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Narrative

#### WE WILL NOTE FIVE LINKS TO THEIR METHOD AND PERFORMANCE:

#### 1st - Failure to foreground our own complicity - We must forefront our complicity in systems of dominations as the starting-point for building alliances – systems of oppression are inter-locking and reinforcing – our intersectional strategy is key to create more productive ways of interacting with one another outside heteropatriarchal white supremacy that produces an arbitrary system of permanent war and domination

Smith 9 (Andrea - intellectual, feminist, and anti-violence activist, Founder of INCITE - A National Activist Organization of radical feminists of color, "Heteropatriarchy and the Three Pillars of White Supremacy: Rethinking Women of Color Organizing," http://www.iamsocialjustice.com/images/Color\_of\_Violence.pdf)

This framework has proven to be limited for women of color and people of color organizing. First, it tends to presume that our communities have been impacted by white supremacy in the same way. Consequently, we often assume that all of our communities will share similar strategies for liberation. In fact, however, our strategies often run into conflict. For example, one strategy that many people in US-born communities of color adopt, in order to advance economically out of impoverished communities, is to join the military. We then become complicit in oppressing and colonizing communities from other countries. Meanwhile, people from other countries often adopt the strategy of moving to the United States to advance economically, without considering their complicity in settling on the lands of indigenous peoples that are being colonized by the United States. Consequently, it may be more helpful to adopt an alternative framework for women of color and people of color organizing. I call one such framework the "Three Pillars of White Supremacy." This framework does not assume that racism and white supremacy is enacted in a singular fashion; rather, white supremacy is constituted by separate and distinct, but still interrelated, logics. Envision three pillars, one labeled Slavery/Capitalism, another labeled Genocide/Capitalism, and the last one labeled Orientalism/War, as well as arrows connecting each of the together. Slavery/Capitalism One pillar of white supremacy is the logic of slavery. As Sora Han, Jared Sexton, and Angela P. Harris note, this logic renders Black people as inherently slave- able-as nothing more than property.' That is, in this logic of white supremacy, Blackness becomes equated with slaveability. The forms of slavery may change- whether it is through the formal system of slavery, sharecropping, or through the current prison-industrial complex-but the logic itself has remained consistent. This logic is the anchor of capitalism, that is, the capitalist system ultimately commodifies all workers-one's own person becomes a commodity that one must sell in the labor market while the profits of one's work are taken by someone else. To keep this capitalist system in place-which ultimately commodifies most people-the logic of slavery applies a racial hierarchy to this system. This racial hierarchy tells people that as long as you are not Black, you have the opportunity to escape the commodification of capitalism. This helps people who are not Black to ' accept their lot in life, because they can feel that at least they are not at the very bottom of the racial hierarchy-at least they are nor property; at least they are not slaveable. The logic of slavery can be seen clearly in the current prison industrial complex (PIC). While the PIC generally incarcerates communities of color, it seems to be structured primarily on an anti-Black racism. That is, prior to the Civil War, most people in prison where white. However, after the thirteenth amendment was passed-which banned slavery, except for those in prison-Black people previously enslaved through the slavery system were reenslaved through the prison system. Black people who had been the property of slave owners became state property, through the conflict leasing system. Thus, we can actually look at the criminalization of Blackness as a logical extension of Blackness as property. Genocide/Colonialism A second pillar of white supremacy is the logic of genocide. This logic holds that indigenous peoples must disappear. In fact, they must always be disappearing, in order to allow non-indigenous peoples rightful claim over this land. Through this logic of genocide, non-Native peoples then become the rightful inheritors of all that was indigenous-land, resources, indigenous spirituality, or culture. As Kate Shanley notes, Native peoples are a permanent "present absence" in the US colonial imagination, an "absence" that reinforces, at every turn, the conviction that Native peoples are indeed vanishing and that the conquest of Native lands is justified. Ella Shoat and Robert Stam describe this absence as "an ambivalently repressive mechanism [which] dispels the anxiety in the face of the Indian, whose very presence is a reminder of the initially precarious grounding of the American nation-state itself.. .. In a temporal paradox, living Indians were induced to 'play dead,' as it were, in order to perform a narrative of manifest destiny in which their role, ultimately, was to dissappear." Rayna Green further elaborates that the current Indian "wannabe" phenomenon is based on a logic of genocide: non-Native peoples imagine themselves as the rightful inheritors of all that previously belonged to "vanished" Indians, thus entitling them to ownership of this land. "The living performance of 'playing Indian' by non-Indian peoples depends upon the physical and psychological removal, even the death, of real Indians. In that sense, the performance, purportedly often done out of a stated and implicit love for Indians, is really the obverse of another well- known cultural phenomenon, 'Indian hating,' as most often expressed in another, deadly performance genre called 'genocide."'~ After all, why would non-Native peoples need to play Indian- which often includes acts of spiritual appropriation and land theft-if they thought Indians were still alive and perfectly capable of being Indian themselves? The pillar of genocide serves as the anchor for colonialism-it is what allows non-Native peoples to feel they can rightfully own indigenous peoples' land. It is okay to take land from indigenous peoples, because indigenous peoples have disappeared. Orientalism/War A third pillar of white supremacy is the logic of Orientalism. Orient; s defined by Edward Said as the process of the West defining itself as a superior civilization by constructing itself in opposition to an "exotic" but inferior "Orient." (Here I am using the term "Orientalism" more broadly than to solely signify what has been historically named as the Orient or Asia.) The logic of Orientalism marks certain peoples or nations as inferior and as posing a constant threat to the well-being of empire. These peoples are still seen as "civilizations"-they are not property or "disappeared"-however, they will always be imaged as permanent foreign threats to empire. This logic is evident in the anti-immigration movements within the United States that target immigrants of color. It does not matter holy long immigrants of color reside in the United States, they generally become targeted as foreign threats, particularly during war time. Consequently, orientalism serves as the anchor for war, because it allows the United States to justify being in a constant state of war to protect itself from its enemies. For example, the United States feels entitled to use Orientalist logic to justify racial profiling of Arab Americans so that it can be strong enough to fight the "war on terror." Orientalism also allows the United States to defend the logics of slavery and genocide, as these practices enable the United States to stay "strong enough" to fight these constant wars. What becomes clear then is what Sora Han states- the United States is not at war; the United States is war.4 For the system of white supremacy to stay in place, the United States must always be at war. Because we are situated within different logics of white supremacy, we may misunderstand a racial dynamic if we simplistically try to explain one logic of white supremacy with another logic. For instance, think about the first scenario that opens this essay: if we simply dismiss Latinos or Arab peoples as "white," we fail to understand how a racial logic of Orientalism is in operation. That is, Latinos and Arabs are often situated in a racial hierarchy that privileges them over Black people. However, while Orientalist logic may bestow them some racial privilege, they are still cast as inferior yet threatening "civilizations" in the United States. Their privilege is not a signal that they will be assimilated, but that they will be marked as perpetual foreign threats to the US world order. Organizing Implications Under the old but still potent and dominant model, people of color organizing was based on the notion of organizing around shared victimhood. In this model, how- ever, we see that we are victims of white supremacy, but complicit in it as well. Our survival strategies and resistance to white supremacy are set by the system of white supremacy itself. What keeps us trapped within our particular pillars of white supremacy is that we are seduced with the prospect of being able to participate in the other pillars. For example, all non-Native peoples are promised the ability to join in the colonial project of settling indigenous lands. All non-Black peoples are promised that if they comply, they will not be at the bottom of the racial hierarchy. And Black, Native, Latino, and Asian peoples are promised that they will economically and politically advance if they join US wars to spread "democracy." Thus, people of color organizing must be premised on making strategic alliances with each other, based on where we are situated within the larger political economy. Thus, for example, Native peoples who are organizing against the colonial and genocidal practices committed by the US government will be more effective in their struggle if they also organize against US militarism, particularly the military recruitment of indigenous peoples to support US imperial wars. If we try to end US colonial practices at home, but support US empire by joining the military, we are strengthening the state's ability to carry out genocidal policies against people of color here and all over the world. This way, our alliances would not be solely based on shared victimization, but where we are complicit in the victimization of others. These approaches might help us to develop resistance strategies that do not inadvertently keep the system in place for all of us, and keep all of us accountable. In all of these cases, **we would check our aspirations** against the aspirations of other communities to ensure that our model of liberation does not become the model of oppression for others. These practices require us to be more vigilant in how we may have internalized some of these logics in our own organizing practice. For instance, much racial justice organizing within the United States has rested on a civil rights framework that fights for equality under the law. An assumption behind this organizing is that the United States is a democracy with some flaws, but is otherwise admirable. Despite the fact that it rendered slaves three-fifths of a person, the US Constitution is presented as the model document from which to build a flourishing democracy. However, as Luana Ross notes, it has never been against US law to commit genocide against indigenous peoples-in fact, genocide is the law of the country. [The United States could not exist without it. In the United States, democracy is actually the alibi for genocide-it is the practice that covers up United States colonial control over indigenous lands. Our organizing can also reflect anti-Black racism. Recently, with the out- growth of "multiculturalism" there have been calls to "go beyond the black/white binary" and include other communities of color in our analysis, as presented in the third scenario. There are a number of flaws with this analysis. First, it replaces an analysis of white supremacy with a politics of multicultural representation; if we just include more people, then our practice will be less racist. Not true. This model does not address the nuanced structure of white supremacy, such as through these distinct logics of slavery, genocide, and Orientalism. Second, it obscures the centrality of the slavery logic in the system of white supremacy, which is based on a black/white binary. The black/white binary is not the only binary which characterizes white supremacy, but it is still a central one that we cannot "go beyond" in our racial justice organizing efforts. If we do not look at how the logic of slaveability inflects our society and our thinking, it will be evident in our work as well. For example, other communities of color often appropriate the cultural work and organizing strategies of African American civil rights or Black Power movements without corresponding assumptions that we should also be in solidarity with Black communities. We assume that this work is the common "property of all oppressed groups, and we can appropriate it without being accountable. Angela P. Harris and Juan Perea debate the usefulness of the black/white binary in the book, Critical Race Theory. Perea complains that the black/white binary fails to include the experiences of other people of color. However, he fails to identify alternative racializing logics to the black/white paradigm. Meanwhile, Angela P. Harris argues that "the story of 'race' itself is that of the construction of Blackness and whiteness. In this story, Indians, Asian Americans, and Latinos do exist. But their roles are subsidiary to the fundamental binary national drama. As a political claim, Black exceptionalism exposes the deep mistrust and tensions among American ethnic groups racialized as nonwhite."~ Let's examine these statements in conversation with each other. Simply saying we need to move beyond the black/white binary (or perhaps, the "black/non- black" binary) in US racism obfuscates the racializing logic of slavery, and prevents us from seeing that this binary constitutes Blackness as the bottom of a color hierarchy. However, this is not the only binary that fundamentally constitutes white supremacy. There is also an indigenous/settler binary, where Native genocide is central to the logic of white supremacy and other non-indigenous people of color also form "a subsidiary" role. We also face another Orientalist logic that fundamentally constitutes Asians, Arabs, and Latinos as foreign threats, requiring the United States to be at permanent war with these peoples. In this construction, Black and Narive peoples play subsidiary roles. Clearly the black/white binary is central to racial and political thought and practice in the United States, and any understanding of white supremacy must take it into consideration. However, if we look at only this binary, we may misread the dynamics of white supremacy in different contexts. For example, critical race theorist Cheryl Harris's analysis of whiteness as property reveals this weakness. In Critical Race Theory, Harris contends that whites have a property interest in the preservation of whiteness, and seek to deprive those who are "tainted" by Black or Indian blood from these same white property interests. Harris simply assumes that the positions of African Americans and American Indians are the same, failing to consider US policies of forced assimilation and forced whiteness on American Indians. These policies have become so entrenched that when Native peoples make political claims, they have been accused of being white. When Andrew Jackson removed the Cherokee along the Trail of Tears, he argued that those who did not want removal were really white.7 In contemporary times, when I was a non-violent witness for the Chippewa spearfishers in the late 1980s, one of the more frequent slurs whites hurled when the Chippewa attempted to exercise their treaty-protected right to fish was that they had white parents, or they were really white. Status differences between Blacks and Natives are informed by the different economic positions African Americans and American Indians have in US society. & African Americans have been traditionally valued for their labor, hence it is in the interest of the dominant society to have as many people marked "Black," as possible, thereby maintaining a cheap labor pool; by contrast, American Indians have been valued for the land base they occupy, so it is in the interest of dominant society to have as few people marked "Indian" as possible, facilitating access to Native lands. "Whiteness" operates differently under a logic of genocide than it does from logic of slavery. Another failure of US-based people of color in organizing is that we often fall back on a "US-centricism," believing that what is happening "over there" is less important than what is happening here. We fail to see how the United States maintains the system of oppression here precisely by tying our allegiances to the interests of US empire "over there." Heteropatriarchy and White Supremacy Heteropatriarchy is the building block of US empire. In fact, it is the building block of the nation-state form of governance. Christian Right authors make these links in their analysis of imperialism and empire. For example, Christian Right activist and founder of Prison Fellowship Charles Colson makes the connection between homosexuality and the nation-state in his analysis of the war on terror, explaining that one of the causes of terrorism is same-sex marriage: Marriage is the traditional building block of human society, intended both to unite couples and bring children into the world . . . There is a natural moral order for the family . . . the family, led by a married mother and father, is the best available structure for both child- rearing and cultural health. Marriage is not a private institution designed solely for the individual gratification of its participants. If we fail to enact a Federal Marriage Amendment, we can expect not just more family breakdown, but also more criminals behind bars and more chaos in our streets." Colson is linking the well-being of US empire to the well-being of the heteropatriarchal family. He continues: When radical Islamists see American women abusing Muslim men, as they did in the Abu Ghraib prison, and when they see news coverage of same-sex couples being "married" in US towns, we make this kind of freedom abhorrent-the kind they see as a blot on Allah's creation. We must preserve traditional marriage in order to protect the United States from those who would use our depravity to destroy us? As Ann Burlein argues in Lift High the Cross, it may be a mistake to argue that the goal of Christian Right politics is to create a theocracy in the United States. Rather, Christian Right politics work through the private family (which is coded as white, patriarchal, and middle class) to create a "Christian America." She notes that the investment in the private family makes it difficult for people to invest in more public forms of social connection. In addition, investment in the suburban private family serves to mask the public disinvestment in urban areas that makes the suburban lifestyle possible. The social decay in urban areas that results from this disinvestment is then construed as the result of deviance from the Christian family ideal rather than as the result of political and economic forces. As former head of the Christian Coalition, Ralph Reed, states: "'The only true solution to crime is to restore the family,"10 and "Family break-up causes poverty."" Concludes Burlein, "'The family' is no mere metaphor but a crucial technology by which modern power is produced and exercised."'\* As I have argued elsewhere, in order to colonize peoples whose societies are nor based on social hierarchy, colonizers must first naturalize hierarchy through instituting patriarchy.13 In turn, patriarchy rests on a gender binary system in which only two genders exist, one dominating the other. Consequently, Charles Colson is correct when he says that the colonial world order depends on heteronormativity. Just as the patriarchs rule the family, the elites of the nation-state rule their citizens. Any liberation struggle that does not challenge heteronormativity cannot substantially challenge colonialism or white supremacy. Rather, as Cathy Cohen contends, such struggles will maintain colonialism based on a politics of secondary marginalization where the most elite class of these groups will further their aspirations on the backs of those most marginalized within the community. Through this process of secondary marginalization, the national or racial justice struggle takes on either implicitly or explicitly a nation-state model as the end point of its struggle-a model of governance in which the elites govern the rest through violence and domination, as well as exclude those who are not members of "the nation." Thus, national liberation politics become less vulnerable to being coopted by the Right when we base them on a model of liberation that fundamentally challenges right-wing conceptions of nation. We need a model based on community relationships and on mutual respect.

#### 2nd – DRONE TALK - Drone prioritization is distancing – it analytically re-centers privilege and trades off with focusing on structural violence – the 1AC performatively erases the violence done to intersectionally marginalized populations

This Week In Blackness 13 ("Drone Policy Is the Most Important Racism," http://thisweekinblackness.com/2013/07/25/drone-policy-is-the-most-important-racism/)

There are several incidents of privilege-blindness among the mostly white male drone-obsessed elite. First, their public anger over the drone program seemed to begin when Eric Holder made [statements](http://www.cnn.com/2013/03/05/politics/obama-drones-cia) extending the legal justification for the program to killing U.S. citizens on U.S. soil.  That implies that these critics think that the U.S. government killing U.S. citizens is new or unusual, when a simple surface-level review of this country’s history shows that the government has always committed sustained and fatal violence against brown people, women, gay people, transpeople, disabled people, and poor people among others. People who insist on talking about drones as an ultimate evil ignore this history of violence, which is well-known in communities not their own. And, the likelihood that white men personally will be targeted by a drone is absurdly small, compared to the likelihood that a member of a marginalized community will continue to suffer from the government’s active and passive violence. So, hearing these critics air their feelings of being “targets” for the first time is offensive to those from communities that have lived under the gun for generations, especially because these feelings exclude points of view from those communities. If you are privileged enough to suddenly feel scared of the government, you are complicit in denying the violence against marginalized people that has always existed.The other part of white male critics’ anxiety comes from recognition that the world order is changing. Traditionally, the American president has been a white man who identifies and legitimizes white men’s problems as American Problems. Now, President Obama is the public face of America, and when he identifies a traditionally invisible Black People’s Problem, it becomes, for the first time, an American Problem. By stubbornly forcing Obama’s statements about Trayvon Martin into the framework of opposition to drone strikes, white male public intellectuals are attempting to return to white men the power to define American Problems. White critics insist that Obama addresses drone strikes above all other expressions of white supremacy, while claiming that they are the “true” soldiers against racism. They apparently believe that they get to decide which policies are “important-racist” and which ones are “unimportant-racist.” It must be a coincidence that the “unimportant-racist” policies are the ones that most directly validate white upper-class male privilege. Also, by arguing that drones exhibit “important racism,” these critics reinforce the narrative that killing Black people is “unimportant racism,” and not as valuable as executing white men’s philosophical priorities.

#### 3rd - group think – The 1AC chooses to footnote their own agency and call on the USFG to take action. This is the same logic that caused fascism to rise to power and it is the same logic that maintains militarism. Their presentation and political practice is one that forecloses any larger discussion of ethics and political agency that will recreate totalitarian violence. It separates the personal from the professional, guaranteeing amorality.

Fasching and DeChant 01, (Darrell and Dell, Prof. of Religious Studies @ University of South Florida, Prof. of Religious Studies @ USF, Comparative Religious Ethics: A Narrative Approach, Pg.  42-43)

Interpreting our own historical situation is a risky business, for we are still too close to the events. We do not have the distance needed to put everything into proper perspective. Nevertheless, without such an interpretation it is impossible to identify the ethical challenges that face us, so we must risk it. In this chapter we argue that two major trends unfolded in the twentieth century that are of significance for thinking about ethics: (1) the phenomenon of mass killing encouraged by sacred narratives that authorize "killing in order to heal," as symbolized by Auschwitz and Hiroshima, and (2) a cross-cultural and interreligious ethic of non-violent resistance or civil disobedience symbolized by figures like Gandhi and King – one that functions as an ethic of audacity on behalf of the stranger. The second, we suggest, offers an ethic of the holy in response to the sacred morality of the first. The modern period, which began with a utopian hope that science and technology would create an age of peace, prosperity, and progress,ended in an apocalyptic nightmare of mass death, symbolized by Auschwitz and Hiroshima, leaving us with the task of creating a post/modern ethic that can transcend the techno-bureaucratic tribalism that expressed itself in two world wars. Technobureaucratic tribalism occurs when sacred narratives are combined with the technical capacity to produce mass death. While we do not pretend to offer an exhaustive explanation of the modern propensity for mass death, we do suggest two key elements: (1) the use of sacred narratives that define killing as a form of healing, and (2) theundermining of ethical consciousness by techno-bureaucratic organization through a psychological process of doubling (separating one's personal and professional identities),which enables individuals to deny that they are responsible for some of their actions. Through sacred stories, the stranger is defined as less than human and therefore beyond the pale of ethical obligation, as well as a threat to sacred order. At the same time, bureaucracies encourage one to engage in a total surrender of self in unquestioning obedience to higher (sacred) authority(whether God, religious leaders, or political leaders), so that when one acts as a professional self on behalf of an institution (the state, the military, the church, etc.) one can say, "It is not I that acts: a higher authority is acting through me, so I am not personally responsible." Yet, despite the seemingly overwhelming dominance of techno- bureaucratic tribalism and mass killing in the twentieth century, a modest but important counter-trend also emerged – a cross-cultural and interreligious ethic of audacity on behalf of the stranger, linked to such names as Tolstoy, Gandhi, and King. The purpose of this chapter is to grasp the ethical challenge of modernity as symbolized by Auschwitz and Hiroshima. The purpose of the remainder of this book is to examine the potential of the ethical response to that challenge offered by the tradition of non-violent civil disobedience, symbolized by Gandhi and King, for a cross-cultural and interreligious post/modern ethic of human dignity, human rights, and human liberation.

4th – THEIR FAITH in the Public sphere – The 1ac believes that we can just put their affirmative out in the PUBLIC Drones policy is shrouded in secrecy – debate is impossible because of the lack of transparency – instead of assessing the information selectively leaked by the government, focus should be on the production of knowledge behind policy.

Toth 13, [Kate Toth, London School of Economics, Dissertation; “REMOTE-CONTROLLED WAR: IMPLICATIONS OF THE DISTANCING OF STATE-SPONSORED VIOLENCE ON AMERICAN DEMOCRACY”; Apr 27, 2013; http://www.academia.edu/3125323/REMOTE-CONTROLLED\_WAR\_IMPLICATIONS\_OF\_THE\_DISTANCING\_OF\_STATE-SPONSORED\_VIOLENCE\_ON\_AMERICAN\_DEMOCRACY]

With regard to drones, what the public knows has been released through leaks to the press that were likely approved by the President (Engelhardt, 2012). Though the government now claims the right to assassinate Americans along with foreigners through the drone program, “informed public debate and judicial oversight” are impossible because “its drone program is so secret [the government] can't even admit to its existence” (Freed Wessler, 2012). That is, except via leaks that allow Obama to craft a politically advantageous narrative (Friedersdorf, 2012a). Meanwhile, the use of drones has exploded domestically, and again, “citizens lack a basic right to know who is operating the drones circling their houses, what information is being collected and how it will be used” (ABC News, 2012). The Bush administration politicized science (Beck, 1992) by notoriously editing reports on climate change and pressuring scientists (Coglianese, 2009). This is instructive for the current debate as it exhibits that one cannot simply assess the information released, but examine this knowledge within a political context, harking back to Foucault’s (1997) production of knowledge. Writing about the covert drone strikes, Friedersdorf (2012b) in The Atlantic asked, “in what sense would we be living in a representative democracy if neither the bulk of Congress nor the people” are told about the strikes? One of the lingering questions raised from this debate is, how different is it if we were told the bare minimum of facts via leaks, so still preventing effective debate, versus being told nothing at all? When President Obama took office, in the memo outlining his “Transparency and Open Government” initiative, it was written that transparency will “ensure the public trust and establish a system of transparency, public participation, and collaboration” and that this transparency will “strengthen our democracy” (White House, 2009). This is what Obama believes transparency has the power to achieve, and it falls in line with the access to information that Diamond and Morlino (2004) highlight as key to accountability in democracy. President Obama’s track record is, perhaps, an example of not striking the right balance between what, and how much, to release. However, given that many of the steps he has taken, both in terms of transparency of existing programs and secrecy regarding proliferation of new programs such as drones, it does not seem likely that this is unintentional. Transparency relies on a strong civil society to use the information effectively, or press for it to be released (Etzioni, 2010); perhaps this lack of accountability is also indicative of the weakness of current American civil society and media.

#### 5th – NEUTRALITY of NUKE WAR — The DEATH CULTURE posed by nuclear war has already ENDED the world for people of color – People of color face NUCLEAR HOLOCAUST and GENOCIDE through their jobs, housing, schools, families and land.

Omolade 84, City College Center for Worker Education in New York City 1984

Barbara-a historian of black women for the past twenty years and an organizer in both the women’s and civil rights/black power movements; Women of Color and the Nuclear Holocaust; WOMEN’S STUDIES QUARTERLY, Vol. 12., No. 2, Teaching about Peace, War, and Women in the Military, Summer, p. 12; <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4004305>

In April, 1979, the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency released a report on the effects of nuclear war that concludes that, in a general nuclear war between the United States and the Soviet Union, 25 to 100 million people would be killed. This is approximately the same number of African people who died between 1492 and 1890 as a result of the African slave trade to the New World. The same federal report also comments on the destruction of urban housing that would cause massive shortages after a nuclear war, as well as on the crops that would be lost, causing massive food shortages. Of course, for people of color the world over, starvation is already a common problem, when, for example, a nation’s crops are grown for export rather than to feed its own people. And the housing of people of color throughout the world’s urban areas is already blighted and inhumane: families live in shacks, shanty towns, or on the streets; even in the urban areas of North America, the poor may live without heat or running water. For people of color, the world as we knew it ended centuries ago. Our world, with its own languages, customs and ways, ended. And we are only now beginning to see with increasing clarity that our task is to reclaim that world, struggle for it, and rebuild it in our own image. The “death culture” we live in has convinced many to be more concerned with death than with life, more willing to demonstrate for “survival at any cost” than to struggle for liberty and peace with dignity. Nuclear disarmament becomes a safe issue when it is not linked to the daily and historic issues of racism, to the ways in which people of color continue to be murdered. Acts of war, nuclear holocausts, and genocide have already been declared on our jobs, our housing, our schools, our families, and our lands. As women of color, we are warriors, not pacifists. We must fight as a people on all fronts, or we will continue to die as a people. We have fought in people’s wars in China, in Cuba, in Guinea-Bissau, and in such struggles as the civil rights movement, the women’s movement, and in countless daily encounters with landlords, welfare departments, and schools. These struggles are not abstractions, but the only means by which we have gained the ability to eat and to provide for the future of our people. We wonder who will lead the battle for nuclear disarmament with the vigor and clarity that women of color have learned from participating in other struggles. Who will make the political links among racism, sexism, imperialism, cultural integrity, and nuclear arsenals and housing? Who will stand up?

Nuclear extinction is a Eurocentric myth—large parts of the world would be safe

Martin, ’82 [Brian Martin, “Critique of nuclear extinction”, Journal of Peace Research, Vol. 19, No. 4, 1982, pp. 287-300. <http://www.bmartin.cc/pubs/82jpr.html> ]

 (g) White, western orientation. Most of the continuing large-scale suffering in the world - caused by poverty, starvation, disease and torture - is borne by the poor, non-white peoples of the third world. A global nuclear war might well kill fewer people than have died of starvation and hunger-related disease in the past 50 or 100 years.[[22]](http://www.bmartin.cc/pubs/82jpr.html#fn22) Smaller nuclear wars would make this sort of contrast greater.[[23]](http://www.bmartin.cc/pubs/82jpr.html#fn23) Nuclear war is the one source of possible deaths of millions of people that would affect mainly white, rich, western societies (China and Japan are the prime possible exceptions). By comparison, the direct effect of global nuclear war on nonwhite, poor, third world populations would be relatively small. White westerners may tend to identify their own plight with that of the rest of the world, and hence exaggerate the threat of destruction wreaked on their own societies into one for all of humanity. White westerners may also tend to see the rest of the world as vitally dependent on themselves for survival, and hence see catastrophe for all as a result of a nuclear war which destroys 'civilisation'. In practice, poor non-white populations arguably would be better off without the attentions of white, western 'civilisation' - although nuclear war is hardly the way to achieve this. These considerations suggest the importance of strengthening links between peace struggles and struggles for justice, equality and freedom from exploitation in poor countries.

#### Our alternative is a process of Intralocality is the process of being self-critical within an intersectional framework – the 1AC reinscibes distancing as a means of protecting one’s privilege – it’s a sequencing question – we must evaluate ourselves in relation to our social locations in the debate community as a starting-point for effective debate to occur

Moore 11 (Darnell L., writer and activist whose work is informed by anti-racist, feminist, queer of color, and anti-colonial thought and advocacy. Darnell's essays, social commentary, poetry, and interviews have appeared in various national and international media venues, including the Feminist Wire, Ebony magazine, and The Huffington Post, "On Location: The “I” in the Intersection," http://thefeministwire.com/2011/12/on-location-the-i-in-the-intersection/)

The most general statement of our politics at the present time would be that we are actively committed to struggling against racial, sexual, heterosexual, and class oppression and see as our particular ask the development of integrated analysis and practice based upon the fact that the major systems of oppression are interlocking. The synthesis of these oppressions creates the conditions of our lives. As black women we see black feminism as the logical political movement to combat the manifold and simultaneous oppressions that all women of color face. -The Combahee River Collective in A Black Feminist Statement¶ Many radical movement builders are well-versed in the theory of intersectionality. Feminists, queer theorists and activists, critical race scholars, progressive activists, and the like owe much to our Black feminist sisters, like The Combahee River Collective, who introduced us to the reality of simultaneity–as a framework for assessing the multitude of interlocking oppressions that impact the lives of women of color–in A Black Feminist Statement (1978). Their voices and politics presaged Kimberlé Crenshaw’s very useful theoretical contribution of “intersectionality” to the feminist toolkit of political interventions in 1989.¶ Since its inception, many have referenced the term—sometimes without attribution to the black feminist intellectual [genealogy](http://thefeministwire.com/2011/12/on-location-the-i-in-the-intersection/) from which it emerged—as a form of en vogue progressive parlance. In fact, it seems to be the case that it is often referenced in progressive circles as a counterfeit license (as in, “I understand the ways that race, sexuality, class, and gender coalesce. I get it. I really do.”) to enter resistance work even if the person who declares to have a deep “understanding” of the connectedness of systemic matrices of oppression, themselves, have yet to discern and address their own complicity in the maintenance of the very oppressions they seek to name and demolish. I am certain that I am not the only person who has heard a person use language embedded with race, class, gender, or ability privilege follow-up with a reference to “intersectionality.”¶ My concern, then, has everything to do with the way that the fashioning of intersectionality as a political framework can lead toward the good work of analyzing ideological and material systems of oppression—as they function “out there”—and away from the great work of critical analyses of the ways in which we, ourselves, can function as actants in the narratives of counter-resistance that we rehearse. In other words, we might be missing the opportunity to read our complicities, our privileges, our accesses, our excesses, our excuses, our modes of oppressing—located “in here”—as they occupy each of us.¶ Crenshaw’s theorization has provided us with a useful lens to assess the problematics of the interrelated, interlocking apparatuses of power and privilege and their resulting epiphenomena of powerlessness and subjugation. Many have focused on the external dimensions of oppression and their material results manifested in the lives of the marginalized, but might our times be asking of us to deeply consider our own “stuff” that might instigate such oppressions?¶ What if we extended Crenshaw’s theory of intersectionality by invoking what we might name “intralocality”? Borrowing from sociologists, the term “social location,” which broadly speaks to one’s context, highlights one’s standpoint(s)—the social spaces where s/he is positioned (i.e. race, class, gender, geographical, etc.). Intralocality, then, is concerned with the social locations that foreground our knowing and experiencing of our world and our relationships to the systems and people within our world. Intralocality is a call to theorize the self in relation to power and privilege, powerlessness and subjugation. It is work that requires the locating of the “I” in the intersection. And while it could be argued that such work is highly individualistic, I contend that it is at the very level of self-in-relation-to-community where communal transformation is made possible.¶ Might it be time to travel into the deep of our contexts? Might it be time for us—theorists/activists—to do the work of intersectionality (macro/system-analysis) in concert with the intra-local (micro/self-focused analysis)?¶ Intersectionality as an analysis, rightly, asks of us to examine systemic oppressions, but in these times of radical and spontaneous insurgencies—times when we should reflect on our need to unoccupy those sites of privilege (where they exist) in our own lives even as we occupy some other sites of domination—work must be done at the level of the self-in-community. We cannot—as a progressive community—rally around notions of “progression” and, yet, be complicit in the very homo/transphobias, racisms, sexisms, ableisms, etc. that violently terrorize the lives of so many others. If a more loving and just community is to be imagined and advanced, it seems to me that we would need to start at a different location than we might’ve expected: self.

## 2NC

What can I do to help the space in which I'm livin',

Fractured by the flaws in the human condition?

Constantly fighting to make the world… WORLD… a better place,

But instead of this earth, this ground I am treadin',

The issue is with the PEOPLE… the people with whom I SHARE this space…

The same people who rarely even look me in the face…

But it's not just "you," it’s not just the unidentified "them," it's also me…

ME, who used to be so caught up in being the change they wanted to see in the WORLD…

ME, who used to determine what CHANGE, what STYLE, what PROCESS is better for others…

ME, McClure Alexander Cronin, YES I, have been complicit in the violence constantly going on around me…

ME, who had the PRIVILEGE attend a private school on scholarship while my friends went to public school in a state that is ranked 51st in the nation when there aren't even 50 god damned states…

My academic privilege comes at the expense of those around me…

BUT I AM DONE BEING SILENT. I AM DONE BEING A TOOL FOR WHITENESS…

I am one of the lucky ones… White… cis-gendered… male…

It is almost GUARANTEED that I am listened too…

What do I do with my words? What CAN I do with my words?

So then, I ask, what good does this space, this place for debate, this site for deliberative democracy, DO?

Well, before we can begin to answer that, we need to ABANDON the world as we know it… GIVE UP on the structures that currently exist, and realize that we are alive…

LOOK at the things around you…

LISTEN to those that share the air you breath…

ENGAGE with your community…

You may be able to articulate what you THINK you "do,"

While you try to make this space livable for YOU,

But real talk, it's a WHOLE LOT bigger than me and you…

And for that, we gotta ask, livable for WHO?

### Alt

#### Undoing privilege is about process-over-product – we must be self-reflexive as a means of destabilizing our privileged modes of viewing the world – this internally link turns their form of debate because privilege warps and distorts our interactions with others

Yancy 8 (George, Prof of Philosophy at Duquesne University, *Black bodies, white gazes : the continuing significance of race*, p. 246-247)

I conceptualize existential conversion in relation to whiteness as a constant affirmation of new forms of responsiveness, new forms of challenging unearned privileges, and assiduous attempts at founding antiwhiteness values. After all, one has to live in the everyday world in which whiteness--despite one's commitment to live one's body in freedom, that is, contrary to the expectations and ready-made meanings that always already exist in the serious world of whiteness-continues to be seductive. To "live one's body in freedom" therefore does not mean that one lives one's body outside various situational constraints and historical forces, but that one continues to achieve those self- reflexive moments that attempt to **destabilize** **various habituated** white normative practices. Hence **existential conversion**, at least with respect to whiteness, must involve a self-reflexive way of being-in-the-world where the newcomer continually takes up the project of disaffiliation from whitely ways of being, even as she undergoes processes of interpellation. My point here is that as she lives her body in freedom, as she challenges the white racialized and racist world, its discourses and power relations, as she attempts to forge new habits and new forms of self-knowledge, she does not live her body outside of history. There is no nonracial Archimedean point from which she can unsettle racism. Hence, while a process of constant destabilization that cracks away at whiteness is indispensable as a value and a form of praxis, there is the realization that "a cartography of race would better describe a white race traitor as 'off center,' that is, as destabilizing the center while still remaining in it.,,67 So, even as the newcomer conceivably extends her hand across the color-line, reaching out to the young W. E. B. Du Bois, thus throwing her whiteness off center and situates herself in that space of liminality, she will, at some point, leave the classroom and be thrown back into the serious world of whiteness where the rich possibilities of ambush are covered over. Concerning the insidious forms of whitely modes of being, Bailey's distinction between privilege-cognizant and privilege-evasive white scripts proves helpful. Within the framework of this discourse, the newcomer must constantly reaffirm her commitment to enacting a privilege-cognizant white script, that is, she must remain cognizant of the ways in which she is privileged (or privileges herself) because of her phenotypic whiteness. According to Bailey, privilege- cognizant whites are race traitors "who refuse to animate the scripts whites are expected to perform, and who are unfaithful to worldviews whites are expected to hold. ,.68 In this way, privilege-cognizant whites are committed to "doing whiteness differently. ,.69 If "race is constituted through the repetition of acts, verbal and nonverbal, that continue to communicate difference," then whites must engage in **counterstylized iterative anti-whitely acts**. 7o It is not easy to discern the subtle and yet pervasive ways in which the ideology of whiteness profoundly distorts mutually flourishing forms of human relationality. Contesting the normative status of whiteness "means living in constant struggle, always working with self and those around you. . . . It is a process that . . . [builds on] the notion that all benefit when whiteness inflicts less violence [on] others in the world.~,7I But it is important to note, in Beauvoirian terms~ that whiteness is like an "inhuman [idol] to which one will not hesitate to sacrifice" all that is of value~ even the white body itself. Therefore~ the serious world of whiteness is a very dangerous world. Whiteness makes tyrants out of human beings. The white elides "the subjectivity of his [her] choice" through the constitution of whiteness as an absolute value that "is being asserted through him [her]." This is done at the expense of white accountability. In this way, one is able to deny "the subjectivity and the freedom of others~ to such an extent that, sacrificing them to the [idol of whiteness]" means absolutely nothing. On this score, it is accurate to describe whiteness as a form of fanaticism that is "as formidable as the fanaticism of passion.,,72 Whiteness as fanaticism **occludes** other voices from speaking~ and other bodies from being, and other ways of **revealing** and **performing** the depths of~ and the promises inherent in~ human reality as homo possibilities. So, don't be fooled. Whiteness is not the best that history has to offer. This conclusion signals the historical bankruptcy of whiteness as an ethical exemplar, the problematic self- certainty and narcissism of whiteness, the historical contingency of whiteness~ and the possibility for new and nonhegemonic hermeneutic horizons.

### Link – Single Axis

#### Single-axis identity politics fractures political coalitions – failure to account for the ways in which YOU could be an oppressor means that the delicate fabric of coalitions will be more readily shredded – turns the case

Chun et. al 13 (Jennifer Jihye - Department of Sociology @ the U of Toronto Scarborough, George Lipsitz - Department of Sociology and Department of Black Studies @ UC Santa Barbara, Young Shin - Asian Immigrant Women Advocates, "Intersectionality as a Social Movement StrategyL Asian Immigrant Women Advocates," Signs, Vol. 38 No. 4, Intersectionality: Theorizing Power, Empowering Theory, (Summer 2013), pp. 917-940)

In both academics and activism, the concept of intersectionality can be used to clear up the confusions about sameness and difference that dominant ways of knowing both permit and promote. It can be a tool for refining understanding of the relationships that link individuals to social groups. No individual lives every aspect of his or her existence within a single identity category. Every person is a crowd, characterized by multiple identities, identifications, and allegiances. Yet the process of racial formation set in motion by dominant racial projects brings individuals together in particular groups with shared and linked fates ð Omi and Winant 1994 Þ . Collective political struggle requires the creation of strategic group positions adaptable to forging coalitions within and across identity groups. These positions are always partial, perspectival, and performative. They never encompass all dimensions of people’s identities. Yet as an analytic tool intersectionality can be used strategically to take inventory of differences, to identify potential contradictions and conflicts, and to recognize split and conflicting identities not as obstacles to solidarity but as valuable evidence about problems unsolved and as new coalitions that need to be formed. Group identities are vital for collective mobilizations for rights, resources, and recognition, yet every collective identity expressed through solidarities of sameness runs the risk of occluding differences within the group. In its most sophisticated articulations, intersectionality acknowledges both the plurality and diversity of identities that comprise any group and the common concerns that create aggregate identities. In Crenshaw’s deft formulation, the utility of intersectionality flows from its ability to mediate “the tension between assertions of multiple identity and the ongoing necessity of group politics” ð 1991, 1296 Þ . Without intersectionality, group unity threatens to degenerate into a compulsory uniformity that benefits some members of the group at the expense of others. For example, employment opportunities and promotions for Black workers do not necessarily provide justice for Black women. Anti- racist organizing can be uncritical about misogyny. Homophobia can seep into feminist and antiracist mobilizations alike, while race and class privilege can be unexamined within queer politics. Still, Crenshaw does not advocate the abandonment of identity categories and the embrace of a disembodied universalism. Instead, she recognizes that identities can contain situated knowledges with valuable vantage points on power. In the tradition of Aime ́ Cesaire, she rejects both parochial particularism and disembodied universalism. Instead, she argues for a “universal” that is contingent, provisional, and rich with particulars, that entails the dialogue of all, the autonomy of each, and the dictatorship of none ð Cesaire 2000, 25 – 26 Þ . Crenshaw’s intersectionality promotes struggles that are race-based but not race-bound, feminist but not essentialist, always pro-Black and pro-woman but never only pro-Black and pro-woman. Seeking unity without uniformity, mobilizing identities without demanding that people be identical, intersectionality matters from Crenshaw’s perspective because it is an indispensible tool for creating new democratic institutions, identities, and practices.

## 1NR

### A2 perm

#### **Depersonalization of Bureaucracy DA - 1AC reproduces the cold gaze of state politicians willing to kill to protect privileged lives at home – public deliberation is possible with recognition of privilege with respect to drone violence.**

Alwazir and Mir 13 (Rooj - Yemeni-American activist and Organizer with SupportYemen, Noor - Anti-Drone Campaign coordinator at CODEPINK, "To Assess U.S. Drone Policies We Must Listen to More Farea al-Muslimis," <http://muftah.org/to-assess-u-s-drone-policies-we-must-listen-to-more-farea-al-muslimis/>)

We are not here to proffer an analysis. We are not academics. We are here as a Pakistani and a Yemeni, as activists, as citizens of this country and as citizens of our homelands. We are dismayed. We are confused. But we are not hopeless.¶ On April 23, 2013, the U.S. Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on the Constitution, Civil Rights and Human Rights held a hearing on the moral, legal and constitutional issues surrounding targeted killings and the use of drones.¶ We had been waiting for this hearing for a long time. There were a handful of location and time changes. Rumors were floating around of [Rand Paul](http://muftah.org/to-assess-u-s-drone-policies-we-must-listen-to-more-farea-al-muslimis/) appearing as a witness. Human rights organizations around the globe were urging U.S. citizens to tell their senators to pose important questions about the civilian casualties of drone attacks. With these goings on, momentum among activists had spiked by the time the hearing finally arrived.¶ We were the first in line for the 4 pm hearing, amused by the cameras trained on members of the Intelligence Committee as they were hurried by their staff into a closed meeting on the Boston bombings.¶ One of our colleagues from CODEPINK stood in the receiving line, asking senators the same question as they quickly walked past him, undoubtedly avoiding the activist in pink, “What about Abdulrahman Al-Awlaki? He was just a boy? Will you ask about why they killed him with a drone strike?” Sen. James Risch (R-ID) eloquently responded with a simple “No.”¶ Hart Building, Room 216 (ironically the same room where we disrupted CIA Director John Brennan’s first public [confirmation](http://muftah.org/to-assess-u-s-drone-policies-we-must-listen-to-more-farea-al-muslimis/) hearing) was filled with journalists and activists, many sporting Amnesty International’s black shirt with white targets.¶ The testimony began with Retired Marine Corp General James Cartwright and moved down the line, with each speaker providing a more or less “pro-drone reform” spin. Rosa Brooks, a professor at Georgetown [University](http://muftah.org/to-assess-u-s-drone-policies-we-must-listen-to-more-farea-al-muslimis/) Law Center, spoke of the anachronistic nature of the Authorization for the Use of Military Force (AUMF) with regard to targets with tenuous links to al-Qaeda, like Somalia’s al-Shabaab. We nodded.¶ Ilya Somin, a law professor at George Mason University, smiled broadly as he explained that enemy combatants on U.S. soil could be lawfully targeted by drones. Retired Col. Martha McSally was introduced as a special guest of Sen. Lindsey Graham (R-SC). She claimed we were better off calling drones “remotely piloted aircrafts or RPAs.” We winced.¶ Her testimony was not dissimilar to that of the pro-drone lobbyist par excellence Michael Toscano, President and CEO of the Association for Unmanned Vehicle Systems International. Last month at a Senate Judiciary hearing, Toscano stated that drones had a negative connotation and should be referred to instead as unmanned aerial vehicles.¶ New American Foundation’s Peter Bergen spoke about calculating the dead and noted that civilian casualties were significantly reduced in 2013.¶ At long last, [Farea al-Muslimi, a friend from Yemen, took the microphone](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JIb0wMfOFhw).¶ We sobbed.¶ For the first time ever, there was a public hearing on the human, yes, “human” cost of drone warfare. For the very first time, the drone debate included, among a panel of predominantly white male faces, a young, brown Yemeni man.¶ Farea spoke clearly but emotionally about how hard it was to reconcile his love for America and Americans with the devastation unleashed against his dear Yemen. He recounted his struggle with informing his community about the goodness of America – that these drone strikes, which are killing innocent people, were not representative of the American people.¶ For the first time, U.S. Senators were hearing from someone whose [job](http://muftah.org/to-assess-u-s-drone-policies-we-must-listen-to-more-farea-al-muslimis/) was not to sift through news sources to calibrate numbers of dead people, or to write lengthy legal opinions “reasoning” about murder. Nor was this person an obvious ex-military apologist for war, cowering behind podiums and office desks.¶ For the first time, senators saw that the human cost of drone warfare went far beyond dollars and triple digit death counts. It was, instead, causing a man to question his identity and morals, placing his home and his family’s life in jeopardy, and making it difficult for him to love a country that had both given him so much and taken away equal amounts.¶ We can relate to his dilemma.¶ Farea was not there to try to win the hearts and minds of the senators by giving them policy or reform suggestions. He was there to tell his story. Still, white privilege and its associated subjectivities were clearly in action.¶ “I have been to Yemen,” Lindsey Graham said to Farea. Our blood pressure rose. “Isn’t your country in turmoil?,” Graham continued. “We have some problems,” replied Al-Muslimi. Graham ended his questioning with a self-indulgent smirk, as if to say, “I rest my case.” Graham’s neo-colonial presumptions about Farea’s understanding of his own country were disgusting.¶ No, Senator, you cannot rest your case. We, as citizens of the United States and witnesses to the turmoil in this nation, do not accept your reasoning. Schools are shutting down across the country and students are staging walkouts to protest this blow to their rights to a fair and equal education. Affirmative action is somehow still a subject of nation-wide debate, as though structural inequalities are a myth.¶ We in the United States are still waging an endless, futile and racist war on drugs and extending a school to prison pipeline that is tearing apart families and disenfranchising youth.¶ Racial profiling and racism are rife. Just last week a Palestinian woman in hijab was attacked in a Boston suburb, while a Bangladeshi man was savagely beaten in the Bronx, both in “retaliation” for the Boston marathon bombings.¶ Despite the serious shootings that devastated Aurora, Colorado (and remember Columbine?), the United States is torn down the middle when it comes to gun control. Monsanto damages our food diversity and destroys our health while propping up our elected officials with one hand and stifling small farms with the other.¶ There are uprisings; there is dissent; there is police brutality. This country, in other words, is in no less turmoil than Yemen, or Pakistan, notwithstanding the condescension and insensitivity to difference that some Americans display when comparing the United States to these countries. Their bigotry precedes them – their causation is fundamentally flawed.¶ Lindsey Graham was not the only one whose self-righteous “understanding” of the political and cultural landscape of places like Pakistan and Yemen barred him from actually exploring the human cost of war.¶ Most of the Senate hearing focused on analyzing flaws in the Obama administration’s reliance on overbearing executive authority, as well as reforming the AUMF. With bated breath, we waited for the hearing to go beyond what we had hoped was only a self-obsessed, stagnant battle of egos. Sadly, it did not.¶ Questions from the senators emphasized the legal, constitutional and operational aspects of the drone program over the stories that Farea could have told. Responses to Farea’s testimony were of the “We thank you for coming such a long way,” or “We thank you for that chilling perspective” variant. Nobody apologized for bombing his village, Wessab. These Senators, who ascribed so profoundly, unwaveringly and without question to the importance of “counterterrorism” strategies, in turn, tried to reject the validity of Farea’s personal experience.¶ There are both benefits and costs to witnessing a panel of white male privilege questioning a similar panel with one brown face. That one brown face was the outlier, the subject of fascination, the other. Upon him, the Senators projected a series of embarrassingly condescending generalizations about the “untrustworthiness” of the Yemeni government. They even asked him whether “Yemenis supported AQAP [Al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula] before the drone strikes,” to which Farea answered no (because surprisingly, people of color do not actually welcome terrorism).¶ When he was afforded the chance, Farea spoke beautifully and passionately about the danger that drones would create more enemies than friends. He was not allowed to analyze or explain his statements any further, curtailed by the committee’s focus on legal jargon and reining in executive authority.¶ We are thankful for Farea’s presence, but are distressed by how the Subcommittee treated him – a cold, removed and uninvolved treatment markedly different from the involved and lengthy conversations the senators had with the remaining witnesses. Why invite a Yemeni to speak about the human costs of drone wars and then cast a shadow of doubt and ignorance over his experience by adopting a presumptuous tone?¶ On the positive side, Farea’s testimony was the only part of the hearing that was different from what had come before and what the public wanted to hear. We appreciate that his statements prompted moral discussion and colored the panel of academics and military experts with the human impact of drone-related tragedies. We are grateful that Farea occupies a very special place as a person who looks at the United States as a second home and as a place of generosity and kindness; this sentiment lay at the center of his testimony and highlighted his complex relationship with the U.S. drone war in Yemen.¶ We must focus on these personal stories, the destroyed and mangled bodies, identified by mothers via cell phone video. We must focus on Farea’s love and respect for this country and his simultaneous dismay at its terror. We must cherish his work in challenging the usual power dynamics. We must invite a Farea to every hearing on drone strikes and allow for the voice of a person of color to be empowered and to resound with its own volition, devoid of the presumptions and blanket abstractions of our elected officials.¶ We must disempower these officials of their given privilege and attend to the power of Farea’s words so critically different from the rest. We must not presume that his country is lesser than ours, or more conflicted than ours, or in need of the sort of dialogue that is prefaced on “What I feel is good for you, must be good for you.”¶ As we left the hearing room, a young male journalist came up to us and said, “Are you with CODEPINK? Do you know that what you do is counterproductive? Your chortling and whispering during the hearing impairs my ability to listen.”¶ This is our response to him: We are Yemeni, we are Pakistani, we are Americans. We are activists and we are dissenting – be it with an article, or a louder than usual whisper, a die-in in front of a drone manufacturer, a sit-in, a voluntary arrest, or charging towards an elected representative.

#### Misfocus DA to the perm – Their focus on what the USFG shouldn’t do trades off with formulating political strategies about what we as individuals should do – Not only is this inaccessible and psychological violent who do not want to put faith in federal institutions, it wastes rhetorical and political energy arguing about an institution that ultimately doesn’t give a shit what you think – State policies are not accidents – they are deliberate attempts to expand violent policing and targeted killing of bodies and regimes not aligned with US interests

Herod 2001 (James, “A Stake, Not a Mistake: On Not Seeing the Enemy,” October. http://www.jamesherod.info/index.php?sec=paper&id=9)

I spent several years in the early sixties studying Underdevelopment. It was frustrating, in that none of the theories I examined really seemed to explain the phenomenon. That is, the Theories of Development that were prevalent then (only in mainstream discourse, I later learned) didn't really answer the question: Why are some countries poor? I would look at US Aid programs, only to conclude that they didn't work, that they didn't help countries develop, and often got in the way. My response at that time was to argue, and to try to call to the attention of US Aid administrators, that the programs weren't working, and were not achieving the results they were supposed to. The programs were not facilitating development and economic growth in the countries they were supposed to be benefiting. Fortunately for me, with the explosion and re-emergence of radical consciousness in late sixties, I was able to overcome this naiveté. Unfortunately though, for much of the American Left (especially for its so-called progressive wing), this naiveté, this bad habit of not seeing the enemy, this tendency to think that the US government's policies and actions are just mistakes, this seemingly ineradicable belief that the US government means well, is the most common outlook. It was certainly the majoritarian belief among those who opposed the Vietnam War. I helped write a broad sheet once, which we distributed at a big anti-war demonstration in Washington DC in November 1969, and which was titled "Vietnam is a Stake not a Mistake". In this document we spelled out the imperial reasons which explained why the government was waging war, quite deliberately and rationally, against Vietnam. In subsequent decades there has been no end to the commentators who take the 'this is a mistake' line. Throughout the low intensity (i.e., terrorist) wars against Nicaragua and El Salvadorin the 1980s we heard this complaint again and again. It is currently seen in the constant stream of commentaries onthe US assault on Colombia. It has been heard repeatedly during the past two years in the demonstrations against the World Bank and theWorldTrade Organization. Protesters complain that the WTO's policies of structural adjustment are having the opposite effect of what they're suppose to. That is, they are hindering, not facilitating, development, and causing poverty, not alleviating it.¶ Two years ago, in 1999,throughout the 78 day bombing attack on Yugoslavia, much of the outpouring of progressive commentary on the event (that which didn't actually endorse the bombing that is) argued that "this is a mistake".[1] My favorite quote from that episode, was from Robert Hayden, Director of the Center for Russian and East European Studies at the University of Pittsburgh, being interviewed by Amy Goodman on Democracy Now, April 19, 1999. He said: "But we have the Clinton administration that developed a diplomacy that seems to have been intended to have produced this war, and now the Clinton administration's actions seem determined to produce a wider war." Amy Goodman: "Why would the Clinton Administration want to produce a war?" Hayden: "Boy, you know what? You've got me there. And as I say, you have to go back to the simple principles of incompetence. Never assume competence on the part of these guys." This was surely the bottom of the pit for the 'this is a mistake' crowd. I could cite quotes like this by the dozen, but instead let me turn to our current "war".¶ So what has been the response of the 'progressive community' to the bombing of Afghanistan? As usual, they just don't get it. They just can't seem to grasp the simple fact that the government does this stuff on purpose. Endlessly, progressives talk as if the government is just making a mistake, does not see the real consequences of its actions, or is acting irrationally, and they hope to correct the government's course by pointing out the errors of its ways. Progressives assume that their goals -- peace, justice, well-being -- are also the government's goals. So when they look at what the government is doing, they get alarmed and puzzled, because it is obvious that the government's actions are not achieving these goals. So they cry out: "Hey, this policy doesn't lead to peace!" or "Hey, this policy doesn't achieve justice (or democracy, or development)!" By pointing this out, they hope to educate the government, to help it to see its mistakes, to convince it that its policies are not having the desired results.[2]¶ How can they not see that the US government acts deliberately, and that it knows what it is doing? How can they not see that the government's goals are not peace and justice, but empire and profit. It wants these wars, this repression. These policies are not mistakes; they are not irrational; they are not based on a failure of moral insight (sincemorality is not even a factor in their considerations); they are not aberrations; they are not based on a failure to analyze the situation correctly; they are not based on ignorance. This repression, these bombings, wars, massacres, assassinations, and covert actions are the coldly calculated, rational, consistent, intelligent, and informed actions of a ruling class determined at all costs to keep its power and wealth and preserve its way of life (capitalism). It has demonstrated great historical presence, persistence, and continuity in pursuing this objective. This ruling class knows that it is committing atrocities, knows that it is destroying democracy, hope, welfare, peace, and justice, knows that it is murdering, massacring, slaughtering, poisoning, torturing, lying, stealing, and it doesn't care. Yet most progressives seem to believe that if only they point out often enough and loud enough that the ruling class is murdering people, that it will wake up, take notice, apologize, and stop doing it.¶ Here is a typical expression of this naiveté (written by an author, Brian Willson, who was in the process of introducing a list of US interventions abroad!):¶ "Many of us are continually disturbed and grief stricken because it seems that our U.S. government does not yet understand: (a) the historical social, cultural, and economic issues that underlay most of the political and ecological problems of the world; (b) the need to comply with, as legally agreed to, rather than continually defy, international law and international institutions established for addressing conflict; and (c) that military solutions, including production, sale, and use of the latest in technological weapons, are simply ill-equipped and wrong-headed for solving fundamental social and economic problems." [3]¶ He is wrong on all three counts. (a)The US government has an intimate, detailed knowledge of the social, cultural, and economic characteristics of every country it intervenes in. It is especially familiar with the ethnic, linguistic, political, and religious divisions within the country. It is not interested in how these issues "underlay most of the political and ecological problems of the world", since it is not interested in those problems, certainly not in solving them, since it is the main creator of those problems. Rather, it uses its expert knowledge to manipulate events within the country in order to advance its own goals, profit and empire. (b) The US government understands perfectly that it expressly needs not to comply with international law in order to maintain its ability to act unilaterally, unfettered by any constraints, to advance its imperial aims. The claim that the US defies international law because of a misunderstanding is absurd. (c) Who says that the US government is trying to solve "fundamental social and economic problems"? These are not its aims at all. The objectives that it does pursue, consciously and relentlessly, namely profit and empire, are in fact the causes of these very "social and economic problems".Furthermore, for its true aims, military solutions, far from being "ill-equipped and wrong-headed", work exceptionally well. Military might sustains the empire. Arming every little client regime of the international ruling class with 'the latest in technological weapons" is necessary, and quite effective, in maintaining the repressive apparatus needed to defend empire, in addition to raking in lots of profit for the arms manufacturers. But evidently Mr. Willson "does not yet understand" any of these things.¶ Let's take another example. Russell Mokhiber and Robert Weissman, otherwise very sensible writers, complain that "bombing a desperately poor country under the yoke of a repressive regime is a wrongheaded response [to the "unspeakable acts of violence" committed on Sept. 11]. "The U.S. bombing of Afghanistan should cease immediately," they say. They discuss three reasons: "1. The policy of bombing increases the risk of further terrorism against the United States. 2. The bombing is intensifying a humanitarian nightmare in Afghanistan. 3. There are better ways to seek justice." All three statements are true of course, but irrelevant, because seeking justice, avoiding humanitarian nightmares, and reducing the risk of terrorism do not enter into the calculations of US policy makers. Quite the contrary, US policy makers create injustice, humanitarian nightmares, and terrorism, throughout the world, in pursuit of the imperial objective of making profit, and this has been thoroughly documented in thousands of scholarly studies. So for Mokhiber and Weissman to talk in this way, and phrase the problem in this way, exposes their failure to really comprehend the enemy we face, which in turn prevents them from looking for effective strategies to defeat that enemy, like so many other opponents of the "war". Hence all the moralizing, the bulk of which is definitely directed at the rulers, not at the ruled. That is, it is not an attempt to win over the ruled, but an attempt to win over the rulers.[4]¶ It's what I call the "we should" crowd -- all those people who hope to have a voice in the formation of policy, people whose stances are basically that of consultants to the ruling class. "We" should do this, "we" shouldn't do that, as if they had anything at all to say about what our rulers do. This is the normal stance among the bootlicking intelligentsia of course. But what is it doing among progressives and radicals? Even if their stance is seen to be not exactly that of consultants, but that of citizens making demands upon their government, what makes them think that the government ever listens? I think this attitude --the "we should" attitude -- is rooted in part at least in the fact that most progressives still believe in nations and governments. They believe that this is "our" country, and that this is "our" government, or at least should be. So Kevin Danaher says that "we should get control of the government." They identify themselves as Americans, or Germans, or Mexicans, or Swedes. So they are constantly advising and making demands that 'their' government should do this and that. If they would reject nationalism altogether, and states and governments, they could begin to see another way.¶ A variation of the 'this is a mistake' theme has appeared in commentaries on the present "war", on Afghanistan. Progressives argue that the US is "falling into a trap". They argue that Osama bin Laden had hoped to provoke the US into doing just what it is doing, attacking Afghanistan. In their view, the US government is being stupid, acting blindly, responding irrationally, and showing incompetence. That is, it is "making a mistake".It never seems to occur to these analysts that the government may actually be awake, even alert, or that it jumped at the opportunity offered it by the attacks of September Eleven to do what it had wanted to do anyway -- seize Afghanistan, build a big new base in Uzbekistan, declare unending war on the enemies of Empire everywhere, and initiate draconian repression against internal dissent in order to achieve "domestic tranquility".