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#### Interpretation:

#### Restrictions are prohibitions --- the aff is distinct

Jean Schiedler-Brown 12, Attorney, Jean Schiedler-Brown & Associates, Appellant Brief of Randall Kinchloe v. States Dept of Health, Washington, The Court of Appeals of the State of Washington, Division 1, http://www.courts.wa.gov/content/Briefs/A01/686429%20Appellant%20Randall%20Kincheloe%27s.pdf

3. The ordinary definition of the term "restrictions" also does not include the reporting and monitoring or supervising terms and conditions that are included in the 2001 Stipulation.

Black's Law Dictionary, 'fifth edition,(1979) defines "restriction" as;

A limitation often imposed in a deed or lease respecting the use to which the property may be put. The term "restrict' is also cross referenced with the term "restrain." Restrain is defined as; To limit, confine, abridge, narrow down, restrict, obstruct, impede, hinder, stay, destroy. To prohibit from action; to put compulsion on; to restrict; to hold or press back. To keep in check; to hold back from acting, proceeding, or advancing, either by physical or moral force, or by interposing obstacle, to repress or suppress, to curb.

In contrast, the terms "supervise" and "supervisor" are defined as; To have general oversight over, to superintend or to inspect. See Supervisor. A surveyor or overseer. . . In a broad sense, one having authority over others, to superintend and direct. The term "supervisor" means an individual having authority, in the interest of the employer, to hire, transfer, suspend, layoff, recall, promote, discharge, assign, reward, or discipline other employees, or responsibility to direct them, or to adjust their grievances, or effectively to recommend such action, if in connection with the foregoing the exercise of such authority is not of a merely routine or clerical nature, but required the use of independent judgment.

Comparing the above definitions, it is clear that the definition of "restriction" is very different from the definition of "supervision"-very few of the same words are used to explain or define the different terms. In his 2001 stipulation, Mr. Kincheloe essentially agreed to some supervision conditions, but he did not agree to restrict his license.

#### Restrictions on authority are distinct from conditions

William Conner 78, former federal judge for the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York United States District Court, S. D. New York, CORPORACION VENEZOLANA de FOMENTO v. VINTERO SALES, http://www.leagle.com/decision/19781560452FSupp1108\_11379

Plaintiff next contends that Merban was charged with notice of the restrictions on the authority of plaintiff's officers to execute the guarantees. Properly interpreted, the "conditions" that had been imposed by plaintiff's Board of Directors and by the Venezuelan Cabinet were not "restrictions" or "limitations" upon the authority of plaintiff's agents but rather conditions precedent to the granting of authority. Essentially, then, plaintiff's argument is that Merban should have known that plaintiff's officers were not authorized to act except upon the fulfillment of the specified conditions.

#### Authority is power delegated to an agent by a principle

Kelly 3 Judge for the State of Michigan, JOSEPH ELEZOVIC, Plaintiff, and LULA ELEZOVIC, Plaintiff-Appellant/Cross-Appellee, v. FORD MOTOR COMPANY and DANIEL P. BENNETT, Defendants-Appellees/Cross-Appellants., No. 236749, COURT OF APPEALS OF MICHIGAN, 259 Mich. App. 187; 673 N.W.2d 776; 2003 Mich. App. LEXIS 2649; 93 Fair Empl. Prac. Cas. (BNA) 244; 92 Fair Empl. Prac. Cas. (BNA) 1557, lexis

Applying agency principles, a principal is responsible for the acts of its agents done within the scope of the agent's authority, "even though acting contrary to instructions." [Dick Loehr's, Inc v Secretary of State, 180 Mich. App. 165, 168; 446 N.W.2d 624 (1989)](https://www.lexis.com/research/buttonTFLink?_m=6cbcd97524abff5644c0987b135f7517&_xfercite=%3ccite%20cc%3d%22USA%22%3e%3c%21%5bCDATA%5b259%20Mich.%20App.%20187%5d%5d%3e%3c%2fcite%3e&_butType=3&_butStat=2&_origin=TOASHLX&_butNum=115&_butInline=1&_butinfo=%3ccite%20cc%3d%22USA%22%3e%3c%21%5bCDATA%5b180%20Mich.%20App.%20165%2cat%20168%5d%5d%3e%3c%2fcite%3e&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=136&_startdoc=101&wchp=dGLbVtb-zSkAk&_md5=708331d40466e4347936b73e103c82fb). This is because, in part, an agency relationship arises where the principal [\*\*\*36]  has the right to control the conduct of the agent. [St Clair Intermediate School Dist v Intermediate Ed Ass'n/Michigan Ed Ass'n, 458 Mich. 540, 558 n 18; 581 N.W.2d 707 (1998)](https://www.lexis.com/research/buttonTFLink?_m=6cbcd97524abff5644c0987b135f7517&_xfercite=%3ccite%20cc%3d%22USA%22%3e%3c%21%5bCDATA%5b259%20Mich.%20App.%20187%5d%5d%3e%3c%2fcite%3e&_butType=3&_butStat=2&_origin=TOASHLX&_butNum=116&_butInline=1&_butinfo=%3ccite%20cc%3d%22USA%22%3e%3c%21%5bCDATA%5b458%20Mich.%20540%2cat%20558%5d%5d%3e%3c%2fcite%3e&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=136&_startdoc=101&wchp=dGLbVtb-zSkAk&_md5=c0a63a81a484a6ce53be229bc2290a07) (citations omitted). The employer is also liable for the torts of his employee if "'the servant purported to act or to speak on behalf of the principal and there was reliance upon apparent authority, or he was aided in accomplishing the tort by the existence of the agency relation,'" [McCann v Michigan, 398 Mich. 65, 71; 247 N.W.2d 521 (1976)](https://www.lexis.com/research/buttonTFLink?_m=6cbcd97524abff5644c0987b135f7517&_xfercite=%3ccite%20cc%3d%22USA%22%3e%3c%21%5bCDATA%5b259%20Mich.%20App.%20187%5d%5d%3e%3c%2fcite%3e&_butType=3&_butStat=2&_origin=TOASHLX&_butNum=117&_butInline=1&_butinfo=%3ccite%20cc%3d%22USA%22%3e%3c%21%5bCDATA%5b398%20Mich.%2065%2cat%2071%5d%5d%3e%3c%2fcite%3e&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=136&_startdoc=101&wchp=dGLbVtb-zSkAk&_md5=5219d53b6a7119254f8041c911d87fd2), quoting [Restatement of Agency, 2d § 219(2)(d)](https://www.lexis.com/research/buttonTFLink?_m=6cbcd97524abff5644c0987b135f7517&_xfercite=%3ccite%20cc%3d%22USA%22%3e%3c%21%5bCDATA%5b259%20Mich.%20App.%20187%5d%5d%3e%3c%2fcite%3e&_butType=4&_butStat=0&_origin=TOASHLX&_butNum=118&_butInline=1&_butinfo=AGENCY%20SECOND%20219&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=136&_startdoc=101&wchp=dGLbVtb-zSkAk&_md5=71c1bf8c001fe5ae1153be4268b8e9e9), p 481; see also [Champion v Nation Wide Security, Inc, 450 Mich. 702, 704, 712; 545 N.W.2d 596 (1996)](https://www.lexis.com/research/buttonTFLink?_m=6cbcd97524abff5644c0987b135f7517&_xfercite=%3ccite%20cc%3d%22USA%22%3e%3c%21%5bCDATA%5b259%20Mich.%20App.%20187%5d%5d%3e%3c%2fcite%3e&_butType=3&_butStat=2&_origin=TOASHLX&_butNum=119&_butInline=1&_butinfo=%3ccite%20cc%3d%22USA%22%3e%3c%21%5bCDATA%5b450%20Mich.%20702%2cat%20704%5d%5d%3e%3c%2fcite%3e&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=136&_startdoc=101&wchp=dGLbVtb-zSkAk&_md5=3d1841dc7f4fb90804d8adb6349a6fae), citing [Restatement of Agency, 2d § 219(2)(d)](https://www.lexis.com/research/buttonTFLink?_m=6cbcd97524abff5644c0987b135f7517&_xfercite=%3ccite%20cc%3d%22USA%22%3e%3c%21%5bCDATA%5b259%20Mich.%20App.%20187%5d%5d%3e%3c%2fcite%3e&_butType=4&_butStat=0&_origin=TOASHLX&_butNum=120&_butInline=1&_butinfo=AGENCY%20SECOND%20219&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=136&_startdoc=101&wchp=dGLbVtb-zSkAk&_md5=c1927abf5bf3954a85d211c044ada141), p 481 ("the master is liable for the tort of his servant if the servant 'was aided in accomplishing the tort by the existence of the agency relation'"). In [Backus v  [\*213]  Kauffman (On Rehearing), 238 Mich. App. 402, 409; 605 N.W.2d 690 (1999)](https://www.lexis.com/research/buttonTFLink?_m=6cbcd97524abff5644c0987b135f7517&_xfercite=%3ccite%20cc%3d%22USA%22%3e%3c%21%5bCDATA%5b259%20Mich.%20App.%20187%5d%5d%3e%3c%2fcite%3e&_butType=3&_butStat=2&_origin=TOASHLX&_butNum=121&_butInline=1&_butinfo=%3ccite%20cc%3d%22USA%22%3e%3c%21%5bCDATA%5b238%20Mich.%20App.%20402%2cat%20409%5d%5d%3e%3c%2fcite%3e&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=136&_startdoc=101&wchp=dGLbVtb-zSkAk&_md5=d9947545fee151274d489cbc14123160), this Court stated: The term "authority" is defined by Black's Law Dictionary to include "the power delegated by a principal to an agent." Black's Law Dictionary (7th ed), p [\*\*\*37]  127. "Scope of authority" is defined in the following manner: "The reasonable power that an agent has been delegated or might foreseeably be delegated in carrying out the principal's business." Id. at 1348.

#### Violation:

#### Ex-post review only determines whether particular targeted killings exceeded authority the government already had---that doesn’t affect the legality of targeted killings at all

Steve Vladeck 13, professor of law and the associate dean for scholarship at American University Washington College of Law, 2/5/13, “What’s Really Wrong With the Targeted Killing White Paper,” <http://www.lawfareblog.com/2013/02/whats-really-wrong-with-the-targeted-killing-white-paper/>

Many of us wondered, at the time, just where this came from–since it’s hard to imagine what due process could be without at least some judicial oversight. On this point, the white paper again isn’t very helpful. The sum total of its analysis is Section II.C, on page 10, which provides that:

[U]nder the circumstances described in this paper, there exists no appropriate judicial forum to evaluate these constitutional considerations. It is well established that “[m]atters intimately related to foreign policy and national security are rarely proper subjects for judicial intervention,” because such matters “frequently turn on standards that defy the judicial application,” or “involve the exercise of a discretion demonstrably committed to the executive or legislature.” Were a court to intervene here, it might be required inappropriately to issue an ex ante command to the President and officials responsible for operations with respect to their specific tactical judgment to mount a potential lethal operation against a senior operational leader of al-Qa’ida or its associated forces. And judicial enforcement of such orders would require the Court to supervise inherently predictive judgments by the President and his national security advisors as to when and how to use force against a member of an enemy force against which Congress has authorized the use of force.

There are two enormous problems with this reasoning:

First, many of us who argue for at least some judicial review in this context specifically don’t argue for ex ante review for the precise reasons the white paper suggests. Instead, we argue for ex post review–in the form of damages actions after the fact, in which liability would only attach if the government both (1) exceeded its authority; and (2) did so in a way that violated clearly established law. Whatever else might be said about such damages suits, they simply don’t raise the interference concerns articulated in the white paper, and so one would have expected some distinct explanation for why that kind of judicial review shouldn’t be available in this context. All the white paper offers, though, is its more general allusion to the political question doctrine. Which brings me to…

Second, and in any event, the suggestion that lawsuits arising out of targeted killing operations against U.S. citizens raise a nonjusticiable political question is almost laughable–and is the one part of this white paper that really does hearken back to the good ole’ days of the Bush Administration (I’m less sold on any analogy based upon the rest of the paper). Even before last Term’s Zivotofsky decision, in which the Supreme Court went out of its way to remind everyone (especially the D.C. Circuit) of just how limited the political question doctrine really should be, it should’ve followed that uses of military force against U.S. citizens neither “turn on standards that defy the judicial application,” nor “involve the exercise of a discretion demonstrably committed to the executive or legislature.” Indeed, in the context of the Guantánamo habeas litigation, courts routinely inquire into the very questions that might well arise in such a damages suit, e.g., whether there is sufficient evidence to support the government’s conclusion that the target is/was a senior operational leader of al Qaeda or one of its affiliates…

Don’t get me wrong: Any suit challenging a targeted killing operation, even a post hoc damages action, is likely to run into a number of distinct procedural concerns, including the difficulty of arguing for a Bivens remedy; the extent to which the state secrets privilege might preclude the litigation; etc. But those are the arguments that the white paper should’ve been making–and not a wholly unnuanced invocation of the political question doctrine in a context in which it clearly does not–and should not–apply.

V. A Modest Proposal

This all leads me to what I’ve increasingly come to believe is the only real solution here: If folks are really concerned about this issue, especially on the Hill, then Congress should create a cause of action–with nominal damages–for individuals who have been the targets of such operations (or, more honestly, their heirs). The cause of action could be for $1 in damages; it could expressly abrogate the state secrets privilege and replace it with a procedure for the government to offer at least some of its evidence ex parte and in camera; and it could abrogate qualified immunity so that, in every case, the court makes law concerning how the government applies its criteria in a manner consistent with the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment. This wouldn’t in any way resolve the legality of targeted killings, but it would clear the way for courts to do what courts do–ensure that, when the government really is depriving an individual of their liberty (if not their life), it does so in a manner that comports with the Constitution–as the courts, and not just the Executive Branch, interpret it. It’s not a perfect solution, to be sure, but if ever there was a field in which the perfect is the enemy of the good, this is it.

#### Vote neg---

#### Neg ground---only prohibitions on particular authorities guarantee links to every core argument like flexibility and deference

#### Precision---only our interpretation defines “restrictions on authority”---that’s key to adequate preparation and policy analysis

#### Limits---there are an infinite number of small hoops they could require the president to jump through---overstretches our research burden
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#### Immigration will pass --- it’s Obama’s top priority

Eleanor Clift, 10-25-2013, “Obama, Congress Get Back to the Immigration Fight,” Daily Beast, http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2013/10/25/obama-congress-get-back-to-the-immigration-fight.html

But now with the shutdown behind them and Republicans on the defensive, Obama saw an opening to get back in the game. His message, says Sharry: “‘Hey, I’m flexible,’ which after the shutdown politics was important, and he implied ‘if you don’t do it, I’m coming after you.’” For Obama and the Democrats, immigration reform is a win-win issue. They want an overhaul for the country and their constituents. If they don’t get it, they will hammer Republicans in demographically changing districts in California, Nevada, and Florida, where they could likely pick up seats—not enough to win control of the House, but, paired with what Sharry calls “the shutdown narrative,” Democratic operatives are salivating at the prospect of waging that campaign. Some Republicans understand the stakes, and former vice-presidential candidate and budget maven Paul Ryan is at the center of a newly energized backroom effort to craft legislation that would deal with the thorniest aspect of immigration reform for Republicans: the disposition of 11 million people in the country illegally. Rep. Raul Labrador (R-ID), an early advocate of reform who abandoned the effort some months ago, argues that Obama’s tough bargaining during the shutdown means Republicans can’t trust him on immigration. “When have they ever trusted him?” asks Sharry. “Nobody is asking them to do this for Obama. They should do this for the country and for themselves.... We’re not talking about tax increases or gun violence. This is something the pillars of the Republican coalition are strongly in favor of.” Among those pillars is Chamber of Commerce President Tom Donahue, who on Monday noted the generally good feelings about immigration reform among disparate groups, among them business and labor. He expressed optimism that the House could pass something, go to conference and resolve differences with the Senate, get a bill and have the president sign it “and guess what, government works! Everybody is looking for something positive to take home.” The Wall Street Journal reported Thursday that GOP donors are withholding contributions to lawmakers blocking reform, and that Republicans for Immigration Reform, headed by former Bush Cabinet official, Carlos Gutierrez, is running an Internet ad urging action. Next week, evangelical Christians affiliated with the Evangelical Immigration Table will be in Washington to press Congress to act with charity toward people in the country without documentation, treating them as they would Jesus. The law-enforcement community has also stepped forward repeatedly to embrace an overhaul. House Speaker John Boehner says he wants legislation, but not the “massive” bill that the Senate passed and that Obama supports. The House seems inclined to act—if it acts at all—on a series of smaller bills starting with “Kids Out,” a form of the Dream Act that grants a path to citizenship for young people brought to the U.S. as children; then agriculture-worker and high-tech visas, accompanied by tougher border security. The sticking point is the 11 million people in the country illegally, and finding a compromise between Democrats’ insistence that reform include a path to citizenship, and Republicans’ belief that offering any kind of relief constitutes amnesty and would reward people for breaking the law. The details matter hugely, but what a handful of Republicans, led by Ryan, appear to be crafting is legalization for most of the 11 million but without any mention of citizenship. It wouldn’t create a new or direct or special path for people who came to the U.S. illegally or overstayed their visa. It would allow them to earn legal status through some yet-to-be-determined steps, and once they get it, they go to the end of a very long line that could have people waiting for decades. The Senate bill contains a 13-year wait. However daunting that sounds, the potential for meaningful reform is tantalizingly close with Republicans actively engaged in preparing their proposal, pressure building from the business community and religious leaders, and a short window before the end of the year to redeem the reputation of Congress and the Republican Party after a bruising takedown. The pieces are all there for long-sought immigration reform. We could be a few weeks away from an historic House vote, or headed for a midterm election where Republicans once again are on the wrong side of history and demography.

#### Judicial interference in drone policy wrecks PC---Obama would fight

Elinor June Rushforth 12, J.D. candidate, University of Arizona, James E. Rogers College of Law, Class of 2013, Fall 2012, “NOTE: THERE'S AN APP FOR THAT: IMPLICATIONS OF ARMED DRONE ATTACKS AND PERSONALITY STRIKES BY THE UNITED STATES AGAINST NON-CITIZENS, 2004-2012,” Arizona Journal of International and Comparative Law, 29 Ariz. J. Int'l & Comp. Law 623, p. lexis

Because of staunch political and military support for the drone program, it is unlikely that these attacks will diminish in the near future. If that is indeed the case, it is more important than ever that the Executive, in conjunction with Congress and the judiciary, set out clear standards for these lethal operations. The nation has faced these difficult questions before and "[i]n keeping with the purpose and the pragmatism of Mathews v. Eldridge, this investigation should be as thorough, independent, and public as possible without damage to national security." n189 Specifically, a heightened and public standard of review is needed for the CIA drone program as the military operates within its own chain of command. There should be an open standard of selection that clearly delineates why an individual becomes a target, how long they may be targeted, and who reviews the information about the target. Though these standards are likely to remain classified based on national security concerns, there has been success in integrating national security cases into the judicial process; for example, in the Guantanamo detainee cases. n190 A federal court or panel should also be created, similar to Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Courts that will aid in the targeting process and issue a warrant for a strike. n191¶ A. The Standard for a Lethal Targeting Operation¶ Because of the U.S. commitment to the rule of law, any lethal program not operated by a military branch should be subject to a more public and judicially overseen review. The CIA needs to define exactly who they are searching for; whether it is the "anyone who aids and abets" terrorism level of involvement or a mere scintilla of suspicion. By defining whom they are targeting, a level of credence will be lent to the program. Further, the United States should take a page out of Israel's playbook and declare that there must be actionable intelligence against the proposed target that identifies "the target as a person actively involved in acts of terrorism." n192 There must be an actual plan of attack (time, place, means) in place by that individual that is known through the [\*652] intelligence; n193 this will lessen the likelihood of opportunistic targeting that risks error and miscalculation. Further, an assessment of the distinction and proportionality of the attack should be tied into the decision to attack, n194 as well as a reflection on potential domestic political consequences n195 and foreign political blowback from an attack. n196 Then, supervisors should review a package of information about the proposed target and decide if the intelligence is good enough to continue up the chain of command. Due to the Executive's reassurances, a review process similar to this is already in place, however, without sacrificing national security interests this standard of selection should be made more public. Though the decision to attack terrorist organizations, and those providing material support, has already been made, n197 public support for the tactics used in the Overseas Contingency Operations should help guide the executive and legislative game plan. ¶ B. The Role of the Courts in Targeted Killing Operations¶ The next level of review should be a statutorily created court that is the last stop on the targeted killing process. Though there may be some grumbling among judges and politicians about overextended courts and full dockets, national security concerns and the risk of lethal mistakes should outweigh reluctance to introduce an important check on targeted killing. The President, and perhaps Congress, could also be reluctant to allow courts into what they deem a core executive function. n198 Attorney General Eric Holder gave the public another piece of the Obama administration's targeted killing model when he claimed that the Constitution "guarantees due process, not judicial process" and that "due process [\*653] takes into account the realities of combat." n199 This signals to the public that the Obama administration will remain wary of any encroachment and that the imposition of judicial process on targeted killing would be fought.

#### **Political capital is the deciding factor**

Michael Shifter 12, is the President of Inter-American Dialogue, 12/27, “Will Obama Kick the Can Down the Road?” 2012, http://www.thedialogue.org/page.cfm?pageID=32&pubID=3186

Not surprisingly, Obama has been explicit that reforming the US’s shameful and broken immigration system will be a top priority in his second term. There is every indication that he intends to use some of his precious political capital – especially in the first year – to push for serious change. The biggest lesson of the last election was that the “Latino vote” was decisive. No one doubts that it will be even more so in future elections. During the campaign, many Republicans -- inexplicably -- frightened immigrants with offensive rhetoric. But the day after the election, there was talk, in both parties, of comprehensive immigration reform. ¶ Despite the sudden optimism about immigration reform, there is, of course, no guarantee that it will happen. It will require a lot of negotiation and deal-making. Obama will have to invest a lot of his time and political capital -- twisting some arms, even in his own party. Resistance will not disappear.

#### Ag industry’s collapsing now---immigration’s key

Alfonso Serrano 12, Bitter Harvest: U.S. Farmers Blame Billion-Dollar Losses on Immigration Laws, Time, 9-21-12, http://business.time.com/2012/09/21/bitter-harvest-u-s-farmers-blame-billion-dollar-losses-on-immigration-laws/

The Broetjes and an increasing number of farmers across the country say that a complex web of local and state anti-immigration laws account for acute labor shortages. With the harvest season in full bloom, stringent immigration laws have forced waves of undocumented immigrants to flee certain states for more-hospitable areas. In their wake, thousands of acres of crops have been left to rot in the fields, as farmers have struggled to compensate for labor shortages with domestic help.¶ “The enforcement of immigration policy has devastated the skilled-labor source that we’ve depended on for 20 or 30 years,” said Ralph Broetje during a recent teleconference organized by the National Immigration Forum, adding that last year Washington farmers — part of an $8 billion agriculture industry — were forced to leave 10% of their crops rotting on vines and trees. “It’s getting worse each year,” says Broetje, “and it’s going to end up putting some growers out of business if Congress doesn’t step up and do immigration reform.”¶ (MORE: Why Undocumented Workers Are Good for the Economy)¶ Roughly 70% of the 1.2 million people employed by the agriculture industry are undocumented. No U.S. industry is more dependent on undocumented immigrants. But acute labor shortages brought on by anti-immigration measures threaten to heap record losses on an industry emerging from years of stiff foreign competition. Nationwide, labor shortages will result in losses of up to $9 billion, according to the American Farm Bureau Federation.

#### Extinction

Lugar 2k Chairman of the Senator Foreign Relations Committee and Member/Former Chair of the Senate Agriculture Committee (Richard, a US Senator from Indiana, is Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and a member and former chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee. “calls for a new green revolution to combat global warming and reduce world instability,” pg online @ http://www.unep.org/OurPlanet/imgversn/143/lugar.html)

In a world confronted by global terrorism, turmoil in the Middle East, burgeoning nuclear threats and other crises, it is easy to lose sight of the long-range challenges. But we do so at our peril. One of the most daunting of them is meeting the world’s need for food and energy in this century. At stake is not only preventing starvation and saving the environment, but also world peace and security. History tells us that states may go to war over access to resources, and that poverty and famine have often bred fanaticism and terrorism. Working to feed the world will minimize factors that contribute to global instability and the proliferation of [WMDs] weapons of mass destruction. With the world population expected to grow from 6 billion people today to 9 billion by mid-century, the demand for affordable food will increase well beyond current international production levels. People in rapidly developing nations will have the means greatly to improve their standard of living and caloric intake. Inevitably, that means eating more meat. This will raise demand for feed grain at the same time that the growing world population will need vastly more basic food to eat. Complicating a solution to this problem is a dynamic that must be better understood in the West: developing countries often use limited arable land to expand cities to house their growing populations. As good land disappears, people destroy timber resources and even rainforests as they try to create more arable land to feed themselves. The long-term environmental consequences could be disastrous for the entire globe. Productivity revolution To meet the expected demand for food over the next 50 years, we in the United States will have to grow roughly three times more food on the land we have. That’s a tall order. My farm in Marion County, Indiana, for example, yields on average 8.3 to 8.6 tonnes of corn per hectare – typical for a farm in central Indiana. To triple our production by 2050, we will have to produce an annual average of 25 tonnes per hectare. Can we possibly boost output that much? Well, it’s been done before. Advances in the use of fertilizer and water, improved machinery and better tilling techniques combined to generate a threefold increase in yields since 1935 – on our farm back then, my dad produced 2.8 to 3 tonnes per hectare. Much US agriculture has seen similar increases. But of course there is no guarantee that we can achieve those results again. Given the urgency of expanding food production to meet world demand, we must invest much more in scientific research and target that money toward projects that promise to have significant national and global impact. For the United States, that will mean a major shift in the way we conduct and fund agricultural science. Fundamental research will generate the innovations that will be necessary to feed the world. The United States can take a leading position in a productivity revolution. And our success at increasing food production may play a decisive humanitarian role in the survival of billions of people and the health of our planet.
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#### Judicial review would result in all targeted killings being ruled unconstitutional---courts would conclude they don’t satisfy the requirement of imminence for use of force in self-defense

Benjamin McKelvey 11, J.D., Vanderbilt University Law School, November 2011, “NOTE: Due Process Rights and the Targeted Killing of Suspected Terrorists: The Unconstitutional Scope of Executive Killing Power,” Vanderbilt Journal of Transnational Law, 44 Vand. J. Transnat'l L. 1353

In the alternative, and far more broadly, the DOJ argued that executive authority to conduct targeted killings is constitutionally committed power. n101 Under this interpretation, the President has the authority to defend the nation against imminent threats of attack. n102 This argument is not limited by statutory parameters or congressional authorization, such as that under the AUMF. n103 Rather, the duty to defend the nation is inherent in the President's constitutional powers and is not subject to judicial interference or review. n104

The DOJ is correct in arguing that the President is constitutionally empowered to use military force to protect the nation from imminent attack. n105 As the DOJ noted in its brief in response, the Supreme Court has held that the president has the authority to protect the nation from "imminent attack" and to decide the level of necessary force. n106 The same is true in the international context. Even though Yemen is not a warzone and al-Qaeda is not a state actor, international law accepts the position that countries may respond to specific, imminent threats of harm with lethal force. n107 [\*1367] Under these doctrines of domestic and international law, the use of lethal force against Aulaqi was valid if he presented a concrete, specific, and imminent threat of harm to the United States. n108

Therefore, the President was justified in using lethal force to protect the nation against Aulaqi, or any other American, if that individual presented a concrete threat that satisfied the "imminence" standard. n109 However, the judiciary may, as a matter of law, review the use of military force to ensure that it conforms with the limitations and conditions of statutory and constitional grants of authority. n110 In the context of targeted killing, a federal court could evaluate the targeted killing program to determine whether it satisfies the constitutional standard for the use of defensive force by the Executive Branch. Targeted killing, by its very name, suggests an entirely premeditated and offensive form of military force. n111 Moreover, the overview of the CIA's targeted killing program revealed a rigorous process involving an enormous amount of advance research, planning, and approval. n112 While the President has exclusive authority over determining whether a specific situation or individual presents an imminent threat to the nation, the judiciary has the authority to define "imminence" as a legal standard. n113 These [\*1368] are general concepts of law, not political questions, and they are subject to judicial review. n114

Under judicial review, a court would likely determine that targeted killing does not satisfy the imminence standard for the president's authority to use force in defense of the nation. Targeted killing is a premeditated assassination and the culmination of months of intelligence gathering, planning, and coordination. n115 "Imminence" would have no meaning as a standard if it were stretched to encompass such an elaborate and exhaustive process. n116 Similarly, the concept of "defensive" force is eviscerated and useless if it includes entirely premeditated and offensive forms of military action against a perceived threat. n117 Under judicial review, a court could easily and properly determine that targeted killing does not satisfy the imminence standard for the constitutional use of defensive force. n118

#### Judicial review of targeted killings would destroy unit cohesion, cause risk aversion, undermine mission effectiveness, and disclose key intel sources---all of those destroy effective drone ops

Larry Maher 10, Quartermaster General, Veterans of Foreign Wars, et al, 9/30/10, BRIEF OF THE VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES AS AMICUS CURIAE IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANTS AND DISMISSAL, Nasser al-Aulaqi, Plaintiff, vs. Barack H. Obama, et al., Defendants, <http://www.lawfareblog.com/wp-content/uploads/2010/10/VFW_Brief_PACER.pdf>

As a member organization comprised of individual veterans who have served this nation in war, and who continue to do so around the world, the VFW has a strong interest in protecting the operations of the U.S. armed forces from unwarranted or inappropriate judicial intrusion, as it believes is the case here. Such judicial interference with the Executive Branch and its constitutional war powers has dangerous implications for national security and our armed forces. Litigation over combat activities would undermine unit cohesion, the core of combat effectiveness at the small unit level. Judicial scrutiny of combat decision making—including strategic, operational and tactical decisions—would induce risk aversion and second-guessing among America’s military leaders, degrading their effectiveness. And, in the sensitive field of special operations, cases such as this may compromise the sources and methods used by America’s elite warriors, potentially threatening both their mission and their safety. Because of the importance of these issues, and the serious threat that this suit and similar litigation pose to national defense, the VFW is submitting this amicus curiae brief in order to share with the Court its perspective on the reasons why this action should be dismissed for lack of subject-matter jurisdiction.

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

The VFW agrees with the Government’s arguments regarding why this suit is barred, including by the political question doctrine. Rather than repeating those arguments, this amicus brief seeks to add perspective to the reasons why suits like the present action would threaten national security by interfering with ongoing military operations. Allowing this case to proceed would contravene the core military principle of “unity of command,” and undermine the military’s chain of command, creating uncertainty for subordinate leaders and soldiers. Such litigation also would adversely affect unit cohesion, the glue which binds small units together in the heat of battle, and enables them to survive and accomplish their missions. Further, litigation of cases such as this would undermine battlefield decisionmaking by subjecting tactical, operational and strategic decisions to second-guessing by courts far removed from the battlefield. And, to the extent this case will involve the activities of special operations forces, the VFW urges the Court to tread with particular caution, because of the need to protect the extremely sensitive sources and methods utilized by our nation’s elite forces.

#### Targeted killing’s vital to CT

Kenneth Anderson 13, Professor of International Law at American University, June 2013, “The Case for Drones,” Commentary, Vol. 135, No. 6

Targeted killing of high-value terrorist targets, by contrast, is the end result of a long, independent intelligence process. What the drone adds to that intelligence might be considerable, through its surveillance capabilities -- but much of the drone's contribution will be tactical, providing intelligence that assists in the planning and execution of the strike itself, in order to pick the moment when there might be the fewest civilian casualties.

Nonetheless, in conjunction with high-quality intelligence, drone warfare offers an unparalleled means to strike directly at terrorist organizations without needing a conventional or counterinsurgency approach to reach terrorist groups in their safe havens. It offers an offensive capability, rather than simply defensive measures, such as homeland security alone. Drone warfare offers a raiding strategy directly against the terrorists and their leadership.

If one believes, as many of the critics of drone warfare do, that the proper strategies of counterterrorism are essentially defensive -- including those that eschew the paradigm of armed conflict in favor of law enforcement and criminal law -- then the strategic virtue of an offensive capability against the terrorists themselves will seem small. But that has not been American policy since 9/11, not under the Bush administration, not under the Obama administration -- and not by the Congress of the United States, which has authorized hundreds of billions of dollars to fight the war on terror aggressively. The United States has used many offensive methods in the past dozen years: Regime change of states offering safe havens, counter-insurgency war, special operations, military and intelligence assistance to regimes battling our common enemies are examples of the methods that are just of military nature.

Drone warfare today is integrated with a much larger strategic counterterrorism target -- one in which, as in Afghanistan in the late 1990s, radical Islamist groups seize governance of whole populations and territories and provide not only safe haven, but also an honored central role to transnational terrorist groups. This is what current conflicts in Yemen and Mali threaten, in counterterrorism terms, and why the United States, along with France and even the UN, has moved to intervene militarily. Drone warfare is just one element of overall strategy, but it has a clear utility in disrupting terrorist leadership. It makes the planning and execution of complex plots difficult if only because it is hard to plan for years down the road if you have some reason to think you will be struck down by a drone but have no idea when. The unpredictability and terrifying anticipation of sudden attack, which terrorists have acknowledged in communications, have a significant impact on planning and organizational effectiveness.

#### Plan would collapse the effectiveness of Special Forces missions---lawsuits would disclose sources and methods that are vital to mission accomplishment

Larry Maher 10, Quartermaster General, Veterans of Foreign Wars, et al, 9/30/10, BRIEF OF THE VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES AS AMICUS CURIAE IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANTS AND DISMISSAL, Nasser al-Aulaqi, Plaintiff, vs. Barack H. Obama, et al., Defendants, <http://www.lawfareblog.com/wp-content/uploads/2010/10/VFW_Brief_PACER.pdf>

Finally, the VFW’s membership includes many current and former members of the U.S. armed forces’ elite special operations forces—Army Rangers and Special Forces, Navy SEALs, Air Force parajumpers and combat controllers, and Marine Corps Force Reconnaissance personnel, among others. These elite warriors conduct highly dangerous missions today in Iraq, Afghanistan, and other countries around the world. By definition, special operations “are operations conducted in hostile, denied, or politically sensitive environments to achieve military, diplomatic, informational, and/or economic objectives employing military capabilities for which there is no broad conventional force requirement. These operations often require covert, clandestine, or low-visibility capabilities.” U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, Joint Pub. 3-05, Doctrine for Joint Special Operations, at I-1 (2003), available at http://www.dtic.mil/doctrine/new\_pubs/jp3\_05.pdf.

Special operations are differentiated from conventional operations in many ways, but foremost among these are their “degree of physical and political risk, operational techniques, mode of employment, independence from friendly support, and dependence on detailed operational intelligence and indigenous assets.” Id. “Surprise is often the most important principle in the conduct of successful [special operations] and the survivability of employed [special operations forces],” and the very nature of special operations requires “high levels of security . . . to protect the clandestine/covert nature of missions.” Id. at I-6. More than mission accomplishment is at stake—“[g]iven their operating size, [special operations teams] are more vulnerable to potential hostile reaction to their presence than larger conventional units,” and therefore the protection of sources and methods is essential for the survival of special operations forces. Id. To preserve this element of surprise, special operations forces must broadly conceal their tactics, techniques and procedures, including information about unit locations and movements, targeting decisions, and operational plans for future missions. Disclosure of this information would allow this nation’s adversaries to defend themselves more effectively, potentially inflicting more casualties upon U.S. special operations forces. Such disclosure would also provide information about how the U.S. military gathers information about its adversaries, enabling terrorist groups like Al Qaeda to alter its communications and activities in order to evade future detection and action by the U.S. Government. Such harm would not be limited to just this instance or terrorist group group; these disclosures would also provide future terrorist adversaries and military adversaries with insight into U.S. special operations capabilities which would enable them to counter such capabilities in future conflicts. Cf. Public Declaration of Robert M. Gates, Secretary of Defense, Govt. Exhibit 4, September 23, 2010, at ¶¶ 6-7.

In this matter, the Plaintiff asks the Court to pull back the veil on the U.S. special operations community, exposing special operations sources and methods to the public, including this nation’s enemies. This would do tremendous harm to current special operations personnel, including VFW members, who are operating abroad in Iraq, Afghanistan, and elsewhere, and who depend on stealth, security and surprise for their survival and mission accomplishment. Further, in his prayer for relief, Plaintiff asks the Court to order the disclosure of “the criteria that are used in determining whether the government will carry out the targeted killing of a U.S. citizen.” As Secretary Gates states in his public declaration filed by the Government, without confirming or denying any allegation made by Plaintiff, this type of information “constitutes highly sensitive and classified military information that cannot be disclosed without causing serious harm to the national security of the United States." Id. at ¶5. These criteria necessarily reflect the sources, methods and analytic processes used to produce them, and would tend to reveal other information about military' sources and methods which are essential to the success and survival of special operations personnel.

#### Special forces’ effectiveness is key to counter-prolif

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

WMD do not represent new threats to U.S. security interests, but as nascent nuclear powers grow their arsenals and aspirants like Iran continue to pursue nuclear capabilities, the threat of nuclear proliferation, as well as the potential for the actual use of nuclear weapons, will increase. Upheaval in failing or outlaw states like Libya and Syria, which possess chemical weapons and a range of missiles, highlights the possibility that in future instances of state collapse or civil war, such weapons could be used by failing regimes in an act of desperation, fall into the hands of rebel forces, or be seized by parties hostile to the United States or its interests. SOF can contribute across the spectrum of counter-WMD efforts, from stopping the acquisition of WMD by hostile states or terrorist groups to preventing their use. The global CT network SOF have built over the last decade could be repurposed over the next decade to become a global counter-WMD network, applying the same logic that it takes a network to defeat a network. Increasing the reach and density of a global counter-WMD network will require expanding security cooperation activities focused on counter-proliferation. Finally, SOF may offer the most viable strategic option for deposing WMD-armed regimes through UW campaigns should the need arise.

#### Special forces are key to disarm rogues’ nuclear programs---the alternative is U.S. counterforce nuclear strikes

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

Finally, if the United States goes to war with a nuclear-armed adversary, SOF may offer the least-worst option for regime change. In 2011, former Secretary of Defense Robert Gates famously said that, “…future defense secretary who advises the president to again send a big American land army into Asia or into the Middle East or Africa should ‘have his head examined,’ as General MacArthur so delicately put it.” 209 While current and future American political leaders may be reluctant to dispatch large-scale forces to conduct regime change operations akin to Operation Iraqi Freedom, SOF offer a viable strategic option for deposing WMD-armed regimes through UW campaigns should the need arise. Using UW may represent the best alternative to using nuclear weapons or large ground forces to invade and occupy a country possessing WMD. The traditional downside of UW is that preparations for such campaigns could take years to put in place, if not longer. The United States would do well to begin developing limited UW options in advance - by using SOF and intelligence assets to build relationships with groups that could threaten WMD-armed regimes - so that future presidents have a viable unconventional regime-change option when confronting WMD-armed adversaries.

#### Rogues will locate their WMD in cities---U.S. nuclear strikes cause mass casualties

Gormley 9 – Dennis Gormley, Senior Fellow in the James Martin Center for Nonproliferation Studies at the Monterey Institute for International Studies, Fall 2009, “The Path to Deep Nuclear Reductions: Dealing with American Conventional Superiority,” online: http://www.ifri.org/files/Securite\_defense/PP29\_Gormley.pdf

Attacking strategic underground targets seems superficially to be the role for which nuclear weapons are most indispensable. According to the U.S. Intelligence Community, there are roughly 2,000 of these targets of interest to U.S. military planners. Due to their burial depth, a good number of these facilities are beyond the reach of existing conventional earth-penetrator weapons.24 Many are susceptible to destruction by one or more nuclear earth penetrators, but not without unwanted consequences. Because more than half of these strategic underground targets are located near or in urban areas, a nuclear attack could produce significant civilian casualties (depending on yield, between thousands and more than a million, according to the U.S. National Academy of Sciences); even in more remote areas, casualties could range between a few hundred to hundreds of thousands, depending on yield and wind conditions.25 A new nuclear earthpenetrator weapon, which the Bush administration favored studying and their NPR endorsed but Congress rejected, would effectively capture a few hundred of these strategic underground targets but some uncertain number would presumably remain beyond reach, and such weapons would still produce unwanted collateral effects.26

### 1NC

#### Plan breaks the political question doctrine---triggers a slippery slope

Christopher Ehrfurth 11, 10/10/11, “The Extrajudicial Killing of Anwar al-Awlaki,” http://law.marquette.edu/facultyblog/2011/10/10/the-extrajudicial-killing-of-anwar-al-awlaki/

The legality of the extrajudicial assassination of al-Awlaki was the subject of a civil suit in 2010. After learning that his son had been placed on a CIA/Joint Special Operations Command “kill list”, al-Awlaki’s father brought suit in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia against President Obama, Secretary of Defense Robert Gates, and CIA Director Leon Panetta. In an attempt to enjoin the executive branch from killing his son, al-Awlaki introduced several claims based in both constitutional and tort law. The court’s lengthy opinion begins with a compelling recitation of the questions presented:

How is it that judicial approval is required when the United States decides to target a U.S. citizen overseas for electronic surveillance, but that, according to defendants, judicial scrutiny is prohibited when the United States decides to target a U.S. citizen overseas for death? Can a U.S. citizen –himself or through another — use the U.S. judicial system to vindicate his constitutional rights while simultaneously evading U.S. law enforcement authorities, calling for “jihad against the West,” and engaging in operational planning for an organization that has already carried out numerous terrorist attacks against the United States? Can the Executive order the assassination of a U.S. citizen without first affording him any form of judicial process whatsoever, based on the mere assertion that he is a dangerous member of a terrorist organization? How can the courts, as plaintiff proposes, make real-time assessments of the nature and severity of alleged threats to national security, determine the imminence of those threats, weigh the benefits and costs of possible diplomatic and military responses, and ultimately decide whether, and under what circumstances, the use of military force against such threats is justified? When would it ever make sense for the United States to disclose in advance to the “target” of contemplated military action the precise standards under which it will take that military action? And how does the evolving AQAP relate to core al Qaeda for purposes of assessing the legality of targeting AQAP (or its principals) under the September 18, 2001 Authorization for the Use of Military Force?

Al-Aulaqi v. Obama, 727 F.Supp.2d 1, 8-9 (D.D.C. 2010).

Before contemplating the more compelling issues, the court first decided the issue of standing. Al-Awlaki’s father lacked “next-friend” standing because he failed to provide an adequate reason justifying why Anwar could not appear in court on his own behalf. His father claimed that if Anwar presented himself to authorities he would be exposed to attack. The court disagreed, citing public government statements indicating that if al-Awlaki surrendered peacefully he could not be executed without due process.

The court also denied third party standing, holding that Anwar’s father could not show that a parent suffers an injury in fact if his adult child is threatened with a future extrajudicial killing. Anwar’s status as an adult was of particular importance because a parent does not have a constitutionally (or common law) protected liberty interest in maintaining a relationship with his adult child free from government influence.

Prudential standing was denied because, among other reasons, the court refused to “unnecessarily adjudicate rights” that it believed al-Awlaki did not wish to assert himself. The court noted that al-Awlaki made numerous public statements professing his contempt for the U.S. legal system. Al-Awlaki did not believe that he was bound by U.S. laws because, in his view, they are contrary to the teachings of Allah. I personally find it difficult to believe that a person would not want to contest his own assassination, but it also seems unlikely that al-Awlaki would wish to assert legal rights in a court system that he did not recognize as authoritative, especially in a country that he openly despised.

Ultimately, the most compelling issues were not addressed because the court found that judicial review was inappropriate. The court held that separation of powers and the political question doctrine prohibited interfering with the executive branch’s orders with respect to military action abroad. Meaningful review was deemed impossible, because it would require an unmanageable assessment of the quality of the President’s interpretation of military intelligence and his resulting decision (based upon that intelligence) to use military force against terrorist targets overseas:

[T]his Court does not hold that the Executive possesses “unreviewable authority to order the assassination of any American whom he labels an enemy of the state.” (citation omitted), the Court only concludes that it lacks the capacity to determine whether a specific individual in hiding overseas, whom the Director of National Intelligence has stated is an “operational” member of AQAP, (citation omitted), presents such a threat to national security that the United States may authorize the use of lethal force against him. This Court readily acknowledges that it is a “drastic measure” for the United States to employ lethal force against one of its own citizens abroad, even if that citizen is currently playing an operational role in a “terrorist group that has claimed responsibility for numerous attacks against Saudi, Korean, Yemeni, and U.S. targets since January 2009,”(citation omitted) But as the D.C. Circuit explained in Schneider, a determination as to whether “drastic measures should be taken in matters of foreign policy and national security is not the stuff of adjudication, but of policymaking.” (citation omitted) Because decision-making in the realm of military and foreign affairs is textually committed to the political branches, and because courts are functionally ill-equipped to make the types of complex policy judgments that would be required to adjudicate the merits of plaintiff’s claims, the Court finds that the political question doctrine bars judicial resolution of this case.

Al-Aulaqi, 727 F.Supp.2d at 52-53.

It is unfortunate that the Aulaqi case never made it beyond the issue of standing, but perhaps that was the proper outcome. Although Awlaki was a U.S. citizen (and a citizen of Yemen), he was also clearly a member of al-Qaeda. Shortly after 9/11, Congress passed the Authorization for Use of Military Force (“AUMF”). The AUMF provides that:

[T]he President is authorized to use all necessary and appropriate force against those nations, organizations, or persons he determines planned, authorized, committed, or aided the terrorist attacks that occurred on September 11, 2001…in order to prevent any future acts of international terrorism against the United States…

Everyone (except for the guy who leaves “9/11 was inside job” comments beneath every news article on the internet) knows that al-Qaeda is the organization that planned and committed the terrorist attacks that occurred on 9/11. Al-Awlaki was indisputably a member of al-Qaeda. The Executive’s killing of al-Awlaki was certainly aimed at preventing future acts of international terrorism against the United States. If the AUMF can be read as authorizing al-Awlaki’s killing, then it would appear that the President assassinated him with congressional approval. In that scenario, Justice Jackson’s concurrence in Youngstown would indicate that the President was acting at the highest ebb of his authority.

Still, many columnists and politicians like Ron Paul believe that Obama’s decision was illegal on due process grounds. Might Ron Paul be engaging in political grandstanding? I do seem to remember hearing something about an upcoming election. On the other hand, the AUMF only authorizes necessary and appropriate force. In his suit against the Executive, al-Aulaqi suggested that imminence is the key factor in determining whether lethal force is justified. It would have been interesting to find out what legal standard the court would apply to the use of lethal force on foreign soil against a member of al-Qaeda holding U.S. citizenship, but that issue was never addressed.

Was the force used against al-Awlaki necessary and appropriate? It seems difficult to determine without a meaningful presentation of evidence against al-Awlaki. Personally, I don’t think I’ll hold my breath waiting for the day that the general public is offered an explanation as to why al-Awlaki couldn’t be captured and tried in a U.S. courtroom. It is troubling to know that the President can order the extrajudicial execution of a U.S. citizen based upon secret evidence. On the other hand, it has been said that the Constitution is not a suicide pact, and it’s comforting to know that the President is tracking and killing those who are actively trying to kill Americans.

After reading the al-Aulaqi opinion, I was left feeling unsatisfied with the court’s decision to defer to the other branches of government, but I understood why it did so. In many ways, the moral issue of al-Awlaki’s murder leaves me feeling the same way. I think it’s unfortunate that al-Awlaki was not indicted, captured, and tried in Federal court. I also understand that applying traditional due process to a terrorist abroad might create a logistical nightmare and place many innocent lives in danger. Is this a slippery slope? If so, wouldn’t requiring the judicial approval of military strategy abroad be just as slippery? Either way, I respect those who speak out in favor of due process. I also wonder how many of those people, if faced with the same choice as the President, would choose differently.

#### That spills over to climate change cases---litigants are turning to the Courts now and asking them to abrogate the PQD

Laurence H. Tribe 10, the Carl M. Loeb University Professor, Harvard Law School; Joshua D. Branson, J.D., Harvard Law School and NDT Champion, Northwestern University; and Tristan L. Duncan, Partner, Shook, Hardy & Bacon L.L.P., January 2010, “TOOHOTFORCOURTSTO HANDLE: FUEL TEMPERATURES, GLOBAL WARMING, AND THE POLITICAL QUESTION DOCTRINE,” <http://www.wlf.org/Upload/legalstudies/workingpaper/012910Tribe_WP.pdf>

Two sets of problems, one manifested at a microcosmic level and the other about as macrocosmic as imaginable, powerfully illustrate these propositions. Not coincidentally, both stem from concerns about temperature and its chemical and climactic effects, concerns playing an increasingly central role in the American policy process. As those concerns have come to the fore, courts have correspondingly warmed to the idea of judicial intervention, drawn by the siren song of making the world a better place and fueled by the incentives for lawyers to convert public concern into private profit. In both the fuel temperature and global warming cases, litigants, at times justifying their circumvention of representative democracy by pointing to the slow pace of policy reform, have turned to the courts. By donning the cloak of adjudication, they have found judges for whom the common law doctrines of unjust enrichment, consumer fraud, and nuisance appear to furnish constitutionally acceptable and pragmatically useful tools with which to manage temperature’s effects. Like the proverbial carpenter armed with a hammer to whom everything looks like a nail, those judges are wrong. For both retail gasoline and global climate, the judicial application of common law principles provides a constitutionally deficient—and structurally unsound—mechanism for remedying temperature’s unwanted effects.

It has been axiomatic throughout our constitutional history that there exist some questions beyond the proper reach of the judiciary. In fact, the political question doctrine originates in no less august a case than Marbury v. Madison, where Chief Justice Marshall stated that “[q]uestions in their nature political, or which are, by the constitution and laws, submitted to the executive, can never be made in this court.”1 Well over a century after that landmark ruling, the Supreme Court, in Baker v. Carr, famously announced six identifying characteristics of such nonjusticiable political questions, which, primarily as a “function of the separation of powers,” courts may not adjudicate.2 Of these six characteristics, the Court recently made clear that two are particularly important: (1) the presence of “a textually demonstrable constitutional commitment of the issue to a coordinate political department;” and (2) “a lack of judicially discoverable and manageable standards for resolving it.”3

The spectrum of nonjusticiable political questions in a sense spans the poles formed by these two principles. At one pole, the Constitution’s specific textual commitments shield issues expressly reserved to the political branches from judicial interference. At the other pole lie matters not necessarily reserved in so many words to one of the political branches but nonetheless institutionally incapable of coherent and principled resolution by courts acting in a truly judicial capacity; such matters are protected from judicial meddling by the requirement that “judicial action must be governed by standard, by rule” and by the correlative axiom that “law pronounced by the courts must be principled, rational, and based upon reasoned distinctions.”4

At a deeper level, however, the two poles collapse into one. The reason emerges if one considers issues that courts are asked to address involving novel problems the Constitution’s framers, farsighted though they were, could not have anticipated with sufficient specificity to entrust their resolution to Congress or to the Executive in haec verba. A perfect exemplar of such problems is the nest of puzzles posed by humaninduced climate change. When matters of that character are taken to court for resolution by judges, what marks them as “political” for purposes of the “political question doctrine” is not some problem-specific language but, rather, the demonstrable intractability of those matters to principled resolution through lawsuits. And one way to understand that intractability is to view it as itself marking the Constitution’s textual, albeit broadly couched, commitment of the questions presented to the processes we denominate “legislative” or “executive”—that is, to the pluralistic processes of legislation and treaty-making rather than to the principle-bound process of judicially resolving what Article III denominates “cases” and “controversies.” In other words, the judicial unmanageability of an issue serves as powerful evidence that the Constitution’s text reserves that issue, even if broadly and implicitly, to the political branches.5

It has become commonplace that confusion and controversy have long distinguished the doctrine that determines, as a basic matter of the Constitution’s separation of powers, which questions are “political” in the specific sense of falling outside the constitutional competence of courts and which are properly justiciable despite the “political” issues they may touch. But that the principles in play have yet to be reduced to any generally accepted and readily applied formula cannot mean that courts are simply free to toss the separation of powers to the winds and plunge ahead in blissful disregard of the profoundly important principles that the political question doctrine embodies. Unfortunately, that appears to be just what some courts have done in the two temperature-related cases—one involving hot fuels, the other a hot earth— that inspired this publication. In the first, a court allowed a claim about measuring fuels to proceed despite a constitutional provision specifically reserving the issue to Congress. In the second—a case in which the specific issue could not have been anticipated, much less expressly reserved, but in which the only imaginable solutions clearly lie beyond judicial competence—a court, rather than dismissing the case as it ought to have done, instead summarily dismissed the intractable obstacles to judicial management presented by climate change merely because it was familiar with the underlying cause of action. As this pair of bookend cases demonstrates, the political question doctrine is feeling heat from both directions.

#### That wrecks coordination necessary to solve warming

Laurence H. Tribe 10, the Carl M. Loeb University Professor, Harvard Law School; Joshua D. Branson, J.D., Harvard Law School and NDT Champion, Northwestern University; and Tristan L. Duncan, Partner, Shook, Hardy & Bacon L.L.P., January 2010, “TOOHOTFORCOURTSTO HANDLE: FUEL TEMPERATURES, GLOBAL WARMING, AND THE POLITICAL QUESTION DOCTRINE,” <http://www.wlf.org/Upload/legalstudies/workingpaper/012910Tribe_WP.pdf>

But that being said, if the Second Circuit was implying that such claims are justiciable in part because they are relatively costless, it was wrong again. In the wake of the recent Copenhagen climate negotiations, America is at a crossroads regarding its energy policy. At Copenhagen, the world—for the first time including both the United States and China—took a tremulous first step towards a comprehensive and truly global solution to climate change.44 By securing a modicum of international consensus—albeit not yet with binding commitments—President Obama laid the foundation for what could eventually be a groundbreaking congressional overhaul of American energy policy, an effort that will undoubtedly be shaped by considerations as obviously political as our energy independence from hostile and unreliable foreign regimes and that will both influence and be influenced by the delicate state of international climate negotiations.45

Against this backdrop, courts would be wise to heed the conclusion of one report that what “makes climate change such a difficult policy problem is that decisions made today can have significant, uncertain, and difficult to reverse consequences extending many years into the future."46 This observation is even more salient given that America—and the world—stand at the precipice of major systemic climate reform, if not in the coming year then in the coming decade. It would be disastrous for climate policy if, as at least one commentator has predicted,47 courts were to “beat Congress to the punch” and begin to concoct common law “solutions” to climate change problems before the emergence of a legislative resolution. Not only does judicial action in this field require costly and irreversible technological change on the part of defendants, but the prior existence of an ad hoc mishmash of common law regimes will frustrate legislators’ attempts to design coherent and systematic marketbased solutions.48 Indeed, both emissions trading regimes and carbon taxes seek to harness the fungibility of GHG emissions by creating incentives for reductions to take place where they are most efficient. But if courts were to require reductions of randomly chosen defendants—with no regard for whether they are efficient reducers— they would inhibit the effective operation of legislatively-created, market-based regimes by prematurely and artificially constricting the size of the market. And as one analyst succinctly put it before Congress, “[a]n insufficient number of participants will doom an emissions trading market.”49

There is no doubt that the “Copenhagen Accord only begins the battle” against climate change, as diplomats, bureaucrats, and legislators all now begin the lengthy struggle to turn that Accord’s audacious vision into concrete reality.50 But whatever one’s position in the debate between emissions trading and carbon taxes, or even in the debate over the extent or indeed the reality of anthropogenic climate change, one thing is clear: legislators, armed with the best economic and scientific analysis, and with the capability of binding, or at least strongly incentivizing, all involved parties, are the only ones constitutionally entitled to fight that battle.

CONCLUSION

Some prognosticators opine that the political question doctrine has fallen into disrepute and that it no longer constitutes a viable basis upon which to combat unconstitutional judicial overreaching.51 No doubt the standing doctrine could theoretically suffice to prevent some of the most audacious judicial sallies into the political thicket, as it might in the climate change case, where plaintiffs assert only undifferentiated and generalized causal chains from their chosen defendants to their alleged injuries. But when courts lose sight of the important limitations that the political question doctrine independently imposes upon judicial power–even where standing problems are at low ebb, as with the Motor Fuel case–then constitutional governance, and in turn the protection of individual rights and preservation of legal boundaries, suffer. The specter of two leading circuit courts manifestly losing their way in the equally real thicket of political question doctrine underscores the urgency, perhaps through the intervention of the Supreme Court, of restoring the checks and balances of our constitutional system by reinforcing rather than eroding the doctrine’s bulwark against judicial meddling in disputes either expressly entrusted by the Constitution to the political branches or so plainly immune to coherent judicial management as to be implicitly entrusted to political processes. It is not only the climate of the globe that carries profound implications for our future; it is also the climate of the times and its implications for how we govern ourselves.

#### Extinction

Flournoy 12 -- Citing Feng Hsu, PhD NASA Scientist @ the Goddard Space Flight Center. Don Flournoy is a PhD and MA from the University of Texas, Former Dean of the University College @ Ohio University, Former Associate Dean @ State University of New York and Case Institute of Technology, Project Manager for University/Industry Experiments for the NASA ACTS Satellite, Currently Professor of Telecommunications @ Scripps College of Communications @ Ohio University (Don, "Solar Power Satellites," January, Springer Briefs in Space Development, Book, p. 10-11

In the Online Journal of Space Communication , Dr. Feng Hsu, a  NASA scientist at Goddard Space Flight Center, a research center in the forefront of science of space and Earth, writes, “The evidence of global warming is alarming,” noting the potential for a catastrophic planetary climate change is real and troubling (Hsu 2010 ) . Hsu and his NASA colleagues were engaged in monitoring and analyzing climate changes on a global scale, through which they received first-hand scientific information and data relating to global warming issues, including the dynamics of polar ice cap melting. After discussing this research with colleagues who were world experts on the subject, he wrote: I now have no doubt global temperatures are rising, and that global warming is a serious problem confronting all of humanity. No matter whether these trends are due to human interference or to the cosmic cycling of our solar system, there are two basic facts that are crystal clear: (a) there is overwhelming scientific evidence showing positive correlations between the level of CO2 concentrations in Earth’s atmosphere with respect to the historical fluctuations of global temperature changes; and (b) the overwhelming majority of the world’s scientific community is in agreement about the risks of a potential catastrophic global climate change. That is, if we humans continue to ignore this problem and do nothing, if we continue dumping huge quantities of greenhouse gases into Earth’s biosphere, humanity will be at dire risk (Hsu 2010 ) . As a technology risk assessment expert, Hsu says he can show with some confidence that the planet will face more risk doing nothing to curb its fossil-based energy addictions than it will in making a fundamental shift in its energy supply. “This,” he writes, “is because the risks of a catastrophic anthropogenic climate change can be potentially the extinction of human species, a risk that is simply too high for us to take any chances” (Hsu 2010 )

### 1NC

#### The Executive branch should publicly articulate its legal rationale for its targeted killing policy, including the process and safeguards in place for target selection. The United States Congress should enact a resolution and issue a white paper stating that, in the conduct of its oversight it has reviewed ongoing targeted killing operations and determined that the United States government is conducting such operations in full compliance with relevant laws, including but not limited to the Authorization to Use Military Force of 2001, covert action findings, and the President’s inherent powers under the Constitution.

#### The CP’s the best middle ground---preserves the vital counter-terror role of targeted killings while resolving all their downsides

Daniel Byman 13, Professor in the Security Studies Program at the Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service at Georgetown University and a Senior Fellow at the Saban Center for Middle East Policy at the Brookings Institution, July/August 2013, “Why Drones Work,” Foreign Affairs, Vol. 92, No. 4

Despite President Barack Obama's recent call to reduce the United States' reliance on drones, they will likely remain his administration's weapon of choice. Whereas President George W. Bush oversaw fewer than 50 drone strikes during his tenure, Obama has signed off on over 400 of them in the last four years, making the program the centerpiece of U.S. counterterrorism strategy. The drones have done their job remarkably well: by killing key leaders and denying terrorists sanctuaries in Pakistan, Yemen, and, to a lesser degree, Somalia, drones have devastated al Qaeda and associated anti-American militant groups. And they have done so at little financial cost, at no risk to U.S. forces, and with fewer civilian casualties than many alternative methods would have caused.

Critics, however, remain skeptical. They claim that drones kill thousands of innocent civilians, alienate allied governments, anger foreign publics, illegally target Americans, and set a dangerous precedent that irresponsible governments will abuse. Some of these criticisms are valid; others, less so. In the end, drone strikes remain a necessary instrument of counterterrorism. The United States simply cannot tolerate terrorist safe havens in remote parts of Pakistan and elsewhere, and drones offer a comparatively low-risk way of targeting these areas while minimizing collateral damage.

So drone warfare is here to stay, and it is likely to expand in the years to come as other countries' capabilities catch up with those of the United States. But Washington must continue to improve its drone policy, spelling out clearer rules for extrajudicial and extraterritorial killings so that tyrannical regimes will have a harder time pointing to the U.S. drone program to justify attacks against political opponents. At the same time, even as it solidifies the drone program, Washington must remain mindful of the built-in limits of low-cost, unmanned interventions, since the very convenience of drone warfare risks dragging the United States into conflicts it could otherwise avoid.

#### Solves---the combination of executive disclosure and Congressional support boosts accountability and legitimacy

Gregory 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>

Perhaps the most obvious way to add accountability to the targeted killing process is for someone in government to describe the process the way this article has, and from there, defend the process. The task of describing the government’s policies in detail should not fall to anonymous sources, confidential interviews, and selective leaks. Government’s failure to defend policies is not a phenomenon that is unique to post 9/11 targeted killings. In fact, James Baker once noted

"In my experience, the United States does a better job at incorporating intelligence into its targeting decisions than it does in using intelligence to explain those decisions after the fact. This in part reflects the inherent difficulty in articulating a basis for targets derived from ongoing intelligence sources and methods. Moreover, it is hard to pause during ongoing operations to work through issues of disclosure…But articulation is an important part of the targeting process that must be incorporated into the decision cycle for that subset of targets raising the hardest issues…"519

Publicly defending the process is a natural fit for public accountability mechanisms. It provides information to voters and other external actors who can choose to exercise a degree of control over the process. However, a detailed public defense of the process also bolsters bureaucratic and professional accountability by demonstrating to those within government that they are involved in activities that their government is willing to publicly describe and defend (subject to the limits of necessary national security secrecy). However, the Executive branch, while wanting to reveal information to defend the process, similarly recognizes that by revealing too much information they may face legal accountability mechanisms that they may be unable to control, thus their caution is understandable (albeit self-serving).520

It’s not just the Executive branch that can benefit from a healthier defense of the process. Congress too can bolster the legitimacy of the program by specifying how they have conducted their oversight activities. The best mechanism by which they can do this is through a white paper. That paper could include:

A statement about why the committees believe the U.S. government's use of force is lawful. If the U.S. government is employing armed force it's likely that it is only doing so pursuant to the AUMF, a covert action finding, or relying on the President's inherent powers under the Constitution. Congress could clear up a substantial amount of ambiguity by specifying that in the conduct of its oversight it has reviewed past and ongoing targeted killing operations and is satisfied that in the conduct of its operations the U.S. government is acting consistent with those sources of law. Moreover, Congress could also specify certain legal red lines that if crossed would cause members to cease believing the program was lawful. For example, if members do not believe the President may engage in targeted killings acting only pursuant to his Article II powers, they could say so in this white paper, and also articulate what the consequences of crossing that red line might be. To bolster their credibility, Congress could specifically articulate their powers and how they would exercise them if they believed the program was being conducted in an unlawful manner. Perhaps stating: "The undersigned members affirm that if the President were to conduct operations not authorized by the AUMF or a covert action finding, we would consider that action to be unlawful and would publicly withdraw our support for the program, and terminate funding for it."

A statement detailing the breadth and depth of Congressional oversight activities. When Senator Feinstein released her statement regarding the nature and degree of Senate Intelligence Committee oversight of targeted killing operations it went a long way toward bolstering the argument that the program was being conducted in a responsible and lawful manner. An oversight white paper could add more details about the oversight being conducted by the intelligence and armed services committees, explaining in as much detail as possible the formal and informal activities that have been conducted by the relevant committees. How many briefings have members attended? Have members reviewed targeting criteria? Have members had an opportunity to question the robustness of the internal kill-list creation process and target vetting and validation processes? Have members been briefed on and had an opportunity to question how civilian casualties are counted and how battle damage assessments are conducted? Have members been informed of the internal disciplinary procedures for the DoD and CIA in the event a strike goes awry, and have they been informed of whether any individuals have been disciplined for improper targeting? Are the members satisfied that internal disciplinary procedures are adequate?

3) Congressional assessment of the foreign relations implications of the program. The Constitution divides some foreign policy powers between the President and Congress, and the oversight white paper should articulate whether members have assessed the diplomatic and foreign relations implications of the targeted killing program. While the white paper would likely not be able to address sensitive diplomatic matters such as whether Pakistan has privately consented to the use of force in their territory, the white paper could set forth the red lines that would cause Congress to withdraw support for the program. The white paper could specifically address whether the members have considered potential blow-back, whether the program has jeopardized alliances, whether it is creating more terrorists than it kills, etc. In specifying each of these and other factors, Congress could note the types of developments, that if witnessed would cause them to withdraw support for the program. For example, Congress could state "In the countries where strikes are conducted, we have not seen the types of formal objections to the activities that would normally be associated with a violation of state's sovereignty. Specifically, no nation has formally asked that the issue of strikes in their territory be added to the Security Council's agenda for resolution. No nation has shot down or threatened to shoot down our aircraft, severed diplomatic relations, expelled our personnel from their country, or refused foreign aid. If we were to witness such actions it would cause us to question the wisdom and perhaps even the legality of the program."

## Case

## CMR

### CMR Crisis Inev

#### Lack of military education about CMR makes the gap inevitable

Noonan 8 – Michael P. Noonan, managing director of the Program on National Security at the Foreign Policy Research Institute and a veteran of Operation Iraqi Freedom, January 2008, “Mind the Gap: Post-Iraq Civil-Military Relations in America,” online: http://www.fpri.org/enotes/200801.noonan.mindthegap.html

Repairing the “rent fabric” of contemporary U.S. civil-military relations will require a sustained and comprehensive effort. One key element will be to address professional military education from pre-commissioning through the war college levels. Civil-military relations are too silent a theme throughout the military educational system. Among the services, for instance, only the Army and Marine Corps have civil-military relations books on their professional reading lists. Another element that is needed is an explicit code for the military profession. The code would define the fundamentals of the professional officer “dedicated to this republic’s values and institutions,” distinguish between the professional military and the National Guard and reserves, denote the rights, privileges, and obligations of retired senior officers, define the expectations for loyalty, obedience, and dissent in clear terms, and clarify for both branches of government the necessity for the institutional integrity of the armed forces of the United States above reproach. Once established, it needs to be taught to the military and civilians alike and enforced. “We all realize that civilians have a right to be wrong in our system, but we devote too little study to minimizing the frequency of its occurrence.” A national commission on the American military ethic, said Hoffman, should also be established to define and complete the ethical codification, with bipartisan political, civilian, and military representation.¶ In conclusion, Hoffman stated, “Unless serious efforts are made to rectify the components that constitute the entire relationship between the nation and its uniformed servants, expectations for improved performance are low, and my expectation for greater volatility between institutions of government is high.” Our leaders failed us in the planning and conduct of the conflict in Iraq, and while this may not comprise a “dereliction of duty,” it is a failure nonetheless. “If we continue to ignore the difficulty inherent to the uneasy dialogue that supports the ultimate decision about going to war, and we fail to educate future leaders about the duty and professional obligation inherent to that decision, we are going to continue to pay a high price,” argued Hoffman.

### No Modeling

#### Their internal link ev is about detention – massive alt cause

#### Friendly democracies can decipher between good and bad US norms, and authoritarian nations don’t care either way

John O. McGinnis 7, Professor of Law, Northwestern University School of Law. \*\* Ilya Somin \*\* Assistant Professor of Law, George Mason University School of Law. GLOBAL CONSTITUTIONALISM: GLOBAL INFLUENCE ON U.S. JURISPRUDENCE: Should International Law Be Part of Our Law? 59 Stan. L. Rev. 1175

The second benefit to foreigners of distinctive U.S. legal norms is information. The costs and benefits of our norms will be visible for all to see. n268 Particularly in an era of increased empirical social science testing, over time we will be able to analyze and identify the effects of differences in norms between the United States and other nations. n269 Such diversity benefits foreigners as foreign nations can decide to adopt our good norms and avoid our bad ones.

The only noteworthy counterargument is the claim that U.S. norms will have more harmful effects than those of raw international law, yet other nations will still copy them. But both parts of this proposition seem doubtful. First, U.S. law emerges from a democratic process that creates a likelihood that it will cause less harm than rules that emerge from the nondemocratic processes [\*1235] that create international law. Second, other democratic nations can use their own political processes to screen out American norms that might cause harm if copied.

Of course, many nations remain authoritarian. n270 But our norms are not likely to have much influence on their choice of norms. Authoritarian states are likely to select norms that serve the interests of those in power, regardless of the norms we adopt. It is true that sometimes they might cite our norms as cover for their decisions. But the crucial word here is "cover." They would have adopted the same rules, anyway. The cover may bamboozle some and thus be counted a cost. But this would seem marginal compared to the harm of allowing raw international law to trump domestic law.

### AT: LA Prolif

#### No chance of prolif – treaty norms, and most analysts don’t regard it as a significant threat

Sarah Chankin-Gould 4, a Scoville Peace Fellow with the Arms Sales Monitoring Project at the Federation of American Scientists, Winter 2004, FAS Public Interest Report, Vol. 57, No. 1, online: http://www.fas.org/faspir/2004/v57n1/tlatelolco.htm,

In 1967, before the Nuclear Non- Proliferation Treaty (NPT) and at the height of the Cold War, the states of Latin America signed the Treaty of Tlatelolco, creating the world’s first regional Nuclear Weapons Free Zone (NWFZ). Today, Latin America is off the radar screen of much of the arms control community, and nuclear proliferation in the hemisphere is not regarded as a significant threat. Yet rather than detracting from the importance of the Tlatelolco regime, this should serve as a reminder of what the Treaty has accomplished. The Treaty of Tlatelolco has contributed to the development of non-proliferation norms in the region. It was signed only five years after the Cuban Missile Crisis, at which time Cuba remained committed to maintaining the option of nuclear weapons as long as its conflict with the US persisted. In addition, Argentina and Brazil were engrossed in their own race for nuclear arms during the 1970s and 80s. Today, following Cuba’s 2002 ratification, all 33 states in the region have signed and ratified the Treaty. The Treaty of Tlatelolco The Treaty commits States Parties to use nuclear power for peaceful means. The parties are required to prohibit and prevent the testing, use, manufacture, production, acquisition, receipt, storage, installation, deployment and possession of nuclear weapons in their territory. To ensure its effectiveness, the Treaty includes two Additional Protocols committing states with responsibility for territories in the region (France, Holland, the UK and US), and the major nuclear powers (China, France, Russia, UK, and US) to maintaining the NWFZ. The Agency for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America and the Caribbean – OPANAL – serves as a secretariat for the Treaty regime. A five-member elected Council meets every two months, with states serving four-year terms. In addition, a General Conference of all Member States is convened every two years. The Agency is responsible for ensuring compliance with the Treaty and fulfilling the mandates of the Council and General Conference, including writing reports and maintaining contact with relevant states and international organizations. OPANAL and its Member States have shown a commitment to promoting nuclear non-proliferation both in their own NWFZ and around the world.

### AT: Prolif

#### No prolif impact

Colin H. Kahl 13, Senior Fellow at the Center for a New American Security and an associate professor in the Security Studies Program at Georgetown University’s Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service, Melissa G. Dalton, Visiting Fellow at the Center for a New American Security, Matthew Irvine, Research Associate at the Center for a New American Security, February, “If Iran Builds the Bomb, Will Saudi Arabia Be Next?” <http://www.cnas.org/files/documents/publications/CNAS_AtomicKingdom_Kahl.pdf>

\*cites Jacques Hymans, USC Associate Professor of IR\*\*\*

I I I . LESSONS FROM HISTOR Y Concerns over “regional proliferation chains,” “falling nuclear dominos” and “nuclear tipping points” are nothing new; indeed, reactive proliferation fears date back to the dawn of the nuclear age.14 Warnings of an inevitable deluge of proliferation were commonplace from the 1950s to the 1970s, resurfaced during the discussion of “rogue states” in the 1990s and became even more ominous after 9/11.15 In 2004, for example, Mitchell Reiss warned that “in ways both fast and slow, we may very soon be approaching a nuclear ‘tipping point,’ where many countries may decide to acquire nuclear arsenals on short notice, thereby triggering a proliferation epidemic.” Given the presumed fragility of the nuclear nonproliferation regime and the ready supply of nuclear expertise, technology and material, Reiss argued, “a single new entrant into the nuclear club could catalyze similar responses by others in the region, with the Middle East and Northeast Asia the most likely candidates.”16 Nevertheless, predictions of inevitable proliferation cascades have historically proven false (see The Proliferation Cascade Myth text box). In the six decades since atomic weapons were first developed, nuclear restraint has proven far more common than nuclear proliferation, and cases of reactive proliferation have been exceedingly rare. Moreover, most countries that have started down the nuclear path have found the road more difficult than imagined, both technologically and bureaucratically, leading the majority of nuclear-weapons aspirants to reverse course. Thus, despite frequent warnings of an unstoppable “nuclear express,”17 William Potter and Gaukhar Mukhatzhanova astutely note that the “train to date has been slow to pick up steam, has made fewer stops than anticipated, and usually has arrived much later than expected.”18 None of this means that additional proliferation in response to Iran’s nuclear ambitions is inconceivable, but the empirical record does suggest that regional chain reactions are not inevitable. Instead, only certain countries are candidates for reactive proliferation. Determining the risk that any given country in the Middle East will proliferate in response to Iranian nuclearization requires an assessment of the incentives and disincentives for acquiring a nuclear deterrent, the technical and bureaucratic constraints and the available strategic alternatives. Incentives and Disincentives to Proliferate Security considerations, status and reputational concerns and the prospect of sanctions combine to shape the incentives and disincentives for states to pursue nuclear weapons. Analysts predicting proliferation cascades tend to emphasize the incentives for reactive proliferation while ignoring or downplaying the disincentives. Yet, as it turns out, instances of nuclear proliferation (including reactive proliferation) have been so rare because going down this road often risks insecurity, reputational damage and economic costs that outweigh the potential benefits.19 Security and regime survival are especially important motivations driving state decisions to proliferate. All else being equal, if a state’s leadership believes that a nuclear deterrent is required to address an acute security challenge, proliferation is more likely.20 Countries in conflict-prone neighborhoods facing an “enduring rival”– especially countries with inferior conventional military capabilities vis-à-vis their opponents or those that face an adversary that possesses or is seeking nuclear weapons – may be particularly prone to seeking a nuclear deterrent to avert aggression.21 A recent quantitative study by Philipp Bleek, for example, found that security threats, as measured by the frequency and intensity of conventional militarized disputes, were highly correlated with decisions to launch nuclear weapons programs and eventually acquire the bomb.22 The Proliferation Cascade Myth Despite repeated warnings since the dawn of the nuclear age of an inevitable deluge of nuclear proliferation, such fears have thus far proven largely unfounded. Historically, nuclear restraint is the rule, not the exception – and the degree of restraint has actually increased over time. In the first two decades of the nuclear age, five nuclear-weapons states emerged: the United States (1945), the Soviet Union (1949), the United Kingdom (1952), France (1960) and China (1964). However, in the nearly 50 years since China developed nuclear weapons, only four additional countries have entered (and remained in) the nuclear club: Israel (allegedly in 1967), India (“peaceful” nuclear test in 1974, acquisition in late-1980s, test in 1998), Pakistan (acquisition in late-1980s, test in 1998) and North Korea (test in 2006).23 This significant slowdown in the pace of proliferation occurred despite the widespread dissemination of nuclear know-how and the fact that the number of states with the technical and industrial capability to pursue nuclear weapons programs has significantly increased over time.24 Moreover, in the past 20 years, several states have either given up their nuclear weapons (South Africa and the Soviet successor states Belarus, Kazakhstan and Ukraine) or ended their highly developed nuclear weapons programs (e.g., Argentina, Brazil and Libya).25 Indeed, by one estimate, 37 countries have pursued nuclear programs with possible weaponsrelated dimensions since 1945, yet the overwhelming number chose to abandon these activities before they produced a bomb. Over time, the number of nuclear reversals has grown while the number of states initiating programs with possible military dimensions has markedly declined.26 Furthermore – especially since the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) went into force in 1970 – reactive proliferation has been exceedingly rare. The NPT has near-universal membership among the community of nations; only India, Israel, Pakistan and North Korea currently stand outside the treaty. Yet the actual and suspected acquisition of nuclear weapons by these outliers has not triggered widespread reactive proliferation in their respective neighborhoods. Pakistan followed India into the nuclear club, and the two have engaged in a vigorous arms race, but Pakistani nuclearization did not spark additional South Asian states to acquire nuclear weapons. Similarly, the North Korean bomb did not lead South Korea, Japan or other regional states to follow suit.27 In the Middle East, no country has successfully built a nuclear weapon in the four decades since Israel allegedly built its first nuclear weapons. Egypt took initial steps toward nuclearization in the 1950s and then expanded these efforts in the late 1960s and 1970s in response to Israel’s presumed capabilities. However, Cairo then ratified the NPT in 1981 and abandoned its program.28 Libya, Iraq and Iran all pursued nuclear weapons capabilities, but only Iran’s program persists and none of these states initiated their efforts primarily as a defensive response to Israel’s presumed arsenal.29 Sometime in the 2000s, Syria also appears to have initiated nuclear activities with possible military dimensions, including construction of a covert nuclear reactor near al-Kibar, likely enabled by North Korean assistance.30 (An Israeli airstrike destroyed the facility in 2007.31) The motivations for Syria’s activities remain murky, but the nearly 40-year lag between Israel’s alleged development of the bomb and Syria’s actions suggests that reactive proliferation was not the most likely cause. Finally, even countries that start on the nuclear path have found it very difficult, and exceedingly time consuming, to reach the end. Of the 10 countries that launched nuclear weapons projects after 1970, only three (Pakistan, North Korea and South Africa) succeeded; one (Iran) remains in progress, and the rest failed or were reversed.32 The successful projects have also generally needed much more time than expected to finish. According to Jacques Hymans, the average time required to complete a nuclear weapons program has increased from seven years prior to 1970 to about 17 years after 1970, even as the hardware, knowledge and industrial base required for proliferation has expanded to more and more countries.33 Yet throughout the nuclear age, many states with potential security incentives to develop nuclear weapons have nevertheless abstained from doing so.34 Moreover, contrary to common expectations, recent statistical research shows that states with an enduring rival that possesses or is pursuing nuclear weapons are not more likely than other states to launch nuclear weapons programs or go all the way to acquiring the bomb, although they do seem more likely to explore nuclear weapons options.35 This suggests that a rival’s acquisition of nuclear weapons does not inevitably drive proliferation decisions. One reason that reactive proliferation is not an automatic response to a rival’s acquisition of nuclear arms is the fact that security calculations can cut in both directions. Nuclear weapons might deter outside threats, but leaders have to weigh these potential gains against the possibility that seeking nuclear weapons would make the country or regime less secure by triggering a regional arms race or a preventive attack by outside powers. Countries also have to consider the possibility that pursuing nuclear weapons will produce strains in strategic relationships with key allies and security patrons. If a state’s leaders conclude that their overall security would decrease by building a bomb, they are not likely to do so.36 Moreover, although security considerations are often central, they are rarely sufficient to motivate states to develop nuclear weapons. Scholars have noted the importance of other factors, most notably the perceived effects of nuclear weapons on a country’s relative status and influence.37 Empirically, the most highly motivated states seem to be those with leaders that simultaneously believe a nuclear deterrent is essential to counter an existential threat and view nuclear weapons as crucial for maintaining or enhancing their international status and influence. Leaders that see their country as naturally at odds with, and naturally equal or superior to, a threatening external foe appear to be especially prone to pursuing nuclear weapons.38 Thus, as Jacques Hymans argues, extreme levels of fear and pride often “combine to produce a very strong tendency to reach for the bomb.”39 Yet here too, leaders contemplating acquiring nuclear weapons have to balance the possible increase to their prestige and influence against the normative and reputational costs associated with violating the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). If a country’s leaders fully embrace the principles and norms embodied in the NPT, highly value positive diplomatic relations with Western countries and see membership in the “community of nations” as central to their national interests and identity, they are likely to worry that developing nuclear weapons would damage (rather than bolster) their reputation and influence, and thus they will be less likely to go for the bomb.40 In contrast, countries with regimes or ruling coalitions that embrace an ideology that rejects the Western dominated international order and prioritizes national self-reliance and autonomy from outside interference seem more inclined toward proliferation regardless of whether they are signatories to the NPT.41 Most countries appear to fall in the former category, whereas only a small number of “rogue” states fit the latter. According to one count, before the NPT went into effect, more than 40 percent of states with the economic resources to pursue nuclear programs with potential military applications did so, and very few renounced those programs. Since the inception of the nonproliferation norm in 1970, however, only 15 percent of economically capable states have started such programs, and nearly 70 percent of all states that had engaged in such activities gave them up.42 The prospect of being targeted with economic sanctions by powerful states is also likely to factor into the decisions of would-be proliferators. Although sanctions alone proved insufficient to dissuade Iraq, North Korea and (thus far) Iran from violating their nonproliferation obligations under the NPT, this does not necessarily indicate that sanctions are irrelevant. A potential proliferator’s vulnerability to sanctions must be considered. All else being equal, the more vulnerable a state’s economy is to external pressure, the less likely it is to pursue nuclear weapons. A comparison of states in East Asia and the Middle East that have pursued nuclear weapons with those that have not done so suggests that countries with economies that are highly integrated into the international economic system – especially those dominated by ruling coalitions that seek further integration – have historically been less inclined to pursue nuclear weapons than those with inward-oriented economies and ruling coalitions.43 A state’s vulnerability to sanctions matters, but so too does the leadership’s assessment regarding the probability that outside powers would actually be willing to impose sanctions. Some would-be proliferators can be easily sanctioned because their exclusion from international economic transactions creates few downsides for sanctioning states. In other instances, however, a state may be so vital to outside powers – economically or geopolitically – that it is unlikely to be sanctioned regardless of NPT violations. Technical and Bureaucratic Constraints In addition to motivation to pursue the bomb, a state must have the technical and bureaucratic wherewithal to do so. This capability is partly a function of wealth. Richer and more industrialized states can develop nuclear weapons more easily than poorer and less industrial ones can; although as Pakistan and North Korea demonstrate, cash-strapped states can sometimes succeed in developing nuclear weapons if they are willing to make enormous sacrifices.44 A country’s technical know-how and the sophistication of its civilian nuclear program also help determine the ease and speed with which it can potentially pursue the bomb. The existence of uranium deposits and related mining activity, civilian nuclear power plants, nuclear research reactors and laboratories and a large cadre of scientists and engineers trained in relevant areas of chemistry and nuclear physics may give a country some “latent” capability to eventually produce nuclear weapons. Mastery of the fuel-cycle – the ability to enrich uranium or produce, separate and reprocess plutonium – is particularly important because this is the essential pathway whereby states can indigenously produce the fissile material required to make a nuclear explosive device.45 States must also possess the bureaucratic capacity and managerial culture to successfully complete a nuclear weapons program. Hymans convincingly argues that many recent would-be proliferators have weak state institutions that permit, or even encourage, rulers to take a coercive, authoritarian management approach to their nuclear programs. This approach, in turn, politicizes and ultimately undermines nuclear projects by gutting the autonomy and professionalism of the very scientists, experts and organizations needed to successfully build the bomb.46 Alternative Sources of Nuclear Deterrence Historically, the availability of credible security guarantees by outside nuclear powers has provided a potential alternative means for acquiring a nuclear deterrent without many of the risks and costs associated with developing an indigenous nuclear weapons capability. As Bruno Tertrais argues, nearly all the states that developed nuclear weapons since 1949 either lacked a strong guarantee from a superpower (India, Pakistan and South Africa) or did not consider the superpower’s protection to be credible (China, France, Israel and North Korea). Many other countries known to have pursued nuclear weapons programs also lacked security guarantees (e.g., Argentina, Brazil, Egypt, Indonesia, Iraq, Libya, Switzerland and Yugoslavia) or thought they were unreliable at the time they embarked on their programs (e.g., Taiwan). In contrast, several potential proliferation candidates appear to have abstained from developing the bomb at least partly because of formal or informal extended deterrence guarantees from the United States (e.g., Australia, Germany, Japan, Norway, South Korea and Sweden).47 All told, a recent quantitative assessment by Bleek finds that security assurances have empirically significantly reduced proliferation proclivity among recipient countries.48 Therefore, if a country perceives that a security guarantee by the United States or another nuclear power is both available and credible, it is less likely to pursue nuclear weapons in reaction to a rival developing them. This option is likely to be particularly attractive to states that lack the indigenous capability to develop nuclear weapons, as well as states that are primarily motivated to acquire a nuclear deterrent by security factors (as opposed to status-related motivations) but are wary of the negative consequences of proliferation.

## Warfighting

### No Program Collapse

#### There’s a sustainable consensus on the drone program---won’t collapse

Robert Chesney 12, professor at the University of Texas School of Law, nonresident senior fellow of the Brookings Institution, distinguished scholar at the Robert S. Strauss Center for International Security and Law, 8/29/12, “Beyond the Battlefield, Beyond Al Qaeda: The Destabilizing Legal Architecture of Counterterrorism,” <http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2138623>

This multi-year pattern of cross-branch and cross-party consensus gives the impression that the legal architecture of detention has stabilized at last. But the settlement phenomenon is not limited to detention policy. The same thing has happened, albeit to a lesser extent, in other areas.

The military commission prosecution system provides a good example. When the Obama administration came into office, it seemed quite possible, indeed likely, that it would shut down the commissions system. Indeed, the new president promptly ordered all commission proceedings suspended pending a policy review.48 In the end, however, the administration worked with the then Democratic-controlled Congress to pursue a mend-it-don’t-end-it approach culminating in passage of the Military Commissions Act of 2009, which addressed a number of key objections to the statutory framework Congress and the Bush administration had crafted in 2006. In his National Archives address in spring 2009, moreover, President Obama also made clear that he would make use of this system in appropriate cases.49 He has duly done so, notwithstanding his administration’s doomed attempt to prosecute the so-called “9/11 defendants” (especially Khalid Sheikh Mohamed) in civilian courts. Difficult questions continue to surround the commissions system as to particular issues—such as the propriety of charging “material support” offenses for pre-2006 conduct50—but the system as a whole is far more stable today than at any point in the past decade.51

There have been strong elements of cross-party continuity between the Bush and Obama administration on an array of other counterterrorism policy questions, including the propriety of using rendition in at least some circumstances and, perhaps most notably, the legality of using lethal force not just in contexts of overt combat deployments but also in areas physically remote from the “hot battlefield.” Indeed, the Obama administration quickly outstripped the Bush administration in terms of the quantity and location of its airstrikes outside of Afghanistan,52 and it also greatly surpassed the Bush administration in its efforts to marshal public defenses of the legality of these actions.53 What’s more, the Obama administration also succeeded in fending off a lawsuit challenging the legality of the drone strike program (in the specific context of Anwar al-Awlaki, an American citizen and member of AQAP known to be on a list of approved targets for the use of deadly force in Yemen who was in fact killed in a drone strike some months later).54

The point of all this is not to claim that legal disputes surrounding these counterterrorism policies have effectively ended. Far from it; a steady drumbeat of criticism persists, especially in relation to the use of lethal force via drones. But by the end of the first post-9/11 decade, this criticism no longer seemed likely to spill over in the form of disruptive judicial rulings, newly-restrictive legislation, or significant spikes in diplomatic or domestic political pressure, as had repeatedly occurred in earlier years. Years of law-conscious policy refinement—and quite possibly some degree of public fatigue or inurement when it comes to legal criticisms—had made possible an extended period of cross-branch and cross-party consensus, and this in turn left the impression that the underlying legal architecture had reached a stage of stability that was good enough for the time being.

### No Heg Impact

#### No heg impact

Fettweis, 11 Christopher J. Fettweis, Department of Political Science, Tulane University, 9/26/11, Free Riding or Restraint? Examining European Grand Strategy, Comparative Strategy, 30:316–332, EBSCO

It is perhaps worth noting that there is no evidence to support a direct relationship between the relative level of U.S. activism and international stability. In fact, the limited data we do have suggest the opposite may be true. During the 1990s, the United States cut back on its defense spending fairly substantially. By 1998, the United States was spending $100 billion less on defense in real terms than it had in 1990.51 To internationalists, defense hawks and believers in hegemonic stability, this irresponsible “peace dividend” endangered both national and global security. “No serious analyst of American military capabilities,” argued Kristol and Kagan, “doubts that the defense budget has been cut much too far to meet America’s responsibilities to itself and to world peace.”52 On the other hand, if the pacific trends were not based upon U.S. hegemony but a strengthening norm against interstate war, one would not have expected an increase in global instability and violence. The verdict from the past two decades is fairly plain: The world grew more peaceful while the United States cut its forces. No state seemed to believe that its security was endangered by a less-capable United States military, or at least none took any action that would suggest such a belief. No militaries were enhanced to address power vacuums, no security dilemmas drove insecurity or arms races, and no regional balancing occurred once the stabilizing presence of the U.S. military was diminished. The rest of the world acted as if the threat of international war was not a pressing concern, despite the reduction in U.S. capabilities. Most of all, the United States and its allies were no less safe. The incidence and magnitude of global conflict declined while the United States cut its military spending under President Clinton, and kept declining as the Bush Administration ramped the spending back up. No complex statistical analysis should be necessary to reach the conclusion that the two are unrelated. Military spending figures by themselves are insufficient to disprove a connection between overall U.S. actions and international stability. Once again, one could presumably argue that spending is not the only or even the best indication of hegemony, and that it is instead U.S. foreign political and security commitments that maintain stability. Since neither was significantly altered during this period, instability should not have been expected. Alternately, advocates of hegemonic stability could believe that relative rather than absolute spending is decisive in bringing peace. Although the United States cut back on its spending during the 1990s, its relative advantage never wavered. However, even if it is true that either U.S. commitments or relative spending account for global pacific trends, then at the very least stability can evidently be maintained at drastically lower levels of both. In other words, even if one can be allowed to argue in the alternative for a moment and suppose that there is in fact a level of engagement below which the United States cannot drop without increasing international disorder, a rational grand strategist would still recommend cutting back on engagement and spending until that level is determined. Grand strategic decisions are never final; continual adjustments can and must be made as time goes on. Basic logic suggests that the United States ought to spend the minimum amount of its blood and treasure while seeking the maximum return on its investment. And if the current era of stability is as stable as many believe it to be, no increase in conflict would ever occur irrespective of U.S. spending, which would save untold trillions for an increasingly debt-ridden nation. It is also perhaps worth noting that if opposite trends had unfolded, if other states had reacted to news of cuts in U.S. defense spending with more aggressive or insecure behavior, then internationalists would surely argue that their expectations had been fulfilled. If increases in conflict would have been interpreted as proof of the wisdom of internationalist strategies, then logical consistency demands that the lack thereof should at least pose a problem. As it stands, the only evidence we have regarding the likely systemic reaction to a more restrained United States suggests that the current peaceful trends are unrelated to U.S. military spending. Evidently the rest of the world can operate quite effectively without the presence of a global policeman. Those who think otherwise base their view on faith alone.

### Coop Inevitable – Self-Interest

#### EU cooperation on terrorism intel high and inevitable – in their self interest

Kristin Archick 13, European affairs specialist @ CRS, 9-4, “U.S.-EU Cooperation Against Terrorism,” Congressional Research Service, <http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/RS22030.pdf>

As part of its drive to bolster its counterterrorism capabilities, the EU has also made promoting law enforcement and intelligence cooperation with the United States a top priority. Washington has largely welcomed these efforts, recognizing that they may help root out terrorist cells both in Europe and elsewhere, and prevent future attacks against the United States or its interests abroad. U.S.-EU cooperation against terrorism has led to a new dynamic in U.S.-EU relations by fostering dialogue on law enforcement and homeland security issues previously reserved for bilateral discussions. Contacts between U.S. and EU officials on police, judicial, and border control policy matters have increased substantially since 2001. A number of new U.S.-EU agreements have also been reached; these include information-sharing arrangements between the United States and EU police and judicial bodies, two new U.S.-EU treaties on extradition and mutual legal assistance, and accords on container security and airline passenger data. In addition, the United States and the EU have been working together to curb terrorist financing and to strengthen transport security.

### Allies Not Key

#### US anti-terror intel is fine on its own – outstrips everybody else

Barton Gellman and Greg Miller, 8-29-2013, “Top secret ‘black budget’ reveals US spy agencies’ spending,” LA Daily News, http://www.dailynews.com/government-and-politics/20130829/top-secret-black-budget-reveals-us-spy-agencies-spending

“The United States has made a considerable investment in the Intelligence Community since the terror attacks of 9/11, a time which includes wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, the Arab Spring, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction technology, and asymmetric threats in such areas as cyber-warfare,” Director of National Intelligence James Clapper said in response to inquiries from The Post. “Our budgets are classified as they could provide insight for foreign intelligence services to discern our top national priorities, capabilities and sources and methods that allow us to obtain information to counter threats,” he said. Among the notable revelations in the budget summary: Spending by the CIA has surged past that of every other spy agency, with $14.7 billion in requested funding for 2013. The figure vastly exceeds outside estimates and is nearly 50 percent above that of the National Security Agency, which conducts eavesdropping operations and has long been considered the behemoth of the community. The CIA and NSA have launched aggressive new efforts to hack into foreign computer networks to steal information or sabotage enemy systems, embracing what the budget refers to as “offensive cyber operations.” The NSA planned to investigate at least 4,000 possible insider threats in 2013, cases in which the agency suspected sensitive information may have been compromised by one of its own. The budget documents show that the U.S. intelligence community has sought to strengthen its ability to detect what it calls “anomalous behavior” by personnel with access to highly classified material. U.S. intelligence officials take an active interest in foes as well as friends. Pakistan is described in detail as an “intractable target,” and counterintelligence operations “are strategically focused against [the] priority targets of China, Russia, Iran, Cuba and Israel.” In words, deeds and dollars, intelligence agencies remain fixed on terrorism as the gravest threat to national security, which is listed first among five “mission objectives.” Counterterrorism programs employ one in four members of the intelligence workforce and account for one-third of all spending. The governments of Iran, China and Russia are difficult to penetrate, but North Korea’s may be the most opaque. There are five “critical” gaps in U.S. intelligence about Pyongyang’s nuclear and missile programs, and analysts know virtually nothing about the intentions of North Korean leader Kim Jong Un. Formally known as the Congressional Budget Justification for the National Intelligence Program, the “Top Secret” blueprint represents spending levels proposed to the House and Senate intelligence committees in February 2012. Congress may have made changes before the fiscal year began on Oct 1. Clapper is expected to release the actual total spending figure after the fiscal year ends on Sept. 30. The document describes a constellation of spy agencies that track millions of individual surveillance targets and carry out operations that include hundreds of lethal strikes. They are organized around five priorities: combating terrorism, stopping the spread of nuclear and other unconventional weapons, warning U.S. leaders about critical events overseas, defending against foreign espionage and conducting cyber operations. In an introduction to the summary, Clapper said the threats now facing the United States “virtually defy rank-ordering.” He warned of “hard choices” as the intelligence community — sometimes referred to as the “IC” — seeks to rein in spending after a decade of often double-digit budget increases. This year’s budget proposal envisions that spending will remain roughly level through 2017 and amounts to a case against substantial cuts. “Never before has the IC been called upon to master such complexity and so many issues in such a resource-constrained environment,” Clapper wrote. The summary provides a detailed look at how the U.S. intelligence community has been reconfigured by the massive infusion of resources that followed the Sept. 11 attacks. The United States has spent more than $500 billion on intelligence during that period, an outlay that U.S. officials say has succeeded in its main objective: preventing another catastrophic terrorist attack in the United States. The result is an espionage empire with resources and reach beyond those of any adversary, sustained even now by spending that rivals or exceeds the levels reached at the height of the Cold War.

### Coop Inevitable/No Impact to Backlash---Drones

#### Allies will inevitably come around on US drone doctrine questions---they know they’re the future of war and won’t want to be left out

Ulrike Esther Franke 13, Ph.D. Candidate, International Relations, University of Oxford, April 2013, “Just the new hot thing? The diffusion of UAV technology worldwide and its popularity among democratic states,” <http://files.isanet.org/ConferenceArchive/4269932e782d47248d5269ad381ca6c7.pdf>

As shown in the first part of this paper, democracies seem to be particularly interested in drone technology. Niklas Schoerning argues that especially western democracies are fuelling a global UAV arms race.56 I argue that in addition to the aforementioned arguments, there are three main reasons why democracies and especially western democracies are particularly interested in the unmanned technology.

Prestige (among partners): Not only autocracies have an interest in depicting their armed forces as modern and powerful. Democracies use UAVs to show off as well – however, their aim is rather to portray themselves as capable and reliable coalition partners for other western democracies and especially with an eye on the United States. French General Patrick Charaix points out: “If [France] wants to remain powerful within a coalition, we need to bring an unmanned capability to the table. Indeed, those countries that count have this military means which contributes on the one hand to the success of a mission and on the other hand increases the power and influence of the country.57 German defence minister Thomas de Maizière voiced a similar opinion in a recent speech on UAVs in the Bundestag: “We cannot say ‘we’ll keep the stagecoach’ while all others are developing the railway”.58 UAVs, according to this interpretation, are the irresistible future – those who are not part of it will lose out. An important aspect of this desire not to lose out is interoperability.59 Western states rarely go to war alone anymore. Today’s western wars are fought by coalitions, namely within NATO. This has important consequences for the equipment that is needed: the members of the coalition need to use the same kind of material in order to be effective and powerful.60 As NATO is dominated by the US and since the US is the most capable user of UAVs, this has important repercussions on the other NATO members. For Frans Osinga, NATO is “an obvious and important avenue of infusion of US military […] technology”.61

### Targeting Decisions Key

#### The plan doesn’t restrain the executive’s authority to determine who’s a target---that’s the most relevant objection to current drone policy

Kenneth Anderson 9, Professor of Law, Washington College of Law, American University, and Research Fellow, The Hoover Institution, Stanford University, 5/11/09, “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>

The elephant in the room, so to speak, however, is the standard by which American forces select targets in the first place. This is the core objection to the whole practice, for example, raised by UN special rapporteurs and many others—on what basis does the U.S. conclude that this person is a terrorist? While the substantive standard governing conduct to evaluate a potential targeted killing in relation to innocent third party collateral damage is best drawn from standards in the law of IHL armed conflict, target selection in targeted killing is an intelligence matter. And although military intelligence has much to offer in the way of methodology, military law has much less so. Yet the intelligence community, for many reasons, has had only limited success in picking targets since 9/11—although the quality of target selection in the current campaign of Predator strikes by the CIA in Pakistan has clearly gone up. Congress can impose more demands for information to the intelligence committees and greater monitoring of target selection either before or after an attack, but it faces great limits in doing more than that. Congress cannot make the intelligence judgments.

The concerns over targeted killings are not, of course, limited to targeting and collateral damage questions. Other states, particularly friendly and allied states, have excellent reason to view these policies with political alarm—quite apart from their abstract legal assessments of them. Britain, for example, has a certain number of radical imams who appear directly to influence their followers, among other things, to take up jihad in Pakistan and Afghanistan against the U.S. and NATO allies.97 In purely hypothetical terms, the U.S. might do well to target and kill them in Britain. While the U.S. is obviously not going to do that, it will target al Qaeda with Yemen’s consent in Yemen, and there are circumstances in which it will target terrorist suspects without territorial state consent.

### Alt Cause – NSA

#### NSA scandal wrecks terror coop

Matthew Feeney 10/25, Reason, "EU Leaders: Latest NSA Revelations Could Threaten Fight Against Terrorism", 2013, reason.com/blog/2013/10/25/eu-leaders-latest-nsa-revelations-could

The latest reporting on the documents leaked by Edward Snowden reveals that the NSA has spied on 35 world leaders, who have not been named.¶ From The Guardian:¶ The National Security Agency monitored the phone conversations of 35 world leaders after being given the numbers by an official in another US government department, according to a classified document provided by whistleblower Edward Snowden.¶ The confidential memo reveals that the NSA encourages senior officials in its "customer" departments, such as the White House, State and the Pentagon, to share their "Rolodexes" so the agency can add the phone numbers of leading foreign politicians to their surveillance systems.¶ The document notes that one unnamed US official handed over 200 numbers, including those of the 35 world leaders, none of whom is named. These were immediately "tasked" for monitoring by the NSA.¶ The news comes days after the French newspaper Le Monde reported that the NSA spied on millions of French phone records, the German newspaper Der Spiegel reported that the NSA hacked into the Mexican president’s public email account, and German Chancellor Angela Merkel called President Obama over concerns that her cellphone was targeted by American intelligence.¶ The timing of these revelations is not good for the Obama administration. European Union leaders recently began their latest summit in Brussels, and unsurprisingly both the French and the Germans are pushing for a “no-spying” agreement with the U.S.¶ While the NSA revelations from this week make up only some of the latest embarrassing news facing the Obama administration, it is the only news that could have long-lasting diplomatic and national security implications.¶ Ironically, the behavior of the NSA (which is supposedly tasked with helping keep the U.S. safe) could threaten the fight against terrorism. A statement from the heads of state and government of European Union nations reads in part:¶ "Alongside our foreseen work, we had a discussion tonight about recent developments concerning possible intelligence issues and the deep concerns that these events have raised among European citizens.¶ The Heads of State or government underlined the close relationship between Europe and the USA and the value of that partnership. They expressed their conviction that the partnership must be based on respect and trust, including as concerns the work and cooperation of secret services.¶ They stressed that intelligence gathering is a vital element in the fight against terrorism. This applies to relations between European countries as well as to relations with the USA. A lack of trust could prejudice the necessary cooperation in the field of intelligence gathering.

# Block

## CMR

### Prlif inev

#### Prolif inev --- coop can’t do anything about it

Jacques E. C. **Hymans**, Assistant Professor in the School of International Relations at the University of Southern California, **2006**, The Psychology of Nuclear Proliferation: Identity, Emotions, and Foreign Policy, p. 1-2

This book is an analysis of why some – but only some – political leaders decide to endow their states with nuclear weapons. It finds that decisions to go or not to go nuclear result not from the international structure, but rather from individual hearts. Simply put, some political leaders hold a conception of their nation’s identity that leads them to desire the bomb; and such leaders can be expected to turn that desire into state policy. The book’s focus on individual leaders is unusual in the social-scientific literature on proliferation and non-proliferation. Indeed, most authors on the subject hardly even bother to ask the question of how leaders come to desire nuclear weapons. Instead, they simply adopt a tragic sensibility, viewing nuclear weapons as a symptom of a fallen humanity’s raw quest for power. More than a few even explicitly and unironically refer to nuclear weapons as “temptations,” to those who succumb to those temptations as “nuclear sinners,” and to the goal of non-proliferation efforts as the construction of an inevitably fragile “nuclear taboo.” This book takes a different tack. It starts its analysis by pointing out the basic fact of the history of nuclear proliferation: the large and fast-growing number of nuclear-weapons capable states, contrasted with the **small and slow-growing number of actual nuclear** weapons **states**. This combination of widespread capability with widespread restraint, which **has persisted despite numerous shocks**, is baffling until one sheds the tragic sensibility. To do so need not mean adopting a blithe, sunny optimism about humankind. Rather, it means seeing political leaders for what they are – flesh-and-blood human beings – and the question of acquiring nuclear weapons for what it is – a revolutionary decision. Facing the unknown and unknowable nuclear future, burdened with the responsibility of protecting their nations from destruction, leaders can hardly do otherwise than look deep inside themselves for guidance. The answers they find via that process of introspection vary widely, but they can be systematically summarized and rigorously explained.

The leaders who have chosen to thrust their nations into the nuclear club include the democratic and the dictatorial, the religious and the secular, the rough and the refined, the Western and the Eastern, the Northern and the Southern. Very little unites them. Yet on the basis of case studies of leaders from France, Australia, Argentina, and India, this book does find something that sets those few leaders with definite nuclear weapons ambitions apart from the many who do not harbor such ambitions. What sets those few leaders apart is a deeply held conception of their nation’s identity that I call “oppositional nationalist.” Oppositional nationalists see their nation as both naturally at odds with an external enemy, and as naturally its equal if not its superior. Such a conception tends to generate the emotions of fear and pride – an explosive psychological cocktail. Driven by fear and pride, oppositional nationalists develop a desire for nuclear weapons that goes beyond calculation, to self-expression. Thus, in spite of the tremendous complexity of the nuclear choice, leaders who decide for the bomb tend not to back into it. For them, unlike the bulk of their peers, the choice for nuclear weapons is neither a close call nor a possible last resort but an absolute necessity.

In the process of making its case about the importance of oppositional nationalism for decisions to go nuclear, the book also develops a more general model of identity-driven foreign policy decisionmaking. In particular, the book carefully outlines the linkages from leaders’ national identity conceptions, through emotions, to their ultimate foreign policy choices. This model holds the potential to improve our understanding not only of decisions on nuclear weapons, but also of other foreign policy decisions of revolutionary significance. The immediate task at hand, however, is to show the model’s applicability to the issue of nuclear proliferation.

## DA

### Special ops

#### Due process collapses intelligence gathering --- sources dry up --- destroys the heart of counter-terror policy

Delery Et.al. ’12 - Principal Deputy, Assistant Attorney General, Civil Division, DOJ

Principal Deputy, Assistant Attorney General, Civil Division, STUART F. DELERY

Defendants' Motion to Dismiss, United States' Statement of Interest, Case 1:12-cv-01192-RMC Document 18 Filed 12/14/12 Page 1 of 58, UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, 12/14/2012

Third. Plaintiffs' claims raise the specter of disclosing classified intelligence information in open court. The D.C. Circuit has recognized that "the difficulties associated with subjecting allegations involving CIA operations and covert operatives to judicial and public scrutiny" are pertinent to the special factors analysis. Wilson, 535 F.3d at 710. In such suits, "'even a small chance that some court will order disclosure of a source's identity could well impair intelligence gathering and cause sources to close up like a clam."'1 Id. (quoting Tenet v. Doe, 544 U.S. 1,11 (2005)). And where litigation of a plaintiffs allegations "would inevitably require an inquiry into "classified information that may undermine ongoing covert operations,"\* special factors apply. Wilson, 535 F.3d at 710 (quoting Tenet, 544 U.S. at 11). See also Vance, 2012 WL 5416500 at "8 ("When the state-secrets privilege did not block the claim, a court would find it challenging to prevent the disclosure of secret information.11); Lebron, 670 F.3d at 554 (noting that the "chilling effects on intelligence sources of possible disclosures during civil litigation and the impact of such disclosures on military and diplomatic initiatives at the heart of counterterrorism policy1' are special factors); Arar, 585 F.3d at 576 (holding that the risk of disclosure of classified information is a special factor in the "extraordinary rendition" context).

### Civilian Casualties---1NC

#### Casualties are way down and drones are far more precise than alternatives---our ev uses the best data

Michael Cohen 13, Fellow at the Century Foundation, 5/23/13, “Give President Obama a chance: there is a role for drones,” The Guardian, http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2013/may/23/obama-drone-speech-use-justified

Drone critics have a much different take. They are passionate in their conviction that US drones are indiscriminately killing and terrorizing civilians. The Guardian's own Glenn Greenwald argued recently that no "minimally rational person" can defend "Obama's drone kills on the ground that they are killing The Terrorists or that civilian deaths are rare". Conor Friedersdorf, an editor at the Atlantic and a vocal drone critic, wrote last year that liberals should not vote for President Obama's re-election because of the drone campaign, which he claimed "kills hundreds of innocents, including children," "terrorizes innocent Pakistanis on an almost daily basis" and "makes their lives into a nightmare worthy of dystopian novels". ¶ I disagree. Increasingly it appears that arguments like Friedersdorf makes are no longer sustainable (and there's real question if they ever were). Not only have drone strikes decreased, but so too have the number of civilians killed – and dramatically so. ¶ This conclusion comes not from Obama administration apologists but rather, Chris Woods, whose research has served as the empirical basis for the harshest attacks on the Obama Administration's drone policy. ¶ Woods heads the covert war program for the Bureau of Investigative Journalism (TBIJ), which maintains one of three major databases tabulating civilian casualties from US drone strikes. The others are the Long War Journal and the New America Foundation (full disclosure: I used to be a fellow there). While LWJ and NAJ estimate that drone strikes in Pakistan have killed somewhere between 140 and 300 civilians, TBIJ utilizes a far broader classification for civilians killed, resulting in estimates of somewhere between 411-884 civilians killed by drones in Pakistan. The wide range of numbers here speaks to the extraordinary challenge in tabulating civilian death rates. ¶ There is little local reporting done on the ground in northwest Pakistan, which is the epicenter of the US drone program. As a result data collection is reliant on Pakistani news reporting, which is also dependent on Pakistani intelligence, which has a vested interest in playing up the negative consequences of US drones. ¶ When I spoke with Woods last month, he said that a fairly clear pattern has emerged over the past year – far fewer civilians are dying from drones. "For those who are opposed to drone strikes," says Woods there is historical merit to the charge of significant civilian deaths, "but from a contemporary standpoint the numbers just aren't there." ¶ While Woods makes clear that one has to be "cautious" on any estimates of casualties, it's not just a numeric decline that is being seen, but rather it's a "proportionate decline". In other words, the percentage of civilians dying in drone strikes is also falling, which suggests to Woods that US drone operators are showing far greater care in trying to limit collateral damage. ¶ Woods estimates are supported by the aforementioned databases. In Pakistan, New America Foundation claims there have been no civilian deaths this year and only five last year; Long War Journal reported four deaths in 2012 and 11 so far in 2013; and TBIJ reports a range of 7-42 in 2012 and 0-4 in 2013. In addition, the drop in casualty figures is occurring not just in Pakistan but also in Yemen. ¶ These numbers are broadly consistent with what has been an under-reported decline in drone use overall. According to TBIJ, the number of drone strikes went from 128 in 2010 to 48 in 2012 and only 12 have occurred this year. These statistics are broadly consistent with LWJ and NAF's reporting. In Yemen, while drone attacks picked up in 2012, they have slowed dramatically this year. And in Somalia there has been no strike reported for more than a year. ¶ Ironically, these numbers are in line with the public statements of CIA director Brennan, and even more so with Senator Dianne Feinstein of California, chairman of the Select Intelligence Committee, who claimed in February that the numbers she has received from the Obama administration suggest that the typical number of victims per year from drone attacks is in "the single digits".¶ Part of the reason for these low counts is that the Obama administration has sought to minimize the number of civilian casualties through what can best be described as "creative bookkeeping". The administration counts all military-age males as possible combatants unless they have information (posthumously provided) that proves them innocent. Few have taken the White House's side on this issue (and for good reason) though some outside researchers concur with the administration's estimates.¶ Christine Fair, a professor at Georgetown University has long maintained that civilian deaths from drones in Pakistan are dramatically overstated. She argues that considering the alternatives of sending in the Pakistani military or using manned aircraft to flush out jihadists, drone strikes are a far more humane method of war-fighting.

#### Pakistan’s government exaggerates the number of strikes---military statements confirm

Brian Glyn Williams 11, Associate Professor of Islamic History at the University of Massachusetts-Dartmouth, March 2011, “Accuracy of the U.S. Drone Campaign: The Views of a Pakistani General,” CTC Sentinel, Vol. 4, No. 3, http://www.brianglynwilliams.com/pdfs/Williams-nearfinal.pdf

One of the most contentious issues related to the Central Intelligence Agency’s covert drone campaign in Pakistan is the estimated number of civilians killed. Those against drone strikes in Pakistan have emphasized that the attacks kill a disproportionate number of civilians. Others, however, argue that the number of civilian casualties is small, and that the operations have led to the deaths of many senior Taliban and al-Qa`ida leaders. Finding evidence to confirm either argument has proved difficult. Journalists rarely enter the tribal areas where the strikes occur, so analysts are left to rely on government statements when trying to assess militant and civilian casualties.

Recently, however, the Pakistani general in command of forces in the embattled North Waziristan tribal agency told reporters that “a majority of those eliminated [in drone strikes] are terrorists, including foreign terrorist elements.” This article explains the significance of the general’s comments, which should serve to temper what appear to be broad misconceptions about the accuracy of the U.S. drone campaign.

### Pakistan Supports Drones/AT: Kickout

#### Pakistan has to act like they’re kicking us out---but if they were going to, they would have already

Gregory 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>

Granted, “lawyers at the State Department, including top legal adviser Harold Koh, believe this rationale veers near the edge of what can be considered permission” and are concerned because “[c]onducting drone strikes in a country against its will could be seen as an act of war.”62 Nevertheless, the notion of consent is one that is hotly debated by opponents of targeted killings. The Bureau of Investigative Journalism reports that Pakistan “categorically rejects” the claim that it tacitly allows drone strikes in its territory63 and in the same New York

Times article discussed above an official with Pakistani intelligence “said any suggestion of Pakistani cooperation was ‘hogwash.’”64 However, these protests lack credibility as Pakistan has not exercised its rights under international law to prevent strikes by asking the U.S. to stop, intercepting American aircraft, targeting U.S. operators on the ground, or lodging a formal protest with the UN General Assembly or the Security Council. If the strikes are truly without consent, are a violation of Pakistani sovereignty, and are akin to acts of war, one would expect something more from the Pakistani government. With regard to Yemen, the question of consent is far clearer as Yemeni officials have gone on the record specifically noting their approval of U.S. strikes.65

#### Pakistan supports aggressive U.S. drone strikes---they just can’t admit it publicly for domestic political reasons

Daniel Byman 13, Professor in the Security Studies Program at the Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service at Georgetown University and a Senior Fellow at the Saban Center for Middle East Policy at the Brookings Institution, July/August 2013, “Why Drones Work,” Foreign Affairs, Vol. 92, No. 4

It is also telling that drones have earned the backing, albeit secret, of foreign governments. In order to maintain popular support, politicians in Pakistan and Yemen routinely rail against the U.S. drone campaign. In reality, however, the governments of both countries have supported it. During the Bush and Obama administrations, Pakistan has even periodically hosted U.S. drone facilities and has been told about strikes in advance. Pervez Musharraf, president of Pakistan until 2008, was not worried about the drone program's negative publicity: "In Pakistan, things fall out of the sky all the time," he reportedly remarked. Yemen's former president, Ali Abdullah Saleh, also at times allowed drone strikes in his country and even covered for them by telling the public that they were conducted by the Yemeni air force. When the United States' involvement was leaked in 2002, however, relations between the two countries soured. Still, Saleh later let the drone program resume in Yemen, and his replacement, Abdu Rabbu Mansour Hadi, has publicly praised drones, saying that "they pinpoint the target and have zero margin of error, if you know what target you're aiming at."

As officials in both Pakistan and Yemen realize, U.S. drone strikes help their governments by targeting common enemies. A memo released by the antisecrecy website WikiLeaks revealed that Pakistan's army chief, Ashfaq Parvez Kayani, privately asked U.S. military leaders in 2008 for "continuous Predator coverage" over antigovernment militants, and the journalist Mark Mazzetti has reported that the United States has conducted "goodwill kills" against Pakistani militants who threatened Pakistan far more than the United States. Thus, in private, Pakistan supports the drone program. As then Prime Minister Yousaf Raza Gilani told Anne Patterson, then the U.S. ambassador to Pakistan, in 2008, "We'll protest [against the drone program] in the National Assembly and then ignore it."

Still, Pakistan is reluctant to make its approval public. First of all, the country's inability to fight terrorists on its own soil is a humiliation for Pakistan's politically powerful armed forces and intelligence service. In addition, although drones kill some of the government's enemies, they have also targeted pro-government groups that are hostile to the United States, such as the Haqqani network and the Taliban, which Pakistan has supported since its birth in the early 1990s. Even more important, the Pakistani public is vehemently opposed to U.S. drone strikes.

### Pakistan Reforms Card

#### Reforms to the targeting process resolved Pakistan’s governmental objections---no chance of a breach in relations

WSJ 11 – Wall Street Journal, 11/4/11, “U.S. Tightens Drone Rules,” http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970204621904577013982672973836.html

Adm. Mullen argued that the CIA needed to be more selective. Then-Defense Secretary Robert Gates feared that the Pakistanis, if pushed too hard, would block the flow of supplies to troops in Afghanistan, officials said.

For Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, who has supported the CIA's strikes in the vast majority of cases, the biggest focus has been to make sure political ramifications are properly assessed to avoid a situation where the political opposition in Pakistan becomes so great that the country's current or future leaders decide to bar the drones outright.

Independent information about who the CIA kills in signature strikes in Pakistan is scarce. The agency tells U.S. and Pakistani officials that there have been very few civilian deaths—only 60 over the years. But some senior officials in both governments privately say they are skeptical that civilian deaths have been that low.

Some top officials in the White House meetings this summer argued for a broader reassessment. "The question is, 'Is it even worth doing now? We've got the key leadership in al Qaeda, what is it that we're there for now?" one of the officials recalled some advisers asking.

The White House review culminated in a Situation Room meeting with Mr. Obama in June in which he reaffirmed support for the program.

But changes were made. Mr. Obama instituted an appeals procedure to give the State Department more of a voice in deciding when and if to strike. If the U.S. ambassador to Pakistan objected to a strike, for example, the CIA director or his deputy would first try to talk through their differences with the ambassador. If the conflict was unresolved, the secretary of state would appeal directly to the CIA director. If they couldn't reach agreement, however, the CIA director retained the final say.

Since the changes were made, officials say internal tensions over the strikes have eased and agencies were acting more in concert with each other.

### AT: Recruiting

#### Targeted killings destroy operational effectiveness of terror groups---they can’t recruit new operatives fast enough to keep pace with losses

Alex Young 13, Associate Staff, Harvard International Review, 2/25/13, “A Defense of Drones,” Harvard International Review, http://hir.harvard.edu/a-defense-of-drones

Moreover, drone strikes have disrupted al Qaeda’s system for training new recruits. The Times of London reports that in 2009, Al Qaeda leaders decided to abandon their traditional training camps because bringing new members to a central location offered too easy a target for drone strikes. Foreign Policy emphasized this trend on November 2nd, 2012, arguing that, “destroying communication centers, training camps and vehicles undermines the operational effectiveness of al-Qaeda and the Taliban, and quotes from operatives of the Pakistan-based Haqqani Network reveal that drones have forced them into a ‘jungle existence’ where they fear for the lives on a daily basis.” The threat of death from the skies has forced extremist organizations to become more scattered.

More importantly, though, drone strikes do not only kill top leaders; they target their militant followers as well. The New America Foundation, a think tank that maintains a database of statistics on drone strikes, reports that between 2004 and 2012, drones killed between 1,489 and 2,605 enemy combatants in Pakistan. Given that Al Qaeda, the Pakistani Taliban, and the various other organizations operating in the region combined do not possibly have more than 1,500 senior leaders, it follows that many, if not most, of those killed were low-level or mid-level members – in many cases, individuals who would have carried out attacks. The Los Angeles Times explains that, “the Predator campaign has depleted [Al Qaeda’s] operational tier. Many of the dead are longtime loyalists who had worked alongside Bin Laden […] They are being replaced by less experienced recruits.” Drones decimate terrorist organizations at all levels; the idea that these strikes only kill senior officials is a myth.

#### Drones destroy terror groups’ ability to train new recruits

Daniel Byman 13, Professor in the Security Studies Program at the Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service at Georgetown University and a Senior Fellow at the Saban Center for Middle East Policy at the Brookings Institution, July/August 2013, “Why Drones Work,” Foreign Affairs, Vol. 92, No. 4

Drones have also undercut terrorists' ability to communicate and to train new recruits. In order to avoid attracting drones, al Qaeda and Taliban operatives try to avoid using electronic devices or gathering in large numbers. A tip sheet found among jihadists in Mali advised militants to "maintain complete silence of all wireless contacts" and "avoid gathering in open areas." Leaders, however, cannot give orders when they are incommunicado, and training on a large scale is nearly impossible when a drone strike could wipe out an entire group of new recruits. Drones have turned al Qaeda's command and training structures into a liability, forcing the group to choose between having no leaders and risking dead leaders.

### AT: Global Blowback

#### No global blowback

Kenneth Anderson 13, Professor of International Law at American University, June 2013, “The Case for Drones,” Commentary, Vol. 135, No. 6

That leaves the broader claim of global blow-back -- the idea that drone campaigns are effectively creating transnational terrorists as well as sympathy for their actions. That could always be true and could conceivably outweigh all other concerns. But the evidence is so diffuse as to be pointless. Do Gallup polls of the general Pakistani population indicate overwhelming resentment about drone strikes -- or do they really suggest that more than half the country is unaware of a drone campaign at all? Recent polls found the latter to be the case. Any causal connections that lead from supposed resentments to actual terrorist recruitment are contingent and uncertain. Discussing global blowback is also an easy stance for journalists writing about U.S. counterterrorism -- Mark Mazzetti's new book, The Way of the Knife, is a good example -- because it automatically frames an oppositional narrative, one with dark undertones and intimations of unattractive, unintended consequence. The blowback argument is also peculiarly susceptible to raising the behavioral bar the United States must meet in order to keep the local population happy enough not to embrace suicide bombing and terrorism. It defines terrorist deviancy down, while U.S. and Western security behaviors are always defined up.

From a strategic standpoint, however, the trouble with the blowback theory is simple: It will always counsel doing nothing rather than doing something. It's the kibitzer's lazy objection. Whether one knows a lot or a little about the action and its possible blowback consequences, whether one has an axe to grind or is reasonably objective, one can always offer the blow-back scenario.

There might be situations in which to give it priority; Gregory Johnsen, a Yemen expert, for example, says that a particular form of strike in Yemen causes blowback because it hits low-level fighters whose families cannot understand the American justification. (The response is, usually, that we are effectively fighting as the air arm of the Yemen government against its insurgents, including its low-level fighters.) That bears attention; whether it outweighs the strategic concern of supporting the Yemeni government, which does have to fight even low-level insurgents who in effect offer protection to the transnational terrorist wing, is another question. But we should consider it carefully.

Blowback is a form of the precautionary principle. But it's awfully difficult to conduct war, after all, on the basis of "first do no harm." As it happens, the United States once had a commander driven largely by considerations of blowback from a restive local population. His name was George McClellan. If he had not been replaced by Abraham Lincoln, the Union would have lost the Civil War.

#### No data supports the blowback or radicalization thesis

Michael Aaronson 13, Professorial Research Fellow and Executive Director of cii – the Centre for International Intervention – at the University of Surrey, and Adrian Johnson, Director of Publications at RUSI, the book reviews editor for the RUSI Journal, and chair of the RUSI Editorial Board, “Conclusion,” in Hitting the Target?: How New Capabilities are Shaping International Intervention, ed. Aaronson & Johnson, http://www.rusi.org/downloads/assets/Hitting\_the\_Target.pdf

Unintended detrimental consequences of intervention – ‘blowback’– are by no means a new phenomenon, nor an inherent feature of drone versus other kinds of strikes. A widespread view holds that drones are fuelling a political and societal backlash against the US.15 Worse, unintended civilian deaths may be creating new grievances, driving new recruits to join terrorist groups, and undermining the legitimacy of the very governments the US is trying to bolster.16 In other words, the covert drone programme is radical Islamism’s latest recruiting sergeant.17

This is contested, as is inevitable when relying on anecdotal evidence. Some data suggest that the effect is overblown – one analyst conducting fieldwork in Yemen found very little causation between drone strikes and radicalisation.18 The lack of information is a major problem for both policymakers and the public in attempting to definitively determine the strategic impact of any intervention, not just drone strikes. Here, again, the secrecy of the CIA programme is an obstacle – what data we do have on it comes from leaks, rather than systematic analysis.19 Neither is the US alone guilty of secrecy; in the aftermath of the UN Special Rapporteur’s report on the legality of drone strikes in Pakistan, one might note that the Pakistani government’s complaints to the Special Rapporteur seem to be contradictory given what is known from WikiLeaks documents about private approval.20

A lack of data may mean that talk of blowback is misguided, or it might not; Hastings Dunn and Wolff offer some clarity on the relationship between targeting policy and public anger in this regard. A bigger issue is that media reports tend to be unreliable from regions like the FATA, particularly when weapons forensics experts – who would be able to determine, for instance, what kind of weapon system has caused what kind of damage – cannot reach these areas.21 Ultimately, the information problem may mean that we cannot conclude whether anti-Americanism or fragile support for local regimes is caused by or coincident with drone strikes. This highlights the importance of casualty-recording and damage assessment, outlined in this report, to the strategic conduct of intervention.

### Ex-Post Link to All Broad Courts Links

#### Ex-post review would involve rulings on fundamental questions of overall TK legality like the scope of armed conflict with Al-Qaeda and the executive’s interpretation of imminence

Jonathan Hafetz 13, Associate Professor of Law, Seton Hall University School of Law, 3/8/13, “Reviewing Drones,” http://www.huffingtonpost.com/jonathan-hafetz/reviewing-drones\_b\_2815671.html

The better course is to ensure meaningful review after the fact. To this end, Congress should authorize federal damages suits by the immediate family members of individuals killed in drone strikes.

Such ex post review would serve two main functions: providing judicial scrutiny of the underlying legal basis for targeted killings and affording victims a remedy. It would also give judges more leeway to evaluate the facts without fear that an error on their part might leave a dangerous terrorist at large.

For review to be meaningful, judges must not be restricted to deciding whether there is enough evidence in a particular case, as they would likely be under a FISA model. They must also be able to examine the government's legal arguments and, to paraphrase the great Supreme Court chief justice John Marshall, "to say what the law is" on targeted killings.

Judicial review through a civil action can achieve that goal. It can thus help resolve the difficult questions raised by the Justice Department white paper, including the permissible scope of the armed conflict with al Qaeda and the legality of the government's broad definition of an "imminent" threat.

Judges must also be able to afford a remedy to victims. Mistakes happen and, as a recent report by Columbia Law School and the Center for Civilians in Conflict suggests, they happen more than the U.S. government wants to acknowledge.

Errors are not merely devastating for family members and their communities. They also increase radicalization in the affected region and beyond. Drone strikes -- if unchecked -- could ultimately create more terrorists than they eliminate.

Courts should thus be able to review lethal strikes to determine whether they are consistent with the Constitution and with the 2001 Authorization for Use of Military Force, which requires that such uses of force be consistent with the international laws of war. If a drone strike satisfies these requirements, the suit should be dismissed.

### 2NC Jud Review

Delery fantastic ---

Plan Fetters field commanders bc it deters them from using force---no one wants to be held individually accountable --- suits normally brought v US but plan = against individuals which none of their link D assumes --- also proves they kill heg because even if they boost readiness we won’t be willing to use force --- our evidence says that quick action is crucial in the context of CT so weighing the risks of judicial review means we don’t act until it’s too late

#### Judicial review of tactical targeting decisions collapses unit cohesion which is the core of military effectiveness---cohesion depends on military unity of command---i.e., the idea that military orders are final and won’t be subjected to second-guessing after the fact. Judicial review causes risk aversion and fear of legal scrutiny which both destroy the effectiveness of TK missions---that’s Maher.

#### Judicial review of TKs compromises unity of command---that’s fundamental to warfighting and successful operations---the plan injects devastating legal uncertainty into battlefield decisionmaking

Larry Maher 10, Quartermaster General, Veterans of Foreign Wars, et al, 9/30/10, BRIEF OF THE VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES AS AMICUS CURIAE IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANTS AND DISMISSAL, Nasser al-Aulaqi, Plaintiff, vs. Barack H. Obama, et al., Defendants, <http://www.lawfareblog.com/wp-content/uploads/2010/10/VFW_Brief_PACER.pdf>

A. Adjudication Of This Case Would Compromise The Military Principle Of “Unity Of Command,” And Undermine The Chain Of Command

“Unity of command,” and its corollary, “unity of effort,” are fundamental principles of warfare which are central to the effectiveness of Western militaries. See Carl von Clausewitz, On War 200-210 (Michael Howard & Peter Paret, ed. and trans., Princeton University Press 1976) (1832) (hereinafter “Clausewitz”). There “is no higher and simpler law of strategy” than to apply this principle in order to concentrate a nation’s military power its adversaries’ “center of gravity.” Id. at 204. This principle was first embraced by the American military during the 19th Century, and has subsequently shaped the organizational structure of American warfighting through two world wars and countless other conflicts. See James F. Schnabel, History of the Joints Chiefs of Staff, Vol. 1 at 80-87 (1996); Russell F. Weigley, History of the United States Army at 422-423 (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1984). Unity of command requires the integration of all combat functions into a single organizational element, with command authority vested in a single individual. See U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, Joint Pub. 3-0, Joint Operations at Appx. A, p. A-2 (2010), available at http://www.dtic.mil/doctrine/new\_pubs/jp3\_0.pdf.

The U.S. military implements “unity of command” through its chain of command—a hierarchical organizational structure which transmits command authority from the President through the Secretary of Defense, through subordinate military officers, down to the lowest ranking soldier, sailor, airman or Marine on the frontlines of America’s armed conflicts. This chain of command serves important organizational purposes, by vesting command authority in individual officers who are responsible for specific missions, and are empowered to command their personnel to achieve those missions. The chain of command also supports important normative and legal policy purposes, such as the doctrine of “command responsibility,” which renders battlefield commanders responsible for all their units do or fail to do, whether they knew about such conduct, or should have known about it. See Application of Yamashita, 327 U.S. 1, 14-16 (1946); see also Army Field Manual 27-10, The Law of Land Warfare at ¶ 501 (1956) (stating U.S. Army doctrine on “command responsibility”).

“Everything in war is very simple,” Clausewitz noted, “but the simplest thing is difficult.” Clausewitz at 119. The dangers of war, the fatigue of close combat, and the uncertainty which lurks within the fog of war, all combine to create a kind of “friction” which impedes the progress of armies. Id. A more contemporary author and veteran describes this fog:

For the common soldier, at least, war has the feel, the spiritual texture, of a great ghostly fog, thick and permanent. There is no clarity. Everything swirls. The old rules are no longer binding, the old truths no longer true. Right spills over into wrong. Order blends into chaos, love into hate, ugliness into beauty, law into anarchy, civility into savagery. The vapor sucks you in. You can’t tell where you are, or why you’re there, and the only certainty is overwhelming ambiguity . . . . You lose your sense of the definite, hence your sense of truth itself.

Tim O’Brien, The Things They Carried 88 (1990).

The military chain of command is designed to counteract this fog and friction of war, by providing clarity of orders and purpose to individual soldiers and their units. Similarly, this organizational structure exists to impose some order on the behavior and actions of soldiers and units, aligning their conduct with national goals, framing their actions in the context of strategic and operational campaigns, and focusing their efforts on the missions which support these broader endeavors. It is this structure which differentiates the armed forces of a nation from an armed group of thugs, and which ensures that national armed forces conduct themselves in accordance with the laws of armed conflict. Cf. Annex to the Convention, Hague Convention No. IV Respecting the Laws and Customs of War on Land, art. 1, Oct. 18, 1907, 36 Stat. 2277, 205 Consol. T.S. 277; Geneva Convention (III) Relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War, art. 4, Aug. 12, 1949, 6 U.S.T. 3316, T.I.A.S. No. 3364.

Our nation’s military personnel depend on their chain of command to provide them with certainty, clarity and authority in the heat of battle. Into this ordered system, Plaintiff wishes to inject the uncertainty of the American adversarial litigation process, by seeking, inter alia, that this Court declare there is no armed conflict in Yemen, and that orders issued by the President in response to that conflict should be enjoined. Not only would this force the court to go far beyond the “limited institutional competence of the judiciary” by involving it in sensitive matters of national security, cf. Arar v. Ashcroft, 585 F.3d 559, 576 (2d Cir. 2009) (citations omitted), but this also would undermine the chain of command by literally interposing this Court between the President and his subordinate officers, thereby contravening the core doctrinal principle of “unity of command,” which has served American military forces in good stead since the Civil War.

In asking the Court to hear this case, and to entertain the extraordinary remedy of injunctive relief against the President and his cabinet, the Plaintiff is asking the court to overturn the political judgment of the President and Congress that the nation is at war; that this war is an armed conflict against Al Qaeda; and that it is appropriate to use a blend of military, intelligence and diplomatic force to wage this war. All three branches of Government have decided that “[w]e are [] at war with al Qaeda and its affiliates.” Remarks of the President on National Security, May 21, 2009; see also Authorization for Use of Military Force (“AUMF”), Pub. L. No. 107-40, 115 Stat. 224 (2001); Hamdan v. Rumsfeld, 548 U.S. 557, 628-31 (2006). Political leaders from both political parties, over the course of two presidencies and five elected Congresses, have agreed upon, authorized, and appropriated funds for this war against Al Qaeda.

It is a fundamental axiom among American strategists that, “[a]s a nation, the United States wages war employing all instruments of national power – diplomatic, informational, military, and economic.” U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, Joint Pub. 1, Doctrine for the Armed Forces of the United States at I-1 (2009), available at http://www.dtic.mil/doctrine/new\_pubs/jp1.pdf. Plaintiff would seek to overturn the considered judgment of this nation’s political leaders in choosing the national strategy for this war, including the Attorney General of the United States, who has written that, in this war against Al Qaeda, “we must use every weapon at our disposal . . . [including] direct military action, military justice, intelligence, diplomacy, and civilian law enforcement.” See Letter from Attorney General Eric H. Holder, Jr. to Sen. Mitch McConnell, February 3, 2010 (emphasis added). The relief requested by plaintiff is both extraordinary and inappropriate, and completely inconsistent with the strategic imperative for “unified action [which] ensures unity of effort focused on [national] objectives and leading to the conclusion of operations on terms favorable to the United States.” See Joint Pub. 1 at I-1.

#### Judicial review decks unit cohesion---undermines authority of orders and makes units turn against themselves in litigation

Larry Maher 10, Quartermaster General, Veterans of Foreign Wars, et al, 9/30/10, BRIEF OF THE VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES AS AMICUS CURIAE IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANTS AND DISMISSAL, Nasser al-Aulaqi, Plaintiff, vs. Barack H. Obama, et al., Defendants, <http://www.lawfareblog.com/wp-content/uploads/2010/10/VFW_Brief_PACER.pdf>

B. Adjudication Also Would Adversely Affect Unit Cohesion

Throughout military history, from the Spartan warriors at Thermopylae to today’s American infantrymen in Afghanistan, soldiers have been motivated by comradeship and unit cohesion to sacrifice, persevere, and fight. See generally Richard Holmes, Acts of War (1986) (describing role of unit cohesion in mitigating fear and combat stress in World Wars I and II); James MacPherson, For Cause and Comrades (1997) (chronicling the motivations of American soldiers during the Civil War); Nancy Sherman, The Untold War (2010) (describing the emotional landscape of soldiering in Iraq and Afghanistan) Although war brings many emotions to the surface, unit cohesion matters more than any other motivating factor in the heat of battle. “[Unit] cohesion exists in a unit when the primary day-to-day goals of the individual soldier, of the small group with which he identifies, and of unit leaders, are congruent--with each giving his primary loyalty to the group so that it trains and fights as a unit with all members willing to risk death and achieve a common objective.” William Darryl Henderson, Cohesion: The Human Element in Combat, (1985), available at http://www.au.af.mil/au/awc/awcgate/ndu/cohesion/.

Studies of wars throughout the 20th Century have shown unit cohesion to be the critical ingredient for the success or failure of small units. See Edward A. Shils and Morris Janowitz, “Cohesion and Disintegration in the Wehrmacht in World War II,” Public Opinion Quarterly 12 (Summer 1948) 280-315 (finding that unit cohesion translated into higher battlefield effectiveness, survivability and hardiness); Charles C. Moskos, Jr., The American Enlisted Man: The Rank and File in Today’s Military 144-46 (1970) (finding that close bonds between soldiers played a key role in determining unit effectiveness and survival in the Vietnam War); Samuel Rolbant, The Israeli Soldier: Profile of an Army 200-210 (1970) (finding that Israeli soldiers had “a very strong sense of mutual affection and attraction among unit members,” and that this cohesion contributed significantly to their exemplary combat performance); William Darryl Henderson, Why the Vietcong Fought: A Study of Motivation and Control in a Modern Army in Combat 107-118 (1979) (finding that a combination of “very strong cohesion” and simple logistics enabled the North Vietnamese Army to persevere against overwhelming firepower); Leonard Wong, “Combat Motivation in Today’s Soldiers,” 32 Armed Forces & Soc. No. 4, 659- 663 (2006) (concluding that, in Iraq and Afghanistan, American soldiers are primarily motivated by unit cohesion and comradeship, among other factors); Army Field Manual 6-22.5, Combat and Operational Stress Control Manual for Leaders and Soldiers, at ¶ 2-3 (2009) (“Unit cohesion and morale is the best predictor of combat resiliency within a unit or organization. Units with high cohesion tend to experience a lower rate of [combat stress] casualties than units with low cohesion and morale.). “I hold it to be one of the simplest truths of war that the thing which enables an infantry soldier to keep going with his weapons is the near presence or the presumed presence of a comrade.” S.L.A. Marshall, Men Against Fire 42 (1947).

In this lawsuit, Plaintiff asks this Court to declare that the U.S. Government is not engaged in an armed conflict in Yemen, and that U.S. personnel may not therefore use lethal force against individuals in Yemen absent “circumstances in which they present concrete, specific, and imminent threats

to life or physical safety, and there are no means other than lethal force that could reasonably be employed to neutralize the threats.” Further, plaintiff seeks disclosure of the allegedly classified criteria used to designate U.S. citizens for targeting. And, in this suit’s most extraordinary request, Plaintiff asks this Court to enjoin the President, his advisers, and his generals, from conducting certain parts of the nation’s war against Al Qaeda.

As described above, judicial action of the sort requested by Plaintiff would have a deleterious effect on the chain of command. Judicial action also would, necessarily, affect unit cohesion by undermining both the vertical bonds among leaders and followers, and the horizontal bonds among comrades. These bonds depend on the clarity of orders and authorities which are the sine qua non of the military organizational structure. A judicial order on the lawfulness of the armed conflict in Yemen, or the appropriateness of U.S. military actions there, would cast doubt upon the orders of the President and his subordinate military officers, and introduce uncertainty into the military structure. Further, should this suit be allowed to proceed, it may eventually result in litigation relating to actions taken by military forces in Yemen. Such litigation may require units and soldiers to participate in the production of documents, interrogation of witnesses, and presentation of evidence at trial in an adversarial proceeding. Such litigation would rip apart the military units it touched, by pitting comrades against each other as potential witnesses, and creating the risk that every uttered or written word could eventually be used in a future courtroom, making every battlefield act susceptible to secondguessing and criticism. At its core, unit cohesion reflects a core trust among comrades so powerful that it would motivate a soldier to sacrifice his or her life for another, such that “[c]ombat soldiers describe the bond, hesitantly or openly, as love.” See Army Field Manual 22- 51, Leaders’ Manual for Combat Stress Control, at ¶ 3-7 (1994). Judicial intervention in this matter would erode that bond for the units touched by this process, undermining their effectiveness and our national security.

### Immanence

#### Plan collapses drones --- McKelvey says doesn’t meet standard of immanance bc we plan the ops over a period of montsh

#### Expansive interpretation of imminence is key to win the entire war on terror---prevents bio and nuclear terrorism

John Yoo 12, Professor of Law, University of California at Berkeley, School of Law; Visiting Scholar, American Enterprise Institute, 2011/12, “Assassination or Targeted Killings After 9/11,” New York Law School Law Review, http://www.nylslawreview.com/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2011/08/Yoo-56-1.pdf

Imminence is not a purely temporal concept. The concept traces its origins to the 1837 Caroline affair, in which British forces pursued Canadian insurgents into American territory, destroyed a vessel, and killed dozens of U.S. citizens.74 After that incident, the United States and Great Britain agreed in 1841 that a preemptive attack was justified if the “necessity of self-defense [was] instant, overwhelming, leaving no choice of means, and no moment for deliberation.”75 Imminence classically depended on timing. Only when an attack is soon to occur, and thus certain, can a nation use force in preemptive self-defense. What about the magnitude of harm posed by a threatened attack? According to conventional doctrine, a nation must wait until an attack is imminent before using force, whether the attack is launched by a small band of cross-border rebels, as in the Caroline affair, or by a terrorist organization armed with biological or chemical weapons. Terrorist groups today can launch a sudden attack with weapons of devastating magnitude. To save lives, it is now necessary to use force earlier and more selectively.

Imminence as a concept also fails to deal with covert activity. Terrorists deliberately disguise themselves as civilians. Their organizations have no territory or populations to defend, and they attack by surprise. This makes it virtually impossible to use force in self-defense once an attack is “imminent.” There is no target to attack in the form of the army of a nation-state. The best defense will be available only during a small window of opportunity when terrorist leaders become visible to the military or intelligence agencies. This can occur, as in the case of bin Laden, well before a major terrorist attack occurs. Imminence doctrine does not address cases in which an attack is likely to happen, but its timing is unpredictable. Rules of self defense need to adapt to the current terrorist threat.

In addition to imminence, the United States needs to account for the degree of expected harm, a function of the probability of attack times, the estimated casualties, and damage. There is ample justification for factoring this in, just as it ought to be a factor in ordinary acts of self-defense, as when one is attacked with a gun, as opposed to a set of fists. At the time of the Caroline decision in the early nineteenth century, the main weapons of war were single-shot weapons and artillery, cavalry, and infantry. There was an inherent technological limit on the destructiveness of armed conflict.

The speed and severity possible today mean that the right to preempt today should be greater than in the past. Weapons of mass destruction have increased the potential harm caused by a single terrorist attack from hundreds or thousands of innocent lives to hundreds of thousands, or even millions. This is not even counting the profound, long-term destruction of cities or contamination of the environment and the resulting long-term death or disease for large segments of the civilian population. WMDs can today be delivered with ease—a suicide bomber could detonate a “dirty bomb” using a truck or spread a biological agent with a small airplane. These threats are difficult to detect, as no broad mobilization and deployment of regular armed forces will be visible. Probability, magnitude, and timing are relevant factors that must be considered in determining when to use force against the enemy.

### Geography

#### Judicial review would result in limiting AUMF drone strikes to declared zones of armed conflict---that functionally bans drones

Milena Sterio 12, Associate Professor of Law, Cleveland-Marshall College of Law, Fall 2012, “Presidential Powers and Foreign Affairs: Rendition and Targeted Killings of Americans: The United States' Use of Drones in the War on Terror: The (Il)legality of Targeted Killings Under International Law,” Case Western Reserve Journal of International Law, 45 Case W. Res. J. Int'l L. 197

After the terrorist attacks of 9/11, President George W. Bush, in his capacity as Commander-in-Chief, authorized the use of drones against leaders of al-Qaeda forces, pursuant to Congress' Authorization for Use of Military Force (AUMF). n1 Pursuant to AUMF, drones could be utilized against al-Qaeda forces to target or to kill enemies. It has been reported that the United States possesses two types of drones: smaller ones, which predominantly carry out surveillance missions, and larger ones, which can carry hellfire missiles and have been used to conduct strikes and targeted killings. n2 Drone strikes have been carried out by both the military as well as the CIA. As Jane Mayer famously noted in her article:

The U.S. government runs two drone programs. The military's version, which is publicly acknowledged, operates in the recognized war zones of Afghanistan and Iraq, and targets enemies of U.S. troops stationed there. As such, it is an extension of conventional warfare. The C.I.A.'s program is aimed at terror suspects around the world, including in countries where U.S. troops are not based. n3

[\*199]

Moreover, although the President had designated Afghanistan and its airspace as a combat zone, the United States has used drones in other areas of the world, such as Yemen, where al-Qaeda forces have been targeted and killed. n4 In fact, the U.S. approach for the use of drones is that members of al-Qaeda forces may be targeted anywhere in the world: that the battlefield follows those individuals who have been designated as enemies due to their affiliation with al-Qaeda. n5 While many in the international community have criticized the United States' expansive geographical use of drones against al-Qaeda forces, n6 officials in the Bush Administration have defended the drone program as consistent and conforming to international law. n7 President Obama has continued this approach and has expanded the use of drones in the war on terror. n8 Moreover, high-level officials in the Obama Administration have offered detailed legal justifications for the legality of the American drone program.

Harold Koh, State Department Legal Advisor, justified the use of drones at the American Society of International Law Annual Meeting on March 25, 2010, arguing "it is the considered view of this Administration . . . that U.S. targeting practices, including lethal operations conducted with the use of unmanned aerial vehicles, comply with all applicable law, including the laws of war." n9 In his speech, Koh cited both domestic law (AUMF) and international law as proof that the United States is engaged in armed conflict with al-Qaeda, the Taliban, and "associated forces." n10 Targeted killings, according to Koh, are justified because they are performed in [\*200] accordance with the laws of war. n11 In other words, the United States conducts targeted strikes consistent with the well-known principles of distinction and proportionality to ensure that the targets are legitimate and collateral damage minimized. n12

Koh offered four reasons supporting the legality of targeted drone killings. First, enemy leaders are legitimate targets because they are belligerent members of an enemy group in a war with the United States. n13 Second, drones can constitute appropriate instruments for such missions, so long as their use conforms to the laws of war. n14 Third, enemy targets are selected through "robust" procedures; as such, they require no legal process and are not "unlawful extrajudicial" killings. n15 Finally, Koh argued that using drones to target "high level belligerent leaders" does not violate domestic law banning assassinations. n16

The Obama Administration has continued to use drones in Pakistan, as well as in Yemen. Increasingly, however, the American drone program has been run by the CIA. n17 Leon Panetta, the CIA Director, has praised the drone program stating that drones were "the only game in town." n18 On September 30, 2011, a CIA-operated drone targeted and killed an American citizen in Yemen, Anwar al-Awlaki. n19 Al-Awlaki had been accused of holding prominent roles within the ranks of al-Qaeda and had been placed on a hit list, authorized by President Obama. n20 His assassination marked the first time in history an American citizen had been targeted abroad without any judicial involvement or proceedings to determine guilt of any crime.

In a subsequent speech, Attorney General Eric Holder confirmed the Obama Administration's view on the legality of targeted killings, including killings of American citizens. On March 5, 2012, in a speech at Northwestern University, Holder claimed targeted killings of American citizens are legal if the targeted citizen is located abroad, a [\*201] senior operational leader of al-Qaeda or associated forces, actively engaged in planning to kill Americans, poses an imminent threat of violent attack against the United States (as determined by the U.S. government), and cannot be captured; such operations must be conducted in a manner consistent with applicable law of war principles. n21

Despite Koh's and Holder's justifications, many have questioned the legality of the American use of drones to perform targeted killings of al-Qaeda members and of U.S. citizens. Philip Alston, UN Special Rapporteur on Extrajudicial, Summary, or Arbitrary Executions, has famously stated his concerns that drones "are being operated in a framework which may well violate international humanitarian law and international human rights law." n22 This article highlights some of the most relevant issues surrounding the (il)legality of targeted killings under the current approach of the Obama Administration. This article concludes that most targeted killings are illegal under international law; only a very small number of such killings, performed under carefully crafted circumstances, could potentially comply with the relevant rules of jus ad bellum and jus in bello, and only if one accepts the premise that the United States is engaged in an armed conflict against al-Qaeda. This article discusses the following issues related to the use of drones to perform targeted killings: the definition of the battlefield and the applicability of the law of armed conflict (Part II); the identity of targetable individuals and their status as combatants or civilians under international law (Part III); the legality of targeted killings under international humanitarian law (Part IV); and the location and status of drone operators (Part V).

II. What and Where is the Battlefield? Which Laws Apply?

Under the Bush Administration approach, the United States post 9/11 was engaged in a global war against terrorists. Under this expansive approach, the war had no geographic constraints, and the battlefield was of a global nature. n23 In other words, the war followed [\*202] the terrorist enemies, and wherever they were located was where the battlefield could be temporarily situated. According to the Bush Administration, as well as the U.S. Supreme Court case Hamdan v. Rumsfeld, the United States was at war against al-Qaeda and Taliban forces, and the applicable laws were the laws of war. n24 Thus, military force, including the use of drones, could be used if consistent with the laws of war.

Under the Obama Administration, the rhetoric has slightly changed: the United States is no longer engaged in a global war on terror but rather, in a war against al-Qaeda, the Taliban, and associated forces. n25 However, the Obama Administration, by conducting drone strikes in a variety of locations, including Pakistan and Yemen, has followed the Bush Administration view of the global battlefield. The Obama Administration believes, like the Bush Administration, that the laws of war apply to the use of drone strikes because the United States is engaged in an armed conflict. n26 Moreover, the Obama Administration has claimed drones can be used in countries that harbor terrorist enemies and are unwilling or unable to control territory where such enemies are located. n27 This rationale would likely exclude places like England and France from the possible definition and localization of the battlefield, but would purport to justify the use of drones in places like Pakistan and Yemen, where remote territories are hard to control and where central governments cannot claim to possess effective control. n28 [\*203]

The above described terminology ("global war on terror" and "war against al-Qaeda, the Taliban, and associated forces") is vastly important, as it designates the applicable legal framework surrounding targeted killings and drone strikes. If one accepts the premise that the United States is engaged in armed conflict against al-Qaeda terrorists, then one has to conclude that laws of war apply. n29 If laws of war apply, then the rules of jus ad bellum determine whether military force is utilized in a lawful way. In fact, laws of war permit targeted killings if two particular requirements of jus ad bellum are satisfied: the use of force is necessary and the use of force is proportionate.

First, a state resorting to force must prove its decision to resort to force was a result of an armed attack and necessary to respond to such attack. n30 It is possible to argue that al-Qaeda's campaign of terrorist attacks against the United States, including 9/11, corresponded to an armed attack. However, it is also possible to argue that "al Qaeda's campaign against the United States does not trigger the right of self-defensive force . . . because al Qaeda has not launched a full scale military offensive." n31 Another difficulty in this context is that al-Qaeda is not a state, and under traditional international law, only states could initiate armed attack against states, thus triggering the right to self-defense. n32 While some commentators have argued that the use of force in self-defense against a non-state actor should be [\*204] permissible, "in an era where non-state groups project military-scale power," n33 this view remains controversial. n34

Second, a state resorting to the use of force must prove its use of force was proportionate to the military campaign's objective. n35 The proportionality test of jus ad bellum should "be applied contextually, to determine whether the overall goal of a use of force . . . is a proportionate objective." n36 Because the CIA operates the drone program in Pakistan in secrecy, it is impossible to determine conclusively whether the program meets the proportionality requirement of jus ad bellum. It is possible to argue the resort to targeted killings through the use of drones is at least sometimes necessary and proportionate (for example, when a U.S. military commander possesses information that a high-value al-Qaeda operative, engaged in planning armed attacks against Americans, is located in a specific location which is relatively easily reachable via drones, and the commander decides that neutralization of the al-Qaeda target is necessary to prevent attacks against Americans). It is probable that many drone strikes do not meet the requirements of jus ad bellum, but it is nonetheless difficult to conclude, under this approach, that the entire drone program is per se illegal. Should the U.S. government--specifically the CIA--release more facts regarding the drone program, it may become plausible to assess the lawfulness of this type of force through the jus ad bellum prism.

If, however, one rejects the conclusion that the United States is engaged in armed conflict, then the legality of the entire drone program becomes questionable. One could logically conclude the United States is not fighting a true war, but chasing terrorists. Under this view, the law of armed conflict would no longer apply, and the United States could use force against such terrorists only under a law enforcement paradigm--only when the use of force is absolutely necessary. Moreover, if the laws of war do not apply, then international human rights law dictates that targeted killings are legal only if a threat imminent and the reaction necessary, because under human rights law, "it is never permissible for killing to be the sole [\*205] objective of an operation." n37 "A killing is only legal to prevent a concrete and imminent threat to life, and, additionally, if there is no other non-lethal means of preventing that threat to life." n38 The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) prohibits "arbitrary" killing, as well as punitive or deterrent killings of terrorists. n39 The very nature of the American drone program, where targeted killings are utilized to neutralize al-Qaeda operatives, even though such killings are not absolutely necessary, is contrary to international human rights law. Under this paradigm, one must conclude that the drone program is illegal.

## CP

### CP Solves

#### Disclosing target criteria builds diplomatic credibility, enacts domestic accountability, and doesn’t link to the terror disad

Gregory 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>

Related to defending the process, and using performance data is the possibility that the U.S. government could publish the targeting criteria it follows. That criteria need not be comprehensive, but it could be sufficiently detailed as to give outside observers an idea about who the individuals singled out for killing are and what they are alleged to have done to merit their killing. As Bobby Chesney has noted, "Congress could specify a statutory standard which the executive branch could then bring to bear in light of the latest intelligence, with frequent reporting to Congress as to the results of its determinations."521 What might the published standards entail? First, Congress could clarify the meaning of associated forces, described in Part I and II. In the alternative, it could do away with the associated forces criteria altogether, and instead name each organization against which force is being authorized,522 such an approach would be similar to the one followed by the Office of Foreign Assets Control when it designates financial supporters of terrorism for sanctions.523¶ The challenge with such a reporting and designation strategy is that it doesn’t fit neatly into the network based targeting strategy and current practices outlined in Parts I-III. If the U.S. is seeking to disrupt networks, then how can there be reporting that explains the networked based targeting techniques without revealing all of the links and nodes that have been identified by analysts? Furthermore, for side payment targets, the diplomatic secrecy challenges identified in Part I remain --- there simply may be no way the U.S. can publicly reveal that it is targeting networks that are attacking allied governments. These problems are less apparent when identifying the broad networks the U.S. believes are directly attacking American interests, however publication of actual names of targets will be nearly impossible (at least ex ante) under current targeting practices.¶ As was discussed above, the U.S. government and outside observers may simply be using different benchmarks to measure success. Some observers are looking to short term gains from a killing while others look to the long term consequences of the targeted killing policy. Should all of these metrics and criteria be revealed? Hardly. However, the U.S. should articulate what strategic level goals it is hoping to achieve through its targeted killing program. Those goals certainly include disrupting specified networks. Articulating those goals, and the specific networks the U.S. is targeting may place the U.S. on better diplomatic footing, and would certainly engender mechanisms of domestic political accountability.

#### Strongly err neg---their authors don’t understand how thorough and effective inter-executive mechanisms are---adding transparency’s clearly sufficient

Gregory 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>

To date scholars have lacked a thorough understanding of the U.S. government’s targeted killing practices. As such, their commentary is oftentimes premised on easily describable issues, and fails to grapple with the multiple levels of intergovernmental accountability present in current practice. When dealing with the theoretical and normative issues associated with targeted killings, scholars have failed to specify what they mean when they aver that targeted killings are unaccountable. Both trends have impeded legal theory, and constrained scholarly discourse on a matter of public import.

This article is a necessary corrective to the public and scholarly debate. It has presented the complex web of bureaucratic, legal, professional, and political accountability mechanisms that exert influence over the targeted killing process. It has demonstrated that many of the critiques of targeted killings rest upon poorly conceived understandings of the process, unclear definitions, and unsubstantiated speculation. The article’s reform recommendations, grounded in a deep understanding of the actual process, reflect an assumption that transparency, performance criteria, and politically grounded independent review can enhance the already robust accountability mechanisms embedded in current practice.

### AT: Their Args

#### No public backlash in Pakistan or Yemen---just as many people love them as hate them

Max Boot 13, the Jeane J. Kirkpatrick Senior Fellow in National Security Studies at the Council on Foreign Relations, 2/6/13, “Obama Drone Memo is a Careful, Responsible Document,” http://www.commentarymagazine.com/2013/02/06/obama-drone-memo-is-a-careful-responsible-document/

Drone strikes are by no means risk free, the biggest risk being that by killing innocent civilians they will cause a backlash and thereby create more enemies for the U.S. than they eliminate. There is no doubt that some of these strikes have killed the wrong people–as the New York Times account highlights in one incident in Yemen. There is also little doubt, moreover, that drone strikes are no substitute for a comprehensive counterinsurgency and state-building policy designed to permanently safeguard vulnerable countries such as Pakistan, Yemen, Somalia, Libya, and Mali from the incursions of radical jihadists. But drone strikes have been effective in disrupting al-Qaeda operations and they have been conducted with less collateral damage and more precision than in the past.

It is hard to assess what impact they have had on public opinion in countries such as Yemen and Pakistan, but there is at least as much evidence that these strikes are applauded by locals who are terrorized by al-Qaeda thugs as there is evidence that the strikes are reviled for killing fellow clansmen. As the Times notes: “Although most Yemenis are reluctant to admit it publicly, there does appear to be widespread support for the American drone strikes that hit substantial Qaeda figures like Mr. Shihri, a Saudi and the affiliate’s deputy leader, who died in January of wounds received in a drone strike late last year.”

### Solves --- Legitimacy

#### Congressional oversight of the program is already effective, it’s just not publicly discussed---the CP solves soft power

Gregory 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>

Congressional oversight of executive branch activities is believed to be a core constitutional duty.443 Arthur Schlesinger wrote that this duty, while not written into the Constitution, existed because “the power to make laws implied the power to see whether they were faithfully executed.”444 Founding-era actions support this view, with Congress conducting in 1792 its first oversight investigation into America’s military campaign against Indians on the frontier.445 In 1885, future president Woodrow Wilson (at the time an academic) wrote in Congressional Government that Congressional oversight was just as important as lawmaking.446 Oversight is a form of accountability, but what exactly is oversight? Moreover, how can we know what “good” oversight is?

Amy Zegart argues that defining good oversight is difficult for three reasons.447 First, “‘good’ oversight is embedded in politics and intertwined with policy advocacy on behalf of constituents and groups and their interests.”448 Second, “many agencies are designed with contradictory missions that naturally pull them in different directions as the power of contending interest groups waxes and wanes.”449 Third, “good oversight is hard to recognize because many important oversight activities are simply invisible or impossible to gauge.”450 In a particularly salient example, Zegart notes:

Telephone calls, e-mails and other informal staff oversight activities happen all the time, but cannot be counted in data sets or measured in other systematic ways. Even more important, the very possibility that an agency’s action might trigger a future congressional hearing (what some intelligence officials refer to as ‘the threat of the green felt table’) or some other sort of congressional response can dissuade the executive branch officials from undertaking the proposed action in the first place. This kind of anticipatory oversight can be potent. But from the outside, it looks like no oversight at all.451

If oversight of targeted killings is a form of political accountability, it may be one that is difficult to see from the outside. This fact is borne out by Senator Diane Feinstein’s release of details regarding congressional oversight of the targeted killing program. Those details were largely unknown and impossible to gauge until political pressure prompted her to issue a statement. In that statement she noted:

The committee has devoted significant time and attention to targeted killings by drones. The committee receives notifications with key details of each strike shortly after it occurs, and the committee holds regular briefings and hearings on these operations—reviewing the strikes, examining their effectiveness as a counterterrorism tool, verifying the care taken to avoid deaths to non-combatants and understanding the intelligence collection and analysis that underpins these operations. In addition, the committee staff has held 35 monthly, in-depth oversight meetings with government officials to review strike records (including video footage) and question every aspect of the program.452

#### Executive transparency combined with Congressional expressions of support for the process demonstrates accountability for the overall program---solves legitimacy

Jack Goldsmith 12, Harvard Law professor and a member of the Hoover Task Force on National Security and Law, 3/19/12, “Fire When Ready,” http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/03/19/fire\_when\_ready

There are at least two separate issues about what information should be disclosed. The first concerns the legal basis for the targeted killing program. In addition to the New York Times leak, four senior Obama administration officials -- Attorney General Holder, Defense Department General Counsel Jeh Johnson, State Department Legal Advisor Harold Koh, and senior counterterrorism advisor John Brennan -- have given major speeches outlining this legal basis. These speeches go far beyond the usual public explanations for actions of this sort. But, as Charlie Savage of the New York Times said of Holder's Northwestern talk, they "fell far short of the level of detail contained in the Office of Legal Counsel memo." After Holder's speech, the nation has a general explanation of the constitutional and international law bases for the administration's actions. But the speech also shows that the legal rationale for targeted killing can be discussed without disclosing operations, targets, means of fire, or countries, and without revealing means and methods of intelligence gathering. The Holder speech, in short, weakens the rationale against disclosing more detail and analysis about the legal basis for (and limitations on) targeted killings.

A second disclosure issue concerns the process by which targeting decisions are made and the factual basis for those decisions (including the evidence of ties to al Qaeda, the imminence of the threat posed by the target, the extent of cooperation with other nations, and the reasons capture is not feasible). This is the most legitimate concern of critics and even some supporters of the president's targeted killing campaign, especially when that campaign involves a U.S. citizen. There is every reason to think that the government was super careful and extra scrupulous in the process preceding the Awlaki killing. But despite the elaborate system of deliberation, scrutiny, and legitimation supporting U.S. targeting practices, the U.S. government can and sometimes does make mistakes about its targets. There is simply no way to wring all potential error from the system and still carry on a war. Even full-blown ex ante judicial review of targeting would not guarantee the elimination of errors.

The government needs a way to credibly convey to the public that its decisions about who is being targeted -- especially when the target is a U.S. citizen -- are sound. The government did provide this kind of information when there was public uncertainty about whether Awlaki was an operational leader of al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula or merely an inspirational figure. In its sentencing memorandum for "underwear bomber" Umar Farouk Abdulmutallab, the government revealed details about Awlaki meeting with Abdulmutallab and providing assistance for the planned attack on a U.S.-bound plane on Christmas Day 2009. This disclosure is credible because it is based on Abdulmutallab's debriefing statements. And because it is based on those statements, it does not reveal the sensitive intelligence that originally informed the government's conclusion that Awlaki was an operational leader. Outside this unusual context, however, it is hard for the executive branch to disclose more than it has about the factual basis for its high-value targeting decisions without disclosing and thus destroying its intelligence-gathering techniques or its arrangements with foreign governments. And that, in turn, leaves the government in the unattractive position of asking the public to trust its controversial targeting decisions without any outside confirmation of the facts.

I can think of only two ways to improve the current arrangement. First, the government can and should tell us more about the process by which it reaches its high-value targeting decisions. It should answer a number of questions, such as: How many layers of bureaucracy are involved? How many people, from how many agencies, typically weigh in on such decisions? How long do the deliberations generally take? What, in general, are the intelligence review processes like? How long does a typical congressional briefing on such an issue take? How many members of the relevant congressional committees show up? Does the administration show committee members legal analyses? Do committee staffers, including committee lawyers, participate? How much sharing is there, if any, between the intelligence and armed services committees? Are targets or operations sometimes, frequently, or always revised by these processes? Are they sometimes, or frequently, aborted? The more the government tells us about the eyeballs on the issue and the robustness of the process, the more credible will be its claims about the accuracy of its factual determinations and the soundness of its legal ones. All of this information can be disclosed in some form without endangering critical intelligence.

Second, the government should take advantage of the separation of powers. Military detention at Guantánamo Bay, Cuba has become more legitimate and less controversial in part because another branch of government, the judiciary, has looked at the detentions and agreed with the executive's assessment. Such judicial review is inappropriate for targeting decisions and, in any event, not available. But a different adversarial branch of government -- Congress -- can play an analogous role. The congressional intelligence and arms services committees know a lot about the president's targeting policies, and have gone along with the president's actions. These committees could (without revealing sensitive information) do more to enhance the president's credibility by stating publicly -- and preferably in a bipartisan fashion -- that they have monitored the president's high-value targeting decisions and find them, and the facts and processes on which they are based, to be sound. Congress does not typically like the responsibility (or the hard work) that such an endorsement would entail. But especially when courts are not available to review the president's actions, it should step up its public involvement in scrutinizing and vouching for (or criticizing) the president's targeting decisions. Indeed, the president should insist on it.

### AT: Executive Trust Deficit

#### Transparency solves allied perception and blowback while maintaining the CT benefits of targeted killings

Michael Aaronson 13, Professorial Research Fellow and Executive Director of cii – the Centre for International Intervention – at the University of Surrey, and Adrian Johnson, Director of Publications at RUSI, the book reviews editor for the RUSI Journal, and chair of the RUSI Editorial Board, “Conclusion,” in Hitting the Target?: How New Capabilities are Shaping International Intervention, ed. Aaronson & Johnson, http://www.rusi.org/downloads/assets/Hitting\_the\_Target.pdf

The Obama administration faces some tough dilemmas, and analysts should be careful not to downplay the security challenges it faces. It must balance the principles of justice and accountability with a very real terrorist threat; and reconcile the need to demonstrate a credibly tough security policy with the ending of a long occupation of Afghanistan while Al-Qa’ida still remains active in the region. Nevertheless, more transparency would provide demonstrable oversight and accountability without sacrificing the necessary operational secrecy of counter-terrorism. It might also help assuage the concern of allies and their publics who worry about what use the intelligence they provide might be put to. A wise long-term vision can balance the short-term demands to disrupt and disable terrorist groups with a longer-term focus to resolve the grievances that give rise to radicalism, and also preclude inadvertently developing norms of drone use that sit uneasily with the civilised conduct of war. Drones are but one kinetic element of a solution to terrorism that is, ultimately, political.

#### The CP shapes the development of global norms on drones and actively builds legitimacy---that means it solves their perception deficits because all their ev is only about the way that drones are perceived now, not how they’re perceived after a vigorous defense by the U.S.

Kenneth Anderson 10, Professor of International Law at American University, 3/8/10, “Predators Over Pakistan,” The Weekly Standard, <http://www.weeklystandard.com/print/articles/predators-over-pakistan>

But a thorough reading of the Predator coverage calls to mind how the detention, interrogation, and rendition debates proceeded over the years after 9/11. As Brookings scholar Benjamin Wittes observes, those arguments also had elements of both legal sense and sensibility. Ultimately the battle of international legal legitimacy was lost, even though detention at Guantánamo continues for lack of a better option. It is largely on account of having given up the argument over legitimacy, after all, that it never occurred to the Obama administration not to Mirandize the Christmas Bomber. Baseline perceptions of legitimacy have consequences. ¶ Nor is the campaign to delegitimize targeted killing only about the United States. Legal moves in European courts have already been made against Israeli officials involved in targeted killing against Hamas in the Gaza war. Unsavory members of the U.N. act alongside the world’s most fatuously self-regarding human rights groups to press for war crimes prosecutions. All of this is merely an opening move in a larger campaign to stigmatize and delegitimize targeted killing and drone attacks. What can be done to Israelis can eventually be done to CIA officers. Perhaps a London bookmaker can offer odds on how soon after the Obama administration leaves office CIA officers will be investigated by a court, somewhere, on grounds related to targeted killing and Predator drone strikes. And whether the Obama administration’s senior lawyers will rise to their defense—or, alternatively, submit an amicus brief calling for their prosecution. ¶ Thus it matters when the U.N. special rapporteur on extrajudicial execution, Philip Alston, demands, as he did recently, that the U.S. government justify the legality of its targeted killing program. Alston, a professor at New York University, is a measured professional and no ideologue, and he treads delicately with respect to the Obama administration—but he treads. Likewise it matters when, in mid-January, the ACLU handed the U.S. government a lengthy FOIA request seeking extensive information on every aspect of targeted killing through the use of UAVs. The FOIA request emphasizes the legal justification for the program as conducted by the U.S. military and the CIA. ¶ Legal justification matters, partly for reasons of legitimacy and partly because the United States is, and wants to be, a polity governed by law. This includes international law, at least insofar as it means something other than the opinions of professors and motley member-states at the U.N. seeking to extract concessions. International law, it is classically said, consists of what states consent to by treaty. Add to this “customary law”—as evidenced by how states actually behave and as provided in their statements, their so-called opinio juris. Customary law is evidenced when states do these things because they see them as binding obligations of law, done from a sense of legal obligation—not merely habit, policy, or convenience, practices that they might change at any moment because they did not engage in them as a matter of law. ¶ What the United States says regarding the lawfulness of its targeted killing practices matters. It matters both that it says it, and then of course it matters what it says. The fact of its practices is not enough, because they are subject to many different legal interpretations: The United States has to assert those practices as lawful, and declare its understanding of the content of that law. This is for two important reasons: first to preserve the U.S. government’s views and rights under the law; and second, to make clear what it regards as binding law not just for itself, but for others as well. ¶ Other states, the United Nations, international tribunals, NGOs, and academics can cavil and disagree with what the United States thinks is law. But no Great Power’s consistently reiterated views of international law, particularly in the field of international security, can be dismissed out of hand. It is true of the United States and it is also true of China. It is not a matter of “good” Great Powers or “bad.” Nor is it merely “might makes right.” It is, rather, a mechanism that keeps international law grounded in reality, and not a plaything of utopian experts and enthusiasts, departing this earth for the City of God. It remains tethered to the real world both as law and practice, conditioned by how states see and act on the law. ¶ The venerable U.S. view of the “law of nations” is one of moderate moral realism—the world “as it is,” as the president correctly put it in his Nobel Prize address. It is not the vision of radical utopians and idealists; neither is it that of radical skeptics about the very existence of law in international affairs. On the contrary, the time-honored American view has always been pragmatic about international law (thereby acting to preserve it from radical internationalism and radical skepticism). But upholding the American view requires more than simply dangling the inference that if the United States does it, it means the United States must intend it as law. Traditional international law requires more than that, for good reason. The U.S. government should provide an affirmative, aggressive, and uncompromising defense of the legal sense and sensibility of targeted killing. The U.S. government’s interlocutors and critics are not wrong to demand one, even those whose own conclusions have long since been set in stone. ¶ A clear statement of legal position need not be an invitation to negotiate or alter it, even when others loudly disagree. In international law, a state’s assertion that its policies are lawful, particularly such an assertion from a great power in matters of international security, is an important element all by itself in making it lawful, or at least not unlawful. But in vast areas of security, self-defense, and the use of force, the U.S. government has in recent years left a huge deficit as to how its actions constitute a coherent statement of international law. ¶ For once, Washington should move to get ahead of a contested issue of international legal legitimacy and “soft law.” Why else have an Obama administration, if not to get out in front on a practice that it has ramped up on grounds of both necessity and humanitarian minimization of force? The CIA has taken a few baby steps by selectively leaking some collateral damage data to a few reporters. But the CIA is going to have to say more. The U.S. government needs to defend targeted killings as both lawful, and as an important step forward in the development of more sparing and discriminating—more humanitarian—weaponry.

### Solves---CMR

#### Publicizing target procedures is the most effective way to resolve the perception of targeted killing as violating human rights and CMR

Cheri Kramer 11, J.D., Santa Clara University School of Law, 1/1/11, “The Legality of Targeted Drone Attacks as U.S. Policy,” Santa Clara Journal of International Law, http://digitalcommons.law.scu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1105&context=scujil

Some advocates in the field of human rights assert that targeted killing denies individuals due process. 134 However, due process does not require that each target be given the opportunity to defend him or herself before a legitimate judicial authority before being eliminated: "[A] state that is engaged in an armed conflict or in legitimate self-defense is not required to provide targets with legal process before the state may use lethal force."135¶ Still, in non-international armed conflicts such as the situation in Afghanistan, a target is not lawful until it has qualified as such under either CCF or DPH.136 Without public disclosure of the procedures for enforcing compliance with applicable law, it is impossible to determine whether or not the government is adhering to the requirements of law. Making public the procedures for target selection may be the most effective means to confront the human right challenges to targeted killing. In particular, if the U.S. wants to keep the higher moral ground, it should afford the public the process of clear, systematic target selection procedures to minimize the risk of targeting an unlawful target (i.e., a civilian), and thereby invoking guilt for a war crime under the Rome Statute.13 7

## Allies Advantage

### Program Sustainable

#### There’s a sustainable consensus on the drone program---no chance of judicial, legislative, diplomatic, or domestic political constraints---detention policy empirically proves - that’s Chesney

#### Absolutely zero chance that criticism of the drone program causes the U.S. to ban it

Benjamin Wittes 13, Senior Fellow in Governance Studies at the Brookings Institution, 2/27/13, “In Defense of the Administration on Targeted Killing of Americans,” http://www.lawfareblog.com/2013/02/in-defense-of-the-administration-on-targeted-killing-of-americans/

This view has currency among European allies, among advocacy groups, and in the legal academy. Unfortunately for its proponents, it has no currency among the three branches of government of the United States. The courts and the executive branch have both taken the opposite view, and the Congress passed a broad authorization for the use of force and despite many opportunities, has never revisited that document to impose limitations by geography or to preclude force on the basis of co-belligerency—much less to clarify that the AUMF does not, any longer, authorize the use of military force at all. Congress has been repeatedly briefed on U.S. targeting decisions, including those involving U.S. persons.[5] It was therefore surely empowered to either use the power of the purse to prohibit such action or to modify the AUMF in a way that undermined the President’s legal reasoning. Not only has it taken neither of these steps, but Congress has also funded the relevant programs. Moreover, as I noted above, Congress’s recent reaffirmation of the AUMF in the 2012 NDAA with respect to detention, once again contains no geographical limitation.

There is, in other words, a consensus among the branches of government on the point that the United States is engaged in an armed conflict that involves co-belligerent forces and follows the enemy to the new territorial ground it stakes out. It is a consensus that rejects the particular view of the law advanced by numerous critics. And it is a consensus on which the executive branch is entitled to rely in formulating its legal views.

### No Heg Impact

#### Their internal link is laughable – overstretch in 2010 with two wars wasn’t enough – no threshold for it causing total collapse

#### No terminal impact – Fettweis is way better than their laundry list garbage

#### Impact’s empirically denied

Preble 10 – Former prof, history, Temple U. PhD, history, Temple (Christopher, U.S. Military Power: Preeminence for What Purpose?, 3 August, http://www.cato-at-liberty.org/u-s-military-power-preeminence-for-what-purpose/)

Goure and the Hadley-Perry commissioners who produced the alternate QDR argue that the purpose of American military power is to provide global public goods, to defend other countries so that they don’t have to defend themselves, and otherwise shape the international order to suit our ends. In other words, the same justifications offered for American military dominance since the end of the Cold War. Most in Washington still embraces the notion that America is, and forever will be, the world’s indispensable nation. Some scholars, however, questioned the logic of hegemonic stability theory from the very beginning. A number continue to do so today. They advance arguments diametrically at odds with the primacist consensus. Trade routes need not be policed by a single dominant power; the international economy is complex and resilient. Supply disruptions are likely to be temporary, and the costs of mitigating their effects should be borne by those who stand to lose --- or gain --- the most. Islamic extremists are scary, but hardly comparable to the threat posed by a globe-straddling Soviet Union armed with thousands of nuclear weapons. It is frankly absurd that we spend more today to fight Osama bin Laden and his tiny band of murderous thugs than we spent to face down Joseph Stalin and Chairman Mao. Many factors have contributed to the dramatic decline in the number of wars between nation-states; it is unrealistic to expect that a new spasm of global conflict would erupt if the United States were to modestly refocus its efforts, draw down its military power, and call on other countries to play a larger role in their own defense, and in the security of their respective regions. But while there are credible alternatives to the United States serving in its current dual role as world policeman / armed social worker, the foreign policy establishment in Washington has no interest in exploring them. The people here have grown accustomed to living at the center of the earth, and indeed, of the universe. The tangible benefits of all this military spending flow disproportionately to this tiny corner of the United States while the schlubs in fly-over country pick up the tab.

#### No escalation

Haas 8 Richard, President of the Council on Foreign Relations, former director of policy planning for the Department of State, former vice president and director of foreign policy studies at the Brookings Institution, the Sol M. Linowitz visiting professor of international studies at Hamilton College, a senior associate at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, a lecturer in public policy at Harvard University’s John F. Kennedy School of Government, and a research associate at the International Institute for Strategic Studies, April, “Ask the Expert: What Comes After Unipolarity?” http://www.cfr.org/publication/16063/ask\_the\_expert.html

Does a non polar world increase or reduce the chances of another world war? Will nuclear deterrence continue to prevent a large scale conflict? Sivananda Rajaram, UK Richard Haass: I believe the chance of a world war, i.e., one involving the major powers of the day, is remote and likely to stay that way. This reflects more than anything else the absence of disputes or goals that could lead to such a conflict. Nuclear deterrence might be a contributing factor in the sense that no conceivable dispute among the major powers would justify any use of nuclear weapons, but again, I believe the fundamental reason great power relations are relatively good is that all hold a stake in sustaining an international order that supports trade and financial flows and avoids large-scale conflict. The danger in a nonpolar world is not global conflict as we feared during the Cold War but smaller but still highly costly conflicts involving terrorist groups, militias, rogue states, etc.