

Gilbert's book will be useful for seminary study and for pastors who engage in lifelong learning. In addition to Gilbert's interesting thesis and analysis of preaching in context, the book contains numerous sermon texts for reading and study. One could use it as a topical or companion text in a preaching class for these reasons. Chapter 3, which sketches the framework for Exodus preaching, could be a useful assignment for comparison of homiletical methods. Chapter 4, which examines sermons of Ransom, Randolph, and Powell, provides useful case studies. Gilbert's overall approach to emphasize the centrality of contextual analysis for effective preaching is a message valuable to all who prepare for ministry.

MIKAEL BROADWAY

Shaw University Divinity School

Drones and the Ethics of Targeted Killing. By Kenneth R. Himes, OFM. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2016. xv + 196 pages. \$24.95 (paper).

doi: 10.1017/hor.2017.40

Himes contends "that drone attacks are a species of the genus of human action called targeted killing" (ix). He focuses his just war-based ethical analysis on targeted killing, then addresses the new US weapon of choice for accomplishing this: armed drones. The topic may strike the reader as somewhat dry, but it is a significant one, and Himes' approach is well organized, well researched, and clear.

After an introduction to the idea of targeted killing and the nature and use of drones, Himes addresses the topic in four steps. First he traces the history of the idea of targeted killing in Western philosophy and theology. The next two chapters scrutinize targeted killings in two contemporary contexts: first is *Israel's* targeted killing policy in response to the suicide bombings that characterize the Second Palestinian Intifada; second is the process the *United States* uses to target individuals, and how this practice is justified. The final chapter assesses the ethics of targeted killing and the use of drones, which will be my focus here.

Often Himes is content to raise ethical questions, but one of his clearest criticisms of the Obama administration's counterterrorism policy is its *lack of transparency*. There are two contexts for the US use of drones in targeted killing: military counterinsurgency in the battlefields of Afghanistan and Iraq, and CIA counterterrorism in places where the United States is not formally involved in a war, such as Pakistan, Yemen, and Somalia. The latter are by law covert operations (163) and much more controversial in that such strikes seem to override the sovereignty of the countries where they happen. The

lack of transparency results in a lack of accountability—for mistakes in targeting or civilian deaths, for example—and sets a bad precedent regarding drones. It is impossible to legally and ethically evaluate the US policy when the administration will not make public the legal basis for its actions or explicitly delineate how the policy works and its results. According to Himes, Obama has announced that the CIA oversight of the counterterrorism policy will be transferred to the military, but this good idea has not been implemented. Himes rightly raises the question of whether the lack of transparency about targeted killings outside conventional war zones undermines democracy itself.

Himes explains how Israeli debates arrived at the conclusion that the proper conceptual framework for justifying the targeted killing of terrorists is not law enforcement but military action. International law, however, does not adequately address the situation of nonstate actors, such as terrorist groups, involved in armed conflict, and is thus in need of reform. Terrorists do not adhere to the criteria for a combatant set out by the Geneva Accords: terrorist groups have a decentralized command structure; their members do not wear uniforms or show their weapons; and they explicitly target civilians. Thus they are “illegal combatants” taking an active role in hostilities, but they are not owed the protections offered to legal combatants, such as POW status. When arrest is not feasible, targeted killing is justified in self-defense and to prevent attacks on civilians (not for revenge or punishment).

The United States has engaged in “signature strikes” (where people are targeted because they exhibit suspect behavior) and in “double-tap” strikes (where those who respond to help the victims of a first strike are targeted on the assumption that they too are terrorists). Himes argues that it must be demonstrated that a target actively participates in terrorism before an attack is justified, and that double-tap strikes are “morally dubious” (I’d say ordinarily wrong and perverse).

The use of drones for targeted killing has been tactically effective, but is strategically questionable. The persistent surveillance and the precision of drone strikes can limit civilian casualties. The constant presence of noisy, low-flying drones over a targeted area, however, can be a form of terrorism in itself, which can multiply militants rather than reduce terrorism. A reliance on drones can skew counterterrorism policy toward a military approach rather than peace building through working for social justice.

Himes consistently asks and pursues the right questions. His book belongs in college libraries and on course syllabi.

J. MILBURN THOMPSON
Bellarmino University