This book has considered national security law and process in the context of four security threats. First is the threat of attack by nonstate and state-sponsored or supported actors using terrorist means. Overseas, this threat is realized on a daily basis. Within the United States the threat is continuous, but intermittent. The threat of high-explosive attack, like car and truck bombs, targeted suicide bombings, or the sabotage of aircraft, is most likely to materialize. The threat of catastrophic attack with nuclear weapons has the greatest potential impact on our way of life and in terms of human cost.

It is in relation to this threat in particular that we need to evaluate and test national security law and process, both because of the potential consequence and because of the focus the enemy has placed on this means of attack.

Second, U.S. constitutional values may ebb and wane in an endless conflict against state and nonstate actors engaged in acts of terrorism or posing the threat of terrorism. In light of the interminable nature of this threat, assertions of presidential authority in an extreme may become embedded in U.S. practice and law without a corresponding application of checks and balances. Left outside the reach of effective and independent mechanisms of appraisal, broad assertions of executive authority may in time diminish both the principles of law that define American life as well as the physical security at which they are directed.

Third, sincere policy differences, as well as those that are politically inspired, regarding the nature of the terrorist threat and the corresponding measure of response may result in a zero-sum compromise; that is, a diminution of security or a diminution of law, rather than contextual formulas that advance both at once. If the executive needs broad and rapid authority to engage in intelligence collection — as it does — the better course is not to limit the authority, for fear of misuse, but to increase the opportunities for meaningful internal and external appraisal. Such appraisal will deter misuse, but as importantly, encourage effective use. In this enduring conflict we may exhaust our resources or our principles in a manner that leaves us unwilling or unable to effectively address this century's other certain crises, including the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction to unreliable state actors, the advent of pandemic disease, and environmental degradation and change.

This book has focused on the threat of terrorist attack because this is the threat that today drives the legal debate about the president's constitutional authority. More generally, it drives the purpose and meaning of national security law. It will continue to do so. It is also the threat with the greatest potential to transform U.S. national security, in both a physical and a values sense. The importance of addressing other issues, such as conflict in the Middle East, totalitarian regimes, or pandemic disease, must not be overlooked. Each bears the potential to spiral beyond control resulting in catastrophe at home and overseas. Each of these issues warrants full consideration of the national security instruments and processes described in this book.

In each context, law and national security lawyers may contribute to national security in multiple ways. First, the law provides an array of positive or substantive instruments the president may wield to provide for security. Second, the law provides procedural mechanisms offering opportunities to consider, validate, appraise, and improve policy, as well as ensure its lawful execution. These mechanisms include the horizontal separation of constitutional powers at the federal level, and the vertical separation of powers between the federal government and state government. They are found as well in statute and in internal executive directive.

The most effective means of appraisal are often found through informal practice. Informal contact allows participants to speak with a freedom not permitted or not often found when bearing the institutional mantle of an office or branch of government. Consider the difference in reaction between the counsel that sits down with the policymaker for a discussion and the counsel who requests the policymaker to put down in a memorandum everything that occurred. With informal practice the role of personality and friendship can serve to facilitate information exchange and the frank exchange of views.

Third, in the international context, law provides mechanisms to achieve U.S. national security objectives. This is evident in the context of maritime security, where U.S. law is pegged to an international framework, and effective security requires international as well as domestic participation. In the area of intelligence integration, bilateral and multilateral agreements, like the PSI and bilateral aviation agreements, provide essential mechanisms for identifying intelligence, sharing intelligence, and acting on intelligence.

Fourth, the law reflects and projects American values of democracy and liberty. Values are silent force multipliers as well as positive national security tools. As Lawrence Wright, the author of The Looming Tower, and others argue, jihadists like Osama Bin Laden offer no programs or policies for governance, no alternative to Western democracy. They offer only the opportunity for revenge. Rule of law is the West's alternative to jihadis.
terrorism. Law, and respect for law, offers the structure of democracy, the opportunity for individual fulfillment regardless of sex, race, or creed, and a process for the impartial administration of justice. Sustained commitment to the rule of law in practice and perception will serve as a positive national security tool in curtailing recruitment of the next wave and generation of jihadists.

But law, like homeland security, is an incremental endeavor. It is dependent on sustained action, not rhetoric, and perceptions can be swept aside in a few ill-chosen moments. Law, like this conflict, requires sustained sacrifice and sustained support. Thus, divisive legal arguments should be eschewed, unless they are essential to security and there are no alternative means to accomplish the same necessary security end.

The law may contribute to national security in other ways as well. The law is a source of predictability. Through prediction, it becomes a source of deterrence. If the law is understood to permit the use of force, or the collection of intelligence, then allies and opponents alike may modulate their behavior accordingly.

Law can also be a source of calm and stability at times of crisis, guiding but not compelling decision makers to processes of decision that rapidly identify risks and benefits and fix accountability. Rapid decision can be obtained through secrecy and by truncating process; it can also be found through the expectation and practice that process provides. This is evident in the case of the military chain of command. This can be true with the president's national security processes as well.

The law is also a source of continuity. An enduring conflict requires enduring commitment, in values, funding, and sacrifice, and thus unity across party or factional transitions. Where essential policy is embedded in framework statutes, it is less subject to, but not immune from the vicissitudes of momentary political advantage or the policy pressures of immediacy. In a conflict marked by intermittent attacks over years, at least in the United States, law can insulate policy from the loss of public or even official attention. For example, where a tool is dependent on sustained funding and policy commitment, legal mandates can hold bureaucratic focus. And, where policy is embedded in law, intelligence and law enforcement operatives may take greater risks knowing the authority for their actions is documented in law and not dependent on classified authorities or recollections of approval.

At the same time, there is much the law cannot do. Law and process provide an opportunity for success, but do not guarantee result. Leadership, culture, personality, and sometimes good luck are as important as law. A well-crafted emergency response directive does not compel first responders to climb the stairs of a burning building—courage, leadership, and commitment do.

Law is a human endeavor that is dependent on the human factor. We are a nation of laws, but we are also a nation of men and women, or if you like a nation of law and lawyers. It is men and women who write the law, interpret the law, and decide whether to uphold the law. Where national security is at stake, the human influence is manifest. "National security" necessitates the application of subjective values and not just security criteria. Further, as considered in Chapter 4, the law is as dependent on theory as it is on black-letter principle, and thus is dependent on human values and choice. Even where the law is clear, the facts rarely are, for the reasons articulated in Chapter 7. The application of fact to law, of intelligence to security, involves human judgment rather than the mechanical review of facts.

Law also involves moral courage. Field Marshal Slim, who served on the Western Front during the First World War and is considered one of the best commanders during World War II, compared physical and moral courage. He described moral courage as "a more reasoning attitude, which enables a man coolly to strike career, happiness, his whole fortune, on his judgment of what he thinks either right or worthwhile." Slim said,

I have known many men who had marked physical courage, but lacked moral courage. On the other hand I have seen men who undoubtedly possessed moral courage very cautious about taking physical risks. But I have never met a man with moral courage who would not, when it was really necessary, face bodily danger. Moral courage is a higher and a rarer virtue than physical courage.1

Most lawyers will not have Field Marshal Slim's opportunity to test the comparative proposition. But they will have their moral courage tested. They will be tested sitting at a Principals Meeting when they have to decide whether, and how to speak up. They will be tested when they must step outside their personalities, loud, quiet, or in between, and step into a different role in order to apply the law more meaningfully. The quiet personality will be asked to make public presentations on behalf and in defense of the law. Sometimes the strong personality must sit down for the law, for example, at an interagency meeting where bureaucratic diplomacy may be the order of the day. But minutes later, in the face of the deputy secretary or national security advisor, the lawyer must have the courage to insist on attendance at a necessary meeting. In short, national security law is as contingent on the national security lawyer as it is on the law.

A. NATIONAL SECURITY LEGAL PRACTICE

In a constitutional democracy decisions are intended to be made according to law. That means that sound national security process must incorporate timely and competent legal advice. What form should that advice take?

In some cases, legal review is dictated by statute, as in the case of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, which requires designated officials...
including lawyers, to certify requests for electronic surveillance or physical search before they are submitted to the FISA court. In other cases, the president has directed a specific process of legal review, for example, in areas historically prone to peril, such as covert action. However, the majority of legal advice within the national security process is not required by law or directive, but is the product of practice, custom, and the rapport, if any, between officials and their lawyers.

At the national level the daily participants are generally the same from administration to administration: the attorney general and deputy attorney general; the Office of Legal Counsel within the Department of Justice; and other agencies’ general counsels, especially those at Defense, State, CIA, and DHS, as well as the chairman’s legal advisor. Of course, in context, senior deputies and alter egos play an equivalent role.

Traditionally, lawyers for the president engaged in national security law have included the counsel to the president and the National Security Council’s legal advisor. Practice varies as to the relative role and weight of each and the extent to which other White House lawyers, such as the deputy White House counsel, are involved in national security decision making, if at all. Depending on administrations, and personalities, the role of the counsel to the vice president has ranged from a defining one to no role at all with respect to national security law.

Other lawyers play central roles as well. The judge advocates general of the military services, for example, are central players in the development of military law and legal policy as well as the application of the law of armed conflict. Within the Department of Justice, the assistant attorney general for national security, the head of the Office of Intelligence Policy and Review, the Office of Legal Counsel, and the assistant attorney general for the criminal division are all central players on issues of intelligence and counterterrorism. Counsel at each of the intelligence community components and those engaged in issues of terrorism asset control and money laundering at Treasury also engage in daily national security practice. Each of these officials is supported by line attorneys who in many cases are the experts in their discipline and serve as the initial (and often final) point of contact for legal advice.

Each president, agency head, and commander will adopt his or her own approach to legal advice, ranging from active engagement with their lawyers and an understanding of the law to avoidance. Some officials do not seek legal advice unless the word “law” is mentioned and then only if it is mentioned four times in the subject line of a memo. Other officials view their lawyers as wide-ranging advisors, officials outside the policy process—non-stakeholders, and thus troubleshooters who may serve in capacity of counselor and not just legal advisors.

Officials and lawyers sometimes refer to lawyers “staying in their lane.” But with national security there is rarely a street map. It is not always clear where the lane begins or ends, and whether the intended road is a goat path or an informational superhighway. Some lawyers will operate on a defined track—litigators litigate, Office of Intelligence Policy and Review (OIPR) attorneys process FISA requests (among other things), the AECA lawyer reviews munitions list licenses. However, for more senior lawyers there are rarely set templates outside those dictated by law or directive—how to practice national security law. That means the individual lawyer will define the role as much as he or she will assume it. Moreover, policy officials will ultimately find those lawyers whose style and advice they trust regardless of individual assignments.

Application of national security law involves the rapid review and identification of legal issues embedded in policy options, policy decisions, and policy statements. At the NSC, for example, counsel traditionally coordinate the provision of advice to meetings of the Principals and Deputies Committees, among other tasks, and, where appropriate, attend such meetings to field questions and identify issues. However, this role appears to have varied in texture depending on whether the NSC staff are viewed as facilitators of interagency process or sources of rival legal advice to departmental general counsel. It also depends on the national security role assumed by the counsel to the president. In addition, NSC counsel provide internal legal advice to the president, national security advisor, and NSC staff as well as review and write memoranda to the president, issue spotting and discussing the legal issues raised. However, these roles are not defined in statute and are, outside the confines of certain narrow spheres, not defined in directive. Rather, these roles are defined by practice and the adoption or modification of past practice by successor officials.

Lawyers serving in defined billets are more likely to find continuity in the form and method of practice, but not necessarily in the substance of practice. For example, the assistant attorney general for the Office of Legal Counsel and his or her deputies generally provide constitutional advice to the executive branch and arbitrate interagency legal disputes, usually through promulgation of formal (often classified) legal memoranda. They are consulted, but are usually less active on daily issues of national security implementation and NSC policy development.

Likewise, line attorneys, as well as programmatic attorneys, are more likely to specialize in particular areas of law and find defined and generally accepted roles. This description might apply, for example, to a line attorney at the State Department who reviews export control licenses, or the attorney at the Treasury Department who reviews financial transactions with foreign states, or a Justice Department lawyer who reviews FISA applications. These lawyers play critical national security roles, but are less likely to address the breadth of national security issues identified in this book. Their lanes are relatively clear and defined.
In addition, lawyers serving as agency general counsel, or their equivalent, perform or oversee the performance of myriad tasks generally associated with lawyers, such as drafting legal documents, reviewing legislation, overseeing litigation, and addressing matters of budget, personnel, and contracting. Rule of law and respect for law are often defined by these tasks. Do the lawyers apply the ethics rules with reason, care, and rigor? Are legislative and public document searches conducted in earnest? These everyday tasks help to define constitutional government, involving as they do the interplay between branches of government and between the government and the public.

Harder to define is the role lawyers should take involving matters where there is discretion as to the style of practice, where the lawyer might have a choice between a proactive, active, or reactive role. In role-playing, personality can be as important as intellectual capacity and training. Not every attorney is suited to a process of decision-making that can be rapid and is conducted under stress and often involves the application of law to uncertain or emerging facts. In this context, lawyers must know when to render their best advice and let go of an issue or when to hold an issue and request time for further review, or to buck the issue up the legal line. There is rarely time to double back for a second look. This may be difficult for lawyers who prefer the deliberative and careful speed of appellate work. It may also be difficult for lawyers who prefer practice areas oriented toward black-letter law and absolute answers. In short, national security practice requires a capacity to close on issues and make decisions, identifying nuance and caveats, if necessary.

National security practice also requires a capacity to compartmentalize work. This is true in a security sense. Lawyers operate under multiple constraints regarding what they can say and to whom based on the attorney-client, deliberative process, and state secrets privileges. (A sure way for a lawyer not to be in the right place at the right time is to garner a reputation for indiscretion.) However, by compartmentalization, I also mean an emotional and intellectual ability to move from one issue to another in rapid succession without getting stuck on just one issue. Policymakers must master this same skill. In contrast, subordinates assigned to specific issues are expected to devote their attention to a single policy issue and drive that issue up and down the chain of command.

As in other legal fields, national security lawyers should learn to subordinate matters of ego to the task of meaningfully applying the law. In doing so, they will have ample opportunity to learn the maxim that it is often the messenger who pays the price for the message. How common is the disapproving refrain, "Lawyers!" The refrain might be more aptly addressed - "Legislators!" "Democracy!" or "Benjamin Franklin!" - unless, of course, it is the lawyer who has delayed decision or diluted decision out of undue caution or concern. Lawyers must also appreciate that while steady and faithful application of the law is a hallmark of constitutional government, in most bureaucratic and substantive contexts they are a supporting arm to the policy process. Outside the Department of Justice, success is associated with the policy and not the legal work that supports the policy.

Lawyers are also subject to having their advice tested, as they should. That is part of the national security process and an essential part of internal and external appraisal. Does the lawyer understand the facts? Does the lawyer understand the law? Has the lawyer distinguished between law and legal policy? However, style varies. Where the stakes are high the distinction between understanding, testing, and bullying may be lost. Policymakers have a duty to push. Policymakers do not become policy generals by sitting back and waiting for events to unfold or opportunities to come their way. Boot camp, it turns out, is sound training for national security lawyers. National security lawyers will be tested and pushed, as they should be when national security is at stake. The lawyers will know when a bad idea has encountered a better idea and they must have the courage to adjust their views; but they will also know when they have bent under pressure, knowing the difference between a good faith argument and an inability to hold a line.

The practice of national security law, like many areas of law, requires endurance. However, in private practice the client has usually come to the counsel and now expects hard and constant effort. National security law requires comparable effort, but a different kind of endurance. Lawyers are not always invited into the decision-making room. This reluctance reflects concerns about secrecy, delay and "lawyer creep" (the legal version of "mission creep," whereby one legal question becomes seventeen, requiring not one lawyer, but forty-three to answer). Of course, decisionmakers may also fear that the lawyer may say no to something the policymaker wants to do. Rule of law often depends on the lawyer being in the right place at the right time to render advice. This is achieved by reading agendas, attending staff meetings, and ensuring that they and not the policymaker or the secretariat define what it is the lawyer needs to see.

National security process is never designed to convenience the lawyer. Sometimes it is specifically designed to avoid the lawyer. Endurance means having fresh legs in the middle of the night as well as first thing in the morning. Some officials will wait until the late night or the weekend to move their memos, noting "not available" for a legal clearance. The lawyer avoids such traps by meeting deadlines, negating silent consent, and where necessary by laying out tripwires, alerting the executive secretary of issues they need to see, sending timely e-mail prompting inclusion in discussions, and meeting each policy staff member one-on-one to establish expectations and confidence.
Most important, counsel should gain the support of the principal official engaged. This is done by adding value to the process and articulating for the decisionmaker why lawyers should have a seat at the table (or in the Situation Room, along the wall). Counsel keeps that seat through effective practice that is proactive, entailing the same zeal in overcoming legal and bureaucratic obstacles as they show in identifying them. A lawyer engaged at the advent of policy development is more likely to influence and guide than one that clears the final memorandum to the decisionmaker, where policy advisors have already committed to both the substance of decision and means of execution. Moreover, if the lawyer waits for issues, or is perceived as an obstacle rather than a source of value, the lawyer will find he or she is only contributing to decisions where legal review is mandated and then only as the last stop on the bureaucratic bus route.

Lawyers can advance the application of law in a number of ways. First, by understanding national security process, counsel can better identify where decisions are formed and made and thus where legal input is most useful. Second, by understanding the military and intelligence instruments counsel can better apply the law to fact. For example, military lawyers can hardly apply the principles of proportionality, discrimination, and necessity to targets without having an understanding of the weapons, munitions, and tactics that inform judgments about necessity and proportionality. Likewise, counsel addressing the use of force should understand the qualitative and quantitative limits of intelligence, distinguishing between evidence, inference, and intelligence in the process. Third, counsel must understand bureaucracy, knowing when and how to provide advice in person, via memo, and through e-mail, without losing sight that each written communication is a record no matter how informal, and that tone and demeanor can get lost in e-mail.

Finally, counsel should master and proactively recommend legal methods for overcoming bureaucratic inertia and resistance. Such methods include (a) presidential directives, (b) agency directives, (c) interagency or intra-agency memoranda of understanding, (d) lead agency designations, (e) the conduct of exercises, (f) textual adjustments that defer or eliminate concerns, or (g) just the force of personality or diplomacy. Concerns about the deployment of armed forces in civil context might be addressed through resort to any one of these methodologies or by textually limiting the scope, service, or situation in which the forces might be used. Such limitations might be put in the president’s action memorandum, in the executive order, or in the rules of engagement. Alternative process may work as well, such as resorting to biweekly meetings of the agency heads, in an effort to take issues up and over bureaucratic obstacles, or holding weekly lunches of the sort that Mr. Carlucci and Mr. Berger found effective.

Where lawyers are being used to dress policy disagreements up in determinative legal clothing – “my lawyer says this is illegal” – good legal process can allow decisionmakers to focus on the policy issues at hand. Legal issues should be culled from policy agendas and intra- or inter-agency legal meetings held in advance to review options. This allows an opportunity to send issues up the legal chain rather than letting them linger, and possibly sidetrack deliberations. Moreover, just as policymakers forum shop for “can do” lawyers, or perhaps compliant lawyers, lawyers do the same, looking for lawyers who are problem solvers and do not shoot from the hip.

As in other areas of law, preparation is essential. This means reading agendas, consulting with relevant experts on an intra-agency and inter-agency basis, and taking issues up the legal chain of command in advance of meetings so that the lawyer can speak authoritatively when presented with the opportunity to do so. The opportunity may not come again.

Lawyers should also craft, and figuratively or actually, carry walk-about books to address national security issues as they arise. There is no excuse, for example, if the Northern Command staff judge advocate or counsel to the president does not have draft declarations “in the can” to address virtually every homeland security scenario. One purpose of tabletop exercises is to alert policymakers and lawyers to legal obstacles that lie ahead so that lawyers might find the means of circumnavigation before the crisis.

Preparation also entails educating the policymaker. Absent groundwork, the policymaker may respond at the moment of crisis by seeing the law only as something that allows or does not allow the policymaker to do what he wants. Contextual advice built on a foundation already laid is readily absorbed and accepted and will add greater value to the national security mission. A 3 A.M. conference call is no time to explain for the first time the principles of proportionality, necessity, and discrimination in targeting. Nor is the immediate aftermath of a natural disaster or terrorist attack the optimal time to explore for the first time the delicate legal policy issues raised by the deployment of U.S. military personnel in a civil context. In addition, the policymaker will understand in a live situation that the lawyer is applying “hard law” – specific, well established, and sanctioned – and not criticizing on policy or operational matters.

Advance education also helps establish lines of communication and a common vocabulary of nuance between lawyer and policymaker before the crisis. A policymaker who hears a good brief on civil-military deployment will be sure his or her lawyer fully participates in any subsequent decisional process. In a large and layered bureaucracy, where the lawyer may be least proximate to the decisionmaker, and cannot count on immediate access, the teaching process is equally important in defining roles as well as legal expectations; however, it is more likely to occur through submission of written memoranda.

National security law also entails the application of legal policy; however, lawyers must take care to distinguish between what is law and what is legal
policy. The identification of a preferred course as between lawful options is legal policy. The identification of a better argument among available arguments is legal policy. Identification of the long-term and short-term impact of legal arguments is legal policy. For example, will other states assert the same right to act as the United States asserts, and if so, what are the long-term costs and benefits of the United States asserting such authority? If a constitutional argument is legally available to the president, will it nonetheless generate a congressional or public response disproportionate to the benefits of using the argument?

The reality is that many national security law questions are not yes or no questions. Just as many national security policy decisions represent 51-49 judgments, legal judgments may be close calls; legal policy helps to identify the pros and cons of taking alternative positions. This is particularly the case where legal policy is national security policy as well; for example, where foreign reaction to U.S. legal choices may help or hinder alliances, or where reciprocal applications of law may harm U.S. national security.

Finally, lawyers, like policymakers, must return to appraise their work. Has the ground truth shifted in a manner that alters the legal basis for an action in either a permissive or restrictive manner? Has the president’s directive been implemented in the manner intended? Do the ROEs provide adequate protection and flexibility for U.S. forces? Has process been implemented in a manner that facilitates or that impedes rapid decision or the identification of policy options?

In summary, the national security lawyer must consider not only the substance of the law but also the practice and process of law and the essential decisional skills that bear on the practice of national security law. In the end, however, most senior executive branch lawyers serve at the direction and sometimes discretion of the department counsel, department head, and ultimately the president. Chances are, if the policymaker is not satisfied with the manner, method, or substance of advice he will replace his counsel, seek his reassignment, or work around counsel to work with other lawyers. Whether he is satisfied will not only depend on the performance of the lawyer but also on whether they share common expectations of how to define the duties of the national security lawyer.

B. THE DUTY OF THE NATIONAL SECURITY LAWYER

Academics and practitioners sometimes define the roles and responsibilities of lawyers through identification of the client and the client’s interests. Thus, in private context, the ABA Model Rules of Professional Conduct state:

A lawyer must act with commitment and dedication to the interests of the client and with zeal in advocacy upon the client’s behalf.”

It is the client who must decide critical questions of strategy and it is to the client to whom the attorney owes a duty of loyalty and confidentiality.

The client-based private model, however, is less apt in identifying and defining the responsibilities of the national security lawyer. To start, in government context, there are differing views on just who (or perhaps what) is the “client.” Scholars and practitioners have identified both animate and conceptual candidates, including the president, the agency, the head, the public interest, and the Constitution. Consider that there are at least five possible and distinct facets to the president as client alone. At any given time the president may function as chief executive, party leader, commander in chief, the embodiment of the institution of the office of the president, or the president in his personal capacity. Each facet potentially represents distinct interests and responsibilities. While the national security lawyer certainly owes the president dedication and commitment as commander in chief, he does not necessarily owe the president as party leader the same zeal. Indeed, he may be legally barred under the Hatch Act from exercising any zeal at all.

In a related manner, there are differing perspectives, or models, on how national security lawyers should practice law, which reflect but are not necessarily determined by the identification of the “client.” In the judicial model, for example, the lawyer is expected to render neutral detached views on the law, as a judge might, ultimately rendering a decision as to what the law is. The advisory model posits that the attorney will render advice on legally available options. The advocacy model, perhaps, is closest in paralleling the private model, with the attorney serving to guide the client to the client’s preferred outcomes and then defending the client’s actions. It might be said that with the judicial model the attorney works with both hands, presenting both sides of each issue. In the client-based or advocate model, the attorney works with one hand, finding a legal basis for what it is the client wishes to accomplish.

Such models bring structure to consideration of the practice of national security law and may serve as a point of departure in describing the duties of the national security lawyer. However, in the daily mix of practice, most national security lawyers do not relate their conduct back to specific theories of ethical responsibility and conflict of interest analysis, as a government or private practitioner might do in criminal practice. This reflects the nature of most national security practice. The provision of advice regarding the Foreign Assistance Act, for example, does not require identification of the client, but rather the competent official who can authorize use of the authority. This may vary depending on the section of law and internal agency process. When the assistant secretary asks whether the United States can provide aid, the question is not, who is the client? — it is whether the Act authorizes such aid and, if so, subject to what substantive and procedural thresholds.
Likewise, judge advocates in the field do not ask, who is the client? – they ask, which commander has the authority to issue the lawful order to attack?

Even where issues present what look like traditional private legal ethics questions, for example, in cases involving the waiver of a privilege, the question is not resolved through identification of the client – for example, the agency or agency head – but rather through knowledge of the substance of law and process. In the case of executive privilege the answer is the president. In the case of classified information the answer is found in some combination of the originating agency, the DNI, and the president. And in the litigation context, the answer may vary depending on who can ultimately speak for the government on the specific issue presented.

Moreover, attorneys need not resort to ethics or academic models to define their role, when so much of the role is already defined in law, and in particular in the Constitution. First, in Article II the president is charged with taking “Care that the Laws be faithfully executed.” Second,

Before he enter on the Execution of his Office, he shall take the following Oath or Affirmation:

“I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will faithfully execute the Office of President of the United States, and will to the best of my ability, preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States.”

Third, Article VI requires that “all executive and judicial Officers, both of the United States and of the several States, shall be bound by Oath or Affirmation, to support this Constitution.”

As a matter of statute, government officials, including attorneys, also undertake an oath of office tied to the Constitution.

An individual, except the president, elected or appointed to an office of honor or profit in the civil service or uniformed services, shall take the following oath:

“[I.] ... do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign or domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God.”

This section does not affect other oaths required by law. As is clear from the statutory text, the oath is not exclusive, but is applied in conjunction with other ethical obligations. Thus, in context, attorneys may well have to consider questions pertaining to the identification of the client. A judge advocate, for example, must adhere to his constitutional oath and to applicable bar codes pertaining to the representation of criminal law clients.

The point is that in the private context where academics and practitioners might reasonably debate to whom the attorney owes loyalty, the government attorney takes one oath and that is to the Constitution and not to a client. Further, that oath and the Constitution require faithful application of the law. That starts with faithful application of the Constitution, its structure and its substance, in the common defense of security and liberty.

Finally, the “client,” used here to identify the official with authority to decide an issue, as well as the role of the national security attorney, will vary in context. There are more than 40,000 lawyers in the government. Only a fraction of this number practice national security law. In each context, the “client” may be different. Moreover, within each setting the lawyer will (or should) play each role described above: advisor, counselor, advocate, and judge. The practice is also sufficiently contextual that the answer as to which role is appropriate is found not in identifying the client or a particular model of practice, but in the facts. The skill and art is in knowing when and how to play each role.

Consider the following hypothetical, presenting a preemptive scenario likely to occur in the future. The president’s attorney is asked in the middle of the night to review a prospective target for a missile strike. For reasons of operational security, a “bigot list” is in place. It does not include the attorney general. The target is a suspected WMD weapons facility in a restricted country, but one with which the United States is nominally at peace. The facility is operating under cover as a legitimate commercial enterprise. The target is in play because of intelligence suggesting, but not confirming, that the plant is linked to an Al Qaeda affiliate.

For sound operational reasons, an up or down decision on attacking is needed within two hours, or sooner, to avoid the risk that the enemy will disperse extant WMD weapons. However, it turns out that at the staff level there is disagreement on whether the intelligence linking the target to terrorist actors or even clandestine activities is credible and persuasive. There are also differences of view as to whether additional methods of intelligence gathering may improve U.S. knowledge, although there is general agreement that the target is a hard target and that any disclosure of U.S. interest in the facility could lead to the rapid dispersion of existing WMD stockpiles (if any).

What is the role and the duty of the attorney, and is that role defined by identification of the client or application of a judicial, advocacy, or advisory model of practice?

In the advocate model, the attorney might determine that he or she will defend the president’s decision regardless of how the factual dispute is resolved, or for that matter whether it is resolved. Thus, the attorney might advise that so long as the president believes he is defending the country she has the legal authority to do so and counsel will support the decision under U.S. and international law.
In a judicial model, the attorney might ask additional questions. What is the potential for collateral consequences? And, what is the basis for the difference in intelligence opinion? He would then apply the law to the facts as they are known to determine whether a strike is lawful under U.S. and international law. To the extent the attorney believes the target is "unlawful" under U.S. law he would indicate so, and if necessary, advise the president that he could not in good faith approve the target.

Under an advisory model, the attorney might advise the president as to the legal standard and defer to the president’s judgment on the application of law to fact. Under the public interest model, the attorney might consider what is in the best interest of the United States or the public. Presumably this interest would revolve around getting the facts right, but also taking all measures necessary to defend the country, erring on the side of security.

The attorney should play all of these roles. First, under any rubric the attorney has a duty to resolve the factual ambiguity. Arguably, under an advocacy model, the attorney might sit back and defer to the president’s view of the law and facts and then defend both. However, it is not clear how such inaction would represent zealous or diligent representation. The president would still require knowledge of the facts and the law to faithfully execute his security functions. Moreover, under the advocacy model, even if the attorney were poised to validate the president’s judgment, he would still need to know the counterarguments to better represent the president’s choice. Thus, the question is how best to do so in a manner that respects the role of the president as commander in chief and chief executive.

The hypothetical also illustrates the potential range of duties, functions, and choices the attorney might (and in my view should) address in a given scenario. The national security lawyer has a duty to guide decisionmakers toward legally available options. In performing this function in a timely and meaningful manner, the lawyer provides for our physical security. In doing it faithfully, based on honest belief on the application of law, he provides for the security of our way of life, which is to say, a process of decision founded on respect for the law and subject to law.

The hypothetical presents threshold questions of authority. Therefore, the attorney must consider whether the president has the constitutional authority to authorize the missile strike. As the president is also, in effect, approving a specific military target while authorizing the initial resort to force the attorney should run through a three-pronged substantive template:

1. Does the president have the constitutional authority to use force, and is it subject to a statutory overlay? If so, must or should the president consult with the Congress, or notify the Congress in advance?
of action. Bigot list permitting, the lawyer ensures the State Department is generating an Article 51 report to the United Nations identifying the U.S. legal position as one of self-defense.

The strike occurs. The lawyer now shifts to the role of advisor appraising the process. What worked well and what didn’t work well? Could the factual dispute have been resolved through alternative process, or was it only identified and forced to the surface through the presentation of decision? Should the president retain case-specific decision authority over comparable strikes, or authorize such strikes in concept in the future and if so subject to what qualifications in policy, law, and legal policy? Is this a question of law, or of command preference that should be dictated by operational need and presidential style?

The hypothetical also illustrates the extent to which the application of national security law and process is dependent on culture, personality, and style. The president can direct legal review of his decisions, but if a national security advisor is not committed to such a review, it will not occur in a meaningful manner, if at all. The process would have failed if the lawyer did not make the call or if the national security advisor would not take the call. In short, it is not the presence of counsel at the NSC, the White House, or the Defense Department that upholds the law. It is the active presence of a president, a national security advisor, and department secretaries who insist on legal input in the decision-making process and lawyers who will place their integrity and careers on the line to provide it.

An indeterminate conflict, of indefinite duration, against unknown enemies and known enemies unseen will put uncommon strain on U.S. national security. It will also put uncommon strain on principles of liberty. If we meet this day’s threats without destroying the fabric of our constitutional liberty it will be through the effective and meaningful application of national security law.

The sine qua non for broad national security authority is meaningful oversight. By oversight, I mean the considered application of constitutional structure, executive process, legal substance, and relevant review of decision-making – all of which depend on the integrity and judgment of lawyers. It is lawyers who will help us find the right combination of broad executive authority to defeat terrorism with the considered application of law before action and subsequent appraisal to protect our liberty. So whether one likes law or not, it is central to national security. Lawyers and not just generals will decide the outcome of this conflict.

Lawyers reside at the intersection where physical safety and liberty merge. In this role they are indispensable to good process and should feel a duty to advocate good process. Good process permits the faithful application of the law and the accomplishment of the security objectives. In any given context, the pressure of the moment may encourage short-term thinking and the adoption of process shortcuts. The lawyer alone may be sufficiently detached from the policy outcome to identify the enduring institutional consequences of a particular course of action. So too, the lawyer alone may be familiar, and may feel an obligation to be familiar, with applicable written procedures. Process is substance if it means critical actors and perspectives are omitted from the discussion table.

Good process is not antithetical to timely decisions, operational timelines, or to secrecy. Process must find the right balance between speed and strength, secrecy and input. But process can always meet deadlines. There is no excuse for shortcuts. Process can be made to work faster and smarter. By example, if legal review is warranted, the attorney general alone can review a matter and, if need be, do so while sitting next to the president in the Oval Office.

Third, process should be contextual. The legal and policy parameters for responding to terrorism are different from those for responding to a Balkan crisis. Clandestine and remote military operations against a hidden enemy will dictate different decision processes than NATO air operations against fixed targets, as will the different political and policy parameters of both situations. One has to maintain situational awareness, to find the measure of process and approval that ensures law is applied in a manner that is faithful to constitutional, statutory, and executive dictates and that meets operational timelines. Therefore, there will always be some tension as to who should see what when.

Finally, lawyers support and defend the Constitution and not just the policies of their government. It is not clear how a president can faithfully apply the law without faithfully applying the constitutional principles identified in Chapters 3 and 4, including the separation of powers, and checks and balances. Constitutional faith recognizes that the Constitution is a national security document, which in the face of a WMD threat is appropriately read broadly and realistically. Constitutional faith also recognizes that liberty and the rule of law are national security values, which the Constitution is designed to preserve and to protect.

A definition of national security that includes constitutional values makes lawyers schooled in history, law, and ethics essential to the national security process. Being a lawyer in such a process is more than saying yes to a client’s goals; it means guiding lawmakers not just to lawful outcomes but to outcomes addressing both aspects of national security by providing for security and preserving our sense of liberty. That is one reason this book places as much emphasis on the role of the lawyer as it does on the content of the law.
There are hard questions ahead in a time of homeland insecurity from which lawyers should not shy. Hamilton observed,

The violent destruction of life and property incident to war, the continual effort and alarm attendant on a state of continual danger, will compel nations the most attached to liberty to resort for repose and security to institutions that have a tendency to destroy their civilian and political rights. To be more safe, they at length become willing to run the risk of being less free.

It is the national security lawyer's duty to alert policymakers to these tensions. The lawyer's duty is to show all sides to every issue while guiding policymakers and above all the president to lawful decisions that protect our security and our liberty. This is hardest to do when lives are at stake. But the Constitution was not designed to fail, to safeguard our security at the expense of our freedom, nor celebrate freedom at the expense of security. It is designed to underpin and protect us and our way of life. National security lawyers daily demonstrate how it can and must do both.

As a result, we should not begrudge democracy's adherence to law, but continue to find the best contextual process for its meaningful application. In war, and no more so than in addressing a threat where the terrorists' choice of weapons and targets may be unlimited, this means a substance, process, and practice of law that is both security effective and faithful to democratic values.

As Justice Brandeis reminded in *Whitney*,

Those who won independence believed that the final end of the state was to make men free to develop their faculties, and that in its government the deliberative forces should prevail over the arbitrary. They believed liberty to be the secret of happiness and courage to be the secret of liberty.\(^{15}\)

The law depends on the morality and courage of those who apply it. It depends on the moral courage of lawyers who raise tough questions, who dare to argue both sides of every issue, who insist upon being heard at the highest levels of decision-making, and who ultimately call the legal questions as they believe the Constitution dictates and not necessarily as policymakers may want at a moment in time. We do not live in a moment in time. We and our children live in perilous times.