#### Our 1AC begins with a re-telling of the Rehman family’s story, as told by Rania Khalek after she spent time with the family in November

Rania Khalek is an independent journalist living in the Washington, DC “Drone Victims Tell Empty US House Their Story; Is America Listening?” November 1 http://truth-out.org/news/item/19751-drone-strike-victims-tell-their-story-but-is-america-listening

Pakistani school teacher Rafiq ur Rehman traveled over 7,000 miles with his children - 13-year-old Zubair and 9-year-old Nabila - from a small, remote village in North Waziristan to tell lawmakers about the US drone strike that killed his 67-year-old mother, Mamana Bibi. It was a harrowing tale that brought many in the room to tears, including Rep. Alan Grayson (D-Fla.), who was responsible for inviting the family to Capitol Hill for the briefing.

In the end, only five members of the US House of Representatives bothered to attend. Grayson was joined by Reps. Jan Schakowsky (D- Ill.), Rush Holt (D-NJ), John Conyers (D-Mich.) and Rick Nolan (D-Minn.).

Meanwhile, President Obama, according to his October 29 schedule, was meeting with the CEOs of Lockheed Martin and Northrup Grumman, both of which manufacture drones. More importantly, Lockheed Martin manufactures hellfire missiles, the very weapon fired from the drone that killed Mamana Bibi.

Though Obama did not publicly acknowledge the briefing, his actions the next day suggest he was either unmoved or did not tune in.

Just one day after the Rehman family addressed Congress, a US drone strike killed three people and injured at least three more in North Waziristan. The identities of the dead have yet to be confirmed, but Pakistani intelligence officials say they were suspected militants, the same claim made in the aftermath of Mamana Bibi's death.

In Their Own Words

"On October 24, 2012, a CIA drone killed my mother and injured my children," Rehman said, speaking through a translator. And so began the first time members of Congress heard a drone victim tell their story.

"Nobody has ever told me why my mother was targeted that day," he continued. "Some media outlets reported that the attack was on a car, but there is no road alongside my mother's house. Others reported that the attack was on a house. But the missiles hit a nearby field, not a house. All of them reported that three, four, five militants were killed. But only one person was killed that day.

"She was the string that held our family together. Since her death, the string has been broken, and life has not been the same. We feel alone and we feel lost."

Rehman was returning from buying groceries when he learned his mother had been killed. "When I heard this news, all the groceries - the fruits and sweets I had bought - just fell from my hands. It was as if a limb had been cut from my body to hear the news of my mother's death," he told Truthout.

"All my neighbors and relatives were telling me to come immediately to the mosque because they were going to start the prayers. But I said no, I want to go to my house, I want to see my mom's face before they bury her to rest. They were telling me that no, you don't want to see the condition she is in," said Rehman. "Later, I realized that because she was blown to pieces, they collected whatever they could and put it in a box. I wanted to see my mom's face for the last time but they had taken her remains and put it into a box."

It was the day before Eid and Rehman's mother was outside with eight of her grandchildren picking okra. Both Zubair and Nabila said they noticed a drone overhead but, as Zubair explained, "I wasn't worried because we are not militants."

Nabila described to Truthout what happened next. "All of the sudden I heard this 'dum dum' noise, and I saw these two white lights come down and hit right where my grandmother was. Everything had become dark, and it was smelling weird. I was really scared and didn't know what to do so I started to run, and I just kept running and running," she said.

"I felt some pain in my hand. When I looked, it was bleeding. I tried to bandage it and wipe it with my scarf to stop the bleeding but the blood just kept coming out. I had lost a lot of blood. Next thing I know I ended up in a hospital and it was evening time."

Zubair's experience was equally as horrific. "My grandmother was blown up into pieces, and I got injured in my leg," he told Truthout. "At the funeral, everyone was trying to console me, saying, 'We all lost a grandmother.' There was no one else like her. She would always make sure that we would have something to eat, and she would always make our favorite meals or buy our favorite fruits from the market."

Zubair has since undergone multiple surgeries to have shrapnel removed from his leg. Medical costs have piled up, forcing Rehman to borrow money and sell his land to pay for treatment. In the meantime, the US government has yet to provide an explanation for the strike or offer any compensation to the family for their loss, which appears to be a widespread problem. The peace group Codepink recently discovered that over the last four years, not a single dime of the $40 million allocated by Congress for that purpose has gone to Pakistani victims of drone strikes.

Rep. Grayson told Truthout he was unaware of the problem but promised to have his office look into it.

Since the briefing, Rehman says no one from the US government has approached him about compensation, though he stressed, "That's not the reason why I came here. I wasn't looking for any compensation in any way. What I was coming here to do is tell the truth, to share my story. This is about humanity. This is about the truth. This is about justice."

The briefing came one week after the release of several scathing reports by human rights organizations and the UN criticizing the US drone program as a violation of international law. The Obama administration responded to the UN by defending the program as "necessary, legal and just."

Amnesty International, which investigated 45 drone strikes carried out in Pakistan's North Waziristan region between January 2012 and August 2013, accused the United States of "exploiting the lawless and remote nature of the local region to evade accountability for violations of the right to life." Amnesty was particularly concerned about "signature strikes," where drone operators fire on unidentified groups of people based on patterns of behavior that signify militant activity. A signature strike is believed to have killed 18 laborers and injured 22 others in July 2012, according to the report, which also documents several double-taps or follow-up strikes targeting rescuers and mourners. Amnesty concluded that up to 900 civilians have been killed by US drone strikes in Pakistan in "unlawful killings that may constitute . . . war crimes."

Despite the mounting evidence to the contrary, the White House has insisted that the president requires "near-certainty" that civilians will not be harmed before approving a drone strike, adding that there is a "wide gap" between the administration's casualty numbers and those of the nongovernmental organizations. Unfortunately, it is impossible to compare the two because the White House refuses to release its data. That being said, if the president's numbers are significantly lower, it might be related to his definition of the term "militant." Obama tallies "all military-age males in a strike zone as combatants . . . unless there is explicit intelligence posthumously proving them innocent," a counting method that surely lowers the casualty number.

Shahzad Akbar, the Rehman family's attorney who was refused a visa to attend the briefing, told Truthout that Obama administration claims about low civilian casualties are absurd. "Either [Obama] is lying or he is being lied to," he said.

Akbar is a legal fellow with the British human rights group Reprieve and the director of the Pakistan-based Foundation for Fundamental Rights, where he represents over 150 drone strike victims. "I didn't expect this from Obama," he said. "I liked him. I thought that he was the hope of East meets West. He turned out to be the biggest disappointment." Akbar continued, "Obama's first drone strike hit a house filled with civilians, and he was informed of this fact. But what does he do? He escalates the drone strikes."

At the briefing, the lawmakers were asked repeatedly whether certain drone strikes constituted war crimes, as suggested by Amnesty International. All deflected the question except for Grayson, who argued that US drone strikes are not war crimes because the killing of civilians is not "deliberate."

Asked whether signature strikes, which target unidentified persons, might constitute war crimes, Grayson declined to speculate, calling instead for more transparency. "I do think that there is overwhelming evidence that we need a different, more reliable system if we're going to be undertaking operations like this," he told Truthout.

But according to Reprieve attorney Jennifer Gibson, intention is not the only litmus test.

"[Intention] matters to the degree that you are required to be proportionate in your targeting to minimize civilian casualties," Gibson told Truthout. "To the extent that you're being deliberately negligent in minimizing civilian casualties, which is the category that signature strikes would fall into, then yes, in certain instances we very well might be committing war crimes." But there are no agreed-upon parameters for proportionality. Still, Gibson argued, "What I do know is a grandmother and her eight grandchildren is disproportionate."

"Before, I would hear the drones but I didn't think much of it. I would just go about my daily life. I'd want to go to school. There would hardly be a time that I would refuse to go outside," Zubair told Truthout. "But now, after I've seen what's happened to me and my family and that I've had two operations, I'm scared. I don't want to go outside anymore. I don't feel like playing cricket, volleyball and soccer with my friends. I don't even want to go to school. I just fear every time I hear the noise overhead."

Zubair added that there are already too few schools in his community and due to the fear of drone strikes, "students have stopped going to the ones that exist," echoing a report published last year by Stanford and NYU, in which researchers observed that the presence of US drones buzzing over northwest Pakistan 24 hours a day "terrorizes men, women and children, giving rise to anxiety and psychological trauma among civilian communities," who "have to face the constant worry that a deadly strike may be fired at any moment and the knowledge that they are powerless to protect themselves." As a result, "Some parents choose to keep their children home, and children injured or traumatized by strikes have dropped out of school."

"As a teacher, my job is to educate. But how do I teach something like this? How do I explain what I myself do not understand?" asked Rehman, bringing his translator to tears. "How can I in good faith reassure the children that the drone will not come back and kill them, too, if I do not understand why it killed my mother and injured my children?"

"In the end I would just like to ask the American public to treat us as equals. Make sure that your government gives us the same status of a human with basic rights as they do to their own citizens," said Rehman. "This indiscriminate killing has to end, and justice must be delivered to those who have suffered at the hands of the unjust."

Rafiq, Zubair and Nabila stood bravely before the US Empire and demanded peace. Let's hope that America listens.

#### Thus Clara and I demand that the United States federal government should be put on trial for its targeted killings.

#### Clara and I may be American citizens living thousands of miles from Yemen, but our demand demonstrates solidarity with victims of drone strikes. Obama and his lawyers continue to justify the targeted killing of hundreds in the name of counterterrorism. Saying nothing in the face of these murders is a passive endorsement of the status quo. We may not be able to stop all executive abuses, but we want them to know that they need to keep our names out of their justification when they do it. Drone victims want to know Americans are listening- they want us to share their stories and demand an end to targeted killing.

Mohammed Al Qawli, whose brother was killed in a drone strike, wrote in December Mohammed Al Qawli is an educational consultant at the Ministry of Education in Sanaa, Yemen and the former director of the Ministry of Education in Khawlan province. His brother, Ali Al Qawli, was killed in a drone strike in January 2013. Dec 5 2013 “The US killed my brother with a drone. I want to know why” http://america.aljazeera.com/opinions/2013/12/grieving-yemena-sinnocentdead.html

I have been waiting for almost a year now for an apology and for meaningful answers as to why my brother had to die, but no one in the U.S. or Yemeni government has ever contacted me or claimed responsibility for their actions. I’d heard that the United States of America was sending support to Yemen, but for a long time I did not know what that meant. Now I can see it firsthand. I have received U.S. gifts and U.S. aid, wrapped in a body bag. These explosive fragments kill Yemenis, destroy their spirits, burn their bodies and only further empower the militants. The U.S. and Yemeni governments killed a young man who strongly opposed terrorism and tried to bring change through education — the very same things they purport to want themselves. I want to know why. Ali al Qawli the schoolteacher has left us, but his tremendous legacy of love, passion and hope remains. I hope that the American people will demand an end to the illegal extrajudicial executions happening in their name. I hope they will stand against the violent actions of their Nobel Peace Prize–winning president and join us in demanding that the U.S. government stop its blind killing of hundreds of innocent people. Most important, I hope they will represent the best ideals of their country’s founding and help end this injustice committed in their name. I may live thousands of miles from the United States, but I hope that when Americans hear about drones, they will share my brother’s story and the stories of countless other civilians who have died in the name of counterterrorism. We must ensure that both courts and governments stop the killing and do not make a farce of the principles they purport to uphold.

#### The anti-drone movement needs policy help. 2013 has been an important year for the anti-drone movement. Now is a critical time to discuss the policy changes in order to build momentum

Medina 13 Daniel, The Huffington Post, 11-18, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/daniel-medina/drone-summit-demands-end-\_b\_4297581.html

Within view of the U.S. Capitol and just a little more than a mile from the White House, hundreds of of anti-drone proliferation activists, academics, lawyers and concerned citizens from all over the world gathered this weekend for the second annual drone summit. The conference, co-sponsored by the peace and social justice movement Code Pink and the National Lawyers Guild amongst others, was held at a full capacity auditorium at the Georgetown University Law Center in northwest Washington. Attendees, clad in the organization's ubiquitous pink t-shirts and stickered attire, listened in on high-profile speakers and from panels of experts who confronted the thorniest issues related to the CIA's largely clandestine drone program, ranging from the legal challenges to drone strikes to the questions surrounding privacy with surveillance drones. Dr. Cornel West, the Columbia University professor and social activist, gave the opening address, offering a damning critique of the Obama administration's drone policies. "We are here today because we are not indifferent to the Obama administration's unlawful killing of innocent civilians abroad," said Dr. West to the roaring crowd before invoking a reference to Biblical scripture. " Indifference to evil is more evil than evil itself." Officially titled "Drones Around The Globe: Proliferation and Resistance," the summit was not merely a gathering of like minded activists with little opportunity to change policy on Capitol Hill. Each session, workshop and panel was aimed at developing strategies to stop the proliferation of drones used for killing and spying and to lay out concrete steps on where to take the movement as it shifts to a larger national profile. This has been a whirlwind year for the anti-drone proliferation movement, at home and abroad. President Obama's nomination of "drone-czar" John Brennan as CIA Director this past spring galvanized thousands to join the movement as critics saw the move as an effort "to begin the process of the normalization of killing with no accountability and far less transparency," said Dr. West. Code-Pink co-founder Medea Benjamin's rise as the movement's public face has also given it a bona fide leader. Benjamin, who made national headlines for heckling President Obama repeatedly during his drone policy speech at the National Defense University in May, says the NSA leaks "moved the needle a great deal" towards informing the public of government overreach. "Last year for our first summit, we were coming from a sense of there's only a small group of us that care about these issues. How are we going to start convincing more of the public that the drones aren't good? " said Benjamin. "Now, how are we going to take policies that have started to shift because there's less drone strikes, there's more care for civilian casualties, there's talk about taking the drones out of the hands of the CIA, how are we going to push those things to really happen? That's what we did this weekend in our organizing workshops." Part of this strategy, Benjamin says, is to shine a light on places, like Yemen, where attacks are taking place but that remain largely unknown to most Americans. An invited speaker at the summit was Entesar al Qadhi, a prominent female Yemeni parliamentarian representing the Mareb Governorate in North Yemen, an area that has been battered by US drone strikes in recent years. " I may never know why we are being targeted on a daily basis by drones, but I do know that they are not stopping terrorism in my country," said al Qadhi through a translator. "Because drones are just another form of terrorism." Another country spotlighted was Pakistan; the country most attacked by US drone strikes, which have deteriorated relations between Washington and Islamabad. A Pakistani delegation, headed by Shafqat Mahmood-an MP from Imran Khan's opposition PTI party, was on hand to address the crowd. A surprise speaker who had not been listed on the official itinerary, Mahmood traveled to Washington last week for meetings with Senators Diane Feinstein (D-CA) and James E. Risch (R-ID) to lobby both members of the Senate Intelligence Committee to cease drone strikes in his country. Once aides told Benjamin that he was in town, she immediately contacted Mahmood to speak at the summit, hoping he could offer what she described as "an insider view on the relationship at the highest levels of government between our two countries and drone attacks." Mahmood eagerly accepted. "We forcefully put across how these drone strikes are having a negative impact in Pakistan, how they actually are increasing militancy," said Mahmood of the meetings. " In particular, the last drone strike, which killed Hakimullah Mehsud [Pakistani Taliban leader], for whom we have no sympathy, but it destroyed the possibility of any kind of peace talks that had been planned between the Taliban and the government. That effort has been completely sabotaged." According to the Bureau of Investigative Journalism, an independent UK-based government watchdog that tracks US drone attacks, there have been 24 CIA drone strikes this year in Pakistan alone, which have reportedly killed between 103-195 people. The issue has been a lightning rod for Pakistani politics across party lines. Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif has, both privately and publicly, pushed President Obama to stop all drone attacks in Pakistan arguing that they are illegal under international law and violate the country's national sovereignty. The PTI party has been the most outspoken on the attacks, even threatening to blockade the northern province of Khyber Paktunkwa, where it holds power, from NATO supplies moving to and from Afghanistan, in retaliation to the strike that killed Mehsud. Many Pakistan analysts see Mahmood as a trusted confidante to PTI leader Imran Khan who has the ear of the ex-cricket legend turned politician. Such a high-profile get was not lost on Benjamin. "Having him here today was really special. When you have one of the most influential Pakistani opposition politicians coming over to speak face-to-face with members of Congress who support the drone strikes, that's powerful," said Benjamin. "That wouldn't have been possible a few years ago. All of our work has forced changes in attitudes on drones and the tides of public opinion are shifting. This weekend shows that if we remain united as a movement, we can get there."

#### Lawsuits are a visible platform advocates can use to generate media attention and public conversations. The conversations that result from the aff spillover to broader conversations about constitutional concerns and human rights issues.

Wexler 13 Lesley Wexler Professor of Law and Thomas A. Mengler Faculty Scholar, University of Illinois College of Law “The Role of the Judicial Branch during the Long War: Drone Courts, Damage Suits, and FOIA Requests” May 8 http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=2262412

This chapter suggests the judiciary may play an important role in the debate over the executive branch’s decisions regarding IHL even if it declines to speak to the substance of such cases. First, advocates may use courts as a visible platform in which to make their arguments and spur conversations about alternative, non-judicially mandated transparency and accountability measures. As they did with the trio of detention cases, advocates can leverage underlying constitutional concerns about the treatment of citizens to stimulate interest in the larger IHL issues. Second, litigants may use courts to publicize and pursue Freedom of Information (FOIA) requests and thus enhance transparency. Even if courts decline to grant FOIA requests, the lawsuits can generate media atten-tion about what remains undisclosed. Third, and most robustly, Congress may pass legislation that would facilitate either prospective review of kill lists through a so-called drone court or remove procedural barriers to retrospective damage suits for those unlawfully killed by a drone strike. Even the threat of such a judicial role may influence executive branch behavior.

#### Tort litigation succeeds where traditional rights fail. Tort strategies provide forums for a unique and critical form of confronting biopower through the expression of individual bodily experience.

Bloom 12 \*Anne, Professor of Law, the University of the Pacific/McGeorge School of Law. Southwestern Law Review, 41 Sw. L. Rev. 241

My argument is that tort litigation presents us with an interesting alternative to the emphasis on civil rights-based strategies that ought to be more seriously pursued. Historically, tort litigation has played a relatively minor role in the legal tactics of activist lawyers. While tort claims are occasionally tacked on to civil rights cases, they are rarely the focus of activist lawyers' legal strategies. n67 There are many reasons for this, including the structure of tax laws, which makes it more difficult for nonprofits to litigate cases on the contingency fee basis on which most tort claims proceed. There is also the stigma that is associated with tort litigation; in the minds of many elite lawyers (including those who make up the public interest bar), tort practice is less prestigious, particularly when it involves representation of plaintiffs. These biases against the pursuit of tort litigation as part of a broader strategy of resistance need to change. Tort litigation provides a relatively unique opportunity to confront and resist biopower, in both its institutional and more diffuse forms. In part, this is because tort litigation is the area of law that people tend to turn to when medical products and treatments fail to help them successfully comply with biopower's demands. n68 In recent years, for example, we have [\*250] seen increased litigation around the failure of a variety of sexual identity enhancing products, such as breast implants, n69 erectile dysfunction medication, n70 and weight-loss drugs. n71 The existence of this litigation suggests that a very large number of people feel that they need artificial help for their bodies to successfully comply with the bodily "truth" of binary ("male" or "female") identity. Because of this, the litigation exposes the gap between biopower's bodily "truths" and lived experience. At the same time, however, the exposure of this gap presents an opportunity to resist, rework, or reproduce those "truths." Tort litigation is also an important site in which to confront and resist the operation of biopower because of the heavy role that medical experts play in most tort cases. In the typical tort case, medical elites take the stand to offer a diagnosis of how the plaintiff's body varies from idealized bodily "truths" about what normal bodies should look like and how they should function. n72 Moreover, in many cases, medical elites are also relied upon to suggest a course of treatment aimed at helping to bring the body into compliance with these "truths." n73 As a result, tort litigation routinely acts as a venue in which the idealized bodily narratives of biopower are compared against particular material conditions (plaintiffs' bodies). This juxtaposition, however, also presents an important opportunity to expose how these dominant narratives create expectations that are at odds with lived experience. For the same reasons, the litigation also presents an opportunity to directly challenge those narratives with counter-narratives that better reflect lived experience. In sum, tort litigation is an important venue for resistance to biopower because so many tort cases expose a gap between the metaphysical ideals of biopower and the reality of lived experience. But I also believe that there are other reasons why tort litigation may be useful for purposes of resistance. By virtue of its common law roots, tort litigation is less rigid and more "local" than civil rights litigation. As compared to other areas of the law - such as civil rights litigation- there is more room for imaginative pleading in tort litigation; there are also more opportunities for dialogue with grass roots activists. n74 These differences are important because the [\*251] greater flexibility and the closer connection to the community make it more likely that activists will be able to use the litigation to successfully challenge and rework the dominant bodily narratives of biopower.

#### Our method of sharing the stories of drone victims is a critical tool activists can use to change people’s minds.

Rania Khalek explains Rania Khalek is an independent journalist living in the Washington, DC, area “Drone Strike Victims Find Support From Activists, Silence from Unapologetic US Leaders” Nov 25 http://truth-out.org/news/item/20238-drone-strike-victims-find-support-from-activists-silence-from-unapologetic-us-leaders

Building Political Pressure against Drone-delivered Racist Imperialism One way activists are combating the indifference that has accompanied the imperialist rise of drone warfare is by shedding light on the human toll. Reprieve Strategic Director Cori Crider has no doubt that exposing Americans to drone victims like Faisal is having an impact. "This year we've seen a sea change in the debate in the United States about drones," she told Truthout. "When we were starting this stuff in 2010, very few people were talking about it. Now, a lot more mainstream entities are a part of the debate and are asking questions about civilian casualties and about the wisdom of a putative counterterrorism policy that may well create tens and tens of people who have reason to wish us harm for every one that they may take out." Much like with Guantanamo, it is "individual human stories that change people's minds," thereby creating the necessary political pressure to bring about justice, argued Crider. Though Faisal returned to Yemen without the answers or justice his family deserves from the US government, his story, resilience and courage in standing up to the world's most dangerous superpower have fueled demands for accountability from a growing number of concerned citizens who want an end to the killing.

#### This topic has the possibility of allowing some of the screams of America’s victims to make its way into the public. As debaters, we have the possibility of asking questions that NEVER GET ASKED. We have an opportunity to put ourselves in the shoes of the tens of millions of victims of our leaders war-making.

Fred Branfman writes Fred, Director of Project Air War, interviewed the first Lao refugees brought down to Vientiane from the Plain of Jars in northern Laos, American anti-war activist and author of a number of books about the Indochina War. Alternet, 6-26

How would you view a foreign power which bombed you for five and a half years, forced you and your family to live in caves and holes like animals, burned and buried alive countless of your neighbors, and then one day blinded you in a bombing raid that leveled your ancestral village, where you had honored your ancestors and had hoped after your death to be remembered by your offspring? (U.S. Executive Branch leaders massively bombed civilian targets in Laos for nine years, Cambodia for four years.) What would you think of foreign assassins whom as Jeremy Scahill reports in Dirty Wars, broke into your house at 3:30am as a dance was coming to an end, shot your brother and his 15-year old son, then shot another of your brothers and three women relatives (the mothers of 16 children) denied medical help to your brother and 18-year-old daughter so that they slowly bled to death before your eyes, then dug the bullets out of the women's bodies to cover up their crimes, hauled you off to prison, and for months thereafter claimed they were acting in self-defense? And how would you feel toward the leaders of the nation that had fielded not only these JSOC assassins but thousands more, who were conducting similar secret and lawless assassinations of unarmed suspects while covering up their crimes in many other countries around the world? (3) How would you view the foreign leaders responsible right now for drone attacks against you if you lived in northwest Pakistan where, a Stanford/NYU study reported [8]after a visit there, "hovering drones have traumatized millions living in these areas. Drones hover twenty-four hours a day over communities in northwest Pakistan, striking homes, vehicles and public spaces without warning. Their presence terrorizes men, women and children, giving rise to anxiety and psychological trauma among civilian communities. Those living under drones have to face the constant worry that a deadly strike may be fired at any moment, and the knowledge that they are powerless to protect themselves." These are not rhetorical questions. Every one of these acts, and countless more, have been committed by the U.S. Executive Branch over the past 50 years, and will continue indefinitely until it is transformed. If we judge them by their actions, not words, we must face the following facts: -- The U.S. Executive Branch killed in Vietnam from a U.S. Senate Refugee Subcommittee estimated 415,000 civilians to the 1.2 million civilians later estimated by Robert McNamara, to the two million civilians estimated [9] by Nick Turse. And it wounded at least 1,050,000 civilians and refugeed at least 11,368,000, according to the Refugee subcommittee (3); assassinated through its Phoenix Program [10] an officially estimated 26,000 civilians, and imprisoned and tortured 34,000 more, on unproven grounds that they were "Vietcong cadre"; created an estimated 800,000-1.3 million war orphans and 1 million war widows [9]; and after the war ended left behind Agent Orange poisons, unexploded cluster bombs, and landmines, creating an estimated 150,000 deformed [11] Vietnamese children; and killing and maiming 42,000 peacetime victims [12]. -- The U.S. Executive has, in Laos, conducted nine years of bombing which has been estimated [13]by Laos' National Regulatory Authority to have killed and wounded a minimum of 30,000 civilians by bombing from 1964-'73, and another 20,000 since then from the unexploded cluster bombs it left behind. It also created over 50,000 refugees after it had leveled [14] the 700-year-old civilization on the Plain of Jars. -- The U.S. Executive has, in Cambodia, killed and wounded tens of thousands of civilians by carpet-bombing villages from 1969-'75. All told, after Richard Nixon and Henry Kissinger secretly bombed and invaded Cambodia, waging a war that made the U.S. Executive responsible for casualties on all sides, the U.S. Senate Refugee Subcommittee estimated that 450,000 persons had been killed and wounded, and 3,990,000 made refugees. (4)Historian Michael Clodfelter has estimated that 600,000 Cambodian civilians died from the bombing. (5) -- The U.S. Executive under Bill Clinton in Iraq, John Tirman reports in The Deaths of Others, imposed an embargo so severe that "UNICEF estimated that 500,000 children under five years of age had died as a result of the war and sanctions from malnutrition, diseases for which cures were available but medicine in Iraq was not, and poor health at birth due to prenatal effects on mothers." (6) Dennis Halliday, Assistant UN Secretary General,declared [15] that "I had been instructed to implement a (sanctions) policy that has effectively killed over a million individuals." -- And after invading Iraq in 2003, the Executive under George W. Bush, as the Occupying Power, was legally responsible for maintaining law and order. Its war was also an aggressive war as outlawed at Nuremberg. It thus bears both the moral and legal responsibility for the deaths of more than130 [16],000 [16]Iraqis(Iraq Body Count) to 654,965 [17] (Lancet [17] Scientific Journal) to 1,220,580 [18] (Opinion Research Business), hundreds of thousands more wounded, and more than officially estimated 5 million refugees. -- The Executive has, in Afghanistan, conducted thousands of night raids familiar to viewers of World War II Gestapo movies – killing over 1500 civilians in 6282 raids in 10 months from 2010 to early 2011 alone, as revealed [19] by investigative reporter Gareth Porter. They have also conducted numerous bombing strikes and supported a corrupt regime which has stolen billions of dollars while their fellow citizens died for lack of healthcare and food. --The Executive has, in Pakistan and Yemen, killed an estimated 2,800-4,000 persons [20] from drone strikes, only 73 [21] of whom it has named. Most were killed in “signature strikes” in which the victims’ names were unknown, and who in no way threatened the United States. -- Also, over the past 50 years, the U.S. Executive Branch bears a major responsibility for massive death and torture throughout Central and Latin America and in Africa. Church, human rights and others estimate that U.S.-installed, trained, equipped and advised death squads in El Salvador and Contras in Nicaragua killed well over 35,000 [22] and 30,000 [23] persons respectively. The U.S.-supported Rios Montt regime in Guatemala killed an estimated 200,000 [24]. The U.S.-supported coup in Chile brought to power a regime that killed an estimated 3,200-15,000 [25] political opponents and tortured another 30,000 [26]. U.S. support for Indonesian government genocide in East Timor helped kill over 200,000 persons [27]. U.S. support for terrorists led by Jonas Savimbi in Angola helped kill an estimated 1.2 million persons and displaced another 1.5 million. (7) And how much can you trust the decency of a US. Executive that treats these millions of human beings as mere nameless, faceless "collateral damage" at best, direct targets at worst, as human garbage barely worthy of mention, as "non-people" as Noam Chomsky has observed? We almost never ask such questions in this country, never try to put ourselves in the shoes of the tens of millions of victims of our leaders' war-making, because doing so confronts us with a grave dilemma. On the one hand, if we would say these acts are evil if done to ourselves they are obviously also evil when done to others. But admitting that would require most of us to challenge our most basic beliefs about this nation and its leadership. And if we are members of our political, intellectual, media, government and private sector elites, it would threaten our jobs and livelihoods. We are divided. The honest part of ourselves knows there is only one word that can adequately describe the U.S. Executive Branch’s indifference to non-American life. It is not a word to be used lightly, for overuse robs it of its power. But when appropriate, failing to use it is an act of moral cowardice that assures its continuation. That word is evil. If we would regard such acts as evil if done to us, they are equally evil if done to others. This is what we teach our children when we teach them the Golden Rule or that America is a nation of laws, not men. It means, simply, that if needlessly ruining the lives of the innocent is evil, the U.S. Executive Branch is the most evil and lawless institution on the face of the Earth today, cannot be trusted, and poses a clear and present danger to countless innocents abroad and democracy at home. We speak of “institutional evil” here because the greatest evils of our time are conducted by often personally decent, even idealistic, men and women. It is not necessary to be hate-filled or personally violent for an American to commit evil today. One need only be part of, or support the police, intelligence and military activities of the U.S. Executive Branch. But the practical part of ourselves, the part that needs to make a living and maintain emotional equilibrium, leads us to ignore the mass evil our leaders engage in. It is so much easier. For accepting this truth means accepting that our leaders are not good and decent people; that JSOC commandos are not "heroes" but rather lawless assassins whose very existence shames us all; that we are not being protected, but endangered by leaders who are turning hundreds of millions of Muslims against us; that we must assume that Executive officials are right now secretly engaging in a wide variety of illegal and immoral activities that would shock and disgust us if they were revealed; and that we cannot believe a word they say when these abuses are revealed as they so regularly engage in secrecy and stonewalling, lying when discovered, covering up when the lie is revealed, and claiming it was an aberration and/or blaming it on a subordinate when the coverup fails. (8) The issue of trust is key since it is the only basis upon which U.S. citizens can support secret Executive actions about which they are not informed. And the issue of trust is ultimately a moral, not legal judgment. We acknowledge that the citizen actually has a moral obligation to resist an unjust law promulgated by an immoral government, whether in the Soviet Union, South Africa, or, as we acknowledge when we celebrate Martin Luther King Jr.'s birthday, in America. Even when the law is used by the likes of David [28]Ignatius [28],David Brooks [29],Tom Brokaw [30], and Nancy Pelosi [31] and to attack Edward Snowden, their key unstated assumption is that they trust the U.S. Executive since they know little more about its secret activities than anyone else. The moral dividing line is clear. Those indifferent to innocent human life and democracy are less angry at Executive mass murder and threats to democracy than at those who reveal this wrongdoing. Although the principal responsibility for the millions of lives U.S. leaders have ruined lies with the Executive, most of America's other organs of power have also participated in keeping the screams of America's victims from reaching the public. Republicans and conservatives have not only shown no concern for America's innocent victims, but heartlessly cheered on its leaders' torment of the innocent.

#### The role of the ballot should never just be about what happens in a debate round. The role of the ballot should always be a negotiation of three important groups: what is best for debaters, what is best for the debate community, and what is best for people in the non-debate space. If debate becomes too focused on what we say or perform here as individuals, without a concern for how what we say or learn here affects people outside this room, then debate becomes insulated with no responsibility or attempt to pay attention to people outside this space. We should be concerned about how our arguments affect debaters here, but that concern shouldn’t trump a concern for the larger non-debate space. We should also be concerned with how our arguments impact the debate community because it is a broader community that we are all a part of and care about, but that concern should not trump a concern for the non-debate space. We also have a responsibility to pay attention to what is going on in the larger non-debate space- debate has the potential to be more than just what it has been in the past. Your ballot should not privilege one argument based on an assertion from debaters- it should attempt to balance what is best for all three spaces.

#### The aff is key to empathy- Exposing ourselves to different modes of understanding is critical to cultivating sympathy for different ways of life

Kathie Jenni explains Kathie, Pf Philosophy at Redlands, Social Theory and Practice, July v27 i3 p437

The claim on behalf of academics' value to the world at large is that **in enhancing the moral reasoning of students, we indirectly contribute to ending injustice and suffering, as well. We ourselves may not minister to the starving or rescue the tortured, lobby Congress, or protest in the street. But in sustaining the life of higher education, we are preparing (as it were) moral armies to go and do those things themselves, or at least to live in ways that may eventually make other kinds of activism less necessary. The intellectual's contribution to global welfare, then, is indirect and yet potentially immense. Empirical work supports this optimistic assessment of higher education's value, noting the role it can play in moral development.** Eamonn Callan, for example, notes the importance of **exposing students to *different modes* of moral understanding and thus cultivating "imaginative sympathy for alien ways of life**."(8) Others observe that liberal arts **education provides a natural setting for "the discomfiture that comes with experiences that do not fit one's earlier conceptions," which seems essential for growth in moral judgment.(9)**

#### Lawsuits create stories that run contrary to the executive’s national security narrative.

Wexler 13 Lesley Wexler Professor of Law and Thomas A. Mengler Faculty Scholar, University of Illinois College of Law “The Role of the Judicial Branch during the Long War: Drone Courts, Damage Suits, and FOIA Requests” May 8 http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=2262412

The current wave of lawsuits comes in the two forms detailed below. Some actors seek a substantive ruling from the courts as to whether a conflict exists and IHL has been properly applied. These suits seek remedies such as damages and injunctions. Other simply seek access to information that the government will not release in the absence of judicial intervention. The following section introduces the most notable of these lawsuits and where they currently stand. In assessing the cases described below, I posit at least four reasons why individuals might employ the courts. First, and most aggressively, they may hope that a court disgusted with the lack of transparency and accountability will decide to substantively intervene as the Supreme Court did in the trio of Hamdi, Hamdan, and Boumedienne. Like with Hamdi and Hamdan, advocates may hope that tying their concerns to constitutional questions regarding citizens will make the court more likely to intervene. This section briefly describes the Israeli Targeted Killings case as a model for such an approach. Second, they may believe that the lawsuit will produce useful government information that can create the opportunity for public accountability. Third, they may use lawsuits as a platform from which to seek attention and publicity. Lawsuit filings and rulings create opportunities for media coverage that may be difficult to generate in the absence of high profile events. Last, and relatedly, the lawsuits provide a narrative from which advocates can frame their approach to the application and interpretation of IHL. It provides a venue in which to elucidate their arguments and creates a story that runs contrary to the executive branch’s national security narrative.