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Extensions for the Terminator

There is a linear relation relationship—each drone attack increases the odds of an attack on the U.S.

**McGrath 10**

LIEUTENANT COLONEL SHAUN R. MCGRATH United States Air Force

STRATEGIC MISSTEP: “IMMORTAL” ROBOTIC WARFARE, INVITING COMBAT TO SUBURBAN AMERICA March 18, 2010 <http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA521822&Location=U2&doc=GetTRDoc.pdf> d.a. 7-27-10

Today one solution to the vexing problem of engaging in continued retribution and pro-active strikes against terrorists or insurgents creates a growing strategic peril with every ostensible tactical success. The strategic peril stems from the expanded use of remotely piloted aircraft (RPA) strikes that target individuals. The peril primarily emanates from strikes against high value targets (HVT) or high value individuals (HVI) outside of direct force-on-force engagements. 3 When used in a complimentary role for force-on-force actions, an RPA’s persistent over-watch ability and targeted firepower enhances tactical success. Extrapolating this tactical success to a broader strategic campaign without the full consideration for second and third order effects induces potential strategic missteps. Key counter-terrorism experts already argue that the second order effect of anti-U.S. sentiment continues to grow with each one of these strikes.4 Today, however, few experts appear to connect the dots to the postulated third order effect of an increased risk of enduring enemy attacks on U.S. soil.

Drones pervert war operations into reality video games

Graham 06

STEPHEN GRAHAM,  Centre for the Study of Cities and Regions, Department of Geography, University of Durham, Cities and the 'War on Terror'nWiley interscience [International Journal of Urban and Regional Research](http://www3.interscience.wiley.com/journal/118511932/home) [Volume 30, Issue 2](http://www3.interscience.wiley.com/journal/118603045/issue), Pages 255-276

As a further demonstration of how the transnational connections underpinning US military technology both reflect, and erupt within, the 'war on terror's' urban imaginative geographies, some Predator 'pilots' actually operate from virtual reality 'caves' in a Florida air base 8–10,000 miles away from the drones' target zones. For the US military personnel doing the piloting, this 'virtual' work is almost indistinguishable from a 'shoot-'em-up' video game (except that the people who die are real). 'At the end of the work day', one Predator operator reflected in 2003, 'you walk back into the rest of life in America' (quoted in [Newman, 2003](http://www3.interscience.wiley.com/cgi-bin/fulltext/118603050/main.html,ftx_abs#b60)).

Drones produce a dehumanization that makes future wars inevitable

Mintzes 08

[Rob Mintzes](http://www.groundreport.com/rmintzes)   Reporter for Groundreport July 09, 2008 Dehumanization of the Military <http://www.groundreport.com/US/Dehumanization-of-the-Military/2864728>

The stories feature the newest UAV in the Air Force's arsenal: the Reaper.  Unlike its predecessor -- the Predator -- the Reaper can carry the same bomb load as an F-16 fighter jet, all without a pilot physically being in the cockpit (and with far less maintenance required than with the F-16).  From Creech Air Force Base, northwest of Las Vegas, Nevada, the pilots control the planes some 7,500 miles from where the fight is. You've got to admit that this kind of technology is pretty incredible, but I'm worried about something else: the dehumanization of the military and of war itself.  Here is where I face my dilemma.  I believe that we need to keep our soldiers, pilots, and other military personnel as safe as possible, and I know that doing so means replacing them with machines and other instruments that do the dirty work for us.  But that's not the kind of dehumanization I'm talking about. Here's what I mean.  In an interview, one of the Reaper pilots said, "Seeing bad guys on the screen and watching them possibly get dispatched, and then going down to the Taco Bell for lunch, it's kind of surreal."  They're there, but he's not.  I'm talking about dehumanization in terms of being totally emotionally disconnected from war. Basically, all the pilots have to do is pull a trigger while sitting in an armchair (they're called armchair pilots), and someone dies 7,500 miles away.  Granted, the gravity of it may not the same as pushing a red button and launching a storm of nukes at Russia, but the concept is similar.  Looking through a grainy infrared camera, you might only see what resembles a human form, if you see a person at all.  You don't see their face, don't hear their voice, don't know their name...and as CNN said, "military commanders see remotely piloted aircraft as the model for the way future wars will be fought." That's the part that scares me: the idea of us fighting future wars from armchairs.  War is a terrible thing, but I would think that seeing it on a screen from an armchair creates a highly diminished sense of just how horrible it is.  The thought of seeing bombing raids against Baghdad or Teheran conducted solely from within air-conditioned bases in the States leaves an awful taste in my mouth.  The pilots aren't physically looking out of a cockpit window to see the impact of their actions.  They're not the soldiers on the ground who get to see charred, twisted rubble and bodies blown apart.  They don't get to see the true horrors of war.  War should never be something that's considered acceptable, and it's something to which we should never be desensitized.  Theoretically, with the Reapers, pilots can take off, go grab lunch while the plane's on autopilot, fire a few missiles at their targets and see some onscreen explosions, land the bird back at a base in Afghanistan or Iraq, and then drive home to bed without ever having to leave Nevada. It feels like war as a 9-to-5 video game job.  When I play a video game like "Halo," I don't care about the characters I'm killing, because even though I'm seeing them on a screen, I know they're not real.  Those who are killed by the Reapers are real, and whether they're America-hating terrorists or innocent civilians caught in the crossfire, they're real people all the same.  It's an unfeeling way to conduct a war, and it's the wrong way.  I'm afraid that it could only lead to generations of pilots and soldiers who feel nothing for the lives they have taken, because they never physically see those people face-to-face...of people who don't fully understand the consequences of their actions because they basically fight via television set. One of things that makes us most human is our ability to feel remorse for the things we've done, to -- like my grandfather did -- vomit at the thought that we are capable of taking the life of another person.  Do I want our soldiers and pilots to be the best?  Absolutely, but not at the cost of losing their humanity and becoming unfeeling killing machines.  I want them to be able to comprehend the weight of their actions and understand their significance.  A military of soldiers without feeling is a military I'm afraid of, and one that I have trouble throwing my full support behind. After seeing the so much death at the Battle of Fredericksburg in 1862, Robert E. Lee said, "It is well that war is so terrible...otherwise we would grow too fond of it." Those words ring truer now more than ever, and I think Lee sums up my fears very nicely.  I don't want to see more future wars, but these UAVs look like they could be the Pentagon's surefire solution to ensuring that we can engage in an increasing number of conflicts without feeling the human pinch (and who knows how many we'll kill on the opposite end).

**Drones promote dehumanization**

Kelly & Terrell 09

Kathy Kelly, Co-Director of Organization for Creative NonViolence and Brian Terrell, executive director of Catholic Peace April 04, 2009 [A closer look at the US’ drones: The illusion that war can be waged with no domestic cost dehumanizes both us and our enemies](http://saltspringnews.com/index.php?name=News&file=article&sid=19082) <http://saltspringnews.com/index.php?name=News&file=article&sid=19082> d.a. 7-25-10

The Unmanned Aerial Vehicles, (UAVs), take off from runways in the country of origin, controlled by a pilot, nearby, "on the ground." But once many of the UAVs are airborne, teams inside trailers at Creech Air Force base and other U. S. sites begin to control them. ... Our statement says: "Proponents of the use of UASs insist that there is a great advantage to fighting wars in ‘real-time’ by ‘pilots’ sitting at consoles in offices on air bases far from the dangerous front line of military activity. With less risk to the lives of U.S. soldiers and hence to the popularity and careers of politicians, the deaths of ‘enemy’ noncombatants by the thousands are counted acceptable. The illusion that war can be waged with no domestic cost dehumanizes both us and our enemies. It fosters a callous disregard for human life that can lead to even more recklessness on the part of politicians." We hope that U.S. people will take a closer look at our belief that peace will come through generous love and through human interaction, negotiation, dialogue and diplomacy, and not through robots armed with missiles.

**Drones will lead us to a state of perpetual war**

Mayer 09

[Jane Mayer](http://www.newyorker.com/magazine/bios/jane_mayer/search?contributorName=jane%20mayer) investigative jouranlist for the New Yorker What are the risks of the C.I.A.’s covert drone program? <http://www.newyorker.com/reporting/2009/10/26/091026fa_fact_mayer> d.a. 7-25-10

Peter W. Singer, the author of “Wired for War,” a recent book about the robotics revolution in modern combat, argues that the drone technology is worryingly “seductive,” because it creates the perception that war can be “costless.” Cut off from the realities of the bombings in Pakistan, Americans have been insulated from the human toll, as well as from the political and the moral consequences. Nearly all the victims have remained faceless, and the damage caused by the bombings has remained unseen. In contrast to Gaza, where the targeted killing of Hamas fighters by the Israeli military has been extensively documented—making clear that the collateral damage, and the loss of civilian life, can be severe—Pakistan’s tribal areas have become largely forbidden territory for media organizations. As a result, no videos of a drone attack in progress have been released, and only a few photographs of the immediate aftermath of a Predator strike have been published. The seeming unreality of the Predator enterprise is also felt by the pilots. Some of them reportedly wear flight suits when they operate a drone’s remote controls. When their shifts end, of course, these cubicle warriors can drive home to have dinner with their families. Critics have suggested that unmanned systems, by sparing these combatants from danger and sacrifice, are creating what Sir Brian Burridge, a former British Air Chief Marshal in Iraq, has called “a virtueless war,” requiring neither courage nor heroism. According to Singer, some Predator pilots suffer from combat stress that equals, or exceeds, that of pilots in the battlefield. This suggests that virtual killing, for all its sterile trappings, is a discomfiting form of warfare. Meanwhile, some social critics, such as Mary Dudziak, a professor at the University of Southern California’s Gould School of Law, argue that the Predator strategy has a larger political cost. As she puts it, “Drones are a technological step that further isolates the American people from military action, undermining political checks on . . . endless war.”

Their author (Love) concedes that it has a distancing effect

Love 10

[Maryann Cusimano Love](http://www.americamagazine.org/content/searchresults.cfm?search=Maryann%20Cusimano%20Love&startrow=1&searchby=2) professor of international politics at Catholic University The National Catholic Weekly MARCH 15, 2010 A Troubling Disconnection

<http://www.americamagazine.org/content/article.cfm?article_id=12180&comments=1> d.a. 7-29-10

Third, there is a troubling disconnect for drone operators who kill by day, then go home to their families at night. As one Predator drone pilot described it, “You’re going to war for 12 hours, shooting weapons at targets, directing kills on enemy combatants. And then you get in the car and…within 20 minutes, you’re sitting at the dinner table talking to your kids about their homework.”

Extensions for Blowback advantage

Drone strikes are radicalizing opposition in Pakistan and Afghanistan

Siddiqui 10

Tayyab Siddiqui- former Pakistani Ambassador Pakistan’s drone dilemma <http://www.dawn.com/wps/wcm/connect/dawn-content-library/dawn/news/pakistan/04-drone-dilemma-qs-03> 7-18-10 d.a. 7-25-10

The US must recognise that no matter what the volume of economic assistance given to Pakistan, it will never inspire any feelings of friendliness and partnership until the recurring drone attacks are stopped in accordance with the national milieu. Drone attacks are reprehensible not only in their violation of Pakistan’s sovereignty but also for the civilian deaths they cause and which are becoming increasingly frequent. So far, 144 drone strikes have been carried out in the tribal areas with 1,366 civilian casualties, according to the US National Counterterrorism Center. These attacks are causing deep hatred of the US and their military value is also questionable. In May 2009, in a testimony to US Congress, US Advisor to Gen. David Kilmulllen, asked the Obama Administration to call off the drone attacks stating, “We have been able to kill only 14 senior Al Qaeda leaders since 2006 and in the same period, killed over 700 Pakistani civilians.” The unkindest cut of all was delivered by President Obama who dismissed Pakistan’s protests against drone attacks: “We cannot tolerate a safe haven for terrorists whose location is known and whose intentions are clear.” These attacks have proved counterproductive, both in military and emotional terms. A US think tank has assessed the impact stating, “Predator strikes have inflamed anti-American rage among Afghans and Pakistanis, including first and second generation immigrants in the West as well as elite members of the security services.” Drone attacks are now broadening the area of concerns. Philip Alston, the UN Human Rights Council’s investigator, in a report to the UNGA has warned that “drone strikes employed to attack target executions may violate international law. The onus is really on the government of the US to reveal more about the ways in which it makes sure that arbitrary executions and extrajudicial executions are not in fact being carried out through the use of these weapons.” The legal and juridical aspects of the drone strikes are not only becoming a subject of scrutiny and denunciation internationally, but domestically too the debate is extending to legal forums. Tehrik-i-Insaaf chairman Imran Khan has moved the Supreme Court to declare the predator drone attacks a war crime and violation of sovereignty of Pakistan. The Lahore High Court, in another case, has asked the government to adopt measures to stop them. Public resentment against these attacks, it is argued, is being exploited by rightist elements to maintain that the US does not wish to see any strong Muslim state and that the US and its strategic partner India are bent on destabilising Pakistan. Whatever the impact of such feelings, there is no doubt that drone attacks have become a rallying cry for militants feeding the flow of volunteers as is evident from the terror strikes and suicide attacks in Pakistani cities. Drones based in Afghanistan are blamed for attacks in Pakistan Japan Today 09 <http://www.japantoday.com/category/world/view/us-spy-drones-kill-11-in-pakistan>. Missile strikes targeting militants in Pakistan in recent weeks have been blamed on U.S.-led coalition forces or CIA drones based in Afghanistan. Plan will be perceived in Pakistan Rupee News 10 July 18, 2010 [Clinton’s colossal credibility problem in Pakistan](http://rupeenews.com/2010/07/18/clintons-colossal-credibility-problem-in-pakistan/) <http://rupeenews.com/2010/07/18/clintons-colossal-credibility-problem-in-pakistan/> d.a. 7-25-10 While the State Department is using hyperbolic cliches like “most critical country” and “massive” aid projects, the arrival of the US Secretary of State has drawn a big yawn from the Pakistanis. The Pakistanis are well read and tune to Voice of America, the BBC, CNN, and read the New York Times, Washington Post, and also rags like the Huffington Post. Pakistanis know the innate hatred from Pakistan in the US media. Pakistanis also keep track of the happenings in the US Congress and watch Bharati (aka Indian) media to keep them abreast of the neighborhood and the intentions of Delhi viz a viz Pakistan and Afghanistan.

**At: Ban use but keep presence c-plan**

**Solvency deficit—if the drones are still sitting it will not be perceived as credible—only a complete ban can solve**

**Satia 09**

PRIYA SATIA Assistant Professor of Modern British History at Stanford University

|  |
| --- |
| From Colonial Air Attacks to Drones in Pakistan |
| New Perspectives Quarterly 26 no3 34-7 Summ 2009 |

Military skeptics warn of the impossibility of usefully analyzing the enormous amount of data the drones collect. News reports confirm that civilians are often caught in their lethal sights, not least because of the practical difficulty of identifying "bad guys" in societies engaged in various kinds of protest against their American-backed governments. Uncertainty about the actual number of deaths feeds rumors of the worst. Similarly, news of a temporary halt will not allay suspicions of their continued, even more covert use: the effort to defuse Afghan anger over recent strikes shows that when a covert imperial power issues a denial, no one listens. The casualties and the imposition of continual foreign surveillance provoke more anger and insecurity than the system contains. Just as the British failure produced our present discontents, today's mistaken faith in an aerial panacea will fuel the conflicts of the future.     Proponents of drone warfare insist that its military advantages outweigh its political ramifications; they remain blind to the fact that their military opponent draws its sustenance -- its recruits and resources -- from the political capital it gains (and the American government loses) as a result of drone attacks. It grows with each American homage to the imperial politics of the past. Mr. Obama must heed local rulers' requests to end drone attacks -- as a matter of tactical as much as political wisdom.

At: regular air strikes will trigger retaliation

Attacks from regular planes in the battlefield do not trigger revenge strikes because they are not remote killing from afar

McGrath 10 LIEUTENANT COLONEL SHAUN R. MCGRATH United States Air Force STRATEGIC MISSTEP: “IMMORTAL” ROBOTIC WARFARE, INVITING COMBAT TO SUBURBAN AMERICA March 18, 2010 <http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA521822&Location=U2&doc=GetTRDoc.pdf> d.a. 7-27-10 No the reference is not to the ancient Roman warrior’s leather seat used in scythed chariots as an early revolution in military weaponry to better survive collisions with their enemies.38 It does however, refer to those who remotely control armed drones called Predators (MQ-1), Reapers (MQ-9) and Sky Warriors (MQ-1C) operating in support of global counter-terrorist and global counter-insurgent missions. Singer, in Wired for War, sees the robotic development as the beginning of the true 21st century revolution in military affairs. “History may look back at this period as notable for the simultaneous loss of the state’s roughly 400-year-old monopoly over which groups could go to war and humankind’s loss of its roughly 5,000-year-old monopoly over who could fight in these wars.”39 Some may contend “not so fast.” They will argue that this evolution is not all that new and certainly not that different than the changes introduced to the battlefield from the machine gun, the tank, or even manned aircraft themselves. From a purely tactical effects perspective, such arguments may resonate. When put in the strategic context of the hypothesis at hand, the argument flat-lines. The difference is the risk taken by the combatant. In this case the imminent battlefield risk is not taken by the “distant combatant,” but rather displaced to another time or to another face. Consider the following comment, “[a] fleet of unmanned planes crawl like Piper Cubs but deliver real-time video from the battlefield without risking the lives of crew members, who can unwind afterward with a beer in their living rooms, or pick up dinner on the way home from soccer practice.” Negligible differences in tactical weapon’s effects exist between a combatant RPA operator’s strike and a similar manned platform strike. Contrasting the strategic effects in the context of warfare where two living forces are held at risk for political ends, the comparisons are miles apart. An armed RPA’s tactical effects are closely aligned to those of a fighter aircraft, such as the F-16, F-15E, F-18 or A-10. Fighter aircraft may appear to fly with the same impunity as RPAs today, but only because they all operate in an uncontested air supremacy environment. Fighter aircraft do face reduced risk in current conflicts while engaging similar targets with similar weapons, aimed and guided by similar sensors to those utilized by RPAs. While air supremacy limits the airborne threat presented by the enemy in the battle-spaces of Iraq and Afghanistan, there are still significant risks taken by aircrew as combatants. First, they are subject to risk of enemy counter actions. Whether during low-altitude phases of flight, such as take-off and landing operations, or even while they sleep between combat missions at bases which are within the country borders of the conflict, they are at risk.42 Second, other airborne risks are not altogether absent. Aircraft malfunctions do occur and if required to “bail-out” in an inhospitable area while executing an attack or even a non-kinetic reconnaissance mission, aircrew risk death at the hand of the enemy. Regardless of the engagement’s nature, a combined air and 40 It refers to the reconnaissance mission and not the armed mission of RPAs, but the operational concept is one in the same.41 Reconnaissance missions do not directly hold enemy targets or individuals at risk. Armed RPAs absolutely hold the enemy at risk. Discussing differences of risk to combatants then likely invokes a follow-on comment of “what’s the difference from…?” 15 ground force attack or a solo air attack against an HVT/HVI, the “mortal combatants” are clearly and directly at risk while delivering lethal power in human-to-human interactive combat. While tactically similar, the combatants share risk on a common and immediate battlefield. This diminishes compelling or legitimate cases for an enemy’s strategy of retribution attacks beyond the direct area of conflict.

**Biopower Add on**

Drones entrench biopolitical control and destroy the value of life

Graham 06

STEPHEN GRAHAM,  Centre for the Study of Cities and Regions, Department of Geography, University of Durham, Cities and the 'War on Terror'nWiley interscience [International Journal of Urban and Regional Research](http://www3.interscience.wiley.com/journal/118511932/home) [Volume 30, Issue 2](http://www3.interscience.wiley.com/journal/118603045/issue), Pages 255-276

Crucially, however, **this very integration of geographically distanced urban sites through military techno-science is being done in a manner which actually hard-wires highly divisive judgements of people's right to life within the 'war on terror' into hard, military systems of control, targeting and,** sometimes, **(attempted) killing. These systems**, very literally, enable, reinforce and inscribe the geopolitical, biopolitical and urban architectures of US Empire, with their stark judgements of the value — or lack of value — of the urban subjects and human lives under scrutiny within an integrated and all-encompassing 'battlespace'. In US cities, as we saw in this article's first discussion, this scrutiny is aimed at separating out, for extra-legal processing or incarceration, those deemed 'terrorists' and their sympathizers from legitimized and valorized US citizens warranted protection and value. In the 'targeted' Arab cities just discussed, however, all human subjects are deemed to warrant no rights or protections. In such cities, the exposure of human subjects within the unified 'battlespace' is, as we shall soon discuss, being combined with the development of new, high-tech weapons systems. These threaten to emerge as automated systems dealing out continuous violence and death to those deemed by computerized sensors to be 'targets', with little or no human supervision.  

Bio-politics have led to the bloodiest wars and genocides in history

Elden**,** Lecturer in politics at the University of Warwick, England, 2002 Stuart, boundary 2 - Volume 29, Number 1, page project muse

It is worth thinking this through in a little more detail. As Foucault notes, "Never have wars been so bloody as they have been since the nineteenth century, and all things being equal, never before did regimes visit such holocausts on their own populations" (*VS*, 179; *WK*, 135–36). He suggests that the modern formidable power of death is the counterpart of a power that administers life through precise controls and comprehensive regulations (*FDS*, 215; *VS*, 179–80; *WK*, 136). What happens is that politics becomes increasingly scientific: medical and mathematical. There is a discipline of the individual body—an *anatomo-politics*—and a regulation of the social body—a bio-politics of the population or human species (*FDS*, 216; *VS*, 183; *WK*, 139). Bio-power involves the builing up of profiles, statistical measures, and so on, increasing knowledge through monitoring and surveillance, extremely meticulous orderings of space, and control through discipline. Birth and death rates and measures of longevity become important; fertility, illness, diet, and habitation become measured; statistics and demographics come together with economics and politics (*FDS*, 215–16; see also *VS*, 36; *WK*, 25). This use of figures is pronounced in medical campaigns at the time (*FDS*, 217). This notion of calculation is both a particular case and the foundation of the more general science of ordering. As Foucault notes, "The body is a bio-political reality; medicine is a bio-political strategy" (*DE*, 3:210).

**At: Drone use in other countries**

1. Our advantages are specific to launches of drones in and from Afghanistan and the Turse evidence says drones are based in Afghanistan
2. Afghanistan is critical, because the world is watching what we do there

**Defrank 09**

Democrats whack President Obama over his

Afghanistan plan [Thomas M. Defrank](http://www.nydailynews.com/authors/Thomas%20M.%20Defrank) DAILY NEWS WASHINGTON BUREAU CHIEF http://www.nydailynews.com/news/politics/2009/11/30/2009-11-30\_dems\_whack\_bam\_over\_plan.html "

The whole world is watching what we're doing there," Graham said. "We'll be evaluated by some pretty tough characters in the world as to how we handle Afghanistan. This is not just any place on the planet."

1. Afghanistan is the testing ground for advanced UAV technologies

Lake 09

Darren Lake, Editor - Unmanned Vehicles Mystery UAV operating in Afghanistan April 10, 2009 <http://www.shephard.co.uk/news/2393/mystery-uav-operating-in-afghanistan/> d.a. 7-25-10

Afghanistan maybe the testing ground for a new, advanced but as yet undisclosed UCAV programme. Pictures shown exclusively to Unmanned Vehicles magazine and taken at an airbase in the war-torn country reveal a large flying wing-type design, adopted by UCAV designers, but not yet seen on an operational type. The image shown in the link below has been drawn directly from the photograph but none of the experts consulted by UV had any concrete idea of what the system might be. The image shown to UV was taken from a long distance, as the aircraft taxied in on a hazy day, but the image was clear enough to show that this UAV’s design is like no other UAV in current operational service.

1. **Afghanistan is the test ground for drone technologies**

Rozoff 10

Rick Rozoff is an author and geopolitical analyst Decade Of The Drone: America’s Aerial Assassins <http://www.voltairenet.org/article164422.html>. D.a. 7-25-10

**Using the AfPak battlefield as a testing ground, the U.S. industrial-military complex has fine-tuned the most sophisticated high-tech weapon of the 21st century and has elevated warfare to the highest levels of cynicism.** Operated through a screen from half a world away, unmanned drones slaughter indiscriminately great swaths **of the civilian population while keeping U.S. lives safe.**

1. Afghanistan is the key test case of robotic technology

Buchbinder 02

David Buchbinder is an analyst for Human Rights Watch, Special to The Christian Science Monitor / July 31, 2002 In Afghanistan, a new robosoldier goes to war The 'war on terror' is a testing ground for new technology <http://www.csmonitor.com/2002/0731/p01s03-usmi.html> d.a. 7-25-10

But for the US military, Fester is no laughing matter; he's among the vanguard in a new type of warfare. In fact, the Afghan theater has been a testing ground for a variety of futuristic technologies. Sitting in the broiling sun, US Army Col. Bruce Jette, the head of the robotics team, is both triumphant and apologetic: "Today is the first time conventional forces have ever employed robots in a wartime environment." Afghanistan is the key to drone use in other countries Levi 10 David Levi, Portland, ME July 6th, 2010 New York Times blog d.a. 7-25-10 http://community.nytimes.com/comments/ideas.blogs.nytimes.com/2010/07/06/afghanistan-a-regional-proxy-war/ The occupation of Afghanistan is many things, though it is not a war. It is an excuse to funnel billions of tax payer dollars into the weapons industry, which has been the largest heavy industry in the US since WWII. It is a testing ground for new military technologies (like drones) which will increasingly be brought online elsewhere (i.e. Yemen) and perhaps, ultimately, at home, especially as this unsustainable system continues to collapse.

1. **Drones have been shifted from other commands to Afghanistan**

Burghardt 10

Tom Burghardt is an acclaimed author, incisive investigator and leading scholar of the emerging technology in the defense and security industries.  His book, Police State America: U.S. Military 'Civil Disturbance' Planning published by AK press established him as one of the world's leading authorities on the national security state May 3rd, 2010 d.a. 7-25-10

High-Tech Death from Above: U.S. Drone Wars Fuel War Crimes <http://dissidentvoice.org/2010/05/high-tech-death-from-above-u-s-drone-wars-fuel-war-crimes/> Judging by proverbial “facts on the ground,” they’ll need it. The [World Socialist Web Site](http://www.wsws.org/articles/2010/may2010/afgh-m01.shtml) disclosed May 1, that a “semi-annual report released by the Pentagon on the Afghanistan war recorded a sharp increase in attacks on occupation troops and scarce support for the corrupt US-backed puppet regime of President Hamid Karzai.” Despite Obama’s dispatch of 35,000 troops since his inauguration as imperial Consul, socialist critic Bill Van Auken writes that the congressionally-mandated progress report “presented a grim picture of the state of the nearly nine-year-old, US-led war,” and that “the country’s so-called insurgents considered 2009 their ‘most successful year’.” That the drone wars will escalate is underscored by a piece in [Air Force Times](http://www.airforcetimes.com/news/2010/05/defense_uavs_centcom_050110/). Writing May 1, an anonymous correspondent reports that Marine Corps Brig. Gen. Glenn Walters, the deputy director for resources and acquisition for the Pentagon’s Joint Staff, said “the U.S. military has sent so many of its 6,500 UAVs to the Middle East that other operating theaters are going without.” Speaking April 28 at an Institute for Defense and Government Advancement ([IDGA](http://www.uavevent.com/Event.aspx?id=253502)) conference in northern Virginia, Walters said that Obama’s Afghanistan “surge” has stripped other Pentagon commands of drones and that it “will likely be a year before U.S. planners have a better handle on how many UAVs will be needed there and how many can be spared for use outside of the Middle East.”

1. **The plan mandates the elimination of drones in Afghanistan which means we destroy the drones so they can’t be shifted elsewhere.**

**At: drones good**

The release of classified documents reveal that claims that drones are effective are false

Chivers 7-25-10

Inside the Fog of War: Reports From the Ground in Afghanistan C. J. Chivers, Carlotta Gall, Andrew W. Lehren, Mark Mazzetti, Jane Perlez, and Eric Schmitt, New York Times reporters NYT http://www.nytimes.com/2010/07/26/world/asia/26warlogs.html d.a. 7-26-10

A six-year archive of **classified military documents made public** on Sunday offers an unvarnished, ground-level picture of the war in Afghanistan that is in many respects more grim than the official portrayal. The secret documents, released on the Internet by an organization called WikiLeaks, are a daily diary of an American-led force often starved for resources and attention as it struggled against an insurgency that grew larger, better coordinated and more deadly each year. The New York Times, the British newspaper The Guardian and the German magazine Der Spiegel were given access to the voluminous records several weeks ago on the condition that they not report on the material before Sunday. The documents — some 92,000 reports spanning parts of two administrations from January 2004 through December 2009 — illustrate in mosaic detail why, after the United States has spent almost $300 billion on the war in Afghanistan, the [Taliban](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/organizations/t/taliban/index.html?inline=nyt-org) are stronger than at any time since 2001. As the new American commander in Afghanistan, Gen. [David H. Petraeus](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/p/david_h_petraeus/index.html?inline=nyt-per), tries to reverse the lagging war effort, the documents sketch a war hamstrung by an Afghan government, police force and army of questionable loyalty and competence, and by a Pakistani military that appears at best uncooperative and at worst to work from the shadows as an unspoken ally of the very insurgent forces the American-led coalition is trying to defeat. The material comes to light as Congress and the public grow increasingly skeptical of the deepening involvement in Afghanistan and its chances for success as next year’s deadline to begin withdrawing troops looms. The archive is a vivid reminder that the Afghan conflict until recently was a second-class war, with money, troops and attention lavished on Iraq while soldiers and [Marines](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/organizations/m/us_marine_corps/index.html?inline=nyt-org) lamented that the Afghans they were training were not being paid. The reports — usually spare summaries but sometimes detailed narratives — shed light on some elements of the war that have been largely hidden from the public eye: • The Taliban have used portable heat-seeking missiles against allied aircraft, a fact that has not been publicly disclosed by the military. This type of weapon helped the Afghan mujahedeen defeat the Soviet occupation in the 1980s. • Secret commando units like Task Force 373 — a classified group of Army and Navy special operatives — work from a “capture/kill list” of about 70 top insurgent commanders. These missions, which have been stepped up under the Obama administration, claim notable successes, but have sometimes gone wrong, killing civilians and stoking Afghan resentment. • The military employs more and more [drone aircraft](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/u/unmanned_aerial_vehicles/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier) to survey the battlefield and strike targets in Afghanistan, although their performance is less impressive than officially portrayed. Some crash or collide, forcing American troops to undertake risky retrieval missions before the Taliban can claim the drone’s weaponry.

**Even the CIA has conceded that the drone strikes are counterproductive**

Nevins 10

Sean, reporter for Real News Network <http://www.therealnews.com/t2/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=31&Itemid=74&jumival=5383&updaterx=2010-07-14+18%3A12%3A53> d.a. 7-26-10

**According to** Jeffrey Addicott, a retired US Army colonel and former legal advisor to the US Special Forces, it is President Obama who is pushing the drone program, not the CIA. Apparently, the president likes the program because it gives clear results that can be easily measured as evidence of the US's determination to thwart al-Qaeda and other militant groups. Recently, however, it has come to light that many CIA officials intimately involved with the drone strikes in Pakistan oppose the program because it is used to help recruit militants and simply isn't working. In fact, 2009 saw a record high of 87 suicide attacks, killing 1,300 people and wounding over 3,600 more. Indeed, the New America Foundation, a think tank based in Washington, DC, has calculated that drone strikes have a civilian fatality rate of 32 percent and are responsible for creating the intense anti-American atmosphere within Pakistan Drones strikes from Afghanistan create massive political backlash in Pakistan and the strikes fail

Burghardt 10

Tom Burghardt is an acclaimed author, incisive investigator and leading scholar of the emerging technology in the defense and security industries.  His book, Police State America: U.S. Military 'Civil Disturbance' Planning published by AK press established him as one of the world's leading authorities on the national security state May 3rd, 2010 d.a. 7-25-10 High-Tech Death from Above: U.S. Drone Wars Fuel War Crimes <http://dissidentvoice.org/2010/05/high-tech-death-from-above-u-s-drone-wars-fuel-war-crimes/>

But with civilian deaths spiking, the robot reign of terror has sparked widespread opposition across all political sectors in Pakistan, from far-right Islamist factions to the [socialist left](http://links.org.au/node/1385). While Pentagon and CIA officials claim that civilian deaths are “regrettable,” an unintended consequence of America’s global imperial project, facts on the ground tell a different tale. Last year, investigative journalist Amir Mir reported in Lahore’s English-language newspaper, [The News](http://www.thenews.com.pk/top_story_detail.asp?Id=21440), that of 60 “cross-border predator strikes carried out by the Afghanistan-based American drones in Pakistan between January 14, 2006 and April 8, 2009, only 10 were able to hit their actual targets, killing 14 wanted al-Qaeda leaders, besides perishing 687 innocent Pakistani civilians. The success percentage of the US predator strikes thus comes to not more than six per cent.” According to Mir, the “drone attacks went wrong due to faulty intelligence information, killing hundreds of innocent civilians, including women and children.” The Pentagon and CIA dispute these figures. In February however, Mir [disclosed](http://www.thenews.com.pk/daily_detail.asp?id=221847) that Afghanistan-based Predator drones “carried out a record number of 12 deadly missile strikes in the tribal areas of Pakistan in January 2010, of which 10 went wrong and failed to hit their targets, killing 123 innocent Pakistanis. The remaining two successful drone strikes killed three al-Qaeda leaders, wanted by the Americans.” According to the journalist, the spike in drone assaults indicated that “revenge is the major motive for these attacks,” and can be “attributed to December 30, 2009 suicide bombing in the Khost area of Afghanistan bordering North Waziristan, which killed seven CIA agents. US officials later identified the bomber as Humam Khalil Abu Mulal al-Balawi, a Jordanian national linked to both al-Qaeda and the Tehrik-e-Taliban Pakistan (TTP).” In other words, the slaughter of 123 civilians was viewed by the CIA and Pentagon as a splendid means “to avenge the loss of the seven CIA agents and to raise morale of its forces in Afghanistan.”

Military claims that drones can be operated effectively are false

Zucchina 10 David Zucchino, Pullitzer prize winning national correspondent for the Los Angeles Times <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2010/07/07/us-drones-suffer-from-hum_n_637767.html> d.a. 7-25-10

Reporting from Kandahar, Afghanistan -- The U.S. military often portrays its drone aircraft as high-tech marvels that can be operated seamlessly from thousands of miles away. But Pentagon accident reports reveal that the pilotless aircraft suffer from frequent system failures, computer glitches and human error. Design and system problems were never fully addressed in the haste to push the fragile plane into combat over Afghanistan shortly after the Sept. 11 attacks more than eight years ago. Air Force investigators continue to cite pilot mistakes, coordination snafus, software failures, outdated technology and inadequate flight manuals.

**AT: Consult Pakistan**

**Pakistan says no --The govt supports the drone strikes**

Siddiqui 10

Tayyab Siddiqui- former Pakistani Ambassador Pakistan’s drone dilemma <http://www.dawn.com/wps/wcm/connect/dawn-content-library/dawn/news/pakistan/04-drone-dilemma-qs-03> 7-18-10 d.a. 7-25-10

US media reports have, however, repeatedly alleged that the drone attacks have tacit understanding and approval of military authorities in Pakistan. Pakistan’s ambassador to the US indirectly confirmed this, in a press briefing on July 2: “Pakistan has never said that we do not like the elimination of terrorists through predator drones.” This duplicity primarily stems from the public reaction to Islamabad’s acquiescence to the drone attacks. T

The Pakistan govt would say no to the c-plan because the strikes are in a region of opposition forces—they would call for more strikes

Mahadevan 10

Prem Mahadevan Center for Strategic Studies THE MILITARY UTILITY OF DRONES <http://kms1.isn.ethz.ch/serviceengine/Files/ISN/118844/ipublicationdocument_singledocument/6b2f708d-2657-4df1-9b9c-d840cf0627dc/en/CSS_Analysis_78.pdf>. D.a. 7-26-10

Finally, although drones are depicted as undermining Pakistani sovereignty, **the fact remains that Islamabad is happy to countenance their use. 80 % of drone strikes have been concentrated in the Waziristan region, which constitutes the home base of the Pakistani Taliban, a group opposed to Islamabad. Although publicly, Pakistani officials denounce these strikes, in private some officials criticise their American counterparts for not carry­ing out more strikes**.

The govt privately supports the drone strikes and would say no to the plan

Gul 10 Imtiaz Gul heads the Center for Research and Security Studies, Islamabad <http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=128332426> d.a. 7-26-10

Others object not to the drones, but to Pakistani public opinion on their use. For instance, Ayaz Ameer, an analyst-turned-politician, and an MP from the opposition Pakistan Muslim League-N, said at a recent conference hosted by my Islamabad think tank that Pakistani officials take two contradictory positions on drone strikes: publicly condemning them while endorsing them privately. Chriss Rogers, research fellow at Campaign for Innocent Victims in Conflict (CIVIC), [said at the forum](http://www.thenews.com.pk/daily_detail.asp?id=248176), "Since Pakistan formally never raised the issue at any international forum nor did it formally and officially issue statement against it, there seemed to be a tacit understanding between the United States and Pakistan over it." Turn, the govt saying no would accelerate the case impacts—the Pakistani govt would become the target of blame for not reversing the policy causing attacks on the govt and risking a coup in Pakistan

Turn, The plan solves the net benefit Drone attacks are gutting U.S. Pakistan relations

Jones 10

Bill Jones, an analyst with the Executive Intelligence Review from Washington. <http://www.presstv.ir/detail.aspx?id=132927> d.a. 7-25-10 <

**Jones:** I think the drone attacks in particular have served to make the relationship with Pakistan, which is very important, very much unstable. Every time you go with a drone to kill individuals whether they be terrorists you get collateral damage, with or without a nod from Islamabad, this is going to cause a lot of problems for the government in Pakistan and that is some thing you do not want to do. You have to be able to cooperate with them if you are going to deal with a problem that is existing on area which they theoretically control, and that has been damaged.

**At: Drones in Pakistan**

1. Drones are no longer allowed to operate out of Pakistan—The data for their authors claims is a google maps image from 06 – it is no longer true

Page 09

Jeremy Page, reporter from New Delhi [The Australian](http://www.theaustralian.com.au/) February 20, 2009

<http://www.theaustralian.com.au/news/google-shows-secret-cia-drone-flights/story-e6frg6t6-1111118905799>

THE US was secretly flying unmanned drones from the Shamsi airbase in Pakistan's southwestern province of Baluchistan as early as 2006, according to an image of the base from Google Earth. The image, which is no longer on the site but which **was obtained by The News, Pakistan's English language daily newspaper,** shows what appear to be three **Predator** drones **outside** a hangar at the end of the runway. The image, whose co-ordinates confirm that it is the Shamsi airfield, also known as Bandari, about 320km southwest of the Pakistani city of Quetta. Reports this week revealed the CIA, despite denials from Washington and Islamabad, was secretly using Shamsi to launch the Predator drones that observe and attack al-Qa'ida and Taliban militants around Pakistan's border with Afghanistan. US special forces used the airbase during the invasion of Afghanistan in 2001, but the Pakistani Government said in 2006 that the Americans had left and both sides have since denied repeatedly that Washington was using Pakistani bases. Pakistan has also demanded that the US cease drone attacks on its tribal area, which have increased over the past year, allegedly killing several "high-value" targets as well as many civilians.

1. Any drones in Pakistan are rescue drones and are prohibited from any offensive military strikes

Khan 09

HABIBULLAH KHAN and NICK SCHIFRIN ABC reporters ISLAMABAD, Pakistan, Feb. 23, 2009

Allegations That CIA Predator Drones Have Bases in Pakistan

U.S. Claims Only Surveillance Drones Are Based in Pakistan, Not Deadly Predators <http://abcnews.go.com/International/story?id=6938365&page=1> d.a. 7-27-10

In 2006, the Pakistani government claimed American personnel had left the base. But Google Earth satellite images **initially obtained by the Pakistani newspaper The News** seem to show three drones parked in the Shamsi airstrip as recently as 2006. A recent Google Earth satellite image shows an air strip with additional buildings created since 2006, but no drones. Drones are also landing and taking off from the Shahbaz air field, located in Jacobabad, about 300 miles north of Karachi, the intelligence official said. It too was used by American forces after 9/11. "Under the terms of an agreement with Pakistan, the allied forces can use these bases for search and rescue missions, but are not permitted to use them to stage attacks on Taliban targets," according to GlobalSecurity.org, a public policy group in Alexandria, Va.

Khan 09

HABIBULLAH KHAN and NICK SCHIFRIN ABC reporters ISLAMABAD, Pakistan, Feb. 23, 2009

Allegations That CIA Predator Drones Have Bases in Pakistan

U.S. Claims Only Surveillance Drones Are Based in Pakistan, Not Deadly Predators <http://abcnews.go.com/International/story?id=6938365&page=1> d.a. 7-27-10

But the United States has told Pakistan the drones using Pakistani bases are surveillance drones, according to Pakistani intelligence and diplomatic officials, and not the [Predator drones](http://blogs.abcnews.com/worldview/2008/11/zardari-to-cent.html) that launch missiles into the tribal areas in a campaign targeting al Qaeda leaders.

1. We would still solve—the U.S. could not launch the massive attacks we launch from Afghanistan with the thousands of drones we have stationed there – the fact that 3 drones were once spotted in Pakistan does not mean they could launch massive raids.
2. No shift—the plan mandates the elimination of the drones which means we would destroy the drones in Afghanistan—they could not be shifted to Pakistan
3. Doesn’t assume the plan—in a world where the U.S. had publicly renounced the drones it would be politically impossible for either the U.S. or the Pakistan government to authorize a massive new campaign from within Pakistan or anywhere else.

Drones is the right term for the plan

**The term drones is good**

Mahadevan 10

Prem Mahadevan Center for Strategic Studies THE MILITARY UTILITY OF DRONES <http://kms1.isn.ethz.ch/serviceengine/Files/ISN/118844/ipublicationdocument_singledocument/6b2f708d-2657-4df1-9b9c-d840cf0627dc/en/CSS_Analysis_78.pdf>. D.a. 7-26-10

The term “drone” refers to all unmanned powered aircraft which can be used repeat­edly (unlike missiles). These are variously known in technical jargon as Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (UAVs), Remotely Piloted Vehicles (RPVs) or Remotely Operated Aircrafts (ROAs). There are three types of drones: strategic, operational, and tactical.

At: Renounce extra topical

1. Renouncing is contextually a way to reduce

Korten 09

. David C. Author, Lecturer The Great Turning: Epic Passage <http://www.davidkorten.org/node/116> d.a. 7-26-10

Reduce aggregate consumption, which means renouncing economic growth and obsessive over consumption as our defining economic priority in favor of meeting real human needs, including needs for dignity, community and meaningful work

Mason 09

John, professor at Penn State University and has taught in both the Management Division and the Engineering Division CIT's Debt Issues Show Why the Economy Won't Be Picking Up Any Time Soon

[http://seekingalpha.com/article/148730-cit-s-debt-issues-show-why-the-economy-won-t-be-picking-up-any-time-soon. d.a](http://seekingalpha.com/article/148730-cit-s-debt-issues-show-why-the-economy-won-t-be-picking-up-any-time-soon.%20d.a). 7-27-10

There are three ways for economic units to reduce debt. The first is to sell assets and pay off the debt. However, if people are uncertain about asset values this solution to the debt problem is not going to work. Second, economic units can save out of income and revenues and pay down their debt. This, of course, is the soundest way to de-leverage, but it is also the slowest way to reduce the debt on a balance sheet. The third way to reduce debt is to renounce the debt: that is, declare bankruptcy. This solution does have repercussions, however, on the value of the assets of other people and other businesses.

Dallery 90

Allery Ph.D.Yale, Associate Professor Bryn Mahr College Crises in continental philosophy - Google Books

In his study of Stefan George’s poem “Das Wort”, Heidegger states “renouncing means: to give up the claim to something, to deny oneself something.

2. Renouncing is a way of reducing that includes rejecting rather than simply removing.

Supreme Court of Mississippi 03

Woodfield v. Woodfield www.mssc.state.ms.us/Images/Opinions/CO44397.pdf

The term renounce means to “give up or abandon formally a right or interest; to disclaim” Blacks Law Dictionary 1299 (7th ed. 1999) while the term withdrawal means “the act of taking back or away, removal.” Id at 1595.

3. Doesn’t take away negative ground but actually protects their ground—It means we commit to a rejection of using drones in Afghanistan—that ensures the negative link ground and prevents us from claiming to increase drone presence in the future—It commits the aff to a permanent reduction.

4. Not a voting issue—If you decide renounce is extratopical you would just strike it from the plan—it would not be a reason to vote negative

5. Extratopical provisions are ok in plans—they expand negative ground and the negative could always counterplan with any extratopical plan parts.

AT: Midterms

Gridlock will trigger economic regulation through executive order

Monk 10

[Linda R. Monk, J.D.](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/linda-r-monk-jd) Constitutional scholar,

<http://www.huffingtonpost.com/linda-r-monk-jd/did-al-qaeda-trigger-the_b_441825.html>.

That gives President Obama a very persuasive rationale -- national security -- for immediately enacting financial reform. If legislation continues to prove difficult, the president could issue a temporary freeze on derivatives by executive order. For those who still believe that unfettered markets can do no wrong, the unregulated intersection between banks and betting might be seen as too soft a target for terrorists. Economic security and national security are inextricably linked.

Gridlock would push Obama to use Executive Orders to push his regulatory economic agenda which would access their internal link to markets

Nemana 10

<http://nyulocal.com/national/2010/02/22/more-executive-power-is-a-good-thing/>.

[National](http://nyulocal.com/national/) - by [Vivekananda Nemana](http://nyulocal.com/author/vivek-nemana/) on Monday, February 22, 2010

More Executive Power Is A Good Thing

President Obama is making plans to expand his use of executive power, as [reported](http://www.nytimes.com/2010/02/13/us/politics/13obama.html?scp=1&sq=Obama%20Executive%20Power&st=Search) last week by the New York Times. The decision comes in response to the loss of the Democratic super-majority in the Senate and to the dark cloud of filibustering that now looms ominously ahead. Obama has so far been [issuing](http://washingtontimes.com/news/2010/feb/19/obama-lags-behind-peers-on-executive-orders/) executive orders at a slower pace than presidents before him, but that’s likely to change—for the better. By now we all have our criticisms of the Obama administration. But the singularly most common complaint about Obama is that he isn’t “doing anything” (not saying that it’s true, just saying that’s what the perception is). You could certainly argue that he hasn’t done a good enough job organizing the Democrats, but considering how legislation welters in Congress these days, even before the Democrats lost the super-majority, the lack of progress can’t entirely be credited to the Obama administration’s failings. Signs of increased executive authority are already beginning to show. Last week the Senate cleared 27 stalled nominations for presidential appointments after Obama threatened successfully to appoint them himself during the Senate recess, something known as (ahem) “recess appointment power.” The administration is also laying the foundation for a bipartisan budget commission (which sounds potentially ill-fated to me considering the increasing pressure on Republicans to shun bipartisanship) and making plans to ease the rule against gays in the military, instead of waiting for Congress to get around to repealing it. And the EPA is working on regulations on greenhouse gases as the cap and trade bill mucks around in the Senate. Obama does need to proceed with caution, considering how he criticized both Clinton and Bush’s use of executive power; the former for wasting it on trivial pursuits and the latter for abusing it to pull stunts like secret wiretapping. But done properly, Obama’s use of executive power could be extremely successful. John B. Judis [argued](http://www.tnr.com/article/politics/the-quiet-revolution) in a The New Republic article earlier this month that Obama’s most significant accomplishment last year was reinvigorating regulatory agencies such as the EPA and the SEC—the so-called “fourth branch of government.” I completely agree with Judis. Obama not only increased the budget of some of the severely under funded agencies (don’t worry, a “large” budget for a regulatory agency is a drop in federal spending), but he also replenished their progressive ideals by appointing actual scientists with policy experience to top positions (the Republicans chose hacks). This is a perfect example of what the Obama administration is capable of when working independently of Congress. I’m not in favor of Congress being circumvented entirely, but when you have a stubborn opposition that childishly refuses to compromise for anything and a fair amount of chaos within your own party (along with a declining approval rating because of your apparent inability to get anything done) then it makes sense to roll up your sleeves and put things to work yourself. By acting strategically the administration could not only directly accomplish more tasks on its agenda, but also persuade Congress to act quicker with its own legislation. More legislation would improve approval ratings among those who say the government isn’t doing anything, which would both be good for this year’s elections and perhaps even encourage bipartisanship (and more legislative progress!) from Republicans from moderate areas.

No public perception—they don’t know anything about the drone program

Payne 09

Michael, author and foreign policy analyst Deadly Drones: Immoral Weapons of Civilian Destruction <http://www.opednews.com/articles/Deadly-drones-immoral-wea-by-michael-payne-091021-444.html>

Most of America is still not aware of the rapidly escalating program for using these WCD's in the war on Al-Qaeda and the Taliban. But more and more writers are spreading the word about the use of these highly sophisticated drones, the Predator and the more heavily armed Reaper. The Air Force is said to have 200 drones in Afghanistan and Pakistan, with many more being manufactured.

The public and democratic base are not mobilized against drone strikes—There are no political consequences to doing drone strikes

Hentoff 7-25-10

Nat Hentoff is a nationally renowned authority on the First Amendment and the Bill of Rights and author of many books, including "The War on the Bill of Rights and the Gathering Resistance." <http://www.wnd.com/index.php?fa=PAGE.view&pageId=184581>.

When I broke into news reporting during the 1950s, the advice from veteran journalists was: "Kid, if a story is important, stay with it, even if few other reporters do." Since news of our pilotless killer drones hurling more Hellfire missiles abroad has largely vanished from our press, here is more evidence of President Obama's fixation on this dark side of our war on terrorism.

An impressive exception to the inattention to Obama's favorite weapon is investigative reporter Adam Entous of Reuters. In "How the White House learned to love the drone" (May 18), he quotes two administration officials (who, of course, refused to be named) saying that killing wanted terrorists is simply "easier than capturing them."

In a previous column, I quoted another U.S. intelligence officer in Yemen saying the same thing. Particularly revealing is Entous' conversation with another intelligence official who confidently pointed out that this long-distance way of avoiding American combat deaths is "politically foolproof" for Obama because political campaigners of both parties compete "on who can kill more" of the jihadists.

Fearing no reprisals from American public opinion, Entous reports that, contrary to the administration's claim that only high-level terrorists researched are targeted, "the CIA has killed around 12 times more low-level fighters than mid-to-high-level al-Qaida and Taliban leaders since the drone strikes intensified in the summer of 2008."

Turn—Drone Strikes are popular with both the Democratic and Republican Bases—The plan would mobilize Republicans and demobilize Democrats

Considine 10

Craig Considine research assistant for Ambassador Akbar S. Ahmed at The American University's School of International Service in Washington, DC [Obama: Continuing Bush’s War Crimes with Drone Bombing Campaign](http://www.worldcantwait.net/index.php/features-mainmenu-220/the-war-of-terror/6248-obama-continuing-bushs-war-crimes-with-drone-bombing-campaign) 4-1-10 [Obama: Continuing Bush’s War Crimes with Drone Bombing Campaign](http://www.worldcantwait.net/index.php/features-mainmenu-220/the-war-of-terror/6248-obama-continuing-bushs-war-crimes-with-drone-bombing-campaign)

<http://www.worldcantwait.net/index.php/home-mainmenu-289/6248-obama-continuing-bushs-war-crimes-with-drone-bombing-campaign>. D.a. 7-29-10

The drone campaign is, perhaps, one issue that both Democrats and Republicans can agree upon.  Republican Senator McCain and Independent, Republican-leaning Senator Lieberman recently hailed the drone campaign as ‘a critical element in our effort, our campaign, and our strategy to deny the terrorists who are terrorizing the people of Afghanistan and Pakistan’.  McCain has gone as far as claiming it is ‘part of an overall set of tactics which make up the strategy for victory’.   Would you expect anything else but this type of rhetoric and propaganda from those ‘leaders’ in Washington?   And how sad **it is** that one of the only issues Democrats and Republicans can agree upon is their own acts of terrorism!   Obama is taking the lazy route and ‘easy way out’ with his war in Afghanistan and Pakistan.  In his own blindness, he continues to assume that taking out one militant, even if the drone strike kills dozens of civilians, is a sign that the drone bombing campaign is working.  Instead of looking down the road at the future consequences of his own administration’s terrorist actions, Obama is using drones as quick fixes to short-term problems.    I guess short-term fixes is what any effective politician cares about anyways.  For Obama, the use of drones and the appearance that progress is being made is quite the sly way to try to boost his own approval rating.

Turn—The democratic base supports drone use in Afghanistan

Homes 10

[Cale Homes](http://answers.yahoo.com/my/profile?show=bUD8qagnaa) Why are the Democrats percieved as a left-wing party <http://answers.yahoo.com/question/index?qid=20100507175936AA3XzID> d.a. 7-29-10

Democrats support a cap and trade scheme which gives polluters permits and let them just go along with the market which would decide the best way to meet the cap and drive down the price of fossil fuel. This system isn't a concret strategy to stop climate change. And consumers will have to pay more. Most Democrats support the US hegemony through neoliberalism. DNC Chairman Howard Dean was talking about how we have to 'troop it out' in Afghanistan. He wants to kill and traumatize many American soldiers to support a corrupt regime and fuel occupation that fuels terrorism. Democrats also support drone usage in Afghanistan, Pakistan, Somalia, and Yemen.

Drones can not be used to rally the democratic base—There is no democratic opposition rallying against drones and they are perceived as a less costly way to fight

Callam 10

- **Andrew Callam** International Affairs Review [International Science and Technology](http://www.iar-gwu.org/taxonomy/term/17), [Security Policy](http://www.iar-gwu.org/taxonomy/term/20) Volume XVIII, No. 3: Winter 2010 d.a. 7-29-10 <http://www.iar-gwu.org/node/144>

The lack of attention paid to the legal issues and civilian casualties surrounding the CIA’s drone program underlies the general apathy of the American public towards drone warfare. This suggests that using drones instead of humans can lead to the perception of a “costless war.” The first reason for this is that these strikes occur away from American eyes. Journalists typically cannot enter areas where the drone strikes occur and, in the case of Baitullah Mehsud, the Taliban disrupted phone lines and set up defenses to prevent word of Mehsud’s death from leaking out. Very few videos or photographs of the drone strikes are available to the public, which isolates Americans from the damage these strikes can cause.

The second and more crucial reason for the perception of a “costless war” is the fact that waging a war with drones quite literally comes at no human costs to the United States. By their very nature, UAVs offer two advantages over manned aircraft: they are cheaper and eliminate the risk of a pilot’s life. The potential drawback of this is that, without men and women coming home in coffins, the American public is less likely to object to war and, in the words of New York Times columnist Roger Cohen, “going to war can become hard to distinguish from going to work.” The “costless war” erodes the political checks and accountability that are characteristic of waging war in a democratic society. Taking this argument to its logical extreme, removing costs from war could lead to an increased willingness to use force, essentially invalidating the premise of the democratic peace theory.

Turn- the Plan would be unpopular—The public loves drones because they perceive them as key to protecting American soldiers lives

NPR 10

July 17, 2010 <http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=128584729&ft=1&f=1014> d.a. 7-29-10

SIMON: Americans might like drones because they don't risk the lives of American soldiers or pilots. But we know a lot of people overseas don't like the image of a 24-year-old kid at some secret site in Nebraska steering a drone almost like hes playing a video game that delivers a bomb on their village.

Prof. RADSAN: It does seem that its not fair, that were not fighting in the same way with the same tools and arms, but I don't know that it goes very far in that sense. If we use a cruise missile - the Taliban don't have those. We have our technology. It is proper. The taxpayers would want us to use all the tools we have when were in a conflict and that conflict is supposed to serve the American interest.

What we should do is reassure the American people and the international public that this is not a video game, that the people that are operating these drones, they take it just as seriously as an F-16 pilot, that they understand that there are people that are being viewed in that screen; they need to comply with the laws that apply and they need to do something that makes sense as a part of our strategy.

Prof. OCONNELL: And, Scott, I would say that I am not at all against the use of technology that protects our soldiers, and Im with the American public on that entirely. But I do think a lot about not only the legal but the moral ramifications of the drone, the ability to kill from thousands of miles away, not just a mile or two away. And what is that doing to us a nation?

AT: Politics—political capital versions

No Link—The call to end strikes by General Kilcullen gives political cover top stopping them

Naimun 09

Robert, The Muslim Observor Stopping Pakistan Drone Strikes Suddenly Plausible

<http://muslimmedianetwork.com/mmn/?p=4043>. D.a. 7-29-10

Writing in The Los Angeles Times, Doyle McManus notes that counterinsurgency guru David Kilcullen has told Congress that US drone strikes in Pakistan are backfiring and should be stopped. Until now, Congress has been reluctant to challenge the drone strikes, as they are reluctant in general to challenge “military strategy,” even when it appears to be causing terrible harm. But as McManus notes, Kilcullen has unimpeachable Pentagon credentials. He served as a top adviser in Iraq to General Petraeus on counterinsurgency, and is credited as having helped design the Iraq “surge.” Now, anyone in Washington who wants to challenge the drone strikes has all the political cover they could reasonably expect.

AT: 44 countries already have drones

Other countries have not yet weaponized their drones—Now is the critical time to reject attack drones

Mahadevan 10

Prem Mahadevan Center for Strategic Studies THE MILITARY UTILITY OF DRONES <http://kms1.isn.ethz.ch/serviceengine/Files/ISN/118844/ipublicationdocument_singledocument/6b2f708d-2657-4df1-9b9c-d840cf0627dc/en/CSS_Analysis_78.pdf>. D.a. 7-26-10

At present, only the United States and Is­rael have demonstrated the capacity to manufacture attack drones. However, with more than 50 countries purchasing drones or building them indigenously, this is cer­tain to change. More doubtful is whether drone technology will be able to remain inexpensive while becoming more sophis­ticated. The experience of manned mili­tary aviation, where acquisition costs have risen with technological improvements, does not suggest that future drones will be cheap.

At: No Modeling

1. Their Anderson evidence feeds our advantage- it says other countries don’t model acquisition of drones and drones are inevitable—our argument is that other countries will model how we use drones—the plan sets a precedent for stopping the militarization of drones

Graham 10

Andy Graham on June 3, 2010 <http://uavc.mckeon.house.gov/2010/06/un-analyst-faults-us-drone-use.html>

Philip Alston, a New York University law professor who serves as the United Nations' special rapporteur on extrajudicial killings, made the comments Wednesday as he released a report on targeted killings. The report criticizes the U.S. for asserting "an ever-expanding entitlement for itself to target individuals across the globe" in its fight against Al Qaeda and other militant groups.   Alston acknowledged that the right to self-defense may justify drone strikes in Pakistan, where the planners of the Sept. 11 attacks are thought to have fled. But he questioned whether that right extended to other countries where links to the attacks are more remote, such as Yemen or Somalia. He urged the U.S. to be more open about the program.   He also expressed concern about the precedent set by the U.S. program. Many other countries are seeking drone technology and when they obtain it, they are likely to copy U.S. tactics, he said.

1. Experts agree how they are used will be modeled

CNN 10

CNN Wire Staff April 28, 2010 House subcommittee hearing questions legality of drone attacks <http://www.cnn.com/2010/POLITICS/04/28/drone.attack.hearing/index.html>.

William Banks, the founding director of Syracuse University's Institute for National Security and Counterterrorism, said the U.S. government has engaged in targeted killings of individual combatants dating at least back to a 1916 border war with Mexican bandits.

Banks said the authors of the 1947 National Security Act, which traditionally gives the CIA much of its legal authority, probably didn't contemplate the targeted killings tied to drone attacks. But the statute, he said, was "designed as dynamic authority to be shaped by practice and by necessity."

"The intelligence laws permit the president broad discretion to utilize the nation's intelligence agencies to carry out national security operations, implicitly including targeted killing," he said. U.S. laws "supply adequate -- albeit not well-articulated or understood -- legal authority for these drone strikes."

The American Civil Liberties Union sent a public letter to Obama on Wednesday that said the drone attacks are part of an illegal program authorized by the administration allowing suspected terrorists -- including Americans -- to be targeted and killed by U.S. operatives.

"The program you have reportedly endorsed is not simply illegal but also unwise, because how our country responds to the threat of terrorism will in large measure determine the rules that govern every nation's conduct in similar contexts," ACLU Executive Director Anthony Romero said.

"If the United States claims the authority to use lethal force against suspected enemies of the U.S. anywhere in the world -- using unmanned drones or other means -- then other countries will regard that conduct as justified. The prospect of foreign governments hunting and killing their enemies within our borders or those of our allies is abhorrent."

1. Their evidence doesn’t assume the U.S. renounces use. The McGrath ev in the 1ac says other countries are looking to follow the U.S. lead

**Modeling Extension cards**

Other countries will model how we use UAV’s

Dreyfuss 10

[Robert Dreyfuss](http://www.thenation.com/authors/robert-dreyfuss) is a Nation contributing editor, is an investigative journalist in Alexandria, Virginia, specializing in politics and national security UN Slams US Drone Killings <http://www.thenation.com/blog/un-slams-us-drone-killings>. D.a. 7-29-10

Drop what you’re doing and take half an hour to read [the report by Philip Alston](http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/hrcouncil/docs/14session/A.HRC.14.24.Add6.pdf), the UN’s special rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary, or arbitrary executions, on the implications of the U.S.-sponsored drone attacks in Pakistan, Afghanistan, and around the world. It’s a stunning indictment of how the United States is flouting the rule of law and setting a precedent that could lead, in Alston’s view, to a world in which nations willy-nilly use drone technology to kill anywhere, anywhere, they care to.   Which is what the United States is doing.   The report also cites killings by Russia and Israel, among other countries, but the United States is far and away the principal culprit.

Graham 10

Andy Graham on June 3, 2010 <http://uavc.mckeon.house.gov/2010/06/un-analyst-faults-us-drone-use.html>

"The United States is committed to following international legal standards," said Rep. John Tierney, D-Massachusetts, the subcommittee's chairman. "Our interpretation of how these standards apply to the use of unmanned weapons systems will set an example for other nations to follow."

Agence France Press 10

CIA Drones Claim 'License to Kill' with Impunity: UN Expert

[http://www.commondreams.org/headline/2010/06/02-8 d.a. 7-29-10](http://www.commondreams.org/headline/2010/06/02-8%20d.a.%207-29-10)

In a report to the UN Human Rights Council, Philip Alston, the special rapporteur on extrajudicial executions, warned that the "prolific" US use of targeted killings, mainly by unmanned aircraft, was setting a damaging example that other countries would follow.

"I?m particularly concerned that the United States seems oblivious to this fact when it asserts an ever-expanding entitlement for itself to target individuals across the globe," he told the 47-member council.