and bring criminals to justice? Calls for diplomacy and international law are well intended and important; they implicate a decent and civilized ethic of global order. But they are also vague and empty, because they are not accompanied by any account of how diplomacy or international law can work effectively to address the problem at hand. The campus left offers no such account. To do so would require it to contemplate tragic choices in which moral goodness is of limited utility. Here what matters is not purity of intention but the intelligent exercise of power. Power is not a dirty word or an unfortunate feature of the world. It is the core of politics. Power is the ability to effect outcomes in the world. Politics, in large part, involves contests over the distribution and use of power. To accomplish anything in the political world, one must attend to the means that are necessary to bring it about. And to develop such means is to develop, and to exercise, power. To say this is not to say that power is beyond morality. It is to say that power is not reducible to morality. As writers such as Niccolo Machiavelli, Max Weber, Reinhold Niebuhr, and Hannah Arendt have taught, an unyielding concern with moral goodness **undercuts political responsibility**. The concern may be morally laudable, reflecting a kind of personal integrity, but it suffers from three fatal flaws: (1) It fails to see that the purity of one's intention does not ensure the achievement of what one intends. Abjuring violence or refusing to make common cause with morally compromised parties may seem like the right thing; but if such tactics entail impotence, then it is hard to view them as serving any moral good beyond the clean conscience of their supporters; (2) it fails to see that in a world of real violence and injustice, moral purity is not simply a form of powerlessness; it is often a form of **complicity in injustice**. This is why, from the standpoint of politics--as opposed to religion--pacifism is always a potentially immoral stand. In categorically repudiating violence, it refuses in principle to oppose certain violent injustices with any effect; and (3) it fails to see that **politics is as much about unintended consequences as it is about intentions**; it is the effects of action, rather than the motives of action, that is most significant. Just as the alignment with "good" may engender impotence, it is often the pursuit of "good" that generates evil. This is the lesson of communism in the twentieth century: it is not enough that one's goals be sincere or idealistic; it is equally important, always, to ask about the effects of pursuing these goals and to judge these effects in pragmatic and historically contextualized ways. Moral absolutism inhibits this judgment. It alienates those who are not true believers. It promotes arrogance. And it undermines political effectiveness.

### AT: Prior Questions – Cochrane

#### Prior questions will never be fully settled---action’s prior

Molly Cochran 99, Assistant Professor of International Affairs at Georgia Institute for Technology, “Normative Theory in International Relations”, 1999, pg. 272

To conclude this chapter, while modernist and postmodernist debates continue, while we are still unsure as to what we can legitimately identify as a feminist ethical/political concern, while we still are unclear about the relationship between discourse and experience, it is particularly important for feminists that we proceed with analysis of both the material (institutional and structural) as well as the discursive. This holds not only for feminists, but for all theorists oriented towards the goal of extending further moral inclusion in the present social sciences climate of epistemological uncertainty. Important ethical/political concerns hang in the balance. We cannot afford to wait for the meta-theoretical questions to be conclusively answered. Those answers may be unavailable. Nor can we wait for a credible vision of an alternative institutional order to appear before an emancipatory agenda can be kicked into gear. Nor do we have before us a chicken and egg question of which comes first: sorting out the metatheoretical issues or working out which practices contribute to a credible institutional vision. The two questions can and should be pursued together, and can be via moral imagination. Imagination can help us think beyond discursive and material conditions which limit us, by pushing the boundaries of those limitations in thought and examining what yields. In this respect, I believe international ethics as pragmatic critique can be a useful ally to feminist and normative theorists generally.

### Law Works

#### No impact---legal checks work

William E. Scheuerman 6, Professor of Political Science at Indiana University, Constellations, Vol. 13, No. 1. p. 116

Schmitt offers three reasons in support of this view. First, he implicitly relies on the stock argument that “authentic” politics necessarily elides legal regulation: when conflicts involve “existentially” distinct collectivities faced with “the real possibility of killing,” the attempt to tame such conflicts by juridical means is destined to fail, or at least badly distort the fundamental (political) questions at hand. Insofar as the partisan fighter represents one of the last vestiges of authentic (i.e., *Schmittian*) politics in an increasingly depoliticized world, he has to dub any attempt to regulate the phenomenon at hand as misguided and maybe even dangerous. Yet this argument relies on Schmitt’s controversial model of politics, as outlined eloquently but unconvincingly in his famous *Concept of the Political*. To be sure, there *are* intense conflicts in which it is naïve to expect an easy resolution by legal or juridical means. But the argument suffers from a troubling circularity: Schmitt occasionally wants to define “political” conflicts as those irresolvable by legal or juridical devices *in order then* to argue against legal or juridical solutions to them. The claim also suffers from a certain vagueness and lack of conceptual precision. At times, it seems to be directed against trying to resolve conflicts in *the courts or juridical system narrowly understood*; at other times it is directed against *any legal* regulation of intense conflict. The former argument is surely stronger than the latter. After all, legal devices have undoubtedly played a positive role in taming or at least minimizing the potential dangers of harsh political antagonisms. In the Cold War, for example, international law contributed to the peaceful resolution of conflicts which otherwise might have exploded into horrific violence, even if attempts to bring such conflicts before an international court or tribunal probably would have failed.22

[italics in original]

### AT: SVio

#### Their conception of violence is reductive and can’t be solved

**Boulding 77**

 Twelve Friendly Quarrels with Johan Galtung

Author(s): Kenneth E. BouldingReviewed work(s):Source: Journal of Peace Research, Vol. 14, No. 1 (1977), pp. 75-86Published

 Kenneth Ewart Boulding (January 18, 1910 – March 18, 1993) was an economist, educator, peace activist, poet, religious mystic, devoted Quaker, systems scientist, and interdisciplinary philosopher.[1][2] He was cofounder of General Systems Theory and founder of numerous ongoing intellectual projects in economics and social science.

 He graduated from Oxford University, and was granted United States citizenship in 1948. During the years 1949 to 1967, he was a faculty member of the University of Michigan. In 1967, he joined the faculty of the University of Colorado at Boulder, where he remained until his retirement.

 Finally, we come to the great Galtung metaphors of 'structural violence' 'and 'positive peace'. They are metaphors rather than models, and for that very reason are suspect. Metaphors always imply models and metaphors have much more persuasive power than models do, for models tend to be the preserve of the specialist. But when a metaphor implies a bad model it can be very dangerous, for it is both persuasive and wrong. The metaphor of structural violence I would argue falls right into this category. The metaphor is that poverty, deprivation, ill health, low expectations of life, a condition in which more than half the human race lives, is 'like' a thug beating up the victim and 'taking his money away from him in the street, or it is 'like' a conqueror stealing the land of the people and reducing them to slavery. The implication is that poverty and its associated ills are the fault of the thug or the conqueror and the solution is to do away with thugs and conquerors. While there is some truth in the metaphor, in the modern world at least there is not very much. Violence, whether of the streets and the home, or of the guerilla, of the police, or of the armed forces, is a very different phenomenon from poverty. The processes which create and sustain poverty are not at all like the processes which create and sustain violence, although like everything else in 'the world, everything is somewhat related to everything else. There is a very real problem of the structures which lead to violence, but unfortunately Galitung's metaphor of structural violence as he has used it has diverted attention from this problem. Violence in the behavioral sense, that is, somebody actually doing damage to somebody else and trying to make them worse off, is a 'threshold' phenomenon, rather like the boiling over of a pot. The temperature under a pot can rise for a long time without its boiling over, but at some 'threshold boiling over will take place. The study of the structures which underlie violence are a very important and much neglected part of peace research and indeed of social science in general. Threshold phenomena like violence are difficult to study because they represent 'breaks' in the systenm rather than uniformities. Violence, whether between persons or organizations, occurs when the 'strain' on a system is too great for its 'strength'. The metaphor here is that violence is like what happens when we break a piece of chalk. Strength and strain, however, especially in social systems, are so interwoven historically that it is very difficult to separate them. The diminution of violence involves two possible strategies, or a mixture of the two; one is Ithe increase in the strength of the system, 'the other is the diminution of the strain. The strength of systems involves habit, culture, taboos, and sanctions, all these 'things which enable a system to stand lincreasing strain without breaking down into violence. The strains on the system 'are largely dynamic in character, such as arms races, mutually stimulated hostility, changes in relative economic position or political power, which are often hard to identify. Conflicts of interest 'are only part 'of the strain on a system, and not always the most important part. It is very hard for people ito know their interests, and misperceptions of 'interest take place mainly through the dynamic processes, not through the structural ones. It is only perceptions of interest which affect people's behavior, not the 'real' interests, whatever these may be, and the gap between percepti'on and reality can be very large and resistant to change. However, what Galitung calls structural violence (which has been defined 'by one unkind commenltator as anything that Galitung doesn't like) was originally defined as any unnecessarily low expectation of life, on that assumption that anybody who dies before the allotted span has been killed, however unintentionally and unknowingly, by somebody else. The concept has been expanded to include all 'the problems of poverty, destitution, deprivation, and misery. These are enormously real and are a very high priority for research and action, but they belong to systems which are only peripherally related to 'the structures whi'ch produce violence. This is not rto say that the cultures of violence and the cultures of poverty are not sometimes related, though not all poverty cultures are cultures of violence, and certainly not all cultures of violence are poverty cultures. But the dynamics lof poverty and the success or failure to rise out of it are of a complexity far beyond anything which the metaphor of structural violence can offer. While the metaphor of structural violence performed a service in calling attention to a problem, it may have d'one a disservice in preventing us from finding the answer.

### \*Pacifism Alt Bad

#### The alt’s pacificism lets injustice go unstopped – we can acknowledge that all violence is tragic while still recognizing that it’s necessary in some instances

Debra Bergoffen 8, Professor of Philosophy and a member of the Women's Studies and Cultural Studies programs at George Mason University, Spring, The Just War Tradition: Translating the Ethics of Human Dignity into Political Practices, Hypatia Volume 23, Number 2

The just war tradition is riddled with ambiguities. It speaks of a single human community bounded by universal moral laws, as it recognizes and, under certain conditions, legitimates the division of that community into enemy factions in violation of those laws. It recognizes the inevitability of war while speaking of the demands of peace. It sets up reason as the arbiter of wartime strategies, while noting that armed conflicts, once begun, may not be amenable to the rule of reason. Given these ambiguities, a result of the ways in which just war theory attempts to negotiate the competing demands of justice and the politics of power, it is no accident that the just war tradition has been ridiculed by power "realists" for its utopian naïveté and dismissed by pacifists for sacrificing the principles of peace to the demands of war.¶ Twentiethand twenty-first-century war waging has bolstered "realist" and pacifist critiques of the just war doctrine. The trench warfare strategy of World War I, the Allied bombing strategies of World War II, the genocidal evil of Nazi Germany, and the nuclear capacities of the United States and the USSR mocked the just war premise that war could be morally and rationally [End Page 72] constrained. Ironically, the cold-war policy of mutual assured destruction, with its acronym MAD, made the case for the pacifist argument that a just war in a world of nuclear weapons was impossible. MAD did not, however, create the conditions for peace envisioned by just war advocates.¶ The twenty-first century, young as it is, has managed to establish itself as an heir to the twentieth century's mockery of the idea of a just war. Erasing the "never again" post–World War II just war promise with multiple spectacles of genocides, betraying the promise of a post–cold-war world of peaceful coexistence with the reality of a world dominated by ideological wars of terror, a U.S.–declared war on terrorism, and the proliferation of nuclear and biological weapons, **this century has made it increasingly difficult for the just war tradition to establish itself as a counterweight to the politics of violence**.¶ Given the destructive powers of modern weaponry and the absolutist ideologies of contemporary conflicts, and given the fact that the just war tradition is historically tied to the idea of the sovereign state as the sole legitimate source of war and to Western notions of natural law and rights, it might seem time to declare the very idea of a just war a relic of more manageable and naïve times, and a symptom of Eurocentric ideology. It might seem time to face the fact that politically motivated violence is more chaotic than envisioned by just war advocates, and less amenable to the rule of reason required by just war restrictions.¶ Before writing the just war obituary, however, we need to note the ways in which institutional responses to the evils of unbridled violence—war crimes tribunals, a body of international laws and treaties delineating the particulars of war crimes and crimes against humanity, the development of human rights laws—speak the language of just war theory. For these institutions and laws insist that political and military officials are bound by just war morality and hold military and political actors punishably responsible for failing to adhere to the moral obligations of the just war code. These developments suggest that despite the antipathy between current technologies and ideologies of war and the principles of just war doctrines, **the just war insistence that the political and moral worlds are tethered remains relevant**.¶ To see whether just war theory can meet the challenges of its origins and of our times we need to see how it fares against the criticisms of power-politics advocates, such as Carl von Clausewitz (1780–1831), and how it stands up to pacifist and nonviolent rejections of all forms of political violence.¶ In his classic text, On War, Clausewitz argued that even when/if the original objectives of war are limited, war, once begun, cannot escape its absolutist logic.1 According to Clausewitz, as an act of force intended to compel an enemy to surrender, war is subject to the rules of unintended consequences and escalation that no rule of justice can counter (Shaw 2003, 19). In advancing his thesis of reality politics, Clausewitz analyzed the very idea of the just war, the thesis [End Page 73] that war could and should be limited both in its objectives and in its conduct. He made it clear that it is the logic of war, not the technologies of warfare, that constitute its inherent peril. He anticipated Rwanda. Machetes were all the Hutu needed to perpetuate genocide.¶ Clausewitz's argument against the just war premise of rule-governed war has been joined by two other arguments that point to serious loopholes in just war theory. The first of these arguments demonstrates the ways in which the logic of just war itself can become a justification for unlimited war waging. The point of just war doctrine is to distinguish morally justifiable from morally unjustifiable political violence. Thus, just war doctrine can be invoked to establish the righteousness of certain types of war (for example, holy wars, wars to make the world safe for democracy, wars to liberate the proletariat from the exploitations of capitalism, or wars to create democratic states). Once appealed to in this way, however, just war principles, far from limiting or preventing war, become a war-enhancing tool, a (self-) righteous justification of unlimited war (Coates 1997, 2–3). The second objection concerns the authority to declare war. Just war thinking assumes that war is the province of legitimate states. It presumes that legitimate states have some interest in limiting wars. The logic of this link among legitimate states, war making, and limited war is less than compelling. It is, however, thoroughly undermined in our postmodern world of international conglomerates, paramilitary armies, and "rogue" states, where legitimate states no longer monopolize the power of war making (Coates 1997, 6; Shaw 2003, 63).¶ Arguments against the just war premise that war can be contained both in its objectives and its conduct do not necessarily make the "realist" case for unrestrained power politics, however. Instead of linking the failed logic of just war thinking to the inevitable amorality of politics, pacifists, among whom we may include such eighteenth-century advocates of perpetual peace as Immanuel Kant, and those who would limit the fight against injustice to nonviolent methods argue that the failures of just war theory alert us to our moral obligation to reject the very idea of war. They see the fact of the inevitability of unlimited war as requiring us to reject of all forms of politically sanctioned violence. Sara Ruddick, for example, recommends a suspicion of the "rhetoric and reason of deliberate collective violence" and advocates developing nonviolent methods of resistance to violence (Ruddick 1990, 232).¶ Power-politics advocates, nonviolence proponents, and perpetual-peace defenders agree that once political violence begins it cannot be controlled. Their differences concern how to deal with this absolute trajectory of war. Power-politics realists argue that it renders all talk of war and justice superfluous. Pacificists argue that it renders all recourse to war unjustifiable. Just war theorists reject the idea that political violence is always either self-interested or unjust. **They find that rules of war have and can be observed, and that our desires and** [End Page 74] **behaviors are better accounted for by the ambiguous logic of justice and war than the clear-cut justice or war logic of power-politics and pacifist advocates**.¶ Between the ambiguous agenda of the just war tradition and its realist and pacifist critics, we are confronted with the violence of war, the realities of injustice, the moral demand of peace with justice, and the question of how to counter the violence of injustice without unleashing the absolute logic of war. **Different as they are in their prescriptions for international order, political realists and nonviolent pacifists find the demands of power politics radically incompatible with the demands of morality**. Whether it is the realists accusing nonviolence proponents of a naïve utopianism, or the pacifists finding the realists lacking in moral courage and imagination, both agree that the just war tradition is fundamentally misguided in its attempt to tether a politics that accepts the legitimacy of violence to the moral demands of justice. It seems to me, however, that it is precisely this ambiguity of the just war tradition that constitutes its value for the feminist pursuit of global justice; for in invoking the utopian imagination and yoking the realities of violence to the demands for justice, **it puts injustice on trial within the context of the dialectics of power politics**. **The ambiguity of the just war tradition signals its commitment to the intersection of the ethical and the political**. Its strength lies in the ways in which it looks to the moral imagination to set the political agenda. Rather than severing the political from the moral, or finding current visions of politics morally impossible, it looks for ways to translate moral discourses into (imperfect) political strategies.¶ My sympathy for the project of the just war tradition owes much to Simone de Beauvoir and her principle of ambiguity, which, in part at least, requires that we tie our "impossible" visions of justice to the concrete realities of human existence. Specifically, Beauvoir reminds us that violence and evil are part of the horizon of our world. The complexity of our condition and tragedy of our situation is such that violence, though never morally justified, is sometimes morally necessary (Beauvoir 1947/1991). Violence is never moral because it is an assault on our humanity. Invoking it, however, is sometimes necessary to preserve our humanity. **When injustice cannot be rectified in any other way, the resort to violence is justified**. As justified, however, it remains tragic. Beauvoir's concept of the tragic here is crucial; for it stops the logic of justified war from sliding into a doctrine of (self-) righteous, absolute war. Though The Second Sex is notable for its refusal to include violent revolution in the arsenal of liberatory strategies to be taken up by women, it nowhere calls upon women to renounce violence. Further, when Beauvoir discusses the liberatory meanings of violence available to patriarchal men but not women and calls women's exclusion from certain violent practices a curse, she makes it clear that, although she is not renouncing her Ethics of Ambiguity assessment of the tragic relationship between violence and justice, she finds the turn to violence, under certain circumstances, an affirmation of one's dignity. [End Page 75]¶ Between her discussions of what must be done when confronted by the Nazi soldier in The Ethics of Ambiguity and her invocation of the power of the imagination in her defense of the slave and the harem women who do not rebel in The Second Sex, we find Beauvoir validating the utopian imagination as an antidote to passivity in the face of injustice and accepting the idea of legitimate war/violence. By joining the utopian demands for justice with the acceptance of violence through the idea of the tragic, however, she rejects the legitimacy of unrestrained violence. **However legitimate the cause, absolute war is never legitimated**. Here, she and just war advocates share common ground. Both find that the intersecting demands of politics and ethics require a logic of ambiguity rather than a logic of the either/or. In posing the question of feminist justice in the context of the question of war, peace, and human rights, I take up the ambiguities of this common ground.

## CP

### Conditionality Bad – 2AC (S)

#### Conditionality is a voting issue—destroys 2AC strategic flexibility which is the arc of clash and education in debate—magnified by multiple worlds—depth is key to debate’s political value—multiple options remove the squo as a logical option and causes late developing debates – reject the team to set a precedent – 1 solves

### Zones PIC

#### CP locks in squo

McNeal 13, Associate Professor of Law, Pepperdine University, 3/5/13, “Targeted Killing and Accountability,” <http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1819583>, Gregory McNeal

The transparency related accountability reforms specified above have the ability to expose wrongdoing; however that’s not the only goal of accountability. Accountability is also designed to deter wrongdoing. By exposing governmental activity, transparency oriented reforms can influence the behavior of all future public officials—to convince them to live up to public expectations 527 The challenge associated with the reforms articulated above is a bias towards the status quo.528 Very few incentives exist for elected officials to exercise greater oversight over targeted killings and interest group advocacy is not as strong in matters of national security and foreign affairs as it is in domestic politics.529

#### Codifying TK transparency is infeasible and links to their NB

Eric Jensen 10/23, Professor at BYU Law School, formerly Chief of the Army's International Law Branch and Legal Advisor to US military forces in Iraq and Bosnia, "Guest Post: The Report of the UN Special Rapporteur for Extrajudicial Executions: Law or Advocacy?", 2013, justsecurity.org/2013/10/23/guest-jensen-un-report/

The Report goes on to state in the recommendations that States “must disclose the legal basis for the use of drones, operational responsibility, criteria for targeting, impact (including civilian casualties), and information about alleged violations, investigations, and prosecutions . . . Drone operators must not be placed within a chain of command that requires them to report within institutions that are unable to disclose their operations.”¶ The boldness of these statements, particularly when written as if they were actual legal requirements, is another example of the Special Rapporteur overstating the law. The Report quotes no law as the basis for these assertions, probably because there doesn’t appear to be any. There have been many calls for increased transparency in drone operations from many different sources, and the United States has responded by increasing transparency in small degrees. But these changes have been done as a matter of policy, not as a matter of law. Requiring a State to disclose such information ahead of an attack would be truly revolutionary.¶ Consider any other weapon system. What other weapon or tactic does the law require such transparency? Is there some element in each nation’s defense ministry where all military attacks are controlled and this element discloses to the public targeting criteria and decisions? Is there any other weapon system where targeteers are placed in an unclassified information environment before they can use the weapon? Of course such situations do not exist and are certainly not required as a matter of law. Either drones are somehow so fundamentally different than every other weapon system in the military arsenal or the Report is misstating the law.¶ Further, as with the Report’s conclusions on co-belligerency, if the Report’s incorrect assertions were right, the unintended consequences of such a rule would be serious. Assume that the United States was required to disclose its targeting criteria, including the circumstances when the rules of engagement would and would not allow for an attack to take place. Every potential target would ensure that they were continuously in a position to be untargetable, while still engaging in hostile actions. Similar steps are already taken as potential targets often surround themselves with civilians in an effort to immunize themselves from attack. Such actions are specifically violative of the law of armed conflict, or international humanitarian law, as it is often called.

### Geography Key

#### Geography’s key to norm-setting

Rosa Brooks 4, Associate Professor of Law, University of Virginia School of Law, December, ARTICLE: WAR EVERYWHERE: RIGHTS, NATIONAL SECURITY LAW, AND THE LAW OF ARMED CONFLICT IN THE AGE OF TERROR, 153 U. Pa. L. Rev. 675

Here again, I think there is no single "legal" answer. The approach taken by Amnesty International rests on a traditional, if formalistic, reading of the law of armed conflict; the approach of the U.S. also rests on a plausible, if flexible, reading of the law of armed conflict n167 and the U.N. Charter. n168 The policy choice made by the Bush administration can nonetheless be questioned and criticized, however, for just as the breakdown of the boundaries between crime and conflict has potentially staggering implications, so too does the breakdown of the spatial boundaries between zones of conflict and zones of peace. If there is no place on earth where the U.S. cannot legitimately use military force at any time, without warning, other states will claim the same rights, and we risk an escalating spiral of unconstrained violence precisely what the creators of the U.N. Charter system sought to avoid. n169

#### Lack of geographical limits means the CP does nothing

Rosa Brooks 4, Associate Professor of Law, University of Virginia School of Law, December, ARTICLE: WAR EVERYWHERE: RIGHTS, NATIONAL SECURITY LAW, AND THE LAW OF ARMED CONFLICT IN THE AGE OF TERROR, 153 U. Pa. L. Rev. 675

If the war knows no geographical or temporal boundaries, if no one deemed an enemy enjoys any of the protections envisioned by the law of armed conflict, and if the line between terrorist combatants and terrorist civilians makes no sense, then there are very few legal constraints on U.S. behavior abroad. U.S. forces can attack, capture, detain, and kill with impunity, subject, of course, to political and diplomatic constraints, but virtually unfettered by legal constraints. To be sure, it is true that even in earlier periods, there has been no effective international legal enforcement mechanism able to restrain U.S. behavior abroad in matters relating to national security. Nonetheless, the U.S. has to a significant degree internalized the law of armed conflict, and willingly accepted the constraints that flow from this body of law. n247 Now, however, the law of armed conflict appears to dictate very few constraints, either internal or external, and this has had a spillover effect on other areas of the law that do contain clear guidelines, such as prohibitions on torture.

#### Perception of geographical overreach sufficient to trigger backlash

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

No single national security policy shift in recent memory has produced more legal controversy than the overt, robust, and ongoing use of a State’s military power as an international counterterrorism tool.27 This is equally unremarkable for two primary reasons. First, never before had the United States engaged in an ongoing military campaign of this magnitude and duration against a non-State opponent operating in various locations throughout the globe. Second, and perhaps more importantly, is the consistent invocation of authority derived from a situation of armed conflict to provide the legal foundation for these military operations. This has produced a profound expansion of national authority to seek out and incapacitate members of terrorist organizations falling within the scope of what the United States considers the “enemy”—defined by the authority to kill as a measure of first resort and subject captives to long-term preventive detention.28¶ When the Bush administration originally coined the phrase “Global War on Terror” (GWOT), it was intended to put the terrorist enemy on notice that no longer were they functionally immune from the powerful U.S. combat arsenal. However, it also unleashed a decade long barrage of controversy, driven in large measure by the suggestion that this new “war” lacked any geographical limitation. Unlike wars of the recent past, all of which were conducted within a de facto geographically confined battlespace, the United States would, according to this new theory, take the fight to the enemy—an enemy so unconventional that this might include locations without even the slightest link to a theater of “active” combat operations, areas commonly characterized as “hot zones” today. Although President Obama abandoned the GWOT moniker, his administration nonetheless continues to strike targets of opportunity when and where they emerge, embracing the same threat–based scope of combat operations.29¶ In practice, these operations have never come close to matching the extreme rhetoric of power assertion invoked by opponents of the armed conflict with al Qaeda. The United States has never engaged in a cavalier assertion of combat power into the territory of a functioning State.30 Opponents to the GWOT concept like to erect the straw man of a U.S. attack in the streets of Berlin, London, Paris, or Zurich to demonstrate the consequences of a geographically unconstrained armed conflict against an unconventional terrorist enemy. In reality, however, the actual scope of combat operations has always been much more constrained by the (at least implicit) recognition of sovereignty.¶ Nonetheless, the concept of armed conflict of international scope conducted against a loosely organized non-State opponent—a typology of armed conflict resulting in the increasingly common characterization of “transnational armed conflict,”—certainly creates the perception, if not the reality, of authority overreach. The central theme of this theory is that the nature of the struggle justifies invoking and applying LOAC based authorities, while at the same time the dispersed and unconventional nature of the “enemy” necessitates taking the fight to where the attack opportunity arises.

## DA

### 2AC Haphazard Restrictions Inevitable

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

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

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

### 2AC Clarity DA

#### no link --- the plan’s delineation means that states CAN’T site LOAC authority outside of zones --- this means that the aff resolves the conflation between self-defense justifications and LOAC justification

#### PMC’s jack the LOAC

Daniel P. Ridlon, A.F. Captain, JD Harvard, 2008, “CONTRACTORS OR ILLEGAL COMBATANTS? THE STATUS OF ARMED CONTRACTORS IN IRAQ,” 62 A.F. L. Rev. 199, ln

In addition to legal liability, the United States' employment of PMF personnel in future conflicts has potential negative policy ramifications. Employing PMF personnel who are potentially viewed as illegal combatants may undermine the public image that the United States conducts its military operations in accordance with the laws of war. This would not only serve as a public relations problem for the United States, but it could also be used as justification for other nations or non-state actors to violate the laws of war, especially if those states or groups are engaged in a conflict against the United States. In the end, the employment of illegal combatants could reduce prisoner of war [\*253] protections afforded to United States military personnel if they are captured.

#### Goldstone report destroys the LOAC

Michael A. Newton 10, Law Prof @ Vanderbilt, “LAWFARE AND THE ISRAELI-PALESTINE PREDICAMENT: Illustrating Illegitimate Lawfare,” 43 Case W. Res. J. Int'l L. 255, ln

After detailing the content of the leaflet and radio broadcast warnings, the Report concluded that the warnings did not comply with the obligations of Protocol I because Israeli forces were presumed to have had the capability to issue more effective warnings, civilians in Gaza were uncertain about whether and where to go for safety, and some places of shelter were [\*277] struck after the warnings were issued. n91 Thus, despite giving more extensive warnings to the civilian population than in any other conflict in the long history of war, the efforts of the Israeli attackers were equated with attacks intentionally directed against the civilian population. This approach eviscerates the appropriate margin of appreciation that commanders who respect the law and endeavor to enforce its constraints should be entitled to rely upon--and which the law itself provides. There is simply no legal precedent for taking the position that the civilians actually respond to such warnings, particularly in circumstances such as Gaza where the civilian population is intimidated and often abused by an enemy that seeks to protect itself by deliberately intermingling with the innocent civilian population. The newly minted Goldstone standard for warning the civilian population would displace operational initiative from the commander in the attack to the defender who it must be remembered commits a war crime by intentionally commingling military objectives with protected civilians. This aspect of the report would itself serve to amend the entire fabric of the textual rules that currently regulate offensive uses of force in the midst of armed conflict.¶ This, then, is the essence of illegitimate lawfare. Words matter--particularly when they are charged with legal significance and purport to convey legal rights and obligations. When purported legal "developments" actually undermine the ends of the law, they are illegitimate and inappropriate. Legal movements that foreseeably serve to discredit the law of armed conflict even further in the eyes of a cynical world actually undermine its utility. Lawfare that creates uncertainty over the application of previously clear rules must be opposed vigorously because it does perhaps irrevocable harm to the fabric of the laws and customs of war. Illegitimate lawfare will marginalize the precepts of humanitarian law if left unchecked, and may serve to create strong disincentives to its application and enforcement. Knowledge of the law and an accompanying professional awareness that the law is binding remains central to the professional ethos of military forces around our planet irrespective of the reality that incomplete compliance with the jus in bello remains the regrettable norm. Hence, it logically follows that any efforts to distort and politicize fundamental principles of international law cannot be meekly accepted as inevitable developments.

#### Conflation between jus ad bellum and jus in bello is globally inevitable

Robert Sloane 9, Associate Professor of Law, Boston University School of Law, 2009, “The Cost of Conflation: Preserving the Dualism of Jus ad Bellum and Jus in Bello in the Contemporary Law of War,” Yale Journal of International law, http://www.yale.edu/yjil/files\_PDFs/vol34/Sloane

This case reflects, in microcosm, a pressing issue in the contemporary law of war. After 9/11, countless scholars and statesmen have called for changes in the jus ad bellum, the law governing resort to force, or the jus in bello, the law governing the conduct of hostilities.10 These invitations to reform, whatever their merit, raise an equally vital but distinct legal issue that has been largely neglected in recent legal scholarship: the relationship between the traditional branches of the law of war.11 Since the U.N. Charter introduced a positive jus ad bellum into international law, the reigning dogma has been that reflected in the SCSL Appeals Chamber’s opinion: the jus ad bellum and the jus in bello are, and must remain, analytically distinct. In bello rules and principles apply equally to all combatants, whatever each belligerent’s avowed ad bellum rationale for resorting to force: self-defense, the restoration of democratic government, territorial conquest, or the destruction of a national, ethnic, racial, or religious group, as such.12 It is immaterial, on this view, whether the ad bellum intent of the militia leaders indicted by the SCSL had been to restore a democratic government or to topple that government and install a brutal regime in its stead: they must adhere to and be judged by the same in bello rules and principles.

Postwar international law regards this analytic independence as axiomatic,13 as do most just war theorists. They insist that “[i]t is perfectly possible for a just war to be fought unjustly and for an unjust war to be fought in strict accordance with the rules.”14 In theory, then, any use of force may be simultaneously lawful and unlawful: unlawful, because its author had no right to resort to force under the jus ad bellum; lawful, if and to the extent that its author observes “the rules,” that is, the jus in bello. 15 I will refer to this particular rule, which insists on the analytic independence of ad bellum and in bello, as the dualistic axiom. Despite its widespread acceptance,16 the axiom, as we will see, is logically questionable, 17 undertheorized, and at times disregarded or misapplied in practice—with troubling consequences for the policies that underwrite these components of the contemporary law of war. Consider briefly a few examples, which, among others, will be explored in greater detail below:

• In 1999, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) carried out a four-month air campaign against Serbia. At the outset, NATO’s leaders made an in bello decision: its pilots would fly at a minimum height of 15,000 feet to reduce their risk from anti-aircraft fire essentially to zero, even though that would increase the risk to Serbian civilians because it often prevented visual confirmation of legitimate military targets. Many would argue that the in bello principle of proportionality obliges combatants to take some risk in an effort to reduce the risk to enemy civilians.18 If so, the perceived legitimacy of NATO’s avowed ad bellum goal, i.e., to halt the incipient ethnic cleansing of ethnic Albanian Kosovars, influenced the international ex post appraisal of NATO’s in bello conduct in the conflict.19

• After 9/11, the Bush administration launched and prosecuted what it described as a “Global War on Terror.” In this war, if it is a war,20 political elites and their lawyers invoked ad bellum factors—for example, the novel nature of the conflict or the enemy and the imperative to avoid at any cost another catastrophic terrorist attack— to justify or excuse in bello violations.21 Both treaties and custom, for example, categorically prohibit the in bello tactic of torture. It is difficult to dispute that the United States deliberately tortured some detainees in its custody. Alberto R. Gonzales also wrote in what has become an infamous memorandum that “the war against terrorism is a new kind of war,” which “renders obsolete Geneva’s strict limitations on questioning of enemy prisoners and renders quaint some of its provisions.” 22 One might recharacterize this assertion in the framework of this Article as a suggestion that ad bellum considerations may justifiably relax, or even vitiate, what some see as anachronistic in bello constraints.23

• In 1996, the International Court of Justice (ICJ) considered the legality of the threat or use of nuclear weapons.24 This required it to analyze both the jus ad bellum and the jus in bello. The Court concluded that the jus in bello generally prohibits nuclear weapons— with a curious qualification. It could not say “whether the threat or use of nuclear weapons would be lawful or unlawful in an extreme circumstance of self-defence, in which the very survival of a State would be at stake.”25 Again, to recharacterize this statement in the framework of this Article: if the ad bellum consequences for one party to a conflict become bad enough, a weapon otherwise categorically prohibited by the jus in bello might become legal for that party, although presumably it would remain illegal for the other—unless that other party, too, “a State,” faced an “extreme circumstance of self-defence.”

The logic in each of these examples is contrary to the dualistic axiom, which insists that in bello constraints apply equally to all parties to a conflict. They do not vary based on ad bellum appraisals of the justice, legitimacy, or even urgency of one side’s asserted casus belli (cause or justification for resort to force). 26 Yet these examples reflect a trend in contemporary international law to relax or disregard the dualistic axiom, that is, to allow ad bellum considerations to influence and, at times, even to vitiate the jus in bello—an outcome that degrades the efficacy of both components of the law of war. Recent state practice and some jurisprudence also suggest a related, and equally misguided, tendency to collapse the distinct ad bellum and in bello proportionality constraints imposed by the law of war. As explained in greater detail below, today, in contrast to the pre-U.N. Charter era, all force must be doubly proportionate: that is, proportionate relative to both the jus ad bellum and the jus in bello. 27 Yet, at times, the ICJ has confused, neglected, or misapplied the two principles, as have belligerents—again to the detriment of the key values and policies that underwrite the contemporary law of war.

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

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

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

#### Blurring now

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

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

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

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

State sovereignty was another impetus for creating the requirement that the hostilities reach a certain level of intensity before LOAC could apply. States wanted to limit the involvement of outside States in their domestic affairs. This objective must, therefore, be seen in light of the fact that the types of conflicts envisioned were mainly internal armed conflicts. In an extraterritorial NIAC context, the reluctance of the State party to the conflict to be subject to interference from other States in its internal affairs largely disappears.150 Neither internal disturbances nor the conflict itself takes place in their own territory.

Does it matter in terms of what LOAC requires for its application that it is the State not party to the conflict whose territorial integrity is infringed? In other words, could this geographic shift in where the hostilities occur affect one of the original underlying reasons for the existence of the threshold? In contrast to the previous two points (whether the violence undertaken by various armed groups may be conglomerated and whether the distribution of violence over space means that it does not reach the sufficient level of intensity), this point questions whether the level of intensity customarily required for internal armed conflicts is the same for extraterritorial conflicts.

It may be argued that the territorial State (i.e., the State in which an extraterritorial NIAC physically takes place) has an interest in trying to prevent incursions into its sovereignty, even though it may not be a party to that NIAC. An incursion by an outside State in order to fight an armed group would likely have implications for the “uninvolved” territorial State. For instance, such an action could be an indication that the territorial State is not able to maintain its own security—an image that States usually take pains to avoid. Or, the territorial State may be concerned that the outside State might gain control or influence within their State.

The implications this shift might have on establishing the threshold of an extraterritorial armed conflict are not clear. At the very least, the reassignment of which State’s sovereignty is affected indicates that issues arising from the shifted location of the conflict warrant further examination. Therefore, even if one accepts the premise that NIACs may exist extraterritorially, the fact that the law was designed for a different context presents challenges in determining the existence of an armed conflict.

VI. GEOGRAPHIC BOUNDARIES OF EXISTING ARMED CONFLICTS

The removal of territorial boundaries from a system based on these physical limits raises the related question of where LOAC may be applied once the law of armed conflict has been triggered. Limited discussion has arisen previously on this issue in the context of purely internal conflicts. However, the main controversy surfaces today specifically with regard to individuals affiliated with an organized armed group located in a second State (“outside of an active battlefield”151). The unease of some commentators that the world could become a battlefield reappears here.

Because NIAC law was designed for internal application, its extraterritorial parameters are not clear. Two main options have been discussed for how to deal with this challenge. One proposes that the geographic application of LOAC is limited to the area of hostilities. The other maintains that once an armed conflict exists the law may extend beyond the immediate zone of hostilities. This latter approach has been interpreted by some to suggest that the law applies to the parties to the conflict wherever they may be located.

The first proposal, suggesting that LOAC would not apply at a distance from wherever the hostilities were taking place,152 may seem logical on its face, but lacks a legal basis. Jurisprudence from the ICTY dealing with the geographic scope of Common Article 3 within a State contradicts this interpretation, providing that “international humanitarian law continues to apply . . . in the case of internal conflicts . . . [to] the whole territory under the control of a party, whether or not actual combat takes place there.”153 The ICTY case law has generally been interpreted by other bodies to mean that Common Article 3 applies to the entire country in which a conflict is taking place, regardless of where hostilities occur.154 This language has been repeatedly upheld by subsequent ICTY and ICTR judgments.155 In the absence of explicit treaty law or customary international law, this jurisprudence could be said to have relevance when it comes to interpreting the geographic contours of internal conflicts.

Resort to the object and purpose of the law also supports application of the law beyond areas of hostilities. One of the law’s fundamental purposes is to ensure protection of individuals once in the hands of the enemy. To interpret the law as only applying to areas of combat would reduce the protection afforded to some of the most vulnerable, who may be located at a distance from active hostilities.

Finally, the text of AP II can be turned to for some guidance, even though the types of conflicts under discussion here are those with a lower threshold. AP II explicitly provides that it applies to “to all persons affected by an armed conflict.”156 This indicates that although AP II limits its applicability to the State in which the conflict is taking place,157 its application is not restricted to areas of active hostilities.158

The second approach considers that once an armed conflict exists LOAC applies beyond the area of active hostilities.159 It is argued that this is the more defensible position of the two. Although this view does not find an explicit basis in treaty law, it is difficult to find justification within the existing law for restricting the application of LOAC to a certain region once an armed conflict exists. In addition, the ICTY and ICTR case law just noted could be said to indirectly support this position in that it interprets the application of the law as extending beyond the combat zones. However, too much reliance on this jurisprudence is misguided as it still depends on State boundaries. For example, if one accepts that the armed conflict in Afghanistan has spilled over into Pakistan, does Common Article 3 then apply throughout the country of Pakistan?

The view that LOAC applies beyond the area of active hostilities leads to the question of whether anything restricts the geographic application of LOAC. One approach is to interpret the ICTY case law as literally referring to the areas where the parties to the conflict have control.160 Under such a view, NIAC law would only apply to the territory under control of the Pakistani Taliban (and other armed groups) in the North-West Frontier Province. This construction, however, presents hurdles.161 First, what is meant by control?162 Second, if it is territorial control that is envisioned, the majority of commentators and jurisprudence view the control of territory by an armed group as an indicator for the applicability of Common Article 3, rather than an obligation.163 It would not make sense to require territorial control by an armed group in order to determine the reach of an armed conflict within a country, but not to require territorial control for the existence of an armed conflict.164 Third, taken to its extreme this interpretation illogically suggests that if neither party controls territory, then LOAC does not apply,165 leading to the possibility that LOAC would not apply precisely where the battle rages.

The U.S. government position that LOAC is not geographically constrained with regard to individual members of a party to a conflict166 has engendered criticism.167 However, it is a defensible stance if one has already accepted that the territorial boundaries of States do not limit LOAC’s application. The bigger issue seems to be that the law was not designed for extraterritorial application. As such, should the view that territorial boundaries are not relevant to LOAC’s application gain force, it may be that the law will develop in a clearer and more nuanced manner.168 Notwithstanding the lack of clarity with regard to this issue, significant restrictions on the use of force against an individual located at a distance from hostilities in a second country already exist. Perhaps most importantly, the question only arises in the first place if an armed conflict exists between the State using force and the armed group against which the force is directed (which includes establishing that the group to which the individual belongs is an identifiable party). Second, and crucially, the separate question then arises of whether an individual is targetable (either by virtue of the membership approach or because s/he is directly participating in hostilities).169 This includes determining that the individual in question has a sufficient nexus to the ongoing armed conflict.170

Should those conditions be fulfilled, then the constraints within LOAC still apply (such as all of the rules pertaining to the principles of distinction and proportionality), as would the country’s domestic law and human rights law to the degree that it interacts with LOAC. It is likely that if the occurrence were far from active hostilities the latter two bodies of law would play a greater role. Issues of State sovereignty could, and often do, present one of the greatest limitations on action. Therefore, it is not the case that force may be used anywhere in the world at any time against parties to the conflict once an armed conflict exists.

VII. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the general trend today is that some extraterritorial conflicts may qualify as NIACs, despite the fact that they are not geographically confined to a single State. This interpretation recognizes that to artificially restrict the law in a way that does not reflect either the realities on the ground or the purpose of the law itself is counterproductive. However, because the existing law was not designed for extraterritorial conflicts, challenges arise in its application.

The issue of links between armed groups in NIACs is an area where the law may need reinterpretation or development. Analogies with other areas of the law do not lead to more clarity. The tenuous suggestion that in order to fulfill the intensity requirement not only should the affiliated armed group be organized and part of an identifiable party, but also that the group’s actions and goals should constitute a threat to the opposing party carries with it practical problems. Specifically, it could be difficult to ascertain both the threat and which members of an armed group are actually participating in actions that are part of the global conflict, as opposed to part of a separate internal conflict.

Determining whether amassing violence that is diffused over distances may fulfill the intensity requirement is another example of how the geographic extension of the law’s application may present difficulties. It has been argued here that taking into account the underlying purpose of the law, the violence must reach a certain level of intensity within a geographic region for an armed conflict to exist. When the violence is spread out geographically, such that in an individual country the law enforcement regimes may function, it is difficult to view the intensity requirement as being met. However, as with links, this issue is far from resolved.

The third principal challenge resulting from the extraterritorial application of NIAC law is that a reassignment of sovereignty occurs. It is unclear if this shift might impact on how States perceive the threshold of the existence of an armed conflict.

Once the existence of an armed conflict has been established, a separate issue arises as to the geographic boundaries of that conflict. This impacts the controversial question of when an individual may be targeted or detained if located in another country away from the main battlefield. Here too, because the law was originally intended to apply within State boundaries, very little guidance exists. It is argued that as the law currently stands, once an armed conflict exists LOAC applies to the parties to the conflict wherever they may be located, but that other restraints within LOAC and jus ad bellum limit its application. In particular, the question of whether an armed conflict exists in the first place is not self-evident. The debate on who can be targeted and when applies both to internal NIACs and extraterritorial NIACs. It may be that additional stipulations will be considered necessary as the law develops given the lack of State boundaries and the distance from an active battlefield. However, currently the law does not require this. Finally, the restrictions found in jus ad bellum curtail action that may be taken.

Therefore, to erase territorial boundaries from the equation entirely when establishing the existence of an armed conflict raises challenges to the structure of the law and some of its underlying purposes. Certain obstacles may prompt clarification in the law; others may remain as limitations on the law’s application. As a consequence, it is not clear where the bar for the application of Common Article 3, and thus LOAC, lies, particularly when applied to conflicts that spread across multiple countries. Some States want to ensure that they have sufficient flexibility to deal with these circumstances. Other States (as well as organizations and commentators) are concerned that the law may be interpreted too permissively and ultimately be abused. A balance must be found in the solution to these issues.

### 2AC Immigration DA

#### Won’t pass---Boehner irrelevant

Adam O'Neal 12-23, December 23rd, 2013, "Immigration reform in 2014? Not so fast," https://www.humanevents.com/2013/12/23/immigration-reform-in-2014-not-so-fast/

A California-based immigration reform activist, who spoke to CalWatchdog.com on the condition of anonymity to be more candid, said that Boehner’s recent behavior was “heart-warming” and seemed “honest.”¶ The activist, who has been involved in lobbying California Congressmen to push for reform, added, “It makes you think, ‘OK, maybe [Boehner will] play ball.’”¶ But he cautioned that, while activists are optimistic, they’re not blindly so. He expects that major immigration reform won’t be able to pass until 2015, at the earliest. It’s difficult to pass major legislation in an election year, he explained, and it makes more strategic sense (from the Republican point of view) to wait.¶ Republicans, who are at a politically advantageous position because of the trouble associated with the rollout of Obamacare, reasonably expect to pick up seats in the midterms. They could feasibly control the Senate — though that will be no easy task — by January 2015. So why would they pass immigration reform when they’re almost certain to pick up seats and enter a stronger bargaining position? The answer is simple: They wouldn’t.¶ So, yes, Speaker Boehner has changed his tune. But that doesn’t mean he’ll change his strategy just yet.

#### The DA is not intrinsic – it’s within the agential ambit of the USFG to do the plan and pass immigration

**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

**PC not key**

Greg **Sargent 13**, "Syria won't make GOP's immigration problem go "poof" and disappear ; Syria or no Syria, Republicans will still pay the same price among Latinos if they kill reform," 9/12, Washington Post, Factiva

But when it comes to immigration -- as with this fall's fiscal fights -- **that question is largely irrelevant**. Obama's "standing" or "strength" with regard to Congress won't play any significant role in determining whether immigration reform happens. That, too, is a question that turns only on whether Republicans resolve their differences over it.¶ Immigration reform's fate, at bottom, **rests solely on** **whether Republicans decide it needs to pass** for the long term good of the party. **Either they will decide killing reform is too risky**, because it will lock in anti-GOP hostility among Latinos for a generation or more. **Or they will decide passing reform won't do enough to win over Latinos,** given their disagreement with the GOP on other issues, and that the downsides of alienating the base aren't worth the potential upsides. **Neither** the fact that Congress is distracted by **Syria, nor Obama's short term dip in popularity or standing** or whatever you want to call it, will have anything whatsoever to do with that decision. Nor will Latino reaction to the GOP's eventual decision. Does anyone imagine that if Republicans kill reform, Latinos will somehow see the Syria debate -- or, even more ludicrously, Beltway-generated ideas about Obama's "standing" -- as mitigating factors?

### AT: Econ

**Economic benefits are overstated**

Mike **Flynn 13**, Breitbart reporter, July 13, "White House Oversells Economic Benefits of Immigration Reform," www.breitbart.com/Big-Government/2013/07/13/white-house-oversells-economic-benefits-of-immigration-reform

On Saturday, President Obama used his weekly radio address to tout the economic benefits of passing the Senate immigration reform bill. On Wednesday, the White House issued a report saying the immigration reform bill would both trim the deficit and boost the economy over the next two decades. Even accepting the Administration's numbers at face-value, the report shows how little would be gained economically from reform in the long-term. In the short-term, however, there are some very real costs ignored by the White House.¶ The White House report draws heavily from a CBO analysis on the economic impact of the Senate bill, released in mid-June. The CBO estimates that, under the Senate bill, in 20 years, the nation's GDP would be $1.4 trillion higher than it otherwise would be if the bill didn't pass. The Administration claims the bill will grow the economy by 5.4% in that time-frame. ¶ Which sounds impressive, until one realizes that we are talking about a 20 year window here. An incremental growth of 5% over two decades isn't exactly an economic bonanza.

In that time-span the US economy will generate $300-500 trillion in total economic impact. An extra few trillion is at the margins or the margins.¶ Worse, the economic benefits the CBO estimates will accrue only begin at least a decade after enactment. Through 2031, Gross National Product, which measures the output of US residents and firms, would be lower than it otherwise would be. In ten years, the per capita GNP would be almost 1% lower than without the Senate bill. ¶ The CBO analysis also shows that average wages of American workers would be lower than they otherwise would be through at least the first 10 years of the law's enactment. The unemployment rate would also rise for the first decade, due to a large increase in the labor force.¶ Supporters and opponents of immigration reform both overstate its economic impact. In a nation of more than 300 million people and a $16 trillion economy, any economic impact is going to be felt at the margins. The CBO, however, finds that, for at least a decade, the economic effects of the Senate bill are negative at the margins. After 2 decades, the CBO says the effects become positive at the margin. ¶ A decade of relatively worse economic performance to secure marginally better performance 20 years from now is not an obviously good bargain. One can make many argument in favor of immigration reform. Economic growth, however, seems a very weak one.

# 1AR

## Case

### AT: Circumvention

#### Formalization prevents circumvention

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

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

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

## CP

### Geo Key

#### Only the aff prevents ‘war everywhere’ from becoming the new standard

Gregory Conners 12, Georgetown University Law Center J.D., Former US Air Force, Summer, NOTE: The World Is Not a Battlefield, Or Is It? Defining the Extent of the Battlefield in the Global War on Terror, 10 Geo. J.L. & Pub. Pol'y 645

This question in the most recent context of the post-9/11 world may elicit some attractively simple answers, ranging from Iraq, Afghanistan, and other countries where militaries are engaged in major operations, to anywhere and everywhere the enemy can be found. The simplicity of these answers, and their potential attractiveness to those who seek to either limit or expand military operations against terrorists, may be what has led to an as-yet unanswered legal question. However, because "twenty-first-century armed conflicts often have no battlefield in the traditional sense," the question can no longer be ignored as self-evident. n63 This lack of clarity has fostered the current ad hoc approaches to the questions which raise significant risks. n64 It is clearly inappropriate to claim that approval in international circles of the U.S. practice following the 9/11 attacks could constitute immediate customary international law, were such a concept possible. n65 Yet "instantaneous custom" is not necessarily the only way to accept U.S. practice as defining. As Professor Dinstein made clear, "[w]ar can be waged over large portions of the planet and beyond. The space subject to the potential spread of hostilities is known as the region of war." n66 This region, where combat operations have not yet reached but where they may be waged under the auspices of the armed conflict, is the potential battlefield.¶ As former President George W. Bush stated, "Today we focus on Afghanistan, but the battle is broader . . . . In this conflict, there is no neutral ground." n67 Likewise, as Undersecretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz stated after the airstrike against al-Harithi in Yemen in 2002, there is no principal front in this war. It is a global conflict. n68 These claims of global conflict are not confined to the Bush administration, as the Obama administration, which continues to decry the so-called "Bush Doctrine," n69 has simultaneously made the doctrine its own and even expanded upon it. n70 This can be seen from the nomination hearings for Attorney General Eric Holder and Supreme Court Justice Elena Kagan regarding [\*655] the recent strike that killed an American citizen in Yemen. In his nomination hearings, Attorney General Holder stated, "The battlefield .. . [is] in Afghanistan, but there are battlefields, potentially, you know, in our Nation." n71 Similarly, in her Supreme Court nomination hearings, in relation to her work as Solicitor General of the United States, Justice Kagan confirmed that an al Qaeda financier in the Philippines qualified as someone within the physical battlefield. n72 Yet this global battlefield doctrine was not even new in its fundamentals, n73 as Secretary of State George P. Shultz stated in 1984, "[w]e can expect more terrorism directed at our strategic interests around the world in the years ahead. To combat it, we must be willing to use military force." n74¶ It is also important to consider the U.S. approach in light of the contentions made by the terrorists themselves and the practice of other states in the current context. The World Islamic Front, in a statement signed by Osama bin Laden, and representative of much that he has published, stated that "to kill the Americans and their allies--civilians and military--is an individual duty for every Muslim who can do it in any country in which it is possible to do it." n75 The U.S. is not alone in practicing this aggressive form of self-defense. Considering Turkish incursions against the PKK in northern Iraq or Columbian military strikes against FARC insurgents in Ecuador, it is clear the U.S. approach is not unique. n76¶ The most significant modern development is not merely that the enemy is transnational and stateless, without "headquarters [or] designated zones of operation." n77 Technological developments have cast whatever historical clarity there may have been into even greater disarray. The utilization of special operations forces, while in many ways similar to guerrilla warfare in past conflicts, is enhanced by the ability to infiltrate and exfiltrate to strike targets in states not party to any conflict, and possibly without that state's knowledge. n78 More expansive is the use of drones to strike targets worldwide with extreme precision while the pilot launching the strike may be located within the U.S. n79 In the historical context and, as some currently argue, this could be said to render both locations clearly within the boundaries of a battlefield, because the combatants are physically located in both places. n80 If these strikes are found to be based upon clear military necessity and are not otherwise unlawful, then they could be lawful under established LOAC principles. n81 Yet this is not a universally accepted proposition, and the ICRC rejects it outright. n82 However, the question of whether such a drone strike could render the operator's location part of the battlefield, if only for the duration of those operations, is legitimate.¶ In the context of the fast-evolving threat of cyber-warfare, some have contended that the "[s]tate subjected to an armed attack is entitled to resort to self-defense measures against the aggressor, regardless of the geographic point where the attack was delivered." n83 This statement brings to light the lack of geographic boundaries in this new realm of warfare. With such indistinct and global possibilities, assuming that (1) the "cyber battlefield" extends beyond cyberspace to encompass both the physical computer infrastructure supporting the attack and being attacked, (2) the "cyber battlefield" extends to the physical targets of the attack, like power plants, and (3) that cyber attacks constitute armed conflict, the ramifications for the battlefield may be extreme. n84 Not only are civilian targets vulnerable, but a civilian server either apparently or actually hijacked and put into service for such cyber-attacks may be vulnerable under LOAC to either kinetic or non-kinetic attacks in response. n85 There does not appear to be a clear answer in the current framework addressing to what extent a civilian server might constitute the battlefield in such a cyber-attack, but the possibilities for kinetic targeting of civilian network infrastructure could render unprecedented geographic breadth subject to the LOAC applicable to the battlefield. Attempting to create a framework under which such decisions could be made in a consistent manner, in light of perhaps the most global potential for a "battlefield" status, might "serve as a first step to re-evaluating lawful participation in hostilities in other forms of remote warfare." n86¶ State practice in the context of such new and evolving threats reveals an inherent tension in the legal framework of the UN Charter right to self-defense n87 and the territorial sovereignty of the state who is not actively supporting [\*657] a terrorist organization yet refuses, or is unable, to counter their illegal acts or simply their presence. n88 This tension is resolved to a certain degree in States that cooperate, n89 yet this may be the exception rather than the rule. And with this exception comes a change in status of the neutral state because "[n]eutral states must refrain from allowing their territory to be used by belligerent states for the purposes of military operations." n90 Thus, a cooperating state opens itself up to attack. n91 Yet this tension may shed light on the status of the battlefield, for example in Yemen where U.S. military operations are allowed in its territory.¶ A recent instance highlighting what is ostensibly the battlefield during such an operation, is the targeted killing of Anwar al-Awlaki in Yemen. On Sept. 30, 2011, al-Awlaki was reportedly killed in a drone strike on his convoy of vehicles traveling in Yemen. n92 This targeted killing of a U.S. citizen, and radical Islamic militant reportedly a member of al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula and "cobelligerent with al Qaeda," on Yemeni soil was reportedly authorized by a memorandum from the U.S. Department of Justice that placed al-Awlaki on a kill or capture list. n93 Whether this strike was carried out with the consent or assistance of the Yemeni government or not raises important questions; however, in either case it was a military strike on foreign soil apart from recognized traditional "battlefields" as they exist in Iraq and Afghanistan. This exercise of military force fits within Dinstein's region of war paradigm and begs the question whether, if Yemen is within the region of war, there is an area outside of it, and thus not susceptible to the "battlefield" label. n94¶ One might argue that it is only the terrorist combatant who can be taken out with military force, and he is likely to be found on a more traditional battlefield, yet it may be that the financier or planner plays a more important role and presents the greatest threat. n95 These higher-level, arguably more important targets are unlikely to ever be found on what could be more traditionally labeled a battlefield, yet a military strike where they are located might be far more [\*658] critical in prosecuting the war on terror. The potential breadth to which this practice could push the battlefield, similar to the possibilities with cyber warfare, threatens to further support the idea of the global battlefield.¶ Yet, despite the breadth of what has historically been treated as the battlefield, there has never been a truly global battlefield. As seen above, from Lieber to the Additional Protocols to the Geneva Conventions, and throughout state practice there have been limits on the extent of what could be termed the battlefield. Though recent trends such as cyber warfare and remotely operated weapons pose a greater possibility of claims that the battlefield is global, n96 limits have existed and must continue to be explored in greater depth to define clearly what is and is not the battlefield in the newest realms of war. While the law of armed conflict has not yet spoken definitively to this question, it is not incapable of growth and development and often must be readdressed in light of changes in the world and the state's capability to wage war.¶ V. FUTURE OPERATIONS AND A FRAMEWORK FOR MOVING FORWARD¶ The armed conflicts of the future, and the battlefields on which they are fought, will likely challenge the application of the law of armed conflict in ways today's military and legal scholars cannot foresee. The advent of cyber warfare, financial warfare, advances in space, and the development of stealth drones capable of worldwide unmanned strikes suggest even more radical changes to come. While the law continues to grow and evolve to meet these new challenges and ones not yet foreseen, a framework for answering the question of where the battlefield extends may help control unchecked applications of force. Bearing in mind the admonishment that, "[w]hen principle is involved, [one must] be deaf to expediency," n97 it is necessary to base current and future actions on a principled, rather than ad hoc approach to this important question. A framework for deciding the legality of extending the battlefield in new conflict can provide this principled approach.

#### Key to the allied coop

Anthony Dworkin 13 is a senior policy fellow at the European Council on Foreign Relations, CNN, July 17, 2013, "Actually, drones worry Europe more than spying", http://globalpublicsquare.blogs.cnn.com/2013/07/17/actually-drones-worry-europe-more-than-spying/

Behind the scenes, though, it is not data protection and surveillance that produces the most complications for the transatlantic intelligence relationship, but rather America's use of armed drones to kill terrorist suspects away from the battlefield. Incidents such as the recent killing of at least 17 people in Pakistan are therefore only likely to heighten European unease.¶ In public, European governments have displayed a curiously passive approach to American drone strikes, even as their number has escalated under Barack Obama’s presidency. Many Europeans believe that the majority of these strikes are unlawful, but their governments have maintained an uneasy silence on the issue. This is partly because of the uncomfortable fact that information provided by European intelligence services may have been used to identify some targets. It is also because of a reluctance to accuse a close ally of having violated international law. And it is partly because European countries have not worked out exactly what they think about the use of drones and how far they agree within the European Union on the question. Now, however, Europe’s muted stance on drone strikes looks likely to change.¶ Why? For one thing, many European countries are now trying to acquire armed drones themselves, and this gives them an incentive to spell out clearer rules for their use. More importantly, perhaps, Europeans have noticed that drones are proliferating rapidly, and that countries like China, Russia and Saudi Arabia are soon likely to possess them. There is a clear European interest in trying to establish some restrictive standards on drone use before it is too late. For all these reasons, many European countries are now conducting internal reviews of their policy on drones, and discussions are also likely to start at a pan-European level.¶ But as Europeans begin to articulate their policy on the use of drones, a bigger question looms. Can Europe and the United States come together to agree on when drone strikes are permissible? Until now, that would have seemed impossible. Since the September 11 attacks, the United States has based its counterterrorism operations on the claim that it is engaged in a worldwide armed conflict with al Qaeda and associated forces — an idea that President Obama inherited from President George W. Bush and has been kept as the basis for an expanded drone strike campaign. European countries have generally rejected this claim.¶ However, the changes to American policy that President Obama announced in May could open the way to at least the possibility of a dialogue. Obama suggested that he anticipated a time in the not-too-distant future when the armed conflict against al Qaeda might come to an end. More substantially, he made clear that his administration was in the process of switching its policy so that, outside zones of hostilities, it would only use drone strikes against individuals who posed a continuing and imminent threat to the U.S. That is a more restrictive standard than the claim that any member of al Qaeda or an associated force could lawfully be killed with a drone strike at any time.¶ European countries might be more willing to accept an approach based on this kind of “self-defense” idea. However, there remain some big stumbling blocks.¶ First, a good deal about Obama’s new standards is still unclear. How does he define a “zone of hostilities,” where the new rules will not apply? And what is his understanding of an “imminent” threat? European countries are likely to interpret these key terms in a much narrower way than the United States.¶ Second, Obama’s new approach only applies as a policy choice. His more expansive legal claims remain in the background so that he is free to return to them if he wishes.¶ But if the United States is serious about working toward international standards on drone strikes, as Obama and his officials have sometimes suggested, then Europe is the obvious place to start. And there are a number of steps the administration could take to make an agreement with European countries more likely.

#### Geography disputes short-circuit all other cooperation

Pardiss Kebriaei 12, Senior Attorney, Center for Constitutional Rights, lead counsel for CCR in Al-Aulaqi v. Panetta, Fall, The Distance Between Principle and Practice in the Obama Administration’s Targeted Killing Program: A Response to Jeh Johnson, http://yalelawandpolicy.org/sites/default/files/Kebriaei\_The%20Distance%20Between%20Principle%20and%20Practice%20in%20the%20Obama%20Administration%27s%20Targeted%20Killing%20Program-%20A%20Response%20to%20Jeh%20Johnson.pdf

The broad geographic scope of the program is also based on the Administration claims that the laws of war permit the United States to target individuals potentially anywhere they are located, even in areas that do not exhibit the battlefield conditions that justify those exceptional rules.39 That position is not only highly legally contested,40 including by some of the United States’ closest allies,41 but also dangerous: according to the International Committee of the Red Cross, “the notion that a person ‘carries’ a [noninternational armed conflict] with him when he moves to the territory of a nonbelligerent state should not be accepted.”42 Accepting such a view, and the attendant “proposition that harm or damage could lawfully be inflicted on [civilians or civilian objects] in operation of the [International Humanitarian Law] principle of proportionality because an individual sought by another state is in their midst . . . would in effect mean recognition of the concept of a ‘global battlefield.’”43

#### It’s a lightning rod

RYAN J. Vogel 11, Foreign Affairs Specialist, Office of the Secretary of Defense, U.S. Department of Defense, Jan, DRONE WARFARE AND THE LAW OF ARMED CONFLICT, http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=1759562&rec=1&srcabs=1332096&alg=1&pos=3

This geographical expansiveness, and the line of logic that flows from it,39 has been a lightning rod for criticism both within the United States and abroad. In fact, some have argued that targeting operations conducted outside the geographical battlefield do not fall under the law of armed conflict at all, but under the criminal law, and therefore such operations constitute unlawful killings.40 Those who take this position typically oppose the idea of a “global battlefield,” preferring the more traditional territorially-contained battlefield – in this case, the territory of Afghanistan.41 Of course, in practice, the United States will almost certainly not embrace the broadest application of a “global battlefield” with regard to targeting operations. If there is a government willing and able to either capture or kill a sought-after belligerent within its territory, the United States is not likely to undermine that state’s sovereignty and risk the certain diplomatic blowback by targeting the individual anyway. However, in countries such as Pakistan, Somalia, and Yemen, where the respective governments maintain only partial control over their territory and have proven incapable of eliminating, or unwilling to eliminate, terrorist actors and activities, the United States has resorted to territorial incursions through drone strikes.42 Koh notes that the decision of “whether a particular individual will be targeted in a particular location will depend upon considerations specific to each case, including those related to the imminence of the threat, the sovereignty of the other states involved, and the willingness and ability of those states to suppress the threat the target poses.”43 According to the United States, it may conduct such strikes as long as the individuals (e.g., AUMF parties) are lawfully targetable as belligerents or civilians who have forfeited their protected status.4

## DA

### BLUR NOW

Geoffrey Corn, South Texas College of Law, Professor of Law and Presidential Research Professor, J.D., 10/22/11, Self-defense Targeting: Blurring the Line between the Jus ad Bellum and the Jus in Bello, http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=1947838

At the core of the self-defense targeting theory is the assumption that the jus ad bellum provides sufficient authority to both justify and regulate the application of combat power.71 This assumption ignores an axiom of jus belli development: the compartmentalization of the jus ad bellum and the jus in bello.72 As Colonel G.I.A.D. Draper noted in 1971, “equal application of the Law governing the conduct of armed conflicts to those illegally resorting to armed forces and those lawfully resorting thereto is accepted as axiomatic in modern International Law.”73 This compartmentalization is the historic response to the practice of defining jus in bello obligations by reference to the jus ad bellum legality of conflict.74 As the jus in bello evolved to focus on the humanitarian protection of victims of war, to include the armed forces themselves,75 the practice of denying LOAC applicability based on assertions of conflict illegality became indefensible.76 Instead, the de facto nature of hostilities would dictate jus in bello applicability, and the jus ad bellum legal basis for hostilities would be irrelevant to this determination.77

This compartmentalization lies at the core of the Geneva Convention lawtriggering equation.78 Adoption of the term “armed conflict” as the primary triggering consideration for jus in bello applicability was a deliberate response to the more formalistic jus in bello applicability that predated the 1949 revision of the Geneva Conventions.79 Prior to these revisions, in bello applicability often turned on the existence of a state of war in the international legal sense, which in turn led to assertions of inapplicability as the result of assertions of unlawful aggression.80 Determined to prevent the denial of humanitarian regulation to situations necessitating such regulation—any de facto armed conflict—the 1949 Conventions sought to neutralize the impact of ad bellum legality in law applicability analysis.81

This effort rapidly became the norm of international law.82 Armed conflict analysis simply did not include conflict legality considerations.83 National military manuals, international jurisprudence and expert commentary all reflect this development.84 This division is today a fundamental LOAC tenet—and is beyond dispute.85 In fact, for many years the United States has gone even farther, extending application of LOAC principles beyond situations of armed conflict altogether so as to regulate any military operation.86 This is just another manifestation of the fact that States, or perhaps more importantly the armed forces that do their bidding, view the cause or purported justification for such operations as irrelevant when deciding what rules apply to regulate operational and tactical execution.

This aspect of ad bellum/in bello compartmentalization is not called into question by the self-defense targeting concept.87 Nothing in the assertion that combat operations directed against transnational non-State belligerent groups qualifies as armed conflict suggests the inapplicability of LOAC regulatory norms on the basis of the relative illegitimacy of al Qaeda’s efforts to inflict harm on the United States and other victim States (although as noted earlier, this was implicit in the original Bush administration approach to the war on terror).88 Instead, the self-defense targeting concept reflects an odd inversion of the concern that motivated the armed conflict law trigger. The concept does not assert the illegitimacy of the terrorist cause to deny LOAC principles to operations directed against them.89 Instead, it relies on the legality of the U.S. cause to dispense with the need for applying LOAC principles to regulate these operations.90 This might not be explicit, but it is clear that an exclusive focus on ad bellum principles indicates that these principles subsume in bello conflict regulation norms.91

There are two fundamental flaws with this conflation. First, by contradicting the traditional compartmentalization between the two branches of the jus belli,92 it creates a dangerous precedent. Although there is no express resurrection of the just war concept of LOAC applicability, by focusing exclusively on jus ad bellum legality and principles, the concept suggests the inapplicability of jus in bello regulation as the result of the legality of the U.S. cause. To be clear, I believe U.S. counterterror operations are legally justified actions in self-defense. However, this should not be even implicitly relied on to deny jus in bello applicability to operations directed against terrorist opponents, precisely because it may be viewed as suggesting the invalidity of the opponent’s cause deprives them of the protections of that law, or that the operations are somehow exempted from LOAC regulation. Second, even discounting this detrimental precedential effect, the conflation of ad bellum and in bello principles to regulate the execution of operations is extremely troubling.93 This is because the meaning of these principles is distinct within each branch of the jus belli.94
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All of them claim the Administration is operating exclusively within the AUMF, and based on that assumption conclude certain things about what the Administration has done.

There is abundant evidence to refute that. After all, the Administration invokes self-defense about as many times as it does AUMF in the white paper. The white paper actually situates the authority to kill an American in “constitutional responsibility to protect the country” — that is, Article II authority — and inherent right to self-defense even before it lists the AUMF.

The President has authority to respond to the imminent threat posed by al-Qa’ida and its associated forces, arising from his constitutional responsibility to protect the country, the inherent right of the United States to national self defense under international law, Congress’s authorization of the use of all necessary and appropriate military force against this enemy, and the existence of an armed conflict with al-Qa’ida under international law.

(Interestingly, the Holder speech reverses that order, listing AUMF, law of war, Article II, and then self-defense under international law.)

One of the Senators who has actually been briefed on Anwar al-Awlaki’s killing kept asking, for an entire year, “is the President’s authority to kill Americans based on authorization from Congress or his own authority as Commander-in-Chief?” While Wyden didn’t repeat that question in open session at Brennan’s hearing (so it may have been answered in the OLC memos he got the morning of the hearing), if he didn’t know, then how can all these people who haven’t been briefed claim to know?

Similarly, Colleen McMahon — who has been briefed at least on why CIA needed to invoke No Number No List over their own public speech — emphasized the unilateral nature of the decision to kill Awlaki.

And ultimately, we should look to what Stephen Preston — the General Counsel of the agency that actually carried out the Awlaki killing — has to say about where the CIA gets its authorization to engage in lethal covert operations.

Let’s start with the first box: Authority to Act under U.S. Law.

First, we would confirm that the contemplated activity is authorized by the President in the exercise of his powers under Article II of the U.S. Constitution, for example, the President’s responsibility as Chief Executive and Commander-in-Chief to protect the country from an imminent threat of violent attack. This would not be just a one-time check for legal authority at the outset. Our hypothetical program would be engineered so as to ensure that, through careful review and senior-level decision-making, each individual action is linked to the imminent threat justification.

A specific congressional authorization might also provide an independent basis for the use of force under U.S. law.

In addition, we would make sure that the contemplated activity is authorized by the President in accordance with the covert action procedures of the National Security Act of 1947, such that Congress is properly notified by means of a Presidential Finding. [my emphasis]

The CIA, the agency that killed Awlaki, looks to Article II authority before it engages in targeted killing. Congressional authorization might also provide authority, Preston says. But Preston makes it clear that all the CIA needs to conduct lethal covert operations (though he does not specify that this holds with an American citizen) is the President’s Article II say-so.

At best, this record shows that Obama has operated under Article II and AUMF yoked together. There is no conceivable way (except by deliberate misreading) to argue that he is operating exclusively under the AUMF, because these public statements point to both the AUMF and Article II. And the Preston language at least envisions conducting such operations solely under Article II.

Finally, this notion that the President doesn’t think he could shoot drones against the Colombian drug lords or the LRA? It would be a lot more defensible statement if the Administration would share with even the Intelligence Committees — which it has thus far refused to do — the list of all the countries it has operated with lethal force. Add in those 7 OLC memos authorizing targeting killing (though not of Americans) that the Administration also has thus far refused to share, and there’s good reason to believe the Administration is conducting targeted killings — whether by drones or other means — in ways that must stretch the AUMF, because they won’t share that information with the Congress that purportedly authorized it.

These arguments that Obama ordering the death of an American (purportedly under exclusively AUMF authority) isn’t that bad are all very nice. But insofar as they ignore the public record, which shows that Obama is at least partially situating his authority to kill in his Article II authority, the arguments are simply spin on what Obama really did.