### 1AC

#### Targeted killing is part and parcel of a western occularcentric strategy that maps out and destroys otherness

Shaw, Graaham, and Majed ’12. Shaw, Ian Graham, and Akhter, Majed. "The Unbearable Humanness of Drone Warfare in FATA, Pakistan." Antipode 44.4 (September 2012).

Representation, a social practice and strategy through which meanings are constituted and communicated, is unavoidable when dealing with militarism and military activities. Armed Forces, and defence institutions, take great care in producing and promoting specific portrayals of themselves and their activities in order to legitimize and justify their activities in places, spaces, environments and landscapes ([Woodward 2005](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-8330.2011.00940.x/full#b87):729).¶ In this section, we argue that the ramping up of drone deployments is justified by a distinctive targeting logic. As [Paul Virrilo (1989)](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-8330.2011.00940.x/full#b88) has long argued, there is never war without representation, which is to say, the deadly materiality of war is always coiled within a discursive system (see also [Shaw 2010](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-8330.2011.00940.x/full#b70)). In this sense, the drone performs a well-rehearsed imaginative geography ([Bialasiewicz et al 2007](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-8330.2011.00940.x/full" \l "b13" \o "Link to bibliographic citation); [Gregory 2004](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-8330.2011.00940.x/full#b29)) that is underwritten by targeted kills across neat isometric grids and algorithmic calculations ([Amoore 2009](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-8330.2011.00940.x/full" \l "b8" \o "Link to bibliographic citation)), far removed from the brutal Real ([Jones and Clarke 2006](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-8330.2011.00940.x/full#b41)), and in a peculiar relation with the visceral imagery of previous wars ([Tuathail 2003](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-8330.2011.00940.x/full" \l "b75" \o "Link to bibliographic citation)). The official “definition” of a targeted kill is not agreed upon under international law. Yet as a recent UN report on targeted killing reveals, it can be thought of as follows:¶ A targeted killing is the intentional, premeditated and deliberate use of lethal force, by States or their agents acting under colour of law, or by an organized armed group in armed conflict, against a specific individual who is not in the physical custody of the perpetrator. In recent years, a few States have adopted policies, either openly or implicitly, of using targeted killings, including in the territories of other States. Such policies have been justified both as a legitimate response to “terrorist” threats and as a necessary response to the challenges of “asymmetric warfare”. In the legitimate struggle against terrorism, too many criminal acts have been re-characterized so as to justify addressing them within the framework of the law of armed conflict. New technologies, and especially unarmed combat aerial vehicles or “drones”, have been added into this mix, by making it easier to kill targets, with fewer risks to the targeting State ([Alston 2010](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-8330.2011.00940.x/full#b6):3).¶ The means and methods of killing vary, and include sniper fire, shooting at close range, missiles from helicopters, gunships, drones, the use of car bombs, and poison ([Alston 2010](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-8330.2011.00940.x/full#b6):4)¶ The drone is heralded by the US military as the apex of a targeting logic—accurate, efficient, and deadly. This logic traces a distinct genesis. In 1938 Martin Heidegger wrote of the “age of the world picture”, in a classic essay on the split between subject and object. For him, today's world is conceived, grasped, and conquered as a picture—and what it means “to be” is for the first time defined as the objectiveness of representing. In this modern age of humanism, a subjective “worldview” arises for the first time—humans appear as Cartesian subjects and the world as a calculated picture, engineered by science and technology. Ray [Chow (2006)](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-8330.2011.00940.x/full#b17) extends this metaphysical analysis to contend that the world has further been produced as a “target”. In the wake of the atomic event of Hiroshima, the entire globe is rendered as a grid of targets to be destroyed as soon as it can be made visible. Indeed, to see is to destroy.¶ Vision is thus crucial to an ocularcentric Western society ([Rose 2001](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-8330.2011.00940.x/full#b66)), and always already entangled within military culture. The ability to gaze from “nowhere” and yet represent “everywhere” is what [Haraway (1988)](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-8330.2011.00940.x/full#b33) labels the “god-trick”. She argues that the eyes have been perfected by the logics of military, capitalist, and colonial supremacy; one that is fundamentally located within a nexus of disembodiment:¶ … the vantage point of the cyclopian, self-satiated eye of the master subject. The Western eye has fundamentally been a wandering eye. Vision is apparently without limit, the ‘ordinary primate’ can now see underwater, at night, through walls, into biological cells, onto distant galaxies: an “unregulated gluttony” that prides itself on its “objectivity” (1988:586).¶ This disembodied visual logic is perfected in the doctrine of airpower, the dominant theme of US national defense post World War II. [Kaplan (2006a)](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-8330.2011.00940.x/full#b42) names this a “cosmic view” that both unifies and separates “targets” from above. The sky is the space in which technology masters the world. It is clean, disembodied, and a place where nobody dies (that just happens on the ground). Do we not seehere a colonial logic of “us” in the sky, versus “them” on the ground **([Amoore 2009](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-8330.2011.00940.x/full" \l "b8" \o "Link to bibliographic citation);** [**Gregory 2010**](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-8330.2011.00940.x/full#b32)**)?** The drone is capable of performing **([Bialasiewicz et al 2007](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-8330.2011.00940.x/full" \l "b13" \o "Link to bibliographic citation))** this logic,through a digital worldview of targets that dismisses ambiguity and reinforces the same old god-trick of a view of somewhere from nowhere([Kaplan 2006b](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-8330.2011.00940.x/full#b43)). This is not to say that the sky is a space of pure deterritorialization ([Deleuze and Guattari 1987](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-8330.2011.00940.x/full" \l "b20" \o "Link to bibliographic citation)). Since the mid-twentieth century the atmosphere has become increasingly nationalized, particularly after the Cold War ([Kaplan 2006b](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-8330.2011.00940.x/full#b43); [Williams 2010](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-8330.2011.00940.x/full#b85)). The “Revolution in Military Affairs” (RMA) was a set of tactics put forward by the US military for securing the future of warfare ([Kaplan 2009](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-8330.2011.00940.x/full#b44)). They include information communications, space technology, satellites, drones, nano-robotics, all pivoting around the idea of “network-centric warfare”. As [McDonald (2007)](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-8330.2011.00940.x/full#b54) argues, this is precisely the reason that “outer space” needs to be investigated by critical geography, given that social life tied to the celestial, and space-based subjectivities are increasingly normalized.¶ Orbital logics thus spill into the everyday, as does the pervasive influence of targeting in US culture. From the use of GIS sciences that spatialize, calculate, and fix Cartesian wanderings—without a necessary appeal to the uniqueness of place or its crumpled ontologies—to the vicarious gazing and gaming of a far-away war ([Shaw 2010](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-8330.2011.00940.x/full#b70); [Wark 2007](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-8330.2011.00940.x/full#b80)), targeting is now woven into the fabric of mundane life. GIS and GPS programs are no longer alien technologies used by armies and government agencies, but shared everyday practices. As such, the drone is not an aberration—but the apex of an expanding targeting zeitgeist. In this age, “to be” is to be locked within the cool certainty of a crosshair.

#### This is part and parcel of a turn in military strategy that deploys new technologies to counter the successful insurgencies abroad The supposed objectivity of this strategy gives the guise of legitimacy to the historic practice of u.s colonialism

Graham, Stephen 2007 Ph.D. (Science and Technology Policy)

ROBO-WARTM DREAMS: GLOBAL SOUTH URBANISATION AND THE US MILITARY'S 'REVOLUTION IN MILITARY AFFAIRS crisis states working paper]

“The ultimate expression of sovereignty resides [...] in the power and capacity to dictate who may live and who must die” (Mbembe 2003: 11)¶ A large-scale military research and development programme is currently underway in the United States to tailor the ‘Revolution in Military Affairs’ to the specific micro-geographies of the global south cities that many US military theorists envisage to be their main ‘battlespaces’ on the 21st century. Here the cutting-edge techno-scientific efforts and priorities of the world’s dominant military power are being shifted dramatically from an emphasis on globe-spanning control, networking and vertical targeting – treating planet Earth as some unitary, ageographical ‘battlespace’ – to one aimed at bringing maximum control, surveillance and killing power to the detailed micro-geographies of the burgeoning urban environments of the global south.¶ Such dreams of omnipotence must, of course, be treated with caution. The US military and its associated complex of R & D outfits have, after all, long held fantasies of superweapons that would deterministically realise their dreams of mastery and omnipotence (Franklin 1988). As now, such technophiliac dreams of mastery have usually evolved closely with the wider discourses of speculative fiction and popular geopolitical domains and entertainment industries (Gannon 2003). The ‘technological fanaticism’ of both has deep roots within US political, popular and military culture (Sherry 1987). As Jeremy Black (2001: 97) suggests, we therefore need to be careful to interpret the RMA, and its latest ‘urban turn’, not as some quasi-rational response amongst US military and political elites to changing geopolitical conditions, but, rather, as “symptomatic of a set of cultural and political assumptions that tell us more about modern western society than they do about any objective assessment of military options”.¶ Moreover, we must also remember that the ‘U.S. military’ is far from being some single, unitary actor. All of the discourses, projects and programmes analysed in this paper remain extremely contested. Within the vast institutional complex that together constitutes the ‘US military’, and its associated security and military industries and lobby groups, major political battles are underway – fuelled by the ongoing nightmare in Iraq – over the degree to which technophiliac dreams of omnipotence, through some urbanised ‘RMA’ or ‘network centric warfare,’ are realistic, even in military terms. Many in the US Army, in particular, are deeply sceptical that the horrors and ‘fog of war’ in bloody ‘urban operations’ like the Iraqi insurgency can ever really be technologised, mediated, and saturated with sentient surveillance and targeting systems to anything like the degree that is common in the discursive imaginings driving the programmes discussed above.¶ Whilst what I have called here the urban turn in the RMA is, of course, being driven by often wild and fantastical discourses, its effects are likely to be very material and profound. Massive techno-scientific efforts to equip the US military so that they can saturate global south cities with real-time surveillance, targeting and killing systems are undoubtedly underway, fuelled by the nascent experimentations on the streets of Iraq’s cities and in and above the West Bank and Gaza. The latest military-industrial-‘security’ research drive is focusing on using new algorithmic surveillance capabilities to try and overcome the ways in which the micro-geographies of global south cities are portrayed as environments that interrupt wider dreams of US military and technological omnipotence. Above all, as the ‘war on terror’ seeks to project notions of war that are unbound in time and space, so the sovereign power to kill is in the process of being delegated to computer code.

#### Targeted killing is an ultimate manifestation of sovereign manipulation- it crafts a *racist* relation to life that cedes complete power to the State to let live or make die. It instills a systemic state of fear of ethnic populations

Irving Goh [Fellow @ Harvard University where he worked on a research project on Balibar's philosophy of citizenship. He has also been Research Fellow at the National University of Singapore. His research emphasis is in continental philosophy and its intersections with other disciplines like politics, literature, and architecture] “Disagreeing Preemptive/ Prophylaxis: From Philip K. Dick to Jacques Rancière” Fast Capitalism, 2.1 2006, <http://www.uta.edu/huma/agger/fastcapitalism/2_1/goh.html>

At present, the time of the preemptive presents the targeted body without the chance, or the right, to offer a counter-hypothesis, so as to prove the preemptive erroneous. The targeted body of the preemptive is not offered, and cannot offer, a prophylaxis contra the preemptive so as to delay the elimination of the right to be alive. In other words, in the staging of the preemptive, there is no space for disagreement. His or her speech, phone or logos—the desperate cries (phone) of denial of any (future) wrongdoing; or the cries of injustice of a treatment towards another human being, articulated in a linguistic idiom rational and intelligible (logos); and the cries to surrender (including deferring one's own innocence for the sake of one's safety)—no longer matters. It is no longer heard, as in the case of the preemptive shooting in Miami. Even silence is not heard either, as in the case of the London shooting. The rush of a preemptive is a sonic barrage that drowns out any (silent) voice that seeks to defer it. The gap opened by a suspected body between itself and the law that promises the security of the territory is already too great. The law and its need to secure a terrifying peace cannot bear the widening or delaying of that interval by a further demand of a disagreeing counter-hypothesis or auto-prophylaxis. To allow the normalization of the fatal preemptive would be to institute the legitimization of an absolute or extreme biopolitics. According to Foucault, biopolitics is the control and management of individual bodies by the State through technics of knowledge (usually through surveillance) of those same bodies. In a biopolitical situation, the State holds the exceptional power to determine either the right to let live or make die the individual belonging to the State. Should the preemptive become a force of reason of contemporary life, one would terribly risk submitting the freedom of life and therefore an unconditional right to be alive to a biopolitical capture, handing over the right to let die to the State police and military powers. It would be a situation of abdicating the body as a totally exposed frontier of absolute war. For in the constant exposure of the imminent preemptive, the body at any time—when decided upon by military or police powers to be a security threat—becomes the point in which the space and time of conductibility of war collapse in a total manner. The preemptive reduces the body to a total space of absolute war. Virilio has suggested that the absolute destruction of an enemy in war is procured when the enemy can no longer hypothesize an alternate if not counter route or trajectory (of escape or counter- attack) from impending forces (1990: 17). In the sequence of executing the preemptive to its resolute end, the escaping body faces that same threat of zero hypothesis. There is no chance for that body to think (itself) outside the vortical preemptive. Preemptive bullets into the head would take away that chance of hypothesis. A spectral figure begins to haunt the scene now. And that is the figure of the homo sacer, who according to Agamben's analysis, is the one who in ancient times is killed without his or her death being a religious sacrifice, and the one whose killers are non indictable of homicide. This figure is also the sign par excellence of the absolute biopolitical capture of life by the State, in which the decision to let live and make die is absolutely managed and decided by the State, and thereby the right to be alive is no longer the fact of freedom of existence for the homo sacer (Agamben 1998). For the right to be alive to be secured in any real sense from any political capture, for it to be maintained and guaranteed as and for the future of the human, the body cannot be allowed to return to this figure of the homo sacer. But victims of the preemptive irrepressibly recall the figure of the homo sacer. In the current legal proceedings of the London shooting, it has not been the fact that the police officers shot an innocent Brazilian that they will be charged. That charge remains absent. The charge of homicide against the officers remains elliptical. Instead, the plan has been to charge them for altering the police log book to conceal the fact that they had mistakenly identified the victim as a terror suspect. The possible turn of human life into the figure of homo sacer as decided by forces of the police or military under the overarching security measure of the preemptive divides the common space of existence. The space of existence becomes less than common now. The preemptive, as in the decision of a homo sacer, brings along with it a certain profiling of certain peoples, regardless of whether the force of law or the State would like to admit or not to such profiling measures. The law or the State would deny this unspoken profiling, but the evidence of its real imminence is felt by the peoples who would most likely fall under the category that the police or military would identify as a possible terror threat. And there is no denying that this profiling largely takes on an ethnic contour. And the fears of such a contouring are not unspoken. "Anyone with dark skin who was running for a bus or Tube could be thought to be about to detonate a bomb," expressed a concerned Labor peer Lord Ahmed for the U.K. Muslim community after the London shooting ("U.K. Muslims Feel 'Under Suspicion'" BBC News. 25 July 2005). The irreducible profiling in the culture of the preemptive is happening in the United States too. A New York Times article reports of a police-speak of "M.E.W.C's" under its intense surveillance—"Middle Eastern with a camera—perhaps taking pictures of a bridge, a hydropower plant or a reservoir" (Kershaw, New York Times. 25 July 2005). The nonnative ethnic community senses a state of emergency that works against them, that restricts their freedom of living on without fear. Indeed, after the London shooting, the BBC carried a report that said "many young Muslims were reluctant to leave their homes" ("U.K. Muslims Feel 'Under Suspicion'" BBC News. 25 July 2005). Their right to be alive becomes under siege as they "believed they could become victims of mistaken identity by armed police" (ibid.). They simply cannot hypothesize, innocent as they are of the intent of terror, a way to disprove the charge of the deadly preemptive that (mis)identifies or profiles them as possible terror suspects. As a Muslim living in Manchester says, "How do I know I won't just be picked up and labeled as a terrorist?" (ibid.). The possibility of a counter-hypothesis against the preemptive, and the unconditional right to be alive, become for these peoples, the unthinkable. That is what Anderton in Minority Report feels too once the naming of himself as a criminal-to-be and the decision of the preemptive capture of him have been disseminated. Even with a counter-proof that he will not commit a crime, he resigns to the fact that nothing can be done to reverse the precession of the preemptive, nothing to stop "precrime" from believing that he has not "the remotest intention of killing" (Dick 1997:329).

#### Targeted killing causes a global feeling of terror and fear, the fact that you can be obliterated at any moment causes physic trauma

Goh 6 [Irving, Fellow @ Harvard University, Fast Capitalism, 2.1 2006, http://fastcapitalism.com/]

**The articulation of wait cannot be more urgent today.** **It must be pronouncedly reiterated, in disagreement with the deadly preemptive, before the latter becomes a "necessary" global security condition of living in the world today.** **The deadly preemptive** without chance for a counterhypothetic prophylaxis being offered **must be resisted against its gaining momentum to procure a global consensual, legal status**. **And even if it is already in the process of being legalized or normalized as a contemporary fact or "necessity" of life in this twenty-first century of insecurity, it still has to be disagreed with**. According to Rancière, **consensus is arrived at from a striated observation of the real. The real today is a situation in which terror is surprising major cities and cities thought to be defensible against if not impenetrable to such surprises** in ever greater media visibility and spectacle. **To prevent more of these terrifying surprises (mediatising themselves) elsewhere, or such that second surprises will not tear apart the same city, the determination has been to short-circuit the possible dissemination of such terror at whatever cost.** **And this is where the preemptive has come in, the only possible measure to erase the slightest shadow of the next surprise.** It cannot take chances. There is no chance for the counter-hypothesis. The real "is the absorption of all reality and all truth in the category of the only thing possible" (Rancière 1999:132). **This is the real through which the consensus on the preemptive is or will be reached.** The consensus is that "which asserts, in all circumstances, that it is only doing the only thing possible to do" (ibid.). The aggregation of the striated observation of the real, the "only thing possible to do," and consensus, is the final collapse of thinking of another trajectory of the future of the real, the erasure of the exposition of what is unthinkable or impossible that will falsify the future of "the only thing possible to do." **The singular fatal preemptive cannot become a consensus of the "only thing possible to do."** It cannot be thought as a necessity of security, a "perceptible given of common life" (Rancière 2004:7). Furthermore, consensus tends to fail to solve the problem it seeks to address. According to Rancière, in the political scene of the late 1990s, "'Consensus' was presented as the pacification of conflicts that arose from ideologies of social struggle, and yet it brought about anything but peace" (2004:4). Instead, **there has been but the "re-emergence and success of racist and xenophobic movements"** (ibid.). **One can hardly imagine that a different outcome will indeed arise with the consensus of the deadly preemptive today.** While policies are being put in place to rid a territory of hatred or hate-mongers, as in the United Kingdom today, **the normalization of the preemptive, which brings along with it** its unspoken profiling contours, would only serve to undermine if not contradict the former, since the profiling contour of the preemptive has been known elsewhere to have "produced **tremendous resentment and hostility"** [3] (Kershaw, New York Times. 25 July 2005). And as the American State war-machine leads the world in the global "war on terror," conducting war in countries like Iraq to preempt the spread of terror, **not only is the right to be alive of innocent civilians in Iraq denied by military collateral damage there, but any homeland in America or elsewhere has not the sense that it has procured a better security.** **Instead, there remains the constant fear of further terror carried out under the pretext of retaliation against the preemptive like the one in Iraq.** **This worry has been exactly the same sentiment echoed recently in response to the** Bush Administration's engineering of its next preemptive military measure, **the Prompt Global Strike (PGS): "[PGS] may push potential hostile nations to be prepared to launch nuclear-armed missiles with even less notice than before in order to avoid them being destroyed in any preemptive U.S. first strike. Therefore, […] far from making the American people and homeland safer, the development of such weapons could put them at even greater risk from thermonuclear attack"** (Sieff, United Press International. 09 February 2006). **More than exorcizing the past trauma, the preemptive only perpetuates more trauma as more lives are lost and the right to be alive severely striated by the force of law.** **The global legal consensus on the singular deadly preemptive is therefore nothing short of terrifying** either. One is reminded of Minority Report here, in which "rule by terror" is also the name given to the "precrime" methods of preemptively "arresting innocent men—nocturnal police raids, that sort of thing" (Dick 1997:348). And in turn, does that not remind one of all those rendition operations of the CIA, in which terror suspects, some of them arrested preemptively, and some of them already proven innocent in yet another case of mistaken identity or intelligence let-down of the preemptive, are rendered to prisons outside the United States where they can get no legal help and where they may more likely than not be tortured, in clear violation of international law? These preemptive renditions are now beginning to be slowly unveiled to have some sort of consensus from some European nations like the United Kingdom and Germany, and nations that have had supported these prisons such as Poland, Romania, Morocco, and Thailand. There is something not very democratic about the preemptive, to say the least. And the more consensus it gathers around it, the more undemocratic its practice will become. This is at least Rancière's argument of the consensus. For Rancière, consensus is nothing short of the erasure of politics or democracy. The aura of democratic practice that surrounds the politics of consensus is but a false illusion. Politics or democracy should be that primary irreducible gesture of disagreement with any injustice that is at work against an individual or a collective, especially the injustice that detaches the individual or a certain collective from an immanent fact of common freedom by denying them the right to partake of that common. But consensus does not open a space for such a gesture. Instead, according to Rancière, consensus is only "the dissolution of all political differences and juridical distinctions," the "erasing [of] the contestatory, conflictual nature of the very givens of common life" (Rancière 2004:8/7). **It would only be in the spirit of democracy to disagree with the consensus, the consensus of the preemptive in all its forms.**

#### Our criticism is not narrowly limited to the imperialist tactics of targeted killing, we need to make linkages between domestic manifestations of white supremacy, global violence, and other forms of oppression in order to form holistic and transformative politics- targeted killing is just the starting point

West, Union Theological Seminary philosophy professor, 7-22-13  
Cornel, “Cornel West: Obama’s Response to Trayvon Martin Case Belies Failure to Challenge "New Jim Crow"”<http://www.democracynow.org/2013/7/22/cornel_west_obamas_response_to_trayvon>

**AMY GOODMAN:** This is the march of the—honoring the 50th anniversary—¶ **CORNEL WEST:** The 50th anniversary.¶ **AMY GOODMAN:** —of the "I Have a Dream" speech.¶ **CORNEL WEST:** And you know what the irony is, Sister Amy? Brother Martin would not be invited to the very march in his name, because he would talk about drones. He’d talk about Wall Street criminality. He would talk about working class being pushed to the margins as profits went up for corporate executives in their compensation. He would talk about the legacies of white supremacy. Do you think anybody at that march will talk about drones and the drone president? Will you think anybody at that march will talk about the connection to Wall Street? They are all on the plantation.¶ **AMY GOODMAN:** Are you invited?¶ **CORNEL WEST:** Well, can you imagine? Good God, no. I mean, I pray for him, because I’m for liberal reform. But liberal reform is too narrow, is too truncated. And, of course, the two-party system is dying, and therefore it doesn’t have the capacity to speak to these kinds of issues. So, no, not at all.¶ **AMY GOODMAN:** So you’re saying that President Obama should not only say, "I could have been Trayvon Martin," but "I could have been, for example, Abdulrahman al-Awlaki," the 16-year-old son—¶ **CORNEL WEST:** Yes.¶ **AMY GOODMAN:** —of Anwar al-Awlaki, who was killed in a drone strike.¶ **CORNEL WEST:** Or the name of those 221 others, precious children, who are—who were as precious as the white brothers and sisters in Newtown that he cried tears for. Those in Indian reservations, those in Chinatown, Koreatown, those in brown barrios, each child is precious. That is a moral absolute, it seems to me we ought to embrace. And if that’s true, then we’ve got monstrous mendacity, hyper hypocrisy and pervasive criminality in high places. That’s why Brother Snowden and Brother Manning are the John Browns of our day, and the Glenn Greenwalds and the Chris Hedges and Glen Fords and Bruce Dixons and Margaret Kimberleys and Nellie Baileys are the William Lloyd Garrisons of our day, when we talk about the national security state.¶ **AMY GOODMAN:** Clearly, the power of the personal representation is what grabbed people on Friday.¶ **CORNEL WEST:** Absolutely.¶ **AMY GOODMAN:** You also had Attorney General Eric Holder doing the same thing—¶ **CORNEL WEST:** The same thing.¶ **AMY GOODMAN:** —when he was speaking at the NAACP convention on Tuesday. Holder drew parallels between his own experience as an African-American male and those of Trayvon Martin, when he recalled times in his life when he was racially profiled.¶ **ATTORNEY GENERAL ERIC HOLDER:** The news of Trayvon Martin’s death last year and the discussions that have taken place since then reminded me of my father’s words so many years ago. And they brought me back to a number of experiences that I had as a young man—when I was pulled over twice and my car searched on the New Jersey Turnpike, when I’m sure I wasn’t speeding, or when I was stopped by a police officer while simply running to catch a movie at night in Georgetown in Washington, D.C. I was, at the time of that last incident, a federal prosecutor.¶ Trayvon’s death last spring caused me to sit down to have a conversation with my own 15-year-old son, like my dad did with me. This was a father-son tradition I hoped would not need to be handed down. But as a father who loves his son and who is more knowing in the ways of the world, I had to do this to protect my boy. I am his father, and it is my responsibility, not to burden him with the baggage of eras long gone, but to make him aware of the world that he must still confront. This—this is a sad reality in a nation that is changing for the better in so many ways.¶ **AMY GOODMAN:** That’s U.S. Attorney General Eric Holder. They’re the ones, in the Justice Department, who are deciding whether or not to bring civil rights violations, criminal charges against George Zimmerman, who was acquitted in the Trayvon Martin killing. Professor Cornel West?¶ **CORNEL WEST:** And, no, there’s no doubt that the vicious legacy of white supremacy affects the black upper classes, it affects the black middle classes. But those kinds of stories hide and conceal just how ugly and intensely vicious it is for black poor, brown poor. And so you end up with, if that’s the case, why hasn’t the new Jim Crow been a priority in the Obama administration? Why has not the new Jim Crow been a priority for Eric Holder? If what they’re saying is something they feel deeply, if what they’re saying is that they’re—themselves and their children have the same status as Brother Jamal and Sister Latisha and Brother Ray Ray and Sister Jarell, then why has that not been a center part of what they do to ensure there’s fairness and justice?¶ Well, the reason is political. Well, we don’t want to identify with black folk, because a black president can’t get too close to black folk, because Fox News, with their reactionary self in oft—in so many instances, will attack them, and that becomes the point of reference? No. If they’re going to be part of the legacy of Martin King, Fannie Lou Hamer and Ella Baker and the others, then the truth and justice stuff that you pursue, you don’t care who is coming at you. But, no, this black liberal class has proven itself to be too morally bankrupt, too hypocritical, and indifferent to criminality—Wall Street criminality, no serious talk about enforcement of torturers and wiretappers under the Bush administration. Why? Because they don’t want the subsequent administration to take them to jail. Any reference to the hunger strike of our brothers out in California and other places, dealing with torture? Sustained solitary confinement is a form of torture. And we won’t even talk about Guantánamo. Force-feeding, torture in its core—didn’t our dear brother Yasiin Bey point that out, the former Mos Def? God bless that brother. Jay Z got something to learn from Mos Def. Both of them lyrical geniuses, but Jay Z got a whole lot to learn from Mos Def.¶ **AMY GOODMAN:** Explain that. Yasiin Bey actually underwent—¶ **CORNEL WEST:** That’s right.¶ **AMY GOODMAN:** —force-feeding—¶ **CORNEL WEST:** Yes, he did.¶ **AMY GOODMAN:** —to see how it felt, and broke down and started screaming "Stop! Stop!" in the middle of it, and it was a videotape that went viral.¶ **CORNEL WEST:** And it happens twice a day for those precious brothers in Guantánamo Bay. And, of course, that’s under Bush. People say, "That’s under Bush." OK, Bush was the capture-and-torture president. Now we’ve got the targeted killing president, the drone president. That’s not progress. That’s not part of the legacy of Martin King. That’s not part of the legacy of especially somebody like a Dorothy Day and others who I think ought to be at the center of what we’re all about, you see.¶ **AMY GOODMAN:** Let me turn to another clip. Near the end of his speech on Friday, President Obama said the nation should be doing a better job helping young African-American men feel that they are a fuller part of society. I want to play that clip in a moment, but how would you do this?¶ **CORNEL WEST:** Well, when I heard that, I said to myself, "Lord, he came to the York City and said Michael Bloomberg was a terrific mayor." Well, this is the same mayor who, again, nearly four-and-a-half million folk have been stopped and frisked. What’s terrific about that, if you’re concerned about black boys being part of society? No, no, I would say we’re going to have to talk seriously about massive employment programs; high-quality public education, not the privatizing of education; dealing with gentrification and the land grab that’s been taking place, ensuring that young black boys—and I want to include all poor boys, but I’ll begin on the chocolate side of town, there’s no doubt about that—that ought to have access a sense of self-respect and self-determination, not just through education and jobs, but through the unleashing of their imagination, more arts programs in the educational system. They’ve been eliminated, you see. Those are the kind of things, hardly ever talked about. But, oh, we can only talk about transpartnerships in terms of global training for capital and multinational corporations and big banks. That’s been the priority, the Wall Street-friendly and the corporate-friendly policies that I think are deeply upsetting for somebody like myself vis-à-vis the Obama administration.¶ **AMY GOODMAN:** This is what President Obama said Friday.¶ **PRESIDENT BARACK OBAMA:** We need to spend some time in thinking about how do we bolster and reinforce our African-American boys. And this is something that Michelle and I talk a lot about. There are a lot of kids out there who need help, who are getting a lot of negative reinforcement. And is there more that we can do to give them a sense that their country cares about them and values them and is willing to invest in them?¶ You know, I’m not naïve about the prospects of some grand, new federal program. I’m not sure that that’s what we’re talking about here. But I do recognize that, as president, I’ve got some convening power, and there are a lot of good programs that are being done across the country on this front. And for us to be able to gather together business leaders and local elected officials and clergy and celebrities and athletes, and figure out how are we doing a better job helping young African-American men feel that they’re a full part of this society and that they’ve got pathways and avenues to succeed, I think that would be a pretty good outcome from what was obviously a tragic situation. And we’re going to spend some time working on that.¶ **AMY GOODMAN:** Cornel West?¶ **CORNEL WEST:** Yeah, you see, if you’re concerned about poor black brothers, then you make it a priority. It’s the first time he spoke publicly about this in five years, so it’s clear it’s not a priority. When he went down to Morehouse, it was more scolding: "No excuses." Went to NAACP before, "Quit whining." No, we’re wailing, we’re not whining. So, to say to the country, "Well, we need to talk about caring," well, you’ve got to be able to enact that, you see. And for those of us who spend a lot of time in prisons, those of us at Boys Clubs, all the magnificent work that various churches and civic institutions do in the black community—and it cuts across race, of course; you’ve got a lot of white brothers and sisters and brown and others who are there, as well—the question is: Since when has it been a priority in this administration at all? So that that language begins to ring very, very hollow. Because he’s right: We’ve got to love, we’ve got to care for our poor brothers and sisters, and especially our black and brown brothers and sisters, because they’re lost, they’re confused, they’re desperate, they’re unemployed, they’re too uneducated, and they turn on each other, because when you criminalize poor people and criminalize poor black people, we turn on each other. There’s no doubt about that. Can you imagine if the creativity and intelligence that goes into turning on each other is turned on the system—not any individual, but the system itself, the unfair system—and tries to undercut the criminality of our criminal justice system to make it fair and to make it just?¶ **AMY GOODMAN:** You mentioned stop and frisk under Ray Kelly, who is being considered for head of Department of Homeland Security, and under Mayor Bloomberg—¶ **CORNEL WEST:** That’s right.¶ **AMY GOODMAN:** —700,000 stops and frisks in New York City. It’s now on trial, in court, vastly, overwhelming, of young African-American mainly young men, some young women—the vast majority do not get arrested, but they—¶ **CORNEL WEST:** That’s right.¶ **AMY GOODMAN:** —have these endless encounters with the authorities.¶ **CORNEL WEST:** Absolutely. And I just never forget Brother Carl Dix and others, right when we were on—we had a week-long trial and had a guilty verdict. But during that week—¶ **AMY GOODMAN:** When you were protesting and you got arrested.¶ **CORNEL WEST:** After we protested and went to jail and then went to court and was—had a guilty verdict, right? That week, the president came to New York and said, "Edward Koch was one of the great mayors in the last 50 years," and then said, "Michael Bloomberg was a terrific mayor." Now, this is the same person saying we’ve got to care for black boys, and black boys are being intimidated, harassed, humiliated, 1,800 a day. It’s just not a matter of pretty words, Mr. President. You’ve got to follow through in action. You see, you can’t use the words to hide and conceal your mendacity, hypocrisy and the support of criminality—or enactment of criminality when it comes to drones, you see.¶ And the sad thing is, Sister Amy, is that we just don’t have enough free people, let alone free black people. Black people, we settled for so little, so we get a little symbolic gesture, we get a little identification, and like on MSNBC, which is part of the Obama plantation, they start breakdancing again: "Oh, isn’t it so wonderful? He’s really one of us. We can now wave the flag again. We can now support our mindless Americanism," in the language of my dear brother Maulana Karenga, intellectual that he is. No. We ought to be over against injustice, no matter what, across the board, and be vigilant about it. I don’t care what color the president or the governor or the mayor is.¶ **AMY GOODMAN:** Let’s talk about Stand Your Ground for a minute. You know, Stevie Wonder now says he won’t play in any state that has Stand Your Ground.¶ **CORNEL WEST:** Yeah, that’s a beautiful thing, a beautiful thing.¶ **AMY GOODMAN:** President Obama addressed the issue of the Stand Your Ground law in Florida, the law allowing people fearing for their lives to use deadly force without retreating from a confrontation.¶ **PRESIDENT BARACK OBAMA:** I know that there’s been commentary about the fact that the Stand Your Ground laws in Florida were not used as a defense in the case. On the other hand, if we’re sending a message as a society in our communities that someone who is armed potentially has the right to use those firearms, even if there’s a way for them to exit from a situation, is that really going to be contributing to the kind of peace and security and order that we’d like to see?¶ And for those who resist that idea that we should think about something like these Stand Your Ground laws, I’d just ask people to consider, if Trayvon Martin was of age and armed, could he have stood his ground on that sidewalk? And do we actually think that he would have been justified in shooting Mr. Zimmerman, who had followed him in a car, because he felt threatened? And if the answer to that question is at least ambiguous, then it seems to me that we might want to examine those kinds of laws.¶ **AMY GOODMAN:** That’s President Obama speaking on Friday. Cornel West?¶ **CORNEL WEST:** Well, I certainly agree with him that we ought to fight Stand Your Ground laws, but we’ve got to keep in mind Stand Your Ground laws are part of the legacy of the slave patrol, which is to say it’s primarily white brothers and sisters armed to keep black people under control. And I come from Sacramento, California. I remember when the Black Panther Party walked into the Capitol with their guns. Now, you noticed at that moment, all of a sudden people were very much for gun control, even the right wing. Why? Because the Panthers were saying, "Well, let’s just arm all the black folk to make sure they stand their ground." Oh, Lord. That’s such a challenge. Now, see, you know, as a Christian and trying to be part of the legacy of Martin, you see, I don’t want people armed across the board. I do believe in self-defense, just like I believe in self-respect and self-determination, but I don’t want people armed. So it’s very clear there’s a class and a racial bias in these laws, and therefore we ought to fight these laws. There’s no doubt about it. But we have to be very honest and candid about the hypocrisy operating when we talk about these things.¶ **AMY GOODMAN:** It was rather chilling to hear both Robert Zimmerman, George Zimmerman’s brother, and also Mark O’Mara, the attorney for George Zimmerman, talking about how—the fact that George Zimmerman is supposed to get his gun back, that he needs it more than ever, because he’s targeted, because he’s afraid. What is more frightening than a frightened George Zimmerman with a gun?**CORNEL WEST:** No, it’s true. But it’s—I mean, when you let criminals off, they feel—they feel as if their criminality has been affirmed, and therefore they want to be able to continue to act as if they—the business is as usual, back to business as usual.**AMY GOODMAN:** Cornel, as we wrap up this segment, I’d like you you to stay for the next segment about—¶ **CORNEL WEST:** Sure, sure.**AMY GOODMAN:** —Howard Zinn’s books in Indiana. If you were invited to speak at the 50th anniversary celebration of the "I Have a Dream" speech, the March on Washington—August 28th, 1963, is when it happened, 50 years ago—what would you say? Give us a few minutes.¶ **CORNEL WEST:** I would say we must never tame Martin Luther King Jr. or Fannie Lou Hamer or Ella Baker or Stokely Carmichael. They were unbossed. They were unbought. That Martin was talking about a beloved community, which meant that it subverts any plantation—Bush’s plantation, Clinton’s plantation, Obama’s plantation—and the social forces behind those plantations, which have to do with Wall Street, have to do with multinational corporations. And we’re going to focus on poor people. We’re going to focus on working people across the board. We’re going to talk about the connection between drones, which is a form of—a form of crimes against humanity outside the national borders. We’re going to talk about Wall Street criminality. We’re going to talk about how we ensure that our gay and lesbian brothers and sisters have their dignity affirmed**.** We’re going to talk about the children.¶ Martin Luther King Jr. was a free black man. He was a Jesus-loving free black man. Will the connection between drones, new Jim Crow, prison-industrial complex, attacks on the working class, escalating profits at the top, be talked about and brought together during that march? I don’t hold my breath. But Brother Martin’s spirit would want somebody to push it. And that’s part of his connection to Malcolm X. That’s part of his connection to so many of the great freedom fighters that go all the way back to the first slave who stepped on these decrepit shores.

#### Obama is a global George Zimmerman- we must recognize the way domestic and international targeted killing inform one another- anything else is an incomplete explanation of violence

Janani, 13; (Author and editor at BGD,<http://www.blackgirldangerous.org/2013/08/08/201388zimmermans-and-drones-antiblackness-and-global-domination/> 10/4/13)

This is an urgent structural analysis.  I write this as President Obama is sending drones to Pakistan, [which you can visualize here](http://www.motherjones.com/politics/2013/03/drone-strikes-interactive-visualization-pitch).  I write this as the US sends $3 billion a year in military aid to Israel, materially supporting the maintenance of the gaza strip as an [open air prison](http://electronicintifada.net/content/gaza-strip-open-air-prison/5716).  I write this on the heels of the anniversary of the shooting at a Sikh Gurudwara in Wisconsin.  Last year, Harsha Walia wrote a [poignant response](http://www.racialicious.com/2012/08/06/hate-crimes-always-have-a-logic-on-the-oak-creek-gurudwara-shootings/)in commemoration of the Wisconsin tragedy, that did precisely the work of connecting this incident of violence against Sikhs and other, broader structures of White supremacy and empire. She calls for fellow Sikhs to build solidarity with other racialized communities: ‘with Muslim communities bearing the brunt of Islamophobia, with Blacks who disproportionately endure police violence and over- incarceration, with Indigenous people who are being dispossessed of their lands and resources, with non-status migrants who have been deemed illegal and are facing deportation.’

Walia’s piece does the critical, challenging work of maintaining the specificity of violence against her community, while also putting it in context with other struggles.  Cornel West makes a similar move [in his interview with Democracy Now!](http://www.democracynow.org/2013/7/22/cornel_west_obamas_response_to_trayvon), where he calls out President Obama for talking about race in relation to Trayvon Martin’s murder without talking about other structures of domination, in which the President and the state are brutally complicit.  West calls Obama a ‘global George Zimmerman’, meaning that the President, like Zimmerman, racially profiles and murders.

*So when [Obama] comes to talk about the killing of an innocent person, you say, “Well, wait a minute. What kind of moral authority are you bringing? You’ve got $2 million bounty on Sister Assata Shakur. She’s innocent, but you are pressing that intentionally. Will you press for the justice of Trayvon Martin in the same way you press for the prosecution of Brother Bradley Manning and Brother Edward Snowden?” So you begin to see the hypocrisy.*

In a way, Obama’s statements about Trayvon Martin and the viral refrain ‘I am Trayvon Martin’ are both failures of the same multiculturalism, of considering racism as something broad and incidental, rather than specific and material.  West asks: ‘Will [Obama's identification with Trayvon Martin]  hide and conceal the fact there’s a criminal justice system in place that has nearly destroyed two generations of very precious, poor black and brown brothers?’.

A material consideration of antiblackness in relation to patterns of violence against other POC, and to US imperialism in particular, would hold space for both parallels and specificity.  Abu-Ghraib, Guantanamo, and the US prison-industrial complex.  Zimmerman and Obama.  COINTELPRO and XKeyscore.  These are patterns of policing and violence that inform each other, in psychology, and also in that the military/police strategies deployed domestically and abroad mirror each other.  For example, Obama is a global George Zimmerman, but also: [Zimmerman is a domestic drone](http://www.counterpunch.org/2013/07/15/zimmerman-is-a-domestic-drone/).  Solidarity can begin with challenging attitudes in our communities, but it must also include connecting those dots between the tactics of enslavement, incarceration, colonialism, and empire.

#### Thus, Nick and I oppose the war powers authority of the president to use targeted killing.

#### We must support the victims who do not get a voice in the states’ decision to destroy them we are a counter hegemonic project that goes against the seemingly inevitable logic of pre-emption. Our academic dissensus is the only effective methodology for tearing down the broader notions racism perpetuated by the united states

**Goh ’06** [Irving, **Fellow @ Harvard University**, *Fast Capitalism*, 2.1 2006, http://fastcapitalism.com/]

The fact remains that the victim of the London police preemptive shooting had no link to terror—had no intent of terror. (neither had the victim of the Miami shooting.) **There is nothing right about that preemptive act. It has been a wrong calculation, a wrong decision, executed in a method of resolute excess.** This is not the first time intelligence fails the preemptive. It has failed in the case of the Iraq war of 2003, since no "weapons of mass destruction" have been found, while the hypothesis of stores of such weapons has been but evidence in absentia that "justified" the projectile of war against Iraq to preempt Iraq from disseminating the said weapons. But the remaining evidence, the only real verifiable evidence, is that there is an intelligence problem with the preemptive in overdrive. **So there is in fact a double wrong to the entire sequence of the preemptive. The misidentification of an innocent being as a terror-suspect and denying that being the right to be alive, the intelligence let-down, is the second wrong.** The first wrong is what has been discussed earlier—the tearing of the immanent collective of living beings into those that are likely to fall under the force of the preemptive act and those who do not. And as said earlier too, this partition is rather discernible. Basically, the different, the non-natives of the territory tend to belong to those whose right to be alive is now abdicated to the decision of the preemptive force of law. They have no part in articulating that right by themselves anymore. They have no part in voicing out their disagreement with the irreducible profiling force of the preemptive that separates them from others who will hardly be thought to be a suspect. Their voices are simply not heard. They cannot claim to a common collective of living beings insisting on the right to be alive simply by the fact of existence. That they are under the scope of the preemptive separates them from that common. And they are also denied the equality of thinking that any act of violence against civilians of terror is undesirable. For the preemptive to regard these peoples to be as against terror now or in the future is an impossibility. That is unthinkable to the preemptive and its profiling horizon. This is the wrong that one must recognize first and foremost. **The space of wrong, in which those are wronged, must be given exposition. One must re-mark wrong, after the marking out of those who do not have equal right to be alive by the politics of preemptive. As Ranciére (1999) says, The concept of wrong is […] not linked to any theater of 'victimization.' It belongs to the original structure of politics. Wrong is simply the mode of subjectification in which the assertion of equality takes it political shape.** […] Wrong institutes a singular universal, a polemical universal, by tying the presentation of equality, as the part of those who have no part, to the conflict between parts of society. (P. 39) In relation to the imminent preemptive, "the part of those who have no part" has to be articulated. The "part of those who have no part" is that assemblage of peoples—which is, contrary to the delimited perspective of the preemptive, certainly not limited to the migrant, the illegal immigrant, the asylum seeker, the ethnic peoples— who have no part in being presumed innocent or being without suspicion of intent of terror as demarcated by that politics; the peoples who disagree with the deadly force of the preemptive without agreeing with the ideologies and methods of terror; and the peoples who without crime and without intent of crime desire just a right to disappear and just run, from the force of law. It is a people to come, to use Deleuze and Guattari's term, who will say wait to the speed of the preemptive, who will disagree with the law of the preemptive, as long as the law refuses to allow the sending of the prophylaxis or the time of a counter-hypothesis. The beginning of the paper suggested that if one is to disagree with the preemptive, one needs to get outside of it. **This assemblage of "the part of those who have no part" is precisely the people to come who are outside the consensus (the police chiefs, the State, the military complex) that seeks to normalize the preemptive. They are therefore the outside whose exposé must not be denied or deferred anymore. With them reserves the potentiality of what Ranciére calls "dissensus" that will break the politics of consensus, the politics of consensus on the preemptive. The voice of this assemblage might not be heard at present, blocked by the deafening speed of the preemptive, yet this assemblage nonetheless has to have a persistence in inscribing itself as an exposition that disagrees with the politics of the preemptive. And it will do so only to (re)claim that common fact of right to be alive without submitting to the decision of the preemptive,** **to (re)claim the common equality to be presumed innocent and be without profiling by the preemptive, and the common equality of sharing the common desire to resist the ideologies and methods of terror.** The persistence of this assemblage inscribing itself is its force of disagreement. (Disagreement or mésentente for Ranciére is about the persistence of the exposition of wrong.) This disagreement is the prophylaxis the assemblage brings to the preemptive, displacing it, counter-checking it, counter-arguing it. The persistence this assemblage gives is also what Ranciére calls the "processing" of a wrong. It "passes through the constitution of specific subjects that take the wrong upon themselves, give it shape, invent new forms and names for it to conduct its processing in a specific montage of proofs" (Ranciére 1999:40). With regard to the preemptive, these proofs will be those that prove that a prophylaxis or counter-hypothesis may change the course the "suspect" takes and therefore maintaining every single possibility of the right to be alive, proofs that disarticulate the interpretation and judgment of the preemptive and therefore securing for the mistaken identity the right to be alive, and proofs that the profiling contours of the preemptive is wrong to deny them the equality of being presumed innocence and without suspicion of terror-intent. This persistence can be seen as an effective prophylaxis or counter-hypothesis because it is also an interval, an "opening up [of] the world where argument can be received and have an impact" (Ranciére 1999:56, my emphasis). **This persistence is like the counter-hypothetic "minority report" in Philip K. Dick's text. And just as a "minority report" must be given an exposure to counter the deadly preemptive, so must this persistence.**  If there is anything disappointing about the dénouement of the text of Minority Report, it is perhaps its reactionary turn at the end. There is the chance for Anderton to live out the possibility, the counter-hypothesis of him not being a murderer-to-be. It is the chance presented to him when Anderton's prospective victim according to the "precrime" vision of the future, Kaplan, invites Anderton onto an impromptu stage to expose the flaw of "precrime," to expose the fact that "precrime" makes wrong judgment like the possible misidentifying of Andertonas a potential killer. That could have constituted the emergence of disagreement with the preemptive, as Anderton and Kaplan, "the killer and his victim," "standing side by side," exposes the wrong of "precrime." And the right to be alive, for both Anderton and Kaplan, would have been preserved. But the status quo of the preemptive "precrime" is reinstated instead. In a flash of "blind terror," (Dick 1997: 352) Anderton decides to fulfill the prophecy of "precrime" and fatally shoots Kaplan (One cannot help reading it as a foreshadowing of the "blind terror" of the London shooting in complete view of tube commuters). The exposure of the flaw of "precrime" is thereby short-circuited and the institution of the preemptive is maintained. "Precrime" is secured from any criticism, from any prophylaxis. But the right to be alive is compromised, not Anderton's at least, but Kaplan's. Aside from the politics between the police and the military of which Kaplan belongs, one finds it difficult to justify the exchange of Kaplan's right to be alive for the perpetuation of the preemptive "precrime" system. Anderton , by that time, had already acknowledged and experienced the flaw of "precrime," the flaw that "there've been other innocent people(1997: 333)" under the "precrime" directive. He was going to forcefully resist or disagree with the "precrime" system, for his right to be alive. He had said, "If the system can survive only by imprisoning innocent people, then it deserves to be destroyed. My personal safety is important because I'm a human being" (1997:342). But in the end, Anderton's thought of life is abdicated to a thought of the system. The moment Anderton decides to murder Kaplan is the moment when he "was thinking about the system" so that the "basic validity of the Precrime system" will not be shaken (1997:342, 350). **At the end, all is normal with the preemptive "precrime" system. It returns to the terrifying normalcy of the preemptive condition. Life must not imitate fiction in this case.** Once again, **critical thought must resist any consensual normalization of the preemptive condition. But to be sure again, there is no disputing the good intentions and the possible good what a preemptive can deliver.** One cannot ignore the fact that its point of departure is to be prophylactic. The question, perhaps, is about the question of the relative speeds of the preemptive itself. It would be a question of negotiating between its belatedness—so as to let arrive a possible counter-hypothesis, and its acceleration. To put it in another way, it would be a question of opening up a space of disagreement between its two speeds. Every policy seeks to be both a just act or an act of justice, and an act that serves a certain functionality. **The problem with policies is that States assume an uninterrupted or noncontestable continuum between functionality and justice.** But according to Ranciére, **this continuum is but a "false continuity"** (1999:21). For Ranciére, there is always a wrong that interrupts this continuum: **"Between the useful and the just lies the incommensurability of wrong" (ibid.). The articulation of this wrong, which posits a disagreement with an act** presumed to be both functional and just, or which **proves the "false continuity" between functionality and justice of an act, cannot disappear, cannot be made to disappear. This articulation must surface. So there must be the persistence of exposition of disagreement with the preemptive as it is today**, **so as to (re)open thought to the unconditional right to be alive that the deadly preemptive is putting into danger, and to open the entire question of the preemptive to intensive critique and inquiry so as to prevent all thoughts of the preemptive to collapse into an uncritical consensus on its deadly speed.** **The force of persistence of disagreement would also put into question the undemocratic profiling and partitioning practices of the preemptive.** Its exposition will only "presuppose the refutation of a situation's given assumptions" (assumptions like the deadly speed of the preemptive as the only necessity of contemporary security condition; the assumption that the ethnic different, the nonnative, the migrant, tends to incline towards a propensity of future terror) and "the introduction of previously uncounted objects and subjects" (like that of the assemblage of wrong) (Ranciére 2004:7). As Ranciére says, disagreement is "the invention of a question that no one was asking themselves until then" (1999:33). The time of invention of a question in disagreement with the preemptive is none other than but now.

#### The 1AC speech act unites our local position to stand in solidarity with an ongoing global grassroots movement against millitarism – this is necessary to expose the status quo targeted killing policy.

Kinane 13; [Ed, ““Think Global, Act Local: Grassroots Opposition to Weaponized Drones,” accessed: 9-11-13, SpS]

And I especially must highlight the vigorous, imaginative and gutsy CODEPINK anti-drone campaign radiating out from Washington, DC. However, both Col. Ann Wright and Ally McCracken can speak from direct involvement about these essential efforts to rouse the nation to resist the weaponized drone.

But back to upstate New York: since 2009 a few of us – and as time goes on, dozens more of us – have been working to expose the weaponized Reaper drone war crime perpetrated from Hancock air base. Twenty minutes’ drive from my home, Hancock is the home of the 174th Attack Wing of the NY Air National Guard. The issue is global; the work local.

Safely removed from the battlefield, costumed in aviator jumpsuits, air-conditioned and sitting ergonomically at computer screens, jiggling joy sticks linked to earth-orbiting satellites, the 174th Attack Wing technicians “pilot” the unmanned weaponized Reaper over Afghanistan. Further, Hancock is the national center for training technicians to maintain the Reaper. Those technical skills are fungible; such skills can be used not only to service the Afghanistan Reaper, but also the Reaper clandestinely terrorizing other nations – with whom the US has not declared war. In these nations – Iraq, Yemen, Pakistan and others – the CIA, with scant accountability, deploys the Reaper to commit extrajudicial executions. During his re-election campaign last fall, the White House leaked that the President signs off on such killing every Tuesday.

Many politicians and talking heads purvey the premise that the Reaper and other weaponized airborne robots are key assets in the “war on terrorism.” These deliberate or unwitting propagandists –some with snug perches in academia –miss a key point: while the Reaper wins a host of extremely asymmetrical battles, it may well be losing the war. The Reaper may be tactically clever, but thanks to the blowback and proliferation it spawns, deploying the Reaper is strategically stupid.

Further – and it’s hard not to emphasize this enough – weaponized drones are themselves terrorist. Those who so readily invoke the boogey man of “terrorism” seldom define terrorism. According to the US State Department definition terrorism is the use of violence or the threat of violence against civilians for political purposes. By that definition the weaponized drone – indeed aerial warfare generally – is itself one of the planet’s major instruments of terrorism.

The weaponized drone not only perpetrates terrorism, but thanks to the quite justifiable hatred it incites toward the United States,it may perpetuate terrorism – mostly of the retaliatory and asymmetric kind. The Pentagon and CIA’s wholesale and cowardly terrorism surely has been a boon for “Al Qaeda’s” recruiters. Such state terrorism, lucrative for university research institutes and US weapons systems corporations spread across numerous Congressional districts, keeps the pot boiling, keeps us locked in perpetual war.

Upstate Drone Action is a grassroots, decentralized, informally-organized group made up primarily from people from Syracuse, Buffalo, Rochester, Utica, Binghamton and Albany, New York. But our direct actions at Hancock have involved activists from as far away as Iowa and Virginia, Illinois and Hawaii. Two years ago Kathy Kelly of Voices for Creative Nonviolence, and Col. Ann Wright spoke at a drone rally in St. Lucy’s parish gym in Syracuse, galvanizing our first civil resistance.

That April 22, 2011 die-in at the base led to the week-long trial of the “Hancock 38,” in November 2011 – a bench trial before Judge David Gideon in the DeWitt Town court. Former US attorney general Ramsey Clark spent several hours testifying on our behalf. Ramsey told Judge Gideon that the Hancock Reaper committed war crimes and that the Nuremburg principles require citizens to expose and challenge their nation’s war crime.

Through direct actions and ensuing endless court appearances, through frequent legal demonstrations and street theatre, and through both mainstream and movement media, Upstate Drone Action has sought to educate the public about Reaper assassinations and extra-judicial killings. We seek to educate about the drone’s harrowing impact on civilians and about drone proliferation and blowback, as well as the surveillance and civil liberties threat the Reaper and other airborne robots pose domestically. We also hope our message reaches Hancock base personnel. Who knows, such exertions just might inspire the next Bradley Manning!

Legitimized by international law, including the Nuremburg Principles, and by the First Amendment of the US Constitution, Upstate Drone Action members seek to expose and impede our nation’s Reaper war crimes. In theory the First Amendment protects our freedom of assembly, our freedom of speech, and especially relevant in this case, our right to petition our government for a redress of grievance. At Hancock each time we approach the main gate we attempt to deliver a peoples’ war crimes indictment. When we are rebuffed, typically we block that gate with banners and with our bodies, either standing or, once, lying on the pavement wrapped in bloody shrouds. But our actions don’t require the warrant of legality: we are acting on our respect for life; we are heeding our conscience.

And speaking of conscience, I must mention Brian Terrell. Brian was one of one of the “Hancock 38” and one of the “Creech 14.” He is now serving six months in Yankton federal prison for seeking to deliver a citizens’ drone war crimes indictment to Whiteman Air Force Base, a drone hub in Missouri.

Anti-military drone activists like Brian and Upstate Drone Action are committed to nonviolent direct action at the entrance to the offending military base. And as at Benning, we keep coming back. We call such recurring civil resistance “Gandhian Waves.” We periodically endure arrest, trial and even incarceration. Typically in court we “go pro se,” i.e. each of us defends his or herself, declaring to the court why we did what we did in an effort to put the Hancock drone itself on trial.

We say our Hancock actions are civil resistance not civil disobedience. Civil disobedience entails (justifiably) breaking the law, whereas our direct actions seek to enforce the law – international law. Despite such law being widely ignored by local, state and federal courts, under Article 6 of the US Constitution, international law is the supreme law of the land.

[Let me remind you of how Article 6 reads: This Constitution, and the Laws of the United States which shall be made in Pursuance thereof; and all Treaties made, or which shall be made, under the Authority of the United States, shall be the supreme Law of the Land; and the Judges in every State shall be bound thereby, any Thing in the Constitution or Laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding.]

As historians you’ll surely recall how, back in the day, white mobs would periodically lynch blacks. For generations they did so with impunity, such torture and murder being ignored or enabled by all levels of the judiciary. Likewise today the judiciary thus far seems extremely tolerant of, or implicitly enables, if not condones, drone assassination and extra-judicial execution. You can decide whether or not the killing **–** virtually exclusively **–** of people of color in Islamic lands, is a kind of 21st century high-tech lynching…and whether or not such killing is yet another expression and tool of white, Western supremacy….

#### This space is political- - US imperialism sustains itself by controlling the boundaries of knowledge. Only exposing the epistemic and material violence of imperialism can offer ways of knowing that counteract the violence and elitism of US Empire.

McLaren and Kincheloe 5 (Peter Professor of Education, Graduate School of Education and Information Studies @ UCLA and Joe, professor and Canada Research Chair at the Faculty of Education, McGill University in Montreal, Quebec, Canada. The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research, Third Edition, Eds Norman Denzin and Yvonna Lincoln)

In this context, it is important to note that **we understand** a **social theory as a** map or a **guide to the social sphere**. In a research context, **it** does not determine how we see the world but **helps us devise** questions and **strategies for exploring it**. **A critical** social **theory is concerned** in particular **with issues of power and justice and the ways** that the economy; matters of race, class, and gender; **ideologies; discourses**; education; religion **and other** social **institutions**; and cultural dynamics **interact to construct a social system** (Beck-Gernsheim, Butler, & Puigvert, 2003; Flccha, Gomez, & Puigvert, 2003). Thus, in this context we seek to provide a view of an evolving criticality or a reconceptualized critical theory. **Critical theory is never static**; it is always evolving, changing in light of both new theoretical insights and new problems and social circumstances. The list of concepts elucidating our articulation of critical theory indicates a criticality informed by a variety of discourses emerging after the work of the Frankfurt School Indeed, some of the theoretical discourses, while referring to themselves as critical, directly call into question some of the work of Horkheimer, Adorno, and Marcuse. Thus, diverse theoretical traditions have informed our understanding of criticality and have demanded understanding of diverse forms of oppression including class, race, gender, sexual, cultural, religious, colonial, and ability-related concerns. The evolving notion of criticality we present is informed by, while critiquing, the post-discourses—for example, postmodernism, poststructuralism, and postcolonialism. In this context, critical theorists become detectives of new theoretical insights, perpetually searching for new and interconnected ways of understanding power and oppression and the ways they shape everyday life and human experience. In this context, **criticality and the research it supports are always** evolving, always encountering new ways to irritate dominant forms of power, to provide more evocative and compelling insight**s.** Operating in this way, an evolving criticality is always vulnerable to exclusion from the domain of approved modes of research. **The forms of social change it supports always position it in some places as an outsider, an awkward detective always interested in uncovering social structures, discourses, ideologies, and epistemologies that prop up both the status quo and a variety of forms of privilege. In the epistemological domain**, white, male, class elitist, heterosexist**, imperial, and colonial privilege often operates by asserting the power to claim objectivity and neutrality.** Indeed**, the owners of such privilege often own the "franchise" on reason and rationality.** **Proponents of an evolving criticality possess a variety of tools to expose such oppressive power politics.** Such proponents assert that critical theory is well-served by drawing upon numerous liberatory discourses and including diverse groups of marginalized peoples and their allies in the nonhierarchical aggregation of critical analysts {Bello, 2003; Clark, 2002; Humphries, 1997). **In the present era, emerging forms of neocolonialism and neo-imperialism in the United States move critical theorists to examine the wavs American power operates under the cover of establishing democracies all over the world. Advocates of an evolving criticality argue**—as we do in more detail later in this chapter—**that such neocolonial power must be exposed so it can be opposed in the United States and around the world. The American Empires justification in the name of freedom for undermining democratically elected governments** from Iran (Kincheloe, 2004), Chile, Nicaragua, and Venezuela to Liberia (**when its real purpose is to acquire geopolitical advantage for future military assaults, economic leverage in international markets, and access to natural resources) must be exposed by critical-ists for what it is—a rank imperialist sham** (McLaren, 2003a, 2003b; McLaren & Jaramillo, 2002; McLaren & Martin, 2003). **Critical researchers need to view their work in the context of living and working in a nation-state with the most powerful military-industrial complex in history** that is shamefully using the terrorist attacks of September 11 to advance a ruthless imperialist agenda fueled by capitalist accumulation by means of the rule of force (McLaren & Farahmandpur,2003). Chomsky (2003), for instance, has accused the U.S. government of the "supreme crime" of preventive war (in the case of its invasion of Iraq, the use of military force to destroy an invented or imagined threat) of the type that was condemned at Kuremburg. Others, like historian Arthur Schlesinger (cited in Chomsky, 2003), have likened the invasion of Iraq to Japan's "day of infamy'' that is, to the policy that imperial Japan employed at the time of Pearl Harbor. David G. Smith (2003) argues **that such imperial dynamics are supported by particular epistemological forms. The United States is an epistemological empire based on a notion of truth that undermines the knowledges produced by those outside the good graces and benevolent authority of the empire.** Thus, in the 21 st century, **critical theorists must develop sophisticated ways to address not only the brute material relations of class rule linked to the mode and relations of capitalist production and imperialist conquest (whether through direct military intervention or indirectly through the creation of client states) but also the epistemological violence that helps discipline the world Smith refers to this violence as a form of "information warfare" that spreads deliberate falsehoods** about countries such as Iraq and Iran. **U.S. corporate and governmental agents become more sophisticated in the use of such episto-weaponry with every day that passes.** Obviously, **an evolving criticality** does not promiscuously choose theoretical discourses to add to the bricolage of critical theories. It **is highly suspicious**—as we detail later—**of theories that fail to understand the malevolent workings of power, that fail to critique the blinders of Eurocentrism, that cultivate an elitism of insiders and outsiders, and that fail to discern a global system of inequity supported by diverse forms of ideology and violence. It is uninterested in any theory**—no matter how fashionable—**that does not directly address the needs of victims of oppression and the suffering they must endure.** The following is an elastic, ever-evolving set of concepts included in our evolving notion of criticality. With theoretical innovations and shifting Zeitgeists, they evolve. The points that are deemed most important in one time period pale in relation to different points in a new era. <P306-307>

#### Integration of the lived experience of those who have experience the violence of US militarism shatters the objective knowledge of empire.

Wedeen 7 (Lisa, Professor of Political Science Lisa Wedeen specializes in comparative politics, the Middle East, political theory, feminist theory, and qualitative methods, Scientific Knowledge, Liberalism and Empire: American Political Science in the Modern Middle East Social Science Research Council, June 14-15, 2007, http://www.ssrc.org/workspace/images/crm/new\_publication\_3/%7B8a197abf-ed60-de11-bd80-001cc477ec70%7D.pdf)

The late Edward **Said** (1978**) famously underscored the connections between empire and distinct forms of knowledge**, and in the spirit of his book Orientalism, this essay also specifies the normative conditions, in this case in political science, that have helped make possible distinct visions of the Arab and Muslim Middle East. I want to argue **that these visions are not simply embellishments of an imperial domination independently existing; they are an integral part of the project itself**.4 Such a claim is not meant to suggest that all political scientists participate in reproducing possibilities for empire, or that they do so single-handedly and deliberately. Thus this essay also takes issue with approaches that attribute political power to scholarly discourses without attending to the ways in which scholarship operates within broader discursive and institutional frameworks. Admittedly, **it is by no means self-evident how political science’s complicities with U.S. empire would jibe with the two aspects of political science I argue above are currently defining the discipline—the convergence**, or perhaps more historically accurate, the continuing coalescence in new forms, **of science and liberalism**. This essay is devoted to fleshing out those links while considering how scholarly convictions, combined with the realities of U.S. foreign policy, have structured the terms in which the Middle East is understood and studied today. Part one explores the discipline’s seemingly contradictory commitments to value-neutrality and liberal values. Part two foregrounds the constitutive relationship among science, liberalism, and empire in the making of modern Middle Eastern politics as an area of academic inquiry. One caveat worth noting from the outset: the words “empire” and “imperialism” are politically charged nouns these days. By empire I simply mean, following the Oxford English Dictionary, a state with extensive political and military dominion. In the age of nation-states, imperial states generally exercise this dominion over populations that are perceived (by conqueror and conquered) as different from (in the sense of ineligible for incorporation into) the dominant state exercising control. From the inception of the American Political Science Association in 1903 until the present, there have been repeated attempts within the association to “transform the study of politics into an independent science” (Ross 1991: 288; see also Heaney and Hansen 2006). Despite important variations among positivists and significant disagreements between positivists and nonpositivists (including what “positivism” means), efforts **to make political science a science have generally entailed separating facts from values, identifying law-like principles governing political action, and subjecting these rules to empirical tests.** In this context, objectivity enjoys an “aura of self-evidence”—practical agreement about what counts as a fact and the modes through which knowledge about facts are produced (Shapin and Schaffer 1985: 13-14). Committed to objectivity and value-free scholarship, dominant political science’s applications of positivist principles find expression in causal explanations that rely on a nomothetical understanding of what causation entails. Formulated by Hume and formalized by the prominent positivist, Carl Hempel, the task of science, in this view, is to discover a “covering law” that, in the context of observable initial conditions, can be said to produce the observed event (Hempel 1965; on positivism see Hacking 1983; Cederman 1997; Johnson 2006). Yet contrary to scientific commitments to objectivity and value-free scholarship**, much research in “mainstream” political science has also historically presupposed the value of liberal politics** (Ross 1991; Ricci 1984; Gunnell 1993). Like positivism, liberalism has embodied divergent ideas and been identified variously in different geographical and historical locations. Despite these variations**, the liberal tradition in political science can nevertheless be characterized by four interrelated assumptions** about the connection between human subjectivity and good government (Ricci 1984, 72-73). First**, human beings are born as rights-bearing individuals**. A good government is one that protects an individual’s inalienable rights. Second, **human beings are capable of thinking clearly and rationally.** Good institutions are ones that cultivate human proclivities to reason. Third, **individuals naturally come together and form groups** in order to promote their interests and check those of rival factions. Good institutions are ones that encourage pluralistic interests while dampening potentially incendiary conflicts. Fourth**, individuals are capable of creating governments that operate democratically**, namely, that are responsive to the will of the people.5 Good democratic governments are those that provide procedural mechanisms, such as elections, that enable people to exercise their will as individuals. Of course, liberalism’s values, like those of any ideology, have never been borne out fully in practice. But whereas Marxism and other variants of socialism could be criticized for finding political expression in totalizing systems**, liberalism’s tenets have been treated as separate from people’s experiences in liberal polities. Political scientists have helped make this separation secure by sequestering normative political theory from empirical studies, and by appealing to the authority of scientific discovery** to justify commitments to piecemeal reforms. I am not arguing for better science, however. Nor am I claiming that positivist social science is bad. Rather, I want to bracket the legitimacy or illegitimacy of the enterprise and consider **how the insistence on separating fact from value**, in particular, **has contributed to three persistent disciplinary moves. First, the division has excluded viewing science as a value in and of itself,** indeed as a metaphysic. Political scientists do not tend to ask how scientific knowledge operates to cultivate passionate belief or why science is inherently the most valuable form of knowledge. **Second, the split between fact and value has prevented thinking through how epistemological assumptions** and nationalpolitical commitments **coalesce** to defend the stability of a liberal politics—how **liberalism is itself ideological or “hegemonic**,” and how political science helps to make it so. Or to put it differently, **epistemologies have a politics, and knowledge production in political science tends to shore up certain liberal assumptions and aspirations even while overt prescription and “bias” are seen to be outside the objectivist goals of science**. **Third, the split between fact and value allows methodology**, in particular**, to be viewed as value neutral**, as a technique devoid of normative assumptions. **This v**iew **enables** positivist **political science to occupy the position of authorized** (because disinterested**) discoverer**, teacher, and enforcer of what counts as true or justified statements about politics. **The ultimate effect of this** sequestering of fact-finding from rigorous philosophical examination **has been that dominant epistemological communities are maintained by institutional and practical-discursive means** rather than by any exclusive purchase such conceptual frameworks could have on the truth. Disciplinary strategies (such as writing a methodological textbook designed to unify the discipline) and powerbrokering practices (such as dismissing out of hand arguments that are epistemologically reflexive) help establish the rules and devise the evaluative criteria by which statements about the world are considered knowledge or not. At the same time**, these activities supply and enforce norms about what may and may not be asked. They generally discourage scrutiny into the practices that bound and normalize a discipline**, **enabling certain kinds of knowledge to thrive while foreclosing** or de-authorizing **other** **ways of knowing**. In other words, in addition to the tasks of socializing student-citizens and advising government officials, political science, not surprisingly, operates as a discipline, reproducing the norms, prohibitions, conventions, and constraints that generate standards for identifying expertise. In political science, this expertise affirms the possibility and importance of pursuing value-free science, on the one hand, and the vision of a rationalist liberal politics, on the other.