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Permanent Occupation 1AC

The United States has built an imperial powerhouse on permanent occupation of territory—we have continued this trend in Iraq, where we have used language of democracy to justify totalitarian ends, with no end in sight.

Salah Hassan, associate professor and director of the Honors Program in the Department of English at Michigan State University, Never Ending Occupations, New Centennial Review, Spring 2008

A military occupation that ends with the complete withdrawal of all foreign troops from the occupied territory almost always is associated with political failure, lost causes, and wasted lives. Just as the launching of an aggressive war of occupation is a messy political affair, so is the postwar situation with the looming prospect of a withdrawal that invariably raises questions about what was accomplished by the war. This last point explains the intense political anxiety about exit strategies and disengagement from the field of battle. The cessation of hostilities and the handing over of authority to a presumably sovereign government—as was the case in Iraq in 2004—may mark the end of the legal occupation, but regimes of occupation often project themselves long into the future, averting complete withdrawal, and instituting a permanent presence in the occupied territory through the establishment of garrisoned military bases that have come to characterize never-ending occupations. For the purposes of this essay, I am particularly interested in current U.S. political discourse on the occupation of Iraq and [End Page 1] discussions of the future of that particularly violent intervention that appears to have no end. I also want to suggest that the United States has a 100-year history of never-ending occupations that have contributed to contemporary views of it as an imperial power. At the core of this paper is an analysis of the political language of rights and freedom mobilized by the Bush White House to justify the war. Critics of the war have tended to dismiss the discourse of democracy as meaningless propaganda designed to conceal U.S. strategic interests in the region, but Presidential speeches, policy statements and legislation provide an important set of coordinates for analyzing the political and cultural ethos that underwrites never-ending military occupations.
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But, this isn’t the first time—the imperial nature of occupation is part and parcel of a tradition established with the occupation of Puerto Rico, the Philippeans, Germany, Japan and now Afghanistan and Iraq, these invasions were meant to be temporary installations of democratic values, but when these countries resist they are met with mass murder and unending war.

Salah Hassan, associate professor and director of the Honors Program in the Department of English at Michigan State University, Never Ending Occupations, New Centennial Review, Spring 2008

The U.S. occupation of Iraq is only the most recent in a long history of violent interventions. Despite developments in the international laws of war over the last 100 years, the rhetoric and modalities of the U.S. occupation of Iraq reproduce the features of previous never-ending occupations. One can see a repeating pattern from the 1890s occupation of Puerto Rico and the Philippines to the mid-twentieth-century occupation of Germany and Japan to the early twenty-first-century occupation of Afghanistan and Iraq. In every one of these cases, the U.S. presence was ostensibly temporary, aimed at overthrowing an unjust dictatorship, yet quickly took the form of a permanent military presence. In each case, the occupation resulted from a formal declaration of war and was, therefore, subject to the laws of war, such as they are. These U.S. military occupations were initially explained as an administrative necessity; the end of hostilities witnessed a change of regime and created a political vacuum that was first filled by the U.S. military and its allies and then by some form of civilian administration operating always under the umbrella of the U.S. armed forces. It is precisely the convergence of these circumstances that produce the possibilities for an occupation without end. In the Philippines, for example, the Spanish-American War culminated in the United States displacing Spain as the colonial authority, according to the terms of the 1898 Treaty of Paris, but Philippine nationalists resisted U.S. hegemony, which took a decisive administrative form with the passage of the Philippine Bill in 1902. Section 3 of the Philippine Bill clearly asserts U.S. sovereignty over the islands: [End Page 2] That the President of the United States during such time as and whenever the and authority of the United States encounter armed resistance in the Philippine Islands, . . . shall continue to regulate and control commercial intercourse with and within said Islands by such general rules and regulations as he . . . may deem most conducive to the public interests and the general welfare. (Philippine Bill of 1902) Here political authority, commercial activity, and public good are all associated with the figure of the U.S. President, the veritable embodiment of sovereignty, who stands in opposition to the armed resistance. In passing the Philippine Bill, the U.S. Congress provided the legal grounds for what was to become a formal occupation of “said Islands,” from 1898 until 1946, when the Philippines was granted nominal independence, but remained subject to a sizeable and permanent U.S. military presence. Furthermore, the occupation of the Philippines was perhaps the first overseas occupation—beyond the territorial United States—that was rationalized in the name of securing democracy, restoring freedom and advancing the cause of progress. The most fundamental form of these ideas is expressed in reestablishing political rights and the rule of law in the postwar context. For instance, Section 5 of the Philippine Bill states: “That no law shall be enacted in said islands which shall deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, or deny to any person therein the equal protection of the laws.” Even if one disagrees with Slovo Zizek’s claim that “Americans have historically seen their role in the world in altruistic terms” (44), it would be a mistake to write off the principles of rights and freedoms as mere political window dressing for the more nefarious objectives of securing precious resources and dominating the world.
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The principles are important not only because they give the pretense of legitimacy to the U.S. occupation of a foreign country, but because they have come to occupy a central place in public discourse in connection with all U.S. wars of occupation, one historical context being made to serve another. On a visit to the Philippines in October 2003, only five months after U.S. troops entered Baghdad, Bush addressed the Philippine Congress and claimed for the United States its share in emancipating the islands from [End Page 3] Spanish despotism. The speech implies a parallel between the U.S. role in the Philippines and in Iraq. Early in the speech, Bush states: “America is proud of its part in the great story of the Filipino people. Together our soldiers liberated the Philippines from colonial rule. Together we rescued the islands from invasion and occupation.” This simplification of history gives expression to a classic example of Orwellian doublespeak in which the U.S. occupation of the Philippines is turned into an act of liberation. It should be no surprise that this rhetorical move has become a staple of Bush’s public statements on the occupation of Iraq. After one has dismissed the real lies about weapons of mass destruction and the Saddam Hussein al-Qaeda conspiracy, the only reasonable political rationale for the occupation of Iraq is ending the dictatorship and instituting democracy. In a move aimed at discrediting critics of the war in Iraq, Bush then goes on to assert the cross-cultural nature of democratic ideas: “Democracy always has skeptics. Some say the culture of the Middle East will not sustain the institutions of democracy. The same doubts were once expressed about the culture of Asia. These doubts were proven wrong nearly six decades ago, when the Republic of the Philippines became the first democratic nation in Asia” (Bush 2003a). Here Bush positions opponents of the war, not only as anti-democratic, but also as racists, presenting himself, his administration, and the United States as the great emancipator of the wretched of the earth.

**Permanent Occupation 1AC**

Additionally, Politics is more than just policies—the language that pundits and political authority figures use define the policies that are created and how those policies are enforced. Current rhetoric puts DEMOCRATIC FREEDOM at the forefront of our political imagination, but occupation makes this phrase an empty signifier, and ensures that mass murder fills in.

Salah Hassan, associate professor and director of the Honors Program in the Department of English at Michigan State University, Never Ending Occupations, New Centennial Review, Spring 2008

By late 2003, the theme of universal freedom had become the centerpiece of almost every public statement coming out of the White House in defense of the U.S. invasion and its continued presence in Iraq. In a November 2003 speech, Bush announced “a new policy, a forward strategy of freedom in the Middle East.” He goes on to claim that “The advance of freedom is the calling of our time. It is the calling of our country . . . And we believe that freedom— the freedom that we prize—is not for us alone. It is the right and capacity of all mankind” (Bush 2003b). By emphasizing this strain of political rhetoric in its varied manifestations—such as political speeches, policy documents, and legislation—I want to underscore the way that language transforms military occupations into political obligation and an altogether intractable foreign policy. In other words, invoking freedom and democracy may make military occupations acceptable policy on humanitarian grounds, but it is impossible [End Page 4] to achieve freedom and democracy under occupation. The effectiveness of the discourse of freedom and democracy is the fact that democracy here is emptied of signification. Moreover, if the occupation forces fail to impose order in the face of resistance and insurgencies, as was the case in the Philippines and is the case today in Iraq, less rather than more “freedom” is the result, and the army of occupation must be reinforced. In late 2006 and early 2007, following the November elections that brought Democrats to power in Congress on a wave of popular discontent with the course of the war, the Bush administration had to acknowledge policy failures in Iraq. An increasing number of politicians began to speak openly of the need to formulate a plan for a U.S. withdrawal from Iraq. One of the fundamental critiques of the Bush invasion of Iraq had long been the absence of a clear endgame or exit strategy. As the occupation approached its four-year anniversary, the White House appeared to accept the prospect of a change in approach. The idea of a drawdown of troops had emerged already in summer 2006, but found formal expression in a December 2006 report titled “The Way Forward: A New Approach” prepared by the Iraq Study Group, a Congressional appointed panel co-chaired by James Baker and Lee Hamilton. The Iraq Study Group document is an interesting and complicated effort to reconcile U.S. military and political objectives in the broader Middle Eastern context.
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American strategy in Iraq is built on a few resonant metaphors that synonimize withdrawl with failure. This has become a cultural phenomena that guarantees that Iraq (and other occupations) become permanent, and no alternative possibilities are considered.

Salah Hassan, associate professor and director of the Honors Program in the Department of English at Michigan State University, Never Ending Occupations, New Centennial Review, Spring 2008

The obvious parallels aside, Engelhardt’s point about **the relationship between discussions of withdrawal and continuing the occupation exposes the importance of an exit strategy at the discursive level, if not at the operational level.** That is to say**, because no occupation of a sovereign territory can legally be permanent, every occupation has to include at the very least the possibility of a withdrawal, a withdrawal that can be infinitely deferred. Ironically, never-ending occupations often begin with political claims that they are provisional, finite, temporary, ostensibly limited in time and space. In that infamous “Mission Accomplished” speech of 2003, for example, when George W. Bush praised the strategic acumen of Donald Rumsfeld, [End Page 10] lauded the effectiveness of the U.S. armed forces as they entered Baghdad, and officially inaugurated U.S. military rule of Iraq, he also asserted the narrative conclusion of the operation: “The transition from dictatorship to democracy will take time, but it is worth every effort. Our coalition will stay until our work is done and then we will leave and we will leave behind a free Iraq.”** The fanciful prediction that U.S. troops will come home when they have successfully completed their mission—ostensibly liberating Iraq—is another instance of the classic occupation is liberation theme. But perhaps more important is the less obviously contradictory form of doublespeak, implying that there is no tension between winning and bringing the troops home, as if a U.S. withdrawal will mark a victory as opposed to a defeat. The coalition presence, little more than a euphemism for the U.S. occupation of Iraq, not unlike the U.S. engineered NATO occupation of Afghanistan, may shrink in size, but the U.S. military cannot win in Iraq (or Afghanistan) and also withdraw completely, which explains the U.S. Army’s construction of at least four multi-billion dollar “enduring” bases or camps in Iraq (Balad Air Base, Camp Victory, Al Assad Air Base, and Talil Air Base). As Carl Conetta, the codirector of the Project on Defense Alternatives and author of a 2004 Iraq exit strategy, stated in an interview last fall: “**Nobody likes the term permanent, including the Pentagon, but personally I think our current plan is to stay there forever, and that includes the Democrats”** (2007). In November 2005, when the occupation of Iraq was less triumphant and the U.S. forces faced constant warfare with Iraqi resistance movements, Bush links the end of the occupation to a yet-to-be-achieved U.S. victory: “**Most Americans want two things in Iraq: They want to see our troops win, and they want to see our troops come home as soon as possible. And those are my goals as well.” Here Bush invokes that wartime cliché, “bring the troops home,” embraced as much by the advocates of the military occupation of Iraq as by opponents; the phrase provides politicians across the partisan divide and populist anti-war activists with a middle ground of national consensus that emphasizes loyalty to the military, embodied by rank-and-file soldiers serving in Iraq. The mental image of soldiers—for there are few representations of the U.S. troops in Iraq—operates at the level of pathos, binding together both advocates and critics of the war and producing an instant of national unity**. But “bring the [End Page 11] troops home” and its related phrase “support the troops,” which have been joined together in an anodyne anti-war slogan, are detached from a policy of full-spectrum dominance, premised on permanent troop deployments and continual redeployments among the many overseas territories now occupied by the U.S. military. There is no mainstream U.S. politician who envisions a complete withdrawal of U.S. forces from Iraq at any time in the near future. The “enduring bases” in Iraq, like the many other U.S. bases around the world, will remain, perpetuating a never-ending occupation.
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These military interventions devolve into police actions that extend the biopolitics of the state across the globe, guaranteeing that situations like Iraq become the norm, rather than the exception.

Caldwell, 04 (Anne, Assistant Prof. of Poly. Sci. @ Louisville, “Bio-sovereignty and the Emergence of Humanity” Theory and Event 7.2 2004. MUSE.

The shift from standing law to exception evident in the treatment of refugees also appears in humanitarian military interventions. Those interventions increasingly take place as exceptions to both domestic and international law, exposing "the allied face of human war" (Dillon and Reid 2000: 5). The American led NATO intervention into Kosovo, for example, was carried out as an exception to the U.S. Constitution, the NATO Charter and the UN.[13](http://80-muse.jhu.edu.proxy.uwlib.uwyo.edu/journals/theory_and_event/v007/7.2caldwell.html%22%20%5Cl%20%22FOOT13#FOOT13) The new American doctrine of pre-emptive strikes has made the decision on the exception official policy. Indeed, new forms of post-Cold War warfare are having the general effect of internationalizing the exception. Modern wars typically occurred between two or more legally equal sovereigns. Contemporary conflicts are more akin to police actions. They take the form of a "diffuse and continuous" violence seeking to guarantee order rather than control territory (Guehenno 1995:119). One of the clearest signs of this change in conflict is the growing difficulty in distinguishing between civil and international wars, and between intranational and international wars (Meron 2000: 261; Kaldor 1998: 102). Modern distinctions "between 'war' and peace', 'internal' and 'external' . . . associated with the autonomy of the nation-state, seem to be breaking down" (Kaldor 1998:91). As a result, interventions into what might once have appeared independent nation-states no longer involve "independent juridical territories." They appear rather as "actions within a unified world," aimed "at maintaining an internal order" (Hardt and Negri 2000: 35, 38). The effect is to place the rights of humanity in "the hands of the international community police" 7The moment one sovereign power acts to protect those who belong to other states, or those who have been so severely abandoned by their own states as to have no other category of belonging than humanity, sovereignty reinforces an international definition of life, rights and belonging. In that moment, sovereignty undermines the very identifications and connections of the citizen/nation/state order. A sovereignty ruling over such groups is no longer liberal and national, but bio-political and global.      We should not be surprised then that contemporary sovereignty is ceasing to make use of modern methods of legitimation. Max Weber, influencing generations of scholars, once insisted the distinctive feature of modern democracy was its rule through law. That focus on law is being replaced by Schmitt's definition of a power legitimated on the basis of its capacity to decide. This incorporation of extra-legal and contingent decisions into an order of law is the phenomena Benjamin noted decades ago. In "The Critique of Violence," he pointed out that the space of the exception in modern democracies was being filled out by the police. The police have the power to suspend law when necessary, and create it ad hoc when necessary (Benjamin 1978: 287). Benjamin's own account treated the expansion of the police within the domestic politics of sovereignty -- and condemned it as such. As bio-sovereignty increasingly operates in an international mode, the police actions of domestic sovereignty are becoming internationalized, further undermining the limited forms of rule that regulate international relations.[15](http://80-muse.jhu.edu.proxy.uwlib.uwyo.edu/journals/theory_and_event/v007/7.2caldwell.html%22%20%5Cl%20%22FOOT15#FOOT15) Sovereignty is coming to operate internationally in the same manner it was always capable of operating domestically: outside the boundaries of law, and ruling directly over life.      The role of the exception and the presence of bare life appear in the capriciousness of international humanitarian interventions. As the great powers intervene in Bosnia or Kosovo or stand aside, as in the early war in Bosnia, in Rwanda, or in the long running war between Turkey and its Kurds; as they debate whether to classify massacres as "ethnic cleansing" or "genocide" depending on the level of obligation they wish to take on; as they bomb populations formed of both the "innocent" and the "guilty," the life addressed appears -- from the standpoint of sovereign power -- as indifferent life whose status is determined by the sovereign decision. Caught in the ban of a sovereign law tracing out new relations beyond old borders, bare life is abandoned by the law without being removed from it, ruled by it without being saved by it, consigned to a state of exception become the rule. These variations in interventions are not simply hypocrisy. They are the modus operandi of a form of sovereign power that has always grounded itself in the capture and valuation of life.
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The United States use of democracy and human rights as justification for intervention fuels the imperialist project of the United States, culminating in worse violence and oppression, which creates and locks in a cycle of violence between imperialism and excess

**Marrouchi, 02** (Mustapha, author, Introduction: Colonialism, Islamism, Terrorism. Spring 2002, MUSE,

Add to that the deliberate physical extermination of Iraq, Palestine, Cuba, Korea, Bulgaria. These are crimes as abominable as any contemporary genocide. [3](http://80-muse.jhu.edu.proxy.uwlib.uwyo.edu/journals/college_literature/v030/30.1marrouchi02.html%22%20%5Cl%20%22FOOT3#FOOT3) I do not mean to downplay the horrors of September 11, which occurred at a time when the U.S. had emerged as the undisputed heir to the crown of imperial domination, when there is no longer a viable Left to provide a kind of moral allegory, but until more Americans realize that U.S. action as a state does cause offence to many people outside the U.S.—their stance on international Court Justice and the Kyoto Protocol exhibits a spoiled, narcissistic contempt for other peoples (Arab and/or Muslim in the present case, but it could also be Chinese in the near future) and the planet; their public rejection of the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty and the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty and the Biological Weapons Convention, [4](http://80-muse.jhu.edu.proxy.uwlib.uwyo.edu/journals/college_literature/v030/30.1marrouchi02.html%22%20%5Cl%20%22FOOT4#FOOT4) the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court (they instead brought into operation the American Service Members Protection Act which will permit the authorization of military force to free any American soldier taken into International Criminal Court custody; or, to put it otherwise, they really will "send in the Marines"), and the treaty on Biological Weapons Convention makes them a vast, over-determined symbol of everything the rest of the world hates and fears at the same time; their bombing of Iraq, Lybia, Sudan and Afghanistan has played a clear negative role in sponsoring anti-Americanism, supporting terrorism, and maintaining corrupt, undemocratic societies; their long-standing position on the Arab-Israeli conflict adds up to a near-promise that anything to do with Palestinian resistance to murderous Israeli practices, never more brutal, never more dehumanizing and illegal than today, is snuffed out; their astonishingly obdurate policy on prisoners of war as witness the Guantanamo case of "freedom fighters, Mujahdeen, soldiers, unlawful combatants, detainees, terrorists" [5](http://80-muse.jhu.edu.proxy.uwlib.uwyo.edu/journals/college_literature/v030/30.1marrouchi02.html%22%20%5Cl%20%22FOOT5#FOOT5) —we are all in for a rocky ride. The only international treaties the U.S. signs and honors are those it can both draft and impose on other countries. The agreement on Intellectual Property Rights is a case in point. "World bullies," Mary Beard writes, "even if their heart is in the right place, will in the end pay the price" (2001, 20). It is only now that the results of American imperialism are working their way out into actuality, for the resultant absence of any secular alternative, means that popular revolt and resistance in the Third World have nowhere to go but into religious and fanatic forms. As the U.S. war against terrorism spreads, more unrest is almost certain; far from closing things down, U.S. power is likely to stir them up in ways that may not be containable as witness the rejection of offers of a UN Security Council resolution authorizing the war **[End Page 9]** on terrorism, preferring instead to rely on an extended claim of self-defense. Moreover, the U.S. government has forged new alliances with illiberal regimes in Pakistan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan, Saudi Arabia, Jordan, and Egypt reversing years of effort to promote human rights and freedom of speech (Byer, 2002, 14). In an age of increasing interdependence and co-operation, Bush and his hyena-like advisers (from tight iron pants Rice to cold-blooded Rumsfeld) are deliberately out of step with most of the world.
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Biopolitics and natural life are the basic formations of modern politics, democracy will never solve and slip into totalitarianism until we challenge the basic relation that forms western politics

Agamben, 98 (Giorgio, philosopher , “Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life.” 1998, Stanford University Press,

The protagonist of this book is bare life, that is, the life of *homo sacer* (sacred man), who *may be killed and yet not sacrificed,* and whose essential function in modern politics we intend to assert. An obscure figure of archaic Roman law, in which human life is included in the juridical order *[ordinamento]*' solely in the form of its exclusion (that is, of its capacity to be killed), has thus offered the key by which not only the sacred texts of sovereignty but also the very codes of political power will unveil their mysteries. At the same time, however, this ancient meaning of the term *sacer presents* us with the enigma of a figure of the sacred that, before or beyond the religious, constitutes the first paradigm of the political realm of the West. The Foucauldian thesis will then have to be corrected or, at least, completed, in the sense that what characterizes modern politics is not so much the inclusion of *zoe' in* the *polis—* which is, in itself, absolutely ancient—nor simply the fact that life as such be­comes a principal object of the projections and calculations of State power. Instead the decisive fact is that, together with the process by which the exception everywhere becomes the rule, the realm of bare life—which is originally situated at the margins of the political order—gradually begins to coincide with the political realm, and exclusion and inclusion, outside and inside, *bios* and *zoe,* right and fact, enter into a zone of irreducible indistinction. At once exclud­ing bare life from and capturing it within the political order, the state of exception actually constituted, in its very separateness, the hidden foundation on which the entire political system rested. When its borders begin to be blurred, the bare life that dwelt there frees itself in the city and becomes both subject and object of the conflicts of the political order, the one place for both the organiza­tion of State power and emancipation from it. Everything happens as if, along with the disciplinary process by which State power makes man as a living being into its own specific object, another process is set in motion that in large measure corresponds to the birth of modern democracy, in which man as a living being pres­ents himself no longer as an *object* but as the *subject* of political power. These processes—which in many ways oppose and (at least apparently) bitterly conflict with each other—nevertheless con­verge insofar as both concern the bare life of the citizen, the new biopolitical body of humanity. If anything characterizes modern democracy as opposed to clas­sical democracy, then, it is that modern democracy presents itself from the beginning as a vindication and liberation of *zoe,* and that it is constantly trying to transform its own bare life into a way of life and to find, so to speak, the *bios* of *zoe.* Hence, too, modern democracy's specific aporia: it wants to put the freedom and happiness of men into play in the very place—"bare life"—that marked their subjection. Behind the long, strife-ridden process that leads to the recognition of rights and formal liberties stands once again the body of the sacred man with his double sovereign, his life that cannot be sacrificed yet may, nevertheless, be killed. To become conscious of this aporia is not to belittle the conquests and accom­plishments of democracy. It is, rather, to try to understand once and for all why democracy, at the very moment in which it seemed to have finally triumphed over its adversaries and reached its greatest height, proved itself incapable of saving *zoe,* to whose happiness it had dedicated all its efforts, from unprecedented ruin. Modern democracy's decadence and. gradual convergence with totalitarian states in post-democratic spectacular societies (which begins to become evident with Alexis de Tocqueville and finds its final sanction in the analyses of Guy Debord) may well be rooted in this aporia, which marks the beginning of modern democracy and forces it into complicity with its most implacable enemy. Today politics knows no value (and, consequently, no nonvalue) other than life, and until the contradictions that this fact implies are dissolved, Nazism and fascism—which transformed the decision on bare life into the supreme political principle—will remain stub­bornly with us. According to the testimony of Robert Antelme, in fact, what the camps taught those who lived there was precisely that "calling into question the quality of man provokes an almost biological assertion of belonging to the human race" *(L'espece humaine,* p. n). The idea of an inner solidarity between democracy and totalitar­ianism (which here we must, with every caution, advance) is obviously not (like Leo Strauss thesis concerning the secret con­vergence of the final goals of liberalism and communism) a historiographical claim, which would authorize the liquidation and leveling of the enormous differences that characterize their history and their rivalry. Yet this idea must nevertheless be strongly main­tained on a historico-philosophical level, since it alone will allow us to orient ourselves in relation to the new realities and unforeseen convergences of the end of the millennium. This idea alone will make it possible to clear the way for the new politics, which remains largely to be invented.
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The problem isn’t just combat troops either, it is the commitment to perpetual occupation that is our foundational concern. It’s been proven by the end of the Bush administration, a commitment to withdrawl is not enough because troops will be shifted elsewhere. Making occupation spacially and temporally limitless.

Salah Hassan, associate professor and director of the Honors Program in the Department of English at Michigan State University, Never Ending Occupations, New Centennial Review, Spring 2008

In late 2006 and early 2007, following the November elections that brought Democrats to power in Congress on a wave of popular discontent with the course of the war, the Bush administration had to acknowledge policy failures in Iraq. An increasing number of politicians began to speak openly of the need to formulate a plan for a U.S. withdrawal from Iraq. One of the fundamental critiques of the Bush invasion of Iraq had long been the absence of a clear endgame or exit strategy. As the occupation approached its four-year anniversary, the White House appeared to accept the prospect of a change in approach. The idea of a drawdown of troops had emerged already in summer 2006, but found formal expression in a December 2006 report titled “The Way Forward: A New Approach” prepared by the Iraq Study Group, a Congressional appointed panel co-chaired by James Baker and Lee Hamilton. The Iraq Study Group document is an interesting and complicated effort to reconcile U.S. military and political objectives in the broader Middle Eastern context.

On the surface, the Iraq Study Group Report sees the U.S. position in Iraq as an opportunity to address a number of outstanding conflicts by emphasizing diplomacy, security and economic development. The diplomatic component includes negotiations with Iran and Syria, the security component entails a significant commitment to building the Iraqi Army, and the economic policy centers on privatization of the Iraqi oil sector, including privatizing security of the wells and pipelines. The Iraq Study Group seeks to leverage an Iraqi commitment to the U.S. policy by setting specific milestones that must be met by the Nouri al-Maliki government in order to maintain continued support. For instance, Recommendation 40 proposes: “The United States should not make an open-ended commitment to keep large numbers of American troops deployed in Iraq” (51). This recommendation is justified in part because “an open-ended commitment of American forces would not **[End Page 5]** provide the Iraqi government with incentive to take . . . political action” (50). Even though the report asserts the conditional nature of the U.S. commitment, it also makes the following affirmation: “Even after the U.S. has moved all combat brigades out of Iraq, we would maintain a considerable military presence in the region, with our significant force in Iraq and our powerful air, ground and naval deployments in Kuwait, Bahrain and Qatar, as well as an increased presence in Afghanistan” (49). This point leaves no doubt that the U.S. military occupation of Iraq and more broadly the strategic region of the Persian Gulf has no geographical or temporal limit.

Permanent Occupation 1AC

These rhetorical plays have guaranteed that policy options are only discussed within a U.S.- centered frame, which makes violence inevitable.

Barry Rubin is director of the Global Research in International Affairs (GLORIA) Center of the Interdisciplinary University in Herzliya, Israel, and editor of the Middle East Review of International Affairs (MERIA). Reality Bites:

The Impending Logic of Withdrawal from Iraq, 2005

Despite the Iraq war's complexities, the arguments made and policy options proposed in discussing this issue have been remarkably limited and largely confined to a U.S.-centered framework. The realities of Iraq are all too often neglected, misunderstood, or ignored. Indeed, the basic conception bothof the Bush administration and of its most bitter opponents regardingthe situation in Iraq is inaccurate and increasingly disastrous. The ruling premise in Washington is that, by staying the course, maintaining a large-scale U.S. presence, defeating the insurgents, and strengthening an elected government, it is possible to achieve both stability and a large measure of democracy in Iraq. Critics of these policies assert that the U.S. government is mishandling Iraq's problems or perhaps should not be dealing with them at all. Yet whether U.S. policy has been working or failing, the present situation in Iraq demands a new U.S. approach for the future. If the current strategy fails and anarchy deepens, both the new Iraqi leaders and Washington will call for a reduction in the U.S. role. If it succeeds, at least by putting a strong, freely elected Iraqi government in power, this new regime will still likely insist on a substantial and perhaps complete U.S. withdrawal from the country within a reasonable time period. Either way, there is little reason to expect that a peacefully negotiated resolution of Iraq's power struggle is going to end the violence in the near future or create a situation in which U.S. troops are going to be welcome indefinitely. The insurgents are not going to give up and in fact may well escalate their battle as a Shi'a-ruled Iraq seems inevitable. The government is going to want to assert its sovereignty and set its own strategy for fighting the civil war. Only a test of arms will decide the country's future course. [End Page 67] Such an inevitable, violent outcome can have one of two results for Washington. If the war goes on endlessly or if the Iraqi government wins it through ruthless repression and the killing of thousands of people, the world will hold the United States responsible. If a regime emerges from the insurgency that the United States has tried desperately to defeat, the United States would face a catastrophic loss of credibility and will have made a new enemy in Iraq for decades to come. The United States must therefore decide which political forces it wants to support in Iraq and begin planning its exit strategy.

Ext: A2: Withdrawal CP

The rhetoric of withdrawl only creates the condition for more hawkish-imperialism. The 2007 troop surge proves, the response from the neocons will be “retreat is defeat” and will plug more troops elsewhere.

Salah Hassan, associate professor and director of the Honors Program in the Department of English at Michigan State University, Never Ending Occupations, New Centennial Review, Spring 2008

Despite the Iraq Study Group’s recommendations to create the conditions for a partial redeployment of U.S. combat troops, in 2007 the Bush administration moved in the opposite direction, implementing “the troop surge.” Bush promoted the idea of “a surge” in a January 10, 2007 speech: “America will change our strategy to help the Iraqis carry out their campaign to put down sectarian violence and bring security to the people of Baghdad. This will require increasing American force levels. So I’ve committed more than 20,000 additional American troops to Iraq. The vast majority of them—five brigades—will be deployed to Baghdad” (Bush 2007). The strategy outlined in the speech drew in part on aspects of the Iraq Study Group report, but the surge was based on an American Enterprise Institute plan titled “Choosing Victory: A Plan for Success in Iraq” authored principally by Frederick Kagan. The proposed plan was first outlined in December 2006 and the Phase I Report was published on January 5, 2007. “Choosing Victory” presents an operational military strategy that makes the case for increased troop deployments in and around Baghdad and an intensification of counterinsurgency operations. “Choosing Victory” is explicitly directed against the more subtle political aspects of the Iraq Study Group’s Report. Where the Iraq Study Group has the appearance of a moderate middle ground, somewhere between “staying the course” and “cutting and running,” the American Enterprise Institute policy document is polemical in its advocacy of a reinforcement of U.S. military power in the region. The first premise of the American Enterprise Institute argument is that the United States must achieve a decisive military victory in Iraq and establish its uncontested authority on the terrain: “There can be no question that victory in Iraq is worth considerable American effort [End Page 6] or that defeat would be catastrophic” (3). The Report goes on to assert the importance of national wartime effort: the nation must be put on a war footing. That does not mean a return to the draft. It is possible and necessary to maintain a volunteer military while fighting this war and beyond. It does, however, mean abandoning peacetime bureaucratic routines within the Pentagon and throughout the defense establishment. It means that the president must issue a call to arms. It means that Congress must provide the necessary financial support. It means that everyone involved in the defense of the nation must make supporting the troops fighting this war the number one priority. It is disgraceful that the nation has not been placed on a war footing even this far into such an important conflict, but it is essential to transform this state of affairs if the United States is to conduct the operations necessary to avoid imminent defeat and pursue victory. (39) Lurking in the American Enterprise Institute’s argument is the equation of withdrawal with defeat. Despite the apparent differences in emphasis and scope, the Iraq Study Group and the American Enterprise Institute envision a long-term U.S. military presence in Iraq; neither “The Way Forward” nor “Choosing Victory” can imagine a complete U.S. withdrawal from Iraq, because it would be the equivalent of acknowledging the absolute political and military failure of the United States in the region. In other words, both strategic plans express the ethos of a never-ending occupation of Iraq whose antithesis is defeat and retreat. The end of the French colonial occupation of Algeria, the withdrawal of U.S. troops from Vietnam, and the retreat of the Israeli army in Southern Lebanon, are all instances of defeated military occupations that have cast a long shadow of political failure. As with Iraq today, Algeria, Vietnam, and Lebanon were situations in which the occupying power encountered a determined resistance movement, failed to establish legitimate political authority in the occupied territory, and faced growing popular discontent on the home front. The French occupation of Algeria is distinct from the other contexts because of its long colonial history, which came to an end following a brutal [End Page 7] counterinsurgency war in the mid-1950s. Although the 400,000 French troops succeeded in crushing the armed factions of the FLN (Front de Liberation Nationale), at a political level the French military operation failed, leading to a series of crises in France, not the least of which was the collapse of the 4th Republic in 1958. The Algerian example is also distinct from Vietnam or Lebanon, because French tactics have served as model of sorts for some U.S. policy analysts. Not long into the U.S. occupation of Iraq during fall 2003, well before the 2007 troop surge, the Pentagon organized a screening of Pontecorvo’s famous film “Battle of Algiers,” presumably to provide a historical analogy to the U.S. counterinsurgency operations in Iraq. Commenting on the screening in the New York Times (Sept 7, 2003), Michael Kaufman writes:

Ext: A2 Withdrawal CP

Conditions that the French faced in Algeria are similar to those the United States is finding in Iraq.” The idea that U.S. war strategists might learn something from a leftist film that portrays a brutal colonial war, may seem surprising; after all, France withdrew in 1962, ending its 130-year occupation of Algeria. But perhaps the usefulness of the film for the Pentagon lies in the short-term success of the French paratroopers in breaking the resistance movement and securing Algiers and not in the long term failure of French policy in Algeria. This view is in part confirmed by the ravings of Arthur Herman who in a April 2007 article published in Commentary defended the French counterinsurgency in Algeria and blamed metropolitan intellectuals and the media for France’s ultimate political defeat: “[in 1958] the fight against the FLN insurgents in Algeria was all but won. But the war itself was lost. By late 1959, even as the army was scoring victory after victory, President Charles de Gaulle had concluded that he had no choice but to offer Algeria ‘self-determination.’ Within two years, the French had pulled out and the FLN’s leader, Ben Bela, was Algeria’s president. What happened was this: while the French military had been concentrating on fighting the insurgency in the streets and mountains in Algeria, an intellectual and cultural insurgency at home, led by the French left and the media, had been scoring its own succession of victories” (26). [End Page 8] Herman presents a three-way comparison between Iraq, Algeria, and Vietnam, arguing that militarily the French and the United States had succeeded in the field of combat, but had lost the war on the political front, leading to withdrawal, the ultimate sign of defeat. He writes: “Most wars are lost, not won. To most Americans, the nearest example of a failed war is Vietnam. As in Iraq today, we came up against a guerrilla-type insurrectionary force led by ideological extremists; in the end, we were forced to withdraw and surrender the country of South Vietnam to the aggressors. But an even more striking parallel to our present situation exists in the French experience in Algeria almost exactly 50 years ago” (Herman 24). He concludes by emphasizing the costs of a failed military occupation: For the French, the price of failure in Algeria was the collapse of one Republic and a permanent stain on the next—along with the deep alienation of the French military from the political establishment that it believed (with considerable justification) had betrayed it. Here at home, it took the American military almost a decade and a half to recover its confidence and resiliency after the failure and humiliation of Vietnam. How we would weather another and even more consequential humiliation is anybody’s guess; but the stakes are enormous, and the clock is ticking. (28)

Ext: A2: Withdrawal CP

Occupation is built on more than just troops or bases. It comes from a historical context that is founded on a syndrome of past defeats—Withdrawl never actually happens because, even if we take the troops out, war intensifies on the periphery while simultaneously stifling American dissent.

Salah **Hassan**, associate professor and director of the Honors Program in the Department of English at Michigan State University, Never Ending Occupations, New Centennial Review, Spring **2008**

According to Herman, Algeria and Vietnam represent those historic political defeats associated with military withdrawal from an occupied territory. Herman is not wrong to make this association. The problem is with the ideological conclusion that he draws from these contexts. Rather than accepting the consequences of a wrong-headed war, he wants to incite the U.S. public and administration to redouble the war, raising the specter of an Iraq syndrome that would potentially produce a staggering effect on the United States. The U.S. debacle in Vietnam confirms the general principle that retreat equals defeat and provides the political logic for the Bush administration’s never-ending occupation of Iraq. From the very outset of the war in Iraq, commentators connected this war to that other war, opponents of the war predicting that Iraq would become another quagmire, like Vietnam, and proponents of the war arguing that the occupation of Iraq was a sign that the United States had finally overcome the syndrome of past defeats. But the [End Page 9] effect of the U.S. withdrawal from Vietnam has not been a hesitation on the part of U.S. politicians to undertake military deployments since the 1970s, which is the common understanding of the Vietnam syndrome;1 rather, since at least the 1980s, the United States has been unrestrained in its willingness to maintain and multiply military occupations in the form of significant deployments, for example in Haiti, Grenada, Iraq, and Afghanistan. For “stay the course” advocates of the war, Iraq 2007 is not Vietnam 1975; it is the Philippines 1898 or Germany 1945. Yet as the prospect of a U.S. exit strategy and possible withdrawal enters public discussion, Vietnam returns. For example, in a July 2007 article that exposes the myths about a possible withdrawal from Iraq in the context of a surge, Tom Engelhardt comments that “Withdrawal, it turns out, is forever.” He later draws an astute parallel between Iraq and Vietnam: Similarly, in the Vietnam years, the nonwithdrawal withdrawal was an endlessly played upon theme. The idea of “withdrawing” from Vietnam arose almost with the war itself, though never as an actual plan to withdraw. All real options for ending the war were invariably linked to phrases—some of which still ring bells—like “cutting and running,” or “dishonor,” or “surrender,” or “humiliation,” and so were dismissed within the councils of government more or less before being raised. . . . If anything, in the later years, “withdrawal” became—as it is now threatening to become in Iraq—a way to maintain, or even intensify, the war while pacifying the American public.

Ext: A2: Mechanism CP’s

The counterplan reinforces the root of violence- Iraq happened because of reactive problem-solution politics, our duty as academics and policymakers should be to question the forms of knowledge production that went into creating instances of conflict like Iraq. Aff is the prerequisite.

Bellamy,Pf of Peace & Conflict Studies @ Queensland and Williams,Pf of Security Studies @ Birmingham, 2004 (Alex J. and Paul, International Peacekeeping, Spring, Vol.11, No.1, Spring 2004)

Problem solving theory takes the world as it finds it and aims to make the relationships and institutions found therein work smoothly by dealing with particular sources of trouble. As we discuss in greater detail in the concluding essay, such theories are far from socially or politically redundant but must be seen as limited in their perspective and as identifying and dealing with problems in a particular manner . In this collection, several contributors argue that the theory and practice of peace operations and conflict resolution have been shaped by a problem-solving epistemology. This has resulted in managerialist solutions based upon the prevailing definitions of common sensethat privilege particular types of knowledge and experiences as relevant, and draw spatial and temporal limits around the remit of peace operations. Although such approaches may mitigate particular violent conflicts they do not challenge or seriously reflect upon the globalstructures that contribute to human suffering and, sometimes, violent conflict in the first place. Moreover, problem-solving approaches define certain forms of action as relevant, identify particular lines of causality and render certain practices legitimate at the expense of others. Critical theory on the other hand aims to reflect upon the characteristics and structures of the prevailing world order and asks how that order came about. Critical knowledge calls into question existing institutions and social power relations by enquiring into their origins and how and whether they might be in the process of changing. In relation to peace operations, a critical approach seeks to investigate who benefits from certain types of practices, what linkages exist between local actors and global structures, and why certain voices and experiences are marginalized in policy debates.24 But critical theory is not solely concerned with developing critiques of past and present thought and action. It is also fundamentally concerned with proposing reconstructive agendas based on possibilities immanent within the current global order. The first step in any reconstructive agenda, however, is to challenge prevailing conceptions of common sense and listen to what Edward Said called ‘the poor, the disadvantaged, the voiceless, the unrepresented, the powerless’.25 Reflecting upon the epistemological assumptions behind current peace operations is thus a necessary part of thinking anew.

Ext: Democracy -> Biopolitics

Democracy serves to prevent radical acts and maintain the system, the result is that we target ourselves in a war against difference

Zizek, 02 (Slavoj, philosopher and psychoanalyst, Welcome To The Desert of the Real, Verso, New York, NY, 2002

What underlies these ominous strategies is the fact that democracy (the established liberal-democratic parliamentary system) is no longer 'alive' in the Paulinian sense of the term: the tragic thing is that the only serious political force which is today 'alive' is the new populist Right. Insofar as we play the democratic game of leaving the place of power empty, of accepting the gap between this place and our occupying it (which is the very gap of castration), are we - democrats - all not 'fidel castros', faithful to castration? Apart from anaemic economic administration, the liberal-democratic centre's main function is to guarantee that nothing will really happen in politics: liberal democracy is the party of non-Event. The line of division is more and more 'Long Jive. . Le Pen, Haider, Berlusconi!' versus 'Death to ... the same!' - with the opposition life/ death adequately distributed between the two poles. Or, to put it in Nietzschean terms (as they were interpreted by Deleuze): today, the populist Right acts, sets the pace, determines the problematic of the political struggle, and the liberal centre is reduced to a 'reactive force': it ultimately limits itself to reacting to the populist Right's initiatives, either opposing them radically from an impotent Leftist posturing, or translating them into the acceptable liberal language ('while rejecting the populist hatred of the immigrants, we have to admit they are addressing issues which really worry people, so we should take care of the problem, introduce tougher immigration and anti-crime measures. .'). The notion of the radical political Act as the way out of this democratic deadlock, of course, cannot but provoke the expected reaction from the liberals. The standard critique concerns the Act's allegedly 'absolute' character of a radical break, which renders impossible any clear distinction between a properly 'ethical' act and, say. a Nazi monstrosity: is it not that an Act is always embedded in a specific socio-symbolic context? The answer to this reproach is clear: of course - an Act is always a specific intervention within a socio-symbolic context; the same gesture can be an Act or a ridiculous empty posture, depending on this context (say, making a public ethical statement when it is too late changes a courageous intervention into an irrelevant gesture). In what, then, resides the misunderstanding? Why this critique? There is something else which disturbs the critics of the Lacanian notion of Act: true, an Act is always situated in a concrete context - this, however, does not mean that it is fully determined by its context. An Act always involves a radical risk, what Derrida, following Kierkegaard, called the madness of a decision: it is a step into the open, with no guarantee about the final outcome - why? Because an Act retroactively changes the very co-ordinates into which it intervenes. This lack, of guarantee is what the critics cannot tolerate: they want an Act without risk -- not without empirical risks, but without the much more radical 'transcelldental risk' that the Act will not only simply fail, but radically misfire. In short, to paraphrase Robespierre, those ""vho oppose the 'absolute Act' effectively oppose the Act as such, they want an Act without the Act. What they want is homologous to the 'democratic' opportunists who, as Lenin put it in the autumn of 1917, want a 'democratically legitimized' revolution, as if one should first organize a referendum, and only then, after obtaining a clear majority, seize power ... It is here that one can see how an Act proper cannot be contained within the limits of democracy (conceived as a positive system of legitimizing pm-ver through free elections). The Act occurs in an emergency when one has to take the risk and act without an)' legitimization, engaging oneself into a kind of Pascalean wager that the Act itself will create the conditions of its retroactive 'democratic' legitimization. Say, when, in 1940, after the French defeat, de Gaulle called for the continuation of warfare against the Germans, his gesture was without 'democratic legitimization' (at that moment, a large majority of the French were unambiguously supporting Marshall Petain - Jacques Duclos, the leading French Communist, "' .. Tote that, if 'free elections' were to be held in France in the autunm of 1940, Petain would have got at least 90 per cent of the votes). However, in spite of this lack of 'democratic legitimization' , the truth was on de Gaulle's side, and he effectively was speaking on behalf of France, of the French people 'as such'. This also enables us to answer the ultimate democratic reproach: the absolute (self-referential) act is deprived of any external control which would prevent terrifying excesses - anything can be legitimized in a self-referential war? The answer is clear: as (among others) the case of France in 1940 demonstrates, democracy itself cannot provide such a guarantee; there is no guarantee against the possibility of the excess - the risk has to be assumed, it is part of the very field of the political. And, perhaps, the ultimate aim of the 'war on terror' , of the imposition of what one cannot but call the 'democratic state of emergency', is to neutralize the conditions of such an Act. According to an old Marxist topos, the evocation of the external enemy serves to displace the focus from the true origin of tensions, the inherent antagonism of the system - recall the standard explanation of anti-Semitism as the displacement onto the figure of the Jew, this external intruder into our social body, of the cause of the antagonisms v,rhich threaten the harmony of this body.

There is, however, also the opposite ideological operation, the false evocation of internal causes of failure. In 1940, when Pertain became the French leader, he explained the French defeat as the result of a long process of degeneration of the French state caused by the liberal-Jewish influence; so, according to Petain, the French defeat was a blessing in disguise, a shattering and painful reminder of one's weaknesses and thus a chance to reconstitute French strength on a healthy base. Do we not find the same motif in many a conservative critic of today's permissive-consumerist Western societies? The ultimate threat does not come from out there, from the fundamentalist other, but from within, from our own lassitude and moral weakness, loss of clear values and firm commitments, of the spirit of dedication and sacrifice.... No wonder that, in their first reaction, Jerry Falwell and Pat Robertson claimed that, on September 11, the USA got what it deserved. What, then, if exactly the same logic sustains the 'war on terror'? What if the true aim of this '.war' is ourselves, our own ideological mobilization against the threat of the Act? What if the 'terrorist attack' , no matter how 'real' and terrifying, is ultimately a metaphoric substitute for this Act, for the shattering of our liberal-democratic consensus.

Ext: Democracy -> Biopolitics

Sovereignty uses democracy as a tool to organize constituents to limit and control populations locking them into the social order

Yegenoglu 03 (Meyda, Wendy, Liberal Multiculturalism and the Ethics of Hospitality in the Age of Globalization, MUSE,

For Negri, to speak of constituent power is to speak of democracy for it is constituent power that regulates democracy. It is not only all-powerful, but also has an expansive and unlimited quality. It emerges from the vortex of the void and is characterized by the openness of its needs and the absence of determinations and finalities. Its strength lies in the fact that it never ends up in power, nor its multitude results in a totality. As an open multiplicity, it is always based upon a set of singularities. Its all-powerful and expansive tendency, its strength, which opens a horizon, never results in a vertical or totalitarian dimension. The active elements of constituent power are resistance, desire, and an ethical impulse. It does not seek institutionality but aims at constructing an ethical being. It is for these reasons that Negri emphasizes the strong link between constituent power and democracy. Democracy is the political form of constituent power. The concept of democracy in Negri's formulation is not treated as a subspecies or a subcategory of liberalism but refers to a form of governability that enables the freeing of constituent power, because it entails a totality without a closure and the exclusion of any sign of external definition. It is a project of the multitude and is a creative force. This multitude is not an ungraspable multiplicity but is the strength of singularities and differences. As a singular multidirectionality it refers to an irreducible concept of the political and to an ethics that recognizes singularities. Like democracy, constituent power resists being constitutionalized.      The opposite of democracy and constituent power is not totalitarianism but sovereignty itself and constitutional power. The establishment of constitutional power presents a closure to the always-open nature of constituent power. When constituent power is articulated in juridical definitions, it is limited, closed, reduced to juridical categories, and is restrained in administrative routines. The State's constitutionality and its various other regulatory activities bring a form of control, well-defined limits, and procedures to the all-expansive force of the constituent power. Once it is situated in the concept of the nation and absorbed by the mechanism of representation, constituent power is perverted, desiccated, congealed in a static system. Representation is one of the fundamental juridical-constitutional instruments in exercising control and in segmenting constituent power. Its dilution in representative mechanisms manifests itself in political space but is disguised in the activity of the Supreme Court and other organs of the State. These mechanisms restore traditional sovereignty and close the possibility of democratic innovation. The taming and suffocation of constituent power by constitutionalist arrangements entails the mediation of inequalities and hence the neutralization of its strength. The fixing and institutionalization of constituent power implies its de facto termination and negation. And in this way, the sovereignty inverts the ostensible foundation of democratic polity and reconstructs itself as the foundation.

Ext: Democracy -> Biopolitics

Democracy generates its obsene underside, serves to prevent change and maintain a corrupt system

Zizek, 02 (Slavoj, philosopher and psychoanalyst, Welcome To The Desert of the Real, Verso, New York, NY, 2002

A postmodern liberal democrat’s first, quasi-automatic, reaction to this joke would be: this, precisely, is the source of Evil today - people who think they have a direct line to God (Truth, Justice, Democracy, or some other Absolute), and feel justified in denouncing others, their opponents, as having a direct line to Hell (Evil Empires or axes of Evil); against this absolutization, we should modestly accept that all our positions are relative, conditioned by contingent historical constellations, so that no one has definitive Solutions, merely pragmatic temporary solutions. The falsity of this stance was denounced by Chesterton: 'At any street corner we may meet a man who utters the frantic and blasphemous statement that he may be wrong. Every day one comes across somebody who says that of course his view may not be the right one. Of course his view must be the right one, or it is not his view.'32 Is the same falsity not clearly discernible in the rhetoric of many a Postmodern deconstructionist? Chesterton is quite right to use the strong term 'blasphemous', which must be given its whole weight here: the apparently modest relativization of one's own position is the mode of appearance of its very opposite, of privileging one's own position of enunciation. Compare the struggle and pain of the 'fundamentalist' with the serene peace of the liberal democrat who, from his safe subjective position, ironically dismisses every full-fledged engagement, every 'dogmatic' taking sides. So are we preaching the old lesson of how the ideological meaning of an element does not dwell in this element itself, but hinges on the way it is (appropriated', articulated into a chain? Yes - with one fateful proviso: that we should summon up the courage to abandon' democracy' as the Master-Signifier of this chain. Democracy is today's main political fetish, the disavowal of basic social antagonisms: in the electoral situation, the social hierarchy is momentarily suspended, the social body is reduced to a pure multitude which can be numbered, and here the antagonism is also suspended. A decade ago, in the State of Louisiana's governor elections, when the only alternative to the ex-KKK David Duke was a corrupt Democrat, many cars displayed a sticker: 'Vote for a crook - it's important!' In the May 2002 French presidential elections, Front National leader Jean-Marie Ie Pen got through to the final round against the incumbent, Jacques Chirac, who is suspected of financial impropriety. Faced with this unenviable choice, demonstrators displayed a banner reading 'L' arnaque plutot que la haine [Swindling is better than hating}'. That is the ultimate paradox of democracy: within the existing political order, every campaign against corruption ends up being co-opted by the populist extreme Right. In Italy, the ultimate outcome of the 'clean hands' campaign which destroyed the old political establishment centered on Christian Democracy is Berlusconi in power; in Austria, Haider legitimized his rise to power in anti-corruption terms; even in the USA, it is accepted common wisdom that Democratic Congressmen are more corrupt than Republican ones. The idea of a 'honest democracy' is an illusion, as is the notion of the order of Law without its obscene superego supplement: what looks like a contingent distortion of the democratic project is inscribed into its very notion - that is, democracy is democrassouille. The democratic political order is of its very nature susceptible to corruption. The ultimate choice is: do we accept and endorse this corruption in a spirit of realistic resigned wisdom, or can we summon up the courage to formulate a Leftist alternative to democracy in order to break the vicious cycle of democratic corruption and the Rightist campaigns to get rid of it?

\*\*\*Policy Aff Section\*\*\*
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Contention 1: Inherency

Iraq is teetering on sectarian violence now, but stabilizing, action soon is key.

McGurk, 10 - International Affairs Fellow in Residence at the Council on Foreign Relations (Brett H. McGurk, April 2010, “Iraq: Struggling Through 'Highest Risk' Window” <http://www.cfr.org/publication/21842/iraq.html?breadcrumb=/region/publication_list%3Fid%3D405>)

On the positive side of the ledger, Iraq has suffered far worse violence than anything seen in the past week. Nor are there signs of an unraveling situation. Indeed, the precursors to large-scale sectarian violence--which we saw in 2006--are not present. There are no signs of militias regenerating; Iraq's security forces are responding ably (as opposed to committing their own atrocities); and the government is continuing to serve in a caretaker capacity. We simply do not know whether the spark of sectarian bloodshed might once again be lit--but we now know for certain that AQI will try its hardest to do so. The coming months, therefore, will be extremely delicate, dangerous, and uncertain. Remember that the Samarra Mosque attack, which launched a sectarian war in Iraq, took place on February 22, 2006--nine weeks after national elections. We are today less than four weeks out from the March 7, 2010, elections, and months away from having a new government in place. General Raymond Odierno, the commander of U.S. forces in Iraq, has called the ninety days after an election the "window of highest risk

However, Increasing violence means the withdrawal will be delayed

Chulov, The Guardian, 5-12-2010 (Martin, “Iraq violence set to delay US troop withdrawal”, http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2010/may/12/iraq-us-troop-withdrawal-delay)

The White House is likely to delay the withdrawal of the first large phase of combat troops from Iraq for at least a month after escalating bloodshed and political instability in the country. General Ray Odierno, the US commander, had been due to give the order within 60 days of the general election held in Iraq on 7 March, when the cross-sectarian candidate Ayad Allawi edged out the incumbent leader, Nouri al-Maliki. American officials had been prepared for delays in negotiations to form a government, but now appear to have balked after Maliki's coalition aligned itself with the theocratic Shia bloc to the exclusion of Allawi, who attracted the bulk of the minority Sunni vote. There is also concern over interference from Iraq's neighbours, Iran, Turkey and Syria. Late tonight seven people were killed and 22 wounded when a car bomb planted outside a cafe exploded in Baghdad's Sadr City, a Shia area, police and a source at the Iraqi interior ministry said. The latest bomb highlights how sectarian tensions are rising, as al-Qaida fighters in Iraq and affiliated Sunni extremists have mounted bombing campaigns and assassinations around the country. The violence is seen as an attempt to intimidate all sides of the political spectrum and press home the message to the departing US forces that militancy remains a formidable foe. Odierno has kept a low profile since announcing the deaths of al-Qaida's two leaders in Iraq, Abu Omar al-Baghdadi and Abu Ayub al-Masri, who were killed in a combined Iraqi-US raid on 18 April. The operation was hailed then as a near fatal blow against al-Qaida, but violence has intensified ever since.

\*\*\*1AC\*\*

Contention Two: Advantages

First, Human Rights-

U.S. troops practice collective punishment on civilians, killing 1200 people per strike, destroying human rights credibility.

MHRI 5 [“First Periodical Report of Monitoring Net of Human Rights in Iraq”, http://www.brusselstribunal.org/survey111105.htm#6]

The U.S. Army applied the method of collective punishment of civilians, with the pretence that armed groups of fighters live among them. The U.S. Army bombed the city of Fallujah killing more than 700 persons in the month of April, and more than 1200 persons during the November battle. On the outskirts of the city, in the Al-Sajar area, a mass grave with more than 400 bodies was found, including bodies of children, men and women of all age groups. The rests of other bodies found under the ruins were gathered by the U.S. Army and were then disposed of in the "Al-Maqale'" area, outside of Fallujah. This area is now officially closed, no entrance is permitted. Collective punishment was also conducted on the citizens of the cities of Al-Qa'em and Al-Karabelah, without discrimination between young or old. Before that, a wedding party at Al-Qa'em was bombed killing more than 41 persons, most of them children and women, in addition to the groom Mohammad Rakad Al-Fahdawi and his brother Ahmad. The U.S. Army bombed the village of Al-Bofraj, near Al-Ramadi (west Iraq) with heavy artillery after the U.S. military base there had been attacked by Iraqi fighters. The bombing killed 3 citizens, a woman and a child were injured. During a five day siege, the city of Ruwah (West Iraq) was bombed randomly, causing the families to flee. During the initial and random bombing of Fallujah in the night from 13th to 14th October, 34 buildings were damaged. According to medical centers in the city the number of victims could not be identified, due to the fact that the bombing increased and many of the victims were buried beneath the ruins. During the military attacks on the city of Haditha, conducted by the U.S. and Iraqi Forces, civilians send out a letter demanding help, since their city was being deemed permissible, their women and children and elderly were being killed, among them Sheikh Ismaeel Al-Rawi as he came out of the mosque (Al-Saif Al-Haditha) after attending the morning prayers. Families were driven out of their homes, which were then turned into military bases. Further, the citizens were subject to abuse and insults by the members of the National Guard

Human rights violations by the US military are perceived internationally.

**Washington Post**, July 23, **2000**

US military forces will increasingly be called upon to conduct a broad range of operations—from peacekeeping, as in Somalia; to nation building, as in Kosovo and Haiti, to the traditional warfare we waged in Kuwait. As formidable as these tasks are operationally, they will be even more difficult if charges of human rights abuses undermine America’s military standing. Not only will opponents of the United States exploit past war crimes charges to undermine America’s credibility and future military operations, but even US allies will find it difficult to support already politically sensitive missions if there is no independent resolution of such charges. Whether or not a civilian commission is the answer, in order to build international coalitions and deploy troops effectively, the United States must have credibility as a protector of human rights.

\*\*\*1AC\*\*\*

Loss of human rights credibility destroys relations, hurts soft power, and guarantees that we can no longer persuade allies.

Doug Cassel, Director of the [Center for Civil and Human Rights](http://www.nd.edu/~cchr/) at the University of Notre Dame Law School. “Next President Must Restore America’s Human Rights Credibility.” May 21, 2008. <http://www.wbez.org/content.aspx?audioid=23280>

What can the next President do to restore American credibility on human rights? Following the lapses of this Administration, there is nowhere to go but up. But if we are to recover our good name, dramatic words must be accompanied by persuasive actions. Failure to seize this opportunity would be a serious foreign policy loss. No one puts the case more eloquently than a group of former United States diplomats whom I had the privilege to represent in a friend-of-the-court brief before the United States Supreme Court. Their brief argues that prisoners held by the US at Guantanamo should have a right to file habeas corpus petitions to challenge the lawfulness of their detention. In language penned by former Under Secretary of State William D. Rogers, whose death shortly after the brief was filed I mourn, the diplomats advise: “It has been the experience of each of us that our most important diplomatic asset has been this nation’s values. Power counts. But this nation’s respect for the rule of law – and in particular our reverence for the fundamental constitutional guarantee of individual freedom from arbitrary government authority – have gone far to earn us the respect and trust which lie at the heart of all cordial relations between nations. …” “Any hint that America is not all that it claims, or that it is prepared to ignore a ‘non-negotiable demand of human dignity,’ … demeans and weakens this nation’s voice abroad.”

U.S. soft power stifles 30+ fledgling conflicts from escalating to nuclear conflagration, otherwise instability and vertical escalation guarantee power, regional and communal conflict.

Joseph S. Nye Jr., created the theory of “soft power,” distinguished service professor and former dean of Harvard’s Kennedy School of Government, PhD in Political Science from Harvard, 1996 (“Conflicts after the Cold War,” Washington Quarterly)

As a result of such disjunctions between borders and peoples, there have been some 30 communal conflicts since the end of the Cold War, many of them still ongoing. Communal conflicts, particularly those involving wars of secession, are very difficult to manage through the UN and other institutions built to address interstate conflicts. The UN, regional organizations, alliances, and individual states cannot provide a universal answer to the dilemma of self-determination versus the inviolability of established borders, particularly when so many states face potential communal conflicts of their own. In a world of identity crises on many levels of analysis, it is not clear which selves deserve sovereignty: nationalities, ethnic groups, linguistic groups, or religious groups. Similarly, uses of force for deterrence, compellence, and reassurance are much harder to carry out when both those using force and those on the receiving end are disparate coalitions of international organizations, states, and sub national groups. Moreover, although few communal conflicts by themselves threaten security beyond their regions, some impose risks of "horizontal" escalation, or the spread to other states within their respective regions. This can happen through the involvement of affiliated ethnic groups that spread across borders, the sudden flood of refugees into neighboring states, or the use of neighboring territories to ship weapons to combatants. The use of ethnic propaganda also raises the risk of "vertical" escalation to more intense violence, more sophisticated and destructive weapons, and harsher attacks on civilian populations as well as military personnel. There is also the danger that communal conflicts could become more numerous if the UN and regional security organizations lose the credibility, willingness, and capabilities necessary to deal with such conflicts. Preventing and Addressing Conflicts: The Pivotal U.S. Role Leadership by the United States, as the world's leading economy, its most powerful military force, and a leading democracy, is a key factor in limiting the frequency and destructiveness of great power, regional, and communal conflicts. The paradox of the post-cold war role of the United States is that it is the most powerful state in terms of both "hard" power resources (its economy and military forces) and "soft" ones (the appeal of its political system and culture), yet it is not so powerful that it can achieve all its international goals by acting alone. The United States lacks both the international and domestic prerequisites to resolve every conflict, and in each case its role must be proportionate to its interests at stake and the costs of pursuing them. Yet the United States can continue to enable and mobilize international coalitions to pursue shared security interests, whether or not the United States itself supplies large military forces. The U.S. role will thus not be that of a lone global policeman; rather, the United States can frequently serve as the sheriff of the posse, leading shifting coalitions of friends and allies to address shared security concerns within the legitimizing framework of international organizations. This requires sustained attention to the infrastructure and institutional mechanisms that make U.S. leadership effective and joint action possible: forward stationing and preventive deployments of U.S. and allied forces, prepositioning of U.S. and allied equipment, advance planning and joint training to ensure interoperability with allied forces, and steady improvement in the conflict resolution abilities of an interlocking set of bilateral alliances, regional security organizations and alliances, and global institutions.

\*\*\*1AC\*\*\*

US military withdrawal from Iraq is the vital internal link to solving for human rights abuses.

Ghali Hassan, *contributor to Global Research. “*How the US Erase Women’s Rights in Iraq.” October 7, 2005. http://www.globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=va&aid=1054

The U.S. is not the “guardian” of human rights, as many Americans still living with this fallacy; the U.S. has become the opposite, a creator of misery and injustice. The American people should be made a ware of the path their nation is taking, and the crimes it is committing in their name against innocent people around the world. Whatever Americans think of their nation and the crimes their government committing against innocent people, “for the people of Iraq and the rest of the world, [the torture and abuses of human rights] will serve as a reminder of America’s unyielding sadism against those who have the misfortune of living under its occupation”, wrote Dr. Joseph Massad of Columbia University in New York. “The [Occupation] proves that the content of the word[s] ‘freedom’ [and “liberty”] that American politicians and propagandists want to impose on the rest of the world [are] nothing more and nothing less than America’s violent domination, racism, torture, sexual humiliation, and the rest of it”, added Dr. Massad. The U.S. Occupation of Iraq proves that freedom and liberty were not the words the United States was founded upon. **The only hope left for Iraqis to gain their freedom and liberty is the immediate and full withdrawal of U.S. troops,** and their collaborators from Iraq. The forming of an Iraqi government based on national unity and independence should provide laws that are legitimate and that guarantee human rights for all Iraqis.

\*\*\*1AC\*\*\*

Advantage 2: Racism

US occupation establishes a divide between races that is founded upon mutual insecurity, guaranteeing sectarian wars and abuse of civilians.

**MHRI 5** [“First Periodical Report of Monitoring Net of Human Rights in Iraq”, http://www.brusselstribunal.org/survey111105.htm#6]

One of the biggest crimes committed by occupation is establishing the bases of racism by dividing the temporary government authorities and institutions according to racial and religious backgrounds. This practice was widened by the bad-reputed Emergency Law. Therewith, if a certain political party takes control of a certain ministry, the former staff and cadres, especially those of higher and key positions, are being dismissed and released from their offices, so as to be replaced by new staff pertaining to that political party. This, for example, has happened in the Ministry of Electricity at the beginning of the Al-Ja'afari government period. The newly appointed Minister of Electricty belonged to the Shi'ite confession; three General Directors within the Ministry, all belonging to the Sunnite confession, were then dismissed and replaced by three Shi'a counterparts. The same happened in other ministries. Baan Solagh, the Minister of Interior in Al-Ja'afari government, did the same in his Ministry. He further used security forces which were mainly constituted of the militia of his party (SCIRI). In one incident, a group of security forces (Group 20), who were being trained in Jordan, were surprised to see upon their return, that the post that they were supposed to fill had been given to other people, while they had been fired for no justified reasons. This incident led to the dismissal of 1200 graduates of the security forces, and was confirmed by Noori Alnoori, the General Inspector in the Ministry of Interior. There is a current debate to merge the different parties' militias into the Iraqi Army without considering the necessity of forming the army from independent individuals who will only follow the orders of the government and not the directions of their parties or who are affected by their parties' policies. In the city of Samawa and despite the approval of Dr. Ibraheem Al-Ja'afari to appoint 1,987 police men, many of the nominated were replaced by others with different excuses. The replacsed police men organized a peaceful demonstration on Tuesday, 19th July 2005, demanding their rights. The demonstration was ended when the police opened fire on the demonstrators in the presence of the governorate's Mayor Muhammad Alziadi, killing Razzaq Faisal Salman and injuring 7 others. The security forces have committed many arrests based on citizen's confessions, especially in Sunni dominated neighborhoods in Baghdad. In Alamiriya, Alkhadhra, Al'iskan, and Abu Ghoraib persons were arrested after viewing their IDs according to their confessions and family names. There are sectarian and racial discriminations in the arrests being made in the cities of Al-Mosul and Karkouk. Kurdish arrestees were released shortly after their arrests because the investigating officers were Kurds. It is worth noticing that the sectarian feelings are being used only by some of the political parties and militias who want to gain wide public support, employing sectarian propaganda and using their media to strengthen their influence, while a large portion of the Iraqi people reject and resent such racist methods. In the northern parts of the governorate of Babel, random killings take place among the different religious confessions. The aim of these killings is to start a sectarian civil war that will spill over to other parts of the country. Some of the citizens in that area reported that the violence was started by militias of some of the political parties.

\*\*\*1AC\*\*\*

Preventing racism is an apriora framing issue. We don’t claim to solve all racism, but incrementally move away from it by avoiding racist occupation of Iraq—independent reason to vote affirmative.

Joseph Barndt, co-director of Crossroads, a multicultural ministry, 1991, Dismantling Racism: The Continuing Challenge to White America, p. 155-6

The limitations imposed on people of color by poverty, subservience, and powerlessness are cruel, inhuman, and unjust: the effects of uncontrolled power, privilege, and greed, which are the marks of our white prison, will inevitably destroy us. But we have also seen that the walls of racism can be dismantled. We are not condemned to an inexorable fate, but are offered the vision and the possibility of freedom. Brick by brick, stone by stone, the prison of individual, institutional, and cultural racism can be destroyed. You and I are urgently called to join the efforts of those who know it is time to tear down, once and for all, the walls of racism. The danger point of self-destruction seems to be drawing even more near. The results of centuries of national and worldwide conquest and colonialism, of military buildups and violent aggression, of overconsumption and environmental destruction may be reaching a point of no return. A small and predominately white minority of the global population derives its power and privilege from the sufferings of the vast majority of peoples of color. For the sake of the world and ourselves, we dare not allow it to continue.

\*\*\*1AC\*\*\*

Plan: The United States federal government should withdraw all forward deployed combat troops from the Republic of Iraq.

\*\*\*HR Advantage\*\*\*

UQ: Human Rights Efforts Failing

Current human rights efforts are failing

**MHRI 5** [“First Periodical Report of Monitoring Net of Human Rights in Iraq”, http://www.brusselstribunal.org/survey111105.htm#6]

Many workers in the field of human rights have been denied access to the American and the Iraqi jails. The field team of the Baghdad Center for Human Rights was denied access to the city of Fallujah. One member of the team was assaulted and the others were expelled. Ali Al-Shammaa', the chairman of the Iraqi Organization of Human Rights, along with 3 of the members were killed in his office. Nothing was taken from the office, indicating that the criminals were not looters but rather that they object to the spread of ideas and to the education of the human rights in the new Iraqi society.

Internal: Troop Presence Kills HR Cred

Perception is that the U.S. is promoting Human Rights while abusing Iraqi’s---kills credibility.

Daya Gamage**,** US National Correspondent Asian Tribune. 04-07**-**2010. “U.S. war crimes-atrocities in Iraq/Afghanistan exposed: Attempted cover-up foiled.” http://www.asiantribune.com/news/2010/04/07/us-war-crimes-atrocities-iraqafghanistan-exposed-attempted-cover-foiled

The United States, which periodically lectures to developing Third World nations about protecting human rights, rule of law, good governance and high moral standards, annually issuing ‘human rights practices’ of other countries, cannot restrain its own Special Operations forces stationed in Iraq and Afghanistan from indiscriminately killing innocent civilians. The worst is that U.S. authorities blatantly lie about these atrocities and war crimes by twisting the story to read that ‘insurgents’ were killed in a confrontation. This week, the United States, the foremost advocator to the Globe on human rights and rule of law while accusing other nations of committing genocide, war crimes and other atrocities, was exposed how U.S. Special Operations forces killed an innocent family in Afghanistan last February and another civilian massacre in Iraq in 2007.

Internal: Troops Abuse Civilians in Iraq

The US military has dramatically increased day-to-day violence in Iraq. Iraqi women have locked themselves in their homes to prevent getting beaten or raped by troops.

Ghali Hassan, *contributor to Global Research. “*How the US Erase Women’s Rights in Iraq.” October 7, 2005. <http://www.globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=va&aid=1054>

Indeed, Western mainstream media, Western propagandists, and women movements are deliberately concentrating on the role of Islam in the new constitution, ignoring the Occupation as the main violator of Iraqi women’s rights. Iraq has been a secular society for generations. Iraqi women are more literal with their Islam than any of the surrounding dictatorships who alleged to live according to Islamic laws. Since the U.S. Occupation, Iraqi women started to cover their heads which is continuously promoted in Western media as the face of oppressed Iraqi women. On the contrary, the percentage of Iraqi women in traditional wear was miniscule before the invasion. The brutality of the U.S. Occupation and the violent nature of the US military created the right conditions for the current violence against women. All evidence shows that violence has increased dramatically since the invasion, because it served the U.S. main objective. “Several [Iraqi] politicians [in the puppet government] have actually suggested that the U.S. is involved in the sectarian killings in Iraq; encouraging sectarian strife with the aim of weakening the Iraqi nation and destabilizing the country, which would justify extending its military presence there”, reported *Al-Jazeera* on 04 October 2005. U.S.-instigated violence and the miserable living conditions created by the Occupation have forced Iraqi women to lock themselves in their homes. And even in their homes, Iraqi women are less safe today than before the invasion. U.S. forces and their collaborators continue to raid, Iraqi homes days and nights, accompanied by terror and human rights

Internal: Troops Kill Civilians

Violent firing by the US military causes an overwhelming number of civilian casualties.

Daya Gamage**,** US National Correspondent Asian Tribune. 04-07**-**2010. “U.S. war crimes-atrocities in Iraq/Afghanistan exposed: Attempted cover-up foiled.” http://www.asiantribune.com/news/2010/04/07/us-war-crimes-atrocities-iraqafghanistan-exposed-attempted-cover-foiled

The news also brings evidence of another civilian massacre, this time from a July 27, 2007 incident near Baghdad in Iraq. Wikileaks, an investigative journalistic web site, released a video this week apparently showing a US helicopter crew firing upon a group of Iraqis hanging out on a street corner, and on a van that stopped to carry the wounded to the hospital. Over a dozen people, including two Reuters reporters, were killed and two children in the van were wounded. The U.S. admitted that the 37-minute video release Monday, April 5 was authentic. As in the Afghan incident, the military initially denied that any error had taken place. 5th April 2010 WikiLeaks released a classified US military video depicting the indiscriminate slaying of over a dozen people in the Iraqi suburb of New Baghdad -- including two Reuters news staff. Reuters has been trying to obtain the video through the Freedom of Information Act, without success since the time of the attack. The video, shot from an Apache helicopter gun-site, clearly shows the unprovoked slaying of a wounded Reuters employee and his rescuers. Two young children involved in the rescue were also seriously wounded. Wikileaks has obtained and decrypted this previously unreleased video footage from a US Apache helicopter in 2007. It shows Reuters journalist Namir Noor-Eldeen, driver Saeed Chmagh, and several others as the Apache shoots and kills them in a public square in Eastern Baghdad. They are apparently assumed to be insurgents. After the initial shooting, an unarmed group of adults and children in a minivan arrives on the scene and attempts to transport the wounded. They are fired upon as well. The official statement on this incident initially listed all adults as insurgents and claimed the US military did not know how the deaths occurred. Wikileaks released this video with transcripts and a package of supporting documents on April 5, 2010 on <http://collateralmurder.com> At a news conference at the National Press Club in Washington, WikiLeaks said it had acquired the video from whistle-blowers in the military and viewed it after breaking the encryption code. WikiLeaks edited the video to 17 minutes. On the day of the attack, United States military officials said that the helicopters had been called in to help American troops who had been exposed to small-arms fire and rocket-propelled grenades in a raid. “There is no question that coalition forces were clearly engaged in combat operations against a hostile force,” Lt. Col. Scott Bleichwehl, a spokesman for the multinational forces in Baghdad, said then. The U.S. cover-up of the incident blew in their face with the release of the video by Wikileaks. Dave Lindorff, a columnist for Counterpunch, said “There has been no talk of bring charges against the Special Forces personnel who committed these killings and who then sought to cover up their actions, or those who were with them who allowed this crime to be committed and didn't report it.” These are two of series of massacres of innocent civilians in Afghanistan and Iraq, how the United States endeavored to conceal and blew in their faces when evidence surfaced to the dismay of U.S. authorities. It is interesting to see if the United Nations Secretary-General would appoint a ‘panel of experts’ to apprise him of atrocities, war crimes and other excesses committed by the occupying forces of the U.S. and other NATO countries in Iraq and Afghanistan

# Internal: Troop Presence kills HR Cred

Iraqi civilians have less freedom post-US invasion.

**MHRI 5** [“First Periodical Report of Monitoring Net of Human Rights in Iraq”, http://www.brusselstribunal.org/survey111105.htm#6]

Since the beginning of occupation, the occupation forces did not conceal their fears and hatred towards the Islamic worshiping places since they consider them to be the source of inspiration for those who fight the occupation. Despite all international treaties, concerning the preservation of religious freedoms, the occupation forces failed to respect the sacredness of holy places and of the right to conduct religious rituals. It has become common practice to launch raids against the worshipping places, such as the raid of Al-Haq mosque in Alsha'ab neighborhood in Baghdad on 21st July 2005 by police forces. Sheikh Ahmad Hasan Alnajjar, the mosque's preacher, along with his son Tariq were arrested, the doors of the mosques were destroyed and its belongings were messed with. Similar acts on the Sunni mosques in Iraq have become daily practice. The American forces supported by the Iraqi forces have carried out raids against more than 143 mosques in Baghdad, and more than once against the same mosques in some cases. In addition to the desecration of these places of worship, they caused damages to the buildings and to their possessions (see Appendix 2). The American and the Iraqi forces have killed more than 53 preachers and mosques servants and arrested more than 665 for no clear reasons (see Appendices 3 and 4). On 20th January 2005, during a routine patrol in Buka jail in Basra city, the American forces tore the holy Qur'an. This profanation resulted in an uproar among the prisoners, who then demonstrated and clashed with the occupation forces, ending with the killing of 4 prisoners and injuring 2 American soldiers. The Emergency Law is being used to supress many **civil rights**. In the city of Falloujah, for example, peaceful demonstrations are only allowed after obtaining the approval of the military governor Genral Mahdi Alghrawi, who orders random arrests and receives bribes from relatives of tortured detainees, as was reported by many citizens. The Council of the governorate of Babil issued a resolution to prohibit peaceful demonstrations until an undetermined date, after an explosion that killed one of the police commandos. This resolution denies the basic civil right to the freedom of expression.

No alt causes—the US is negatively perceived internationally uniquely because of its failures in Iraq.

FrancisFukuyama,American [philosopher](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Philosopher), [political economist](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Political_economy), and author. “After Neoconservatism.” February 19,2006**.** <http://www.nytimes.com/2006/02/19/magazine/neo.html?pagewanted=print>

As we approach the third anniversary of the onset of the [Iraq](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/international/countriesandterritories/iraq/index.html?inline=nyt-geo) war, it seems very unlikely that history will judge either the intervention itself or the ideas animating it kindly. By invading Iraq, the Bush administration created a self-fulfilling prophecy: Iraq has now replaced Afghanistan as a magnet, a training ground and an operational base for jihadist terrorists, with plenty of American targets to shoot at. The United States still has a chance of creating a Shiite-dominated democratic Iraq, but the new government will be very weak for years to come; the resulting power vacuum will invite outside influence from all of Iraq's neighbors, including Iran. There are clear benefits to the Iraqi people from the removal of [Saddam Hussein's](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/h/saddam_hussein/index.html?inline=nyt-per) dictatorship, and perhaps some positive spillover effects in Lebanon and Syria. But it is very hard to see how these developments in themselves justify the blood and treasure that the United States has spent on the project to this point. The so-called Bush Doctrine that set the framework for the administration's first term is now in shambles. The doctrine (elaborated, among other places, in the 2002 National Security Strategy of the United States) argued that, in the wake of the Sept. 11 attacks, America would have to launch periodic preventive wars to defend itself against rogue states and terrorists with weapons of mass destruction; that it would do this alone, if necessary; and that it would work to democratize the greater Middle East as a long-term solution to the terrorist problem. But successful pre-emption depends on the ability to predict the future accurately and on good intelligence, which was not forthcoming, while America's perceived unilateralism has isolated it as never before. It is not surprising that in its second term, the administration has been distancing itself from these policies and is in the process of rewriting the National Security Strategy document.

# Internal: Troop Presence kills HR Cred

US-controlled prisons violate human rights

**MHRI 5** [“First Periodical Report of Monitoring Net of Human Rights in Iraq”, http://www.brusselstribunal.org/survey111105.htm#6]

The number of Iraqi prisoners in U.S. prison camps is estimated to exceed 280,000 prisoners of both sexes and all ages. The methods of torture and the exertion of pressure on prisoners to make t-em confess to crimes they have not committed, such as joining the armed resistance or give false information about people, vary greatly. U.S. military medical cadres remove organs and body parts from wounded prisoners before killing them, as well as from prisoners sentenced to death. These body parts are then sold, via a well organized network, in the U.S. Many bodies of the victims killed by U.S. forces were lacking organs. Oddly, the medical reports testified natural causes of death. Cases of prisoners infected with phthisis pneumonalis in the prison of Al-Mosul Police Department were reported. The causes of infection are maltreatment and physical torture. Five prisoners, Ra'fat Aziz Mansour, Marwan and three others were infected. When this became known to the officials, the prisoners were disposed of by transferring them to external prisons on the 11th of July 2005. The military and security corps are applying methods of torture which are more brutal and bloody than those used by the occupation forces. Nevertheless, formerly used methods of torture are still applied such as: Whipping on the back with wires Kicking in the lower body parts Shackling using iron chains and leaving the tortured hanging from bars or windows in painful positions for long periods of time Burning the bodies using cigarettes To struck prisoners with electricity, especially in the genitals Solitary confinement into cages, small enough so there is even no possibility to sit Deprivation of sleep Signing of testimonies without permission to read these The former kinds of torture were extended to include drilling holes into the bodies and using acids, such as sulfuric acids, burning parts of the body. During torture, the tortured are promised to be spared further torture, if they confess having committed crimes. These methods were used in Al-Mosul and other parts of Iraq. Despite a recently issued decree by the Council of Ministers, presided by its president Dr. Al-Jafari, prohibiting the detention of any person without an order by court, arbitrary and unjustified arrests are still carried out. An example for these arbitrary detentions is the case of two men, arrested by the Wolf Brigade (Al-Theeb) in Al-Mosul. The two men have been in arrest for over five months now, without any clear charges or evidence against them. Confessions were taken from them by means of torture. Currently they are detained at the Police Department of Al-Mosul in Sirdab after having spent 3 months in a prison in Al-Theeb district, and 2 months at the police department in Ninawa. The U.S. forces have turned some vital public facilities into head quarters and prisons, as they have done at the Al-Maseeb Electricity Station and at Al-Karkh Water Clarification Station at Al-Taremiyah, thereby hindering these facilities to serve the Iraqi citizens. The Iraqi Vice-Minister of Justice, Judge Bosho Ibrahim, declared the initiation of building two huge prisons in Iraq, with a capacity of 7,000 prisoners complying with international standards. The first will be built in Al-Nasseriyah and will be able to take in 4,000 prisoners. The second will be built in the area of Bani Khan in the governorate of Diyali with a capacity for 2,800 prisoners. The construction of a third prison at Rania Military Castle in the governorate of Al-Salmaniyah is planned. These prisons will take in prisoners who are sentenced to life. The plans seem to be an encouraging step towards detaining more Iraqi prisoners in support of the detention campaigns carried out in the name of fighting terrorism? For further information, 200 million U.S. $ have been granted by U.S. sources for the construction of new Iraqi prisons. The same source affirmed the existence of 3273 imprisoned and detained persons in the prisons of Baghdad, 2140 prisoners in the prisons of the central areas, and 1333 prisoners in the prisons of the southern area. In addition, there are 180 prisoners in the women's prison in Al-Kathemiyah in Baghdad. No information could be obtained on the number of prisoners in the northern areas where, according to U.S. press sources, a great number of prisoners are being held and continuous violations, with the knowledge of the U.S. forces, are taking place. In Fallujah, a clergy (A.A.S.) was arrested and tortured for 4 days by security forces, whose president is General Mahdi Al-Gharawi. The arrested was then handed over to U.S. forces, which found him innocent of any charge and thus released him. His testimony and the marks of torture were registered by the representative of the Ministry of Human Rights in the region. This representative asserted that more than 50 persons had been arrested in Fallujah in February, and that most of them had been tortured and had only been released after authorities had received bribes, ranging from 600 to 1200 U.S.$. Released prisoners of Buka prison (Basra) testified that U.S. forces killed 4 prisoners in this prison on the 29th of January 2005 and a fifth prisoner on the 3rd of February 2005. In addition, the health status of the prisoners and arrested persons is very bad, as most of them were put in tents that don’t contain any of the basic health rights that should be available. All these happenings taking place shows that there are many executions cases have taken place out of the law, and many arbitrary executions without trials are committed. This is shown through the long periods of arresting without doing any trials.

Internal: Troop Presence kills HR Cred

US-controlled prisons violate the Geneva Accords

**MHRI 5** [“First Periodical Report of Monitoring Net of Human Rights in Iraq”, http://www.brusselstribunal.org/survey111105.htm#6]

Despite the fact that the General Secretary of the United Nations and other international organizations have acknowledged the existence of more than 10,000 randomly arrested persons without clear charges, U.S. and Iraqi Forces continue with their arbitrary arrests and prolonged detentions of Iraqi citizens. These arrests continue despite a recently issued decree by the actual Council of Ministers prohibiting any detentions without lawful judgment. Nevertheless, there have been reports on cases, where judges issued verdicts to release a prisoner, but the executive authorities did not comply with this verdict. The disregard of these verdicts is sometimes used as a means to receive bribes by the detained person's family members. The most outrageous and terrible acts witnessed these days in prisons and detention camps is the inhuman treatment of children. Children are tortured to either make them or their parents confess crimes they did not commit. And although the U.S. Forces have established a council for those who want to appeal against the arrest of their children, this council does not have any practical effect and rather serves to polish the image of the U.S. Forces. In effect, this council does not hinder the U.S. Forces to violate the Geneva Conventions of 1949. The Geneva Conventions also state that citizens may only be arrested for security reasons or to trial them because of penal crimes they have committed, and that they have the right to appeal. The right of detainees to appeal is not granted in Iraq. Penalties of 3 months are extended to become several years. It has to be mentioned, that the most dangerous violation of the rights of Iraqi prisoners in U.S. detention camps in Iraq, is their transfer into U.S. prison camps outside of Iraq, such as the camp at Guantanamo, prisons on board of U.S. warships located in the Arabic Gulf and in the Pacific Ocean, and to prisons within Kuwaiti territories. The International Red Cross affirmed the presence of 8500 Iraqi prisoners of war in Kuwait.

US military presence in Iraq uniquely kills US human rights credibility

**U.S. Newswire 6** (AIUSA to Highlight Emerging Problems with Private Military Contractors During 2006 Annual Report Release, May 23 Lexis)

  <Amnesty International USA (AIUSA) today highlighted the role of private military contractors in the U.S. government's current system for outsourcing key military detention, security and intelligence operations. Such outsourcing fuels serious human rights violations and undermines accountability, the organization stated at the release of its 2006 Annual Report on the status of human rights in 150 countries. "The United States has become a world leader in avoiding human rights accountability; a case in point is the reliance of the United States government on private military contractors, which has helped create virtually rules-free zones sanctioned with the American flag and fire power," said Larry Cox, who became AIUSA's executive director May 1. "Business outsourcing may increase efficiency, but war outsourcing may be facilitating impunity. Contractors' illegal behavior and the reluctance of the U.S. government to bring them to justice are further tarnishing the United States' reputation abroad, hurting the image of American troops and contributing to anti-American sentiment. These results are a distressing return on the U.S. taxpayers' billion-dollar- plus investment and undermine what remains of U.S. moral authority abroad."  In the rush to war and with little notice, the U.S. government has outsourced billions of dollars in contracts to private military contractors, leaving to civilians some of the most essential and sensitive functions in the war, including protecting supply convoys, translating during interrogations and conducting interrogations. Despite the weak requirements for reporting crimes, allegations have surfaced implicating civilians working for the U.S. government in mistreatment of Iraqi and Afghan civilians, including hundreds of incidents of shootings at Iraqi civilians, several deaths in custody and involvement in the Abu Ghraib torture scandal. Major General George Fay's report on detainee abuse at Abu Ghraib detailed the involvement of two private military companies -- Arlington, Va.-based CACI (NYSE: CAI) and BTG, a subsidiary of San Diego-based Titan Corporation (NYSE: TTN) -- at that notorious prison facility. Titan, under an INSCOM contract with a current ceiling of approximately $650 million, has provided hundreds of linguists. CACI provided interrogators and other intelligence-related personnel under a contract with the National Business Center of the Interior beginning in September 2003. An Army Inspector General's report found that 35 percent of CACI's Iraqi interrogators had no "formal training in military interrogation policies and techniques," let alone training in the standards of international law. Currently the contractors operate in a virtually rules-free zone; they are exempt from Iraqi law per a Coalition Provisional Authority order and they fall outside the military chain of command. Of the 20 known cases of alleged misconduct by civilians in the war on terror that were forwarded by the Pentagon and CIA to the U.S. Department of Justice for investigation, DOJ has dismissed two, brought one indictment, while the remaining 17 are classified as open.>

Impact: HR Cred Solves Extinction

Increasing Human Rights Leadership prevents extinction

Copeland**,** law professor, 99 (Rhonda, NYU, New York City Law Review, 1999, p. 71-2)

The indivisible human rights framework survived the Cold War despite U.S. machinations to truncate it in the international arena. The framework is there to shatter the myth of the superiority. Indeed, in the face of systemic inequality and crushing poverty, violence by official and private actors, globalization of the market economy, and military and environmental depredation, the human rights framework is gaining new force and new dimensions. It is being broadened today by the movements of people in different parts of the world, particularly in the Southern Hemisphere and significantly of women, who understand the protection of human rights as a matter of individual and collective human survival and betterment. Also emerging is a notion of third-generation rights, encompassing collective rights that cannot be solved on a state-by-state basis and that call for new mechanisms of accountability, particularly affecting Northern countries. The emerging rights include human-centered sustainable development, environmental protection, peace, and security. Given the poverty and inequality in the United States as well as our role in the world, it is imperative that we bring the human rights framework to bear on both domestic and foreign policy. of all pro bono calls attempted through this system failed. In some months in 2006, the failure rate for these calls was between 60 and 65 percent.

# HR Cred Impact: AIDS

Preserving human rights is fundamental in preventing a massive HIV/AIDS outbreak, rghts violation increase vulnerability to infection.

**Amnesty International, No Date** (“HIV, AIDS, and Human Rights,” Accesses 11/18/2009, http://www.amnesty.org/en/health-and-human-rights/hiv-aids)

Human rights are fundamental to addressing the HIV and AIDS epidemic. On the one hand human rights violations fuel the epidemic by increasing people’s vulnerability to infection. On the other, human rights violations often follow infection and people living with HIV and AIDS can be subjected to various forms of discrimination and ill-treatment, including harassment, arbitrary arrest and torture. Discriminatory policies and practices can also result in people being denied access to the information, support and services necessary to make informed decisions and to reduce their vulnerability and risk of infection. Everywhere in the world, HIV-positive people are still subject to serious forms of stigma and discrimination. They risk losing their jobs, being ostracised from their communities and being denied equal access to goods and services necessary to realise their human rights, and even the protection of the law. The vast majority of people living with HIV have inadequate access to care and treatment. All people, including people living with HIV, have a right to the highest attainable standard of health. Amnesty International believes that respecting, protecting and fulfilling the full range of human rights of all individuals is indispensable to reducing the rates of HIV infection, expanding access to care and treatment and mitigating the impact of the epidemic, including acts of discrimination and violence.

Unchecked HIV/AIDS Risks Extinction

Michael Kibaara Muchiri, Kenyan Ministry of Education, “Will Annan Finally Put Out Africa’s Fires,” JAKARTA POST, March 6, 2000

There is no doubt that AIDS is the most serious threat to humankind, more serious than hurricanes, earthquakes, economic crises, capital crashes or floods. It has no cure yet. We are watching a whole continent degenerate into ghostly skeletons that finally succumb to a most excruciating, dehumanizing death. Gore said that his new initiative, if approved by the U.S. Congress, would bring U.S. contributions to fighting AIDS and other infectious diseases to $ 325 million. Does this mean that the UN Security Council and the U.S. in particular have at last decided to remember Africa? Suddenly, AIDS was seen as threat to world peace, and Gore would ask the congress to set up millions of dollars on this case. The hope is that Gore does not intend to make political capital out of this by painting the usually disagreeable Republican-controlled Congress as the bad guy and hope the buck stops on the whole of current and future U.S. governments' conscience. Maybe there is nothing left to salvage in Africa after all and this talk is about the African-American vote in November's U.S. presidential vote. Although the UN and the Security Council cannot solve all African problems, the AIDS challenge is a fundamental one in that it threatens to wipe out man. The challenge is not one of a single continent alone because Africa cannot be quarantined. The trouble is that AIDS has no cure -- and thus even the West has stakes in the AIDS challenge. Once sub-Saharan Africa is wiped out, it shall not be long before another continent is on the brink of extinction. Sure as death, Africa's time has run out, signaling the beginning of the end of the black race and maybe the human race

Soft Power Impacts:

Laundry List

Soft power is key to stopping disease, the global economy, world trade, weapons of mass destruction, drug traffiking, and global terrorism

Nye, 2002(Joseph S. Nye Jr, Dean at Harvard’s JFK School of Government, “Unilateralism vs. Multilateralism: American Can’t Go It Alone,” *International Herald Tribune,* p. 8, June 13, 2002) [[accessed: p. Proquest 3/31/04]]

Some transnational issues are inherently multilateral and cannot be managed without the help of other countries. Climate change is a perfect example. The United States is the largest source of greenhouse gases, but three-quarters of the sources originate outside its borders. Without cooperation, the problem is beyond American control. The same is true of a long list of items: the spread of infectious diseases, the stability of global financial markets, the international trade system, proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, narcotics trafficking, international crime syndicates, transnational terrorism. In addition, multilateralism is a means to get others to share the burden of providing pub-lic goods. Sharing also helps foster commitment to common values. Even militarily, the United States should rarely intervene alone. (Polls show that two-thirds of Americans prefer multilateral actions.) It pays a minority share of UN and NATO peacekeeping operations, and the legitimacy of a multilateral umbrella reduces collateral political costs. In choosing between multilateral and unilateral tactics, Washington should consider the effects of the decision on U.S. soft power, which can be destroyed by excessive unilateralism and arrogance.

Terrorism

Lack of consideration of soft power leads to isolationism and is the largest cause of terrorism

Nye, 2003 (Joseph S. Nye Jr, Dean at Harvard’s JFK School of Government, “Limits of American Power,” *Political Science Quarterly,* p. 545-560, Winter 2002/2003) [[accessed: p. Proquest 4/1/04]]

Pax Americana is likely to last not only because of unmatched American hard power but also to the extent that the United States "is uniquely capable of engaging in 'strategic restraint,' reassuring partners and facilitating cooperation."48 The open and pluralistic way in which U.S, foreign policy is made can often reduce surprises, allow others to have a voice, and contribute to soft power. Moreover, the impact of American preponderance is softened when it is embodied in a web of multilateral institutions that allow others to participate in decisions and that act as a sort of world constitution to limit the capriciousness of American power. That was the lesson the United States learned as it struggled to create an antiterrorist coalition in the wake of the September 2001 attacks. When the society and culture of the hegemon are attractive, the sense of threat and need to balance it are reduced.49 Whether other countries will unite to balance American power will depend on how the United States behaves as well as the power resources of potential challengers.

A loss of soft power creates a newer, smarter terrorism that will tear down the empire

Nye, 2004(Joseph S. Nye Jr, Dean at Harvard’s JFK School of Government, “A Dollop of Deeper American Values,” *Washington Post,* p. A19, March 30, 2004) [[accessed: p. Proquest 3/31/04]]

The United States is more powerful than any country since the Roman Empire, but like Rome, it is neither invincible nor invulnerable. Rome did not succumb to the rise of another empire but to the onslaught of waves of barbarians. Modern high-tech terrorists are the new barbarians. As we wend our way deeper into the struggle with terrorism, we are discovering that there are many things beyond U.S. control. The United States alone cannot hunt down every suspected al Qaeda leader hiding in remote regions of the globe. Nor can we launch a war whenever we wish without alienating other countries and losing the cooperation we need to win the peace. The war on terrorism is not a clash of civilizations -- Islam vs. the West -- but rather a civil war within Islamic civilization between extremists who use violence to enforce their vision and a moderate majority who want such things as jobs, education, health care and dignity as they practice their faith. We will not win unless the moderates win. Our soft power will never attract Osama bin Laden and the extremists. We need hard power to deal with them. But soft power will play a crucial role in our ability to attract the moderates and deny the extremists new recruits.

A2: Alt Causes to HR Cred

**The torturing of innocent civilians by U.S. troops in Iraq is the most vital internal link in the loss of H.R. credibility.**

Mark Weisbrot, co-director of the Center for Economic and Policy Research, in Washington. “Washington’s Lost Credibility on Human Rights” March 11th 2009,

http://www.cepr.net/index.php/op-eds-&-columns/op-eds-&-columns/washingtons-lost-credibility-on-human-rights/

The U.S. State Department's annual human rights report got an unusual amount of criticism this year. This time the center-left coalition government of Chile was notable in [joining other countries](http://www.valparaisotimes.cl/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=480/388/) such as Bolivia, Venezuela, and China – who have had more rocky relations with Washington – in questioning the "moral authority" of the U.S. government's judging other countries' human rights practices. It's a reasonable question, and the fact that more democratic governments are asking it may signal a tipping point. Clearly a state that is responsible for such high-profile torture and abuses as took place at Abu Ghraib and Guantanamo, the regular killing of civilians in Afghanistan and Iraq, and has reserved for itself the right to kidnap people and send them to prisons in other countries to be tortured ("extraordinary rendition") has a credibility problem on human rights issues.

US Key

The United States the key influence over Iraq

Meghan L. O'Sullivan (Adjunct Senior Fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations) March, 2010 “ After Iraq's Election, the Real Fight” http://www.cfr.org/publication/21612/after\_iraqs\_election\_the\_real\_fight.html

It is fashionable to argue that the United States has no influence in Iraq anymore. But the reality is more subtle. Certainly, U.S. financial leverage dissipated years ago, when Iraq's oil revenues skyrocketed; similarly, U.S. military leverage was always hard to use, because threats of withdrawal were credible only in extreme circumstances. Yet, although Washington is less central than in the past, it remains influential. The United States is the only party respected, if grudgingly, by nearly all sides. No other entity has the same power to convene in Iraq -- not Iran, not the United Nations. This power can be critical in a crisis or a deadlock.

\*\*\*Racism Adv\*\*\*

Racism is the politics of death used to separate individuals, at its foundation is the fear of difference, which culminates in extinction.

Eduardo Mendieta, Professor of Philosophy at SUNY-Stony Brook, April 25, 2002, online: http://www.stonybrook.edu/philosophy/faculty/emendieta/articles/foucault.pdf, accessed August 29, 2006

. It was also a power that by its own juridical logic had to submit to the jostling of rights and claims. In the very performance of its might, the power of the sovereign revealed its limitation. It is a power that is localized and circumscribed to the theater of its cruelty, and the staging of its pomp. In contrast, however, the power of the biopower state is over life [expand]. And here Foucault asks “how can biopolitics then reclaim the power over death?” or rather, how can it make die in light of the fact that its claim to legitimacy is that it is guarding, nurturing, tending to life? In so far as biopolitics is the management of life, how does it make die, how does it kill? This is a similar question to the one that theologians asked about the Christian God. If God is a god of life, the giver of life, how can he put to death, how can he allow death to descend upon his gift of life –why is death a possibility if god is the giver of life? Foucault’s answer is that in order to re-claim death, to be able to inflict death on its subjects, its living beings, biopower must make use of racism; more precisely, racism intervenes here to grant access to death to the biopower state. We must recall that the political rationality of biopower is deployed over a population, which is understood as a continuum of life. It is this continuum of life that eugenics, social hygiene, civil engineering, civil medicine, military engineers, doctors and nurses, policeman, and so on, tended to by a careful management of roads, factories, living quarters, brothels, red-districts, planning and planting of gardens and recreation centers, **and** the gerrymandering of populations by means of **roads, access to public transformations,** placement of schools**, an**d so on. Biopolitics is the result of the development and maintenance of the hothouse of the political body, of the body-politic. Society has become the vivarium of the political rationality, and biopolitics acts on the teeming biomass contained within the parameters of that structure built up by the institutions of health, education, and production. This is where racism intervenes, not from without, exogenously, but from within, constitutively. For the emergence of biopower as the form of a new form of political rationality, entails the inscription within the very logic of the modern state the logic of racism. For racism grants, and here I am quoting: “the conditions for the acceptability of putting to death in a society of normalization. Where there is a society of normalization, where there is a power that is, in all of its surface and in first instance, and first line, a bio-power, racism is indispensable as a condition to be able to put to death someone, in order to be able to put to death others. The homicidal [meurtrière] function of the state, to the degree that the state functions on the modality of bio-power, can only be assured by racism “(Foucault 1997, 227) To use the formulations from his 1982 lecture “The Political Technology of Individuals” –which incidentally, echo his 1979 Tanner Lectures –the power of the state after the 18th century, a power which is enacted through the police, and is enacted over the population, is a power over living beings, and as such it is a biopolitics. And, to quote more directly, “since the population is nothing more than what the state takes care of for its own sake, of course, the state is entitled to slaughter it, if necessary. So the reverse of biopolitics is thanatopolitics.” (Foucault 2000, 416). Racism, is the thanatopolitics of the biopolitics of the total state. They are two sides of one same political technology, one same political rationality: the management of life, the life of a population, the tending to the continuum of life of a people. And with the inscription of racism within the state of biopower, the long history of war that Foucault has been telling in these dazzling lectures has made a new turn: the war of peoples, a war against invaders, imperials colonizers, which turned into a war of races, to then turn into a war of classes, has now turned into the war of a race, a biological unit, against its polluters and threats. Racism is the means by which bourgeois political power, biopower, re-kindles the fires of war within civil society. Racism normalizes and medicalizes war. Racism makes war the permanent condition of society, while at the same time masking its weapons of death and torture. As I wrote somewhere else, racism banalizes genocide by making quotidian the lynching of suspect threats to the health of the social body. Racism makes the killing of the other, of others, an everyday occurrence by internalizing and normalizing the war of society against its enemies. To protect society entails we be ready to kill its threats, its foes, and if we understand society as a unity of life, as a continuum of the living, then these threat and foes are biological in nature.

A2: DAs – NUQ: Withdraw Inev

US cannot stay in Iraq – costs too high

Carpenter 10 - Vice president for foreign policy studies at the CATO institute (Ted Galen Carpenter, “Iraq is Defenseless”, CATO Institute, June 11, 2010, <http://www.cato.org/pub_display.php?pub_id=11890>)

 Predictably, there are calls, both in Iraq and at home, to have the United States stay on past the 2011 troop withdrawal date to play the role of regional stabilizer. Otherwise, advocates warn, there will be a dangerous rivalry for power involving, at a minimum, Iran, Saudi Arabia and Turkey. That danger is all too real. But U.S. leaders need to consider the costs of keeping American military forces deployed in Iraq and providing a security shield for that country. Such a mission would be expensive. It could also prove quite dangerous. What exactly would the United States do, for example, if NATO ally Turkey decides that it can no longer tolerate the existence of a de facto independent Iraqi Kurdistan, and moves to occupy that region militarily? What would Washington's response be if Tehran attempts to expand its already considerable influence in Shiite-led Iraq. Or if Saudi Arabia continues to aid anti-government Sunni forces? Shielding a vulnerable protectorate in a hostile neighborhood is neither cheap nor easy. Nor is it a mission that would end anytime soon. Indeed, it would likely go on for decades. U.S. leaders had better think long and hard before undertaking such a thankless commitment.

A2: Condition CP

Conditioning withdrawal enrages terrorists, guarantees insurgency.

Raed Jarrar (Iraqi-born political analyst, and a Senior Fellow with Peace Action based in Washington, DC.) May 26, 2010 “ Don’t Reward Violence in Iraq by Extending US Troop Withdrawal Deadline” http://www.commondreams.org/view/2010/05/26-1

Linking the U.S. withdrawal to conditions on the ground creates an equation by which further deterioration in Iraq will automatically lead to prolonging the U.S. military presence. Some of the current Iraqi ruling parties want the U.S. occupation to continue because they have been benefiting from it. Some regional players, including the Iranian government, do not want an independent and strong Iraq to re-emerge. And other groups, including Al Qaeda, would gladly see the United States stuck in the current quagmire, losing its blood, treasure and reputation. Connecting the pullout to the prevalent situation would be an open invitation to those who seek an endless war to sabotage Iraq even further, and delaying it will send the wrong message to them. By contrast, adhering to the current time-based plan would pull the rug from under their feet and allow Iraqis to stabilize their nation, a process that may take many years but that cannot begin as long as Iraq's sovereignty is breached by foreign interventions.

A2: Condition CP

CP doesn’t solve human rights cred—hurts perception, ensures instability in Iraq.

Jarrar, Iraqi-born political analyst, and a Senior Fellow with Peace Action based in Washington, DC, 3-4-2010 (Raed, “A Military Coup in Iraq?” http://www.truth-out.org/a-military-coup-iraq57374)

There is a high probability that Iraq will face a political meltdown after these elections. There is also the possibility, if al-Iraqiya wins the elections, that ISCI and other ruling parties backed by the Iranian government might stage a military coup. Most Iraqis would agree that the upcoming months will most probably bear a lot of bad news. However, for the US, this should not affect withdrawal plans. There are two approaching deadlines for the US withdrawal from Iraq: President Obama's plan to withdraw all combat forces and end combat operations by August 31 of this year and the US-Iraq bilateral security agreement's deadline for all troops to withdraw by December 31, 2011. Both these deadlines are time-based, as opposed to the Bush-era's condition-based benchmarks. Last month, the Pentagon submitted its first official request to approve "contingency plans" to delay the combat forces withdrawal this year in case conditions on the ground deteriorate. The plan has caused a wave of **panic** in Iraq, and even concern in the US that President Obama might be breaking his promises. Going back to a condition-based withdrawal plan would not only further diminish US credibility worldwide, but it would also lead to **more deterioration** and destruction in Iraq. Linking the US withdrawal to conditions on the ground creates an equation by which further deterioration in Iraq will automatically lead to prolonging the US military presence. Some groups, like the Iraqi ruling parties, want the US occupation to continue because they have been benefiting from it. Some regional players, including the Iranian government, do not want an independent and strong Iraq to re-emerge. And other groups, including al-Qaeda, would gladly see the US stuck in the current quagmire, and would love to see the US continue to lose blood, treasure and reputation in Iraq. Linking the withdrawal to conditions on the ground would be an open invitation to those who want to ensure an endless war. The situation in Iraq is horrible, and it will most likely deteriorate further this year, but that should not be used as an excuse to delay or cancel the US withdrawal from the country. Prolonging the occupation will not fix what the occupation has broken, and extending the US military intervention will not help protect Iraq from other interventions. The **only** way we can help Iraq and Iraqis is to first withdraw from the country, and then do our best to help them help themselves - without interfering in their domestic issues.

# A2: Condition CP

Only the plan solves – counterplan sets a precedent for further interventions and instability

Jarrar, Iraqi-born political analyst, and a Senior Fellow with Peace Action based in Washington, DC, 6-1-2010 (Raed, “Don't delay withdrawal from Iraq”, Lexis)

Obama should not bow to the Beltway voices urging him to keep U.S. troops longer in Iraq. At a recent speech at West Point, Obama said: "We are poised to end our combat mission in Iraq this summer." His statement, which the cadets greeted with applause, is a reaffirmation of his pledge to have all U.S. combat forces leave Iraq by Aug. 31. Any remaining armed forces are required to leave Iraq by the end of 2011 in accordance with the binding bilateral Security Agreement, also referred to as the Status of Forces Agreement. But Washington pundits are still pushing Obama to delay or cancel the U.S. disengagement, calling on him to be "flexible" and take into consideration the recent spike of violence in Iraq. Hundreds of Iraqis have been killed and injured during the last few months in what seems to be an organized campaign to challenge U.S. plans. While most Iraqis would agree that Iraq is still broken, delaying or canceling the U.S. troop removal will definitely not be seen as "flexibility" but as a betrayal of promises. Iraqis believe that prolonging the military occupation will not fix what the occupation has damaged, and they don't think that extending the U.S. intervention will protect them from other interventions. The vast majority of Iraqis see the U.S. military presence as a part of the problem, not the solution. Linking the U.S. withdrawal to conditions on the ground creates an equation by which further deterioration in Iraq will automatically lead to prolonging the U.S. military presence. Some of the current Iraqi ruling parties want the U.S. occupation to continue because they have been benefiting from it. Some regional players, including the Iranian government, do not want an independent and strong Iraq to re-emerge. And other groups, including al-Qaeda, would gladly see the U.S. stuck in the current quagmire, losing its blood, treasure and reputation. Connecting the pullout to the prevalent situation would be an open invitation to those who seek an endless war to sabotage Iraq even further, and delaying it will send the wrong message to them. By contrast, adhering to the current time-based plan would pull the rug from under their feet and allow Iraqis to stabilize their nation, a process that may take many years but that cannot begin as long as Iraq's sovereignty is breached by foreign interventions

A2 T – Combat Troops

Combat operations will be ceased in August

CBO (Congressional Budget Office) October 2009 “ Withdrawal of U.S. Forces from Iraq:

Possible Timelines and Estimated Costs”

President Obama has announced that all U.S. combat operations for the war in Iraq—also called Operation Iraqi Freedom (OIF)—will cease by the end of August 2010. According to the timeline described by Administration officials, the approximately 128,000 U.S. military personnel currently in Iraq would remain there through the Iraqi elections scheduled for January 2010. After that, U.S. forces would decline to no more than 50,000 troops by the end of August 2010. In accordance with the Status of the Forces Agreement signed by Iraq and the United States in November 2008, the remaining 50,000 U.S. troops must leave the country by the end of December 2011. The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) estimates that to comply with that timeline, the Administration will need to withdraw military personnel from Iraq in two stages: one between the Iraqi election and August 2010, when almost 80,000 U.S. troops would be removed over a period of seven months, and the other before the end of calendar year 2011, when 50,000 troops will need to be withdrawn.