1AC

Observation (1) Inherency.

The United States has made Afghanistan the focal point for a global drone war. Afghanistan is the basing location for drone strikes around the world

Turse 10

*Nick Turse is a fellow at New York University’s Center for the United States and the Cold War and the winner of a 2009 Ridenhour Prize for Reportorial Distinction* <http://nwoobserver.wordpress.com/2010/01/31/drone-surge-today-tomorrow-and-2047/> d.a. 7-27-10

The Air Force has created an interconnected global command-and-control system to carry out its robot war in Afghanistan (and as Noah Shachtman of Wired’s Danger Room blog [has reported](http://www.wired.com/dangerroom/2009/12/us-military-joins-cias-drone-war-in-pakistan/), to assist the CIA in its drone strikes in Pakistan **as well**).  Evidence of this can be found at high-tech U.S. bases around the world where drone pilots and other personnel control the planes themselves and the data streaming back from them.  These sites include a converted medical warehouse at Al-Udeid Air Base, a billion-dollar facility in the Persian Gulf nation of Qatar where the Air Force secretly oversees its on-going drone wars; Kandahar and Jalalabad Air Fields in Afghanistan, where the drones are physically based; the global operations center at Nevada’s [Creech Air Base](http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2009/05/08/60minutes/main5001439.shtml?tag=contentMain;contentBody), where the Air Force’s “pilots” fly drones by remote control from thousands of miles away; and -- perhaps most importantly -- at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, a 12-square-mile facility in Dayton, Ohio, named after the two local brothers who invented powered flight in 1903.  This is where the bills for the current drone surge -- as well as limited numbers of strikes in [Yemen](http://online.wsj.com/article/SB126332847649526553.html?mod=WSJ_WSJ_US_World) and Somalia -- come due and are, quite literally, paid.

Afghanistan is now ground zero of the drone war as U.S. has shifted its drones to Afghanistan from Iraq

Barnes 10

Julie, LA Times reporter U.S. Shifting Drone Focus to Taliban

http://2scottmontgomery.blogspot.com/2009/07/los-angeles-times-us-shifting-drones.html

But the Obama administration's primary military effort is now clearly Afghanistan. And a senior Defense official said Central Command, which has operational control over both wars, made its moves to shift Predator drones in consultation with McChrystal and the commander in Iraq, Army Gen. Ray Odierno. In addition to the drones, Army Gen. David H. Petraeus, the head of Central Command, has ordered combat engineer units, road-clearance teams, helicopters and other equipment to move from Iraq to Afghanistan. The military also plans to increase the number of U2 flights. The advanced camera on the U2 is useful in spotting locations where roadside bombs have been placed, but only if the planes fly over the same area every 24 hours. In addition, all of the Air Force's unmanned Global Hawks are going to be shifted to Afghanistan, officials said.

Thousands of drones are being surged into Afghanistan

Press TV noted in 10

US deploys 1000s drones in Afghanistan

<http://www.presstv.ir/detail.aspx?id=125382&sectionid=351020403> d.a. 7-27-10

The US is deploying thousands of drones in Afghanistan, raising suspicions as to whether the move is aimed at monitoring militants or targeting another country**.** Regional defense analysts believe that the unmanned aerial vehicles could be brought into play against regional countries in the wake of mounting tensions with Iran over its nuclear activities, the *Pakistan Observer* newspaper reported on Tuesday. Deputy Director for Resources and Acquisition for the Pentagon's Joint Staff, Marine Corps Brig. Gen. Glenn Walters, recently said **that** the American military has sent a host of its 6,500 drones to the Middle East region.

The surge in Afghanistan has made it the focus of militarized drone activities

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.”

The surge is substantial—The military impact of the drones dwarfs the impact of the ground troop surge

Turse 10

*Nick Turse is a fellow at New York University’s Center for the United States and the Cold War and the winner of a 2009 Ridenhour Prize for Reportorial Distinction* <http://nwoobserver.wordpress.com/2010/01/31/drone-surge-today-tomorrow-and-2047/> d.a. 7-27-10

What were once unacknowledged, relatively infrequent targeted killings of suspected militants or terrorists in the George W Bush years have become commonplace under the Barack Obama administration. And since a devastating December 30 suicide attack by a Jordanian double agent on a Central Intelligence Agency forward operating base in Afghanistan, unmanned aerial drones have been hunting humans in the AfPak war zone at a record pace**.** In Pakistan, an “unprecedented number” of strikes – which have killed armed guerrillas and civilians alike – have led to more fear, anger and outrage in the tribal areas, as the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), with help from the United States Air Force, wages the most public “secret” war of modern times. In neighboring Afghanistan, unmanned aircraft, for years in short supply and tasked primarily with surveillance missions, have increasingly been used to assassinate suspected militants as part of an aerial surge that has significantly outpaced the highly publicized “surge” of ground forces now underway. And yet, unprecedented as it may be in size and scope, the present **ramping up of** the drone war is only the opening salvo in a planned 40-year Pentagon surge to create fleets of ultra-advanced, heavily-armed, increasingly autonomous, all-seeing, hypersonic unmanned aerial systems **(UAS). Today’s** surge Drones are the hot weapons of the moment and the upcoming Quadrennial Defense Review – a soon-to-be-released four-year outline of Department of Defense strategies, capabilities and priorities to fight current wars and counter future threats – is already known to reflect this focus. As the Washington Post recently reported, “The pilotless drones used for surveillance and attack missions in Afghanistan and Pakistan are a priority, with the goals of speeding up the purchase of new Reaper drones and expanding Predator and Reaper drone flights through

Plan

The United States federal government should renounce and eliminate the presence of militarized drones in Afghanistan.

Advantage I-- The Loitering Presence

**Drones create a unique military presence in the air that cannot be provided by any other aircraft because of their ability to loiter and strike**

Deutscher 10

Nadav Deutscher  Defense Professional News 5-12-10

<http://www.defpro.com/news/details/15172/> d.a. 7-22-10

Looking ahead to the future, Maj. Gen. Nechushtan spoke of the function of the Air Force's Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (UAV), saying that they do not replace other air operations, but rather represent a complementary force: "UAVs belong to a whole aerial niche which did not exist before, because they enable new capabilities on the battlefield. **Planes in general do not remain on the battlefield**; they go and come back, and to that end they need very precise planning, as opposed to ground forces that go to the field and only then finalize operational plans. **UAVs work in a different way – they go to the battlefield and spend a lot of time there.** They can help and accomplish a lot in both air and ground missions".  **"UAVs allow us presence in the air,** and this is a revolution that the Air Force is entering by using them. This is expressed when considering the total flight hours of the IAF during Operation Cast Lead, where UAVs made up for about half of the total flight hours. Their contribution to the battlefield is considerableand they constitute a complementary and crucial tool to the IAF", he added.

Drones contextually increase our military presence because they give us a permanent above ground presence

Space Express 06

http://www.spacewar.com/reports/Boeing\_Demonstrates\_UAV\_Automated\_Aerial\_Refueling\_Capability\_999.html

St. Louis MO (SPX) Nov 28, 2006

The Boeing Automated Aerial Refueling (AAR) program successfully completed flight tests in August that demonstrated for the first time an unmanned air vehicle's ability to autonomously maintain a steady refueling station behind a tanker aircraft. "With autonomous air refueling capabilities, unmanned aircraft will have greater combat radius and loiter time," said David Riley, Boeing Phantom Works AAR program manager.

"This can enable a quicker response for time-critical targets and will reduce the need for forward-staging refueling areas. Another benefit is increased in-theater military presence with fewer military assets."

The military presence is based on the ability to loiter in surveillance mode and strike at will

Callam 10

Andrew, Research Assistant [United States Institute of Peace](http://www.linkedin.com/companies/united-states-institute-of-peace?trk=ppro_cprof&lnk=vw_cprofile)

Drone Wars: Armed Unmanned Aerial Vehicles Volume XVIII, No. 3: Winter 2010

International QAffairs Review <http://www.iar-gwu.org/node/144>

While the U.S. military employs a wide variety of UAVs, there are only three currently in use with offensive capabilities: the MQ-1 Predator, the MQ-1C Sky Warrior, and the MQ-9 Reaper, all three built by General Atomics. The Predator, the most commonly used drone in the American arsenal, can loiter at 25,000 feet for nearly 40 hours, and is equipped with two Hellfire missiles and two cameras—one infrared and one regular—that can read a license plate from two miles up. The Army’s Sky Warrior is a slightly larger version of the Predator that can fly slightly higher, loiter for a shorter amount of time, and carry two more missiles than the Predator. The Reaper, also known as the Predator B, is the largest and most powerful of the three drone models. The Reaper can fly at twice the altitude and speed of the Predator and can carry eight Hellfire missiles or four missiles and two laser-guided bombs. It also carries an improved camera and software package that can “recognize and categorize humans and human-made objects,” such as improvised explosive devices. Although the Defense Department’s 2011 budget doubles spending on the Reaper, the Predator will remain the primary UAV in use.

The distancing built into this loiter and strike military presence creates space for surveillance and destruction that devalue 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

In the 'target' cities and spaces of the Middle East, on the other hand, Huber and Mills stress that superficially similar, automated systems of sensing and surveillance must also be seamlessly integrated into the high-tech US military machine. Rather than pinpointing and reducing threats, however, the purpose of these systems is to continuously and automatically project death and destruction to pinpointed locations in the cities and spaces that have discursively been constructed as targets for US military power in the 'war on terror'. 'We really do want an Orwellian future', they write, 'not in Manhattan, but in Kabul' (ibid.: 29). Their prognosis is stark and dualistic. It renders the ideology of 'New Normalcy' and the Pentagon's 'long war' into a binaried splitting of geography overlain by, and facilitated through, globe-spanning US military sensor and targeting systems. 'Terrorist wars will continue, in one form or another, for as long as we live', they write: We are destined to fight a never-ending succession of micro-scale battles, which will require us to spread military resources across vast expanses of empty land and penetrate deep into the shadows of lives lived at the margins of human existence. Their conscripts dwell in those expanses and shadows. Our soldiers don't, and can't for any extended period of time. What we have instead is micro-scale technology that is both smarter and more expendable than their fanatics, that is more easily concealed and more mobile, that requires no food and sleep, and that can endure even harsher conditions (ibid.: 29). Saturating adversary cities and territories with millions of 'loitering' surveillance and targeting devices, intimately linked into global and 'network-centric' surveillance and targeting systems, thus becomes the invisible and unreported shadow of the high-profile, technologically similar 'homeland' security systems erected within and between the cities of the US mainland. To Huber and Mills, the United State's 'longer-term objective must be to infiltrate their homelands electronically, to the point where we can listen to and track anything that moves', where the 'their' refers to the 'terrorists' inhabiting the targeted cities (ibid.: 30). Then, when purported 'targets' are detected, US forces: can then project destructive power precisely, judiciously, and from a safe distance week after week, year after year, for as long as may be necessary. . . . Properly deployed at home, as they can be, these technologies of freedom will guarantee the physical security on which all our civil liberties ultimately depend. Properly deployed abroad, they will destroy privacy everywhere we need to destroy it . . . At home and abroad, it will end up as their sons against our silicon. Our silicon will win (ibid.: 31–34).     Technophiliac unveilings of 'homeland' and 'target' cities Strikingly, in Huber and Mills's scenario, political judgements about the (lack of) value of human life in the demonized cities and spaces that have been so powerfully (re)constructed in 'war on terror' discourses, is actually maintained and policed through automated surveillance and killing systems. For here the apparent disposability of life in such 'target' cities is maintained continuously by the ongoing presence of Unmanned Combat Aerial Vehicles (or UCAVs) armed with 'Hellfire' missiles. These weapons can be launched at short notice, sometimes from operators sited at transoceanic distances, once the surveillance webs that saturate the 'target cities' detect some notional 'target'. Far from being some fanciful military futurology from Huber and Mills' technophiliac fantasies, then, these principles are actually directly shaping the design of new US military systems which are already under development or even deployment as part of the new Pentagon strategy of 'long war' in which the number of unmanned and armed drones is to be more than doubled by 2010 ([US Department of Defense, 2006](http://www3.interscience.wiley.com/cgi-bin/fulltext/118603050/main.html,ftx_abs#b79)). Thus, on the one hand, as already mentioned, the cities and urban corridors within US national borders are being wired up with a large range of automated sensors which are designed to detect and locate a whole spectrum of potentially 'terrorist' threats. On the other, the Pentagon's research and development outfit, DARPA (the Defense Applications Research and Projects Agency), is now developing the sorts of large-scale, 'loitering' surveillance grids to try and 'unveil' the supposedly impenetrable and labyrinthine landscapes of closely built Middle Eastern cities. In a new programme tellingly titled Combat Zones That See (or CTS), [DARPA (2003](http://www3.interscience.wiley.com/cgi-bin/fulltext/118603050/main.html,ftx_abs#b15)) is developing systems of micro-cameras and sensors that can be scattered discretely across built urban landscapes and that automatically scan millions of vehicles and human faces for 'known targets' and record any event deemed to be 'unusual'. 'The ability to track vehicles across extended distances is the key to providing actionable intelligence for military operations in urban terrain', the brief for the programme argues. 'Combat Zones that See will advance the state of the art for multiple-camera video tracking to the point where expected tracking length reaches city-sized distances' ([DARPA, 2003](http://www3.interscience.wiley.com/cgi-bin/fulltext/118603050/main.html,ftx_abs#b15)). Befitting the definition of Middle Eastern 'target' cities within US military doctrine as zones where human life warrants little protection or ornamentation, 'actionable' here is most likely to be translated in practice — Israeli style — as automated or near-automated aerial attempts at killing the 'targeted' person(s). Because urban density in target cities is seen to render 'stand-off sensing from airborne and space-borne platforms ineffective' (ibid.), CTS' main role will be to hold even targets within densely urbanized spaces continuously 'at risk' from near-instant targeting and destruction from weapons guided by the Global Positioning System. In US military jargon this is termed 'compressing the kill chain'— a process which 'closes the time delay between sensor and shooter' to an extent that brings 'persistent area dominance' (or PAD) even over and within dense megacities like Baghdad ([Hebert, 2003](http://www3.interscience.wiley.com/cgi-bin/fulltext/118603050/main.html,ftx_abs#b40): 36).

Drones deployed to sustain a presence over the “other” construct Afghanistan as a permanent target that entrenches racist colonization and violence

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

Importantly, then, this complex of discourses and representations — themselves the product of increasingly militarized popular and political cultures — work, on the one hand, to problematize urban cosmopolitanism in 'homeland cities' and, on the other, to essentialize and reify the social ecologies of 'target' cities in profoundly racist ways. From such symbolic violence real violence only too easily follows. Second, this article has demonstrated that the production of this highly charged dialectic — the forging of exclusionary, nationalist, imagined communities and the Othering of both those deemed 'terroristic' within US cities and whole swathes of our urbanizing planet — has been a fundamental prerequisite for the legitimization of the entire 'war on terror'. The truly striking thing here is how such fundamentalist and racist constructions of urban place have their almost exact shadow in the charged representations of cities routinely disseminated by fundamentalist Islamist networks like al-Qaeda ([Zulaika, 2003](http://www3.interscience.wiley.com/cgi-bin/fulltext/118603050/main.html,ftx_abs" \l "b20)). Here, however, the 'targets' are the 'infidel', 'Christian' or 'Zionist' cities of the West or Israel. The theological mandate is invoked from a different source. And the sentimentalized cities and spaces of the Islamic 'homeland' are to be violently 'purified' of 'Western' presence in order to forcibly create a transnational Islamic space or umma which systematically excludes all diversity and Otherness through continuous, murderous force. The real tragedy of the 'war on terror', then, is that it has closely paralleled al-Qaeda in invoking homogeneous and profoundly exclusionary notions of 'community' as a way of legitimizing massive violence against innocent civilians. Strikingly, the strategies and discourses of both the Bush administration and al-Qaeda have both been based on charged, and mutually reinforcing, dialectics and imaginative geographies of place construction. Both have relied heavily on promulgating hyper-masculine notions of (asymmetric) war, invocations of some absolute theological mandate, and absolutist notions of violence to finally exterminate the enemy without limits in space or time. Both have also relied heavily on the use of transnational media systems to repeatedly project good versus evil rhetorics and spectacles of victimhood, demonization, dehumanization and revenge ([Gilroy, 2003](http://www3.interscience.wiley.com/cgi-bin/fulltext/118603050/main.html,ftx_abs#b25); [Zulaika, 2003](http://www3.interscience.wiley.com/cgi-bin/fulltext/118603050/main.html,ftx_abs#b20); [Boal et al., 2005](http://www3.interscience.wiley.com/cgi-bin/fulltext/118603050/main.html,ftx_abs#b9)). Third, the reliance of the 'war on terror's' imaginative geographies on projections of absolute difference, distance and disconnection are overlaid by, and potentially usurped through, the manifold flows and connections that link urban life in Arab cities intimately to urban life in the cosmopolitan urban centers of the USA. The binaried urban and global imaginative geographies underpinning the 'war on terror' are inevitably undermined by such contradictions as rapidly as they are projected. Thus, a revivified Orientalism is used to remake imaginative geographies of 'inside' and 'outside', just as a wide range of processes demonstrate how incendiary such binaries now are. On the one hand, the construction of 'homeland cities' as endlessly vulnerable spaces open without warning to an almost infinite range of technologized threats, actually works to underline the necessary integration of US and Western cities into the manifold flows and processes that sustain the rescaling political economies and state processes of neoliberal globalization. Similarly, the attempt to discursively demarcate the everyday urban life of US citizens from Arab ones denies the transnational and increasingly globalized geographies of media flow, migration, mobility, neocolonial governance, resource geopolitics, social repression and incarceration, and the predatory capital flows surrounding neoliberal 'reconstruction' that, paradoxically, are serving to connect US cities ever more closely with Arab cities. Thus — especially in the more cosmopolitan cities of the US — the representations and discourses stressing disconnection and difference analysed in this article are continuously contradicted by the proliferation of moments and processes involving connection, linkage and similarity. Many of these, of course, are shaped by the geographies of 'accumulation by dispossession' ([Harvey, 2003](http://www3.interscience.wiley.com/cgi-bin/fulltext/118603050/main.html,ftx_abs#b39)), 'primitive accumulation' ([Boal et al., 2005](http://www3.interscience.wiley.com/cgi-bin/fulltext/118603050/main.html,ftx_abs" \l "b9)), and resource wars, that so dominate the neoconservative geopolitical strategy of the Bush Administration ([Harvey, 2003](http://www3.interscience.wiley.com/cgi-bin/fulltext/118603050/main.html,ftx_abs#b39); [Boal et al., 2005](http://www3.interscience.wiley.com/cgi-bin/fulltext/118603050/main.html,ftx_abs#b9)). A key task, then, is to understand how the urban imaginative geographies and military technologies considered here help to constitute broader territorial configurations of a hyper-militarized US Empire ([Kipfer and Goonewardena, 2005](http://www3.interscience.wiley.com/cgi-bin/fulltext/118603050/main.html,ftx_abs" \l "b51)). A critical question emerges here for further research: how might the various acts of urban denial, erasure, securitization, targeting and 'reconstruction' that are so foundational to the 'war on terror' help to constitute and sustain the US empire's changing territorial colonial configurations, core-periphery geographies and economic dynamics? Our final conclusion derives from this article's third focus: the treatment of US and Arab cities within emerging US military technology for 'persistent surveillance'. Here, we see colonial military technologies and militarized urban planning practices emerging which stress the connection and integration of cities within both the US and in targeted nations within a single, urbanizing 'battlespace'. Such examples remind us that — whilst usually ignored — military geographies and technologies are actually themselves key drivers of neoliberal globalization ([Shamar and Kumar, 2003](http://www3.interscience.wiley.com/cgi-bin/fulltext/118603050/main.html,ftx_abs" \l "b74)). They also underline that, throughout the history of empires, military, social control **and planning innovations, tried and** tested in 'colonized' cities, have been used as exemplars on which to try and re-model practices of attempted social control in cities of the 'homeland' **([Misselwitz and Weizman, 2003](http://www3.interscience.wiley.com/cgi-bin/fulltext/118603050/main.html,ftx_abs" \l "b57)). It should be no surprise, however, that** an ultimate 'colonial splitting of reality' lurks within this **apparent,** technologized **(albeit** highly militarized) integration. Here the colonialist imaginative geographies are being hard-wired into code, servers, surveillance complexes and increasingly automated weapons systems. For the ways in which judgements about the value of the human subjects are being embedded into the high-tech war-fighting, surveillance, and software systems now being developed to expose all urban citizens to scrutiny, in both US and Arab cities, could not be more different. In 'homeland' cities, to be sure, there is a radical ratcheting-up of surveillance and (attempted) social control, the endless 'terror talk', highly problematic clampdowns, the 'hardening' of urban 'targets', and potentially indefinite incarcerations, sometimes within extra-legal or extra-territorial camps, for those people deemed to display the signifiers of real or 'dormant' terrorists. In the 'targeted' urban spaces of worlds within Barnett's 'non-integrating gap', meanwhile, weapons systems are currently being designed which are emerging as systems of automated, continuous (attempted) assassination. Here, chillingly, software code is being invested with the sovereign power to kill. Such systems are being brought into being within legal and geographical states of exception that are now increasingly being normalized and universalized as global strategy. This trend is backed by neoconservative ideologies and geopolitical scripts. These justify continuous, pre-emptive US military aggression against sources of 'terrorism' as a central platform of Dick Cheney's 'New Normalcy', or the Pentagon's 'long war'. Such a strategy is also being fuelled by the great temptation, in the light of the horrors of street fighting during the Iraq insurgency, and the 2000+ US military dead, for the US state and military to deploy autonomous and robotized US weapons against purported enemies who are always likely to remain all-too human ([Graham, 2006b](http://www3.interscience.wiley.com/cgi-bin/fulltext/118603050/main.html,ftx_abs#b31)). 'The enemy, are they going to give up blood and guts to kill machines?' wondered Gordon Johnson, head of a US army robot weapons team, in 2003. 'I'm guessing not' (cited in [Lawlor, 2004](http://www3.interscience.wiley.com/cgi-bin/fulltext/118603050/main.html,ftx_abs#b53): 3). The main worry here is that these systems will be deployed stealthily by the US state to 'loiter' more or less permanently above and within cities and regions deemed to be the 'war on terror's' main targets. They might then produce realms of automated, stealthy and continuous violence. Let loose from both the spatial and temporal limits, and the legal norms, of war, as traditionally understood (i.e. in its declared and demarcated state-vs-state guises), this violence is likely to largely escape the selective and capricious gaze of mainstream Western media (see [Blackmore, 2005](http://www3.interscience.wiley.com/cgi-bin/fulltext/118603050/main.html,ftx_abs#b8)). This shift to robotized war, and militaristic paradigms which see cities as mere battlespace, and their inhabitants as mere targets, is far from uncontested. Even within the US military **— especially the infantry in the US Army —** many are deeply sceptical of any military 'silver bullets' emerging from the think tanks, research complexes and weapons manufacturers of the US military-industrial-entertainment complex. Nonetheless**, the latest 2006 Pentagon Defense Review suggests that** the widespread deployment of autonomous, armed drones across large swathes of our urbanizing world is already being planned and undertaken**.** The links explored here between urban imaginative geographies, high-tech weaponry, and the urbanizing geopolitics of insurgency against the transnational colonial and military power of the US empire, thus look set to deepen further.

Warfighting through drones creates a process of dehumanization that makes war and extinction inevitable

Lafferty 09

Patrick Lafferty Combat Without Cognizance - or Murder by Joystick? April 7, 2009 <http://www.opednews.com/populum/print_friendly.php?p=12803>. D.a. 7-25-10

What needs to be said here is war and conflict regardless of means is tragic, heartbreaking and often criminal. There is a distinction to made between the technique of Operation Cast Lead and the use of Drones. If we must as a species continue to kill each other for any reason under the Military, LOAC and RoE, I think we should continue to operate with face to face annihilation of our supposed enemies. The use of UCAV’s may seem to some as a means to prevent the death of ones forces or manpower, but it leaves the personal intercourse, witnesses, testimonies, human reaction that may avoid a deadly encounter and most important accountability.

Who bears the responsibility for an autonomous attack when things go wrong? Can a computer determine proportional response? Can the computer mimick humanity? Can this technology weigh casualties against advantage anticipated? Can an autonomous system differentiate between unnecessary suffering or injury? Sanitizing and dehumanizing these factors will open the doors to what I believe will be unspeakable disregard for humanity and the necessary processes of distinction.

I apologize to the families who have lost love ones but I stand fast on this point. If you enlist to fight for your country, you enlist to kill for your country and you risk dying for your country as well. How you deal with these in your time of service are what will progress our hopeful enlightenment to an end to war and armed conflict and an avoidance of assured mutual destruction.

It is foolish for the public to be aghast at the tragedies such as Israel’s possible crimes or the matter of Lt. Calley in the Mei Lei massacre in Vietnam. It is the harsh realities and bitter pills that we must swallow until we address the real issues of leadership, our military agendas, the industrial military corporations and the men who wear the star clad shoulder bars and ribbons, for they are the ones who back and support the technology of killing without faces, without feeling and without accountability. This is a**nother** slippery slope that if we do not consider the inevitable desensitizing effect of this kind of combat and the long war mentality, then powers behind the creations of these conflicts will be happy to run drone and joystick wars **in the backrooms of their stores** for years to come **while ringing their cash registers.**

Advantage II. Pashtun Blowback

Militarized drone attacks in and from Afghanistan risk blowback against the United States

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

Air force operators control the drones from locations such as Creech Air Force Base, in the vicinity of Las Vegas, Nevada. The other program is operated by the C.I.A. and is designed to hunt down terrorists in various regions of the world. **The C.I.A. drones use air bases in Afghanistan under the guidance of controllers located in Langley, Virginia.** Since he assumed the office of the U.S. presidency, President Obama has authorized many drone strikes in both Afghanistan and Pakistan. These strikes have targeted and killed any number of important Al-Qaeda and Taliban leaders to be sure. But in doing so they have also killed several hundred innocent civilians; men, women and children. Jane Mayer reports in the New Yorker, "Seems like President Barack Obama ��" Nobel Peace Laureate - has taken his predecessor's predator drone program and jacked it up with steroids. The New Yorker's Jane Mayer reports this week that the number of Obama-authorized strikes in Pakistan equals the sum launched by the Bush Administration -- in the last three years of his tenure. Wow. And the Republicans were worried that he wouldn't be "man" enough". Who says he hasn't done anything? President Obama and the military leaders see this new generation of weaponry as a very effective tool in the so-called War on Terror. But it is very difficult to understand why they cannot comprehend the massive blowback will come from enraged villagers who will become insurgents to get revenge. There is much evidence that for every drone strike that results in killing innocent civilians the insurgent forces are able to recruit scores of new recruits to aid their cause. There are reports that the drone war is bringing in hundreds of recruits from other nations in the region who are reacting to the carnage. This appears to be one of those situations in which the use of napalm, white phosphorus weapons and Agent Orange in the Vietnam War enraged the population and resulted in a tremendous blowback. At that time, our military was under the impression that such shock and awe administered on the nation of Vietnam would bring them to their knees. In fact, the result was exactly the opposite when, after 58,000 U.S. troops lost their lives, our military was forced to quickly exit that war when Saigon fell to the Viet Cong in 1975.

Since the drones are “piloted” from the U.S. they create a risk of retaliatory counter strikes against the U.S. itself

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

Aided by rapid technological advances, operators of Remotely Piloted Aircraft (RPA) can now carry out lethal combat actions from perceived safe sanctuaries in the United States (U.S.), 7,500 miles from the enemy. However, this thesis challenges the U.S. assumption that such tactical successes using armed RPAs to engage the enemy with “risk-less distant warfare” will result in strategic victory. This is particularly true when used to engage the enemy outside of direct force-on-force engagements. The very nature of this use negates America’s own goal of decreasing the threat to its civilian populace from enduring enemy counter action. The enduring threat will grow from a deficient U.S. assessment of the environment in which the enemy’s ability to attract support for its historically based strategy is aided by instantaneous and ubiquitous global interconnectivity. The lack of clarity in legal, moral, and ethical policies guiding the employment of such robotic warfare highlights the current strategic misstep by prolonging the Long War from increased anti-U.S. sentiment and an enduring legitimate counter attack threat to RPA operators. The persistent threat will not only hold the operators at risk, but also those around them in suburban America.

Drone attacks operated from the U.S. will justify strikes against the U.S. and the risks are linear
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Leaders in the RPA community voice concerns of a risk to attacks. The U.S. Air Force Director of Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance Innovations commented that, “We are taking very seriously in the United States the notion of insurgency teams coming surreptitiously in the states and trying to attack our bases.”104Such warnings have not prompted policy changes to RPA employment. The analysis is also deficient, as military bases pose a greater challenge to attack than a suburban home. The enemy and unfortunately many around the world would likely view an attack in suburban America against RPA operators as justified by a comparison to the U.S. targeting of individuals outside of direct force-on-force combat action. The reported expansion of the use of armed RPAs over the past year in current conflicts illuminates additional strategic concerns. While officially acknowledged use of RPA strikes dates back to 2002, the most alarming expansion may not be the actual reported use, but more so in the prolific world-wide reporting and discussion of their use in Congressional testimony and mainstream media. A 60-Minutes special aired in May, 2009 clearly outlines the operational concept of RPA employment. 105 Again a feature story in the March, 2010 Popular Mechanics magazine details the operations and insights to the future.106The incredible growing quantity of unofficial or alleged reports of attacks in areas outside of coalition force-on-force engagements should also be of great concern in the expansion of robotic warfare. By now it is crystal clear around the world, who, where, and how the U.S. operationally employs this distant lethal weapon. Reported RPA strikes in the future, fully corroborated or not, will continue to lead enemies to assume operators 7,500 miles or more from the point of death conducted the “risk-less” attacks. That assumption greatly increases the reality of risk to enemy counter attacks being held by combatants and those around them on U.S. soil. Recent “interpretive guidance” offered by the International Committee of the Red Cross and arguments by U.S. lawyers attempt to classify non-state militants and terrorists into the Westphalian definitions of “combatant” and further to justify actions against them.107 These attempts lend justification for the U.S. and others to authorize RPA operator attacks on individuals outside of direct force-on-force combat, but in doing so may unwittingly unravel a strategy that seeks to minimize long term attack on home soil. In a not so complimentary irony, these clarifications potentially open the door to the international eye viewing these enemy counter attacks on U.S. soil as legitimate combatant versus combatant actions and would be tantamount to a great reversal of strategy. However, in a great “Catch-22,” the failure to classify and justify the actors and actions of 21 stCentury conflict risks the targeted killings by RPA operators being viewed as illegal acts of war. Regardless of these debates’ outcome, RPA warfare will continue to gain the front line press and scrutiny it deserves. Reminiscent of enduring thoughts of the nuclear age, any hopes of completely “putting the genie back in the bottle” are false. The risk to RPA operators will increase with every Hellfire missile fired or bomb dropped that is not in direct support of force-on-force combat. The risk unfortunately will not be theirs alone to hold when they most vulnerable during breaks between “combat.” Unless the U.S. engages in decisive action soon, the allure of technological prowess that spurred a rush to embrace tactical success as a key to strategic victory, will instead begin to weaken its own desired strategic outcome.

Unlike normal military operations, drones create a unique risk of retaliation against the U.S. homeland—The risk outweigh any benefits to operating the drones
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Expanding “risk-less or risk-free” capabilities to the battlefield became a stated goal of the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) of 2001. 48 This direction from Congress and the events of 9/11 expedited the era of the 7,500 mile “risk-less” and perceived immortal combatant to the battlefield. The first claimed U.S. use of an RPA assisting in an HVI strike in Afghanistan occurred in November, 2001.49 The strike assisted Navy F/A-18 fighters in successfully killing the highest ranking violent extremist group member in Afghanistan to date.50 Less than two months later, on February 12, History demonstrated that second order effects from “risk-less” attacks are clear. The third order effect did occur in a time and place away from the initial battlefield. The first enemy counter action was not on U.S. soil against non-combatants, but against military combatants in their naval vessel. The attacks on 9/11 were clearly against non-combatants in the eyes of the international community and law. Unlike the swift retaliation for 9/11, no retributive attacks for the USS Cole were conducted. 17 2002, Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld commented in a press conference on those new battlefield armed RPA weapon operations in Afghanistan. The overwhelming bulk of all activity in Afghanistan since the first U.S. forces went in have been basically under the control of the Central Command. And that's particularly true after the first month. The one exception has been the armed Predators -- I shouldn't say "the one exception." An exception has been the armed Predators, which are CIA-operated. It's just a historical fact that they were operating these things over recent years, and they were in Afghanistan prior to the involvement of CENTCOM.51 Daniel Benjamin and Steven Simon, both former members of the National Security Council, contend that George Tenet, the director of the CIA raised his objection in a Principals meeting on September 4, 2001 to the agency taking the lead in transforming the Predator reconnaissance platform to one capable of armed strikes.52 However, events seven days later likely resolved the impasse. With retribution on the mind of the U.S. and the 107th Congress signing Public Law 107-40 (Authorization for Use of Military Force) on September 18th, this tactical move made initial strategic sense. 53Fast removal of key extremist organization leaders responsible for the devastation was paramount. But few strategies are timeless and fewer survive in times of rapid change. Eight years later, RPAs are a true force multiplier ensuring tactical success when blended into the fog of direct force-on-force combat action. When applied to broad spectrum conflict, using RPAs for targeting outside of direct force-on-force action, especially against individuals, builds anything but a clear path to strategic success. Tactical success continues to cloud critical or more rounded assessments of the strategic implications in protracted global conflicts. The allure of tactics that appear to mitigate immediate risk might very well create greater risks to combatants and civilians on U.S. soil, as well as risk breaking legitimate U.S. strategy. Notwithstanding continued violent extremist organization rhetoric, history and Pashtun tribal code provide additional powerful reminders to realistic strategists of the duration of threat the U.S. faces. In the Long War, the strategic peril increases with every expanded use of RPAs as a perceived panacea for engaging a broad spectrum of HVT/HVIs. Particular concern of their use is warranted if leaders consider engaging a greater list of “kill or capture” individuals involved in support, but not direct combat action.54 Utilizing RPAs in “challenged access” areas of the world should magnify concerns, not alleviate them. In these areas, the “risk-less” tactical ease of an RPA strike may compel their use, but opens the U.S. to long term strategic challenges outweighing the short term gain. The U.S. must carefully consider the certain increases to second and third order effects before expanding or authorizing such strikes. Today, those debates are waged in press reports and blogs, but rarely are readily apparent dialogues engaged in by high level officials to mitigate these effects by resolving legal, moral or ethical issues. 55 Recognized counter-insurgency expert David Kilcullen and U.S. politicians already highlight an increase to second order effects and risks from RPA activity.56

Drone attacks in Afghanistan create a unique danger of retaliation against the U.S. homeland
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Century through perceived crusades today appears to resonate well in the extremist’s recruits. Those recruits susceptible to radicalization are inculcated to see retribution not only as necessary, but mandated.

The need for “revenge” is not historically unique to any one specific culture, but more pronounced and even prescribed by some. History is replete with examples of revenge fueled by fear as a means to compel a call to action and recruitment. In a second fatwa 18 issued in 1998 by a now well known extremist terrorist leader, fear is the theme.19 Historically inspired fear combined with the Pashtun tribal heritage and culture that spans the Afghanistan and Pakistan borders creates a virulent mix of revenge based enemy counter actions. A 2008 Naval Postgraduate School thesis on “The Evolution of Taliban” notes an intrinsic link between the Taliban and a predominantly Pashtun heritage. “While it would be incorrect to refer to the Taliban insurrection or resurrection as merely a Pashtun affair, it would not be far from the mark.”20

Pashtuns **also** hold a long tribal heritage predating Islam**.** Pashtuns are expected to live in accordance to Pashtunwali code. Violators of the code are subject to a Jirga (a tribal assembly of elders). Two key aspects of the code are nang (honor) and badal (revenge). 21 Nang refers to family honor and badal to the “revenge killing,” required to restore honor. The revenge “can be immediate or occur generations later if the family whose honor was violated is in a weak position at the time of infraction.”22

Both Sun Tzu’s advice to know one’s enemy and Churchill’s sage advice to explore history provide insight. The insight illuminates a threat of enduring revenge from enemy counter actions to current “risk-less” U.S. attacks. Accordingly, the U.S. must recognize the strategic dangers percolating from the expansion of remotely piloted aircraft kinetic power being applied to individual killings outside of direct force-on-force combat action. This is also more clearly pronounced when such strikes are against targets not perceived as clearly linked to imminent vital national interests.

If the U.S. does not provide the link, then not only will the enemy seek retribution, but fewer in the world may be compelled to partner with the U.S. to prevent those counter attacks. General McCrystal’s revised strategy for less kinetic operations in Afghanistan ground combat is clearly prudent based on history and the appreciation of immediate second order effects. The “distant risk-less warfare” provides an invitation for the enemy to bring the third order effects to U.S. soil. History and culture must inform over-all U.S. strategy, but an appreciation of the convergence of local and global environments further shapes and molds such strategy in the 21stcentury.

Ubiquitous Revolutions in Information

**This is the greatest risk of a nuclear or biological attack on the U.S.**

Bohon, 10

6/15 [Dave Bohon, Government Panel Predicts WMD Attack by 2013, New American, 6/ 15/10, http://www.thenewamerican.com/index.php/usnews/politics/3788-government-panel-predicts-wmd-attack-by-2013]

The official report from a blue-ribbon panel warns that terrorists with weapons of massive destruction (WMD) are likely to attack somewhere in the world in the next three years, and the United States could be a prime target. According to the Commission on the Prevention of Weapons of Mass Destruction Proliferation and Terrorism, the likelihood is high that by 2013 terrorists will use WMDs in an attack somewhere in the world, and while several nations with terrorist ties are now in a race to produce nuclear weapons, the commission’s report says that an attack using biological weapons is the more likely scenario, with potentially devastating consequences. Among its recommendations, the commission said it believes that “the U.S. government needs to move more aggressively to limit the proliferation of biological weapons and reduce the prospect of a bio-terror attack.” The commission, co-chaired by former U.S. Senators Bob Graham (D-Fla.) and Jim Talent (R-Mo.), originally reported its findings in December 2008. During a June 10 press conference to announce legislation aimed at addressing dangers from terrorism, members of the commission joined with members of the House Homeland Security Committee to address the commission’s findings. “The consequences of a biological attack are almost beyond comprehension,” said former Senator Graham. “It would be 9/11 times **ten or** a hundred in terms of the number of people who would be killed.**”** Noting the millions of Americans who died as a result of the epidemic flu virus of 1918, Graham predicted that a lab-generated biological agent in the hands of terrorists could prove far worse. “Today it is still in the laboratory,” **he said,** “but if it should get out and into the hands of scientists who knew how to use it for a violent purpose, we could have multiple times the 40 million people who were killed 100 years ago.” In December 2008, at the same time the commission presented its findings, former Director of National Intelligence Mike McConnell offered a similar assessment of the likelihood of a biological attack, telling a Harvard University audience, “With weapons of mass destruction that could result in the death of many people — chemical, biological, nuclear — we assess biological as the more likely,” adding that “it’s better than an even chance in the next five years that an attack by one of those weapons systems will be conducted in some place on the globe.” While emphasizing the likely scenario of a biological attack, the commission also warned of the danger that exists of nuclear attacks, **and** cited efforts by both Iran and North Korea to produce a nuclear weapon. It also **cited the specific danger that Pakistan poses to the United States**, warning that while the country is officially an ally of the United States, “**the next terrorist attack against the United States is likely to originate from within the Federally Administered Tribal Areas” of Pakistan**, which has been identified as a haven for terrorists. “**Were one to map terrorism and weapons of mass destruction today, all roads would intersect in Pakistan,**” the report stated. Said Graham, “We think time is not our ally,” warning that the United States “needs to move with a sense of urgency.”

The US will retaliate to a terror attack, causing extinction

Speice 06 [Patrick F., Jr. "Negligence and nuclear nonproliferation: eliminating the current liability barrier to bilateral U.S.-Russian nonproliferation assistance programs." William and Mary Law Review 47.4 (Feb 2006): 1427(59). Expanded Academic ASAP]

The potential consequences of the unchecked spread of nuclear knowledge and material to terrorist groups that seek to cause mass destruction in the United States are truly horrifying. A terrorist attack with a nuclear weapon would be devastating in terms of immediate human and economic losses. (49) Moreover, there would be immense political pressure in the United States to discover the perpetrators and retaliate with nuclear weapons, massively increasing the number of casualties and potentially **triggering** a full-scale nuclear conflict. (50) In addition to the threat posed by terrorists, leakage of nuclear knowledge and material from Russia will reduce the barriers that states with nuclear ambitions face and may trigger widespread proliferation of nuclear weapons. (51) This proliferation will increase the risk of nuclear attacks against the United States or its allies by hostile states, (52) as well as increase the likelihood that regional conflicts will draw in the United States and escalate to the use of nuclear weapons. (53)

Stopping drone attacks is key to solvency
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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**.**

An end to drone attacks solves
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As Pakistan spirals out of its grasp, the Obama administration is at last hearing criticism of drone attacks in the country. Influential military officials such as Col. David Kilcullen, a former adviser to Gen. David Petraeus in Iraq, have testified that, despite damaging the Taliban leadership and protecting United States pilots, the strategy is backfiring. The Taliban's recent gains come on the heels of President Barack Obama's intensification of remotely piloted air strikes-16 strikes in the first four months of 2009 compared with 36 in all of 2008.  
    The belated skepticism about drones is well placed but a halt is not enough. Only a permanent end to the strategy will win Pakistani hearts and minds back to their government and its US ally. They, like Afghans and Iraqis, are struck less by the strategy's futuristic qualities than by its uncanny echo of the past: Aerial counterinsurgency was invented in precisely these two regions -- Iraq and the Pakistani-Afghan borderland -- in the 1920s by the British.

Advantage III. Militarized Drone Prolif

We are at a critical moment--Unless the U.S. restrains the use of weaponized drones there will be a global proliferation of militarized drone technology leading to the globalization of death
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[America Detached from War: Bush's Pilotless Dream, Smoking Drones, and Other Strange Tales From the Crypt](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/tom-engelhardt/america-detached-from-war_b_624155.html)

Smoking Drones, not a single smoking drone is in sight. Now it's the United States whose UAVs are ever more powerfully weaponized.  It's the U.S. which is [developing](http://amconmag.com/article/2010/apr/01/00030/) a 22-ton tail-less drone 20 times larger than a Predator that can fly at Mach 7 and ([theoretically](http://www.wired.com/dangerroom/2009/11/can-killer-drones-land-on-carriers-like-human-top-guns/)) land on the pitching deck of an aircraft carrier.  It's the Pentagon which is planning to increase the funding of drone development by [700%](http://amconmag.com/article/2010/apr/01/00030/) over the next decade. Admittedly, there is a modest counter-narrative to all this enthusiasm for our robotic prowess, “precision,” and “valor.”  It involves legal types like Philip Alston, the United Nations special representative on extrajudicial executions.  He recently [issued](http://www.nytimes.com/2010/06/03/world/03drones.html) a 29-page report criticizing Washington’s “ever-expanding entitlement for itself to target individuals across the globe.”  Unless limits are put on such claims, and especially on the CIA’s drone war over Pakistan, he suggests, soon enough a plethora of states will follow in America’s footprints, attacking people in other lands “labeled as terrorists by one group or another.” Such mechanized, long-distance warfare, he also suggests, **will** breach what respect remains for the laws of war.  “Because operators are based thousands of miles away from the battlefield,” he wrote, “and undertake operations entirely through computer screens and remote audio-feed, there is a risk of developing a 'PlayStation' mentality to killing.” Similarly, the ACLU has [filed](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2010/03/24/drone-wars-without-any-ru_n_511056.html) a freedom of information lawsuit against the U.S. government, demanding that it “disclose the legal basis for its use of unmanned drones to conduct targeted killings overseas, as well as the ground rules regarding when, where, and against whom drone strikes can be authorized, and the number of civilian casualties they have caused.” But pay no mind to all this.  The arguments may be legally compelling, but not in Washington, which has mounted a half-hearted [claim](http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702303450704575159864237752180.html) of legitimate [“self-defense,”](http://www.wired.com/dangerroom/2010/03/drone-attacks-legit-self-defense-says-administration-lawyer/#more-23429) but senses that it’s already well past the point where legalities matter.  The die is cast, the money committed.  The momentum for drone war and yet more drone war is overwhelming.  It’s a done deal.  Drone war is, and will be, us. A Pilotless Military If there are zeitgeist moments for products, movie stars, and even politicians, then such moments can exist for weaponry as well.  The robotic drone is the Lady Gaga of this Pentagon moment.  It’s a moment that could, of course, [be presented](http://www.tomdispatch.com/post/175056/tom_engelhardt_terminator_planet) as an apocalyptic nightmare in the style of the Terminator movies (with the U.S. as the soul-crushing Skynet), or as a remarkable tale of how “networking technology is expanding a homefront that is increasingly relevant to day-to-day warfare” (as Christopher Drew [recently put it](http://www.nytimes.com/2010/06/08/technology/08homefront.html) in the New York Times).  It could be described as the arrival of a dystopian fantasy world of one-way slaughter verging on entertainment, or as the coming of a generation of homegrown video warriors who work “in camouflage uniforms, complete with combat boots, on open floors, with four computer monitors on each desk... and coffee and Red Bull help[ing] them get through the 12-hour shifts.” It could be presented as the ultimate in cowardice -- the killing of people in a world you know nothing about from thousands of miles away -- or (as Col. Mathewson would prefer) a new form of valor. The drones -- their use expanding exponentially, with ever newer generations on the drawing boards, and the planes even [heading for](http://www.theatlanticwire.com/opinions/view/opinion/Should-Drones-Be-Allowed-Across-US-Skies-3990) “the homeland” -- could certainly be considered a demon spawn of modern warfare, or (as is generally the case in the U.S.) a remarkable example of American technological ingenuity, a problem-solver of the first order at a time when [few American problems](http://www.commondreams.org/view/2010/06/21) seem capable of solution.  Thanks to our technological prowess, it’s claimed that we can now kill them, wherever they may be lurking, at absolutely no cost to ourselves, other than the odd [malfunctioning drone](http://www.aviationweek.com/aw/blogs/defense/index.jsp?plckController=Blog&plckBlogPage=BlogViewPost&newspaperUserId=27ec4a53-dcc8-42d0-bd3a-01329aef79a7&plckPostId=Blog%3a27ec4a53-dcc8-42d0-bd3a-01329aef79a7Post%3a32530e23-3fa1-4379-8f67-3f785feb01fd&plck).  Not that even all [CIA operatives](http://blogs.alternet.org/skeeterbitesreport/2010/06/08/cias-drone-attacks-in-pakistan-drawing-new-round-of-opposition-from-inside-cia/) involved in the drone wars agree with that one.  Some of them understand perfectly well that there’s a price to be paid. As it happens, the enthusiasm for drones is as much a fever dream as the one President Bush and his associates offered back in 2002, but it’s also distinctly us.  In fact, drone warfare fits the America of 2010 tighter than a glove.  With its consoles, [chat rooms](http://www.nytimes.com/2010/06/08/technology/08homefront.html), and “single shooter” death machines, it certainly fits the skills of a generation raised on the computer, Facebook, and video games.  That our valorous warriors, their day of battle done, can increasingly leave war behind and head home [to the barbecue](http://www.latimes.com/news/nation-and-world/la-fg-drone-crews21-2010feb21,0,2614633.story) (or, given American life, the foreclosure) also fits an American mood of the moment. The Air Force [“detachments”](http://www.nellis.af.mil/news/story.asp?id=123075622) that “manage” the drone war from places like Creech Air Force Base in Nevada are “detached” from war in a way that even an artillery unit significantly behind the battle lines or an American pilot in an F-16 over Afghanistan (who could, at least, experience engine failure) isn’t.  If the drone presents the most extreme version thus far of the detachment of human beings from the battlefield (on only one side, of course) and so launches a basic redefinition of what war is all about, it also catches something important about the American way of war. After all, while this country garrisons the world, invests its wealth in its military, and fights [unending, unwinnable frontier wars](http://www.tomdispatch.com/blog/175261/tomgram%3A_engelhardt%2C_washington_drunk_on_war/) and skirmishes, most Americans are remarkably detached from all this.  If anything, since Vietnam when an increasingly rebellious citizens’ army proved disastrous for Washington’s global aims, such detachment has been the goal of American war-making. As a start, with no draft and so no citizen’s army, war and the toll it takes is now the professional business of a tiny percentage of Americans (and their families).  It occurs thousands of miles away and, in the Bush years, also became a heavily privatized, for-profit activity.  As Pratap Chatterjee [reported](http://www.atimes.com/atimes/Middle_East/LF18Ak01.html) recently, “[E]very US soldier deployed to Afghanistan and Iraq is matched by at least one civilian working for a private company. All told, about 239,451 contractors work for the Pentagon in battle zones around the world.”  And a majority of those contractors aren’t even U.S. citizens. If drones have entered our world as media celebrities, they have done so largely without debate among that detached populace.  In a sense, our wars abroad could be thought of as the equivalent of so many drones.  We send our troops off and then go home for dinner and put them out of mind.  The question is: Have we redefined our detachment as a new version of citizenly valor (and covered it over by a constant drumbeat of “support for our troops”)? Under these circumstances, it’s hardly surprising that a “pilotless” force should, in turn, develop the sort of contempt for civilians that [can be seen](http://www.rollingstone.com/politics/news/17390/119236?RS_show_page=0) in the [recent flap](http://www.juancole.com/2010/06/obamas-macarthur-moment-mcchrystal-disses-biden.html) over the derogatory comments of Afghan war commander General Stanley McChrystal and his aides about Obama administration officials. The Globalization of Death Maybe what we need is the return of George W. Bush’s fever dream from the American oblivion in which it’s now interred.  He was beyond wrong, of course, when it came to Saddam Hussein and Iraqi drones, but he wasn’t completely wrong about the dystopian Drone World to come.  There are now reportedly more than [40 countries](http://www.nuvo.net/nuvo/indiana-connections-to-drone-warfare-technology/Content?oid=1343970) developing versions of those pilot-less planes.  Earlier this year, the Iranians [announced](http://www.sfexaminer.com/world/83787472.html) that they were starting up production lines for both armed and unarmed drones.  Hezbollah [used them](http://www.noahshachtman.com/blog/archives/2828.html) against Israel in the 2006 summer war, years after Israel began [pioneering](http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2010/feb/21/new-israeli-drone-can-reach-iran/) their use in [targeted killings](http://www.hrw.org/en/reports/2009/06/30/precisely-wrong-0) of Palestinians. Right now, in what still remains largely a post-Cold War arms race of one, the U.S. is racing to produce ever more advanced drones to fight our wars, with few competitors in sight.  In the process, we’re also obliterating classic ideas of national sovereignty, and of who can be killed by whom under what circumstances.  In the process, we may not just be obliterating enemies, but creating them wherever our drones buzz overhead and our missiles strike. We are also creating the (il)legal framework for future war on a frontier where we won’t long be flying solo.  And when the first Iranian, or Russian, or Chinese missile-armed drones start knocking off their chosen sets of "terrorists," we won’t like it one bit.  When the first “suicide drones” appear, we’ll like it even less.  And if drones with the ability to spray chemical or biological weapons finally do make the scene, we’ll be truly unnerved. In the 1990s, we were said to be in an era of “globalization” which was widely hailed as good news.  Now, the U.S. and its detached populace are pioneering a new era of killing that respects no boundaries, relies on the self-definitions of whoever owns the nearest drone, and establishes planetary free-fire zones.  It’s a nasty combination, this globalization of death.

U.S. drone attacks will incite international, uncontrolled drone use and risks the spread of new weapons tech—

Savage ’10 [Charlie, columnist for the New York Times, New York Times, “U.N. Report Highly Critical of American Drone Attacks, Warning of Use by Others”, June 6th, 2010, http://www.nytimes.com/2010/06/03/world/ 03drones.html, Academic Search Premier]

A senior United Nations official said on Wednesday that the growing use of armed drones by the United States to kill terrorism suspects was undermining global constraints on the use of military force. He warned that the American example would lead to a chaotic world as the new weapons technology inevitably spread.

In a world of proliferating drones every international crisis is likely to lead to war

Singer 09

P. W. Singer is director of the 21st Century Defense Initiative at the Brookings Institution. Singer.

Winter 2009 Robots at War: The New Battlefield

<http://www.wilsonquarterly.com/article.cfm?aid=1313>. D.a. 7-25-10

James **Der Derian** is an expert at Brown University on new modes of war. He believes that the combination of these factors means that robotics will “lower the threshold for violence.” The result is a dangerous mixture: leaders unchecked by a public veto now gone missing, combined with technologies that seem to offer spectacular results with few lives lost. It’s a brew that could prove very seductive to decision makers. “If one can argue that such new technologies will offer less harm to us and them, then it is more likely that we’ll reach for them early, rather than spending weeks and months slogging at diplomacy.”

When faced with a dispute or crisis, policymakers have typically regarded the use of force as the “option of last resort.” Unmanned systems might now help that option move up the list, with each upward step making war more likely. That returns us to Korb’s scenario of “more Kosovos, less Iraqs.”

While avoiding the mistakes of Iraq certainly sounds like a positive result, the other side of the tradeoff would not be without problems. The 1990s were not the halcyon days some recall. Lowering the bar to allow for more unmanned strikes from afar would lead to an approach resembling the “cruise missile diplomacy” of that period. Such a strategy may leave fewer troops stuck on the ground, but, as shown by the strikes against Al Qaeda camps in Sudan and Afghanistan in 1998, the Kosovo war in 1999, and perhaps now the drone strikes in Pakistan, it produces military action without any true sense of a commitment,lash-outs that yield incomplete victories at best. As one U.S. Army report notes, such operations “feel good for a time, but accomplish little.” They involve the country in a problem, but do not resolveit.

Even worse, Korb may be wrong, and the dynamic may yield not fewer Iraqs but more of them. It was the lure of an easy preemptive action that helped get the United States into such trouble in Iraq in the first place. As one robotics scientist says of the new technology he is building, “The military thinks that it will allow them to nip things in the bud, deal with the bad guys earlier and easier, rather than having to get into a big-ass war. But the most likely thing that will happen is that we’ll be throwing a bunch of high tech against the usual urban guerillas. . . . It will stem the tide [of U.S. casualties], but it won’t give us some asymmetric advantage.”

Thus, robots may entail a dark irony. By appearing to lower the human costs of war, they may seduce us into more wars.

In a world of unconstrained militarized drones nuclear war is inevitable

Chester 09

Mitchell A. Chester, an attorney and civic activist Failsafe Revisited…Psychology and Robotic Delivery of the Bomb 12/26/2009 d.a. 7-25-10

<http://sharedemergency.wordpress.com/2009/12/26/failsafe-revisited-psychology-and-robotic-delivery-of-the-bomb/>

As nations assess future military capabilities, it is not surprising that **strategic use of drones** (including such devices with tactical nuclear weapons) **is on mankind’s doorstep**. But crossing the tactical/strategic nuclear boundary when considering robotic air warfare is a threshold that we dare not cross. Before it gets too late, this technology should be arrested, contained and outlawed on a planetary scale. Recent open discussion in the military press has centered on whether strategic bombers should be replaced by nuclear-armed drones. In the June, 2009 issue of Armed Forces Journal, Air Force Research Institute Professor Adam Lowther pondered “whether it’s time to pursue a long-range, unmanned and nuclear armed bomber.” ArmedForcesJournal.com published a November, 2009 article **by** Col**. James** Jinnette, warningthe “defense establishment has become seduced by the idea of unmanned airpower,” some of which may be controlled by [artificial intelligence](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Artificial_intelligence). He points out that judgment and “creative capacity” may be pushed aside by such technology. With these voices, future militarization takes on a most serious debate, as the world is embarking into uncharted intellectual killing territory. According to PW Singer in his TED talk of February, 2009, robotic war “changes the experience of the warrior, and even the identity of the warrior.” (See video). The easier and faster it is to initiate a tactical nuclear attack, without endangering crew lives, the more we hide behind robotics to accomplish our human instinct to kill. According to Singer, “Another way of putting this is that mankind’s 5000 year old monopoly on the fighting of war is breaking down in our lifetime**.”** The more we rely on machines, computer programs and remote control technology, the closer we approach the point of no return by (ironically) further dehumanizing war. Tactical military robotics with conventional weapons can save lives, but nuclear equipped robotics can help end all life. Much of 20th Century nuclear policy was based on the psychology of [“mutual assured destruction.”](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mutual_assured_destruction) Human emotions controlled the threats. It is that mindset that has helped us reach 2010. Another reason we have survived is that humans have instincts, and, at the personal level, the desire to survive. It is those qualities that helped avoid an accidental nuclear exchange in 1995 when Russian Rocket Forces mistook a scientific missile launch for an ICBM attack. It is the exercise of reason and intuition that spared America during the 13 days of the Cuban Missile Crisis.  The more we encumber the exercise of human judgment (despite it’s frailties) by relying on highly complex but remote technology via nuclear delivery systems, the more inhumane, mechanical and likely nuclear war actually becomes. Machines lack consciousness, and if programmed improperly, they can be subverted to misunderstand logic.

If the U.S. publicly renounced its military strategy in Afghanistan it would allow drawing clear ethical lines

Heinberg 01

Richard Senior Fellow-in-Residence at [Post Carbon Institute](http://www.postcarbon.org) and author of 9 books <http://archive.richardheinberg.com/museletter/117>. D.a. 7-31-10

Renounce: to give up, refuse, or repudiate

The US is engaged in a self-declared war on terrorism. That war, little more than two months old, has already entailed extraordinary measures that include the domestic curtailment of civil liberties, the spending of billions of dollars on military operations overseas, and the killing of hundreds or perhaps thousands of non-combatant civilians in Afghanistan (the exact number may never be known). Officials have stated that the heavy bombing of other nations, such as Iraq, is being contemplated.

If polls are to be trusted, most Americans think this war on terrorism is a good thing. Nobody wants to be terrified, after all. And the horrors inflicted on innocents in New York and Washington on September 11 surely require some response that would ensure that no similar attacks will follow. Moreover, the war seems to be going well: the Taliban are on the run and it appears that arch-terrorist Osama bin Laden is on the verge of being taken.

But if the US government is effectively to oppose terrorism in the long run, one would think that an important early step would be for its officials to publicly renounce the use of terror by the United States as an instrument of foreign policy. Such a gesture would have the immediate benefit of drawing a clear moral line distinguishing the actions of the 9-11 perpetrators from those of the American government in rounding up the evil-doers.

The ethical commitment would constrain weaponization of drones

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

The concept of “at risk” must be weighed now and with future warfare advances. While not advocating the U.S. secede its overwhelming advantage in the field of battle, knowingly expanding the battlefield to U.S. soil transfers an additional enduring risk to the civilian populace similar to nuclear warfare retaliation and is unacceptable. The U.S. Air Force also advocates evaluating strategic risks before moving forward, “Ethical discussions and policy decisions must take place in the near term in order to guide the development of future UAS capabilities, rather than allowing the development to take its own path apart from this critical guidance.”113 Unfortunately those words were not put into a doctrinal document until less than a year ago…over seven years after the first time death was delivered from nearly 7,500 miles away. To retain true world superpower legitimacy, the U.S. must lead the effort to limit the use of “distant warfare” and lead meaningful legal, moral, and ethical debates. The world is watching to follow the lead of the U.S. as robotic warfare rapidly advances forward. Hopefully the guiding voice of General Robert E. Lee who witnessed great death on the battlefield is heard, “It is good that we find war so horrible, or else we would become found of it.”114

Empirically public renunciation by the U.S. has spurred international restraints on weapon systems

World Health Organization 03

Public Health Response to Chemical and Biological Weapons <http://www.who.int/csr/delibepidemics/en/allchapspreliminaries_may03.pdf> d.a. 7-31-10

The year 1970 was a watershed in international legal attempts to deal with the problem of biological and chemical weapons . Following the public renunciation of bioweapons by the United States in 1969, the multilateral conference on disarmament in Geneva, then called the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, decided to deal with chemical and biological weapons separately ; these had previously been considered together, as in the 1925 Geneva protocol prohibiting their use. The Conference thereupon started work on a Convention to banning the development, stockpiling, and production of biological weapons, leaving consideration on a counterpart treaty for chemical weapons for later. The resultant Biological and Toxic Weapons Convention (BWC) was opened for signature in 1972 and entered into force three years later.

Substantially Topicality

AT 25%

1. We meet- we are 50%. We eliminate the ability to have an aerial presence mission loitering over the country—The Deutscher and Space Express evidence says that drones are the only way to have an aerial military presence. We eliminate the aerial presence mission while leaving the ground presence missions—which is half the presence missions
2. We meet – We eliminate 100% of the military drone presence
3. --Their definition is not “the” exclusive military definition of substantially—It is a definition used for the single context of obligations to inform contractors of reductions under the Domestic Base Closing Act—The DOD had a vested interest in picking a high number to save money on how many contractors were affected by the law.
4. Their definition is in the wrong context. It defines a “substantial reduction” not “substantially reduce” They define substantial which is an adjective not substantially which is an adverb. As an adverb it means how you reduce not the amount you reduce

**Watson 2**

JAMES L. WATSON, SENIOR JUDGE 2002

UNITED STATES COURT OF INTERNATIONAL TRADE GENESCO INC., :Plaintiff, :v.Court No. 92-02-00084 UNITED STATES

<http://www.cit.uscourts.gov/slip_op/Slip_op00/00-57.pdf>.

The term “substantially” is used as an adverb preceding a verb, the term means “in a substantial manner: so as to be substantial.” Webster’s Third New International Dictionary of the English Language Unabridged

(1968).

Black's Law Dictionary 1428-29 (6th ed. 1990)

"Substantially" means " without material qualification

We meet because we make an unconsitional reduction in our presence

1. Counterdefiniton—The DOD defines substantially as significant to the matter

 DOD 2000

REFERENCE GUIDE T0 POST-GOVERNMENT SERVICE EMPLOYMENT ACTIVITIES OF

PERSONNEL DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

<http://www.dod.gov/dodgc/defense_ethics/ethics_issues/refguide_postgovDONapr00.doc>

          To participate "personally" means to participate directly, and includes the direct and active supervision of a subordinate's participation.  To participate "substantially" means that the employee's involvement is of significance to the matter.

**6. We Meet- UAV’s are a significant part of our presence**

Joint Doctrine Encyclopedia 08

<http://www.dtic.mil/doctrine/jrm/encyr_w.pdf>.

UAVs are significant force enhancers. When first introduced, the UAVs were referred to

as remotely piloted vehicles. With the development of Department of Defense-approved

class categories, the name has been changed to UAV.

#### **Glynn 07**

Buffalo News Sunday, November 4, 2007 MATT GLYNN NEWS BUSINESS REPORTER

<http://www.calspan.com/ourCompany/news/11_04_07.html> d.a. 7-22-10

##### **Pilotless aircraft have become an important part of military operations in** places such as Iraq and **Afghanistan,** providing U.S. forces with surveillance capabilities as well as performing combat roles. “They’re an eye in the sky,” said Louis Knotts, president of Calspan and one of the test pilots.

1. Eliminating drones is a huge reduction in our aerial presence—comparing the number of planes to the number of ground troops doesn’t make any sense because a large number of ground troops only establish presence in a small part of the country—A relatively small number of drones can establish a permanent presence over parts of the country troops can’t even get to.
2. We don’t unlimit—we remove the ability of the U.S. to maintain a permanent UAV aerial presence over the country—This is a large reduction in our presence—It does not legitimate affs that remove any military equipment or change strategies for how equipment is used
3. Percentage based measures of substantial are arbitrary and distort context

LEO 08

Kevin Leo\*\* J.D. Candidate, Spring 2008, Hastings College of the Law.

Hastings Business Law Journal Spring, 2008 4 Hastings Bus. L.J. 297 LEXIS

In contrast, the court in Haswell v. UnitedStates held that spending over sixteen percent of an organization's time on lobbying was substantial. [n83](http://www.lexisnexis.com.www2.lib.ku.edu:2048/us/lnacademic/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.156249.8509902761&target=results_DocumentContent&reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1253667274610&returnToKey=20_T7405211855&parent=docview) The court **found that applying a strict percentage test to determine whether activities are substantial would be inappropriate**, since  [\*308]  such a test "obscures the complexity of balancing the organization's activities in relation to its objectives and circumstances in the context of the totality of the organization." [n84](http://www.lexisnexis.com.www2.lib.ku.edu:2048/us/lnacademic/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.156249.8509902761&target=results_DocumentContent&reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1253667274610&returnToKey=20_T7405211855&parent=docview)

Additional DOD definition

DOD 2000

REFERENCE GUIDE T0 POST-GOVERNMENT SERVICE EMPLOYMENT ACTIVITIES OF

PERSONNEL DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

<http://www.dod.gov/dodgc/defense_ethics/ethics_issues/refguide_postgovDONapr00.doc>

The prohibition does not arise unless the former official's participation in the matter was "personal and substantial."[[40]](http://www.dod.gov/dodgc/defense_ethics/ethics_issues/refguide_postgovDONapr00.doc" \l "_edn40)  Personal and substantial participation can be exercised "through decision, approval, disapproval, recommendation, the rendering of advice, investigation, or other such action."[[41]](http://www.dod.gov/dodgc/defense_ethics/ethics_issues/refguide_postgovDONapr00.doc" \l "_edn41)  Personal participation refers to both the former employee's actions and those of a subordinate when actually directed by the former employee.  **Substantial** participation **means involvement that is, or reasonably appears to be, significant to the matter**.  Mere official responsibility over a matter, knowledge of it, or perfunctory involvement on an administrative or peripheral issue does not amount to substantial participation.  **Participating in a single critical step, however, may be "substantial.**"  Although participation generally requires some form of action, a former officer's inaction may be regarded as sub­stantial participation if such inaction could cause a result to be different.