### 1AC Plan Text

#### The United States federal judiciary should apply a clear statement principle to presidential war powers authority that the Suspension Clause applies to individuals indefinitely detained at the will of the United States

### 1AC Legitimacy

#### Advantage 1 is Legitimacy

#### Two internal links

#### First is habeas hypocrisy

Yang ’11 (Christina – dissertation @ Emory, advised by Michael Sullivan - PhD, Vanderbilt University, 2000 JD, Yale Law School, 1998 “Reconstructing Habeas: Towards a New Emergency Scheme!”

“[The] concern that the Executive could move detainees physically beyond the reach of the Constitution and detain them indefinitely,”99 is the primary principle driving the District Court’s decision to attribute greater importance to the third factor – the site of apprehension. And insofar as this concern implicates serious separation-of-powers questions as it introduces the possibility of the political branches playing hide-and-seek with the judiciary, this third factor should be afforded greater weight. “[If] Congress and the president had the power to take control of a territory and then determine that U.S. law does not apply there,”100 it damages America’s long-held reputation as abiding by the rule of law in all situations, at all times. We are not a dictatorship, a fascist or a totalitarian state. The United States of America is, and has always been, a democracy. Yet we are a democratic state not because we happen to hold elections, but because we abide by – and believe in the importance of – the rule of law. This reputation is further harmed when the Executive consciously and purposely transfers detainees from one detention site to another – e.g. from Guantánamo to Bagram or to other CIA black-sites around the world – based on whether or not the U.S. Constitution applies. The rule of law, remember, “is the cornerstone of a modern democratic society, one that is run not on the whims of its leaders but by established rules.”101 Even if adherence to rule of law in times of crisis constrains or impedes executive action to some extent, it also forces the executive to justify its actions – thereby diminishing the risk of heinous mistakes made in the name of urgency. The extension of the writ to Bagram does not guarantee release for the detainee, but simply demands that the executive have reasonable reasons for the petitioner’s continued detention. What harm to security is being done when all habeas does is to protect against arbitrary executive action? Security is, in fact, only harmed when the courts fail to hold the executive accountable for his decisions.102 After all, al-Maqaleh does not advocate for its “malleable, multifactored test”103 to automatically afford habeas rights for all Bagram detainees. The Great Writ of Liberty, it appears, is not absolute but subject to limitation in certain contexts and based on pragmatic grounds. In this global war on terror, America cannot stand alone. But in the aftermath of 9/11, we have become more and more alone. “Once a leading exponent of the rule of law,” David Cole observes, “the United States is now widely viewed as a systematic and arrogant violator of the most basic norms of human rights law – including the prohibitions against torture, disappearances, and arbitrary detention.”104 We cannot afford to alienate our friends with our actions. This loss of legitimacy is not simply harmful because it paints us in hypocritical colors, but because it also leaves us more vulnerable to terrorist attack inasmuch our governmental abuses in the arena of detention “fuels the animus and resentment that inspire the attacks against us in the first place.”105 We only confirm what the terrorists have been saying all along. In the end, the fight against terrorism is fundamentally a battle for hearts and minds.106 The more we win over our enemies, the fewer enemies we have to be concerned about. But the battle is not won with money; it is not won with victory. It is won by a long term commitment to civil liberties and the rule of law – everything that America was once known to stand for – as well as proof that even in the short term, we will act with legitimacy, fairness, and within the constraints of law. “As any leader instinctively knows,” Cole advises, “it is far better to have people follow your lead because they view you as legitimate than to have to try to compel others by force to adhere to your will.”107 Our allies were once willing to aid us in our cause – for the cause, the fight against terrorism, is neither illegitimate nor unworthy of pursuit. They are more reluctant now because we have compromised our legitimacy – i.e., the sincerity of our reasons for fighting this fight – when we employ illegitimate means to reach our ends. We require the help of our allies; and so in order to keep them on our side, we need to maintain “our historic position of leadership in the global spread of the rule of law,” thus reminding them of the “virtue of [the] legal commitments they [too] have made.”108

#### Second is judicial deference

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

The hegemonic model also reduces the need for executive branch flexibility, and the institutional competence terrain shifts toward the courts. The stability of the current U.S.-led international system depends on the ability of the U.S. to govern effectively. Effective governance depends on, among other things, predictability. n422 G. John Ikenberry analogizes America's hegemonic position to that of a "giant corporation" seeking foreign investors: "The rule of law and the institutions of policy making in a democracy are the political equivalent of corporate transparency and [\*155] accountability." n423 Stable interpretation of the law bolsters the stability of the system because other nations will know that they can rely on those interpretations and that there will be at least some degree of enforcement by the United States. At the same time, the separation of powers serves the global-governance function by reducing the ability of the executive branch to make "abrupt or aggressive moves toward other states." n424 The Bush Administration's detainee policy, for all of its virtues and faults, was an exceedingly aggressive departure from existing norms, and was therefore bound to generate intense controversy. It was formulated quickly, by a small group of policy-makers and legal advisors without consulting Congress and over the objections of even some within the executive branch. n425 Although the Administration invoked the law of armed conflict to justify its detention of enemy combatants, it did not seem to recognize limits imposed by that law. n426 Most significantly, it designed the detention scheme around interrogation rather than incapacitation and excluded the detainees from all legal protections of the Geneva Conventions. n427 It declared all detainees at Guantanamo to be "enemy combatants" without establishing a regularized process for making an individual determination for each detainee. n428 And when it established the military commissions, also without consulting Congress, the Administration denied defendants important procedural protections. n429 In an anarchic world characterized by great power conflict, one could make the argument that the executive branch requires maximum flexibility to defeat the enemy, who may not adhere to international law. Indeed, the precedents relied on most heavily by the Administration in the enemy combatant cases date from the 1930s and 1940s - a period when the international system was radically unstable, and the United States was one of several great powers vying for advantage. n430 But during that time, the executive branch faced much more exogenous pressure from other great powers to comply with international law in the treatment of captured enemies. If the United States strayed too far from established norms, it would risk retaliation upon its own soldiers or other consequences from [\*156] powerful rivals. Today, there are no such constraints: enemies such as al Qaeda are not great powers and are not likely to obey international law anyway. Instead, the danger is that American rule-breaking will set a pattern of rule-breaking for the world, leading to instability. n431 America's military predominance enables it to set the rules of the game. When the U.S. breaks its own rules, it loses legitimacy. The Supreme Court's response to the detainee policy enabled the U.S. government as a whole to hew more closely to established procedures and norms, and to regularize the process for departing from them. After Hamdi, n432 the Department of Defense established a process, the CSRTs, for making an individual determination about the enemy combatant status of all detainees at Guantanamo. After the Court recognized habeas jurisdiction at Guantanamo, Congress passed the DTA, n433 establishing direct judicial review of CSRT determinations in lieu of habeas. Similarly, after the Court declared the military commissions unlawful in Hamdan, n434 this forced the Administration to seek congressional approval for commissions that restored some of the rights afforded at courts martial. n435 In Boumediene, the Court rejected the executive branch's foreign policy arguments, and bucked Congress as well, to restore the norm of habeas review. n436 Throughout this enemy combatant litigation, it has been the courts' relative insulation from politics that has enabled them to take the long view. In contrast, the President's (and Congress's) responsiveness to political concerns in the wake of 9/11 has encouraged them to depart from established norms for the nation's perceived short-term advantage, even at the expense of the nation's long-term interests. n437 As Derek Jinks and Neal Katyal have observed, "treaties are part of [a] system of time-tested standards, and this feature makes the wisdom of their judicial interpretation manifest." n438 At the same time, the enemy combatant cases make allowances for the executive branch's superior speed. The care that the Court took to limit the issues it decided in each case gave the executive branch plenty of time to [\*157] arrive at an effective detainee policy. n439 Hamdi, Rasul, and Boumediene recognized that the availability of habeas would depend on the distance from the battlefield and the length of detention. n440 The enemy combatant litigation also underscores the extent to which the classic realist assumptions about courts' legitimacy in foreign affairs have been turned on their head. In an anarchic world, legitimacy derives largely from brute force. The courts have no armies at their disposal and look weak when they issue decisions that cannot be enforced. n441 But in a hegemonic system, where governance depends on voluntary acquiescence, the courts have a greater role to play. Rather than hobbling the exercise of foreign policy, the courts are a key form of "soft power." n442 As Justice Kennedy's majority opinion observed in Boumediene, courts can bestow external legitimacy on the acts of the political branches. n443 Acts having a basis in law are almost universally regarded as more legitimate than merely political acts. Most foreign policy experts believe that the Bush Administration's detention scheme "hurt America's image and standing in the world." n444 The restoration of habeas corpus in Boumediene may help begin to counteract this loss of prestige. Finally, the enemy combatant cases are striking in that they embrace a role for representation-reinforcement in the international realm. n445 Although defenders of special deference acknowledge that courts' strengths lie in protecting the rights of minorities, it has been very difficult for courts to protect these rights in the face of exigencies asserted by the executive branch in foreign affairs matters. This is especially difficult when the minorities are alleged enemy aliens being held outside the sovereign territory of the United States in wartime. In the infamous Korematsu decision, another World War II-era case, the Court bowed to the President's factual assessment of the emergency justifying detention of U.S. citizens of Japanese ancestry living in the United States. n446 In Boumediene, the Court [\*158] pointedly declined to defer to the executive branch's factual assessments of military necessity. n447 The court may have recognized that a more aggressive role in protecting the rights of non-citizens was required by American hegemony. In fact, the arguments for deference with respect to the rights of non-citizens are even weaker because aliens lack a political constituency in the United States. n448 This outward-looking form of representation-reinforcement serves important functions. It strengthens the legitimacy of U.S. hegemony by establishing equality as a benchmark and reinforces the sense that our constitutional values reflect universal human rights. n449 Conclusion When it comes to the constitutional regime of foreign affairs, geopolitics has always mattered. Understandings about America's role in the world have shaped foreign affairs doctrines. But the classic realist assumptions that support special deference do not reflect the world as it is today. A better, more realist, approach looks to the ways that the courts can reinforce and legitimize America's leadership role. The Supreme Court's rejection of the government's claimed exigencies in the enemy combatant cases strongly indicates that the Judiciary is becoming reconciled to the current world order and is asserting its prerogatives in response to the fewer constraints imposed on the executive branch. In other words, the courts are moving toward the hegemonic model. In the great dismal swamp that is the judicial treatment of foreign affairs, this transformation offers hope for clarity: the positive reality of the international system, despite terrorism and other serious challenges, permits the courts to reduce the "deference gap" between foreign and domestic cases.

#### The only alternative is great power wars – withdraw or loss of cred collapses the international order

Kromah 9, Masters Student in IR [February 2009, Lamii Moivi Kromah at the Department of International Relations

University of the Witwatersrand, “The Institutional Nature of U.S. Hegemony: Post 9/11”, http://wiredspace.wits.ac.za/bitstream/handle/10539/7301/MARR%2009.pdf?sequence=1]

A final major gain to the United States from the benevolent hegemony has perhaps been less widely appreciated. It nevertheless proved of great significance in the short as well as in the long term: the pervasive cultural influence of the United States.39 This dimension of power base is often neglected. After World War II the authoritarian political cultures of Europe and Japan were utterly discredited, and the liberal democratic elements of those cultures revivified. The revival was most extensive and deliberate in the occupied powers of the Axis, where it was nurtured by drafting democratic constitutions, building democratic institutions, curbing the power of industrial trusts by decartelization and the rebuilding of trade unions, and imprisoning or discrediting much of the wartime leadership. American liberal ideas largely filled the cultural void. The effect was not so dramatic in the "victor" states whose regimes were reaffirmed (Britain, the Low and Scandinavian countries), but even there the United States and its culture was widely admired. The upper classes may often have thought it too "commercial," but in many respects American mass consumption culture was the most pervasive part of America's impact. American styles, tastes, and middle-class consumption patterns were widely imitated, in a process that' has come to bear the label "coca-colonization."40 After WWII policy makers in the USA set about remaking a world to facilitate peace. The hegemonic project involves using political and economic advantages gained in world war to restructure the operation of the world market and interstate system in the hegemon's own image. The interests of the leader are projected on a universal plane: What is good for the hegemon is good for the world. The hegemonic state is successful to the degree that other states emulate it. Emulation is the basis of the consent that lies at the heart of the hegemonic project.41 Since wealth depended on peace the U.S set about creating institutions and regimes that promoted free trade, and peaceful conflict resolution. U.S. benevolent hegemony is what has kept the peace since the end of WWII. The upshot is that U.S. hegemony and liberalism have produced the most stable and durable political order that the world has seen since the fall of the Roman Empire. It is not as formally or highly integrated as the European Union, but it is just as profound and robust as a political order, Kant’s Perpetual Peace requires that the system be diverse and not monolithic because then tyranny will be the outcome. As long as the system allows for democratic states to press claims and resolve conflicts, the system will perpetuate itself peacefully. A state such as the United States that has achieved international primacy has every reason to attempt to maintain that primacy through peaceful means so as to preclude the need of having to fight a war to maintain it.42 This view of the post-hegemonic Western world does not put a great deal of emphasis on U.S. leadership in the traditional sense. U.S. leadership takes the form of providing the venues and mechanisms for articulating demands and resolving disputes not unlike the character of politics within domestic pluralistic systems.43 America as a big and powerful state has an incentive to organize and manage a political order that is considered legitimate by the other states. It is not in a hegemonic leader's interest to preside over a global order that requires constant use of material capabilities to get other states to go along. Legitimacy exists when political order is based on reciprocal consent. It emerges when secondary states buy into rules and norms of the political order as a matter of principle, and not simply because they are forced into it. But if a hegemonic power wants to encourage the emergence of a legitimate political order, it must articulate principles and norms, and engage in negotiations and compromises that have very little to do with the exercise of power.44 So should this hegemonic power be called leadership, or domination? Well, it would tend toward the latter. Hierarchy has not gone away from this system. Core states have peripheral areas: colonial empires and neo-colonial backyards. Hegemony, in other words, involves a structure in which there is a hegemonic core power. The problem with calling this hegemonic power "leadership" is that leadership is a wonderful thing-everyone needs leadership. But sometimes I have notice that leadership is also an ideology that legitimates domination and exploitation. In fact, this is often the case. But this is a different kind of domination than in earlier systems. Its difference can be seen in a related question: is it progressive? Is it evolutionary in the sense of being better for most people in the system? I think it actually is a little bit better. The trickle down effect is bigger-it is not very big, but it is bigger.45 It is to this theory, Hegemonic Stability that the glass slipper properly belongs, because both U.S. security and economic strategies fit the expectations of hegemonic stability theory more comfortably than they do other realist theories. We must first discuss the three pillars that U.S. hegemony rests on structural, institutional, and situational. (1) Structural leadership refers to the underlying distribution of material capabilities that gives some states the ability to direct the overall shape of world political order. Natural resources, capital, technology, military force, and economic size are the characteristics that shape state power, which in turn determine the capacities for leadership and hegemony. If leadership is rooted in the distribution of power, there is reason to worry about the present and future. The relative decline of the United States has not been matched by the rise of another hegemonic leader. At its hegemonic zenith after World War II, the United States commanded roughly forty five percent of world production. It had a remarkable array of natural resource, financial, agricultural, industrial, and technological assets. America in 1945 or 1950 was not just hegemonic because it had a big economy or a huge military; it had an unusually wide range of resources and capabilities. This situation may never occur again. As far as one looks into the next century, it is impossible to see the emergence of a country with a similarly commanding power position. (2) Institutional leadership refers to the rules and practices that states agree to that set in place principles and procedures that guide their relations. It is not power capabilities as such or the interventions of specific states that facilitate concerted action, but the rules and mutual expectations that are established as institutions. Institutions are, in a sense, self-imposed constraints that states create to assure continuity in their relations and to facilitate the realization of mutual interests. A common theme of recent discussions of the management of the world economy is that institutions will need to play a greater role in the future in providing leadership in the absence of American hegemony. Bergsten argues, for example, that "institutions themselves will need to play a much more important role.46 Institutional management is important and can generate results that are internationally greater than the sum of their national parts. The argument is not that international institutions impose outcomes on states, but that institutions shape and constrain how states conceive and pursue their interests and policy goals. They provide channels and mechanisms to reach agreements. They set standards and mutual expectations concerning how states should act. They "bias" politics in internationalist directions just as, presumably, American hegemonic leadership does. (3) Situational leadership refers to the actions and initiatives of states that induce cooperation quite apart from the distribution of power or the array of institutions. It is more cleverness or the ability to see specific opportunities to build or reorient international political order, rather than the power capacities of the state, that makes a difference. In this sense, leadership really is expressed in a specific individual-in a president or foreign minister-as he or she sees a new opening, a previously unidentified passage forward, a new way to define state interests, and thereby transforms existing relations. Hegemonic stability theorists argue that international politics is characterized by a succession of hegemonies in which a single powerful state dominates the system as a result of its victory in the last hegemonic war.47 Especially after the cold war America can be described as trying to keep its position at the top but also integrating others more thoroughly in the international system that it dominates. It is assumed that the differential growth of power in a state system would undermine the status quo and lead to hegemonic war between declining and rising powers48, but I see a different pattern: the U.S. hegemonic stability promoting liberal institutionalism, the events following 9/11 are a brief abnormality from this path, but the general trend will be toward institutional liberalism. Hegemonic states are the crucial components in military alliances that turn back the major threats to mutual sovereignties and hence political domination of the system. Instead of being territorially aggressive and eliminating other states, hegemons respect other's territory. They aspire to be leaders and hence are upholders of inter-stateness and inter-territoriality.49 The nature of the institutions themselves must, however, be examined. They were shaped in the years immediately after World War II by the United States. The American willingness to establish institutions, the World Bank to deal with finance and trade, United Nations to resolve global conflict, NATO to provide security for Western Europe, is explained in terms of the theory of collective goods. It is commonplace in the regimes literature that the United States, in so doing, was providing not only private goods for its own benefit but also (and perhaps especially) collective goods desired by, and for the benefit of, other capitalist states and members of the international system in general. (Particular care is needed here about equating state interest with "national" interest.) Not only was the United States protecting its own territory and commercial enterprises, it was providing military protection for some fifty allies and almost as many neutrals. Not only was it ensuring a liberal, open, near-global economy for its own prosperity, it was providing the basis for the prosperity of all capitalist states and even for some states organized on noncapitalist principles (those willing to abide by the basic rules established to govern international trade and finance). While such behaviour was not exactly selfless or altruistic, certainly the benefits-however distributed by class, state, or region-did accrue to many others, not just to Americans.50 For the truth about U.S. dominant role in the world is known to most clear-eyed international observers. And the truth is that the benevolent hegemony exercised by the United States is good for a vast portion of the world's population. It is certainly a better international arrangement than all realistic alternatives. To undermine it would cost many others around the world far more than it would cost Americans-and far sooner. As Samuel Huntington wrote five years ago, before he joined the plethora of scholars disturbed by the "arrogance" of American hegemony; "A world without U.S. primacy will be a world with more violence and disorder and less democracy and economic growth than a world where the United States continues to have more influence than any other country shaping global affairs”. 51 I argue that the overall American-shaped system is still in place. It is this macro political system-a legacy of American power and its liberal polity that remains and serves to foster agreement and consensus. This is precisely what people want when they look for U.S. leadership and hegemony.52 If the U.S. retreats from its hegemonic role, who would supplant it, not Europe, not China, not the Muslim world –and certainly not the United Nations. Unfortunately, the alternative to a single superpower is not a multilateral utopia, but the anarchic nightmare of a New Dark Age. Moreover, the alternative to unipolarity would not be multipolarity at all. It would be ‘apolarity’ –a global vacuum of power.53 Since the end of WWII the United States has been the clear and dominant leader politically, economically and military. But its leadership as been unique; it has not been tyrannical, its leadership and hegemony has focused on relative gains and has forgone absolute gains. The difference lies in the exercise of power. The strength acquired by the United States in the aftermath of World War II was far greater than any single nation had ever possessed, at least since the Roman Empire. America's share of the world economy, the overwhelming superiority of its military capacity-augmented for a time by a monopoly of nuclear weapons and the capacity to deliver them--gave it the choice of pursuing any number of global ambitions. That the American people "might have set the crown of world empire on their brows," as one British statesman put it in 1951, but chose not to, was a decision of singular importance in world history and recognized as such.54 Leadership is really an elegant word for power. To exercise leadership is to get others to do things that they would not otherwise do. It involves the ability to shape, directly or indirectly, the interests or actions of others. Leadership may involve the ability to not just "twist arms" but also to get other states to conceive of their interests and policy goals in new ways. This suggests a second element of leadership, which involves not just the marshalling of power capabilities and material resources. It also involves the ability to project a set of political ideas or principles about the proper or effective ordering of po1itics. It suggests the ability to produce concerted or collaborative actions by several states or other actors. Leadership is the use of power to orchestrate the actions of a group toward a collective end.55 By validating regimes and norms of international behaviour the U.S. has given incentives for actors, small and large, in the international arena to behave peacefully. The uni-polar U.S. dominated order has led to a stable international system. Woodrow Wilson’s zoo of managed relations among states as supposed to his jungle method of constant conflict. The U.S. through various international treaties and organizations as become a quasi world government; It resolves the problem of provision by imposing itself as a centralized authority able to extract the equivalent of taxes. The focus of the theory thus shifts from the ability to provide a public good to the ability to coerce other states. A benign hegemon in this sense coercion should be understood as benign and not tyrannical. If significant continuity in the ability of the United States to get what it wants is accepted, then it must be explained. The explanation starts with our noting that the institutions for political and economic cooperation have themselves been maintained. Keohane rightly stresses the role of institutions as "arrangements permitting communication and therefore facilitating the exchange of information. By providing reliable information and reducing the costs of transactions, institutions can permit cooperation to continue even after a hegemon's influence has eroded. Institutions provide opportunities for commitment and for observing whether others keep their commitments. Such opportunities are virtually essential to cooperation in non-zero-sum situations, as gaming experiments demonstrate. Declining hegemony and stagnant (but not decaying) institutions may therefore be consistent with a stable provision of desired outcomes, although the ability to promote new levels of cooperation to deal with new problems (e.g., energy supplies, environmental protection) is more problematic. Institutions nevertheless provide a part of the necessary explanation.56 In restructuring the world after WWII it was America that was the prime motivator in creating and supporting the various international organizations in the economic and conflict resolution field. An example of this is NATO’s making Western Europe secure for the unification of Europe. It was through NATO institutionalism that the countries in Europe where able to start the unification process. The U.S. working through NATO provided the security and impetus for a conflict prone region to unite and benefit from greater cooperation. Since the United States emerged as a great power, the identification of the interests of others with its own has been the most striking quality of American foreign and defence policy. Americans seem to have internalized and made second nature a conviction held only since World War II: Namely, that their own wellbeing depends fundamentally on the well-being of others; that American prosperity cannot occur in the absence of global prosperity; that American freedom depends on the survival and spread of freedom elsewhere; that aggression anywhere threatens the danger of aggression everywhere; and that American national security is impossible without a broad measure of international security. 57 I see a multi-polar world as one being filled with instability and higher chances of great power conflict. The Great Power jostling and British hegemonic decline that led to WWI is an example of how multi polar systems are prone to great power wars. I further posit that U.S. hegemony is significantly different from the past British hegemony because of its reliance on consent and its mutilaterist nature. The most significant would be the UN and its various branches financial, developmental, and conflict resolution. It is common for the international system to go through cataclysmic changes with the fall of a great power. I feel that American hegemony is so different especially with its reliance on liberal institutionalism and complex interdependence that U.S. hegemonic order and governance will be maintained by others, if states vary in size, then cooperation between the largest of the former free riders (and including the declining hegemonic power) may suffice to preserve the cooperative outcome. Thus we need to amend the assumption that collective action is impossible and incorporate it into a fuller specification of the circumstances under which international cooperation can be preserved even as a hegemonic power declines.58 If hegemony means the ability to foster cooperation and commonalty of social purpose among states, U.S. leadership and its institutional creations will long outlast the decline of its post war position of military and economic dominance; and it will outlast the foreign policy stumbling of particular administrations.59 U.S. hegemony will continue providing the public good that the world is associated with despite the rise of other powers in the system “cooperation may persist after hegemonic decline because of the inertia of existing regimes. Institutional factors and different logics of regime creation and maintenance have been invoked to explain the failure of the current economic regime to disintegrate rapidly in response to the decline of American predominance in world affairs.”60 Since the end of WWII the majority of the states that are represented in the core have come to depend on the security that U.S. hegemony has provided, so although they have their own national interest, they forgo short term gains to maintain U.S. hegemony. Why would other states forgo a leadership role to a foreign hegemon because it is in their interests; one particularly ambitious application is Gilpin's analysis of war and hegemonic stability. He argues that the presence of a hegemonic power is central to the preservation of stability and peace in the international system. Much of Gilpin's argument resembles his own and Krasner's earlier thesis that hegemonic states provide an international order that furthers their own self-interest. Gilpin now elaborates the thesis with the claim that international order is a public good, benefiting subordinate states. This is, of course, the essence of the theory of hegemonic stability. But Gilpin adds a novel twist: the dominant power not only provides the good, it is capable of extracting contributions toward the good from subordinate states. In effect, the hegemonic power constitutes a quasigovernment by providing public goods and taxing other states to pay for them. Subordinate states will be reluctant to be taxed but, because of the hegemonic state's preponderant power, will succumb. Indeed, if they receive net benefits (i.e., a surplus of public good benefits over the contribution extracted from them), they may recognize hegemonic leadership as legitimate and so reinforce its performance and position. During the 19th century several countries benefited from British hegemony particularly its rule of the seas, since WWII the U.S. has also provided a similar stability and security that as made smaller powers thrive in the international system. The model presumes that the (military) dominance of the hegemonic state, which gives it the capacity to enforce an international order, also gives it an interest in providing a generally beneficial order so as to lower the costs of maintaining that order and perhaps to facilitate its ability to extract contributions from other members of the system.
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#### No offense – legitimacy determines power and withdraw guarantees extinction

Knowles ‘9 (Robert, Acting assistant Professor, New York University School of Law, “American Hegemony and the Foreign Affairs Constitution,” Arizona State Law Journal, 41 Ariz. St. L.J. 87, October)

International relations scholars are still struggling to define the current era. The U.S.-led international order is unipolar, hegemonic, and, in some ways, imperial. In any event, this order diverges from traditional realist assumptions in important respects. It is unipolar, but stable. It is more hierarchical. The U.S. is not the same as other states; it performs unique functions in the world and has a government open and accessible to foreigners. And the stability and legitimacy of the system depends more on successful functioning of the U.S. government as a whole than it does on balancing alliances crafted by elite statesmen practicing realpolitik. “[W]orld power politics are shaped primarily not by the structure created by interstate anarchy but by the foreign policy developed in Washington.”368 These differences require a new model for assessing the institutional competences of the executive and judicial branches in foreign affairs. One approach would be to adapt an institutional competence model using insights from a major alternative theory of international relations – liberalism. Liberal IR theory generally holds that internal characteristics of states – in particular, the form of government – dictate states behavior, and that democracies do not go to war against one another.369 Liberalists also regard economic interdependence and international institutions as important for maintaining peace and stability in the world.370 Dean Anne-Marie Slaughter has proposed a binary model that distinguishes between liberal, democratic states and non-democratic states.371 Because domestic and foreign issues are “more convergent” among liberal democracies, Slaughter reasons, the courts should decide issues concerning the scope of the political branches’ powers.372 With respect to non-liberal states, the position of the U.S. is more “realist,” and courts should deploy a high level of deference.373 A strength of Dean Slaughter’s binary approach is that it would tend to reduce the uncertainty in foreign affairs adjudication. Professor Nzelibe has criticized this approach because it would put courts in the difficult position of determining which countries are liberal democracies.374 But even if courts are capable of making these determinations, they would still face the same dilemmas adjudicating controversies regarding non-liberal states. Where is the appropriate boundary between foreign affairs and domestic matters? How much discretion should be afforded the executive when individual rights and accountability values are at stake? To resolve these dilemmas, an institutional competence model should be applicable to foreign affairs adjudication across the board. In constructing a new realist model, it is worth recalling that the functional justifications for special deference are aimed at addressing problems of a particular sort of role effectiveness—which allocation of power among the branches will best achieve general governmental effectiveness in foreign affairs. In the 21st Century, America’s global role has changed, and the best means of achieving effectiveness in foreign affairs have changed as well. The international realm remains highly political—if not as much as in the past— but it is American politics that matters most. If the U.S. is truly an empire— and in some respects it is—the problems of imperial management will be far different from the problems of managing relations with one other great power or many great powers. Similarly, the management of hegemony or unipolarity requires a different set of competences. Although American predominance is recognized as a salient fact, there is no consensus among realists about the precise nature of the current international order.375 The hegemonic model I offer here adopts common insights from the three IR frameworks—unipolar, hegemonic, and imperial—described above. First, the “hybrid” hegemonic model assumes that the goal of U.S. foreign affairs should be the preservation of American hegemony, which is more stable, more peaceful, and better for America’s security and prosperity, than the alternatives. If the United States were to withdraw from its global leadership role, no other nation would be capable of taking its place.376 The result would be radical instability and a greater risk of major war.377 In addition, the United States would no longer benefit from the public goods it had formerly produced; as the largest consumer, it would suffer the most. Second, the hegemonic model assumes that American hegemony is unusually stable and durable.378 As noted above, other nations have many incentives to continue to tolerate the current order.379 And although other nations or groups of nations—China, the European Union, and India are often mentioned—may eventually overtake the United States in certain areas, such as manufacturing, the U.S. will remain dominant in most measures of capability for decades to come. In 2025, the U.S. economy is projected to be twice the size of China’s.380 The U.S. accounted for half of the world’s military spending in 2007 and holds enormous advantages in defense technology that far outstrip would-be competitors.381 Predictions of American decline are not new, and they have thus far proved premature.382 Third, the hegemonic model assumes that preservation of American hegemony depends not just on power, but legitimacy.383 All three IR frameworks for describing predominant states—although unipolarity less than hegemony or empire—suggest that legitimacy is crucial to the stability and durability of the system. Although empires and predominant states in unipolar systems can conceivably maintain their position through the use of force, this is much more likely to exhaust the resources of the predominant state and to lead to counter-balancing or the loss of control.384 Legitimacy as a method of maintaining predominance is far more efficient. The hegemonic model generally values courts’ institutional competences more than the anarchic realist model. The courts’ strengths in offering a stable interpretation of the law, relative insulation from political pressure, and power to bestow legitimacy are important for realizing the functional constitutional goal of effective U.S. foreign policy. This means that courts’ treatment of deference in foreign affairs will, in most respects, resemble its treatment of domestic affairs. Given the amorphous quality of foreign affairs deference, this “domestication” reduces uncertainty. The increasing boundary problems caused by the proliferation of treaties and the infiltration of domestic law by foreign affairs issues are lessened by reducing the deference gap. And the dilemma caused by the need to weigh different functional considerations—liberty, accountability, and effectiveness—against one another is made less intractable because it becomes part of the same project that the courts constantly grapple with in adjudicating domestic disputes.

### 1AC Iraq

#### Advantage 2 is Iraq

#### Judicial intervention into detention is inevitable – a wave of lawsuits is on the way

Chesney 13, Law Prof at UT (November, Robert, BEYOND THE BATTLEFIELD, BEYOND AL QAEDA: THE DESTABILIZING LEGAL ARCHITECTURE OF COUNTERTERRORISM, 112 Mich. L. Rev. 163)

The government will not be able to simply ride out the legal friction generated by the fragmentation of al Qaeda and the shift toward shadow war. Those trends do not merely shift unsettled questions of substantive law to the forefront of the debate; they also greatly increase the prospects for a new round of judicial intervention focusing on those substantive questions. 1. Military Detention Consider military detention first. Fresh judicial intervention regarding the substantive law of detention is a virtual certainty. It will come in connection with the lingering Guantanamo population, and it will come as well in connection with any future detainees taken into custody on a long-term basis, regardless of where they might be held. a. Existing Guantanamo Detainees Most of the existing Guantanamo detainees have already had a shot at habeas relief, and many lost on both the facts and the law. But some of them can and will pursue a second shot, should changing conditions call into question the legal foundation for the earlier rulings against them. n202 The first round of Guantanamo habeas decisions depended in almost every instance on the existence of a meaningful tie to ongoing hostilities in Afghanistan, as did the Supreme Court's 2004 decision in Hamdi. Indeed, Justice O'Connor in Hamdi was at pains to caution that at some point in the future this baseline condition making LOAC relevant could unravel. n203 The declining U.S. role in combat operations in Afghanistan goes directly to that point. This decline will open the door to a second wave of Guantanamo litigation, with detainees arguing that neither LOAC nor the relevant statutory authorities continues to apply. This argument may or may not succeed on the merits. At first blush, the NDAA FY12 would seem to present a substantial obstacle to the detainees. That statute expressly codifies detention authority as to members (and supporters) of al Qaeda, the Afghan Taliban, and "associated forces," n204 thus grounding detention authority directly in domestic law rather than requiring courts to impute such authority into the 2001 AUMF by implication from LOAC (as the Supreme Court had to do in [\*214] Hamdi itself). But it is not quite so simple. The same section of the NDAA FY12 relinks the question of detention authority to LOAC after all. It specifies that statutory detention authority as an initial matter exists solely "pending disposition under the law of war." n205 And although it then lists long-term military detention as a possible disposition option, the statute specifically defines this authority as "detention under the law of war without trial until the end of the hostilities authorized by the [AUMF]." n206 A court confronted with this language might interpret it in a manner consistent with the government's borderless-conflict position, such that the drawdown in Afghanistan would not matter. But it might not. The repeated references to the "law of war" in the statute--that is to LOAC--might lead at least some judges to conduct a fresh field-of-application analysis regarding the extent to which LOAC remains applicable in light of the drawdown, and judges might then read the results back into the NDAA FY12. I am not saying that this is the likely outcome or that any such analysis would necessarily reject the government's borderless-conflict position. I am just saying that judges eventually will decide these matters without real guidance from Congress (unless Congress clarifies its intentions in the interim). Note, too, that any such judicial interpretations may well have far broader implications than just the fate of the particular detainee in question; a ruling that LOAC has no application in a given situation would cast a long shadow over any other LOAC-based actions the U.S. government might undertake in the same or similar contexts (including targeting measures). Regardless of what occurs in Afghanistan, the existing Guantanamo detainee population might also find occasion to come back to court should the decline of the core al Qaeda organization continue to the point where it can plausibly be described as defunct. In such a case, it is likely that at least some current al Qaeda detainees would revive their habeas petitions in order to contend that the demise of the organization also means the demise of detention authority over members of the defunct group. This argument would be particularly likely to come from those who were held on the ground of membership in al Qaeda but who the government had not shown to have been otherwise involved in hostile acts. This would be a challenging argument to make; the government would surely respond that al Qaeda would no longer be defunct if some of its members were set free. But setting that possible response aside, such a petition could compel the government to litigate the question of whether the continuing existence of various "franchises," like AQAP or al-Shabaab, suffices to preserve detention authority over al Qaeda members. That is, such a challenge could lead a judge to weigh in on the organizational boundary question.

#### US rule of law leadership on indefinite detention solves Iraqi civil war

Scharf et al 9, PILPG Managing Director [Professor Michael P. Scharf is the PILPG Managing Director, John Deaver Drinko — Baker & Hostetler Professor of Law and Director of the Frederick K. Cox International Law Center at the Case Western Reserve University School of Law, “BRIEF OF THE PUBLIC INTERNATIONAL LAW & POLICY GROUP AS AMICUS CURIAE IN SUPPORT OF PETITIONERS”, www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/publishing/preview/publiced\_preview\_briefs\_pdfs\_09\_10\_08\_1234\_PetitionerAmCuPILPG.authcheckdam.pdf]

As the foregoing examples illustrate, foreign governments rely on the precedent set by the U.S. and this Court when addressing new and complex issues in times of conflict. Finding for the Petitioners in the present case will reaffirm this Court’s leadership in promoting respect for rule of law in foreign states during times of conflict. B. Foreign Judges Follow U.S. and Supreme Court Leadership in Times of Conflict. In addition to its work advising foreign governments, PILPG has been and continues to be involved in a number of judicial training initiatives in foreign states. These initiatives aim to foster independent and fair judicial systems in transitional and post-conflict states throughout Central and Eastern Europe, Africa, and the Middle East. In these trainings, PILPG frequently relies on the work of this Court to illustrate and promote adherence to the rule of law. In 2004, for example, PILPG led a week-long training session for Iraqi judges in Dubai on due process and civil liberties protections to institute in the new post-Saddam legal system. The training was seen as an important step toward the democratization of Iraq, and something that would hasten the ability of the U.S. to withdraw its troops from Iraq. On the second day of the training program, local and international media published the leaked photos of the abuses at Abu Ghraib. The Iraqi judges would not allow the training sessions to continue until PILPG answered to their satisfaction questions about whether the U.S. judicial system could ensure that the perpetrators would be brought to justice, that the victims would be able to bring suit for their injuries, and that the abuses would be halted. When PILPG returned for another training session several months later, the Iraqi judges had mixed reactions to the prosecutions of the Abu Ghraib perpetrators. Some judges perceived the U.S. Prosecutions of the perpetrators as not aggressive enough, which left the Iraqi judges with the impression that the U.S. was not leading by example. Although other Iraqi judges appreciated and sought to follow the U.S. example to try those responsible for abuses before an independent tribunal, it was clear that Abu Ghraib temporarily set back U.S. efforts to establish rule of law in Iraq. A year later, in 2005, PILPG conducted training sessions for the Iraqi high tribunal judges who would be presiding over the trial of Saddam Hussein and other former leaders of the ba’athist regime. Even more than the human rights training of ordinary Iraqi judges discussed above, the successful operation of the Iraqi high tribunal was seen as critical to suppressing the spread of sectarian violence and heading off a full-scale civil war in Iraq. The objectives of the tribunal were twofold. First, the tribunal sought to bring those most responsible for the atrocities committed under the Ba’athist regime before an independent panel of judges to be tried under international standards of justice. Second, the tribunal sought to establish a model for upholding and implementing rule of law in Iraq and to demonstrate that the need for rule of law is greatest in response to the gravest atrocities. During the training sessions, the Iraqi judges requested guidance on controlling disruptive defendants in the courtroom. Specifically, the judges asked whether they could bind and gag the defendants in the courtroom as they understood had been done to the defendants in the 1969 “Chicago Seven” trial in the U.S. PILPG explained that the U.S. Court of Appeals had ultimately overturned the convictions in that case, in part because of the mistreatment of the defendants in the courtroom. United States v. Dellinger, 472 F.2d 340 (7th Cir. 1972). This information persuaded the Iraqi judges to seek less draconian means of control in the trial of Saddam Hussein, which was televised gavel to gavel in Iraq. See generally Michael Newton and Michael Scharf, Enemy of the State: The Trial and Execution of Saddam Hussein (2008). Foreign judicial interest in U.S. respect for rule of law during the war on terror is not limited to Iraqi judges. In 2006, PILPG conducted sessions in a weeklong rule of law training program in Prague for fifty judges from former Soviet Bloc countries in Eastern Europe. At the start of the first session, one of the judges asked “Sobriaetes’ li vi goverit’ o slone v komnate?,” which translates to “Are you going to be addressing the elephant in the room?” Michael P. Scharf, The Elephant in the Room: Torture and the War on Terror, 37 Case W. Res. J. Int’l L. 145, 145 (2006). The question referred to the so-called “White House Torture Memos,” released just before the training session began, which asserted that Common Article 3 of the 1949 Geneva Conventions was not applicable to detainees held at Guantanamo Bay and which provided justification for Military Commissions whose procedures would not meet the Geneva standards. Id. at 145-46. The group of judges asked PILPG to explain “how representatives of the United States could expect to be taken seriously in speaking about the importance of human rights law when the United States itself has recently done so much that is contrary to that body of law in the context of the so-called ‘Global War on Terror.’” Id. at 145. PILPG addressed judges’ concerns by explaining that the President’s decision to establish Military Commissions via Executive Order, and whether those Commissions had to comport with the Geneva Conventions, was currently being reviewed by this Court in Hamdan v. Rumsfeld, 548 U.S. 557 (2006), and that the Executive Branch would be bound to follow the holding of this Court. Scharf, supra, at 148. Foreign judges closely follow the work of this Court and the example set by the U.S. Government in upholding the rule of law during the war on terror. As these examples illustrate, when the U.S. upholds the rule of law, foreign judges are more likely to follow.

#### Data proves Iraqi civil war is inevitable—only strong systems of governance can stabilize the country

Cordesman and Khazai 9/9, Arleigh Burke Chair in Strategy at CSIS

[09/09/13, Anthony H. Cordesman holds the Arleigh A. Burke Chair in Strategy at CSIS, and Sam Khazai is an Associate at CSIS,, “Violence in Iraq: The Growing Risk of Serious Civil Conflict”, https://csis.org/files/publication/120718\_Iraq\_US\_Withdrawal\_Search\_SecStab.pdf]

Iraq is a nation with great potential and its political divisions and ongoing low-level violence do not mean it cannot succeed in establishing stability, security, and a better life for its people. Iraq cannot succeed, however, by denying its growing level of violence and the responsibility of Iraq’s current political leaders for its problems. There are gaps in the data on Iraq’s current level of violence, its causes, and the responsibility of given actors. The data are still good enough, however, to warn that Iraq may be moving back to a level of civil conflict that will amount to a serious civil war. There is also substantial reporting to show that Iraq’s violence is not simply the product of extremists and terrorist groups. Iraq’s growing violence is also the result of the fact that Iraq is the scene of an ongoing struggle to establish a new national identity: one that can bridge across the deep sectarian divisions between its Shi’ites and Sunnis as well as the ethnic divisions between its Arabs and its Kurds and other minorities. Improving the quality and focus of Iraqi efforts at counterterrorism and internal security is a key priority, but it Iraq cannot end its violence through force or repression. Iraq’s leaders must build a new structure of political consensus. They must build an effective structure of governance, and social order that sharply reduces the problems caused by the mix of dictatorship, war, sanctions, occupation, and civil conflict that began in the 1970s and create the kind of national government that can give democracy real meaning and serve the needs of all the Iraqi people.. Iraq must also deal with deep underlying problems. It must cope with a steadily growing population, and diversify an economy that is so dependent on petroleum exports that they provide some 95% of its government revenues. If Iraq’s leaders fail, try to deal with this mix of political divisions and structural problems by denial, or continue their present factional struggles; the end result will be to delay Iraq’s progress by every year their present search for self-advantage continues. What is far worse is that their failures may cause a new major civil war or even divide the country.

#### Strengthened judicial independence is key to solve that – addresses alt causes

Pimental and Anderson 13, Associate and Assistant Professors of Law

[June 2013, David Pimentel is Visiting Associate Professor of Law, Ohio Northern University; Brian Anderson is a Reference Librarian and Assistant Professor, also at Ohio Northern University, “Judicial Independence in Post-Conflict Iraq: Establishing the Rule of Law in an Islamic Constitutional Democracy”, http://works.bepress.com/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1013&context=david\_pimentel]

Contemporary Iraq is facing the full range of challenges that come with post-conflict transitional justice. That includes the backward-looking issues of restorative and retributive justice, for the atrocities and mass human rights violations they suffered during the Saddam Hussein regime and the conflict that followed his downfall.1 It also includes the forward-looking efforts, “paving the road toward peace and reconciliation” and establishing a functional state, characterized by the Rule of Law, in the society torn apart by conflict.2 Among the critical institutions demanding attention in the post-conflict reconstruction is the judiciary, particularly the need for an independent judiciary.3 There is increasing recognition that a functional legal system, one that protects rights and redresses wrongs, is vital to restoring the peace and stability to a war-torn society. Only with such a sound legal system— and a fair, impartial and independent judiciary—will people trust their disputes to the state, and refrain from the vigilante score-settling that signals the breakdown of the Rule of Law.

#### Global nuclear war

Morgan 7 (Former member of the British Labour Party Executive Committee, 3/4, "Better another Taliban Afghanistan, than a Taliban NUCLEAR Pakistan!?" http://www.electricarticles.com/display.aspx?id=639)

The nightmare that is now Iraq would take on gothic proportions across the continent. The prophesy of an arc of civil war over Lebanon, Palestine and Iraq would spread to south Asia, stretching from Pakistan to Palestine, through Afghanistan into Iraq and up to the Mediterranean coast. Undoubtedly, this would also spill over into India both with regards to the Muslim community and Kashmir. Border clashes, terrorist attacks, sectarian pogroms and insurgency would break out. A new war, and possibly nuclear war, between Pakistan and India could not be ruled out. Atomic Al Qaeda Should Pakistan break down completely, a Taliban-style government with strong Al Qaeda influence is a real possibility. Such deep chaos would, of course, open a “Pandora's box” for the region and the world. With the possibility of unstable clerical and military fundamentalist elements being in control of the Pakistan nuclear arsenal, not only their use against India, but Israel becomes a possibility, as well as the acquisition of nuclear and other deadly weapons secrets by Al Qaeda. Invading Pakistan would not be an option for America. Therefore a nuclear war would now again become a real strategic possibility. This would bring a shift in the tectonic plates of global relations. It could usher in a new Cold War with China and Russia pitted against the US.

### 1AC Afghanistan

#### Advantage 3 is Afghanistan

#### Afghanistan will implement indefinite detention policies- their judiciary is modeled on the United States

Rodgers 12 (Chris Rogers is a human rights lawyer for the Open Society Foundations specializing in human rights and conflict in Afghanistan and Pakistan, May 14, “Karzai's bid for a dictatorial detention law”, http://afpak.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2012/05/14/karzais\_bid\_for\_a\_dictatorial\_detention\_law)

As part of the agreement to transfer control of Bagram, the Afghan government is creating the authority to hold individuals without charge or trial for an indefinite period of time on security grounds-a power it has never before said it needed. While such "administrative detention" regimes are permissible under the laws of war, this new detention power is being established in order to hand over a U.S. detention facility, not because changes in the conflict have convinced Afghan officials that it is necessary. A surge in U.S. detention operations like night raids has driven the prison population to over 3,000 detainees, most of whom the United States lacks evidence against for prosecution under Afghans law. Because the Afghan constitution, like the United States', protects individuals from being detained without charge or trial, the Afghan government needs a new detention law, which is now being modeled on deeply problematic U.S. detention policies and practices. As a result, Bagram's real legacy may be the establishment of a detention regime that will be ripe for abuse in a country with pervasive corruption and weak rule of law. Despite potentially far-reaching consequences, the development of this new detention power has been hidden from public view. When I met with leading Afghan lawyers and civil society organizations in Kabul several weeks ago, few knew that the government was proposing to create a new, non-criminal detention regime. Their reaction was disbelief and dismay. None had even seen a copy of the proposed regime, which the Afghan government has not made public and is trying to adopt by presidential fiat. The Open Society Foundations recently obtained a copy of the proposed detention regime, and after review, we have found what it details deeply troubling. The proposed changes leave open critical questions about the nature and scope of this proposed detention regime, which if left unanswered make it ripe for abuse. Who can be held in administrative detention and for how long? Where will it apply? When will the government cease to have this power? How will the government ensure it will not be abused to imprison the innocent or suppress political opposition? Most alarming is the failure to address the serious, long-term risks posed by such a regime. From apartheid South Africa to modern day China, administrative detention regimes adopted on security grounds have too often been used as tools of repression. In Egypt, the former government used administrative detention for decades to commit gross human rights violations and suppress political opposition, relying on a state of emergency declared in 1958, and nominally lifted only after last year's revolution. Across the border in Pakistan, the draconian Frontier Crimes Regulations are another stark reminder of the long, dark shadow that such legal regimes can cast. The ongoing imposition of these British, colonial-era laws, which among other things legalize collective punishment and detention without trial, are cited by many as a key driver of the rise of militancy in the tribal areas of Pakistan. But there is still time for the United States to avoid this legacy in Afghanistan. If the Afghan government cannot be dissuaded from adopting an administrative detention regime, then the United States should urge the Afghan government to include provisions that limit its scope and reduce its vulnerability to abuse. First, a ‘sunset' provision should be adopted, which would impose a time limit on such powers, or require an act by the Afghan Parliament to extend their duration. Second, the regime should be limited to individuals currently held by the United States at Bagram prison. There is no clear reason why the handover of Bagram detainees requires the creation of a nation-wide administrative detention regime. More generally, the scope of who can be detained must be clearly defined and limited. Third, detainees must have right to counsel as well as access to the evidence used against them in order to have a meaningful opportunity to challenge their detention-a fundamental right in international law. At present it seems the government will follow the well-documented due process shortfalls of the U.S. model. The United States and its Afghan partners must be honest about the serious, long-term risks of establishing an administrative detention regime in Afghanistan-particularly one that lacks clear limits and is democratically unaccountable. Protection from arbitrary or unlawful deprivation of life or liberty is at the constitutional core of the United States, and is essential to lasting stability and security in Afghanistan. Living up to the President's promise of responsibly ending the war in Afghanistan requires defending, not betraying this principle.

Indefinite detention erodes faith in the rule of law and ruins the Afghan judiciary

ICG 10 (International Crisis Group, November 17, “REFORMING AFGHANISTAN’S BROKEN JUDICIARY”, http://www.crisisgroup.org/~/media/Files/asia/south-asia/afghanistan/195%20Reforming%20Afghanistans%20Broken%20Judiciary.ashx)

U.S. detention policy has frequently been cited by Afghan and international legal experts as one of the chief obstacles to restoring balance to the Afghan justice system and citizens’ faith in the rule of law.233 The operation of parallel U.S.-controlled prisons has been problematic from the start. Thousands of Afghans have been detained since the start of Operation Enduring Freedom in 2001 without recourse to trial or the means to challenge their detention. Abuse of prisoners at the U.S.-run Bagram Theatre Internment Facility in the early years of its operation under the Bush administration has been well documented, including the use of harsh interrogation techniques that resulted in the deaths of two Afghans.234 Extrajudicial detentions at Bagram have eroded support for foreign troops and for many Afghans – Pashtuns in particular – stand as a symbol of oppression. Like its sister facility at the U.S. military base in Guantanamo, Cuba, the Bagram prison has provided much grist for Taliban propaganda mills.235 U.S. officials under the Obama administration appear to have begun to recognise that extrajudicial detentions have negatively impacted Afghan perceptions of the rule of law. In January 2009, the U.S. government announced plans to close the facility at Guantanamo and to re-evaluate its detainee programs overall. A U.S. federal district court ruling in April 2009 concluding that non-Afghan detainees held at the Bagram facility have a right to challenge their detention in American courts has hastened the need to find solutions to the legal conundrum posed by the extrajudicial status of prisoners at Bagram.236 In September 2009, the U.S. Department of Defense adopted a new framework for evaluating the status of detainees in U.S. facilities in Afghanistan. Responsibility for detainee policy and operations now falls to Task Force 435, an interagency unit under joint military-civilian leadership whose mission is to bring detention and rule of law practices in line with U.S. strategic goals in Afghanistan. The old Bagram facility has since been replaced by the more modern Detention Facility in Parwan (DFIP), which opened in 2009 at the edge of the Bagram military base. Under this new policy, new detainee review board (DRB) procedures were adopted to bring detention practices in Afghanistan more in line with U.S. and international law. They replaced the Unlawful Enemy Combatant Review Boards, which had been generally deemed inadequate because they afforded detainees few, if any, opportunities to challenge their arrest or to review evidence in cases brought against them in closed hearings. Under the new procedures, a military panel determines if a detainee has been properly captured and poses a future threat to the Afghan government or international security forces. Although the U.S. government is careful not to characterise the proceedings as legal or adversarial in the sense that a trial might be, detainees are allowed to some extent to present their version of events with the help of a U.S.-assigned “personal representative”. Hundreds of detainees have had their cases reviewed since the new review procedures were adopted and a number have been released because of insufficient evidence that they posed a threat to the Afghan government.237 These new guidelines are an important step forward, but they are far from replicating internationally recognised fair trial standards. A number of other actions must be taken to make U.S. detention policy more transparent, humane and fair and to bring it in line with international law. Specifically, U.S. investigation and intelligence gathering standards must be improved and the review board process must incorporate a more vigorous mechanism that allows detainees to review and challenge evidence brought against them, including measures for classified evidence. Transition to Afghan control of specially designated detainees will also necessitate a re-evaluation of classification procedures both at the point of capture and across agencies – both Afghan and U.S. The current process of declassifying information is far too cumbersome and there is a demand for greater clarity on the rules of transfer of information from coalition and Afghan sources to Afghan government sources.238 Changes in declassification policy will necessitate a serious review of current Afghan law and investigative practices and procedures employed by the Afghan National Directorate of Security and other security organs. In January 2010, the U.S. and Afghan government signed a memorandum of understanding calling for the DFIP to pass from U.S. to Afghan control in July 2011. By that time, review proceedings should be conducted entirely by Afghan judges and prosecutors; an Afghan judge in the Parwan provincial courts has already reviewed a number of detainee cases.239 The U.S. has set up a rule of law centre at the new facility with a view to training Afghan legal professionals to build cases against the roughly 1,100 detainees housed at the prison. The training and transition are important first steps toward dismantling the parallel legal systems that have co-existed uneasily in Afghanistan since the start of the U.S. military engagement. The transition could entail some tricky procedural challenges in terms of potential conflicts between Afghan courts and U.S. military authorities over the danger posed by “highrisk” detainees.240 This and other issues should be clarified before the transition in 2011.

#### Starting with US policy is key- perception of hypocrisy replicates indefinite detention

Eviatar 12 (Daphne Eviatar Law and Security Program Human Rights First, 1-9, “The Latest Skirmish in Afghanistan: Hate to Say We Told You So”, http://www.humanrightsfirst.org/2012/01/09/the-latest-skirmish-in-afghanistan-hate-to-say-we-told-you-so/)

Responsibility begins with due process. As we wrote in our report in May, based on our observations of the hearings given to detainees at the U.S.-run detention facility at Bagram: “the current system of administrative hearings provided by the U.S. military fails to provide detainees with an adequate opportunity to defend themselves against charges that they are collaborating with insurgents and present a threat to U.S. forces.” As a result, the U.S. hearings “fall short of minimum standards of due process required by international law.” For President Karzai, that’s an argument that the U.S. should immediately turn the thousands of detainees it’s holding over to the government of Afghanistan. But that would do little to solve the problem. TheUnited Nations reported in October that Afghanistan’s intelligence service systematically tortures detainees during interrogations. The U.S. government cannot hand prisoners over to the Afghans if they’re likely to be tortured, according to its obligations under international law. And unfortunately, as we also noted in our report, the Afghan justice system, although improving with the growing introduction of defense lawyers, is still hardly a model of due process. Still, unlike the United States, at least Afghan law does not permit detention without criminal charge, trial and conviction. The United States hasn’t exactly proven itself the best model for the Afghan justice system. Restoring U.S. credibility is going to be key to our ability to withdraw from Afghanistan without it becoming a future threat to U.S. national security. The U.S. government can’t credibly insist that the Afghans improve their justice system and treatment of detainees if the U.S. military doesn’t first get its own detention house in order. Whether for the sake of international law, U.S. credibility, or merely to improve relations with the Karzai government, upon which U.S. withdrawal from Afghanistan depends, the U.S. military needs to start providing real justice to the thousands of prisoners in its custody.

#### Strong Afghan judiciary key to post-drawdown strategy

ICG 10 (International Crisis Group, November 17, “REFORMING AFGHANISTAN’S BROKEN JUDICIARY”, http://www.crisisgroup.org/~/media/Files/asia/south-asia/afghanistan/195%20Reforming%20Afghanistans%20Broken%20Judiciary.ashx)

A substantial course correction is needed to restore the rule of law in Afghanistan. Protecting citizens from crime and abuses of the law is elemental to state legitimacy. Most Afghans do not enjoy such protections and their access to justice institutions is extremely limited. As a result, appeal to the harsh justice of the Taliban has become increasingly prevalent. In those rare instances when Afghans do appeal to the courts for redress, they find uneducated judges on the bench and underpaid prosecutors looking for bribes. Few judicial officials have obtained enough education and experience to efficiently execute their duties to uphold and enforce the law. Endemic problems with communications, transport, infrastructure and lack of electricity mean that it is likely that the Afghan justice system will remain dysfunctional for some time to come. Restoring public confidence in the judiciary is critical to a successful counter-insurgency strategy. The deep-seated corruption and high levels of dysfunction within justice institutions have driven a wedge between the government and the people. The insurgency is likely to widen further if Kabul does not move more swiftly to remove barriers to reform. The first order of business must be to develop a multi-year plan aimed at comprehensive training and education for every judge and prosecutor who enters the system. Pay-and-rank reform must be implemented in the attorney general’s office without further delay. Building human capacity is essential to changing the system. Protecting that capacity, and providing real security for judges, prosecutors and other judicial staff is crucial to sustaining the system as a whole. The international community and the Afghan government need to work together more closely to identify ways to strengthen justice institutions. A key part of any such effort will necessarily involve a comprehensive assessment of the current judicial infrastructure on a province-byprovince basis with a view to scrutinising everything from caseloads to personnel performance. This must be done regularly to ensure that programming and funding for judicial reform remains dynamic and responsive to real needs. More emphasis must be placed on public education about how the system works and where there are challenges. Transparency must be the rule of thumb for both the government and the international community when it comes to publishing information about judicial institutions. Little will change without more public dialogue about how to improve the justice system. The distortions created in the justice system by lack of due process and arbitrary detentions under both Afghan institutions and the U.S. military are highly problematic. Until there is a substantial change in U.S. policy that provides for the transparent application of justice and fair trials for detainees, the insurgency will always be able to challenge the validity of the international community’s claim that it is genuinely interested in the restoration of the rule of law. If the international community is serious about this claim, then more must be done to ensure that the transition from U.S. to Afghan control of detention facilities is smooth, transparent and adheres to international law.

#### That’s key to long-term stability

The Nation 9 (Nov. 11, 2009, http://www.nation.com.pk/pakistan-news-newspaper-daily-english-online/International/11-Nov-2009/UN-body-urges-Karzai-to-fight-corruption)

UNITED NATIONS - The UN General Assembly has urged the government of re-elected Afghan President Hamid Karzai to press ahead with “strengthening of the rule of law and democratic processes, the fight against corruption (and) the acceleration of justice sector reform.” The 192-member assembly made that call Monday night by unanimously adopting a resolution that also declared that Afghanistan’s presidential election “credible” and “legitimate”, despite allegations of widespread fraud that led Karzai’s main challenger Abdullah Abdullah to pull out of the run-off round of the election. But the UN assembly raised no doubts about Karzai’s mandate or his right to continue leading the war-torn country. The resolution welcomed “the efforts of the relevant institutions to address irregularities identified by the electoral institutions in Afghanistan and to ensure a credible and legitimate process in accordance with the Afghan Election Law and in the framework of the Afghan Constitution.” It appealed to the international community to help Afghanistan in countering the challenges of the militants’ attacks that threaten its democratic process and and economic development. Before the assembly approved the resolution, 24 countries, including Pakistan, spoke in the debate on the deteriorating situation in Afghanistan in which they stressed the need for the Afghan Government and the global community to work closely together. Pakistan’s Acting Permanent Representative Amjad Hussain Sial said the core of violence and conflict in Afghanistan emanated from terrorist groups, foreign militants such as Al-Qaeda, and militant Taliban who were not prepared to reconcile and give up fighting. The nexus with drug traders was increasingly discernable. The key to long-term stability in Afghanistan, he said, was reformation of the country’s corrupt governmental systems. Equally important was building the civilian institutions at the central and subnational levels.

#### Post-drawdown Afghan state collapse leads to nuclear war

Cronin 13 (Audrey Kurth Cronin is Professor of Public Policy at George Mason University and author of How Terrorism Ends and Great Power Politics and the Struggle over Austria. Thinking Long on Afghanistan: Could it be Neutralized? Center for Strategic and International Studies The Washington Quarterly • 36:1 pp. 55\_72 http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0163660X.2013.751650)

With ISAF withdrawal inevitable, a sea change is already underway: the question is whether the United States will be ahead of the curve or behind it. Under current circumstances, key actions within Afghanistan by any one state are perceived to have a deleterious effect on the interests of other competing states, so the only feasible solution is to discourage all of them from interfering in a neutralized state. As the United States draws down over the next two years, yielding to regional anarchy would be irresponsible. Allowing neighbors to rely on bilateral measures, jockey for relative position, and pursue conflicting national interests without regard for dangerous regional dynamics will result in a repeat of the pattern that has played out in Afghanistan for the past thirty years\_/except this time the outcome could be not just terrorism but nuclear war.

#### Multiple scenarios for escalation- India and Pakistan fight for influence

Rubin, 11 (Joel, Director of Policy and Government Affairs, Ploughshares Fund, former congressional aide and diplomat, fellow at the State Department in both Near Eastern Affairs and Political-Military Affairs, Master’s degree in Public Policy and Business Administration from Carnegie Mellon University and a Bachelor’s degree in Politics from Brandeis University, Huffington Post, 77/2011, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/joel-rubin/middle-east-nuclear-threat\_b\_891178.html)

The national security calculus of keeping U.S. forces in Afghanistan has shifted. Any gains that we made from keeping 100,000 American soldiers in harm's way are now questionable, especially since al Qaeda has been dealt a significant blow with the killing of Osama bin Laden. President Obama's decision to end the surge by late next year only reinforces this reality. Yet many of the underlying sources of conflict and tension in South and Central Asia will remain after an American withdrawal. In a region that has deep experience on nuclear matters -- with nuclear aspirant Iran bordering Afghanistan on one side and nuclear-armed Pakistan and India on the other -- the United States must take into account the potential for regional nuclear insecurity caused by a poorly executed drawdown in Afghanistan. As much as we may like to, we can't just cut and run. So as the United States draws down its forces, we must take care to leave stable systems and relationships in place; failure to do so could exacerbate historic regional tensions and potentially create new national security risks. It is therefore essential that Washington policymakers create a comprehensive nuclear security strategy for the region as part of its Afghanistan withdrawal plans that lays the groundwork for regional stability. We have only to look to our recent history in the region to understand the importance of this approach. In the 1980s, the U.S. supported the Mujahedeen against the Soviet Union. When that conflict ended, we withdrew, only to see the rise of al Qaeda -- and its resultant international terrorism -- in the 1990s because we didn't pull out responsibly from Afghanistan. Our choices now in Afghanistan will determine the shape of our security challenges in the region for the foreseeable future. And we can't afford for nuclear weapons to become to South and Central Asia in the 21st century what al Qaeda was in the 1990s to Afghanistan. To avoid such an outcome, several key objectives must be included in any Afghanistan withdrawal plan. First, current levels of regional insecurity -- which already are extremely high -- will continue to drive tensions, and quite possibly conflict, amongst the regional powers. Therefore, we must ensure the implementation of a regional approach to military withdrawal. These efforts must bring all relevant regional players to the table, particularly the nuclear and potentially nuclear states. Iran and all the countries bordering Afghanistan must be part of this discussion. Second, the United States must be mindful to not leave a governance vacuum inside Afghanistan. While it is clear that the current counter-insurgency policy being pursued in Afghanistan is not working at a pace that meets either Western or Afghan aspirations, it is still essential that Afghanistan not be allowed to implode. We do not need 100,000 troops to do this, and as the Afghanistan Study Group has recommended, credible political negotiations that emphasize power-sharing and political reconciliation must take place to keep the country intact while the United States moves out. Third, while the rationale for our presence in Afghanistan -- to defeat al Qaeda -- has dissipated, a major security concern justifying our continued involvement in the region -- potential nuclear conflict between India and Pakistan -- will remain and may actually rise in importance. It is crucial that we keep a particularly close eye on these programs to ensure that all is done to prevent the illicit transfer or ill-use of nuclear weapons. Regardless of American troop levels in Afghanistan, the U.S. must maximize its military and intelligence relationships with these countries to continue to both understand their nuclear intentions and help prevent potential conflict. We must avoid a situation where any minor misunderstanding or even terrorist act, as happened in Mumbai in 2008, does not set off escalating tensions that lead to a nuclear exchange. Ultimately, the U.S. will one day leave Afghanistan -- and it may be sooner than anyone expects. The key here is to leave in a way that promotes regional stability and cooperation, not a power vacuum that could foster proxy conflicts. To ensure that our security interests are protected and that the region does not get sucked in to a new level of insecurity and tension, a comprehensive strategy to enhance regional security, maintain a stable Afghanistan, and keep a watchful eye on Pakistan and India is essential. Taking such steps will help us to depart Afghanistan in a responsible manner that protects our security interests, while not exacerbating the deep strategic insecurities of a region that has the greatest risk of arms races and nuclear conflict in the world.

#### It’s the most likely scenario for conflict results in massive loss of life and epidemic disease

Shifferd 1/3/14 (Kent - Ph.D. in history from Northern Illinois University) “After a nuclear war between India and Pakistan – a global nuclear winter” http://nuclear-news.net/2014/01/07/after-a-nuclear-war-between-india-and-pakistan-a-global-nuclear-winter/

What could be worse than a nuclear war? A nuclear famine following a nuclear war. And where is the most likely nuclear war to break out? The India-Pakistan border.¶ Both countries are nuclear armed, and although their arsenals are “small” compared to the U.S. and Russia, they are extremely deadly. Pakistan has about 100 nuclear weapons; India about 130.¶ They have fought three wars since 1947 and are contending bitterly for control over the Kashmir and for influence in Afghanistan……¶ Experts predict a nuclear war between India and Pakistan would kill about 22 million people from blast, acute radiation, and firestorms. However, the global famine caused by such a “limited” nuclear war would result in two billion deaths over 10 years.¶ That’s right, a nuclear famine. A war using fewer than half their weapons would lift so much black soot and soil into the air that it would cause a nuclear winter. Such a scenario was known as far back as the 1980s, but no one had calculated the impact on agriculture.¶ The irradiated cloud would cover vast portions of the earth, bringing low temperatures, shorter growing seasons, sudden crop-killing extremes of temperature, altered rainfall patterns and would not dissipate for about 10 years.¶ Now, a new report based on some very sophisticated studies reveals the crop losses that would result and the number of people who would be put at risk for malnutrition and starvation.¶ The computer models show declines in wheat, rice, corn, and soybeans. Overall production of crops would fall, hitting their low in year five and gradually recovering by year ten.¶ Corn and soybeans in Iowa, Illinois, Indiana and Missouri would suffer an average of 10 percent and, in year five, 20 percent.¶ In China, corn would fall by 16 percent over the decade, rice by 17 percent, and wheat by 31 percent. Europe would also have declines.¶ Making the impact even worse, there are already almost 800 million malnourished people in the world. A mere 10 percent decline in their calorie intake puts them at risk for starvation.¶ And we will add hundreds of millions of people to the world population over the next couple of decades……¶ And what follows famine is epidemic disease.

#### Diseases end civilization

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

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

### 1AC Solvency

#### SCOTUS should extend the writ – the precedents exist already

Siegel ’12 (Ashley - J.D., Boston University School of Law, 2012; B.A. Philosophy and Political Science, Simmons College, 2007) “SOME HOLDS BARRED: EXTENDING EXECUTIVE DETENTION HABEAS LAW BEYOND GUANTANAMO BAY”

The September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks have had a radical impact on the United States and the world. The subsequent war on terror changed the face of modern warfare and created novel legal issues that test the boundaries of separation of powers and sovereignty doctrines. This has been particularly true in the detainee and prisoner-of-war context. With the United States’ detention of prisoners in Guantanamo Bay, the Supreme Court and lower federal courts have been forced to grapple with petitions to extend habeas protection to alien detainees held by the United States in offshore facilities. Federal courts have started to provide some guidance as to when a war-on- terror detainee might be afforded habeas rights. In Boumediene v. Bush,9 the Supreme Court held that the Suspension Clause applied to Guantanamo detainees, giving federal courts jurisdiction to hear detainee habeas petitions.10 The Supreme Court analyzed three factors that contributed to its decision to extend the Suspension Clause – the citizenship and status of the detainee and the adequacy of the process that determined that status, the “nature of the sites where apprehension and then detention took place,” and the “practical obstacles” faced in resolving the prisoner’s invocation of the writ – but acknowledged that those factors might not be exhaustive and that they might apply differently depending on the factual scenario.11 In Al Maqaleh v. Gates, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit reiterated the Supreme Court’s explanation that the Boumediene factors were not exhaustive.12 The court of appeals applied the factors set forth in Boumediene to deny habeas rights to alien detainees held by the United States at Bagram Air Force Base in Bagram, Afghanistan.13 The court of appeals explained that one factor against extending habeas rights to the detainees was that the United States did not have de facto control over Bagram in the same way it had over Guantanamo Bay.14 Although denying the prisoner’s claim, the court emphasized that lack of de facto control over a detainment facility was not decisive; it was merely one factor to consider.15 Thus, the Boumediene factors potentially allow claims to be brought by foreign detainees held offshore in circumstances distinguishable from Bagram. Another context of extraterritorial detention might also help answer the question of what rights alien detainees held by foreign governments possess. In Arar v. Ashcroft,16 the Second Circuit dealt not with a habeas petition but with a Torture Victim Prevention Act civil tort claim against the U.S. government for its extraordinary rendition of the petitioner.17 The Second Circuit reviewed the case of a Canadian and Syrian dual citizen who was detained in the United States en route to Canada.18 The U.S. government detained Arar, who the government claimed was a suspected terrorist, for a week in the United States before removing him to Syria.19 In Syria, Arar was detained for over a year by the Syrian government, interrogated, and tortured.20 The Second Circuit, however, concluded that Arar’s claim ultimately failed because Arar had not established a close enough relationship between the U.S. and Syrian governments to implicate the United States in any activity beyond “encouragement.”21 Yet questions remain about what might result should a detainee establish a more significant relational tie between two such actor- governments. This Note explores the novel area of law extending habeas rights to war-on- terror detainees, the past precedents that may suggest what direction the jurisprudence will take, and how the jurisprudence should resolve the case of a foreign detainee held by a foreign government at the behest of the United States. Part I reviews habeas law from its historical roots to its modern application in executive detention cases brought about by the United States’ detention of aliens at Guantanamo Bay. Part II examines alien detention abroad apart from the habeas context. Part III explores the likelihood and appropriateness of extending the Boumediene line of cases to scenarios of alien detainees held abroad by foreign governments at the behest of the United States. The Supreme Court has recently demonstrated a greater willingness to exert its power in the national security realm, no longer giving broad deference to the Executive’s wartime powers.22 The Supreme Court in this realm appears to take a functionalist, case-by-case approach that leaves open the possibility that the Court will exert itself in different executive detention contexts. Given the vital, fundamental individual rights implicated by executive detention, the Supreme Court should continue to actively review the actions of the legislative and executive branches. Further, based on the reasoning supporting its past precedents, the Court should extend jurisdiction to detainees held by foreign nations at the behest of the U.S. government.

#### Applying a clear statement principle solves- significantly restricts detention authority

Sarah Erickson-Muschko (J.D., Georgetown University Law Center) June 2013 “Beyond Individual Status: The Clear Statement Rule and the Scope of the AUMF Detention Authority in the United States” 101 Geo. L.J. 1399, Lexis

III. EXISTING SCHOLARSHIP ON THE CLEAR STATEMENT RULE: THE FOCUS ON INDIVIDUAL STATUS

Many scholars have advanced arguments regarding the application of a clear statement principle to the AUMF. 133 Two specific arguments have been made [\*1419] about the applicability of a clear statement principle in the context of U.S. territory, both of which focus on the status of the individual as the triggering factor. Professors Richard Fallon and Daniel Meltzer argue that a clear statement principle applies when U.S. citizens are detained on U.S. territory. 134 This argument is based on statutory grounds, namely the theory that the Non-Detention Act triggers the clear statement requirement. 135 This argument is perfectly sound in that respect. However, it is incomplete in that it does not address the constitutional grounds for imposing a clear statement rule: the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment, which applies to all persons, including noncitizens. 136 Reading the AUMF and the NDAA 2012 together to allow for the indefinite military detention without trial of individuals arrested on U.S. territory would be inconsistent with the constitutional prohibition on depriving a person of liberty without due process of law. Professors Curtis Bradley and Jack Goldsmith offer the most comprehensive constitutionally based argument for when and how to apply a clear statement principle. Their position is that courts should apply a clear statement requirement "when the President takes actions under the AUMF that restrict the liberty of noncombatants in the United States," but not when such actions only restrict the liberty of combatants. 137 Looking to the three World-War-II-era decisions discussed in Part II, they conclude that Endo and Duncan stand for the proposition that liberty interests trump the President's commander-in-chief authority when the President's actions are unsupported by historical practice in other wars and affect the constitutional rights of U.S. citizens who are not combatants. 138 In this context, "the canon protecting constitutional liberties prevails." 139 In contrast, the authors point to Quirin to show that "the Court did not demand a clear statement before concluding that the U.S. citizen enemy combatant in that case could be subject to a military commission trial in the United States even though neither the authorization to use force nor the authorization for military commissions specifically mentioned U.S. citizens." 140 In such a case, the authors contend that a clear statement requirement protecting civil liberties is not required because "the presidential action involves a traditional wartime function exercised by the President against an acknowledged enemy combatant or enemy [\*1420] nation." 141 In this context, "the President's Article II powers are at their height, and the relevant liberty interests (and thus the need for a liberty-protecting clear statement requirement) are reduced (or nonexistent)." 142 Despite its level of detail, Bradley and Goldsmith's clear statement principle will likely never be of much help to courts construing the AUMF. By basing their clear statement requirement on the distinction between combatants and noncombatants, they fail to resolve the key interpretive question: namely, how to construe the AUMF to avoid grave constitutional concerns where an individual's status as an enemy combatant is in dispute. Their interpretation accommodates a broad reading of Quirin. However, in Quirin, nobody disputed that the detainees were in fact unlawful enemy combatants under long-standing law-of-war principles. In contrast, a court reviewing the classification of an individual as an "enemy combatant" under the AUMF and NDAA 2012 must determine what it means to be "part of" or provide "substantial[] support[]" to al-Qaeda or an "associated force[]" or otherwise to commit a "belligerent act." 143 The question of how to construe these terms lies at the core of detainee litigation, 144 and the provisions in the NDAA 2012 failed to clarify their meaning. Bradley and Goldsmith acknowledge that the AUMF is silent on the point of "what institutions or procedures are appropriate for determining whether a person captured and detained on U.S. soil is in fact an enemy combatant." 145 However, they fail to address how this ambiguity impacts the application of their clear statement principle. Their framework is therefore of no real help to courts that must first determine whether an individual was properly deemed to be an "enemy combatant" before determining whether the clear statement rule applies to thee AUMF. The clear statement rule thus fails to fulfill its core purpose of resolving statutory ambiguity in a manner that avoids serious constitutional questions. In addition to failing to resolve the due process questions surrounding the [\*1421] "enemy combatant" determination, Bradley and Goldsmith's argument does not resolve the core separation of powers concern: namely, whether, and if so under what conditions, it is constitutionally permissible for the President to apply martial law in place of the criminal justice system on U.S. territory despite the absence of any compelling need to do so. In short, their argument assumes that such an application of law-of-war principles on U.S. territory, outside of the battlefield context, would be a legitimate exercise of the President's war powers in the context of counterterrorism. This is hard to square with the Milligan Court's powerful statements to the contrary. 146 IV. MOVING BEYOND INDIVIDUAL STATUS: THE CONSTITUTION APPLIES IN THE UNITED STATES This Note argues that the clear statement principle applies to the AUMF detention authority whenever it is invoked to detain individuals arrested within the United States--at least where the enemy combatant question is in dispute. The principal trigger for application of the clear statement principle should not be an individual's status but rather the presumption that constitutional rights and restraints apply on U.S. territory. Courts therefore should dispense with the enemy combatant inquiry under these circumstances. This Note posits that such a construction is required to preserve the constitutionality of the AUMF. This constitutional default rule presumes that Congress has not delegated power to the executive branch to circumvent due process protections wholesale, and that it has not altered the traditional boundaries between military and civilian power on U.S. territory. Any departure from this baseline at least requires a clear manifestation of congressional intent. As evinced by the divisions in Congress over passage of the detention provisions in the NDAA 2012, there is no consensus as to the breadth of the detention power afforded to the executive branch under the AUMF. Courts should therefore not presume that the statute authorizes application of martial law to circumvent otherwise applicable constitutional restraints and due process rights. By making the jurisdictional question--civilian versus military--the trigger for the clear statement principle, the judiciary would properly place the impetus on Congress to clearly define and narrowly circumscribe the conditions under which the executive may use military jurisdiction to detain individuals on U.S. territory. This is the only way to ensure that our nation's political representatives have adequately deliberated and reached a consensus with respect to delegating powers to the executive branch where such delegation would have the consequence of displacing, in a wholesale fashion, constitutional protections. For all its controversy, § 412 of the USA PATRIOT Act of 2001 provides an example of where Congress has provided for executive detention under circumstances that are arguably sufficiently detailed to satisfy a clear statement [\*1422] requirement. 147 Absent this level of clarity, where the President purports to use the AUMF to detain militarily on U.S. territory, courts must presume that constitutional rights and restraints apply and are not displaced by martial law. A. DUE PROCESS CONCERNS One of the most basic rights accorded by the Constitution is the fundamental right to be free from deprivations of liberty absent due process of law. The AUMF must be read with the gravity of this fundamental right in mind. As the Court made clear in Endo, where fundamental due process rights are at stake, ambiguous wartime statutes are to be construed to allow for "the greatest possible accommodation of the liberties of the citizen." 148 Courts "must assume, when asked to find implied powers in a grant of legislative or executive authority, that the law makers intended to place no greater restraint on the citizen than was clearly and unmistakably indicated by the language they used." 149 This includes statutes that would otherwise "exceed the boundaries between military and civilian power, in which our people have always believed, which responsible military and executive officers had heeded, and which had become part of our political philosophy and institutions . . . ." 150 B. THE SUSPENSION CLAUSE The Suspension Clause lends further constitutional support to applying a clear statement requirement to the AUMF detention authority on U.S. territory. The Suspension Clause gives Congress the emergency power to suspend the writ of habeas corpus "when in Cases of Rebellion or Invasion the public Safety may require it." 151 As Fallon and Meltzer observe, this Clause--and the limited circumstances in which it may be invoked--suggest, or even explicitly affirm, "the presumptive rule that when the civilian courts remain capable of dealing with threats posed by citizens, those courts must be permitted to function." 152 To interpret the AUMF as congressional authorization to displace the civilian system and apply military jurisdiction on U.S. territory would "render that [\*1423] emergency power essentially redundant." 153 The Suspension Clause also underscores that the right to be free from the arbitrary deprivation of physical liberty is one of the most central rights that the Constitution was intended to protect. C. THE LACK OF MILITARY NECESSITY The lack of military necessity for applying law-of-war principles on U.S. territory further supports the construction of the AUMF to avoid displacing civilian law with law of war in the domestic context. The Supreme Court long ago declared that martial law may not be applied on U.S. territory when civilian law is functioning and "the courts are open and their process unobstructed." 154 Instead, "[t]he necessity [for martial law] must be actual and present; the invasion real, such as effectually closes the courts and deposes the civil administration." 155 In the absence of such necessity, "[w]hen peace prevails, and the authority of the government is undisputed, there is no difficulty of preserving the safeguards of liberty . . . ." 156 The past ten years have shown that there is no need to stretch law-of-war principles in the AUMF to reach U.S. territory. The exigencies associated with an active battlefield, which were critical to the Hamdi plurality's interpretation of the AUMF, 157 are simply not present in the United States. Instead, "American law enforcement agencies . . . continue to operate within the United States. These agencies have a powerful set of legal tools, adapted to the criminal process, to deploy within the United States against . . . suspected [terrorists], and the civilian courts remain open to impose criminal punishment." 158 Indeed, for more than a decade since the 9/11 attacks, domestic law enforcement agencies have carried the responsibility for domestic counterterrorism and have successfully thwarted several terrorism plots. 159 Civilian courts have adjudicated the prosecution of suspected terrorists captured on U.S. territory under [\*1424] federal laws. 160 The experience of the past decade shows that the civilian system is up to the task, and there is no military exigency that justifies curtailing constitutional protections and applying military authority in the domestic context. 161 Accordingly, the circumstances that the Supreme Court found to justify the use of the military authority under the AUMF to capture and indefinitely detain Hamdi, who was found armed on the active battlefield in Afghanistan, do not extend to persons captured on U.S. territory. The manner in which the government handled the Padilla and al-Marri cases further demonstrates the lack of military necessity. In both cases, the government abandoned its position that national security imperatives demanded that they continue to be held in military custody; both were transferred to federal custody and ultimately convicted of federal crimes carrying lengthy prison terms. 162 The Supreme Court's precedent in Quirin neither requires, nor can it be fairly read to justify, a different conclusion. First, the issue of indefinite military detention without trial was not before the Court in that case. Second, the status of the Nazis in Quirin as enemy combatants was undisputed, in contrast to that of individuals who are "part of" or "substantially support" al-Qaeda or "associated forces." 163 Third, the Court in Quirin went "out of its way to say that the Court's holding was extremely limited," encompassing only the precise factual circumstances before it. 164 Finally, Quirin itself is shaky precedent, as evidenced by the Court's own subsequent statements and as elaborated in numerous scholarly commentaries on the case. 165 As Katyal and Tribe observe: Quirin plainly fits the criteria typically offered for judicial confinement or reconsideration: It was a decision rendered under extreme time pressure, with respect to which there are virtually no reliance interests at stake, and where the statute itself has constitutional dimensions suggesting that its construction should be guided by relevant developments in constitutional law. 166 [\*1425] This case therefore should not be read as foreclosing the application of a clear statement principle to the AUMF as applied on U.S. territory where an individual's status as an enemy combatant is in dispute. CONCLUSION The AUMF is ambiguous: it does not specify whether it reaches individuals captured on U.S. territory, and Congress declined to resolve this question when it enacted § 1021 of the NDAA 2012. If a future administration invokes the AUMF as authority to capture and hold persons on U.S. territory in indefinite military detention, it will be left to the courts to determine whether this is constitutional. Courts should resolve this question by applying a clear statement requirement. This Note has argued that the trigger for this clear statement requirement is not the individual's status but rather the presumption that constitutional rights and restraints apply on U.S territory. Courts should apply this default presumption regardless of an individual's citizenship status, and it should apply even where the government claims that the individual is an "enemy combatant," at least where that determination is subject to dispute. This Note has argued that this method of statutory interpretation is constitutionally required. "[B]y extending to all 'persons' within the Constitution's reach such guarantees as . . . due process of law, the Constitution constrains how our government may conduct itself in bringing terrorists to justice." 167 If these constraints are to remain meaningful, these guarantees require, at the very least, that courts presume that constitutional guarantees prevail where congressional intent is unclear. The past ten years have shown that our criminal justice system is capable of thwarting terrorist attacks and bringing terrorists to justice while still preserving the safeguards of liberty that are fundamental to our system of justice. "[T]hese safeguards need, and should receive, the watchful care of those [e]ntrusted with the guardianship of the Constitution and laws." 168

#### Plan solves – judiciary review and habeas rights

Sidhu 11 [2011, Dawinder S. Sidhu, J.D., The George Washington University; M.A., Johns Hopkins University; B.A., University of Pennsylvania, Judicial Review as Soft Power: How the Courts Can Help Us Win the Post-9/11 Conflict”, NATIONAL SECURITY LAW BRIEF, Vol. 1, Issue 1 http://digitalcommons.wcl.american.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1003&context=nslb]

The “Great Wall” The writ of habeas corpus enables an individual to challenge the factual basis and legality of his detention,91 activating the judiciary’s review function in the separation of powers scheme.92 Because the writ acts to secure individual liberty by way of the judicial checking of unlawful executive detentions, the writ has been regarded as a bulwark of liberty. The Supreme Court has observed, for example, that “There is no higher duty of a court, under our constitutional system, than the careful processing and adjudication of petitions for writs of habeas corpus . . . .”93 The writ is seen as a vital aspect of American jurisprudence, and an essential element of the law since the time of the Framers.94 The United States is a conspicuous actor in the world theater, subject to the interests and inclinations of other players, and possessing a similar, natural desire to shape the global community in a manner most favorable to its own objects. The tendency to attempt to inﬂuence others is an inevitable symptom of international heterogeneity and, at present, the United States is mired in an epic battle with fundamentalists bent on using terrorism as a means to repel,95 if not destroy, America.96 American success in foreign policy depends on the internal assets available to and usable by the United States, including its soft power. The law in America is an aspect of its national soft power. In particular, the moderates in the Muslim world—the intended audience of America’s soft power— may ﬁnd attractive the American constitutional system of governance in which 1) the people are the sovereign and the government consists of merely temporary and recallable agents of the people, 2) federal power is diffused so as to diminish the possibility that any branch of the government, or any of them acting in tandem, can infringe upon the liberty of the people, 3) structural protections notwithstanding, the people are entitled to certain substantive rights including the right to be free of governmental interference with respect to religious exercise, 4) the diversity of interests inherent in its populace is considered a critical safeguard against the ability of a majority group to oppress the minority constituents, 5) the courts are to ensure that the people’s rights to life, liberty, and property are not abridged, according to law, by the government or others, and 6) individuals deprived of liberty have available to them the writ of habeas corpus to invoke the judiciary’s checking function as to executive detention decisions. The Constitution, in the eyes of Judge Learned Hand, is “the best political document ever made.”97 If the aforementioned constitutional principles are part of the closest approximation to a just and reasoned society produced by man, surely they may have some persuasive appeal to the rest of the world, including moderate Muslims who generally live in areas less respectful of minority rights and religious pluralism. Such reverence is to be expected and warranted only if the United States has remained true to these constitutional principles in practice, and in particular, in its behavior in the aftermath of the 9/11 attacks, when national stress is heightened and the option of deviating from such values in favor of an expedient “law of necessity” similarly tempting.98 The extent to which the United States has remained true to itself as a nation of laws—and thus may credibly claim such legal soft power—is the subject of the next section. II. THE COURTS AND SOFT POWER The Judiciary In Wartime The United States has been charged with being unfaithful to its own laws and values in its prosecution of the post-9/11 campaign against transnational terrorism. With respect to its conduct outside of the United States, following 9/11, America has been alleged to have tortured captured individuals in violation of its domestic and international legal obligations,99 and detained individuals indeﬁ nitely without basic legal protections.100 Closer to home, the United States is thought to have proﬁ led Muslims, Arabs, and South Asians in airports and other settings,101 conducted immigration sweeps targeting Muslims,102 and engaged in mass preventative detention of Muslims in the United States,103 among other things. These are serious claims. The mere perception that they bear any resemblance to the truth undoubtedly impairs the way in which the United States is viewed by Muslims around the world, including Muslim-Americans, and thus diminishes the United States’ soft power resources.104 The degree to which they are valid degrades the ability of the United States to argue persuasively that it not only touts the rule of law, but exhibits actual ﬁ delity to the law in times of crisis. These claims relate to conduct of the executive and/or the legislature in the aftermath of the 9/11 attacks. This Article is concerned, however, with the judiciary, that is whether the courts have upheld the rule of law in the post-9/11 context—and thus whether the courts may be a source of soft power today (even if the other branches have engaged, or are alleged to have engaged, in conduct that is illegal or unwise). As to the courts, it is my contention that the judiciary has been faithful to the rule of law after 9/11 and as such should be considered a positive instrument of American soft power. Prior to discussing post-9/11 cases supporting this contention, it is important to provide a historical backdrop to relationship between the courts and wartime situations because judicial decision-making in cases implicating the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq does not take occur on a blank slate, despite the unique and modern circumstances of the post-9/11 conﬂ ict.

#### Suspension Clause application solves without sacrificing military missions

Nelson ’11 (Luke - B.A., University of Minnesota Duluth, 2007; J.D. Candidate, University of New Hampshire School of Law, 2011) “Territorial Sovereignty and the Evolving Boumediene Factors: Al Maqaleh v. Gates and the Future of Detainee Habeas Corpus Rights” http://law.unh.edu/assets/images/uploads/publications/unh-law-review-vol-09-no2-nelson.pdf

Lastly, Al Maqaleh presents another opportunity for the Supreme Court to provide further guidance on the practical-obstacles factor. As mentioned earlier, the inherent deficiency of a multi-factored, functional test is its arbitrary and unequal application.144 The Boumediene Court’s deficient guidance on the practical-obstacles factor only exacerbates this problem. Unquestionably, deference to the President and military leaders regarding decisions on military necessity, operations in an active theater of war, and reasonable detention of enemy combatants should not be circumvented. However, questions remain regarding the risk of executive manipulation of the Boumediene test.145 For instance, one question is the effect on the practical-obstacles analysis when a detainee is captured beyond an active theater of war and later transported into an active theater for detention. This scenario played out in Al Maqaleh. In our current “Global War on Terrorism,” another lingering question is the actual boundaries of an active theater of war.146 A detainee should not be denied Suspension Clause protections because the government transported him into an active theater where the Suspension Clause would arguably not reach. Furthermore, another question is the effect of military necessity and the military mission on the practicalobstacles factor. These questions require that a delicate and fine line be drawn. On one hand are the surest safeguards of liberty and the separation of powers check on the executive.147 On the other hand is the importance of the military mission and executive deference in international conflict policy decisions. The answer to these questions must include some level of deference to the legitimate needs of the armed forces in advancing the military mission148 but also address the pertinent constitutional issues that cannot be overlooked. Safe to say, the writ of habeas corpus is one of these pertinent constitutional issues. However, as the Boumediene Court recognized, the executive branch is entitled to a “reasonable period of time” before a court will entertain a habeas corpus petition from a detainee.149 This reasonable period of time is necessary to allow the military to screen and review the detainee and determine the detainee’s combatant status.150 This balance between the military mission and an individual’s surest safeguard of liberty will allow the courts to maintain a practical, functional, and detainee-by-detainee, detention-site-by-detention-site application of the habeas test that the Boumediene Court envisioned.

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

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

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

### AT Stripping

#### No deference now

Siegel 12, Associate at Cleary Gottlieb

(Ashley E., SOME HOLDS BARRED: EXTENDING EXECUTIVE DETENTION HABEAS LAW BEYOND GUANTANAMO BAY, www.bu.edu/law/central/jd/organizations/journals/bulr/documents/SIEGEL\_000.pdf)

This Note explores the novel area of law extending habeas rights to war-on terror detainees, the past precedents that may suggest what direction the jurisprudence will take, and how the jurisprudence should resolve the case of a foreign detainee held by a foreign government at the behest of the United States. Part I reviews habeas law from its historical roots to its modern application in executive detention cases brought about by the United States’ detention of aliens at Guantanamo Bay. Part II examines alien detention abroad apart from the habeas context. Part III explores the likelihood and appropriateness of extending the Boumediene line of cases to scenarios of alien detainees held abroad by foreign governments at the behest of the United States. The Supreme Court has recently demonstrated a greater willingness to exert its power in the national security realm, no longer giving broad deference to the Executive’s wartime powers. The Supreme Court in this realm appears to take a functionalist, case-by-case approach that leaves open the possibility that the Court will exert itself in different executive detention contexts. Given the vital, fundamental individual rights implicated by executive detention, the Supreme Court should continue to actively review the actions of the legislative and executive branches. Further, based on the reasoning supporting its past precedents, the Court should extend jurisdiction to detainees held by foreign nations at the behest of the U.S. government.

#### Their link is terminally non-unique—Congress was twice stripped in this context

Elsea 13 – Legislative Attorney, Congressional Research Service

Jennifer; 5/13/13; "The Military Commissions Act of 2009 (MCA 2009): Overview and Legal Issues";

The use of military commissions to try suspected terrorists has been the focus of intense debate ¶ (as well as significant litigation) since President Bush in November 2001 issued his original ¶ Military Order (M.O.) authorizing such trials.1¶ The M.O. specified that persons subject to it ¶ would have no recourse to the U.S. court system to appeal a verdict or obtain any other sort of ¶ relief, but the Supreme Court essentially invalidated that provision in its 2004 opinion, Rasul v. ¶ Bush.¶ 2¶ In response, Congress enacted the Detainee Treatment Act of 2005 (DTA).3¶ The DTA did ¶ not authorize military commissions, but amended Title 28, U.S. Code to revoke all judicial ¶ jurisdiction over habeas claims by persons detained as “enemy combatants,” and it created ¶ jurisdiction in the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit to hear appeals of final ¶ decisions of military commissions. ¶ The Supreme Court, after finding that Congress’s efforts to strip it of jurisdiction did not apply to ¶ a case already pending before the Court, Hamdan v. Rumsfeld,¶ 4¶ invalidated the military ¶ commission system established by presidential order. The Court held that although Congress had ¶ in general authorized the use of military commissions, such commissions were required to follow ¶ procedural rules as similar as possible to courts-martial proceedings, as required by the Uniform ¶ Code of Military Justice (UCMJ).5¶ In response, Congress promptly passed the Military ¶ Commissions Act of 2006 (MCA 2006)6¶ to authorize military commissions and establish ¶ procedural rules that were modeled after, but departed from in some significant ways, the UCMJ. ¶ The MCA 2006 also amended the Detainee Treatment Act in order to strip the judiciary of habeas ¶ jurisdiction in all cases brought by detainees, including pending cases,7¶ but the Supreme Court ¶ held that provision to be an unconstitutional suspension of the Writ of Habeas Corpus.8

#### Doesn’t turn the case – court stripping can’t reverse decisions

**Devins ’06** (Neal, Prof of Law and Prof of Government @ College of William & Mary,  May, 90 Minn. L. Rev. 1337 ln)

Fourth, jurisdiction-stripping measures do not nullify Supreme Court rulings (or, for that matter, any court ruling). Consequently, since proponents of court-stripping cannot count on state courts to back their policy agenda, these bills may not accomplish all that much. **131** Accordingly, interest groups may be better off pursuing their substantive agenda through funding bans, constitutional amendments, the enactment of related legislation, and the appointment of judges and Justices. Court-curbing measures, in contrast, seem more a rhetorical rallying call than a roadmap for change.

#### No backlash

Christina Wells. 2004. Missouri Law Review. 69 Mo. L. Rev. 903]

The judicial system is a powerful institution. In the context of resolving constitutional issues, many people, the Court included, believe that the judicial system has the final (and, thus, most powerful) say. 227 To be sure, executive officials, past and present, have asserted that national security matters are particularly within the executive branch's ambit, suggesting that they do not share this view of the Court's legitimacy. 228 Even so, executive officials rarely flout the Court's authority, instead preferring to enlist the Court's support (which the Court often willingly provides). Executive officials might prove more willing to deny the Court's authority if it engaged in more rigorous review of executive decisions regarding national security. However, popular support for the institution of judicial review would likely preclude outright executive defiance 229 and could eventually spur acceptance. This might be especially true if the Court's constitutional standards of review focused more explicitly on decision-making processes, thus avoiding the impression that the Court was substituting its judgment for the executive's.

#### Boumediene ruling disproves the DA

OW Blog ‘8 [Law blog run by various attorneys and professors of law and philosophy] “Boumediene: When Justices Stop Being Polite, and Start Getting Realist” http://obsidianwings.blogs.com/obsidian\_wings/2008/06/boumediene-when.html

In addition, I think policy considerations heavily informed their analysis (even their textual analysis). For instance, the majority apparently thought the suspension clause should be construed narrowly in light of the broader textual context. Suspension, remember, is an exceedingly narrow exception to an expansive right, and it should be read that way. For the same reason, the opinion implied that efforts to evade habeas (executive efforts) should be met with heightened scrutiny. I mean, the whole purpose of moving the detainees to Gitmo was to evade the Constitution. The Court’s analysis wasn’t blind to these realities.¶ Admittedly, today’s decision was not compelled by text or precedent. But the mere fact that policy and pragmatism played a role today doesn’t make the case wrongly-decided. Courts do this stuff all the time — if parties are playing games in litigation, courts take steps to limit it. It’s exactly what happened in the Warren Court’s race cases — the Court refused to play the role of useful idiot by ignoring the outside world any longer.¶ And today, the outside world mattered. Rather than ignoring the obvious fact that most constitutional decisions are determined in such ways, let’s instead stipulate to the obvious and have a old-fashioned political debate about it. Personally, I think it’s ok to construe habeas rights broadly given that the entire point of habeas is to limit unlawful executive detention. Likewise, I think it’s ok for judges — after seeing parties drag things out for years and ignore the spirit of their rulings — to step in more assertively.

### AT EU

EU weakness inevitable.

Singh 8 – School of Politics and Sociology, BirkbeckCollege, University of London , Robert, “The Exceptional Empire: Why the United States Will Not Decline — Again”, International Politics (2008) 45, 571–593. doi:10.1057/ip.2008.25

**The EU,** for example, **faces** acute **demographic problems** thatdeeply complicate the still unresolved institutional and political dilemmas shaping its development. **Generous welfare spending, inflexible labour markets,** a rapidly aging workforce, a **diminishing tax base**, a declining fertility ratio **and** the **problems of a** growing but **alienated Muslim population pose powerful hindrances to sustaining positive growth rates**. **However large its economy, the EU** likewise **remains a** relatively **minor global actor**: "In the near future, the European Union (EU) will be a structurally-crippled geopolitical actor. **It** has **expanded too fast** and speaks in 23 tongues. **Too much** of the leaders' **time is spent on discussing how Europe should make** its **decisions**. The patchwork accords reached under the German presidency in June 2007 have not solved the fundamental problem. It would only be a mild exaggeration to say that the perpetual European discussions on seating arrangement are akin to re-arranging the deck chairs on the Titanic. The geopolitical environment around Europe has worsened while **the EU has focused inwards**: it faces a more troubled environment in North Africa, the Middle East, the Balkans, the Caucasus and even vis-a -visRussia. This is a pretty dismal record. (Mahbubani, 2007, 203–204)" Whether one regards European attitudes to war and peace as a Venusian function of de facto weakness or a more principled end point of Europe's long familiarity with conflict, the **eclipse of the willingness** and ability **to use violence** that was once central to European statehood has **condemned** the **EU's ambition to be limited to** that of becoming **a super-state** (a super civilian state), **not** a genuine **superpower** (Sheehan, 2008).

#### Warming will be small.

Nature 12—Warming, but not as much, Nature 481, 413 (26 January 2012), http://www.nature.com/nature/journal/v481/n7382/full/481413e.html?WT.ec\_id=NATURE-20120126

The climate system may be less sensitive to greenhouse-gas warming than many models have predicted.

Nathan Gillett and his co-workers at Environment Canada in Victoria, British Columbia, analysed how well the latest Canadian Earth System Model tracked temperature changes attributable to volcanoes, man-made aerosols and rising greenhouse-gas emissions. They adjusted the model using temperature records from 1851 to 2010 — 60 years of data more than most previous analyses. The model predicted a short-term increase of 1.3–1.8 °C for a doubling of atmospheric carbon dioxide levels, which is low in the range of estimates from previous forecasts.

#### Warming is inevitable.

Gelbspan 7— American writer and activist. He has written two books relating to global warming, Ross, It’s too late to stop climate change, argues Ross Gelbspan — so what do we do now?, Grist, 12-11, http://grist.org/article/beyond-the-point-of-no-return/

But even assuming the wildest possible success of their initiatives — that humanity decided tomorrow to replace its coal- and oil-burning energy sources with noncarbon sources — it would still be too late to avert major climate disruptions. No national energy infrastructure can be transformed within a decade.

All these initiatives address only one part of the coming reality. They recall the kind of frenzied scrambling that is characteristic of trauma victims — a frantic focus on other issues, any other issues — that allows people to avoid the central take-home message of the trauma: in this case, the overwhelming power of inflamed nature.

Within the last two years, a number of leading scientists — including Rajendra Pachauri, head of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), British ecologist James Lovelock, and NASA scientist James Hansen — have all declared that humanity is about to pass or already has passed a “tipping point” in terms of global warming. The IPCC, which reflects the findings of more than 2,000 scientists from over 100 countries, recently stated that it is “very unlikely” that we will avoid the coming era of “dangerous climate change.”

## Iraq

### Circumvention

#### Prez will adhere - S.C. decisions are supported by public and congress who check.

Bradley and Morrison ‘13

[Curtis A., William Van Alstyne Professor of Law, Duke Law School. Trevor W., Liviu Librescu Professor of Law, Columbia Law School. Columbia Law Review 113. <http://www.columbialawreview.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/05/Bradley-Morrison.pdf> ETB]

In addition to the constraining influence arising from the internalization of legal norms by executive branch lawyers and other officials, law ¶ could constrain the President if there are “external” sanctions for ¶ violating it. The core idea here is a familiar one, often associated with ¶ Holmes’s “bad man”139: One who obeys the law only because he ¶ concludes that the cost of noncompliance exceeds the benefits is still ¶ subject to legal constraint if the cost of noncompliance is affected by the ¶ legal status of the norm. This is true even though the law is likely to ¶ impose less of a constraint on such “bad men” than on those who have ¶ internalized legal norms, and even though it is likely to be difficult in ¶ practice to disentangle internal and external constraints. ¶ Importantly, external sanctions for noncompliance need not be ¶ formal. If the existence or intensity of an informal sanction is affected by ¶ the legal status of the norm in question, compliance with the norm in ¶ order to avoid the sanction should be understood as an instance of law ¶ having a constraining effect. In the context of presidential compliance ¶ with the law, one can plausibly posit a number of such informal ¶ sanctions. One operates on the level of professional reputation, and may ¶ be especially salient for lawyers in the executive branch. If a lawyer’s own ¶ internalization of the relevant set of legal norms is insufficient to prevent ¶ him from defending as lawful actions that he knows are obviously beyond ¶ the pale, he might respond differently if he believed his legal analysis ¶ would or could be disclosed to the broader legal community in a way that ¶ would threaten his reputation and professional prospects after he leaves ¶ government.140 (This concern might help further explain the OLC and other Justice Department officials’ resistance to the White House in the ¶ warrantless surveillance example discussed above.) ¶ Although fear of harm to their professional reputations may indeed ¶ help constrain government lawyers, if that were the only operative ¶ external sanction in this context it would be fair to ask whether it ¶ translated into a real constraint on the President in high-stakes contexts. ¶ But it is not the only potential sanction. A related and perhaps more ¶ significant sanction may operate directly on political leaders within the ¶ government, including the President himself: partisan politics. If being ¶ perceived to act lawlessly is politically costly, a President’s political rivals ¶ will have an incentive to invoke the law to oppose him. Put another way, ¶ legal argumentation might have a salience with the media, the public at ¶ large, and influential elites that could provide presidential opponents in ¶ Congress and elsewhere with an incentive to criticize executive actions in ¶ legal terms. If such criticism gains traction in a given context, it could ¶ enable the President’s congressional opponents to impose even greater ¶ costs on him through a variety of means, ranging from oversight hearings ¶ to, in the extreme case, threats of impeachment. Thus, so long as the ¶ threat of such sanctions is credible, law will impose an external ¶ constraint—whether or not the President himself or those responsible ¶ for carrying out his policies have internalized the law as a normative ¶ matter. The prospect of political sanctions might help explain, for ¶ example, why modern Presidents do not seem to seriously contemplate ¶ disregarding Supreme Court decisions.141 And if Presidents are constrained to follow the practice-based norm of judicial supremacy, they ¶ may be constrained to follow other normative practices that do not ¶ involve the courts. ¶ Work by political scientists concerning the use of military force is at ¶ least suggestive of how a connection between public sanctions and law ¶ compliance might work. As this work shows, the opposition party in ¶ Congress, especially during times of divided government, will have both ¶ an incentive and the means to use the media to criticize unsuccessful ¶ presidential uses of force. The additional political costs that the ¶ opposition party is able to impose in this way will in turn make it less ¶ likely that Presidents will engage in large-scale military operations.142 It is ¶ at least conceivable, as the legal theorist Fred Schauer has suggested, that ¶ the political cost of pursuing an ultimately unpopular policy initiative ¶ (such as engaging in a war) goes up with the perceived illegality of the initiative.143 If that is correct, then actors will require more assurance of ¶ policy success before potentially violating the law. This should count as a ¶ legal constraint on policymaking even if the relevant actors themselves ¶ do not see any normative significance in the legal rule in question.

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

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

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

## AT T- Judicial Restriction

#### 1. W/M – suspension clause is a restriction on WPA

Natelson 8/19/13 (After a quarter of a century as Professor of Law at the University of Montana, he recently retired to work full time at Colorado's Independence Institute.) “Where is the Power to Suspend Habeas Corpus?” http://blog.tenthamendmentcenter.com/2013/08/where-is-the-power-to-suspend-habeas-corpus/#.UmL\_E5TwIic

The Constitution’s Suspension Clause (Art. I, Section 9, cl. 2) limits when the writ of habeas corpus can be suspended. But the Constitution doesn’t seem to grant the federal government power to suspend the writ in the first place. Why not? And why limit a power never given?¶ In an Aug. 17 Wall Street Journal piece, constitutional law professor Nicholas Quinn Rosenkrantz infers that Congress has the sole suspension authority from the structure of the constitutional text. He writes:¶ “Since the Suspension Clause appears in Article I of the Constitution, which is predominately about the powers of Congress, there is a strong argument that only Congress can suspend the habeas writ.”¶ He concludes that when President Abraham Lincoln suspended the writ, he probably intruded on Congress’s prerogative, and thereby exceeded his constitutional authority. (Professor Rosenkrantz also gives Lincoln credit for trying to cure the constitutional defect.)¶ This is largely correct, but the organization of the text is not the sole reason. When read in legal and historical context, the language of the Constitutiondoes give the federal government authority to suspend the writ.¶ Here’s why: At the time of the Founding, suspending habeas was a recognized incident of war powers—repeatedly resorted to both by Parliament and by the Continental Congress. When the Constitution granted Congress authority to declare war, this grant carried with it the incidental power to suspend the writ. (The Necessary and Proper Clause confirmed this.) For more on that, see my book The Original Constitution: What It Actually Said and Meant, pp. 106-07.¶ The President’s power to serve as commander-in-chief also carried with it incidental authority to suspend the writ. (The Necessary and Proper Clause doesn’t apply to the President, but for other reasons the doctrine of incidental powers does.) However, the President’s suspension authority was limited to the actual theater of war. See p. 134.¶ Thus, Professor Rosenkranz was correct to conclude that Lincoln exceeded this authority by suspending the writ over large areas outside the war theater.

#### 2. We meet – Habeas corpus is a judicial restriction

Justice Kennedy ‘8 (Speaking in the Context of Bomedine v. Bush which dealt with presidential authority to deny HC to indef detentions) “LAKHDAR BOUMEDIENE, ET AL., PETITIONERS 06–1195 v. GEORGE W. BUSH, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, ET AL. KHALED A. F. AL ODAH, NEXT FRIEND OF FAWZI KHALID ABDULLAH FAHAD AL ODAH, ET AL., PETITIONERS 06–1196 v. UNITED STATES ET AL. ON WRITS OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT” http://www.law.cornell.edu/supct/pdf/06-1195P.ZO

Our basic charter cannot be contracted away like this. The Constitution grants Congress and the President the power to acquire, dispose of, and govern territory, not the power to decide when and where its terms apply. Even when the United States acts outside its borders, its powers are not “absolute and unlimited” but are subject “to such restrictions as are expressed in the Constitution.” Murphy v. Ramsey, 114 U. S. 15, 44 (1885). Abstaining from questions involving formal sovereignty and territorial governance is one thing. To hold the political branches have the power to switch the Constitution on or off at will is quite another. The former position reflects this Court’s recogni tion that certain matters requiring political judgments are best left to the political branches. The latter would permit a striking anomaly in our tripartite system of government, leading to a regime in which Congress and the President, not this Court, say “what the law is.” Marbury v. Madison, 1 Cranch 137, 177 (1803). These concerns have particular bearing upon the Suspension Clause question in the cases now before us, for the writ of habeas corpus is itself an indispensable mechanism for monitoring the separation of powers. The test for determining the scope of this provision must not be subject to manipulation by those whose power it is designed to restrain.

#### 3. Restriction means a limit or qualification, and includes conditions on action

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

P10 The term "restriction" is not defined by the Legislature for the purposes of the DUI statutes. See generally A.R.S. § 28-1301 (2004) (providing the "[d]efinitions" section of the DUI statutes). In the absence of a statutory definition of a term, we look to ordinary dictionary definitions and do not construe the word as being a term of art. Lee v. State, 215 Ariz. 540, 544, ¶ 15, 161 P.3d 583, 587 (App. 2007) ("When a statutory term is not explicitly defined, we assume, unless otherwise stated, that the Legislature intended to accord the word its natural and obvious meaning, which may be discerned from its dictionary definition."). P11 The dictionary definition of "restriction" is "[a] limitation or qualification." Black's Law Dictionary 1341 (8th ed. 1999). In fact, "limited" and "restricted" are considered synonyms. See Webster's II New Collegiate Dictionary 946 (2001). Under these commonly accepted definitions, Wagner's driving privileges were "restrict[ed]" when they were "limited" by the ignition interlock requirement. Wagner was not only [\*7] statutorily required to install an ignition interlock device on all of the vehicles he operated, A.R.S. § 28-1461(A)(1)(b), but he was also prohibited from driving any vehicle that was not equipped with such a device, regardless whether he owned the vehicle or was under the influence of intoxicants, A.R.S. § 28-1464(H). These limitations constituted a restriction on Wagner's privilege to drive, for he was unable to drive in circumstances which were otherwise available to the general driving population. Thus, the rules of statutory construction dictate that the term "restriction" includes the ignition interlock device limitation.

#### 4. Predictable ground – limits restrictions to current presidential action that’s already rooted in the literature

#### 5. CI leads to a race to limit out the aff – prefer reasonability

#### 6. Potential abuse isn’t a voter – this round doesn’t set a precedent

## AT Bond DA

### 2AC Insulation No Link

#### The Court decides each case on the facts, not based on political calculations.

Rosen 12 (Jeffrey, legal affairs editor of The New Republic, “Welcome to the Roberts Court: How the Chief Justice Used Obamacare to Reveal His True Identity,” June 29, http://www.newrepublic.com/blog/plank/104493/welcome-the-roberts-court-who-the-chief-justice-was-all-along#)

Of course, it didn’t all come down to judicial temperament. In the most divisive constitutional cases, the substance of legal arguments will always play a part. Arguments by liberal scholars who care about constitutional text and history, such as Neil Siegel of Duke Law School, were reflected in Chief Justice Roberts’s opinion about the taxing power. Justice Ginsburg’s defense of Congress’s power to pass the mandate under the commerce clause adopted New Textualists arguments by Jack Balkin of Yale Law School about how the framers of Article VI of the Virginia Plan during the Constitutional Convention would have wanted Congress to coordinate economic action in areas where the states were powerless to act on their own. The majority opinion also vindicated Solicitor General Don Verrilli’s decision to emphasize the breadth of Congress’s taxing power. But in the end, there are good arguments on both sides of any constitutional question, and justices have broad discretion to pick and choose among competing legal arguments based on a range of factors—including concerns about text, history, precedent, or institutional legitimacy. The fact that Roberts chose to place institutional legitimacy front and center is the mark of a successful Chief. As Roberts recognized, faith in the neutrality of the law and the impartiality of judges is a fragile thing. When I teach constitutional law, I begin by telling students that they can’t assume that it’s all politics. To do so misses everything that is constraining and meaningful and inspiring about the Constitution as a framework for government. There will be many polarizing decisions from the Roberts Court in the future, and John Roberts will be on the conservative side of many of them. But with his canny performance in the health care case, Roberts has given the country a memorable example of what it means to be a successful Chief Justice.

#### The judges are mocking the chemical convention - won't be a narrow ruling

Holland 13 - Reporter (http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/11/05/supreme-court-bond-case\_n\_4219658.html, Supreme Court Skeptical Of Chemical Weapons Law In Bond Case, November 5th 2013)

Carol Anne Bond, from Lansdale, Pa., is challenging her conviction, saying that the federal government's decision to charge her using a chemical weapons law was an unconstitutional reach into a state's power to handle what her lawyer calls a domestic dispute. Bond, unable to bear any children of her own, was excited when her best friend Myrlina Haynes announced her pregnancy. But later Bond found out her husband of more than 14 years, Clifford Bond, had impregnated Haynes. Bond, a laboratory technician, then stole the chemical 10-chloro-10H phenoxarsine from the company where she worked and purchased potassium dichromate on Amazon.com. Both can be deadly if ingested or exposed to the skin at sufficiently high levels. Bond spread the chemicals on Haynes' door handle and in the tailpipe of Haynes' car. Haynes, noticing the chemicals, called the local police, who didn't investigate to her satisfaction. She then found some on her mailbox, and called the United States Postal Service, which videotaped Bond going back and forth between Haynes' car and the mailbox with the chemicals. Postal inspectors then arrested her, and a federal grand jury indicted her on two counts of possessing and using a chemical weapon, applying a federal anti-terrorism law. The law was passed to fulfill the United States' international treaty obligations under the 1993 Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction. Bond pleaded guilty and received six years in prison. A couple of justices were very critical of government prosecutors for choosing even to prosecute Bond using the chemical weapons law. "If you told ordinary people that you were going to prosecute Ms. Bond for using a chemical weapon, they would be flabbergasted," said Justice Samuel Alito. "It's so far outside of the ordinary meaning of the word." Justice Anthony Kennedy said it "seems unimaginable that you would bring this prosecution." Justices went down a long list of everyday items that could be prosecuted under the law since they could cause harm to humans or animals, including the use of kerosene, matches, performance-enhancing drugs used in sports, and even vinegar — which would poison goldfish if introduced to a fishbowl. Alito later drove home his point by saying under the law, even innocent ordinary actions could become questionable if the government's power is not limited. "Would it shock you if I told you that a few days ago my wife and I distributed toxic chemicals to a great number of children?" he said to laughter from the courtroom. "On Halloween we gave them chocolate bars. Chocolate is poison to dogs, so it's a toxic chemical under the chemical weapons" law. Solicitor General Donald Verrilli assured Alito he would probably get away with it, but warned justices that the issue was no joke and they shouldn't get involved in trying to decide what treaty terms mean.

#### Their ev concludes it won't be narrow.

Baldi 13 - (Maxwell Baldi is President of the Foreign Affairs Society. Supremacy and Federalism: Treaty Power under the Necessary and Proper Clause http://foreignaffairsreview.co.uk/2013/02/treaty-power-federalism/)

So will the American foreign policy toolbox be dramatically reduced? The Court has the option in Bond II of vacating the Third Circuit’s ruling on narrowly tailored grounds: if the Court finds that the CWC does not encompass poisoning outside the context of war, it can avoid the major constitutional question. If the Court chooses to address the scope of the treaty clause head-on, five justices are likely posed to issue a sweeping ruling. Justices Roberts, Scalia, Thomas, and Alito tend to adopt the narrowest possible construction of the Necessary and Proper clause. Justice Kennedy, often considered a ‘swing vote’, sees structural limitations on Congressional power as protective of individual rights; he seems unlikely to be receptive to an argument for nearly unbounded federal power through treaties. The Court may rule by June.

### 2AC No Spill Over

#### Interbranch conflicts don’t spill over—individual court cases are decided on specific issues

Redish and Drizen 87, Professor of Law and Law Clerk [April, 1987, Martin H. Redish (Professor of Law, Northwestern University) and Karen L. Drizin (Law Clerk to the Honorable Seymour Simon, Illinois Supreme Court) “CONSTITUTIONAL FEDERALISM AND JUDICIAL REVIEW: THE ROLE OF TEXTUAL ANALYSIS”. NEW YORK UNIVERSITY LAW REVIEW V. 62]

Dean Choper's fundamental assumption, then, is that Supreme Court abstention on issues of constitutional federalism would somehow increase, or at least curtail loss of, limited capital for the more vital area of individual liberty. However, even if one were to concede that judicial review is more fundamental to our constitutional scheme in the area of individual liberty than in matters of federalism, acceptance of Dean Choper's proposal would not necessarily follow. The problem is that it is neither intuitively nor empirically clear that the Court's so-called capital is transferable from one area of constitutional law to another. As one of the current authors has previously argued: It is difficult to imagine . . . that the widespread negative public reactions to Miranda v. Arizona, Engle v. Vitale, or Roe v. Wade would [\*37] have been affected at all by the Court's practices on issues of separation of powers and federalism. Rather, public reaction in each seems to have focused on the specific, highly charged issues of rights for criminals, prayer in public schools, and abortions. It is doubtful that the Court would have had an easier time if it had chosen to stay out of interbranch and intersystemic conflicts. 146

## AT Con Ammend

### 2AC Theory

#### Constitutional amendments are a voting issue—never happens and no advocate prove its not a germaine or legitimate opportunity cost

Baker 10

[Director of the Con Law Center at Drake, 10 Widener J. Pub. L. 1]

There is a reason that there have been only 27 amendments over more than 200 years: Constitutional amendments must have the sustained and one-sided support of great majorities in the Congress and across the states. Very few issues ever garner such importance and support.

#### Even they fiat immediacy, it takes years to have a meaningful effect

Joyce, Prof of Public Administration at George Washington, 98

“The Rescissions Process After the Line Item Veto: Tools for Controlling Spending”

http://www.rules.house.gov/archives/rules\_joyc07.htm

In the final analysis, there is no clear fallback position for supporters of the Line Item Veto Act. The Supreme Court, in its majority opinion, stated flatly that a different role for the President in the lawmaking process could only "come through the Article V amendment procedures". Deciding the issue through amending the Constitution, however, has two substantial drawbacks. The first is that Constitutional amendments are notoriously difficult to adopt. Even if a Constitutional amendment were adopted, it would likely not take effect for a number of years. The second is more substantive. A constitutionally provided line item veto would only allow the President to veto items that were specifically provided for in appropriation bills. Most federal "line items", however, are found not in statute, but in report language accompanying statutes.

## AT Security

#### Death outweighs – it destroys the subject and outweighs contemplation of being

Paterson 2003 – Department of Philosophy, Providence College, Rhode Island (Craig, “A Life Not Worth Living?” Studies in Christian Ethics, Vol. 16, No. 2, pp. 1-20, 2003, http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=1029225)

Contrary to those accounts, I would argue that it is death per se that is really the objective evil for us, not because it deprives us of a prospective future of overall good judged better than the alternative of non-being. It cannot be about harm to a former person who has ceased to exist, for no person actually suffers from the sub-sequent non-participation. Rather, death in itself is an evil to us because it ontologically destroys the current existent subject — it is the ultimate in metaphysical lightening strikes.80 The evil of death is truly an ontological evil borne by the person who already exists, independently of calculations about better or worse possible lives. Such an evil need not be consciously experienced in order to be an evil for the kind of being a human person is. Death is an evil because of the change in kind it brings about, a change that is destructive of the type of entity that we essentially are. Anything, whether caused naturally or caused by human intervention (intentional or unintentional) that drastically interferes in the process of maintaining the person in existence is an objective evil for the person. What is crucially at stake here, and is dialectically supportive of the self-evidency of the basic good of human life, is that death is a radical interference with the current life process of the kind of being that we are. In consequence, death itself can be credibly thought of as a ‘primitive evil’ for all persons, regardless of the extent to which they are currently or prospectively capable of participating in a full array of the goods of life.81 In conclusion, concerning willed human actions, it is justifiable to state that any intentional rejection of human life itself cannot therefore be warranted since it is an expression of an ultimate disvalue for the subject, namely, the destruction of the present person; a radical ontological good that we cannot begin to weigh objectively against the travails of life in a rational manner. To deal with the sources of disvalue (pain, suffering, etc.) we should not seek to irrationally destroy the person, the very source and condition of all human possibility.82

#### Must propose alternatives or else they are complicit with the evil they criticize

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

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

#### Rights demands and legal strategies prevent state violence—habeas specific

Ahmad 9, Professor of Law

[2009, Muneer I. Ahmad is a Clinical Professor of Law, Yale Law School, “RESISTING GUANTÁNAMO: RIGHTS AT THE BRINK OF DEHUMANIZATION”, Northwestern University Law Review, Vol. 103, p. 1683, American University, WCL Research Paper No. 08-65]

Rights as Resistance.—Habeas corpus, whose history has been explored exhaustively by others,297 translates as ―show me the body,‖ and captures the communitarian, corporeal, and testimonial dimensions of not just rights claims, but citizenship. For a judge to order the government to produce a defendant for the purposes of considering the legality of his detention is to recognize the defendant‘s a priori membership in the community. To require that the defendant himself—his corpus—be produced, and not just reasons for his detention proffered, is to acknowledge the physicality and inescapably human experience of an otherwise abstract liberty interest. And to permit the defendant to not only attend his own hearing, but to speak on his own behalf, is to credit his standing as an actor and agent. Taken together, the communitarian, corporeal, and testimonial bespeak a shared concern: human dignity. It is this human dignity, the human as distinguished from the merely biological, with which Arendt was fundamentally concerned. For Arendt, rights are indispensable to humanity, a protective membrane poised between the state and the individual. What she saw, and Giorgio Agamben has recently revived,298 is the idea that a confrontation between the state and the individual unmediated by rights reduces the individual to bare life, or naked life,299 which is life without humanity. It is this unmediated, unmitigated confrontation that both requires and enables the rendering of the human inhuman, animal, and savage.300 It is this rights-free confrontation that permits torture—the hand of the state encumbered by no law other than the laws of physics. And it is this unmediated confrontation that permits the transmogrification of a child into a terrorist. For Arendt, to be a citizen is to be human, and to be anything else is merely, and barely, life. The conception of rights as a bare protection interposed between the individual and state violence is intuitively familiar to the anti-death penalty advocate301 and to criminal defense lawyers generally. But the American legal embodiment of citizenship as rights is Dred Scott.302 While Scott was suing for his freedom from slavery, the case turned upon his citizenship. The Supreme Court found that Scott was not a ―citizen of a State,‖ and therefore, under the jurisdictional limits of Article III of the Constitution, could not bring suit in federal court.303 Thus, the case removed Scott‘s right even to be heard, by removing him from the polity. Like the Guantánamo prisoners, he had no right to have rights, and the negation of his political citizenship condemned him to the unmitigated violence of slavery. The denial of habeas to Omar and the other prisoners similarly placed them outside the communitarian consent that rights require. This expulsion from the polity authorizes the expulsion from humanity that torture represents. Here, we must remember that this expulsion was prefigured by the state iconography that placed the prisoners outside the realm of human understanding, and therefore outside of humanity itself.304 Stripped of the mediation of rights, Guantánamo reveals the essential and inescapable violence of law. Politics may dictate who is entitled to mediation and what form it will take, but all are subject to the force of the state that, fundamentally, animates law. The demand for rights is a plea to blunt state force, and not to fundamentally reorganize the structure of power. With this understanding of rights in mind, I return to the litigation strategy we adopted in Omar‘s case. By invoking rights, we sought recognition of Omar in a polity of significance. In this way, rights hailed Omar into the community, though his admission would depend upon community consent. As Arendt‘s analysis suggests, the demand for recognition is tantamount to a claim to humanity. To be human, to rise above biological existence and to secure political and social life, requires rights. And yet, once more, this bid was subject to political forces. No amount of rights-claiming could overcome a political will to deny the prisoners‘ humanity. In light of this, our strategy can be understood in a third way: rights as resistance. By this account, the rights claim sought not to escape the violence of the state, but to make that violence more costly to the state. To continue its brutal regime at Guantánamo, the government first would have to do violence to rights; to lay its hands on Omar again, the state would have to crash through his rights claims. Rather than avoid the state‘s confrontation with the individual, this strategy seeks to expose it. The onus then shifts from the prisoner trying to establish the existence of rights to the state establishing their nonexistence, from the individual establishing harm done to the state justifying its own violence. In some respects, this strategy has worked. So long as it could avoid any discussion of Guantánamo, as it long attempted to do, the government could enact violence without political cost. But rights claims force the government into discourse in which the violence of the state is put on display and must be justified. The claim of rights itself may interpose a membrane between the state and the individual even if the right itself ultimately is found not to exist. Thus, our rights-based strategy could be understood as interposing a protective membrane between Omar and the state. In this way, we wanted to mediate, and moderate, the relationship between the state and Omar, with the hope of ultimately transforming the relationship from one of potentate and biological mass to one more recognizable as warden and prisoner. This was a form of resistance to Omar‘s mistreatment, which required the state either to stop its violence or to engage in it in the public forum of the court. This approach had some success, as the worst of the mistreatment of Omar and the other prisoners stopped once the government was forced to grapple with it in the daylight of federal court.305 And yet, Omar‘s other fundamental material conditions—indefinite detention, and trial before a substandard tribunal—remained the same, just as the fundamentals of Guantánamo have remained largely the same for the hundreds of other prisoners. At the end of the day, I believe our approach has not proven more successful because the fundamental question of political citizenship has not been resolved in the prisoners‘ favor, and as I have argued, the success of even first-order rights depends upon a priori political membership. When I have rehearsed these arguments for others, particularly lawyers, the response I have often gotten is that we did the best that we could, and that there was no alternative. To argue the existence of rights, and to do so forcefully, is to fulfill the professional obligation of a lawyer. But this strikes me as too weak a conception of professional obligation. I believe that the rights-based approach has been worthy and necessary, but not merely because it was a form of last-resort lawyering. Rather, the rightsbased lawyering has performed an essential role of mounting resistance to the unbridled exercise of state violence, essential not because there is nothing else to be done, but because of the opportunities and potentialities that resistance creates. This is consistent with what Scott Cummings has termed ―constrained legalism,‖ 306 for it capitalizes on what law can accomplish, even as it recognizes what law cannot.

#### 6. Perm do the plan and all non-competitive parts of the alt – Refusing to use the state empowers its worst aspects

Barbrook, 97-professor at the Hypermedia Research Centre at the University of Westminster, 1997  (Richard, message to a list serve, http://www.nettime.org/Lists-Archives/nettime-l-9706/msg00034.html)

I thought that this position is clear from my remarks about the ultra-left posturing of the 'zero-work' demand. In Europe, we have real social problems of deprivation and poverty which, in part, can only be solved by state action. This does not make me a statist, but rather an anti-anti-statist. By opposing such intervention because they are carried out by the state, anarchists are tacitly lining up with the neo-liberals. Even worse, refusing even to vote for the left, they acquiese to rule by neo-liberal parties.   I deeply admire direct action movements. I was a radio pirate and we provide server space for anti-roads and environmental movements. However, this doesn't mean that I support political abstentionism or, even worse, the mystical nonsense produced by Hakim Bey. It is great for artists and others to adopt a marginality as a life style choice, but most of the people who are economically and socially marginalised were never given any choice. They are excluded from society as a result of deliberate policies of deregulation, privatisation and welfare cutbacks carried out by neo-liberal governments. During the '70s, I was a pro-situ punk rocker until Thatcher got elected. Then we learnt the hard way that voting did change things and lots of people suffered if state power was withdrawn from certain areas of our life, such as welfare and employment. Anarchism can be a fun artistic pose. However, human suffering is not.

#### 9. Reps focus trades of with material change

**Solas 2** – John, PhD in Humanities and Lecturer in Rural Social Welfare at the School of Behavioural and Social Sciences and Humanities (“The poverty of postmodern human services,” Australian Social Work, vol. 55, is. 2, June2002, Wiley)

Abstract Postmodernism cannot or will not tell the difference between truth and falsehood, reality and simulacra, principle and dogma, or right and wrong. As a corollary, it is unable or unwilling to make any ‘veritable’ difference to the nature or order of things. Indeed, there is no escape from, nor anything outside of, the ‘panopticon of language’. Accordingly, there is no significant probative difference between the practice and experience of genocide, and talking or writing about it. All one can do is be sceptical about discourses, even those concerned with ethnic cleansing and the like. As ludicrous as this sounds, it has not prevented postmodernism from monopolising discourses about significant aesthetic, cultural, economic, intellectual, political and social practices and sensibilities. Postmodernism manifests itself in a host of disciplines, and its presence is being increasingly felt in human services education and practice. If, as I shall argue, postmodernism is such a thoroughly baseless, reductive and inert doctrine, then why persist with it? The poverty of postmodernism prompts a timely return to the rich legacy of Marxism. The lure of postmodernism What is it about postmodernism that could attract the interest and support of erstwhile human service educators and practitioners, especially those on the political left? Judging from the literature on the subject there appear to be several main attractions. One of these is that there is no longer any need to be overly concerned about objective, material reality, or struggle with Realpolitik since neither exist in a definitive sense (Wood, 1997). Jean Baudrillard (1988) is cited as an ‘authority?’ on this exorbitant thesis. It is Baudrillard’s (1991) contention that we have arrived at an epoch of purely fictive or illusory appearances; that ‘reality’ is nowadays largely predefined by media-hype; and that henceforth we had better adjust to a life of virtual reality, rather than cling to the illusion that anything has veridical force. There are simply no ontological or epistemological grounds for distinguishing the difference between ‘simulacra’ or image and substance. Thus, Baudrillard (1991) was able to assure readers of The Guardian that the Gulf War would never happen because ‘talk’ of war had now become a substitute for the real event, and even if war broke out spectators would be unable to wrest fact from fiction since they would never have unmediated access to events. Thanks to Baudrillard, human services educators and practitioners will never again mistake the ‘hyperreality’ of immiseration for the real thing. Equally attractive is the notion of a ‘decentred subject.’ The thinking, feeling, willing, speaking and acting ‘liberal humanist’ self or ‘subject’ is now non-essential. This particular subject was the cause of so much depravity and violence that its departure is both expedient and a welcomed relief. Without it, human service workers need not contend with all the hard questions over which they had once agonised such as freedom, justice, equality, solidarity and the like. It is enough to theorise about how the subject is an effect of language or product of discourse, devoid of free will, agency and reflective grasp and fragmented by power, desire, convention or the dictates of various interpretative communities, than actually do anything about it. Another of the main attractions is postmodernism’s hostility towards the tyranny of ‘totality’ (Wood, 1997). All totalities, that is attempts to fashion and/or share something in common, be it a cause, culture, gender, language, race, ethnicity, humanity or whatever are, or have the potential to be, totalitarian. Thus, the disciples of postmodernism have acquired the virtues of being (absolutely?) sceptical towards universals and respectful of differences, except, that is, of different totalities. These are virtues which Jean François Lyotard (1988) has done much to establish and exemplify. When asked whether he condoned terrorism and war, Lyotard’s and Thébaud (1986) unqualified allegiance to these particular virtues obliged him to remain completely indiscriminate about the differences between the two. He was even unable to offer a reason for considering either of them just or unjust. As Lyotard (1985) blithely admitted: if you ask me why I am on that side, I think that I would answer that I do not have an answer to the question ‘why’? and that is in the order of transcendence. When I say ‘transcendence,’ it means: I do not know who is sending me the prescription in question. (p. 69). Lyotard claims that he is not in a position to know for sure the exact source of the discourse, he cannot judge its authority, intent or institutional warrant. True to his own postmodernist lights, Lyotard is content to remain in doubt rather than find out. The task for human services, then, is not to seek change, or even to articulate the political aspirations of a particular oppressed group,

but to suspect all meta-narratives and preserve without judgement any difference, or differend in Lyotard’s (1988) terms. Finally, subscribers to postmodernism are not bound nor animated by a belief in ‘progress’ (Wood, 1997). This enables them to avoid the ‘naturalistic fallacy,’ which holds that it is possible to get from bad to better times. There is, therefore, absolutely nothing about the past, present or future that could be regarded as an advance – including, for instance, a capitalist-free Jurassic period, a 20th century devoid of dinosaurs, or more particularly, any notion of progressive human services. The age of enlightenment, according to postmodernists, has been a particularly egregious period. Belief in enlightenment has been the ultimate cause of peoples’ inhumanity to each other. Death camps, death squads, civil, cold and world wars, ethnic cleansing, Hiroshima, Nagasaki, the Cuban missile crisis and the persistent threat of nuclear annihilation, to mention only a few of the major events included in a large and growing inventory, attest to the brutal and oppressive logic of so-called ‘enlightened’ thought (Harvey, 1990). Postmodernists are adamant that serious doubt must be cast upon any appeal made to so-called enlightened ideals (reason, truth, knowledge, freedom and so on) in order to avoid more unmitigated disaster. The human services owe a large debt to Michel Foucault (1963, 1967, 1977) in particular for revealing the depth of their complicity in making things which they purport to remedy worse. Their knowledge has given them the power to help incriminate and incarcerate, pathologise and hospitalise, discipline and render docile individuals. Foucault annuls the difference between historical fact and ideological fiction, and hence, spares workers the arduous and risky task of exposing and challenging institutionalised lies and hypocrisies. A crucial question is what will become of the critical and progressive ethos of human services education and practice in the wake of postmodernism? Against postmodernism The retreat from frontline activism to the barricades of abstraction is, as Perry Anderson (1977) argued, a typical response to disillusionment. However, what is surprising is the failure of deserters to realise or acknowledge the extent to which they contribute to their own confinement in the backwaters of mainstream political life. The immodest and largely uncritical embrace of postmodernism must surely rank as one of the most self defeating and untimely gestures that could be made in response to the exigencies human service professions now face. It promotes a deep suspicion of anything that attempts to oppose fiction with facts, falsehood with truth and simulacrum with reality. According to postmodern luminaries, it is no longer possible –‘realistically’ possible – to believe in the value of reason, truth, freedom, progress and the emancipating power of enlightened critique. It would seem to be far better to abandon these values than be taken for a downright teleologically essentialistic universalist humanist fool for trusting in them. Of course, it is important to keep these values under close scrutiny. However, there is nothing to be gained by subscribing to total(ising) disbelief, unless of course one is willing to agree with Michel Foucault (1980) that ignorance is bliss. Nor is there any point engaging in iconoclasm of the postmodern variety if its denouement is to justify the claim to have reached the limits of what is ‘realistically’ possible, and closes off opportunities for direct, far-reaching political action.

# 1AR

#### game-theory proves that liberal internationalism is effective

Recchia and Doyle 11 Stefano, Assistant Professor in International Relations at the University of Cambridge, and Michael, Harold Brown Professor of International Affairs, Law and Political Science at Columbia University, “Liberalism in International Relations”, In: Bertrand Badie, Dirk Berg-Schlosser, and Leonardo Morlino, eds., International Encyclopedia of Political Science (Sage, 2011), pp. 1434-1439

Relying on new insights from game theory, scholars during the 1980s and 1990s emphasized that so-called international regimes, consisting of agreed-on international norms, rules, and decision-making procedures, can help states effectively coordinate their policies and collaborate in the production of international public goods, such ¶ as free trade, arms control, and environmental protection. Especially, if embedded in formal multilateral institutions, such as the World Trade ¶ Organization (WTO) or North American Free ¶ Trade Agreement (NAFT A), regimes crucially ¶ improve the availability of information among ¶ states in a given issue area, thereby promoting ¶ reciprocity and enhancing the reputational costs ¶ of noncompliance. As noted by Robert Keohane, ¶ institutionalized multilateralism also reduces strategic competition over relative gains and thus ¶ further advances international cooperation. ¶ Most international regime theorists accepted ¶ Kenneth Waltz's (1979) neorealist assurription of ¶ states as black boxes-that is, unitary and rational ¶ actors with given interests. Little or no attention ¶ was paid to the impact on international cooperation of domestic political processes and dynamics. ¶ Likewise, regime scholarship largely disregarded ¶ the arguably crucial question of whether prolonged interaction in an institutionalized international setting can fundamentally change states' interests or preferences over outcomes (as opposed ¶ to preferences over strategies), thus engendering positive feedback loops of increased overall cooperation. For these reasons, international regime ¶ theory is not, properly speaking, liberal, and the ¶ term neoliberal institutionalism frequently used to ¶ identify it is somewhat misleading. ¶ It is only over the past decade or so that liberal ¶ international relations theorists have begun to systematically study the relationship between domestic politics and institutionalized international cooperation or global governance. This new scholarship ¶ seeks to explain in particular the close interna tional ¶ cooperation among liberal democracies as well as ¶ higher-than-average levels of delegation b)' democracies to complex multilateral bodies, such as the ¶ \ ¶ Liberalism in International Relations 1437 ¶ European Union (EU), North Atlantic Treaty ¶ Organization (NATO), NAFTA, and the WTO ¶ (see, e.g., John Ikenberry, 2001; Helen Milner & ¶ Andrew Moravcsik, 2009). The reasons that make liberal democracies particularly enthusiastic about international cooperation are manifold: First, transnational actors such as nongovernmental ¶ organizations and private corporations thrive in liberal democracies, and they frequently advocate increased international cooperation; second, elected democratic officials rely on delegation to multilateral bodies such as the WTO or the EU to commit to a stable policy line and to internationally lock in fragile domestic policies and constitutional arrangements; and finally, powerful liberal democracies, such as the United States and its ¶ allies, voluntarily bind themselves into complex global governance arrangements to demonstrate strategic restraint and create incentives for other states to cooperate, thereby reducing the costs for ¶ maintaining international order. ¶ Recent scholarship, such as that of Charles ¶ Boehmer and colleagues, has also confirmed the ¶ classical liberal intuition that formal international ¶ institutions, such as the United Nations (UN) or ¶ NATO, independently contribute to peace, especially when they are endowed with sophisticated ¶ administrative structures and information-gathering ¶ capacities. In short, research on global governance ¶ and especially on the relationship between democracy and international cooperation is thriving, and ¶ it usefully complements liberal scholarship on the ¶ democratic peace.

**Turn—rejecting predictions makes them inevitable—decisionmakers will rely on ideology instead of analysis**

**Fitzsimmons 7** (Michael, “The Problem of Uncertainty in Strategic Planning”, Survival, Winter 06/07)

But handling even this weaker form of uncertainty is still quite challeng- ing. If not sufficiently bounded, a high degree of variability in planning factors can exact a significant price on planning. The complexity presented by great variability strains the cognitive abilities of even the most sophisticated decision- makers.15 And even a robust decision-making process sensitive to cognitive limitations necessarily sacrifices depth of analysis for breadth as variability and complexity grows. It should follow, then, that in planning under conditions of risk, variability in strategic calculation should be carefully tailored to available analytic and decision processes. Why is this important? What harm can an imbalance between complexity and cognitive or analytic capacity in strategic planning bring? Stated simply, where analysis is silent or inadequate, **the personal beliefs of decision-makers** **fill the void**. As political scientist Richard Betts found in a study of strategic sur- prise, in ‘an environment that lacks clarity, abounds with conflicting data, and allows no time for rigorous assessment of sources and validity, ambiguity allows intuition or wishfulness to drive interpretation ... The greater the ambiguity, the greater the impact of preconceptions.’16 The decision-making environment that Betts describes here is one of political-military crisis, not long-term strategic planning. But a strategist who sees uncertainty as the central fact of his environ- ment brings upon himself some of the pathologies of crisis decision-making. He invites ambiguity, takes conflicting data for granted and **substitutes a priori scepticism about the validity of prediction** for time pressure as a rationale for discounting the importance of analytic rigour. It is important not to exaggerate the extent to which data and ‘rigorous assessment’ can illuminate strategic choices. Ambiguity is a fact of life, and scepticism of analysis is necessary. Accordingly, the intuition and judgement of decision-makers will always be vital to strategy, and attempting to subordinate those factors to some formulaic, deterministic decision-making model would be both undesirable and unrealistic. All the same, there is danger in the opposite extreme as well. Without careful analysis of what is relatively likely and what is relatively unlikely, what will be the possible bases for strategic choices? A decision-maker with no faith in prediction is left with little more than a set of worst-case scenarios and his existing beliefs about the world to confront the choices before him. Those beliefs may be more or less well founded, but if they are not made explicit and subject to analysis and debate regarding their application to particular strategic contexts, they remain only beliefs and premises, rather than rational judgements. Even at their best, such decisions are likely to be poorly understood by the organisations charged with their implementation. At their worst, such decisions may be poorly understood by the decision-makers themselves.

#### The status quo is structurally improving

Dash 13 Co-Founder and Managing Director at Activate, a new kind of strategy consultancy that advises companies about the opportunities at the intersection of technology and media co-founder and CEO of ThinkUp, which shows you how to be better at using your social networks, publisher, editor and owner of Dashes.com, my personal blog where I've been publishing continuously since 1999, entrepreneur, writer and geek living in New York City (Anil Dash, 4 February 2013, “THE WORLD IS GETTING BETTER. QUICKLY.,” http://dashes.com/anil/2013/02/the-world-is-getting-better-quickly.html)

The world is getting better, faster, than we could ever have imagined. For those of us who are fortunate enough to live in wealthy communities or countries, we have a common set of reference points we use to describe the world's most intractable, upsetting, unimaginable injustices. Often, we only mention these horrible realities in minimizing our own woes: "Well, that's annoying, but it's hardly as bad as children starving in Africa." Or "Yeah, this is important, but it's not like it's the cure for AIDS." Or the omnipresent description of any issue as a "First World Problem". But let's, for once, look at the actual data around developing world problems. Not our condescending, world-away displays of emotion, or our slacktivist tendencies to see a retweet as meaningful action, but the actual numbers and metrics about how progress is happening for the world's poorest people. Though metrics and measurements are always fraught and flawed, Gates' single biggest emphasis was the idea that measurable progress and metrics are necessary for any meaningful improvements to happen in the lives of the world's poor. So how are we doing? THE WORLD HAS CHANGED The results are astounding. Even if we caveat that every measurement is imprecise, that billionaire philanthropists are going to favor data that strengthens their points, and that some of the most significant problems are difficult to attach metrics to, it's inarguable that the past two decades have seen the greatest leap forward in the lives of the global poor in the history of humanity. Some highlights: Children are 1/3 less likely to die before age five than they were in 1990. The global childhood mortality rate for kids under 5 has dropped from 88 in 1000 in 1990 to 57 in 1000 in 2010. The global infant mortality rate for kids dying before age one has plunged from 61 in 1000 to 40 in 1000. Now, any child dying is of course one child too many, but this is astounding progress to have made in just twenty years. In the past 30 years, the percentage of children who receive key immunizations such as the DTP vaccine has quadrupled. The percentage of people in the world living on less than $1.25 per day has been cut in half since 1990, ahead of the schedule of the Millennium Development Goals which hoped to reach this target by 2015. The number of deaths to tuberculosis has been cut 40% in the past twenty years. The consumption of ozone-depleting substances has been cut 85% globally in the last thirty years. The percentage of urban dwellers living in slums globally has been cut from 46.2% to 32.7% in the last twenty years. And there's more progress in hunger and contraception, in sustainability and education, against AIDS and illiteracy. After reading the Gates annual letter and following up by reviewing the UN's ugly-but-data-rich Millennium Development Goals statistics site, I was surprised by how much progress has been made in the years since I've been an adult, and just how little I've heard about the big picture despite the fact that I'd like to keep informed about such things. I'm not a pollyanna — there's a lot of work to be done. But I can personally attest to the profound effect that basic improvements like clean drinking water can have in people's lives. Today, we often use the world's biggest problems as metaphors for impossibility. But the evidence shows that, actually, we're really good at solving even the most intimidating challenges in the world. What we're lacking is the ability to communicate effectively about how we make progress, so that we can galvanize even more investment of resources, time and effort to tackling the problems we have left.