## 1AC

#### Drones have gotten a bad wrap in the debate community so far. Conservative teams would have you believe that drones need to be rained in but have minimal collateral damage and are the best tool to keep democratic citizens safe, while liberal teams would have you believe that we are drunk with power in our usage of drones, slaughtering babies at their mothers side to hit a cell phone of a terrorist leader. Both and neither of these realities are true. Ignored from these conversations has been the intensification of the intimate forms of violence that drone pilots and their targets experience, commanded from afar by policy makers, drone pilots watch their targets die closer than ground troops did in Iraqi during combat. The human experience of war form this conversation has been ignored.

Holmqvist, 2013. (Caroline, Holmqvist. Centre for International Studies, London School of Economics, UK Swedish National Defense College, Sweden. Undoing War: War Ontologies and the Materiality of Drone Warfare. May 1, 2013. <http://mil.sagepub.com/content/early> )

No doubt, drone warfare is infinitely more real for the populations amongst whom attacks take place, who risk being killed, losing loved ones or having their homes destroyed. Yet, while such arguments have understandable appeal, close study of drone operators’ activity yields a more complicated picture. Derek Gregory’s study of drone operators’ experience focuses on the ‘scopic regime’ that enables drone warfare in the first place and closely examines the different types of vision and imaging that drone operators are exposed to, from wide area airborne surveillance to the macro-field of micro-vision.24 These visibilities are conditional and conditioning because they are not merely technical feats but ‘techno-cultural accomplishments’.25 Rather than any straight- forward abstracting of war into a video game, the abstracting that takes place is convoluted and paradoxical. Contrary to common perception, drone warfare is ‘real’ also for those staring at a screen and, as such, the reference to video games is often simplistic. It s the *immersive* quality of video games, their power to draw players into their virtual worlds, that make them potent – this is precisely why they are used in pre-deployment training.26 The video streams from the UAV are shown to have the same immersive qual- ity on the drone operator – they produce the same ‘reality-effect’.¶ Virtual war, it seems, is less virtual than would appear at first glance. This conclusion is strengthened by the growing realisation that drone operators suffer as high, and possibly higher, rates of post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) as soldiers engaged in battle as a result of exposure to high-resolution images of killing, including the details of casualties and body parts that would never be possible to capture with the human eye.27 In other words, drone operators see *more* than soldiers in theatre. This is not to imply any trivialising parallels between operating drones from afar and physical engagement in battle, however. The view of the ‘hunter-killer’ is, in Gregory’s words, still privileged as the drone operator empathises with his fellow comrades on the ground in Afghanistan and feels compelled to ‘protect’ and ‘help’ them by instructing to shoot.28 Ultimately, the ‘drone stare’ still furthers the subjuga- tion of those marked as Other.29 What is of interest to us in examining the interaction of the virtual, material and human here, however, is that this occurs not through the experience (on the part of the drone operator) of distance, remoteness or detachment, but rather through the ‘sense of proximity’ to ground troops inculcated by the video feeds from the aerial plat- forms.30 The relationship between the fleshy body of the drone operator and the steely body of the drone and its ever-more sophisticated optical systems needs to be conceptualised in a way that allows for such paradoxes to be made intelligible.¶ Moreover, there is clearly a need to think of the study of the experience of war in new ways: if drone operators are not as shielded from the realities of war as is gener- ally assumed, what might they be bringing into the wider communities of which they are part? To what extent are their experiences theirs alone, and to what extent do we see them seeping out in a wider social corpus? In Merleau-Ponty’s terms, can we see the body (of the drone operator) ‘literally incarnating’ material capacities for agency, and thereby affecting the political disposition of a wider community?31 It is well estab- lished that soldiers returning from service run a higher risk of committing domestic violence, and the US military has an established programme for combating domestic violence.32 The high rate of PTSD amongst drone operators points to the need for follow-up studies of how these individuals behave in their home communities. By extension, this suggests that those interested in the experience of war need to include consideration also of the experience of – in this case – Nevada communities amidst which drone operators live. What such studies might yield we can only guess; yet it seems reasonable to suspect that the complex assemblage of virtual and material experiences that drone warfare produces might have its very own repercussions for processes and dynamics of societal militarisation and other manifestations of members’ violent experiences set in motion by, but far exceeding, war itself. In Merleau-Ponty’s terms, the human body is not separate from things, matter or representation; rather, ‘the flesh (of the world or my own) is ... a texture that returns to itself and conforms to itself’.33 Human bodies are ‘beings-in-the-world’,34 and the material ‘reality’ of robotic warfare, like the flesh of human bodies, is irredeemably generative. The fol- lowing section will expand on how.¶ Agentic Capacities of Material Objects¶ The targeting logic of drone warfare relies on a clear objectification of people, marking and classifying them as ‘targets’ of different ‘value’, with ‘high-value targets’ most hotly sought for capture or death, and the more recent expansion of targeting regimes to cover what are referred to as ‘low level fighters’.35 Advocates of decapitation strategies using drone warfare often rely on precisely such objectification of people.36 This is interesting in terms of what is revealed of the ethical relation between real people – in this case, seemingly allowing for the eschewal of any real encounter involving mutual recognition and recognisability37 – and raises interesting questions about the way in which that rela- tion is mediated by technology.

#### Today’s civilian is tomorrow’s terrorist, and today’s terrorist is tomorrow’s civilian. If the literature on indefinite detention is teaching us anything it’s that these divisions are malleable. The idea that we can fly planes into a foreign country and rain death from the sky, without any way for affected populations to contest it reproduces the need for strikes continually.

Schmidt 08 (Dennis J. Schmidt Who Counts? On Democracy, Power, and the Incalculable Research in Phenomenology 38 (2008) 228–243)

In place of any possible sovereign power, today we find the final possible alternative to the present shape of power. What is left as such an alternative is the power of individuals who stand completely apart from sovereignty and the turnover of power. We call such individuals “terrorists”—those whose power is terrible, terrifying, and monstrous—simply because the form of the power they express is outside that which has no outside. What is left, what is expressed by such power, is the assertion of unreason and real powerlessness in the form of the individual.30 What is left is irrational, incalculable, inefficient, non- sense. Such is the only remaining outside of power, and so long as there are no alternatives, such explosive expressions of powerlessness will not cease. Efforts to step outside the static tyranny of the new form of power as it is figured by globalized technology will always have something of desperation about them, something of nihilism, since it is a form of power that will not turn itself over. When the locus of power is no longer able to be contested, when power has calcified and become total leaving no alternative political power, then simple violence, naked brutality, is all that remains as a means of contesting the established power. There has always been political brutality and unspeakable violence; our age did not invent terror and horror. But our age has witnessed an intensification of certain dimensions of violence, an intensification changing the landscape of every exercise of power and turning the attempt to contest power into violence of a new order: open, public spaces can now be dangerous, no one is considered innocent, children have become weapons as well as targets, strangers are threatening, the material shapes of everyday life— airplanes, envelopes, shoes—are turned back upon individuals as weapons. Sovereign nations are not attacked, individuals are attacked. In short, the old forms by which those in power were confronted and power was contested have taken a new form, namely the form of raw violence, and the reason for this is that the power in power is itself a fundamentally new form. Or, so Heidegger would argue.¶ In the Greek world of its beginnings, democracy rested upon two sets of necessary conditions. The first of these conditions took the form of a prior agreement, the consent of all who would be citizens, to abide by the rule of the majority. This condition is met by individuals prior to any sense that there is a ␣␣␣␣␣. It is something of a pledge in which each person agrees to abide by a count, by numbers, that has yet to be tabulated. The second of the conditions requisite for democracy is, as Aristotle argued, the freedom of every individual, the absence of any coercion in matters of the democratic process, in the voice one has, and equally, the equality of all individuals when it comes to the matter of counting.31 These conditions are, of course, at odds: the first requires that each citizen be recognized as a singular being, an end unto him/herself, the second requires a reduction of each citizen to an abstract equality in which no one is different. If Heidegger’s claims about the present historical juncture are right, if we do indeed live in an age in which a sort of reduction to what is calculable is definitive, an age in which singularity is effaced, if not erased, then one can see how it is that the conditions of democratic life are in jeopardy. Despite the glaring inequities in the world, a curious equalization of everyone as an abstraction, as a simple number, is being achieved today, and at the same time, the singularity that is the locus of freedom seems more than ever to be alienated. Facing a form of power that will not turn over, the source of which will not change, any people, all peoples, seem to be in the strange condition of being outsiders.¶ If Heidegger’s argument about the nature of technological reason, the Gestell and Machenschaft, is right, then the possibilities of democracy in our time must indeed be considered in the light of the challenges of technological reason and the globalization that such rationality makes possible. Above all, one must ask how it is that we can preserve—or perhaps recover—an openness permitting the appearance of individuals in their singularity, that is, in their difference from others. One must also ask, just as urgently, how it is that power can transfer itself and not be calcified into one form. In other words, how it might be possible for history to begin again. Heidegger expressed a sense of helplessness before this question: “only a god can save us,” he said.32 That comment is not a declaration of faith; it is rather a statement of despair and hopelessness: we are powerless, only an outside, something beyond our understanding, can introduce change and set history into motion anew. It is not difficult to see the reasons for such a claim: globalization has, by virtue of the technologies that drive it and render it possible, shown itself to be a homogenization of the world and a shrinking of the spaces of political life, the spaces, that is, of differences. Nonetheless, one can still ask if this totalization and closure of the space of political life is indeed so seamless.

#### Drone pilots are confronted with the fluidity of the distinction between civilian and terrorist. The attempt to proscribe a response to the presencing of beings in zones of conflict makes violent political response inevitable.

#### We think that we should not targeted kill civilians(terrorists).

#### This juxtaposition is an ethical response that fosters openness and refuses to impose order, containment, and domination onto such others. It problematizes the current order of politics by blurring the lines of identification. This aporia is the only way to move towards justice.

**MacDonald ‘99** Department of Political Studies, Queens University 1999 Eleanor Science & Society 63.2 proquest

In an unusually direct moment in his article, "Force of Law: The `Mystical Foundation of Authority'," Derrida makes the statement, "deconstruction is justice" (Derrida, 1992, 15). The question of the relationship between deconstruction and politics returns continuously to this claim. It also, of necessity, begs the question of what then is "deconstruction." In Spectres of Marx, Derrida describes deconstruction as "a motif." As well, in a comparison with Marxist philosophy he suggests that what he is doing is "a performative interpretation": "An interpretation that transforms what it interprets is definitive of the performative as unorthodox with regard to speech act theory as it is with regard to the 11 th Thesis on Feuerbach ( `The philosophers have only interpreted the world in various ways; the point, however is to change it')" (Derrida, 1994, 51). Elsewhere, in the same text, Derrida uses the term "infinite critique" to describe his approach: A deconstructive thinking, the one that matters to me here, has always pointed out the irreducibility of affirmation and therefore of the promise, as well as the undeconstructibility of a certain idea of justice.... Such a thinking cannot operate without justifying the principle of a radical and interminable, infinite (both theoretical and practical, as one used to say) critique. This critique belongs to the movement of an experience open to the absolute future of what is coming, that is to say, a necessarily indeterminate, abstract, desert-like experience that is confided, exposed, given up to its waiting for the other and for the event. (Derrida, 1994, 90.) What this experience of "infinite critique" or this "motif" of deconstruction appears as, is a series of maneuvers performed on texts. These maneuvers seem designed to interrupt our confidence in meaning, and in the categories through which we organize meaning, by making these apparent, by playing with them, and by indicating the arbitrariness of their boundaries or oppositions. Deconstructive practices consist in a combination of wordplay, of play on metaphors, of taking things "to extremes," of introducing apparently unrelated texts as parallel to the central one and reading them alongside it, interweaving the multiple texts until meanings become jumbled, and new and unexpected meanings begin to emerge. The overall effect is to unsettle a text, to disturb any straightforward reading of it, to eventually abandon questions about authorial intention, to set the text adrift, as it were. And why is this "justice"? First, because of the "aporia" that it introduces - the sense of confusion that is in fact the "true" or "honest" and "ethical" response to and perception of the world. I use the word "honest" because what is other is truly other, and therefore finally unknowable - one is only being honest in an acknowledgment of this. And second, this is "ethical" because categories of meaning, it would seem, are imposed by us, onto others and otherness as a way of ordering, containing, and therefore dominating what is "other to ourselves." Language is a necessary violence for which deconstruction is the just or ethical response. What is true, then (in the understanding of the world that Derrida provides through deconstruction), is inadequation, non-commensurability, disjointedness. The ethical response is a recognition of this unknowability, a suspicion of all self-certainty. The political response is one of a corresponding openness, a promise of "democracy-tocome" (a promise which Derrida also assures us can never be wholly realizable in the present, in any present). At stake here is the very concept of democracy as concept of a promise that can only arise in such a diastema (failure, inadequation, disjunction, disadjustment, being "out of joint"). That is why we always propose to speak of a democracy to come, not of future democracy in the future present, not even of a regulating idea, in the Kantian sense, or of a utopia - at least to the extent that their inaccessibility would still retain the temporal form of a future present, of a future modality of a living present (Derrida, 1994, 64-5.)

#### We think debate matters, that debate is a unique political space. It is here that we see an intersection of citizenship, politics, law, and democracy. Debate gestures towards the democracy to come, an open hospitable environment characterized by radically different views of what matters. How we conceptualize polarized others in this space matters, the openness to terrorism has the possibility of a different conceptualization of difference outside of the rubric of security and extermination.

Kuswa and Walsh 2007 (Arguing War in an Era of Terrorism: “Democracy to Come” and Critical Pedagogy Kevin Kuswa and Briann Walsh (CONTROVERSIA Volume 5 Issue 2 <http://www.idebate.org/resources/publications/controversia.php> )

Our argument updates the insights of critical pedagogy by re-thinking the way the Other is conceived during times of conflict. Most importantly, the emerging era of terrorism and security intensifies the importance of reinvigorating our educational priorities, striving to achieve space for cultural difference and dissent, an interdisciplinary perspective, a critique of a polarized and pre-existing Other, and citizenship built on critical thinking. As might be expected, critical pedagogy comes full circle back to Derrida’s defense of democracy. Education is one place where opportunities are generated, conceivably the most significant place where citizenship, the law, the nation-state, and even the political are hatched and developed. Derrida, in a rare moment where he advocates political action, discusses a notion of democracy outside sovereignty, in a place where subjects are not pre-defined by citizenship, the law, the nation-state, or even world-citizenship. This move requires rethinking what politics is about, broadening our roles as teachers and students:¶ This is no small task...What I call ‘democracy to come ’ would go beyond the limits of cosmopolitanism, that is, of a world citizenship. It would be more in line with what lets singular beings (anyone)‘live together.’...That said, and because all of this will remain for some time out of reach, I believe that everything must be done to extend the privilege of citizen- ship in the world. (130)¶ To continue the necessary resuscitation of democracy in Derrida’s sense, a critical pedagogy in an era of conflict and terrorism demands another look. The aim of articulating a non-mediating rhetoric is to resist deployments of education that would craft an expansive and violent Other under the signs of security and counter-terrorism. Our argument ends and begins from the position that practices of critical pedagogy in an argumentation studies setting (“What is terrorism?”) mark a potential response to violence and a polarized Other. The stakes are large in that the underlying issue is how to address local and global strategies of fear, oppression, control, annihilation, and extermination. An open-ended critical pedagogy informed by Derrida’s concept of a “democracy to come” and Dewey’s advocacy of a politics “against war” can work toward expressive engagements between selves and Others. Our era of fear and war based on terrorism and counter-terrorism requires a vision of a radical, even if impossible, democracy. More specifically, the abandonment of war in certain instances becomes a call symbolizing the need to encounter the Other without judgment or mediating rhetoric, a critical connection to teaching and learning that argues war to transcend.

#### Politics has been ceded to the think tanks, tested in focus groups than formulated into law. The entire system would be laughable if it wasn’t our current political context. This engagement with stupidity begs for deconstruction. Our politics is one that is allergic to policy itself, an issue for the public as well as the policy maker. This difference from policy is exactly what makes democracy thinkable it is a politics that lends way to agency.

Mcquillan 08 (Derrida and Policy: Is Deconstruction Really a Social Science? Derrida Today)

In order for politics to be thinkable there must be some moment at which thought moves over into politics. Now, one could pick at this opening sentence for some time, books could be written and research projects designed to interrogate whether it is true or not. Its truth or otherwise will certainly depend upon what one means here by 'politics' (twice and non-identically), 'thinkable', 'some moment', 'thought', 'moves over', and indeed 'into', none of this is without consequence for either deconstruction or truth. However, allow me momentarily to place my own opening sentence in inverted commas, as if it had been spoken by someone else and with the authority of a someone else. Allow me the In order for politics to be thinkable there must be some moment at which thought moves over into politics. Now, one could pick at this opening sentence for some time, books could be written and research projects designed to interrogate whether it is true or not. Its truth or otherwise will certainly depend upon what one means here by 'politics' (twice and non-identically), 'thinkable', 'some moment', 'thought', 'moves over', and indeed 'into', none of this is without consequence for either deconstruction or truth. However, allow me momentarily to place my own opening sentence in inverted commas, as if it had been spoken by someone else and with the authority of a someone else. Allow me the considerable license of taking this quotation as axiomatic for what is to follow even if both you and I do not believe it as a statement of fact, or at least even if you and I do not quite believe it as a statement of fact because we are more than capable of acting upon it in good faith as if it were fact. Such a statement is a seduction to short-circuit thinking. It asks us not to look at it - do not question me, take me as 'read.' In this sentence, one can find a concentrated example of the logo-rhetorical illusion that is the predicate of politics, in which politics and thought separate themselves into conceptual spheres just as these spheres emerge from the mediated, supplatory conceptualisation in which thought and politics are inextricably bound one to the other. However, today I am in the mood to be seduced and there are ways in which one can, more or less, give oneself up strategically to such overtures. Imagine for a moment that both thought and politics were imaginable outside of mediation and that one followed the other as day follows night and that one could be translated into the other by some alchemical process. Then imagine the consequences of this for politics. If one were able to momentarily suspend all this disbelief (as if 'deconstruction' and centuries of politics had never happened) then we would find ourselves in the position of the policy maker. This is not a new position to be in but one that has a certain visibility today in the technocratic space of liberal democracies. Today, 'policy making' is out- sourced to so-called 'think tanks' where policy is formulated and road- tested on 'focus groups' before being adopted (or paid for) by political parties, diluting to taste.¶ 'Policy' is one of those obscure words of the modern political lexicon; nothing could be more vague or less well understood than this term, which of course means that it is invoked ubiquitously without reflection. The basic assumption of policy, as an idea, is the logo-rhetorical illusion par excellence that theory translates (and is translate-able in principle) into practice. Policy then becomes law, as if the transmission of the law were itself a straightforward and transparent thing. One might laugh at such a naIve, 'un-deconstructed' notion, if it were not for the fact that this is how the world is run. The comedian Ken Dodd says of Freud's formulation of laughter as a release of psychic energy: 'the problem with Freud is that he never played the Glasgow Empire.' Equally, the problem with the deconstruction of policy might be that the White House has yet to open itself to a policy of deconstruction. I want to ask in this essay, what would such a policy or set of policies look like, if they were imaginable? This is not to suggest that, after his death, the writing of Derrida might give rise to a set of 'practical' political policies, as the texts of Marx and Lenin were 'read' as the biblical revelation of an onto-theo-politics. Rather, it is to accept Roland Barthes' caution that one cannot simply exclude oneself from the discourse of stupidity. 'I don't mean that one can't be innocent of it', he told Jean-Jacques Brochier in 1975, 'that would be bad faith, but one can't be innocent of it *simply .* .. In any case, stupidity's mode of being is triumph. One can do nothing against stupidity. One can only internalize it, take a small homeopathic dose of it - but not too much' (Barthes 1985, 224). Think of this then as a hypothesis, what analytic philosophy would call a thought experiment. It is certainly not a bid for interpretative rights to the text of Derrida or the political futures of deconstruction, whatever such a word continues to mean. I am also reminded here of another caution, that of Edward Said who had little time for what he called 'travelling theory' (Said 1994, 389 and Said 1991, 226-47), whereby specialization as a mode of professionalisation within the academy comes to serve the interests of policy makers. His complaint is against the professional production of specialists on the 'Orient' who sell their expertise to the government and media while having their appearance in the government or media affirm their expertise. While the very idea of 'policy' no doubt marks an important, and not easily dismissed, transformation in the arena of competency of both party politicians and academics, it calls out for deconstruction. That is a deconstruction of its very premises as the dialectical-complex and unholy alliance between the techno-scientific, global economy and the technocratic university of specialisation in relation to a mediatic space, which presents one through the explanation of the other in terms of pragmatism, expediency, compromise or 'realism'. Here I am talking about a certain culture that we call politics, the properly political (the discourse of parties and politicians in governmental power across the world). As Derrida points out in *Specters of Marx,* in this culture 'virtually everywhere Western models prevail' (Derrida 1994, 52). ¶ This culture has always been bound to the culture of tele-technology, to mediation and representation. However, today, this relation is accelerated in an unprecedented fashion according to the rhythm of so-called 'communications' as the 'selective and hierarchized production of "information'" (Derrida 1994, 52) and its auto-immunised interpretation. The academic discourse of the technocratic university is welded to this apparatus in an indissociable way. It is almost impossible to watch a news programme without the appearance of an academic witness who provides the most banal and unscholarly of comments to justify or exemplify the content of a news item. Whole news items are nothing more than the appearance of academics to promote their 'research findings' or latest reports; entire university research strategies are written around the stated desire for such appearances. Which university does not now have a press office? In my institution at least half of the Faculties of the university (those that can afford them) have contracts with media consultants who are employed to write 'accessible' accounts of research activities with a view to placing stories in the media or promoting individuals to the level of media figure, talking head or guru. ¶ There is no point at which it is thought that academic research (another obscure term which we will need to tackle on another day) is inimical to this form of reductionism or that certain forms of thought might be allergic to passing through a me ia culture in this way. At any rate the idea of policy is related, in no doubt complex and over-determined, ways to this mutation in the channels which run between the academic and public spaces, which have more or less neutralised the notion of the public intellectual (another term we might caution against today given its historical relation to closely policed questions of propriety, gender, race and sexuality).¶ A thinking of the relationship between the text of Derrida and the articulation of policy will necessarily involve a new thinking of the ground of policy and its relation to the media-political culture of today. What if it were possible to imagine something like a 'counter-policy', a thinking of policy as an intervention in the world that neither separated theory from practice nor accepted the easy place of the academic in the political-mediatic apparatus? What if it were possible to set policy- making against itself, to make policies to which policy was itself allergic? This would be an impossible policy, policy which understood the idea of policy to be impossible: policy without telos, policy without policy, policy no longer able to accept the name of policy but the only policy to be worthy of the name as an action in the material world. In imaging such a decentring of policy, one might also pertinently ask, does politics as such always imply an idea of policy in the same way that it always implies an idea of the human? That is to say does policy itself (as the pretext, off-spring and crafting of the moment of political antagonism) imply or assume an inherited idea of the human? Given the location of policy, in its modern sense, within the topography of contemporary political culture, in which policy precedes and enables the agency of political man then the answer is surely yes and a rethinking of policy would be nothing less than an entire disarticulation of this logo-anthro- onto-pological schema. Such a thinking of policy would then require the inauguration of a counter-culture as well as a counter-policy, with its own counter-institutions and spaces of articulation that would of course have their own vexed relation to channels of communication and the new technologies of the digital epoch as an exercise of public critical reason. One should also say that it is undoubtedly the case that such cultural transformations are already under way in spaces not visible to the academic-anthropological or mediatic gaze, across the hinterlands of the world wide web, cyber activism and in corners of the thinking world un-compromised by the funded research culture of the transnational university. However, in this text I am only proposing to take a position not to do the work that the sustainability of such a position would require. I am also talking about a relation between philosophy and policy that would be, unlike other articulations of militancy currently to be found in cyber-space, both properly philosophical and properly a 'political science', if such a thing exists.

#### Justice is the only non-deconstructable impact. Justice is the foremost concern for the policymaker, to pay respect to the otherness of the other.

Mcquillan 08 (Derrida and Policy: Is Deconstruction Really a Social Science? Derrida Today)

Again to be for Justice is to be in favour of breathing and given the way that this term is routinely abused and appropriated it is no doubt necessary to take care around this word. However, Derrida is moved to tell us that 'justice is the undeconstructable condition of any deconstruction' (Derrida 1994, 28). This is a syntagm with which I have wrestled for some time, given that any metaphysical concept can in principle be deconstructed and that 'justice' is surely a metaphysical concept politically and philosophically inscribed. To be too hasty in my commentary, the notion of justice that Derrida is invoking here is of course catachrestic and quasi-transcendental, whereby the idea of 'justice' refers to the act of deconstruction which does justice to the otherness of the event by enabling that otherness to speak, the undeconstructable (irreducible) condition of any deconstruction would be to articulate such otherness. The present importance of this is that in doing justice to policy one must take account of the difficulty of what is referred to by Derrida by the twin names of the 'undecideablity' and 'responsibility' of such an event. One the one hand, the policy maker should take account of the injustice of his/her own policy formation, which as a textual inscription, will inevitably fail to do justice to the possibilities of otherness within itself and will simultaneously and constantly be in the process of disarticulating itself from within as a consequence of this otherness, rendering itself unstable and radically undecideable. Taking account of this scenario will require the self-aware policy maker to act responsibly with respect to the task of policy making by taking time to reflect judiciously on the event of alterity (which will be forever undecideable) and at the same time acting responsibly with the respect to the other by doing justice to that other and acting quickly (or formulating policy quickly) which will respond to the immediate urgency in the here and now of the needs of the other. This is to say, once again that policy, properly understood, is beginning to look more and more like an untenable prospect from a "deconstructive" point of view. Some would say that it would be entirely typical of 'the Derrida Party' to have a policy of having no policies. However, this would be a crude reduction. I think the more considerable difficulty here is that it may not be possible for deconstruction ever to produce an inaugural or generative political discourse outside of an act of reading or critical intervention. From the point of view of a faithfulness to a certain manner of reading the world, there could be no political discourse worthy of the name of deconstruction which was generated outside of or anterior to a singular act of 'reading' a unique event. This is not to say that deconstruction would be for ever condemned to read and reread the texts of the political canon as a route to articulating the alterity repressed within them by the logocentric model of western political discourse (as if this were merely or simply a secondary, supplementary or weaker task than, say, policy making). Rather, with the reading (as critical intervention) of singular events comes the requirement to affirm a position with respect to that event and in so doing negotiate between that necessarily material and institutional position (counter-institutions are also institutions) and the risk to that position incurred by the affirmation of the unpredictable effects of otherness. Every policy then needs to be open to the risk of its own deconstruction by the very political conditions it puts in play. It is of course not the role of deconstruction to offer reassuring and easily appropriable policies to policy-makers. However, risk and policy are uneasy companions; we live in an age of 'risk management', in which policies are formulated to predict the unpredictable consequences of risk. Risk can be neutralised by techne, such is the dream of the death cult of contemporary managerialism.