## 2AC Overview Oklahoma

The 1AC juxtaposes the intimate violence of drone policy against how we traditionally think of drone strikes. Holmqvist indicates that drone pilots have very close relationships with their targets. In that heat of the moment when the pilots see specs moving towards ground troops, they have to make the heavy decision of whether or not to pull the trigger. Do they risk their troops by not pulling the trigger? Or do they risk the life of a civilian by pulling it?

Meanwhile the family whose brother, mother, or sister just became “collateral damage” has no outlet to express their grief. Devoid of any political forum such others can ONLY resist in ways that we come to know of as terrorism. This is the cyclical form of violence that has no foreseeable end. That’s Schmitt.

Presented by this situation, our methodological process is one of deconstruction – our affirmation to not targeted kill civilians(terrorists) problematizes current democratic practices by blurring the line between the terrorist and civilian. This action allows us to ethically posture ourselves towards the Other and create a space of alterity where we no longer impose order, meaning, and violence upon those who are outside our conceptual framework. That’s Kuswa and Walsh.

Your ballot should be an affirmation of justice – to not impose meaning onto Otherness is the only ethical option that challenges the violence of language. Language attempts to define, stratify, and mark populations through the establishment of stable meanings – our counterpolicy invokes new tropes of political reality that counteracts status quo representations of the Other. That’s Mcquillian.

We think the role of the debate is to imagine alternative possibilities that don’t rely on extermination. This is the nexus point for where a variety of political questions arise. The conceptualization of how we deal with our violence changes how we interact in the social and political sphere.

“Western modernism is a network or grid of broad assumptions and beliefs that are deeply embedded in the way dominant Western culture constructs the nature of the world and one’s experiences in it”

“the majority of Euro-Americans adhere to a Eurocentric perspective founded on covert and overt assumptions regarding White superiority,”

“individuals or knowledges that depart from this norm are often devalued and subordinated.”

## A2: View From Nowhere

#### We are not a view from nowhere – we are a view from the drone pilot – Holmqvist talks about how the drone pilot is put in a position where he or she cannot effectively distinguish between terrorists and civilians and as a result has to conflate their identity. The pilot feels a fraternal connection with the troops on the ground which puts them in the stressful position of having to pull the trigger. This examination of the drone pilot has been left out of discussions of targeted killing.

## A2: Privilege

#### Daniel and I both go to Dartmouth we acknowledge our privilege as speaking from a position of whiteness – what can we do? – the response is to not impose onto otherness – the 1AC may very well contain elements of whiteness but it’s a question of how we appropriate that whiteness – we are able to reorient whiteness as something that isn’t oppressive but rather ethical through the lack of imposition of meaning. By creating an aporia of confusion within debate we allow the Other to speak and engage in forms of whatever discourse they please.

A retreat is privileged narcissism that abdicates political responsibility in favor of political apathy. WHITE SCHOLARS MUST FIND WAYS TO SPEAK ABOUT RACE.

Dr. Crenshaw ‘97 Prof of Speech Comm @ Univ. Ala. Carrie-PhD. USC; former director of debate @ Univ. of Ala.; WESTERN JOURNAL OF COMMUNICATION; Resisting Whiteness’ Rhetorical Silence; 61(3), Summer; pp. 253-278.

Another difficulty related to talking about race is what Alcoff has called "the problem of speaking for others." White people's voices have always been privileged, even if they are attempting to resist racism. If one pretends one's own privileged social location has no impact on her ability to make epistemic claims, the result may very well be the continuation or (re)production of oppression. Indeed, one part of the experience of oppression is to be (mis)representecl by others who enjoy the power to speak and to be heard by virtue of their social location. Another is to go unheard in an overwhelming cacophony of privileged voices (Alcoff 6-7). On the other hand, a retreat from argument may constitute a kind of privileged narcissism that abdicates political responsibility and social interconnectedness in favor of political apathy. It is safer for a white privileged person to walk away from these issues or to refuse the discussion of racialized personal experience in abstract conversation about racism. Even if the choice to be silent is principled, it can often lead to political inefficacy. Refusing to talk about white privilege will not make it go away. Worse still, a retreat may only serve to "conceal the actual authorizing power of the retreating intellectual" (Alcoff 22), and thus, constitute nothing less than complicity with whiteness' rhetorical silence. The question we must answer, then, is this: can white scholars speak to the issue of racism without speaking for or crowding out the voices of people of color? It is important to find a way to answer this question affirmatively because otherwise, in the wake of white critics' retreat into political apathy and social disconnectedness, all the moral and political work of resisting racism is left solely to people of color.