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# PEACE MOVEMENTS TURN

**A.** **The BP oil spill is sparking new life in the Afghanistan war movement—working together with environmentalists and gaining momentum.**

**Horowitz, 2010**

Jake Horowitz, Arab American Support Center, “Could BP Oil Fuel the Afghan Antiwar Movement?” <http://humanrights.change.org/blog/view/could_bp_oil_fuel_the_afghan_antiwar_movement> June 23, 2010

Hard as it may be to believe, the BP oil disaster may actually have an upside, by bringing new life to the antiwar movement in Afghanistan.

Despite the constant daily stream of news stories covering the BP oil spill, the mainstream media has until now failed to draw the important connections between the environmental crisis in the Gulf and America's wars abroad.

But, there's a growing movement, led by Public Citizen, a government watchdog group, that calls on the U.S. government to hold BP fully accountable for its actions in the Gulf of Mexico by canceling the company's multi-billion dollar business contracts with the Department of Defense to fuel U.S. fighter jets and military vehicles in Iraq and Afghanistan.

In a letter recently sent to the White House and Defense Secretary Robert Gates, the group gathered 150,000 backers in a drive to remove BP from the federal payroll, by calling on the White House to suspend and revoke the DoD's six federal fuel contracts — worth a total of $2.1 billion dollars — to the company and its subsidiaries. According to the group's director Tyson Slocum, "You have to send a clear message to shareholders that committing felonies is not tolerated in the United States. And the way you do that is through some form of permanent sanctions."

It's no secret that the U.S. military's foreign wars have left the country heavily dependent on petroleum companies. But, as Nick Turse highlights in his recent article at TomDispatch.com, BP receives the lion's share of DoD contracts, already awarded more than $837 million dollars in this fiscal year alone. In 2009, the company was the largest government-funded oil moneymaker, receiving almost 12 percent of all of the petroleum contract dollars awarded by the Pentagon for the year.

The fact that the same company that is responsible for what the Obama administration's top environmental adviser Carol Browner has deemed "the worst environmental disaster we've ever faced in this country," is being subsidized by the Pentagon and Americans' tax dollars is surely evidence for greater linkage between the environmental and antiwar movements.

As tens of thousands of barrels of oil continue to spill into the Gulf, U.S. fighter planes are burning 47,000 gallons per mission over the skies of Afghanistan. If this movement to cancel BP's defense contracts with the government continues to gather steam, environmental and antiwar activists may be able to channel and utilize the public's outrage with BP not only to give much-needed spark to the green movement, but also as a new weapon in the effort to withdraw U.S. troops from the AfPak region.
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**B. The Aff Kills the Peace Movement—sudden withdrawl makes the peace movement will collapse into confusion.**

**Hayden, 2007**

Tom Hayden, Senator, the Nation Institute's Carey McWilliams Fellow, has played an active role in American politics and history for over three decades, beginning with the student, civil rights and antiwar movements of the 1960s. “Hawks for Withdrawal” http://www.thenation.com/article/hawks-withdrawal?page=0,0

The peace movement should take some credit for this. And the peace movement should keep the pressure on the pillars of the war policy, lest public opinion backslide into divisions or despair. The peace movement should also be planning now to make it virtually impossible for presidential candidates to campaign successfully in 2008 without committing to a speedy withdrawal from Iraq.

But there are understandable limits to what the peace movement can accomplish in the short run, aside from forcefully expressing the majority's desire that the United States withdraw. What are those limits? The peace movement cannot force the US government to "withdraw now," unless of course the insurgents suddenly overrun the Green Zone. The peace movement cannot force the United States out of the Middle East, though it can help pressure our government to reverse the Israeli occupation, which our tax dollars subsidize. But with the public climate soured over Iraq, the peace movement can mobilize opinion against military intervention in places like Venezuela.

Movements generally have power against the system when they apply pressure to the focal point of its weakness, in this case the dramatic waste of lives and taxes spent on an unwinnable war conducted undemocratically. The strong popular demand to set a withdrawal timetable is becoming impossible for the elites to avoid. **When and if withdrawal is announced, the peace movement may face serious shrinkage and internal confusion.** The phase of negotiation tends to wear movements down. The Paris peace talks of the Vietnam era took some seven years. The Israeli-Palestinian negotiating process appears eternal. An exception worth examining has been the peace process in Northern Ireland.

Besides remaining a formidable factor for politicians facing close elections and military recruiters chasing down high school students, the peace movement has a historic role to play every day in shaping the public understanding of the lessons of Iraq. The lessons of this war will "prepare the battlefield," to borrow a Pentagon term, for future wars and political campaigns. It will determine whether the current peace movement will be limited to a single important issue or be an embryo of a broader progressive movement.

This is the sharpest potential difference between the peace movement and the centrists. Both can and should collaborate on military withdrawal. But the peace movement wants to prevent future wars, reverse the nuclear weapons momentum, end domestic spying, divert resources to domestic priorities and, just for starters, put an end to the pattern of "armed privatization."

These are issues the centrists and most politicians will not touch unless they are confronted with a future climate of opinion in which real answers are demanded. Moderates wish the war to end so that the "real" war against terrorism can be prosecuted more effectively. Progressives should be making the case that the Iraq War is far from a misguided adventure but rather the result of pursuing an anti-terrorism approach that divides the world into camps of good and evil, just as Vietnam was the logical outcome of cold war assumptions about a monolithic Communist conspiracy.
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**C. Impact--Even if peace movements don’t accomplish their end goals, they set limits on society that are important to moderate militarism and lead to social justice**

**Dawley, 2006**

Alan Dawley, author of Changing the World: American Progressives in War and Revolution (Harvard Press, 2003), Professor of History at The College of New Jersey, and a member of the Steering Committee of Historians Against the War. March 13, 2006, “Why Peace Movements Are Important” http://hnn.us/articles/22749.html

On the third anniversary of “Shock and Awe” on March 19, 2006, bells will ring to commemorate the growing toll of American and Iraqi dead. Peace activists will stage solemn protests against what they believe is an unjust and un-winnable war. The American public will note with regret the continuation of a war which a substantial majority now believes was a mistake.

And the war will go on.

As the Iraq war enters its fourth year with no end in sight, doubts creep in about the effectiveness of the peace movement. If the largest peace demonstration in world history – perhaps 10 million on February 15, 2003, alone – could not prevent the war; and if a vigorous peace movement has been unable to end it, then it is reasonable to ask whether peace movements can stop wars.

A realistic appraisal of American history suggests the answer is no. At the beginning of the twentieth century, the Philippines were conquered in the face of a powerful anti-imperialist movement. Widespread opposition did not prevent U.S. entrance into the First World War. Revulsion against that war produced a peace movement of unprecedented scope, but it did not prevent the outbreak of World War II, nor did it stop the Roosevelt administration from participation even prior to Pearl Harbor. Opposition to the Vietnam War produced the largest demonstration in American history up to that point in the 1969 “moratorium,” but it could not stop the war. What did stop it was U.S. defeat at the hands of the Vietnamese, who, with Soviet and Chinese backing, were determined to be free of foreign domination. In short, peace movements have protested all of America’s modern wars (except Korea), and they have failed to end any of them.

If peace movements do not end wars, does that mean protest is futile? Definitely not. It means we need to approach the matter from a different angle. We should be asking, “How have peace movements shaped history?” Posing the question this way yields abundant evidence of why peace movements are important.

The list begins with setting limits on war-makers. In raising the cry, “Never again!” peace organizations played an important role in bringing about the Geneva conventions against the kind of chemical weapons used in the First World War, just as the campaign for nuclear disarmament helped insure there would be no repeat of the ghastly slaughter at Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Peace activists helped create a climate that led to a series of nuclear arms limitation treaties, beginning with the atmospheric test ban of 1963 and running through the Strategic Arms Limitation treaties of the 1970s. Seeking to curry favor with an anti-nuclear public, even President Reagan said in 1982, "To those who protest against nuclear war, I can only say: `I'm with you!'" When Reagan sat down with Mikhail Gorbachev in Reykjavik to discuss the “zero option” of completely eliminating nuclear weapons, it was clear that this bold idea was more popular with the public than with their respective military establishments.

Setting limits requires the creation of a political climate where politicians who take steps toward peace are rewarded at the polls, not punished. Consider the late stage of the Vietnam War. By the end of 1968 a majority of Americans were telling pollsters the Vietnam War was a mistake, largely because the United States was not winning. Although Nixon remained bent on victory, his policy of “Vietnamization” led to the gradual withdrawal of U.S. ground troops and ended the draft lottery, enabling him to say he sought “peace with honor.” It was a cynical ploy that critics said merely “changed the color of the corpses,” but it helped him win a landslide victory in 1972. Meanwhile, Congressional opponents took the more direct route in 1973 of cutting off funding for future ground operations, thwarting any lingering impulse to rescue the South Vietnamese puppet regime.

Setting limits also applies to peace settlements. Peace movements are important in laying out demands for a just peace. They were especially powerful at the end of the two world wars, when diplomats were under strong pressure to create a world worthy of wartime sacrifice. Peace movements took seriously the extravagant promises of “a world safe for democracy,” “a land fit for heroes,” and “a New Deal for the world,” and they demanded redemption of these pledges in “industrial democracy,” full employment, and racial equality. They pressured framers of the United Nations to prevent future wars by creating international machinery to resolve disputes and by removing the social and economic grievances believed to be the root cause of war.

Peace movements are also important players in the struggle over the distribution of resources. That is evident in their recurrent opposition to militarism.

[CONTINUED]
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Every era has its version of “money for schools, not for bombs.” In the First World War, the American Union Against Militarism opposed building a 400,000 man army and a navy equal to the British on the grounds that militarism drained resources from civilian needs. Proposing a “moral equivalent of war,” William James called for boot camps for wilderness conservation instead of military training. In the Vietnam era, activists called for a redirection of funds away from the hundreds of overseas military bases toward “model cities” and other Great Society programs at home. In the Reagan years, the nuclear freeze movement called for “economic conversion” from the military-industrial complex to civilian investment, pointing out that school construction and investment in health care produced far more jobs dollar-for-dollar than building costly B-1 bombers.

The struggle over resources leads peace movements towards social justice. As Martin Luther King observed, “Peace is not the absence of conflict, it is the presence of justice.” While many hew to the single issue of war, some leading organizations consciously combine peace and social justice, including the Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom founded in 1919 and today’s largest anti-war organization United for Peace and Justice. From Jane Addams forward, feminists have been particularly prominent in pacifist ranks, while King linked racial and economic justice to ending the Vietnam War. Although the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations were reliably pro-war until recently, many other segments of the labor movement objected to the First World War in class terms as a “rich man’s war, poor man’s fight,” or what socialists like Eugene Debs called “capitalist war.”

Of course, peace and justice movements are no more effective in ending social injustice than in ending wars, but they can be important weights in the social balance of power. For example, advocates of “People’s Peace” and other anti-warriors of 1917-1918 helped labor win concessions from elites in the form of the War Labor Board to settle disputes and a Women’s Bureau to guard against exploitation of women workers.

Peace and justice movements also play an important role in opposing empire. Early in the twentieth century, anti-imperialists sought to preserve a republic free of the overweening influence of finance capital, seen by many populists and progressives as the malign force behind U.S. intervention in the Philippines, the Caribbean, revolutionary Mexico, and Bolshevik Russia. Although most of the credit for forcing U.S. withdrawal from Mexico in 1916 and Russia in 1920 goes to resistance on the ground, anti-imperial forces in the United States also played a hand.

What are the lessons for today? It seems unlikely that the peace movement will stop the Iraq war any time soon, let alone the permanent “war on terror” that started in Afghanistan and Iraq and will expand to who knows where? For the first time in our history, America’s rulers have rested their case for war on fear and fear alone. They make no promise of a better world and ask no sacrifice. To the contrary, they crush civil liberties, slash the social benefits of low income people, and give tax cuts to the rich. The logical outcome is a nightmarish Orwellian world where ordinary people are forced to foot the bill for the corporate-military tyranny that oppresses them.

Fortunately, the current situation suggests other possible outcomes. Opposition to U.S. empire is strong abroad; there are signs of disorder in ruling circles at home; President Bush’s poll numbers put him in the company of Nixon on the eve of resignation. If ever there was a time for a peace movement to oppose permanent war – another name for empire – this is it. Linkage between peace and economic justice would expand the ranks. At the very least, today’s movement can do what peace movements have always done -- claim the moral high ground by affirming life over death. Finally, for those who think the war does not concern them, there is something to think about on March 19 th: “Ask not for whom the bell tolls; it tolls for thee.”
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**The peace movement is growing now and has shifted focus to Afghanistan**

**Thai Press Reports, 2009**

October 20, 2009, “United States/Afghanistan/Germany US, German Peace Activists Warn of ‘Second Vietnam in Afghanistan’” Lexis

General News - German and US peace activists warned of a "second Vietnam" in Afghanistan ahead of a three-day international Afghan peace conference in Berlin.

Addressing a news conference in the German capital on Friday, the Managing Director of the German branch of the International Association of Lawyers Against Nuclear Arms (IALANA) Reiner Braun said, "The war in Afghanistan is increasingly turning the country into a second Vietnam, not only for the US but also for Europe." Braun's remarks were underscored by Joseph Gerson who heads the US pacifist group, American Friends Service Committee.

He pointed to US media reports about Afghanistan, making also analogies to the Vietnam war era.

Gerson emphasized the need for political talks with the radical Afghan Taliban militia as a serious alternative to the ongoing war in the country.

He referred to deep differences among US military leaders as to how many troops were really needed to stabilize Afghanistan.

Gerson added that there was also a "serious split in the US elite" on dealing with the deteriorating situation in the war-stricken country.

The pacifist said 58 percent of Americans want a withdrawal of US troops from Afghanistan.

He added **the US peace movement was now refocusing itself from the Iraq military campaign to the Afghan war by launching grassroots actions and acts of civil disobedience.**

Gerson urged closer anti-Afghan war coordination between the US and European peace movement.

Peace organizations from 14 countries were due to begin talks later in the day on chances for pacifying the situation in Afghanistan.

Peace activists from throughout the world, among them the US, Germany and France, Britain, Spain and Greece, were to reiterate calls for the pullout of all US and NATO troops from Afghanistan.

Tens of thousands of NATO-led troops and US soldiers are battling a fierce Taliban and al-Qaeda insurgency.

More and more western countries, including Japan, the Netherlands and Canada, are planning to withdraw their forces from Afghanistan next year amid a mounting death toll as a result of the war in the Asian country. - PNA
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**Anti-war sentiment is rising; protests are becoming more frequent**

**Harris, 2009**

Paul Harris, The Guardian correspondent, “US braced for surge of protest over war in Afghanistan” September 27, 2009, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2009/sep/27/us-braced-afghanistan-protest-surge>

At his home in Richmond, Virginia, Larry Syverson spends part of every day worrying there will be an unwanted knock on the door. Syverson's son, Branden, is an American soldier serving in Afghanistan, conducting dangerous patrols in an area infested with Taliban.

"I worry every day that I might hear someone come to the door unexpected. Just last week two of his best friends were killed over there," he said.

That's why Syverson, 60, an environmental engineer, is trying to organise a protest in Richmond against the war in Afghanistan for the second weekend in October, almost eight years after the conflict began.

He is a member of Military Families Speak Out, an anti-war group made up of relatives of military personnel that is preparing to turn its attentions from the conflict in Iraq to the one in Afghanistan. He has three sons in the military who together have served five tours in Iraq as well as Branden's stint in Afghanistan.

"I am extremely proud that they have chosen a military career. I just don't like the way that they are being used to fight these unnecessary wars," said Syverson.

That is a growing sentiment in America. As Barack Obama appears likely to increase America's already greatly enlarged troop commitment to the Afghan war, the war itself is becoming increasingly disliked.

The conflict used to be called America's "forgotten war". No longer. As casualties have spiked, so has hatred for the war: a solid 57% of Americans now oppose it. That has seen the anti-war movement in America prepare to turn its attentions from Iraq to Afghanistan, gearing up for an autumn campaign of marches and civil disobedience.

They hope to emulate the anti-Vietnam war protests, using highly visible public campaigns to force the hand of the White House to pull out of the country, not escalate the conflict.

The first major protest will happen next weekend, when anti-war protesters plan to arrange more than 500 empty pairs of boots on a grassy lawn right outside the White House. Each pair will represent an American soldier killed in the war.

Syverson knows that such a move is symbolic but he hopes its position so close to the centre of power will be effective, just like the old Vietnam war protesters who regularly thronged Washington's Mall in the 1960s.

"If Obama looks out of his window, he is going to see a symbol of over 500 soldiers who died in Afghanistan. He is going to know the public is waking up to this war. The honeymoon with Obama is over and the American people are not going to stand for it much longer." Syverson said.

One person who will be in Washington for the boots protest is Cindy Sheehan, perhaps the most famous single protester to emerge from the demonstrations against the Iraq war. Since her son, Casey, was killed in Iraq, Sheehan has become a bête noir to many conservatives and an outspoken rallying point for the anti-war movement. She was a one-woman force of nature who dominated the headlines when she camped outside the Texas ranch of President George W Bush.

Now she too is concentrating on opposing the war in Afghanistan. She has already kept a vigil outside Obama's summer holiday home on Martha's Vineyard and will be going to Washington next weekend. "It's unfortunate that it has taken eight years for the anti-war movement to focus on Afghanistan," she told the Observer. "We have to start to put a human face on what is happening over there."

Sheehan said that she and her fellow organisers would be gearing up for next year, which will feature midterm elections to Congress. She sees this autumn's events as being a preview of mass actions to come all the way through 2010.

"It is year of the midterm elections. I can't tell you what we are planning but it is going to be brilliant. There will be a lot of protests, a lot of civil disobedience," she said.

A broad coalition of anti-war groups is also already co-ordinating protests and demonstrations for the coming weeks, hoping to emulate the successes of the Vietnam protests in a way that the anti-Iraq war movement never pulled off. There will be vigils, memorials, teach-ins, demonstrations and marches. They will range in scale from a few individuals to events where thousands of people will be expected to turn up.

Groups involved include Military Families Speak Out, Win Without War, Code Pink, United For Peace and Justice and Iraq Veterans Against the War.

[CONTINUED]
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"There will be hundreds of events all across the US," said Syverson. Some other groups, like US Labor Against the War, which represents 190 unions, which have been largely silent on Afghanistan compared to Iraq, have also announced they are now planning to start opposing the Afghan war too.

The movement is certainly tapping into a growing public mood of anger and discontent. For years, Afghanistan was seen as the "good war" as opposed to Iraq's "bad war". It had supposedly been won with relatively little loss of life, deposed a reviled government and been justified by the Taliban's open support of al-Qaida.

But now, there are more US casualties each day in Afghanistan than in Iraq, and American troop numbers will have risen dramatically to 68,000 by the end of the year. Indeed, Washington and the White House are consumed by speculation over whether Obama will accept a request from General Stanley McChrystal for yet more troops to be sent to the combat zone.

On American television screens, reports from Iraq have become rare. But news from Afghanistan – nearly all of it bad – has become common. Pictures of the carnage reach into every American living room and are frequently splashed across the front pages.

Now public sentiment has shifted firmly towards wanting American troops to pull out, a reversal of the once common opinion that Afghanistan had been a conflict worth fighting. As recently as April, a majority of Americans supported the war. Now only 43% do.
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**Obama’s decision to escalate the war in Afghanistan is enraging activist groups and creating more protests.**

**Fox News, 2009**

November 30, 2009 , “Anti-War Left Protests Obama's Afghanistan War Strategy” http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2009/11/30/anti-war-left-protests-obamas-afghanistan-war-strategy/

The anti-war left is turning on the president it helped put into office, launching a counteroffensive against President Obama's decision to escalate the war in Afghanistan.

Activist groups are joining liberal members of Congress in condemning the president's expected announcement on Tuesday that he will order roughly 30,000 more troops to the war zone as part of an overhauled strategy to finish what President Bush started eight years ago. Some are urging him not to go through with it -- though the strategy apparently is set in stone, with Obama having issued his final orders to his generals Sunday evening.

"I simply can't believe you're about to do what they say you are going to do," documentary filmmaker Michael Moore said in an open letter to Obama posted on his Web site. Moore warned that Obama would tarnish his legacy, turn away his supporters and effectively crown himself the new "war president" by escalating the war in Afghanistan.

"With just one speech tomorrow night you will turn a multitude of young people who were the backbone of your campaign into disillusioned cynics," Moore wrote. "Your potential decision to expand the war ... will do more to set your legacy in stone than any of the great things you've said and done in your first year.

"For the sake of your presidency, hope, and the future of our nation, stop. For God's sake, stop," Moore wrote.

Such warnings speak to the deep divide the president will face Tuesday night when he announces his strategy during a speech at the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, N.Y. Many Americans have grown weary of the war effort, and some regard the Afghan government as a hopelessly corrupt partner that will undermine U.S. military efforts there. Others hold Obama's stated view that Afghanistan is the right war and must be pursued to prevent the region from becoming an international staging ground for more terrorist attacks.

Obama highlighted his opposition to the Iraq war, not the Afghanistan war, during his presidential campaign. He repeatedly criticized his top Democratic primary opponent, Hillary Clinton, for voting in favor of the Iraq war, and he held up his own opposition to that war as a state senator in Illinois as a sign of his foreign policy judgment.

Now the groups that cheered him for opposing the Iraq war are blasting him for diverting military resources back to Afghanistan.

MoveOn.org, which broke its tradition of not intervening in the Democratic primary process to endorse Obama over Clinton during the campaign, has urged members to send messages to the White House voicing their opposition to the troop increase.

"President Obama is poised to make a critical decision about the Afghanistan war in the next few weeks. He needs to hear that we need an exit strategy -- not tens of thousands more troops stuck in a quagmire," the group's Web site says.

The activist group Code Pink is urging people to protest and hold vigils before, during and after Obama's speech. The group asked Obama to "stop the surge" and begin withdrawing troops.

While Republicans in Congress expressed dismay that Obama took three months to reach a decision on Afghanistan strategy, some Democratic members of Congress are siding with the anti-war groups in saying it's time to wind down U.S. involvement in Afghanistan.
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**Antiwar movement growing—rallies prove**

**McMorris-Santoro, 2009**

Evan McMorris-Santoro, community journalist, December 9, 2009, “Anti-War Activists Plan 'Emergency' Rally In D.C. To Protest Afghanistan Escalation” http://tpmdc.talkingpointsmemo.com/2009/12/anti-war-activists-plan-emergency-rally-in-dc-to-protest-afghanistan-escalation.php

A new coalition led by more than 100 anti-war activists has announced an "Emergency Anti-Escalation Rally" to protest President Obama's new strategy for Afghanistan. The rally, scheduled for Dec. 12 in front of the White House, will include speeches by former U.S. Senator Mike Gravel and 2008 Green Party presidential nominee Cynthia McKinney.

The new coalition, called EndUSWars.org, has posted an "open letter" to Obama on its website, where it calls for an end to all U.S. military action in the Afghanistan region, including Predator drone airstrikes and covert intelligence operations.

Though the coalition's demands are to the extreme left-wing side of the progressive furor over Obama's plan add troops to the Afghanistan conflict, the organizer of the Dec. 12 rally says the coalition's anger at Obama is becoming more mainstream among the left.

"This is a movement, and it's growing," Laurie Dobson told TPMDC. "A lot of people said any change was better [than President Bush], but it's not better if we're still peddling perpetual war across the planet."

Dobson founded the coalition of anti-war progressives earlier this month, when she said it became clear to her that Obama was not going to cease military operations in Afghanistan. Dobson said the Dec. 12 rally is the first step in a series of protests moves she said might end with anti-war progressives running their own candidate for the 2012 Democratic presidential nomination.

Though Dobson said the conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan began as "neo-con wars" under Bush, she claimed Obama's speech last night put made the wars his refocused the full force of the anti-war protests Bush faced onto the Obama administration.

"It's about Obama," she said of the Dec. 12 rally. "And refusing to support his presidency any longer."

# Peace Movements U—growing

**Peace movement growing—each protest gathers support.**

**Colombant, 2009**

Nico Colombant, multimedia reporter for VOA news, December 12, 2009, “US Protesters Seek New Anti-War Movement Demonstration follows President Obama's Nobel speech” http://www1.voanews.com/english/news/usa/US-Protesters-Seek-New-Anti-War-Movement-79139207.html

Hundreds of protesters have gathered near the White House to try and start a new anti-war movement. Saturday's demonstration closely follows President Obama's Nobel Peace Prize speech, in which he said war is sometimes needed to establish lasting peace. Demonstrators in Washington opposed this view, as well as the president's request for 30,000 more U.S. troops in Afghanistan.

"Make it personal, make it personal, because killing is personal. It's immoral. It's personal," chanted protesters.

Former Democratic Alaska Senator and 2008 presidential candidate Mike Gravel led protesters in anti-war chants, while calling for a mass movement to help end U.S. wars in Iraq and Afghanistan.

The gathering, full of peace signs, anti-war posters, and one mock Guantanamo detainee, began under sunny, but cold skies with music from the hip-hop band Head-Roc.

The headline speaker at the event was current U.S. Democratic Representative from Ohio Dennis Kucinich.

"We must rally, protest, march to exercise our civic capacity to bring about real change. Congress must take responsibility. I will soon introduce two bills invoking the War Powers Act, which will force votes on withdrawal from Afghanistan. The decision to go to war is not the president's alone to make" stated Kucinich.

But Kucinich acknowledged Congress has other plans in mind. He went on to say, "this coming week, Congress will fold unemployment compensation into a bill which will provide $ 130 billion dollars to keep the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq going. The message is clear: 'we have money for war, but not for jobs; money for war, but not for peace.'"

Many at the rally said they had voted for President Obama in the 2008 election, including Bill Steyert who took a morning train from New York City.

Steyert said, "I would go after al-Qaida if and where we know they are and get them. But having thousands of troops shooting up villages, breaking in doors, looking for needles in haystacks, many times, it's ridiculous. And I am just furious because I am a Vietnam veteran and I saw the terrible waste of lives there. You can go to the (Vietnam Veterans War Memorial) Wall here in D.C. and see what that got us, and for what: an independent, communist Vietnam who now we trade with."

One unemployed woman, Wendy Fournier, said the protest was just a start.

"I think that there is such a thing as critical mass, the more protests, the more people out, the more people have to be aware of what is going on, the more people are conscious, that right there throws weight in our favor. Consciousness is the beginning of the whole thing," she stated.

Speaker after speaker called for a safe return of all troops, the end of drone strikes and torture and secret detentions, while police looked on and singers like Jordan Page provided musical interludes.

# \*\*\*AFF PEACE MOVEMENTS ANSWERS\*\*\*

# Peace Movements U—Weak now

**The peace movement is dying—nobody cares about action anymore**

**Hedges, 2010**

Chris Hedges, American journalist, author, and war correspondent, specializing in American and Middle Eastern politics and societies, “Is the US peace movement dead?” http://www.greenchange.org/article.php?id=5796

We are approaching a decade of war in Afghanistan, and the war in Iraq is in its eighth year. Hundreds of thousands of Iraqis and thousands more Afghans and Pakistani civilians have been killed. Millions have been driven into squalid displacement and refugee camps. Thousands of our own soldiers and Marines have died or been crippled physically and psychologically. We sustain these wars, which have no real popular support, by borrowing trillions of dollars that can never be repaid, even as we close schools, states go into bankruptcy, social services are cut, our infrastructure crumbles, tens of millions of Americans are reduced to poverty, and real unemployment approaches 17 percent. Collective, suicidal inertia rolls us forward toward national insolvency and the collapse of empire. And we do not protest. The peace movement, despite the heroic efforts of a handful of groups such as Iraq Veterans Against the War, the Green Party and Code Pink, is dead. No one cares.

The roots of mass apathy are found in the profound divide between liberals, who are mostly white and well educated, and our disenfranchised working class, whose sons and daughters, because they cannot get decent jobs with benefits, have few options besides the military. Liberals, whose children are more often to be found in elite colleges than the Marine Corps, did not fight the North American Free Trade Agreement in 1994 and the dismantling of our manufacturing base. They did nothing when the Democrats gutted welfare two years later and stood by as our banks were turned over to Wall Street speculators. They signed on, by supporting the Clinton and Obama Democrats, for the corporate rape carried out in the name of globalization and endless war, and they ignored the plight of the poor. And for this reason the poor have little interest in the moral protestations of liberals. We have lost all credibility. We are justly hated for our tacit complicity in the corporate assault on workers and their families.

Our passivity has resulted, however, in much more than imperial adventurism and a permanent underclass. A slow-motion coup by a corporate state has cemented into place a neofeudalism in which there are only masters and serfs. And the process is one that cannot be reversed through the traditional mechanisms of electoral politics.

Last Thursday I traveled to Washington to join Rep. Dennis Kucinich for a public teach-in on the wars. Kucinich used the Capitol Hill event to denounce the new request by Barack Obama for an additional $33 billion for the war in Afghanistan. The Ohio Democrat has introduced H. Con Res. 248, with 16 co-sponsors, which would require the House of Representatives to debate whether to continue the Afghanistan war. Kucinich, to his credit, is the only member of Congress to publicly condemn the Obama administration's authorization to assassinate Anwar al-Awlaki, a U.S. citizen and cleric living in Yemen, over alleged links to a failed Christmas airline bombing in Detroit. Kucinich also invited investigative journalist Jeremy Scahill, writer/activist David Swanson, retired Army Col. Ann Wright and Iraq war veteran Josh Stieber to the event.

The gathering, held in the Rayburn Building, was a sober reminder of our insignificance. There were no other Congress members present, and only a smattering of young staff members attended. Most of the audience of about 70 were peace activists who, as is usual at such events, were joined by a motley collection of conspiracy theorists who believe 9/11 was an inside job or that former Sen. Paul Wellstone, who died in a plane crash, was assassinated. Scahill and Swanson provided a litany of disturbing statistics that illustrated how corporations control all systems of power. Corporations have effectively taken over our internal security and intelligence apparatus. They run our economy and manage our systems of communication. They own the two major political parties. They have built a private military. They loot the U.S. Treasury at will. And they have become unassailable. Those who decry the corporate coup are locked out of the national debate and become as marginalized as Kucinich.

"We don't have any sort of communications system in the country," said Swanson, who co-founded an anti-war coalition (AfterDowningStreet.org) and led an unsuccessful campaign to impeach George W. Bush and Dick Cheney. "We have a corporate media cartel that overlaps with the war industry. It has no interest in democracy. The Congress is bought and paid for. It is absolutely corrupted by money. We kick ourselves for not being active enough and imposing our demands, but the bar is set very high for us. We have to try very, very hard and make very, very big sacrifices if we are going to influence this Congress prior to getting the money out and getting a decent media system. Hypocritical Congress members talk about money all the time, how we have to be careful about money, except when it comes to war. It is hypocritical, but who is going to call them on that? Not their colleagues, not their funders, not the media, only us. We have to do that, but we don't in large part because they switch parties every number of years and we are on one team or the other."

Scahill-who has done most of the groundbreaking investigative reporting on private contractors including the security firm Blackwater, renamed Xe-laid out how the management of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan is being steadily transferred by the Pentagon to unaccountable private contractors. He lamented the lack of support in Congress for a bill put forward by Rep. Jan Schakowsky known as the Stop Outsourcing Security (SOS) Act, H.R. 4102, which would "responsibly phase out the use of private security contractors for functions that should be reserved for U.S. military forces and government personnel."

"It is one of the sober realities of the time we are living in that you can put forward a bill that says something as simple as 'we should not outsource national security functions to private contractors' and you only get 20 members of Congress to support the bill," Scahill said. "The unfortunate reality is that Rep. Schakowsky knows that the war industry is bipartisan. They give on both sides. For a while there it seemed contractor was the new Israel. You could not find a member of Congress to speak out against them because so many members of Congress are beholden to corporate funding to keep their House or Senate seats. I also think Obama's election has wiped that out, as it has with many things, because the White House will dispatch emissaries to read the riot act to members of Congress who don't toe the party line."

# Peace Movements U—Weak now

**Antiwar movement is dead—activists don’t care anymore**

**Krey, 2009**

Patrick Krey, M.B.A., J.D., LL.M., freelance writer and lawyer, August 25, 2009, “Obama's Wars Trigger New Activists”, http://www.thenewamerican.com/index.php/usnews/politics/1725

The election of Barack Obama to the Presidency has highlighted the foreign policy double standard that the activists on the left end of the political spectrum have exhibited, or should one say not exhibited, towards the President's war-centric foreign policy.

Obama is following the McCain plan for Iraq, doubling the U.S. forces in Afghanistan in addition to sharply increasing the number of private contractors operating in that region and bombing Pakistan on a regular basis. Yet, all of these actions, which in prior years would have been decried by those who consider themselves liberals/progressives, have seemingly fallen off the radar of the left-wing grassroots activists.

The Netroots Nation, an alliance of liberal activists, held their annual convention on August 13-16 in Pittsburgh which featured "the most concentrated gathering of progressive bloggers to date." Surprisingly, the issue of ending the multiple conflicts the United States is actively engaged in, which was such a big topic from prior years, was barely a blip on the agenda. Byron York, writing for the Washington Examiner, states: "Not too long ago, with a different president in the White House, the left was obsessed with America's wars. Now, they're not even watching."

But does this mean that the antiwar movement in America is dead? Some political observers feel that the time is long past due for a political realignment to oppose Obama's wars. John V. Walsh, writing for Antiwar.com, passionately argues that activists from the right can succeed in an area where activists from the left failed so miserably.

**Peace movement is dying—most opposition disappeared as Bush left office**

**Sniegoski, 2009**

Stephen Sniegoski, Ph.D. in United States History from the University of Maryland, diplomatic historian, August 23, 2009, "Where is the Anti-War Movement in the Age of Obama?" http://www.infowars.com/where-is-the-anti-war-movement-in-the-age-of-obama/

It appears that most liberal opponents of the wars in the Middle East/ Central Asia have ceased their opposition with the Obama presidency. The liberal Democrats who abhorred Bush’s war policy (and most grass roots liberal Democrats did vehemently oppose the Bush war policy although this was not always the case with liberal politicians and media figures) apparently were simply opposed to wars led by Republicans. As Byron York, a conservative, writes in the first article below: “For many liberal activists, opposing the war was really about opposing George W. Bush. When Bush disappeared, so did their anti-war passion.” Anti-war protest leader, Cindy Sheehan, agrees completely, stating: “The ‘anti-war’ ‘left’ was used by the Democratic Party. I like to call it the ‘anti-Republican War’ movement.”

Obama is perceived as a liberal, a man of peace, and a charismatic figure, which enables him to get away with things that had been impossible for Bush the Younger.

Thus Obama can say such things as the war in Afghanistan is “fundamental to the defense of our people” and not be savaged by the former critics of the war. This is not to say that the former anti-war people have become cheerleaders for war. Rather, they have become largely indifferent to it. Their attention has been largely diverted to the health care issue, the economy, the environment, or some other liberal cause. This political indifference has given Obama a virtual freehand in military policy. The most dangerous possible development is war with Iran, which is sought by Israel and its Lobby. Escalating American involvement in Afghanistan along with the continued American occupation of Iraq allows for incidents with Iran (or incidents blamed on Iran) that could lead to war. If Obama keeps sagging in the polls–due to the health care reform issue, a continuing problematic economy, and other domestic difficulties– an aggressive foreign policy might likely be seen as a necessary political ploy. Even if war is not the deliberate goal, an aggressive policy, such as a naval blockade of Iran to enforce an embargo of various supplies (proposed in Congress in 2008), certainly brings a high risk of all-out war.

# AFF—PEACE MOVEMENTS FAIL

**Peace movements face three inevitable problems barring their success**

**Clotfelter, 82** – (7/21-28/82, James, Dr. Clotfelter is a professor of political science at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro, this article appeared in the *Christian Century* July 21-28, 1982, p. 790, “Why Peace Movements Fail,” <http://www.religion-online.org/showarticle.asp?title=1329>)

Some problems facing national, peace movements, I would argue, are unavoidable and thus not worth much attention. One is their inability to reconcile the fact that they are asking a nation for action with the fact that the action has international dimensions. There is no way around this problem, but it confronts proponents of military solutions as well. A second inevitable weakness of peace movements is their factionalism. I see no cure for this ill; it must be endured where it is troublesome, and exploited where it is helpful. Third, it is claimed that the peace movement is all heart and no head, that it is weak on realistic analysis. Peace activists should avoid the purely sentimental and the wildly hyperbolic. Regardless of their efforts at rigor, however, peace activists will ultimately call on people to make decisions with their hearts as well as their heads.

A look at seven possibly avoidable causes for the failure of peace movements might suggest new approaches for the future. The first two are the extremes of the continuum of consonance with national values. The third is the time perspective. The last four relate to appeals and symbols used by or forced on the movement.

# AFF—PEACE MOVEMENTS FAIL

**Peace movements empirically fail – nine reasons**

**Clotfelter, 82** – (7/21-28/82, James, Dr. Clotfelter is a professor of political science at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro, this article appeared in the *Christian Century* July 21-28, 1982, p. 790, “Why Peace Movements Fail,” <http://www.religion-online.org/showarticle.asp?title=1329>)

1. Peace movements fail because they are not seen as reflecting the basic values of a society. This was the case with the pre-1914 movement in Germany, widely identified as foreign in its spirit and impetus. This hazard can never be entirely eliminated, because peacemaking is foreign to some values of all nations. There are indigenous peace themes in the history of the English-speaking countries that did not exist in Germany, but the American and English themes are those of a tolerated minority rather than of the dominant culture.

2. Peace movements fail because they identify with such widely approved national symbols and themes as to deny themselves a clear identity. This situation describes the pre-1914 peace movement in the United States. Presidents Taft and Wilson and five secretaries of state between 1905 and 1914 were members of peace societies. Yet in 1917, when the United States entered the European war, only a small number of socialists, social reformers and religious pacifists maintained that a peace movement must of necessity oppose war.

3. Peace movements fail because they focus on the past, the present or the distant future, rather than the intermediate future. Each time perspective has its own hazards. But I am asserting, without benefit here of evidence, that the focus should be on the intermediate future: later than next year, sooner than the withering away of the state.

Leaders of peace organizations, like military generals, often prepare to fight the previous war. The American peace movement of the 1930s benefited from a retrospective distaste for the Great War of 1914-1918. William Allen White spoke for many Americans in the ‘30s when he warned: “The next war will see the same hurrah and the same bowwow of the big dogs to get the little dogs to go out and follow the blood scent and get their entrails tangled in the barbed wire.” Yet, even as the movement restated the evils of the Great War, some peace elements came to feel that they were irrelevant to the European situation of the late 1930s, while others found themselves uncomfortably allied with isolationists at home. The peace testimony of the churches was muted. Soon the war effort was attracting many a William Allen White.

Movements with immediate goals sometimes achieve those goals. American opposition to atmospheric nuclear testing helped make possible the 1963 partial test-ban treaty. So much of the energy of the movement had focused on that immediate goal, however, that when the treaty was ratified, public support could not be mobilized for a next step. Immediate goals often are modest ones, and the linkage with larger goals may not be clear.

Furthermore, linkages with immediate and intermediate goals may not be clear when a peace movement’s focus is on the distant future, as in the pre-1914 European socialists’ opposition to “capitalists’ wars.” The European socialists had not sufficiently considered the power of nationalism, nor had they built mechanisms able to withstand that power. The opposition to war evaporated in 1914, and soon French proletarians were killing German proletarians and vice versa.

4. Peace movements fail because they are unable, or unwilling, to convince people that wars hurt economies. “Business pacifism” was part of pre-1914 peace sentiment in the United States and western Europe. Norman Angell, in The Great Illusion, argued that wars destroy prosperity, even for the victor. As the president of the National Association of Manufacturers (U.S.) commented, “Dead men buy no clothes.” After World War II, which stimulated the American economy and created jobs, “business pacifism” was almost obliterated in America, and President Eisenhower’s identification of a “military-industrial complex” seemed to confirm that war is good for business. Yet the Vietnam war severely damaged the American economy, and by 1968 radical proposals on Vietnam were appearing in Forbes and the Wall Street Journal. Peace activists of the 1960s were slow to argue that war, although it benefits some, has a negative net effect on the economy. Perhaps they were reluctant to appeal to people’s self-interest, or perhaps they were slow to believe that economic self-interest could work against war.

5. Peace movements fail because they fail to bridge class and ideological divisions. The class and ideological characteristics of peace activists are well known. Activists usually are from the middle class; in the United States they tend to be white, from the northeast or from large cities in the west and midwest; women, college students and “modernist” Protestant clergy have been conspicuously represented. In political ideology (except for pre-1914 America),
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peace movements have drawn disproportionately from the radical left. None of these characteristics is inevitably associated with peacemaking. All are cause and effect of the minority status of peace movements.

6. Peace movements fail because they become identified with threatening symbols unrelated to peace. By 1967 the antiwar movement in America had become stereotyped as a band of long-haired, profane, pot-smoking kids in revolt against the older generation and its institutions. Whereas participants in the civil rights movement a few years earlier had combed their hair and, curbed their tongues to present a positive public image, the antiwar activists sought to shock and in some cases to offend. The result was that while the Vietnam war was unpopular, the antiwar movement was even less popular -- and the style of some activists may have deterred working-class and rural Americans from moving to an antiwar stance.

7. Peace movements fail because they become identified with appeasement of national adversaries. This charge often is made unjustly, but it remains a difficult one for peace activists to deal with. The pre-1914 German peace movement, when it was noticed at all, was attacked as a stooge for the English. The appeasement charge was particularly unjust at the time of World War II, for American peace activists had been outspoken critics of Hitler and of the Munich agreement. But if it was unjust to link peace work and appeasement in the ‘40s, the suspicion was more understandable in the ‘60s, when some American antiwar activists made no effort to conceal their sympathies for an authoritarian regime in North Vietnam.

So much for what may be empirically verifiable. Other flaws in peace movements can be evaluated only subjectively. I am identifying two that frequently concern peace advocates. To the extent that these flaws exist, they are, I suggest, the most serious ones; however, they are now widely recognized. My first assertion below is conventional wisdom in 1982 in some circles, and the second reflects one of the oldest articles of Christian faith.

1. Peace movements fail because they work for a “peace” too narrowly defined. Too often in the past, peace has been defined as order -- as the absence of conflict, even as the absence of change. Given the inevitability and in some instances the desirability of conflict and change, this concept of peace fails on both empirical and normative grounds. The pre-1914 French, German and American peace movements all possessed an unduly legalistic notion of what peace involved. The same could be said of the more respectable elements of the post-1945 movement in the U.S. A better concept would be some variation of “peace with justice” (amply discussed in available literature).

2. Peace movements fail because they dwell on fear rather than hope. Just as peace movements need both optimism and pessimism to thrive, it is inevitable that in their appeals fear will be mixed with hope. But introducing fear in popular appeals is like introducing poison gas to a battlefield on a gusty day. Fear produces unstable and unpredictable results. In America in 1938-1941, for example, fear of war generated support for such disparate goals as peace, isolation and military involvement.

The recent discovery of nuclear war by television and mass-circulation magazines, and efforts to publicize the consequences of nuclear war through Ground Zero and university teach-ins, have brought war concerns to a wider audience. The risk is that this attention will encourage fear without giving grounds for hope, that it will stimulate anxiety without providing a constructive, release for that anxiety.

The fact that peace movements persist despite their failures is a tribute to the capacity of peace activists to sustain hope. Nonetheless, a study of the history of peace movements challenges one’s ability to be optimistic. This review, loosely in the tradition of Lasswell’s Garrison State and Dickens’s Ghost of Christmas Future, uses historical trends to suggest the future that awaits us if we do not mend our ways.

# \*\*\*US Exceptionalism Case Defense 1NC\*\*\*

**1. NO IMPACT—Public opinion checks imperial adventures**

**Stokes and Kohut 09-** work for the Pew Research Center (**May 9, 2006 “The Problem of American Exceptionalism”** <http://pewresearch.org/pubs/23/the-problem-of-american-exceptionalism>)

The ordinary American's modest appetite for spreading U.S. ideals goes hand in hand with the public's lack of imperial aspirations. Consider the American reaction to the collapse of the Soviet Union. While pundits and politicians made much of the vindication of democracy and capitalism, ordinary Americans barely paid attention--less than half the public very closely followed news about the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989, according to Times Mirror Center for the People & the Press surveys at the time. Far from a mood of triumph or hunger for world domination, the American public became even more indifferent to international affairs than it had been, while the size of the isolationist minority in the United States rose to a 40-year high.

**Today, in a more dangerous and contentious time, even American elites -- academics, journalists, business leaders and so forth -- show few aspirations for empire and little appetite for proselytizing**. While two out of three American opinion leaders believe that the United States should play a strong leadership role in the world (twice the proportion of the public at large), fewer than 10 percent think the United States should be the single world leader-- a consistent finding in surveys throughout the 1990s and into 2001. Further, American elites have not given the spread of democracy around the world much greater priority than has the average citizen.4

It is true that the idea that the United States should play the evangelist because its values are the "right" ones has in recent years echoed in speeches by America's leaders and in commentaries by political analysts. Writing in the Weekly Standard, Robert Kagan and William Kristol asserted in 2002 that "September 11 really did change everything…. George W. Bush is now a man with a mission. As it happens, it is America's historic mission."5 But **while Bush administration officials and many neo-conservatives have given the impression that U.S. nationalism is proactive and evangelistic, their views do not reflect general public opinion**.

The case that Americans are dangerously nationalistic is further undermined by Americans' refreshing penchant for self-criticism. Pew's 2005 global survey asked people in 16 countries and the United States what words or phrases they associated with the American people. Fully 70 percent of Americans described their fellow countrymen as greedy, a harsher criticism than that leveled by any non-Americans in the survey. About half of Americans, 49 percent, saw themselves as violent, a self-criticism with which majorities agreed in 13 of the 16 other countries surveyed. **These significant reservations about their own character suggest a healthy self-doubt that tempers any tendencies toward imperial hubris**.

**2. No impact—all the good the US does depends on our attitude of exceptionalism**

[**Loconte**](http://www.american.com/author_search?Creator=Joseph%20Loconte) **10-** Joseph Loconte is a lecturer in politics at the King’s College in New York City and a contributing editor to THE AMERICAN **(**March 5, 2010 **“**Two Cheers for American Exceptionalism” http://www.american.com/archive/2010/march/two-cheers-for-american-exceptionalism/article\_print)

Of course, the concept of American exceptionalism is not without its problems. The idea lends itself to American arrogance and exploitation. Unchecked by political realism, it can shut down diplomacy and rationalize badly conceived conflicts.

The fact remains, however, that America’s achievements in the cause of freedom owe a large debt to this belief in the exceptional character of its democratic culture. American virtue is always mixed with vices, its noblest aims always tainted by self-interest; such is the nature of human life and human societies. America’s democratic example does not shine like John Winthrop’s biblical “city on a hill”—ever pure, steady, and bright. But it is visible, nonetheless. **The great and grievous flaw of America’s critics is to despise this light, to confuse it with darkness**. A left-wing blogger expressed their gloomy outlook: “The only city on a hill we resemble today is Mordor!” Here is the cry of the embittered utopian: Let him remain in the sanctuary, where his mischief is contained. Let others, flawed in character yet humane in purpose, do the hard work that only statesmen can do.

# \*\*\*DEMOCRATIC CONSOLIDATION TURN\*\*\*

**A. Democratic movements are consolidating and spreading in the status quo, but intellectual and institutional support from the west is key to prevent backsliding and authoritarian counter-movements:**

Marc F**. Plattner 10,** director of the International Forum for Democratic Studies at the National Endowment for Democracy, January 2010, Journal of Democracy, Volume 21, Number 1

At the same time, however, the new focus on the resilience of authoritarianism may have led to a tendency to neglect or undervalue the resilience of democracy—a subject that I believe merits fresh attention. Despite the obstacles that democracy has encountered in recent years, it in fact continues to endure remarkably well. In the first place, in a departure from previous cycles, the “third wave” of democratization that began in 1974 has not yet given way to a third “reverse wave,” in which the number of countries experiencing democratic breakdowns substantially exceeds the number giving birth to new democracies. It is true, as Larry Diamond has noted**, that the incidence of democratic breakdown or backsliding has increased** in the last few years, but the democratic regimes that have succumbed have all been of fairly recent vintage.2 Put differently, no well-established or consolidated democracies have been lost. In particular, in countries that have achieved high levels of per capita GDP, there still has not been a single case of democratic breakdown. Part of the explanation, of course, is that democratic regimes today enjoy a high degree of legitimacy, not only among their own citizens but **in the world at large**. This can be seen in the endorsement that democracy has been given by international and regional organizations, in the way in which nondemocratic countries try to claim the mantle of democracy for themselves, and in the support for democracy that public opinion surveys find in every region of the world. As Amartya Sen has written, In any age and social climate, there are some sweeping beliefs that seem to command respect as a kind of general rule—**like a “default” setting in a computer program**; they are considered right unless their claim is somehow precisely negated. While democracy is not yet universally practiced, nor indeed universally accepted, in the general climate of world opinion, democratic governance has now achieved the status of being taken to be generally right.3 The high degree of legitimacy that democracy enjoys can also be observed in the paucity of support in established democracies for antidemocratic movements and regimes elsewhere. During the twentieth century, there were significant sources of support in Western public opinion, especially among academics and intellectuals, not only for Marxism, but for Stalin’s Soviet Union, for Mao’s China, for Castro’s Cuba, and for the Sandinistas’ Nicaragua. In the democratic world today, open backing for the regimes of Russia, China, or Iran is rarely to be found. There is, of course, a great deal of criticism of Western and especially U.S. policy toward these regimes, but that is a very different matter from endorsing their ideological claims. Yet although explicit sympathy for antidemocratic alternatives is virtually absent among significant groups of citizens in consolidated democracies, this cannot be taken to reflect widespread satisfaction on their part with political life in their own countries. When viewed from the vantage point of emerging democracies, the advanced democracies may appear to be paragons of successful governance, but that is not generally how it looks from the inside, where dissatisfaction with politics is widespread. This manifests itself in **contempt for politicians** (especially the people’s chosen representatives in the legislature), frequent outbreaks of scandal and corruption, and **declining trust in political institutions.** Moreover, across the political spectrum, at least in the United States, one hears heightened expressions of concern about escalating partisanship, a coarsening of political discourse, an inability to get things accomplished, and a broader cultural decline. It would be hard to deny that many of these complaints have a good deal of justification. Yet in the developed world democracy remains, if not exactly robust, seemingly impregnable. This may in part be due to an increasing acceptance of what has been dubbed “the Churchill hypothesis”—that “democracy is the worst form of Government except for all those other forms that have been tried from time to time.”4 It is surely true that the failures and drawbacks of other types of regimes help to shore up the continuing appeal of democracy. Even cases such as the People’s Republic of China, with its remarkable success over the past three decades in achieving economic growth and military power, have not been able to convince citizens in the advanced democracies that they would want to sacrifice their liberties to enjoy the putative benefits of single-party rule. The direction of migration in the world remains overwhelmingly from less free countries to freer ones.

# DEMOCRATIC CONSOLIDATION TURN

**And, Rejecting unambiguous support for liberal democracy in favor of “anti-imperialism” provides implicit and explicit support for authoritarian regimes. Asserting a global commonality of values is the only way to resist genocide.**

**Shaw 2001** [Martin Shaw is a sociologist of global politics, war and genocide. He is Research Professor of International Relations at the University of Sussex The unfinished global revolution: intellectuals and the new politics of international relations http://www.martinshaw.org/unfinished.pdf]

Some reject the idea of common global values because their expressions are mostly Western in origin. However, all world religions contain recognitions of human commonality. The attempt to assert that there is a ‘clash of civilisations’17, stronger than those things pulling us together, is not supported by worldwide evidence. Go to Teheran, first centre of the Islamic revolution: our counterparts in universities there are trying to connect to global, even Western, politics and culture. Go to Beijing, Jakarta, Kuala Lumpur or Rangoon, and see whether students and academics will give up ideals of democracy and human rights for the ‘Asian values’ proclaimed by their rulers. Of course, people interpret common values in the contexts of nationality and religion, and they often have justified suspicions of Western leaders and world institutions. But none of this negates the strong drive towards commonality, which means that we can talk of the wave of global-democratic revolution.

**These points are not merely of abstract importance**. They have a **life**-or-**death** meaning for many people in non-Western regions. If you are Timorese and have endured a quarter of a century of oppression, your national aspirations and global values are not divisible. The people who will tell you about national as opposed to Western values are those who will **burn down your village, kill members of your family, and disregard your vote**. The same is true, of course, for the Kosovo Albanians or the Iraqi Kurds. For the most oppressed peoples, like the student campaigners in the capital cities, the democratic revolution is framed within a global commonality of values.18

# DEMOCRATIC CONSOLIDATION TURN

**And, Intellectuals must unambiguously embrace western democratic ideals and institutions to lend support to consolidate democratic movements and prevent backsliding. The aff does NOT a peaceful world without US exceptionalism, as they describe it--rather, it is local authoritarian rule, a near guarantee of genocide, and the possibility of new nuclear wars.**

**Shaw 2001** [Martin Shaw is a sociologist of global politics, war and genocide. He is Research Professor of International Relations at the University of Sussex The unfinished global revolution: intellectuals and the new politics of international relations http://www.martinshaw.org/unfinished.pdf]

The new politics of international relations

The new politics of international relations require us, therefore, to **go beyond the anti-imperialism of the intellectual lef**t as well as of the **semi-anarchist traditions of the academic discipline**. We need to recognise three fundamental truths. First, in the twenty-first century people struggling for democratic liberties across the non-Western world are likely to make **constant demands on our solidarity**. **Courageous academics, students and other intellectuals will be in the forefront of these movements.** **They deserve the unstinting support of intellectuals in the West.** Second, the old international thinking in which democratic movements are seen as purely internal to states no longer carries conviction – despite the lingering nostalgia for it on both the American right and the anti-American left. The idea that global principles can and should be enforced worldwide is firmly established in the minds of hundreds of millions of people. This consciousness will a powerful force in the coming decades. Third, global state-formation is a fact. International institutions are being extended, and (like it or not) they have a symbiotic relation with the major centre of state power, the increasingly internationalised **Western conglomerate.** The success of the global-democratic revolutionary wave depends first on how well it is consolidated in each national context – but second, on how thoroughly it is embedded in international networks of power, at the centre of which, **inescapably, is the West**. From these political fundamentals, strategic propositions can be derived. First, democratic movements cannot regard non-governmental organisations and civil society as ends in themselves. They **must aim to civilise local states,** rendering them open, accountable and pluralistic, and curtail the arbitrary and violent exercise of power. Second, **democratising local states is not a separate task from integrating them into global and often Western-centred networks**. Reproducing isolated local centres of power carries with it classic dangers of states as centres of war.84 Embedding **global norms** and integrating new state centres with global institutional frameworks are essential to the control of violence. (To put this another way: the proliferation of purely national democracies is not a recipe for peace.) Third, while the global revolution cannot do without the West and the UN, neither can it rely on them unconditionally. We need these power networks, but we need to tame them too, to make their messy bureaucracies enormously more accountable and sensitive to the needs of society worldwide. This will involve the kind of ‘cosmopolitan democracy’ argued for by David Held85. It will also require us to advance a global social-democratic agenda, to address the literally catastrophic scale of world social inequalities. This is not a separate problem: social and economic reform is an essential ingredient of alternatives to warlike and genocidal power; these feed off and reinforce corrupt and criminal political economies. Fourth, if we need the global-Western state, if we want to democratise it and make its institutions friendlier to global peace and justice, we **cannot be indifferent to its strategic debates.** It matters to develop **international political interventions,** legal institutions and robust peacekeeping as strategic alternatives to bombing our way through zones of crisis. It matters that international intervention supports pluralist structures, rather than ratifying Bosnia-style apartheid.**86 As political intellectuals in the Wes**t, we need to have our eyes on the ball at our feet, but we also need to raise them to the horizon. We need to grasp the historic drama that is transforming worldwide relationships between people and state, as well as between state and state. We need to think about how the turbulence of the global revolution can be consolidated in democratic, pluralist, international networks of both social relations and state authority. We cannot be simply optimistic about this prospect. Sadly**, it will require repeated violent political crises to push Western and other governments towards the required restructuring of world institutions**.87 What I have outlined is a huge challenge; but the alternative is to see the global revolution splutter into partial defeat, or degenerate into new genocidal wars - perhaps even nuclear conflicts. The practical challenge for all concerned citizens, and the theoretical and analytical challenges for students of international relations and politics, are intertwined.

# Democratic Consolidation DA—A2: “but that’s imperialist”

**Their argument that we are neocons or imperialists is *profoundly* misleading. The real threat of imperialism comes not from the West, but from local authoritarian regimes. Only a western democratic ideal can stand opposed to this.**

Shaw 2002 [Martin Shaw is a sociologist of global politics, war and genocide. He is Research Professor of International Relations at the University of Sussex, http://www.martinshaw.org/empire.htm]

It is fashionable in some circles, among which we must clearly include the organizers of this conference, to argue that the global era is seeing 'a new imperialism' - that can be blamed for the problem of 'failed states' (probably among many others). Different contributors to this strand of thought name this imperialism in different ways, but novelty is clearly a critical issue. The logic of using the term imperialism is actually to establish *continuity* between contemporary forms of Western world power and older forms first so named by Marxist and other theorists a century ago. The last thing that critics of a new imperialism wish to allow is that Western power has changed sufficiently to invalidate the very application of this critical concept. Nor have many considered the possibility that if the concept of imperialism has a relevance today, it applies to certain aggressive, authoritarian regimes of the non-Western world rather than to the contemporary West.

In this paper I fully accept that there is a concentration of much world power - economic, cultural, political and military - in the hands of Western elites. In my recent book, *Theory of the Global State*, I discuss the development of a 'global-Western state conglomerate' (Shaw 2000). I argue that 'global' ideas and institutions, whose significance characterizes the new political era that has opened with the end of the Cold War, depend largely - but not solely - on Western power. I hold no brief and intend no apology for official Western ideas and behaviour. And yet I propose that the idea of a new imperialism is a profoundly misleading*, indeed ideological* conceptthat obscures the realities of power and especially of empire in the twenty-first century. This notion is an obstacle to understanding the significance, extent and limits of contemporary Western power. It simultaneously serves to obscure many real causes of oppression, suffering and struggle for transformation against the quasi-imperial power of many regional states.

# Democratic Consolidation Link—Anti-Imperialism

**They prevent responses to authoritarianism—we need a commitment to western ideals of justice in order to prevent genocide. Their opposition to the current western state is implicit support of authoritarian leaders abroad**

Shaw 2002 [Martin Shaw is a sociologist of global politics, war and genocide. He is Research Professor of International Relations at the University of Sussex, http://www.martinshaw.org/empire.htm]

Conclusion: The abuses of anti-imperialism

It is worth asking how the politics of anti-imperialism distorts Western leftists' responses to global struggles for justice. John Pilger, for example, consistently seeks to minimise the crimes of Milosevic in Kosovo, and to deny their genocidal character - purely because these crimes formed part of the rationale for Western intervention against Serbia. He never attempted to minimise the crimes of the pro-Western Suharto regime in the same way. The crimes of quasi-imperial regimes are similar in cases like Yugoslavia and Indonesia, but the West's attitudes towards them are undeniably uneven and inconsistent. To take as the criterion of one's politics opposition to Western policy, rather than the demands for justice of the victims of oppression as such, distorts our responses to the victims and our commitment to justice. We need to support the victims regardless of whether Western governments take up their cause or not; we need to judge Western power not according to a general assumption of 'new imperialism' but according to its actual role in relation to the victims.

The task for civil society in the West is not, therefore to oppose Western state policies as a matter of course, à la Cold War, but to mobilise solidarity with democratic oppositions and repressed peoples, against authoritarian, quasi-imperial states. It is to demand more effective global political, legal and military institutions that genuinely and consistently defend the interests of the most threatened groups. It is to grasp the contradictions among and within Western elites, conditionally allying themselves with internationalising elements in global institutions and Western governments, against nationalist and reactionary elements. The arrival in power of George Bush II makes this discrimination all the more urgent.

In the long run, we need to develop a larger politics of global social democracy and an ethic of global responsibility that address the profound economic, political and cultural inequalities between Western and non-Western worlds. We will not move far in these directions, however, unless we grasp the life-and-death struggles between many oppressed peoples and the new local imperialisms, rather than subsuming all regional contradictions into the false synthesis of a new Western imperialism.

# Democratic Consolidation--A2: Extinction/War Inevitable

**Ths is only true in the world of the Aff—the wars of the status quo are started by authoritarian elites afraid of democratic momentum. Failure to offer unambiguous western support for democratic movements makes these sorts of genocidal wars inevitable**

Shaw 2001 [Martin Shaw is a sociologist of global politics, war and genocide. He is Research Professor of International Relations at the University of Sussex The unfinished global revolution: intellectuals and the new politics of international relations http://www.martinshaw.org/unfinished.pdf]

Today, because of structural changes that are partly products of the new democratic movements, the basic compartmentalisation underlying these analyses no longer works in the old way. Global-democratic revolution is not just about the form of government within states, but about the shape of world order. Wars, traditionally thought about as being mainly between centres of state power, are now mostly between states and peoples. And yet they are not simply ‘civil wars’, in the old sense of conflicts within a single state. What Mary Kaldor has called ‘new wars’ are about the shape of civil society as well as the state.20 They mobilise cross-border alliances of ethnic nationalists, on the one hand, and of civic nationalists with global humanitarians, on the other. In reality, most wars going on at the turn of the early twenty-first century (and some are not so new) are wars of the anti-democratic, anti-globalist counter-revolution. War is the tool of authoritarian and semi-authoritarian regimes, in quasi-imperial states like Serbia and Iraq, Indonesia, Turkey and Sudan, and indeed, Russia and China, threatened by democratic movements – and particular by secessionist demands from oppressed minorities which inevitably accompany democratisation.21 I contend that in the hands of this kind of state machine, war is almost invariably genocidal to some degree. But many question whether atrocities such as those of the Serbian regime in Kosovo amount to ‘genocide’.

# EXCEPTIONALISM GOOD EXTENSIONS

**American exceptionalism is good--leads to democracy and human rights**

[**Loconte**](http://www.american.com/author_search?Creator=Joseph%20Loconte) **10-** Joseph Loconte is a lecturer in politics at the King’s College in New York City and a contributing editor to THE AMERICAN **(**March 5, 2010 **“**Two Cheers for American Exceptionalism” http://www.american.com/archive/2010/march/two-cheers-for-american-exceptionalism/article\_print)

There are plenty of legitimate criticisms of American foreign policy in the post-9/11 era. The failures of the Bush administration’s democracy agenda are manifest, and the contribution of hubris and wishful thinking to its errors should not be underrated. Nevertheless, the latest vogue in reproaches against the exercise of U.S. power suffers from its own muddy-headed rationalizing. Its most conspicuous trait is its assault on American exceptionalism. Under this view, America’s sense of its unique democratic identity and mission is the root cause of the world’s evils. There is reason to believe that this idea, or something like it, has taken hold in the Obama White House.

During a European trip last year, President Obama was asked about his view of American influence in the world. “I believe in American exceptionalism,” he said, “just as I suspect that the Brits believe in British exceptionalism and the Greeks believe in Greek exceptionalism.” Translation: We all cling to our parochial mythologies. No American president ever disowned so openly the singular achievement of the United States, namely, to arrange its national life so that its extraordinary power—military, political, and economic—would promote democratic ideals and institutions.

Critics of American exceptionalism indulge in a propagandistic treatment of U.S. engagement in the world. The late Howard Zinn made historical revisionism a booming business with sales of his popular textbook, A People’s History of the United States. A slightly more sophisticated version of the problem appears in the work of Boston University’s Andrew Bacevich, a retired Army veteran who lost a son in the war in Iraq. His book, The Limits of Power: The End of American Exceptionalism, raises important caveats about American materialism and its influence on foreign policy. Yet for all his self-styled “realism,” Bacevich echoes a tired utopian theme: that U.S. foreign policy is a story of thinly disguised militarism, and that its claim to noble, liberating intentions is invalidated by its “penchant for consumption and self-indulgence.” There are plenty of legitimate criticisms of American foreign policy in the post-9/11 era.

You have to circumvent a lot of American history to arrive in this sinkhole of self-flagellation. In reality, the most laudable acts of U.S. foreign policy—especially those involving the defense of democracy and human rights—are bound up with a belief in America’s exceptional role on the world stage.

# EXCEPTIONALISM GOOD EXTENSIONS

**We need US exceptionalism—the alternative is chaos and mass murder**

**Boot 03 --**Olin senior fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations and author of "The Savage Wars of Peace: Small Wars and the Rise of American Power."(Max BootFebruary 19, 2003 **“**America's Destiny Is to Police the World - Council on Foreign Relations” http://www.cfr.org/publication/5559/americas\_destiny\_is\_to\_police\_the\_world.html?id=5559)

The intransigence of France, China and Russia last week makes it unlikely that the United Nations Security Council will pass another resolution authorising a war in Iraq. But even if it did, everyone realises this would be only a fig leaf for US-led action. If the US does not step forward, nothing will happen - not even weapons inspections. In other words, America is once again forced to play Globocop.

This stirs up opposition on both the left and right, at home and abroad. Why should America take on the thankless task of policing the globe, critics wonder? To answer that question, start by asking, does the world need a constable? That is like asking whether London or New York needs a police force. As long as evil exists, someone will have to protect peaceful people from predators. The international system is no different in this regard from your own neighbourhood, except that predators abroad are far more dangerous than ordinary robbers, rapists and murderers. They are, if given half a chance, mass robbers, mass rapists and mass murderers.

There are, to be sure, lots of international laws on the books prohibiting genocide, land mines, biological weapons and other nasty things. But without enforcement mechanisms, they are as meaningless as the Kellogg-Briand Pact of 1928, which outlawed war as an instrument of national policy.

**The Alternative to US exceptionalism is global instability**

**Koh 3** – Professor of Int’l Law at Yale University and Former Assistant Secretary of State for Democracy, Human Rights and Labor (May 2003, Harold Hongju, “On American Exceptionalism,” [*Stanford Law Review*](http://www.jstor.org.proxy.lib.umich.edu/action/showPublication?journalCode=stanlawrevi), Vol. 55, No. 5, pp. 1479-1527)

In each of these cases, my historical account and policy prescription may be controversial, but my broader point should not be. American exceptionalism has both good and bad faces, and we should be acutely aware of both. On the Korean peninsula, in Afghanistan, in the Middle East, the United States cannot disengage, and the world simply cannot afford to let the United States disengage. Rather, the United States must reengage in each of these areas, not with hard power-which has limited resolving power in these delicate diplomatic situations-but with "soft" diplomatic power backed by carrots and sticks. In each of these cases, American passivity is not an acceptable option and has demonstrably made matters worse. By constantly stressing the ways in which America is the problem, single-minded critics of American exceptionalism may perversely encourage dangerous passivity in places where the United States presents the only viable solution to a festering global problem.

**Absent US imperialism, more belligerent nations fill in**

**D’Avigdor 9** – columnist at the Sydney Globalist (6/12/09, Louis, “Two Sides of The Coin: American Imperialsim”, The Sydney Globalist, <http://thesydneyglobalist.org/archives/653>)

**HEADS**

The proliferation of American influence is neatly encapsulated by a 1989 statement from the spokesman for former Soviet President Michael Gorbachev: “We now follow the Frank Sinatra Doctrine: I’ll do it my way.”

Imperial behaviour is a necessary fixture in maintaining a civilised world order. In the last century, three serious contenders – the Soviet Union, Nazi Germany and Imperial Japan – vied for the role the U.S. occupies today. The acts that accompanied the U.S. ascendancy to ‘superpower’ status seem positively angelic compared with those of Stalin, Hitler and General Hirohito.

Whilst negative perceptions of America’s quasi-imperial behaviour abound, its actions reflect a benevolent concern for global security. The liberal ideals of Wilsonianism, informed by a sincere desire to free the world from tyranny, prevailed throughout the twentieth century.

At the close of World War Two, America stepped into a deserted playing field in dire need of strong leadership. While the United States’ 700 military bases scattered across the globe could be perceived as a form of imperial coercion, they are the means by which America maintains the social and political stability of the current world order.

Perhaps the negative connotations of the term ‘imperialism’ prove more of a terminological quandary than a substantive one. Considering its overwhelming resources, it is arguably America’s duty alone to safeguard the world. The Bush Administration’s military expenditure budget allowance for 2009 ($711 billion) accounted for 48 per cent of the world’s total military spending.