#### 1.

Butler 2004 (Judith, Professor of Rhetoric, Precarious Life: the Power of Mourning and Violence)

At the same time, essential to so many political movements is the claim of bodily integrity and self-determination. It is important to claim that our bodies are in a sense our own and that we are entitled to claim rights of autonomy over our bodies. This assertion is as true for lesbian and gay rights claims to sexual freedom as it is for transsexual and transgender claims to self-determination, as it is to intersex claims to be free of coerced medical and psychiatric interventions. It is as true for all claims to be free from racist attacks, physical and verbal, as it is for feminism's claim to reproductive freedom, and as it surely is for those whose bodies labor under duress, economic and political, under conditions of colonization and occupation. It is difficult, if not impossible, to make these claims without recourse to autonomy. I am not suggesting that we cease to make these claims. We have to, we must. I also do not wish to imply that we have to make these claims reluctantly or strategically. Defined within the broadest possible compass, they are part of any normative aspiration of a movement that seeks to maximize the protection and the freedoms of sexual and gender minorities, of women, and of racial and ethnic minorities, especially as they cut across all the other categories. But is there another normative aspiration that we must also seek to articulate and to defend? Is there a way in which the place of the body, and the way in which it disposes us outside ourselves or sets us beside ourselves, opens up another kind of normative aspiration within the field of politics? The body implies mortality, vulnerability, agency: the skin and the flesh expose us to the gaze of others, but also to touch, and to violence, and bodies put us at risk of becoming the agency and instrument of all these as well. Although we struggle for rights over our own bodies, the very bodies for which we struggle are not quite ever only our own. The body has its invariably public dimension. Constituted as a social phenomenon in the public sphere, my body is and is not mine. Given over from the start to the world of others, it bears their imprint, is formed within the crucible of social life; only later, and with some uncertainty, do I lay claim to my body as my own, if, in fact, I ever do. Indeed, if I deny that prior to the formation of my "will," my body related me to others whom I did not choose to have in proximity to myself, if I build a notion of "autonomy" on the basis of the denial of this sphere of a primary and unwilled physical proximity with others, then am I denying the social conditions of my embodiment in the name of autonomy?

#### 2.

Butler 2004 (Judith, Professor of Rhetoric, Precarious Life: the Power of Mourning and Violence)

A hierarchy of grief could no doubt be enumerated. We have seen it already, in the genre of the obituary, where lives are quickly tidied up and summarized, humanized, usually married, or on the way to be, heterosexual, happy, monogamous. But this is just a sign of another differential relation to life, since we seldom, if ever, hear the names of the thousands of Palestinians who have died by the Israeli military with United States support, or any number of Afghan people, children and adults. Do they have names and faces, personal histories, family, favorite hobbies, slogans by which they live? What defense against the apprehension of loss is at work in the blithe way in which we accept deaths caused by military means with a shrug or with self-righteousness or with clear vindictiveness? To what extent have Arab peoples, predominantly practitioners of Islam, fallen outside the "human" as it has been naturalized in its "Western" mold by the contemporary workings of humanism? What are the cultural contours of the human at work here? How do our cultural frames for thinking the human set limits on the kinds of losses we can avow as loss? After all, if someone is lost, and that person is not someone, then what and where is the loss, and how does mourning take place? This last is surely a question that lesbian, gay, and hi-studies have asked in relation to violence against sexual minorities; that transgendered people have asked as they are singled out for harassment and sometimes murder; that intersexed people have asked, whose formative years are so often marked by unwanted violence against their bodies in the name of a normative notion of the human, a normative notion of what the body of a human must be. This question is no doubt, as well, the basis of a profound affinity between movements centering on gender and sexuality and efforts to counter the normative human morphologies and capacities that condemn or efface those who are physically challenged. It must also be part of the affinity with anti-racist struggles, given the racial differential that undergirds the culturally viable notions of the human, ones that we see acted out in dramatic and terrifying ways in the global arena at the present time. I am referring not only to humans not regarded as humans, and thus to a restrictive conception of the human that is based upon their exclusion. It is not a matter of a simple entry of the excluded into an established ontology, but an insurrection at the level of ontology, a critical opening up of the questions, What is real? Whose lives are real? How might reality be remade? Those who are unreal have, in a sense, already suffered the violence of derealization. What, then, is the relation between violence and those lives considered as "unreal"? Does violence effect that unreality? Does violence take place on the condition of that unreality?

#### 3.

Butler 2004 (Judith, Professor of Rhetoric, Precarious Life: the Power of Mourning and Violence)

If violence is done against those who are unreal, then, from the perspective of violence, it fails to injure or negate those lives since those lives are already negated. But they have a strange way of remaining animated and so must be negated again (and again). They cannot be mourned because they are always already lost or, rather, never "were," and they must be killed, since they seem to live on, stubbornly, in this state of deadness. Violence renews itself in the face of the apparent inexhaustibility of its object. The derealization of the "Other" means that it is neither alive nor dead, but interminably spectral. The infinite paranoia that imagines the war against terrorism as a war without end will be one that justifies itself endlessly in relation to the spectral infinity of its enemy, regardless of whether or not there are established grounds to suspect the continuing operation of terror cells with violent aims. How do we understand this derealization? It is one thing to argue¶ that first, on the level of discourse, certain lives are not considered¶ lives at all, they cannot be humanized, that they fit no dominant frame¶ for the human, and that their dehumanization occurs first, at this¶ level, and that this level then gives rise to a physical violence that in¶ some sense delivers the message of dehumanization that is already at¶ work in the culture. It is another thing to say that discourse itself¶ effects violence through omission. If 2oo,ooo Iraqi children were¶ killed during the Gulf War and its aftermath/ do we have an image,¶ a frame for any of those lives, singly or collectively? Is there a story¶ we might find about those deaths in the media? Are there names¶ attached to those children?¶ There are no obituaries for the war casualties that the United¶ States inflicts, and there cannot be. If there were to be an obituary,¶ there would have had to have been a life, a life worth noting, a life¶ worth valuing and preserving, a life that qualifies for recognition.¶ Although we might argue that it would be impractical to write¶ obituaries for all those people, or for all people, I think we have to¶ ask, again and again, how the obituary functions as the instrument by¶ which grievability is publicly distributed. It is the means by which a¶ life becomes, or fails to become, a publicly grievable life, an icon for¶ national self-recognition, the means by which a life becomes noteworthy.¶ As a result, we have to consider the obituary as an act of¶ nation-building. The matter is not a simple one, for, if a life is not¶ grievable, it is not quite a life; it does not qualify as a life and is not¶ worth a note. It is already the unburied, if not the unburiable. It is not simply, then, that there is a "discourse" of dehumanization¶ that

#### 4. Bibi Mamana

Bureau of Investigative Journalism no date (independent research center, Naming the Dead Project, http://www.thebureauinvestigates.com/namingthedead/people/nd526/?lang=en)

Little is known of Bibi Mamana’s life except that she was in her 60s, a grandmother, the wife of the retired headmaster of the Government High School in Miranshah, and a midwife who ‘delivered hundreds of babies‘ in her community. However the events immediately around her death have been well documented. According to detailed reporting in The Times and the BBC’s Panorama programme, among others. For days before the strike there had been the constant hum of drones overhead, it was reported. Mamana and several of her grandchildren were outside the family home. She was picking okra, gathering wood for Eid al Adha tending to livestock when a drone struck. It is not clear how many missiles were fired. But Mamana’s eight-year-old granddaughter Nabeela (aka Mabeela Rehman) was 20m away from where they hit. She told The Times: ‘I saw the first two missiles coming through the air… They were following each other with fire at the back. When they hit the ground, there was a loud noise. After that I don’t remember anything.’ Nabeela was injured by flying shrapnel. At the sound of the explosion, Mamana’s grandson Kaleem (aka Kaleemur or Kaleemullah), 18, ran from the house to help his grandmother. But five to seven minutes later the drones struck again, he told the BBC. He was knocked unconscious. His leg was badly broken and damaged by shrapnel, and needed surgery. The missiles physically hit Mamana, Amnesty researcher Mustafa Qadri said. ‘She’s literally hit flush and is blown to smithereens.’ Atiq, 38, Nabeela’s father and Mamana’s son, was in or was leaving a mosque at the time of the attack. On hearing the blast and seeing the plume of smoke he rushed to the scene. When he arrived he could not see any sign of his mother, he told The Times. He said: ‘My relatives arrived and urged me not to go too close. I started calling out for her but there was no reply. Then I saw her shoes. We found her mutilated body a short time afterwards. It had been thrown quite a long distance away by the blast and it was in pieces. We collected many different parts from the field and put a turban over her body.’ Atiq’s brother Rafiq was also away from the house when the missiles hit. He arrived as Mamana’s grave was being dug. Her body was already in a coffin. He told the BBC: ‘I threw myself over her coffin but the box was closed. The family told me not to open it as she had been hit by a missile and her body was in pieces.’ Family members hit in the same blast made the eight-hour bus journey to Peshawar for medical treatment. While there, Atiq showed The Times his mother’s identity card. The family then travelled on to Islamabad for specialist help. There Rafiq showed the BBC Mamana’s passport, pictures of her grave, the spot where they say the missile hit and fragments of the missile. Rafiq said his mother was ‘the string that holds the pearls together’ to their village, ABC reported. He told Al Jazeera English he received a letter after the strike from a Pakistani official which said the attack was a US drone strike and Bibi was innocent. But nothing more came of it, he said.

### BIJ #2

#### 5. Osama and Badruddin Haqqani

Bureau of Investigative Journalism no date (independent research center, Naming the Dead Project, http://www.thebureauinvestigates.com/namingthedead/strikes/ob287/?lang=en)

CIA drones bombed a house and vehicle killing between five and 25 people in the fourth attack in as many days. The Haqqani network’s military commander, who is the son of the group’s leader, was killed in the attack. A high-profile target, Badruddin Haqqani was listed as a supporter of al Qaeda by the UN in 2011. There were three fresh graves in the family’s cemetery, and a 13-year-old Haqqani, Osama, was also killed in this strike. Islamabad again complained about the strike, summoning a senior US diplomat into the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to hear the complaints.

### BIJ #3

#### Mir Gull Jan Age unknown

#### Shoaib Age unknown

#### Shamroz Khan Aged 24

#### Gull Saeed Khan Aged unknown

#### Gallop Haji Jan Aged unknown

#### Batkai Jan Age unknown

#### Noor Bhadsha Khan aged unknown

#### Allah Mir Khan Aged unknown

#### Mir Jahan Gul Aged unknown

#### Salay Khan Aged unknown

#### Akram Aged unknown

#### Khasmir Khan aged unknown

#### Mir Ajab Khan Aged 22

#### Wolayet Khan aged 25

#### Saleh Khan Aged 14

#### Fazel Rehman Aged 18

#### Sahibdin Aged unknown

#### Min Gul Aged 23

#### Bengal Khan Aged 28

#### Dil Gir Khan Aged unknown

#### Sahid Din Aged Unknown

#### Mir Ajat Aged Unknown

#### Haq Nawaz Aged 23

#### Hatiqullah

Bureau of Investigative Journalism no date (independent research center, Naming the Dead Project, http://www.thebureauinvestigates.com/namingthedead/strikes/ob281/?lang=en

)

Drones hit a house three times in one night, deliberately targeting rescuers and killing civilians for only the third time in the year. Comments by unnamed officials confused the picture of this strike, with one saying the attack hit ‘a truck packed with explosives heading across the border’. But a field investigation by the Bureau found the strike hit a house killing men eating dinner at around 7.40pm. After half an hour, 20 local tribesmen moved in to rescue the injured and 12 were killed. Eight of them were named and identified as civilians by legal charity Reprieve. However Amnesty International independently investigated the strike and named 18 civilians. The rights organisation also uncovered many of their ages, occupations and family circumstances. It is not clear if the eight named by Reprieve and 18 by Amnesty are duplicates with different names, or distinct individuals killed in this strike. Shoaib died 06/07/2012 Akram died 06/07/2012 Hatiqullah died 06/07/2012 Haq Nawaz died 06/07/2012 Mir Ajat died 06/07/2012 Sahid Din died 06/07/2012 Dil Gir Khan died 06/07/2012 Bangal Khan died 06/07/2012 Min Gul died 06/07/2012 Mir Ajab Khan died 06/07/2012 Sahibdin died 06/07/2012 Waliullah died 06/07/2012 Fazel Rehman died 06/07/2012 Shamroz Khan died 06/07/2012 Saleh Khan died 06/07/2012 Wolayet Khan died 06/07/2012 Khashmir Khan died 06/07/2012 Gul Dad Khan died 06/07/2012 Gull Saeed Khan died 06/07/2012 Mir Jahan Gul died 06/07/2012 Allah Mir Khan died 06/07/2012 Noor Bhadshah Khan died 06/07/2012 Mir Gull Jan died 06/07/2012 Batkai Jan died 06/07/2012 Gallop Haji Jan died 06/07/2012 Salay Khan died 06/07/2012

### BIJ #4

7. Bureau of Investigative Journalism no date (independent research center, Naming the Dead Project, Tariq Aziz, http://www.thebureauinvestigates.com/namingthedead/people/nd475/?lang=en)

Tariq Aziz was a 16-year-old from North Waziristan, who attended a high-profile anti-drone rally in Islamabad in October 2011. Days after his return home, he was killed in a drone strike with his cousin and up to two others. Aziz was the youngest of seven children. His father Mumtaz Khan worked in the United Arab Emirates as a driver to support his family. He was described by relatives as a quiet teenager, good with computers. His uncle Noor Kalam said: ‘He was just a normal boy who loved football.’ On October 27, days before his death, Aziz made the eight hour drive to Islamabad for a grand jirga – a high council meeting. The meeting was convened by Waziri elders to discuss how to end civilian deaths in drone strikes. Pakistani politician Imran Khan, his former wife Jemima, members of legal campaign group Reprieve and several western journalists also attended the meeting. Aziz had a personal interest in the subject matter: 18 months earlier, his cousin Aswarullah had been reportedly killed by a drone as he rode a motorcycle. Tariq took his cousin’s identity card to the conference. The Bureau has not been able to identify the specific strike in which Aswarullah reportedly died. Aziz went to the jirga after lawyer Shahzad Akbar called him offering him basic photography classes and a camera to help document drone strikes. Around 25 men of all ages entered the conference hall, shaking hands and kissing cheeks of over a dozen Waziri elders who had convened the high level meeting at the Margalla hotel in Islamabad. Tariq walked in, pressing his right palm on the chest of each of the elders who lined up to meet them. He took his place in the audience, two rows behind Jemima Khan. Neil Williams from Reprieve, who attended the meeting, said Aziz seemed very introverted. He said he asked Aziz if he had ever seen a drone. Aziz said he saw 10 or 15 every day. He said they meant he could not sleep. ‘He looked absolutely terrified,’ Williams added. After a four-hour debate, the audience joined around 2,000 people at a protest rally outside the Pakistani parliament. After the rally, the tribesmen made the long journey home. The following day Aziz and his cousin Wahid went to pick up his newly married aunt to take her back to Norak. On their way they dropped off a friend. When they were 200 yards from the house two missiles slammed into their car. The blast killed Aziz and Wahid instantly. Some reports suggested Wahid was 12 years old, although video seen by the Bureau indicates he was more likely to have been in his mid- to late teens. An anonymous US official acknowledged the CIA had launched the strike but denied they were children. The occupants of that car were militants, he said. Following the strike, Shahzad Akbar wrote to the US ambassador: ‘I am considering initiating legal proceedings against you as a co-conspirator in Tariq and Wahid’s murder – for murder is the only word that can properly be applied to the act committed by CIA agents and their accomplices.’