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**The affirmative’s literal depictions of the bomb ignore the symbolic nature of representation. By focusing on the literal descriptions of a omnipotent weapon, we are forced to divide the world between good and evil to rationalize the Bombs existence. We are starved of symbolic thinking, thus we cling to literal depictions of the bomb as a place for symbolic adoration.**

**Chernus, 86** (Ira Chernus. professor of religious studies university of Colorado at boulder.

University of South Caroline 1986 “Dr. Strangegod.” Page 153-156//ts)

Moreover, even if we could imagine the reality of nuclear war in purely literal terms, there is good reason to believe that we should not follow this path. **Literal thinking and literal language impose a particular mode of thought and feeling, one that is intimately linked with the Bomb and its symbolism.** Literalism insists that in every situation there is one single meaning and one single truth to be found. Thus it divides the world into true and false, right and wrong, good and evil, with no middle ground allowed. It is the characteristic language of a culture bent on an apocalyptic crusade to wipe out all evil. It allows no ground for a unified vision of good and evil or life and death together. At the same time, literalism underscores our psychic numbing. With its statistics, computer projections, and abstract theoretical models, the literal approach reduces the world to a set of finite means and ends, each with a single simple meaning. It fails to grasp the complexities of human reality and human response. It creates a dehumanized world, amenable to manipulation and control, in which we learn to see other people and ultimately ourselves as mere inert objects. It is the characteristic language of a technological culture that has made a death-machine its deity. The inert words of literalism create an inert world, in which every thing is just the thing it is and can be nothing else. In this one-dimensional world it is increasingly difficult to give possible realities and imagined realities any meaningful place. So we are prevented by our mode of speaking and thinking from exploring genuine alternatives to the existing situation. We are also prevented from recognizing the reality and power of our symbolisms and fantasies. Since we define literal truth as the only valid form of truth. we deny that our unconscious processes have any valid truth at all So literalism becomes part of the process of psychological repression. This is especially dangerous in the nuclear age, when the difference between literal reality and fantasy is so hard to find. With fantasy images affecting us so powerfully, we must exert ever more powerful processes of repression. One way to achieve this is simply to intensify our numbing-to refuse to feel at all. Another way is to project our inner thoughts and feelings onto external objects-to make the Enemy responsible for all the anger and hatred and dark feeling that wells up inside us. As numbing reinforces our commitment to dehumanizing technology, projection reinforces our commitment to the apocalyptic crusade against the Enemy. So **literalism again ties together both our ways of thinking about the Bomb and our efforts to avoid thinking about it. Yet even the most ardent literalism cannot banish the symbolic dimensions of our minds and our symbolic responses to the Bomb. Indeed, our conviction that literal truth is the only truth paradoxically strengthens the grip of symbolic meanings. The more literalism starves our supply of symbolic thinking and feeling, the more it feeds our hunger, and the more intensively we cling to our symbols**. **Since we are convinced that these nuclear symbols are actually literal realities, they take even deeper root in our psyches**. When warnings of the dire reality of nuclear war are cast in purely literal terms, they are received on the symbolic level (even if we consciously deny this) and their threatening aspect is largely nullified. Perhaps this explains, in part, the relatively limited success of the nuclear disarmament movement. The movement has tried to move us from the level of numbing to the level of awareness by urging us to imagine the literal horrors of nuclear war. Yet its alarms have fallen largely on deaf ears. The movement itself has explained this deafness by pointing to the conflict between the first two levels of awareness and numbing. But in its commitment to literal thinking it has ignored the third level of symbolic meaning. This literalism is just part of a larger picture-the disarmament movement's roots in the liberal humanism of the eighteenth-century Enlightenment. This rationalistic humanism strips the issue of its religious and psychological complexities and sees it as a purely ethical matter: humanism and life against global death, one value against another. It assumes that ethical problems must be resolved by literal factual analysis and clear logical analysis alone. It assumes, furthermore, that all people are rational and can be shown the convergence of morality and self-interest. Therefore the movement puts all its energies into education based solely on facts and logical arguments. Yet it is clear that the nuclear issue goes beyond ethical considerations, and it is equally clear that the antinuclear campaign cannot succeed merely by stressing the irrationality of nuclear armament, for the Bomb's nonrational symbolic meanings lie at the heart of its appeal. Moreover, the Enlightenment tradition still links its faith in rationality to a belief in "progress," which means the triumph of the forces of life over the forces of death. Yet all these Enlightenment values are the very values held just as fervently by nuclear policymakers, strategists, and political and military leaders. We have seen ample evidence that they too put their faith in logical analysis and the triumph of life over death, always holding the opposites apart. And proponents of nuclear armament have always couched their arguments in the most literal terms. The media have largely accepted this literal treatment and passed it along to the general public. Media presentations of the issue have been saturated with symbolic meanings that have gone unrecognized as symbolism because we have assumed that all truth must be literal truth. So the disarmament movement's own roots are closely intertwined with the roots of the very tree it hopes to fell. As long as it fails to recognize the role of symbolism and the irrational in the psyche, it will fail to grasp the fascinating, appealing qualities of the Bomb. If we are to "imagine the real," the first step is to understand that the reality we must imagine is largely a symbolic reality that crosses the line between literalism and fantasy.

# 1nc (2/5)

**Viewing the Bomb as omnipotent turns all of humanity into machines- allowing us to view nuclear weapons as a symbol of our power. This mechanical life will only cause us to desire to control all things through the bomb which leads to the worst forms of dehumanization. This makes the physical destruction of our environment, along with nuclear war both inevitable and more probable in the world of the affirmative because of our allowance of the Bomb to control the world we live in**

**Chernus, 86** (Ira Chernus. professor of religious studies university of Colorado at boulder.

University of South Caroline 1986 “Dr. Strangegod.” Page 136-140//ts)

The similarities between the Bomb and other religious realities tell us part of what we need to know. But we must also ask how our new God differs from all previous gods, for only then can we see clearly how it affects us in unprecedented ways. One point, which has been implicit in our previous discussion, must now be brought out explicitly: this God is a machine, a technological device invented by human beings. Yet the machine, being infinitely more powerful than the humans who invented it, has become a Frankenstein's Monster, independent of its creators and capable of turning violently upon them. And "them" is now, of course, all of us. We have the choice of either cooperating or resisting when the machine acts; because of its many appealing symbolic qualities, we generally cooperate. We become partners in the machine's actions and thus, in a very real sense, parts of the machine. We are all soldiers in the front-line trenches, but the Bomb is our commander and we do its bidding. This is especially clear in the concept of MAD; the citizens of all superpowers become linked together in a single machine, which demands more and more sacrifices; the actions of one side must (according to this theory) necessarily evoke corresponding actions from the other side. The way in which we prepare for war reflects and foreshadows the way we shall wage war: "In a push-button war involving nuclear missiles, there will be no direct contact between adversaries. The techniques of war are fast becoming as impersonal and mechanized as pulling a lever to start a production chainbelt. In such a setting, the best soldier is not the 'hero' but the 'automaton.'''1 We voluntarily become automatons, mere parts of a machine, in part because of our age-old mythic dream of being heroes and our mythic desire to embody in ourselves the power inherent in the divine machine. What Moss says of the Strategic Air Command bomber pilot may be true for all of us: "He is equally remote from the human will that makes a decision on using or not using the bomb, and the human suffering that its use would cause. He sees himself as part of a complex instrument, an agent between someone else's will and its effect, a living button. His pride is to function in this role perfectly. He has a sense of importance."2 Ultimately, though, in our symbolic perception, it may very well be the Bomb itself whose will we obey, for how can any human will dare to interfere with that of the divine? Even the greatest national leaders are merely parts of the machine. And, as we have seen, our importance becomes not merely social or political, but in fact sacred and cosmic in scope. At the same time, psychic numbing reinforces the pattern effected by symbolic meaning. For if we are in fact "dead in life," already suffused with the death taint of the Bomb, then it is that much easier to see ourselves as machines and to take pride in being perfectly functioning machines. Of course, this sense of the mechanization of human life was hardly created by the nuclear age. Here, as in so many other instances, the Bomb is both a reflection and a shaper of our relationship with reality. But the elevation of a machine to a central place in our symbolic world-the deification of a machine-surely makes it much more likely that we shall see ourselves as automatons. Moreover, the technologically induced problem offers itself as a solution. As this machine God intensifies our psychic numbing, we seek to escape that numbing by finding meaning in a symbolic form of immortality that is itself technological, as Lifton suggests: "Everyone in this age participates in a sense of immortality derived from the interlocking human projects we call science and technology."3 Thus, as technology absorbs those provinces of life that were previously considered spiritual, it may be fair to say that technology has become the soul of the body of humanity. Yet we cannot be totally content with being machines. In fact, as we saw previously, the existentialist movement may be said to have started with Dostoevski's revolt against being a mere piano key, a part of a machine. The sense of dehumanization and the sheer boredom-the flatness of life-which afflicts automatons can be challenged only in situations of great intensity. Russian roulette may easily become, as in the film *The Deer Hunter,* a primary symbol for the modern world's escape from the dehumanization of a technological God. The intensity of risk is combined with the joy of being entertained in a theater of life-and-death. But for the ultimate "kick," the stakes must be ultimately high. Thus **the machine deity leads us to give ourselves over to it in a game of global Russian roulette in which we all hold the pistol. And apparently we do so willingly. Machines must inevitably see all the world as a machine: "The more a man acts on the basis of a self-image that assumes he is powerless, an impotent cog in a huge machine, the more likely he is to drift into a pattern of dehumanized thinking and action toward others**."5 "We have become masters of the impersonal and the inanimate. Our energy and even our emotions have gone into things; the things serve us but come between us, changing the relationship of man to man. And the things take on an authority that men accept without protest. The impersonality is epidemic. It is almost as though we feared direct contact, almost as though the soul of man had become septic."6 Thus we find our identity not by relating to other individuals as individuals, but by seeing ourselves merely as a part of "the crowd" or "the nation," whose emblem and savior is the Bomb, the ultimate machine. We lose the subtleties and nuances of human complexity and see the world in absolutes, "us versus them." We view human relationships in terms of the mythic, apocalyptic vision, a vision whose ultimate promise is the annihilation of "their" machine and unlimited license for "our" machine to do whatever it wants. In fact, **the ultimate goal of machine people is always to have total dominance, unlimited autonomy to manipulate the environment-both human and natural-in endless technological ways. Thus the machine God also shapes our relationship with our physical and material environment, leading us to the environmental crisis that we now face.** Again, **the fouling of the air, water, and land was hardly begun in the nuclear age, but the symbolism of the Bomb makes it much more difficult to escape from this predicament too.** Behind our callousness toward the natural realm there is not only a desire for quick and easy profit, but a more fundamental view of ourselves as radically separated from nature. In the battle of the machines to dominate the elements, we are clearly on the side of the machines-we are the machines--and this battle is seen in radically dualistic, even apocalyptic, terms. Thus. having no meaningful relationship with nature, we are free, perhaps even compelled, to manipulate it endlessly. The transformation of raw materials into manufactured goods thus becomes our primary goal and value; if the Bomb is God, then the GNP is chief of the angels. Yet our commitment to material goods as highest good may have a more complex significance. It is fostered not only by the symbol of the Bomb as divine controller, manipulator, and dominator, but also by the psychic numbing that the Bomb creates. If we dare not think about the true reality of our lives-the sword of Damocles that constantly threatens total extinction at a moment's notice­ then we must divert ourselves, making the other, numbed level so complex and interesting that we shall not have time to think about the truth. And **we** must **make ourselves so comfortable that we shall not care to deal with the danger.** Thus the Bomb and the economy are interlocked not only from a strictly economic point of view (though most people do believe that more bombs are good for the economy, despite the doubts raised by economists), but also from the psychological and symbolic standpoints. The Bomb, the economy, and our lives all form parts of one interlocking machine, offering us enough satisfactions that we refuse to ask about the deeper meaning of the machine's life. When this question threatens to arise, the diversions of life as theater of the absurd and global Russian roulette are there to entertain us and soothe our doubts. Thus we desperately desire the security that we hope to gain from total domination and manipulation of our world, but we simultaneously demand the insecurity that will make life interesting and entertaining. And we certainly get this insecurity, for we have based our hopes of security on a God that, as we have seen, cannot provide it. We hope to dominate the Enemy with a weapon that by its very nature cannot offer the freedom that we seek through domination. We are caught in a vicious circle in which the quest for security can only breed the anxiety of insecurity. But machines can't feel anxiety, so it may be easier, for this reason too, to live as a machine. Finally, then, we come to treat not only the natural world and our fellow human beings as machines, but ourselves as well. We offer ourselves, our thoughts and feelings, to the machine and the nation that embodies it, and we perceive those feelings and thoughts as parts of the unreality that surrounds us: "Faced with the prospect of the destruction of mankind, we feel neither violent nor guilty, as though we were all involved in a gigantic delusion of negation of the external as well as of our internal reality."7 We allow ourselves to be numbed, finding it the easiest way to cope with an impossible situation, and thus we commit "partial suicide," which in turn allows us to continue preparing for total suicide on a global scale. **We commit ourselves to a machine that is infinitely violent and must wreak its violence on us if it is to be used on others. Therefore, as much as we fear the Enemy, we must fear ourselves in equal measure, and this fear of ourselves reinforces the numbing**.

# 1nc (3/5)

**And, the act of securitization based on fear of the bomb, increases the likelihood of the bomb’s use- Turns the Case**

**Chernus, 91.** Ira (PROFESSOR OF RELIGIOUS STUDIES UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO AT BOULDER), *Nuclear Madness: Religion and the Psychology of the Nuclear Age* 40-41//jh

"It is not enough to destroy one's own and other people's experience. One must overlay this devastation by a false consciousness inured, as Marcuse puts it, to its own falsity." 19 The nexus has three more weapons in its arsenal to achieve this final triumph. Laing calls them "mystification," "invalidation," and "collusion.'' Mystification, in its broadest sense, means masking a reality by denying its existence or calling it something else. All fantasy is mystification of a sort. But it becomes especially virulent when one experience is mapped onto another that is its very opposite. In the nuclear age, obvious examples are easy to find. Planning for war is called planning for peace. Arms increases are called paths to arms reduction. Increasing the nuclear danger is called protecting national security. Every description of reality is also an injunction to experience reality and respond to it in a certain way. When others describe reality falsely, they lead us to feel and act falsely often directly contrary to our own best interests. Through injunctions, a nexus can go one step further and mystify individuals to the point where they cannot feel or act at all. The simplest way to achieve this is to give an individual two or more conflicting injunctions and demand that all be accepted simultaneously. "Various internal and external systems playing off against each other neutralize the command system so that one can't move; one is immobilized, actually brought to a standstill by the contradiction." Like a classic double bind, the constant barrage of conflicting nuclear images evokes such a no-win situation while blocking all the exit routes. Things must change to build a better future so that we can continue standing fixedly for firm traditional values. Something must be done to improve our security, yet every step to make us more secure simultaneously makes us less secure. For example, if we want to make the world safer, we should build smaller, more accurate bombs that provide a more compelling second-strike deterrent. But smaller bombs can also be used for a decapitating first strike, so they destabilize the world and increase the risk of war. So to make the world safer we should build bigger bombs. But if you get rid of two big bombs for every new small bomb, you are reducing nuclear arsenals; so reducing arms means increasing the risk of war. To do the right thing, you must do the wrong thing. To do good, you must do evil. It is little wonder that the average person, assaulted by this welter of contradiction, ends up immobilized. When language and reality are so thoroughly bent out of any meaningful shape, we cannot begin to look for truth even if we want to. The rare individual who suspects that things are not what they are said to be usually succumbs to bewildering confusion, emotional exhaustion, and the fear of madness. It is just too difficult, and too frightening, to know the truth when "everyone knows" that one's truth is "really" a lie. One can quickly come to feel like Alice, but the world is hardly a wonderland. The surprising fact is not that so few speak up and raise questions but that anyone speaks up at all.

# 1nc (4/5)

**Representations are key- Nuclear policies are falsely assumed neutral and therefore impermeable for discursive change—the language of policy makes it impossible for amends to be made to the nuclear situation.**

**Chernus, 91.** Ira (PROFESSOR OF RELIGIOUS STUDIES UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO AT BOULDER), *Nuclear Madness: Religion and the Psychology of the Nuclear Age* 58-59//jh

This is just what has happened, Tillich indicates, in modernity. Under the guise of scientific objectivity, a wall has been erected between public institutions and private feelings. The public realm of the production/consumption machine is now proclaimed morally neutral. The state, as manager of the machine, exempts itself in principle from questions of value and religion; all its policies, including its nuclear policies, are (at least theoretically) based solely on rational calculations and "reasons of state." All questions of meaning are relegated to the subjective dimension of personal feelings and private opinions. But even this private realm consists only of partial realities. Reality can no longer be experienced by the whole person, and the person can no longer experience the whole of reality. So one can ask about the meanings of parts of one's life, but the question of the meaning of the whole is in principle meaningless. Every value becomes simply a means to some other value, which is in its turn just a means. Each can only be a link in a chain whose sole purpose is to perpetuate itself to no end. The more passionately we search for our own unique meanings in the privacy of our own unique lives, the more our lives are radically finitized and emptied of meaning. Occasionally threats to the whole may arise that force us to consider the nature of our concern for the totality of life. The nuclear threat is the most obvious case in point. But we avoid confronting this issue, as we avoid confronting our realistic fears, by claiming that it is just too big to comprehend. Again, there is truth in this claim. In a rare private moment we may wonder about the ultimate meaning of our individual lives, though we are denied an answer. But the Bomb is squarely in the middle of the public realm, where questions of ultimate meaning are impossible. We cannot connect our finite lives with ultimate meaning, nor can we connect our private lives with public meaning, so we cannot hope to connect our finite private lives with the ultimate public question of meaning implicit in the Bomb. We simply cannot ask that question. The language of public political discourse has no place for it. Those who try to inject ultimate value terms into the nuclear weapons debate inevitably face this problem of language boundaries. First they are asked to reduce their terms to a concrete policy option within the parameters of the current political debate. If they comply, their value concerns may be appended to the political discussion as useful embellishment. Even when these value terms are genuinely the source of political opinions, they are only received into mainstream discourse when presented as appendages to currently debated political options. If questions of ultimate meaning can not be reduced to the "realistic" terms of finite public policy questions, they will probably be written off by the mainstream as "idealistic" and therefore irrelevant. Through these various maneuvers we insure that we can not ask such questions in the public realm. Nor do we want to. By and large, we feel saved from the threat of anxiety by our meaninglessness.

# 1nc (5/5)

**The alternative is to reject the affirmative as an opportunity to embrace the politics of despair. Because the affirmative continues to try to realize their distant structures, they are prevented from confronting with the horror of the bomb. Imagining our total destruction must come before new forms of politics. We should affirm our inability to prevent death through despair. Only by embracing the path to destruction will we be able to motivate change.**

**Chernus, 86** (Ira Chernus. professor of religious studies university of Colorado at boulder.

University of South Caroline 1986 “Dr. Strangegod.” Page 136-140//ts)

Our initiations must be in some sense individual and private, but they must also be done in community; society as a whole must undergo the experience. Hence we can learn our path not only from the myth of the individual hero but also from the myth of the heroic rebirth of whole peoples, even of the whole world. Indeed we have such a myth, kept alive for us by the Bomb, in the tradition of the apocalypse. We can learn something valuable from this tradition too. We can learn that our initiation must be acted out in real history—in the empirical reality of the political, social, and cultural world. And we can learn that no matter how bad things may be now, they must get worse before they get better. The chaos of today must be intensified; death must be given its full due before new life can begin. We must face more honestly and more deeply the distortions in our lives—the insecurity of a fragmented and chaotic world whose survival hangs on such a slim thread. In doing so, we must admit that we feel ourselves living in desperate times and immersed to some degree or other in feelings of despair. Joanna Rogers Macy has written eloquently on this subject, showing how our numbing leads us to repress the despair that must arise from an honest assessment of our situation: “This refusal of feeling takes a heavy toll…. The energy expended in pushing down despair is diverted from more creative uses.”² Macy suggests that we must allow ourselves to feel this despair if our life energy is to be freed again: this opening up of despair, as she describes it, clearly has initiatory dimensions. For in feeling the depth of our despair we may, in fact, “disintegrate.” But this is “positive disintegration”: “It is helpful in despair work to realize that going to pieces or falling apart is not such a bad thing. Indeed, it is as essential to evolutionary and psychic trans-formation as the cracking of outgrown shells…. Our ‘going to pieces,’ however uncomfortable a process, can open us up to new perception, new data, new response…. There is healing in such openness, for ourselves and perhaps for the world.”³ In admitting our craziness, we must face our despair. And in facing despair, we must deepen our craziness. Yet it is a necessary part of our initiation.

\*\*\*LINKS

# 2nc link- general

**Our fascinations with the bomb along with our fears of it only draw us in closer to it, regarding it as our God. This fascination make the use of nuclear weapons innevitable**

**Chernus, 86** (Ira Chernus. professor of religious studies university of Colorado at boulder.

University of South Caroline 1986 “Dr. Strangegod.” Page 18-19//ts)

It may well be that nuclear weapons have become the Deus Otiosus of contemporary culture. The otiose god is the hidden god, the god who remains unrevealed to the living. It is often only through death that one can make contact with this god and bring him out of his hiddenness. Perhaps, then, the hidden Bomb beckons to us today as did the otiose god of an earlier age. The gods, the sacred, the numinous do beckon to us. Their unlimited power, mystery, and inscrutable wisdom make them objects of awe and dread, but this is only one side of the picture. There is always a simultaneous attraction to the holy, for it inspires fascination as well as fear. This fascination may rise to a level of enchantment, intoxication, or even Dionysian ecstasy. As the fear stems largely from the sense of unlimitedness, our inability to control or even predict the ways of unlimited power, so equally docs the fascination stem from this same quality. For only that which is unlimited can promise unlimited good, help, salvation. The blessedness it offers cannot be put into words, but it is sensed us a positive gift beyond compare. Just because it is ineffable, it seems to be a bliss beyond all limits-the peace that passes understanding. Just as all can agree that nuclear explosions are awesome, so it is hard to contest the assertion that there is a fascinating aspect in them. And just as the religious person is drawn to the numinous, wanting to identify with it and merge with its power, so we may be drawn to the Bomb. Survivors of the Hiroshima nuclear bombing reacted in part with this kind of fascination: "For some, identification with the bomb was related to being in awe of its power. The grocer, for instance ... remembered feeling 'only the greatness of the bomb: ... This combination of awe and fear could sometimes come close to admiration."18 But Americans who have not lived through such an experience can show similar responses when asked about nuclear weapons: "Many people, in fact, used 'fascination' to describe a significant part of their response, now and then: 'Just the tremendous power of the thing,' said the poet from Philadelphia, 'and the sort of slow cloud going up and the incredible colors of the blast and just the huge majesty' would never be forgotten."19 Perhaps the most important aspect of nuclear weapons as symbol is this simultaneous response of dread and fascination, which draws us toward the Bomb at the very same moment that we flee from it.

**Obsession with the bomb creates a schizophrenic view of the nuclear bomb, creating a greater likelihood that the bomb will be used.**

**Schwartz and Derber 92**, professor of property law at Yeshiva University's Cardozo School of Law and professor of Sociology at Boston College (William and Charles, “The Nuclear Seduction: Why the Arms Race Doesn’t Matter, and What Does”, p48, Print.) AW

Historical experience suggests that military and political leaders on both sides have a "schizophrenic" view of nuclear weapons. For in real foreign policy decisions and in the handling of real crises, their behavior does not appear to be affected by which weapons each side has built. They may still be willing to run the risk of nuclear war-as we document in Part II-but when they do so the details of the nuclear balance do not influence them and certainly do not delude them about the risk they are running. At the time of the Cuban missile crisis, for example, the United States had a far larger and more advanced nuclear arsenal than the Soviets and had a highly evolved counterforce strategy for launching a disarming at­ tack against Soviet nuclear facilities. If differences in hardware affect leaders' perceptions, then that would have been the time. Many assume that a widespread perception of American nuclear superiority was in fact decisive-motivating Chairman Khrushchev to put nuclear missiles in Cuba; leading President Kennedy to demand the missiles' removal to avoid an unfavorable change in the nuclear balance of power; and allowing the United States to prevail in the crisis. But as we will see in Chapter 8, Khrushchev and Kennedy considered the missiles important not for military reasons but mainly for symbolic ones. Kennedy certainly knew full well that the missiles caused no significant change in the nuclear balance of power.

**Nuclear weapons in the political sphere are seen as things not to be afraid of, but things that should be worshiped for their exotic and exclusive embellishment of power.**

**Malcolmson 85,** Professor at Queen’s University at Kingston (Robert W, “Nuclear Fallacies: How We Have Been Misguided Since Hiroshima”, 1985, p. 67/68, Print.)AW

One final point. Nuclear weapons, in the contemporary world, are not simply physical realities. While they obviously embody vast destructive forces, they have also acquired a special significance in the world of human communications. For they have now become important symbols: symbols of power, status, and national prestige. They convey vital messages to others, messages that bespeak a special sort of domination and subordination. Whatever doubts may be felt about their practical utility, nuclear weaponry is, in essential respects. the principal currency of power in the modem world. It is the most awesome, the most exotic, the most exclusive of the various embodiments of power. As political currency. as a medium of symbolic exchange between states and as an overt expression of capability. it has been highly valued by its possessors, whatever problems they may have encountered in actually using it. It is a currency that the United States and the Soviet Union have struggled to manage and profit from. It underlines their special superpower status, their separation from all other states. They have, indeed, a common interest in keeping this currency as exclusive as possible and ensuring that, whatever bits of it might get into the hands of lesser nations, their own overwhelming superiority is maintained. The nuclear dimension is central to their great power status. However debased this nuclear currency might seem to be to its critics, however little "protection" it might seem to offer, and however unusable its physical power might seem to be, it is a currency that can play and has played a major role in the psychological dynamics of posturing between nations. It can be used to show who is boss, to remind lesser states of where power really lies, to display resolve, to distinguish clearly the key players from the rest. In the theatre of world politics, where imagery looms large and is assiduously cultivated, nuclear weapons derive significance, not only from the world of hardware, but also from the world of language \_ the world of symbolic exchange.

**Widespread panic about the Bomb just creates a religious adoration of the bomb – we redeem the bomb from its evil and transform it as our savior.**

**Chernus et al. 89** (Ira et al., “A Shuddering Dawn: Religious Studies and the Nuclear Age”, Chernus and Linethal, State University of New York Press, Albany, New York, p. 10/11, Print.) AW

The dominant theme, however, is to mute the cries of the doom-shouters. «A mood of alarm and bewilderment [is] the worst of all moods in which to pass sweeping judgments or to take fateful decisions." Similarly, the greatest hindrance to civil defense planning is the threat of widespread panic: "To achieve discipline an urban population would have to be drilled like an army," the magazine asserts, without passing judgment on the possibility it has raised. In "this desperate world of survival," with" the whole world worried," the best advice is obviously to "keep cool." So we are challenged to develop a philosophy of adjustment to the constant presence of this vast *memento mori* [reminder of death]." A series of photos indicate scientists' impersonal objective attitude toward the H-bomb explosion. Why should we not all feel the 'same way? Although a policy of massive retaliation is still necessary to deter Soviet aggression, our attention should return to our main task-calmly building prosperity for the free world. "The avoidance of hydrogen war is merely a precondition of civilized life, not a substitute." Once the experts have harnessed the infinite in the service of freedom and prosperity, there is no limit to America's prospects for progress. The image of an infinite, ambiguous, incalculable power sustaining good in the war against evil is hardly new in human history. Religious traditions around the world, and certainly in the West, have been built on just such foundations. So the *Reader's Digest,* in its principal nuclear article of 1954, intertwines political and religious themes in issuing its own challenge to the nation. "The Road Ahead in the Light of the H-Bomb" is subtitled "Provocative gospel on today's major problem."14 The question is really spiritual salvation, defined here as peace, international harmony, and the brotherhood of all humanity. The road to salvation is a pilgrimage of the spirit, following the Star of Bethlehem up the Lord's mountain. On this road we must "toil through rough realities, with the hydrogen bomb our companion-and peace our compulsion." The Bomb is ambiguous. It leaves us "poised in dread on a hairline between life and death. . . . Many of the ancients made the sun a god. We have made him a devil. How shall we chain that devil? No man can answer surely." But the very need to "chain the devil" is the force propelling us on the road to salvation. We are "searching in the horrendous glare of the H-bomb" for peace. Its saving light brings together scientists from around the world, prophesying the coming time "for making the atom the friend of the whole human race." Even if there is a war, "the world is not going to disappear. Enrico Fermi informs us authoritatively that science knows no way of destroying the planet. And life will persist on it." Religious wars in the past often destroyed whole nations. Yet the world survived and enemies often became friends: "Someday the Russians may again be allies.... When that day comes we shall see that our true enemies were not the millions of Russian people but the handful of men who ruled them." We should be busy preparing for that day, the article continlJ.es. Yet few of us work for peace earnestly enough. The true challenge of the nuclear age is the spiritual challenge to overcome our own deficiencies and travel the long hard road to saving peace. The H-bomb, with a moral ambiguity mirroring our own, lights our way, leads us, and compels us on that eschatological journey. So we must do more than merely chain the nuclear devil. We must use it to purify and redeem ourselves from evil. Doing so, **we redeem the Bomb from its own evil, transform it, and render it divine**: "We want *permanent* peace. Let us follow the light that can lead us to it.... Since the stars gave us the hydrogen bomb, we can call it the saving Star of Bethlehem."

# 2nc link- politics

**Politicians often fabricate politics to fit their stories.**

**Chernus, 6** - Professor of Religious Studies University of Colorado at Boulder – (Ira, 2006, Monsters to Destroy: The Neoconservative War on Terror and Sin, pg 5-6)

When people view everything that happens through the lens of their stories, they can easily undermine their own security. Yet they usually feel more secure, regardless of physical risk, as long as they believe that the world really is the way they think it is. Living within the safe shelter of their story, they see only the parts of reality that already fit into their story. They don't judge the truth of their stories by testing them against facts. The story comes first. It tells what can count as a fact and how the facts should be understood. If some parts of reality don't seem to fit the story, people often reinterpret them to make them fit. If that doesn't work, they may simply deny those parts of reality. Instead of seeking out the facts, they create their own version of the facts. That's why they can feel so sure that their stories are a mirror image of the real world.The Bush administration seems to be living inits own invented reality. An unnamed senior advisor to the president told journalist Ron Suskind that liberal writers are "in what we call the reality-based community.... [They] believe that solutions emerge from judicious study of discernible reality." "That's not the way the world really works anymore," the advisor explained. "We're an empire now, and when we act, we create our own reality. And while you're studying that reality-ridiciously, as you will-we'll act again, creating other new realities, which you can study too, and that's how things will sort out. We're history's actors ... and you, all of you, will be left to just study what we do." Comments such as this outrage liberals like *New York Times* columnist Maureen Dowei, who wrote of the Bush administration: "They're still behaving like Cinderella's evil stepsisters, who cut their feet to fit them into the glass slipper: butchering reality to make the fairy tale come out their way."9 Even thoughtful conservatives can be disturbed when they see stories blotting out realities. Paul Craig Roberts, a prominent right-wing journalist who served in the Reagan administration, wrote: Delusion has settled over America. Washington cannot tell fact from fantasy, ... The Bush administration is the first government in history to initiate a war based entirely on fantasy-fantasy about nonexistent "weapons of mass destruction," fantasy about nonexistent "terrorist links," fantasy about "liberating" a people from their culture, fantasy about a"cakewalk" invasion, fantasy about America's omnipotence. Reality has yet to penetrate the Oval Office or America's "red state" consciousness. As a result of all this unreality, Robert Scheer writes, "we still do not have a credible narrative of a 'war on terror' that is being fought in the shadows." No one should suggest that the administration's stories are totally false. They usually do contain pieces of actual reality, sometimes big important pieces (which is one reason they can be so widely believed). There probably are people planning right now to inflict another major attack on the U.S. homeland. Some of them probably are Muslim traditionalists. The problem begins when the pieces of actual reality are incorporated in, and distorted to fit, the fictions of a story. For example, Scheer and others take seriously the claim of British filmmaker Adam Curtis that the popular image of Al Qaeda corresponds to no existing reality: "Americans are chasing a phantom enemy."ll By 2005, the administration itself was beginning to acknowledge that"Al Qaeda" is largely a symbolic name for a diffuse collection of only vaguely related, and sometimes wholly unrelated, small groups. By basing its policies on stories, imaginings, and only fragmentary truths, the administration makes it much harder to recognize and respond to empirical realities. If we do not understand who may want to attack us and why, we cannot take any steps that might change their hearts and minds.

**America convinces its citizens that we need a particular strength measured by foreign and domestic affairs.**

**Chernus, 6** - Professor of Religious Studies University of Colorado at Boulder – (Ira, 2006, Monsters to Destroy: The Neoconservative War on Terror and Sin, pg 29)

Is that the kind of strength America needs most? Neoconservatives certainly think so. They have done everything in their power to inject their obsession with strength deep into the political life of the nation, in foreign as well as domestic affairs. "While the nation must maintain vigilance toward the enemy outside," they believe, "it must also demand internal purity against the enemy within."35 Historian Edward T. Linenthal wrote those words to sum up the neocon position in the 1970s. But his words describe just as well the view most neocons hold today, as they tell their story of the war on terrorism. The link between domestic and foreign policy is crucial to understanding neoconservatism, past and present. Peter Steinfels, a historian of the movement, explains that the neocon "emphasis on foreign affairs emerged [in the 1970s] after the New Left and the 'counterculture' had dissolved as convincing foils for neoconservativism." They needed a new actor to take on the role of the enemy. However, Steinfels acknowledges that"domestic and international elements are inextricably mixed in the neoconservative vision." They must be, because "the essential source of that anxiety is not military or geopolitical or to be found overseas at all; it is domestic and cultural and ideological." When neocons turned to foreign affairs, they were only playing out the same drama on a different stage. As Midge Deeter put it quite candidly,domestic policy was foreign policy, and vice versa." Neocon historian Walter Laqueur assured his readers that the kinds of strength involved in foreign and domestic policy were the same: a confident, dynamic country can play an active part in world affairs and at the same time cope with its internal problems. A people adrift, lacking purpose and conviction, cannot do either."36 The neoconservatives first issued their call for greater military strength to counter the weakness caused, they claimed, by new left-wing ideals at home. Podhoretz reflects their scale of priorities when he writes: "Neoconservatives undertook the job of rebuilding intellectual and moral confidence in the values and institutions on which American society rests, not to mention the actual physical defenses on which the country's security depends." As Edward Linenthal says, "They feared that America was morally tired and militarily weak after its failure of nerve in Vietnam." Historian Andrew Bacevich agrees: "American weakness was the problem [for the neocons], not American might. Weakness endangered those who relied on the United States for protection; it also sowed confusion among the American people.”

# 2nc link- hard power

**Aggressive foreign policy with nuclear weapons feeds our ideas of omnipotence and invulnerability- this makes us servants to the Bomb**

**Chernus, 86** (Ira Chernus. professor of religious studies university of Colorado at boulder.

University of South Caroline 1986 “Dr. Strangegod.” Page 35//ts)

It might be possible, of course, for two opposing nations, caught in this Catch-22 cycle, to admit their dilemma and work constructively to solve it. "But," writes Lifton, "the more frequent national response resembles that of an individual who fends off his imagery of threatened annihilation by means of more aggressive and more total measures to assert his power, measures which may in turn enable him to believe his illusion of invulnerability. Thus nations, perhaps especially bomb-possessors, are likely to move toward totalism in both foreign and domestic policies."6 This means that each side, while perhaps believing in its slogans of freedom and self-determination, is inexorably led to attempt to impose itself and its power on the entire world; and governments, in the name of freedom and security, increasingly limit the freedoms of their own people.

# 2nc link- security

**Ideas of securitization and the national need for security against a common enemy not only leads our needing of the bomb and omnipotence, but also characterizes our enemies as the absolute evil. The solution against our enemies can then only be seen as their ultimate destruction.**

**Chernus, 86** (Ira Chernus. professor of religious studies university of Colorado at boulder.

University of South Caroline 1986 “Dr. Strangegod.” Page 32-33//ts)

By starting with the observation that everyone is awed by a nuclear explosion, we have been able to discover a number of similarities between nuclear weapons and religious symbols. However, the importance of religious symbols is not exhausted in exploring this dimension of awesome power. Another equally important side of the religious life, and an equally important symbolic dimension of nuclear weapons, may be revealed if we begin from another observation with which all can agree: nuclear weapons were developed, and continue to be produced and deployed, in the context of a professed concern for national security. Whether this concern is the only or even principal motivation for nuclear armament is surely open to question. But the governments that deploy these weapons, and most of the people ruled by those governments, appear to believe that national security is their overriding concern. These two observations are not unrelated. The desire for security can easily grow into a desire for invincible omnipotence. The freedom that security is supposed to protect then becomes equated with omnipotence. As we shall see, these developments foster an attitude of extreme dualism; the quest for security turns into a battle of absolute good against absolute evil. The first atomic bomb was developed, of course, in the context of an all-out drive to defeat an enemy, and especially out of fear that the enemy would develop the Bomb first. While this first enemy soon became an ally, it was supplanted by others, and so the Bomb has continued to be seen as our principal protection from enemy threat. We find ourselves sheltering behind our arsenal of nuclear weapons, as if it were some kind of magical shield out of a medieval legend. It offers an imagined sense of invulnerability, in which Americans may be particularly prone to believe. Because we expect to find absolute protection and absolute safety from a weapon of absolute power, the dualism of "our side" and "the Enemy" becomes absolute too: "Once a nation pledges its safety to an absolute weapon, it becomes emotionally essential to believe in an absolute enemy."1 The nuclear shield becomes a wall of total separation. Thus Senator Brien McMahon urged the development of the hydrogen bomb not only because it meant "total power" for America, but also because Russia was "total evil. The nature of modern warfare seems to have been leading in the direction of such absolutism even before the advent of nuclear arms. World War I may have been the first war in modern times marked by a sense of total confrontation between two implacably opposed sides that are radically polarized. Paul Fussell suggests that this new view stemmed from the psychological conditions of trench warfare, which "with its collective isolation, its 'defensiveness,' and its nervous obsession with what 'the other side' is up to, establishes u model of modern political, social, artistic, and psychological polarization."3 In modern warfare-and certainly in the age of nuclear warfare-the distinction between combatants and noncombatants is virtually erased. In this situation, "whole populations come more and more to be regarded as legitimate objects of annihilation.... Restraints on the way the enemy's will to resist is broken down have disappeared.... We quickly reach, by benefit of propaganda that terribly simplified morality with a single absolute: 'Any act that helps my side win the war is right and good, and any act that hinders it is wrong and bad.' This drive toward moral absolutism of a totalitarian sort affects all other aspects of warfare in our age. Hence the enemy as a real flesh-and-blood individual disappears, to be replaced by "the Enemy" as an abstraction that embodies total and unredeemable evil. The only possible attitude toward such evil is to hate it and resolve to use every means to destroy it.

**Portraying other countries as enemies creates a bomb-craze; Soviet Union proves.**

**Chernus et al. 89** (Ira et al., “A Shuddering Dawn: Religious Studies and the Nuclear Age”, Chernus and Linethal, State University of New York Press, Albany, New York, p. 12/13, Print.) AW

By this time, *Reader’s Digest* had less patience for the complexities of clear issues. Under the heading, “Soviet Union vs. U.S.A. What Are the Facts'?''16 it offered a recitation of classic Cold War images, us presented by "three distinguished Americans who have unsurpassed opportunity to know the facts." The "authorities" are a triumvirate of well-known cold warriors: Admiral Arleigh Burke, SAC General Curtis leMay, and AEC Chairman Lewis Strauss. The "facts" fall into a flawless pattern of moral dualism. "The United States has never seriously been labeled as an aggressor." Ever since 1946, the United States has made "the most earnest and persistent efforts to achieve real atomic disarmament, inspected and controlled." We are a hard­ working, honest people whose industriousness gives us the high standard of living that all freedom-loving people desire. The Soviet Union, on the other hand, is the polar opposite of all that we value. "Their purpose and intention is to conquer and destroy the free world. That means, first and foremost, us." Their promises of peaceful intention are worthless, as are any agreements they might sign. (An accompanying article documents "the Reds' shocking record of violating every important promise they have ever made.', The Soviet leaders compel their people to forego basic consumer goods so that they can build up their war machine. Although it is not likely that they would be foolish enough to attack us, "there is always the possibility that a mad or irresponsible person or government in possession of nuclear weapons could start a war." This possibility compels the United States to keep on building nuclear weapons. We have maintained peace until now because we are omnipotent. *As of today,* our defensive shield comprehends a vast complex of ground, sea, and air units superbly equipped and strategically deployed around the world. The most powerful deterrent to war in the world ... presents to any potential attacker who would unleash war upon the world the prospect of virtual annihilation of his own country. The key phrase is *as of today.* If we have the will to build bigger and better bombs tomorrow, and the day after, the Bomb will continue to be our savior! 7 Our superior technology and industrial capacity can keep us ahead of the Soviets forever. "If, however, we let them get ahead of us-well, I never have thought Communists the sort of people you should offer a shot at a sitting duck." The challenge remains as clear, and as urgent, as ever. Popular concern about nuclear war reached its pinnacle in the great bomb shelter craze of 1961. "As the warlike rattle rolled out of Moscow and as small amounts of fallout from the daily succession of Soviet nuclear tests floated over the U.S., the people woke up to the fact that they ought to be doing something to protect themselves." War with all its horror is still an ever present possibility, so there is the "grim reality of the necessity to prepare for the worst!," But the good news is that we can prepare. The September 15. 1961, issue of *14('* offers u live-article spread to help us. IX Nuclear war is not "too terrible to contemplate.... The best-informed estimates deny that maimed survivors would be fighting for burned crusts amid the ruins of civilization." The nature of nuclear attack and its fallout is now well understood. Although people may still be worrying, "parades of sober statistics also bring them relatively hopeful facts." Fallout, for example, loses 99 percent of its radioactivity within two days. "Prepared, you and your family could have 97 chances out of 100 to survive." Protection is not very difficult. One article offers a quick "Rundown of Things to Remember in Case Attack Should Come." The Russians will probably attack at night, which means you will be at home where you can have your own fallout shelter. Otherwise, you can take shelter in a subway tunnel or "dig a cave in a hillside." "You can live for several weeks without food, "though it is necessary to have a water supply. After the war the government "will provide food and medicine [and] rebuild a going economy," in ways to be revealed later on. Knowing that shelters can do the job, we should set aside moral qualms. Some 5 million people might die in a nuclear war, "but you have to look at it coldly." Though shelters cannot guarantee survival, "they will increase the odds." The man who builds a shelter "is actually a solid, sensible man-and a responsible citizen." Responsibility means a prudent, rational approach to the irrational; it means gambling intelligently. As readers learn in "A Message To You From The President," "we must prepare for all eventualities. The ability to survive coupled with the will to do so are essential. " Responsible citizens not only know how to prepare for disaster~-they have the will to prepare, endure, and survive. The imagery of the shelter craze offers a communal celebration of all the nation's traditional values. Americans are optimists with an eye toward a better future, but they are also hard-headed realists. If an emergency arises, "there can be no doubt that it will be met as America has met past emergencies with speed, know-how, and calm efficiency." Americans pool their funds and work in off-hours to build communal shelters; they pull together to make sure that everyone is protected. Fortunately, there is enough excess wealth to make shelters available for all. In fact, shelters fit in nicely with the affluent American life-style. *Life* offers instructions on a variety of shelters, including "A $700 Prefabricated Job to Put Up in 4 Hours. "One family is pictured relaxing on the patio alongside "an attractive addition" to their home; another is seen "In the Shelter, Snug, Equipped, and Well Organized." Beneath a photo of a teenager on the telephone, laughing and drinking Coca-Cola, the caption reads: "At the moment the shelter is her clubhouse. But the air-blower is ready for serious work."

# 2nc link- terrorism

**Our war on terrorism is a story we are forced to believe crafted by our favorite storytellers: the government. These stories instigate international provocations and disintegrate domestic stability.**

**Chernus, 6** - Professor of Religious Studies University of Colorado at Boulder – (Ira, 2006, Monsters to Destroy: The Neoconservative War on Terror and Sin, pg 1-2)

Monsters are not real-unless you believe in them. Monsters exist only in fictional stories. But if you really believe in the stories, you will believe in the monsters. Then the monsters will have very real effects. That's how monsters become real. That's what we are doing in our war on terrorism. On September 11, 2001, some very real people hijacked four airplanes and did very terrible, wholly unjustifiable things. Then America turned those people, and many other people perhaps (or perhaps not) associated with them, into monsters. We call them "the terrorists." The real people are certainly dangerous to us. They are far more dangerous, though, as monsters. Every day, America goes abroad searching for those monsters and trying to destroy them. Every day, that effort puts our freedom, our civil liberties, our national spirit, and our national security at risk. Every day, it creates new ways to harm our country and our people. Muslims are attacked, imprisoned, and tortured, giving anti-U.S. forces a powerful recruiting tool. Prolonged war in Iraq provides a rich training ground for the recruits. Threats of preemptive attack against Iran, Syria, and other nations destabilize the global political scene, creating new enemies. Increased spending for weapons, especially nuclear weapons, encourages other nations to spend more too, spurring nuclear proliferation. Every day, the United States sells weapons to nations that are now allies but might someday tum those weapons against us. Bush administration policies alienate world opinion, making it more likely that allies will tum into enemies. Meanwhile, restrictions on civil liberties create constitutional dilemmas and growing political splits at home. The government spies on, and sometimes imprisons, innocent people. As the costs of national security rise dramatically (military spending in fiscal 2007 will exceed half a trillion dollars) the ballooning budget deficit plays havoc with the nation's financial future. Huge sums must be borrowed from foreign nations, giving those nations (including most notably, China) unpredictable leverage over the U.S. economy. And billions are wasted in homeland security efforts that tum out to be more or less useless. As long as people want to attack us, they will find a way, no matter how much we spend to stop them. We won't be safe until they no longer want to attack us. So far, nearly everything the United States has done in response to 9/11 has given them more reason to want to attack us. If we want to reverse our course--if we want to make ourselves more secure--the most important thing is to understand why they want to attack us. Or, as the question is so often put, Why do they hate us?

# 2nc link- retaliation

**The affirmative’s belief that nuclear weapons can help produce and stop retaliation just increases dependence on and obsession with the bomb.**

**Schwartz and Derber 92**, professor of property law at Yeshiva University's Cardozo School of Law and professor of Sociology at Boston College (William and Charles, “The Nuclear Seduction: Why the Arms Race Doesn’t Matter, and What Does”, p29, Print.) AW

During the brief American nuclear monopoly after World War II, many believed that the United States might use nuclear weapons again in a war or political crisis. No country could retaliate, and the 1945 nu­ clear attacks on two defenseless Japanese cities as well as the earlier killing of hundreds of thousands of German and Japanese city dwellers with conventional weapons showed that moral considerations might not inhibit American actions. As the Soviets developed their own nuclear arsenal, however, American strategists worried that the fear of retaliation could reduce the United States to a hobbled nuclear state. They became obsessed with what was politely termed the "credibility" problem: how to make the world believe that American nuclear threats might actually be carried out even though the result could be the destruction of the United States. The belief that special weapons are required to solve this problem is one of the major driving forces of, and rationales for, the nuclear arms race.

# 2nc link- deterrence

**Deterrence is a fantasy that sees international relations solely as a means towards self-preservation. This causes otherization and leads us to believe we are invulnerable—makes mediation impossible. This just solidifies our need for the Bomb, and makes nuclear proliferation inevitable.**

**Chernus, 91**.Ira (PROFESSOR OF RELIGIOUS STUDIES UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO AT BOULDER), *Nuclear Madness: Religion and the Psychology of the Nuclear Age* p 19-20//jh

The omnipotence fantasy is also reflected in the various strategies of nuclear deterrence. With the amount of violence at our disposal apparently infinite, it seems possible to compel the whole world to live within our chosen deterrence fantasy forever. But deterrence images speak more loudly of the complementary fantasy: just as freedom behind the false self means omnipotence, so security means isolation and invulnerability. Ontological insecurity makes every relationship a potential pitfall. Relationships can only be arenas for self-preservation at best, never for true self-enhancement. Thus the best relationship is one in which the other is unable to touch the self. Of course once the self is cut off from the other it can have no real knowledge of the other; it can only relate to its fantasy images of the other. The world of mutual deterrence is a perfect image of a society of schizoids. Deterrence strategies are based not on what "the other side" is actually doing, but on our perceptions (and fears) of what the other might door merely be able to do at any time in the future in a worst case scenario. Psychologists have long noted that deterrence strategies make it increasingly difficult for us to have any real knowledge of "the other side"; instead they persuade us to believe ever more firmly in our own frightening fantasies.19 Inevitably those fantasies convince us that we must be absolutely invulnerable. It is hardly surprising that each side also strives to develop whatever defensive system it can technologically and economically afford. The American Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI or "Star Wars") plan, as originally proposed by Ronald Reagan in 1983, is perhaps the ultimate analogue to the false self fantasy of a shield providing perfect protection against whatever attack the other might mount. As long as there is reality and life in the world, however, the world remains independent, unpredictable, and threatening. The schizoid can feel completely secure only by imagining the world as a vast empire of inert objects ruled by the self's unfettered will. The appeal of nuclear deterrence rests in part on such a fantasy. Each side renders the other too petrified to make a move. Each side maps out its global strategy as if every other nation were merely a piece in the strategists' puzzlean object that can be manipulated at will. The ultimate result is the Pentagon officer (and no doubt his Moscow counterpart) choosing nuclear targets at random, never stopping to think that each new pin in the map may represent several million dead human beings. Images of annihilation and images of invulnerable omnipotence nearly exhaust the repertoire of Cold War imagery. Thinking about the Bomb is defined largely by these two mutually exclusive alternatives. Absolute control of the Bomb's dangers is proclaimed as the only possible alternative to the absolute unleashing of those dangers. But controlling the Bomb is generally equated with controlling the enemy's threat. So Cold War thinking about political relationships also assumes a schizoid quality. As in the schizoid's fantasy world, one must be either absolutely independent or absolutely dependent. There is no middle ground, no place for thinking about mediating possibilities. All thinking, and acting, is defined by the stark simple contrast of good and evil.

**Our deterrence policy in society makes nuclear weaponry the epicenter of our society, but the cost retaliation is more dangerous than aggression.**

**Mehan, Wills, 88** - (Mehan) Ph. D in Sociology from UC Santa Barbara in 1971, Professor of Sociology and Director of The Center for Research on Educational Equity, Access, and Teaching and Excellence (CREATE) at UCSD, (Wills) B. A. Philosophy, University of Illinois, 1956, M. A. East Asian Studies, Harvard University, 1960, Emeritus Professor of History at USC - (Hugh, John, October 1988, Society for the Study of Social Problems, "MEND: A Nurturing Voice in the Nuclear Arms Debate," Social Problems, Vol. 35, No. 4, pg 366)

While the meaning of nuclear weapons in our society has been fluid and dynamic for the past forty years, the prevailing voice defining the nuclear situation is at present known as "deterrence policy." Fundamental premises of this doctrine include: (1) the Soviets are an unambiguous and non-negotiable threat to U.S. interests; (2) Soviet expansionism must be contained; and (3) nuclear weapons are designed to deter the Soviet Union from launching an attack on the United States or its allies. This policy emerged in the post war period when ambiguous Soviet behavior was interpreted unambiguously as a threat to U.S. national security and the security of other Western nations (Nathanson, forthcoming). The social construction of the Soviets as a threat rationalized the further development of nuclear weapons. The deterrence policy discourse explains that nuclear weapons are able to play this peace keeping function because both the United States and the Soviet Union are mutually assured of each other's destruction should either side launch an attack on the other. If one side uses nuclear weapons, then the other side will respond. The response will be so devastating in cost of lives, damage to political infrastructure, the economy and the environment that a nuclear attack would not be worth the price. In short, the cost of retaliation is greater than the benefit of aggression. The rhetoric of deterrence makes nuclear weapons the centerpiece of U.S. national security because they have been perceived as sufficient to deter and neutralize the Soviet Union's aggressive impulses. Deterrence doctrine is presented in a language with a technical vocabulary which has specialized meanings and a logic which emphasizes the strategic implications of nuclear war (Cohn, 1987a, 1987b; Skelly, forthcoming; Wertsch, 1987). An example of this technical-strategic way of legitimating claims about nuclear weapons is provided by the late Herman Kahn (1960), whose book, On Thermonuclear War, has had a great influence on nuclear strategy and strategic thinking.

**Nuclear stability solidifies our belief of nuclear imagery as God and falsely sees the world as immutable—the aff sees deterrence as a way to save itself from its own harms.**

**Chernus, 91.** Ira (PROFESSOR OF RELIGIOUS STUDIES UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO AT BOULDER), *Nuclear Madness: Religion and the Psychology of the Nuclear Age* 74-76//jh

There is a nearly universal assumption that disarmament through the arms control negotiation process is the only viable way out of the nuclear trap. But this faith in arms control is faith in a process of mutual constriction. It looks forward to a day when the rational ego's expertise will devise a set of agreements so perfectly balanced that each side will be eternally immobilized and prevented from moving against the other. 4 The test of every prospective arms control treaty is its capacity to eliminate all risk. The disarmament movement's most successful initiative of the eightiesthe nuclear freezereflects the same desire to freeze reality as a way of defending ourselves. Images of political stasis, permanence, and rigidity also abound in eras of détente. If the situation can be eternally frozen, we hope, we and the whole world can be eternally safe. So the new-found friendship between the superpowers resembles the friendships developed by schizoids. They are mutually negotiated arrangements for interacting without the prerequisite of all genuine human interaction: the risk of mutual vulnerability. No new political or military initiative can gain popular support unless it is first proven to be virtually risk-free. All the emerging proposals for perfectly secure arms control treaties and negotiated settlements seem reasonable enough. In truth, though, all aim to defend us principally against the schizoid's real enemythe inevitable flux of reality itself, whose code name in our political discourse is "instability." A society suffering acute ontological insecurity must see every change as a threat to its tenuous reality and therefore fear "instability" above all. No doubt the threat may be labeled differently at different times. In some eras it is "the Russians" or ''the Communists"; in others it is the Bomb itself or the "terrorists" who could, with a bit of purloined plutonium and a suitcase, incinerate a city. But despite these changes our goal remains the same: "stability," which is a political code word for the extreme of psychic numbinga world too petrified even to contemplate change. Therefore, we increasingly pin our hopes for national security on the numbing power of the false self system and its apparently reasonable technological program. Just as we used to prize the "firmness" of a "rigid defense posture" above all, so we now prize "firmness" at the negotiating table as the only way to achieve the parity we must have at all costs. Since our goal is a stable balance that we believe will benefit the whole world, it seems perfectly reasonable, even benign, to cast ourselves as the immovable center from which the newly balanced world order proceeds, and as the rigidly vigilant center from which that balance is maintainedby threat of renewed force if necessary. Yet the "stability" we seek is actually the permanent petrification that the schizoid fears yet embraces, hoping to avoid death by becoming dead in life. If the world and the nations in it are already dead, it matters little whether a given nation be treated as enemy or friend. In either case, all danger is denied. So an enemy nation can become a friend (or vice versa) very easily, and sometimes surprisingly rapidly. Communist China was transformed from enemy to ally almost overnight by the Nixon administration. The Soviet Union was changed, more gradually but no less strikingly, from "evil empire" to dialogue partner during the Reagan administration. Such eras of détente, even more than eras of overt enmity, validate Laing's perception of the family of nations as a nexus, in which both sides cooperate in keeping the international false self system alive. As Laing notes: "The game's the thing: not perhaps fundamentally even a matter of winning it, but of perpetuating it." 5 Détente means that the partners in the nexus openly admit their mutual desire to play the same game. In Laing's analysis of the nexus, the partners continue to play the game largely because each hopes to get reality from the other. As the false self assumes more and more control, schizoids feel increasingly drained of reality, so they turn to others to try to get reality without incurring any risk. One way to do this is to let the other spy on oneself, as the superpowers do with their growing willingness for mutual inspection of military facilities and nuclear weapons tests. Indeed all the recent moves toward superpower cooperation may be seen as attempts to open oneself up to the other's reality without risking one's own. As in any nexus, though, the game still depends on mutual coercion masquerading as mutual concern. The transformation from enemy to ally is so easy because within the nexus one's closest ally always remains one's enemy. Therefore the pursuit of détente and disarmament need not mean a halt to weapons production. Most Americans believe that we must still keep up our guard, that new weapons can compel the enemy to negotiate arms reduction, that deterrence is necessary until the disarmament process is complete, and that some nuclear deterrence capability will thus be necessary for a very long timeperhaps forever. But deterrence and disarmament seem very compatible in the public mind because both reflect the same basic principle: that humanity can be saved by a technologically constructed and constricting static balance, using the Bomb itself to save us from its horrors.

# 2nc link- percieved threats

**The affirmative’s presentation of other countries as threats leads the public to look to what they think is their only answer to the problem at hand, the bomb, as something to be worshiped, praised, and obsessed over.**

**Malcolmson 85,** Professor at Queen’s University at Kingston (Robert W, “Nuclear Fallacies: How We Have Been Misguided Since Hiroshima”, 1985, p. 108/109, Print.)AW

We inhabit a peculiar world. In the search for what is called national security, the great powers pursue an arms race that is virtually guaranteed to heighten insecurity, as it has since the late I940s. In Western political cultures there is much agitated talk: of the "Soviet threat," and yet many perhaps most - of the actual problems we confront, both domestically and globally, have little or nothing to do with the USSR. One notices that most of the bloody conflicts of the early 1980s were largely or entirely unrelated to Soviet initiatives (Afghanistan is the sole significant exception). All this talk about "the threat" (in the Soviet Union the threat is said to come from "capitalist imperialism") serves, it is clear, not to explain the world, but rather to deflect our attention from a much more fundamental and common threat: the massive presence in the world of nuclear weaponry and the extent to which this weaponry has become deeply embedded in our system of international relations. The everyday language of political opportunism, especially the Cold War language from both sides of the great-power divide, is designed in part to obscure the reality of this peril and to present an invariably one-sided view of the East-West confrontation as the central drama of the modern world. In the course of these power and propaganda struggles, much mystification is deployed, which the mass media, as a rule, obediently disseminate. One's own side's nuclear arsenal is made to appear, by a kind of linguistic sleight of hand, as benign as possible: the other side is said to "threaten" and is at all time a "potential aggressor"; we, it is said, merely "deter" and prepare to act in self-defence.73 Of course, the rhetoric of peace continues to be dispensed at least as liberally as ever before, and meanwhile the militarization of international relations and the increasing refinement of the technologies of destruction actively proceed apace. Inattempting to dispel some of the mists that enshroud our perceptions of these present dangers, all of us, no doubt, can make our own particular contributions. But however we might choose to direct our energies, it will be necessary at all times to address the fundamental issue of language - the issue that George Orwell, and others, have been so acutely aware of. For much of the language of conventional politics is a barrier to clear thinking and critical understanding. It is riddled with stereotypes; it is often (as in 1984) deliberately dishonest; it is consciously reworked and reshaped by powerful interests to discourage awkward questions and to help put people's minds at ease. A sensitivity to language is almost always the beginning of political wisdom never more so than in the nuclear age. It is clear, certainly, that much of the orthodox language of nuclear strategists and military specialists is overdue for close inspection. The preoccupation of these people is overwhelmingly with technique, with the means to achieve presupposed ends; the ends themselves, the purposes of policies, are seldom scrutinized, and it is just such purposes that warrant, and would benefit from, critical attention. Moreover, the world of these nuclear experts and professional strategists is alarming­ ly simplistic and lacking in nuance. They are intolerant of ambiguity. For them "enemies" and "aggressors" are easy to identify and "threats" are conceived almost exclusively in military terms; and their notion of "security" is so remarkably constricted that they exclude from consideration most of what human security actually means and has meant in most civilizations. This lack of subtlety, this narrowing of vision, and this warping of language should not go unchallenged. Finally, it is important to recognize how much of the specialist literature on the nuclear age is decidedly ethnocentric. I t is vitiated by a persistent failure to imagine, sympathetically, alternative views of the world (including those of supposed enemies); by an inability to accord any degree of legitimacy to adversaries' views of their own security; and by a chronic tendency to equate national self-interest with universal values.74 Such ethnocentrism is, of course, by no means novel. But it is now much more dangerous in its implications. Never before has the potential price been so high for failing to understand how others see the world. And here, again, many of us can contribute to a broader discussion, especially by challenging those stereotyping images of outsiders that ethnocentrism always promotes, and by resisting the contaminating influences of narrow, parochial, and confrontational modes of thought.

# 2nc link- peace

**We evaluate peace as something we must achieve through war.**

**Chernus, 87** - Professor of Religious Studies at the University of Colorado at Boulder - (Ira, 1985, Journal of the American Academy of Religion: Book Reviews, "The Quest for Peace" pg 798-799)

Modem students of religion and ethics have given much attention to understanding war, but rather less attention to understanding peace. Perhaps war isintrinsically more interesting than peace (just as, some contend, hell is intrinsically more interesting than heaven.) Perhaps we assume that the meaning of peace is self-evident-it is merely the absence, or the opposite, of war-and so the problem is not to understand, but to achieve, peace. Since we want peace, we study war.      Now James Turner Johnson, a noted expert on the "just war" tradition, has turned his attention to the problem of peace and discovered that the meaning of peace in Western culture is not at all self-evident, because notions of peace and war are actually correlative rather than antithetic. Every conception of war implies a particular conception of peace, and vice versa. The Quest for Peace outlines the historical development of three major conceptions of war and peace in the West since the beginning of Christianity. Just war theory is seen here as the dominant tradition against which the other two must be understood. It assumes that war is necessary to settle political conflicts (which are inevitable this side of the eschaton), and it views peaceas a precarious balance of power maintained through perpetual, sometimes violent, adjustment. The second tradition, sectarian pacificism, rejects war and violence not because they are evil in themselves but because they are aspects of "the world," which is rejected in its entirety. In this tradition peace means nothing less than the kingdom of God, which can only be experienced in thelife of a community withdrawn from the world, living in the fullness of the Spirit. The third tradition, rooted in late medieval thought, views war as useless folly, always engendering more suffering than its goals could justify. This tradition insists that since war always stems from conflicts among states, peace can only mean a single world government that removes the sources of conflict, insuring that war will simply wither away. Johnson labels this tradition "utopian," claiming that it is unrealistic to expect states to relinquish their sovereignty voluntarily. He notes that many "utopians," recognizing this problem,have advised violence to compel recalcitrant states to accept the new world order. Since they are not absolutely pacifist, and the sectarian tradition does not reject war or violence as evil in themselves, Johnson concludes that there is no such thing as absolute pacificism in Western history. But the differences among the three approaches are stressed throughout the book, which concludes that all have both their merits and their shortcomings.

**Our nuclear discourse that defined peace as apocalypse management, which distorts our standards of violence and peace.**

**Chernus, 87** - Professor of Religious Studies at the University of Colorado at Boulder - (Ira, 1985, Journal of the American Academy of Religion: Book Reviews, "The Quest for Peace" pg 802)

Chernus specializes in the study of rhetoric, and his primary concernlies in analyzing the forms of discourse that the Eisenhower administration developed to express and disseminate an understanding of its nuclear policies during the president's first year in office. Drawing on both published and archival materials, Chernus examines Eisenhower's April 1953 Chance for Peace speech, the administration's discussions concerning Operation Candor, and the rise of the New Look policy before dealing directly with the December 1953 Atoms for Peace speech. He finds few indications that Eisenhower intended a serious pursuit of nuclear disarmament. Instead, the administration deployed the rhetoric of peace primarily as a means of shoring up America's nuclear defenses while simultaneously reassuring the American public, placating world opinion, and lessening U.S.-Soviet tensions enough to head off all-out nuclear war. As Chernus observes, to the White House "Peace meant apocalypse management: protecting the United States and its efforts to consolidate a liberal capitalist 'free world/by keeping the cold war perpetually cold. That meant mounting an effective deterrent against any possible Soviet attack. It also meant consolidating the cold war consensus" (p. 51). Not only did Atoms for Peace not advocate nuclear disarmament, but, behind the scenes, the administration also rejected any linkage between its proposal for an international pool of fissionable materials to be used for peaceful purposes and the promotion of arms control. Although Chernus makes much of the virtues of discourse analysis, his study does not really break new methodological ground. He asserts that while historians "often pay close attention to the intentions and motivations of policymakers,"  they "have given too little weight to the meanings and uses of words" (p. 5). Methodologically, however, Chernus provides little more than the type of close reading at which historians have always excelled - namely, the evaluation of textual evidence with a sensitivity  toward the ways in which individual personalities and perceptions as well as larger political and cultural currents, shape meaning. The heart of Chernus's critique lies less in the arena of method than in the realm of interpretation. There, he parts with those scholars who have viewed Atoms for Peace as the beginning of serious nuclear disarmament negotiations. Such explanations, he points out, give too much credence to Eisenhower's diaries and memoirs rather than to the substance of the actual policy discussion. In his diary, Eisenhower claimed that his speech marked a starting point for disarmament, yet the administration's deliberations during the early months of 1954 explicitly avoided any serious commitment to arms control. Thus, Chernus concludes, "The speech's overriding aim was to prepare the way for the New Look and at the same time secure the EDC [European Defense Community] by reshaping public attitudes in the United States and abroad" (p.100).

# 2nc link- fantasy

**The aff’s fantasy allows us to believe we are leading normal lives while with each action we reinscribe ourselves into the fantasy and kills us.**

**Chernus, 91.** Ira (professor of religious studies university of colorado at boulder), *nuclear madness: religion and the psychology of the nuclear age* 33-34//jh

While Laing argues that a limited identity saves us from a sense of unreality, he does not articulate the converse: it also saves us from an equally threatening sense of unlimited reality. In a culture riddled with the fear of unreality, there is no way to cope with the anxiety inherent in the infinite possibility of the not-yet-real. The prospect of being anything you want to be is just as appalling as the prospect of being no one at all. So we rely on the false self system that safely defines us to safely confine us too. As we learn who and what we are, we build an individual false self embedded in an apparently universal system. Thus we acquire a numbed outer shell that allows us to employ the schizoid strategy for staving off threats to our reality while living perfectly "normal" lives. We can play out the intricate scripts of the social fantasy play at being "just ourselves" without ever running the risk that our true inner selves will be hurt, for they cannot be touched by anything, or anyone, in external reality. Of course immersion in the nexus of fantasy is immersion in the very unreality we most fear. If the root cause of our dedication to that fantasy is our abiding sense of unreality, then we are taking refuge in the problem itself as if it were the solution and exacerbating the danger. This is the schizoid pattern that we act out so clearly in the nuclear arms race. But since the social fantasy defines and constitutes our sense of reality, no one is aware of the growing danger of unreality. Indeed everything feels more real inside the nexus, and we may live our entire lives enmeshed quite comfortably in this communal web: "The *normal* state of affairs is to be so immersed in one's immersion in social phantasy systems that one takes them to be real. We are dead, but think we are alive. We are asleep, but think we are awake."

# 2nc link- otherization

**The terrifying idea of being killed by an unimaginable “Other” creates the want for more bombs to ensure safety – the Bomb is seen as salvation.**

**Chernus et al. 89** (Ira et al., “A Shuddering Dawn: Religious Studies and the Nuclear Age”, Chernus and Linethal, State University of New York Press, Albany, New York, p. 40/41, Print.) AW

The air of unreality helps to sustain the most terrifying of all the old images, the actual waging of a nuclear war. Here again, though, the new modifies the old. Despite the explicit affirmations that no one can win a nuclear war, there are implicit claims that nuclear war will be fought much like traditional war-the familiar contest of challenge and response, offense and defense, with a winner and a loser. "Many features of the American defense plan greatly increase confidence that the U.S. could mount a potent nuclear counterattack even if the Soviets were to strike first. "55 Pentagon war-fighting plans "describe what has for some time been U.S. strategy: ensuring a second­ and third-strike capability that would allow the country to continue fighting the Soviets after an initial nuclear exchange."56 The commander of a Trident submarine "will have at his fingertips the power to bring a total of 192 targets under nuclear attack.''57 "If the vital interests of the Atlantic Alliance are involved," the NATO commander stoutly asserts, "we1l fight.''58 For the average reader, the obvious implication is that we are ready to fight-and win-now as we have always been. In hot war as in Cold War, however, winning no longer means quite what it used to mean. Of course, in the media's view, only the Soviets could be destabilizing enough to launch a war. If they do attack us, then deterrence has failed, and our goal is to reestablish deterrence: "War fighting makes sense (and rather shaky sense at that) only as an extension of deterrence-deterrence by other means, as Clausewitz might have put it. ''59 So our goal is not primarily victory over the attacker but victory over the true enemy-instability: "Whatever the Soviets do or threaten to do, the U.S. must be in a position to do something worse, and to do it with such speed, precision and force that the Kremlin will not escalate the conflict."60 Fortunately, we have both the rational plan (the Single Integrated Operating Plan) and the technological capacities to keep control of any situation, even a nuclear war. The SIOP "would theoretically allow for a limited nuclear war, in which a Soviet attack could be answered with surgical retaliations that would conceivably be halted before a full-scale missile exchange occurred.” The president is at the helm: “the SIOP is intended to give the President an elaborate array of carefully calibrated choices for retaliation.''''2 The assumption is that the president would remain cool, logical, and precise. Yet even if tempted to respond emotionally, "there is no way a President could succumb to reflexive nuclear revenge.... The President must deal with an impersonal and coldly rational chain of command. ''In war as in peace, only balanced rationality and the Bomb can be our salvation.”

# 2nc link- preemtive strike

**The affirmative’s depictions of nuclear weapons and preemptive strike place fear in people’s hearts – this creates a dependence on the use of the nuclear bomb, and the politically proclaimed safety it promises.**

**Schwartz and Derber 92**, professor of property law at Yeshiva University's Cardozo School of Law and professor of Sociology at Boston College (William and Charles, “The Nuclear Seduction: Why the Arms Race Doesn’t Matter, and What Does”, p26/27, Print.) AW

Still, specialists claim that in at least one extreme circumstance a first strike might logically be considered a rational move: when one side feels that nuclear war is inevitable no matter what steps it takes. If a nuclear war cannot be avoided, the argument goes, then preemption-striking before the enemy does-might be the best way to fight it. Richard K. Betts argues that "there are few plausible circumstances in which striking first could seem to make sense-at least for the superpowers. . . . when one believes the enemy is about to strike ... is the only situation in which the initiator would have reason to believe that starting a nu­ clear war could cost less than waiting to try other options."l3 But as Stansfield Turner writes, "I cannot imagine a Director of Central Intelligence [futner's former position] ever having anything approaching 100 percent confidence in his prediction that the Russians were truly going to attack. The President would be faced with a choice between the total probability of nuclear destruction" if he launched a preemptive strike that brought down the almost inevitable Soviet response and "some lesser probability" if he waited. Richard Ned Lebow, in an unusually sensible discussion of first strike, agrees that "the judgment that the other superpower is about to strike can never be made with full certainty. . . . the side that strikes first risks making its fear of nuclear war unnecessarily self-fulfilling. . . . preemption is an altogether irrational act."14 Preemption is, in Bismarck's phrase, "suicide for fear of death." No arms control treaties are needed to ensure that preemption is suicidal and totally irrational, and this cannot be altered by any plausible development in the arms race. It is an existential fact of life in the nuclear age.15

# 2nc link- threat con

**The affirmative’s construction of other countries as threats creates a sense of fear in the political and public environment. This fear of other countries’ nuclear weapons builds a more formal faith and obsession with the bomb capabilities of the ‘home’ country.**

**Malcolmson 85,** Professor at Queen’s University at Kingston (Robert W, “Nuclear Fallacies: How We Have Been Misguided Since Hiroshima”, 1985, p. 60/61, Print.) AW

There are two main dimensions to this interaction of worst-case assessments. (I am speaking here primarily of the United States, where, unlike the Soviet Union, public opinion and debate play a major role in the formulation of national security policy.) The first is what has become known as "threat inflation." This is the process by which the military capabilities of the enemy are seriously and persistently exaggerated - sometimes deliberately, sometimes less consciously. There is a long history of such threat inflation in American military circles. Soviet military strength has been repeatedly overrated, Soviet weaknesses and vulnerabilities have been time and again undervalued and disregarded.57 The same sorts of claims regularly recur: "the Soviets are known to be developing""" ," "the Soviets have been deploying large numbers of ."" ," "the Soviets may soon have the capacity to "" .." On these occasions little is usually said about the always formidable American capabilities. When efforts have been made to compare the forces on the two sides, the comparisons have frequently been misleadingly constructed and bolstered by the highly selective use of statistics. Normally they are designed largely to support those conclusions about "our" weakness and "their" might (with various associated demands for new military procurements) which have already been reached on less empirical grounds. More­ over, these sorts of threat assessments are usually reinforced by certain more-or-less unscrutinized assumptions about Soviet intentions, in particular, by a certain "hard" image of the other side's objectives. As Lawrence Freedman has demonstrated, such perceptions strongly informed the Pentagon's thinking in the late 1960s and early 1970s: The Pentagon's adversary image emphasised a Soviet drive to military superiority. All Soviet activity was interpreted by reference to this basic motivation. Any evidence of force modernisation was taken as confirmation of the basic thesis; any suggestion that Soviet objectives might be more moderate was dismissed as wishful thinking; any Soviet concessions in the SALT process were distrusted as an attempt to lull the West into a false sense of security. To military planners it seemed imprudent to make any reassuring assumptions as to the good sense and rationality of the adversary. Instead of emphasising the possibilities for arms control they took it to be their responsibility to warn of the dangers inherent in the negotiating process, and in particular the danger of prematurely lowering the military guard.58 Second, among many strategic and military planners there is a constant preoccupation with and publicizing of "vulnerabilities." The key element here is the creation of a sense of anxiety - anxiety that, because of certain alleged Western military deficiencies, Moscow might cease to be deterred ("in certain circumstances the Soviets might think they could succeed in..."); anxiety about what the enemy "can do to us" because of our supposed weaknesses, weaknesses that (it is said) can be remedied only through increased military expenditure. Much of this thinking is purely theoretical. It involves the abstracting of nuclear strategy from its political context. It is usually inattentive to the actualities of human purposes, political goals, and particular national traditions. Moreover, this search for vulnerabilities tends to take on a life of its own; it develops a capacity for self-reproduction. This process has been nicely observed with reference to the problem of ICBM vulnerability by Bernard O'Keefe, a man who has long and practical experience in nuclear weapons policy and production. He takes note of the suggestion that these missiles be made mobile, and points out what is likely to happen if this were done: "I have been around nuclear strategists for many years and I know how they think. I am certain that if the MX missiles are deployed in a mobile configuration, someone wiII write a paper suggesting that the Soviets could break the scheduling code [for moving the missiles]. Someone else would write a paper suggesting that since we don't know whether the Soviets could break the code or not, we should, for maximum security, assume that they could. This would open a new window of vunerability, and off we would go to a new level of escalation. 59

**The affirmative constructs threats to make the public endorse their plan out of fear – this fear is actually just used to justify the affirmative’s true obsession with the idea of the nuclear bomb.**

**Malcolmson 85,** Professor at Queen’s University at Kingston (Robert W, “Nuclear Fallacies: How We Have Been Misguided Since Hiroshima”, 1985, p. 61/62, Print.) AW

Some of the vulnerabilities from the past have been largely or entirely imaginary: the bomber gap, the missile gap, the window of vulnerability. Others have had more substance, although they have, as a rule, been greatly exaggerated.60 One might mention, for example, the long-standing tendency to overstate the inferiority of Western non-nuclear armaments relative to those of the Soviet Union and its Warsaw Pact allies. (This inferiority is the central justification for NATO'S heavy reliance on nuclear weapons.) Soviet troop strength has been repeatedly exaggerated - sometimes grossly exaggerated.61 It is now known that, as recently as the early 1980s, NA TO'S estimates of the size of the Soviet-bloc armies available for combat in Europe were almost 50 per cent too high.62 Contrary to what is commonly thought, NATO'S conventional forces have been formidable, especially since the early 1960s. NATO'S total military manpower is roughly the same size as that of the Warsaw Pact, and the Soviet predominance in numbers of tanks is offset by the West's superiority in anti-tank weaponry. The standard scenario of a Soviet conventional attack on Western Europe is highly implausible. Not only does the Soviet Union have nothing to gain from such an attack - its hands are already full in eastern Europe; why should it seek additional disgruntled "and rebellious client states? - it does not possess the re­ sources to have any confidence that it could succeed in such an extra­ ordinary adventure.

**The affirmative furthers irrational fixation and worship of the bomb through focusing on the threats the bomb creates and trying to prevent them.**

**Malcolmson 85,** Professor at Queen’s University at Kingston (Robert W, “Nuclear Fallacies: How We Have Been Misguided Since Hiroshima”, 1985, p. 26/27, Print.) AW

This is an unprecedented situation. Never before have the potential costs of carrying out a threat been so staggering. Never before has there been such a striking dissonance between, on the one hand, the logic of stated intention that is, the assurance of retaliation and, on the other hand, the irrationality of this promised conduct if it were actually to be pursued. Striking back holds out virtually no prospect for making things better, or for reversing a setback, or for retrieving the initiative, or for mitigating losses already suffered. Deterrence thinking, as Jonathan Schell points out, has "endeavoured to increase the element of *threat* to the maximum while reducing the risk of *use* to the minimum." This effort, he claims - and the claim is hard to refute was, essentially, self-contradictory, "since the threat was credible only insofar as use was a real possibility"; it was "like trying to make use of the shadow of an object without having the object itself," to threaten, and thereby to achieve certain benefits, but never to act upon these threats. We find ourselves, in short, in a rather absurd situation, a situation that is rooted in the very existence of nuclear arsenals, which doctrine then tries to rationalize and render intelligible. To obtain the benefit of a posture of deterrence, according to Schell, "we must threaten to perform an insane action. But the benefit we seek is precisely *not* to perform that action. We thus seek to avoid performing an act by threatening to perform it. ,,37 It is hard to imagine that we can rest content with these contortions indefinitely. As yet there is little sign that governments are much given to sceptical views on the doctrine of deterrence. Indeed, they propose huge expenditures in the name of this doctrine. Undoubtedly it would be utopian, and perhaps even foolish, to expect the great powers, in the present state of world affairs, to renounce the retaliatory core of nuclear deterrence. But we should not conceal from ourselves the confused thinking that surrounds this commitment to nuclear retaliation. As Herbert Butterfield, a distinguished historian and Christian thinker, once remarked in questioning the justification for this threat, "the right of retaliation could mean no more than the right to multiply an initial catastrophe that could not be undone.,,38 If deterrence ever does fail, probably the only sensible thing to do would be to try to stop the whole debacle as soon as possible; that is, quickly to restore diplomatic communications, to pull back from the brink, to resist demands for urgent military action, and to seek as the foremost priority the termination of hostilities. Efforts of this sort, efforts to regain political control of a desperate and potentially ruinous situation, would, in virtually any conceivable circumstances, be much more rational than a nuclear response to an emerging conflict. If the principal objective of war is to bring about a better peace, it seems clear that nuclear retaliation as a means to attain this political end is, to say • the least, neither entirely convincing, nor rich in promise, nor free of contradictions.

# 2nc link- arms race

**The affirmative’s portrayal of a nuclear arm’s race turns into an obsession with the bomb, the technology that makes up the bomb, and the entirety of the ideals that make up the bomb.**

**Malcolmson 85,** Professor at Queen’s University at Kingston (Robert W, “Nuclear Fallacies: How We Have Been Misguided Since Hiroshima”, 1985, p. 64/65, Print.) AW

While the political competition between the Soviet Union and the United States is obviously of central importance to the nuclear arms race, this race is now, perhaps, sustained as much by technological innovation as by political tensions. Indeed, the momentum of technological development has a definite life of it own, almost independent of the state of international or domestic politics at any given time. These technological changes occur quietly, out of the public view; they are often largely unknown to and unscrutinized by the elected policy-makers. As Deborah Shapley, an authority on this process, has suggested, "the capabilities of weapons seem to be shaped by the enthusiasm of scientists for advertising the potential of their work, the interest of program managers and design bureaus in testing improvements, and the armed services' wish to have the most up-to-date versions of their systems." This more or less self-generating technological momentum is produced largely by project engineers, systems managers, and bureaucrats, all of whom are continually trying to find ways to improve their weapons and to convince their superiors of the value of the work they are doing. Shapley calls this process "technology creep" in order to "emphasize its gradual, inconspicuous, bureaucratic character.,,68 The political impact of this technological momentum can be truly formidable, partly because it contributes to mutual fear and distrust, partly because of the immense domestic political power that has come to be exercised by the military-scientific-industrial establishments of both superpowers. Most of the results of military research are not particularly revolutionary; however, there is always the fear that the other side will produce some breakthrough, and even small innovations on one side create pressure for the other side to develop similar or superior capabilities. Once this technological dynamic becomes established, it develops its own impressive momentum, with political implications of considerable importance. The process has been well identified by the authors of *Common Security:* "Fear of technological inferiority causes nations to expand their military scientific establishments, thereby strengthening bureaucratic and corporate interests which favour a continuance of the arms race ... The technological competition contributes to doubts and suspicions on each side and, eventually, to the deterioration of political relations; this in tum leads to greater pressures for the development of new .weapons. In other words, the race for technological sophistication and qualitative advantage becomes self-perpetuating.,,69 This unceasing technological competition has been recognized by numerous observers and applauded by some. As General Curtis LeMay candidly put it, "Once the counter to a new weapon system has been invented and put into use, then, of course, the cycle repeats itself. And new offensive or defensive systems must be developed." This permanent arms race met with his approval.70

**The affirmative’s depictions of on-going arms races instill fear into the hearts of those hearing their claims; this creates an overwhelming obsession with winning these arms races, and an eventual spiritual obsession and closeness with the bomb.**

**Malcolmson 85,** Professor at Queen’s University at Kingston (Robert W, “Nuclear Fallacies: How We Have Been Misguided Since Hiroshima”, 1985, p. 56/57, Print.) AW

The ongoing arms race between the two superpowers has been and still is fuelled by mutual fears and distrust. Each superpower has been, at different times and to varying degrees, acutely anxious for its own security. Fear has been aroused in each nation by the power of the other; each has feared the other's intentions and imagined the worst. Soviet fears have tended to focus on Western technological superiority the security of Russia's far-flung borders, and the possibility of hostile encirclement. Indeed, a deep sort of insecurity has loomed persistently over Russian experience in a manner unknown to the histories of, say, England, Canada, or the United States. Fear of foreigners foreign cultural influences, foreign economic dynamism, invasion by foreigners has been of critical importance in the Russian experience of nationhood. These fears have not diminished since the Bolshevik revolution or since the Soviet triumph over Nazi Germany. After 1945, as a thoughtful Australian diplomat has pointed out, Soviet leaders "were not without reasons for fear; America did encircle Russia by a chain of bases and did utter threats about 'the massive retaliation' of thermo-nuclear war and did re-arm Germany and did favour Japan, and the American press, and not a few American politicians, did threaten Russia repeatedly. "With the revival from the late 1970s in the United States of harsh anti-Soviet declamations, Soviet anxieties concerning their nation's security apparently intensified - along with, it should be said, a growing disposition to act defiantly in the face of what the Kremlin saw as American "provocation.,,51 American fears, which are much more recent and much more historically unaccustomed - the American mainland, after all, has never been invaded – have tended to focus on the numerical superiority of Soviet land the risk of surprise attack, and the erosion of American influence in unstable regions of the world. Geopolitical realities have ensured that, if Russians fear encirclement, Americans fear that the USSR, as the most important power in the world's "heartland" (i.e., the Eurasian continent), will be tempted to expand into those regions that are on or near its borders (western Europe, the Middle East), thereby isolating the United States in its own, considerably smaller, hemisphere, and depriving it of access to a truly world-wide economy. Americans also entertain frequent anxieties as to a devastating first-strike against their territory, a kind of repeat of the nightmare of Pearl Harbor. Moreover, these particular fears have not been eased by certain actual changes in global power relations that have occurred since the Second World War. In 1945 and shortly thereafter the vitality and robust self-confidence of the United States were, in part, a consequence of the weaknesses of all other states. This overwhelming predominance came to be seen by many Americans as normal and natural - even as a kind of manifest destiny. But other nations, including the Soviet Union, were sure to rebuild their strength. And as a consequence of this rebuilding. the relative superiority of the United States was bound to erode, a process to which many Americans, perhaps understandably, have not been easily reconciled. In the 1980s one has noticed considerable nostalgia for these earlier and, in many eyes, simpler years. This nostalgia finds it hard to accept some of the present realities of world politics: realities that include revolutionary upheaval in many Third World countries, the loss of U.S. nuclear hegemony, and a situation of totally unprecedented American vulnerability to enemy attack. Both superpowers have justified their actions, to both themselves and the world, in terms of self-defence. Each has seen itself as acting strictly in the interests of its own security. As John Gaddis has remarked, "Both the Soviet Union and the United States have explained their projection of influence over much of the rest of the world as necessary to protect themselves against the other. 52 At the end of the Second World War, each nation found itself in vastly different circumstances from those that had prevailed only a few years before, and each was concerned to make its own future more secure ­ in its own way. Looking back on this post-war period, Louis Halle, a diplomat at that time, recalls that "Neither Moscow nor Washington was aiming to conquer the world. But the abrupt and largely unpremeditated expansion of Russian power at the end of the War had provoked the defensive expansion of American power, which had provoked a similar Russian reaction. As in the Punic Wars, both sides were moved primarily by defensive considerations, and both sides suspected or at least accused the other of wishing to conquer the world."s3 (The proposition that Moscow is bent on world conquest is, of course, still widely and uncritically accepted, especially in the United States.)

# 2nc link- wmd

**The affirmative’s pictures of the bomb as a weapon of mass destruction that should strike fear in our hearts transforms the bomb into not something to be feared, but something to be idolized and religiously worshiped as the executioner of mankind, a God on Earth, and a ruler of the world.**

**Malcolmson 85,** Professor at Queen’s University at Kingston (Robert W, “Nuclear Fallacies: How We Have Been Misguided Since Hiroshima”, 1985, p. 28/29, Print.) AW

Let us conclude with one final observation - an observation that touches on a critical dimension of our thinking about nuclear weapons. The more one examines what others have thought about these weapons, and the more one inspects the official and unofficial thinking about our existence in the nuclear age, the more it is apparent that much of this thinking revolves around one large, fundamental issue: that is, the question of *manageability.* For the first time in history we face the prospect that what we have created may not be within our powers of control. The sheer destructiveness of our new technology threatens to break through and overwhelm those human institutions that are designed to contain violence, to civilize human relations, and to preserve the continuity of life. If this technology were applied to the actual conduct of war, there is the distinct possibility that war would cease to be, as it has heretofore always been, a means to an end, and become instead an end in itself, perhaps even the absolute end. Man's technology has now transformed the very significance of warfare. Nuclear technology is manifestly so potent in relation to its human creators that it could easily run away with us. It confers upon us a power that we may not be able to control. Indeed, it is most dramatically through this technology that science, as one observer has put it, "**threatens to transform itself from the servant to the executioner of mankind**. 41 It is on this question of control that one detects a striking incompatibility between the dominant orthodox military thinking since 1945 and the thinking of those who are mostly outside the various military establishments. Military doctrine has assumed that nuclear weapons can be controlled. It has been determined to find ways in which this new technology can be made politically usable. It has rejected the proposition that nuclear weaponry has rendered obsolete the objectives of classical strategy, including the pursuit of victory. As one writer has observed, "Since the dawn of the nuclear age, the military mind has been at work trying to devise plausible scenarios for nuclear-war-fighting in which traditional operational considerations, such as numerical superiority, the importance of offensive momentum, the relevance of defense, and even the possibility of victory, all play a part.,,42 Strategic thinkers have been intent on finding ways in which nuclear weapons could be employed, at least by means of threats, to alter the conduct of other states. They have worked diligently to devise plans for the "rational" use of these weapons. They have stressed, not the fundamental discontinuities between the nuclear and the pre-nuclear age, but rather the political continuities and the enduring relevance in the nuclear age of the heritage of strategic thought. A representative expression of this outlook can be found in a remark by two American writers on international politics, Robert Art and Kenneth Waltz, who assert that "nuclear power, though revolutionary in the magnitude of its destructive force and in the speed of its deliverability, is nevertheless still only an instrument of force usable to threaten and deter, to punish and destroy. And these are the ways in which force in the hands of rulers has always been used."43

# 2nc link- uncontrollable nukes

**Depictions of nuclear war as “uncontrollable” or “unpredictable” create an obsessive fixation with nuclear use.**

**Malcolmson 85,** Professor at Queen’s University at Kingston (Robert W, “Nuclear Fallacies: How We Have Been Misguided Since Hiroshima”, 1985, p. 30/31, Print.) AW

It is this set of assumptions - assumptions that are central to modern military planning that has been received with such widespread disbelief by many independent commentators who have given some thought to these matters. For it seems to many of these observers that strategies for the controlled use of nuclear weapons are unconvincing. They think that the risks involved in modem warfare are now beyond calculation. They think that, whether we like it or not, the conduct of war in the nuclear age is, in virtually all respects, completely unpredictable. As a distinguished physicist has put it, "Once nuclear war is initiated by any power, under any doctrine, in any theatre, or for any strategic or tactical purpose, the outcome will involve truly massive casualties and devastation, leading to effects on the future of mankind that are essentially unca1culable.,,45 According to this view, the use of nuclear weapons, for whatever reason - whether informed by a theory of "escalation control," or perhaps pursued for the sake of coercive domination would lead us unequivocally into the realm of the unknown and the unknowable. Such nuclear use, itis thought, would be a veritable cosmic stab in the dark, a desperate roll of the dice, with apocalyptic implications.

# 2nc link- human rights/ ethics

**Even fundamental human rights claims link – religious and moral questions concerning our views of nature allow a fixation with the bomb and an eventual worship of the nuclear weapon.**

**Malcolmson 85,** Professor at Queen’s University at Kingston (Robert W, “Nuclear Fallacies: How We Have Been Misguided Since Hiroshima”, 1985, p. 30/31, Print.) AW

We come, certainly, to realize how much our thinking about the nuclear age raises fundamental philosophical - perhaps even religious questions concerning our views of human nature and of the capacity of human beings to cope with this revolutionary manifestation of power. Indeed, to a degree there has even been disagreement as to the appropriateness of the designation "revolutionary." Few people, perhaps, have rejected it entirely, but for many, especially in the armed forces and within the national security establishments, the primary concern has been to carry on with business as usual. While numerous voices have at different times drawn attention to the predicament in which we now find ourselves - as Herbert Butterfield remarked a generation ago, "we have reached the point at which our weapons have turned against us, because their destructiveness is so out of relation with any end that war can achieve for mankind,,46 the exertions of numerous governments especially those of the United States and the Soviet Union, have been devoted mostly to the building of more and more nuclear weapons. The tensions and contradictions that are embedded in these policies have been crisply stated by Abba Eban: Both the United States and the USSR accept the paradox that the main justification for possessing nuclear weapons is to deter their use; yet both nations also seek through a variety of doctrines, strategies and policies to find means of expressing their nuclear power in political tennis - whether through veiled threat or the elaboration of contingency plans and scenarios in which nuclear war is treated as a concrete and viable possibility. Thus, the global imperative of preventing a nuclear holocaust collides with the exercise of sovereign power and national interest. The destiny of this planet still remains fixed on the horns of ·this nuclear dilemma. The nations live in an atmosphere of duality. They understand the nuclear revolution but they conduct much of their behavior as though the revolution had not occurred.

# 2nc link- literal claims

**Witnessing a nuclear explosion or literal depictions of it leads us to want it even more, and develop strong relationships with the idea of the bomb. This results in inevitable future use.**

**Chernus, 86** (Ira Chernus. professor of religious studies university of Colorado at boulder.

University of South Caroline 1986 “Dr. Strangegod.” Page 20-21//ts)

What happens when we witness a manifestation of intense power? It commands and demands our full attention. This may be most obvious in the case of all, explosion, but it is equally true when we see a powerful waterfall or a powerful runner or a powerful film. It "takes our breath away," it "rivets us to the spot," perhaps it even "blows our mind." For a brief moment, our normal state of distractedness, of fragmented and scattered attention, is suspended, and all of our mental, emotional, and physical energies are concentrated on a single object. It is, in a sense, an involuntary entry into something like the meditative state that yogins attain by consciously concentrating all of their energies on a single object. Such a moment forces all of our normally scattered and conflicting faculties to work together in harmony, all focusing on a common object and therefore binding themselves together. And, quite simply, it feels good. But we do more than observe power; at the same time we enter into a relation with it. Having focused our energies, we find that somehow those energies have gone out to get in closer touch with the power, and the powerful reality seems to have come closer to us. Therefore we find an inner feeling of power rising to resonate with the power outside us. Watching a powerful runner, we come closer to feeling what it would be like to run powerfully ourselves. Hearing a powerful singer, we come closer to feeling what it would be like to sing powerfully. And witnessing an explosion, we come closer to feeling what it would be like to explode. Experiencing external power, we also experience internal power, and we feel more powerful, more vital, more alive. Many interpreters of modern culture have suggested that it is just this feeling of vitality, of aliveness, which is most fundamentally missing, most desperately sought after, in our world today. Some have interpreted the modern preoccupation with sexuality, with technology, with drugs, with sports. with various forms of violence. as so many ways of experiencing vitality and power.

**The affirmative’s literal presentation of the nuclear bomb becomes a religious obsession; we must reject this obsessive culture to prevent dynamic moral tensions, terror, and the collapse of defense systems.**

**Prins, No Date,** LSE Research and Expertise professor of Long Wave Events (Gwyn, “How Change Became a Possibility”, No Date Given, Print.) AW

I shall consider two paradoxes, a lesser and a greater; in fact a paradox within a paradox. The greater is to do with an idea. For forty years, nuclear deterrence has shown itself to be remarkably vigorous and intellectually self-sufficient; yet now, as it enters its fifth decade, suddenly, surprisingly, fundamental and corrosive doubt strikes at its core. For forty years it has offered a grand but frozen perspective on a period of contemporary history dominated for those decades by the volatile rise of nuclear superpowers. The coexistence of immobile concept and dynamic confrontation is no coincidence. In the West, in George Kennan's haunting phrase, nuclear deterrence has militarised the general perception of international relations. Thus it provided the intellectual matrix for the East-West competition. It has also deflected concern about potential instability in that competition by portraying it as reassuringly 'stable'. If Part of the great success of this idea has lain in its comprehensiveness. In its view, i**t explains everything that matters, and what it doesn't explain, doesn't matter**. Like earlier belief systems with similar pretensions - the Divine Right of Kings, fascism or some varieties of fundamentalist religion, for example - nuclear deterrence t has difficulty in accommodating contrary evidence. But since it has been so very successful for most of its life, it has had the power to ridicule or to ignore. All this is beginning to change. The lesser paradox concerns the people who believe the idea: the 'nuclear priesthood' whose shadowy and strangely-named com­ I mittees and departments are described by Scilla Elworthy, and whose self-satisfaction and consistent contempt for overt, critical public opinion have been attested in the British case by Clive Ponting. In hierarchical religions, the power of the priest often lies in his privileged access to secret knowledge, always in his sanctified role in ritual. Priests, by definition, adhere to their dogma. **So it is with the nuclear priesthood**. Yet during the last decade, doubt has broken through. Doubts about the tactics dictated by a nuclear posture dog military minds; doubts about the postulated threat among the Keepers of the Threat obtrude as Soviet Studies have been rapidly deepened and transformed and as recently, the Soviet Union itself has shown signs of fundamental change; doubts about diplomatic strategy have vexed political minds as detente plunged into the second Cold War; doubts about the presumed credibility of threat-making with the decisive weapon have entered minds in nuclear priesthood itself. What is going on? Plainly one thing which is *not* going on, yet, is the wholesale abandonment of the West's principal framework of foreign policy analysis of the postwar generation. The signs of doubt are no more than that: signs only. But they deserve our attention both because of the rigid nature of the nuclear deterrence argument, and because of the character of the nuclear priesthood, described in the previous two chapters. There are two reasons why, upon a little reflection, it should not be too surprising that a strong theory:strongly held, might suffer severe internal rupture. One is expressed in Thomas Kuhn's famous theory about how scientific hypotheses change.1 In contrast to the conven­ tional wisdom which sees a smooth learning curve, driven by a constant increment of knowledge which is converted rationally into modificat~on of the hypothesis, Kuhn described a series of immensely stressful zigzag changes of course, each change (or 'paradigm switch' as he called it), the product of a build-up of pressure within a dynamic tension, finally resolved when the strength of contrary evidence overwhelmed the emotional and other circumstantial reasons which had caused the previous position to be still supported against the facts. Nuclear deterrence is certainly not yet at the 'paradigm switch'; but it is buckling under pressure. The other reason is that history shows repeatedly that it is precisely highly-articulated and dogmatic belief systems which are defended the most fiercely. Often we see increased fervour as criticism mounts (the Scopes trial), sometimes ruthlessness (the forced recantation of Galileo), occasionally terror (the doctors' plot in Stalin's last years). When such energetic defences eventually fail, the decisiveness of the collapse tends to be in equal proportion to that energy. Nuclear deterrence is such a system.

**Discussion of the power of the bomb and the extent of its power creates an obsession with the bomb.**

**Chernus et al. 89** (Ira et al., “A Shuddering Dawn: Religious Studies and the Nuclear Age”, Chernus and Linethal, State University of New York Press, Albany, New York, p. 16/17/18, Print.) AW

There is elation, too-at the beauty of the Bomb and at its manifold benefits. "It was a crucial part of our effort to deter a nuclear war by keeping our nuclear superiority. The Pacific blast may lead to better weapons for us-and perhaps even a defense against enemy missiles." As part of our endless technological advance it "has also the promise of untold reward." And it seems so benign. A nuclear explosion is a thrilling spectator event, "safely remote." Some spectators in Hawaii, "seemingly undisturbed by the symbolism, watched from a cemetery." Of course, there are dangers in the nuclear age. The religious emotions evoked by this awesome blast include "prayers across the world that man's headlong mastery of his universe would always stay as wondrous, and as safety remote." But human progress always has its risks. When man first discovered fire and burned his thumb, "he chose, in moment of anguish, to keep the fire-and all its benefits-and to take the risks . . . . Since then it has been his nature to go on burning his fingers . . . . The beauties and bounties of the ages have been his reward." This greatest of all human-made fires is primarily a symbol of our wondrous mastery of the universe. "Now man was no longer an observer of his sky. He had tumultuous lightnings of his own. Last week he loosed them. . . . We set the sky on fire.... We seemed to be triumphing wholesale in tests of strength and skill with nature." Inevitably, a headline tells us, "Man Pursues His Fiery Destiny." Now man is .. It is foolhardy to predict what these things making plans still more vast may someday mean. . . . In rising so far so fast, man has pursued his roving destiny, accepting both the risks and the rewards. The fire that once could only warm his food ... now propels him, as he knew intuitively it one day must, toward the stars. Though we must go through fire and blood, "occasionally be hurt, even to death," we shall one day rise to the heavens-propelled by the Bomb-and assume our rightful place as masters of the universe. The religious response to nuclear weapons was equally prevalent, though in a very different context, in *Life's* coverage of the 1962 Cuban missile crisis. Under the headline, “Heads Down – But Not the Spirit”, a photograph of a women praying in church is juxtaposed with one of schoolchildren crouched in a corridor. The article leaves no doubt that "across the U.S." calm prayer was the universal response to the crisis. People knelt, crouched, bowed their heads, went to church and listened to clergymen. They took cover, shielded and braced themselves, watched alertly. They "gave way to neither panic nor jubilation." Inwardly, though, they were standing proudly erect. "Clergymen of many faiths . . . exhorted their congregations to stand united with the President," and they did. Although the government was far away attending to the crisis, the people, left on their own, supported their leaders with national unity. (The only permissible doubt was whether the President "had gone far enough.") A machinist from Illinois sums up the article's message: "Before it was just like putting your head between your legs. Now you know you can hold your head up." The familiar image of descending to the ground to survive numinous danger is applied here to a real, rather than a fantasy, crisis. But the result is the same-the nation weathers the storm and arises reborn, taller and stronger than ever. Yet the mood of this article is distinctly subdued. There are no stirring calls to wipe out the enemy's evil, no praises of the Bomb and its beneficent power. Perhaps the nation had come too close to an actuality that would belie its naively confident imagery. In fact, this closest brush with nuclear reality had a profound impact on America's nuclear images: the images virtually disappeared, at least from the popular news media. In 1963, the press reported the Limited Test Ban Treaty. After that, the nuclear issue made only rare appearances for over fifteen years. The nation occupied itself with other concerns and other images. This brief excursion into the first phase of nuclear imagery has led through a rather chaotic maze. Although nuclear war was obviously not "the unthinkable," popular thinking about it seems to have been a patchwork affair. The images reflect a wide variety of conflicting policies, ideologies, feelings, and fantasies. No logically coherent sets of concepts underlie these scattered pieces. But a psychologically meaningful pattern comes into focus once we realize that the Bomb was essentially a religious reality. At the heart of the nuclear issue lies a quest for salvation. With good and evil locked in mortal global combat, we-the forces of good--can only be saved from the threat of evil by making ourselves invulnerable and omnipotent. We must be prepared at every moment for the final apocalyptic battle in which we will vanquish evil forever. We must possess the infinite saving power that only the Bomb can offer. As we bring its unlimited power and possibilities under our control, we can look forward to political mastery of the world and along with it a technological mastery that promises limitless prosperity. So the fear inspired by the awesome weapon should be outweighed by feelings of security, trust, progress, and hope. With the Bomb as our savior, there is no limit to the ways in which we can transcend ourselves. Just as the Bomb can redeem us, so we redeem the bomb. It is an incomprehensible mystery, radically alien to our ordinary life and capable of unprecedented mass destruction. Yet every religious symbol is marked by the same moral ambiguity. The uncanny irrational terror of the numinous always makes it a potential source of evil, while its beneficent, rational, and familiar qualities make it the ultimate source of all good. When salvation is conceived as apocalyptic transformation, this ambiguity is resolved with little difficulty. The redeemer makes all things new precisely by enacting the old familiar pattern; good defeats evil one last unalterable time. Nuclear irrationality is redeemed by serving as the instrument of omnipotent rational order. It unleashes its infinite destructiveness precisely to secure the triumph of the constructive and the good. It brings us to the edge of terrifying danger only to save us from danger forever.

# 2nc link- root cause

**The root cause of theological orientation toward nuclear weaponry is because of our consciousness and the institutions we create based off of that behavior. The affirmative reflects a problem instead of a solution, so we must reject the 1AC.**

**Chernus, 85** - Professor of Religious Studies at the University of Colorado at Boulder - (Ira, 1985, Journal of the American Academy of Religion: Book Reviews, "Theology of Nuclear Age" pg 590)

Kaufman begins by asserting that theology must reorient itself to meet a radically new situation. Now, for the first time, the apocalyptic end of history "must be conceived not as God's doing but as ours." Some might debate this premise, but those who accept it will find a stimulating argument flowing from it: Theology must be reconceived as an enterprise of human imagination; God must be reimagined as the unity of all natural and socio-cultural forces making us what we are; nuclear weapons therefore threaten God as well as our human/natural world (there seems to be little difference between the two); only Christ-like self-denial, a "thorough 'transvaluation' (Nietzsche) of all our ordinary values and ways of thinking," can save us and God. Kaufman correctly sees nuclear weapons as an "apocalyptic symbol" of "the most profound human problem today," humanity's inclination to render its natural and socio-cultural environment unlivable. This is a humanistic theology shaped in the service of social and political change. But there is little probing of the roots of the problem--the modes of consciousness that produce our behavior and institutions. Indeed the preoccupation with socio-political concerns may reflect the problem more than it points to a solution. While Kaufman suggests that the nuclear threat opens up the dimension of mystery, his response is a familiar call for ethical decision-making, pragmatic rationality, and social action. Yet these forms of consciousness, which tend to lead us away from the domain of mystery, are responsible for much of our highly problematic culture. Nietzsche would surely ask whether radical self-denial is really the "transvaluation" we need today. He would also ask whether Christianity,   having largely shaped Western civilization, has the resources to save it. Can     any image of God be disentangled from dualism and domination? Can the   Christ-image ever avoid legitimating self-destruction in the name of some    higher "spiritual" value? Kaufman's insistence that Christianity needs to take   account of the nuclear age is certainly salutary. But his claim that the nuclear    age needs Christian theology is open to question. The ultimate question is    whether Christian images, no matter how radically reinterpreted, carry a    cargo of meaning that has become too dangerous and must be jettisoned. A   truly radical Christian thinking will some day have to face the question of its   own self-denial.

# 2nc link- fear

**The fear of the bomb creates a sense of urgency to create more nuclear weapons; this constant circle-relationship with the nuclear bomb ensures that people will always become fixated on the next best thing – which inevitably turns out to be the next nuclear bomb strategy.**

**Malcolmson 85,** Professor at Queen’s University at Kingston (Robert W, “Nuclear Fallacies: How We Have Been Misguided Since Hiroshima”, 1985, p. 16/17, Print.) AW

War-planning, on an increasingly complex scale, has been a central characteristic of u.s. nuclear policy since the late 194Os, and these plans have been premised on the assumption at least since the Soviet Union obtained its own substantial arsenal and thus could set some of the rules of play - that nuclear combat (normally referred to as "nuclear exchanges") can be conducted with restraint and prudence. Some of the recent critics of this war-planning heritage object to it, not because they feel that it is implausible, but rather on the grounds that it is not taken sufficiently seriously. That is, they fear that American policy-makers are not fully committed to the pursuit of nuclear victory. American policy, they feel, goes part way in the search for victory, but not all the way. As Colin S. Gray puts it, "the United States should not have an operational ... policy of being willing to initiate a very small nuclear war ... unless it has a very persuasive theory for the successful conduct of a very large nuclear campaign. 20 American nuclear policy, according to this view, has been much too inhibited; "u.s. official thinking and planning," complains Gray, "does not embrace the idea that it is necessary to try to effect the *defeat* of the Soviet Union." The fundamental purpose of u.s. military force should be clearly acknowledged: "The United States should plan to defeat the Soviet Union and to do so at a cost that would not prohibit u.s. recovery. Washington should identify war aims that in the last resort would contemplate the destruction of Soviet political authority and the emergence of a postwar world order compatible with Western values ... Once the defeat of the Soviet state is established as a war aim, defense professionals should attempt to identify an optimum targeting plan for the accomplishment of that goal. ..21 Such views have not been confined to the margins of the American "national security" establishment. They have been taken very seriously by people of high authority. Richard Burt, just before he assumed a senior position in the State Department in 1981, advocated a revamped strategy of nuclear escalation. " A new emphasis," he said, "must be placed on generating nuclear responses that are militarily meaningful." He went on to call for "a broader concept for nuclear use" and for "American forces [that] are capable of waging a large scale, sustained nuclear campaign.,,22 Such thinking has now become quite common­ place - at least in official circles. As two of its defenders put it in 1984, writing in a journal closely linked to the Pentagon (one of the authors had helped formulate u.s. nuclear targeting policy): "the u.s. concept of deterrence has matured. Deterrence is no longer deemed distinct from - 'or antagonistic to the capabilities to conduct nuclear war operations. Current u.s. strategy recognizes that credible operational capabilities are essential to effective deterrence." This, they state, is the "concept of a deterrent based on an ability to conduct nuclear war."23 Such assumptions about the possibility of waging a limited nuclear war have had a considerable impact on the changing agenda of u.s. strategy during the 1980s, as seen, for example, in the priority that has been given to plans for "prevailing" in a protracted, global nuclear ~ contest with the USSR.

**The affirmative’s fearful depictions of nuclear bombs and warfare cause popular support and worship of nuclear bombs, the so-portrayed saviors of the new world.**

**Malcolmson 85,** Professor at Queen’s University at Kingston (Robert W, “Nuclear Fallacies: How We Have Been Misguided Since Hiroshima”, 1985, p. 62/63, Print.) AW

The exploitation of fear of course, no new thing. Indeed, fear, if it can be "properly" defined and managed, has great political utility. As a prominent historian of u.s. foreign policy has recalled, 10hn Foster Dulles was very conscious of the importance of keeping vigorously alive the idea of the "communist menace" and "liked to argue that the moment of greatest danger for the West would come when the perceived threat from the East had begun to fade then allies would become quarrelsome, collective security arrangements would begin to seem outdated, neutralism would gain respectability. 'Fear,' he concluded, 'makes easy the tasks of diplomats.' ,,64 The fear that Dulles had in mind pointed very much in a particular direction- in the direction of Moscow, not of the rapidly expanding nuclear arsenals themselves. Of course, fear of some adversary has always been one of the principal supports of any military establishment's identity and continued vitality. And in this respect one can recognize a keen mutuality of interest between the two dominant such establishments in the world of the late twentieth century. As Richard Barnet has noted: The military establishments in the United States and the Soviet Union are no doubt each other's best allies. The Soviets accommodate Pentagon budget planners by surfacing submarines, parading a new weapons system in Red Square that justifies bigger budgets. (No market operates here. Threat is the substitute for consumer demand.)65 What we see nowadays, thinks another writer, is a kind of "tacit alliance between adversaries ... The military-industrial establishments on both sides cite the research and procurement of the other in justification of their demands for larger budgets and new programs." It may be that "in a number of branches Soviet and u.s. counterparts are in effect 'functional bureaucratic allies' and 'external pacers' for each other." They certainly help to justify each other's massive size. And the members of each national security establishment, especially the more hard-nosed, confrontational, and unaccommodating members, are greatly dependent on "the assistance of the adversary to provide support for their prophecies of doom and gloom. ,,66 The distinguished historian William McNeill has remarked on how in the twentieth century these national security establishments have made use of fear to greatly expand their authority. For the past several decades, he writes, "military-industrial elites have nearly always prevailed over domestic rivals without much difficulty. Time and again fear of the foreign foe persuaded the political managers and the population at large to acquiesce in new efforts to match and overtake the other side's armament. The escalating arms race, in turn, helped to maintain conformity and obedience at home, since an evident outside threat was, as always, the most powerful social cement known to humankind.,,67 This process continues. However, there is a new factor at work, a new fear, and that is the fear for the future of human life itself. And it is this fear - that weaponry has put survival fundamental­ ly at risk - that is challenging and perhaps undermining the agenda of fear proposed by these military-industrial elites. Their threats are now not necessarily everyone's leading threats, and their definition of enemies may no longer be so readily and uncritically accepted. These differences in identifying and assessing threats have become central to the debates of the 1980s and are likely to continue so for many years to come:.

**The bomb takes on a sort of religious power when confronted with fear; the blinding power of nuclear fission and discussion bring the bomb to a higher viewing level with massive power and unrepressed terror.**

**Chernus et al. 89** (Ira et al., “A Shuddering Dawn: Religious Studies and the Nuclear Age”, Chernus and Linethal, State University of New York Press, Albany, New York, p. ix/x, Print.) AW

The modern study of religion has something important to say about the Bomb. Many readers will be familiar with the idea of the Christian or Jewish theologian who comments on matters of moment from an angle of commitment. Such prophetic voices are part of living religion. But the modern study of religion stands in a sense at a higher level, commenting on the nature of religious symbols, myth, rituals, experience, doctrines, and so on. It has learned to stand apart in order to understand, and so it is not speaking from within the midst of commitment. But by that somewhat detached stance it can throw light upon the significance of human practices and ideas, and this is the logic of the present book: to use the resources of religious studies to help us to understand some of the deeper meanings of the Bomb in contemporary life, especially in America. As the editors themselves point out, their division of the field into four sub-disciplines is somewhat artificial (though convenient). For whether we are thinking about some facet -of human life from a sociological, psychological, historical and comparative, or reflective theological angle, we shall primarily be trying to understand the emotional and symbolic forces that direct our attitudes and select our concepts. The present age is, of course, unique in human history in that we now have the power to destroy all of civilization. This unnerving thought, coupled with the blinding power of nuclear fission, is enough to stir symbolic forces within us. **The Bomb takes on a kind of religious power.** There are plentiful sources for expressing and repressing our terror. Western history has in part been shaped by the fear of the numinous, hoping and dreading in the face of the End, a sense of disquiet in face of the incomprehensible. Such themes are evident in a new and secular way as a result of the discovery of the art of nuclear Bomb making. It is not surprising that J. Robert Oppenheimer should have quoted from the *Bhagavadgita* when the first atomic explosion proved to be a "success." It was awesome enough then, but the potential for terror has been increasing ever since. The faithful conjunction of the Bomb with the development of computers, for guidance, and rockets has brought annihilation a few minutes away from us all. Yet though we know this, we go on living as though it were not so. Thus it is important for us to analyze the symbolic meaning of the Bomb in order better to understand the polar responses that we have to the new force. The editors of this book have brought together essays that are bound to stir in us reflection. For human beings there is no neutral stance in the face of the Bomb; but there is a higher level from which it can be viewed. This book might be described as "applied religious studies." It brings the resources of the field to help us analyze and judge the phenomena associated with the violent edge of the nuclear age. The two sides of the quest for application are brought out in the two parts of this volume. From the first five essays we gain some understanding of the way the study of religion can depict the realities of the nuclear situation and, in particular, the ways in which people, whether technically involved or not, tend to view the Bomb. The latter essays explore some practical alternatives-not proceeding from a faith-community's commitment as such, but rather looking at some of the insights that religion and religions can share-for example, the life and thought of Gandhi and their relevance to the peacemaking process. We in religious studies are concerned with world view analysis-which looks to the structures of values controlling human life-and such analysis tends to emphasize the importance of ideational factors over economic and material causes. The relative importance of mental and material factors is something that we can discover only in the actual grain of history, and the distinction in any case cannot be neatly made. But insofar as we emphasize the spiritual dynamic in nuclear Bomb wielding we are surely right. What makes war between the superpowers possible and even at times perhaps likely is that they have their rockets targeted on one another. But why? The answer is largely ideological. They have cast each other as rivals. In short, the causes of destruction ultimately will turn out, if the horrific ever happens, to be mental; that is, located in the beliefs and values and fears of the elites (and to some extent peoples) of the two superpowers. We shall not resolve our problems by technological means but ultimately by mental means. This is why the modern study of religion, which so emphasizes the symbolic, mythic, and emotional factors in human behavior, is important for the ongoing nuclear debate. The editors and contributors to this volume are to be commended for providing us with much to ponder on. And pondering before action is wise. While we still have time, let us, then, ponder.

# 2nc link- society

**Nuclear bombs have become the focus in society; we look to these bombs as forces of nature which we revere and worship, and surround the technology until it consumes the heart of society.**

**Malcolmson 85,** Professor at Queen’s University at Kingston (Robert W, “Nuclear Fallacies: How We Have Been Misguided Since Hiroshima”, 1985, p. 8/9, Print.) AW

The bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki concentrated people's minds - or at least some people's minds - for they signalled a stunning and conspicuous transformation in the nature of warfare. Old modes of conduct and thinking suddenly demanded scrutiny. All the established rules of warfare, said some observers, would have to be re-examined, and many of these rules might have to be completely abandoned. As one strategic thinker later remarked, "with the advent of nuclear weapons the entire value of past military experience as a guide to the future was called basically into question.,,9 Nuclear technology also forced people to confront, with a seriousness that had never before been so compelling, another fundamental problem: the role of science in modem society. The critical dimensions of this question were identified just after the end of the Second World War by Niels Bohr, the great Danish physicist. In 1946 Bohr published a short essay on "Science and Civilization" in which he touched on one of the central dilemmas of the modern condition: The possibility of releasing vast amounts of energy through atomic disintegration, which means a veritable revolution of human re­ sources, cannot but raise in the mind of everyone the question of where the advance of physical science is leading civilization. While the increasing mastery of the forces of nature has contributed so prolifically to human welfare and holds out even greater promises, it is evident that the formidable power of destruction that has come within reach of man may become a mortal menace unless human society can adjust itself to the exigencies of the situation. Civilization is presented with a challenge more serious perhaps than ever before, and the fate of humanity will depend on its ability to unite in averting common dangers and jointly to reap the benefit from the immense opportunities which the progress of science offers. 10 Bohr, like many prominent scientists, was something of an internationalist and advocated the strengthening of measures for collective action and the pursuit of co-operative endeavours among nations. While such aspirations have, thus far, remained largely unfulfilled, the problem that Bohr diagnosed is still very much with us and no closer ~o resolution. The fear that technology might destroy the human race is not entirely novel: it has been represented by various strands of cultural pessimism concerning the impact of machines on men, attitudes of fear and antagonism that have persisted since at least the time of the Industrial Revolution. But these anxieties, which in previous generations were always dwarfed by the faith in progress, have become more deeply rooted, even if somewhat irregularly expressed, since 1945. For in the nuclear age we seem to approach the apotheosis of technology's ambiguous power. That is, we "possess" a technology that, in tapping the basic energy of the universe, threatens to turn on its human users and control them rather than be controlled. Nature, in a sense, no longer surrounds us; we surround it, both in our imaginations and in our actual power. But our control of this scientific power is an uncertain thing. Its presence, in the form of nuclear weaponry, is now pervasive and still growing. It looms over the conduct of that semi-anarchy known as international relations. It dominates much of thinking about peace and the possibility of war. It threatens to make war into an experience totally unlike all previous human experiences. War, of course, is at the centre of our contemporary concerns; and it is to the nature of war and thinking about war in the nuclear age that our discussion now turns.

\*\*\*IMPACTS

# our impacts outweigh

**Obsession with the bomb causes bigger impacts than the affirmative can solve for – they actually incentivize the use of nuclear weapons.**

**Schwartz and Derber 92**, professor of property law at Yeshiva University's Cardozo School of Law and professor of Sociology at Boston College (William and Charles, “The Nuclear Seduction: Why the Arms Race Doesn’t Matter, and What Does”, p59, Print.) AW

At one level, then, nuclear schizophrenia reflects flawed styles of thinking-internal confusion and obsession with marginal military capabilities-that lead officials to seek new weapons in the vain hope of increasing real military capabilities. But nuclear schizophrenia is also a deliberate strategy designed in part, as Warner Schilling explained earlier, to deal with others' supposed weaponitis by feigning one's own. Kull found that though most American officials know that new weapons cannot change the nature of nuclear war, they suspect that Soviet and other foreign leaders might not understand that. Hence they act *as if* the nuclear balance mattered, buying weapons to impress those leaders-in part to discourage any lingering misperception that a successful first strike against the United States is possible and even perhaps to *encourage* the misperception that a successful U.S. first strike against the Soviet Union *is* possible. If foreign perceptions of American military power (however unfounded) grow, then-as American officials have publicly argued-so will America's ability to intervene abroad without interference. The Soviets, as Kull found, follow a similar strategy-building weapons to counter supposed *American* misperceptions. "The situation resembles nothing so much as a drawing-room comedy," Kull observes. "All of the key characters know a certain secret­ that strategic asymmetries are militarily irrelevant in an age of over­ kill-but because they think that others do not know the secret they act as if they do not know the secret either. A farcical quality emerges as all the characters, more or less unconsciously, collude to establish a norm of behavior based on a failure to recognize the secret.'>33 But in crises leaders-all of whom *do* know the secret-do not consult the nuclear balance or indulge in the fantasy that either side can actually use its new nuclear systems without inviting worldwide destruction.

# plan spillovers to large scale

**Public political discourse influences political discourse on a larger scale.**

**Mehan, Wills, 88** - (Mehan) Ph. D in Sociology from UC Santa Barbara in 1971, Professor of Sociology and Director of The Center for Research on Educational Equity, Access, and Teaching and Excellence (CREATE) at UCSD, (Wills) B. A. Philosophy, University of Illinois, 1956, M. A. East Asian Studies, Harvard University, 1960, Emeritus Professor of History at USC - (Hugh, John, October 1988, Society for the Study of Social Problems, "MEND: A Nurturing Voice in the Nuclear Arms Debate," Social Problems, Vol. 35, No. 4, pg 365)

**Performances in public political discourse, like verbal performances in face-to-face interaction** or literary texts, are often organized in anticipation of reaction from others and subsequent action. In the case of political discourse, reaction is anticipated from subsequent press conferences or television talk shows, laws, or treaties. In the case of literary texts, reaction is anticipated from ensuing book reviews and critical essays; in both cases, the reactions to verbal performances typically have a defining influence on succeeding works (Voloshinov 1986:95). Public political discourse in this global conversation inevitably orients itself to previous performances, often taking its point of departure from the discourse of others or sometimes from the discourse of the same performer voiced at an earlier time. Public political discourse, like printed or verbal performance, engages in ideological colloquy on a large scale. It responds to something, objects to something, affirms something, anticipates possible responses and objects, seeks support, influences actual practice and the ways in which people think.

# 2nc impact: heroic survivor

**When using literal descriptions to talk about and imagine nuclear war happening, we imagine ourselves as the "Heroic Survivor". This imagination of a nuclear apocalypse makes us want to be the only one left alive- Looking down of the rest of the world and feeling the ability to rebuild it. By thinking that we are capable of this, we begin to want our imaginations to become realities. This makes a nuclear war not just more attractive, but inevitable.**

**Chernus, 86** (Ira Chernus. professor of religious studies university of Colorado at boulder.

University of South Caroline 1986 “Dr. Strangegod.” Page 86-90//ts)

The same potential was also triggered among those who dropped the Bomb. Much of America's response to the first atomic bombs was shaped by the reporting of journalist William Laurence. Laurence, having watched the first nuclear explosion, wrote: "One felt as though he had been privileged to witness the Birth of the World.... The big boom came about a hundred seconds after the great flash-the first cry of the newborn world .... If the first man could have been present at the moment of Creation when God said, 'Let there be light: he might have seen something very similar to what we have seen."4 Lifton has noted that many who were professionally involved with nuclear weapons were grasped by a religious fascination with the "new technological deity ... seen as capable not only of apocalyptic destruction but also of unlimited creation."5 The crucial point in such a religious view, of course, is that **destruction is the necessary prelude to creation and therefore a consummation devoutly**, albeit fearfully, **to be wished.** If this kind of mythological imagery was a common response to bombs dropped in the past, it is even more common in responding to bombs that might fall in the future. Perhaps this is inevitable. In order to think about a nuclear war at all, as we have seen, the mind is compelled to put itself in the role of survivor. It is compelled to assume that something must follow cataclysmic destruction, and so it finds itself willy-nilly in the age-old scenario of death and rebirth. Nuclear war easily comes to appear, especially in unconscious fantasy, as the "big bang" that will wipe away the accumulated terrors of history and bring the birth of a pristine new world. The Bomb therefore comes to symbolize the endlessness of the chain of death-and-life, playing the role of destroyer and creator that was once reserved for a less technological deity.The inescapable lure of this mythic pattern is surely evident in the myriad fictional nuclear wars that have filled literature, television, film, and comic books for forty years. In these science-fiction depictions, there is always at least a hint-and often much more than a hint-that annihilation is acceptable, or even desirable, as the necessary prelude to new creation. The appeal of science fiction, like the appeal of myth, comes in part from the very act of experiencing the story. As reader or listener or viewer, one is taken out of the normal everyday world and projected into a "fabulous" time, in which the events are more powerful, more intense, more grandiose than any we have actually known. Thus the world of myth and science fiction is "surreal"more than real. Yet at the same time it is, in the modern view, unreal, as in our characteristic equation of "mythical" with "unreal." But this, too, as we have seen, is a consolation and even an attraction when speaking of nuclear weapons; by casting them into an unreal setting we can make our own world with its precariousness and all-envelopingdanger unreal as well. Thus **mythicizing can make nuclear war more appealing, while the terrible danger of nuclear war makes the mythicizing of it more appealing as well. Just as we are ambivalent about the dangers of nuclear war, so are we ambivalent about the powers spoken of in myth.** But the appeal of a mythicized imaginary nuclear war as depicted in science fiction rests as much or more on the content of that fiction as on the form. The most pervasive story about nuclear war in all science fiction is that which might be called" the myth of the heroic survivors." The plot is familiar enough to need no specific documentation: despite the vast destruction, some do survive. They are the characters in the story, the "real" people with whom we are to identify. They are usually more blond and beautiful and creative and capable than we are, but not more than we imagine ourselves to be or think we deserve to be. After an appropriately brief glance backward at the destruction of their civilization, they begin to build a new civilization-a new human future which is inevitably better than the human past. The actual situation after a nuclear war might, of course, bear little if any resemblance to this mythic vision. But such logical objections are unlikely to diminish its attractiveness. For this scenario speaks not to the logical mind but to the unconscious yearning in each of us to be a hero. The myth of the heroic survivors of nuclear war is merely one instance of the more general myth of the hero, which is perennially popular in our culture as in every other. In one form or another, it is the mainstay of all of our popular entertainments. The hero myth appeals primarily because it exemplifies the theme of death and rebirth in the life of a single individual, an individual with whom we can identify; thus we can vicariously experience death and rebirth ourselves. In experiencing ordeals, battles, tests of strength, suffering, and the like, the hero is actually undergoing a symbolic death, thereby escaping from the world with its temporality and history. Like the community that recites and reenacts its myths, the hero symbolically returns to the beginning and is reborn as a new being, replicating the birth of the world out of chaos; and he thereby experiences a new, fresh cosmos, cleansed of the accumulated terrors and sufferings of past history. The hero is initiated and raised to a higher spiritual level, learning the sacred wisdom that is reserved for initiates alone. The heroic survivors of science-fiction nuclear war are classic initiates, for they are in fact on a higher level-their world is more intense, more "real," and life is experienced on a cosmic scalewhile they have also gained a certain kind of mature wisdom, which, along with the new technical skills they acquire, enables them to forge a new and better life for themselves and their descendants. They have experienced the primordial chaos, the escape from time, and are reborn in a timeless world; having survived total death, they need no longer fear death and thus no longer fear time. The myth of the hero and the initiatory scenario have offered a sense of hope on a cosmic scale to millennia of human beings, and there is little reason to think that they have ceased to do so now. The heroic-survivor plot does not always appear in such a pristine form. There are innumerable possible variants, of which some are particularly interesting. One, for example, reflects that particularly American version of the hero myth that has been called the "Captain America complex." In this variant, the common people, with whom we identify, are left helpless in the face of the catastrophe that they have just survived. But an all-powerful stranger (Captain America, Superman, the Lone Ranger) arrives unexpectedly on the scene, sets the situation right, and then leaves as abruptly as he came, with the mystery of his identity still unsolved. This stranger may be a technological genius who provides the knowledge needed to build the new civilization. Alternatively, the unknown hero may be an inscrutable "wise man" who gives the survivors the wisdom to rebuild their world in a more peaceful and humane-though often less highly technologized-way. In either event, the myth is attractive because we ourselves are just as likely as not to be among the happy survivors, chosen by Fate or Chance, who need expend no effort to gain and enjoy a reborn world. A related mythic plot, though in a different context, involves the hero who saves the nation or the world on the brink of nuclear disaster. While this myth does not speak of actual dissolution and rebirth, it does reflect the myth of the hero because the hero often confronts mortal danger but averts it. Here, as in the "Captain America" myth, the common people are helpless and must rely on a lone individual with special technological or other abilities to rescue them at the last moment from imminent destruction. Again, this myth is satisfying in part because we identify with the hero and in part because we identify with the helpless but ultimately safe masses whom the hero rescues. While the other myths discussed here promote an unrealistic sense of the reality of nuclear war, this myth promotes an equally unrealistic sense of the reality of nuclear weapons, affording us the luxury of believing that we shall always be pulled back from the brink and thus have nothing to fear. The appeal of this sense of unreality, this perception of nuclear weapons as theatrical props, is certainly part of the appeal of this mythical approach to the subject. For if nuclear weapons and war are mythical, then perhaps all of our lives are mythical, and there is fascination (as well as terror) in living in the intensity, power, and drama of myth. Moreover, as we have seen, there may be equal fascination in exploring the contradiction between myth and reality; hence the mythic approach, whether believed to be "realistic" or not, can generate a power that attracts us to it. Even some of the variants that stress the difficulties ofsurviving a nuclear war may contain important attractive elements. In some plots the survivors must face a continuing series of smaller crises after surviving the initial catastrophe. Yet in most cases the survivors experience these lesser crises as a series of new initiations-new chances to experience the joys of rebirth and learn new skills that are necessary in rebuilding the world. In even more pessimistic visions, the survivors are unable to restore anything of the culture that has been destroyed; their lives become so degraded that they seem to be almost subhuman. We can often find in this plot a reversion to the "natural" or even animal state. Yet such a reversion forms a positive element in many myths that oppose the simple joys of nature to the tortured artifices of civilization. Civilization itself is often experienced as a complex set of limitations, and there is a pervasive desire to experience the organic wholeness and spontaneity that we attribute to the animal world and, in general, to nature. Hence the popular appeal of wilderness, the "great out-of-doors"-which has been increasing in recent years-the fantasy of living off the land, the fascination with the "wild child" raised solely by animals, and so forth. Among the many symbolic meanings of nuclear weapons, one of the most widespread and often heard is their ability to "wipe out the whole mess so we can start over again." One college student wrote: "I have sometimes thought that massive human destruction by nuclear war may be the social means by which evolution is working its course to re-establish a balance which we have thrown askew."6 It is crucial to note, of course, that when profound pessimism with the state of civilization leads to such a wish, **there is always the assumption that if *"we* wipe out the whole mess, *we* can start over again"; the advocates of such a solution always assume their own survival. Thus even when fiction writers hope to portray a totally negative view of nuclear war, the popular imagination may well turn that view into something positive and attractive.**

# heroic survivor exts.

**The bomb is described as a formation-changing hero, relied upon and described with a religious, fantastical tone creating not a wariness of the intense power it brings, but an obsessive dependence on the bomb’s power and use.**

**Malcolmson 85** (Robert W., “Nuclear Fallacies: How We Have Been Misguided Since Hiroshima”, McGill-Queen’s University Press. 1985. Print.) AW

And what, exactly, did these men observe? The first thing they saw was an extraordinary brightness – a brightness beyond anything that any of them had ever before witnessed. “Suddenly and without any sound,” recalled Otto Frisch, one of the British scientists at the test site, “the hills were bathe in brilliant light, as if somebody had turned on the sun with a switch,” Another recorder of the explosion was William L. Lawrence, a science writer for the *New York Times* who had been appointed by the Manhattan Project to report, at a later date, on its various activities. Lawrence’s journalist background did not fail him when he came to describe his sensations. At 5:30 a.m., he wrote: There rose as if from the bowels of the earth a light not of this world, the light of many suns in one. It was a sunrise such as the world had never seen, a great green supersun climbing in a fraction f a second to a height of more than eight thousand feet, rising ever higher until it touched the clouds, lighting up earth and sky all around with dazzling luminosity. Up it went, a great ball of fire about a mile in diameter, changing colors as it kept shooting upward, from deep purple to orange, expanding, growing bigger, rising as it expanded, an elemental force freed from its bonds after being chained for billions of years.” The official report on the morning’s events that was sent to Henry Stimson, the secretary of war, who read it to President Truman, was in its tone less intensive and more matter of face, but in its own was just as impressive. Stimson was told that the explosive power of the test was equivalent to at least 15,000 to 20,000 tons of TNT. “The light from the explosion was seen clearly at Albuquerque, Santa Fe,…El Paso and other points generally to about 180 miles away.” **One of the distant witnesses “was a blind women who saw the light”.** This awesome brightness was observed in silence. For a long time there was no sound at all. Then came the blast wave, the hot wind, the thunderous roar, the rumblings of the earth. A few observers also noticed the clouds of radioactive dust, and the strange way they glowed as they climbed up into the atmosphere. The observers of this first nuclear explosion not only described what happened. They also **reflected on its meaning and import, for humanity and for the future**. While some, as one might expect, were simply gratified with the technical success of their venture and content that the massive effort to construct a nuclear bomb had paid off, **others were more contemplated and sensitive to some of the human implications of the sudden appearance on the world’s stage of such unprecedented power. Their reflections tended to be articulated within the tradition of religious expression**, a kind of sensibility that seemed particularly appropriate to the drama and spectacle of the occasion. Joseph Hirschfelder, one of the scientists present, thought that “**There weren’t any agnostics watching this stupendous demonstration. Each, in his own way, knew that God had spoken”**. Brigadier-general Thomas Farrell, the deputy military director of the entire Manhattan Project, even in his satisfaction at the success of the test, had certain doubts about what had been accomplished. Nuclear fission, he wrote, “was a new force to be used for good or for evil.” But as “the strong, sustained, awesome roar” of the explosion reached his shelter, some 10,000 yards from the point of the detonation, he could not help wondering – and his words were included in the War Department’s official report – whether this roar “warned of doomsday”; for it “made us feel”, he said, “that we puny things were blasphemous to dare tamper with the forces heretofore reserved to The Almighty.” Perhaps the most pertinent and most compelling reflection came from J. Robert Oppenheimer, a man of both scientific brilliance and humanistic refinement. At the moment that the blinding light lit up the desert, there flashed into Oppenheimer’s mind a passage from the sacred book of the Hindus, the *Bhagavad-Gita*. The lines were as follows: If the radiance of a thousand suns were to burst at once into the sky, that would be like the splendor of the Mighty One…I am become Death, the shatterer of worlds.

# 2nc impact: otherization

**The affirmatives literalism insists that there is a dichotomy between ourselves, who we believe to be the "good", and everyone else. We define everyone else as the "Others" and even "evil". By believing that only our symbolism is correct, we enforce fascism, which inevitably leads to global conflict and extinction.**

**Chernus, 86** (Ira Chernus. professor of religious studies university of Colorado at boulder.

University of South Caroline 1986 “Dr. Strangegod.” Page 97-99//ts)

The links between apocalyptic and modern attitudes toward nuclear war are obvious enough. In some communities there is a direct link explicitly articulated between God's power, the nation's power as embodied in its nuclear arsenal, the Christian community's power, and the individual's power. Such communities tend (though it is important not to overgeneralize here) to stress the value of traditional structures and lifestyles and the symbols that support and embody them, thus rejecting the rapid change that they see around them. It is not surprising that a president who came to power promising a return to traditional values was also perceived as more willing to brandish the nuclear sword against the nation's supposed enemies. But the appeal of apocalyptically influenced attitudes may well be wider than the circle of explicitly apocalyptically oriented Christian communities. Perhaps the one feature of modern life that everyone can agree on-whether endorsing, opposing, or merely acquiescing-is the extraordinary rapidity of change. As technological and social and economic forms change, the symbols that express them must change too. Such a process may easily become intolerable to the psyche. When it does, there is an understandable desire to stop the process, to fix the structure and its symbols once and for all. **This in turn may easily become a fanatic dedication to one's own symbols and a demand that everyone accept these particular symbols.** Carried to extremes, **this results in a kind of "totalism," which is at the heart of modern fascism. And fascism clearly has roots in the apocalyptic tradition; it is willing to provoke worldwide conflict and catastrophe, if need be, secure in the trust that "our side" will inevitably emerge victorious and the "other side," embodying total evil, will be eliminated, thus purifying the world for future generations.** There are few people who can be totally open to constant change. In most of us there is at least some degree of desire for permanence, for an enduring and dependable world of structures and symbols. Thus most of us have some capacity to be drawn toward a "totalizing" apocalypticlike orientation, identifying the familiar with the good and the unfamiliar with the evil. Moreover, rapid change is likely to affect us all in some adverse ways, and thus many will be predisposed to feel victimized in some way or another, and this too lends itself to apocalyptic attitudes in which the victims eagerly await the reversal of roles. But even those whose personal situation does not dispose them at all toward apocalypticism cannot entirely escape its influence. Because apocalyptic is so central in Christianity, it is necessarily a central element in Western civilization. No one raised in a Western culture can remain untouched by this view of history. It is hardly coincidental that *Star Wars,* with its simplistic apocalyptic plot, was the most popular film of our time. Although other interpretations of history are certainly available and have been important in various ways, none has been quite as influential as the apocalyptic. This means that when Westerners want to appropriate the myth of the hero or the initiatory scenario of death and rebirth in a personally meaningful way, they are led almost inevitably to look to the historical process. And when Westerners want to relate to history in a meaningful way, the apocalyptic scenario will almost inevitably be present. This was as true of Karl Marx, despite his desire to eliminate traditional religion, as it was of the American founding fathers and the Nazis, each of whom drew in their own ways on this basic stock of traditions. For one of the distinctive features of Western culture is that, absorbing some of the fundamentals of Christianity, it also necessarily absorbed fundamentals of biblical Israelite religion. And perhaps the key to the latter is that, in appropriating the Canaanite religion, it took a mythological process of death and rebirth and read it into the historical process; it fused myth and politico-social history. Thus the divine warrior must act in the historical process; the disorder that he overcomes is fundamentally political disorder. The great innovation of ancient Israelite religion was its drive to see everything in terms of the God who acts in, on, and through the processes of human political life. Thus it became impossible to separate mythic perceptions from perceptions of the political history of the nation. "Evil" as a mythological reality was fused with the real political enemies of Israel, domestic and foreign. And the mythological dissolution, which prepared the way for spiritual or cosmic rebirth, was fused with the real military wars, which prepared the way for a reestablishment of peace and the political order. Although this fusion of myth and politics is not as pervasive in Christianity, it is nevertheless an indelible part of Christianity's foundation. Westerners are inevitably drawn to seeing political conflict in terms of the apocalyptic scenario, even when their reason or better judgment warns against it. This tendency has been significantly magnified by the development of nuclear weapons. In times past the temptation to go to war has always been fostered in part by the sense that this might be the final war, the war to end all wars. Now, for the first time, the apocalyptic vision of a final war-a cataclysmic destruction of cosmic proportions-is truly within humanity's ability to realize. The power that would be released when good and evil reach their fullest intensity and collide is the awesome power of the atom. With its 2,000-year history of apocalypticism, convinced that the end is now and the victory of "our side" is inevitable, with just one final battle needed to rid the world of evil forever, it is hardly surprising that the Christian West is loath to give up its nuclear weapons. In sum, the appeal of apocalyptic embodies a number of factors that reinforce each other: It is ingrained in our culture. It makes sense out of the contradictions that appear in times of rapid change. It gives the myth of death and rebirth an especially vivid sense of reality by projecting it into the politico-historical process. It ties together many of the appealing aspects of the symbolism of nuclear weapons that we have discussed here. And it simplifies and solidifies the worldview, neatly separating good and evil stressing the inevitability of the victory of good.

# otherization exts.

**Aff sees all Others as a threat to US omnipotence—compels annihilation of the Other, which is only possible since we project them as a lifeless object.**

**Chernus, 91**. Ira (PROFESSOR OF RELIGIOUS STUDIES UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO AT BOULDER), *Nuclear Madness: Religion and the Psychology of the Nuclear Age* p 21-22//jh

The schizoid's insecurity is further magnified by another basic principle of ontological insecurity: in a world where everything seems threatening, the self must suspect that its own intentions are always reciprocated. When freedom is defined as omnipotence, the very existence of the other serves as evidence of this reciprocity. As long as the other exists as an independent reality, there is always a chance that it might be able to act independently; thus the self is not omnipotently free. So the other inevitably appears intent on depriving the self of its freedom. "If one experiences the other as a free agent, one is open to the possibility of experiencing oneself as an *object* of his experience and thereby of feeling one's own subjectivity drained away. Any other is then a threat to his 'self' (his capacity to act autonomously) not by reason of anything he or she may do or not do specifically, but by reason of his or her very existence." Moreover, since the schizoid self can only interpret this reciprocal intent as the other's quest for omnipotence, the other's freedom is inevitably equated with the terrifying possibility of the other's omnipotence. By definition, the self and the other cannot both be omnipotent simultaneously; either one or the other must perish. The self feels compelled to annihilate the other, then, not for anything it has done or might do but simply because it exists. Yet as the self attempts to render the other a lifeless object, it must see the other as trying to do the same to itself. So the self can never free itself of its fear that its reality might be taken away. Every move against the other further convinces the self that its fear is justified, so it becomes a move against its own sense of security. Many psychologists have described the role of projection in political affairs: we accuse the enemy of wanting to do precisely those things that we want to do to them.

**Focusing on the Bomb only increases our need to reach the impossible goal of omnipotence. When striving for this goal, our enemy is transformed into the Other, and the only way to achieve our unattainable goal is the utter obliteration of our enemy.**

**Chernus, 86** (Ira Chernus. professor of religious studies university of Colorado at boulder.

University of South Caroline 1986 “Dr. Strangegod.” Page 34-35//ts)

It is impossible to have the freedom of omnipotence when one's perceived enemy has an instrument of absolute power. Yet the "superpowers" seem blind to this obvious fact, and so they pursue the impossible dream of omnipotence simultaneously and, inevitably, endlessly. With both sides already possessing practically unlimited power, neither can ever surpass the other, so each must be forever frustrated and thus forever chasing the other. Yet the impossibility of the goal makes it even more of an absolute goal and leads the "superpowers" to commit themselves ever more abso*lutely* to it. Not only is our ideological goal one of absolute freedom, but we perceive the Enemy's goal as the absolute cessation of our freedom. Hence we feel compelled to respond with an absolute commitment to destroying the Enemy once and for all; for as long as the Enemy exists, we are by definition less than omnipotent and therefore not really free. Our goal becomes total obliteration of the other, not because of some specific harm the other might inflict upon us, but simply because the other exists. And our possession of weapons of unlimited power makes this goal appear to be attainable, however unrealistic that appearance might be. For if we cannot attain it, how can we ever be truly free? It might be possible, of course, for two opposing nations, caught in this Catch-22 cycle, to admit their dilemma and work constructively to solve it. "But," writes Lifton, "the more frequent national response resembles that of an individual who fends off his imagery of threatened annihilation by means of more aggressive and more total measures to assert his power, measures which may in turn enable him to believe his illusion of invulnerability. Thus nations, perhaps especially bomb-possessors, are likely to move toward totalism in both foreign and domestic policies."6 This means that each side, while perhaps believing in its slogans of freedom and self-determination, is inexorably led to attempt to impose itself and its power on the entire world; and governments, in the name of freedom and security, increasingly limit the freedoms of their own people.

**We create the Other as the inverse of the Self and allow an escalation of violence, which is caused by the cycle of the Bomb and ends in annihilation.**

**Chernus, 91**.Ira (PROFESSOR OF RELIGIOUS STUDIES UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO AT BOULDER), *Nuclear Madness: Religion and the Psychology of the Nuclear Age* 35-36//jh

We may invent ''the Russians," for example, as an experiential reality, just as "the Russians" invent "the Americans," to give Us a continuous sense of being who We are; We know We are Us because We are not Them. Having invented Them, We may find it convenient to use Them as a recurrent scapegoat. If all our problems are caused by "the Russians," we have no problems of our own worth worrying about. So the problems generated and amplified within the nexus are projected from the inner to the outer realm. Our principal problem, as always, is our fear of unreality. And our maneuvers to preserve and strengthen our reality are sure to embed us in the selfdefeating complexities of the schizoid strategy and increase the unreality we fear. Yet it is a simple matter to project the unreality produced by projection back onto the projection: insofar as everything threatening our reality is evil, evil is unreality, and "the Russians" are evil, so they must be the embodiment of unreality. Yet we know that "the Russians" are very real, because we experience Them really threatening us with unreality. So we have no choice but to destroy Them: "*They* exist to be destroyed and are destroyed to be reinvented. We need not worry that the kill ratio between Them and Us will get too high. There are always more where *they* came from. From *inside Us*." It matters very little precisely who They are. Whether "the Russians," "the Commies," "the terrorists," "invaders from outer space," or whatever, they are never anything more than the inverse image of Us. They are just as insubstantial as Us, for both are simply reifications of patterns of perception and interaction, first projected, then introjected, then accepted as inevitable reality. Yet we sacrifice our inner freedom to the fantasied security of national loyalty and its concomitant fantasy of fighting against Them. "The peculiar thing about Them is that They are created only by each one of us repudiating our own identity. When we have installed Them in our hearts, we are only a plurality of solitudes in which what each person has in common is his allocation to the other of the necessity for his own actions. Although I can make no difference, I cannot act differently"11because if I even think about acting differently, "What about the Russians?" The Russians presumably ask with equal sincerity, "What about the Americans?" The same dynamic is probably at work with the same compelling effect on the other side of the Iron Curtain. Just as they are Them to us, so we are Them to them. Just as we gladly offer our authentic being to our nation in return for protection from Them, so they offer theirs equally gladly to their nation in return for protection from us, whom they call Them. As we both drain ourselves of authentic reality, we both hide more insistently behind the false self and the schizoid life that it demands. We both hide more insistently, too, behind the wall of nuclear deterrence that grows ever higher. How else can We be sure of being stronger than Them? On both sides, nuclear images have been locked into an all-encompassing gridwork of national political fantasy, a gridwork forged by our schizoid political life. On both sides, the fantasies of nuclear strategy become the distorted reflection of a publicly shared schizoid strategy, which sees no middle ground between annihilation and invulnerable omnipotence. Our Bomb becomes a symbol of national greatness, a rallying point for fervent reaffirmations of group loyalty, and an embodiment of the nation's very reality, while Their Bomb is seen as the ultimate proof of just how dangerous They really are and just how badly we need Our Bomb. Ontological insecurity, now crystallized around the Bomb, requires us to draw the Iron Curtain between Us and Them ever more firmly. The Bomb thus demands loyalty to the nexus, and loyalty to the nexus demands loyalty to the Bomb. If one piece of the fantasy is pulled out, might not the whole structure come crashing down around us? Both superpowers use the Bomb to tighten the knot of the national nexus. On both sides of the Iron curtain, the argument is just as compelling: since They are preparing to destroy Us, We must prepare to destroy Them. "So long as they *are*, we are in danger. So we must destroy them. If we must destroy them, they must destroy us to prevent us destroying them, and we must destroy them before they destroy us before we destroy them before they destroy us. [This] is where we are at the moment."13 This is probably where we have always been, as long as there has been an Us and a Them. At the moment, though, we are also in a new place, a place where no one can destroy Them without simultaneously destroying Us too. Both sides play the same game in pursuit of a common goal, security, for both face a common threat of "total collapse, disintegration, emptiness"which comes, above all, from the Bomb itself. This new essential fact should be enough to show us that the fiercely competing superpowers are actually a nexus bound together in a common enterprise. It should be easy enough to see that their violence stems from holding each other hostage to the mutual goal of keeping the superpower game alive. Laing's observation on a family that drove one member mad is surely just as true of the nuclear arms race: "The game's the thing: not perhaps fundamentally even a matter of winning it, but of perpetuating it." 14 As mirror images of each other, "both sides come more and more to resemble each other. The uroboros eats its own tail. The wheel turns full circle. Shall we realize that We and They are shadows of each other?"

# 2nc impact: suicide

**The literal phrasing of The Bomb makes the possibility of living in the future "questionable". This heightens the aspects of suicidal feelings by increasing our sense of hopelessness and the feeling that we are trapped. The only visible way to then break out of this appears to be killing oneself. These suicidal feelings lead to further promotion of nuclear weapons.
Chernus, 86** (Ira Chernus. professor of religious studies university of Colorado at boulder.

University of South Caroline 1986 “Dr. Strangegod.” Page 120-122//ts)

Those who attempt or contemplate suicide often hold logically contradictory thoughts about it, and thus they are irrational, but this does not make them mad in the psychiatric sense. The contradictions are, rather, reflections of an ambivalence that may, at some level, be present in all of us. Most suicides "do not want either to live or to die, but to do both at the same time--usually one more than the other."2 Ambivalence over suicide is even apparent in the teachings of the Christian church, which officially bans suicide and yet recognizes its appeal by praising martyrdom. The ambivalence surrounding suicide, religious and otherwise, suggests that the suicide is not actually sure whether, through such an act, life will be extinguished or renewed: "Suicide, then, is a highly ambivalent action. Even those individuals with very serious intentions of dying by suicide rarely give up hope of living. We shall explore further dimensions of this ambivalence and hope directly. At this point, however, it should be apparent that national leaders who affirm the MAD-ness of nuclear war as "mutual suicide" and yet simultaneously prepare for a postwar future, talking of a serious commitment to use the weapons, are behaving very much like those individuals who contemplate or attempt taking their own lives. Certain characteristics do seem to occur in the mental states of most if not all potential suicides. One of these is a sense of hopelessness, which many think is the primary factor in bringing on attempts at suicide. This, in tum, is linked to a feeling of powerlessness, inability to change one's situation for the better: "Present is an overwhelming sense of being hemmed in, blocked, thwarted, a sense of the impossibility of achieving form or meaning.... Killing oneself may appear to be the only way to break out of the 'trap.' "4 Such a feeling of hopelessness and powerlessness is often cited as an element of that meaninglessness which many see as pervasive in the present age. We have noted how **the Bomb reinforces such a feeling, and now it appears that this feeling may in tum lead to a willingness to contemplate using the Bomb, even when such use is seen as suicidal.** This feeling also deeply affects the attitude toward the future: "One's ultimate involvements are so impaired that one is simply unable to imagine a psychologically livable future."5 In some cases, "the self-inflicted deaths relate primarily to the individual's falling out of his sense of a procession of generations. . .. The person who falls out of his society or out of his lineage is a person who has lost investment in his own 'post-self-that which continues after his death."6 **Because the Bomb makes the possibility of any future questionable, heightening the tendency to "live for the moment," it must also heighten this aspect of the suicidal feeling. The feeling of losing continuity deepens the suicidal trap even further by intensifying psychic numbing, the feeling that one is already in some sense dead, for "one must see one's self as already dead in order to kill it**."7 "Death in life" heightens the ambivalence of not knowing whether one wants to be dead or alive and leads to an apathy of not caring whether one lives or dies. Such a person often "has taken as many of the world's assaults as he cares to take; his limits or tolerance for continuing his bargain with life have been reached."8 Again, many contemporary thinkers would see this as a characterization of much of modem society as a whole. One philosopher suggests: "Contemporary man shows distinct signs of having lost the animal *joie de vivre--the* exultation of simply being alive. One could even assert that many-and this includes numbers of those who enjoy physical and social well-being-do not really care whether they are alive or dead."9 Thus it may be necessary to see many aspects of modern culture as "partial suicides"-behaviors that reflect ambivalence about life, yet a simultaneous fear to actually kill oneself-"such as certain patterns of psychosis, addiction, alcoholism, prostitution, delinquency, incivility, underachievement, and ennui. There are numerous ways of committing partial suicide and permitting partial death, all truncations of the spirit."JO Lifton has argued at length that many behaviors and patterns in our culture reflect this sense of "partial death" or "death in life," and that all of these are in some way linked to the mass deaths of the present century, which are symbolized by the Bomb. Thus **the psychic numbing generated and embodied in nuclear weapons enhances the urge toward suicide and thus the urge to use these weapons.** Moreover, Lifton claims that suicide is much more likely if one already has experienced some model for it, which he calls "death equivalents." There seems, then, to be a vicious circle in which nuclear weapons as "death equivalents" produce, in a variety of ways, the states of mind and feeling that make suicide more likely, and these states in turn promote more willingness to consider the use of "suicidal" weapons.

**And this sense of suicide isn't only felt in one place. It results in hostility and anger towards another through the use of nuclear weapons. This causes suicidal conflicts to spread globally.**

**Chernus, 86** (Ira Chernus. professor of religious studies university of Colorado at boulder.

University of South Caroline 1986 “Dr. Strangegod.” Page 123-124//ts)

But the most relevant message expressed in many suicides is one of anger and hostility toward another. For nuclear weapons are said by their supporters to be necessary only because we have an enemy who imposes the threat of conflict upon us. **If conflict between individuals is a relevant factor in suicide, conflict between nations must surely be relevant in understanding international suicide**. Suicide may be seen as a means to punish someone, to get revenge for a real or imagined hurt. This helps to explain Lifton's surprising discovery that some Hiroshima survivors actually wished for a global nuclear war. He cites a woman who put it plainly: "I feel very angry about my unlucky fate. Being angry about it, I sometimes wish that all of the earth would be annihilated."17 He explains: "The *hibakusha's* 'underground' wish for ultimate retaliation or total nuclear conflagration can be understood as the most extreme expression of the survivor's embittered world-view ... which says, in effect: 'I can accept having been singled out for this special degree of suffering only if everybody else is put through it; I can accept the A-bomb only if the world is engulfed in nuclear disaster. If Lifton is correct in claiming that all of us in the nuclear age are touched by the "survivor mentality," then we all may share in some degree the survivor's anger. And the vast majority of us, having no direct experience of suffering through nuclear war, may be all the more easily led to fantasize nuclear suicide as a retaliation against our enemies. Moreover, in our fantasies we may see ourselves escaping the obvious consequences of our actions, while gaining the relief of venting our rage. Alvarez, discussing this dynamic as it appears in many religious dimensions of various cultures, says: "Suicide under these conditions is curiously unreal; it is as though it were committed in the certain belief that the suicide himself would not really die. Instead, he is performing a magical act which will initiate a complex but equally magical ritual ending in the death of his enemy. The complexity of suicide is compounded, however, by the common observation that those we most hate may be those we most love. Our rage is, therefore, often accompanied by acute feelings of guilt. Freud suggested that suicides might harbor within themselves an objectified other person who was simultaneously the object of love, rage, and guilt feelings. He saw the act of suicide as an attempt to rid the self of the guilt by allowing the objectified other to take its revenge and destroy the guilt by destroying the self. Lifton also found evidence in Hiroshima to support this view, indicating that the anger that led to desire for annihilation was reinforced by extreme guilt feelings. As he summarizes survivors' thinking: "I almost died; I should have died; I did die, or at least I am not really alive; or if I am alive, it is impure of me to be so; anything I do which affirms life is also impure and an insult to the dead, who alone are pure. . .. The survivor feels drawn into permanent union with the force that killed so many others around him"20 While the result of this is psychic numbing-living as if dead-it can also lead to a desire for actual death; the survivor "becomes overwhelmed by death guilt, experiences a marked diminution of vitality, and embraces a 'death-welcoming' formulation."21 Again, if all of us see ourselves as survivors and feel guilt toward the innumerable victims of contemporary mass death, we may be propelled by this dynamic toward such a suicidal situation.

# 2nc impact- value to life

**Nuclear imagery creates a fantasy that precludes change and sees the world as static—each new image deadens us more. This ends up destroying any value to life that we have.**

**Chernus, 91**. Ira (PROFESSOR OF RELIGIOUS STUDIES UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO AT BOULDER), *Nuclear Madness: Religion and the Psychology of the Nuclear Age* 31-32//jh

This interpretation of social identity throws new light on the relationship between psychic numbing and nuclear imagery. Nuclear images, like all images, are not just private intrapsychic events. They grow out of an immense network of interpersonal and social communications that create and reinforce the mappings of fantasy. We cannot begin to think about the nuclear issue without stepping into this social fantasy; once we do, it is difficult to escape. But this fantasy functions as part of a publicly shared false self system. It is detached from living reality and can not respond authentically to changes in reality; it is a prescription for death in life. Every new nuclear image only deadens us more and removes us further from reality. A catalog of the mappings involved in the nuclear fantasy could well be endless. Different interpreters would focus on different aspects of experience to explain the mappings projected onto the Bomb. For sociologists, the Bomb may embody the ingroup's self-image as it desires to annihilate the out-group. For political scientists, it may be a fantasy of the nation's "manifest destiny." Economists may see it representing a lust for unlimited resources. Psychologists may identify nuclear weapons with interpersonal hostility, dominance needs, repressed rage, or magical defenses against insecurity. Freudians will find a mapping of infantile omnipotence desires. Jungians will find archetypal patterns of all sorts. Theologians will consider the Bomb a mapped replication of our traditional image of God. But all will attest the existence of a social fantasy. Fantasy is at work in the images surrounding the Bomb as well. We understand the arms race because we know what a race is: a head-to-head competition with a winner and a loser. We contemplate building bomb shelters because we have all fallen asleep in mother's arms and awakened safely the next morning. We consent to new weapons development because proverbial wisdom and common sense tell us to plan today for unexpected contingencies tomorrow. We rise to the various challenges of the nuclear age because we already know the thrill of overcoming obstacles and receiving praise. All our experiences, as children and parents, as workers and players, as lovers and haters, find their way into the psychological labyrinth of nuclear imagery, For that labyrinth is just one corner of the much larger maze of social fantasy in which we live every moment of every day. Why do we embrace a social fantasy world suffused with nuclear terror? The issueas our politicians and generals regularly remind us is security. But in Laing's view it is not, as these leaders would have us believe, a question of military or political or economic security. It is a question of ontological security. No matter how dangerous its component parts, the social fantasy system weaves an irresistible ontological web, a nexus of fantasy that beckons with the illusory promise of secure reality. The strongest strand in that web is personal identity.

# value to life exts.

**The affirmative’s fixation with the nuclear bomb leads to an obsession that transforms human life into a sub-servant being under the influence of the bomb.**

**Malcolmson 85,** Professor at Queen’s University at Kingston (Robert W, “Nuclear Fallacies: How We Have Been Misguided Since Hiroshima”, 1985, p. 28/29, Print.) AW

Let us conclude with one final observation - an observation that touches on a critical dimension of our thinking about nuclear weapons. The more one examines what others have thought about these weapons, and the more one inspects the official and unofficial thinking about our existence in the nuclear age, the more it is apparent that much of this thinking revolves around one large, fundamental issue: that is, the question of *manageability.* For the first time in history we face the prospect that what we have created may not be within our powers of control. The sheer destructiveness of our new technology threatens to break through and overwhelm those human institutions that are designed to contain violence, to civilize human relations, and to preserve the continuity of life. If this technology were applied to the actual conduct of war, there is the distinct possibility that war would cease to be, as it has heretofore always been, a means to an end, and become instead an end in itself, perhaps even the absolute end. Man's technology has now transformed the very significance of warfare. Nuclear technology is manifestly so potent in relation to its human creators that it could easily run away with us. It confers upon us a power that we may not be able to control. Indeed, it is most dramatically through this technology that science, as one observer has put it, "**threatens to transform itself from the servant to the executioner of mankind**. ,,41 It is on this question of control that one detects a striking incompatibility between the dominant orthodox military thinking since 1945 and the thinking of those who are mostly outside the various military establishments. Military doctrine has assumed that nuclear weapons can be controlled. It has been determined to find ways in which this new technology can be made politically usable. It has rejected the proposition that nuclear weaponry has rendered obsolete the objectives of classical strategy, including the pursuit of victory. As one writer has observed, "Since the dawn of the nuclear age, the military mind has been at work trying to devise plausible scenarios for nuclear-war-fighting in which traditional operational considerations, such as numerical superiority, the importance of offensive momentum, the relevance of defense, and even the possibility of victory, all a part. 42 Strategic thinkers have been intent on finding ways in which nuclear weapons could be employed, at least by means of threats, to alter the conduct of other states. They have worked diligently to devise plans for the "rational" use of these weapons. They have stressed, not the fundamental discontinuities between the nuclear and the pre-nuclear age, but rather the political continuities and the enduring relevance in the nuclear age of the heritage of strategic thought. A representative expression of this outlook can be found in a remark by two American writers on international politics, Robert Art and Kenneth Waltz, who assert that "nuclear power, though revolutionary in the magnitude of its destructive force and in the speed of its deliverability, is nevertheless still only an instrument of force usable to threaten and deter, to punish and destroy. And these are the ways in which force in the hands of rulers has always been used."43

# 2nc impact: death cult

**The affirmative’s obsession creation leads to a “nuclear death cult” which becomes the world’s rage – this death cult mentality affects the entire world and makes any chance of solving impossible because everyone is obsessed with the bomb and death.**

**Chernus et al. 89** (Ira et al., “A Shuddering Dawn: Religious Studies and the Nuclear Age”, Chernus and Linethal, State University of New York Press, Albany, New York, p. 49/50, Print.) AW

American cultural criticism has always been concerned with "new religions," and in recent years much attention has been given to the notion of an American "civil religion." Yet the cult with which we are dealing has so far largely eluded sociological purview, although it is a new religious form that must be seen in the context of, and indeed as a manifestation of, American civil religion. To be sure, the disturbingly friendly fascination with nuclear holocaust on the part of the religious right has not entirely escaped the notice of journalists and social scientists.' But this chapter addresses a similar awakening, not just among those who might be dismissed as extremists, but also among more intellectually respectable types: nuclear physicists and engineers. Although we typically treat the alleged prophets of new cults with disdain, these fathers of the nuclear death cult are often approached as objects of admiration. By critically exposing the religious imagery and mythology of both the nuclear establishment and of ordinary folk, we can make our own conventional attitudes toward the Bomb a bit more conscious. Once compelled to view the authentic religious roots of our peculiar attachment to a , weapon of mass destruction, we may be momentarily freed to address the problems it brings in a more profound and clear-minded way. But what could possibly be "religious" about the Bomb? Those of us raised in the benign comforts of intellectualized western religious traditions­ where God is seen as the epitome of goodness-perceive religion as integral to ,~ the development of the humane life. We forget that religion is first and foremost a response to manifestations of power, and these can take many forms, humane and inhumane. Rudolf Otto considered religious experience as quite unlike the everyday emotions of trust, submission, hope, humility, or contentment. The experience of the numinous, the sacred, is a feeling of frightening mystery that either slowly envelops the soul or bursts in upon it.2 In either case, it is ineffable, inexplicable, and unforgettable: it demands a response. Its power to transport the subject to wholly unfamiliar psychological regions is unmistakable. The experience of the sacred is not, then, in its most elementary sense a vision of a specific God, a certainty of salvation as prescribed in a particular theology, nor a compelling example of sacrificial moral uprightness. While after long periods of systematic rationalization holiness may be overlaid with ethical, aesthetic, and cognitive attributes, it is not itself derived from these. The unearthly power of nuclear weapons has engendered responses of awe and allegiance among members of the nuclear cult. Human beings have, in both their primal fears and primal attractions, responded to the Bomb as laden with otherworldly power. It is among the very physicists and engineers who design, construct and test nuclear weaponry that we can chart these responses. These are men and women presumably immune to irrational flights of imagination and emotion, practitioners of the experimental method and operational definition, disciplined to ignore personal fancy or fear in generalizing from facts, and, above all, professionally imbued with an attitude of ethical and emotional neutrality.

**This nuclear death cult encourages rituals which revolve around the blessing of the bomb; these rituals force people to ignore implications of the nuclear age and can lead to flase orientations and diminish fundamental life values.**

**Chernus et al. 89** (Ira et al., “A Shuddering Dawn: Religious Studies and the Nuclear Age”, Chernus and Linethal, State University of New York Press, Albany, New York, p. 70/71, Print.) AW

Ritual refers to "a regularly repeated, traditional, and carefully prescribed set of behaviors intended to symbolize a value or a belief.''4 It consists of actions that are "symbolic expressions of sentiments ''that are frequently duplicated.6 Rituals are social forms that constitute celebrations and affirmations of values, world views, and the social organizations that sustain and are legitimated by them. Thus, ritualization is a neutral process that supports whatever values are celebrated and legitimates the institutions with which they are associated. The *content* of rituals, therefore, can be distinguished from their *form,* and the critique of ritualization that follows is not intended to assess the value of the ritual form but to analyze the implications of the content of a particular kind of ritualization which has emerged in the nuclear age. Many recent scholars use the concept of ritual in a very general way, quite divorced from established religions,7 as in Goffman's discussion of "interaction rituals''8 or Moore and Myerhoffs discussion of "secular rituals. ''9 Goffman, following Durkheim and Radcliffe-Brown, used *ritual* to refer to "a way in which the individual must guard and design the symbolic implications of his acts while in the immediate presence of an object that has a special value for him. "10 Whereas Goffman was dissecting face-to-face interaction, we discuss a more abstract phenomenon: nuclear weapons are objects with "special value" toward which people are oriented, whether or not they are in one's immediate presence. The very nature of nuclear weapons and their deployment requires that most people treat them as if they were real and immediate, despite the fact that few people have ever actually seen them. That absence of the object in question may enhance, rather than diminish, the value of rituals related to them, as the weapons themselves are mystified.

# 2nc impact- violence

**The aff can never escape violence—security and reality can only be found within violence and leave space for no alternative.**

**Chernus, 91.** Ira (PROFESSOR OF RELIGIOUS STUDIES UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO AT BOULDER), *Nuclear Madness: Religion and the Psychology of the Nuclear Age* 39-40//jh

When we leave the supposed comforts of the family nest and go out into the world, we naturally find more of the same. From the local ballfield to the international diplomatic and military battlefield, all social structures replicate the same patterns of envy, hostility, and struggle. All pledge their allegiance to the motto of every nexus: "Do unto others before they do unto you." The path to security is always via threat of destruction, both received and given, and willingness to carry out that threat. The violence encased in the Bomb and in all our nuclear images is only an immense magnification of the violence inherent in every family. Though the scale is changed, the principles remain the same. And at every turn those principles dictate that security and reality itself must be founded on violence. In such a world, exhortations to love our fellow man or woman, or even our own children, are hardly likely to reverse the course toward nuclear destruction. The cycle seems unbreakable. Every act of destruction and every threat commits us more firmly to the false self system it is intended to protect. The more firmly we are committed, the more enmeshed we are in the web of suspicion and violence. As the size of the nexus grows, so does the scale of violence. But we embrace and encourage this growth because it means more and more people sharing our schizoid fantasies, confirming our false selves, and making our illusory reality seem more indubitably secure. Nuclear images, as the centerpiece of the international fantasy nexus, work the same paradoxical effect as all shared fantasies. They offer a heightened feeling of reassuring reality while simultaneously draining the world of genuine reality and fostering the spread of deadening illusion. This is what the partners in the nuclear nexus, as in any nexus, desire. A nexus is always dedicated to the schizoid strategy of freezing reality in its status quo; the spiral of insecurity makes every change appear threatening. As the members fight desperately to freeze their own identities, their inert false selves, each insists with equal fervor that all the others remain just as rigidly frozen. Authentic individual experience, with its unlimited possibility, must succumb to the rigid uniformity of the social fantasy. Attributed identities, mapped fantasies, enforced loyalty, and mutual terror and violence are all potent weapons in this battle. But the Bomb and its images may be our most potent weapons today. Since their web of fantasy encompasses the whole family of nations, denying the possibility of any alternative, they make our shared fantasy seem absolutely unquestionable and uniquely real. So we cling to our images of nuclear violence, direct them against the enemy, and reap a twofold gain: committing ourselves more firmly to the social fantasy and its schizoid strategy while managing to forget the fundamental violence we are wreaking upon each other and upon ourselves. Because our violence seems so normal, we barely notice it. In this atmosphere, the threat of military violence can be taken for granted, while the possibility of violence against ourselves simply means more of the same.

# violence exts.

**An obsession with war creates an abandonment of the struggle for pacification of violent agendas – empirically proven.**

**Chernus 05** Professor of Religious Studies at the University of Colorado at Boulder (Ira, “Is War Good for Nonviolence?” Fellowship, Volume 71, Issue 5/6, p 12, June 2005, ProQuest, <http://proquest.umi.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/pqdweb?did=858316121&Fmt=3&clientId=17822&RQT=309&VName=PQD>) AW

History works in unexpected ways, however. Events have subterranean effects, which may not be seen until years later. That's particularly true of wars. As President Dwight D. Eisenhower once said, the only thing you can be certain of in war is that the course of events will surprise you. In US history, war has indeed had unpredictable and surprising impacts. More often than not, as paradoxical as it may seem, war has provided fertile soil to nurture a new burst of growth for nonviolence. To be sure, it can happen that war weakens the movement toward a nonviolent world. The most obvious example was the Civil War. When the struggle over slavery finally broke out in bloody violence, the great abolitionist William Lloyd Garrison and most of his followers abandoned their commitment to nonviolence. For them, slavery was the greatest of all evils. Abolitionism had been their great moral passion before they had embraced nonviolence. Once war broke out, it was evident that slavery would not end through nonviolent means. They could not resist the pressure to endorse any means, no matter how violent, to bring about the ultimate victory of good over evil. It took decades for the nonviolence movement to recover from this shock. After the Civil War, the Universal Peace Union (UPU) barely kept the idea of nonviolence alive. Even though it had fine leaders like Alfred Love, Lucretia Mott, and Belva Ann Lockwood, its ranks dwindled to a bare handful. In the 1890s it began to revive a bit, attracting several thousand followers to its annual conferences. By the early 20th century, though, the UPU was decidedly out of date. It was dominated by traditional moral reformers, who saw war primarily as a product of individual sinful behavior. Yet the idea of ending war by persuading individuals to be more virtuous was rapidly becoming old-fashioned. So the UPU and its commitment to strict nonviolence were pushed to the margins of the peace movement. When World War I broke out, and Americans debated their role in the conflict, the antiwar forces were a broad coalition of legalist, liberal capitalist, and socialist factions. At first, the idea of nonviolence played a rather small role.

# 2nc impact- collective death

**The aff’s image of nuclear warfare loses the Self and makes us apathetic in the face of possible salvation—causes whole societies to choose collective death over an encounter with the Bomb.**

**Chernus, 91.** Ira (PROFESSOR OF RELIGIOUS STUDIES UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO AT BOULDER), *Nuclear Madness: Religion and the Psychology of the Nuclear Age* p 10-12//jh

Whenever people survive an encounter with massive death, Lifton contends, the psychodynamics of the *hibakusha* are likely to be repeated. According to his theory, a massive death encounter calls into question every form of symbolic immortality; it raises the possibility that the stream of life as a whole may come to an end. Therefore it undercuts the grounding of the self and undermines every image of personal vitality. For the ungrounded self, every new stimulus that calls for new inner imagery evokes the threat of death. This threat can lead the self to refuse to seek new imagery at all. When the formative process thus shuts itself down, the result is psychic numbing. The self imposes upon itself a "form of symbolic death in order to avoid a permanent physical or psychic death."3 On the basis of this theory, Lifton puts forth his well-known idea that psychic numbing is the central fact of the nuclear age. The twentieth century, with its world wars, its unprecedented holocausts, and especially its threat of nuclear annihilation, has forced us all to encounter death on a massive scale. So Lifton concludes that we are all psychically numbed survivors. We fail to respond to the nuclear threat, he claims, because we have no adequate images of the Bomb and its effects. We have no images because we are numbed survivors of our encounter with the massive death embodied in the Bomb. Precisely because the potential consequences of nuclear weapons undermine all four forms of symbolic immortality, we have choked off our formative process and rendered ourselves unable to head off those consequences. Lifton acknowledges his debt to other thinkers in developing his concept of psychic numbing. He describes numbing using Paul Tillich's definition of neurosis: "the way of avoiding nonbeing by avoiding being." 4 He also cites R.D. Laing's early work as an important influence on his own; he sees Laing's concept of 'the false self' as substantially identical to his own idea of numbing: "What Laing calls 'the false self' I prefer to call the dead self, or deadened self. That view is in keeping with Laing who, at another point, speaks of 'the murder of the self.'"5 But Lifton is the only psychologist who has elaborated this concept specifically in response to the nuclear threat. There is no doubt that this is an achievement of signal importance in our understanding of the nuclear age. Its value has been widely appreciated, and it remains the most influential psychological interpretation of the nuclear dilemma. Within the nuclear disarmament movement, psychic numbing has become almost a cliche. Yet Lifton's theory has received surprisingly little careful scrutiny. Nor have its implications been sufficiently recognized. The core of his argument is that when people feel threatened by imminent death they may paradoxically choose death as an escape route from the threat. This can happen not only to individuals but to whole societies. His most radical claim is that modern American society (and perhaps modern Western society as a whole) has chosen this route in the nuclear age. Although we are terrified of impending mass annihilation and precisely because we are terrified of impending mass annihilation we simultaneously desire a collective "murder of the self." Death in life describes not only our psychological plight but our deepest desire: just as much as we want life, we also want the national and global death that we fear. Part I of this book will examine Lifton's theory and its radical implications, with special reference to the ideas of Laing and Tillich that have informed the theory.

# 2nc impact- universal annihilation

**Deterrence precludes interaction with reality and creates a cycle of insecurity—leads to universal annihilation to prove omnipotence.**

**Chernus, 91.** Ira (PROFESSOR OF RELIGIOUS STUDIES UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO AT BOULDER), *Nuclear Madness: Religion and the Psychology of the Nuclear Age* p 22-23//jh

Our nuclear fantasies, like our nuclear arsenals, are intended to create a wall of deterrence that wards off all reality and condemns us to pure fantasy, leaving no way to test the actuality behind our fears. Every fear, whether totally or only partially rooted in fantasy, increases our sense of unreality. Every fear reinforces the schizoid defenses that shut out reality and increase our insecurity. This ever-deepening vicious spiral is the basic pattern of schizoid life, a life in which every effort toward increased security makes one less secure. If the nuclear superpowers are living the same kind of life in their Cold War rivalry, Laing's analysis would go far toward resolving an enduring contradiction between nuclear means and ends: the more we depend on nuclear arsenals to protect national security, the less secure we actually feel, because (as most Americans readily admit) the weapons that we depend on to save us can only be used to destroy us. As Laing's analysis proceeds to further dimensions of the schizoid strategy, it leads deeper into this web of contradiction. Omnipotence and annihilation fantasies helped shape international relations long before the nuclear age. Images of engulfment, implosion, petrification, fire, cold, desolation, and the like have always been part of these fantasies. But the Bomb has made these images seem all too believable on a global scale, and it has forced every such image directed against the other to rebound back at oneself. This should make the futility of the schizoid strategy clear. When faced with futility, though, the schizoid self resorts to other attempts at escape that only imprison it more firmly in its dilemma. A similar escalation occurs among the nuclear superpowers, who embrace a further set of fantasies that seem uniquely suited to the nuclear age. One logical response to deepening fear is to declare external reality so dangerous that it must be physically destroyed. Here the self fantasizes its own omnipotence carried to the ultimate step: a final act of universal annihilation that leaves only a dead desolate world, either frozen and petrified or engulfed in flames, insuring that no one and nothing can henceforth do it any harm. The self does unto others, in fantasy, just what it fears the others will do unto it. This is, of course, the source of the oldest and perhaps the most seductive of all nuclear images the image of "winning" a world-destroying nuclear cataclysm, with "our side" somehow surviving in splendid and perfectly secure isolation.

# annihilation exts.

**Trying to reach a literal approach to the Bomb results in a new perception of our imminent death and annihilation. This constructs a psychic numbing that envelops us in craziness and turns out psychic madness into reality and extinction.**

**Chernus, 86** (Ira Chernus. professor of religious studies university of Colorado at boulder.

University of South Caroline 1986 “Dr. Strangegod.” Page 66-68//ts)

One psychiatrist has looked closely at this issue, however, and found it the crux of the true "madness" of nuclear weapons: "The fact that one's ideological love object is imagined as existing, even though the whole world may be destroyed, seems comprehensible only on the basis of the intervention of a strong mechanism of denial of destruction and loss ... whereby-in extreme cases­ existence is confused with non-existence, and the most forceful, affirmation coincides with the most forceful denial."9 This interpretation leads to the conclusion that we can experience the effects of nuclear war only in terms of the illusory fantasies of the unconscious, in which the love object can be destroyed and preserved simultaneously. "Thus we find ourselves confronted with an unforeseen situation leading to the following hypothesis: In order to be able to perceive the catastrophic situation as a real historical situation, each of us must somehow associate himself with an illusory catastrophic situation relating to our sadistic attacks against Our love object."10 Such sadistic attacks occur (for the vast majority of us) only in fantasy; yet such fantasies do generate guilt, which may become the source of pathological or even psychotic processes. "It would appear to follow that the possibility of facing realistically the problems of the catastrophic age involves treating as an instrument of verifying reality something which we are accustomed to consider a psychotic process. What we are accustomed to call madness may, then, become an instrument of verifying reality. "Madness and fear of madness are intimately linked with the sense of unreality and absurdity symbolized by the Bomb. Something as simple as an airplane or a fire siren can raise a whole cluster of issues concerning reality and sanity in a terrifying, gut-level way. Carey writes that "A poet from Philadelphia still wonders if the loud sirens he hears as a normal part of urban life might be a warning that nuclear war is imminent. How can he tell if this is ‘It’? How can he suggest to others that nuclear war might be underway without raising doubts about this sanity?” And the doubts will come not only from the others, but also form himself, as he is forces to find both total normalcy and totally horrifying abnormality signaled by the same siren. How can he have any sane standard to distinguish between them? Those who have actually experienced the Bomb were also touched by the feeling of craziness in a special way; Lifton suggests that they experienced a "lived-out psychosis" in experiencing "death in life," and he asks "whether or not it created an inner 'knowledge' of the psychotic state-or even a tendency to resort to psychotic-like behavior under certain forms of stress-without lapsing into full-blown psychosis. When *hibakusha* did describe others' 'going crazy' at the time of the holocaust, their details were often vague and the image seemed to be another manifestation of the aura of absolute power surrounding the weapon--of the feeling that anyone exposed to it should have gone crazy. Craziness of course, is a very unpleasant feeling, and we will go to great psychological lengths to avoid it. Thus the survivors of Hiroshima overwhelmingly shut themselves off emotionally not only from the event that haunted them but also, by necessary extension, from large parts of life itself: "The survivor undergoes a radical but temporary diminution of his sense of actuality in order to avoid losing this sense completely and permanently; he under­ goes a reversible form of symbolic death in order to avoid a permanent physical or psychic death."14 This is the process that Lifton calls "psychic numbing." And many have agreed with Lifton that the same process characterizes those facing the possibility of future nuclear annihilation, that is, all of us. But psychic numbing is not simply a product of denial. As Lifton sees it, its roots are more complex, and a fuller understanding of it leads to the conclusion that even those who resolve to confront the true reality of the Bomb are inevitably caught in the web of craziness. Psychic numbing is a result of the loss of an essential component of human life: images and symbols of life-continuity which make the death of the individual endurable. These symbolic modes of "immortality" may be in terms one's offspring, one's lifework, one's personal survival in religious terms, or merely the survival of the world itself; but all give the individual the capacity to confront, in however limited a way, the reality of death. In our century, however, death has come increasingly to appear as total annihilation-the ultimate cessation of life not only for the individual but for the whole world. And the Bomb has been the chief cause as well as the chief symbol of this new perception of death. It would seem that the more one pursues a realistic confrontation with the effects of nuclear weapons, the more one is immersed in this vision of utter annihilation-the more one fuses every image of death with the total extinction of the Bomb. Yet the burden of the absurdity of "total death" is too great for most of us to bear; thus the result is a sort of "double life" in which we must deny the • reality that we nevertheless know is true. Although we cannot escape the craziness of living constantly under the shadow of annihilation, we usually manage to repress it. We go about our "business as usual," acting as if the danger did not exist, and thus deadening our sensitivity precisely where we need it most. The threat of nothingness paralyzes us and forces us to lose touch with reality: "If extinction is nothing, we may unconsciously ask ourselves, may not no reaction be the right one?" asks Schell. The madness that pervades our reality is further fostered by the role of government. In the psychiatrically oriented view, the Bomb is necessarily a reflection of our individual unconscious wishes as well as fears; yet it is produced and maintained by the state. Thus the state acquires a monopoly on our fantasies of total destruction. This alienates individuals from their own unconscious lives, and therefore, Fornari says, "faced with the prospect of the destruction of mankind, we feel neither violent nor guilty, as though we are involved in a gigantic delusion of negation of the external as well as of our internal reality."16 Thus our reality-testing is further impaired, and a sort of craziness is even more inevitable.

**The use and discussion of the bomb as a positive thing is false and only increases the world’s capacity for self-annihilation.**

**Malcolmson 85,** Professor at Queen’s University at Kingston (Robert W, “Nuclear Fallacies: How We Have Been Misguided Since Hiroshima”, 1985, p. 103/104, Print.)AW

Whatever practical arrangements might prove most feasible, the fundamental objective would be to preserve stability in the course of a crisis, to prevent it from getting out of hand and triggering a disastrous course of events that all parties actually wanted not to occur. There may be other practical measures as well that warrant serious consideration, such as easing the time pressures on both sides' decision-makers by pulling back those weapons that can strike very quickly at major command centres. Wisdom, in this respect, indicates that both Pershing IIS in West Germany and Soviet submarine­ launched missiles near the U.S. Atlantic coast, with their short flight times, are to nobody's benefit. Mutual agreements for withdrawing such missiles, along with other hard-headed agreements based on the recognition that squeezing the other fellow too hard only increases the risk of mutual destruction, would contribute to the prospects for keeping a lid on the political pot when the pot threatens to boil over, as it most certainly will someday. The need, in short, is to construct much more sturdy buffers: buffers between, on the one hand, the frenzv that crises always generate and, on the other hand, the world's actual capacity for self-annihilation.

**The faith and obsession the affirmative creates with the bomb only adds to the perils of our life situation, as the illusions this faith creates blind the human image from seeing the real war-truth.**

**Malcolmson 85,** Professor at Queen’s University at Kingston (Robert W, “Nuclear Fallacies: How We Have Been Misguided Since Hiroshima”, 1985, p. 102/103, Print.)AW

Third, more people must realize that nuclear weapons have no military utility. They are, in fact, unusable, or, if used, they are probably suicidal. In a nuclear war, after the darkness lifts, the ancient distinction between victor and vanquished is likely to be meaningless. To depend so heavily on such useless weapons for our security, then, is fundamentally irrational. Many prominent men have come to this conclusion, including Field Marshall Lord Carver, former chief of the British defense staff; Admiral Noel Gayler, former commander in chief of U.S. forces in the Pacific; Lord Zuckennan, former chief science adviser to the British government; and Robert McNamara. Former U.S. secretary of defense, the late Earl Mountbatten, one of Britain's most distinguished leaders of this century, in 1979 expressed his view as follows: "As a military man who has given half a century of active service I say in all sincerity that the nuclear arms race has no military purpose. Wars cannot be fought with nuclear weapons. Their existence only adds to our perils because of the illusions which they have generated."

# 2nc impact: preemptive strike

**The affirmative’s discussion of the necessity of nuclear weapons causes an obsession with the bomb. This obsession leads to a buildup of nuclear weapons which will psychologically scar the population and cause a preemptive strike which will destroy the world.**

**Schwartz and Derber 92**, professor of property law at Yeshiva University's Cardozo School of Law and professor of Sociology at Boston College (William and Charles, “The Nuclear Seduction: Why the Arms Race Doesn’t Matter, and What Does”, p22/23, Print.) AW

A Soviet first strike against the United States could succeed only if whoever survives to command U.S. forces decides not to destroy the Soviet Union *and* if the many lower-level U.S. commanders with control over nuclear weapons that can strike the Soviet Union decide the same thing. As the Soviets know, the chances of that are remote (and have little to do with the technical characteristics of the weapons anyway). A major study recently concluded that "a large-scale [first-strike] attack on strategic forces would cause so many civilian casualties that it would be difficult to distinguish from a deliberate attack on the population.'" Hence, vengeful retaliation is almost certain. Thomas Schelling, perhaps the dean of strategic analysts, observes that "over a protracted period, both sides in a strategic nuclear war would preserve a more than sufficient capacity to do horrendous dam­ age, and neither could hope to gain even a 'bargaining advantage' with any confidence." Most fears of a Soviet first strike, he points out, derive from nothing more than the existence of theoretically vulnerable, fixed land-based missiles in the United States. The remainder of the U.S. deterrent force has acquired a bizarre "vulnerability by association." Schelling knows there is no real first-strike danger to worry about, but he proposes the elimination, unilateral if necessary, of land-based missiles in order to "clean the atmosphere psychologically." [f we unilaterally abolished our land-based missiles, we would instantly deprive a large part of the Soviet land-based mi5.~ile force for *[sic]* it~ raison d'etre. It might look to them as if they had much less to preempt. They actually would not, because the U.S. missiles they might have preempted were redundant in the first place. Looking over a seascape inhabited by U.S. sub­ marines and at bombers likely to be launched on warning, they would see, without the smoke and ruins, what would have been left over after they preempted! In other words, the fear of a Soviet first strike has become so irrational that *reducing* the American deterrent force would help calm it! Those who warn of an *America11* first-strike threat are as misleading as those who warn of a Soviet one, and for the same reasons. When the new generation of U.S. strategic weapons is fully deployed, the United States may in theory pose a greater threat to the Soviet deterrent than the Soviets can pose in return, particularly considering U.S. advantages in antisubmarine warfare. But no matter how many MX and D-5 ballistic missiles, B-l and Stealth bombers, air-launched cruise missiles, and other weapons the United States builds, striking first still means almost guaranteeing America's own destruction in return.

\*\*\*Turns case

# turns case- state violence

**The affirmative’s obsession with the bomb consumes all other forms of state violence and pushes everything into the background of the political realm, which collapses the reformation potential of the affirmative.**

**Bejer 06** Assistant Professor of Political Science, McMaster University, McMaster University, ( J. Marshall, “Disarming Politics: Arms, Agency, and the (Post)Politics of Disarmament Advocacy”, Canadian Political Science Association, 2006, <http://www.cpsa-acsp.ca/papers-2007/Beier.pdf>) AW

Post-Politics and Disarmament Advocacy Novel though it may be, the re-siting of agency taking place at the heart of the RMA does not bring subjectivity fully into view. Claims made on behalf of PGMs have yet to go so far as to suggest that the weapons decide on the terms of their own use – though the crucial role of those who actually despatch them is mystified, it is not denied. Key to how imaginaries founded in and sustained by briefing videos and like (re)presentations depoliticize war, then, is that the effect has been to cast weapons as agents, but without completing the anthropomorphic turn that would inscribe them also as sites of ethical responsibility. However, this does not merely imply a bifurcation of the subject, the sum of which is nevertheless as visible as divisible. Rather, the severed whole has become something less than the sum of its parts in the alienation of the purposive subject from the operant site of agency: a crucial element of whole subjectivity is lost 18to the extent that a deep ambivalence about responsibility is engendered. A cruise missile, it should be remembered, intends nothing. Our gaze is therefore fixed on a weapon-agent that can be no more than a grammatical subject separated from ethical subjecthood in what appears at first as a profoundly depoliticizing move. But more than this, the mystified site of ethical subjecthood is insulated from responsibility for any dire consequences that might be visited upon noncombatants. Read through the imaginaries of the RMA, such events become the exceptions in which something has gone awry. ‘Responsibility’ consequently lacks for an intelligible tether to either the weapon-agent or the fragmented subjectivity associated with it, but does not fully become a free floating signifier since it may yet plausibly attach to the victims.15 Although turned to a more progressive purpose, the rhetorical/discursive strategies of the landmine ban effect and work through a similar disturbance of sites of responsibility. The success of the mine ban movement owes in no small measure to the marking of antipersonnel landmines as ‘bad’ weapons – a move that has enabled even states that have widely used mines to join in denouncing them as a humanitarian scourge without simultaneously repudiating recourse to militarized violence more generally. At the campaign level and with the specific practical objective of securing the broadest possible ban on landmines, this was a very well conceived approach. Indeed, had this strategy not been adopted, it is unlikely that the movement would have swayed many – if any – states to the cause. But practically expedient though it may be, it is also contingent on putting responsibility out of sight. Like errant cruise missiles, landmines intend nothing. What makes them bad, then, speaks not of disposition, but rather a technological limitation resulting in an objective property of indiscriminacy. While this might at first seem suggestive of the need for a technological solution, the mine ban movement quite rightly worked to foreclose the possibility of recourse to ‘smart mines’ in deference to the goal 19 of a complete prohibition. This would appear to mark it quite decidedly apart from the war- enabling technologies of the RMA and their part in refashioning the bases of legitimacy in contemporary warfare. The mystification of responsibility so crucial to the ban, however, reveals some disturbing points of intersection. On first gloss, the approach of the mine ban movement seems quite clearly to disavow any recourse to ‘better’ technology as a fix for landmine indiscriminacy. The importance of this cannot be overstated since, as has been the case with the RMA, distinguishing between ‘good’ and ‘bad’ weapons raises the specter of a like distinction in terms of the conduct of those who use them – a distinction not always well sustained by the actual consequences of their use. In refusing to concede that some mines might be less pernicious than others, therefore, the movement has simultaneously denied all bases of legitimacy in mine use that might otherwise have been claimed by the technologically advantaged. But things become rather more problematic when considered from without the narrow context of the landmines issue. While the rhetorical casting of mines as bad proved a remarkably effective strategy in pursuit of a ban, it only makes sense if it in fact is imagined that there are somewhere ‘good’ weapons. Since it is not killing per se but killing with landmines that is rendered indefensible, the use of other presumably more discriminating weapons is lent a certain legitimacy it might not otherwise have enjoyed. And this is revealing of the important sense in which the core claims of the mine ban contribute to the reproduction of essential ideational bases of the ‘new American way of war.’ Inviting none of the cynicism about motives that might have attached to a wholly state-led initiative, the central involvement of civil society actors in the mine ban movement – well known and respected peace and human rights advocacy groups among them – both naturalizes and 20 valorizes a much larger constellation of claims to meaningful discriminacy, whether overt or subsumed. Pressing for a ban on landmines thus involved the complete disaggregation of this one issue not only from peace activism in general but from the more particular realm of disarmament advocacy as well, parceling it off in such a way as to suggest that there are more effective ways to do the sorts of things landmines are intended to do. Although the success of the campaign is often tied to the support given it by the late Princess of Wales, that really speaks more to its public face and the winning of popular opinion. Much more important in making the case to states was a group of retired high-ranking US military officers – including General Norman Schwarzkopf – who backed the ban on grounds that landmines, besides resulting in unintended dire human consequences, were no longer appropriate to contemporary warfare and could even frustrate its prosecution; other weapons, they argued, could do the job much more effectively.16 Espoused by the general who came to international fame alongside Gulf War briefing videos, this position is inseparable from popular imaginaries about PGMs and surgical strikes – indeed, its very intelligibility owes to them. And while it would certainly be too much to suggest that unequally shifting arbiters of legitimacy in war are sustained by this form of disarmament advocacy, the mine ban movement’s foregrounding of the dire human consequences of indiscriminacy nevertheless merges neatly with the imaginaries of the RMA. In combination with this, the movement’s enthusiastic endorsement of Schwarzkopf’s position is telling of the post-political frame in which efforts to ban landmines have been confined. As Žižek (1999) describes it, post-politics is, in essence, the obliteration of the political through the reduction of the overall demand of a particular group to just that demand. That is to say, it is the reduction of a call for better working conditions, for example, to that very specific 21 issue alone, divesting it of its politicized content as part of a broader push for social justice and therefore also divesting it of the potential to, as Žižek (1999: 204) puts it, ‘function as a metaphoric condensation of...opposition...so that the protest is no longer actually just about that demand, but about the universal dimension that resonates in that particular demand.’ This is key to an understanding of politics as something more than ‘administration of social matters’ – for Žižek (1999: 199; emphasis in original), ‘the political act (intervention) proper is not simply something that exists well within the framework of the existing relations, but something that changes the very framework that determines how things work.’ Post-politics takes place within the status quo framework, containing particular demands – even to the extent of answering them – in such a way as to prevent their ‘metaphoric universalization’ (Žižek: 204). The rhetorical/discursive disaggregation of landmines from state practices of organized violence more broadly finds it on just such a post-political terrain, severing at least this particular exercise of disarmament advocacy from any appeal against militarism writ large. The central validity claims of the ban, having cast landmines as the agents of dire human consequences, also divorce it from appeals against the killing of noncombatants with other weapons, including errant PGMs. **Conclusion: Disarming Politics** At base, the essence of the case advanced by the movement to ban them was that antipersonnel landmines are bad weapons because they do not discriminate – that is the position that ultimately accounts for the remarkable success of the campaign to ban them. But the idea of bad weapons, as opposed to bad practices, has some important implications and effects. First, and most fundamentally, it confines disarmament advocacy to a decidedly post-political terrain of 22 engagement whereon it is possible to imagine a ban on landmines without in any way disturbing the militarized practices that led to the circumstance that there are presently more than a hundred million mines lying in wait in conflict- and post-conflict zones around the world. Indeed, militarized practices are not only moved off the critical agenda, but are actually reinforced to the extent that the crux of the case turns on the idea that landmines are problematic for their unintended consequences. That has the effect of reconfirming as legitimate both their intended effects and the broader purposes they had been intended to serve by those effects. The demand that landmines be banned is therefore reduced to just that particular demand. And perhaps the best indication of this is that the movement has been unable to parlay its success with landmines into a much hoped-for ban on small arms and light weapons. But what is perhaps the most troubling implication of the mine ban rhetoric follows from this: agency is shifted to weapons themselves in casting landmines as ‘bad’ and as the site of responsibility for the dire human consequences that have been associated with them. That mystifies the site of responsibility such that when a ‘good’ weapon – a cruise missile, for example – hits other than its intended target questions about responsibility stop at the weapon itself and can be resolved by pointing to a malfunction. In this way, responsibility is contained and managed. The broader significance of the shifting of agency toward weapons comes more fully to light via the rhetorics of the RMA and the imaginaries it sustains: in particular, well popularized understandings of smart bombs and surgical strikes. The whole discourse of ‘smart bombs’ also ascribes individualized agency to weapons. That they are not actually smart matters little when popular imaginaries take at face value the discursive and aesthetic renderings together with attending rhetorics. In instances of implausibly deniable ‘collateral damage’ the weapon is at fault because it has been rendered an autonomous agent. Similarly placing blame for dire 23 human consequences on weapons, mine ban rhetoric upholds the viability of this. In common with the landmines taboo, the new American way of war turns also on the matter of meaningful discrimination between combatants and noncombatants and of who, or, more precisely, what fails to discriminate. All that is unique, important, and laudable about the Ottawa Process raises urgent questions about disarmament advocacy. What seems clear is that the rhetorical/discursive and aesthetic renderings of the RMA are key to understanding both the successes and the limits of the campaign to ban landmines and, with it, something of the future of disarmament advocacy more broadly. The extent to which it stands as a workable model for future initiatives would seem to be contingent upon the degree to which its success owes to the nexus between a re- emergent discriminacy norm and the advent of weapon-agents. As the frustrated hopes for a follow-on success in the area of small arms and light weapons suggest, this might not be easily replicable. In any event, it would seem to fix quite restrictive limits on the range of weapons that might be singled out for prohibition, whilst ironically depopulating war once more by objectifying victims and confounding the easy identification of whole subject positions whence issue the injuring practices of war. Confined to a post-political terrain of engagement, the most profound limitation of the approach taken in the landmine ban resides in the forfeiture of any thoroughgoing critique of militarized practices. As noted above, it is probably too much to say that the mine ban movement’s adoption of weapon-agent discursive strategies played any significant part in preparing the ideational ground for the sanitized rhetorics of discriminacy in Afghanistan and Iraq. It is, however, implicated in the very imaginaries that sustain those rhetorics and may, no less, have been enabled by them. Besides mystifying sites of agency and responsibility, this 24 undergirds claims to meaningful discriminacy that have become an increasingly important part of cultivating legitimacy in recourse to war. What is more, it also effectively abandons those bodies marked as combatants, unlawful or otherwise. And while it is widely accepted that combatants, by virtue of their direct participation in Clausewitz’s ‘other means,’ enjoy no special right of protection, this may be to lose sight once more of the ineluctable fact of war’s embeddedness in broader socio-political contexts and practices. It is imperative, from this perspective, to bear in mind that the ascription ‘combatant’ may be no less socially and politically contingent than that of ‘unlawful combatant.’ We are thus enjoined to consider the significance of conscription and the unequal social determinants characteristic and enabling of much recruitment. These are just some of the thornier implications of undertaking efforts toward disarmament on the terms of the RMA and new ways of war – implications that call for careful reflection on the fundamental values and ultimate objectives of activist and advocacy work in this important area. Such are the disarming politics of our moment.

**This turns the case – their adoration of weapons puts obsession at the forefront of the mind, ensuring that the state will ignore other forms of violence and allow appeals to the state to be ignored, allowing bigger and deadlier weapons to be built.**

**Martin 86** associate professor in Science, Technology and Society at the University of Wollongong, Australia, Peace Studies (Brian, “Nuclear Disarmment is Not Enough”, No. 3, June/July 1986, pp. 36-39, <http://www.uow.edu.au/arts/sts/bmartin/pubs/86ps.html>) AW

Nuclear disarmament is a key theme of the Australian peace movement. There are, for example, the various People for Nuclear Disarmament groups, the Nuclear Disarmament Party, and the major Nuclear Disarmament Conference held in Melbourne in August 1985. I argue that it is dangerously narrow to focus so much on nuclear weapons, and also to focus so much on disarmament. The basic problem with focussing on nuclear weapons is that they are only one product of the war system. The history of modem warfare is one of recurrent technical innovation to increase the killing power of weaponry. This process has been routinised in the past century through the heavy sponsorship of science and technology by the state. In effect, much of the knowledge and skills produced and used by science and technology is tied to the military aims of separate states. It so happens that nuclear weapons are currently the most prominent of technological threats to human life. But the driving force behind the development of weapons of mass destruction is the state-technology system, not the weapons themselves. As a potential solution to the problem of mass killing in warfare, the locus on nuclear weapons has several limitations: The killing power of conventional weapons has been increasing at a great rate for decades. A large-scale conventional war between major industrialised powers could kill many tens or even hundreds of millions of people. Even if all nuclear weapons were dismantled tomorrow, the capacity to produce new nuclear weapons would remain. With technological advances in uranium isotope separation, in a few years time it may be possible for small states and non-state groups to produce nuclear weapons without great difficulty or expense. Chemical and especially biological weapons have the potential to kill large numbers of people. Future biological weapons could easily pose as great a threat as present nuclear weapons. Quite a few people realise that getting rid of nuclear weapons is not enough, but nevertheless think that concentrating on nuclear weapons is essential. One view is that cutting back on nuclear weapons should be seen as only the first stage of efforts against war. The problem with this is that most people, including members of peace groups, get caught up with the immediate demands. The peace movement in the late 1950s and early 1960s made the cessation of nuclear testing in the atmosphere a major demand, with the result that the Partial Test Ban Treaty in 1963 took a lot of the wind out of the movement. Another stance is that the threat posed by nuclear weapons is so enormous and unprecedented that focussing on nuclear weapons is necessary to buy time for any other social action: if there is a nuclear war we will not be around to worry about poverty or sexism. In response I would argue that there is no automatic reason why 'buying time' is best achieved through a narrow concern about nuclear weapons. The effectiveness of social movements does not derive simply from the size of the threat to human life that they are protesting about, but rather from a whole range of factors, including the possibility of reforms, the bandwagon effect and the organisation of the movement. Another argument is that a wider alliance can be built by focussing on nuclear weapons and not alienating people by bringing up other demands. The problem with that case is reliance on the lowest common denominator makes it difficult to achieve anything more than pious declarations. The heads of all the major weapons states tell us that they are in favour of 'peace', but that doesn't achieve anything. The major problem with the concentration on nuclear weapons is that it encourages a technical fix approach such as the nuclear freeze or other agreements made by governments. The evidence is overwhelming that arms negotiations hold little potential for changing the war system, irrespective of popular pressure applied to governments.[2] Quite a number of historical examples show the limitations for social movements of making demands which are too narrow. For example, the progressive movement in the United States around the turn of the century was a powerful reform movement. One of its major concerns was the abuses perpetrated by large corporations: monopoly, exploitation, etc. The focus was on large corporations, and the solution sought was 'trust-busting', in other words, using government intervention to break up the monopolies. As in the case of nuclear disarmament negotiations, there was more sound than action from politicians who took up the progressive cause. But the basic limitation of the approach was seeing the problem in the trusts rather than deeper in the capitalist system. It hardly needs mentioning that although some monopolies were broken up at the time, the size and power of US-based transnational corporations is greater than ever today. A similar difficulty faced the first wave of the feminist movement when around the turn of the twentieth century it made achieving the vote for women the major target. Barring women from voting was useful but - as later events showed - not essential to continued male domination. After the feminist movement achieved its immediate aim of the vote, it went into decline for decades. This is the great danger of focussing too much on 'achievable' reforms. 'Disarmament' is the other side of the central attention placed on nuclear disarmament. Disarmament is normally conceived as a reversal of the armament process and as something that is undertaken by governments. The major limitation here, once again, is that concentrating on disarmament does not address the driving forces behind the war system. If the system of states, with each state founded on claims to a monopoly on 'legitimate' violence, is at the basis of the war system, then it is futile to expect to turn back the armament process by appealing to the rationality or political concerns of state elites.[3] And yet that is exactly what the Australian peace movement has attempted to do. The main strategy of the Australian peace movement - inasmuch as a main strategy can be perceived - is to apply pressure to the Australian government to push for cutting free of the nuclear weapons connection. The major rallies have been largely aimed at getting as many people on the streets as possible, to impress the public and the government with the breadth of concern. Efforts to support the Democrats or the Nuclear Disarmament Party are designed to apply electoral pressure on the government to sever its links to the US nuclear system. The trouble with this is that the peace movement has no alternative to military defence which it can proceed to implement itself. By focussing on nuclear disarmament, the movement ties itself to a 'see and plea' approach of the sort which has failed time and time again. Will getting millions of people into the streets force the government to take action? There were a million in the streets of New York in 1982. Furthermore, opinion polls show that a large majority of US people favour a nuclear freeze. Have the US policy-makers responded? Not in terms of the substance of their policies.

# turns case- fear

**The affirmative’s fear of other country’s nuclear capabilities only causes the harms they claim to solve for; the affirmative creates an obsession with the bomb, which allows more buildup of nuclear materials and actually hides the violence that comes from them.**

**Malcolmson 85,** Professor at Queen’s University at Kingston (Robert W, “Nuclear Fallacies: How We Have Been Misguided Since Hiroshima”, 1985, p. 58/59, Print.) AW

In the course of the arms competition that has been going on since 1945, each superpower has been inclined and this is hardly unusual to value very highly its own security requirements and to depreciate the fears of its rival. Neither has been much inclined to try to see the world from the other's point of view. Both have gone through times of heightened anxiety concerning national security. And fear has energized urgent action: the American military buildup in partial response to Sputnik; the Soviet attempt in 1962, partly in response to this buildup, to place missiles in Cuba; the recent accelerated American armaments program. which has been fuelled by fears for the future (such as the ';window of vulnerability") and a desire to return to the more comforting Pax Americana of earlier years. Fearing an American attempt to regain nuclear superiority, the Kremlin has now, undoubtedly, authorized the development of new major weapons of its own. Fear, then, tends to feed upon as each power seeks to enhance its own security by means of threatening actions directed at the other. And whatever else it might generate, such fear invariably results in the acquisition of more and more weapons, the further consolidation of military bureaucracies, and the hardening of confrontational concepts of international relations. In the nuclear age fear has come to have a distinctive political significance. Now, for one's rival to be fearful is not necessarily a good thing. This truth is often insufficiently appreciated. As McGeorge Bundy. the national security advisor to Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, has remarked, "It is vital to understand that nuclear weapons scare other people more than they comfort the possessor. That's been true right from the beginning"55 and it may be getting truer with time. Nuclear weapons, by their very nature, are weapons of terror. They are not defensive; they provide no "shield" against attack. They offer, on their own, no reliable basis for security. They can only (it is hoped) deter through the threat of retaliation. But what one superpower calls its deterrent tends to be seen by the other side as a threat. And feeling threatened, it replies with new threatening weapons of its own. This notion of "threat" pervades our thinking about the nuclear age. It is also one of the principal driving forces behind the arms race. Indeed, there is little doubt that this intense competition has been vigorously pushed along by both superpowers' alarmist, even morbid, assumptions about each other's intentions. (I shall look more closely at our understanding of the "Soviet threat" in the following chapter.) Each great power tends to attribute to the other power very large and aggressive objectives, and each then arms in order to meet these imagined, perhaps even imaginary. objectives. Analysts on both sides come up with worst-case scenarios concerning their own nation's security (this is done in part by highlighting the adversary's advantages while ignoring or deprecating one's own advantages). These scenarios invariably point to the need for large military deployments. And the deployments that result confirm the worst-case assessments of the analysts on the other side, who are thereby able to argue more convincingly for their own military programs. In this way the hawks on both sides feed on and help sustain one another. This process of interacting worst-case assessments makes a big contribution to driving the arms race onwards and upwards. As one American expert has remarked. "Our worst-case assessments, with our incomplete in­ formation, interact with Soviet worst-case assessments, and the result is a constant push upward, which is far, far stronger than any sort of downward pressures that political leaders are at all likelv to exercise.

**The affirmative’s portrayal of fear for the bomb has been transformed into a sick obsession. This fixation on the bomb obscures real political changes and makes political conflict and violence possible.**

**Schwartz and Derber 92**, professor of property law at Yeshiva University's Cardozo School of Law and professor of Sociology at Boston College (William and Charles, “The Nuclear Seduction: Why the Arms Race Doesn’t Matter, and What Does”, p1/2, Print.) AW

For many years, a striking consensus has reigned: the nuclear arms race between the superpowers is the main source of danger. The arms race is "the central concern of the closing years of the century," the cause celebrity of our time. A U.S. senator says that "the very survival of our planet, the survival of the human race, is at stake," a common view.' The right, the center, and the left disagree, of course, about how the United States should run the arms race. The right urges us to build weapons like the MX missile, the Stealth bomber, and "Star Wars"; the center, to sign arms control treaties like INF and START with the Soviet Union; and the left, to stop and then reverse the arms race through a test ban, a "freeze," and huge reductions in nuclear arsenals. But all focus, on the hardware, the weapons themselves. Most of the nuclear debate concerns which weapons should be deployed and which destroyed. But short of near-total nuclear disarmament, we believe that no change in the arms race can in fact make a profound difference. MX, Star Wars, INF, a freeze, or even a 90 percent reduction in nuclear arsenals cannot reliably change the horror of a nuclear war. They cannot much affect the risk that the nuclear states will plunge us into that horror. They cannot make the world much safer *or* more dangerous than it already is. The nuclear danger is real-even more ominous, as we will show, than most people appreciate. **But the fixation on weapons has obscured the real menace: the political conflict and violence raging around the world that could one day burn out of control and set off a nuclear cataclysm**. As the world debates largely irrelevant missiles and arms control' treaties, the superpowers are fanning the flames of conflict and war from Afghanistan to Nicaragua, Lebanon to Cambodia. Forty years of history reveal that such conflicts can suddenly veer out of control and even erupt into open superpower confrontation. Yet in a time of unprecedented public concern about nuclear war, few-even in the peace movement-protest the nuclear hazards of their governments' foreign intrigues and interventions**. Those of us concerned with the nuclear threat have long been like the apocryphal drunk who searches for his lost keys hour after hour under a lamppost-because it's light there.** The **giant weapons systems are seductive**, the obvious place to look for answers to the nuclear peril. The light there is good. But there is little to be found. If we want the keys to a safer world, we must turn the light to the real conflicts and battlefields where the superpowers and their clients confront each other every day, often hidden from public view, and where they periodically collide in terrifying crises that threaten to provoke worldwide catastrophe.

# turns case- empirical

**We must look to the future, not empirical examples, to guide us into new ways of working with and against other states; if we don’t we will just repeat the same answers and cycles that we’ve always had, creating the bomb as a deity and not understanding the bomb’s actual function.**

**Malcolmson 85,** Professor at Queen’s University at Kingston (Robert W, “Nuclear Fallacies: How We Have Been Misguided Since Hiroshima”, 1985, p. 67/68, Print.)AW

Analysis and interpretation are important, but it is also vital to look ahead and to consider what might be done to repair past damage and to act more intelligently in the future. Looking backward, we have been concerned to inject some historical sensitivity, a degree of historical depth, into our understanding of present political circumstances. But we also want to look forward and, with an eye on the past, bring forth proposals for change that are sensible, realistic, and likely to command widespread assent. What, then, are some of the conditions that will have to be satisfied if we are to enjoy a more secure future? And what are some of the steps that could and should be taken to reduce the prospect of nuclear devastation? First, it is vital that nations come to recognize, and to act upon, their shared interest in survival. Security cannot be achieved through unilateral action. It cannot arise out of efforts by each superpower to aggravate the other superpower's insecurity. Each side must be prepared to grant the other side the same degree of security that it seeks for itself. Indeed, each has a self-interest in seeing that the other side feels more secure. In the nuclear age national security must be based on the pursuit of common security; it can be achieved only by working *with* other states, not against them. Some measure of positive collaboration, informed by a realistic recognition of power and common objectives, is essential. As former u.s. Secretary of State Cyrus Vance wrote in 1982, Neither the United States nor the Soviet Union can provide for its own security against nuclear holocaust unless it also helps to provide that security for the other. Neither can seek a decisive nuclear advantage without the risk of provoking an attack in which both would be destroyed. In short, the most basic security of all for the superpowers ­ security from nuclear war - cannot in the final analysis be dominated by competition. Their security must be based on an unparalleled degree of cooperation.64 Total security cannot be achieved and should not be sought, least of all through unilateral measures - that is, the attempt, which is now completely misguided, to save ourselves by ourselves. "There is only one way the United States and the Soviet Union can save themselves from each other's missiles," as Thomas Powers has remarked, "and that is together. ,,65 Second, in order to highlight this mutuality of interest, this common stake in survival, it will be imperative to reduce the adversarial character of the relationship between the world's two dominant powers. The u.s.-Soviet rivalry is bound to continue. It is a rivalry that has deep structural and cultural roots. But it is vital that this competition be managed prudently, that it not be allowed to provoke a direct confrontation, and that the nuclear dimension of the rivalry be greatly reduced. The common interest in avoiding nuclear catastrophe should take precedence over all other considerations. This means that, in an effort to ease tensions and build on common interests, there must be a revival of diplomacy and of non-military communications of all sorts. Economic, cultural, and scientific exchanges should be actively promoted and expanded. Rather than accentuating the sore points and aggravations of the East-West relationship, there is a pressing need to normalize this relationship as much as possible and to rescue it from at least some of the paralysis of Cold War confrontation­ al premises, including much of the gratuitous emphasis on antagonistic relations that is embedded in the orthodoxies of deterrence. Each side is inordinately afraid of "appeasing" its adversary and prefers to be seen as tough. But toughness can be costly. For while, as a writer on military affairs once observed, a crude policy of appeasement "never pays, the mutual friction of two 'tough' policies generates a shower of sparks, and any of these are liable to detonate an explosion. Flexibility is not a sign of weakness. It is essential both to co-operate and to deter; but thus far political energies have been devoted almost entirely to the latter.

# turns case- arms race

**The affirmative’s attempt to fix the nuclear problem with a nuclear arms race is fundamentally flawed – it causes us to rely on nuclear weapons and conceals the fact that there are no realistic changes that can be made to stop nuclear existence and threats.**

**Schwartz and Derber 92**, professor of property law at Yeshiva University's Cardozo School of Law and professor of Sociology at Boston College (William and Charles, “The Nuclear Seduction: Why the Arms Race Doesn’t Matter, and What Does”, p17/18, Print.) AW

The right, the center, and the left seem equally misguided in attaching great significance to which nuclear weapons are deployed or destroyed *by* the superpowers. Because no realistic changes in the pace, balance, or even direction of the arms race can alter the basic conditions of our nuclear existence, they should make little difference to the incentives to start nuclear war, the damage we can expect should a war occur, or the division of international political power. Even major steps by the super­ powers to rearm (including Star Wars) or to disarm (including the nu- clear freeze or large cuts in nuclear arsenals) would leave the nuclear problem essentially unchanged, as we argue in more detail in succeeding chapters. **The common tendency to identify the *problem of nuclear war* with the *nuclear arms race* is a logical fallacy that dangerously distorts nuclear politics by promoting technical fixes to what is overwhelmingly a political problem**.

\*\*\*alternative

# a2: cede the political

**Critical theory does not cede the political: the affirmative’s claim serves to make critique impossible: only critique can break the conservative’s hold on the political sphere**

**Brown, 05** Professor of Political Science at Cal-Berkeley (Wendy, “Edgework”, pg. 4-5, JPW)

The rebuff of critical theory as untimely provides the core matter of the affirmative case for it. Critical theory is essential in dark times not for the sake of sustaining utopian hopes, making flamboyant interventions, or staging irreverent protests, but rather to contest the very senses of time invoked to declare critique untimely. If the charge of untimeliness inevitably also fixes time, then disrupting this fixity is crucial to keeping the times from closing in on us. It is a way of reclaiming the present from the conservative hold on it that is borne by the charge of untimeliness.

To insist on the value of untimely political critique is not, then, to refuse the problem of time or timing in politics but rather to contest settled accounts of what time it is, what the times are, and what political tempo and temporality we should hew to in political life. Untimeliness deployed as an effective intellectual and political strategy, far from being a gesture of indifference to time, is a bid to reset time. Intellectual and political strategies of successful untimeliness therefore depend on a close engagement with time in every sense of the word. They are concerned with timing and tempo. They involve efforts to grasp the times by thinking against the times. They attempt, as Nietzsche put it, to “overcome the present” by puncturing the present’s “overvaluation of itself,” an overcoming whose aim is to breathe new possibility into the age. If our times are dark, what could be more important.

**Nuclear disbarment wont work unless we look past the political and social aspects and focus on its symbolism**

**Chernus, 86** (Ira Chernus. professor of religious studies university of Colorado at boulder.

University of South Caroline 1986 “Dr. Strangegod.” Page 11//ts)

But one basic theme will appear clearly throughout all the complex twists and turns of this study: nuclear weapons are appealing to us because of their many symbolic meanings, and so we are reluctant to part with them. Shall we ever part with them, or shall we cling to them as faithful adherents until the day that they dispose of us? No one can say. and this book makes no predictions. It does predict, however, that no movement for nuclear disarmament can succeed with purely rational arguments and political methods. We shall never be able to turn away from our nuclear faith until we first understand it in its own symbolic terms. Above all, we must understand that, just as our ancestors found all religious meanings converging in one awesome beloved God, so we find all religious meanings converging in our strange yet alluring God-the Bomb.

# 2nc alt solvency- must read

**By using reason and reality to try to break out of the confines of the Bomb, we inevitably become intertwined within madness and craziness. This forces us to the conclusion of annihilation and utter destruction. Any attempt of nuclear disarmament by the aff fails if they do not confront our epistemology first.**

**Chernus, 86** (Ira Chernus. professor of religious studies university of Colorado at boulder.

University of South Caroline 1986 “Dr. Strangegod.” Page 72-73//ts)

For the immediate future, however, the language of the defense strategists is likely to remain predominant. The general public will continue to experience the conflict between their symbolic perceptions of the Bomb and the experts' supposedly literal perception. At some level. though, the public may be dimly aware that the experts 'themselves are caught in a conflict between empirical and symbolic perceptions. Awareness of these conflicts, coupled with a realization that in the language of "techno-death" the human reality is completely effaced, produces a sense of discordant realities, which enhances the air of craziness surrounding the whole subject. Yet the government, fostering nuclear armaments for a wide variety of reasons, willingly embraces the "experts," not only because elected officials feel unequipped to deal with the subject but also because the analysts' language offers the desired blend of symbolic impact and logical "realistic" appearance. Public statements by the government, often echoed by the media, of course will emphasize the ideological symbolic elements, indicating only that the impeccable logic of the experts supports the publicized conclusions. Thus the government's concern is not so much that the public understand the reasoning involved but, rather, that the public accept the prestige and mysterious wisdom of the experts. In other words, for the government the important thing is the analytic approach as a symbol, giving legitimation to its policies by creating a feeling of awe toward reasoning itself. Again, however, this symbolic dimension is insistently linked with the symbolic world created by the ideological assumptions, and those who question this symbolic structure are labeled "unrealistic" or, if need be, "crazy." Clearly the question of who is crazy is immensely complicated. As we try to unravel the intertwining strands of logic and illogic, reality and unreality, and literal and symbolic truth wrapped around the Bomb, the answer seems increasingly to be, "All of us.” But these paradoxes lead us back to the basic paradox of all religious experience: the same reality that threatens and terrifies us also lures us toward it, and for the very same reasons. Just as we are ambivalent about annihilation, so we are ambivalent about unreality and madness, for they too are the marks of the transcendence of limits. As our strange God, the machine that can only produce death, heightens the unreality and madness of the modern age because of its unique features, it simultaneously heightens our feelings of awe and fascination toward it. Moreover, these unique features create a reality in which reason imprisons us in the logic of annihilation; unreality and madness may become the most alluring of escapes. So, as we try to break out of the confines in which the Bomb has bound us, we depend upon the Bomb. Once again, the problem becomes its own solution.

# a2: alt doesn’t change anything

**While we cannot give you a literal blueprint for what this mythic transformation would look like, only a symbolization—not literalization—of peace and war can free us from the commitment to a form of progress that will never come. We must insist upon the ‘unrealistic.’**

**Chernus 91,** Ira. Nuclear Madness: Religion and Psychology in the Nuclear Age. Albany: State University of New York Press, 19. Pg. 83.

This new understanding of peace demands a new direction for the peace movement. If the peace movement ultimately seeks nuclear abolition, it is not likely to attain its goal as long as it intends its actions and demands purely literally. By that route it only perpetuates the social fantasy system's static visions, whether they be of a *pax Americana* or a "safe Bomb." Construing war and peace primarily in symbolic terms is the paradoxical path to averting literal war and enhancing literal peace. Caring for the process rather than the goal is the paradoxical path to attaining the goal. So the movement should abandon its literalism and learn to see the world peace for which it strives primarily as a symbol for the infinitude of religious imagination. Relinquishing its "hard-headed realism," it would also relinquish its commitment to progress. Peace work could no longer be done as piece work, aiming at a perfectly static balance of disarmament agreements. Acting out the apocalyptic desire of madness for total transformation, the movement would have to become "unrealistic'' and return to its former dynamic vision of immediate and total abolition.

**Public support and debate is needed to create change in the effort of national security.**

**Chernus, 6** - Professor of Religious Studies University of Colorado at Boulder – (Ira, 2006, Monsters to Destroy: The Neoconservative War on Terror and Sin, pg x-xi)

This book is my story about the Bush administration's stories. The punch line of my story is that the administration has chosen unending warfare as its route to escape from moral terror. The main goal of the war on terrorism is not to end anti-American attacks. The main goal is to give Americans a global arena where they can show their moral strength, their allegiance to permanent moral values, and their ability to hold back the whirlwind of change. To prove all that, Americans need to be fighting against sin, evil, and moral weakness; they need monsters to destroy. So the point of the war is not to win. It is, on the contrary, to keep on fighting monsters forever. This is obviously a self-defeating approach. It is a vast effort to make the nation more secure, but inevitably it ~dsup making the nation more insecure. It makes the United States a national insecurity state. But people often go on acting out old familiar stories that make them feel secure, rather than acting out new stories that might actually make them more secure. By the spring of 2006, many observers were suggesting that the neoconservatives had lost much of their influence in the Bush administration. The growing drumbeat for an attack on Iran (perhaps even a nuclear attack) made this assessment seem debatable, at best. Yet even if the neocon influence has faded around the edges of Bush policy, the core of that policy still bears their stamp powerfully and pervasively. And the neocons have shown, over decades, their persistent drive to dominate U.S. foreign policy. They will surely not go away, even after George W. Bush is gone from the White House. So the roots and branches of their story still deserve careful attention. It would be wrong, though, to place all the blame on the president and the neoconservatives. No government can fight a long-term war without substantial public support. Despite criticism on specifics (notably the war in Iraq), the American public has given substantial support to the administration's overall project of an open-ended war on terrorism. Most conservative moralists find it easy to support the story of the war on terrorism, because that story so closely mirrors their own stories about a domestic war on sin and secular humanism. Even many liberals, who staunchly oppose the administration's conservative domestic policies, seem comfortable with an endless war against foreign evil. They fought the same kind of war, against communism, for forty years. The liberals never really expected to win the cold war. Their goal was apocalypse management-preventing fundamental changes in the world system that would (they feared) threaten the American way of life. So these liberals understand and generally embrace the Bush administration's plan to fight a war against an enemy who will always threaten our national security. They accept a permanent national insecurity state. But liberals who support the war on terrorism do not realize that they are supporting abroad the same kind of moral crusade that they oppose so vigorously here at home. They fall into this trap because they let the Bush administration fuse together two questions that should be debated quite separately: How can we make ourselves safer in the future, with the best chance to avoid another attack on our homeland? How should we acquire our moral values, through independent inquiry or by accepting some external authority? As this book will show, we Americans are confusing ourselves, and therefore endangering ourselves, because we are treating those two questions as if they were one. Once we recognize that they are two very different questions, we can begin to have civil public debates about both of them, debates that could lead us closer to genuine national security.

# general solvency

**The alternative is to reject the affirmative to expel their moral impurity and religious adoration of the bomb. Only this rejection of the affirmative’s ideologies and portrayals of nuclear weapons can we prevent the re-occurrence of world wars and create political movements to social justice, love, and reformation.**

**Chernus 05** Professor of Religious Studies at the University of Colorado at Boulder (Ira, “Is War Good for Nonviolence?” Fellowship, Volume 71, Issue 5/6, p 12, June 2005, ProQuest, <http://proquest.umi.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/pqdweb?did=858316121&Fmt=3&clientId=17822&RQT=309&VName=PQD>) AW

Although the newly revived movement seemed to emerge so suddenly, the fuel had actually been gathering for some time. It needed only the spark of war to ignite it. It was fed in part by the 19th century moralists' ideal of love for all humanity (a religious ideal, for most). It drew, too, on the emerging idea of the individual as an organism with a right to fulfill its unique potentialities. Universal love meant each person helping all others to develop fully. Another crucial element was the new Progressive belief that individual growth depends on the social environment; love requires us to change social conditions by improving societal institutions. For the younger generation, it would no longer do to blame war on sin and immorality. They were more inclined to see war as the logical outgrowth of a maladjusted social order. Analyzing the problem rationally, in good Progressive fashion, they quickly recognized that the social order of the enemy was very similar to, and increasingly interlocked with, the social order of the United States and its allies. Since all the nations in the war were parts of the same system, all were equally responsible for the war. So it made no sense to view war as a fight of good nations against bad nations. Since the same moral conflicts are found within every nation, they concluded, war always creates a single global struggle of the good against the evil. As they learned to think in terms of a single international system, the war critics reinforced their desire for a single global society, fostering humanistic values that transcend all national boundaries. Their ideal of peace was more than just individual moral purity. It was an ideal of institutionalized processes for nonviolent resolution of conflicts. Among the young pacifists who championed love and the freely developing individual, many feared socialism because it seemed to promote state power and conformity. But many were drawn to socialism. It offered them the most convincing rational explanation of why the global system had produced such a horrific war. And it offered them a vision of a humane society that was pragmatic and hard-headed, yet also utopian. Although the reborn nonviolence movement was fed by these modern streams of thought, it still flowed in a profoundly Christian channel. Many of its adherents drew on the teachings of the Social Gospel, the most modern form of Christianity in their day. They argued that, because the political and economic system was unjust, it was also un-Christian. They blended a religious appeal to the individual conscience with the Social Gospel's concern for reforming institutions. Their important innovation was to treat those two approaches as two sides of a single coin. The structures of society would be improved when individuals obeyed the voice of conscience and acted with moral virtue. But individuals would be far more likely to obey conscience if they lived within rational, humane, and just social structures. To support this new view they took Jesus as the model of perfect love and reform. They looked forward to the coming Kingdom of God, in which the whole society would follow Jesus' model and be guided by love. This was not merely utopian dreaming for them: they took it as a pragmatic criterion by which to judge the present. Clearly, the present would be found lacking...and that would motivate efforts to improve it. They devoted much of their energy to traditional Christian practices of preaching and exhortation directed at the individual soul. But their desire to change society sent them into the political arena, too. They had to strengthen their organizations. They also had to ally with other organizations, both religious and secular. The persecution of antiwar activists made them feel isolated and thus drove them to organize for mutual support. All were imbued by an optimistic hope that, once the war was over, their movement would lead US society toward ever greater heights of social justice. The years following World War I gave them cause for hope. Most Americans soon came to view their entry into World War I as a mistake. The idea that all war is a mistake attained unprecedented popularity. The broad appeal of peace boosted the fortunes of the nonviolence movement, too. Christian love, the ideal of individual self-fulfillment, Progressivism, pragmatism, and socialism had all been very much alive before World War I. But there had been no large vibrant community of Americans dedicated to nonviolence. The fundamental structure of the modern nonviolence movement, the structure that still undergirds the movement today, was scarcely visible in the years just before the war. It was fully visible in the years just after the war. The war was the spark that ignited the fuel and created an enduring community of nonviolence.

**The only way that we can fully understand how the bomb has come to structure our lives is to understand the symbolic nature behind it. Without this strive for knowledge, the aff begins a never ending cycle of confusion and reliance on the Bomb**

**Chernus, 86** (Ira Chernus. professor of religious studies university of Colorado at boulder.

University of South Caroline 1986 “Dr. Strangegod.” Page 51-52//ts)

This is the fundamental goal of all religious ritual. It does not intend to remove the awesome and threatening aspects of limitless reality altogether. It merely intends to bring us into continuing contact with that reality in familiar, time-tested, and hence apparently safe patterns. It attempts to meld the structure of "security" and the infinitude of "freedom" by creating a humanly constructed and humanly controlled encounter with infinite power. Therefore it tends to increase the attraction and fascination of the sacred while diminishing the fear. We value ritual not because it removes the terrifying threat of dissolution and annihilation but because it seems to contain that threat and make it endurable. In fact, ritual must retain some measure of the threat, and the anxiety it breeds, if it is to have compelling power. The nuclear ritual is all the more valuable to us because it offers a heightened sense of controlled terror. The subtle interweaving of order and disorder, comprehended and incomprehensible, controlled and uncontrollable, confronts us at every turn as we explore the world of the Bomb. The more we ritualize nuclear weapons the more we focus on the orderly, and rationalize or ignore the chaotic. Yet the irrationalities of the nuclear age can only be covered over, never swept away. The upshot is a continued and compounded confusion of rationality and mystery, now largely hidden from view and therefore even more disturbing. So the cycle turns again: confusion breeds more threat of instability and disorder; we cling more tenaciously to the familiar structure; we fear the Enemy even more intensely, prepare for war even more assiduously, and rely on the bomb even more fervently. Alternatives to the nuclear ritual are overlooked or cast aside because they seem more anomie than the Bomb itself. We trust in the rationality of the "experts" to manage and contain the threat. 'But the result is simply a deeper feeling of insecurity and anomie. Having set out to examine the orderly and rational side of nuclear weapons, we have nevertheless arrived back at a place of irrational paradox. Yet because we are unaware of our irrational motives we can believe that we are thinking and acting rationally. And there is a logic here. But it is the special logic of religious symbols, which is also the logic of the nuclear age. It is a logic that enfolds both reason and unreason, finding room for every paradox in an overarching unity that is more compelling and fulfilling than any merely rational logic. Understanding this logic of the symbolic level helps us to understand our insistence on keeping and expanding our nuclear arsenals, despite all truly logical arguments to the contrary.

# alt spillover

**Only the alternative can solve for real world spill over.**

**Chernus, 6** - Professor of Religious Studies University of Colorado at Boulder – (Ira, 2006, Monsters to Destroy: The Neoconservative War on Terror and Sin, pg 3)

No matter how painful or frightening the world might become, it is always easier to handle if we can fit it all into a story line. Stories give shape to our lives. They create a secure picture of what the world is like and how life should be lived. We rely on our stories to give structure to our experience, to make it seem meaningful to turn it from chaos into order. A story lets us hope that we can somehow bring even the most overwhelming events and feelings under control. Most of the time, we can't even tell our most important stories completely in any detailed narrative. We take them for granted. We know them only in bits and pieces, but the whole story is always there. Mentioning just one piece is like pushing a button that brings the whole story to life; the process unfolds largely unconsciously. An outsider who studied our lives closely might well see the full structure of our stories more clearly than we could. That's why it may be helpful for an outsider like myself, a critic of nearly every aspect of Bush administration policy, to piece together the stories of the administration. The power of stories gets noticed in the mainstream media, though only rarely. About a month after the terrible attack of 9/11, journalist Joel Garreau speculated that it might well be a fundamental turning point, a "hinge" of history. "What changes after a hinge," he commented, "is our stories of ourselves. Who we are, how we got that way-where we're headed, and what makes us tick." Later, when the U.S. response to 9/11 had led to war in Iraq, columnist Russ Barclay would write: "We are a storytelling species.... Language shapes perception .... The 'war on terror' and the 'axis of evil' become powerful images that we can transfer from enemy to enemy as circumstances arise." Another columnist, Robert Scheer, would agree: "Language is everything here .... The meaning of 'terror' exists only in the eye of the beholder."s Not all beholders are equal, however. We don't all get an equal say in making up the stories we tell and the words we use about a hinge event. As historian Frank Costigliola says, the "most significant meanings" of historical events are not discovered, as if they exist objectively; they are assigned in a complex process of interpretation. And people who are more privileged in terms of class, race, gender, and other markers have more to say in assigning meanings to objects and events.... What people in society 'know' is heavily influenced by relations of power."6

# alt key to positive change

**A psychological approach is key to overcoming the psychic numbing that comes with fear of the Bomb—ignoring the issue makes meaningful change impossible.**

**Chernus, 91.** Ira (PROFESSOR OF RELIGIOUS STUDIES UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO AT BOULDER), *Nuclear Madness: Religion and the Psychology of the Nuclear Age,* p 2-3//jh

The dilemma can no longer be attributed to a paucity of public knowledge and debate. Nor can it simply be charged to widespread immorality. Most Americans proclaim their love for their land, their children, and themselves unashamedly. For some this love leads to antinuclear sentiments, for others it leads to a pronuclear stance. But there is little reason to doubt that the love is just as genuine in either case. Perhaps that is why moral appeals are no more successful than intellectual appeals in removing the nuclear threat. It is hard for us to see what other approach might be available, though, because the two tracks of antinuclear activism are the two tracks laid down for all moral problem solving in the foundations of Western culture. The first rests on the premise of classical Greek thought (and its Enlightenment revival) that evil stems from ignorance, that those who know the right will inevitably do the right. The second rests on the biblical premise that evil stems from a misguided or perverted will. In the present case, however, it seems that those who are committed to nuclear abolition do need a new diagnosis of the problem. Some disarmament advocates already entertain a third approach. They focus not on problems of thinking or willing but of feeling, or in more general terms on psychological problems. Probably the best known psychological diagnosis is summed up in Robert Jay Lifton's term *psychic numbing*. According to this view the essential problem lies not in the way we think or choose but in our failure to think and choose at all, and this is essentially a failure of imagination a lack of images of the threat. Psychic numbing is a very real phenomenon, and a psychological perspective offers fruitful new approaches to the nuclear dilemma. But it seems to me that the crucial problem is not an absence of images but rather the kind of images we use to think about the nuclear issue. Somehow these images must promote psychic numbing. If so, then it matters little whether we think about the Bomb or not. In either case, we will remain numb and unable to make meaningful changes in the status quo. This book therefore takes Lifton's theoretical model as its starting point and builds upon it, developing a broader model that can account for both the proliferation of nuclear imagery and the persistence of psychic numbing. Lifton suggests that psychic numbing must be understood as in some sense a religious problem. My own previous research suggests that most of our nuclear images have striking analogues in traditional religious images.

# grassroots

**The alternative is to call for a grassroots movement from the streets upward; only through painful levels of domestic opposition and noise can the nuclear age change.**

**Schwartz and Derber 92**, professor of property law at Yeshiva University's Cardozo School of Law and professor of Sociology at Boston College (William and Charles, “The Nuclear Seduction: Why the Arms Race Doesn’t Matter, and What Does”, p236, Print.) AW

If basic changes do not occur, history suggests that we may be heading for disaster. But there is also reason for hope. With large numbers of people alarmed about the nuclear peril in the United States and around the world, the nuclear powers could find that their populations will no longer permit them to endanger everyone in pursuit of power and wealth. An organized movement able to call millions into the streets could seriously inhibit the reckless state actions that have long constituted the prime threat to human survival. What Scott Sagan derisively calls the "noise" of domestic opposition could rise to painful levels. During the next tense Third World crisis, citizens can ensure that John Foster Dulles was correct to worry that "a negative public opinion" might prevent national leaders from using nuclear weapons. We can transform the universal fear of nuclear war into the public revolt against brinksmanship that so haunted Richard Nixon.6 We can ensure that leaders are not free of public pressure when plotting aggression, intervention, and adventurism throughout the world. These are the real challenges for democracy in the nuclear age.

# only alt solves root cause

**Rational thinking cannot solve the question of nuclear arms- only by addressing the root cause of our need to re-arm will we be able to fully comprehend it**

**Chernus, 86** (Ira Chernus. professor of religious studies university of Colorado at boulder. University of South Caroline 1986 “Dr. Strangegod.” Page 4//ts)

But if the hermit could not understand World War II, imagine his bewilderment at the war that followed-the Cold War, with its tens of thousands of nuclear warheads aimed and readied, awaiting only the push of a single button. Imagine that we could join that hermit for a moment and see the nuclear arms race from his perspective. What would we see? Not the "forces of freedom," ready to defend the "free world" against "totalitarian aggression." Nor the "people's armies" standing up against the "imperialist capitalist drive for world domination." These explanations and justifications for nuclear armament would mean nothing to us. We would see, instead, millions of human beings preparing for, or acquiescing in the preparation of, destruction and suffering on a totally unprecedented and unimaginable scale. And we might see some simple and familiar things for the first time in a proper light. We would see, for example, the essential similarity in the goals, the aspirations, the very humanity of the "freedom-loving" West and the "revolutionary masses" of the East. Although we would see genuine points of difference and dispute, we would also see that these by no means require the production or deployment of nuclear weapons. We might see the behavior of each side leading to its own destruction rather than to fulfillment of its aspirations. And we might ask why the two sides failed to agree on less destructive ways to pursue their rivalry. Thus we would be led to explore again, in a new light, the question: Why nuclear weapons? The answers that dawned upon us would take us beneath all political and ideological concerns. They would show us that the roots of the arms race are buried much deeper than purely rational thinking and planning can reach. We would begin to suspect that nuclear weapons have some innate appeal-that they whisper seductively to some essentially human element hidden in the psyches of us all. So we would begin to search for the intrinsic value that all human beings might find in perpetuating nuclear confrontation as an end in itself. Finally, like Glenn Gray, we would ask ourselves, "How does this mad war concern me?" And we would have to admit that there is much we do not yet understand.

# aff fails

**Viewing war and destruction through the eyes of the affirmative is impossible because they solely focus on the literal and real aspects of them. Therefore, it is impossible to confront any conflict**

**Chernus, 86** (Ira Chernus. professor of religious studies university of Colorado at boulder.

University of South Caroline 1986 “Dr. Strangegod.” Page 64-65//ts)

This atmosphere of ineffability is reinforced by our inability to conceive of our own death as a reality: "The extensive emphasis upon ever more powerful nuclear armaments in the effort to become more 'strong and secure,' despite the deadly risk that is involved, suggests that many people are motivated more by fears of weakness and helplessness than by fears of death.... The fact that people have not had the subjective experience of death, as well as the widespread unconscious illusion of one's own invulnerability, may contribute to the lesser psychological 'reality' of annihilation, as compared to that of being defeated and forced to submit" (Group for the Advancement of Psychiatry).6 Thus the slogan "Better dead than red" and other such affirmations of our ideologies are powerful enough to mask the reality of nuclear war from us. Similarly, we are unable to conceive of a "dead world," a world in which no humans survive, and therefore we cannot confront a war that would destroy humanity as a real event. As Fornari expresses it: Since in our minds the idea of the destruction of humanity "to the last man" as a possible event coincides with the idea of suppression of man as a subject capable of witnessing and verifying the destruction, the very fact of thinking of the extermination of man coincides with the impossibility of regarding it as a really verifiable event. In this connection I was told by someone that the idea of a possible nuclear catastrophe where there would be no survivors did not upset him but that the thought of even one man surviving the catastrophe filled him with anxiety.

**No policy advocacy could ever solve the desire for terrorists to attack us again so we should focus policy debate on the criticism.**

**Chernus, 6** - Professor of Religious Studies University of Colorado at Boulder – (Ira, 2006, Monsters to Destroy: The Neoconservative War on Terror and Sin, pg 2)

No grievances could ever begin to justify the horrors of 9 /11 and Madrid. But were the policies that angered the attackers so important that we should continue them, even if it risks more attacks on our soil? Who can say? The question got, and still gets, virtually no public discussion. By common consent, the whole subject of their motives has been sealed by a Great Taboo. Instead, most Americans have settled for two simplistic slogans coined in the White House: "They hate our freedoms." "They're flat evil." The attackers, past and future, are transformed from human beings into monsters, driven by irrational evil or a bloodthirsty desire to take away our freedoms. That means we have done nothing to provoke them. No U.S. policy changes could reduce their desire to attack uS,again. So there is nothing to talk about. We just hunker down, spend more billions on security, and wait for the next attack. When the next attack comes, more than four out of every five Americans believe, itwill "strengthen the nation's resolve to be even tougher in going after terrorists."4 So there is every reason to expect that we'll strike out at the monsters again, remain under the Great Taboo, and be just as insecure, waiting for yet another round of attack and counterattack.

\*\*\* A2: Perm

# a2 Perm: symbolism

**State policies and government programs cannot be combined with the alternative. They ignore the critical thinking that is necessary to understand the symbolism behind the bomb, and instead, they try to save humanity during a nuclear fallout. This just results in the destruction and death of all of humanity.**

**Chernus, 86** (Ira Chernus. professor of religious studies university of Colorado at boulder.

University of South Caroline 1986 “Dr. Strangegod.” Page 103-105//ts)

Thus, when the one-or two-week disruption ends, the world will be essentially unchanged except, of course, for the central fact that we shall have experienced the most immense release of destructive power in the history of the world. We shall have lived through the most awesome initiatory terrors imaginable. The pamphlet gives little attention to this annihilation. It provides a complex chart, with quite small print, describing the destructive effects of nuclear blasts, and it does mention the millions of deaths and the ensuing dangers from fallout. But, as we have seen, it hastily skips over these to assure us at length of the likelihood that we shall survive with little permanent harm if we take a few precautionary measures. And it mentions absolutely nothing about our psychological or emotional condition, our need to cope with unprecedented terror. The civil-defense agencies offer us an easy rebirth with only the slightest tinge of initiatory death. Perhaps this is best symbolized by a sketch in the pamphlet illustrating the proper procedure for someone caught out in the open with no possible shelter when a nuclear bomb explodes: it shows a man lying in a fetal position, with hands over head. The text reads, "If no cover is available, simply lie down on the ground and curl Up."12 And, we might add, await your rebirth. To some, this pamphlet might seem like good sensible advice. To some it will seem the ultimate in monstrous black humor. Many will find their opinion somewhere between these extremes. But it is clear that the sponsors of such a pamphlet have a very clear message to convey to the public. Whether that message turns out to be totally consonant or totally dissonant with the reality of a nuclear war, it is definitely consonant with the myth of heroic survival that we have been discussing here. It gives the government's stamp of legitimacy to the basic structure of that myth, and thus indirectly to other variants of the myth, such as those found in science fiction and apocalyptic. Of course, there are good reasons to believe that the government's scenario will turn out to be largely irrelevant in an actual war. The government itself, through the Congress, has published studies of the effects of nuclear war that make the civil-defense precautions seem highly ineffectual. These government studies, moreover, deal at length with the situation after the two-week shelter period, and their findings are uniformly dismal. Ironically, it is the executive branch of government, through the president and other high officials, that has best summarized the skepticism about the civil-defense view. Many of these leaders, in numerous administrations, have said flatly that nuclear war between the superpowers would be mutual suicide. This opinion obviously contradicts the government's official advice to its citizens. Moreover, the pamphlet itself is hardly internally consistent (although its overall theme is carried through from beginning to end), and it is often vague to the point of bewilderment. Its general tone is that things will probably be okay-although we're not quite sure of the details-so there's really nothing to worry about. It seems likely that the authors were inspired much more by myth and hopes than by careful study. This is hardly surprising, since the myth, beyond its specific political usefulness for specific political interests, has always been much more appealing than a chaotic, unpredictable, un graspable reality. Myth gives form to immense power, making it possible for our limited minds to relate to the experience of power as a meaningful event. And few myths have been as appealing and enduring as the myth of heroic survival and rebirth. Its fascination reaches to the very highest levels of political leadership: in 1981 the Defense Department's ranking official for research on nuclear war advocated "digging holes" as an effective defense against nuclear attack. When the alert sounds, he advised, everyone should dig a hole two or three feet deep, crawl in, then cover it somehow, and wait. This initiatory burial could be counted on to secure a postwar rebirth: "If there are enough shovels to go around, everybody's going to make it. ... It's the dirt that does it." 13 A more classical form of the myth found its way to the Senate floor when Senator Richard Russell rose to advocate more nuclear weapons with a resounding affirmation: "If we have to start over with another Adam and Eve, I want them to be Americans."14

# a2 Perm: it fails

**Any perm operates within the same world of nuclear imagery and leads further into the fantasy—creates even less individual mobility.**

**Chernus, 91.** Ira (PROFESSOR OF RELIGIOUS STUDIES UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO AT BOULDER), *Nuclear Madness: Religion and the Psychology of the Nuclear Age* 44-45//jh

But looking at the issue from every side often means simply rearranging the mappings of a fantasy world. Nuclear imagery, like all social fantasies, does offer choices, but all available alternatives lie within the confines of the fantasy, so every choice leads deeper into the fantasy. Choices that might lead out of the fantasy would lead right out of the reality that "everyone" inhabits, so genuine alternatives, and hence the possibility of genuine change, must be denied. The fundamental rules of the game must remain unchallenged because there is a rule against having a rule against breaking these rulesso in fact there are no rules and there is no game. It all vanishes, just like the problems that cannot exist because we all agree to deny ever having denied the possibility that they might exist. The result is the sense of helplessness epitomized by the nuclear dilemma. No one, it seems, can act decisively to change things; no one is really responsible; no one is in charge. Everyone is simply carrying out orders. And no one even knows quite where the orders come from, since the crucial orders are the subtle injunctions that tell us how to experience reality just like everyone else. "This human scene is a scene of mirages, demonic pseudo-realities, because everyone believes everyone else believes them."28 Thus the individual is compelled to make a decision when no authentically independent or constructive decision is allowed. The easiest way to escape the pain of such a trap is to detach oneself psychologically by experiencing both false self and world as unreal. In the typical pattern of interpersonal knots, the problem is seized as a solution and numbing is intensified. In the end, no one cares that authentic decision making has vanished. Since all action is futile, why bother to weigh and choose between alternatives? A numbed acceptance of the status quo seems more reasonable and more satisfying

**Nuclear policies are falsely assumed neutral and therefore impermeable for discursive change—the language of policy makes it impossible for amends to be made to the nuclear situation.**

**Chernus, 91**. Ira (professor of religious studies university of colorado at boulder), *nuclear madness: religion and the psychology of the nuclear age* 58-59//jh

This is just what has happened, Tillich indicates, in modernity. Under the guise of scientific objectivity, a wall has been erected between public institutions and private feelings. The public realm of the production/consumption machine is now proclaimed morally neutral. The state, as manager of the machine, exempts itself in principle from questions of value and religion; all its policies, including its nuclear policies, are (at least theoretically) based solely on rational calculations and "reasons of state." All questions of meaning are relegated to the subjective dimension of personal feelings and private opinions. But even this private realm consists only of partial realities. Reality can no longer be experienced by the whole person, and the person can no longer experience the whole of reality. So one can ask about the meanings of parts of one's life, but the question of the meaning of the whole is in principle meaningless. Every value becomes simply a means to some other value, which is in its turn just a means. Each can only be a link in a chain whose sole purpose is to perpetuate itself to no end. The more passionately we search for our own unique meanings in the privacy of our own unique lives, the more our lives are radically finitized and emptied of meaning. Occasionally threats to the whole may arise that force us to consider the nature of our concern for the totality of life. The nuclear threat is the most obvious case in point. But we avoid confronting this issue, as we avoid confronting our realistic fears, by claiming that it is just too big to comprehend. Again, there is truth in this claim. In a rare private moment we may wonder about the ultimate meaning of our individual lives, though we are denied an answer. But the Bomb is squarely in the middle of the public realm, where questions of ultimate meaning are impossible. We cannot connect our finite lives with ultimate meaning, nor can we connect our private lives with public meaning, so we cannot hope to connect our finite private lives with the ultimate public question of meaning implicit in the Bomb. We simply cannot ask that question. The language of public political discourse has no place for it. Those who try to inject ultimate value terms into the nuclear weapons debate inevitably face this problem of language boundaries. First they are asked to reduce their terms to a concrete policy option within the parameters of the current political debate. If they comply, their value concerns may be appended to the political discussion as useful embellishment. Even when these value terms are genuinely the source of political opinions, they are only received into mainstream discourse when presented as appendages to currently debated political options. If questions of ultimate meaning can not be reduced to the "realistic" terms of finite public policy questions, they will probably be written off by the mainstream as "idealistic" and therefore irrelevant. Through these various maneuvers we insure that we can not ask such questions in the public realm. Nor do we want to. By and large, we feel saved from the threat of anxiety by our meaninglessness.

# a2 Perm: Nuclear Schizophrenia

**We are too fragile for the permutation - nuclear schizophrenia ensures that we will only respond to the alternative with inaction.**

**Chernus, 91** - Professor of Religious Studies University of Colorado at Boulder - (Ira, 1991, Nuclear Madness: Religion and the Psychology of the Nuclear Age, pg 40-41//EB) Every description of reality is also an injunction to experience reality and respond to it in a certain way. When others describe reality falsely, they lead us to feel and act falsely—often directly contrary to our own best interests. Through injunctions, a nexus can go one step further and mystify individuals to the point where they cannot feel or act at all. The simplest way to achieve this is to give an individual two or more conflicting injunctions and demand that all be accepted simultaneously. "Various internal and external systems playing off against each other neutralize the command system so that one can't move; one is immobilized, actually brought to a standstill by the contradiction.' Like a classic double bind, the constant barrage of conflicting nuclear images evokes such a no-win situation while blocking all the exit routes. Things must change to build a better future so that we can continue standing fixedly for firm traditional values. Something must be done to improve our security, yet every step to make us more secure simultaneously makes us less secure. For example, if we want to make the world safer, we should build smaller, more accurate bombs that provide a more compelling second-strike deterrent. But smaller bombs can also be used for a decapitating first strike, so they destabilize the world and increase the risk of war. So to make the world safer we should build bigger bombs. But if you get rid of two big bombs for every new small bomb, you are reducing nuclear arsenals; so reducing arms means increasing the risk of war. To do the right thing, you must do the wrong thing. To do good, you must do evil. It is little wonder that the average person, assaulted by this welter of contradiction, ends up immobilized. When language and reality are so thoroughly bent out of any meaningful shape, we cannot begin to look for truth even if we want to. The rare individual who suspects that things are not what they are said to be usually succumbs to bewildering confusion, emotional exhaustion, and the fear of madness. It is just too difficult, and too frightening, to know the truth when "everyone knows" that one's truth is "really" a lie. One can quickly come to feel like Alice, but the world is hardly a wonderland. The surprising fact is not that so few speak up and raise questions but that anyone speaks up at all.

# a2 Perm: Nuclear Worship

**The permutation still maintains nuclear worship - images of optimism and predictions of death are compatible because they both sustain the dynamic of madness and the idea that our alternatives can be combined embodies nuclear schizophrenia.**

**Chernus, 91** - Professor of Religious Studies University of Colorado at Boulder - (Ira, 1991, Nuclear Madness: Religion and the Psychology of the Nuclear Age, pg 137//EB)

Most of the time, of course, paranoid Cold War fantasies and optimistic detente fantasies are acted out simultaneously in ever-changing permutations. Paranoia and optimism are so readily compatible because they are merely two different manifestations of the same dynamic of madness: in both cases, images of world- and self-destruction make it not only possible but necessary to imagine ourselves invulnerable and omnipotent through the agencies of the state. In both cases, images of annihilation and images of perfect security flourish side by side because each fosters the other. The two sets of nuclear fantasies are also compatible because madness allows contradictions without number. Public madness, mediated through the state's national security policies, lets us live out the most contradictory fantasies without doubting our own sanity. Logically incompatible ideas, aims, and behaviors are maintained side by side quite comfortably, simply because everyone else maintains them too. Con¬fronting the nuclear threat, the public madness clings to several "quasi-autonomous partial systems." It insists that only a mad¬man bent on suicide would start a nuclear war; but in the next breath it insists that we must retain the right of first use and have enough weapons to defeat the enemy. It affirms military strength as the highest virtue; but in the next breath it decries "the military-industrial complex" for sapping the nation's economy. It praises the Bomb as the "umbrella" that keeps us out of war; but in the next breath it yearns for the simplicity and security of the prenuclear era. It praises the technology that builds ever more sophisticated weapons; but in the next breath it curses that technology as an ineffable danger. It is thankful that the danger of nuclear confrontation is past; but in the next breath it laments having to live in a world that is "falling apart." Each of these views is the basis for some piece of our declaratory or actual nuclear policy. And each may seem reasonable enough within its own framework of belief. But there is no coherence among the various frameworks. Pieces of ideology and imagery from any one system can be juxtaposed with pieces from any others without clear rhyme or reason. Public discourse on the nuclear issue thus becomes just the sort of "word-salad" found in schizophrenia, and public policies are enacted out of this "word-salad" and the "image-salad" that goes along with it. The ego, despite its desire for unifying structure, accepts such chaos as ordinary reality because the chaos protects its numbing. And the superpower state, while claiming to protect us with its structures of "national security," preserves the chaos by monopolizing violence and images of violence. In the fantasy world of madness, only an omnipotent superpower can stave off the threat—a threat that is constantly perpetuated by the public fantasies of the superpower.

# a2 Perm: Literalism

**Permutations fail - literalism colonizes imagery for rational heroism.**

**Chernus, 91** - Professor of Religious Studies University of Colorado at Boulder - (Ira, 1991, Nuclear Madness: Religion and the Psychology of the Nuclear Age, pg 85-86//EB)

Hillman's most valuable contribution to understanding the nuclear dilemma is the link he makes between the content and the form of the heroic ego's images. Not only do the ego's images all speak of oneness, but they are all experienced in the mode of oneness; i.e., literally. The essence of literalism is singleness of vision. It demands a single meaning for every word, event, or idea. It insists that nothing is "really real" except empirically verifiable facts. Literalism objectifies, quantifies, and simplifies because it must reject all confusion, ambiguity, and mystery. Its ultimate goal is to keep reality itself unified, orderly, precise, and single. In pursuit of this goal, it divides all experience into dualities and insists that opposites must be kept apart. Literalism is the natural milieu for the schizoid ego striving to control an uncontrollable world. But the world's chaos is mediated to the mind through the chaos of the mind's own polyvalent imagery. A fantasy image never has a single clear meaning. It is more like a hall of mirrors, opening up an infinite web of interconnected, ambiguous, and entangling meanings. Fantasy compels us to see reality from many angles simultaneously; it is inherently polytheistic. So the ego must also strive to suppress all internal imagery. It must become an imperial power, colonizing the dark continents of imagination and rendering them unconscious in the name of its own enlightening consciousness. The ego cannot dispense with images altogether, of course. But it can hope to win its battle against imagination by choosing images that enshrine its own unique values and then literalizing those images. Literalism and the heroic ego are inseparable partners.

\*\*\*a2: Threats real

# 2nc- flawed knowledge

**Even if their threats are real, their knowledge of these weapons is flawed. This flawed knowledge allows for more powerful weapons to be built, and actually causes the harms their 1AC claims to solve for.**

**Malcolmson 85,** Professor at Queen’s University at Kingston (Robert W, “Nuclear Fallacies: How We Have Been Misguided Since Hiroshima”, 1985, p. 27/28, Print.) AW

In considering these matters we should take pains, I think, to distinguish between the various doctrines concerning deterrence, which are seriously flawed, and what we might call the existential reality of deterrence. Existential deterrence arises inescapably from the mere existence of nuclear weapons: given their existence, they *could* be used. This is not a theory; it is simply an elementary fact of life. Moreover, whatever may happen to the world's nuclear arsenals in the future, and even if they can be substantially reduced, the scientific knowledge that underlies this weaponry will always be with us, ready to be converted into warheads at any time. In this sense an early interpreter of nuclear age, Hanson Baldwin, the military correspondent of the *New York Times,* was undoubtedly right when he said in 1947 that "**The awful weapons man has created are now forever with us; we shall walk henceforth with their shadow across the sun.**"39Here is the central core of existential deterrence that we have to face up to. **Because of our understanding, because of what we have learned, we are destined to live in the shadow of nuclear weapons, in some way or other, forever**. Knowledge, it has been said, is power; and knowledge now gives us the power to destroy ourselves. Since this knowledge cannot be erased, we shall have to find ways of coming to terms with it, of managing it intelligently, of not letting it get the better of us. This, as Jonathan Schell has observed, is the new state of nature in which we find ourselves.40 We cannot wriggle out of it. But we can at least try to deal realistically with these new facts of life, to understand them as clearly as possible, and to seek ways to reduce the risks that are inherent in our new condition of existence. And in working out these strategies for survival we shall have to strip away from the idea of deterrence all those outdated, foggy, and sometimes incoherent notions that have grown up around it over the years. Much of the theorizing about deterrence is arid, convoluted, ideological, and pointless; and in many cases it is simply a cover for planning the conduct of nuclear war- the sort of war that is likely to lead only to the grave. The fallacies in these doctrines need to be exposed. But even if and when they are, we shall not be let off the nuclear hook. For as long as any nuclear weapons exist, their use is possible; and as long as people exist in a state of knowledge, these weapons can always be made. Managing our knowledge and our capacities, then, in the interest of common survival, will remain permanently

# 2nc- aff gives allusion that were in there

**The affirmative’s creation of threats are the only reason these threats are real.**

**Schwartz and Derber 92**, professor of property law at Yeshiva University's Cardozo School of Law and professor of Sociology at Boston College (William and Charles, “The Nuclear Seduction: Why the Arms Race Doesn’t Matter, and What Does”, p31, Print.) AW

Allan S. Krass and Matthew Goodman write that for nuclear threats to be credible, "the capability and the will must exist for carrying them out. . . . Nuclear threats cannot be a rational tool of policy unless nu­ clear war itself is also rational" or at least appears to be. "This defines the problem that nuclear strategists have been trying to solve since *1945: can nuclear war be made rational?"* Colin Gray, among others, argues that only when "victory is possible" will American nuclear threats appear rational and believable, because unless the U.S. home­ land is defensible, carrying out the threats would amount to suicide. With the right weapons (strategic defenses and missiles aimed at the Soviet state apparatus), he contends, the United States could survive all­ Out nuclear war and hence credibly threaten to use nuclear weapons.

# 2nc- threats arent real

**The affirmative’s threats aren’t real – there are too many steps in launching a nuclear attack that must go perfectly in order to succeed.**

**Schwartz and Derber 92**, professor of property law at Yeshiva University's Cardozo School of Law and professor of Sociology at Boston College (William and Charles, “The Nuclear Seduction: Why the Arms Race Doesn’t Matter, and What Does”, p21/22, Print.) AW

First, neither side can find and destroy enough enemy weapons to even begin to prevent retaliation. Nuclear weapons platforms are di­ verse and highly protected: missile silos are vety "hard," bombers can fly off on warning into the sanctuary of the air, and submarines, while "soft," are so difficult to locate in the open oceans that they are "immune to surprise attack."2 In theory, of course, future advances in technology could dangerously increase the vulnerability of submarines and other strategic weapons. But no such advances are in sight, and should they develop, countermeasures will probably be found to further hide and protect nuclear forces. Even if one side could theoretically destroy all the enemy's strategic weapons, massive uncertainty-the key feature of deterrence-would still accompany any nuclear first strike. Except for the dropping of two atomic bombs on nearly defenseless Japanese cities over forty years ago, there is no operational experience with nuclear attack. Yet a successful first strike depends on the correctness of dozens of assumptions, many of which are, as MIT physicist Kosta Tsipis describes, "uncertain," "questionable," and "untestable." Everything must go according to plan the very first time, with nearly 100 percent effectiveness. Tsipis asks, "If we cannot predict the performance of one missile against one silo with the kind of precision the formula for calculation implies, what if anything can we say ahead of time about the outcome of an attack against, say, 1,000 silos with warneads carried by several hundred missiles? ' ' 1 Vital but untested human and political calculations must also play out as expected. The missile operators of the attacking nation must all faithfully execute the launch orders, knowing what the consequences will be for millions of people, and they must do so with perfect timing. And the enemy, after detecting the strike, must *not* launch its weapons on warning, which would doom even a technically perfect attack.

**The affirmative’s nuclear threats aren’t real; they’re just means to a political end.**

**Schwartz and Derber 92**, professor of property law at Yeshiva University's Cardozo School of Law and professor of Sociology at Boston College (William and Charles, “The Nuclear Seduction: Why the Arms Race Doesn’t Matter, and What Does”, p5, Print.) AW

"A page of history," as a lawyer once wrote, "is worth a volume of logic.'" To find the real sources of nuclear danger, we must consult the relevant historical record-not the chronology of the arms race that often passes for the history of the nuclear age, but the actual occasions on which the nuclear sword threatened to drop on humanity. As the re­ view of those occasions in Pan II reveals, since 1950 the arms race has rarely if ever endangered the world. But the same is not true of the superpowers' violent efforts to bring much of the planet under their political and economic control. Aggression, intervention, and threats by both the United States and the Soviet Union have regularly produced crises and confrontations that, as leaders on both sides have openly admitted, could have spun out of control and even ignited a final holocaust. Danger loomed in Europe until the early 1960s and to an extent still does. But the main tinderboxes for nuclear war have always been in what is called the Third World-the real prize of the Cold War and the site of almost all actual superpower collisions. Chapter 6 reviews those shocking events in the Third World. Chapter 7 explains why local Third World conflicts with limited stakes have so often blown up into global crises and how such crises could degenerate into perilous confrontation and even nuclear war. Chapter 8 examines the worst nuclear crisis yet, the 1962 Cuban missile crisis, in the light of the argument of this book. "Those who do not remember the past," wrote George Santayana, "are condemned to relive it.'" We do not remember, and we have not learned. The nuclear dangers lurking in the Third World today, as we will see, seem no less ominous than in the past.

# 2nc- a2: truth claims

**The affirmative’s truth claims aren’t actually true – they are surrounded in guesswork and political backing.**

**Schwartz and Derber 92**, professor of property law at Yeshiva University's Cardozo School of Law and professor of Sociology at Boston College (William and Charles, “The Nuclear Seduction: Why the Arms Race Doesn’t Matter, and What Does”, p17/18, Print.) AW

Leaders, then, cannot know just what will happen if nuclear war breaks out, regardless of the state of the arms race. They know only that they will probably not be in control and that mutual annihilation may well occur. That risk, that uncertainty, is what frightens and deters them. It may or may not be enough to prevent a holocaust. But pending the abolition of nuclear weapons, an effective defense against them, or a way to curb the risk of escalation, further arming or disarming cannot affect the terrible uncertainty that produces the balance of terror. That terror, as Brodie noted, is not at all delicate; it is existential, inherent in the existence of the "absolute weapon."l0 The nuclear warhead is the ultimate blunt instrument of human violence whose effects cannot be calculated in advance and whose use always risks the destruction of far more than is originally intended. After four decades of effort and hundreds of billions of dollars of investment, no one has found a way to sharpen the weapon to eliminate or even greatly reduce this risk. That much is well known. In a 1984 survey 90 percent of Americans agreed that "we and the Soviets now have enough nuclear weapons to blow up each other several times over"; 89 percent said that "there can be no winner in an all-out nuclear war; both the U.S. and the Soviet Union would be completely destroyed";.71 percent believed that "there is no defense in a nuclear war"; and 83 percent thought that "a limited nuclear war is nonsense."l1 McGeorge Bundy coined the term "existential deterrence" to de­ scribe the implications of these basic nuclear realities. He observes that the "terrible and unavoidable uncertainties in any recourse to nuclear war" invalidate all strategies based on specific weapons and scenarios." All that matters is the possibility of uncontrolled escalation once the nuclear shooting begins. No one knows the likelihood of escalation or how to prevent it. So real political leaders, as opposed to abstract models of nuclear strategists, concern themselves only with the gross fact that catastrophic escalation could occur-that is all that they really know.

**The nuclear bomb is not needed; the affirmative only recreates a cycle in which peace is repressed and looked upon as unpatriotic and cowardly, leading to a world of nuclear holocaust.**

**Malcolmson 85,** Professor at Queen’s University at Kingston (Robert W, “Nuclear Fallacies: How We Have Been Misguided Since Hiroshima”, 1985, p. 103/104, Print.)AW

Nuclear weapons, then, are means without any appropriate ends; and the use of these weapons has no credibility as an instrument of policy. It is especially vital that these propositions come to be accepted by growing numbers of the military: men and women who are able to see that opposition to nuclear weapons is entirely compatible with patriotism, loyalty, and professional honor. The physicist Freeman Dyson has pointed to the importance of such a to-be-hoped-for military change of heart: We need above all to have sound and realistic military doctrines ~ doctrines that make clear that the actual use of nuclear weapons cannot either defend our country or defend our allies, that the actual use of nuclear weapons in a world of great powers armed with thousands of warheads cannot serve any sane military purpose whatsoever. If our military doctrines and plans once recognize these facts, then our military leaders and those of our allies and adversaries fully be able to agree upon practical measures to make the world safer for all of us. If our soldiers once understand that they cannot defend us with nuclear weapons, then they may contribute their great moral and political influence to helping us create a world in which non-nuclear defense is possible. If the soldiers can once be turned against nuclear weapons, then ordinary civilians and politicians will be able to campaign for nuclear disarmament without being considered cowardly or unpatriotic. The road of discipline and patriotic self-sacrifice need no longer be the road to nuclear holocaust. 70 There can be little doubt, I think, that an anti-nuclear alliance that brings together both military and civilian constituencies is likely to be much more successful than a civilian peace movement that confronts an overwhelmingly hostile military establishment, an establishment which, despite objections that it has been unable to answer, is still deeply attached to its plans for the conduct of nuclear warfare.

# 2nc- means to an end

**The threats the affirmative constructs are just means to an end – the threats aren’t actually there, and thus the bomb isn’t really needed; the threats they create a just a means to justify political goals and opportunities.**

**Malcolmson 85,** Professor at Queen’s University at Kingston (Robert W, “Nuclear Fallacies: How We Have Been Misguided Since Hiroshima”, 1985, p. 66/67, Print.) AW

This technological armaments race has produced a large constituency inherently in favour of its continuation. Hugh E. DeWitt, a physicist at the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory in California, where many U.S. nuclear weapons are designed, has concluded that the scientists in the weapons laboratories "are a major force in driving and perpetuating the nuclear arms race." Many of these scientists, he reports, strongly believe "that high technology can provide safety and national security in a dangerous world" and that "technological solutions are paramount over political solutions. Such special interests exert no mean influence in Washington. As Ted Greenwood has written of the American defence establishment (and much the same could be said of its Soviet counterpart): "Large organizations have been created that owe their continued existence solely to their ability to invent or design new weapons and sell them to political decision­ makers. These organizations include not only the development commands of the services but also some of the largest of the nation's corporations who together employ millions of workers and represent a powerful political force.,,74 These organizations (for instance, the giant aerospace corporations, hundreds of R&D centres) are deeply committed to maintaining their vitality, to seeking new challenges, to remaining vigorous and viable. In order to do so they have to devise promising new technical opportunities and get support for new projects. These institutional pressures that help to drive the arms race are strong and tenacious. "We are dealing here," asserts Wolfgang Panofsky, "with the institutional inertia or other manifestations of historical persistence that are inherent in any highly organized human activity. Institutions always find it difficult to produce only a fixed and limited amount of any one commodity; the producer always finds reasons why more of what he can produce is needed.,,75 These institutional appetites for more and ever more are determined largely by domestic and bureaucratic politics, not by the current state of relations between nations. And the practical, mundane consequence of these pressures is that, as Richard Barnet has remarked, "Every weapons system comes off the drawing board with a built-in political coalition behind it. 76 This alliance between science and the military has resulted in an arms race that, in the eyes of some critical commentators, has a kind of mad momentum of its own. They see it as a frenetic racing without end, a process with no real political purpose. Herbert York, an experienced observer of (and past participant in) the nuclear arms competition, has concluded that "It is not simply that the basic theory underlying the arms race is wrong. rather it is that there is no underlying theory at all."77 Strategy itself has in many respects become the servant of the weapons makers. Politics is often taking a back seat to technological imperatives. This peculiar relationship between weaponry and politics in the nuclear age was remarked on some years ago by Hans Morgenthau. "There is in these technological developments," he thought, "a kind of inner logic - which is technologically rational but politically and militarily irrational - a technological dynamism which leads to ever more novelties, ever more improvements regardless of the military need and of the political consequences. In other words, what seems to be technologically possible is put into practice for no better reason but because it can be done. 78 Often new weapons are invented. and only then are missions found for them. New weaponry, it would seem, is not only determining much of the political agenda. it is actually, in many cases, outrunning politics in short, we inhabit a world in which the military -technological tail is commonly wagging the political dog. Or, to change the metaphor, the servant threatens to dislodge the master.

\*\*\*A2: Realism

# 2nc- a2: realism innevitable

Purported objectivity and inevitability of realism sanctions mass violence- human history disproves this kind of determinism. Viability and inevitability of realism are linguistic constructs

Robert Alexander Kraig is Wisconsin state political director for Service Employees International Union (SEIU). He is also an instructor in the Communication Department at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee. Rhetoric & Public Affairs 5.1 (2002) 1-30

Given the claimed inevitability of realism's description of international politics, one might think that nations need not look to expert guidance because power interests will inevitably determine governmental policy. But the realists, while embracing determinism, simultaneously argue that human nature is repeatedly violated. One traditional claim has been that America, because of its unique history, has been ever in danger of ignoring the dictates of the foreign policy scene. This argument is offered by Henry Kissinger in his avowedly Morgenthauian work Nuclear Weapons and Foreign Policy. 21 Realists also argue that there are idealists in all human societies who refuse to see the reality of power. As Richard W. Cottam, a trenchant critic of orthodox realism, explained the argument: "Every era has its incorrigible idealists who persist in seeing evil man as good. When they somehow gain power and seek to put their ideas into effect, Machiavellians who understand man's true nature appear and are more than willing and more than capable of exploiting this eternal naivete." 22 Cottam was referring to one of the central ideological constructs of international relations theory—the realist/idealist dichotomy. First explicated in detail by Morgenthau in his Scientific Man vs. Power Politics, 23 this dichotomy is used to discredit leaders who dare to consider transcending or transforming established patterns of global competition. This construct is enriched by the narratives of failed idealists—most prominently Tsar Alexander the First, Woodrow Wilson, Neville Chamberlain, and Jimmy Carter—men who, despite and in fact because of their good intentions, caused untold human suffering. After World War II, realists built their conception of leadership on a negative caricature of Woodrow Wilson. 24 As George Kennan, one of the primary architects of Cold War policy, warned in 1945: "If we insist at this moment in our history in wandering about with our heads in the clouds of Wilsonean idealism . . . we run the risk of losing even that bare minimum of security which would be assured to us by the maintenance of humane, stable, and cooperative forms of society on the immediate European shores of the Atlantic." 25 Wilson's supposed idealism was said by the emerging realist scholars to have led to the unstable international political structure that caused World War II [End Page 6] and now threatened the postwar balance of forces. Despite convincing refutations by the leading historians of Wilson's presidency, most recently John Milton Cooper Jr. in his definitive study of the League of Nations controversy, realists continue to caricature Wilson as a fuzzy-headed idealist. 26 Idealists, in realist writings, all share a fatal flaw: an inability to comprehend the realities of power. They live in a world of unreality, responding to nonexistent scenes. As Riker put it, "Unquestionably, there are guilt-ridden and shame-conscious men who do not desire to win, who in fact desire to lose. These are irrational ones in politics." 27 It is here that the realist expert comes in. It is assumed that strategic doctrine can be rationally and objectively established. According to Kissinger, a theorist who later became a leading practitioner, "it is the task of strategic doctrine to translate power into policy." The science of international relations claims the capacity to chart the foreign policy scene and then establish the ends and means of national policy. This objective order can only be revealed by rational and dispassionate investigators who are well-schooled in the constraints and possibilities of power politics. Realism's scenic character makes it a radically empirical science. As Morgenthau put it, the political realist "believes in the possibility of distinguishing in politics between truth and opinion—between what is true objectively and rationally supported by evidence and illuminated by reason, and what is only subjective judgement." Avowedly modernist in orientation, realism claims to be rooted not in a theory of how international relations ought to work, but in a privileged reading of a necessary and predetermined foreign policy environment. 28 In its orthodox form political realism assumes that international politics are and must be dominated by the will to power. Moral aspirations in the international arena are merely protective coloration and propaganda or the illusions that move hopeless idealists. What is most revealing about this assessment of human nature is not its negativity but its fatalism. There is little if any place for human moral evolution or perfectibility. Like environmental determinism—most notably the social darwinism of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries—political realism presumes that human social nature, even if ethically deplorable, cannot be significantly improved upon. From the stationary perspective of social scientific realism in its pure form, the fatal environment of human social interaction can be navigated but not conquered. Description, in other words, is fate. All who dare to challenge the order—Carter's transgression—will do much more damage than good. The idealist makes a bad situation much worse by imagining a better world in the face of immutable realities. As one popular saying among foreign policy practitioners goes: "Without vision, men die. With it, more men die." 70 (continued) The implications of this social philosophy are stark. Tremendous human suffering can be rationalized away as the inevitable product of the impersonal international system of power relations. World leaders are actively encouraged by the realists to put aside moral pangs of doubt and play the game of international politics according to the established rules of political engagement. This deliberate limitation of interest excuses leaders from making hard moral choices. While a moralist Protestant like Jimmy Carter sees history as a progressive moral struggle to realize abstract ideals in the world, the realist believes that it is dangerous to struggle against the inexorable. The moral ambiguities of political and social ethics that have dogged philosophy and statesmanship time out of mind are simply written out of the equation. Since ideals cannot be valid in a social scientific sense, they cannot be objectively true. The greatest barrier to engaging the realists in serious dialogue about their premises is that they deny that these questions can be seriously debated. First, realists teach a moral philosophy that denies itself. There is exceedingly narrow ground, particularly in the technical vocabulary of the social sciences, for discussing the moral potential of humanity or the limitations of human action. Yet, as we have seen in the tragedy of Jimmy Carter, a philosophical perspective on these very questions is imparted through the back door. It is very hard to argue with prescription under the guise of description. The purveyors of this philosophical outlook will not admit this to themselves, let alone to potential interlocutors. [End Page 21] Second, and most importantly, alternative perspectives are not admitted as possibilities—realism is a perspective that as a matter of first principles denies all others. There is, as we have seen in the Carter narrative, alleged to be an immutable reality that we must accept to avoid disastrous consequences. Those who do not see this underlying order of things are idealists or amateurs. Such people have no standing in debate because they do not see the intractable scene that dominates human action. Dialogue is permissible within the parameters of the presumed order, but those who question the existence or universality of this controlling scene are beyond debate. Third, the environmental determinism of political realism, even though it is grounded in human social nature, is antihumanist. Much of the democratic thought of the last 200 years is grounded on the idea that humanity is in some sense socially self-determining. Society as social contract is a joint project which, over time, is subject to dialectical improvement. Foreign policy realism, as we have seen, presupposes that there is an order to human relations that is beyond the power of humans to mediate. 71 When you add to this the moral imperative to be faithful to the order (the moral of the Carter narrative), then democratic forms lose a great deal of their value. Indeed, there has been a great deal of hand wringing in international relations literature about how the masses are inexorably drawn to idealists like Carter and Wilson. Morgenthau states this much more frankly than most of his intellectual descendants: [the] thinking required for the successful conduct of foreign policy can be diametrically opposed to the rhetoric and action by which the masses and their representatives are likely to be moved. . . . The statesman must think in terms of the national interest, conceived as power among other powers. The popular mind, unaware of the fine distinctions of the statesman's thinking, reasons more often than not in the simple moralistic and legalistic terms of absolute good and absolute evil. 72 Some realists, based on this empirical observation, openly propose that a realist foreign policy be cloaked in a moral facade so that it will be publicly palatable. Kissinger's mistake, they say, was that he was too honest. Morgenthau concludes that "the simple philosophy and techniques of the moral crusade are useful and even indispensable for the domestic task of marshaling public opinion behind a given policy; they are but blunt weapons in the struggle of nations for dominance over the minds of men." If one believes that social scientists have unique access to an inexorable social reality which is beyond the control of humanity—and which it is social suicide to ignore—it is easy to see how democratic notions of consent and self-determination can give way to the reign of manipulative propaganda. 73 There is another lesson that can be drawn from the savaging of Carter in international relations scholarship for those who seek to broaden the terms of American foreign policy thought and practice. Those who would challenge the realist orthodoxy [End Page 22] face a powerful rhetorical arsenal that will be used to deflect any serious dialogue on the fundamental ethical and strategic assumptions of realism. Careful and balanced academic critiques, although indispensable, are unlikely to be a match for such formidable symbolic ammunition. Post-realism, if it is to make any advance against the realist battlements, must marshal equally powerful symbolic resources. What is needed, in addition to academic critiques aimed at other scholars, is a full-blooded antirealist rhetoric.

**Proclaimed inevitability shuts down self reflection and excludes alternative insights- theory is not natural or inevitable, it is always contingently produces**

**Zalewski and Enloe, 95-** \*Lecturer in International Politics at the University of Wales \*\*Professor of Government at Clark University (Marysia and Cynthia, 1995, “International Relations Theory Today,” pg. 299)

The positivist conception of the world and reality typifies much of mainstream international relations theory in the 1990s despite the emergence of the 'third debate' or the so-called post-positivist revolution. This understanding of the world allows the possibility of thinking that defining specific referents or identities as the central issues in international relations theory is not a particularly political or epistemologically significant act; it is merely one of choice. In other words, the choice of referent is seen as a neutral activity by positivists. Waltz can choose to study states, wars and the activity of leaders, others can look at the situation of women or whatever group they wish. Each then collects data and facts about the chosen group and ultimately develops theories about them. Jim George calls this the 'spectator theory of knowledge, in which knowledge of the real world is gleaned via a realm of external facts' (1993, p. 204). Mark Neufeld similarly talks about 'truth as correspondence' (1993, p. 55). This involves believing that there is a distinct separation between 'theory' and the 'real' world, 'the former, the realm of "internally" generated "invention" - the latter, the "external" repository of laws which theories (retrospectively) explain, order and systematise . . . theory . . . always remains distinct from that world' (George, 1993, p. 209). The key point to be taken from this is that theory is represented as a 'cognitive reaction to reality rather than integral to its construction. Theory, in this context, takes place after the fact' (p. 213).But theory does *not* take place after the fact. Theories, instead, play a large part in constructing and defining what the facts are. This is a central claim made by those scholars working on postpositivist perspectives in international relations theory but it is not a new claim. Albert Einstein once pointed out that 'on principle it is quite wrong to try founding a theory on observable magnitudes alone. In reality, the very opposite happens' (quoted in MacKinnon, 1989, p. 106). However, it is a claim resisted strongly by mainstream international relations theory, which remains, despite recent claims to the contrary, entrenched in a realist-positivist paradigm (Runyan and Peterson, 1991; Peterson, 1992b; George, 1993). When vilified for serving the interests of the powerful and preserving the status quo, classical and neo-realists simply reply that they are 'telling things the way they are' (Runyan and Peterson, 1991, p. 70). It may be becoming somewhat of post-positivist cliche to claim that we are living in a complex world and thus simplistic theories will be of little explanatory or descriptive use. But if we are trying to understand more about the world and in particular those events which cause pain and destruction, why would anyone not want to include insights which might help us do that? If realist scholars want genuinely to investigate the causes of war in a sophisticated and systematic manner, why not investigate the construction and internalization of certain images of masculinity in military ideology? If they want to argue that students be better equipped, intellectually and conceptually, to understand international politics, why not extend their analyses to include concepts of identity? There may, of course, be ideological resistance to thinking about these issues. The assumption is made that sexual identity or gender identity can have nothing to do with the causation and enactment of war. But although these are just assumptions they do a great deal of work in defining what is and is not relevant to consider. When this ideological commitment is linked with a limited epistemological understanding of the construction of reality, it becomes easy for scholars within international relations to think that such things as the politics of identity can have no real importance to our understanding of the international system. Additionally, it implies a lot more work in the sense that more books have to be read (ones that many realist scholars might think irrelevant), new methodological tools have to be learned and old positions have to be rethought. iCKal Holsti (1993) is one who laments the increasing theoretical expansion of the discipline of international relations. This expansion, he argues, is not necessarily evidence of progress. Unless we can agree on, at least, the purposes of the theoretical enterprise and on what some of the fundamental problems in the real worldare, the 'menu [of international relations theory] threatens to become tasteless for all but the few that inhabit the rarefied sanctuaries of the Universities' (p. 408). Why should this be the case? If, as Holsti suggests, our 'consumers' are students and policy-makers and what they want most of all is to know 'what is going on in the real world' (p. 407), it seems to make eminent sense to find out more about how that 'real world' works by asking more, deeper and searching questions. What apparently seems to be 'staring us in the face' (p. 407) in the world may well be an example of what psychologists call a perceptual illusion. In these illusions what stares one person in the face cannot be seen at all by another person. The same can be true when we move from a psychologist's drawing to the 'reality' of politics on a global scale. The simple questions 'Who am I?' and 'Who defines who I am?' might be as revolutionary for the discipline of international relations as that of the little boy who questioned not the magnifi- \_ cence of the Emperor's clothes, but whether he had any at a l l ! ^ 3 *°* \*\* In a global age, one characterized by a global menu, global music and global time, the resurgence of claims to identity might be seen as a response to a fear of disappearing into bland sameness. We can drink Coke, eat sushi and watch *Neighbours* and be in practically any country in the world. The fight for identity may, at one level, be an example of resistance to such an image of global uni-identity. Alternatively, the struggle for identity may be a reaffirmation of belonging, in a postmodern, post-local age. This desire may be fuelled by nostalgia, a nostalgia for 'tradition', which might be construed as a nostalgia for the nation-state, the icon of modernity. Identities in this view may be increasingly fluid and multiply at ever more rapid rates as we approach the twentyfirst century. But those properties do not make them analytically irrelevant to the international relations analyst. Who we are, how we are, who defines us, how international processes and events are moulded and manipulated by identities: these are all questions relevant to international politics. Anyone trying to make sense of international political trends in the near future who treats these maddeningly complex and infuriatingly dynamic identities as a mere mosquito to be swatted away risks being surprised.

**Realism isn't inevitable, it just demands "kill or be killed."**

**Chernus, 6** - Professor of Religious Studies University of Colorado at Boulder – (Ira, 2006, Monsters to Destroy: The Neoconservative War on Terror and Sin, pg 40-41)

Sometimes, the internationalists seemed to spin a story in which foreign policy was only a matter of national self-interest, as if moral issues didn't matter at all. "Nations live in a state of nature," Krauthammer proclaimed. "There is no higher authority to protect them. If they do not protect themselves, they die." A self-respecting U.S. would practice a robust and difficult interventionism" when its own interests were threatened. It would exercise overwhelming strength without worrying about the niceties of morality. "The essence of foreign policy is deciding which son of a bitch to support and which to oppose."4 This merely summarized, in unusually pungent terms, a basic theme of neoconservative story since the 1960s. Neocons have always seen nation states as the preeminent example of groups struggling for power, unrestrained by morality Among nations, they assume, it's pretty much kill or be killed; the only law that counts is the law of self-preservation; only the strong, not the spineless, survive. When neoconservatives started their first journal devoted to foreign affairs, they called it*The National Interest.* Its first editorial left no doubt about its premise: "The primary and overriding purpose of American foreign policy must be to defend and advance the national interest of the United States."5 Political scientists call this "realism." Though many take it as literal fact, "realism" is itself a story, as Frank Beer and Robert Hariman explain. According to that story, nation states "necessarily inhabit a condition of anarchy.... Thus, national foreign policy decision makers use whatever means are most appropriate, including direct violence, to achieve the ends of national interest defined in terms ofpower.... Itis a story ofthe fatal limitations of human nature." The pessimistic view of human nature underlying "realism" owes much to the thinking of Reinhold Niebuhr. Ehrman notes his continuing influence on the neoconservatives: "Even in the 1990s, they looked to him as their most reliable guide." Krautharnmer acknowledged that the U.S. empire "does encourage centralized authority, a militaryindustrial complex, the transfer of authority to the executive branch, and the imposition of secrecy on a wide range of government activities," all of which add up to "a diminution of democracy." But he found that a price worth paying to maintain global hegemony. As Niebuhr taught, moral values must give way when national interests demand it.

# 2nc- a2: Realism good

**Even if the AFF wins that some threats are real, it is impossible to deal without them without giving into despair to further our understanding of the Bomb. This turns all of their realism claims and proves that nuclear worship is incompatible with Realism**

**chernus** **91**, professor of religious studies at uc boulder, 19
ira, nuclear madness: on religion and psychology in the nuclear age, p22-23

In relations between superpowers, not all fears are ungrounded. It is plausible to suspect that most intentions are empirically reciprocated. Moreover, as each side acts on its fantasies of imperial omnipotence its behavior becomes increasingly manipulative (which seems perfectly justified since other nations are imagined to be merely inert things); naturally the objects of this manipulation oppose it and act to defend themselves. But it is pointless to argue about whether and when our political fears are justified. Superpowers, like schizoids, assume that direct contact with outside reality is dangerous; they avoid the danger by avoiding genuine relationships with others and relating only to their fantasy images of others. The content of those fantasies matters less than the mere fact of substituting fantasy for reality. **Our nuclear fantasies,** like our nuclear arsenals, **are intended to create a wall of deterrence that wards off all reality and condemns us to pure fantasy, leaving no way to test the actuality behind our fears**. Every fear, whether totally or only partially rooted in fantasy, increases our sense of unreality. Every fear reinforces the schizoid defenses that shut out reality and increase our insecurity. This ever-deepening vicious spiral is the basic pattern of schizoid life, a life in which every effort toward increased security makes one less secure. If the nuclear superpowers are living the same kind of life in their Cold War rivalry, Laing's analysis would go far toward resolving an enduring contradiction between nuclear means and ends: the more we depend on nuclear arsenals to protect national security, the less secure we actually feel, because (as most Americans readily admit) the weapons that we depend on to save us can only be used to destroy us. As Laing's analysis proceeds to further dimensions of the schizoid strategy, it leads deeper into this web of contradiction.

**Realism leads to violence and extinction- As long as we are spiritually connected with the bomb, we accept global destruction**

**Chernus, 86** (Ira Chernus. professor of religious studies university of Colorado at boulder.

University of South Caroline 1986 “Dr. Strangegod.” Page 39//ts)

Because it is clear that the Bomb is a key element in our nomos, it becomes equally clear that to renounce dualism and the Bomb voluntarily we must also renounce our very sense of the meaningful order of reality, a renunciation that no one is likely to make voluntarily. In this light, the ineffectiveness of the nuclear-disarmament movement becomes more understandable. Pointing out inner contradictions in the nomos, pointing out that it might lead to its own destruction and the destruction of those human beings who live within it is not likely to be a very persuasive argument. Death itself may be acceptable- even welcomed- if it is made comprehensible and meaningful within the socially sanctioned nomos**. As long as the religious person can be in touch with sacred power, and as long as that power serves to give sense and meaning to reality, neither logical contradiction nor suffering nor threat of death are able to undermine the nomos.** Conversely, even the lure of logical consistency and perfect safety cannot compensate for the loss of the cherished worldview and meaning-structure.

**The continuity of realism is the end of the United States in an Anti-American world.**

**Chernus, 6** - Professor of Religious Studies University of Colorado at Boulder – (Ira, 2006, Monsters to Destroy: The Neoconservative War on Terror and Sin, pg 42-43)

The American way of life "is not likely to survive for long in a world that is overwhelmingly hostile to American values"; that's a fundamental neoconservative belief Irving Kristol pointed out. In an article titled "We Can't Resign as Policeman of the World/' he argued that unless the U.S. does "policeman's work" around the world there will be "an alarming upsurge in national delinquency and international disorder everywhere. Nor shall we remain unaffected in our chrome-plated American fortress."9 But that is not a selfish matter, either; imperial powers can help the world only if they maintain social balance at home. And only the strong can provide the world with a stable political and social order. The battles against domestic and foreign chaos are two sides of the same coin. When the internationalists pushed the neocon movement to focus on foreign policy issues, while others wanted to switch the emphasis back to domestic issues, they were debating only about means. All the neocon factions shared the common goal of turning back the radical tide of '60s liberalism. Wattenberg stressed that U.S. imperialism is about spreading cultural as well as political domination. Muravchik complained that Bill Clinton's "rampant imposition of ethnic and gender preferences" even to "homosexual groups" was blatantly immoral-and probably spurred by Clinton's radical feminist wife. Neocon James Neuchterlein put the case against feminism in telling terms when he attacked it as "an ethic of noncoercion, a preference for emotion over rational analysis and for noncompetitive modes of social interaction, a focus on being rather than doing and on interpersonal relations as the primary preoccupation of the good life." Any movement that promoted noncoercive, noncompetitive interpersonal relations was anathema to the neocons, who saw strong self-assertive action as the foundation of the good life. Krauthammer, the apostle of the unipolar world, worried aloud that American mass culture, dominated by "skepticism and pleasure," was an "engine of social breakdown." This breakdown was directly related to the problem of unipolarity, he argued. The U.S., like any empire, needed economic resources to fund its international ventures. But the American public was sapping the nation's resources by its deteriorating work habits, its rising demand for welfare state entitlements, and its penchant for spending (especially on "ecological luxuries) rather than saving prudently for the future. The best antidote to all this, in his view, would be a "self-abnegating religious revival," although he regretfully admitted that it was unlikely to happen. Somehow, though, America needed to find the will to exercise its strength, to become "confident enough to define international morality in its own, American terms" all over the world.

**Realism is just idealism in international action where the only left antidote for conflict is mobilization.**

**Chernus, 6** - Professor of Religious Studies University of Colorado at Boulder – (Ira, 2006, Monsters to Destroy: The Neoconservative War on Terror and Sin, pg 52)

Both "realism" and idealism serve their more basic ideals, the same ideals that the great philosopher William James described as "the higher aspects of militaristic sentiment."36 In his classic essay "The Moral Equivalent of War," James described "a type of military character which everyone feels that the race should never cease to breed, for everyone is sensitive to its superiority." Today everyone may no longer see the militaristic character as superior. But neoconservatives do. They share James's admiration for the ideals of the martial life: "fidelity, cohesiveness, tenacity, heroism, conscience, education, inventiveness, economy, wealth, physical health and vigor ... service and devotion, physical fitness, unstinted exertion, and universal responsibility." Any neocon would agree with James that "life is hard.... The planetary conditions once for all are such, and we can stand it." Any neocon could write, as James did, that "intrepidity, surrender of private interest, obedience to command, must still remain the rock upon which states are built-unless, indeed, we wish for dangerous reactions against commonwealths, fit only for contempt, and liable to invite attack whenever a centre of crystallization for military-minded enterprise gets formed anywhere in their neighborhood."37 Neocons see war and preparation for war as the antidote America needs to the self-indulgent weakness and anarchy bred by '60s liberalism. They share William James's" contempt of softness" and disdain for "a simple pleasure-economy" that produces only "weaklings and mollycoddles ... mawkish and dish watery ... soft and squeamish." They agree that war is "the supreme theatre of human strenuousness ... [the] best protection against its weaker and more cowardly self."38 James was describing a militaristic idealism that flourished briefly in the United States in the 1980s and early 1900s. After that era, it lay feeble and sometimes moribund until the neoconservatives revived it. They assume that preparing for and fighting military war is the only way to sustain the nation’s dedication to traditional moral ideals. The idealistic language of freedom and democracy gives them a plausible, even inspiring, banner under which they can march the nation out to war and teach it the virtues of the strenuous life. All this is a far cry from traditional liberal language. Liberals, tracing their heritage back to the Progressivism of Woodrow Wilson, typically speak of ideals like freedom and democracy optimistically. When they talk about making the world safe for democracy, they harbor a real hope for world full of cooperation and harmony. Neocons often mouth optimistic phrases, too. But they cannot escape the frightening shadow that hangs over every word they say. They cannot offer a vision of hope, because both their “realism” and their idealism are trapped in the language of hardship, conflict, threat, crisis, and insecurity.

\*\*\*Ontology

# nuclear policy

**Nuclear policy is a direct response to ontological insecurity—nuclear images promote oppression and instability of the Self.**

**Chernus, 91**.Ira (PROFESSOR OF RELIGIOUS STUDIES UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO AT BOULDER), *Nuclear Madness: Religion and the Psychology of the Nuclear Age* p 16-17//jh

"A man may have a sense of his presence in the world as a real, alive, whole, and, in a temporal sense, a continuous person," the young Laing writes. "Such a basically ontologically secure person will [have] a sense of his integral selfhood and personal identity, of the permanency of things, of the reliability of natural processes." 8 But a man or woman need not have such a sense. There are some people who feel "more unreal than real; in a literal sense, more dead than alive."9 While they may fear physical death, that fear reflects a more fundamental conviction of a psychic death that is already happening to them. For such people, both self and world come to seem unreliable, discontinuous, and disintegrating. Every moment seems to threaten a total loss of reality that would turn the self into nothing-at-all. Everything and everyone is a potential thief, ready to rob one's last shred of personal reality. How do these people imagine that such a dreadful loss of reality might occur? As Laing explored the inner fantasies of his psychiatric patients, he found three recurring themes that ring eerily true in the shadow of the Bomb.10 The one that he calls "engulfment" includes fears of being swallowed up, smothered, stifled, drowned, or buried. "The image of fire recurs repeatedly. Some psychotics say in the acute phase that they are on fire, that their bodies are being burned up." The second theme, "implosion," is a fear of "the world as liable at any moment to crash in and obliterate all identity as a gas will rush in and obliterate a vacuum." "Petrification,'' the third theme, denotes dread of "the possibility of turning, or being turned, from a live person into a dead thing, into a stone, into a robot, an automaton," as well as the emotional and physical effects of this dread: inner feelings of "emptiness, deadness, coldness, dryness, impotence, desolation."11 These vivid images form the world of the ontologically insecure self, a world that is itself insecure, oppressive, and imprisoning. These images also form the world of the nuclear superpowers, for all have their counterparts in familiar nuclear images: the obliterating crash of a nuclear blast, engulfment in the mushroom cloud, the implosion of rushing winds and firestorms, the frozen world of nuclear winter, the empty desolation of Hiroshima in 1945, the trancelike numbing of stupefied survivors, the cold aridity of a dead planet. So they suggest that nuclear imagery and nuclear policy may be understood as responses to ontological insecurity. The analogy between the insecure self and the superpower may therefore hold an important key to understanding the psychodynamics of Cold War rivalry and the nuclear arms race.

# root cause of insecurity

**Addressing the Bomb is key—solves our ontological insecurity.**

**Chernus, 91.** Ira (PROFESSOR OF RELIGIOUS STUDIES UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO AT BOULDER), *Nuclear Madness: Religion and the Psychology of the Nuclear Age* 46//jh

The answers to these questions depend on answering a more basic question: If the schizoid strategy and the social false self system are motivated by ontological insecurity, what is the source of this insecurity? Why should our society be so riddled with a fear of losing its reality that it goes to such extreme lengths in trying to preserve its reality? Is not our reality the one fact that is self-evident, needing no special measures to preserve it? Some might suggest that the Bomb itself is responsible for our ontological insecurity. No doubt the nuclear threat has exacerbated our insecurity and trapped us more firmly in the schizoid strategy. But if the schizoid strategy explains how we came to be under the nuclear threat, then the insecurity that generated the strategy that generated the threat must have existed before nuclear weapons existed. So we are still in need of a theory to explain our society's pervasive ontological insecurity. One resource for solving this problem is a resource upon which both Laing and Lifton have already drawn: the thought of Paul Tillich.

\*\*\*FRAMEWORK

# 2nc FW

**Our psychoanalysis is a metaphor which is the best way to understand the human condition; it’s the only way to achieve meaning. must come before policy making.**
**chernus** **91**, professor of religious studies at uc boulder, 19
ira, nuclear madness: on religion and psychology in the nuclear age, p5
**It is** certainly a **risky** enterprise **to make sweeping generalizations about an entire nation** , its average person, and its cultural milieu. Perhaps the **only think riskier is to refrain from such generalizations** . The kinds of broad-brush interpretations I present here cannot be verified or falsified by empirical data. They are hypothetical constructs and metaphorical models. **Societies have always understood themselves most meaningfully through such constructs and models, not through empirically verifiable research . Exploring the metaphor of madness reminds us that only metaphors can express the full truths of the human condition . It also reminds us that metaphors are the most critical agents in changing our historical conditions** . So I offer not scientific fact, but rather a personal exploration, in which I hope readers can find a mirror of their own experience. If my interpretation gives the appearance of all-embracing certainty, I am the first to acknowledge that this is merely an appearance. The more I study nuclear weapons and public attitudes toward them, the more I am baffled by the irreducible mystery at the core of the thing.

**Turn- debating about nuclear policy leads us to contribute to religious violence because it allows us to direct the states nuclear warriors.**
**Chernus** **91**, Professor of Religious Studies at UC Boulder, 19
Ira, Nuclear Madness: on Religion and Psychology in the Nuclear Age p242-243
**As long as nuclear weapons** are produced and deployed (and **negotiated and debated ) the average citizen can participate in the mythic drama of creative killing committed by the paradigmatic warriors, scientists, and sovereigns** of World War II. **All these roles offer a mode of religious transformation. They all posses a magical power that can dissolve our world and create a more perfect world, because they have been initiated into a secret wisdom. But their creative acts all repeat the tragic message of this wisdom: transformation always demands a prior death** for which the initiate must assume responsibility. **As we repeat the paradigmatic acts narrated in this myth, acting them out on all the great and small stages of nuclear politics, we are lifted** out of our circumscribed profane lives **into the timeless era of beginnings, whose eternally valid events are changed with cosmic saving power** . Although the myth is actually acted out only by a chosen few who work in and for the secret circles of government, the government serves here as a representative agency it was designed to be. **Western democracy has afforded the average person a substantial** sense of (or **illusion of) participation in the heroic exploits of the political elite** for two centuries or more. But only in the nuclear age has this sense of participation become so compelling, for only now are we so clearly linked, from the greatest to the smallest, by a common danger and a common fate. **The elite’s capacity to destroy the world affords us all an unprecedented opportunity to participate in religious experiences that had previously been reserved for the elite alone** . And now, for the first time, the elite figure of horno faber as technological wizard has stepped into the center of the myth of world destruction. **Nuclear weapons offer us all a way to share in this figure’s sacred gesture: completing nature’s and time’s geological work—exhausting the full spectrum of possibilities of the earth’s life—in one convulsive instant of global cataclysm.**

**And dependence upon the state kills our education because of our loss of responsibility.**

**Chernus** **91**, Professor of Religious Studies at UC Boulder, 19
Ira, Nuclear Madness: on Religion and Psychology in the Nuclear Age p243

We are understandably ambivalent about this gesture; the traditional ambivalence of weapons has now been raised to its ultimate cosmic level. We want to share in the privileges that come with being responsible for the Bomb. At the same time, we declare ourselves, and honestly believe ourselves, to be horrified by its potential consequences. But our efforts to escape from it lead back to dependence on the same shamanic figures: the state, its warriors, and its experts. So the ambivalence of those who make and wield nuclear weapons has been raised to new heights too. This intensification makes us more eager to participate in their transformed status, which means participating in the ongoing life of the Bomb itself, with its ambivalent power to redeem by destroying. Ultimately we want to be rid of the Bomb while still retaining it; we want to be rid of responsibility for it while still retaining control over it. Consequently, in popular imagery, the weapon is given a life of its own while yet remaining in the hands of divine or human heroes. Since the magical heat that is the essence of the weapon is shared by all who come in contact with it, the distinction between weapon and wielder may be irrelevant anyway.

**Debates over nuclear policy and weapons are ritualized, and the affirmative is just furthering the obsession with the bomb – their language when talking about the bomb ensures that people will be overcome with the religious obsession described in the kritik – star this card, it’s in the context of debate and assumes their evidence.**

**Chernus et al. 89** (Ira et al., “A Shuddering Dawn: Religious Studies and the Nuclear Age”, Chernus and Linethal, State University of New York Press, Albany, New York, p. 84/85/86, Print.) AW

Second, what *conditions* affect the efficacy of a ritual? A study of the conditions within which the ritual is perceived as effective would require a historical analysis of the context within which a ceremony was created and the changes over time of those conditions. We suggested, for example, that because of the habitual nature of rituals, the military rituals constructed prior to the nuclear age may still be performed, despite questions about their appropriateness and the possibility of "winning" or "losing" a nuclear conflict. Finally, what are the *consequences* of the ritual? The consequences of a ritual's performance must be explored, despite the obvious empirical difficulties in doing so. The question that arises in studying the nuclear buildup is whether it actually makes people more secure. Systematic research is needed on various specific symbolic aspects of the .nuclear arms race, by people with particular areas of expertise and access to the appropriate data. A number of those areas of potential investigation follow: First, to what extent does the research and development of nuclear weapons involve a number of ceremonial sequences? Second, in what ways do the building, testing, and targeting of nuclear weapons, and their deployment in specified sites comprise traditional, regularly repeated behaviors that are meant to symbolize values and beliefs, particularly the logic of deterrence, sacrality of "national interests," and the efficacy of military responses to perceived military threats? Third, **are strategic planning and debates over nuclear policy ritualized**? Approaches to defining nuclear policy**, the language used in such discussions** (e.g., the concern over a series of security "gaps"), and so **forth have remained relatively similar throughout the nuclear era**. Although there are some shifts in emphasis over time, **the debates themselves**, as Freedman observes, **have a cyclical character: "Much of what is offered today as a profound and new insight was said yesterday**.''88 The comparative counting of warheads and missile delivery systems, the juxtapositions of throw-weight, megatonnage, and so on take on a ritual aura related to the value system that legitimates the arms race. Fourth, are mock battles in preparation for nuclear warfare, training maneuvers, war games, and computer simulations all rituals designed to give participants a sense of security about their ability to fight in and rationally control an actual nuclear conflict? To what extent are public displays of weapons and pronouncements on their characteristics routinized along ceremonial lines? Are the parading of weapons in Red Square, the exhibition of missiles, the aerial gymnastics of the Blue Angels, the open houses at Air cultural reorientation away from the ritual elements of the arms race, and ways of responding habitually to security threats without an immediate recourse to violence. The process of constructing reality involves creating images of alternatives, much of which occurs at a subliminal symbolic level.90 The power of ritual behavior can perpetuate the existing networks of reciprocal relations and institutions, or it can be harnessed to assist in a paradigm shift in matters of national policy.

# a2: their framework

**Discussion of the nuclear bomb can never take place without symbolism and epistemic claims, ensuring that religious adoration of the bomb will occur – the affirmative’s claims of objectivism and truth are made false – their constant portrayal of the nuclear bomb can’t come without religious adoration absent the alternative.**

**Chernus et al. 89** (Ira et al., “A Shuddering Dawn: Religious Studies and the Nuclear Age”, Chernus and Linethal, State University of New York Press, Albany, New York, p. 3/4, Print.) AW

The many rituals and myths that surround nuclear weapons remind us that these weapons are much more than mere physical objects: they are perhaps the richest and most emotionally charged symbolic realities in America's public life. When we speak or even think of such immensely powerful weapons, we cannot avoid speaking and thinking in symbolic images. Abstract concepts can never express our deepest responses to the Bomb. When historians of religion address the nuclear issue, they therefore find themselves on familiar ground, for their principal concern is the interpretation of symbolic images and the myths, rituals, and cultural contexts in which those images occur. Historians of religion trace the changing configurations of images, hoping to uncover clues to the changing patterns of human experience. At the same time, they inevitably discover enduring constants in the experience of communities, nations, and perhaps even humanity as a whole. In modern America, nuclear imagery forms a chaotic collage of beliefs, fears, hopes, hunches, and fantasies. While all of us have our own unique kaleidoscope of images, there are common threads running through the national experience. How can we find these unifying threads? We have no sacred scripture, no official body of doctrine or myth to articulate them. Yet we do have a widely shared store of public imagery-the popular media. An unending stream of films, stories, TV shows, comic books, and the like has depicted nuclear themes since 1945 (and even earlier). These are important and instructive for understanding nuclear imagery, but they are usually written off as mere entertainment. Our more serious images occur in the news media, both in current news reports and in feature stories and editorials offering deeper background to the news. A study of these sources using the methods of the historian of religions can illuminate aspects of the nuclear age that might otherwise remain obscure. There is, as yet, little systematic study of the images of nuclear weapons and nuclear war that appear in the popular media. As a first step toward such a study, this article offers a preliminary survey of the most widely read national magazines treating the subject during the first two decades of the nuclear age: *Life* and *Readers Digest.* The themes that recur in these sources suggest, among other things, that the power of the Bomb touches deep recesses of the psyche, recesses that are the breeding ground of religious symbols, myths, and rituals. Images of damnation and salvation, omniscience and omnipotence, faith and infinitude, transformation and rebirth, and many other familiar religious motifs abound in this material. There are recurring allusions to traditional apocalyptic imagery; that is, imagery of a violent cataclysm in which the forces of good permanently vanquish the forces of evil, ending the present era of existence and inaugurating a radically new world situation. The "numinous" quality that James Aho defines in his essay in this book (Chapter 4) is as pervasive in the popular news magazines as it is among atomic scientists. And there are new forms of religious symbolism spawned by the Bomb and its numinous aura. Readers can judge for themselves whether the themes and images described here are indeed the nation's common heritage and basic vision of the nuclear issue.

# psycology first

**We have to evaluate psychology first.**

**Chernus, 87** - Professor of Religious Studies at the University of Colorado at Boulder - (Ira, 1985, Journal of the American Academy of Religion: Book Reviews, "The Future of Immortality and Other Essays for a Nuclear Age" pg 804-807)

Ultimately, Lifton is more concerned about contemporary threats to human life than he is about the clarity of psychological ideas. This characteristic of his work also comes through clearly in the present collection. At the outset, he wonders why he spends so much time studying war and mass death. He concludes that "the investigator and the activist in me are never completely separate. My goal is always to press toward their inner unity" (4). Throughout his career, this goal has taken precedence over the aim of articulating a new paradigm for psychology. Understandably, Lifton's impact has been greater among activists and the general public concerned with global threats than among psychological theoreticians. The essays offered here show him once again responding to the concerns of the former communities more than to the latter. For students of religion, Lifton's ideas can stimulate fresh thinking on a host of issues revolving around that point where psychology, history, and religion all converge. But his most valuable contribution may be the model of his own professional life: always going to the most urgent and painful questions, engaging them personally with full honesty, and using the results to spur the nation's conscience. Who else would have turned from years of interviewing victims of absurd death in Hiroshima and Vietnam to conduct probing interviews with the perpetrators of the most absurd death, the Nazi doctors? For those inspired by Robert Jay Lifton's example, his moral heroism may well outweigh his intellectual accomplishment.

# discourse first

**Discourse comes first in decisions in nuclear weapons.**

**Mehan, Wills, 88** - (Mehan) Ph. D in Sociology from UC Santa Barbara in 1971, Professor of Sociology and Director of The Center for Research on Educational Equity, Access, and Teaching and Excellence (CREATE) at UCSD, (Wills) B. A. Philosophy, University of Illinois, 1956, M. A. East Asian Studies, Harvard University, 1960, Emeritus Professor of History at USC - (Hugh, John, October 1988, Society for the Study of Social Problems, "MEND: A Nurturing Voice in the Nuclear Arms Debate," Social Problems, Vol. 35, No. 4, pg 364)

If discourse-conventional communicative arrangements structuring political thought - is viewed as activity that constructs clarity out of ambiguity, then we should not be surprised to find that there is often a competition over what is to be taken as the correct, appropriate, or preferred representation. Proponents of various positions in conflicts attempt to capture or dominate certain modes of representation. They do this in various ways, including inviting or persuading others to join their side, incorporating the opposition discourse, silencing opponents by attacking their positions and-in extreme cases-imprisoning them. When the attempt to dominate is successful, a hierarchy is formed in which one mode of representing the world and its elements gains primacy over others. We refer to this competition over meaning as the "politics of representation" (cf. Holquist, 1983; and Shapiro, 1988). The idea of competing over the meaning of ambiguous events rests on a view of language that can be understood by visualizing words in a territory or a conversational space. If one conceptualizes conversational space in a personal sense, then one concludes that individuals own meaning, own the territory. Meanings are privately assembled by a solitary speaker and transmitted to a passively receptive hearer. If one conceptualizes conversational space from a deconstructionist point of view, then one concludes no one owns meanings, no one owns the territory; we are left with a perpetual elusiveness of meaning in constantly ambiguous texts. If one conceptualizes words in a dialogic sense, as we do, then one concludes the territory is jointly owned (Holquist, 1983). From the dialogic point of view, meaning is neither in the speaker nor in the hearer; it is in-between speakers and hearers. As Voloshinov (1986:156-57) phrased it: "A word is a territory shared by both addressor and addressee, by the speaker and his interlocutor." This formulation echoes constructionist theory, in which meanings are assembled jointly by addressor and addressee not purely spontaneously upon each occasion of use, but according to protocols and conventions passed down through the history of a language (Mead, 1934; Schutz, 1954; Lewis, 1960; Lakoff, 1986). These theoretical foundations enable and encourage the following sort of questions: How is the dialogic territory governed? What legislates the way meaning is parcelled out? (Holquist, 1983:4). What devices are employed when a particular voice dominates the global conversation on nuclear weapons? What devices do competing voices employ in order to challenge the voice dominating the conversation?

\*\*\*aff answers

# 2ac

**1. Numbing is inevitable and can be used productively**

Robert Jay **Lifton 99** Interview: Conversations with History; Institute of International Studies, UC Berkeley, http://globetrotter.berkeley.edu/people/Lifton/lifton-con3.html

When I thought about that, I began to wonder not just about those who were exposed to the atomic bomb, [but] what about those who make, not just atomic but nuclear weapons, hydrogen bombs? And I thought about the psychic numbing involved in strategic projections of using hydrogen bombs or nuclear weapons of any kind. And I also thought about ways in which all of us undergo what could be called the numbing of everyday life. That is, we are bombarded by all kinds of images and influences and we have to fend some of them off if we're to take in any of them, or to carry through just our ordinary day's work, or really deepen whatever we have to do or say. And yet, it isn't all negative. For instance, I realize that if you take the example of a surgeon who is performing a delicate operation, you don't want him or her to have the same emotions as a family member of that person being operated on. There has to be some level of detachment where you bring your technical skill to bear on it. And from that I formulated a model for professional work that I saw myself working at, and others too, of a combination of advocacy and detachment. And the detachment could involve selective professional numbing of that kind, but one's advocacy was right out there as well, as was mine in studying as accurately and as rigorously as I could the effects of the atomic bombings, but at the same time coming to that study as a person very worried and critical about nuclear weapons.

**2. Displaying the negative impacts of nuclear weapons is a prerequisite to actual abolition – the alt does nothing**

**Whitmore 97**, NGO Committee on Disarmament,

(D.C. Prerequisites to Global Nuclear Disarmament (GND) 6/27, http://abolishnukes.com/short\_essays/prereg\_gnd\_whitmore.html)

As stated earlier, GND advocates have yet to make the case. Bits and pieces are here and there, but profound changes in nuclear arms policies will most likely require a strong intellectual foundation. The perceived gains in security through nuclear deterrence will not be given-up lightly. Many issues need to be resolved before serious progress towards nuclear abolition can be realistically expected. Abolition waits for a strong case. There are several major dimensions to a nuclear abolition rationale. Each is a spoke in the wheel justifying abolition and each spoke is reinforced by a bundle of supporting arguments. One major spoke is the positive benefits that accrue from nuclear disarmament, such as, (1) regime to minimize proliferation and nuclear terrorism risks, (2) contribution to regional security regimes, (3) accidental war risk reduction, (4) immediate and long-term cost savings, and (5) improved resource utilization. The GND justification wheel should go well beyond the list of positive benefits and encompass all issues that likely bear on reaching GND consensus. Thus, another major spoke is nuclear deterrence theory and how it degrades, rather than bolsters, national and global security. A third spoke could be labeled nuclear weapons policy and supporting considerations include tactical military utility; 1st use; launch risk reduction; new warhead research and testing; etc. Additional spokes in the rationale wheel could address the derivation of security and defense requirements; ballistic missile defense; nuclear-free zones; conventional arms control; other weapons of mass destruction; enhancements to nonproliferation regime; abolition treaty verification; regional security measures; United Nations role; etc. Much work remains to be done to build a strong case for nuclear abolition. The principal theme of the rationale should be to demonstrate that the nuclear powers have more to gain from GND than to lose. It should be unquestionably persuasive. In brief, the rationale prerequisite is the "homework assignment" for the GND advocate community and its satisfactory accomplishment is absolutely necessary to help ensure undelayed abolition. Non-Nuclear States Commitment A solid intellectual foundation for nuclear abolition is a necessary, but not sufficient, condition for success. Given the realities of power dynamics in the international community, the nuclear powers may resist expedited GND unless led to understand that their choice is between painful alternatives. This dynamic is more often the rule than the exception and it has been frequently exploited by the nuclear powers in pressing its agenda, e.g., at the 1995 NPT Review and Extension Conference. The non-nuclear states need to rise to this challenge.

**3. Your psycho-analytic understanding is pop psychology – it presents little actual evidence for the existence of the psychological condition and it over-simplifies nuclear attachment as social fantasy. Criticism’s of Chernus’s “Nuclear Madness” prove our argument**

**Summers 91**, Mount Allison University, (Craig, Nuclear Texts & Contexts Spring No. 6)

The only evidence for numbing in the book is Lifton’s observations of victims in Hiroshima, which are then linked to potential victims of the contemporary nuclear threat. Lifton himself recently associated the thought processes in perpetrating Nazi mass killing, and in contemporary “perpetrators” of the nuclear threat, which would have been very relevant to reference here (Lifton and Markusen, 1990). The tendency throughout Nuclear Madness is to increasingly leave the initial evidence and begin describing events as schizophrenic, neurotic or mad. The mental health metaphors in Nuclear Madness are rooted in pre-1950s psychoanalysis. (Even continual reference to “The bomb” rather than “smart missiles,” for example, is outdated.) Chernus states Psychologists may identify nuclear weapons with interpersonal hostility, dominance needs, repressed rage, or magical defenses against insecurity. Freudians will find a mapping of infantile omnipotence desires. Jungians will find archetypal patterns of all sorts. Theologians will consider the bomb a mapped replication of our traditional image of God. But all will attest the existence of social fantasy. (p. 32. Infantile omnipotence desires? All will attest to the existence of social fantasy? Nuclear Madness does, but it is surely a step backwards for any reader attempting to learn something of explanations in contemporary political psychology. In relying on clinical metaphors from over forty years ago, Chernus has tied his philosophy to a clinical approach with little actual evidence, and which is generally no longer accepted. Psychic numbing and mental illness could be used successfully if not treated as just a metaphorical explanation for nuclear irrationality. This is a difference between Lifton’s (1967) actual psychiatric observations and Chernus’s numbing metaphor. But Nuclear Madness dwells on descriptive images and similes, not actually pursuing responses to the nuclear threat using either side of psychology: (a) the experimental and observational bases, which have been extensively documented, or (b) clinical psychopathology, which would be worth seriously pursuing. One could propose very real psychiatric grounds for the suicidal nature of being a passive bystander or having vested interests in the nuclear arms race (see Charny, 1986). Masking, numbing, rationalizing, or however ignoring the potential for nuclear omnicide is a psychological process that poses a very real threat to human life, and may thus fit the criteria for inclusion as a pathological disorder in the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders III (American Psychiatric Association, 1987). People with different political agendas could make completely different conclusions using the material in Nuclear Madness. It is also the case that completely different premises and images could be used to arrive at the same conclusions. A discussion of sexual and pornographic images of the nuclear threat in Rosenbaum (1978) is equally metaphorical. It is descriptive, but not explanatory. Perhaps no real explanation is necessary in Nuclear Madness, though, or even any conclusions on religious thinking or psychological processes. Chernus’s description of “the bomb” as “a symbol of neurotic ambivalence” (p. 67; also 56, 61) is almost just an abstract, artistic image. This would be okay if presented this way in the introduction. As it is, though, we are misled from the title on into thinking that this book will provide an understanding of psychological perceptions and responses to the nuclear threat.

# fear good

**Fear motivates people to pursue constructive means to sustain peace and prevent large-scale conflict**

**Lifton** **01**– Distinguished Professor of Psychiatry and Psychology at John Jay College and the Graduate Center of the City University of New York – 20 (Robert Jay, World Policy Journal, “Illusions of the Second Nuclear Age,” Spring, v18n1)

The trouble is that in other ways the dangers associated with nuclear weapons are greater than ever: the continuing weapons-centered policies in the United States and elsewhere; the difficulties in controlling nuclear weapons that exist under unstable conditions (especially in Russia and other areas of the former Soviet Union);(FN2) and the eagerness and potential capacity of certain nations and "private" groups to acquire and possibly use the weapons. In that sense, the nuclear quietism is perilous. Or, to put the matter another way, we no longer manifest an appropriate degree of fear in relation to actual nuclear danger. While fear in itself is hardly to be recommended as a guiding human emotion, its absence in the face of danger can lead to catastrophe. We human animals have built-in fear reactions in response to threat. These reactions help us to protect ourselves--to step back from the path of a speeding automobile, or in the case of our ancestors, from the path of a wild animal. Fear can be transmuted into constructive planning and policies: whether for minimizing vulnerability to attacks by wild animals, or for more complex contemporary threats. Through fear, ordinary people can be motivated to pursue constructive means for sustaining peace, or at least for limiting the scope of violence. Similarly, in exchanges between world leaders on behalf of preventing large-scale conflict, a tinge of fear--sometimes more than a tinge--can enable each to feel the potential bloodshed and suffering that would result from failure. But with nuclear weapons, our psychological circuits are impaired. We know that the weapons are around--and we hear talk about nuclear dangers somewhere "out there"--but our minds no longer connect with the dangers or with the weapons themselves. That blunting of feeling extends into other areas. One of the many sins for which advocates of large nuclear stockpiles must answer is the prevalence of psychic numbing to enormous potential suffering, the blunting of our ethical standards as human beings.

In the absence of the sort of threatening nuclear rhetoric the United States and Russia indulged in during the 1980s, we can all too readily numb ourselves to everything nuclear, and thereby live as though the weapons pose no danger, or as though they don't exist. To be sure, we have never quite been able to muster an appropriate level of fear with respect to these weapons--one that would spur us to take constructive steps to remove the threat. We have always been able to numb ourselves in this regard, which must be seen as a basic human response to a threat that is apocalyptic in scope and so technologically distanced as to be unreal. But there were at least brief moments when we would awaken from our nuclear torpor. Now there is little but torpor. The weapons have been accepted as belonging on our planet no less than we do, as if they were part of nature--like great trees or mountains that are old, established, immovable--rather than technological instruments of genocide that we ourselves have created.

# they don’t understand our policy

**Dangers are worse in the future if we try to maintain unipolarity while our security is slipping.**

**Chernus, 6** - Professor of Religious Studies University of Colorado at Boulder – (Ira, 2006, Monsters to Destroy: The Neoconservative War on Terror and Sin, pg 45-47)

Four years after writing their essay, Kristol and Kagan edited a book titled *Present Dangers.* Their own contribution indicates that their sense of security was slipping. The essay complains that the U.S. has wasted its chance to get the security of long-term world domination. Now the world has grown far more frightening: "We are likely to face dangers, even within the next decade, that we cannot even imagine today .... Instability in important regions of the world, and the flouting of civilized rules of conduct in those regions, are threats that affect us with almost the same immediacy as if they were occurring on our doorstep.... Eventually, the crises *would* appear at our doorstep." Other contributors to the collection agree. "The world is highly fragile," James Ceaser explains. It won't create order spontaneously; it needs a superior power to impose and preserve order-and to protect universal principles. The United States is uniquely suited to that role, because only the U.S. was founded on universal principles. Protecting those principles is the essence of the national interest.The U.S. exercises its power only to "maintain a civilized world order and allow the benefits of free government to become known." To Donald Kagan (Robert's father), the future looks even more frightening because stability is a fond illusion: "The international balance can *never* be still. ... Change can come with lightning speed.... Dissatisfied states around the world are working hard to increase their military power and to nullify American advantages." If hostile states "read strength and a strong will, they tend to retreat and subside. When they read weakness and timidity, they take risks. The U.s. won the cold war and made the world conducive to its goals and values because it had a powerful military force and the will to use it. "For the world's leading power, there is no escape from the responsibility the position imposes .... In dealing with the issue of its power, a country like the U.S. is really dealing with its values and its security."7 Precisely because we can't predict or even imagine the dangers, Kristol and Kagan argue,1B we can't make specific plans to deter them. We are in the same position as we were after World War II-not knowing where the next threat will come from. So we should do what U.S. leaders did then: assume that threats might arise anywhere and make plans "to deter aggression globally, whoever the aggressor migPtt be." In other words, everything that happens, anywhere in the world, must be seen as an incipient danger. Impending crisis will be the order of the day for the foreseeable future: "Given the unknown perils that await us over the horizon, there can be no respite from this burden." Since any state might turn hostile at any time, the U.S. must project military force permanently, all over the world. If the U.S. tries to get along with its enemies, that would look like weakness, an invitation to aggression. Instead, the policy should be "to promote changes of regime." And the U.S. should act preventively, "at the scene of potential trouble before it has fully erupted ... to shape the international environment to prevent such a threat from arising." Of course, "this does not mean that the United States must root out evil wherever and whenever it rears its head." A prudent nation should intervene only when doing so serves the national interest. Although Kristol and Kagan proclaim their call for regime change "eminently realistic," they justify U.S. intervention primarily in moral terms. "The American-led world that emerged after the cold war is a more just world than any imaginable alternative." Governments that won't play the American way are "extreme manifestations of human evil." American military power defends "the 'norms' of the civilized world." It should be unleashed against regimes that will not "play by the existing-which is to say American-rules of the game." In other words, goodness and civilization amount to nothing more than "the American rules of the game." (In 2000, Kristol told an interviewer that the United States should "command and give orders as to what is to be done" in many parts of the world. "People need that. An authority willing to use troops can make a very good difference.") To bolster their claims, Kristol and Kagan included in their collection of essays a piece by an influential arbiter of moral values, William J. Bennett (who once wrote: "Morality is central to our [American] politics.... Our moral streak is what is best about us"). He, too, views foreign policy as essentially a test of domestic moral fortitude. Ronald Reagan revived the cold war and got Americans to believe "that their security and their prosperity could be preserved only if they stood for something in a world threatened by evil." Now once again we need a neoconservative internationalism to "strengthen our national self-definition ... and remind us who we are."20 Who are we? A nation with a special place in God's creation. "The United States was the first nation ever to base its very sense of nationhood on a set of universal principles derived from natural rights ... to protect our basic God-given liberties." When the U.S. dominates the world, there is nothing self-serving about it. We are merely serving God's plan, "the natural order of things even as it assures our own safety." It is our "great destiny as a people ... to engage in present sacrifice, when necessary, to promote future security" for Western civilization. By promoting "the ideals at the heart of our national enterprise," the U.S. would "ensure stability and the steady growth of freedom throughout the world. "The test is whether we act on those principles," Bennett warns. The greatest risk to the West now is the indifference and selfishness of the American people, the "unwillingness to rise to the challenges of our time.... [I]t is antithetical to the meaning of America." "Our survival and the survival of all we believe in and care most about-the defense of Western civilization and the nurture and protection of our children-will depend on whether we are vigilant and strong and committed in purpose." Bennett, Kristo, Kagan, and their fellow neoconservatives hoped their story would inspire Americans to rise to the moral challenge, to stand strongly against evil, to pass the moral test and fulfill their great destiny.

# policy change solves numbing

**Advocating policy change to address nuclear harms overcomes the problem of numbing**

**Sandman** **and** **Valenti,** **86** Peter M., Professor of Public Health @ Rutgers, Founder and Director of the Environmental Communication Research Program, and Communications Counsel for Environmental Defense Fund, JoAnn M., Professor of Communications @ BYU, January 19 (“Scared Stiff – or Scared into Action” – Bulletin of Atomic Scientists, the Article Won the 86/87 Olive Branch Award for Outstanding Coverage of the Nuclear Arms Issue, www.psandman.com/articles/scarstif.htm)

At a time when everyone ought to be working to prevent nuclear war, the “bombing run” tactics of activists have numbed many people. Activists should appeal to more positive emotions to empower people and inspire action. When the movement against nuclear weapons celebrates its heroes, a place of honor is reserved for Helen Caldicott, the Australian pediatrician who revived Physicians for Social Responsibility (PSR) in 1978 and made it the vehicle for her impassioned antinuclear crusade. In countless communities since then, Caldicott has briskly narrated the devastation that would result if a small nuclear warhead exploded right here and now. Thousands of activists trace their movement beginnings to a Helen Caldicott speech, wondering if it wouldn't help reverse the arms race just to make everyone sit through that speech — and each week hundreds of activists do their best to give the speech themselves. Nonetheless, PSR Executive Director Jane Wales, while acknowledging a huge debt to Caldicott, said in 1984 that the time for the “bombing runs” (as insiders call the speech) was past. “We knew it was past when someone interrupted the speech one evening, actually interrupted it, and said, ’We know all that, but what can we do?’” In a 1985 newsletter, similarly, Sanford Gottlieb of United Campuses to Prevent Nuclear War warned that many students were “being numbed by the emphasis on nuclear blast, fire and radiation” in courses on nuclear war and were therefore “feeling more impotent and depressed than before the class began.”(1) Perhaps the first broad awareness that shock therapy may not be the best therapy came, ironically, in 1983 in the weeks preceding the broadcast of the television film The Day After, when Educators for Social Responsibility and others worried that the program might do children more harm than good. The Day After turned out to be less frightening than expected, but other films (Threads, Testament, and Caldicott’s own The Last Epidemic) raise the same worry — and not just for children. In the following analysis of the fear of nuclear Armageddon and its implications for antinuclear advocacy, we will argue that most people are neither apathetic about nuclear war nor actively terrified of it but rather, in Robert Jay Lifton’s evocative phrase, “psychically numbed”; that it is ineffective to frighten audiences who have found a refuge from their fears in numbness; and that there exist more effective keys to unlocking such paralysis.

# political solutions are best

**Their criticism assumes we only read a harms advantage – promoting clear policy solutions overcomes fear and retrieves people from psychic numbing, while the alternative relegates people to helplessness**

**Sandman** **and** **Valenti 86**,Peter M., Professor of Public Health @ Rutgers, Founder and Director of the Environmental Communication Research Program, and Communications Counsel for Environmental Defense Fund, JoAnn M. Professor of Communications @ BYU, January 19 (“Scared Stiff – or Scared into Action” – Bulletin of Atomic Scientists, the Article Won the 86/87 Olive Branch Award for Outstanding Coverage of the Nuclear Arms Issue, [www.psandman.com/articles/scarstif.htm](http://www.psandman.com/articles/scarstif.htm))

Hope “The main obstacle to action,” writes Frank, “is neither apathy nor terror but simply a feeling of helplessness. To combat it, I have perhaps overemphasized the small signs that antinuclear activities are at last beginning to influence the political process.”(19) Helplessness, hopelessness, futility, and despair are words one hears even more often than fear from the barely active and the formerly active. And like fear, these emotions can easily lead to psychic numbing. Those who feel powerless to prevent nuclear war try not to think about it; and it serves the needs of those who do not wish to think about nuclear war to feel powerless to prevent it. Messages of hope and empowerment, however, break this vicious circle. The label “hope,” as we use it, subsumes a wide range of overlapping concepts: for example, optimism, a sense of personal control and efficacy, confidence in methods and solutions, a sense of moral responsibility, and a vision of the world one is aiming for. It is well established (and hardly surprising) that hope is closely associated with willingness to act. Activism appeals most to people who feel positive about both the proposed solution and their personal contribution to its achievement. Over the long term, this means that antinuclear organizers must communicate a credible vision of a nuclear-free world. Meanwhile, they must offer people things to do that seem achievable and worthwhile. The nuclear-weapons-freeze campaign attracted millions of new activists in 1982 because it offered credible hope. By 1985 many of those millions could no longer ground their hope in the freeze; some found other approaches and some returned to inactivity. Most social psychologists today see the relationship between hope and action as independent of fear or other feelings. For example, Kenneth H. Beck and Arthur Frankel conclude that three cognitions (not emotions) determine whether people will do something about a health risk: recognizing the danger as real, believing the recommended plan of action will reduce the danger, and having confidence in their ability to carry out the plan.(20) Similarly, Sutton’s review of the fear-appeal literature finds inconsistent support for the notion that people can accept higher levels of fear if they feel the proposed solution will remedy the problem, but strong evidence that, regardless of fear, people are more inclined to act on solutions they see as more effective.(21) In a 1983 study, Tom R. Tyler and Kathleen M. McGraw found that, compared to the general public, antinuclear activists were more likely to think nuclear war could be prevented, even though they considered nuclear war itself more likely and said they worried about it more. The activists scored higher than other citizens on measures of general personal and political efficacy, and they were more likely to believe that citizen action would make the difference in preventing nuclear war. Finally, the activists tended to believe that citizens have a moral obligation to work against nuclear war, even though they blamed governments, not citizens, for causing the threat. Interpreting this mix of hope and anger, the authors quote Jesse Jackson: “You are not responsible for being down, but you are responsible for getting up.”(22) The least studied aspect of hope is the need for an affirmative vision. People require short-term achievable goals as benchmarks along the way to build confidence that progress is being made. But progress toward what? While the movement has done an excellent job of articulating visions of nuclear apocalypse, it has only just begun the much harder job of envisioning a plausible world that has renounced nuclear weapons. It is in that vision that new activists will find their hope, and against that vision that they will measure their efficacy. Constructing it should be a top-priority task.

# a2: Psychic numbing

**Psychic numbing is wrong—rests on the false assumption that we have no image of the Bomb.**

**Chernus, 91.** Ira (PROFESSOR OF RELIGIOUS STUDIES UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO AT BOULDER), *Nuclear Madness: Religion and the Psychology of the Nuclear Age* p 11-13//jh

While Lifton's analysis surely deserves the acclaim it has received, it is open to question because it rests on the premise that we have no adequate images to embody the nuclear threat. Yet the nuclear age has triggered an explosion of films, novels, short stories, poems, television dramas, and even comic books that have made nuclear imagery a familiar part of the landscape of contemporary imagination. It may be argued that the power of these images is blunted by the common perception that they are merely for entertainment. But one need only turn to the newspapers, news magazines, and television and radio news reports to find the same images at work: the missile streaking from its silo, the vanished city, the desolation of nuclear winter, the nuclear family huddled in its bomb shelter, the heroic survivors rebuilding their society, the calculated gambles of nuclear diplomacy, the shrewd gamesmanship of the arms control table. All these, and many more, are the vividly familiar images that shape our responses to the Bomb. As Lifton says, all our utterances and even our perceptions must be based on inner imagery. Every word in our endless stream of discourse about nuclear weapons is evidence of our rich nuclear imagery. So it is misleading to suggest that in 1945 there was a sudden break in the nation's image-making process triggered by the bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. On the contrary, those bombings set off an immediate efflorescence of images. While some of these were unfocussed fragments, some were creative attempts to discover coherent new images commensurate with the new reality. Most notably, there was a widespread perception of the Bomb as a radically new kind of weapon whose global destruction could harm its possessors as much as its targets. There were also early images of the Bomb as a technological savior, an instrument of total domination, an unprecedented moral dilemma, and a turning point in human historya harbinger of apocalypse or utopia. All these images have persisted, with innumerable transformations, to the present day. Lifton himself has shown that some of these images represent not a loss but a revival of a traditional mode of symbolic immortality. He groups such images under the rubric of *nuclearism,* the belief that the Bomb can provide salvation and immortality. In nuclearism a very old religious form, death as the path to resurrection, is applied to nuclear holocaust.

**Chernus is just wrong about psychic numbing – disproven by acts of resistence**

**Summers 91.** Craig (Ph.D. Department of Psychology,. Mount Allison University), *BOOK REVIEWS Ira Chernus. Nuclear Madness: Religion and the Psychology of the Nuclear Age* in Nuclear Texts and Contexts spring no 6

This book attempts to explain political psychology in the nuclear age through nuclear imagery and psychiatrist R. J. Lifton’s (1967) construct of psychic numbing. To start with an image of my own, the nuclear threat could be characterized by two men (gender intended), each holding a gun to the other’s head as a means of security. The inherent danger and illogic in this is of course mad; a madness defined by Mutual Assured Destruction (M.A.D.). The book draws heavily on metaphors of madness in attempting to explain this situation, and in attempting to “point to new political possibilities that will lead beyond the nuclear trap and void” (p. 70). The logic followed in the book is that psychic numbing causes us to shut off any thoughts about a fundamental threat to our existence. We therefore develop no images of nuclear doomsday, and this is essentially why we do not act to prevent it. It is not completely clear, however, why numbing makes us inactive regarding the nuclear threat, but not about other threats. Certainly death is a more immediate threat to blacks in South Africa or to those in bread lines in Eastern Europe and the U.S.S.R. Yet rather than being numbed into paralysis, thesevictims defy government threats of bloodshed to hold public rallies. Numbing may not be the cause of general inactivity regarding the nuclear threat; unlike demonstrations against foodlines and racism, we may just find it too long- term, large and improbable to deal with in our day-to-day lives.

# non-falsifiable

**Chernus work is non-falsifiable.**

**Summers 91** Craig (Ph.D. Department of Psychology,. Mount Allison University), *BOOK REVIEWS Ira Chernus. Nuclear Madness: Religion and the Psychology of the Nuclear Age* in Nuclear Texts and Contexts spring no 6

As a central theme, *Nuclear Madness: Religion and the Psychology of the Nuclear Age* states that: “The question to be asked about nuclear weapons . . . is: What fantasy images are embedded in our attitudes and behaviors?” (p. 83). But Psychology as a discipline and profession is based on empirical research, not fantasy images. Author Ira Chernus does acknowledge that his approach is not easily interwoven with formal psychological research (discussing theologian Paul Tillich, p. 48; also pp. 105- 106). But he nevertheless uses arguments, such as those from Mircea Eliade, that “can be neither verified nor falsified by empirical research” (p. 193), an ominous note for social scientists reading the book. Chernus overlooks vast areas of empirical research in political science, economics, political psychology, and even the scientific evidence on nuclear winter, stating that “the empirical reality of a large-scale use of nuclear weapons eludes scientific understanding” (p. 64). As one example to the contrary, in psychology there have been innumerable experimental studies of imagery, both in terms of imaginal thinking, and a narrower literature specifically focusing on nuclear imagery (e.g., *Journal of Social Issues*, v. 39[1]). Skirting these seems to be a gross omission in a book purporting to use imagery as a basis for a psychological understanding of the nuclear age..

# alt cant solve

**Alt can’t solve—their author admits that getting past psychic numbing is nearly impossible, there is no specific solution and there are too many internal contradictions to his theory.**

**Chernus, 91.** Ira (PROFESSOR OF RELIGIOUS STUDIES UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO AT BOULDER), *Nuclear Madness: Religion and the Psychology of the Nuclear Age* p 13-14//jh

This concept of totalism is a crucial element in Lifton's work because it offers one solution to a difficult theoretical problem: How can psychic numbing, a concept developed in terms of individual psychodynamics, be ascribed to societal processes and institutions? But the concept raises other problems that it does not solve. Although it accounts for some continuity with prenuclear images of destroying the enemy, it fails to account for the central uniqueness of the nuclear age: images of destroying the enemy inevitably evoke images not only of revitalizing but of destroying one's own society too. Nor does totalism adequately account for the process of psychological self-destruction in psychic numbing. Lifton does point out that totalism involves a hope of stopping the process of history, which requires further numbing. But he puts little emphasis on this self-perpetuating dynamic of numbing. Nor does he explain how it can coexist with the simultaneous "explosion of symbolizing forays," the apparent urge to revitalization that is the dominant focus of his discussion. The theoretical problem is to make sense of an explosion of images that reinforces numbing rather than counteracting it. But this is not merely a theoretical problem. It also raises the very pressing practical problem of whether numbing can be counteracted at all. Lifton raises grave doubts on this point. Although he urges his readers to redirect the movement toward revitalization and aim it at more life-enhancing images, his paradigm cannot explain why this has not already occurred, and it offers little theoretical explanation of how it might occur in the future. Perhaps this is why Lifton says relatively little about specific remedies. 7 His prescriptive writings consist largely of alerting readers to the dangers of psychic numbing and urging them somehow to muster the will to break through their numbing. But the "somehow" remains rather vague. Lifton's paradigm implies that breakthroughs against numbing will be exceedingly difficult and rare. The record of history, with sporadic outbursts of nuclear concern followed by long years of relative passivity, seems to validate that prediction.

# cede the political

**Chernus cedes the political- material perspectives related to nuclear weapons**

**Charme 91.** Stuart Z (B.A., Columbia University; M.A., Ph.D., University of Chicago, Professor of Religion at Rutgers), *BOOK REVIEWS Ira Chernus. Nuclear Madness: Religion and the Psychology of the Nuclear Age* in the Review of Religious Research vol 33, issue 2

This book demonstrates many of the strengths and weaknesses of psycho-historical inter- pretations. Much of the argument is carried by suggestive analogies and heuristic metaphors, extended descriptions of suprapersonal entities like nations, cultures, and civilizations "as if" they operated according to individual psychodynamics. Chernus himself sprinkles dis- claimers throughout his book denying that his interpretations are empirically verifiable or indeed are anything more than useful fictions to stimulate thought. By the end of the book, however, Chernus' commitment to a particular psychological and metaphysical perspective is more than metaphorical. In his rush to reconnect to an archetypal world of symbols and images, he tends to be somewhat dismissive of more concrete political, economic, historical and scientific perspectives relating to nuclear arms. There can be no doubt that Chernus has produced a creative and unorthodox interpretation of nuclear weapons. Much of its success will depend on the reader's prior commitment (or new conversion) to the perspective of archetypal psychology. Accordingly, some will con- clude from this book that Chernus is tuned in to the unconscious symbolic meaning of the global psyche, whereas others may remain more dubious that new ritual expressions of archetypal images are a sufficient response to the prospect of, say, nuclear proliferation into third world countries like Iraq.

# emperics

**Chernus misunderstands the causes of inaction – it may be rationalization or self interest, not numbing. Fails to incorporate any empirical data**

**Summers 91.** Craig (Ph.D. Department of Psychology,. Mount Allison University), BOOK REVIEWS Ira Chernus. Nuclear Madness: Religion and the Psychology of the Nuclear Age in Nuclear Texts and Contexts spring no 6

This is a book that relies heavily on lofty language and philosophical jargon (e.g., “radical finitude”, p. 53). Relating mythological terms like “the underworld” (p 254) to nuclear deterrence is about as useful to a real understanding of the nuclear threat as former U.S. President Reagan’s references to “the evil empire.” These grandiose descriptions fail to recognize simple economic realities. The scientific-military-industrial complex and the nuclear industry are often supported simply because they provide companies and shareholders with profits, and employees with jobs. Therefore, it may not be thatrace (see Charny, 1986). Masking, numbing, rationalizing, numbing occurs because of the magnitude of the threat, but that rationalization occurs because of vested interests in the threat. It would therefore be worth considering whether there is any difference between numbing in the hibakusha that survived Hiroshima, and rationalization (or numbing) for questionable work that pays well. This distinction may perhaps be studied empirically. As with imagery, there are also empirical studies that could have been considered in any book dealing with these types of psychological mechanisms (e.g., Festinger & Carlsmith, 1959 and all of the subsequent studies validating cognitive dissonance). The only evidence for numbing in the book is Lifton’s observations of victims in Hiroshima, which are then linked to potential victims of the contemporary nuclear threat. Lifton himself recently associated the thought processes in perpetrating Nazi mass killing, and in contemporary “perpetrators” of the nuclear threat, which would have been very relevant to reference here (Lifton and Markusen, 1990). The tendency throughout Nuclear Madness is to increasingly leave the initial evidence and begin describing events as schizophrenic, neurotic or mad.

# outdated

**Chernus ties to outdated, discredited psychological concepts**

**Summers 91** Craig (Ph.D. Department of Psychology,. Mount Allison University), *BOOK REVIEWS Ira Chernus. Nuclear Madness: Religion and the Psychology of the Nuclear Age* in Nuclear Texts and Contexts spring no 6

The mental health metaphors in *Nuclear Madness* are rooted in pre-1950s psychoanalysis. (Even continual reference to “The bomb”rather than “smart missiles,” for example, is outdated.) Chernus states Psychologists may identify nuclear weapons with interper- sonal hostility, dominance needs, repressed rage, or magical defenses against insecurity. Freudians will find a mapping of infantile omnipotence desires. Jungians will find arche- typal patterns of all sorts. Theologians will consider the bomb a mapped replication of our traditional image of God. But all will attest the existence of social fantasy. (p. 32. Infantile omnipotence desires? All will attest to the existence of social fantasy? *Nuclear Madness* does, but it is surely a step backwards for any reader attempting to learn something of explanations in contemporary political psychology. In relying on clinical metaphors from over forty years ago, Chernus has tied his philosophy to a clinical approach with little actual evidence, and which is generally no longer accepted.