

Contents

1	Introduction	1
	References	6
Part I Three Models of Emergency Law		
2	The Rights Model	9
2.1	Legal and Philosophical Articulations of the Rights Model	9
2.2	The Court’s Employment of the Rights Model in <i>Ex Parte Milligan</i>	12
2.3	<i>Ex Parte Milligan</i> and Inherent Difficulties of the Rights Model	19
	References	24
3	The Extralegal Model	25
3.1	Philosophical and Legal Articulations of the Extralegal Model	25
3.2	The Extralegal Model and the Japanese Internment Cases	26
3.3	<i>Hirabayashi v. United States</i>	29
3.4	<i>Korematsu v. United States</i>	32
3.5	<i>Ex Parte Mitsuye Endo</i>	34
3.6	Justice Jackson’s Critique of the Extralegal Model	36
3.7	The Extralegal Model and the <i>Prize Cases</i>	38
	References	41
4	Procedural Model	43
4.1	Philosophical Articulations of the Procedural Model	43
4.2	The Procedural Model and <i>Ex Parte Quirin</i>	45
4.3	The Procedural Model and <i>Youngstown</i>	49
4.4	The Problematic Elasticity of the Procedural Model	54
	References	55

Part II Emergency Law in the Context of Terrorism

5	Rasul v. Bush	59
5.1	Factual Background	61
5.2	Brief for Petitioners: A Limited Rights Model	62
5.3	Brief for Respondents: A Push Towards the Extralegal Model	66
5.4	The Opinion for the Court: A Reluctant Rights Model	68
	References	73
6	Hamdi v. Rumsfeld	75
6.1	Factual Background	76
6.2	Opinion for the Court: A Partly Procedural Model	77
6.3	Dissenting Opinion I: The Rights Model Applied to United States Citizens	81
6.4	Dissenting Opinion II: A Push Towards the Extralegal Model	83
7	Hamdan v. Rumsfeld	87
7.1	Factual Background	89
7.2	Opinion for the Court: An Example of the Procedural Model	90
	Reference	97
8	Boumediene v. Bush	99
8.1	Factual Background	101
8.2	Opinion of the Court: Reverting to the Rights Model	102
	References	107
9	Concluding Remarks	109
	References	112