## t-restriction

#### we meet, literally rule that executive indefinite detention violates the constitution

#### 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.

Any aff on non-detention loses ability- makes every aff an auto link to the DA

Reasonability- competing interps race to the bottom- moves the goal post and crowds out education

## kritik

#### Judicial review prevents their worst impacts- ensures presidential restraint and destroys the jurisprudential model for arms sales that escalate conflict

#### Try or die for Afghanistan- us engagement inevitable- only question of effectiveness- stable government prevents worse US intervention and escalating regional conflict

#### Deconstructing law fails to regulate detention

Jenks and Talbot-Jensen 11 (INDEFINITE DETENTION UNDER THE LAWS OF WAR Chris Jenks\* & Eric Talbot Jensen\*\* Lieutenant Colonel, U.S. Army Judge Advocate General's Corps. Presently serving as the Chief of the International Law Branch, Office of The Judge Advocate General, Washington D.C. The views expressed in this Article are those of the author and not The Judge Advocate General's Corps, the U.S. Army, or the Department of Defense. \*\* Visiting Assistant Professor, Fordham Law School. The authors wish to thank Sue Ann Johnson for her exceptional research and editing skills, and the organizers and attendees at both the 3rd Annual National Security Law Jtinior Faculty Workshop at the University of Texas School of Law, where we first discussed the ideas for this article, and the Stanford Law and Policy Review National Defense Symposium, where we first presented the finished product. STANFORD LAW & POLICY REVIEW [Vol. 22:1] Page Lexis)

Those who would deconstruct the law of war as applied to detention stemming from armed conflict with non state actors may achieve victory, but in an academic, and, practically speaking, pyrrhic sense. Arguing that the Geneva Conventions for Prisoners and Civilians do not, on their face, apply to members of al-Qaeda or the Taliban may be correct, and in more than one way. But in so arguing, the deconstructionist approach removes a large portion of intemationally recognized and accepted provisions for regulating detention associated with armed conflict—^the Geneva Conventions—^while leaving the underlying question of how to govern detention unanswered. At some point, even the deconstmctionist must shift to positivism and propose an altemative, an altemative we submit would inevitably resemble that which is already extant in the law of war. Moreover, while there has been discussion about the strained application of the Geneva Conventions and Additional Protocols to states combating transnational terrorism, attempts at a new convention have gained little traction. Our approach is more an attempt at pragmatism than radicalism—there are individuals currently detained, purportedly indefinitely and under the law of war. Yet despite years of such detention, two administrations have provided little if any information on what exactly such detention means, how and by what it is govemed, and if and how it ends. Conflating aspects of intemationally recognized law of war conventions allows for a transparent process that could be promulgated now. Whether for the up to fifty or so individuals currently detained at Guantanamo or for those who may be detained in the future, we posit that the law of war provides a legitimate model for indefinite detention. And, as the Walsh Report recognized,^' the longer detainees are held, the more concern for their individual situations must be given. We therefore analyze the complete protections provided by the law of war and advocate that all of them, over time and to varying degrees, be applied to the detainees in Guantanamo. In this way, detention under the laws of war can provide a humane system of indefinite detention that strikes the right balance between the security of the nation and the rights of individuals

#### Perm do the plan and all non mutually exclusive parts of the alt- we defend the plan text but not the reps

#### Pragmatic reasoning is correct- prior questions cause policy failure

Kratochwil, IR Prof @ Columbia, 8 [Friedrich Kratochwil is Assistant Professor of International Relations at Columbia University, Pragmatism in International Relations “Ten points to ponder about pragmatism” p11-25]

Firstly, a pragmatic approach does not begin with objects or “things” (ontology), or with reason and method (epistemology), but with “acting” ( *prattein*), thereby preventing some false starts. Since, as historical beings placed in a specific situations, we do not have the luxury of deferring decisions until we have found the “truth”, we have to act and must do so always under time pressures and in the face of incomplete information. Precisely because the social world is characterised by strategic interactions, what a situation “is”, is hardly ever clear *ex ante*, because it is being “produced” by the actors and their interactions, and the multiple possibilities are rife with incentives for (dis)information. This puts a premium on quick diagnostic and cognitive shortcuts informing actors about the relevant features of the situation, and on leaving an alternative open (“plan B”) in case of unexpected difficulties.

 Instead of relying on certainty and universal validity gained through abstraction and controlled experiments, we know that completeness and attentiveness to detail, rather than to generality, matter.

#### Judicial action is a meaningful restraint, and debating judicial prez powers restraints is good

Serrano and Minami, ‘03 (Susan, Project Director, Equal Justice Society; J.D. 1998, William S. Richardson School of Law, University of Hawai', partner, Minami, Lew & Timaki, Asian Law Journal, Korematsu v. United States: A "Constant Caution" in a Time of Crisis, p. Lexis)

Today, a broadly conceived political identity is critical to the defense of civil liberties. In 1942, Japanese Americans stood virtually alone, without allies, and suffered the banishment of their entire race. Forty years later, Japanese Americans, supported by Americans of all colors, were able to extract an apology and redress from a powerful nation. That lesson of the need for political empowerment was made even more obvious after September 11, 2001, when Arab and Muslim American communities, politically isolated and besieged by hostility fueled by ignorance, became targets of violence and discrimination. In the aftermath of September 11, Japanese Americans knew from history that the United States, which turned on them in 1942, could repeat itself in 2001. Therefore, on September 12, 2001, the Japanese American Citizens' League, the oldest Asian American civil rights organization in the country, immediately issued a press release warning against racial discrimination against Arab and Muslim Americans and supporting their  [**[\*49]**](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=bee887063044547ab12532f483726d11&docnum=3&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAk&_md5=f0e31afba24c7755402ea0ead0b3cfb6&focBudTerms=%2522serrano%2522%20and%20%2522minami%2522%20and%20%2522korematsu%2522&focBudSel=all)  civil rights.n60 Other Japanese American individuals and groups have offered their friendship, political support, and solidarity with Arab and Muslim Americans. Japanese Americans also knew from their Redress experience that political power was the strongest antidote. The coram nobis legal teams understood the political dimensions of their cases and adopted a course of litigation that would discredit the Wartime Cases by undermining the legal argument that the Supreme Court had legitimized the World War II exclusion and detention. This impaired (though did not overturn) the value of Korematsu, Hirabayashi, and Yasui as legal precedents for mass imprisonments of any definable racial group without due process. The even larger vision of these cases, however, was the long-term education of the American public. Many still believed (and continue to believe) that there were valid reasons for incarcerating Japanese Americans en masse: the coram nobis cases strongly refuted that notion and boldly illuminated the essentially political nature of the judicial system. In doing so, the coram nobis cases have contributed to the public's education about the frailty of civil rights and the evanescence of justice in our courts. As such, these cases highlight the need for continuing political activism and constant vigilance to protect our civil rights. In today's climate of fear and uncertainty, we must engage ourselves to assure that the vast national security regime does not overwhelm the civil liberties of vulnerable groups. This means exercising our political power, making our dissents heard, publicizing injustices done to our communities as well as to others, and enlisting allies from diverse communities. Concretely, this may mean joining others' struggles in the courts, Congress, schools and union halls; organizing protests against secret arrests, incarcerations, and deportations; building coalitions with other racial communities; writing op-ed essays or letters to politicians; launching media campaigns; donating money; and writing essays and articles.n61 Through these various ways, "our task is to compel our institutions, particularly the courts, to be vigilant, to "protect all.'" n62 The lesson of the Wartime Cases and coram nobis cases taken together is not that the government may target an entire ethnic group in the name of national security; the cases teach us instead that civil rights and liberties are best protected by strongly affirming their place in our national character, especially in times of national crisis. As Fred Korematsu avowed nearly twenty years ago, we must not let our governmental  **[[\*50]](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=bee887063044547ab12532f483726d11&docnum=3&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAk&_md5=f0e31afba24c7755402ea0ead0b3cfb6&focBudTerms=%2522serrano%2522%20and%20%2522minami%2522%20and%20%2522korematsu%2522&focBudSel=all)**  institutions mistreat another racial group in such a manner again. To do this, we must "collectively [turn] the lessons learned, the political and economic capital gained, the alliances forged and the spirit renewed, into many small and some grand advances against continuing harmful discrimination across America."n63 We must become, as Professor Yamamoto has argued, "present-day social actors, agents of justice, because real, hard injustices are occurring all around us every day to Asian Americans and other racial communities and beyond." n64

#### Courts solve bottom-up movements even if its circumvented- creates social movements

Paul Burstein, pub. date: 1991, Professor of sociology and political science at the University of Washington, “Legal Mobilization as a Social Movement Tactic: The Struggle for Equal Employment Opportunity”, JSTOR

What types of actions should we examine? For most sociologists, and for many political scientists studying social movements, the distinction between political action "inside the system" and that taking place "outside” is critical. They see groups resorting to a "politics of protest" when they are not allowed to use institutionalized channels to express their political demands or when such channels prove ineffective. Those interested in social movements see themselves as examining political behavior not directed into "proper channels"-that is, demonstrations, strikes and boycotts, as opposed to election campaigns, lobbying, or legal proceedings. This distinction is often useful, but at times it impedes progress in understanding political change. Those using outsider tactics are often trying, first, to gain access to power holders and, then, to influence their decisions. By defining their interests in terms of particular tactics, those studying social movements virtually force themselves to abandon the field of inquiry when the groups they are interested in begin to have influence-when they gain access to proper channels. I suggest that successful movements generally utilize proper channels as well as outsider tactics and that an adequate understanding of move- ments must therefore consider both. In fact, social movement analysts seem to recognize this, even if only implicitly. This implicit recognition takes two forms: in definitions of social movement and in analyses of particular movements. As for definitions, consider one of Tilly's recent attempts to define social movement (1984, p. 305; italics in original): "The term social movement applies most usefully to a sustained interac-tion between a specific set of authorities and various spokespersons for a given challenge to these authorities. The interaction is a coherent, bounded unit in roughly the same sense that a war or political campaign is a unit." Tilly struggles to limit the definition to outsider groups, but nothing in it excludes the legal tactics often employed by the civil rights movement, even though such tactics involved going through proper channels In fact, analysts of American social movements frequently ascribe im- portance to court cases. McAdam, for example, shows that a Supreme Court decision on segregation had a critical effect on the bus boycotts (1983, p. 741), while Harding (1984, pp. 3 93-95) argues that the decisions of a federal judge undermined the hegemony of white-supremacist ideol- ogy in Mississippi (also see Jenkins and Eckert 1986, p. 827). The role of the courts is seldom the subject of theorizing because so much emphasis is placed on demonstrating the importance of outsider tactics. Yet deep historical knowledge of particular movements consistently forces social movement analysts to report how critical court decisions are.

## congress cp

#### Doesn’t solve the aff:

#### 1- Rule of Law- SCOTUS decisions are modeled by Afghanistan, and key to rule of law protection- that’s Eviatar and Hecht

#### 2- abstention- congressional ruling doesn’t institute a role for the judiciary- makes presidential circumvention and adventurism inevitable

#### Perm do both

#### CP doesn’t solve and links to the net-benefit- Congressional statues would be reviewed by the Supreme Court, but wouldn’t be effective and would take years to solidify

Eviatar 10 (Daphne- Senior Associate in Human Rights First’s Law and Security Program, June 10, “Judges to Congress: Don't Legislate Indefinite Detention”, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/daphne-eviatar/judges-to-congress-dont-l\_b\_607801.html)

For months now, certain commentators and legislators have been arguing that Congress needs to pass a new law authorizing the indefinite detention without charge or trial of suspected terrorists and their supporters.¶ On its face, that would seem to violate some basic tenets of the U.S. Constitution. But the U.S. government is already detaining hundreds of suspects captured abroad at Guantanamo Bay and elsewhere. The question is whether Congress should expand that authority and define it in more detail.¶ Writers such as Benjamin Wittes of the Brookings Institution and lawmakers such as Senator Lindsey Graham of South Carolina argue that even though hundreds of people have been detained over the last eight years at Guantanamo Bay, the law that justifies their detention or mandates their release isn't clear, and Congress needs to step in and make new rules.¶ In fact, as a new report issued today by 16 former federal judges makes clear, that's nonsense. The people in the best position to decide when military detention is legal are already doing just that. The new report, published by Human Rights First and the Constitution Project, explains exactly how that process is working -- and demonstrates that it's actually working very well. Responding to a series of habeas corpus petitions, where Guantanamo detainees have asked the federal court to review the legality of their detentions, federal district court judges in Washington, D.C., have already issued written opinions concerning 50 different detainees that set out the legal standard for indefinite wartime detention, and which cases do and do not meet it.¶ The claim by Wittes and Graham that judges are somehow overstepping their bounds and usurping the role of Congress reflects a fundamental misunderstanding of how the federal courts and judges work. In fact, the courts are doing just what they're supposed to do: interpret the law.¶ The reason judges are so well-situated to explain the contours of U.S. detention authority is because, according to judicial rulings, the right to detain arises out of existing laws, including the Authorization for Use of Military Force against Terrorists, or AUMF, passed by Congress in 2001; the traditional law of war; and the U.S. Constitution.¶ Traditionally, a government at war can detain fighting members of the enemy's forces, under humane conditions, until the war is over. Although that authority is less clear when the government is fighting a loose coalition of insurgent forces around the world rather than another country, the Supreme Court has said that at least in some circumstances, pursuant to the AUMF, the United States can detain enemy fighters seized on the battlefield.¶ It's the Supreme Court's rulings on the subject, combined with the law of war and the mandates of the U.S. Constitution, that highly experienced federal judges have been applying to the habeas corpus cases that have come before them. Applying those rulings, they've developed a clear and consistent body of law that explains what kind of evidence the government needs to have amassed against a suspected insurgent to justify his military detention.¶ Under the D.C. District Court's rulings, for example, Fouad Al Rabiah, a 43-year-old, 240-pound, Kuwaiti Airways executive with a long history of volunteering for Islamic charities who'd been discharged from compulsory military service in Kuwait due to a knee injury, and who suffered from high blood pressure and chronic back pain, did not meet the requirement of being "part of" or having "substantially supported" al Qaeda, the Taliban or associated forces. Although seized while attempting to leave Afghanistan in 2001, by the time of Al Rabiah's hearing, even the government had decided the witnesses who claimed he'd helped al Qaeda weren't credible. The government's own interrogators didn't believe his "confessions," which the court determined had been coerced and were "entirely incredible."¶ On the other hand, Fawzi Al Odah, also Kuwaiti, did meet the law's detention standards. The same judge found that he'd attended a Taliban training camp, learned to use an AK-47, traveled with other armed fighters on a route common to jihadists, and took directions from Taliban leaders - all making it more likely than not that he was a member of Taliban fighting forces.¶ Still, despite the courts' careful analysis in these cases, Congress could step in and write its own new law on indefinite detention. But how can any one statute possibly address all the vastly different factual scenarios, many spanning several countries and decades, that constitute the government's claims that any particular individual is detainable? What's more, any new law will still have to meet the requirements of the U.S. Constitution, and the Supreme Court gets the ultimate say on that. Any new statute passed by Congress, then, would likely be challenged as soon as it's applied, causing more confusion about what the law really is until the U.S. Supreme Court weighs in on that new statute several years later.¶ The federal judges of the D.C. District Court and Court of Appeals are already way ahead of that game. In addition to the trial court opinions, the appellate court recently issued its own opinion setting out the law of detention and the government's constitutional authority. That decision may be appealed to the Supreme Court, whose opinion would set out the binding standard that every judge and future U.S. administration will have to follow.¶ The upshot of all this is that if Congress legislates some new detention standard now, it will actually take a lot longer to get a clearly-defined and binding law that guides the government than it would if Congress just let the courts continue to play the role they're supposed to: deciding the legality of government detention.¶ Wittes, Graham and others may secretly be hoping that Congress will legislate in this area anyway and try to expand the government's indefinite detention autuhority beyond Guantanamo Bay to reach even suspects arrested on U.S. soil. But that would create a whole new constitutional firestorm, resulting in exactly the opposite of what they say they're after: a clear and reliable statement of the law.

#### The plan leads to the CP- but congress acting alone can’t solve extraterritorial rights or regulate detention

Azmy 10 (Professor of Law, Seton Hall Law School. The author was counsel to Murat Kurnaz, one of the petitioners in Boumediene v. Bush, and participated in much of the briefing in the preand post-Boumediene litigation Executive Detention, Boumediene, and the New Common Law of HabeasIOWA LAW REVIEW [2010])

Thus the opinions of the plurality and Justice Souter interpreted silence or ambiguity in the AUMF differently. This, of course, produced a significant practical consequence: the plurality upheld a novel and questionable use of executive power—a judgment that even led some commentators to conclude that Hamdi represented a significant victory for the Bush Administration.43 Yet, despite proposing differing outcomes, O’Connor’s plurality and Souter’s concurrence fall methodologically within the Youngstown framework: each opinion looks to whether Congress delegated the executive action (though the two employ meaningfully different burdens of proof), and each can claim that a coordinate branch of government supported its decision to uphold or reject the asserted lawful delegation of power. Moreover, both the plurality and the Souter concurrence concluded that, while Congress may have authorized the detention of “enemy combatants” such as Hamdi—i.e. persons who actually engaged in hostilities in a zone of combat44—judicial supervision of Hamdi’s habeas petition and scrutiny of the Executive’s “enemy combatant” classification must be meaningful, and not just a rubber-stamp of the Executive’s claimed superior institutional judgment.45 Thus, drawing upon common-law balancing principles it developed in the due-process context, the Court insisted that Hamdi “receive notice of the factual basis for his [enemy combatant] classification, and a fair opportunity to rebut the Government’s factual assertions before a neutral decisionmaker.” In Rasul, the Court held that U.S. courts had jurisdiction under the habeas statute, 28 U.S.C. § 2241, to hear petitions filed by detainees held in Guantanamo, despite the Government’s protest that the United States did not exercise formal sovereignty over that territory.47 The Court deemed inapplicable a canon of judicial construction which presumes that statutes do not reach extraterritorially.48 Because of Guantanamo’s peculiar status as a territory over which the United States exercises “complete jurisdiction and control,” it is functionally a part of U.S. territory.49 Justice Stevens’s majority opinion was relatively opaque about whether the habeas statute (1) was limited to the arguably unique territorial status of Guantanamo, as much of the Court’s rhetoric seemed to suggest, or (2) could extend to all locations where U.S. forces hold foreign prisoners, meaning the courts have personal jurisdiction over respondents50—in Justice Scalia’s prophecy, “to the four corners of the earth.”51 Scholars have variously viewed the Court’s attempt to harmonize the habeas statute’s unlimited provision for habeas jurisdiction with the peculiar circumstances of the Administration’s detention policy as “distort[ed]”52 or “entirely plausible.”53 Nevertheless, the Court’s interpretation appears consistent with the Triad’s functionalist perspective, by rejecting the talismanic significance of sovereignty or citizenship rules and by ensuring that Congress and the judiciary together have a role in checking executive-branch operations. More fundamentally, the Court signaled to the Executive that it could not locate detention operations completely outside the constraints of law.54

#### Perm do the CP then the Plan- avoids the net-benefit because congress shields the courts

#### Rule of law deficits from detention policies kills US-Russia engagement- makes authoritarian crackdowns inevitable

Sarah E. Mendelson 9 is director, Human Rights and Security Initiative, CSIS. "U.S.-Russian Relations and the Democracy and Rule of Law Deficit" tcf.org/assets/downloads/tcf-russiarelations.pdf, DOA: 7-23-13, y2k

Since the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991, every U.S. administration has considered Russia’s political trajectory a national security concern.1 Based on campaign statements and President Barack Obama’s early personnel choices, this perspective likely will affect policy toward Russia in some way for the foreseeable future.2 While the Obama administration plans to cooperate with Moscow on a number of issues, it will find that Russia’s current deficit in the areas of democracy and the rule of law complicate the relationship and may, in some cases, undermine attempts at engagement. The organizers of the Century Foundation Russia Working Group have labeled this policy problem “coping with creeping authoritarianism.” Results from nearly a dozen large, random sample surveys in Russia since 2001 that examine the views and experiences of literally thousands of Russians, combined with other research and newspaper reporting, all suggest the current democracy and rule of law deficit is rather stark.3 The deficit does not diminish the importance of Russia in international affairs, nor is it meant to suggest the situation is unique to Russia. The internal conditions of many states have negative international security implications. As Europeans repeatedly pointed out during the administration of George W. Bush, U.S. departures from the rule of law made the United States increasingly problematic as a global partner, whether through the use of force in Iraq or the manner in which the United States pursued and handled terrorist suspects. In fact, coping with authoritarian trends in Russia (and elsewhere) will involve changes in U.S. policies that have, on the surface, nothing to do with Russia. Bush administration counterterrorism policies that authorized torture, indefinite detention of terrorist suspects, and the rendering of detainees to secret prisons and Guantánamo have had numerous negative unintended consequences for U.S. national security, including serving as a recruitment tool for al Qaeda and insurgents in Iraq.4 Less often recognized, these policies also have undercut whatever leverage the United States had, as well as limited the effectiveness of American decision-makers, to push back on authoritarian policies adopted by, among others, the Putin administration. At its worst, American departures from the rule of law may have enabled abuse inside Russia. These departures certainly left human rights defenders isolated.5 Repairing the damage to U.S. soft power and reversing the departure from human rights norms that characterized the Bush administration’s counterterrorism policies will provide the Obama administration strategic and moral authority and improve the ability of the United States to work with allies. It also can have positive consequences for Obama’s Russia policy. The changes that need to be made in U.S. counterterrorism policies, however politically sensitive, are somewhat more straightforward than the adjustments that must be made to respond to the complex issues concerning Russia. The Obama administration must determine how best to engage Russian leaders and the population on issues of importance to the United States, given Russia’s poor governance structures, the stark drop in oil prices, Russia’s continued aspirations for great power status, and the rather serious resentment by Russians concerning American dominance and prior policies. The policy puzzle, therefore, is how to do all this without, at the same time, sacrificing our values and undercutting (yet again) U.S. soft power.

#### US-Russia engagement is critical to prevent extinction

Allison and Blackwill 11 (Graham, Director – Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs at Harvard’s Kennedy School, and Former Assistant Secretary of Defense, and Robert D. Blackwill, Senior Fellow – Council on Foreign Relations, “10 Reasons Why Russia Still Matters”, Politico, 2011, http://dyn.politico.com/printstory.cfm?uuid=161EF282-72F9-4D48-8B9C-C5B3396CA0E6)

That central point is that Russia matters a great deal to a U.S. government seeking to defend and advance its national interests. Prime Minister Vladimir Putin’s decision to return next year as president makes it all the more critical for Washington to manage its relationship with Russia through coherent, realistic policies. No one denies that Russia is a dangerous, difficult, often disappointing state to do business with. We should not overlook its many human rights and legal failures. Nonetheless, Russia is a player whose choices affect our vital interests in nuclear security and energy. It is key to supplying 100,000 U.S. troops fighting in Afghanistan and preventing Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons. Ten realities require U.S. policymakers to advance our nation’s interests by engaging and working with Moscow. First, Russia remains the only nation that can erase the United States from the map in 30 minutes. As every president since John F. Kennedy has recognized, Russia’s cooperation is critical to averting nuclear war. Second, Russia is our most consequential partner in preventing nuclear terrorism. Through a combination of more than $11 billion in U.S. aid, provided through the Nunn-Lugar Cooperative Threat Reduction program, and impressive Russian professionalism, two decades after the collapse of the “evil empire,” not one nuclear weapon has been found loose. Third, Russia plays an essential role in preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons and missile-delivery systems. As Washington seeks to stop Iran’s drive toward nuclear weapons, Russian choices to sell or withhold sensitive technologies are the difference between failure and the possibility of success. Fourth, Russian support in sharing intelligence and cooperating in operations remains essential to the U.S. war to destroy Al Qaeda and combat other transnational terrorist groups. Fifth, Russia provides a vital supply line to 100,000 U.S. troops fighting in Afghanistan. As U.S. relations with Pakistan have deteriorated, the Russian lifeline has grown ever more important and now accounts for half all daily deliveries. Sixth, Russia is the world’s largest oil producer and second largest gas producer. Over the past decade, Russia has added more oil and gas exports to world energy markets than any other nation. Most major energy transport routes from Eurasia start in Russia or cross its nine time zones. As citizens of a country that imports two of every three of the 20 million barrels of oil that fuel U.S. cars daily, Americans feel Russia’s impact at our gas pumps. Seventh, Moscow is an important player in today’s international system. It is no accident that Russia is one of the five veto-wielding, permanent members of the U.N. Security Council, as well as a member of the G-8 and G-20. A Moscow more closely aligned with U.S. goals would be significant in the balance of power to shape an environment in which China can emerge as a global power without overturning the existing order. Eighth, Russia is the largest country on Earth by land area, abutting China on the East, Poland in the West and the United States across the Arctic. This territory provides transit corridors for supplies to global markets whose stability is vital to the U.S. economy. Ninth, Russia’s brainpower is reflected in the fact that it has won more Nobel Prizes for science than all of Asia, places first in most math competitions and dominates the world chess masters list. The only way U.S. astronauts can now travel to and from the International Space Station is to hitch a ride on Russian rockets. The co-founder of the most advanced digital company in the world, Google, is Russian-born Sergei Brin. Tenth, Russia’s potential as a spoiler is difficult to exaggerate. Consider what a Russian president intent on frustrating U.S. international objectives could do — from stopping the supply flow to Afghanistan to selling S-300 air defense missiles to Tehran to joining China in preventing U.N. Security Council

#### Authoritarian crackdowns make revolts inevitable

Freeland and Gutterman 12 – Chrystia Freeland and Steve Gutterman, writers for Reuters, January 17, 2012, “Russia faces violent revolution if it doesn’t embrace democracy, billionaire Putin challenger declares”, <http://news.nationalpost.com/2012/01/17/russia-faces-violent-revolution-if-it-doesnt-embrace-democracy-billionaire-putin-challenger-declares/>

MOSCOW — Mikhail Prokhorov, a super-rich tycoon challenging Vladimir Putin for Russia’s presidency in March, said his country faced the danger of violent revolution if it did not break conservative resistance and move quickly to democracy. Prokhorov, a billionaire bachelor long seen more as playboy than politician, told The Freeland File on reuters.com Russians had shaken off a post-Soviet apathy and were now “just crazy about politics.” He denied accusations he was a Kremlin tool, let into the race to split the opposition and lend democratic legitimacy to a vote Putin seems almost certain to win. Putin is seeking to return to the Kremlin and rule until at least 2018, but protests against alleged fraud in a December 4 parliamentary vote have exposed growing discontent with the system he has dominated for 12 years. “What worked before does not work now. Look in the streets. People are not happy,” Prokhorov, 46, said in the interview beneath the windowed dome that soars above his spacious office on a central Moscow boulevard close to the Kremlin. “It is time to change,” said Prokhorov, ranked by Forbes magazine as Russia’s third-richest person, with an $18-billion metals-to-banking empire that includes the New Jersey Nets basketball team in the United States. “Stability at any price is no longer acceptable for Russians.” But Prokhorov made clear he considers revolution equally unacceptable for a country with grim memories of a century of hardship, war and upheaval starting with Vladimir Lenin’s 1917 Bolshevik Revolution, instead calling for “very fast evolution.” “I am against any revolution, because I know the history of Russia. Every time we have revolution, it was a very bloody period,” he said. The son of a Soviet sports official, Prokhorov has a basketball player’s 204-cm (6-foot-8) frame, a narrow face and a head of short-cut hair graying around the edges. In a dark suit and blue shirt that looked modest for a Russian tycoon, he sat straight and spoke in English. Public political consciousness is on the rise after years of apathy. The Soviet mentality is fading as a generation of Russians who “don’t know who Lenin was” grows up, he said. The country was finally ripe for change. “We now have all the pieces in place to move very fast to being a real democracy,” Prokhorov said. But he suggested there was a mounting battle in the ruling elite between liberals like himself and conservatives “ready to pay any price” to maintain the status quo. Russia, he said, could face a bloody revolution if opponents of reform prevail. “If there are no changes in Russia, from day to day this risk will increase,” Prokhorov said. “Because 15, 20 percent of the population, the most active ones living in the big cities, want to live in a democratic country.”

#### Revolts lead to miscalc and nuclear war

Pry 99 (Peter Vincent, Former US Intelligence Operative, War Scare: U.S.-Russia on the Nuclear Brink, netlibrary)

Russian internal troubles—such as a leadership crisis, coup, or civil war—could aggravate Russia’s fears of foreign aggression and lead to a miscalculation of U.S. intentions and to nuclear overreaction. While this may sound like a complicated and improbable chain of events, Russia’s story in the 1990s is one long series of domestic crises that have all too often been the source of nuclear close calls. The war scares of August 1991 and October 1993 arose out of coup attempts. The civil war in Chechnya caused a leadership crisis in Moscow, which contributed to the nuclear false alarm during Norway’s launch of a meteorological rocket in January 1995. Nuclear war arising from Russian domestic crises is a threat the West did not face, or at least faced to a much lesser extent, during the Cold War. The Russian military’s continued fixation on surprise-attack scenarios into the 1990s, combined with Russia’s deepening internal problems, has created a situation in which the United States might find itself the victim of a preemptive strike for no other reason than a war scare born of Russian domestic troubles. At least in nuclear confrontations of the 1950s–1970s—during the Berlin crisis, Cuban missile crisis, and 1973 Middle East war—both sides knew they were on the nuclear brink. There was opportunity to avoid conflict through negotiation or deescalation. The nuclear war scares of the 1980s and 1990s have been one-sided Russian affairs, with the West ignorant that it was in grave peril.

## court cap

#### No spill up from individual case to total military policy

#### Stability will survive without US hegemony

Fettweis ‘10 (Chris Fettweis, Professor of national security affairs @ U.S. Naval War College, Georgetown University Press, “Dangerous times?: the international politics of great power peace” Google Books)

Simply stated, the hegemonic stability theory proposes that international peace is only possible when there is one country strong enough to make and enforce a set of rules. At the height of Pax Romana between 27 BC and 180 AD, for example, Rome was able to bring unprecedented peace and security to the Mediterranean. The Pax Britannica of the nineteenth century brought a level of stability to the high seas. Perhaps the current era is peaceful because the United States has established a de facto Pax Americana where no power is strong enough to challenge its dominance, and because it has established a set of rules that a generally in the interests of all countries to follow. Without a benevolent hegemony, some strategists fear, instability may break out around the globe. Unchecked conflicts could cause humanitarian disaster and, in today’s interconnected world economic turmoil that would ripple throughout global financial markets. If the United States were to abandon its commitments abroad, argued Art, the world would “become a more dangerous place” and, sooner or later, that would “rebound to America’s detriment.” If the massive spending that the United States engages in actually produces stability in the international political and economic systems, then perhaps internationalism is worthwhile. **There are good theoretical and empirical reasons, however, the belief that U.S. hegemony is not the primary cause of the current era of stability.** First of all, the **hegemonic stability argument overstates** the **role that the United States plays in the system. No country is strong enough to police the world on its own. The only way there can be stability in the community of great powers is if self-policing occurs, ifs states have decided that their interest are served by peace. If no pacific normative shift had occurred** among the great powers that was filtering down through the system, then **no amount of international constabulary work by the United States could maintain stability**. Likewise, if it is true that such a shift has occurred, then most of what the hegemon spends to bring stability would be wasted. **The 5 percent of the world’s population that live in the United States simple could not force peace upon an unwilling 95**. At the risk of beating the metaphor to death, the **United States may be patrolling a neighborhood that has already rid itself of crime. Stability and unipolarity may be simply** coincidental**.** In order for U.S. hegemony to be the reason for global stability, the rest of the world would have to expect reward for good behavior and fear punishment for bad. Since the end of the Cold War, the United States has not always proven to be especially eager to engage in humanitarian interventions abroad. Even rather incontrovertible evidence of genocide has not been sufficient to inspire action. **Hegemonic stability can only take credit for influence those decisions that would have ended in war without the presence, whether physical or psychological**, of the United States. **Ethiopia and Eritrea are hardly the only states that could go to war without the slightest threat of U.S. intervention. Since most of the world today is free to fight without U.S. involvement, something else must be at work. Stability exists in many places where no hegemony is present.** Second, the **limited empirical evidence we have suggests that there is little connection between the relative level of U.S. activism and international stability.** During the **1990s** the **United States cut back on its defense spending fairly substantially,** By 1998 the United States was spending $100 billion less on defense in real terms than it had in 1990. To internationalists, defense hawks, and other believers in hegemonic stability this irresponsible "peace dividend" endangered both national and global security "No serious analyst of American military capabilities," argued Kristol and Kagan, "doubts that the defense budget has been cut much too far to meet Americas responsibilities to itself and to world peace."" **If** the **pacific trends were due not to U.S. hegemony but a strengthening norm against interstate war**, however, **one would not have expected an increase in global instability and violence. The verdict from the past two decades is fairly plain: The world grew more peaceful while the United States cut its forces. No state seemed to believe that its security was endangered by a less-capable Pentagon, or at least none took any action that would suggest such a belief.** No militaries were enhanced to address power vacuums; **no security dilemmas drove mistrust and arms races; no regional balancing occurred once the stabilizing presence of the U.S. military was diminished.** The **rest of the world acted as if the threat ofinternational war was not a pressing concern, despite the reduction in U.S. capabilities**. The incidence and magnitude of global conflict declined while the United States cut its military spending under President Clinton, and it kept declining as the Bush Administration ramped spending back up. **No complex statistical analysis should be necessary to reach the conclusion that the two are unrelated**. It is also worth noting for our purposes that the United States was no less safe.

#### Normal means is the DC circuit court acting and SCOTUS denying cert to make the aff a law- no link to the DA

Horowitz 13 (J.D. Candidate, 2014, Fordham University School of Law. Captain, U.S. Army, participating in the Funded Legal Education Program, April, “SYMPOSIUM: THE GOALS OF ANTITRUST: NOTE: CREATING A MORE MEANINGFUL DETENTION STATUTE: LESSONS LEARNED FROM HEDGES V. OBAMA”, Lexis)

This part examines how the D.C. District and Circuit courts struggled with the legal boundaries of detention while evaluating the habeas corpus petitions of detainees from 2008 to 2012. It focuses on how the D.C. courts analyzed what would become the three criteria for detention in section 1021(b)(2) of the NDAA: (1) being "part of" Al Qaeda or the Taliban; (2) "substantially supporting" Al Qaeda or the Taliban; and (3) being part of "associated forces" of Al Qaeda or the Taliban. n143 The Supreme Court has not decided the merits of a detention case since Boumediene in 2008. n144 Additionally, in 2011 the Supreme Court denied certiorari to six different Guantanamo detainee cases appealed from the [\*2872] D.C. Circuit. n145 As a result of its continued abstention, the Supreme Court has had little impact in shaping the substantive parameters of executive detention. n146 The substantive law of executive detention has been primarily created by the D.C. District Court and the D.C. Circuit as they evaluate habeas corpus petitions from detainees held at Guantanamo Bay. n147 As the law has evolved since 2008, the D.C. courts have often applied different or changing standards, and some believe that "the D.C. Circuit's opinions almost uniformly favor the government." n148 Additionally, some commentators have expressed concerns about "the habeas process as a lawmaking device" and fear that the standards established by the D.C. Courts are "interim steps" or "a kind of draft" until the Supreme Court eventually steps in to resolve the issues. n149 The judges of the D.C. courts recognize that they are creating law. In their opinions, they have often commented on the lack of guidance from the Supreme Court n150 and their significant role in shaping substantive detention law with each decision. n151 The subsections below focus on the three detention criteria listed in section 1021(b)(2) of the NDAA. Although these criteria were codified in the NDAA in late 2011, the D.C. courts struggled with their meaning in the years after the Boumediene decision in 2008. As one court admitted in [\*2873] 2010, "much of what our Constitution requires for this context remains unsettled." n152

#### Capital is bulletproof

Gibson 12 (James L. Gibson, Sidney W. Souers Professor of Government (Department of Political Science), Professor of African and African-American Studies, and Director of the Program on Citizenship and Democratic Values (Weidenbaum Center on the Economy, Government, and Public Policy) at Washington University in St. Louis; and Fellow at the Centre for Comparative and International Politics and Professor Extraordinary in Political Science at Stellenbosch University (South Africa), 7/15/12, “Public Reverence for the United States Supreme Court: Is the Court Invincible?”, <http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2107587>)

Political scientists and legal scholars continue to be obsessed with the so-called countermajoritarian dilemma created by the United States Supreme Court’s lack of accountability, particularly when coupled with its immense policy-making powers. Especially when the Supreme Court makes decisions that seem to fly in the face of public preferences—as in Kelo v. New London 1 and Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission 2—concerns about the function of the institution within American democracy sharpen. Indeed, some seem to believe that by making policies opposed by the majority of the American people the Court undermines its fundamental legitimacy, its most valuable political capital. The underlying assumption of these worries about the Supreme Court’s legitimacy is that dissatisfaction with the Court’s decisions leads to the withdrawal, or at least diminution, of support for the institution. So when the Court decides a high profile case like Citizens United in a widely unpopular direction, it is logical to assume that the Court’s legitimacy suffers. Again, the assumption is that legitimacy flows from pleasing decisions, but it is undermined by displeasing decisions. At least some empirical evidence directly contradicts this assumption. In what is perhaps the most salient and politically significant decision of the last few decades, the Supreme Court’s decision in Bush v. Gore 3 effectively awarded the presidency to George W. Bush. One might have expected that this decision would undermine the Court’s legitimacy, at least with Democrats and probably with African-Americans as well. Yet several empirical research projects have indicated that, if anything, the Court’s legitimacy was boosted by this decision, even among Democrats and African-Americans. 4 Bush v. Gore had great potential to chip away at the Court’s legitimacy—it was a deeply divided 5-4 decision; divided by the justices’ partisanships as well; it extended the Court’s authority into an area of law in which the Court had generally deferred to the states; the decision was severely criticized by some, with many in the legal academy describing the decision as a “self-inflicted wound”; 5 and, of course, it was a decision of immense political importance. If Bush v. Gore did not subtract from the Court’s institutional legitimacy, it is difficult to imagine less momentous decisions undermining judicial legitimacy. Political scientists have been studying the legitimacy of the Supreme Court for decades now, and several well-established empirical findings have emerged. The findings relevant to the countermajoritarian dilemma can be summarized in a series of nutshells: ● The Supreme Court is the most legitimate political institution within the contemporary United States. Numerous studies have shown that the American mass public extends great legitimacy to the Court; typically, Congress is depicted as being dramatically less legitimate than the Supreme Court. Indeed, some have gone so far as to describe the Supreme Court as “bulletproof,” and therefore able to get away with just about any ruling, no matter how unpopular. And indeed, the United States Supreme Court may be one of the most legitimate high courts in the world.

#### Hedges appeal coming out- the court will rule on INDEFINITE DETENTION

RT 9/3 (Supreme Court to rule on fate of indefinite detention for Americans under NDAA http://rt.com/usa/ndaa-scotus-hedges-suit-359/)

The United States Supreme Court is being asked to hear a federal lawsuit challenging the military’s legal ability to indefinitely detain persons under the National Defense Authorization Act of 2012, or NDAA. According to Pulitzer Prize-winning journalist Chris Hedges — a co-plaintiff in the case — attorneys will file paperwork in the coming days requesting that the country’s high court weigh in on Hedges v. Obama and determine the constitutionality of a controversial provision that has continuously generated criticism directed towards the White House since signed into law by President Barack Obama almost [two years ago](http://rt.com/trends/national-defense-authorization-act-indefinite-detention/) and defended adamantly by his administration in federal court in the years since.

## deference

**No terror**

**Mueller and Stewart 12** [John Mueller is Senior Research Scientist at the Mershon Center for International Security Studies and Adjunct Professor in the Department of Political Science, both at Ohio State University, and Senior Fellow at the Cato Institute in Washington, D.C. Mark G. Stewart is Australian Research Council Professorial Fellow and Professor and Director at the Centre for Infrastructure Performance and Reliability at the University of Newcastle in Australia, “The Terrorism Delusion”, International Security, Vol. 37, No. 1 (Summer 2012), pp. 81–110]

In the eleven years since the September 11 attacks, no terrorist has been able to detonate even a primitive bomb in the United States, and except for the four explosions in the London transportation system in 2005, neither has any in the United Kingdom. Indeed, the only method by which Islamist terrorists have managed to kill anyone in the United States since September 11 has been with gunfire—inflicting a total of perhaps sixteen deaths over the period (cases 4, 26, 32).11 This limited capacity is impressive because, at one time, small-scale terrorists in the United States were quite successful in setting off bombs. Noting that the scale of the September 11 attacks has “tended to obliterate America’s memory of pre-9/11 terrorism,” Brian Jenkins reminds us (and we clearly do need reminding) that the 1970s witnessed sixty to seventy terrorist incidents, mostly bombings, on U.S. soil every year.12 The situation seems scarcely different in Europe and other Western locales. Michael Kenney, who has interviewed dozens of government officials and intelligence agents and analyzed court documents, has found that, in sharp contrast with the boilerplate characterizations favored by the DHS and with the imperatives listed by Dalmia, Islamist militants in those locations are **operationally unsophisticated,** short on know-how, **prone to making mistakes, poor at planning,** and limited in their capacity to learn.13 Another study documents the difficulties of network coordination that continually threaten the terrorists’ operational unity, trust, cohesion, and ability to act collectively.14 In addition, although some of the plotters in the cases targeting the United States harbored visions of toppling large buildings, destroying airports, setting off dirty bombs, or bringing down the Brooklyn Bridge (cared apartment, some of which did not even exist (case 15). In Norway, a neo-Nazi terrorist on his way to bomb a synagogue took a tram going the wrong way and dynamited a mosque instead.15 Although the efforts of would-be terrorists have often seemed **pathetic, even comical or absurd,** the comedy remains a dark one. Left to their own devices, at least a few of these often inept and almost always self-deluded individuals could eventually have committed some serious, if small-scale, damage.16

#### Framing issue- you have no ev tha Detention causes terrorism

Combs 12 (Casey- writer for the Diplomatic Courier and freelance associate for the Foreign Policy Association, citing Martin Sheinin, professor of international law and UN Special Rapporteur on human rights and counterterrorism from 2005 to 2011, January 12, “US Counterterrorism Law May “Backfire”: UN”, http://foreignpolicyblogs.com/2012/01/12/new-us-counterterrorism-law-may-backfire-un/)

When the “global war on terror” was waged following 9/11, he said, the possibility of indefinite detention was extended to terrorism, “far beyond genuine situations of international or even non-international armed conflict. And it extends indefinite detention to persons who are not combatants. For instance, persons who are held to have provided substantial support to terrorism would be subject to indefinite detention.” Against that background, Mr. Sheinan suggested several ways in which violating human rights in the course of countering terrorism can “backfire.” Rights violations can “add to causes of terrorism,” he said, “both by perpetuating ‘root causes’ that involve the alienation of communities and by providing ‘triggering causes’ through which bitter individuals make the morally inexcusable decision to turn to methods of terrorism.” Further, “these kinds of legal provisions are always open for bad faith copying by repressive governments that will use them for their own political purposes.” Though such copying was found to be less common than expected, “repressive governments may do so for their own political purposes.” “It is hard to see any practical advantage gained through the NDAA. It is just another form of what I call symbolic legislation, enacted because the legislators want to be seen as being ‘tough’ or as ‘doing something.’ The law is written as just affirming existing powers and practices and hence not providing any meaningful new tools in the combat of terrorism,” he concluded. With Washington simultaneously fostering democratic transitions across the Middle East and North Africa and gambling on military exits from Iraq and Afghanistan, such “backfires” may well hamper development of the rule of law and respect for human rights when they are needed most.

#### t the president needs detention powers

#### Abstention no-links the disad- courts condition deference on executive following procedure.

#### The abstention advantage outweighs and solves the disadvantage

POSNER 2011 - Kirkland & Ellis Professor, University of Chicago Law School (Eric A. Posner, “Deference To The Executive In The United States After September 11: Congress, The Courts, And The Office Of Legal Counsel”, <http://www.harvard-jlpp.com/wp-content/uploads/2012/01/PosnerFinal.pdf>)

The larger and more striking point of the example is that, even during emergencies, when the stakes are high and time is of the essence, agents should follow rules rather than improvise. In this way, agents should be constrained.^^ This argument has potentially radical implications. Recall that the conventional objection to deference is that the risk of executive abuse exceeds the benefits of giving the executive a free hand to counter al Qaeda. Professor Holmes argues—although at fimes he hedges—that in fact the benefits of giving the President a free hand are zero: A constrained executive, like a constrained medical technician, is more effective than an unconstrained executive. If the benefits of lack of constraint are zero, then the deference thesis is clearly wrong. Constraints both prevent executive abuses such as violations of civil liberties and ensure that counterterrorism policy is most effective.

Suspension clause ruling avoids the link, prevents snowballing and maintains review

Garrett 12 (Brandon, Roy L. and Rosamund Woodruff Morgan Professor of Law, University of Virginia School of Law. HABEAS CORPUS AND DUE PROCESSCORNELL LAW REVIEW [Vol. 98:47] page lexis)

Congress and the Executive have largely accommodated, in the wake of Boumediene, a system in which judicial review plays a central role in detention cases, even if judges remain deferential both to congressional authorization for detention and executive procedures for screening and release of detainees.57 The Suspension Clause may facilitate this equilibrium better than a due process approach, which would focus more on procedure and less on substance. A judge asking whether the Due Process Clause was violated focuses on the minimal adequacy of general procedures, which may not necessarily require a judicial process. A judge asking whether the Suspension Clause was violated asks a different question: whether the process preserves an adequate and effective role for federal judges to independently review authorization of each individual detainee. The specific question for the judge is whether a person is in fact detained lawfully, which is a fundamental question of substance. Despite connections between habeas corpus and due process, the habeas judge’s preoccupation with authorization instead of procedure suggests important reasons for the concepts to remain separate. Habeas corpus and due process can share an inverse relationship,58 meaning that the Suspension Clause can continue to do its work standing alone.

# 1AR Court Capital DA

### 1AR Heg

#### No potential conflicts for hotspots to escilate

Fettweis ‘11 (Christopher J. Fettweis, Department of Political Science, Tulane University, Free Riding or Restraint? Examining European Grand Strategy, Comparative Strategy, 30:316–332, EBSCO, September 26, 2011)

Assertions that without the combination of U.S. capabilities, presence and commitments instability would return to Europe and the Pacific Rim are usually rendered in rather vague language. If the United States were to decrease its commitments abroad, argued Robert Art, “the world will become a more dangerous place and, sooner or later, that will redound to America’s detriment.”53 From where would this danger arise? Who precisely would do the fighting, and over what issues? Without the United States, would Europe really descend into Hobbesian anarchy? Would the Japanese attack mainland China again, to see if they could fare better this time around? Would the Germans and French have another go at it? In other words, where exactly is hegemony is keeping the peace? With one exception, these questions are rarely addressed. That exception is in the Pacific Rim. Some analysts fear that a de facto surrender of U.S. hegemony would lead to a rise of Chinese influence. Bradley Thayer worries that Chinese would become “the language of diplomacy, trade and commerce, transportation and navigation, the internet, world sport, and global culture,” and that Beijing would come to “dominate science and technology, in all its forms” to the extent that soon the world would witness a Chinese astronaut who not only travels to the Moon, but “plants the communist flag on Mars, and perhaps other planets in the future.”54 Indeed China is the only other major power that has increased its military spending since the end of the Cold War, even if it still is only about 2 percent of its GDP. Such levels of effort do not suggest a desire to compete with, much less supplant, the United States. The much-ballyhooed, decade-long military buildup has brought Chinese spending up to somewhere between one-tenth and one-fifth of the U.S. level. It is hardly clear that a restrained United States would invite Chinese regional, must less global, political expansion. Fortunately one need not ponder for too long the horrible specter of a red flag on Venus, since on the planet Earth, where war is no longer the dominant form of conflict resolution, the threats posed by even a rising China would not be terribly dire. The dangers contained in the terrestrial security environment are less severe than ever before. Believers in the pacifying power of hegemony ought to keep in mind a rather basic tenet: When it comes to policymaking, specific threats are more significant than vague, unnamed dangers. Without specific risks, it is just as plausible to interpret U.S. presence as redundant, as overseeing a peace that has already arrived. Strategy should not be based upon vague images emerging from the dark reaches of the neoconservative imagination. Overestimating Our Importance One of the most basic insights of cognitive psychology provides the final reason to doubt the power of hegemonic stability: Rarely are our actions as consequential upon their behavior as we perceive them to be. A great deal of experimental evidence exists to support the notion that people (and therefore states) tend to overrate the degree to which their behavior is responsible for the actions of others. Robert Jervis has argued that two processes account for this overestimation, both of which would seem to be especially relevant in the U.S. case.55 First, believing that we are responsible for their actions gratifies our national ego (which is not small to begin with; the United States is exceptional in its exceptionalism). The hubris of the United States, long appreciated and noted, has only grown with the collapse of the Soviet Union.56 U.S. policymakers famously have comparatively little knowledge of—or interest in—events that occur outside of their own borders. If there is any state vulnerable to the overestimation of its importance due to the fundamental misunderstanding of the motivation of others, it would have to be the United States. Second, policymakers in the United States are far more familiar with our actions than they are with the decision-making processes of our allies. Try as we might, it is not possible to fully understand the threats, challenges, and opportunities that our allies see from their perspective. The European great powers have domestic politics as complex as ours, and they also have competent, capable strategists to chart their way forward. They react to many international forces, of which U.S. behavior is only one. Therefore, for any actor trying to make sense of the action of others, Jervis notes, “in the absence of strong evidence to the contrary, the most obvious and parsimonious explanation is that he was responsible.”57 It is natural, therefore, for U.S. policymakers and strategists to believe that the behavior of our allies (and rivals) is shaped largely by what Washington does. Presumably Americans are at least as susceptible to the overestimation of their ability as any other people, and perhaps more so. At the very least, political psychologists tell us, we are probably not as important to them as we think. The importance of U.S. hegemony in contributing to international stability is therefore almost certainly overrated. In the end, one can never be sure why our major allies have not gone to, and do not even plan for, war. Like deterrence, the hegemonic stability theory rests on faith; it can only be falsified, never proven. It does not seem likely, however, that hegemony could fully account for twenty years of strategic decisions made in allied capitals if the international system were not already a remarkably peaceful place. Perhaps these states have no intention of fighting one another to begin with, and our commitments are redundant. European great powers may well have chosen strategic restraint because they feel that their security is all but assured, with or without the United States.

### 1AR Indefinite Detention Now

#### Extend RT 9—the court will do Hedges v. Obama in their next term that triigers the link

### 1AR Doesn’t Spill Over

#### Extend Gibson—capital is bulletproof and there’s no risk of spillover

Can’t even name who’s going to switch their votes—you should obviously default to ideology on this question because the concept of political capital is based on elections/representation which the supreme court does NONE of—there is literally no iincentive to not vote on capital

#### Court capital doesn’t spillover

Journal of Law & Politics 97 (Journal of Law & Politics, Summer 1997, “Federalist Society Symposium: Washington, D.C.: November 14 - November 16, 1996: Panel Three: Disciplining Congress: The Boundaries of Legislative Power”, 13 J. L. & Politics 585, p. L/N)

The limited pie theory, associated with Professor Choper, [39](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=065838f78f8ec0a0a873b42a3147fa27&csvc=bl&cform=bool&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVlz-zSkAB&_md5=a18d35475600bc5cd6b4c83cbf0d3791#n39) is that the Supreme Court has a limited pie of institutional capital, of institutional goodwill, and if it spends some of that on constitutional federalism, it will be deprived of its opportunity to use that for where it really is needed - individual rights. The reason institutional capital is really needed in individual rights is [\*604]  primarily that the states can protect themselves in the jungles of the political process, while individuals cannot. To that, my colleague Michael Perry and others have added what implicitly underlies this: that individual rights are simply more important than constitutional federalism. [40](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=065838f78f8ec0a0a873b42a3147fa27&csvc=bl&cform=bool&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVlz-zSkAB&_md5=a18d35475600bc5cd6b4c83cbf0d3791#n40) I like to take the position that a true constitutional liberal should strongly believe in adherence to constitutional, not just political, limits on federalism, because federalism serves an important function as a buffer between the government and the individual. The whole idea, the genius of the structure set up by the Framers, was that the system of separation of powers, the system of federalism, and the system of individual rights would all interlock as different fail-safe mechanisms. If federalism and separation of powers are working properly as divisions of government power, tyranny would be prevented, and presumably the number of instances where individuals and government conflict over their rights would be reduced. The story that best illustrates how constitutional federalism can protect against tyranny is the story that I gather is true about Mussolini when he was given a copy of the National Recovery Act, which ultimately was held unconstitutional, and he looks at it and he says in Italian, "Ah, now there's a dictator." And I think that illustrates how dangerous it is in terms of the values of our constitutional system to vest full power within the federal government. The limited pie theory, as a justification, makes no sense because it assumes a kind of fungibility of institutional capital that just doesn't comport with reality. How people feel about individual rights decisions will not be determined by whether the Supreme Court has said anything about constitutional federalism. Reactions to Roe v. Wade [41](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=065838f78f8ec0a0a873b42a3147fa27&csvc=bl&cform=bool&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVlz-zSkAB&_md5=a18d35475600bc5cd6b4c83cbf0d3791#n41) or Miranda v. Arizona [42](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=065838f78f8ec0a0a873b42a3147fa27&csvc=bl&cform=bool&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVlz-zSkAB&_md5=a18d35475600bc5cd6b4c83cbf0d3791#n42) are based on people's concerns about those decisions. What the Supreme Court says or doesn't say about constitutional federalism will have little, if any, effect on reactions to those decisions.  [\*605]

#### Individual decisions don’t affect capital.

Gibson et al., ‘3

[James (Professor in Political Science at Washington University in St. Louis); Gregory Caldeira (Professor in Political Science at Ohio State University); and Lester Spence (Professor in Political Science at Washington University in St. Louis), “Measuring Attitudes Towards the U.S. Supreme Court”, American Journal of Political Science, Vol. 47, No. 2, April 2003]

Perhaps more important is the rather limited relationship between performance evaluations and loyalty to the Supreme Court. These two types of attitudes are of course not entirely unrelated, but commitments to the Supreme Court are not largely a function of whether one is pleased with how it is doing its job. Even less influential are perceptions of decisions in individual cases. When people have developed a "running tally" about an institution-a sort of historical summary of the good and bad things an institution has done-it is difficult for any given decision to have much incremental influence on that tally. Institutional loyalty is valuable to the Court precisely because it is so weakly related to actions the Court takes at the moment.

# 1AR Deference DA

### No Terror

#### The chance of nuclear terrorism is between one in a million and three billion

Choong 12 (William Choong, 3/30/12, “Is nuclear terrorism as big a threat as some perceive?” The Straits Times, ProQuest)

The threat of of nuclear terrorism was raised first in 1946 by Robert Oppenheimer, the creator of the A-bomb, who said that a few men could smuggle nuclear bomb units into New York and blow up the whole city. Since 1946, however, no attack as conceived by Oppenheimer has occurred. Brian Jenkins, a scholar at Rand Corp, a United States think-tank, has been writing about nuclear terrorism since the early 1970s - long before the terrorism studies industry became fashionable. And his position has been remarkably consistent through the years - nuclear terrorism is about the threat that terrorists would acquire and use nuclear weapons, while nuclear terror is about the anticipation of that event. There hasn't been any incidents of nuclear terrorism, but nuclear terror is embedded deeply in the public psyche. 'Terrorists were presumed to have nuclear ambitions, which Al-Qaeda did. (But the) absence of evidence was no longer persuasive as evidence that terrorists were not going nuclear,' he says in an e-mail interview. 'Terrorists don't have nuclear weapons, therefore, they get the most mileage psychologically (creating alarm among their enemies while exciting their followers) by fantasising about using them,' adds the former US Army Special Forces officer. In the unlikely event that such terrorists have secured such material, the odds are stacked against them. Professor John Mueller, a political scientist at Ohio University, has done the maths. He lists some 20 steps that terrorists will have to undertake to build a improvised nuclear device (IND) - of which all must be achieved. These include processes centred on producing, transporting and then detonating the IND. Putting a 50 per cent chance that the group would overcome these obstacles, the chances that the group could pull it off is one in a million. If one assumes that each step involves a 33 per cent chance of success - the odds change to one in over three billion.