# Squo

#### First the squo,

Disads are Non-unique- Obama has curbed presidential power on drones but won’t ban them

Nelson 9/5 (Updated September 5, 2013, 8:58 p.m. ET Obama's Curbs on Executive Power Draw Fire By COLLEEN MCCAIN NELSON White House correspondent for The Wall Street Journal http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424127887323893004579057463262293446.html) Dabo

Others, though, said the president had given up a modicum of authority in an effort to protect presidential power and guard against congressional action.The question of the extent of executive power has been long debated in Washington. President Lyndon Johnson was accused of using a narrow congressional resolution to vastly and illegally expand the Vietnam War, for example, and President Richard Nixon was accused of creating an "imperial presidency" before his resignation.More recently, Mr. Obama's predecessor, Mr. Bush, was accused by Democrats of having inappropriately expanded executive powers in combating terrorism. Jack Quinn, who served as White House counsel for President Bill Clinton, said Mr. Obama's recent moves amount to threading a needle to reach agreements and avoid larger setbacks for executive power. "Sometimes, it's important to show tolerance for others in order to preserve the power that you have," he said. "I don't think anyone can say that he is a shrinking violet when it comes to his use of power as president." A.B. Culvahouse, White House counsel under Ronald Reagan, agreed that the president imposing constraints on executive authority is the preferable course if it helps dissuade Congress from stepping in to impose the same or more onerous limitations. Lawmakers retain the power of the purse, he noted, and also could codify restrictions in statute.This summer, Mr. Obama faced intensifying criticism of NSA surveillance programs and a growing chorus urging him to consult with Congress on Syria. Still, Mr. Culvahouse questioned the president's decision to voluntarily impose new rules limiting drone strikes, saying he thought that was a mistake. "These self-imposed limitations hang around, and it's hard to undo some of these things," he said.Mr. Obama had faced criticism for expanding the drone program launched by Mr. Bush. In May, he imposed new restrictions on drone strikes, establishing that Americans must be directly threatened and saying there must be near-certainty that no civilians would be killed. Last month, he proposed several NSA reforms, calling for a revamp of part of the Patriot Act and changes to the secret Federal Intelligence Surveillance Court.While conventional wisdom suggests that second-term presidents are emboldened to exercise their power, in part because they will not run again for re-election, Mr. Obama has shown an inclination to compromise on some issues. He has spoken about his willingness to act without Congress on domestic issues—particularly gun control and climate change—even as he has sought lawmakers' approval on national-security questions.The president's allies say this is a principled stand, consistent with his campaign promises to be transparent and uphold the Constitution.Andrew Rudalevige, a professor of government at Bowdoin College, said a mix of factors, including political pressure and consideration of the presidential legacy, likely factored into the administration's thinking on such issues."Everything presidents do is political," he said. "Presidents really do care about their legacy. He does not want to be seen as someone who overrode the Constitution as someone who taught constitutional law."In public comments, the president has underscored his belief that he doesn't need Congress's authorization to act against Syria. A senior administration official said working with lawmakers was meant to send a stronger message to the world, not to limit presidential power.The new drone policy, though, reflected the administration's view that the threat of terrorism could be confronted without using executive authority as aggressively as in the past—a message the president delivered in a speech in May.

# Plan

#### Thus the Plan- The United States Federal Government should substantially increase its statutory restrictions on Presidential War Power authority by restricting targeting killing through banning strikes on pilotless aerial vehicles

## Adv 1. Africa

#### Current drone operations are being shifted to Africa

Wolverton 7/30 (Tuesday, 30 July 2013 09:55 President Obama Sending Drones All Around the Globe Written by Joe Wolverton, II, J.D. Joe A. Wolverton, II, J.D. is a correspondent for The New American and travels frequently nationwide speaking on topics of nullification, the NDAA, and the surveillance state. http://www.thenewamerican.com/usnews/item/16125-pres-obama-sending-drones-all-around-the-globe) (We do not support the gendered language in this card) Dabo

The “next phase of drone warfare” will extend “far beyond traditional, declared combat zones," the Washington Post reports. Africa, according to the report filed July 20, will see an enormous increase in the sorties of unmanned aerial vehicles remotely piloted by U.S. airmen. The commander of U.S. forces in Africa has purportedly requested a “15-fold increase in surveillance, reconnaissance and intelligence-gathering on the continent.” Drone bases are going up all over Africa, so the multiplicity of missions will be easily accommodated. As the Post points out: In Africa, the U.S. Air Force began flying unarmed drones over the Sahara five months ago to track al-Qaeda fighters and rebels in northern Mali. The Pentagon has also set up drone bases in Ethiopia, Djibouti and Seychelles.

**3 scenarios**

### Somalia

#### And Drone policies strikes destabilize Somalia

West 10/3 (Blurred Lines of Terrorism: Is Africa the New Afghanistan or Is America Just Overstepping? BY CARLY WEST OCTOBER 3, 2013 http://www.brownpoliticalreview.org/2013/10/blurred-lines-of-terrorism-is-africa-the-new-afghanistan-or-is-america-just-overstepping/) Dabo

American drones, special operations, and proxy soldiers have quietly but rapidly become commonplace in Africa in the past decade. As al-Qaeda’s central headquarters in Pakistan has been degraded into a diffused network of local terror enclaves, Africa has seen the rise of violent extremism and a surge of bloody attacks. The growing security threat from Islamic militants throughout Africa has been paralleled by increased U.S. involvement with local government forces on matters of regional security. Though the threat posed by terrorist organizations in Africa clearly demands a defense strategy, the situation may be exacerbated should the U.S. continue to implement its current approach. Instances of terrorist activity include mass hostage-taking in Algeria and routine killings of civilians in Nigeria, as well as frequent attacks in Mali, Niger, and Kenya. Just last week, during a siege of the top-end Westgate mall in Nairobi, 72 shoppers were massacred by militants from the Somalia-based al-Shabaab group. The U.S. has forged relations with these nations since 9/11, creating various alliances and establishing a physical presence through bases. In response to the recent events in Somalia, Western investigators, including a large F.B.I. contingent, have poured into Kenya to gather intelligence in an effort to help prevent further attacks by the Shabaab.The justification behind this growing military and intelligence surveillance presence, in the words of former U.S. Africa Command (AFRICOM) Commander General Carter Ham, is “The absolute imperative for the United States military to protect America, Americans and American interests; in our case, in my case, [to] protect us from threats that may emerge from the African continent.” Though there have been instances of successful cooperative efforts between African and American forces, America’s attempt to conduct a proxy War on Terror in Africa is inherently problematic.The security threat posed by African jihadists should be countered with a commensurate strategy, which is tailored to the severity and nature of these groups. Audrey Kurth Cronin, a national security scholar, notes that “Overreacting and treating a terrorist campaign as though it were part of a traditional military campaign in which the application of brute force would compel the enemy into submission” was the crucial mistake the United States made after 9/11. Such a concern should be considered when both U.S. and regional forces in Africa are trying to counter threats.The efforts must be conscious of the localized circumstances. After all, Africa is not Afghanistan — and its dangerous to broadly cross-reference the situation. One nation, in Africa’s circumstances, should not directly inform actions in another as part of some “trans-continental diagnoses and prescriptions.” United States will do grave harm to its interests and its ability to help foster development in the region by treating Africa as one unit of assessment. Though the UN has described Africa as fertile “breeding grounds” for terrorism, various academics and scholars display evidence that violent Islamist groups operate within the local and national contexts of their origins, and are often not operating towards a regional or globally coordinated jihad. The origin and incentive of Jihad waged against the Western world has largely stemmed from a history of foreign occupation and perceived humiliation and exclusion, coupled by the pull of charismatic leaders, rather than general poverty and poor governance. The U.S. must also evaluate how military operations will further destabilize nations in Africa and exacerbate the current situation. U.S. drone strike policy, for example, could have seriously harmful implications down the road. Not only do drone strikes inevitably cause collateral damage and engender local animosity, they can hinder future efforts at humanitarian and development missions for other Western actors. For instance, in 2008, drone strikes in Somalia prompted al-Shabaab to target and kill 35 aid workers trying to provide food aid for more than 3 million people. As a result, aid operations were significantly curtailed, deepening a humanitarian crisis that ultimately became a full-fledged famine in 2011. Another egregious instance of U.S. policy undermining its own efforts is the CIA’s use of a childhood vaccination campaign as cover for intelligence gathering against Osama bin Laden. This incident led to tragic consequences for public health, as the distrust towards America rendered millions of infants victim to preventable disease. Violent extremist organizations should be countered, but terrorism cannot be the only, or even primary, lens through which the United States attempts to quell the threat.In the long run, the only real antidote to terrorism in Africa is stable, inclusive, accountable states responsive to the needs of all their citizens, and U.S. interests would be better served by focusing efforts on state building. A collaborative mission towards stability and growth is a long-term endeavor, but one that will be set back by a few short years of U.S. military operations and on-the-ground joint exercises focused solely on counter-terrorism and counterinsurgency. Killing every Islamic extremist in Africa is not possible, and irresponsible American efforts to do so will only generate more threats. As was so eloquently put by CGD policy fellow Kate Knopf, as “Iraq and Afghanistan wind down, let’s not make Africa a receptacle for the U.S. military’s leftovers — equipment, manpower, doctrine — and assess its security challenges and needs in its own light.”

#### **That escalates current conflicts and draws in outside powers**

Glick ‘7 (Senior Middle East Fellow – Center for Security Policy (Caroline, “Condi’s African Holiday”, 12-12, http://www.centerforsecuritypolicy.org/home.aspx?sid=56&categoryid=56&subcategoryid=90&newsid=11568) Dabo

The Horn of Africa is a dangerous and strategically vital place. Small wars, which rage continuously, can easily escalate into big wars. Local conflicts have regional and global aspects. All of the conflicts in this tinderbox, which controls shipping lanes from the Indian Ocean into the Red Sea, can potentially give rise to regional, and indeed global conflagrations between competing regional actors and global powers. Located in and around the Horn of Africa are the states of Eritrea, Djibouti, Ethiopia, Somalia, Sudan and Kenya

### Niger

#### And Drones increase instability in Niger

Schmitt 7/10 (Drones in Niger Reflect New U.S. Tack on Terrorism By ERIC SCHMITT Published: July 10, 2013 http://www.nytimes.com/2013/07/11/world/africa/drones-in-niger-reflect-new-us-approach-in-terror-fight.html?pagewanted=all&\_r=0) Dabo

NIAMEY, Niger — Nearly every day, and sometimes twice daily, an unarmed American drone soars skyward from a secluded military airfield here, starting a surveillance mission of 10 hours or more to track fighters affiliated with Al Qaeda and other militants in neighboring Mali. The United States uses Reaper drones like this one nearly every day to track militants in Mali. The two MQ-9 Reapers that are based here stream live video and data from other sensors to American analysts working with French commanders, who say the aerial intelligence has been critical to their success over the past four months in driving jihadists from a vast desert refuge in northern Mali. The drone base, established in February and staffed by about 120 members of the Air Force, is the latest indication of the priority Africa has become for the United States at a time when it is winding down its presence in Afghanistan and President Obama has set a goal of moving from a global war on terrorism toward a more targeted effort. It is part of a new model for counterterrorism, a strategy designed to help local forces — and in this case a European ally — fight militants so American troops do not have to. But the approach has limitations on a continent as large as Africa, where a shortage of resources is chronic and regional partners are weak. And the introduction of drones, even unarmed ones, runs the risk of creating the kind of backlash that has undermined American efforts in Pakistan and provoked anger in many parts of the world. The increase in the number of potential threats in the region was made clear to Mr. Obama during his visit to Africa last week. “We need in Africa — not just in Senegal but the whole of Africa — to have the military capacity to solve this problem, but we need training, we need materials, we need intelligence,” President Macky Sall of Senegal said after meeting with Mr. Obama in Dakar to discuss fears of a growing violent Islamist threat in the Sahara, according to Reuters. The United States military, however, has only one permanent base in Africa, in Djibouti, more than 3,000 miles from Mali, as well as a constellation of small airstrips in places that include Ethiopia and Burkina Faso, for surveillance missions flown by drones or turboprop planes designed to look like civilian aircraft. The challenge for the United States, with little experience in Africa, is a difficult one. “The U.S. is facing a security environment in Africa that is increasingly more complex and therefore more dangerous,” said Michael R. Shurkin, a former Central Intelligence Agency analyst who is now at the RAND Corporation. “Effective responses, moreover, require excellent knowledge about local populations and their politics, the sort of understanding that too often eludes the U.S. government and military.” And the threats facing Niger are typical of the ones that worry Mr. Sall. The government of President Mahamadou Issoufou is struggling to stem a flow of insurgents across Niger’s lightly guarded borders with Mali, Nigeria and Libya. On May 23, terrorists using suicide car bombs attacked a Nigerien military compound in Agadez and a French-operated uranium company in Arlit, both in the country’s north. Two groups claimed credit for the bombings, which the authorities in Niger say killed at least 24 soldiers and one civilian, as well as 11 militants. One is led by the Algerian militant Mokhtar Belmokhtar and attacked a large gas field in Algeria in January, and the other is a regional offshoot of Al Qaeda called the Movement for Oneness and Jihad in West Africa, or Mujao. The terrorist attacks in May, combined with an escape from Niamey’s biggest jail last month by 32 detainees, including many suspected militants, have left Mr. Issoufou’s government vulnerable to criticism that it cannot provide security, despite allowing American drones on Nigerien soil. The government in Niger has defended that decision, and it is concerned enough about the threat it perceives from extremist fighters pushed out of Mali that it initially wanted the drones to be armed, a former senior American official said. But Obama administration officials thought that was unnecessary and politically unwise. To experts on Africa, the possibility that the drones will yet cause a backlash remains real, especially if Islamic radicals make it an issue. “The concern would be that a lot of the blowback would be through channels we can’t easily perceive, such as Salafist mosques,” said Alexis Arieff, an Africa analyst with the Congressional Research Service in Washington. The United States acknowledged the drone deployment here in February — initially sending a single Predator aircraft and later faster, more capable Reapers — but since then it has released virtually no information about their missions, presumably to avoid raising their public profile. The Pentagon denied a request to interview the Air Force flight crews, logistics and maintenance specialists, and security personnel assigned here at a military airfield on the opposite side of the commercial airport in Niger’s capital.

#### Instability leads to massive destabilizing migrations, contagious disease spread and proliferation to terrorists and rogue nations culminating in nuclear war

African Studies Centre 3 (the Transnational Institute, The Center of Social Studies, Coimbra University, and The Peace Research Center http://www.globalpolicy.org/nations/sovereign/failed/2003/12failedcollapsedstates.pdf) Dabo

In the malign scenario of global developments the number of collapsed states would grow significantly. This would mean that several more countries in the world could not be held to account for respecting international agreements in various fields, be it commercial transactions, debt repayment, the possession and proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and the use of the national territory for criminal or terrorist activities. The increase in failed states would immediately lead to an increase in international migration, which could have a knock-on effect, first in neighbouring countries which, having similar politico- economic structures, could suffer increased destabilization and collapse as well. Developments in West Africa during the last decade may serve as an example. Increased international migration would, secondly, have serious implications for the Western world. In Europe it would put social relations between the population and immigrant communities under further pressure, polarizing politics. An increase in collapsed states would also endanger the security of Western states and societies. Health conditions could deteriorate as contagious diseases like Ebola or Sars would spread because of a lack of measures taken in collapsed areas. Weapons of mass destruction could come into the hands of various sorts of political entities, be they terrorist groups, political factions in control of part of a collapsed state or an aggressive political elite still in control of a national territory and intent on expansion. Not only North Korea springs to mind; one could very well imagine such states in (North) Africa.

### Mali

#### And Drones increase Malian instability, and refugees to neighboring countries

Simanowitz 12 (Intervening in Northern Mali: "The People are like Straw on which Elephants are Fighting" How might military action in northern Mali unfold and what impact will it have on the local population? ARTICLE | 14 NOVEMBER 2012 - 3:37PM | BY STEFAN SIMANOWITZ e has written for, among others, the Guardian (UK), the Independent (UK), the Huffington Post, the Africa Report, Al Jazeera, and the Mail and Guardian (South Africa) http://thinkafricapress.com/mali/citizens-have-nothing-their-eyes-cry-with) Dabo

Aerial reconnaissance and targeted drone strikes might have been effective a year ago when Islamist fighters were holed-up in the desert or camped in the Adrar des Ifoghas mountains. But now they have moved into the villages, towns and cities across their region. And their number has reportedly been swelled due to the arrival of foreign fighters, recruitment of economically impoverished locals and the forced recruitment of children. “Every day they are picking up 10 and 11-year-old children,” a resident of Timbuktu who wished to remain anonymous told a source over the phone last week. While it is true that the local population has little sympathy for the Islamist militants and are keen to be rid of them, they will not welcome military intervention which could destroy their homes and kill their children. On November 11, an emergency summit of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) met in Abuja and agreed to send around 3,000 troops to Mali. With ECOWAS, the African Union and other partner countries finalising their plans for military action to be approved by the UN Security Council later this month, one might expect an increasing number of Malians to join the exodus that has seen over 300,000 flee to refugee camps in neighbouring countries. But while some locals are still leaving, reports suggest that others are returning home. Time magazine recently reported that “buses to the north are now packed, filled with refugees no longer willing to wait out the now quiet conflict far from home”. Speaking from Mbera refugee camp in Mauritania, one refugee told Think Africa Press through a source that poor conditions had persuaded 30 people to return to his village of Tin-Gnéré near Timbuktu. “Others will follow,” he said. Military commitment and logistics Once approved by the United Nations, military action could begin immediately, although mobilisation is unlikely to be ready before early 2013. In the meantime, the militants will have time to strengthen and consolidate their positions both in the desert and in towns where they have been quick to set up semi-functioning forms of administration and service provision. Aware that they would be vulnerable to drone and aircraft attack in the open desert, the militias are likely to try to stay in the cities, towns and villages, dispersing their fighters, heavy weapons and ammunition stockpiles in anticipation of air strikes and even planting anti-personnel mines. Such an enemy will present a challenge for the military force tasked with routing them from the region. The force is expected to consist of ECOWAS and Malian soldiers, few of whom have experience of desert fighting. Serious questions have been raised over the capacity and discipline of the Nigerian army, who will form the backbone of the 3,300-strong ECOWAS fighting force. Meanwhile the weaknesses of the Malian army were sorely exposed by the uprising in the north and the coup in Bamako last March. And the arms embargo imposed by ECOWAS on Mali since the coup has weakened the demoralised Malian army still further. Whilst equipment, intelligence, training and support from American, British and French special forces will add steel to the operation, it will nevertheless involve difficult desert fighting conditions against a well-armed enemy capable of defending cities and launching counter attacks from the desert.

#### And Mali instability and refugees create a flash point for conflict in West Africa

**Naij 13** (Mali Refugee Flood Threatens to Destabilize Region 3 February, 2013 http://news.naij.com/22296.html Politics) Dabo

Blocked roads, empty markets, no electricity, no telephones. The warzone in Mali is completely cut off from the outside world. Any chance of help can only come from the South, or from neighboring countries. In November 2012, the UN Refugee Agency (UNHCR) spoke of a "forgotten crisis." More than 400,000 people in Mali were fleeing even then. Around half of them sought shelter within the country, while the other half had already crossed the borders to neighboring nations like Mauretania, Niger, and Burkina Faso. But the story did not make the news. The world's media was concerned with other conflict zones at the time, and the humanitarian crisis in one of the world's poorest countries hardly registered. Center stage That all changed with France's military deployment in Mali earlier this month. "Since the military intervention by the French forces on January 11, about 18,000 refugees have fled Mali," said UNHCR spokesman William Spindler, who has been observing the situation from the Malian capital Bamako for a week. But UN workers are not allowed to travel freely in the country - in the past few days, they have finally been allowed into the towns of Segou and Mopti, north of the capital, but northern Mali remains out of bounds.Spindler says the crisis could spread to neighboring countries "The situation in the north of Mali is critical," said Spindler. "There is not enough food for people. We have heard that the markets are empty, because the roads have been cut by the conflict. And the border with Algeria, from where some of the products come, is closed.So markets have been looted, electricity services have been disrupted, there is no public transport, and telephone lines have also been cut." Refugees who make it to southern Mali might have reached safety, but their situation is still dire. There are no central camps for them to stay in - the refugees simply scatter across Bamako, looking for shelter with relatives, or they sleep inside mosques.

#### Large-scale African conflict creates proxy wars and escalates to nuclear war

Deutsch 02 (Founder of Rabid Tiger Project (Political Risk Consulting and Research Firm focusing on Russia and Eastern Europe) [Jeffrey, “SETTING THE STAGE FOR WORLD WAR III,” Rabid Tiger Newsletter, Nov 18, http://www.rabidtigers.com/rtn/newsletterv2n9.html]) Dabo

The Rabid Tiger Project believes that a nuclear war is most likely to start in Africa. **Civil wars** in the Congo (the country formerly known as Zaire), Rwanda, Somalia and Sierra Leone, **and domestic instability in Zimbabwe, Sudan and other countries, as well as occasional brushfire and other wars** (thanks in part to "national" borders that cut across tribal ones) **turn into a really nasty stew**. We've got all too many rabid tigers and potential rabid tigers, who are willing to push the button rather than risk being seen as wishy-washy in the face of a mortal threat and overthrown. **Geopolitically speaking, Africa is open range**. Very few countries in Africa are beholden to any particular power. South Africa is a major exception in this respect - not to mention in that she also probably already has the Bomb. Thus, outside powers can more easily find client states there than, say, in Europe where the political lines have long since been drawn, or Asia where many of the countries (China, India, Japan) are powers unto themselves and don't need any "help," thank you. **Thus, an African war can attract outside involvement very quickly**. Of course, a proxy war alone may not induce the Great Powers to fight each other. **But an African nuclear strike can ignite a much broader conflagration**, if the other powers are interested in a fight. Certainly, such a strike would in the first place have been facilitated by outside help - financial, scientific, engineering, etc. Africa is an ocean of troubled waters, and some people love to go fishing.

## Adv. 2 Racism

#### **Drones targeting brown bodies allow for white justification of racism against disenfranchised populations. We are not critical of drone policies because they are a new form of hegemonic American violence but because they are part of the narrative of racial violence**

Lawyer 7/25 (Drone Policy Is the Most Important Racism Posted by Rad-Femme Lawyer http://thisweekinblackness.com/2013/07/25/drone-policy-is-the-most-important-racism/) Dabo

The strange essence of the critique is that Obama is a hypocrite for publicly, personally identifying with one murdered Black boy while the Administration’s foreign policy justifies the murders of innocent brown people abroad. This inappropriate parallel between Obama and Zimmerman erases the suffering of Black people and other marginalized groups in America, allows white men to co-opt the conversation while claiming that they are anti-racist, ignores crucial differences between vigilante justice and foreign policy, and requires Obama to be superhuman to maintain authority. 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 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.

#### **And this rhetoric cloaks the secret racist war against black and brown bodies through the drone. The war on terror rhetoric allows the white males to wash their hands while destabilizing and exploiting the third world**

Lévesque 12 (America’s Secret War in Africa Spreading drone warfare throughout AfricaJulie Lévesque is a journalist and researcher with the Centre for Research on Globalization (CRG), Montreal http://www.globalresearch.ca/americas-secret-war-in-africa/5307958 By [Julie Lévesque](http://www.globalresearch.ca/author/julie-l-vesque) Global Research, October 13, 2012) Dabo

The U.S. secret warfare is alive and well. In addition to its military command in Africa (AFRICOM), America has been deploying special forces all over the continent: “Small teams of special operations forces arrived at American embassies throughout North Africa in the months before militants launched the fiery attack that killed the U.S. ambassador in Libya. The soldiers’ mission: Set up a network that could quickly strike a terrorist target or rescue a hostage.”  (Kimberly Dozier, [White House widens covert ops presence in North Africa](http://www.fayobserver.com/articles/2012/10/02/1208270?sac=fo.military), AP, October 2, 2012.) The U.S. is spreading its clandestine army all over Africa. As reported by Nile Bowie (Global Research, April 2012), the goal is to “balkanize” the African continent: “At an AFRICOM Conference held at Fort McNair on February 18, 2008, Vice Admiral Robert T. Moeller openly declared the guiding principle of AFRICOM is to protect “the free flow of natural resources from Africa to the global market”, before citing China’s increasing presence in the region as challenging to American interests”. In 2007, US State Department advisor Dr. J. Peter Pham commented on AFRICOM’s strategic objectives of “protecting access to hydrocarbons and other strategic resources which Africa has in abundance, a task which includes ensuring against the vulnerability of those natural riches and ensuring that no other interested third parties, such as China, India, Japan, or Russia, obtain monopolies or preferential treatment.” (Nile Bowie, [COVERT OPS IN NIGERIA: Fertile Ground for US Sponsored Balkanization](http://www.globalresearch.ca/covert-ops-in-nigeria-fertile-ground-for-us-sponsored-balkanization/?print=1), Global Research, April 11, 2012.) The “War on Terror” fraud serves to cover up the destabilization of Africa with a view to taking control of its resources. The Balkans were destabilized for the same purpose in the 1990’s: In Liar’s Poker The Great Powers, Yugoslavia and the Wars of the Future, Michel Collon explains how the Balkans were destabilized “to control oil pipeline routes, dominate Eastern Europe as well as weaken and get a hand over Russia” as well as” insure [the establishment of US] military bases [in Eastern Europe and the Balkans].” (Michel Collon, [Liar’s Poker The Great Powers, Yugoslavia and the Wars of the Future](http://www.michelcollon.info/spip.php?page=produit&ref=POKER&lang=fr), Editions Aden, 1998, p. 129.) A similar process, over a large geographic region, is occurring in the Middle East:“Syria, Iran and Iraq signed an agreement for a gas pipeline in July 2011, which plans to link the Iranian South Pars field – the world’s largest – to Syria and therefore to the Mediterranean Sea. Another important oil field was discovered near Homs in Syria, which could become an alternative hub of energy corridors in opposition to those passing through Turkey and other routes controlled by U.S. and European companies” (Manlio Dinucci, [L’art de la guerre. Syrie : l’Otan vise le gazoduc](http://www.mondialisation.ca/lart-de-la-guerre-syrie-lotan-vise-le-gazoduc/), October 9, 2012) America’s clandestine army will resort to drone warfare to assert control over the African resources. Although the U.S. and its allies have financially and materially supported Al-Qaida-linked mercenaries to topple the Libyan government and are operating in the same fashion in Syria, we are told that the “counter terror effort indicates that the administration has been worried for some time about a growing threat posed by Al Qaeda and its offshoots in North Africa.” (Dozier, op.cit.) Although the Pentagon assures that “[t]here are no plans at this stage for unilateral U.S. military operations”, the article states quite to the contrary that a unilateral drone warfare is what awaits Africans: Delta Force group will form the backbone of a military task force responsible for combating al-Qaida and other terrorist groups across the region with an arsenal that includes drones. But first, it will work to win acceptance by helping North African nations build their own special operations and counter terror units. (Ibid.) The hypocritical discourse that follows indicates in which African states the “free flow of natural resources to the global market” and “access to hydrocarbons and other strategic resources” will be protected under the “War on Terror” pretext: The Obama administration has been concerned about the growing power and influence of al-Qaida offshoots in Yemen, Somalia, Iraq and North Africa. Only the Yemeni branch has tried to attack American territory directly so far, with a series of thwarted bomb plots aimed at U.S.-bound aircraft. A Navy SEAL task force set up in 2009 has used a combination of raids and drone strikes to fight militants in Yemen and Somalia, working together with the CIA and local forces. The new task force would work in much the same way to combat al-Qaida’s North African affiliates, which are growing in numbers and are awash in weapons from post-revolutionary Libya’s looted stockpiles. They are well-funded by a criminal network trafficking in drugs and hostages. Al-Qaida in the Islamic Maghreb or AQIM, and Nigerian-based extremist sect Boko Haram are arguably the two largest and most dangerous affiliates. The top State Department official for African affairs said Tuesday that the militants in Mali “must be dealt with through security and military means.” (Ibid.) And even though we are told there are “no plans at this stage for unilateral U.S. military operations”, Johnnie Carson, the U.S. assistant secretary of state for African affairs seems to contradict this claim by saying “any military action up there must indeed be well planned, well organized, well resourced and well thought through” and, how thoughtful, “be agreed upon by those who are going to be most affected by it.” (Ibid.)

#### Ending the drone war is a key step to ending extreme racism

Jain 13 (Edwin, Budding activist interested in economic and social justice, environmental issues, and foreign policy, “MLK On The Racist Drone Wars”, <http://edwisdom.com/2013/08/racist-drone-wars/>, rcheek)

A few weeks ago, Obama launched a series of drone strikes on Yemen. Today is the 50th anniversary of the March on Washington, where MLK gave his “I Have a Dream” speech. How are these two events related?¶ Well, it seems like everybody loves offering lip service to MLK’s ideas, without fully understanding the truly radical ideas he held. Civil rights was just one of many things he fought for. Perhaps we can understand what King railed against in his day from his comment that we must “redeem the soul of America from the triple evils of racism, war and poverty.” The drone war is an issue that’s representative of ALL 3 evils that MLK spoke of. I’ll go through them here briefly.¶ Military Aggression and War¶ This is probably the most obvious “evil” that the drone war represents. I’ve already documented how the drone war is illegal, inaccurate, and morally obscene. That bombing innocent people in other countries is an act of war is not really in doubt. A fierce critic of the Vietnam War, it’s impossible MLK would’ve approved of this war, where people are killed without charge or trial just because of their religion.¶ Economic Exploitation and Poverty¶ This one’s a bit more complex, but just as relevant. As we engage in an endless global war, more and more resources will be funneled into finding creative ways to kill people. That means taxpayer money’s going to large defense companies, which is why I’ve called military spending a “Rigged Institution.” It’s shameful we spend over $600 billion on our military, while 20% of children go hungry in the richest nation in the history of the world.¶ Racism¶ This is the most interesting and revealing “evil.” So how is the drone war racist? Gallup recently took a great poll of American citizens, and the results are worth reading into. A majority, 65% support the use of drones abroad against suspected terrorists. But, if it’s a US citizen abroad, the support drops to 41%. If it’s a US citizen on US soil, the number becomes just 13%. The implications are simple. American people have basic rights to, you know, not get killed while they’re walking to the store. But foreigners, eh. If you’re not an American citizen, your rights don’t matter all that much.¶ And if security is what we’re worried about, then why are people opposed to using drones on US soil, where terrorists are even more of a threat? I know what people are thinking. What if innocent people around the target die? It’s OK to kill those innocent civilians back in Yemen, but not here. No, no, every American life is precious.¶ It’s exactly this kind of racism, this kind of “our lives are worth more than yours” mentality that MLK despised and fought against. As he pointed out, the triple evils are all interrelated. The secret drone war, in which innocent people are murdered because of the color of their skin, must be ended if our support of MLK and the civil rights movement’s ideals is not a farce. I, and the people of the Middle East, hope it isn’t

**You have an obligation to reject any racism in every instance. Rejecting racism is an a priori issue that justifies all forms of violence**
Memmi 2000 (Professor Emeritus of Sociology @ Unv. Of Paris Albert-; RACISM, translated by Steve Martinot, pp.163-165) Dabo

The struggle against racism will be long, difficult, without intermission, without remission, probably never achieved, yet for this very reason, it is a struggle to be undertaken without surcease and without concessions. One cannot be indulgent toward racism. One cannot even let the monster in the house, especially not in a mask. To give it merely a foothold means to augment the bestial part in us and in other people which is to diminish what is human. To accept the racist universe to the slightest degree is to endorse fear, injustice, and violence. It is to accept the persistence of the dark history in which we still largely live. It is to agree that the outsider will always be a possible victim (and which [person] man is not [themself] himself an outsider relative to someone else?). Racism illustrates in sum, the inevitable negativity of the condition of the dominated; that is it illuminates in a certain sense the entire human condition. The anti-racist struggle, difficult though it is, and always in question, is nevertheless one of the prologues to the ultimate passage from animality to humanity. In that sense, we cannot fail to rise to the racist challenge. However, it remains true that one’s moral conduct only emerges from a choice: one has to want it. It is a choice among other choices, and always debatable in its foundations and its consequences. Let us say, broadly speaking, that the choice to conduct oneself morally is the condition for the establishment of a human order for which racism is the very negation. This is almost a redundancy. One cannot found a moral order, let alone a legislative order, on racism because racism signifies the exclusion of the other and his or her subjection to violence and domination. From an ethical point of view, if one can deploy a little religious language, racism is “the truly capital sin.”fn22 It is not an accident that almost all of humanity’s spiritual traditions counsel respect for the weak, for orphans, widows, or strangers. It is not just a question of theoretical counsel respect for the weak, for orphans, widows or strangers. It is not just a question of theoretical morality and disinterested commandments. Such unanimity in the safeguarding of the other suggests the real utility of such sentiments. All things considered, we have an interest in banishing injustice, because injustice engenders violence and death. Of course, this is debatable. There are those who think that if one is strong enough, the assault on and oppression of others is permissible. But no one is ever sure of remaining the strongest. One day, perhaps, the roles will be reversed. All unjust society contains within itself the seeds of its own death. It is probably smarter to treat others with respect so that they treat you with respect. “Recall,” says the bible, “that you were once a stranger in Egypt,” which means both that you ought to respect the stranger because you were a stranger yourself and that you risk becoming once again someday. It is an ethical and a practical appeal – indeed, it is a contract, however implicit it might be. In short, the refusal of racism is the condition for all theoretical and practical morality. Because, in the end, the ethical choice commands the political choice. A just society must be a society accepted by all. If this contractual principle is not accepted, then only conflict, violence, and destruction will be our lot. If it is accepted, we can hope someday to live in peace. True, it is a wager, but the stakes are irresistible.\

#### Racism and oppression cannot merely be rejected or it they’ll be coopted by the oppressors. Rejecting racism is pre-requisite to defeating all forms of oppression

Memmi 2000(Professor Emeritus of Sociology at the University of Paris, Albert, “RACISM”, translated by Steve Martinot, pp.156-157) Dabo

To refuse racism is to choose a certain conception of humanity; it means a reconciliation among different constituent groups, thus a relative unification, not of all in each other but of each in relation to the others. Conversely, humanity cannot unify itself in this relative way except through intergroup equality, and equality between individuals who compose each group. Ordinarily, this is what would be called universalism. Two principal objections have been made to universalism. The first is that it is ineffective and even hypocritical as a philosophy. The second, which flows from the first, is that it is obsolete, like an old horse put out to pasture not for having been used up but for having demonstrated its inherent and tragic uselessness. The Jewish universalism of its prophets, the Christian universalism of its churches, the Islamic universalism of its indulgent community of believers, of people of the book, the Marxist universalism of proletarian unity through which the eventual wellbeing of all by means of the Revolution is projected to have none of them succeed in putting an end to violence, to injustice, or to massacre. At best, up to now, a universalism has remained utopia. Or worse, it has served as an alibi for distracting attention from existent and always recurring privilege. For the dominated, universalism has always been a false philosophy that has served to cover their real oppression with a cloak of abstract virtue. This was true in the slave trade, the industrialization of Europe, and the building of colonial empires. To claim that men are brothers while holding some of them in slavery is to be complicit in the crime. Is universalism possible that would not be either a trap or a utopia? Paradoxically, instead of renouncing it, what is needed is more universalism, that is, the passage from an abstract to concrete universalism. It is not sufficient simply to condemn racism; it is necessary to act on the collective social conditions of its existence. In effect, universalism must pass from being just a philosophy to becoming an activity. A double activity, actually, both negative and positive; a struggle against oppression and a struggle for effective and reciprocal fraternity. In the last analysis, because racism is a direct or indirect manifestation of dominance it becomes possible if only one has the means to dominate another under the guise of an opinion. The practical implication is that to push back racism, one must combat all forms of domination.

#### Racism creates biopolitical control that makes war inevitable

Mendieta 02, Eduardo Mendieta, PhD and Associate professor of Stonybrook School of Philosophy, “‘To make live and to let die’ –Foucault on Racism Meeting of the Foucault Circle, APA Central Division Meeting” http://www.stonybrook.edu/commcms/philosophy/people/faculty\_pages/docs/foucault.pdf

This is where racism intervenes, not from without, exogenously, but from within, constitutively. For the emergence of biopower as the form of a new form of political rationality, entails the inscription within the very logic of the modern state the logic of racism. For racism grants, and here I am quoting: “the conditions for the acceptability of putting to death in a society of normalization. Where there is a society of normalization, where there is a power that is, in all of its surface and in first instance, and first line, a bio-power, racism is indispensable as a condition to be able to put to death someone, in order to be able to put to death others. The homicidal [meurtrière] function of the state, to the degree that the state functions on the modality of bio-power, can only be assured by racism “(Foucault 1997, 227) To use the formulations from his 1982 lecture “The Political Technology of Individuals” –which incidentally, echo his 1979 Tanner Lectures –the power of the state after the 18th century, a power which is enacted through the police, and is enacted over the population, is a power over living beings, and as such it is a biopolitics. And, to quote more directly, “since the population is nothing more than what the state takes care of for its own sake, of course, the state is entitled to slaughter it, if necessary. So the reverse of biopolitics is thanatopolitics.” (Foucault 2000, 416). Racism, is the thanatopolitics of the biopolitics of the total state. They are two sides of one same8 political technology, one same political rationality: the management of life, the life of a population, the tending to the continuum of life of a people. And with the inscription of racism within the state of biopower, the long history of war that Foucault has been telling in these dazzling lectures has made a new turn: the war of peoples, a war against invaders, imperials colonizers, which turned into a war of races, to then turn into a war of classes, has now turned into the war of a race, a biological unit, against its polluters and threats. Racism is the means by which bourgeois political power, biopower, re-kindles the fires of war within civil society. Racism normalizes **and medicalizes war. Racism makes war the permanent condition of society, while at the same time masking its weapons of death and torture.** As I wrote somewhere else, **racism banalizes genocide by making quotidian the lynching of suspect threats to the health of the social body. Racism makes the killing of the other**, of others, **an everyday occurrence by internalizing and normalizing the war of society against its enemies**. To protect society entails we be ready to kill its threats, its foes, and if we understand society as a unity of life, as a continuum of the living, then these threat and foes are biological in nature.

## Solvency

#### **Drones cause more collateral damage than manned aircraft**

Ackerman 7/2 (US drone strikes more deadly to Afghan civilians than manned aircraft – adviser in New York is national security editor for Guardian US. A former senior writer for Wired, he won the 2012 National Magazine Award for Digital Reportingtheguardian.com, Tuesday 2 July 2013 08.00 EDT http://www.theguardian.com/world/2013/jul/02/us-drone-strikes-afghan-civilians)

A study conducted by a US military adviser has found that drone strikes in Afghanistan during a year of the protracted conflict caused 10 times more civilian casualties than strikes by manned fighter aircraft. The new study, referred to in an official US military journal, contradicts claims by US officials that the robotic planes are more precise than their manned counterparts. It appears to undermine the claim made by President Obama in a May speech that "conventional airpower or missiles are far less precise than drones, and likely to cause more civilian casualties and local outrage". Drone strikes in Afghanistan, the study found, according to its unclassified executive summary, were "an order of magnitude more likely to result in civilian casualties per engagement."¶ Larry Lewis, a principal research scientist at the Center for Naval Analyses, a research group with close ties to the US military, studied air strikes in Afghanistan from mid-2010 to mid-2011, using classified military data on the strikes and the civilian casualties they caused. Lewis told the Guardian he found that the missile strikes conducted by remotely piloted aircraft, commonly known as drones, were 10 times more deadly to Afghan civilians than those performed by fighter jets. Lewis, an adviser to the military's Joint Staff, conducted six previous studies of civilian casualties and other episodes in Afghanistan for the military. "The fact that I had been looking at air operations in Afghanistan for a number of years led me to suspect that what I found was in fact the case," Lewis said. But "the potential for [citizens to be] surprised" by the higher rates of civilians killed by drones led Lewis and his co-author, Sarah Holewinski of the non-governmental organization Center for Civilians in Conflict, to refer to Lewis' findings in an article for Prism, a journal published by the Center for Complex Operations at the Defense Department's National Defense University. Lewis said he could not provide specific figures about the numbers of civilian casualties caused by drones and manned aircraft in Afghanistan, citing classified information. Nor does the Prism article specifically refer to the finding that drones are 10 times likelier to kill civilians than manned aircraft are. Holewinski said the disparity reflected greater training by fighter pilots in avoiding civilian casualties. "These findings show us that it's not about the technology, it's about how the technology is used," said Holewinski. "Drones aren't magically better at avoiding civilians than fighter jets. When pilots flying jets were given clear directives and training on civilian protection, they were able to lower civilian casualty rates."

Executive restraint fails – congressional action is key to impose statutory barriers on unchecked presidential drone strikes.
Druck 12 (Judah A, JD Candidate, Cornell Law School; DRONING ON: THE WAR POWERS RESOLUTION AND THE NUMBING EFFECT OF TECHNOLOGY-DRIVEN WARFARE; Cornell Law Review. SSRN. November 15.<http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2185743>) Dabo

Naturally, some have argued that an unchecked President is not necessarily an issue at all. Specifically, in The Executive Unbound, Eric Posner and Adrian Vermeule argue that the lack of presidential constraint is actually a rational development: we want a President who can act with alacrity, especially in a world where quick decisions may be necessary (e.g., capturing a terrorist).153 But rather than worry about this progression, Posner and Vermeule argue that sufficient political restraints remain in place to prevent a president from acting recklessly, making the inability of legal constraints (such as the WPR) to curtail presidential action a moot point.154 Specifically, a mix of “elections, parties, bureaucracy, and the media” acts as an adequate constraint on presidential action, even absent any legal checks on the executive.155 Posner and Vermeule find that presidential credibility and popularity create a deep incentive for presidents to constrain their own power. This restraint does not arise from a sense of upholding the Constitution or fear of political backlash, but from the public itself.156 Because of these nonlegal constraints, the authors conclude that the fear of an unconstrained President (one that has the potential to go so far as tyranny) is unwarranted.157 The problem with such a theory is that the requisite social and political awareness that might have existed in large-scale wars has largely disappeared, allowing the President to act without any fear of diminished credibility or popularity. Specifically, Posner and Vermeule seem to rely on public attentiveness in order to check presidential action but do not seem to consider a situation where public scrutiny fails to materialize. The authors place an important caveat in their argument: “As long as the public informs itself and maintains a skeptical attitude toward the motivations of government officials, the executive can operate effectively only by proving over and over that it deserves the public’s trust.”158 But what happens when such skepticism and scrutiny vanish? The authors premise their argument on a factor that does not exist in a regime that utilizes technology-driven warfare. If credibility is what controls a President, and an apathetic populace does not care enough to shift its political views based on the use of technology-driven warfare abroad, then a President need not worry about public sentiment when deciding whether to use such force. This in turn means that the theory of self-restraint on the part of the President fails to account for contemporary warfare and its social impact, making the problem of public numbing very pertinent.159 CONCLUSION On June 21, 2011, the United States lost contact with a Fire Scout helicopter flying over Libya. Military authorities ultimately concluded that Qaddafi forces shot the helicopter down, adding to the final cost of America’s intervention.160 Yet there would be no outrage back home: no candlelit vigils, no congressional lawsuits, no protests at the White House gates, no demands for change. Instead, few people would even know of the Fire Scout’s plight, and even fewer would care. That is because the Fire Scout helicopter was a drone, a pilotless machine adding only a few digits to the final “cost” of the war, hardly worth anyone’s time or effort. As these situations become more and more common—where postwar assessments look at monetary, rather than human costs—the fear of unilateral presidential action similarly becomes more pertinent. Unlike past larger-scale wars, whose traditional harms provided sufficient incentive for the populace to exert pressure on the President (either directly or via Congress), technology-driven warfare has removed the triggers for checks on presidential action.

#### No risk of turns – drones are the critical internal link to instability, terrorism, and the counterinsurgency

Rogan **10** (Christopher, army cadet, March 29 “INCREASING THE COMBAT POWER OF THE SQUAD ON PATROL: THE POTENTIAL OF THE SOLDIER-PORTABLE DRONE AS A TACTICAL FORCE MULTIPLIER”)

Nonetheless, it is in the very nature of American military commanders to find every possible way to give the advantage to their troops in a firefight. William H. McRaven, a former Navy SEAL and special operations theorist, writes that even the some of the most physically fit and skilled warriors in the world can find themselves on the losing end of a firefight if they do not have some sort of force multiplier—whether it is surprise, speed or firepower—to achieve relative superiority in an engagement. US troops still need some sort of force multiplier; the new constraints of fighting in a counterinsurgency environment make the use of traditional combat support options such as indirect fire nearly impossible. David Kilcullen, a leading expert in counterinsurgency theory, says that too much firepower can be counterproductive in counterinsurgency. Any form of overreaching or collateral damage in a firefight does more to damage the counterinsurgent’s cause than to help him defeat the insurgent. Peter Bergen and Katherine Tiedemann, building on recent comments from David Kilcullen and Andrew Exum, indicate that independent drone strikes have no place in counterinsurgency as they insult the local populace, kill innocent civilians, and subsequently help the insurgent more than the counterinsurgent.

#### Drones are the most accident-prone aircraft in the US Air Force

Bloomberg News 12 (Bloomberg News, 6-18-2012 http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-06-18/drones-most-accidentprone-u-s-air-force-craft-bgov-barometer.html) Dabo

The U.S. military’s three biggest drones, made by Northrop Grumman Corp. (NOC) and General

Atomics Aeronautical Systems Inc., are the most accident-prone aircraft in the Air Force fleet.

The BGOV Barometer shows Northrop’s Global Hawk and General Atomics’s Predator and Reaper

unmanned aerial vehicles have had a combined 9.31 accidents for every 100,000 hours of flying. That’s the highest rate of any category of aircraft and more than triple the fleet-wide average of 3.03, according to military data compiled by Bloomberg. [...] The Air Force in a 15-year period through Sept. 30 recorded 129 accidents involving its medium and high-altitude drones: the MQ-1 Predator, MQ-9 Reaper and RQ-4 Global Hawk. The figures include accidents that resulted in at least $500,000 in damage or destroyed aircraft during missions around the globe