**The global drone bleeds into the local- either we resist strikes or we’ll face them at home- voting NEG means the decision is made by the Empire**

**Taylor ‘13** [Robert Taylor has been writing for PolicyMic since January 2011, he spends his time writing, studying, protesting wars, and advocating the virtues of economic and political freedom., and dedicates himself to undermining the state's ability to initiate aggression against peaceful people, “Obama Drone Memo Sets Dangerous Precedent For Domestic Drone Use,” <http://www.policymic.com/articles/24983/obama-drone-memo-sets-dangerous-precedent-for-domestic-drone-use>]

One of the most defining characteristics of empires and countries with large military establishments is the tendency of these states to employ the tools of foreign subjugation domestically on the people they claim to be protecting. All historic empires expand and turn on themselves; states, especially militarily aggressive ones, grow like cancer cells, eventually overwhelm and destroying their host.¶ America is no different. While drone technology was in its infancy during the Bush administration, it has grown under President Obama to be a staple of his foreign policy. The Pentagon now operates over 7,500 unmanned drones and have been used to bomb Pakistan, Afghanistan, Yemen, Somalia, and North Africa with horrendous collateral damage and dubious claims of legality.¶ While aggressive war, in whatever form, is often rationalized as being employed only against a supposed foreign enemy, the Justice Department affirmed the boomeranging nature of military interventionism in a leak detailing the Obama administration's legal code for targeting and killing American citizens with drones. ¶ The memo claims that the president can suspend the Fifth Amendment without submitting evidence to court, without congressional oversight, and without making it's legal reasoning available to the public. In typical government-speak, the Justice Department expands on already vague and broad domestic and international laws in claiming powers that as the ACLU's Jameel Jaffer puts it, "redefines the word imminence in a way that deprives the word of its ordinary meaning.”¶ Since the Obama administration has already targeted and killed two American citizens with drone strikes with only an embarrassingly minimal outrage among the American public, it is interesting that the Justice Department appears to be working hard on finding legal justification for these attacks. Perhaps the Obama administration is trying to cover its tracks. More likely, however, is that in a similar way to how Obama was scrambling to write a legal code to govern his illegal drone wars in case Republican Mitt Romney was elected in 2012, this is an attempt to codify and institutionalize the targeted assassination of American citizens.¶ Does this mean that drone missiles will be screeching through Omaha tomorrow? No, but what it does signify is another example of empires looking inward. All one has to do is take a peek back at American history to see the trend of domestic authoritarianism that results directly from war.¶ During the Spanish-American War, the U.S. military imposed drug prohibition and waterboarded captives during their occupation of the Philippines. Within a decade, both of these policies found their way across the Pacific. During WWI, while claiming to fight oppressive monarchies, President Woodrow Wilson initiated a brutal and draconian police state on the home front. Income-tax withholding was supposed to be a "temporary wartime measure" during WWII.¶ After 9/11, the CIA's global torture regime, with the cooperation of dozens of countries, that took place in former Soviet dungeons was soon unleashed on American hero Bradley Manning. The militarization of domestic law enforcement has its roots in the Iraq and Afghan wars where police, in their language, dress, tactics, and weaponry, resemble an occupying military force rather than protectors of person and property.¶ In other words, the tools and power needed to wage aggressive war — and in our current case, a permanent "war on terror" — set precedents that slowly find their way to be used domestically for largely the same reasons they are deployed abroad. How many times have you heard a modern president use a previous president's crimes to justify his own? Hey, if Lincoln suspended habeus corpus and FDR ran concentration camps, why shouldn't the president have his own secret assassins?¶ So it is only the logical next step that the Obama administration would expand on Bush's authoritarian claims of power by not only expanding on virtually every one of Bush's violations of domestic and international law, but by codifying news ones leaked in the memo. The only difference — in this case, weaponized robots — is the technology.¶ This is why the struggle for liberty and limiting state power goes hand in hand with opposing aggressive war and exposing the harm **that it does not only to the countries the U.S. is currently targeting but to us domestically as well**. War (except in the rare occasion of self-defense) is and always has been a racket, the health of the state, and an enemy of civilization. The threat posed by America's "enemies," since at least the Cold War, have always been highly inflated and exaggerated.¶ Crushing debt, loss of liberties and wealth, millions of casualties, an evisceration of the Bill of Rights, and a hollowing out of the soul of constitutional government: Is empire really worth it?¶ As the late Chalmers Johnson argued, either we abandon our empire or we'll live under it. And now with a president that claims the legal power, as judge, jury, and executioner, to suspend due process and assassinate American citizens from the sky, we're slowly running out of time before that decision is made for us.

#### The permutation solves best: incorporating your counter-perspective increases total friction with the dominant narrative. That’s guerilla pluralism at its finest.

*We don’t need to commit to one perspective or interpretation – that’s a Western science-based way of thinking. Our history does not lie on the “truth” axis, but rather on the “discourse-power” axis. Your perspective is another subjugated knowledge. Our form of knowledge production denies the notion of mutual exclusivitiy because that is borne out of seeking truth. “Mine is true, so yours cannot be”. The ultimate goal is NOT “truth” but rather disunity. For this, a multiplicity of perspectives are key.*

(Jose **Medina**, October **2011**, Associate Professor of Philosophy at Vanderbilt, Toward a Foucaultian Epistemology of Resistance: Counter-Memory, Epistemic Friction, and Guerrilla Pluralism, 6/26/12,K.H.)

In the 1975-76 lectures ‚Society Must Be Defended,‛ Foucault draws a contrast be-tween ‚the genealogy of knowledges‛ and any kind of linear intellectual history such as the history of the sciences: whereas the latter is located at ‚the cognition-truth axis,‛ ‚the genealogy of knowledges is located on a different axis, namely the discourse-power axis or, if you like, the discursive practice—clash of power axis.‛6 Genealogy traces the development of discursive formations that give rise to certain forms of knowledge and power relations. Through their meaning-generating acti-vities, through a grammar of meanings that makes certain things intelligible, sur-veyable, and the proper objects of investigation and knowledge (and others unintel-ligible, unsurveyable, and epistemically opaque), discursive practices have both (and simultaneously) epistemic and power effects. And it is of course crucial that we re-gard power and knowledge not only as intimately related but as inseparable, which is why Foucault and Foucaultians have used the cumbersome expression ‚power/ knowledge.‛ One may naively think that the opposite of power/knowledge would be powerlessness/ignorance, so that those excluded or marginalized in the discursive practices that produce certain epistemic and power effects would be simply subjects without any knowledge and any power, quasi-non-agents. But the pluralistic genea-logical approach that Foucault sketches goes completely against those views that portray the oppressed as merely powerless and ignorant. In fact, this approach un-masks as an important misconception the view that the oppressed simply lack power and knowledge because of the forms of exclusions and marginalization they suffer. That distorted characterization plays in the hands of the dominant ideologies and grants too much to them: namely, it grants the very definition of what counts as legitimate power and legitimate knowledge. Instead, a more accurate characteriza-tion would be the one that describes oppressed groups as those whose powers and knowledges have been demeaned and obstructed. This is why, after drawing the contrast between genealogy and history of knowledge, Foucault goes on to say that the critical task that genealogy confronts us with is ‚an immense and multiple battle, but not one between knowledge and ignorance, but an immense and multiple battle between knowledges in the plural—knowledges that are in conflict because of their very morphology, because they are in the possession of enemies, and because they have intrinsic power-effects.‛7 How do we fight against power on this view? Not by trying to escape it (as if liberation consisted in standing outside power altogether), but rather, by turning power(s) against itself(themselves), or by mobilizing some forms of power against others. Similarly, how do we fight against established and official forms of know-ledge when they are oppressive? Not by trying to escape knowledge altogether, but rather, by turning knowledge(s) against itself(themselves), or by mobilizing some forms of knowledge against others. The critical battle against the monopolization of knowledge-producing practices involves what Foucault calls ‚an insurrection of subjugated knowledges.‛ When it comes to knowledge of the past and the power associated with it, this battle involves resisting the ‚omissions‛ and distortions of of-ficial histories, returning to lost voices and forgotten experiences, relating to the past from the perspective of the present in an alternative (out-of-the-mainstream) way. And this is precisely what the Foucaultian notions of ‚counter-history‛ and ‚coun-ter-memory‛ offer. Official histories are produced by monopolizing knowledge-producing prac-tices with respect to a shared past. Official histories create and maintain the unity and continuity of a political body by imposing an interpretation on a shared past and, at the same time, by silencing alternative interpretations of historical experien-ces. Counter-histories try to undo these silences and to undermine the unity and continuity that official histories produce. Foucault illustrates this with what he calls ‚the discourse of race war‛ that emerged in early modernity as a discourse of resis-tance for the liberation of a race against the oppression of another, e.g. of the Saxons under the yoke of the Normans. Foucault argues that in Europe—and especially in England—‚this discourse of race war functioned as a counter-history‛8 until the end of the 19th Century, at which point it was turned into a racist discourse (aimed not at the liberation of an oppressed race, but at the supremacy of an allegedly superior race that views all others as an existential threat). In lecture IV of ‚Society Must Be Defended” Foucault sets out to analyze the ‚counterhistorical function‛ of the race-war discourse in early modernity.9 Part of what the race-war discourse did was to retrieve the untold history of a people which could be used as a weapon against the official history that legitimized their oppression. This counter-history tapped into the subversive power of a silenced historical experience and reactivated the past to create distinctive knowledge/power effects: new meanings and normative attitudes were mobilized, so that what was officially presented as past glorious victories that legitimized monarchs and feudal lords as the rightful owners of the land to whom taxes were owed, now appeared as unfair defeats at the hands of abusive conquerors who became oppressors and had to be overthrown.

#### The permutation is the BEST option: the plurality of subjugated knowledge is the ONLY way to exert continued friction against the status quo, create a bulwark against co-option and spur disunity in hegemonic knowledge systems.

(Jose **Medina**, October **2011**, Associate Professor of Philosophy at Vanderbilt, Toward a Foucaultian Epistemology of Resistance: Counter-Memory, Epistemic Friction, and Guerrilla Pluralism, 6/26/12,K.H.)

#### As Foucault puts it, genealogies can be described as the ‚attempt to de-subjugate historical knowledges, to set them free, or in other words to enable them to oppose and struggle against the coercion of a unitary, formal, and scientific theoretical discourse.‛40 But, as he emphasizes, genealogies do not simply ‚reject knowledge, or invoke or celebrate some immediate experience that has yet to be cap-tured by knowledge. This is not what they are about. They are about the insur-rection of knowledges.‛41 Genealogical investigations proceed by ‚way of playing lo-cal, discontinuous, disqualified, or nonlegitimized knowledges off against the uni-tary theoretical instance‛ that filters them out or absorbs them by putting them in their proper place within a hierarchy. Genealogies are insurrections of subjugated knowledges. And the plurals here are crucial, for the plurality of insurrections and of subjugated knowledges has to be kept always alive in order to resist new hegemonic unifications and hierarchizations of knowledges. The danger that the critical work of genealogies can be reabsorbed by hegemonic power/knowledges is brilliantly described by Foucault: Once we have excavated our genealogical fragments, once we begin to exploit them and to put in circulation these elements of knowledge that we have been trying to dig out of the sand, isn’t there a danger that they will be recoded, recolonized by these unitary discourses which, having first disqualified them and having then ignored them when they reappeared, may now be ready to reannex them and include them in their own discourses and their own power-knowledge? And if we try to protect the fragments we have dug up, don’t we run the risk of building, with our own hands, a unitary discourse? 42 Insurrections of (de-)subjugated knowledges and their critical resistance can be co-opted for the production of new forms of subjugation and exclusion (new hege-monies) or for the reinforcement of old ones. The only way to resist this danger is by guaranteeing the constant epistemic friction of knowledges from below, which—as I have argued elsewhere43—means guaranteeing that eccentric voices and perspec-tives are heard and can interact with mainstream ones, that the experiences and concerns of those who live in darkness and silence do not remain lost and un-attended, but are allowed to exert friction. Genealogies have to be always plural, for genealogical investigations can unearth an indefinite number of paths from for-gotten past struggles to the struggles of our present. And the insurrections of sub-jugated knowledges they produce also need to remain plural if they are to retain their critical power, that is, the capacity to empower people to resist oppressive power/knowledge effects. In the next section I will put this Foucaultian pluralism in conversation with other epistemological pluralistic approaches to memory and knowledge of the past. 2. Epistemic Friction, Guerrilla Pluralism, and Counter-Memory What we need in order to maintain possibilities of resistance always open is epistemic friction. As Wittgenstein puts it: ‚We want to walk: so we need friction. Back to the rough ground!‛44 I want to define epistemic friction as follows: epistemic friction consists in the mutual contestation of differently normatively structured knowledges which interrogates epistemic exclusions, disqualifications, and hegemonies. Episte-mic friction is acknowledged and celebrated in pluralistic views of our epistemic negotiations and our cognitive lives, but not every kind of epistemic pluralism makes room for epistemic friction in the same way. In this section I want to explore the implications of a thoroughgoing epistemic pluralism for genealogical investiga-tions. For this purpose, I will compare and contrast Foucault’s pluralism with two different kinds of epistemic pluralism that can be found in American philosophy, ar-guing that Foucaultian pluralism offers a distinctive notion of epistemic friction that has tremendous critical force.

#### There is no one, abstract truth of the situation. These truths become ossified, dead, and inert when not discussed in terms of lived human experience. Our genealogy is a crucial form of epistemic interrogation. \*\*\* NOTE TO SELF: SHORTEN

(Jose **Medina**, October **2011**, Associate Professor of Philosophy at Vanderbilt, Toward a Foucaultian Epistemology of Resistance: Counter-Memory, Epistemic Friction, and Guerrilla Pluralism, 6/26/12,K.H.)

The genesis amnesia with respect to the truths circulated in our discursive practices is problematic because it forces us to accept inherited truths independently of the life-experiences from which they were drawn. James warns us against the danger of relying uncritically on fixed truths, for this means relying on the experiences and valuations of others or of our past selves, which may have lost their force and appropriateness in our current experiential contexts. Fixity is a property that human truths cannot have. Those recalcitrant truths that take the appearance of being permanent and fixed simply hide ossified valuations and rigidified beliefs. Our body of truths always has to be critically revisited in the light of new expe-riences. On James’s view, truths cannot simply be taken for granted, because they become inert or dead truths, i.e. truths that have been removed from the stream of life and are presented in complete independence from particular experiential contexts and particular experiential subjects.52 Truths have to be related to the subjects in whose life they make a difference, to their experiences and valuations. According to James, when truths are detached from the life-experiences that gave them birth, they lose their vital force and they become rigid, ossified, dead. Truths cannot be simply found; they have to be created or recreated to be alive. Living truths are truths of our own making. Of course, the living truths we make today will be the dead truths of tomorrow. **Our truths lose their action-guiding value** and productivity when they are detached from concrete life-experiences, becoming ossified by habitual use. But this does not mean that we cannot rely on those beliefs that have been previously accepted as true. Our epistemic activities need to rely on a stock of truths that have been previously established in our transactions with the world (our own as well as those of others). But the older truths on which we rely cannot be simply taken for granted; they have to be subject to a critical epistemic examination that traces them back to their experiential sources. This is why James claims that, besides a method, pragmatism is ‚a genetic theory of what is meant by truth.‛53 We have to uncover how truths have been made. We need to recover ‚the trail of the human serpent‛ that is left ‚over everything‛54 and is often erased or forgotten. It is in this sense that the Jamesian approach to truth is essentially genealogical.55 On James’s view, the epistemic analysis of our beliefs requires the genealogy of those ideas and thoughts that have been made true in our practices. But of course genealogies are driven by present concerns and interests and, therefore, they are both backward-looking and forward-looking simultaneously. Jamesian genealogies trace the vital trajectories of our truths within our practices, presenting them at the cross-roads between the life-experiences and actions of the past and those of the present and future. The critical task, for James, is to trace the practical trajectories along which the life of those truths have run their course, trying to determine if there is still some life left in them and what paths their present and future life can take. But notice that the exclusive focus of Jamesian genealogies is on continuities and convergences in alethic trajectories within our practices. A Jamesian genealogy tries to uncover what our truths have done so far and what they can still do for us. A Foucaultian genealogy goes much further and its attention to epistemic diffe-rences is more radical. A Foucaultian genealogy tries to uncover what our truths have never done for (some of) us and never will; and it tries to connect the truths generated within a given practice with the un-truths that are also generated along-side them, digging up all sorts of epistemic frictions and struggles that reveal the competing and alternative truths that may lie in the interstices of a discursive practice or in counter-discourses. Thus, as argued above, in Foucault we find a more radical and uncompromising epistemic pluralism, a guerrilla pluralism. Grounded in this pluralism, Foucaultian genealogical investigations have their primary focus on discontinuities and divergences in alethic trajectories that can interrogate the con-tinuities and convergences that we take for granted, and thus produce ‚an insur-rection of subjugated knowledges.‛ Foucaultian genealogy is not only a way of re-freshing or reviving our past in the light of our present; it is the more radical attempt to make our present and our past alien to us, to look at historical trajectories with fresh eyes, with different eyes, so that they appear as strange artifacts. And this pro-cess of self-estrangement in which Foucaultian genealogies consist involves the un earthing of the radical differences that lie within our practices and within ourselves, but have been silenced, marginalized, stigmatized, excluded, or forgotten. A genea-logy animated not simply by a melioristic pluralism, but by a guerrilla pluralism, re-quires more than merely revisiting the past to see how and why things were settled in the way they were. It requires interrogating and contesting any settlement, ma-king the past come undone at the seams, so that it loses its unity, continuity, and na-turalness, so that it does not appear any more as a single past that has already been made, but rather, as a heterogeneous array of converging and diverging struggles that are still ongoing and only have the appearance of having been settled. When social divisions and social struggles become the focus of attention, genealogies lead to the splintering of the present and the past into irreducibly heterogeneous presents and pasts that resist unification and contain multiple cross-roads full of friction.

#### They say “visibility” ---

#### Making the oppressed subject visible provokes surveillance, voyeurism and attempts at imperial possession and incorporation.

Peggy PHELAN Chair NYU Performance Studies Dept. 93 [*Unmarked* p. 7-8]

The current contradiction between “identity politics” with its accent on visibility, and the psychoanalytic/ldeconstructionist mistrust (if visibility as she source of unity or wholeness needs to he refigured, if not resolved. As the left dedicates ever more energy to visibility politics, I am increasingly troubled by the forgetting of the problems of visibility so successfully articulated by feminist film theorists in I he 1970s and 1980s. I am not suggesting that continued invisibility is the “proper” political agenda for the disenfranchised, but. rather that. the binary between the power of visibility and the impotency of invisibility is falsifying. There is real power in remaining unmarked; and there are serious limitations to visual representation as a political goal. Visibility is a trap (“In this matter oft he visible, everything is a trap”: (Lacan *Four Fundamental Concepts*: 93); it summons surveillance and the law; it provokes voyeurism, fetishism, the colonialist/imperial appetite for possession. Yet it retains a certain political appeal. Visibility politics have practical consequences: a line can be drawn between a practice (getting someone seen or read) and a theory (if you are seen it. is harder for “them” to ignore you, to construct a punitive canon); the two can be reproductive. While there is a deeply ethical appeal in the desire for a more inclusive representational landscape and certainly under-represented communities can be empowered by an enhanced visibility, the terms of this visibility often enervate the putative power of these identities. A much more nuanced relationship to the power of visibility needs to be pursued than the Left currently engages.” Arguing that communities of the hitherto under-represented will be made stronger if representational economies reflect and see them, progressive cultural activists have staked a huge amount on increasing and expanding the visibility of racial, ethnic, and sexual “others.” It is assumed that disenfranchised communities who see their members within the representational field will feel great or pride in being Part, of such a community and those who are not in such a community will increase their understanding of the diversity and strength of such communities. Implicit within this argument. are several presumptions which bear further scrutiny: 1) Identities are visibly marked so the resemblance between the African-American on the television and the African-American on the street helps the observer see they are members of the same community. Reading physical resemblance is a way of' identifying community.

2 The relationship between representation and idenity is linear and smoothly mimetic, What one sees is who one is.

3 If one's mimetic likeness is not represented. one is not addressed. 4. Increased visibility equals increased power. Each presumption reflects the ideology of the visible, an ideology which erases the power of the unmarked, unspoken, and unseen.