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#### The aff’s representation of United States “benevolent hegemony” is massively ignorant of history and promotes a framework of the American end of history which terminates the being of all others.

Sardar & Wyn Davies 4 [Ziauddin, Visiting Professor, the School of Arts, The City University, London, Chair – Muslim Institute; Merryl, Welsh Muslim anthropologist; American Terminator: Myths, Movies, and Global Power p211]

Consider, for example, Michael Ignatieff, the Canadian apologist for American imperialism and Professor at Harvard University, who describes the American Empire as a new kind of 'burden': 'America's empire is not like empires of times past, built on colonies, conquest and the white man's burden. We are no longer in the era of the United Fruit Company, when American corporations needed the Marines to secure their investments overseas. The 21st century imperium is a new invention in the annals of political science, an empire lite, a global hegemony whose grace notes are free markets, human rights and democracy.' The new burden means that the US is 'the only nation that polices the world throughout five global military commands; maintains more than a million men and women at arms on four continents; deploys carrier battle groups on watch in every ocean, guarantees the survival of countries from Israel to South Korea; drives the wheels of global trade and commerce; and fills the hearts and minds of an entire planet with its dreams and desires'. So the empire may now be 'lite', but it is still a universal soldier and does what good old heavy empires always did: occupies foreign lands, rapes their economies and cripples their minds!

Apart from being 'lite', the empire is also 'benevolent'. In a much-quoted article in Foreign Policy, Robert Kagan, a senior associate at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, declared that 'the truth about America's dominant role in the world is known to most clear-eyed international observers'. And it is this: 'the benevolent hegemony exercised by the United States is good for a vast portion of the world's population.' A world without US hegemony, he suggests, would be more violent, more chaotic, less democratic and economically stagnant. And he spells out 'the unique qualities of American global dominance': despite overwhelming military and economic superiority, the American people chose not to 'set the crown of world empire on their brows'; instead, they chose a 'strategy to risk nuclear annihilation on [their] otherwise unthreatened homeland in order to deter attack, either nuclear or conventional, on a European or Asian ally'. Moreover, 'the identification of the interests of others with its own has been the most striking quality of American foreign and defence policy'. Americans may be self-interested, selfish, arrogant, and occasionally ham-handed, 'but excusez-moi'; Kagan asks in a mocking tone:

“compared with whom? Can anyone believe that were France to possess the power the United States now has, the French would be less arrogant, less selfish, and less prone to making mistakes? Little in France's history as a great power, or even as a medium power, justifies such optimism. Nor can one easily imagine power on an American scale being employed in a more enlightened fashion by China, Germany, Japan, or Russia. And even the leaders of that least benighted of empires, the British, were more arrogant, more bloodyminded, and, in the end, less capable managers of world affairs than the inept Americans have so far proved to be. If there is to be a sole superpower, the world is better off if that power is the United States." So, what can we expect in this wonderful world of benign American power? Kagan suggests quite explicitly that America should not hesitate in drawing its mighty sword and slaying anything and anyone that gets in its way. Like the deranged villain in Universal Soldier, he laughs out loud at Europe and her multilateralism. A Europe that has achieved integration peacefully and multilaterally, by negotiations and without militarism, has moved 'beyond power into a self-contained world of laws and rules and transnational negotiations and cooperation', and thus has no understanding of the brute realism of empire-building. In contrast to Kant's 'Perpetual Peace' that is the lot of Europe, Kagan suggests in Paradise and Power, the United States is all about taming an anarchic Hobbesian world where war is a necessity. America is thus ever ready to visit violence to any corner of the world both to maintain and to expand its empire.'

What both Ignatieff and Kagan amply demonstrate is a monumental ignorance of history. As Sidney Lens notes in reference to Ignatieff: 'only someone blind to the history of the United States, its obsessive drive for control of oil, its endless expansion of military bases around the world, its domination of other countries through its enormous economic power, its violations of the human rights of millions of people, whether directly or through proxy governments, could make that statement." Robert Jensen, Associate Professor of Journalism at the University of Texas in Austin, describes 'benevolent empire' as the 'third American holocaust' (the first two being the genocide of Native Americans and slavery), the product of a foreign policy that is 'relentlessly barbaric'." But something very specific is at work in Ignatieff and Kagan's views; something that we also find in Paul Berman's notion of 'liberal imperialism's and Stanley Kurtz's 'Democratic Imperialism' ,9 as well as in the works of a string of right- and left-wing champions of the American Empire."? And that something is the deterministic re-formulation of history in the universal soldier framework. History - of democracy, liberalism, cultures, civilisations and great powers - is being presented as universal destiny: the histories of all nations and peoples, states and empires, merge into the universal narrative of American history and culminate to produce a global, benevolent American Empire. This is what the world was created for. This is the sum of all human experience. This is the aggregate of all the yesterdays of humanity. This is the theory that Philip Bobbitt tries to demonstrate in his monumental study The Shield of Achilles.1I Subtitled 'War, Peace and the Course of History', the book suggests that all the wars of all histories and all the peaceful states of the world produced a 'course of history' that ends up with a very special state: a state that is immensely powerful and democratic and committed to human rights - the global United States of America. It is thus the only power that has not only might but historic right on its side - and hence, can attack any country it wishes. This historic imperative, this natural and universal destiny, also gives the US, says Bobbitt, the right to take pre-emptive action against any nation, and places it above international law. This is the new 'constitutional theory' that Bobbitt wants the rest of the world to embrace.

In its most complete and articulate form, this thesis is expressed by Francis Fukuyama in his The End of History and the Last Man. Ignatieff, Kagan, Bobbitt and others are simply borrowing a leaf from Fukuyama, former Deputy Director of the US State Department's Policy Planning Staff and a signatory to the infamous policy paper 'Rebuilding America's Defenses: Strategy, Forces and Resources for a New Century', cobbled together by the neo-conservative think-tank, The Project for the New American Century.

Fukuyama developed his thesis immediately after the fall of the Berlin Wall. The end of the Cold War, he argues, not only means the end of Communism, it also signifies the unabashed victory of American economic and political liberalism. American 'liberal democracy', he suggests, is the 'end point of mankind's ideological evolution', the 'final form of human government', and as such constitutes the 'end of history'. From the American Declaration of Independence onwards, there has been a trend towards democratic governance that demonstrates that there is 'a silent and mysterious inner process at work' underneath the perturbations of history, somewhat similar to the 'invisible hand' of the market. This suggests that:

“There is a fundamental process at work that dictates a common evolutionary pattern for all human societies - in short, something like a Universal History of mankind in the direction of liberal democracy. The existence of peaks and troughs in this development is undeniable. But to cite the failure of liberal democracy in any given country, or even in the entire region of the world, as evidence of democracy's overall weakness, reveals a striking narrowness of view. Cycles and discontinuities in themselves are not incompatible with a history that is directional and universal, just as the existence of business cycles does not negate the possibility of long-term economic growth.” 13

Thus, for the past 300 years all histories, all cultures have been evolving, by the sheer force of nature and deterministic history, towards a single goal: to become part and parcel of a universal American narrative.

“History was not a blind concatenation of events, but a meaningful whole in which human ideas concerning the nature of a just political and social order developed and played themselves out. And if we are now at a point where we cannot imagine a world substantially different from our own, in which there is no apparent or obvious way in which the future will represent a fundamental improvement over our current order, then we must also take into consideration the possibility that History itself might be at an end."

All of us are thus as free as we will ever get, and the status quo is the best we can ever hope for. The United States of America, with its principles of 'Liberty' and 'Democracy', is the apex of human evolution and all of us are propelled towards the Great Republic. But since 'history' - that is, history of non-Western culture which Fukuyama has cannibalised - incorporates the worldviews of all other people, their value systems, their cultures, what we may call their total modes of being, the termination of history also terminates the very being, the very identities, of all Others. So other people, quite incidental to American 'Universal History', can now be truly declared dead and buried: 'it matters little what strange thoughts occur to people in Albania or Burkina Faso', as their culture is not part of the 'the common ideological heritage of mankind'. Indeed, they are not people at all!

#### There are two models for public intellectuals: We can either be expert pundits like who aim their advice at centers of power or we can be intellectuals who expose lies and provide the toolkit needed to mobilize for change. Our criticism is not a fiated advocacy to be implemented by policy elites, but a way to lay bare the lies and propaganda advanced by the 1ac, which is an ethically superior approach that provides ordinary citizens with the agency to pursue alternatives.

Guerlain 6 (Pierre, Professor at Paris West University Nanterre La Défense, “Robert Kagan and Noam Chomsky: Two ways of being a political intellectual”, Comparative International Studies, Vol 4(4): 446-458 GAL)

Although the word 'intellectual' is more frequently used in Europe than in the USA, some thinkers, whether they be academics or think tank researchers, play the part of 'public intellectuals' or policy advisers. Noam Chomsky, the world-famous dissident and persistent critic of American foreign policy, seems to differ radically from Robert Kagan, a neoconservative activist who broadly approves of an interventionist American foreign policy as it is implemented by the Bush administration. These two intellectuals belong to two radically opposed wings of foreign policy thinking and represent two very different intellectual postures. Kagan, like most neoconservatives, is a unilateralist and favors American supremacy; Chomsky is a critic of imperialism or what he calls American hegemony'. Kagan is a journalist, essayist and a think tank pundit, Chomsky a university professor renowned in the field of linguistics and not recognized as a major thinker within the disciplines of political science or history. Kagan is an expounder of American nationalist identity using Europe as a foil whereas Chomsky, who himself repre­sents a type of public intellectual that is more common in the USA than anywhere else, is a deconstructor of American identities. In a way, they typify two ways of being a politicized intellectual in the USA, two ways of thinking about the nation-state and two strategies about changing the world or the representations of the world that citizens and leaders have. In this article I will analyse these different ways of being an intellec­tual in the USA by focusing closely on the work of these two emblematic figures, whilst making a few references to other thinkers. Chomsky and Kagan embody very different conceptions of society and two different ways of understanding the link between thought and deed. The two ways of thinking they represent are not the only ones, of course, but if one gets beyond partisan views, they represent two ideal types of the intellectual in society. I do not wish to focus on individuals and their personalities, nor to present Manichaean, and therefore simplis­tic, oppositions between the professor and the pundit, the left-wing thinker and the right-wing one or the conservative and the liberal. This would be erroneous, not only because these categories do not fit exactly the two thinkers chosen but also because the two ideal types are somewhat unrelated to the ideological stances of Kagan and Chomsky. Yet, in order to discuss these ideal types I will have to deal with the specific writings of these two thinkers. It would have been more possible to contrast Chomsky with Kissinger; then the opposition would have been between two professors famous in Massachusetts and beyond, not between a prof and a pundit.1 At least Kagan's occasional bluntness shows that, as the English say, his mouth is closer to where his money is. Some intellectuals on the right or who describe themselves as conservatives, such as Andrew Bacevich, for instance, or a critic of Chomsky like Richard Posner, are closer to Chomsky in terms of ideal types, or of the definition of their roles in society and vis­a-vis the nation-state. This also applies to their relationship to truth, although Posner would not call himself a 'public intellectual' in the sense he attributes to the term when labelling Chomsky and thinkers like him 'public intellectuals'. In structural terms, Edward Said was, of course, very similar to Chomsky and he could also have been chosen when considering the two major ideal types presented here.2 Samuel Hunting­ton or Francis Fukuyama are very close to the Kagan ideal type, even if their ideas and relationship with power differ slightly from his.3 Writers like Christopher Hitchens represent another ideal type, that of the opportunist gadfly, a 'media intellectual' as pundits are called in France by critics on the left. Gore Vidal, who often takes stands similar to Chomsky's, is a literary intellectual who relishes bashing those he calls ignoramuses; his relationship to truth, society and the nation-state is structurally quite different from Chomsky's. If one were discussing the topic of 'intellectuals and the media' then an opposition between Hitchens and Mark Crispin Miller, two further ideal types, would be in order. If, on the other hand, one were dealing exclusively with foreign policy, Hunt­ington, Chomsky and Ignatieff would have been three possible ideal types.4 In Chomsky's categorization, Kagan is a 'mandarin', whose intellectual work amounts to siding with power against truth, whereas, for neo­conservatives, but also arch-conservatives or neo-cons, Chomsky represents the 'loony left' or 'dangerous liberal academic', an 'anti-American' divorced from political realities. Mandarins may be professors or pundits in think tanks; what distinguishes them is their rhetoric and behaviour rather than their professional affiliations. Although Kagan has lived in Brussels he represents a nationalist way of viewing intellectual and political work whereas Chomsky, an intellectual rooted in a long radical-libertarian American tradition, is a truly internationalist thinker who focuses his scathing criticism on the foreign policy of his own country. Chomsky himself does not approve of being labelled a 'public intellec­tual'. The term is used here in the sense that the 'public' is the intended audience of such writers: ordinary citizens, not elites or the academy. As a linguistics professor Chomsky addresses his colleagues in an elaborately scientific way; as a 'public intellectual' his style and his intended audi­ences are different. Ironically enough, although Kagan, like most so-called neoconservatives, dislikes Kissinger and his foreign policy realpolitik therefore European - approach, Kissinger's thinking is structurally much closer to Kagan's American nationalism than to that of intellectuals like Said or Chomsky, who are more internationalist and also more widely read and discussed outside the USA than within it. If one follows Said's definition of an 'intellectual' as someone who, as a citizen, intervenes in the public sphere and not only in a given field of expertise, then Chomsky is an intellectual whereas Kagan, who does not write qua citizen for other citizens, is an expert or a pundit. Somebody like Niall Fergusson, though British and an academic, as a would-be Machiavellian advisor to the Prince and a so-called 'power intellectual', is structurally very close kin to Kagan.5 The first dimension to take into account when contrasting two types of intellectuals is that of closeness to power. Pundits like Robert Kagan do not necessarily agree with the powers that be or various administra­tions but their aim is to talk to power. When neocons sent President Clinton a letter in 1998 arguing in favour of a war against Iraq, they hoped to exert some influence upon their political leader. Kagan, like the other neocons, is a constructor of visions for politicians to use or imple­ment. Such intellectuals produce the analyses, interpretations and visions that leaders within the Beltway may implement. Kissinger, Brzezinski, Huntington or, more recently, Nye did the same, although the ideas and the leaders in power differed.6 They all inscribe themselves in a Machiavellian tradition and wish to give advice to the Prince. Kagan produces ideas for the people who matter - that is, in our time, either people with political power or more widely the chattering classes in politics and the media. Kagan thus speaks with or to power but not to the people. With the George W. Bush administration, Kagan is much closer to power: though not always heard or followed by political authorities, he only works for movers and shakers. Noam Chomsky famously disagreed with Edward Said when Said argued that the task of the intellectual is to 'speak truth to power', since, Chomsky argued, power already knows the truth. In his famous article entitled 'The Responsibility of Intellectuals', Chomsky wrote: 'It is the responsibility of intellectuals to speak the truth and to expose lies' (Chomsky, 1967). Chomsky spent his lifetime doing precisely this. I will leave aside for a moment what the word 'truth' means in our so-called post-modern times.7 For Chomsky the role of the intellectual is to deconstruct, that is lay bare, the lies, fabrications and omissions of power. So Chomsky is not a constructor of visions for the elites or, as Marxists would say, for the dominant classes, but a deconstructor of lies and a rehabilitator of hidden facts. A lot has been said about Chomsky's rationalism, his belief in facts or even the possibility of facts and hence in the possibility of telling the truth. In one sense Chomsky could not be more of a contrast to thinkers like Jacques Derrida or Stanley Fish, for the existence of facts is not problematic in his political writings. One would need a long philosophical discussion to differentiate between various kinds of 'facts'. The 'facts' that are of interest to Chomsky are facts such as US support for the Indonesian junta which took power in 1965 and massacred hundreds of thousands of people, facts like the breaking of American or international law by the Reagan administration over Nicaragua or facts such as the absence of facts, as when the weapons of mass destruction and the links between Iraq and Al-Qaeda never materialized. For Chomsky, these facts do not depend on prior interpretations or theories. Facts can be established in a way that is similar to the way hard scientists work: by eliminating wrong interpretations and cross-referencing evidence. In this sense, it is impossible to prove the truth of a philosophical system like Marxism or Liberalism but quite easy to determine the lies of the US administration when it accused Iraq of possessing weapons of mass destruction in 2002 and 2003. Thus Zizek's scathing criticism of Chomsky, whom he says he admires, is rather strange. I will use Zizek to reflect two basic critiques of Chomsky (and therefore, by implication, of the type of intellectual he is). Zizek declared in an interview in 2002: Let me give you a very naive answer. I think that basically the facts are already known. Let's take Chomsky's analyses of how the CIA intervened in Nicaragua. OK, [he provides] a lot of details, yes, but did I learn anything fundamentally new? It's exactly what I'd expected: the CIA was playing a very dirty game. Of course it's more convincing if you learn the dirty details. But I don't think that we really learned anything dramatically new there. I don't think that merely 'knowing the facts' can really change people's perceptions. (Zizek, 2002) Chomsky's texts are indeed often fact-packed or, as the phrase goes, 'bone-dry', and do not make for pleasant recreational reading. But of course, establishing the facts matters tremendously when fighting propaganda: who would know about the 'dirty game' of the CIA if not for those who had the facts? How could Zizek know without the facts? How could he distinguish between rumours, propaganda and unsubstantiated allegations if he had not studied the facts? Isn't it rather irresponsible in a media landscape dominated by Murdoch and Fox News, which special­izes in the omission and distortion of facts, to rail against their overabundance? In short, Bertrand Russell's prediction of 'madness' when facts are discarded as the bases of theory seems to be operative here. Rather than challenging Chomsky, Zizek shows that his own work is quite different, based on erudite hunches, puns and rhetorical games but some­times plagued by either a dearth of information or a conflation of fantasy and theory (anti-smoking as a sign of a 'falseness in liberalism' or of 'absolute narcissism' cannot of course be proved by facts, nor are these claimed linkages so well-known that there is no need to analyse them).8 But, of course, Zizek's critique is totally antithetical to the usual right-wing one, which attacks Chomsky for using too few facts or wrong facts or for his anti-American bile amounting to paranoia.9 Zizek is right about Chomsky's Americanness, though that cannot seriously be held against him. For Kagan, as for Charles Krauthammer, another blunt neoconservative nationalist who does not mince his words, the defence of the interests of the US nation-state is of paramount importance - the nation-state here being apprehended as the political machinery ruling over the people. In the battle between the US state apparatus and other powers in the world, Kagan, like most neo- or archeo-conservatives, takes a strong nationalist stand, even if this American nationalist stand is accompanied by a strong critique of nationalism in foreign countries and is not theorized as nation­alism. The nationalism of the Other is targeted and demonized, not US nationalism, which is seen as a given, almost a natural phenomenon. Thus Chinese nationalism or European collective efforts to exist on the world stage may be criticized for going against US interests - that is, the inter­ests of the ruling class in the USA (see Balibar, 2003). So one can say that Kagan is a Gramscian thinker assisting the intel­lectual hegemon to control the machinery of the state. This is one form of irony which is often found when considering those pundits and academics who defend so-called neoliberal or neoconservative views tied to a defence of free trade, globalization and world orders based on market rules: such anti-state theorists often prove to be quite as statist as their ideological opponents. Their definition of the state is not a welfare state in which federal or state authorities fight poverty and social injustice and promote education and a safe environment, yet their theorizing implies a strong defence of a state viewed as a political-military machine serving the interests of US elites - that is, its dominant groups or classes. Kagan can be said to be a Social Darwinist statist for whom the nation-state does not operate for the benefit of its citizens but rather against the 'great beast' of the people. Kagan is very much in favour of a strong military American behemoth (although he calls it 'a behemoth with a conscience'; Kagan, 1998) and of a state that shapes the world according to the inter­ests of some of its privileged citizens and does not hesitate to resort to Machtpolitik. Chomsky, by contrast, is not so much concerned with fighting to gain control of the machinery of the nation-state, though he belongs to the rather large group of people who feel that state, that is to say, federal authorities, should play a bigger role in the fight against deprivation. His main area of concern and therefore intervention is precisely the fight against the behemoth. His stress upon the American behemoth on the world stage has more to do with the fact that, as an American citizen, he can be most effective in his own country, which is also the only super­power left. His critique of European or Asian powers, though less frequent than his critique of the USA, is just as scathing. He writes against the empire, against the lies of the nation-state, but focuses on power, wherever it is located. Whereas Kagan addresses the elites which he feels can implement his visions, Chomsky presents people with the facts he has disinterred so that they can mobilize for change. He believes in the agency of ordinary citizens and conceives of his work as a resource for others, and not a resource that requires a particularly high IQ or expert knowl­edge to be used.10 Although Chomsky is often presented as an activist, a militant, a fire­brand, he is, in fact, most of all, a thinker who believes people can make up their own minds on the basis of adequate information, which he feels it is his job to provide. In this he is probably closer to Emerson and Thoreau than to Marx and totally different from Lenin. Some blame him for being too individualistic or anarchistic, for he devises his 'tool-kits' in isolation from others. This criticism overlooks the intellectual and activist networks Chomsky is involved in and is anyway, of course, a charge that could be levelled at many, if not most, intellectuals. The other critique - whereby academics attack Chomsky for not playing by the rules of academia - is, of course, still relevant. Yet Chomsky does play by the academic rules in his linguistics and in some of his political publi­cations.11 But not when writing as a public intellectual. It is a matter of choice. Also, too many academics play by the rules dictated by careerism and take only calculated risks or pseudo-risks in their political writings. Where the local academic power is radical and left wing, in admittedly the very few departments of this kind, being left wing may only be a matter of conforming to the local orthodoxy. Playing to the local choir when the local choir chants conventional insults at the broader national choir is an easy, hypocritical but perhaps necessary career move. Here one could introduce a discussion of courage versus conformity under many guises but, of course, the courage to express one's views, however un­popular, in public does not characterize only one group of thinkers. Courageous radicals may also be of a right-wing persuasion. Psychologiz­ing ideological positions always presents major difficulties in intellectual analyses. Useful, brilliant or unconventional intellectuals are not necess­arily nice and friendly in public (and vice versa). Whereas Kagan could be said to be a 'top-down' theorist, Chomsky could be called a 'bottom-up' one, to use the admittedly problematic terminology in vogue in management circles. Kagan is an elitist who feels elites must tell others what to do and think, which corresponds to the definition of what public relations are for, according to Walter Lippmann, who coined the phrase 'the manufacture of consent'. Chomsky, in typical libertarian fashion, wants to tear away the veil hiding the naked reality of power. Chomsky invites his readers and listeners to see beyond media interpretations and omissions whereas Kagan is a publicist working for the manufacture of consent among dominant groups. Among other thinkers not interested in the conquest of the state appar­atus, such as Lacan or Baudrillard in France, for instance, there is often an attitude or a pose that differs sharply from Chomsky's. Lacan or Baudrillard do not write for the ordinary reader; their writings address a small body of highly educated cognoscenti who generally respond to their reading in a very individualistic, personal way. The success of these two writers has, in part, something to do with the specific position of intel­lectuals or pundits in France. In the USA and the English-speaking world more generally, their success is well established only in the humanities departments of elite universities. Chomsky is an intellectual who tries to bypass intellectuals and to cross the boundaries between academe and the people. Even when not working within the university, Lacan and Baudrillard never left the confines provided by well-read Parisian elites and do not write for the 'lay person'. So, even though their discourse may be subversive or dissident, they share the same elitist preference as Kagan. This, of course, does not invalidate the quality of their research or even its usefulness in the larger intellectual debate. Zizek's intervention in the public sphere, though often quite Lacanian in style, is more access­ible to non-academics, for his production can be apprehended at differ­ent levels. Yet his wild swings from Lenin to Lacan or from Kant to Habermas can only be understood or appreciated by listeners or readers who are well versed in philosophy and political theory. Bourdieu is a different case; in fact, he is the structural equivalent of Chomsky in France, intervening at two different levels, the academic one and the public one, in different types of publications. His public and political interventions are, however, directly based upon his sociological work. The citizen-scholar or public intellectual may also be an academic in a different capacity. Chomsky is therefore often called a populist because of the apparent simplicity of his (apparently) readily accessible style. This simplicity is common to him and the neocons, who do not write in a complex or convoluted Lacanian style at all. Kagan is a pundit in a rush; like other neocons he wants quick results, a new Middle East policy and a swift change in that area of the world. He wants efficiency and results on the ground. Intellectuals like Chomsky often strive to oppose such neocon objectives, but their aims and methods are more Socratic, in the sense that they address people's thinking abili­ties, their thinking minds. Even political mobilization is secondary and in this they differ from regular activists writing for the dissident press or websites. Pundits like Kagan wish to change the world quickly from above; they are seekers after power, whereas Socratic public intellectuals like Chomsky are seekers after truth. This quest for truth often takes precedence over friendship and loyalty to institutions or groups of people. Chomsky has often got involved in bitter fights with other thinkers on the left or with liberals. His fight to establish the facts may explain his often somewhat harsh attitude in debates. For him, disseminating knowledge matters much more than propping up the nation-state. Citizen-intellectuals like Chomsky cannot hope to change the world in swift, direct ways because, by definition, they are excluded from the sphere of political power. Responsible public intellectuals seeking after truth have to combine scientific research with the dissemination of ideas which may cause public opinion to change - an arduous task which sometimes may be marred by simplification. A key distinguishing factor between Chomsky and Kagan or citizen-intellectuals, on the one hand, and pundits or 'expert-scholars', on the other, is the divorce between ethics and politics in the case of the latter, who are pragmatists for whom the end justifies the means. They are believers in the adage, 'my country, right or wrong', or, rather, 'my nation-state right or wrong', whatever the human costs for others or for subject groups within 'my nation'. Contrary to Kissinger's devious rhetoric, Kagan explains and justifies his pragmatic immorality very explicitly by quoting Cooper, a British analyst and advisor to Blair: 'we need to revert to the rougher methods of an earlier era - force, pre­emptive attack, deception, whatever is necessary' (Cooper, quoted in Kagan, 2003b: 74). Kagan even argues: Among ourselves, we keep the law but when we are operating in the jungle, we must also use the laws of the jungle' (Kagan, 2003b: 74).12 Kagan and Cooper could not be more overt in their xenophobic and racist neo-Kiplingian distrust of the Other. Here Machiavelli's disciples show that advising the Prince entrains disre­gard for ethics in the name of efficiency. Citizen-intellectuals cannot divorce ethics from politics. On the contrary, their politics is based upon a form of ethics. Responsible intel­lectuals who 'speak the truth and expose lies' not only believe in the exist­ence of facts and in the possibility of establishing them but also predicate their activity upon a moral principle. Truth is then the basis for political awareness and action. This reverence for truth is the basis of scientific research, for without truth there is no possibility of scientific discovery or technological innovation. If the expression had not been 'pre-empted' by Hardt and Negri one could say that citizen-scholars have another prince, the 'multitude', or in Marxist terminology, the masses - but to take that step could conjure up the concept of an avant garde, which does not agree with Chomsky's libertarian instincts. Machiavellians, on the other hand, can produce propaganda with no regard for the truth: the objective is to manufacture consent to support the powers that be or to influence power in a specific way (see Zinn, 2003). Expert-scholars like Kissinger illustrate La Rochefoucauld's (1665) maxim that 'Uhypocrisie est un hommage que le vice rend a la vertu' (hypocrisy is the homage paid by vice to virtue), for Kissinger claims that the USA is the most moral of nation-states when, as a decision-maker, he rushed to violate this very morality supposed to characterize America'. Kissinger confuses the rhetoric of morality often resorted to by American leaders with a truly ethical foreign policy, that is to say, he confuses propaganda with analysis. America's raison d'etat may be clothed in democratic, religious or allegedly post-national rhetoric; it is no less strong than it was in 17th-century Europe. The neocons have the advantage of letting Kissinger's cat out of the nationalist bag, even if for them the nation-state is not the state belonging to all its citizens. Marx's aphorism about philosophers - 'intellectuals' in our terminol­ogy - is well-known. In his 'Thesis on Feuerbach' he wrote: 'philosophers have only interpreted the world, the point is to change it' ('Eleventh Thesis'; Marx, 1845: 156). Kagan could be said to be in a rush to change the world without first interpreting it whilst Chomsky does not share Marx's impatience with analysis and comprehension but provides the tool-kits and facts to help change the world. On this score Kagan, like so many so-called conservative thinkers, is a vulgar Marxist while Chomsky is decidedly a non-Marxist. Justice and truth matter more to Chomsky than the nation-state while the princes of the nation are Kagan's main focus.

## Impacts

### Heg/Imperialism = Extinction

#### The drive for hegemonic imperialism causes multiple scenarios for inevitable extinction.

Foster 2005 (John Bellamy, Monthly Review, September, Vol 57, Iss 4, “Naked Imperialism”)

From the longer view offered by a historical-materialist critique of capitalism, the direction that would be taken by U.S. imperialism following the fall of the Soviet Union was never in doubt. Capitalism by its very logic is a globally expansive system. The contradiction between its transnational economic aspirations and the fact that politically it remains rooted in particular nation states is insurmountable for the system. Yet, ill-fated attempts by individual states to overcome this contradiction are just as much a part of its fundamental logic. In present world circumstances, when one capitalist state has a virtual monopoly of the means of destruction, the temptation for that state to attempt to seize full-spectrum dominance and to transform itself into the de facto global state governing the world economy is irresistible. As the noted Marxian philosopher István Mészáros observed in Socialism or Barbarism? (2001)-written, significantly, before George W. Bush became president: "[W]hat is at stake today is not the control of a particular part of the planet-no matter how large-putting at a disadvantage but still tolerating the independent actions of some rivals, but the control of its totality by one hegemonic economic and military superpower, with all means-even the most extreme authoritarian and, if needed, violent military ones-at its disposal."

The unprecedented dangers of this new global disorder are revealed in the twin cataclysms to which the world is heading at present: nuclear proliferation and hence increased chances of the outbreak of nuclear war, and planetary ecological destruction. These are symbolized by the Bush administration's refusal to sign the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty to limit nuclear weapons development and by its failure to sign the Kyoto Protocol as a first step in controlling global warming. As former U.S. Secretary of Defense (in the Kennedy and Johnson administrations) Robert McNamara stated in an article entitled "Apocalypse Soon" in the May-June 2005 issue of Foreign Policy. "The United States has never endorsed the policy of 'no first use,' not during my seven years as secretary or since. We have been and remain prepared to initiate the use of nuclear weapons-by the decision of one person, the president-against either a nuclear or nonnuclear enemy whenever we believe it is in our interest to do so." The nation with the greatest conventional military force and the willingness to use it unilaterally to enlarge its global power is also the nation with the greatest nuclear force and the readiness to use it whenever it sees fit-setting the whole world on edge. The nation that contributes more to carbon dioxide emissions leading to global warming than any other (representing approximately a quarter of the world's total) has become the greatest obstacle to addressing global warming and the world's growing environmental problems-raising the possibility of the collapse of civilization itself if present trends continue.

The United States is seeking to exercise sovereign authority over the planet during a time of widening global crisis: economic stagnation, increasing polarization between the global rich and the global poor, weakening U.S. economic hegemony, growing nuclear threats, and deepening ecological decline. The result is a heightening of international instability. Other potential forces are emerging in the world, such as the European Community and China, that could eventually challenge U.S. power, regionally and even globally. Third world revolutions, far from ceasing, are beginning to gain momentum again, symbolized by Venezuela's Bolivarian Revolution under Hugo Chávez. U.S. attempts to tighten its imperial grip on the Middle East and its oil have had to cope with a fierce, seemingly unstoppable, Iraqi resistance, generating conditions of imperial overstretch. With the United States brandishing its nuclear arsenal and refusing to support international agreements on the control of such weapons, nuclear proliferation is continuing. New nations, such as North Korea, are entering or can be expected soon to enter the "nuclear club." Terrorist blowback from imperialist wars in the third world is now a well-recognized reality, generating rising fear of further terrorist attacks in New York, London, and elsewhere. Such vast and overlapping historical contradictions, rooted in the combined and uneven development of the global capitalist economy along with the U.S. drive for planetary domination, foreshadow what is potentially the most dangerous period in the history of imperialism.

#### US Imperial geopolitics lead to extinction.

Foster 2006 (John Bellamy, Monthly Review, January, Vol. 57, Iss. 8, “The New Geopolitics of Empire”)

The unpopularity of geopolitical analysis after 1943 is usually attributed to its association with the Nazi strategy of world conquest. Yet the popular rejection of geopolitics in that period may have also arisen from the deeper recognition that classical geopolitics in all of its forms was an inherently imperialist and war-related doctrine. As the critical geopolitical analyst Robert Strausz-Hupé argued in 1942, "In Geopolitik there is no distinction between war and peace. All states have the urge to expand, and the process of expansion is viewed as a perpetual warfare-no matter whether military power is actually applied or is used to implement 'peaceful' diplomacy as a suspended threat."35

U.S. imperial geopolitics is ultimately aimed at creating a global space for capitalist development. It is about forming a world dedicated to capital accumulation on behalf of the U.S. ruling class-and to a lesser extent the interlinked ruling classes of the triad powers as a whole (North America, Europe, and Japan). Despite "the end of colonialism" and the rise of "anti-capitalist new countries," Business Week pronounced in April 1975, there has always been "the umbrella of American power to contain it.... [T]he U.S. was able to fashion increasing prosperity among Western countries, using the tools of more liberal trade, investment, and political power. The rise of the multinational corporation was the economic expression of this political framework."36

There is no doubt that the U.S. imperium has benefited those at the top of the center-capitalist nations and not just the power elite of the United States. Yet, the drive for global hegemony on the part of particular capitalist nations and their ruling classes, like capital accumulation itself, recognizes no insurmountable barriers. Writing before September 11, 2001, István Mészáros argued in his Socialism or Barbarism that due to unbridled U.S. imperial ambitions the world was entering what was potentially "the most dangerous phase of imperialism in all history":

For what is at stake today is not the control of a particular part of the planet-no matter how large-putting at a disadvantage but still tolerating the independent actions of some rivals, but the control of its totality by one hegemonic economic and military superpower... .This is what the ultimate rationality of globally developed capital requires, in its vain attempt to bring under control its irreconcilable antagonisms. The trouble is, though, that such rationality...is at the same time the most extreme form of irrationality in history, including the Nazi conception of world domination, as far as the conditions required for the survival of humanity are concerned.37

#### US imperialism will cause backlash and asymmetric warfare, unleashing new global holocausts.

Foster 2003 (John Bellamy, Monthly Review, July/August, “The new age of imperialism”)

This new age of U.S. imperialism will generate its own contradictions, amongst them attempts by other major powers to assert their influence, resorting to similar belligerent means, and all sorts of strategies by weaker states and non-state actors to engage in "asymmetric" forms of warfare. Given the unprecedented destructiveness of contemporary weapons, which are diffused ever more widely, the consequences for the population of the world could well be devastating beyond anything ever before witnessed. Rather than generating a new "Pax Americana" the United States may be paving the way to new global holocausts.

The greatest hope in these dire circumstances lies in a rising tide of revolt from below, both in the United States and globally. The growth of the antiglobalization movement, which dominated the world stage for nearly two years following the events in Seattle in November 1999, was succeeded in February 2003 by the largest global wave of antiwar protests in human history. Never before has the world's population risen up so quickly and in such massive numbers in the attempt to stop an imperialist war. The new age of imperialism is also a new age of revolt. The Vietnam Syndrome, which has so worried the strategic planners of the imperial order for decades, now seems not only to have left a deep legacy within the United States but also to have been coupled this time around with an Empire Syndrome on a much more global scale-something that no one really expected. This more than anything else makes it clear that the strategy of the American ruling class to expand the American Empire cannot possibly succeed in the long run, and will prove to be its own-we hope not the world's-undoing.

## Turns Case

### Turns Warming

#### **American exceptionalism prevents action on global warming**

Kohut, Pew Research Center, president, and Stokes, National Journal, contributing editor, 6

(Andrew, Bruce, 5-9-06, Pew Research Center for the People and the Press, “The Problem of American Exceptionalism,” <http://pewresearch.org/pubs/23/the-problem-of-american-exceptionalism>, accessed 7-10-12, LH)

Indeed, Americans' self-confidence breeds indifference and inertia toward dealing with problems generally and international problems in particular. Americans tend to minimize challenges even as they acknowledge them. In mid-1999, Pew conducted a series of major polls asking Americans to look back on the 20th century and ahead to the 21st. Despite gloomy consensus forecasts of natural disasters, environmental calamities, and international terrorism, a resounding 81 percent of adults were steadfast in their optimism about what the 21st century held for them and their families, and 70 percent believed the country as a whole would do well. Eight in ten Americans described themselves as hopeful, anticipating that the new millennium would usher in the triumph of science and technology. Majorities predicted that it was most likely cancer would be cured, AIDS would be eradicated, and ordinary people would travel in space.9

Such confidence in the face of looming problems is a key element in Americans' "can do" reputation. But optimism can also reinforce a "muddle through" mentality, which, in turn, makes it more difficult to bring public pressure to bear on elected leaders to deal forcefully with problems that Americans themselves see on the horizon. For example, PIPA surveys showed that a very strong majority of the U.S. public believed that global warming is a real and serious problem. Yet 21 percent of respondents stated that unless global warming is a certainty, no steps should be taken to deal with it, and another 42 percent said only gradual, low-cost steps should be taken. Just 34 percent of the public said it was necessary to deal with global warming right now. Moreover 66 percent thought that the United States was either doing more or about as much to limit greenhouse gases as other advanced nations.

#### **American exceptionalism prevents solvency of global warming**

Chalecki, Pacific Institute for Studies in Development, Environment, and Security, research associate, 7

(Elizabeth L., July 2007, Selected Works, “Science Before Law: American Exceptionalism in the Kyoto Protocol and the Development of a Global Norm of Environmental Compliance,” <http://works.bepress.com/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1000&context=elizabeth_chalecki>, p. 12-15, accessed 7-11-12, LH)

Its non-adherence to the Kyoto Protocol is not the only time that the United States has been exceptional with regard to international law, and yet the global legal system has not crumbled. The system contains laws and treaties governing every sort of behavior and commitment, from bilateral and multilateral trade agreements to international human rights conventions to multilateral environmental agreements, and American exceptionalism has apparently not doomed any of it. However, because the global environmental regime involves problems that are literally global in scope and source, it is different – in fact, one might say that it is by definition exceptional. As previously suggested, the non-compliance of the United States may act as a spoiler for the rest of the climate change mitigation regime. 29

In the area of international trade law, non-parties or parties out of compliance with a particular treaty may face economic deprivation or, at worst, sanctions. If recalcitrant parties decide to comply, the sanctions can be reversed relatively quickly with appreciable harm only to certain sectors of domestic society. Laws governing trade govern essentially bilateral relationships between states, and other nations generally are not affected by violations. For example, if a country prohibits importation of a good, the exporting parties will suffer a financial loss, but the trade regime in general is not imperiled by non-compliance, nor is the ability of other nations to engage in trade. If the trade barrier is removed by a WTO arbitration panel, imports of the good in question can be resumed.

In areas of human rights law, non-parties or parties out of compliance may face sanctions, diffuse reciprocity (shunning or shaming, for example), and bad publicity. Non-compliance may also render appreciable harm to women, ethnic or religious minorities, or other sectors of domestic society. This harm may be felt across local borders in the form of refugees or diasporadriven ethnic strife, but it generally does not affect distant nations. If parties decide to comply, harm can generally repair itself within the domestic society in a few years, perhaps over a generation. Sanctions and other punitive measures can be lifted immediately and their effect mitigated quickly. It has been argued that human rights laws are essentially unilateral statements of position, and whether a state complies or does not comply, or is not a party, will not generally affect the dealings and interests of other states, or the existence of the regime itself.

However, the area of global environmental law is critically different from trade and human rights law, because it is neither unilateral nor bilateral, but truly multilateral. The regime attempts to address behavior not between human beings themselves, but between human beings and the natural world. This relationship is one that we do not fully understand and certainly cannot control, though we can affect it. Our assessment of what this regime should look like and what sorts of behavior it should include are governed by the best scientific judgment we can apply at the time, so the very purpose of the regime itself can change over time as our scientific knowledge advances. 31 The scientific component drives the qualitative argument that the global environmental regime is different from trade or human rights because the behavior of one nation can affect the viability of the entire regime for every other participant.

Thus a nation’s non-compliance or non-party status is much more significant in this area than in other areas of international law because the level of harm resulting from non-compliance or non-participation has the potential to be much greater. Specifically, large polluters can negatively affect the viability of the treaty regime, even if they are not parties, by the sheer magnitude of their contamination. The United States puts out approximately 30% of global CO2 emissions and is the largest emitter on a per-capita basis. 32 Even if every other nation on earth was a compliant party to a climate regime, global warming would still proceed because of the non-compliance of the “indispensable party.” This means that one non-party nation can render the entire regime ineffective and useless because the regime would not, and could not, achieve its goal of stabilization of atmospheric GHG levels. Depending on the type of pollutant, the effects of non-compliance can affect every nation on the globe, whether contiguous to the non-party or not. For example, chlorofluororcarbon emissions came largely from the United States and Europe, but they had the greatest effect on the nations around the South Pole (Chile, Argentina, New Zealand) because that is where the most acute damage to the stratospheric ozone layer occurred. GHG emissions are predicted to cause a sea level rise sufficient to inundate major areas of entire Pacific island nations and archipelagos. 33 These effects can take decades or perhaps centuries to reverse. The ozone hole, for example, won’t close till 2050, and we have no idea how long it will take to reverse global climate change, if it is even possible at all. Because the very nature of the global environmental regime is different than that of other areas of international law, the traditional formation of customary norms has proven inadequate to deal with global environmental problems. Indeed, international law as a whole has never been confronted with a set of problems of the nature and quality of global environmental change.

#### **Pursuit of hegemony prevents international climate agreements**

Murali, Madura College, department of philosophy and center for philosophical research, department head, 8

(Dr. R, 12-17-08, Aritclesbase, “The Political Economy of Social Justice,” <http://www.articlesbase.com/college-and-university-articles/the-political-economy-of-social-justice-688358.html>, accessed 7-11-12, LH)

George Soros, another architect of Globalization observes that ‘we have global markets but we cannot build a global society without taking into account moral considerations' He says that US is the major obstacle to international cooperation today. It is resolutely opposed to any international arrangement that would infringe on its sovereignty. The list is long including the International Criminal Court, the Landmines Treaty, the Kyoto Protocol, many of the ILO conventions and many more arcane conventions like the Law of Sea Convention and convention of Biological Diversity. Hence he says that the pursuit of hegemony comes into direct conflict with the vision of a global open society. United States wants to be an unmoved mover.

### Turns Terrorism

#### **American exceptionalism incites terrorism and encourages more drastic counterterrorism efforts**

Vlahos, John Hopkins University, National Security Assessment team, 12

(Mike, 4-24-12, Conflicts Forum, “Counterterrorism and the New American Exceptionalism,” <http://www.conflictsforum.org/2012/counterterrorism-and-the-new-american-exceptionalism/>, accessed 7-11-12, LH)

How can terrorist acts singularly threaten a chosen people of resplendent and undiminished warrior spirit? America’s very language of terrorism provides clues. In our imagination, terrorism is simply “evil.” Yet what makes terrorism so evil? Is it the killing of civilians? (That happens all the time in war.) Is it killing done in the name of politics or religion? (Political ideology is at the very heart of war.) What about those who are labeled “terrorist” but whose resistance is actually nonviolent, or those who gain authority through democratic election? What about those persecuted by state regimes because of their political views or religious beliefs, those for whom justice through non-violence has not even the dream of hope? And how shall we regard those who historically took up arms against injustice rather than endure its yoke, like Boston rebels celebrating their Tea Party?[14]

For increasing numbers of Americans—particularly those who have deeply imbibed the recent militant distortions of a traditional ethos of American exceptionalism—“terrorism” is not primarily about what people do, or whether history celebrates or condemns them. Terrorism is identified as existential threat. For many Americans today, “terrorism” is about much more than any rational calculation of threats; it is about civil-religious identity.[15]

Americanism may still reign as modernity’s strongest civil religion, yet it is the religion of a people otherwise united by the weakest of tribal bonds. Benedict Anderson might have called America the ultimate “imagined community.”[16] A nation that is also an idea must at all costs defend that idea, lest faith and thus identity fail us. American exceptionalism is that idea, and terrorism is our religion’s very antithesis. In American civil-religious thought, terrorism is the Devil himself.

If a challenged state regime uses anti-terrorism as national theater to shore up political strength, characterizing the threat as primitive and savage to orchestrate popular passion, then success may strengthen political authority. But Americans need no orchestration by a cunning state. Even small acts of violence against the American idea—including those most driven by injustice—we instantly transform into mortal threats, justifying the most extravagant sanctions and the most unremitting punishment. Our visceral collective hatred toward Osama Bin Laden is culturally noteworthy as an expression once reserved, in medieval times, for demons from Hell.

#### **American exceptionalism incites more terrorism**

Walt, Harvard University, international affairs professor, 11

(Stephen M., November 2011, Foreign Policy, “The Myth of American Exceptionalism,” <http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2011/10/11/the_myth_of_american_exceptionalism?page=full>, accessed 7-11-12, LH)

For starters, the United States has been one of the most expansionist powers in modern history. It began as 13 small colonies clinging to the Eastern Seaboard, but eventually expanded across North America, seizing Texas, Arizona, New Mexico, and California from Mexico in 1846. Along the way, it eliminated most of the native population and confined the survivors to impoverished reservations. By the mid-19th century, it had pushed Britain out of the Pacific Northwest and consolidated its hegemony over the Western Hemisphere.

The United States has fought numerous wars since then -- starting several of them -- and its wartime conduct has hardly been a model of restraint. The 1899-1902 conquest of the Philippines killed some 200,000 to 400,000 Filipinos, most of them civilians, and the United States and its allies did not hesitate to dispatch some 305,000 German and 330,000 Japanese civilians through aerial bombing during World War II, mostly through deliberate campaigns against enemy cities. No wonder Gen. Curtis LeMay, who directed the bombing campaign against Japan, told an aide, "If the U.S. lost the war, we would be prosecuted as war criminals." The United States dropped more than 6 million tons of bombs during the Indochina war, including tons of napalm and lethal defoliants like Agent Orange, and it is directly responsible for the deaths of many of the roughly 1 million civilians who died in that war.

More recently, the U.S.-backed Contra war in Nicaragua killed some 30,000 Nicaraguans, a percentage of their population equivalent to 2 million dead Americans. U.S. military action has led directly or indirectly to the deaths of 250,000 Muslims over the past three decades (and that's a low-end estimate, not counting the deaths resulting from the sanctions against Iraq in the 1990s), including the more than 100,000 people who died following the invasion and occupation of Iraq in 2003. U.S. drones and Special Forces are going after suspected terrorists in at least five countries at present and have killed an unknown number of innocent civilians in the process. Some of these actions may have been necessary to make Americans more prosperous and secure. But while Americans would undoubtedly regard such acts as indefensible if some foreign country were doing them to us, hardly any U.S. politicians have questioned these policies. Instead, Americans still wonder, "Why do they hate us?"

#### **Terrorist attacks are a response to American hegemony and counterattacks only incite more terrorism- Al-Qaeda proves**

Muzaffar, University of Malaysia, global studies professor, 4

(Chandra, President of the International Movement for a Just World (JUST), 2004, Widener Law Review, “Hegemony, terrorism, and War- Is Democracy the Antidote?,” <http://static7.userland.com/ulvs1-j/gems/wlr/08muzaffar.pdf>, p. 361-362, accessed 7-11-12, LH)

Al-Qaeda, the world’s most notorious terrorist network, was, in a sense, a response to the most obvious manifestation of global hegemony, namely, military power. As soon as the United States had established a military base in Dhahran, Saudi Arabia, in 1991, immediately after the Kuwait War, the alQaeda leader, Osama bin Laden, announced to the world that he would attack Dhahran. He considered the establishment of an “infidel” military base in Islam’s holiest land—Saudi Arabia, where Islam’s two holiest cities, Mecca and Media, are situated—an act of sacrilege.1 In June 1996, al-Qaeda was allegedly involved in a bomb attack upon the base, killing 19 American airmen and wounding 250 others. Two years later, al-Qaeda targeted U.S. embassies in Kenya and Tanzania. This was followed by the 2000 assault on a U.S. warship, the USS Cole, off the coast of Yemen. The climax was of course the infamous 9-11 episode when al-Qaeda operatives allegedly smashed aircrafts into the World Trade Center (WTC) in New York and the Pentagon in Washington, D.C. Almost three thousand men and women were massacred in those horrendous tragedies on the eleventh of September 2001. There is no need to emphasize that the WTC was a symbol of U.S.’s global economic power while the Pentagon represented its global military might.

After 9-11, U.S. global hegemony continued to provoke al-Qaeda and other terrorist outfits. Since the U.S. and its allies had invaded Afghanistan in October 2001 in order to oust the Taliban regime that was protecting Osama, the invasion became the justification for further terrorist attacks. The Bali bombings of October 2002, purportedly carried out by a group affiliated with al-Qaeda, the Jemaah Islamiyyah, were primarily to avenge the Afghan invasion. Then in March 2003, the U.S. and its allies embarked upon a second military invasion. This time the target was Iraq. One year after Iraq was conquered, al-Qaeda struck again; it was responsible for a dastardly carnage at a Madrid railway station. The unconcealed aim was to compel the Spanish government to withdraw its soldiers from the U.S. led force in Iraq. Al-Qaeda succeeded in its objective.

If we reflect upon al-Qaeda attacks, it is obvious that the military, political, and economic dimensions of U.S. hegemony figure prominently on its radar screen. It is seldom acknowledged, however, that the cultural dimension of hegemony has also been a consideration. For instance, during their trial, a couple of the Bali bombers inveighed against Western cultural imperialism and how it was destroying the identity and integrity of indigenous communities.

By arguing that hegemony in all its manifestations breeds terrorism, we are in no way condoning terrorism. Al-Qaeda’s deliberate targeting of noncombatants and civilians in general—in East Africa, on 9-11, in Bali, in Madrid—has been condemned by right-thinking people everywhere. Leading Muslim theologians and scholars have not only denounced al-Qaeda’s misdeeds from a humanitarian perspective, but have also castigated Osama and his underlings as men who have shamelessly violated the essence of Islamic teachings.2 Nonetheless, if we fail to recognize how hegemony— control and dominance over people—leads to acts of terror, we will be no better than the proverbial ostrich that buries its head in the sand.

### Turns Economy

#### **Defense spending hurts the economy- empirically proven**

Barro, Harvard University, professor of economics, 9

(Robert J., 1-22-09, Wall Street Journal, “Government Spending Is No Free Lunch,” <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB123258618204604599.html>, accessed 7-11-12, LH)

I have estimated that World War II raised U.S. defense expenditures by $540 billion (1996 dollars) per year at the peak in 1943-44, amounting to 44% of real GDP. I also estimated that the war raised real GDP by $430 billion per year in 1943-44. Thus, the multiplier was 0.8 (430/540). The other way to put this is that the war lowered components of GDP aside from military purchases. The main declines were in private investment, nonmilitary parts of government purchases, and net exports -- personal consumer expenditure changed little. Wartime production siphoned off resources from other economic uses -- there was a dampener, rather than a multiplier.

We can consider similarly three other U.S. wartime experiences -- World War I, the Korean War, and the Vietnam War -- although the magnitudes of the added defense expenditures were much smaller in comparison to GDP. Combining the evidence with that of World War II (which gets a lot of the weight because the added government spending is so large in that case) yields an overall estimate of the multiplier of 0.8 -- the same value as before. (These estimates were published last year in my book, "Macroeconomics, a Modern Approach.")

#### **Defense spending erodes the economy- crowds out other investments**

Stiglitz, Nobel Prize winning economist, 6

(Joseph, 4-05-06, Spiegel Online, “The War is Bad for the Economy,” <http://www.spiegel.de/international/spiegel/interview-with-nobel-laureate-joseph-stiglitz-the-war-is-bad-for-the-economy-a-409710.html>, accessed 7-11-12, LH)

Stiglitz: Listen, World War II was really unusual, because America was in the Great Depression before. So the war did help the US economy to get securely out of this decline. This time, the war is bad for the economy in both the short and long run. We could have spent trillions in research or education instead. This would have led to future productivity increases.

SPIEGEL: So is the economical mess of the Iraq war even bigger than the political?

Stiglitz: Well, we are so rich, we are able to withstand even this level. Crowding out other investments, weakening the economy in the future, that’s not a crisis yet. But it’s an erosion. It becomes an issue for our legislators. And don’t forget the serious issues of nuclear proliferation in Iran and North Korea. We used up our ability to deal with something serious by dealing with something that was less serious.

#### **Defense spending wasteful- hurts the economy**

Frank, U.S. Representative, 12

(Barney, member of the Democratic Party, former chairman of the House Financial Services Committee, January/February 2012, Foreign Policy, “How to Save the Global Economy: Cut Defense Spending,” <http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/01/03/4_cut_defense_spending>, accessed 7-11-12, LH)

One major change that can reverse this: a substantial reduction in America's military spending. In the current fiscal year, the United States is spending upwards of $650 billion on its military, including the costs of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. This is far more than it spends on Medicare and, more importantly, considerably in excess of what is required for America's legitimate national security needs.

The United States should and will be the strongest country in the world. But it can achieve that status for significantly less than it is now spending. An early withdrawal of U.S. troops from Afghanistan over the next six months would save hundreds of billions of dollars. In addition, we could reach savings of more than $100 billion annually by adopting strategic concepts appropriate to the current world situation, rather than continuing to rack up bills fighting threats that no longer exist. We could also save tens of billions of dollars a year by curtailing our commitment to the defense of Western Europe -- which was perfectly sensible when President Harry Truman made it but is wholly inexplicable now that Europeans are wealthy, strong, and threatened by no one -- as well as by reducing our military presence in Japan and forgoing the new proposal for stationing U.S. Marines in Australia. We do not need to maintain the fighting capacity we had during the height of the Cold War to engage the Soviet Union in an all-out conflict. Terrorists are terrible people who should be confronted, but they are not a thermonuclear-armed Soviet empire. Fighting them, though in many ways more complicated, should be less expensive.

Reducing excessive military spending -- my proposal cuts approximately $900 billion in the next 10 years -- would allow us to provide the short-term economic stimulus needed to continue the progress we are making in breaking out of the recession. Ironically, many of my conservative colleagues have opposed the idea of reducing our military budget on grounds that I refer to as "[weaponized Keynesianism](http://thinkprogress.org/security/2009/06/23/47246/frank-f22-monopoly/)." They claim that government spending doesn't create jobs -- unless it is for the military. Many opponents of cuts in military spending now argue against them not in terms of national defense, but on the grounds that they would cause job losses. In fact, economists tell us, reductions in military spending will have far less negative impact on jobs than comparable reductions in medical care or infrastructure.

## AT: Hegemony Solves Conflict

### AT: Loss of Heg = War

#### Heg decline doesn’t cause war, and even though relative decline is inevitable, the US military advantage is so large that no global challengers will initiate hostility against the US.

Nichols and Johnson-Freese 9 (Tom, professor at the Naval War College and a fellow at Harvard’s Kennedy School of Government, and Joan, chair of the Naval War College’s National Security Decision Making program and a top scholar on China’s space program, “US Less Dominant But So What”, 11/25, <http://www.dodbuzz.com/2009/11/25/us-less-dominant-but-so-what/> GAL)

Here we go again.

America, we are told, is losing its strategic dominance, and that the balance of power is shifting from the Western hemisphere (home to the wealthiest, most technologically advanced military alliance in all of human history) to the East, a hemisphere that manages to combine advanced intercontinental ballistic nuclear weaponry with the basically inability to deliver food and clean water to tens, even hundreds, of millions of human beings. It is a familiar story: Our technological achievements are about to be eclipsed, and our military forces–already mired down in a sideshow in Central Asia–will be dwarfed by the shining new militaries of the East. All that is missing is some Soviet Politburo functionary confidently declaring that “the correlation of forces has shifted away from America’s favor” while standing in front of a television reporting the fall of Saigon.

To paraphrase an exasperated Henry Kissinger from those dark days: “What in the name of God is strategic dominance, and what do you do with it?”

The problem is not that America is in decline. It is. But it is relative decline, and this in itself is neither unnatural nor cause for worry. Other countries are growing stronger, in both military and economic terms: the globalization of money, knowledge and technology have ended the days when the United States, through sheer size and power, could control either the international economy or the spread of weapons. Unchallengeable hegemony, which apparently some see as the standard by which American foreign policy success should be measured, is a far more difficult goal today than when Rome ruled the world or Britannia ruled the waves.

But even if America is in relative decline…so what? What does it mean to say that “power is moving East?” After World War II, power moved both East and West–out of Europe and toward North America and Eurasia–and after the Cold War, power was concentrated solely in the U.S. and NATO, at a level beyond all possible reckoning. This was unnatural and unsustainable, and even undesirable, as it meant that the United States became by default the only power that was expected to solve the world’s problems, especially as hideous dictatorships ran amuck in hidden corners of the world once the USSR collapsed and former U.S. and Soviet clients were left without adult supervision.

Saying that power is shifting away from the United States is true but misleading: it is another way of saying that America was once vastly more powerful than any possible coalition of states it faced, but now it is only immensely more powerful than other states, and is likely to remain so for decades to come. (The Soviets, in their day, did have a chance to defeat us, but only because of their huge nuclear arsenal, and their “victory” would have lasted for about 28 minutes.) Recognition of that relative difference has been reflected in recent years in military posture statements seeking, for example, space dominance rather than the space superiority of the past. But nobody has been able to explain what space dominance really means or how to achieve it without perpetuating a constant arms race–either with real competitors or, in the absence of actual challenges, with ourselves.

Our military strength, we are warned, is declining. But is it? In the end, it is important to remember that there is no objective limit to the size or power of the U.S. armed forces; they are as strong as Americans are willing to pay for. And in a country where personal spending exceeds 4 billion dollars a year on cat food and another 6 billion or so on potato chips, that is a huge amount of military potential. America is a land of choice, and right now Americans are worrying more about their homes, schools, health care and jobs than whether the U.S. government spends more on its military than the next fifteen countries, or just the next ten (including multiples of the Chinese military budget), even considering the well-earned personnel and health care costs that makes our military budget seem so much larger than so many others. If “Support the Troops” bumper stickers cost $100, with proceeds donated directly to the Pentagon, it would be interesting to see sales if went up or down.

Is our intellectual base declining? Perhaps, although it is a question that Chinese researchers might want to explore using their American-designed personal computers, running American software, to access an American-owned search engine, to find that the United States holds nearly all the world’s patents and three times as many Nobel Prizes as its nearest competitor. The best and the brightest worldwide, regardless of their politics, strive to study at American universities. Protesters show up at U.S. embassies around the world with a rock in one hand and a visa application in the other.

And so the question remains: what, exactly, do “declinists” fear? That the once-huge gaps in military power and standards of living between East and West are finally closing? Again, this is demonstrably true, but is it a danger to Western security?

What no one ever seems able to answer in all the hand-wringing about “decline” and “competition” is whether any of this can lead to military conflict that threatens the United States or its overall well-being. (This may sound odd at a time when America is engaged in two regional conflicts, but it is easy to forget that these were wars of choice, and that many of the complications in them were the results of our own poor planning, and particularly in the bizarre and already-outmoded belief that small numbers of high-tech soldiers can, like a cadre of Jedi Knights, do better in small numbers what ordinary soldiers have done so well in larger numbers for centuries.)

In short, we need to ask those who fear that decline means war: what would this war be about? Until the declinists can come up with a scenario in which China, or India, or anyone else, actually thinks it is to their advantage to launch a war against the richest, most advanced, and most militarily powerful country in the world (and thereby slash their own throats economically and physically in the process), Americans should accept that a certain amount of prosperity is going to spread to places we’ve become accustomed to thinking of as backward.

Rather than answer this question, declinists instead seek to instill fear and generate a reaction–and any reaction, apparently, will do. An October 2009 cover of The Weekly Standard, for example, featured cover artwork of President Obama wearing academic robes, holding his Nobel medal, and, like Hamlet, contemplating a bust of Jimmy Carter. “Decline,” the editors wrote, “is a Choice.” Using declinist images and rhetoric is perhaps to be expected in partisan politics. When used in conjunction with the military budget, it can be a ploy for higher budgets. In both cases, however, it is both hackneyed and hyperbolic and each cycle of declinism (and there have been several since 1945) eventually gives way to reality.

### Heg Increases War

#### **U.S. unipolarity has caused an increase in wars**

Monteiro, Yale University, Assistant Professor, Political Science, 2011

(Nuno P., Winter 2011/2012, “Unrest Assured: Why Unipolarity Is Not Peaceful,” International Security, Volume: 36, p. 11, LH)

In contrast, the question of unipolar peacefulness has received virtually no attention. Although the past decade has witnessed a resurgence of security studies, with much scholarship on such conflict-generating issues as terrorism, preventive war, military occupation, insurgency, and nuclear proliferation, no one has systematically connected any of them to unipolarity. This silence is unjustified. The first two decades of the unipolar era have been anything but peaceful. U.S. forces have been deployed in four interstate wars: Kuwait in 1991, Kosovo in 1999, Afghanistan from 2001 to the present, and Iraq between 2003 and 2010.22 In all, the United States has been at war for thirteen of the twenty-two years since the end of the Cold War.23 Put another way, the first two decades of unipolarity, which make up less than 10 percent of U.S. history, account for more than 25 percent of the nation’s total time at war.24 And yet, the theoretical consensus continues to be that unipolarity encourages peace. Why? To date, scholars do not have a theory of how unipolar systems operate.25 The debate on whether, when, and how unipolarity will end (i.e., the debate on durability) has all but monopolized our attention.

#### Hegemony increases uncertainty- causes conflict

Monteiro, Yale University, Assistant Professor, Political Science, 2011

(Nuno P., Winter 2011/2012, “Unrest Assured: Why Unipolarity Is Not Peaceful,” International Security, Volume: 36, p. 23-25, LH)

To be sure, states can never be certain of other states’ intentions.61 There are a couple of reasons, however, why this uncertainty increases in unipolarity, even when the unipole appears to be determined to maintain the status quo. First, other states cannot be certain that the unipole will always pursue nonrevisionist goals. This is particularly problematic because unipolarity minimizes the structural constraints on the unipole’s grand strategy. As Waltz writes, “Even if a dominant power behaves with moderation, restraint, and forbearance, weaker states will worry about its future behavior. . . . The absence of serious threats to American security gives the United States wide latitude in making foreign policy choices.”62 Second, unipolarity takes away the principal tool through which minor powers in bipolar and multipolar systems deal with uncertainty about great power intentions—alliances with other great powers. Whereas in these other systems minor powers can, in principle, attenuate the effects of uncertainty about great power intentions through external balancing, in a unipolar world no great power sponsor is present by definition. In effect, the systemic imbalance of power magnifies uncertainty about the unipole’s intentions.63

Faced with this uncertainty, other states have two options. First, they can accommodate the unipole and minimize the chances of conflict but at the price of their external autonomy.64 Accommodation is less risky for major powers because they can guarantee their own survival, and they stand to benefit greatly from being part of the unipolar system.65 Major powers are therefore unlikely to attempt to revise the status quo. Minor powers are also likely to accommodate the unipole, in an attempt to avoid entering a confrontation with a preponderant power. Thus, most states will accommodate the unipole because, as Wohlforth points out, the power differential rests in its favor.66

Accommodation, however, entails greater risks for minor powers because their survival is not assured if the unipole should turn against them. Thus some of them are likely to implement a second strategic option—resisting the unipole.

The structure of the international system does not entirely determine whether or not a minor power accommodates the unipole. Still, structure conditions the likelihood of accommodation in two ways. To begin, a necessary part of a strategy of dominance is the creation of alliances or informal security commitments with regional powers. Such regional powers, however, are likely to have experienced conflict with, or a grievance toward, at least some of its neighboring minor powers. The latter are more likely to adopt a recalcitrant posture. Additionally, by narrowing their opportunities for regional integration and security maximization, the unipole’s interference with the regional balance of power is likely to lower the value of the status quo for these minor powers.67 As the literature on the “value of peace” shows, countries that attribute a low value to the status quo are more risk acceptant. This argument helps explain, for example, Japan’s decision to attack the United States in 1941 and Syria’s and Egypt’s decision to attack Israel in 1973.68 In both cases, aggressor states knew that their capabilities were signiªcantly weaker than those of their targets. They were nonetheless willing to run the risk of launching attacks because they found the prewar status quo unacceptable.69 Thus, for these states, the costs of balancing were lower relative to those of bandwagoning.

#### **Unipolarity encourages war**

Monteiro, Yale University, Assistant Professor, Political Science, 2011

(Nuno P., Winter 2011/2012, “Unrest Assured: Why Unipolarity Is Not Peaceful,” International Security, Volume: 36, p. 37, LH)

After correcting for these two limitations, it becomes clear that unipolarity possesses much potential for conflict. Contrary to what Wohlforth argued, unipolarity is not a system in which the unipole is spared from any conflicts and major powers become involved only in peripheral wars. Instead, a unipolar system is one that provides incentives for recurrent wars between the sole great power and recalcitrant minor powers, as well as occasional wars among major and minor powers. That is the central prediction of my theory.

#### Unipolarity produces competition, increasing conflict

Monteiro, Yale University, Assistant Professor, Political Science, 2011

(Nuno P., Winter 2011/2012, “Unrest Assured: Why Unipolarity Is Not Peaceful,” International Security, Volume: 36, p. 21, LH)

The basic intuition behind my argument is straightforward. In bipolarity and multipolarity, alliance blocs allow disputes involving minor powers to be aggregated into broader great-power tensions. A dispute involving a great power and a lesser state tends to provoke a response by the latter’s great power sponsor, producing a confrontation between two great powers.52 Likewise, disputes between lesser states often elicit the intervention of each side’s great power ally, again resulting in great power confrontation. These aggregation mechanisms, however, are not possible in unipolarity because there is no potential great power sponsor for a state threatened by the unipole—or by another state aligned with it. Thus, although unipolarity dampens great power competition, it produces competition between the unipole and recalcitrant minor powers and, when the unipole disengages from the world, among major and minor powers.

### Causes conflict- Proliferation

#### **Unipolarity causes conflict- proliferation**

Monteiro, Yale University, Assistant Professor, Political Science, 2011

(Nuno P., Winter 2011/2012, “Unrest Assured: Why Unipolarity Is Not Peaceful,” International Security, Volume: 36, p. 26-27, LH)

Defensive dominance, however, also gives the unipole reason to oppose any such revisions to the status quo. First, such revisions decrease the benefits of systemic leadership and limit the unipole’s ability to convert its relative power advantage into favorable outcomes. In the case of nuclear weapons, this limitation is all but irreversible, virtually guaranteeing the recalcitrant regime immunity against any attempt to coerce or overthrow it. Second, proliferation has the potential to produce regional instability, raising the risk of arms races. These would force the unipole to increase defense spending or accept a narrower overall relative power advantage. Third, proliferation would lead to the emergence of a recalcitrant major power that could become the harbinger of an unwanted large-scale balancing attempt. The unipole is therefore likely to demand that recalcitrant minor powers not revise the status quo. The latter, however, will want to resist such demands because of the threat they pose to those states’ security.74 Whereas fighting over such demands would probably lead to defeat, conceding to them peacefully would bring the undesired outcome with certainty. A preventive war is therefore likely to ensue.

#### Unipolarity leads to proliferation- Iran and North Korea prove

Monteiro, Yale University, Assistant Professor, Political Science, 2011

(Nuno P., Winter 2011/2012, “Unrest Assured: Why Unipolarity Is Not Peaceful,” International Security, Volume: 36, p. 29-30, LH)

In the absence of a great power sponsor and uncertain of U.S. intentions, Iran and North Korea—both recalcitrant minor powers—have made considerable efforts to bolster their relative power by developing a nuclear capability. Unsurprisingly, the United States has consistently opposed their efforts, but has so far been unable to persuade either to desist.

The North Korean nuclear program dates to the 1960s, but most of the nuclear development was conducted in a world with a status quo unipole.85 Throughout the 1990s and into the early 2000s, North Korea sought to elude U.S. opposition without ever crossing the nuclear threshold. The North Korean regime seemed to have understood that the United States would view an explicit move toward a nuclear breakout as an extreme provocation and raise the possibility of a preventive war. When the United States shifted to a strategy of offensive dominance in late 2001, however, Pyongyang wasted little time in acquiring its nuclear deterrent.

#### **Unipolarity leads to invasion and proliferation- Iraq War proves**

Monteiro, Yale University, Assistant Professor, Political Science, 2011

(Nuno P., Winter 2011/2012, “Unrest Assured: Why Unipolarity Is Not Peaceful,” International Security, Volume: 36, p. 31-33, LH)

Reacting to the September 11 terrorist attacks, the United States adopted a strategy of offensive dominance in the Middle East. Although this short period has produced only a slim empirical record that can be harnessed to support my theory, the mechanisms I posit can best be seen at work in the 2003 U.S.-led invasion of Iraq. The United States’ goal was to revise Iraq’s international alignment and decrease its relative power by installing an accommodating regime in Baghdad and ending Saddam’s putative weapons of mass destruction (WMD) program.91

In the end, no WMD were found after the invasion.92 Still, Saddam had possessed a nuclear program, which he stopped only grudgingly when UN imposed sanctions in the aftermath of the 1991 Gulf War made it impossible to acquire the materials and technology needed for a nuclear deterrent.93 Indeed, the possibility of Iraq acquiring nuclear weapons, which Washington was convinced would soon become a reality, featured prominently in the George W. Bush administration’s argument for going to war.

Although confronted with an imminent invasion, Saddam refused to back down. His rationale seems to have been based on his estimate that, first, France or Russia would intercede on Iraq’s behalf, preventing war and, second, if that failed, Iraqi forces would be capable of increasing the military costs for the United States to the point at which American public opinion would force Washington to back down.95 None of this happened. China, France, and Russia—all major powers—did oppose UN authorization to use force against Iraq, but when the United States displayed an unequivocal determination to invade anyway, no major power did much to stop it.96 Ultimately, U.S.-led coalition troops toppled Saddam’s regime in three weeks, and major military operations ended within a month of the invasion date.

The Iraq War also led other recalcitrant minor powers to accelerate their proliferation attempts. Having been identified by President Bush, alongside Iraq, as members of the “axis of evil,” Iran and North Korea were particularly quick to respond.97 A mere two weeks after the fall of Baghdad, Pyongyang officials informed their American counterparts that North Korea possessed nuclear weapons, making the country immune to any U.S. attempts to depose its regime. 98 Iran, too, has ramped up its nuclear program since 2002 and is likely to continue pursuing a nuclear capability while trying to avoid preventive action by the United States.99 Unfortunately for the prospects of peace, it is also likely the United States will oppose this development and, if necessary, resort to the use of force.100

### Increases Conflict- Gulf War

#### **Unipolarity causes conflict- Gulf War proves**

Monteiro, Yale University, Assistant Professor, Political Science, 2011

(Nuno P., Winter 2011/2012, “Unrest Assured: Why Unipolarity Is Not Peaceful,” International Security, Volume: 36, p. 27-28, LH)

On August 2, 1990, Saddam Hussein ordered his forces to invade Kuwait, convinced the United States would not oppose this revision of the status quo. During the months that followed, the United States assembled an international coalition determined to restore Kuwaiti independence, and it obtained UN authorization to use force if Iraq did not withdraw its occupation forces by January 15, 1991. Two days after this deadline, the U.S.-led coalition began military action against Iraqi forces, expelling them from Kuwait in six weeks.77

Two points deserve mention. First, the Gulf War was triggered by Iraq’s miscalculation regarding whether the United States would accept Iraqi annexation of Kuwait. At the outset of the unipolar era, great uncertainty surrounded the limits of what actions U.S. decisionmakers would find permissible.78 Iraq miscalculated the degree of U.S. flexibility, and war ensued. Second, the war was made possible by unipolarity, which placed Iraq in a situation of extreme selfhelp. Indeed, lack of a great power sponsor—at the time, the Soviet Union was in strategic retrenchment—was duly noted in Baghdad. Immediately after the war, Saddam’s foreign minister, Tariq Aziz, lamented, “We don’t have a patron anymore. . . . If we still had the Soviets as our patron, none of this would have happened.”79

### AT: Wohlforth

#### **Unipolarity doesn’t prevent conflict**

Monteiro, Yale University, Assistant Professor, Political Science, 2011

(Nuno P., Winter 2011/2012, “Unrest Assured: Why Unipolarity Is Not Peaceful,” International Security, Volume: 36, p. 17, LH)

In addition, Wohlforth claims that wars among major powers are unlikely, because the unipole will prevent conflict from erupting among important states. He writes, “The sole pole’s power advantages matter only to the degree that it is engaged, and it is most likely to be engaged in politics among the other major powers.44 I agree that if the unipole were to pursue a strategy of defensive dominance, major power wars would be unlikely. Yet, there is no compelling reason to expect that it will always follow such a course. Should the unipole decide to disengage, as Wohlforth implies, major power wars would be possible.

At the same time, Wohlforth argues that the unipole’s power preponderance makes the expected costs of balancing prohibitive, leading minor powers to bandwagon. This is his explanation for the absence of wars between the sole great power and minor powers. But, as I show, the costs of balancing relative to bandwagoning vary among minor powers. So Wohlforth’s argument underplays the likelihood of this type of war.

Finally, Wohlforth’s argument does not exclude all kinds of war. Although power preponderance allows the unipole to manage conflicts globally, this argument is not meant to apply to relations between major and minor powers, or among the latter. As Wohlforth explains, his argument “applies with less force to potential security competition between regional powers, or between a second-tier state and a lesser power with which the system leader lacks close ties.”45 Despite this caveat, Wohlforth does not fully explore the consequences of potential conflict between major and minor powers or among the latter for his view that unipolarity leads to peace.

### Predictability Limited

#### Predictability limited- conflict depends on the unipole’s strategy

Monteiro, Yale University, Assistant Professor, Political Science, 2011

(Nuno P., Winter 2011/2012, “Unrest Assured: Why Unipolarity Is Not Peaceful,” International Security, Volume: 36, p. 22-23, LH)

Furthermore, the unipole does not need to follow one of these strategies globally. It could pursue offensive dominance in one region, defensive dominance in another, and disengagement from yet another. For instance, between 1990 and 2001, the United States implemented a strategy of defensive dominance everywhere except in Africa, from which it largely disengaged after withdrawing from Somalia in 1994. Between late 2001 and 2005, when the Bush Doctrine was in full force, the United States shifted to an offensivedominance strategy in the Middle East, toppling regimes in Afghanistan and Iraq, while maintaining its defensive dominance in Europe and East Asia and remaining largely disengaged from Africa.56

This diversity of strategic options available to the unipole highlights the predictive limits of structural theory. Waltz famously argued that a theory of international politics, not being a theory of foreign policy, was ill equipped to predict how particular states would act.57 As other scholars have noted, “Polarity is at best a necessary part of an explanation rather than a sufficient explanation.”58 A full causal account of any conflict would have to take into consideration, beyond structural incentives, the unit-level decisions that lead to a breakdown in the bargaining process. Accordingly, my theory does not predict which states will become involved in conflicts in a unipolar world. Structures, however, provide incentives. In Waltz’s formulation, they “shape and shove.”59 Thus, a unipolar structure makes some states more prone to involvement in conflicts and encourages certain paths toward war. The path taken depends on the unipole’s strategy.

### AT: Heg => Liberal Peace

#### Even if Kagan is right that US power helped build the liberal democratic peace, there is no reverse causal evidence that democracies will engage in authoritarian backsliding in a world of relative decline.

The Economist 2/2/12 (“The Stakes of American Hegemony”, <http://www.economist.com/blogs/democracyinamerica/2012/02/world-order/print> GAL)

IN THE latest edition of the New Republic, Robert Kagan, a senior fellow at Brookings and noted Kagan, serves up [a ponderous rebuttal to the proposition that America is in decline](http://www.tnr.com/article/politics/magazine/99521/america-world-power-declinism?passthru=ZDkyNzQzZTk3YWY3YzE0OWM5MGRiZmIwNGQwNDBiZmI&utm_source=Editors+and+Bloggers&utm_campaign=cbaee91d9d-Edit_and_Blogs&utm_medium=email). I don't disagree with Mr Kagan that America remains, for the foreseeable future, securely hegemonic, which is the thesis he is most anxious to establish. But I am sceptical of Mr Kagan's assumptions about why American unipolarity must be so jealously protected, which he announces at the outset of his essay:

The present world order—characterized by an unprecedented number of democratic nations; a greater global prosperity, even with the current crisis, than the world has ever known; and a long peace among great powers—reflects American principles and preferences, and was built and preserved by American power in all its political, economic, and military dimensions. If American power declines, this world order will decline with it. It will be replaced by some other kind of order, reflecting the desires and the qualities of other world powers. Or perhaps it will simply collapse, as the European world order collapsed in the first half of the twentieth century. The belief, held by many, that even with diminished American power “the underlying foundations of the liberal international order will survive and thrive,” as the political scientist G. John Ikenberry has argued, is a pleasant illusion.

There is much to quibble with here. It may be that the current global dispensation to some extent "reflects American principles and preferences". If it does, however, it's not because it "was built and preserved by American power", except in a rather trivial sense. The American model of political economy has proved in many ways to be the world's most successful. As the 20th century's main rivals to capitalist liberal democracy failed, polities worldwide looked to the example of Western Europe and North America, and this led to a glad flowering of democracy and prosperity. But America didn't cause the world's numerous socialist and/or authoritarian experiments to fail. Those regimes faltered first and foremost because socialism and authoritarianism tend not to work out in the long run. And America didn't compel aspiring first-worlders to try market economies and democratic governance. The nations of the world could see for themselves what was working and, in their own ways, have mostly followed suit.

If American power does wither, it will be due to America's failure to maintain really first-rate institutions. The ensuing world order would indeed become, as Mr Kagan has it, one "reflecting the desires and the qualities of other world powers". But that's simply because the capitals of the world aren't full of blithering dopes who wouldn't know what to do if Brookings senior fellows didn't tell them. Smart countries will want to emulate those that remain or have become first-rate. And, as far as I can tell, people who become accustomed to wealth and freedom don't have to be bullied and cajoled into wanting to keep it. Because they have grown rich, they'll have the means to keep it. Which is why it's absurd to think that if America loses its lustre, the peoples of the world will inevitably suffer under the dark reign of Russian or Chinese bad guys. Other wealthy, liberal democracies can have huge navies, too, if we'd let them. Mr Ikenberry's alleged "pleasant illusion" looks pleasantly solid to me.

Mr Kagan gives it his all arguing that the "rise of the rest" does not mean America's not still undisputed king of the hill. But Rosa Brooks, a Georgetown law professor, [is right](http://www.latimes.com/news/opinion/commentary/la-oe-brooks-decline-20120201,0,149589.story) that the skyward trajectory of the BRICs does mean America's relative influence has waned, and that that's a happy development:

[A]s Reagan recognized, a decline in relative American power is a good thing, not a bad thing — if we can turn rising states into solid allies. Remember "Gulliver's Travels"? True, it wasn't much fun for Gulliver to be the little guy in the land of Brobdingnagian giants, but it was even less fun to be a giant among the Lilliputians. Like Gulliver, America will prosper most if we can surround ourselves with friendly peer and near-peer states. They give us larger markets and improve burden-sharing; none of the global problems that bedevil us can be solved by the United States alone.

The global public goods Mr Kagan rightly prizes—peace, stability, unimpeded trade routes—will be more, not less secure if the burden of their provision is more broadly distributed. And America is more likely to remain worth emulating were it to redirect some significant portion of the trillions spent maintaining its hegemony into more productive uses.

### AT: Realism

#### Their authors are Neocons, not realists- retrenchment is now the realist position.

Kelly 12 (Robert E., Assistant Professor Dept. of Political Science & Diplomacy @ Pusan National University, 2/5/12, <http://asiansecurityblog.wordpress.com/2012/02/05/retrenchment-liberal-internationalism-dont-really-fit-together-1/> Accessed 2/24/12 GAL)

Taking Brian [Rathbun’s advice](http://duckofminerva.blogspot.com/2011/06/write-less-read-more_10.html), I was reading chapter 4 of Perception and Misperception, when it struck me that Jervis’ argument about values incongruity could be applied to the two most popular normative positions in IR today – that western power and international law can help reduce violence and nastiness in the world (R2P), and that a semi-imperial US is killing far too many people against a fairly minor threat and should retrench somewhat. But increasingly I think that retrenchment, which is traditionally associated with the left in IR (US ‘imperialism’), has become a realist position.

1. IR isn’t that conservative anymore

Both of these positions are arguably left-of-center, which is [where I feel like our field is drifting](http://themonkeycage.org/blog/2012/01/03/inside-the-international-relations-ivory-tower/). During the Cold War, IR was fairly conservative. At least US IR (not Europe though) broadly supported the Vietnam War, or at least we understood the theory of escalated punishment and falling dominoes that lay behind it. We knew what MAD, defection spirals, extended deterrence, etc. were, so we said freaky stuff like [nuclear weapons are good and first strikes make sense](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NXZF6DwKvCI). We thought détente was unlikely to work, because bipolarity was so stark and seemingly zero-sum. We broadly accepted that the USSR was a leninist-revisionist threat. (Yes there was post-Vietnam revisionism, but that was more a diplomatic history than IR phenomenon.) As a result realism was everywhere, and Waltz was king of the 80s along with Michael Jackson.

But then the USSR disappeared, and without a war, for no obvious IR reason. [Realism couldn’t prove](http://www.amazon.com/International-Relations-Theory-End-Cold/dp/0231101953) to the rest of the field’s satisfaction that it could explain what just happened (a blow from which I think realism has never really recovered), and there were no equivalent other threats to justify the enormous, continuing US military posture through the 90s. Nuclear weapons faded, so we in IR thankfully stopped talking as if we were Dr. Strangelove. Increasingly the post-Cold War US talked like an empire indispensible nation, which made us kind of nervous, although we did try to argue the US was a ‘benign hegemon.’

So [we tried](http://www.jstor.org/pss/1149177) to direct that power towards humanitarian do-goodery like Bosnia and Kosovo, but then came 9/11 and the neocons. Liberal internationalism seemed to get hijacked out of nowhere by neocons who re-wrote US liberalism as a ‘[national greatness’ agenda](http://www.theatlantic.com/daily-dish/archive/2008/02/mccains-national-greatness-conservatism/219614/) in which freedom and American nationalism elided into [what really did start to look like empire](http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/58245/g-john-ikenberry/americas-imperial-ambition). On top of that, the US couldn’t afford it all anyway. As [MacDonald and Parent note](http://belfercenter.ksg.harvard.edu/publication/20801/graceful_decline_the_surprising_success_of_great_power_retrenchment.html), most of us in IR now think the US is in relative decline and retrenchment is pretty much inevitable.

So [IR is drifting left](http://duckofminerva.blogspot.com/2012/01/peacenik-profession.html) – the USSR and nuclear theory are over, [realism isn’t taught as the dominant paradigm](http://irtheoryandpractice.wm.edu/projects/trip/IRinUSAcademy.pdf) anymore, our belief in liberalism does not make us American nationalist neocons (Washington is, but not us), and the size of the US defense budget and the globalist ambition of the US foreign policy elite go [well beyond the requirements of unipolarity](http://www.mitpressjournals.org/doi/pdf/10.1162/ISEC_a_00064). Even though we study war, we hardly support it as the regular tool of US post-Cold War diplomacy that it has become (we’re too far from real DC power for that temptation). Contrary to what people in the humanities think, I don’t think we’re militarists or all that affectionate of the national security state.

So by any realist or even liberal definition of IR, the US is now far too activist and [killing far too many people](http://www.cnas.org/blogs/abumuqawama/2012/01/casualties-war-updated.html). To our credit, just about everyone in IR was uncomfortable with the Iraq War before it started. (Remember that [ad in the NYT](http://www.bear-left.com/archive/2002/0926oped.html) against the war?) It’s true we didn’t oppose it that much, but at least we didn’t become the cheerleaders for it as happened at the big op-ed pages and DC think-tanks. The national security state clampdown at home makes us fairly uncomfortable (especially as academics strongly committed to free speech), as does the inevitable nativism and militarism stirred up by a decade-plus of war. The US public’s indifference to the huge numbers of brown Muslims we have killed in the last decade is horrifying (‘[we don’t do body-counts](http://www.iraqbodycount.org/)’), a point lots of Ducks like Vikash have made again and again. US basing is way [beyond any reasonable threat assessment](http://drezner.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2011/12/22/these_crazy_ir_kids_today_with_their_wacky_threat_assessments) to the US homeland. My guess is that most of us not only empirically think retrenchment is coming, but also desperately want it too. We may have shared the neocon intoxication with US power [for a few years after 9/11](http://www.nytimes.com/2006/03/14/books/14kaku.html), but my sense is that [IR now is really, really nervous](http://duckofminerva.blogspot.com/2011/12/rip-habeas-corpus-and-normative-power.html) about what the GWoT is doing to America. Again, we study war, but [we’re not the Kagans](http://asiansecurityblog.wordpress.com/2009/12/01/more-troops-what-a-surprisedo-the-kagans-ever-say-anything-else/).

#### Realism is a reason to vote neg- realists reject the bandwagoning logic used by the 1ac’s neoconservative authors.

Mearsheimer 5 (John J., R. Wendell Harrison Distinguished Service Professor of Political Science and the co-director of the Program on International Security Policy at the University of Chicago, “Hans Morgenthau and the Iraq war: realism versus neo-conservatism”, May 18, <http://www.opendemocracy.net/print/2522> GAL)

Neo-conservative theory – the Bush doctrine – is essentially [Wilsonianism](http://www.opendemocracy.net/http:/www.whitehouse.gov/history/presidents/ww28.html) [7] with teeth. The theory has an idealist strand and a power strand: Wilsonianism provides the idealism, an emphasis on military power provides the teeth. Neo-conservatives correctly believe that the United States has a remarkably powerful military. They believe that there has never been a state on earth that has as much relative military power as the United States has today. And very importantly, they believe that America can use its power to reshape the world to suit its interests. In short, they believe in big-stick diplomacy, which is why the Bush doctrine privileges military power over diplomacy. This belief in the utility of military force explains in large part why the Bush administration and the neo-conservatives favour [unilateralism over multilateralism](http://www.opendemocracy.net/http:/www.csmonitor.com/specials/neocon/neocon101.html) [7]. If the United States emphasised diplomacy over military force, it could not act unilaterally very often, because diplomacy by definition is very much a multilateral enterprise. But if a state has awesome military power and can rely heavily on that power to do business in the international system, then it will not often need allies. Instead, it can rely almost exclusively on its military might to achieve its goals. In other words, it can act unilaterally, as the Bush administration often did during its first term. The key to understanding why the neo-conservatives think that military force is such a remarkably effective instrument for running the world is that they believe that international politics operate according to “bandwagoning” logic. Specifically, they believe that if a powerful country like the United States is willing to threaten or attack its adversaries, then virtually all of the states in the system – friends and foes alike – will quickly understand that the United States means business and that if they cross mighty Uncle Sam, they will pay a severe price. In essence, the rest of the world will fear the United States, which will cause any state that is even thinking about challenging Washington to throw up its hands and jump on the American bandwagon. Before the Iraq war, [realists would say](http://www.opendemocracy.net/http:/www.nybooks.com/articles/12724) [7] to the neo-conservatives that if the United States threatens Iran and North Korea by putting them on the “[axis of evil](http://www.opendemocracy.net/http:/www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/01/20020129-11.html) [7]” along with Iraq, it will drive them to redouble their efforts to acquire nuclear weapons. Neo-conservatives would say to realists that Iran and North Korea will respond to the fall of Saddam by understanding that they are numbers two and three on the hit list, and will seek to avoid the same fate by surrendering. In short, they will jump on the American bandwagon rather than risk death. Critics of the Iraq war would also say to the neo-conservatives that it would make sense to solve the Israeli-Palestinian conflict before invading Iraq. Neo-conservatives would answer that an American victory in Iraq would compel [Yasser Arafat](http://www.opendemocracy.net/articles/View.jsp?id=2234) [9] to sign a peace treaty with Israel. The road to Jerusalem, they would argue, runs through Baghdad. If the mighty United States got tough with troublemakers in the Arab world, the Palestinians would read the writing on the wall. Bandwagoning logic also underpinned the famous “[domino theory](http://www.opendemocracy.net/http:/en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Domino_theory) [7]”, which was a critical factor in the American decision to go to war in Vietnam. According to the domino theory, if Vietnam were to fall to communism, other countries in southeast Asia would quickly follow, and then countries in other regions would begin to fall under the rule of the Soviet Union. Eventually almost every state in the international system would jump on the Soviet bandwagon, leaving the United States alone and weak against an unstoppable juggernaut. Some forty years later, the [Bush administration thought](http://www.opendemocracy.net/articles/View.jsp?id=2348) [10] that it could turn the domino theory to its advantage. Knocking off Saddam, the war party thought, would have a cascading effect in the middle east, if not the wider world. The Iranians, the North Koreans, the Palestinians, and the Syrians, after seeing the United States win a stunning victory in Iraq, would all throw up their hands and dance to Uncle Sam’s tune. The neo-conservatives’ faith in the efficacy of bandwagoning was based in good part on their faith in the so-called revolution in military affairs ([RMA](http://www.opendemocracy.net/http:/www.iwar.org.uk/rma/) [7]). In particular, they believed that the United States could rely on stealth technology, air-delivered precision-guided weapons, and small but highly mobile ground forces to win quick and decisive victories. They believed that the RMA gave the Bush administration a nimble military instrument which, to put it in Muhammad Ali’s terminology, could “float like a butterfly and sting like a bee.”

#### If realism is accurate in describing the world, you should vote neg to reject their bandwagoning logic. North Korea and Iran prove- we live in a balancing world.

Mearsheimer 5 (John J., R. Wendell Harrison Distinguished Service Professor of Political Science and the co-director of the Program on International Security Policy at the University of Chicago, “Hans Morgenthau and the Iraq war: realism versus neo-conservatism”, May 18, <http://www.opendemocracy.net/print/2522> GAL)

Hans Morgenthau and the realist critique of neo-conservatism

What, then, is the realist critique of this neo-conservative theory, and how might Hans Morgenthau have reacted to the arguments for and against the Iraq war?

Realists do not believe that we live in a bandwagoning world. On the contrary, [realists](http://www.opendemocracy.net/http:/www.mtholyoke.edu/acad/intrel/morg6.htm) [7] tend to believe that we live in a balancing world, in which, when one state puts its fist in another state’s face, the target usually does not throw its hands in the air and surrender. Instead, it looks for ways to defend itself; it balances against the threatening state.

Thus, realists predicted that Iran and North Korea would not react to an attack on Iraq by abandoning their nuclear programmes, but would work harder than ever to [acquire a nuclear deterrent](http://www.opendemocracy.net/themes/article-2-680.jsp) [15] so as to immunise themselves from American power. Of course, this is exactly what has happened over the past two years, and there is no sign that either of the remaining members of the axis of evil is likely to cave into the Bush administration’s threats. Simply put, we live in a balancing world.

### AT: Cede Political

#### Academia and politics have already been co-opted- the spread of empire has eliminated alternative political discourse.

Boggs 10

(Carl, author of numerous books in the fields of contemporary social and political theory, European politics, American politics, U.S. foreign and military policy, and film studies, was Chair of the Caucus for a New Political Science, a section within the American Political Science Association. In 2007 he was recipient of the Charles McCoy Career Achievement Award from the American Political Science Association Ph.D. in political science at U.C., Berkeley, and has taught at Washington University in St. Louis, UCLA, USC, and UC, “The Crimes of Empire: Rogue Superpower and World Domination,”16-18)

Lawlessness has been integral to U.S. global behavior for so long that it has come to appear ordinary, routine, scarcely worthy of attention. Moral outrage? Political protest? Such responses cannot be located anywhere in the mainstream political spectrum. Despite rhetorical lip service to the “rule of law,” such American indifference toward its own outlawry extends also to the reputedly “objective” or “scientific” realms of academic life. Hypocrisy and double standards leave their imprint on elite discourse as well as popular consciousness, both saturated with the entitlements of imperial power. No other state devotes even a significant fraction of what the U.S. spends on its armed forces, no other state deploys large-scale military units across dozens of countries, and no other state claims to be defending its own “national security” and “global interests” hundreds and thousands of miles from its home shores.

Despite repeated U.S. violations of international law, we commonly face a business-as-usual attitude toward the consequences of such violations. To raise fundamental criticisms of this behavior in the public sphere has been largely taboo. Questions as to whether the U.S. should be managing a far-flung Empire, should have military bases deployed around the world, should be invading and occupying foreign countries, should be rejecting or obstructing global treaties— or indeed should be prosecuted for any of its criminal behavior—are never permitted to enter political discourse. When such issues do rarely surface, they are simply regarded as normal for great-power activity in the world. Superpowers naturally have urgent global obligations that other nations cannot imagine, as the opinion-mak- ers have been quick to remind any doubters. If political divisions have narrowed in the U.S. since the 1980s, nowhere is this shrinkage more visible than in the realm of foreign affairs, where differences between Democrats and Republicans, never great, have declined to near invisibility.20 Both liberals and conservatives uphold a view of the U.S. as “leader of the free world,” as the driving force behind democracy, human rights, and rule of law in a world threatened by extremes of tyranny and anarchy. Mainstream politicians who so much as timidly question basic assumptions underlying U.S. foreign and military policy meet harsh and immediate backlash. Any second thoughts about American global behavior must be instrumental— that is, centered around matters of tactics and viability—an outlook that has even shaped the bulk of antiwar protests since the 1960s. The moral Zeitgeist informing the broad postwar international consensus has scarcely entered American public debate outside the left fringes. Few in government, the media, or academia have chosen to endorse the perfectly rational notion that the U.S., like every sovereign nation, should be willing to accept legal and moral constraints on its international behavior and should follow the same rules as everyone else. As for the Iraq disaster, few American politicians or media pundits have even mentioned, much less criticized, flagrant U.S. violations of the U.N. Charter as the Bush administration unleashed its war machine on a nation already weakened by war, sanctions, bombings, covert action, and years of international inspections—a nation, moreover, clearly posing no military danger to anyone. The outright deceptions used to justify military aggression elicited nothing close to the kind of political response directed at others for lesser infractions—North Korea and Iran for their nuclear programs, Russia for its assaults on Chechnya, Serbia for its supposed “ethnic cleansing” campaigns, Somalia for its violent warlord combat, China for its human rights abuses, and so forth. Not until a disillusioned American public turned against an obviously failed and costly military operation, in mid 2006, did politicians and the media finally raise questions about the false U.S. pretexts for war.

## AT: Barnett/Owen/Pinker/Goldstein

### AT: Hegemony Solves War

#### **Hegemony doesn’t solve conflict**

Goldstein, American University, School of International Service professor, 2011

(Joshua S., September/October 2011, Foreign Policy, “Think Again: War,” <http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2011/08/15/think_again_war?page=full>, accessed 7-4-12, LH)

Nor do shifts in the global balance of power doom us to a future of perpetual war. While some political scientists argue that an increasingly multipolar world is an increasingly volatile one -- that peace is best assured by the predominance of a single hegemonic power, namely the United States -- recent geopolitical history suggests otherwise. Relative U.S. power and worldwide conflict have waned in tandem over the past decade. The exceptions to the trend, Iraq and Afghanistan, have been lopsided wars waged by the hegemon, not challenges by up-and-coming new powers. The best precedent for today's emerging world order may be the 19th-century Concert of Europe, a collaboration of great powers that largely maintained the peace for a century until its breakdown and the bloodbath of World War I.

### Study Flawed

#### **Pinker and Goldstein’s study is flawed- laundry list of reasons**

Tott, Harvard Kennedy School, Public Policy Professor, 12

(Monica, author of Securitizing the Peace: Durable Settlement of Civil Wars and co-author of God’s Century: Resurgent Religion and Global Politics, 2-2-12, Power and Policy, “The peace bubble,” <http://www.powerandpolicy.com/2012/02/02/the-peace-bubble/>, accessed 7-2-12, LH)

[Steven Pinker](http://pinker.wjh.harvard.edu/about/longbio.html) and [Joshua Goldstein](http://www.joshuagoldstein.com/)have produced impressive and important books on the decline of violence and war across time and space. Whereas [Pinker](http://www.amazon.com/Better-Angels-Our-Nature-Violence/dp/0670022950) discusses violence in more general terms and [Goldstein](http://winningthewaronwar.com/) limits his analysis to war, both scholars make the argument that violence has declined over the past 100 years, but in particular since WWII.

Pinker attributes this decline to the success of the modern state and the imposition of order across multiple levels in society. Not only has war across societies declined as a result, but so too has criminality and violence among individuals. Goldstein tracks similar trends in war; but for him peacekeeping and the United Nations are critical in helping to usher in this period of peace.

The books offer us an optimistic view of contemporary history: both essentially reduce to the claim that the world is getting more peaceful, and as a result, better. Sadly, I remain unconvinced by their characterization (peace),and its implications (a better world), but even if they are each right, I think what they have described is a bubble: a peace bubble.

First, their analyses hinge largely on data and trends in these data. In looking at their data however, a critical question emerges: are they sampling on the extreme? In statistical terms this would amount to sampling bias. One of their responses might be “what about the Thirty Years’ War?” which was responsible for killing one in five Europeans. But this begs a different question: if it happened before, what is to assure us the trend they have identified is uni-directional? Again, what if we are witnessing a kind of “peace bubble”?

In addition to this sampling bias and the possibility of extremes, could it be the case that the decline in violence is not an artifact of the main sources of data? We have excellent data of the wars fought among European powers, for instance, but even these are subject to considerable debate both on empirical (how many Europeans were there and how many died in battle?) and definitional grounds (do victims of war-induced famine count, were they counted by some scholars?). In more contemporary terms, we still don’t know, for example, how many Chinese died during the Chinese Revolution or Cultural Revolution, or even the more recent 1994 Rwandan genocide. Body counts themselves are notoriously difficult to assess, yet each author relies (Pinker to a lesser extent) on these data to support his respective arguments.

This last point highlights the scholars’ understanding of violence in only its most physical manifestation; its implications for death or life. Consider Pinker’s discussion of bullying. Pinker makes the case that bullying has been one of the forms of violence targeted for elimination, and I agree this is a good thing. But the subject of bullying opens the door to a very penetrating question: what if it is possible to be more cruel yet less violent?

Most people tend to think of bullying as physical intimidation, which is easier to identify than the much more destructive (and painful) psychological intimidation which often follows successful efforts to halt physical bullying. When researchers looking at schoolyard bullying, for example, broadened the definition of “aggression” to include psychological cruelty, they found that girls were just as “aggressive” as boys. Moreover, internet bullying is psychologically and emotionally devastating and on the rise, but only rarely results in any physical injury. So again, harm is increasing even as physical violence is declining. Rape is yet another example: in most cases it does not result in a death, and because it is systematically under-reported, it is possible that rape could increasing globally even as violence and war both decline (Pinker admits he has weak data on the global front). Such a narrow indicator of violence may cause us to overlook critical areas where harm is still done, just not physically.

And Pinker is not alone here. Goldstein too relies on physical harm—death—as his critical indicator. What about the psychological impact of war (e.g. post traumatic distress disorder)? Due to advances in the organization of war from medical technology (e.g. surgery, antibiotics) and mobility (e.g. the helicopter) and to the relatively much smaller scale of wars nowadays, many soldiers who would have died in earlier wars have survived physically (and not been counted), but been shattered emotionally and psychologically. Many cannot work and cannot love. Consider brain injuries. According to one estimate, mortality from brain injuries was 75 percent greater in Vietnam than in the most recent Iraq war. Although some soldiers recover, many do not, suffering both the physical trauma and psychological stress of war far beyond the battlefield.[[1]](http://www.powerandpolicy.com/2012/02/02/the-peace-bubble/#_ftn1) In neither case would the harm sustained be counted in Pinker’s and Goldstein’s analyses.

Making the argument that “all that is true, but it still matters that deaths are fewer” is akin to responding to a critic of the US war in Iraq by saying “aren’t you better off with Saddam Hussein dead?” The point of each argument is that the world is getting better; whereas if we decouple physical violence—and death—from harm, such a line of argumentation is called into question.

More generally, most people in the West believe violent death is a universal empirical indicator of harm (and so it is). But what if the harm that is being done to people today cannot be captured by physical violence? This is a major part of the fight between Palestinian Arabs and Israeli Jews: the Arabs say a Jewish settlement is, in and of itself, an act of violence, which then justifies a violent response (say, a suicide bomb). But in this interaction the Israelis have had the easier argument, because they can (and do) claim that their settlements are non-violent. We in the West have arrogated to ourselves the very definition of what counts as violence and what does not, and this leaves us vulnerable to lethal blind spots when we attempt to bargain with or coerce people who do not share our axiomatic connection of harm to death.

Consider how advances in technology make it possible to cause grave injury without killing, by say, deliberately creating refugees. This raises the question of whether the number of peoples left homeless by war has risen in proportion as the number of violent deaths has declined. If so, we would have another example of decreasing violence masking increased harm. I say this to remind us all that forced mass expulsion is considered a grave breach of the Geneva Conventions of 1948 and 1949, and to remind us of Slobodan Milosevic’s strategy in Kosovo: rape and kill a few in order to cause the bulk of the population to flee. Again, relatively few corpses would result, but the harm would be grave.

### Reason Caused Decline in Violence

#### **Reason has caused the decrease in violence, not hegemony**

Pinker, Harvard University, Psychology Professor, 2011

(Steven, 10-20-11, Nature, “Taming the devil within us,” <http://stevenpinker.com/files/taming_the_devil_within_us_-_nature.pdf>, p. 310, accessed 7-2-12, LH)

The most important psychological contributor to the decline of violence over the long term may instead be reason: the cognitive faculties, honed by the exchange of ideas through language, that allow us to understand the world and negotiate social arrangements. Reason, admittedly, seems to have fallen on hard times. Popular culture is plumbing new depths of dumbness, and political discourse has become a race to the bottom. We are living in an era of scientific creationism, New Age flimflam, 9/11 conspiracy theories and psychic hotlines.

Even scientists are joining in. Human beings are led by their passions, say many psychologists, and deploy reason only to rationalize gut feelings after the fact. Behavioural economists exult in showing how human behaviour departs from the rational actor theory, and sympathetic journalists waste no opportunity to smack the theory around. The implication is that because irrationality is inevitable, we may as well lie back and enjoy it.

But I have come to believe that both the pessimistic assessment of the state of reason in the world, and any sentiment that this would not be such a bad thing, are mistaken. For all their foolishness, modern societies have been getting smarter, and all things being equal, a smarter world is a less violent world.

Why might reason lead to less violence? The most obvious pathway is captured in French writer Voltaire’s quip that “those who can make you believe absurdities can make you commit atrocities”. A debunking of hogwash — such as the beliefs that gods demand sacrifices, heretics go to hell, Jews poison wells, animals are insensate, Africans are brutish and kings rule by divine right — will undermine many rationales for violence. Reason can also lead people to want less violence. This may seem to violate Scottish philosopher David Hume’s dictum that “reason is, and ought to be, only the slave of the passions”. Reason, by itself, can lay out a road map to peace or to war, to tolerance or to persecution, depending on what the reasoner wants.

But, two conditions will tend to align reason with nonviolence. The first is that reasoners care about their own well-being. They prefer to live rather than die, keep their body parts intact and spend their days in comfort rather than in pain. Logic does not force them to have those prejudices. Yet any product of natural selection — indeed, any agent that has endured the ravages of entropy long enough to be reasoning in the first place — is likely to have them.

The second condition is that a reasoner be part of a community of reasoners who can impinge on their well-being and who can comprehend each other’s reasoning. And indeed Homo sapiens is not just a rational animal but a social and language-using one. Self-interest and sociality combine with reason to lay out a morality in which nonviolence is a goal. If one agent says, “It’s bad for you to hurt me”, he has also committed to “It’s bad for me to hurt you”, because logic cannot tell the difference between ‘me’ and ‘you’. Therefore as soon as you try to persuade someone to avoid harming you by appealing to reasons why he shouldn’t, you’re sucked into a commitment to the avoidance of harm as a general goal.

#### **Humans have evolved to develop reason- caused a decrease in violence**

Pinker, Harvard University, Psychology Professor, 2011

(Steven, 10-20-11, Nature, “Taming the devil within us,” <http://stevenpinker.com/files/taming_the_devil_within_us_-_nature.pdf>, p. 310-311, accessed 7-2-12, LH)

Humans, of course, were not created in a state of original reason. We descended from ape-like primates, spent hundreds of millennia in small bands and evolved our cognitive processes in the service of foraging and socializing. Only gradually, with the appearance of literacy, cities and longdistance travel and communication, could our ancestors cultivate their reason and apply it to a broader range of concerns. As collective rationality is honed over the ages, it will clamp down on short-sighted and hot-blooded impulses towards violence, and force us to treat a greater number of agents as we would have them treat us.

To be sure, it remains puzzling that it took us so long to figure this out. Why did human rationality need thousands of years to conclude that something might be a wee bit wrong with slavery? Or with beating children, raping unattached women, exterminating native peoples, imprisoning homosexuals or waging wars to assuage the injured vanity of kings?

Perhaps humans have been getting nicer because they have been getting smarter.

#### **Guided reasoning has driven down violence**

Pinker, Harvard University, Psychology Professor, 2011

(Steven, 10-20-11, Nature, “Taming the devil within us,” <http://stevenpinker.com/files/taming_the_devil_within_us_-_nature.pdf>, p. 310-311, accessed 7-2-12, LH)

Could an expansion of reason really have driven down violence? Consider the statements of the great men of a century ago, such as Theodore Roosevelt, who wrote: “I don’t go so far as to think that the only good Indians are dead Indians, but I believe nine out of ten are, and I shouldn’t like to inquire too closely into the case of the tenth”, or the young Winston Churchill, who cheerfully carried out atrocities in British colonies in Asia and Africa and wrote: “I hate Indians. They are a beastly people with a beastly religion.” Today we are stunned by the compartmentalized morality of these men, who in many ways were enlightened when it came to their own race. Yet they never took the mental leap that would have forced them to treat other races with the same consideration. Today’s children have been encouraged to take these cognitive leaps with gentle instruction such as “There are bad Indians and there are good Indians, just like there are bad white people and good white people. You can’t tell whether a person is good or bad by looking at the colour of his skin”, and “Yes, the things those people do look funny to us. But the things we do look funny to them.” Such lessons are not indoctrination but guided reasoning, leading children to conclusions they can accept by their own standards, and the resulting understanding has become second nature.

#### **Reason caused peace**

Singer, Princeton University, bioethics professor, 2011

(Peter, 10-6-11, The New York Times, “Is Violence History?,” <http://www.nytimes.com/2011/10/09/books/review/the-better-angels-of-our-nature-by-steven-pinker-book-review.html?pagewanted=all>, accessed 7-4-12, LH)

Pinker argues that enhanced powers of reasoning give us the ability to detach ourselves from our immediate experience and from our personal or parochial perspective, and frame our ideas in more abstract, universal terms. This in turn leads to better moral commitments, including avoiding violence. It is just this kind of reasoning ability that has improved during the 20th century. He therefore suggests that the 20th century has seen a “moral Flynn effect, in which an accelerating escalator of reason carried us away from impulses that lead to violence” and that this lies behind the long peace, the new peace, and the rights revolution. Among the wide range of evidence he produces in support of that argument is the tidbit that since 1946, there has been a negative correlation between an American president’s I.Q. and the number of battle deaths in wars involving the United States.

### War Declining- International Norms

#### **The reason war is declining is because of international norms, UN peacekeepers**

Goldstein, American University, School of International Service professor, and Pinker, Harvard University, Psychology Professor, 2011

(Joshua S., Steven, 12-17-11, The New York Times, “War Really Is Going Out of Style,” <http://www.nytimes.com/2011/12/18/opinion/sunday/war-really-is-going-out-of-style.html?pagewanted=all>, accessed 7-4-12, LH)

Why is war in decline? For one thing, it no longer pays. For centuries, wars reallocated huge territories, as empires were agglomerated or dismantled and states wiped off the map. But since shortly after World War II, virtually no borders have changed by force, and no member of the United Nations has disappeared through conquest. The Korean War caused a million battle deaths, but the border ended up where it started. The Iran-Iraq War killed 650,000 with the same result. Iraq’s annexation of Kuwait in 1990 backfired. Israel seized land in 1967, but since then most has been returned and the rest remains contested.

The futility of conquest is part of the emergence of an international community regulated by norms and taboos and wielding more effective tools for managing conflicts. Among those tools, the United Nations’ 100,000 deployed peacekeepers have measurably improved the success of peace agreements in civil wars.

### War Declining- Trade

#### **War declining- trade**

Goldstein, American University, School of International Service professor, and Pinker, Harvard University, Psychology Professor, 2011

(Joshua S., Steven, 12-17-11, The New York Times, “War Really Is Going Out of Style,” <http://www.nytimes.com/2011/12/18/opinion/sunday/war-really-is-going-out-of-style.html?pagewanted=all>, accessed 7-4-12, LH)

War also declines as prosperity and trade rise. Historically, wealth came from land and conquest was profitable. Today, wealth comes from trade, and war only hurts. When leaders’ power depends on delivering economic growth, and when a country’s government becomes richer and stronger than its warlords, war loses its appeal.

### War Declining- Self Control

#### **War is declining- increase in self-control**

Goldstein, American University, School of International Service professor, and Pinker, Harvard University, Psychology Professor, 2011

(Joshua S., Steven, 12-17-11, The New York Times, “War Really Is Going Out of Style,” <http://www.nytimes.com/2011/12/18/opinion/sunday/war-really-is-going-out-of-style.html?pagewanted=all>, accessed 7-4-12, LH)

Perhaps the deepest cause of the waning of war is a growing repugnance toward institutionalized violence. Brutal customs that were commonplace for millennia have been largely abolished: cannibalism, human sacrifice, heretic-burning, chattel slavery, punitive mutilation, sadistic executions. Could war really be going the way of slave auctions? Nothing in our nature rules it out. True, we still harbor demons like greed, dominance, revenge and self-deception. But we also have faculties that inhibit them, like self-control, empathy, reason and a sense of fairness. We will always have the capacity to kill one another in large numbers, but with effort we can safeguard the norms and institutions that have made war increasingly repugnant.

### War’s Brutality Declining- Technology

#### **Technology has reduced war’s brutality**

Goldstein, American University, School of International Service professor, 2011

(Joshua S., September/October 2011, Foreign Policy, “Think Again: War,” <http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2011/08/15/think_again_war?page=full>, accessed 7-4-12, LH)

Recent technological changes are making war less brutal, not more so. Armed drones now attack targets that in the past would have required an invasion with thousands of heavily armed troops, displacing huge numbers of civilians and destroying valuable property along the way. And improvements in battlefield medicine have made combat less lethal for participants. In the U.S. Army, the chances of dying from a combat injury fell from 30 percent in World War II to 10 percent in Iraq and Afghanistan -- though this also means the United States is now seeing a higher proportion of injured veterans who need continuing support and care.

### War Declining- Commerce

#### **War declining- commerce encourages altruism**

Pinker, Harvard University, Psychology Professor, 2011

(Steven, 9-24-11, The Wall Street Journal, “Violence Vanquished,” <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424053111904106704576583203589408180.html>, accessed 7-5-12, LH)

Another pacifying force has been commerce, a game in which everybody can win. As technological progress allows the exchange of goods and ideas over longer distances and among larger groups of trading partners, other people become more valuable alive than dead. They switch from being targets of demonization and dehumanization to potential partners in reciprocal altruism.

For example, though the relationship today between America and China is far from warm, we are unlikely to declare war on them or vice versa. Morality aside, they make too much of our stuff, and we owe them too much money.

### War Declining- Cosmopolitanism

#### **War declining- cosmopolitanism**

Pinker, Harvard University, Psychology Professor, 2011

(Steven, 9-24-11, The Wall Street Journal, “Violence Vanquished,” <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424053111904106704576583203589408180.html>, accessed 7-5-12, LH)

A third peacemaker has been cosmopolitanism—the expansion of people's parochial little worlds through literacy, mobility, education, science, history, journalism and mass media. These forms of virtual reality can prompt people to take the perspective of people unlike themselves and to expand their circle of sympathy to embrace them.

These technologies have also powered an expansion of rationality and objectivity in human affairs. People are now less likely to privilege their own interests over those of others. They reflect more on the way they live and consider how they could be better off. Violence is often reframed as a problem to be solved rather than as a contest to be won. We devote ever more of our brainpower to guiding our better angels. It is probably no coincidence that the Humanitarian Revolution came on the heels of the Age of Reason and the Enlightenment, that the Long Peace and rights revolutions coincided with the electronic global village.

## AT: Thayer/Human Nature

### Violence is not Human Nature

#### **Violence isn’t part of human nature**

Kohn, neurobiologist, 2011

(Market, science writer on evolution, biology, and society, 10-7-11, The Independent, “The Better Angels of Our Nature: The Decline of Violence in History and its Causes, by Steven Pinker,” <http://www.independent.co.uk/arts-entertainment/books/reviews/the-better-angels-of-our-nature-the-decline-of-violence-in-history-and-its-causes-by-steven-pinker-2366392.html>, accessed 7-4-12, LH)

His interpretation of the great historical decline in violence turns upon the two dominant themes in his understanding of human psychology. On the one hand, human nature is a package of evolved traits; on the other, humans have cognitive faculties that enable them to do things very different from what their psychology originally induced them to do. As he once put it, "if my genes don't like it, they can go jump in the lake".

Human nature is a package of capacities on which people can draw as necessary, like tools in a toolbox. Contrary to the popular "hydraulic" metaphor, violence is not like a fluid that inexorably wells up in a man's psyche and has to be discharged or channelled. If violence is not needed, not provoked and not admired, it will rarely be used.

## AT: Competitiveness

### Wasteful Spending, Protectionism, Bad Policies

#### **Relying on economic competitiveness leads to wasteful spending, protectionism, and bad policies**

Krugman, Princeton University, Economics and International Affairs professor, 1994

(Paul, Centenary professor at the London School of Economics, op-ed columnist for the New York Times, Nobel Memorial prize winner in Economic Sciences, March/April 1994, Foreign Affairs, “Competitiveness: A Dangerous Obsession,” <http://www.ucema.edu.ar/u/agaletto/krugman_competitiveness.pdf>, p. 41-43, accessed 7-5-12, LH)

Thinking and speaking in terms of competitiveness poses three real dangers. First, it could result in the wasteful spending of government money supposedly to enhance U.S. competitiveness. Second, it could lead to protectionism and trade wars. Finally, and most important, it could result in bad public policy on a spectrum of important issues.

During the 1950s, fear of the Soviet Union induced the U.S. government to spend money on useful things like highways and science education. It also, however, led to considerable spending on more doubtful items like bomb shelters. The most obvious if least worrisome danger of the growing obsession with competitiveness is that it might lead to a similar misallocation of resources. To take an example, recent guidelines for government research funding have stressed the importance of supporting research that can improve U.S. international competitiveness. This exerts at least some bias toward inventions that can help manufacturing firms, which generally compete on international markets, rather than service producers, which generally do not. Yet most of our employment and value-added is now in services, and lagging productivity in services rather than manufactures has been the single most important factor in the stagnation of U.S. living standards.

A much more serious risk is that the obsession with competitiveness will lead to trade conflict, perhaps even to a world trade war. Most of those who have preached the doctrine of competitiveness have not been old-fashioned protectionists. They want their countries to win the global trade game, not drop out. But what if, despite its best efforts, a country does not seem to be winning, or lacks confidence that it can? Then the competitive diagnosis inevitably suggests that to close the borders is better than to risk having foreigners take away high-wage jobs and high-value sectors. At the very least, the focus on the supposedly competitive nature of international economic relations greases the rails for those who want confrontational if not frankly protectionist policies.

We can already see this process at work, in both the United States and Europe. In the United States, it was remarkable how quickly the sophisticated interventionist arguments advanced by Laura Tyson in her published work gave way to the simple-minded claim by U.S. Trade Representative Mickey Kantor that Japan's bilateral trade surplus was costing the United States millions of jobs. And the trade rhetoric of President Clinton, who stresses the supposed creation of high-wage jobs rather than the gains from specialization, left his administration in a weak position when it tried to argue with the claims of NAFTA foes that competition from cheap Mexican labor will destroy the U.S. manufacturing base.

Perhaps the most serious risk from the obsession with competitiveness, however, is its subtle indirect effect on the quality of economic discussion and policymaking. If top government officials are strongly committed to a particular economic doctrine, their commitment inevitably sets the tone for policy-making on all issues, even those which may seem to have nothing to do with that doctrine. And if an economic doctrine is flatly, completely and demonstrably wrong, the insistence that discussion adhere to that doctrine inevitably blurs the focus and diminishes the quality of policy discussion across a broad range of issues, including some that are very far from trade policy per se.

Consider, for example, the issue of health care reform, undoubtedly the most important economic initiative of the Clinton administration, almost surely an order of magnitude more important to U.S. living standards than anything that might be done about trade policy (unless the United States provokes a full-blown trade war). Since health care is an issue with few direct international linkages, one might have expected it to be largely insulated from any distortions of policy resulting from misguided concerns about competitiveness.

#### No economic or technological competition- belief in competition hurts American businesses

Kakaes, New America Foundation, fellow, 12

(Konstantin, 1-9-12, Slate, “It’s wrong to pit U.S. and Chinese scientists against each other in a research arms race,” <http://www.slate.com/articles/technology/future_tense/2012/01/u_s_scientists_are_not_competing_with_china_or_any_other_country_.single.html>, accessed 7-8-12, LH)

Obama and the Republicans might disagree on the answers, but they agree on the question: "How can America compete with the rest of the world, especially China?" But this is the wrong question to be asking. We are not actually engaged in economic or technological competition with China or with anyone else. Absent a state of open war, our economic growth helps that of other countries, and vice versa. New technology developed in the United States will benefit the rest of the world, and vice versa.

The extremely complicated interactions between countries—goods, people, culture, and ideas all flowing back and forth—are not akin to a sporting competition. To pretend that we are all engaged in a giant worldwide track meet for economic domination serves the interest of business above individuals. To pretend that there is a field event for technological domination actually hurts American business by imposing futile regulations on technology exports. This deeply entrenched misunderstanding about the nature of technological innovation leads to unnecessary tax breaks and prioritizes trendy metrics of performance (where putative relative success can be measured) over the fundamentals necessary to shaping a better society. By thinking we are racing with China, or Europe, we will end up worse off.

### Competitiveness wrong- hurts economic policy

#### **Competitiveness discourse is flawed- misguiding and damaging for economic policy**

Wilson, Basque Institute of Competitiveness, 8

(James, May 2008, Trade and Industrial Policy Strategies, “Territorial Competitiveness and Development Policy,” <http://www.tips.org.za/files/Wilson_James_Paper.pdf>, p. 7-9, accessed 7-8-12, LH)

While analysis of territorial competitiveness has proved extremely attractive for many policy analysts and practitioners, reflected for example in wide adoption of the terminology and core principles of Porter’s approach, it has raised concerns in different parts of the academic literature. In general the variability in quality of analyses is noted: “serious analyses as well as ideological tracts, low-level business school reports, banal data churning, applications of impressive but vacuous formulae, and straightforward ‘bashing-theforeigner’” (Lall, 2001a: 2). More specifically, criticism has been aimed directly at Porter’s framework and its impacts on policy. Davies and Ellis (2000), for example, review various critiques in identifying a series of specific weaknesses and suggest that “policy-makers are left with a ‘laundry list’ on which to base simple SWOT-type analyses of their economies, but there is no reliable guide to policy”. Reflective of the distance between the economics and business literatures, Lall (2001a: 5) makes a more general point on business school approaches that transpose corporate strategy to the national level: “they often describe what they regard as the (sensible) constituent elements of competitive success (innovation, skills, clusters) without grounding it in theories of markets, market failures and the ability of government to overcome these failures.” Finally, the use of a concept of competitiveness itself has been attacked, criticisms ranging from it being ‘ambiguous’ due to lack of rigorous definition in the early economics literature (Siggel, 2006), to it being fundamentally ‘misguided and damaging’ (Krugman, 1994).

Krugman’s (1994, 1996, 1998) damning dismissal has been particularly widely cited. However, his strongly-worded call to recognise that “the obsession with competitiveness is both wrong and dangerous” (1994: 44) has neither stemmed the flow of analysis nor put an end to the controversy over its meaning and use. Schoenberger (1998: 3) has since argued that competitiveness has “become truly hegemonic in the Gramscian sense.” In line with some of Krugman’s concerns over the misuse of the concept, she questions whether we can be “sure that the desired objectivity of our research is not subtly undermined by our reliance on a language and a discourse that is not entirely of our own choosing and, arguably, is a language and a discourse that represents the interests of particular social groups and not others?” (ibid.: 13). Such apprehension is echoed by Bristow (2005) in a consideration of regional competitiveness. In particular, she argues that “policy acceptance of the existence and importance of regional competitiveness and its measurement appears to have run ahead of a number of fundamental theoretical and empirical questions” (286). Thus, our theoretical understanding of what is meant by competitiveness at a regional scale lags behind its emergence as a “discrete and important policy goal” and the associated proliferation of “indicators by which policy-makers and practitioners can measure, analyse and compare relative competitive performance” (ibid.: 286).

### Not a Zero-Sum Game

#### Economic competitiveness is not a zero-sum game

Toder, Urban Institute, Institute Fellow, 12

(Eric, previous deputy assistant secretary for Tax Analysis in the U.S. Treasury Office, previous deputy assistant director for tax analysis at the Congressional Budget Office, specializes in taxation and fiscal policy, 1-10-12, Urban Institute and Brookings Institution, “International Competitiveness: Who Competes against Whom and for What?,” <http://taxpolicycenter.org/UploadedPDF/412477-international-competitiveness.pdf>, p. 2-3, accessed 7-7-12, LH)

But is there an economic competition between nations that is analogous to this zero-sum competition between sports teams, political candidates, and companies? The basic premise of most economic theory says no. Ever since Adam Smith refuted the arguments of mercantilists in the Wealth of Nations and David Ricardo developed the theory of comparative advantage, economists have argued that trade between nations benefits all countries. Just as individuals within a country benefit from specialization and trade, so do nations by specializing in activities in which they are relatively more productive than others. Trade between countries is by and large a win-win, not a zero-sum game.

Under standard economic theory, the notion that we are “competing” with China or that economic growth in China represents a threat gets it mostly backwards. Far from being an economic threat, more Chinese prosperity benefits the United States economy by providing more choices for U.S. consumers, markets for U.S. producers, and capital for U.S. borrowers. 3 Unlike Red Sox fans, who have reason to cheer when the Yankees lose we should, by this line of argument, be pleased when China’s economy performs well.

### Economic Competitiveness Wrong

#### Theory of economic competitiveness is wrong

Krugman, Princeton University, Economics and International Affairs professor, 1994

(Paul, Centenary professor at the London School of Economics, op-ed columnist for the New York Times, Nobel Memorial prize winner in Economic Sciences, March/April 1994, Foreign Affairs, “Competitiveness: A Dangerous Obsession,” <http://www.ucema.edu.ar/u/agaletto/krugman_competitiveness.pdf>, p. 29-30, accessed 7-5-12, LH)

It was a disappointing evasion, but not a surprising one. After all, the rhetoric of competitiveness -- the view that, in the words of President Clinton, each nation is "like a big corporation competing in the global marketplace" -- has become pervasive among opinion leaders throughout the world. People who believe themselves to be sophisticated about the subject take it for granted that the economic problem facing any modern nation is essentially one of competing on world markets -- that the United States and Japan are competitors in the same sense that Coca-Cola competes with Pepsi -- and are unaware that anyone might seriously question that proposition. Every few months a new best-seller warns the American public of the dire consequences of losing the "race" for the 21st century. A whole industry of councils on competitiveness, "geo-economists" and managed trade theorists has sprung up in Washington. Many of these people, having diagnosed America's economic problems in much the same terms as Delors did Europe's, are now in the highest reaches of the Clinton administration formulating economic and trade policy for the United States. So Delors was using a language that was not only convenient but comfortable for him and a wide audience on both sides of the Atlantic.

Unfortunately, his diagnosis was deeply misleading as a guide to what ails Europe, and similar diagnoses in the United States are equally misleading. The idea that a country's economic fortunes are largely determined by its success on world markets is a hypothesis, not a necessary truth; and as a practical, empirical matter, that hypothesis is flatly wrong. That is, it is simply not the case that the world's leading nations are to any important degree in economic competition with each other, or that any of their major economic problems can be attributed to failures to compete on world markets. The growing obsession in most advanced nations with international competitiveness should be seen, not as a well-founded concern, but as a view held in the face of overwhelming contrary evidence. And yet it is clearly a view that people very much want to hold -- a desire to believe that is reflected in a remarkable tendency of those who preach the doctrine of competitiveness to support their case with careless, flawed arithmetic.

#### **Competitiveness not true for countries**

Krugman, Princeton University, Economics and International Affairs professor, 1994

(Paul, Centenary professor at the London School of Economics, op-ed columnist for the New York Times, Nobel Memorial prize winner in Economic Sciences, March/April 1994, Foreign Affairs, “Competitiveness: A Dangerous Obsession,” <http://www.ucema.edu.ar/u/agaletto/krugman_competitiveness.pdf>, p. 34, accessed 7-5-12, LH)

Moreover, countries do not compete with each other the way corporations do. Coke and Pepsi are almost purely rivals: only a negligible fraction of Coca-Cola's sales go to Pepsi workers, only a negligible fraction of the goods Coca-Cola workers buy are Pepsi products. So if Pepsi is successful, it tends to be at Coke's expense. But the major industrial countries, while they sell products that compete with each other, are also each other's main export markets and each other's main suppliers of useful imports. If the European economy does well, it need not be at U.S. expense; indeed, if anything a successful European economy is likely to help the U.S. economy by providing it with larger markets and selling it goods of superior quality at lower prices.

International trade, then, is not a zero-sum game. When productivity rises in Japan, the main result is a rise in Japanese real wages; American or European wages are in principle at least as likely to rise as to fall, and in practice seem to be virtually unaffected.

### Not an Indicator

#### **Economic competitiveness is not an indicator of a country’s economy**

Krugman, Princeton University, Economics and International Affairs professor, 1994

(Paul, Centenary professor at the London School of Economics, op-ed columnist for the New York Times, Nobel Memorial prize winner in Economic Sciences, March/April 1994, Foreign Affairs, “Competitiveness: A Dangerous Obsession,” <http://www.ucema.edu.ar/u/agaletto/krugman_competitiveness.pdf>, p. 31-33, accessed 7-5-12, LH)

Most writers who worry about the issue at all have therefore tried to define competitiveness as the combination of favorable trade performance and something else. In particular, the most popular definition of competitiveness nowadays runs along the lines of the one given in Council of Economic Advisors Chairman Laura D'Andrea Tyson's Who's Bashing Whom?: competitiveness is "our ability to produce goods and services that meet the test of international competition while our citizens enjoy a standard of living that is both rising and sustainable." This sounds reasonable. If you think about it, however, and test your thoughts against the facts, you will find out that there is much less to this definition than meets the eye.

Consider, for a moment, what the definition would mean for an economy that conducted very little international trade, like the United States in the 1950s. For such an economy, the ability to balance its trade is mostly a matter of getting the exchange rate right. But because trade is such a small factor in the economy, the level of the exchange rate is a minor influence on the standard of living. So in an economy with very little international trade, the growth in living standards -- and thus "competitiveness" according to Tyson's definition -- would be determined almost entirely by domestic factors, primarily the rate of productivity growth. That's domestic productivity growth, period -- not productivity growth relative to other countries. In other words, for an economy with very little international trade, "competitiveness" would turn out to be a funny way of saying "productivity" and would have nothing to do with international competition.

But surely this changes when trade becomes more important, as indeed it has for all major economies? It certainly could change. Suppose that a country finds that although its productivity is steadily rising, it can succeed in exporting only if it repeatedly devalues its currency, selling its exports ever more cheaply on world markets. Then its standard of living, which depends on its purchasing power over imports as well as domestically produced goods, might actually decline. In the jargon of economists, domestic growth might be outweighed by deteriorating terms of trade. So "competitiveness" could turn out really to be about international competition after all.

#### **Economic competitiveness doesn’t represent the economy**

Kliesen, Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis, Business Economist, 1995

(Kevin L., January 1995, Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis, “The Fixation on International Competitiveness,” <http://www.stlouisfed.org/publications/re/articles/?id=1812>, accessed 7-5-12, LH)

Competitiveness enthusiasts believe that the United States competes with Japan or Germany in the same way that Ford competes with Chrysler or General Motors, with presidents and prime ministers playing the role of CEO and profits and losses being measured in terms of trade surpluses and deficits. By this standard, the United States, which has run a real trade deficit in goods and services for 31 of the past 35 years, should be a basket case economically, increasingly unable to sell its goods and services in world markets. Fortunately, the truth is quite the opposite. In 1993, the United States was the world's largest exporter of merchandise goods, with 12.4 percent of total world exports (up from 11.1 percent in 1980). Germany was the world's second largest exporter in 1993 with a 10.1 percent share, while Japan, further behind in third place, registered 9.7 percent.

Merchandise exports, of course, are only one side of the story. Countries also earn income from the sale of engineering, financial and legal services and the use of communications satellites. When services exports are properly accounted for, the United States, as [Chart 1](http://www.stlouisfed.org/publications/re/articles/?id=1812#chart1) shows, is still by far the world's largest exporter of goods and services.

The prowess of the American economy is also demonstrated in the value of goods and services (output) produced per person. Measured on a purchasing power parity basis, which values goods and services consistently across countries, per capita U.S. output was $22,204 in 1991, 2.1 percent higher than Switzerland ($21,747), 13.9 percent higher than Japan ($19,107) and 12.2 percent higher than Germany ($19,500).

Some may correctly point out that, although per capita output (income) is highest in the United States, the growth rates of per capita output in many other industrialized countries (that is, the yearly increase in their standard of living) have exceeded that in the United States for several years. This is particularly true for Germany and Japan. This development is not, as some may think, the result of the United States becoming less competitive. It simply means that there is a natural tendency for living standards to equalize across industrialized economies over time. Those economies that start out relatively poor will initially grow faster than those countries that start out relatively well off, but at some point their economic growth will slow from unsustainably high rates. A good example of this is Japan after World War II. In 1950, Japan's per capita income was only one-sixth that of the United States. As Japan rebuilt its war-ravaged economy, its living standards improved so that today its income per capita is nearly 90 percent that of the United States; however, its economy is growing nowhere near the phenomenal rates experienced between 1950 and 1973 (about 9 percent per year).

### Scapegoat- Domestic Problems

#### **Economic competitiveness is a scapegoat for domestic problems**

Kakaes, New America Foundation, fellow, 12

(Konstantin, 1-9-12, Slate, “It’s wrong to pit U.S. and Chinese scientists against each other in a research arms race,” <http://www.slate.com/articles/technology/future_tense/2012/01/u_s_scientists_are_not_competing_with_china_or_any_other_country_.single.html>, accessed 7-8-12, LH)

On the surface, there is a sort of international competition over jobs. Commerce Department data show that U.S.-based multinationals cut 2.9 million domestic jobs during the first decade of the century and added 2.4 million jobs abroad. But look more closely, as in a [November report](http://www.bea.gov/scb/pdf/2011/11%20November/1111_mnc.pdf)from the Commerce Department, and you’ll see that of those new jobs abroad, only 8.9 percent involved sales to U.S customers—the overwhelming number of new jobs abroad were related to economic growth abroad. It looks like jobs “moved” from the U.S. to other countries, since the numbers are about the same size.

But the truth is that jobs were lost in the U.S. for many reasons: technological change,[corporate consolidation](http://www.washingtonmonthly.com/features/2010/1003.lynn-longman.html" \t "_blank), and a sluggish economy. The jobs that were created abroad are, by and large, different jobs than the jobs lost in the United States. As Paul Krugman [wrote in an essay for Foreign Affairs in 1994](http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/49684/paul-krugman/competitiveness-a-dangerous-obsession), “it is simply not the case that the world's leading nations are to any important degree in economic competition with each other, or that any of their major economic problems can be attributed to failures to compete on world markets.” It’s easy to blame today’s bleak economic outlook on a failure to compete. But doing so is just finding a scapegoat for domestic shortcomings.

#### Economic competitiveness is just a political excuse

Krugman, Princeton University, Economics and International Affairs professor, 1994

(Paul, Centenary professor at the London School of Economics, op-ed columnist for the New York Times, Nobel Memorial prize winner in Economic Sciences, March/April 1994, Foreign Affairs, “Competitiveness: A Dangerous Obsession,” <http://www.ucema.edu.ar/u/agaletto/krugman_competitiveness.pdf>, p. 40, accessed 7-5-12, LH)

Finally, many of the world's leaders have found the competitive metaphor extremely useful as a political device. The rhetoric of competitiveness turns out to provide a good way either to justify hard choices or to avoid them. The example of Delors in Copenhagen shows the usefulness of competitive metaphors as an evasion. Delors had to say something at the Ec summit; yet to say anything that addressed the real roots of European unemployment would have involved huge political risks. By turning the discussion to essentially irrelevant but plausible-sounding questions of competitiveness, he bought himself some time to come up with a better answer (which to some extent he provided in December's white paper on the European economy -- a paper that still, however, retained "competitiveness" in its rifle).

By contrast, the well-received presentation of Bill Clinton's initial economic program in February 1993 showed the usefulness of competitive rhetoric as a motivation for tough policies. Clinton proposed a set of painful spending cuts and tax increases to reduce the Federal deficit. Why? The real reasons for cutting the deficit are disappointingly undramatic: the deficit siphons off funds that might otherwise have been productively invested, and thereby exerts a steady if small drag on U.S. economic growth. But Clinton was able instead to offer a stirring patriotic appeal, calling on the nation to act now in order to make the economy competitive in the global markets with the implication that dire economic consequences would follow if the United States does not.

### Competitiveness Used to Incite Hysteria

#### **Economic competitiveness incites hysteria- doesn’t describe reality**

Kakaes, New America Foundation, fellow, 12

(Konstantin, 1-9-12, Slate, “It’s wrong to pit U.S. and Chinese scientists against each other in a research arms race,” <http://www.slate.com/articles/technology/future_tense/2012/01/u_s_scientists_are_not_competing_with_china_or_any_other_country_.single.html>, accessed 7-8-12, LH)

Competition rhetoric can be used to incite hysteria—“We are falling behind!”—and to inspire pride—“We’re number one!” Weirdly, the competitiveness crowd often argues both of these at the same time: We are [the greatest country on earth](http://www.slate.com/articles/business/moneybox/2011/12/mitt_romney_believe_in_america_he_says_the_u_s_is_the_greatest_nation_in_the_history_of_the_earth_.html) even as our schools are failing.

This contradiction can only be resolved by realizing that these rankings were meaningless to begin with. We don’t need to run twice as fast, or rise above any storms, or worry if people in Germany or Japan or China live better than they used to. We shouldn’t worry about American technology spreading to our rivals. Television spread quickly throughout the world; so did the computer, the railway, antibiotics, the car, the automatic washing machine, and any other useful technology you care to name. If this diffusion takes place faster today than it used to (witness the rapid adoption of mobile phones around the world), this is a good thing. It doesn’t hurt America’s ability to “compete” because, as an empirical fact, the economic importance of cooperation trumps that of competition on a national scale. This is bad news for jingoistic politicians and business leaders, but good news for everyone else.

## AT: Soft Power

### Soft power isn’t better than hard power

#### Ignore their distinction between hard and soft power. Soft power is just a glamorized form of hard power.

Kumaravadivelu, professor of applied linguistics at TESOL, 2006

(B. TESOL: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages. In Julian Edge (Ed.) *(Re)Locating TESOL in an Age of Empire* (pp. 1-32) “Dangerous Liaison: Globalization, Empire and TESOL.” Pg 10-11) ZLH

The imperial pain is not slowing down empire building, however. In fact, except among the radical liberal wing of the American intellectual community (represented, for example, by Noam Chomsky) which is opposed to any form of American empire, the debate among a number of American politicians and academicians is not whether the US should be an imperial power, but whether it should be a ‘hard’ imperial power or a ‘soft’ imperial power. While conservative thinkers like Niall Ferguson and Paul Johnson advocate unilateralism and militarism to maintain American hegemony, moderates like Joseph Nye and Zbigniew Brzezinski call for persuasion and leadership to achieve the same goal. For Nye (2004a), soft power is the ability to get what the US wants through persuasion rather than coercion. It is exercised through political alliances, economic assistance and cultural exchanges. If soft power fails, then, hard power may be employed, with the support of likeminded allies. In a similar vein, Brzezinski (2004) calls for the establishment of ‘a co-optive hegemony’ in which the US provides the leadership of a global alliance of common interests aimed at maintaining American hegemony. For all the subtleties, soft power ‘is merely the velvet glove concealing an iron hand’ (Ferguson, 2004: 24). Regardless of their preferred path, the proponents of hard as well as soft options share the same goal: the survival and success of the American empire. There is also something else they share: they all see the English language as an effective tool in the service of empire. For instance, Nye (2004b: 19) states that ‘the most effective spokespeople’ for spreading American power abroad ‘are not Americans but indigenous surrogates’. He suggests English language education as one of the ways in which America can promote indigenous surrogates:

### Soft Power = Coercion not persuasion

#### Soft power works through verbal threats against another nation’s security by utilizing a sociolinguistic tactic of coercion embedded in forms of hard power.

Mattern, Associate Professor of Political Science at the University of Singapore, 05

(Janice Bially Millenium-Journal of International Studies 33: 583“Why `Soft Power' Isn't So Soft: Representational Force and the Sociolinguistic Construction of Attraction in World Politics” pg 585-87 <http://mil.sagepub.com/content/33/3/583.abstract>) ZLH

My starting point, which tracks at first with the (ultimately flawed) Habermasian-inspired approach, is that attraction is constructed through communicative exchange. Thus, I abide the basic constructivist insights that ‘reality’ – the broadly accepted facts of the world and the socially expected behaviours that are implied by those facts – is not pre-given and objective, but socially constructed through an ongoing collective process. Actors interpret the world in unique ways, and as they communicate with one another about their interpretations their communicative process enables them to whittle down the diversity of multiple interpretations into one or a few socially legitimated interpretations. Those then acquire the status of the ‘real truth’. Since communicative processes occur most fundamentally through the medium of language, it follows that ‘reality’ is a sociolinguistic construct.6 The same is true for the ‘reality’ of attractiveness. It is a sociolinguistically constructed ‘truth’ about the appeal of some idea; an interpretation that won out over many other possible interpretations through a communicative process. And yet, as Jean François Lyotard has famously noted in response to Habermas’s version of constructivism and communicative exchange, if one’s goal is to get some idea or thing anointed as attractive ‘in fact’ or in ‘reality’ – which is precisely why soft power is appealing to the policy community – persuasion is not likely to be the most effective strategy. This is because as a method of communicative exchange, persuasion functions through argument, and argument, in turn, rests upon evidence-based reasoning. As Lyotard argues, though, in the context of ‘reality’ construction interlocutors often don’t even share understandings of what counts as evidence, and thus, they cannot reason about it. On the contrary, in such a situation, actors often have incentives, which are rooted in the ontological (in)security of their sociolinguistically-constructed subjectivity, to fix the terms of the ‘reality’ in question in a manner that is congenial to the perpetuation of their Self – regardless of others’ views of the ‘evidence’. Thus, rather than trying to persuade one another of the ‘true’ meaning of ‘reality’ they fight over it (verbally)7 among themselves. They sociolinguistically construct ‘reality’ not through evidence-based argument but through representational force. Representational force is a form of power that operates through the structure of a speaker’s narrative representation of ‘reality’. Specifically, a narrative expresses representational force when it is organised in such a way that it threatens the audience with unthinkable harm unless it submits, in word and in deed, to the terms of the speaker’s viewpoint. The unthinkable harm threatened, however, is not physical, for that would imply physical force rather than representational force. Instead the harm promised is to the victim’s own ontological security – it is a threat that exploits the fragility of the sociolinguistic ‘realities’ that constitute the victim’s Self.8 When an author effectively builds such a threat into her narrative of ‘reality’, she can trap the victim with a ‘nonchoice’ between compliance with the view she articulates or tacit participation in the destabilisation, and even ‘death’, of the victim’s own subjectivity. Because it leaves the victim no viable ‘out’, representational force is a very effective tool for actors whose purpose is to ensure the ‘reality’ status of some specific viewpoint. Actors are likely to take advantage of it in world politics, where radical disagreement about the meaning of evidence is frequent and where the stakes of ‘reality’ construction can be quite high. Insofar as verbal fighting via representational force does appear empirically to be a regular part of the construction of attraction in world politics, soft power is rather ironically rooted in hard power. What makes hard power ‘hard’ is its ability to threaten victims into compliance; that is, to coerce.9 Thus, where attraction rests upon coercion the logic of a distinction between soft and hard forms of power becomes unsustainable. Certainly the form of coercion (and ‘hard’ power) to which attraction (and ‘soft’ power) is indebted is sociolinguistic rather than physical, but it is coercive nevertheless. In this way, soft power is not so soft after all. This revelation inheres a variety of practical and normative implications for those actors who wish to effectively accumulate and wield ‘soft’ power.

### Soft Power Bad

#### The USfg constructs its soft power through a coercive process of sociolinguistics which forces other countries to side with their version of “truth.” While this may work to crush some forms of dissent, it also inspires hatred and turns governments against their own people.

Mattern Associate Professor of Political Science at the University of Singapore 2005

(Janice Bially Millenium-Journal of International Studies 33: 583“Why `Soft Power' Isn't So Soft: Representational Force and the Sociolinguistic Construction of Attraction in World Politics” pg 604-9 <http://mil.sagepub.com/content/33/3/583.abstract>) ZLH

In support of the claim that soft power is not always so soft, consider how American attractiveness (and so American soft power) was sociolinguistically constructed immediately following 9/11. At the center of that effort was the phrase ‘war on terrorism’. On one level, the Bush administration had adopted this phrase to signify the ‘hard power’ actions it planned to undertake in response to the World Trade Center and Pentagon attacks. Yet, as Nye suggests, ‘war on terrorism’ was also intended to construct a ‘reality’ of American attractiveness and so to help cultivate soft power.60 This intention becomes clear in the administration’s juxtapositon of the war on terror as a legal and morally righteous act of self-defense against the intractably lawless acts of the terrorists. The contrast obviously highlighted the attractive, good US against the abjectly evil Other. Perhaps more powerfully, though, the US intention to construct its own attractiveness is revealed by the very choice of the phrase ‘war on terrorism’, rather than, say, some phrase that conjured up a retaliation against the persons responsible for the 9/11 attacks. By choosing the former the US implicitly made a promise to defend the whole world from the whole phenomenon of terrorism. Rather than just redressing the threats that affected Americans, the US committed to ‘rooting out terrorism’ altogether. In this way the phrase ‘war on terrorism’ represented the US as a strong, globally responsible leader – a ‘fact’ which supported the ‘reality’ of American attractiveness.61 Of course the narrative rendering of ‘war on terrorism’ as a reflection of American attractiveness was not the only one, and not everyone was naturally inclined toward it. For instance, in the direct aftermath of 9/11 one powerful alternative interpretation of ‘war on terrorism’ emerged among ‘foreign publics’ who worried that it would justify ‘indefinite incarcerat(ion) of foreign prisoners’.62 For these authors, ‘war on terrorism’ was not a ‘fact’ in evidence of American attractiveness, but a caution about the ways in which the US might expand its international control. From the perspective of the US, such an interpretation was ‘dissident’; if anointed ‘reality’ in the international community, this perspective would diminish American soft power. So the US took (linguistic) action. Along with other actors who were already attracted to its policies, the US sought to defeat the dissent through verbal fighting.63 Using representational force to narrate its version of the meaning of ‘war on terrorism’ these authors cleared the field of viable alternative interpretations in a way that promoted theirs to the status of ‘truth’. For at least the first six months following 9/11, representational force was effective; the American view prevailed as ‘reality’.64 It worked like this: the US first devised words and sentences depicting the war on terror as righteous, appropriate, and the only logical response to 9/11, and then they linked those to the threat that ‘you are either with us or with the terrorists’.65 In other words, US authors structured their narrative in a way that linked a representation of attraction to and approval of their policies with a representation that drew a line between good and evil. The effect of this linguistic structure was to similarly draw a line designating those against the policy and the US as definitively evil. For members in the audience whose subjectivities depended in important part on narrative ‘realities’ about being on the ‘good’ side of the good/evil divide, this created a trap. The ‘nonchoice’ was either to accept the US-articulated ‘reality’ of its own attractiveness and preserve the ‘reality’ of their own moral righteousness; or deny it and contradict the logic and integrity of the narratives that inscribed their ‘goodness.’ By forging a link between the phrase ‘war on terrorism’ and that of ‘with us or with the terrorists’ the US used the structure of their narrative to coerce. It is important to note that the coercive threat entailed by the logic of ‘with or against us’ was not a physical threat. In fact, no US administration official ever articulated any relationship between a refusal to accept the attractiveness of the American war on terror and military repercussions. There was a physical threat associated with harboring terrorists, but that was not the threat implied by the narrative links between ‘war on terror’ and ‘with or against us’. The latter threat was meant for actors that dissented from the appeal of the envisioned American war on terrorism but who did not harbor terrorists (or acknowledge it). It was meant for those who just disagreed. For those authors the non-choice ‘offered’ by the American utterance was to either reject American attractiveness, which would cast them on the side of the ‘evil’ terrorists in a way that contradicted their own goodness thus making them agents of their own sociolinguistic destabilization, or accept US attractiveness, support its post-9/11 policies, and sustain the stability of their Self. Importantly, had the American authors structured their narrative of the war on terrorism differently the options facing the audience would have been rather different as well. They certainly would have been less restrictive. For instance, the American authors might have narrated the war on terrorism as a proposition about the best way to exact justice and security in the aftermath of 9/11. They might, that is, have structured their narrative as an argument based on evidence arrived at through reasoning. In that case the audience would have had the option to contest through evidence and reasoning, without fear of punishment. Alternatively, the US authors might have structured their narrative about the war on terrorism as a bargain, inviting the audience to engage in demand-exchange. By instead structuring the narrative in a way that threatened dissidents with categorisation as evil, the authors made submission unavoidable for those audience members who were unwilling to risk degradation of their status as good. Dissident narratives thus disappeared and support for the war on terror, as almost unlimited as it was during that first half-year after 9/11, became a resource for American soft power.66 The forceful ‘war on terrorism’ narrative did, of course, face limitations for shoring up American attractiveness and soft power. For instance, the threat of ‘with us or against us’ only compelled, trapped, and effectively coerced those would-be dissidents whose subjectivities depended in part on sustaining a ‘reality’ of themselves as good according to the US definition of ‘good’. In this regard it should have been predictable that Iraq, whose subjectivity under Saddam Hussein’s reign was decidedly not bound up with the same kind of goodness as that implied by the American narrative, could not be coerced into endorsing the attractiveness of American policy by this specific representationally forceful narrative. The same was true of the western European democracies (notably France and Germany), though for a rather different reason. In this case, their subjectivity as morally righteous, distinctly non-evil states was reinforced in so many ways by so many other overlapping ‘realities’ in the sociolinguistic matrix that made up their Selves that the risk of incurring whatever contradictions might be wrought for their subjectivity as a result of resisting the US view on the war on terrorism would be minimal. Of course, in the immediate aftermath of 9/11 the western European democracies did support the US policies,67 but it is less compelling to think of that support as a function of attraction cultivated through representational force than as a pre-existing attraction; a convergence of European and US beliefs based on a pre-existing common lifeworld. Later, when the US began planning its invasion of Iraq, the common transatlantic lifeworld about what it meant to be a morally righteous state in world politics fractured. Logically one might thus contend that the ensuing European dissent was made possible precisely because of the imperviousness of European Selves to the ‘with us or with the terrorists’ threat that the US had constructed. Where representational force was effective was on those subjects whose sense of Self as morally righteous was important (unlike Iraq) but also indebted to singular or weaker sociolinguistic ‘realities’ (unlike many European countries). These include, for instance, Jordan, Syria, Egypt, and Turkey. These states were susceptible to the American coercive narrative (and were probably the target audience for the narrative in the first place) because their status as ‘good’ was tenuous. The risk of association with the putatively evil terrorists would be a risk too high to bear. Consider Jordan: in exchange for fortification of the ‘reality’ of its moral righteousness, Jordan accepted the logic of the war on terrorism. It embraced the ‘reality’ of American policy as attractive. King Abdullah II of Jordan displayed the ‘nonchoice’ logic driving his submission to the American narrative quite clearly when he stated that ‘it is very obvious that there are those on the side of good and those on the side of bad and some in the middle, who haven’t made up their minds, and those countries better make up their minds pretty quickly’.68 Beyond merely articulating agreement with the American representation, the King also abided the imperative to live the ‘reality’ of attraction to the US. Even as the Jordanian people protested, their government stood by its ‘attraction’ by hosting US military exercises near the border with Iraq.69 That the Jordanian government enacted its attraction to the US against the opposition of domestic Jordanian groups highlights that by no means did all Jordanians feel attracted to the US policy. But that is not required by representational force; what is required is that the government’s policies forced the collectivity of Jordan to live through the effects of an attraction to the US, even though attraction did not accurately describe the psychic state of all of the subactors in Jordan.70 In fact, so effective was representational force in this case – so urgent was the Jordanian government’s desire to stave off the threats to its subjectivity by enacting its attraction to US policies – that it even took up arms against its own dissenting people. This amounted to a radical departure from one of Jordan’s other cultures/‘realities’: its Self as peaceful.71 In this way Jordan sacrificed one aspect of Self to save another that it deemed more crucial to the overall stability and security of its subjectivity. Attraction to the US had become a matter of subjective life and death. The US had effectively used representational force to construct a ‘reality’ of its own attractiveness.

### Soft Power Imperialist

#### Soft power is an attempt at imperial rule

Mabee, Sr Lecturer at the Oxford Brookes Institute, 04

(Bryan; Third World Quarterly, Discourses of Empire: The US 'Empire', Globalisation and International Relations, 25(8), p. 1365 <http://www.arts.ualberta.ca/~courses/PoliticalScience/357B1/documents/MabeeDiscoursesOfEmpireUSEmpireGlobalisationIR.pdf>) ZLH

While it is certainly not the case that all historical empires were "empires of trade', the comparison between the present system and the nineteenth century is useful for the parallels with the global economy and the ideology surrounding the pursuit of an open economy. The guiding role of British informal rule in the nineteenth century was to 'open up' states to British commerce47 and the role of this facet of globalisation is no different, according to both proponents and critics. Along these lines as well, the force of American 'soft power', as Nye has described it. should not be seen as detrimental to empire, but conducive of it.48 Soft power, in essence, also forms one part of a drive to gain a legitimate basis for imperial rule.

#### Soft power simply masks imperialism

Mooers, Chair of the Department of Politics Ryerson University, 06

(Colin, Oneworld, The New Imperialists Ideologies of Empire , p. 2-3 <http://ourrebellion.files.wordpress.com/2010/09/book-new_imperialists1.pdf> )ZLH

Because of this fact, contemporary imperialism has had to drape itself in new ideological clothes; its defenders must now speak the language of democracy and human rights; of freedom and dignity; of inclusiveness and respect for difference; of gender equality and the alleviation of poverty; of good governance and sustainable development. Alongside these decidedly modernist tropes, others have appealed to the timeless verities of human nature or culture to justify the inevitability of war and empire. Still others have touted the supposedly beneficent legacy of older imperialisms. Such juxtapositions are in keeping with “a deep and perplexing doubleness” of the new imperialism: a primal military atavism reminiscent of older forms of empire combined with the “spectacular” deployment of up-to-the-minute technologies of mass deception and distraction.4 Taken as a whole, the new ideologies of empire express the same contradictory combination of the retrogressive and the modern: of civilizational clashes and democratic ideals; of virulent racism and postmodern multiculturalism; of gender equality and religious oppression; of old-fashioned propaganda and newfangled forms of “soft power”; of torture and human rights. Against this backdrop, it would be easy to lose sight of the difference between ideologies and lies. However, ideologies are different from lies even if they are sometimes (as in the case of Iraq) bolstered by lies. For ideologies to work, they must speak to some genuine longing on the part of those who believe in them, however distorted these desires have become by the realities of exploitation and domination. Hence the talk of democracy and freedom. But, like lies, ideologies often involve a good deal of self-delusion on the part of those who traffic in them – how else to explain the debacle of post-invasion Iraq? The systematic character of imperial self-delusion is perhaps best captured in U.S. Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld’s tortured explication of military ignorance: As we know, there are known knowns. There are things we know we know. We also know there are known unknowns. That is to say, we know there are some things we do not know. But there are also the unknown unknowns, the ones we don’t know we don’t know.5 As Slavoj Zizek observes, the one category that Rumsfeld failed to mention were the “unknown knowns”: beliefs or practices – like the horrors of Abu Ghraib – which must be quickly repressed since their knowledge is too much for consciousness to bear. Zizek contends that the real danger for the American empire lies not in the threats which lie undiscovered, but “in the disavowed beliefs, suppositions and obscene practices we pretend not to know about.”6 Be that as it may, a good deal of conscious effort has been expended to justify and normalize the “new imperialism.” It is a mark of the times in which we live that the discourse of empire and imperialism – not so long ago considered an antique preoccupation of the Left – has been embraced by mainstream intellectuals from across the political spectrum. But, before examining these apologias in detail in the essays that follow, we need to ask: what has prompted this sudden desire to reclaim the language of empire? What changes in the global balance of forces account for this momentous ideological shift?

### Nye Indict

#### The scholarship surrounding soft power, and in particular the works of Joseph Nye, are horrendously understudied and lack any real merit.

Mattern, Associate Professor of Political Science at the University of Singapore, 2005

(Janice Bially Millenium-Journal of International Studies 33: 583“Why `Soft Power' Isn't So Soft: Representational Force and the Sociolinguistic Construction of Attraction in World Politics” pg 591-2 <http://mil.sagepub.com/content/33/3/583.abstract>) ZLH

So far, however, the notion of attraction has been under-studied in IR. On one level, this relative inattention is not surprising since hard power/coercion has been assumed to be such a more urgent and effective practice in world politics. But soft power has been a matter of discussion for at least ten years and still there has been no sustained treatment of attraction. The result, I argue, is a confused implicit understanding that has given rise to contradictory practical implications. Consider Nye’s treatment of attraction. As the premiere contemporary analyst and advocate of soft power it would seem crucial that Nye have a sufficiently considered and articulated view of this phenomenon. But Nye is quiet on the character of attraction. In fact, in order to figure out what Nye thinks one must read between the lines – and even his implied account yields disappointing inconsistencies. For instance, on the one hand Nye (implicitly) theorises attraction as a natural objective experience when he describes the allegedly universally attractive values of cosmopolitanism, democracy, and peace.25 On the other hand, Nye implies that attraction is a social construct; he emphasises the utility of public diplomacy for ‘converting’ foreigners so that they become attracted to ones’ own values.26 In short, Nye assigns two ontological statuses to attraction – one as an essential condition and one as a result of social interaction. This dual ontology is meta-theoretically problematic, which makes for bad theory; but even worse, it sows confusion about the kinds of practical expectations one can stake on soft power. Practically speaking, the logic of natural attraction counsels a much more statusquo world than that of constructed attraction, for in the former there is no need (or ability) to cultivate attraction, while in the latter the possibilities for convincing others of the allure of one’s values and culture are potentially vast. So for a scholar trying to discern how much he can make of soft power and how much it can effect the shape of world politics, or for the practitioner trying to optimise soft power, the lack of clarity is troubling. Certainly there exists other IR scholarship that invokes phenomena similar to attraction which could possibly offer the basis for knitting together a more theoretically and functionally consistent account of soft power. But that work too falls short. Consider for instance the now broad IR scholarship on the formation and maintenance of inter-state or inter-group collective identity. Although this literature is diverse – inspired variously by primordialist, social identity, and ‘mainstream’27 constructivist theories – each approach nevertheless invokes something akin to attraction to do important work in its arguments.28 Each posits (though in different ways) that similarity is alluring to actors; that is, that attraction draws like actors together into the international group.29 Yet, like Nye, none of these approaches pays much attention to the logic of attraction upon which their theories depend. Each (even, ironically, the constructivists) offers a worryingly underdeveloped natural or essentialist version of that phenomenon.

## AT: Kagan

### Kagan Indict

#### Kagan has drawn his conclusions through a flawed and fallacious thinking process, refusing to address the harms the status quo presents.

Preble, vice president for defense and foreign policy studies at the Cato Institute, 12

(Christopher A, June 28th 2012, The National Interest “The Critique of Pure Kagan” pg 2-3 <http://nationalinterest.org/bookreview/the-critique-pure-kagan-7061?page=3>) ZLH

Kagan’s too-casual rejection of any reasonable alternative to American hegemony reveals the crucial flaw in his reasoning, however, given that he predicts we might not be afforded a choice in the future. If the United States can’t sustain its current posture indefinitely, a wiser long-term grand strategy would set about—preferably now—easing the difficult and sometimes dangerous transitions that often characterize major power shifts. Rather than continuing to discourage other countries from tending to their security affairs, the United States should welcome such behavior. Kagan’s reassuring tone—about China’s unique vulnerabilities, for example—actually buttresses that competing point of view. After all, if a distant, distracted hegemon like the United States can manage the challenge posed by China, and if it can do so while preventing wars and unrest in several other regions simultaneously, then Asian nations would be at least equally capable of accomplishing the same task given that they will be focused solely on their own security primarily in just that one region. KAGAN REFUSES to consider this possibility. He writes that the “most important features of today’s world—the great spread of democracy, the prosperity, the prolonged great-power peace—have depended directly and indirectly on power and influence exercised by the United States.” It follows, therefore, that the world would become considerably less democratic, less prosperous and less peaceful if the United States were to withdraw militarily from Europe, Asia and the Middle East. Of course, he can’t actually prove either claim to be true, and he concedes as much. Instead, he bases his case on a particular set of beliefs about how the world works and about the United States’ unique characteristics within that system. Kagan asserts that the world requires a single, order-inducing hegemon to enforce the rules of the game and that America must perform this role because its global economic interests demand it. He also believes that the United States has a special obligation, deriving from its heritage as a “dangerous nation,” to spread democracy and human rights. What’s more, America’s military might is the essential ingredient that leads to its international influence. The spread of democracy and market capitalism, Kagan claims, is made possible by U.S. power but would retreat before autocracy and mercantilism if that power were seen to be waning. The attractiveness of America’s culture, economics and political system—the vaunted “soft power” in Joseph Nye’s telling—is fleeting and would dissipate if Americans were to commit what Kagan calls “preemptive superpower suicide.” How other nations respond to U.S. power also follows a familiar pattern. In Kagan’s telling, allies will bandwagon with us if we are committed to defending them but bolt like frightened racehorses at the first sign of trouble. Would-be challengers will back down in the face of U.S. power but rush to exploit opportunities for conquest if Uncle Sam exhibits any hesitation or self-doubt. And Kagan simply dismisses any suggestion that other countries might chafe at American dominance or fear American power. His ideas represent something close to the reigning orthodoxy in Washington today and for the past two decades. Inside the Beltway, there is broad, bipartisan agreement on the basic parameters of U.S. foreign policy that Kagan spells out. This consensus contends that the burden of proof is on those who argue against the status quo. The United States and the world have enjoyed an unprecedented stretch of security and prosperity; it would be the height of folly, the foreign-policy establishment asserts, to upend the current structure on the assumption that an alternative approach would represent any improvement. But such arguments combine the most elementary of post hoc fallacies with unwarranted assumptions and idle speculation. Correlation does not prove causation. There are many factors that could explain the relative peace of the past half century. Kagan surveys them all—including economic interdependence, evolving norms governing the use of force and the existence of nuclear weapons—and concludes that U.S. power is the only decisive one. But, once again, he concedes that he cannot prove it. EVEN THOSE inclined to believe Kagan’s assessment of the international system and America’s role in it must contend with one central fact that Kagan elides: the costs of maintaining the status quo are substantial and likely to grow. That is because Washington’s possession of vast stores of power—and its willingness to use that power on behalf of others—has created an entire class of nations that are unwilling to defend themselves and their interests from threats. The data clearly show a vast and growing gap between what others pay for defense and what Americans pay to defend them.

### Gender Links to Kagan 98/Whining

#### Their characterization of our position as “whining” reinforces gendered metaphors to justify war in the name of masculinity.

Christensen, Assistant Professor of Sociology at Wisconsin-Madison and Ferree Professor of sociology at Wisconsin-Madison, 08

(Wendy M, Myra Marx, 24th June 2008, Qualitative Sociology “Cowboy of the World? Gender Discourse and the Iraq War Debate” 31:287–306 Pg 291-2 [http://www.ssc.wisc.edu/~mferree/documents/ChristensenFerree.pdf accessed 7-2-04](http://www.ssc.wisc.edu/~mferree/documents/ChristensenFerree.pdf%20accessed%207-2-04)) ZLH

Pro-war actors often made their argument by mobilizing gendered metaphors to challenge the masculinity of the anti-war position. This discursive strategy constructed the anti-war position is as either not sufficiently masculine or as expressing an insufficiently dominant or heterosexual kind of masculinity. Looking at the 402 gendered images used in these 149 articles, we find that 76 (19%) present those who are anti-war as unmanly. Even balanced or anti-war stories echo the framing of “being masculine enough” as an issue for anti-war speakers: “Some of the war hawks are saying that Powell is not strong enough, that he’s something of a sissy” (NPR 8/19/02). Sissy and wimp are used interchangeably in an ad hominem way to dismiss any opposition to going to war, as this pro-war speaker in a balanced discussion on NPR asserts: “the EU is a bunch of worthless wimps—they’re not good for anything, you can’t take them seriously; they’re not valuable partners” (NPR 4/21/ 02). The equation of power and masculinity is further underlined in the image of “impotence,” as a pro-war speaker on Fox News asserts: “the UN has become impotent thanks to the Democrats, thanks to the French, thanks to the Germans” (Fox News 1/23/03). Such unmasculine actors are weak and unable to act, and thus “worthless.” In constructing the anti-war position as unmasculine, the pro-war position frames toughness as the opposite of both femininity and homosexuality, both coded as non-hegemonic masculinity. In a discussion on Fox News about the United Nations’ refusal to mandate immediate invasion of Iraq, a pro-war actor chastises the US for ever seeking UN authority for invasion: “if we would have done this right off the bat, what we would have ended up getting was a slap on the wrist from a limp-wristed organization” (Fox News 3/10/03). Dismissing the United Nations as “limp-wristed” ties the anti-invasion position to homosexuality, and makes the inappropriateness of this position seem self-evident to any who share a positive regard for “country masculinity.” Similarly, opposition to pro-war policy is packaged as a lack of nationalism and masculinity together, as one military analyst reports, “There’s a few people in the Pentagon who basically say...that [for] people who disagree, it's not just a question of loyal opposition; this is disloyalty, and these are wimps” (NPR 3/9/02). The homosexual or “wimpy” male is defined as disloyal to “real” masculinity and US interests, which are conflated. The contrast between the US as “Mars” and Europe as “Venus” is sometimes explicitly invoked as a gendered reason for why these nations have different policy preferences, as when as pro-war editorial in the NYT points to the “Venus–Mars disconnect over Iraq” (NYT 2/16/ 03). The Kagan model of the US as masculine and Europe as feminine is by no means restricted to the Mars–Venus analogy alone, but instead is used by both sides to depict European countries as metaphorically women. A pro-war article describes Germany in feminine terms asking; “Who knew the Germans were such delicate, easily intimidated creatures?” (NYT 1/26/03), while an anti-war editorial calling for more diplomacy, chastises the Bush Administration, saying, “Germany is not some wimpy republic you can just date at your convenience and never call again” (NPR 3/18/03). This gendered relationship metaphor (dating, marriage, dancing together) appears in both text and editorial cartoons, using the supposed power of the United States to cast it as the “man” in the relationship and Europe as the subordinate, and therefore womanly “partner.” One antiwar speaker opens a discussion by asking “how can the marriage of Europe and the US be saved?” (NPR 5/28/02) Editorial cartoons in Europe as well as the US took up this gendered framing. Figure 1, an editorial cartoon that appeared in the Baltimore Sun, shows a charming Bush stepping on the toes of his female dance partner, Europe. Figure 2, from a Swedish newspaper, depicts Bush as a cowboy wooing a disinterested woman/Europe. The partnership of unequals politically signified by these courtship images is used in both papers to criticize Bush as an awkward suitor, but casting the US as “the man” naturalizes American leadership and places it beyond debate while also framing marriage as inherently an unequal partnership between “a man” and “a woman.” Europe is portrayed in the US not only as a woman, but as a “bad” and ungrateful woman who fails to appreciate the protective role of the masculine US. For example, a pro-war editorial argues: “France threatens to use its veto in the United Nations Security Council over Iraq. That veto power is undeserved, because France was aWorldWar II wimp” (USA Today 3/7/03). The theme that Europe should be more grateful and appreciative also appears with images of Europeans as “hysterical women, throwing fits and whining” (NYT 1/26/03). Or as a pro-war journalist claims, the US takes action against Iraq, while European countries just “watch and whine” (Fox News 1/23/03). In sum, the war debate between European allies and the US is sometimes cast in terms of a troubled marriage or dating relationship, one in which the strength and power of the US makes it the “man” who legitimately has the right to make decisions. The views of those who take issue with the rush to war are characterized in negatively feminized terms as “wimps” and “whining.” Men who fail to take the “manly” posture of “Mars” are denigrated as “sissies” and their actions are “limp-wristed.” This hegemonic view of masculinity as powerful, decisive, heterosexual and unwilling to listen to the “whining” of women is not left uncontested, however.

#### Policy analysts such as Robert Kagan use the concept of masculinity to securitize the nation.

Rollins, Regents Professor Oklahoma State University American/Film Studies and O’Connor Ph.D. in History from the CUNY Graduate Center, 08

(Peter C. and John E. July 25th 2009 “Why We Fought: America’s War and History” pg 489-491 <http://books.google.com/books?id=166coyZJEssC&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs_atb#v=onepage&q=kagan&f=false> accessed 7/4/12) ZLH

Historically, ideas about masculinity have encouraged political elites in the United States to associate security with military strength and to avoid thinking about the physical and emotional consequences of war (Enloe 126). This association has not happened by accident: rather, it is a function of the gendered symbolic system used to interpret U.S. foreign relations. As feminist scholar Carol Colin has shown, national security discourse depends on a gendered hierarchy of values that privileges "masculine" traits such as rationality, com- petition, and aggression over "feminine" ones such as emotionality, cooperation, and conciliation ("War, Wimps" 229). As with most binaries, the value of the first term is dependent on the devaluation of the second. The defense analysts Conn studied, for example, used sexual imagery to police group identity, describing nuclear war as a "pissing contest" ("Sex and Death" 60) and labeling those who questioned the necessity or effects of war as "pussies," "fags," or "women" ("War, Wimps" 235-36). Such derogatory invocations of femininity and homosexuality permit the disavowal of vulnerability, which is necessary to make the work of calculating human destruction psychologically bearable (Colin, "Sex and Death" 57). However, it also associates militarism with omnipotence and makes war seem like a guarantee of security rather than a threat to it.

This specialized discourse of security has filtered out "to the military, politicians, and the public, and increasingly shapes how we talk and think about war" (Cohn, "War, Wimps" 2\*28). Conservatives in particular (though not exclusively) have favored this view of militarism as the route to security because their value system already conceives of the nation as a patriarchal family requiring masculine protection (Lakoff 65). When the end of the Cold War deprived the United States of a clear rationale for an activist foreign policy, conservatives did not abandon their priorities; rather, they searched for a new rationale. As early as 1992, Paul Wolfowitz, then undersecretary of defense for policy, drafted a defense planning guidance memo advocating the militarized extension of U.S. hegemony as a means of guaranteeing global security. The best defense, he argued, was a good offense (Bacevich 43-44). He and other prominent neoconservatives, including William Kristol, Robert Kagan, Elliott Abrams, Richard Perle, and Donald Rumsfeld, formed a think lank called the Project for the New American Century to press this agenda. They invoked the gendered language of national security to naturalize their positions. For example, they warned that President Clinton's multilateral containment strat- egy for Iraq left the United States "weak." "helpless," and "dependent" on the goodwill of European allies (Kagan 24; Project for the New American Century A21). They described the United States as a "cowering superpower" and an- nounced that "only violence . . . may recoup the damage that the [British] Labour Party, Bill Clinton, and the Near East Bureau of the State Department have done to America's standing" in the Middle East (Gcrecht 29). Weakness, helplessness, dependence, and fear are characteristics associated in U.S. culture with femininity; hence militarized masculinity (violence) is viewed as the only possible antidote to the nation's "feminization." George W. Bush has not only incorporated a number of these individuals into his administration; he has also embraced a number of their ideas.

## AT: Thayer/Human Nature

### Defense: Thayer Wrong

#### Thayer’s wrong- natural selection favors genes that cause individuals to act in favor of their gene pool.

Busser, York University, Department of Political Science, 6

(Mark, August 2006, York University, “The Evolution of Security: Revisiting the Human Nature Debate in International Relations,” <http://www.yorku.ca/yciss/publications/documents/WP40-Busser.pdf>, p. 9-10, accessed 7-9-12, ATP)

The first argument Thayer puts forward is that natural selection favours egoistic individuals over altruistic ones. Following evolutionary theory, he recalls that a member of a species is relatively ‘fit’ in biological terms if it is better able to survive and reproduce than other members of the same community or species. For Thayer, this underscores the important concept of the ‘survival of the fittest.’ He suggests that since what is most important is relative, not absolute fitness, it is only logical to emphasize a competitive aspect to evolution within groups.“In a hostile environment where resources are scarce and thus survival precarious, organisms typically satisfy their own physiological needs for food, shelter, and so on before assisting others.”34 Thayer conveys a simple version of basic principles within evolutionary science, but delves into a scientific niche by incorporating Richard Dawkin’s controversial ‘selfish gene’ theory. Thayer asserts that because selfishness in genes increased fitness, the same sort of selfishness has spread to behaviour patterns in modern animals, including humans.35 Shaw and Wong, for example, suggest that altruism and nepotism can be explained through the concept of ‘inclusive fitness,’ wherein natural selection favours specific genes that cause individuals to act on behalf of their gene pool. The authors use complex mathematical experiments to construct models of evolutionary humankind and explain its likely behaviours as individualistic rational choices.36

#### Their argument about inherent domination in human nature is based on a misinterpretation of Darwin.

Busser, York University, Department of Political Science, 6

(Mark, August 2006, York University, “The Evolution of Security: Revisiting the Human Nature Debate in International Relations,” <http://www.yorku.ca/yciss/publications/documents/WP40-Busser.pdf>, p. 5, accessed 7-9-12, ATP)

The invocation of evolutionary concepts to prove an egoistic and warlike human nature has been common since the first publication of Charles Darwin’s evolutionary theories. The themes of competition, survival, and victory that seemed to permeate Darwin’s work seemed to provide a truly scientific grounds for theorizing an innate drive to battle. Yet Paul Crook argues that Darwin was no determinist, and that his work stresses the human capacity to transcend the pressures of natural selection. It is therefore problematic, Crook argues, for analysts “to read into Darwin’s work a necessary belief in a system of ethics chained to the empirical contours of nature.”16 Over the decades, however, this seems to be precisely what has happened. Popular understanding of Darwin’s core concepts is incomplete and imprecise to say the least, but the interpretation of basic evolutionary arguments is influential.

#### Thayer’s thesis relies on flawed generalizations and the possibility of technology long beyond our means

Busser, York University, Department of Political Science, 6

(Mark, August 2006, York University, “The Evolution of Security: Revisiting the Human Nature Debate in International Relations,” <http://www.yorku.ca/yciss/publications/documents/WP40-Busser.pdf>, p. 14-15, accessed 7-9-12, ATP)

Thayer’s argument about the ubiquity of hierarchical structures of power rely on a dichotomous hypothetical choice between eternal conflict and structures of dominance. The suggestion that the ubiquity of male dominated hierarchies ‘contributes to fitness’ in the present tense comes dangerously close to naturalizing and reifying patriarchal structures of human social organization.54 As presented, the argument reads very much like Hobbes’ Leviathan, in which pre-social actors sought the refuge and protection of a larger social order. In many ways, Thayer seems to be reconstructing the Leviathan using sociobiology rather clumsily to justify broad generalizations. It is certain that some mix of biology and culture have led to male-dominated cultures in the past, and there is a strong basis for the argument that humans have developed a need to belong to social groups. It is also clear that humans have the mental capacity to understand and technologies for operating within dominance hierarchies. Yet these possibilities together do not suggest, contrary to Thayer’s argument, that “humans readily give allegiance to the state, or embrace religion or ideologies such as liberalism or communism, because evolution has produced a need to belong to a dominance hierarchy.”55 If humans do depend on social connectedness, must this necessarily come in the form of hierarchical, patriarchal structures? The case is not made convincingly. As I shall discuss below, alternate understandings of the connection between basic human needs, human culture, and environmental stresses can provide an understanding of dominance hierarchies that does not naturalize their ubiquity.

Beyond the problems with the scientific evidence behind Thayer’s ontological claims, there are also problems with his proposed epistemological project of consilience. Using sociobiology to unite the social and natural sciences (and to give bases to a revitalized classical realism) would depend on achieving a near omnipotence, where known genetic programs could be weighed against known environmental influence, using science to predict the results. At the outset of his essay, Thayer implies that science is progressing at a rapid pace towards making this a reality. Yet evolutionary explanations for specific behaviours become incredibly problematic given all of the possible factors and externalities which might have affected evolutionary outcomes, all of which are impossible to map into even the most complex mathematical theoretical games. Bell and MacDonald point out that many biologists dispute whether sociobiology can offer useful commentary on humans “because of the central role of culture, language, and self-reflexivity in determining human behaviour.”56 Similarly, in response to Shaw and Wong, Joshua Goldstein cites evidence that human beings do not demonstrate an inherent tendency towards aggression, instead displaying cooperation more often. Goldstein offers the possibility that human behavioural traits like aggression, altruism, and sacrifice are shaped more by cultural transmission than by genes. This possibility enormously complicates the attempt at consilience intended by Thayer and his contemporaries, by adding in incalculable variables that come with social and cultural interactions.57

Because of these complications, Lewontin, Rose, and Kamin have asserted that sociobiology’s grand argument is discredited since no aspect of human social behaviour has ever been linked to a specific gene or set of genes.58 As Mary Clark observes, one of the major results of the human genome project was the falsification of the supposition that each protein produced in a human cell was coded by a separate gene. In fact, genes often work interdependently, with the same gene recurring along the chromosome and causing different outcomes depending on its position and neighbouring genes. Clark describes the complex signals and activations which occur at the genetic level, concluding that rather than a linear unidirectional blueprint, the human genome is more like an ecosystem, and can be responsive to its microscopic – and perhaps even the macroscopic – environment.59

#### Thayer’s data is indeterminate- can’t separate environmental factors.

Busser, York University, Department of Political Science, 6

(Mark, August 2006, York University, “The Evolution of Security: Revisiting the Human Nature Debate in International Relations,” <http://www.yorku.ca/yciss/publications/documents/WP40-Busser.pdf>, p. 15-16, accessed 7-9-12, ATP)

Just how important are the influences culture, social behaviour, and environment to the human condition, as distinct from biological programming? In many caveats and footnotes within Thayer’s own argument, he includes statements that acknowledge the importance of cultural factors in the shaping of modern human societies. If all behaviour cannot be explained by sociobiology and other evolutionary arguments because behaviours are contingent on cultural and environmental factors, how strong is the scientific support for Thayer’s revived realist project? As Bell and MacDonald have suggested, many of the scientific foundations Thayer employs to support his epistemological program are indeterminate because they cannot explain when cultural or environmental factors will play a role.60 On the ontological side, Thayer certainly comes a long way from proving that human nature is defined by and limited to egoism and dominance, as he had intended to do. If knowledge borrowed from evolutionary biology and other natural sciences suggests that culture and environment play a significant role in shaping human behaviours, then it may not be the realist project that is best supported by a deep and sustained interdisciplinary exploration.

### Offense: Social Darwinism Bad

#### Thayer’s arguments about human nature are a self-fulfilling prophecy that naturalizes discrimination and limits what is politically possible.

Busser, York University, Department of Political Science, 6

(Mark, August 2006, York University, “The Evolution of Security: Revisiting the Human Nature Debate in International Relations,” <http://www.yorku.ca/yciss/publications/documents/WP40-Busser.pdf>, p. 12, accessed 7-9-12, ATP)

The danger inherent in arguments that incorporate sociobiological arguments into examinations of modern political life, the authors say, is that such arguments naturalize variable behaviours and support discriminatory political structures. Even if certain behaviours are found to have a biological drives behind them, dismissing those behaviours as ‘natural’ precludes the possibility that human actors can make choices and can avoid anti-social, violent, or undesirable action.46 While the attempt to discover a genetically determined human nature has usually been justified under the argument that knowing humankind’s basic genetic programming will help to solve the resulting social problems, discourse about human nature seems to generate self-fulfilling prophesies by putting limits on what is considered politically possible. While sociobiologists tend to distance themselves from the naturalistic fallacy that ‘what is’ is ‘what should be,’ there is still a problem with employing adaptionism to ‘explain’ how existing political structures because conclusions tend to be drawn in terms of conclusions that assert what ‘must be’ because of biologically ingrained constraints.47 Too firm a focus on sociobiological arguments about ‘natural laws’ draws attention away from humanity’s potential for social and political solutions that can counteract and mediate any inherent biological impulses, whatever they may be.

#### This neo-darwinist outlook justifies violence and imperialism

Busser, York University, Department of Political Science, 6

(Mark, August 2006, York University, “The Evolution of Security: Revisiting the Human Nature Debate in International Relations,” <http://www.yorku.ca/yciss/publications/documents/WP40-Busser.pdf>, p. 6-7, accessed 7-9-12, ATP)

George Kateb suggests that although early social Darwinism in its pure form did not justify outright exploitation, it asserted that inequality was natural, and that society was best served by letting individuals thrive or fail. In its extended form, social Darwinism envisioned life as an unavoidable and natural struggle between groups, leading to a justification of all manners of inter-group violence including, perhaps most significantly, imperialist exploitation.18 As Patrick Brantlinger has recounted, extinction discourse rooted in the naturalness of evolutionary arguments was especially utilized in justifying violence, and even genocide, committed against aboriginal peoples during the imperialist era.19 This violent evolutionary discourse affected the relations between states as well. Paul Crook suggests that Darwinian concepts were construed as naturalizing war and imperialism, drawing up an evolutionary hierarchy which placed economic and military powers in an entitled position at the top. Arguments that condoned violence as an inevitable part of the natural world relied on mischaracterizations, or caricatures of the work of Darwin and his contemporaries. However, Crook also contends that historians have underplayed the degree to which Darwinian thought also inspired ‘peace biology,’ based on arguments that favoured Darwin’s holistic ecology.20

Darwin himself, under Bannister’s definitions, was no social Darwinist. He denied that the process of evolution had a teleological drive towards a goal, or that it moved in a linear direction, which is a key element in the argument that what evolutionary selection chooses is right and justified.21 Despite using combative language in his writing, such as “the struggle for existence,” Darwin was unwilling to give priority to themes of militarism and dominance in nature. In The Descent of Man he writes: “Although man, as he now exists, has few special instincts… this is no reason why he should not have retained from an extremely remote period some degree of instinctive love and sympathy for his fellows.”22 In a chapter on the mental faculties of human beings, Darwin puts an emphasis on the unique role of memory, judgement, and feeling in constructing human social relations. He suggests, in one example, that a person saving a helpless victim from a fire would not in the moment of pressure feel a utilitarian “happiness or pleasure” from behaving altruistically, but might act almost thoughtlessly as if under the influence of a deeply planted social instinct.23 Still, responding to Herbert Spenser’s suggestion that moral intuition is inherited, Darwin suggests that while many virtues may seem to be passed down genetically, It appears probable… that they become first impressed on the mental organization through habit, instruction, and example, continued during several generations in the same family, and in a quite subordinate degree, or not at all, by the individuals possessing such virtues having succeeded best in the struggle for life.24 It is perhaps ironic that an argument for the importance of human ‘nurture’ versus ‘nature’ is found in one of the founding texts of evolutionary theory, but this is not a contradiction. It is merely a testament to the complexities of evolutionary theory, as well as the difficulties with drawing conclusion for human behaviour based on natural selection. According to Darwin, the forces of natural influences such as genetic predisposition, sensory encouragement of behaviours, et cetera, in the evolution and development of human beings by no means replace the importance of habit, intergenerational teaching, mimicry, and other social influences.

#### Thayer’s theories are functionalist for a political agenda- legitimize conflict, inequality, and prejudice.

Busser, York University, Department of Political Science, 6

(Mark, August 2006, York University, “The Evolution of Security: Revisiting the Human Nature Debate in International Relations,” <http://www.yorku.ca/yciss/publications/documents/WP40-Busser.pdf>, p. 11-12, accessed 7-9-12, ATP)

Responding directly to Thayer, Duncan Bell and Paul MacDonald have expressed concern at the intellectual functionalism inherent in sociobiological explanations, suggesting that too often analysts choose a specific behaviour and read backwards into evolutionary epochs in an attempt to rationalize explanations for that behaviour. These arguments, Bell and MacDonald write, often fall into what Richard Lewontin and Stephen Jay Gould have called ‘adaptionism,’ or “the attempt to understand all physiological and behavioural traits of an organism as evolutionary adaptations.”42 Arguments such as these are hand-crafted by their makers, and tend to carry forward their assumptions and biases. In an insightful article, Jason Edwards suggests that sociobiology and its successor, evolutionary psychology, are fundamentally political because they frame their major questions in terms of an assumed individualism. Edwards suggests that the main question in both subfields is: “given human nature, how is politics possible?”43 The problem is that the ‘givens’ of human nature are drawn backward from common knowledges and truths about humans in society, and the game-theory experiments which seek to prove them are often created with such assumptions in mind. These arguments are seen by their critics as politicized from the very start. Sociobiology in particular has been widely interpreted as a conservative politico-scientific tool because of these basic assumptions, and because of the political writings of many sociobiologists.44 Because sociobiology naturalizes certain behaviours like conflict, inequality and prejudice, Lewontin et al. suggest that it “sets the stage for legitimation of things as they are.”45

#### The only means to solve war is by engaging in a political ethic of difference

Busser, York University, Department of Political Science, 6

(Mark, August 2006, York University, “The Evolution of Security: Revisiting the Human Nature Debate in International Relations,” <http://www.yorku.ca/yciss/publications/documents/WP40-Busser.pdf>, p. 19-20, accessed 7-9-12, ATP)

Clark describes the African concept of ubuntu or botho, which carries a range of virtuous meanings. Clark relays Archbishop Desmond Tutu’s explanation of the concept’s essence: “My humanity is caught up, is inextricably bound up, in yours… A person is a person through other persons… I am human because I belong. I participate. I share.”77 For differences to coexist peacefully, Clark suggests, it is necessary to build societies that foster recognition of the connectedness of the human experience and the value of difference. “The only compromise (if we must call it that) is to accept the possibility of – and then give respect to – beliefs different than one’s own.”78 The focus on human propensities and needs put forward here lays out a framework for thinking about social and political problems by paying attention to the underlying stresses which result from people’s lack of freedom. When human beings are freely able to negotiate their social bonds, their autonomous movements, and to invest in meaning systems, they have the potential for peaceful and harmonious living. Key to this argument is a political ethic of difference, where Otherness is not only tolerated, but embraced and respected. Clark may not necessarily see this as an ethical assertion. Her book is constructed upon scientific evidence (however contested) and the concluding remarks are framed in terms of a practical argument. Human beings have evolved the psychological, biological, and intellectual tools for social interaction, which provide the potential for peace and for conflict. Alternate outcomes depend on which meaning systems are adopted in a culture. Some particular meaning systems add stress, disrupting the basic human needs as discussed above, and leading to conflict. The most valuable and lasting way to ensure peace and stability, Clark asserts, is to adopt social frameworks wherein different systems of meaning can co-exist without hierarchy.

# Heg K Toolbox- Aff

### \*\*\*\*NB: Pull Roleplaying cards from Framework File and more Heg Good Offense from the Heg Core.

## Heg Good

### Antihegemony Bad (Kagan 98)

#### Critiquing American empire is dangerous whining. Embracing is a recipe for decreasing hegemony

Kagan, senior associate at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 98

(Robert, Foreign Policy, “The benevolent empire” pg 33-34 <http://people.cas.sc.edu/rosati/a.kaplan.benevolentempire.fp.sum98.pdf> accessed 7/4/12) ZLH

Those contributing to the growing chorus of antihegemony and multipolarity may know they are playing a dangerous game, one that needs to be conducted with the utmost care, as French leaders did during the Cold War, lest the entire international system come crashing down around them. What they may not have adequately calculated, however, is the possibility that Americans will not respond as wisely as they generally did during the Cold War.

Americans and their leaders should not take all this sophisticated whining about U.S. hegemony too seriously. They certainly should not take it more seriously than the whiners themselves do. But, of course, Americans are taking it seriously. In the United States these days, the lugubrious guilt trip of post-Vietnam liberalism is echoed even by conservatives, with William Buckley, Samuel Huntington, and James Schlcsinger all decrying American "hubris," "arrogance," and "imperial- ism." Clinton administration officials, in between speeches exalting America as the "indispensable" nation, increasingly behave as if what is truly indispensable is the prior approval of China, France, and Russia for every military action. Moreover, at another level, there is a stirring of neo-isolationism in America today, a mood that nicely complements the view among many Europeans that America is meddling too much in everyone else's business and taking too little time to mind its own. The existence of the Soviet Union disciplined Americans and made them see that their enlightened self-interest lay in a relatively generous foreign policy. Today, that discipline is no longer present. In other words, foreign grumbling about American hegemony would be merely amusing, were it not for the very real possibility that too many Americans will forget—even if most of the rest of the world does not— just how important continued American dominance is to the preservation of a reasonable level of international security and prosperity. World leaders may want to keep this in mind when they pop the champagne corks in celebration of the next American humbling.

### Heg Sustainable/Inevitable

#### Hegemony is durable- alternative can’t overcome it.

Steven G. Brooks and William C. Wohlforth, Associate Professors of Government at Dartmouth College, 9

[“Reshaping the World Order,” Foreign Affairs, March/April 2009, http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/64652/stephen-g-brooks-and-william-c-wohlforth/reshaping-the-world-order]

Now, the conventional wisdom is that the world is rapidly approaching the end of the unipolar system with the United States as the sole superpower. A dispassionate look at the facts shows that this view understates U.S. power as much as recent talk of empire exaggerated it. That the United States weighs more on the traditional scales of world power than has any other state in modern history is as true now as it was when the commentator Charles Krauthammer proclaimed the advent of a "unipolar moment" in these pages nearly two decades ago. The United States continues to account for about half the world's defense spending and one-quarter of its economic output. Some of the reasons for bearishness concern public policy problems that can be fixed (expensive health care in the United States, for example), whereas many of the reasons for bullishness are more fundamental (such as the greater demographic challenges faced by the United States' potential rivals). So why has opinion shifted so quickly from visions of empire to gloomy declinism? One reason is that the United States' successes at the turn of the century led to irrational exuberance, thereby setting unreasonably high standards for measuring the superpower's performance. From 1999 to 2003, seemingly easy U.S. victories in Kosovo, Afghanistan, and Iraq led some to conclude that the United States could do what no great power in history had managed before: effortlessly defeat its adversaries. It was only a matter of time before such pie-in-the-sky benchmarks proved unattainable. Subsequent difficulties in Afghanistan and Iraq dashed illusions of omnipotence, but these upsets hardly displaced the United States as the world's leading state, and there is no reason to believe that the militaries of its putative rivals would have performed any better. The United States did not cease to be a superpower when its policies in Cuba and Vietnam failed in the 1960s; bipolarity lived on for three decades. Likewise, the United States remains the sole superpower today. Another key reason for the multipolar mania is "the rise of the rest." Impressed by the rapid economic growth of China and India, many write as if multipolarity has already returned. But such pronouncements mistake current trajectories for final outcomes -- a common strategic error with deep psychological roots. The greatest concern in the Cold War, for example, came not from the Soviet Union's actually attaining parity with the United States but from the expectation that it would do so in the future. Veterans of that era recall how the launch of Sputnik in 1957 fed the perception that Soviet power was growing rapidly, leading some policymakers and analysts to start acting as if the Soviet Union were already as powerful as the United States. A state that is rising should not be confused with one that has risen, just as a state that is declining should not be written off as having already declined. China is generally seen as the country best positioned to emerge as a superpower challenger to the United States. Yet depending on how one measures GDP, China's economy is between 20 percent and 43 percent the size of the United States'. More dramatic is the difference in GDP per capita, for which all measures show China's as being less than 10 percent of the United States'. Absent a 1930s-style depression that spares potential U.S. rivals, the United States will not be replaced as the sole superpower for a very long time. Real multipolarity -- an international system of three or more evenly matched powers -- is nowhere on the horizon. Relative power between states shifts slowly. This tendency to conflate trends with outcomes is often driven by the examination in isolation of certain components of state power. If the habit during the Cold War was to focus on military power, the recent trend has been to single out economic output. No declinist tract is complete without a passage noting that although the United States may remain a military superpower, economic multipolarity is, or soon will be, the order of the day. Much as highlighting the Soviet Union's military power meant overlooking the country's economic and technological feet of clay, examining only economic output means putting on blinders. In 1991, Japan's economy was two-thirds the size of the United States', which, according to the current popular metric, would mean that with the Soviet Union's demise, the world shifted from bipolarity to, well, bipolarity. Such a partial assessment of power will produce no more accurate an analysis today. Nor will giving in to apprehension about the growing importance of nonstate actors. The National Intelligence Council's report Global Trends 2025 grabbed headlines by forecasting the coming multipolarity, anticipating a power shift as much to nonstate actors as to fast-growing countries. But nonstate actors are nothing new -- compare the scale and scope of today's pirates off the Somali coast with those of their eighteenth-century predecessors or the political power of today's multinational corporations with that of such behemoths as the British East India Company -- and projections of their rise may well be as much hype as reflections of reality. And even if the power of nonstate actors is rising, this should only increase the incentives for interstate cooperation; nonstate threats do not affect just the United States. Most nonstate actors' behavior, moreover, still revolves around influencing the decisions of states. Nongovernmental organizations typically focus on trying to get states to change their policies, and the same is true of most terrorists. When it comes to making, managing, and remaking international institutions, states remain the most important actors -- and the United States is the most important of them. No other country will match the United States' combination of wealth, size, technological capacity, and productivity in the foreseeable future. The world is and will long remain a 1 + x world, with one superpower and x number of major powers. A shift from 1 + 3 to 1 + 4 or 5 or 6 would have many important consequences, but it would not change the fact that the United States will long be in a far stronger position to lead the world than any other state.

#### Even if a shift is coming, it won’t happen in the short term

Brighenti 7

(Olivier, PhD. Candidate University of Geneva, Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs, “Power Maximization, US Grand Strategy and the Unipolar International Structure,”

http://www.allacademic.com//meta/p\_mla\_apa\_research\_citation/1/7/8/7/3/pages178731/p178731-2.php)

Thus we are years away from any balancing coalition and even more remote from the emergence of a new pole. Within the international relations scholarly community most of the debate on unipolarity has focused on the stability of the system, in other words if a unipolar world configuration is peaceful or more prone to instability and war. 7 Realists have also paid attention to the durability of a unipolar configuration, i.e. if unipolarity was only a “moment” in history, a structural anomaly or if this type of configuration could be sustained at length. 8 Until the beginning of the new millennium, it was widely believed that the unipolar world configuration would not last and that the balance would be restored. Kenneth Waltz echoes this view: “Theory enables us to say that a new balance of power will form but not to say how long it will take. National and international conditions determine that. Those who refer to the unipolar moment are right. In our perspective, the new balance of power is emerging slowly, in historical perspectives it will come in a blink of an eye.” 9 Fifteen years after the end of the Cold War and Krauthammer’s path-breaking article, 10 there is no sign of a balancing tendency and we are still in a unipolar world order comprising one sole superpower. First of all, the unipolar structure of world politics is not a temporary setback due to vanish only because international politics abhors unbalanced power. It is an uncontested reality and no one can predict when the disrupted balance will be restored.

#### American hegemony will persist, other powers want us in power.

Norrlof 10

(Norrlof, Associate Professor of Political Science at the University of Toronto, “America’s Global Advantage: US Hegemony and International Cooperation”, Cambridge University Press, May 24th 2010, [http://assets.cambridge.org/97805217/65435/frontmatter/9780521765435\_frontmatter.pdf accessed 7/17/12](http://assets.cambridge.org/97805217/65435/frontmatter/9780521765435_frontmatter.pdf%20accessed%207/17/12)) ZLH

Military power has been seen as important in enforcing debt repayments, but there is clearly a need to rethink the connection between reserve status and military power in the present systemic context where the reserve currency country has the world’s largest external liabilities. We have seen erroneous predictions of American decline before. In the 1970s, the combination of high inflation, high interest rates, high unemployment, the Vietnam War, political and military challenges from China and the Soviet Union, and the economic rise of Japan led to eerily similar forecasts. Pessimists then, as today, underestimated the longevity of American power. The main reason the United States has continued to occupy a unique place in the international system is because a sufficient number of major and lesser powers have a strong interest in maintaining America at the top of the hierarchy. To bring America down would take a deliberate, coordinated strategy on the part of others and this is simply not plausible. As much as the United States benefits from the space it has carved out for itself in the current world order, its ability to reap unequal gains will remain unless and until allies start to incur heavy losses under American dominance. Even that, by itself, will not be sufficient to sink American hegemony. A strong alternative to American rule will have to come into view for things to fundamentally change. At present, no credible alternative is in sight. The United States is not invincible but its dominance is currently steady. Those who are incline to think that American hegemony will persist – at least for a while – tend to dwell on the claim that the United States is providing a range of public goods to the benefit of all at its own expense. This is a chimera. The United States is self-interested, not altruistic. The illusion of benevolence has meant that very little attention has been given to uncovering the mechanism through which the United States gains disproportionately from supplying a large open market, the world’s reserve currency, and a military machine capable of stroking or foiling deadly disputes. This book exposes the mechanism through which the United States reaps unequal gains and shows that the current world system, and the distribution of power that supports it, has built-in stabilizers that strengthen American power following bouts of decline. Although all dominant powers must eventually decline, I will show that the downward progression need not be linear when mutually reinforcing tendencies across various power dimensions are at play. Specifically, I will demonstrate how the United States’ reserve currency status produces disproportionate commercial gains; how commercial power gives added flexibility in monetary affairs; and, finally, how military preponderance creates advantages in both monetary and trade affairs.

#### Even if shift is coming, the American public will never allow the government to change its course.

Gray 9

(Colin S. Gray, Professor of International Politics and Strategic Studies at the University of Reading, “AFTER IRAQ: THE SEARCH FOR A SUSTAINABLE NATIONAL SECURITY STRATEGY,” January 2009, Strategic Studies Institute, [http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pdffiles/PUB902.pdf accessed 7/17/12](http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pdffiles/PUB902.pdf%20accessed%207/17/12)) ZLH

When considered over the longer term, as in this monograph, U.S. foreign policy, national security policy, and strategy must reconcile the demands of a domestic culture that can have dysfunctional consequences abroad, with the objective circumstances of the outside world. It is almost entirely useless for American or other scholars to write books and articles urging a U.S. policy that affronts American culture. The beginning of wisdom has to be with Sun-tzu’s dictum on the necessity for knowledge of the enemy and of oneself. To be sustainable, American policy and strategy must be broadly compatible with American values. Perhaps not all American values, and not all of the time. But any policy vision that is plainly un-American is certain to fail at home eventually. Foreign policy is born at home and has to succeed there if it is to succeed abroad. The current debate to which this monograph relates is replete with arguments about anticipated features of the 21st century that will prove desperately challenging to American national culture. It may well be that this century will see a return of multipolar balance-ofpower politics on a global scale. But when one considers this possibility, even probability, one needs to remember that American culture wants to reject what it regards as the cynical balance-of-power politics of expediency. Americans believe it is a mission of their unique country to improve the world. If thwarted in this noble, even (in the opinion of many) divine, mission, they are likely to insist that the country withdraw, adopting a minimalist foreign policy. Controversialist Christopher Layne speaks for many Americans when he writes: “Precisely because of its power and geography, there is very little the United States needs to do in the world in order to be secure.”15 This is not a majority opinion at present, but it does express a powerful enduring current in American culture. Any and all discussion of a sustainable U.S. national security strategy must be at least as attentive to the persisting realities of American culture as it is to the constraints and opportunities of the outside world. In addition, many scholars and even some official planners are apt to neglect the potent roles that can be played by eccentric personal preference, incompetence, error, pure accident, and unavoidable bad luck. The realm of national security strategy is far from friction free.

### Heg Good Laundry List (Prolif, Terrorism, Genocide)

#### Hegemony key to solve proliferation, terrorism, and genocide.

Lieber 5 PhD from Harvard, Professor of Government and International Affairs at Georgetown, former consultant to the State Department and for National Intelligence Estimates (Robert, “The American Era”, pages 51-52)

The United States possesses the military and economic means to act assertively on a global basis, but should it do so, and if so, how? In short, if the United States conducts itself in this way, will the world be safer and more stable, and is such a role in America’s national interest? Here, the anarchy problem is especially pertinent. The capacity of the United Nations to act, especially in coping with the most urgent and deadly problems, is severely limited, and in this sense, the demand for “global governance” far exceeds the supply. Since its inception in 1945, there have only been two occasions (Korea in 1950 and Kuwait in 1991) when the U.N. Security Council authorized the use of force, and in both instances the bulk of the forces were provided by the United States. In the most serious cases, especially those involving international terrorism, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, ethnic cleansing, civil war, and mass murder, if America does not take the lead, no other country or organization is willing or able to respond effectively. The deadly cases of Bosnia (1991–95) and Rwanda (1994) make this clear. In their own way, so did the demonstrations by the people of Liberia calling for American intervention to save them from the ravages of predatory militias in a failed state. And the weakness of the international reaction to ethnic cleansing, rape, and widespread killing in the Darfur region of Western Sudan provides a more recent example.

### Heg key to Peace

#### Absolute US power smoothes the transition to multipolarity and is empirically correlated to perpetual great-power peace

Barnett, Former Senior Strategic Research at the US Naval War College, 11

(Thomas P.M March 7th 2011, “The New Rules: Leadership Fatigue Puts U.S., and Globalization, at Crossroads,” [http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/8099/the-new-rules-leadership-fatigue-puts-u-s-and-globalization-at-crossroads accessed 7/10/12](http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/8099/the-new-rules-leadership-fatigue-puts-u-s-and-globalization-at-crossroads%20accessed%207/10/12)) ZLH

Events in Libya are a further reminder for Americans that we stand at a crossroads in our continuing evolution as the world's sole full-service superpower. Unfortunately, we are increasingly seeking change without cost, and shirking from risk because we are tired of the responsibility. We don't know who we are anymore, and our president is a big part of that problem. Instead of leading us, he explains to us. Barack Obama would have us believe that he is practicing strategic patience. But many experts and ordinary citizens alike have concluded that he is actually beset by strategic incoherence -- in effect, a man overmatched by the job. It is worth first examining the larger picture: We live in a time of arguably the greatest structural change in the global order yet endured, with this historical moment's most amazing feature being its relative and absolute lack of mass violence. That is something to consider when Americans contemplate military intervention in Libya, because if we do take the step to prevent larger-scale killing by engaging in some killing of our own, we will not be adding to some fantastically imagined global death count stemming from the ongoing "megalomania" and "evil" of American "empire." We'll be engaging in the same sort of system-administering activity that has marked our stunningly successful stewardship of global order since World War II. Let me be more blunt: As the guardian of globalization, the U.S. military has been the greatest force for peace the world has ever known. Had America been removed from the global dynamics that governed the 20th century, the mass murder never would have ended. Indeed, it's entirely conceivable there would now be no identifiable human civilization left, once nuclear weapons entered the killing equation. But the world did not keep sliding down that path of perpetual war. Instead, America stepped up and changed everything by ushering in our now-perpetual great-power peace. We introduced the international liberal trade order known as globalization and played loyal Leviathan over its spread. What resulted was the collapse of empires, an explosion of democracy, the persistent spread of human rights, the liberation of women, the doubling of life expectancy, a roughly 10-fold increase in adjusted global GDP and a profound and persistent reduction in battle deaths from state-based conflicts. That is what American "hubris" actually delivered. Please remember that the next time some TV pundit sells you the image of "unbridled" American military power as the cause of global disorder instead of its cure. With self-deprecation bordering on self-loathing, we now imagine a post-American world that is anything but. Just watch who scatters and who steps up as the Facebook revolutions erupt across the Arab world. While we might imagine ourselves the status quo power, we remain the world's most vigorously revisionist force. As for the sheer "evil" that is our military-industrial complex, again, let's examine what the world looked like before that establishment reared its ugly head. The last great period of global structural change was the first half of the 20th century, a period that saw a death toll of about 100 million across two world wars. That comes to an average of 2 million deaths a year in a world of approximately 2 billion souls. Today, with far more comprehensive worldwide reporting, researchers report an average of less than 100,000 battle deaths annually in a world fast approaching 7 billion people. Though admittedly crude, these calculations suggest a 90 percent absolute drop and a 99 percent relative drop in deaths due to war. We are clearly headed for a world order characterized by multipolarity, something the American-birthed system was designed to both encourage and accommodate. But given how things turned out the last time we collectively faced such a fluid structure, we would do well to keep U.S. power, in all of its forms, deeply embedded in the geometry to come. To continue the historical survey, after salvaging Western Europe from its half-century of civil war, the U.S. emerged as the progenitor of a new, far more just form of globalization -- one based on actual free trade rather than colonialism. America then successfully replicated globalization further in East Asia over the second half of the 20th century, setting the stage for the Pacific Century now unfolding.

#### Hegemony has been key to global peace, multiple factors prove

Owen, Professor of Politics at University of Virginia , 11

(John M. February 11th 2011, “Don’t Discount Hegemony” <http://www.cato-unbound.org/2011/02/11/john-owen/dont-discount-hegemony/> accessed 7/11/12) ZLH

Andrew Mack and his colleagues at the Human Security Report Project are to be congratulated. Not only do they present a study with a striking conclusion, driven by data, free of theoretical or ideological bias, but they also do something quite unfashionable: they bear good news. Social scientists really are not supposed to do that. Our job is, if not to be Malthusians, then at least to point out disturbing trends, looming catastrophes, and the imbecility and mendacity of policy makers. And then it is to say why, if people listen to us, things will get better. We do this as if our careers depended upon it, and perhaps they do; for if all is going to be well, what need then for us? Our colleagues at Simon Fraser University are brave indeed. That may sound like a setup, but it is not. I shall challenge neither the data nor the general conclusion that violent conflict around the world has been decreasing in fits and starts since the Second World War. When it comes to violent conflict among and within countries, things have been getting better. (The trends have not been linear—Figure 1.1 actually shows that the frequency of interstate wars peaked in the 1980s—but the 65-year movement is clear.) Instead I shall accept that Mack et al. are correct on the macro-trends, and focus on their explanations they advance for these remarkable trends. With apologies to any readers of this forum who recoil from academic debates, this might get mildly theoretical and even more mildly methodological. Concerning international wars, one version of the “nuclear-peace” theory is not in fact laid to rest by the data. It is certainly true that nuclear-armed states have been involved in many wars. They have even been attacked (think of Israel), which falsifies the simple claim of “assured destruction”—that any nuclear country A will deter any kind of attack by any country B because B fears a retaliatory nuclear strike from A. But the most important “nuclear-peace” claim has been about mutually assured destruction, which obtains between two robustly nuclear-armed states. The claim is that (1) rational states having second-strike capabilities—enough deliverable nuclear weaponry to survive a nuclear first strike by an enemy—will have an overwhelming incentive not to attack one another; and (2) we can safely assume that nuclear-armed states are rational. It follows that states with a second-strike capability will not fight one another. Their colossal atomic arsenals neither kept the United States at peace with North Vietnam during the Cold War nor the Soviet Union at peace with Afghanistan. But the argument remains strong that those arsenals did help keep the United States and Soviet Union at peace with each other. Why non-nuclear states are not deterred from fighting nuclear states is an important and open question. But in a time when calls to ban the Bomb are being heard from more and more quarters, we must be clear about precisely what the broad trends toward peace can and cannot tell us. They may tell us nothing about why we have had no World War III, and little about the wisdom of banning the Bomb now. Regarding the downward trend in international war, Professor Mack is friendlier to more palatable theories such as the “democratic peace” (democracies do not fight one another, and the proportion of democracies has increased, hence less war); the interdependence or “commercial peace” (states with extensive economic ties find it irrational to fight one another, and interdependence has increased, hence less war); and the notion that people around the world are more anti-war than their forebears were. Concerning the downward trend in civil wars, he favors theories of economic growth (where commerce is enriching enough people, violence is less appealing—a logic similar to that of the “commercial peace” thesis that applies among nations) and the end of the Cold War (which end reduced superpower support for rival rebel factions in so many Third-World countries). These are all plausible mechanisms for peace. What is more, none of them excludes any other; all could be working toward the same end. That would be somewhat puzzling, however. Is the world just lucky these days? How is it that an array of peace-inducing factors happens to be working coincidentally in our time, when such a magical array was absent in the past? The answer may be that one or more of these mechanisms reinforces some of the others, or perhaps some of them are mutually reinforcing. Some scholars, for example, have been focusing on whether economic growth might support democracy and vice versa, and whether both might support international cooperation, including to end civil wars. We would still need to explain how this charmed circle of causes got started, however. And here let me raise another factor, perhaps even less appealing than the “nuclear peace” thesis, at least outside of the United States. That factor is what international relations scholars call hegemony—specifically American hegemony. A theory that many regard as discredited, but that refuses to go away, is called hegemonic stability theory. The theory emerged in the 1970s in the realm of international political economy. It asserts that for the global economy to remain open—for countries to keep barriers to trade and investment low—one powerful country must take the lead. Depending on the theorist we consult, “taking the lead” entails paying for global public goods (keeping the sea lanes open, providing liquidity to the international economy), coercion (threatening to raise trade barriers or withdraw military protection from countries that cheat on the rules), or both. The theory is skeptical that international cooperation in economic matters can emerge or endure absent a hegemon. The distastefulness of such claims is self-evident: they imply that it is good for everyone the world over if one country has more wealth and power than others. More precisely, they imply that it has been good for the world that the United States has been so predominant. There is no obvious reason why hegemonic stability theory could not apply to other areas of international cooperation, including in security affairs, human rights, international law, peacekeeping (UN or otherwise), and so on. What I want to suggest here—suggest, not test—is that American hegemony might just be a deep cause of the steady decline of political deaths in the world. How could that be? After all, the report states that United States is the third most war-prone country since 1945. Many of the deaths depicted in Figure 10.4 were in wars that involved the United States (the Vietnam War being the leading one). Notwithstanding politicians’ claims to the contrary, a candid look at U.S. foreign policy reveals that the country is as ruthlessly self-interested as any other great power in history. The answer is that U.S. hegemony might just be a deeper cause of the proximate causes outlined by Professor Mack. Consider economic growth and openness to foreign trade and investment, which (so say some theories) render violence irrational. American power and policies may be responsible for these in two related ways. First, at least since the 1940s Washington has prodded other countries to embrace the market capitalism that entails economic openness and produces sustainable economic growth. The United States promotes capitalism for selfish reasons, of course: its own domestic system depends upon growth, which in turn depends upon the efficiency gains from economic interaction with foreign countries, and the more the better. During the Cold War most of its allies accepted some degree of market-driven growth. Second, the U.S.-led western victory in the Cold War damaged the credibility of alternative paths to development—communism and import-substituting industrialization being the two leading ones—and left market capitalism the best model. The end of the Cold War also involved an end to the billions of rubles in Soviet material support for regimes that tried to make these alternative models work. (It also, as Professor Mack notes, eliminated the superpowers’ incentives to feed civil violence in the Third World.) What we call globalization is caused in part by the emergence of the United States as the global hegemon. The same case can be made, with somewhat more difficulty, concerning the spread of democracy. Washington has supported democracy only under certain conditions—the chief one being the absence of a popular anti-American movement in the target state—but those conditions have become much more widespread following the collapse of communism. Thus in the 1980s the Reagan administration—the most anti-communist government America ever had—began to dump America’s old dictator friends, starting in the Philippines. Today Islamists tend to be anti-American, and so the Obama administration is skittish about democracy in Egypt and other authoritarian Muslim countries. But general U.S. material and moral support for liberal democracy remains strong.

#### Empirics prove unipolarity is key to global stability – the alternative is doomed to great power wars

Wohlforth, 1999 Assistant prof of IR in Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service at Georgetown

[William C., International Security, “The Stability of a Unipolar World,” V24, N1, p. 5-41, JSTOR, Summer]

Unipolarity does not imply the end of all conflict or that Washington can have its way on all issues all the time. It simply means the absence of two big problems that bedeviled the statesmen of past epochs: hegemonic rivalry and balance-of-power politics among the major powers. It is only by forgetting them that scholars and pundits are able to portray the current period as dangerous and threatening. To appreciate the sources of conflict that unipolarity avoids, consider the two periods already discussed in which leading states scored very highly on aggregate measures of power: the Pax Britannica and the Cold War. Because those concentrations of power were not unipolar, both periods witnessed security competition and hegemonic rivalry. The Crimean War is a case in point. The war unfolded in a system in which two states shared leadership and three states were plausibly capable of bidding for hegemony.41 Partly as a result, neither the statesmen of the time nor historians over the last century and a half have been able to settle the debate over the origins of the conflict. The problem is that even those who agree that the war arose from a threat to the European balance of power cannot agree on whether the threat emanated from France, Russia, or Britain. Determining which state really did threaten the equilibrium-or indeed whether any of them did-is less important than the fact that the power gap among them was small enough to make all three threats seem plausible at the time and in retrospect. No such uncertainty-and hence no such conflict-is remotely possible in a unipolar system. Even during the height of its influence after 1856, Britain was never a major land power and could not perform the conflict-dampening role that a unipolar state can play. Thus it would be inaccurate to ascribe the two, long nineteenth- century periods of peace to British power. From 1815 to 1853, London exercised influence in the context of the Concert of Europe, which was based on a Russo-British cohegemony. But because each of these competitive "bookend empires" was in possession of a different mix of power resources whose ultimate superiority had not been tested, great power cooperation was always vulnerable to hegemonic rivalry-a problem that helped destroy the concert in the Crimean War. With Britain in "splendid isolation" after 1856, Prussia violently refashioned the balance of power in Europe without having to concern itself greatly about London's preferences. After 1871 Bismarck's diplomacy, backed up by Germany's formidable power, played the crucial role in staving off violent competition for power or security on the continent. Owing to differences in the system structure alone, the long periods of peace in the nineteenth century are much more remarkable achievements of statesmanship than a similarly lengthy peace would be under unipolarity. Similar sources of conflict emerged in the Cold War. The most recent and exhaustively researched accounts of Cold War diplomacy reveal in detail what the numerical indicators only hint at: the complex interplay between U.S. overall economic superiority, on the one hand, and the Soviet Union's massive conventional military capabilities, on the other.43 This asymmetrical distribution of power meant that the gap between the two top states could be seen as lopsided or perilously close depending on one's vantage. The fact that the United States was preeminent only in nonmilitary elements of power was a critical factor underlying the Cold War competition for power and security. To produce a military balance, Washington set about creating a preponderance of other capabilities, which constituted a latent threat to Moscow's war planners and a major constraint on its diplomatic strategy. Hence both Moscow and Washington could simultaneously see their rivalry as a consequence of the other's drive for hegemony-sustaining a historical debate that shows every sign of being as inconclusive as that over the origins of the Crimean War. Again, no such ambiguity, and no such conflict, is likely in a unipolar system. Both hegemonic rivalry and security competition among great powers are unlikely under unipolarity. Because the current leading state is by far the world's most formidable military power, the chances of leadership conflict are more remote than at any time over the last two centuries. Unlike past international systems, efforts by any second-tier state to enhance its relative position can be managed in a unipolar system without raising the specter of a power transition and a struggle for primacy. And because the major powers face incentives to shape their policies with a view toward the power and preferences of the system leader, the likelihood of security competition among them is lower than in previous systems.

### UQ: Violence Low Now

#### Studies show that violence is down now-we must resist the urge to radically change the system

Pinker, Professor of Sociology at Harvard, 11

(Steve, “Violence Vanquished” [http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424053111904106704576583203589408180.html accessed 7/7/12](http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424053111904106704576583203589408180.html%20accessed%207/7/12)) ZLH

On the day this article appears, you will read about a shocking act of violence. Somewhere in the world there will be a terrorist bombing, a senseless murder, a bloody insurrection. It's impossible to learn about these catastrophes without thinking, "What is the world coming to?" With all its wars, murder and genocide, history might suggest that the taste for blood is human nature. Not so, argues Harvard Prof. Steven Pinker. He talks to WSJ's Gary Rosen about the decline in violence in recent decades and his new book, "The Better Angels of Our Nature." But a better question may be, "How bad was the world in the past?" Believe it or not, the world of the past was much worse. Violence has been in decline for thousands of years, and today we may be living in the most peaceable era in the existence of our species. The decline, to be sure, has not been smooth. It has not brought violence down to zero, and it is not guaranteed to continue. But it is a persistent historical development, visible on scales from millennia to years, from the waging of wars to the spanking of children. This claim, I know, invites skepticism, incredulity, and sometimes anger. We tend to estimate the probability of an event from the ease with which we can recall examples, and scenes of carnage are more likely to be beamed into our homes and burned into our memories than footage of people dying of old age. There will always be enough violent deaths to fill the evening news, so people's impressions of violence will be disconnected from its actual likelihood. Evidence of our bloody history is not hard to find. Consider the genocides in the Old Testament and the crucifixions in the New, the gory mutilations in Shakespeare's tragedies and Grimm's fairy tales, the British monarchs who beheaded their relatives and the American founders who dueled with their rivals. Today the decline in these brutal practices can be quantified. A look at the numbers shows that over the course of our history, humankind has been blessed with six major declines of violence. The first was a process of pacification: the transition from the anarchy of the hunting, gathering and horticultural societies in which our species spent most of its evolutionary history to the first agricultural civilizations, with cities and governments, starting about 5,000 years ago. For centuries, social theorists like Hobbes and Rousseau speculated from their armchairs about what life was like in a "state of nature." Nowadays we can do better. Forensic archeology—a kind of "CSI: Paleolithic"—can estimate rates of violence from the proportion of skeletons in ancient sites with bashed-in skulls, decapitations or arrowheads embedded in bones. And ethnographers can tally the causes of death in tribal peoples that have recently lived outside of state control. These investigations show that, on average, about 15% of people in prestate eras died violently, compared to about 3% of the citizens of the earliest states. Tribal violence commonly subsides when a state or empire imposes control over a territory, leading to the various "paxes" (Romana, Islamica, Brittanica and so on) that are familiar to readers of history. It's not that the first kings had a benevolent interest in the welfare of their citizens. Just as a farmer tries to prevent his livestock from killing one another, so a ruler will try to keep his subjects from cycles of raiding and feuding. From his point of view, such squabbling is a dead loss—forgone opportunities to extract taxes, tributes, soldiers and slaves. The second decline of violence was a civilizing process that is best documented in Europe. Historical records show that between the late Middle Ages and the 20th century, European countries saw a 10- to 50-fold decline in their rates of homicide. The numbers are consistent with narrative histories of the brutality of life in the Middle Ages, when highwaymen made travel a risk to life and limb and dinners were commonly enlivened by dagger attacks. So many people had their noses cut off that medieval medical textbooks speculated about techniques for growing them back. Historians attribute this decline to the consolidation of a patchwork of feudal territories into large kingdoms with centralized authority and an infrastructure of commerce. Criminal justice was nationalized, and zero-sum plunder gave way to positive-sum trade. People increasingly controlled their impulses and sought to cooperate with their neighbors. The third transition, sometimes called the Humanitarian Revolution, took off with the Enlightenment. Governments and churches had long maintained order by punishing nonconformists with mutilation, torture and gruesome forms of execution, such as burning, breaking, disembowelment, impalement and sawing in half. The 18th century saw the widespread abolition of judicial torture, including the famous prohibition of "cruel and unusual punishment" in the eighth amendment of the U.S. Constitution. At the same time, many nations began to whittle down their list of capital crimes from the hundreds (including poaching, sodomy, witchcraft and counterfeiting) to just murder and treason. And a growing wave of countries abolished blood sports, dueling, witchhunts, religious persecution, absolute despotism and slavery. The fourth major transition is the respite from major interstate war that we have seen since the end of World War II. Historians sometimes refer to it as the Long Peace. Today we take it for granted that Italy and Austria will not come to blows, nor will Britain and Russia. But centuries ago, the great powers were almost always at war, and until quite recently, Western European countries tended to initiate two or three new wars every year. The cliché that the 20th century was "the most violent in history" ignores the second half of the century (and may not even be true of the first half, if one calculates violent deaths as a proportion of the world's population). Though it's tempting to attribute the Long Peace to nuclear deterrence, non-nuclear developed states have stopped fighting each other as well. Political scientists point instead to the growth of democracy, trade and international organizations—all of which, the statistical evidence shows, reduce the likelihood of conflict. They also credit the rising valuation of human life over national grandeur—a hard-won lesson of two world wars. The fifth trend, which I call the New Peace, involves war in the world as a whole, including developing nations. Since 1946, several organizations have tracked the number of armed conflicts and their human toll world-wide. The bad news is that for several decades, the decline of interstate wars was accompanied by a bulge of civil wars, as newly independent countries were led by inept governments, challenged by insurgencies and armed by the cold war superpowers. The less bad news is that civil wars tend to kill far fewer people than wars between states. And the best news is that, since the peak of the cold war in the 1970s and '80s, organized conflicts of all kinds—civil wars, genocides, repression by autocratic governments, terrorist attacks—have declined throughout the world, and their death tolls have declined even more precipitously. The rate of documented direct deaths from political violence (war, terrorism, genocide and warlord militias) in the past decade is an unprecedented few hundredths of a percentage point. Even if we multiplied that rate to account for unrecorded deaths and the victims of war-caused disease and famine, it would not exceed 1%. The most immediate cause of this New Peace was the demise of communism, which ended the proxy wars in the developing world stoked by the superpowers and also discredited genocidal ideologies that had justified the sacrifice of vast numbers of eggs to make a utopian omelet. Another contributor was the expansion of international peacekeeping forces, which really do keep the peace—not always, but far more often than when adversaries are left to fight to the bitter end. Finally, the postwar era has seen a cascade of "rights revolutions"—a growing revulsion against aggression on smaller scales. In the developed world, the civil rights movement obliterated lynchings and lethal pogroms, and the women's-rights movement has helped to shrink the incidence of rape and the beating and killing of wives and girlfriends. In recent decades, the movement for children's rights has significantly reduced rates of spanking, bullying, paddling in schools, and physical and sexual abuse. And the campaign for gay rights has forced governments in the developed world to repeal laws criminalizing homosexuality and has had some success in reducing hate crimes against gay people. \* \* \* \* Why has violence declined so dramatically for so long? Is it because violence has literally been bred out of us, leaving us more peaceful by nature? This seems unlikely. Evolution has a speed limit measured in generations, and many of these declines have unfolded over decades or even years. Toddlers continue to kick, bite and hit; little boys continue to play-fight; people of all ages continue to snipe and bicker, and most of them continue to harbor violent fantasies and to enjoy violent entertainment. It's more likely that human nature has always comprised inclinations toward violence and inclinations that counteract them—such as self-control, empathy, fairness and reason—what Abraham Lincoln called "the better angels of our nature." Violence has declined because historical circumstances have increasingly favored our better angels. The most obvious of these pacifying forces has been the state, with its monopoly on the legitimate use of force. A disinterested judiciary and police can defuse the temptation of exploitative attack, inhibit the impulse for revenge and circumvent the self-serving biases that make all parties to a dispute believe that they are on the side of the angels. We see evidence of the pacifying effects of government in the way that rates of killing declined following the expansion and consolidation of states in tribal societies and in medieval Europe. And we can watch the movie in reverse when violence erupts in zones of anarchy, such as the Wild West, failed states and neighborhoods controlled by mafias and street gangs, who can't call 911 or file a lawsuit to resolve their disputes but have to administer their own rough justice. Another pacifying force has been commerce, a game in which everybody can win. As technological progress allows the exchange of goods and ideas over longer distances and among larger groups of trading partners, other people become more valuable alive than dead. They switch from being targets of demonization and dehumanization to potential partners in reciprocal altruism. For example, though the relationship today between America and China is far from warm, we are unlikely to declare war on them or vice versa. Morality aside, they make too much of our stuff, and we owe them too much money. A third peacemaker has been cosmopolitanism—the expansion of people's parochial little worlds through literacy, mobility, education, science, history, journalism and mass media. These forms of virtual reality can prompt people to take the perspective of people unlike themselves and to expand their circle of sympathy to embrace them. These technologies have also powered an expansion of rationality and objectivity in human affairs. People are now less likely to privilege their own interests over those of others. They reflect more on the way they live and consider how they could be better off. Violence is often reframed as a problem to be solved rather than as a contest to be won. We devote ever more of our brainpower to guiding our better angels. It is probably no coincidence that the Humanitarian Revolution came on the heels of the Age of Reason and the Enlightenment, that the Long Peace and rights revolutions coincided with the electronic global village.

### Decline = Transition Wars

#### Collapse of the hegemonic state leads to transition wars between rising powers

Ikenberry, Professor of International Affairs at Princeton University, 05

(G. John, 4th December 2005 “The Rise of China, Power Transitions and the Western Order” pg 5-6 [http://www.scribd.com/doc/7257921/Ikenberry-Rise-of-China-Power-Transitions-and-the-Western-Order accessed 7/11/12](http://www.scribd.com/doc/7257921/Ikenberry-Rise-of-China-Power-Transitions-and-the-Western-Order%20accessed%207/11/12)) ZLH

International order can be understood as a hierarchical political system that reflects the interests of the dominant state or states. Change occurs as great powers rise and decline and as they struggle over the rules and institutions of order. Robert Gilpin provides a classic account of the dynamics of international relations in these terms. The history of world politics is marked by a succession of powerful – or hegemonic – states that rise up to organize the international system. As Gilpin argues, “the evolution of any system has been characterized by successive rises of powerful states that have governed the system and have determined the patterns of international interactions and established the rules of the system.”4 Steady and inevitable shifts in the distribution of power among states gives rise to new challenger states who eventually engage the leading state in hegemonic war, which in turn gives rise to a new hegemonic state that uses its dominant position to establish an order favorable to its interests. Within a hegemonic order, rules and rights are established and enforced by the power capacities of the leading state. Compliance and participation within the order is ultimately ensured by the range of power capabilities available to the hegemon – military power, financial capital, market access, technology, and so forth. Direct coercion is always an option in the enforcement of order, but less direct “carrots and sticks” are also mechanisms to maintain hegemonic control. Gilpin also argues that a wider set of resources – ideology and status appeals – are integral to the perpetuation of hegemonic order.5 But the authority of the hegemonic state and the cohesion of the hegemonic order are ultimately based on the preeminent power of the leading state. The hierarchical system is maintained as long as the leading state remains powerful enough to enforce the rules and institutions of order. When hegemonic power declines, the existing order begins to unravel and break apart. As Gilpin contends, “a precondition for political change lies in a disjuncture between the existing social system and the redistribution of power toward those actors who would benefit most from a change in the system.”6 The power transition leads to geopolitical struggles and security competition that ultimately culminate in hegemonic war – and the emergence of a new leading state that organizes the international system according to a new logic.

### Heg Key to Successful Multipolar transition

#### US hegemony makes the inevitable transition to multi-polarity peaceful

Walton, Lecturer in IR at University of Reading in England, 07

(Dale C, “Geopolitics and the Great Powers in the Twenty-First Century: Multipolarity and the revolution in strategic perspective” pg 65-66) ZLH

Although international political conditions surely will differ enormously in the Coming decades from those of the middle 1940s, it would be grossly irresponsible for the United Stales to shrug off the burdens of great power status and return to the slumber that it once enjoyed. Almost certainly, if the United States had refused to take an active role in European politics in the middle of the twentieth century, a world would have emerged in which American values would not have flourished and even their survival on the North American continent would have been profoundly threatened. America's refusal to play a substantial role in the great power struggles of this century likely would have similarly deleterious effects. Importantly, if the United States withdraws to its hemisphere a third world war is far more likely. In a meta-region full of young, rising powers, the presence of a strategically mature superpower can be expected to have a stabilizing effect; the enormous military resources possessed by America compels would-be aggressors to consider carefully before launching a strategic adventure. liven more chillingly, as noted above, it is possible that the multipolar system could become sufficiently unbalanced that it would collapse, with a power such as China building a coalition that would allow it ultimately to emerge as the master of Eastern Eurasia and the greatest power in the world. The United States is the "court of last resort" protect-ing against such an eventuality. The latter possibility does not contradict the above argument that US uni-polarity is unsustainable - as an extra-Eurasian power lacking the ruthlessness to destroy potential great power competitors preventively, Washington simply cannot sustain unipolarity indefinitely. Nonetheless, while the emerging multi- polar system appears robust, it still should receive "care and feeding" other- wise, it is vulnerable to grossly unbalancing events, such as the creation of a very aggressive coalition dedicated to achieving Eurasian hegemony and willing, if necessary, to fight a third world war to achieve it. Most likely such a coalition would not be able to simply bully its way to hegemony; it probably would have to fight, the result being a war enormously costly in blood, perhaps even one that would dwarf World War II in its price. If the aggressive coalition won, in turn, the multipolar system would be destroyed and the United States would face a competitor far more powerful than itself, and. in all likelihood, a world in which democracy and personal liberty would be in eclipse. In any case, it is a geopolitical imperative for the United States that no power or coalition attains hegemony in Eastern Eurasia, much less that an explicitly hostile state or coalition succeeds in doing so. If the United States is to guard its national interests successfully in this century, it is vital that it ensures that the transition from unipolarity to multipo- larity occurs in as gentle a manner as possible. In this capacity, it is important to understand that the United States is in long-term relative decline, but, at the same time, to acknowledge that it has very great military, financial, and diplo- matic resources at its disposal. If Washington deploys these resources wisely, it can maximize its security over the long term and minimize the probability of a great power war.

### Heg Solves Terrorism

#### Heg solves terrorism - deterrence

Thayer 7 – Associate Professor in the Department of Defense and Strategic Studies, Missouri State University (Bradley A., American Empire, Routledge, page 16)

Another critical question is not simply how much the United States spends on defense but what benefits it receives from its spending: “Is the money spent worth it?” the benefits of American military power are considerable, and I will elaborate on five of them. First, and most importantly, the American people are protected from invasion and attack. The horrific attacks of 9/11 are—mercifully—an aberration. The men and women of the U.S. military and intelligence community do an outstanding job deterring aggression against the United States.

Second, American interests abroad are protected. U.S. military power allows Washington to defeat its enemies overseas. For example, the United States has made the decision to attack terrorists far from America’s shores, and not to wait while they use bases in other countries to plan and train for attacks against the United States itself. Its military power also gives Washington the power to protect its interests abroad by deterring attacks against America’s interests or coercing potential or actual opponents. In international politics, coercion means dissuading an opponent from actions America does not want it to do or to do something that it wants done. For example, the United States wanted Libya to give up the weapons of mass destruction capabilities it pos-sessed or was developing. As Deputy Defense Secretary Paul Wolfowitz said, “I think the reason Mu’ammar Qadhai agreed to give up his weapons of mass destruction was because he saw what happened to Saddam Hussein.”21

## AT: Imperialism

### AT: Heg = Imperialism

#### Hegemony is not synonymous with imperialism

Prys, Professor at the German Institute of Global and Area Studies and Robel Professor at the school of International Studies in Dresden, 11

(Miriam and Stefan Journal of International Relations and Development pg 248-249 “Hegemony, not empire” <https://25d8ff2c-a-62cb3a1a-s-sites.googlegroups.com/site/atetenyi/03szem_PrysRobel.PDF?attachauth=ANoY7cpgM1AnPyaEYmYrrmQ-0gZVOh7SFzyv2AIe4zAETGWRBkCusqutwfV3qtTD4SgDyEQ-OYcQ5aNcpUxRFoiheRfBQ1nbmgaDMxYpPBpm0VAqgauhVfrzOMQKboBP5D5Aq3HtAoDT7L4Ejqx-fNYMkKqOu4Wb2EwP7wbh66Twn1GshIrj08LGLgKmqqv58NfEmfTOUPQ3hOPsOL4vSzN-RRi5uXAL1A%3D%3D&attredirects=0> accessed 7/7/12) ZLH

Nevertheless, this article suggests that the concept of empire is not an appropriate choice for the description of the power relationships that the US has established with the rest of the world. Both empirical and conceptual arguments can be made. At the empirical level, some, if not most, of the central aspects of what historically has been understood as and linked to the existence of empire have not been fulfilled by the US in the past decade. The US lacks a dense network of client states through which it exercises power indirectly and the Bush administration's 'assertive unilateralism' and rhetoric of 'with or against us\ as well as the failure of its policy to spread democracy in the Middle East, have all reflected the inability of the US to create and maintain an empire. On top of this, the ongoing global economic and financial crisis of 2008 and 2009 presents an existential challenge to the fundaments of any possible American imperial domination. Thus, even ahead of the inauguration of Barack Obama as the 44th US President, it was not hard to predict that, at the very least, the openly unilateral approach to foreign-policy making would change, regardless of the outcome of the 2008 elections. The notion of empire also suffers from significant drawbacks at the conceptual level. While there is nothing fundamentally wrong, at least semantically, with the acknowledgement of the existence of an (albeit globally selective) imperialistic foreign policy under the leadership of President George W. Bush (cf. Czempiel 2002: 93), a foreign policy strategy that aims at the establishment of an empire is quite a different thing compared to an empire in existence. Other flaws in the different usages of the empire concept, among them the distortion and stretching of the historical meaning of the word, will be discussed more extensively below. It is therefore anticipated that the heydays of this empire debate are over. Instead, the concept of hegemony, after all, is suggested as the more useful and analytically valuable alternative for the description of the US' role in the international system. Its appropriateness for application in both academic and policy discourses depends, however, on a clear understanding of what we mean by hegemony and its constitutive elements. Of equal importance is a careful explication of how the term hegemony relates to other concepts in its conceptual neighbourhood, such as empire and leadership. With this in mind, we review in the following sections the debate of the 1980s and 1990s about hegemony that was carried out under the heading of the 'Theory of Hegemonic Stability", as it shows some important lessons about how not to deal with the concept of hegemony. Rather than replicating mistakes of the past, the article then pursues a strategy of deliberate concept-building following suggestions by Gary Goerlz (2006) and others that are applied to hegemony. This means that, first, clear external boundaries are developed, or, in other words, an unambiguous under- standing of the relation of hegemony to other concepts, such as empire and leadership. Second, the constitutive elements of different understandings of hegemony are unearthed with the help of a selected set of guiding questions for a textual analysis of some of the representative authors of different schools of IR theory. Findings from this analysis are then used to propose an 'integrated concept of hegemony' that combines in a novel way some of the strengths of existing conceptualisation of the term and avoids the pitfalls of others. The central contribution of our research is thus an integrative understanding of hege- mony that is not only applicable to a certain specific foreign policy conception of one or more specific administrations but also serves as a useful analytical tool of US hegemony since the end of World War II until today and beyond.

#### US power doesn’t foster imperial interventions.

Shaw, Professor of International Relations at the University of Sussex 01

(Martin, “The Problem of the Quasi-Imperial State”, <http://www.theglobalsite.ac.uk/press/212shaw.htm> accessed 7/8/12)ZLH

Furthermore, Western leaders have consistently sought to shore up failed and failing (semi-) authoritarian state structures, rather than supporting their break-ups. The West has supported central Russian power throughout all the vicissitudes of the Gorbachev, Yeltsin and Putin regimes. The West has maintained a 'constructive' relationship with Chinese Communism through Tiananmen Square and all subsequent phases of repression. The eastern advances of NATO and the European Union have responded largely to the demands of local elites and populations - as well as to the fear of further state breakdown in regions close to Western Europe. Even after the West had defeated the Saddam regime in the Gulf War, and even as the latter waged genocidal war on Shi'ites and Kurds, it was reluctant to countenance the break-up of the Iraqi state. Likewise, the West's early response to the Yugoslav crisis was to try to shore up a federal state that was ceasing to exist, condoning the early atrocities of the Yugoslav National Army; after several years of war, it still backed Milosevic's Serbia as a force for stability. Only long after it became clear that the latter was leading to new wars, in Kosovo and (threatened) in Montenegro, did Western leaders move reluctantly to confront Serbia. Thus it was not only in East Timor, where the historically pro-Western Indonesian regime was the oppressor, that the West supported the existing centre and was late in coming to the rescue of the victims of genocide. Generally, therefore, Western power generally supports the maintenance of state structures even where these are dominated by regimes that are anti-Western as well as repressive. More extreme cases of 'state collapse' have tended to occur in countries like Somalia, Liberia and Sierra Leone that have been of minimal or declining strategic and economic significance. In these cases, even more than in Iraq or Yugoslavia, Western elites have generally been extremely reluctant to intervene. The more credible charge against the West is not that it intervenes widely in support of its own interests, but that: \* it avoids intervention and tolerates even genocidal repression, where its own interests are not strongly engaged; \* its interventions are therefore consistently late in responding to state and human crises; \* its interventions are often half-baked, appeasing local elites and failing to anticipate events; \* its national elites are unwilling to risk even small numbers of 'their' soldiers, even when the lives of large numbers of non-Western civilians are at risk; \* it is disinterested in the strong development of global institutions, preferring ad hoc structures that it can manipulate to genuine global democratic governance. In what sense, then, can contemporary Western power be said to represent an advance on historic European empires and Cold War American power? The above is hardly a positive appraisal. Indeed, the main positive advantages of Western power lie in its internal characteristics (internationalisation and democratisation) rather than in the development of a positive post-imperial relationship with the non-Western world. The principal challenges to empire, authoritarianism and repression come today from civil society and social movements, rather than from the Western state.

### Imperialism Inevitable

#### US imperialism is inevitable – embracement is key to successful policy

Mallaby, Washington Post Columnist, 02

(Sebastian, FOREIGN AFFAIRS March/April Issue Vol. 81. Issue 2 “The Reluctant Imperialist: Terrorism, Failed States, and the Case for American Empire” accessed 7/8/12 <http://www.hum.uu.nl/medewerkers/a.j.boekestijn/historisch%20ambacht/mallaby.htm> ) ZLH

Empires are not always planned. The original American colonies began as the unintended byproduct of British religious strife. The British political class was not so sure it wanted to rule India, but commercial interests dragged it in there anyway. The United States today will be an even more reluctant imperialist. But a new imperial moment has arrived, and by virtue of its power America is bound to play the leading role. The question is not whether the United States will seek to fill the void created by the demise of European empires but whether it will acknowledge that this is what it is doing. Only if Washington acknowledges this task will its response be coherent.

### Anti-Imperialism Bad

#### Anti-imperialism prevents intervention in the face of genocide.

Willis 95(Ellen, Professor of Journalism & Director of Concentration in Cultural Reporting and Criticism at NYU, The Village Voice, 12-19-95)

If intellectuals are more inclined to rise to the discrete domestic issue than the historic international moment, this may have less to do with the decay of the notion of international solidarity than with the decay of confidence in their ability to change the world, not to mention the decay of anything resembling a coherent framework of ideas within which to understand it. Certainly the received ideas of the left, to the extent that a left can still be said to exist, have been less than helpful as a framework for understanding the Bosnian crisis or organizing a response to it. Although the idea of American imperialism explains less and less in a world where the locus of power is rapidly shifting to a network of transnational corporations, it still fuels a strain of reflexive anti-interventionist sentiment whose practical result is paralyzed dithering in the face of genocide. Floating around "progressive" circles and reinforcing the dithering is a brand of vulgar pacifism whose defining characteristic is not principled rejection of violence but squeamish aversion to dealing with it. In the academy in particular, entrenched assumptions about identity politics and cultural relativism promote a view of the Balkan conflict as too complicated and ambiguous to allow for choosing sides. If there is no such thing as universality, if multiethnic democracy is not intrinsically preferable to ethnic separatism, if there are no clear-cut aggressors and victims but merely clashing cultures, perhaps ethnic partition is simply the most practical way of resolving those "implacable ancient rivalries.

#### Worse powers fill the gap- turns the k

Shaw, 2002 (Martin Shaw, professor of international relations at University of Sussex, Uses and Abuses of Anti-Imperialism in the Global Era, 4-7-2002, http://www.martinshaw.org/empire.htm)

It is fashionable in some circles, among which we must clearly include the organizers of this conference, to argue that the global era is seeing 'a new imperialism' - that can be blamed for the problem of 'failed states' (probably among many others). Different contributors to this strand of thought name this imperialism in different ways, but novelty is clearly a critical issue. The logic of using the term imperialism is actually to establish continuity between contemporary forms of Western world power and older forms first so named by Marxist and other theorists a century ago. The last thing that critics of a new imperialism wish to allow is that Western power has changed sufficiently to invalidate the very application of this critical concept. Nor have many considered the possibility that if the concept of imperialism has a relevance today, it applies to certain aggressive, authoritarian regimes of the non-Western world rather than to the contemporary West.  In this paper I fully accept that there is a concentration of much world power - economic, cultural, political and military - in the hands of Western elites. In my recent book, Theory of the Global State, I discuss the development of a 'global-Western state conglomerate' (Shaw 2000). I argue that 'global' ideas and institutions, whose significance characterizes the new political era that has opened with the end of the Cold War, depend largely - but not solely - on Western power. I hold no brief and intend no apology for official Western ideas and behaviour. And yet I propose that the idea of a new imperialism is a profoundly misleading, indeed ideological concept that obscures the realities of power and especially of empire in the twenty-first century. This notion is an obstacle to understanding the significance, extent and limits of contemporary Western power. It simultaneously serves to obscure many real causes of oppression, suffering and struggle for transformation against the quasi-imperial power of many regional states. I argue that in the global era, this separation has finally become critical. This is for two related reasons. On the one hand, Western power has moved into new territory, largely uncharted -- and I argue unchartable -- with the critical tools of anti-imperialism. On the other hand, the politics of empire remain all too real, in classic forms that recall both modern imperialism and earlier empires, in many non-Western states, and they are revived in many political struggles today. Thus the concept of a 'new imperialism' fails to deal with both key post-imperial features of Western power and the quasi-imperial character of many non-Western states. The concept overstates Western power and understates the dangers posed by other, more authoritarian and imperial centres of power. Politically it identifies the West as the principal enemy of the world's people, when for many of them there are far more real and dangerous enemies closer to home. I shall return to these political issues at the end of this paper.

#### Anti-Imperialism prevents peacebuilding missions which serve the purpose of promoting self-governance in the long run.

Paris, Associate Profferssor Graduate School of Public and International Affairs at the University of Ottawa, 10

(Roland, Review of International Studies “SAVING LIBERAL PEACEBUILDING” pg 17-20 [http://aix1.uottawa.ca/~rparis/Saving\_Liberal\_Peacebuilding\_FINAL.pdf accessed 7/9/12](http://aix1.uottawa.ca/~rparis/Saving_Liberal_Peacebuilding_FINAL.pdf%20accessed%207/9/12)) ZLH

Although there are similarities between European colonialism and today’s post-settlement peacebuilding operations, such comparisons should also not be taken too far. To be sure, both types of intervention have involved powerful external actors seeking to refashion the domestic structures of weaker societies in accordance with prevailing notions of good or “civilized” governance. In this sense, today’s post-conflict missions may be viewed as a modern version of the old mission civilisatrice – or the belief that European colonial powers had a duty to improve the people living in their overseas possessions – now translated into contemporary parlance of “capacity building” and “good governance.” Furthermore, as many have pointed out, international administrators have exercised extraordinarily broad powers in several modern missions, including the right to dismiss local officials from office who allegedly violate the terms or spirit of a peace agreement. To some commentators, these powers resemble the far-reaching authority of colonial administrators and create similar relations of dependency and domination. 46 Suhrke, “The Dangers of a Tight Embrace” (2009). 47 David Edelstein, “Foreign Militaries, Sustainable Institutions, and Postwar Statebuilding,” in Roland Paris and interests of “transnational capitalism” have yet to demonstrate that either the expectation or the desire for economic gain has driven the decision to launch any such operations. Second, although the various European colonial powers differed on the prospects and desirability of their respective colonies moving towards independence, it was not until the 20th century that the ethic of “national self-determination” fully discredited the traditional view of colonies as imperial possessions. Put differently, shifts in the normative environment of international affairs gradually made colonialism impossible to justify or continue. As Neta Crawford points out, “Colonialism – the political control, physical occupation, and domination by one group of people over another and their land for purposes of extraction and settlement to benefit the occupiers – was considered a ‘normal’ practice until the early 20th century.”54 The anti-colonialist ethic continues to predominate today and shapes the normative environment in which modern peacebuilding operations have unfolded.55 Even the longest-lasting and most intrusive missions of recent years have been designed to exercise temporary and transitional authority in their host states, and to create the conditions for effective self-government in those states. To be clear, I am not suggesting that colonialism was wholly self-interested or that modern peacebuilding is wholly altruistic. Both practices involved complex mixtures of motivations and effects.56 For this reason, it is interesting to compare and contrast these practices. But observing that there are echoes of colonialism in peacebuilding is quite different from asserting their equivalence. Not only is the colonialism-peacebuilding analogy overstated, but it also serves to discredit and delegitimize peacebuilding by establishing an “interpretive frame” in which these missions are portrayed as exploitative, destructive, and ultimately disreputable forms of international intervention and assistance.57 Further, such characterizations make it difficult to distinguish between different types of peacebuilding, some of which have stronger echoes of imperialism than others.

### Imperialism Good

#### Imperialism is not all bad, it leads to immense benefits in the long term

D’souza, Research Fellow at the Hoover Institution at Stanford University, 02

(Dinesh, “Two Cheers for Colonialism” [http://www3.fitnyc.edu/Patrick\_Yanez/Readings/Globalism/Colonialism.htm accessed 7/8/12](http://www3.fitnyc.edu/Patrick_Yanez/Readings/Globalism/Colonialism.htm%20accessed%207/8/12)) ZLH

The descendants of colonialism are better off than they would be if colonialism had never happened. I would like to illustrate this point through a personal example. While I was a young boy, growing up in India, I noticed that my grandfather, who had lived under British colonialism, was instinctively and habitually antiwhite. He wasn't just against the English; he was generally against white people. I realized that I did not share his antiwhite animus. That puzzled me: Why did he and I feel so differently? Only years later, after a great deal of reflection and a fair amount of study, did the answer finally hit me. The reason for our difference of perception was that colonialism had been pretty bad for him, but pretty good for me. Another way to put it was that colonialism had injured those who lived under it, but paradoxically it proved beneficial to their descendants. Much as it chagrins me to admit it -- and much as it will outrage many third-world intellectuals for me to say it -- my life would have been much worse had the British never ruled India. How is that possible? Virtually everything that I am, what I do, and my deepest beliefs, all are the product of a worldview that was brought to India by colonialism. I am a writer, and I write in English. My ability to do this, and to reach a broad market, is entirely thanks to the British. My understanding of technology, which allows me, like so many Indians, to function successfully in the modern world, was largely the product of a Western education that came to India as a result of the British. So also my beliefs in freedom of expression, in self-government, in equality of rights under the law, and in the universal principle of human dignity -- they are all the products of Western civilization. I am not suggesting that it was the intention of the colonialists to give all those wonderful gifts to the Indians. Colonialism was not based on philanthropy; it was a form of conquest and rule. The British came to India to govern, and they were not primarily interested in the development of the natives, whom they viewed as picturesque savages. It is impossible to measure, or overlook, the pain and humiliation that the British inflicted during their long period of occupation. Understandably, the Indians chafed under that yoke. Toward the end of the British reign in India, Mahatma Gandhi was asked, "What do you think of Western civilization?" He replied, "I think it would be a good idea." Despite their suspect motives and bad behavior, however, the British needed a certain amount of infrastructure to effectively govern India. So they built roads, shipping docks, railway tracks, irrigation systems, and government buildings. Then they realized that they needed courts of law to adjudicate disputes that went beyond local systems of dispensing justice. And so the British legal system was introduced, with all its procedural novelties, like "innocent until proven guilty." The British also had to educate the Indians, in order to communicate with them and to train them to be civil servants in the empire. Thus Indian children were exposed to Shakespeare, Dickens, Hobbes, and Locke. In that way the Indians began to encounter words and ideas that were unmentioned in their ancestral culture: "liberty," "sovereignty," "rights," and so on. That brings me to the greatest benefit that the British provided to the Indians: They taught them the language of freedom. Once again, it was not the objective of the colonial rulers to encourage rebellion. But by exposing Indians to the ideas of the West, they did. The Indian leaders were the product of Western civilization. Gandhi studied in England and South Africa; Nehru was a product of Harrow and Cambridge. That exposure was not entirely to the good; Nehru, for example, who became India's first prime minister after independence, was highly influenced by Fabian socialism through the teachings of Harold Laski. The result was that India had a mismanaged socialist economy for a generation. But my broader point is that the champions of Indian independence acquired the principles, the language, and even the strategies of liberation from the civilization of their oppressors. This was true not just of India but also of other Asian and African countries that broke free of the European yoke. My conclusion is that against their intentions, the colonialists brought things to India that have immeasurably enriched the lives of the descendants of colonialism. It is doubtful that non-Western countries would have acquired those good things by themselves. It was the British who, applying a universal notion of human rights, in the early 19th century abolished the ancient Indian institution of suttee -- the custom of tossing widows on their husbands' funeral pyres. There is no reason to believe that the Indians, who had practiced suttee for centuries, would have reached such a conclusion on their own. Imagine an African or Indian king encountering the works of Locke or Madison and saying, "You know, I think those fellows have a good point. I should relinquish my power and let my people decide whether they want me or someone else to rule." Somehow, I don't see that as likely. Colonialism was the transmission belt that brought to Asia, Africa, and South America the blessings of Western civilization. Many of those cultures continue to have serious problems of tyranny, tribal and religious conflict, poverty, and underdevelopment, but that is not due to an excess of Western influence; rather, it is due to the fact that those countries are insufficiently Westernized. Sub-Saharan Africa, which is probably in the worst position, has been described by U.N. Secretary General Kofi Annan as "a cocktail of disasters." That is not because colonialism in Africa lasted so long, but because it lasted a mere half-century. It was too short a time to permit Western institutions to take firm root. Consequently, after their independence, most African nations have retreated into a kind of tribal barbarism that can be remedied only with more Western influence, not less. Africa needs more Western capital, more technology, more rule of law, and more individual freedom. The academy needs to shed its irrational prejudice against colonialism. By providing a more balanced perspective, scholars can help to show the foolishness of policies like reparations as well as justifications of terrorism that are based on anticolonial myths. None of this is to say that colonialism by itself was a good thing, only that bad institutions sometimes produce good results. Colonialism, I freely acknowledge, was a harsh regime for those who lived under it. My grandfather would have a hard time giving even one cheer for colonialism. As for me, I cannot manage three, but I am quite willing to grant two. So here they are: two cheers for colonialism! Maybe you will now see why I am not going to be sending an invoice for reparations to Tony Blair.

## Competitiveness Good

### Competitiveness key to Soft Power

#### Economic competitiveness key to maintain soft power

Rachman 11 (Gideon, columnist on foreign affairs, January/February, http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2011/01/02/think\_again\_american\_decline?page=0,2&sms\_ss=blogger&at\_xt=4d2732d48e4effd8,0 7/3/11) HD

All true -- but all more vulnerable than you might think. American universities remain a formidable asset. But if the U.S. economy is not generating jobs, then those bright Asian graduate students who fill up the engineering and computer-science departments at Stanford University and MIT will return home in larger numbers. Fortune's latest ranking of the world's largest companies has only two American firms in the top 10 -- Walmart at No. 1 and ExxonMobil at No. 3. There are already three Chinese firms in the top 10: Sinopec, State Grid, and China National Petroleum. America's appeal might also diminish if the country is no longer so closely associated with opportunity, prosperity, and success. And though many foreigners are deeply attracted to the American Dream, there is also a deep well of anti-American sentiment in the world that al Qaeda and others have skillfully exploited, Obama or no Obama.

### Competitiveness key to Heg

#### US technological leadership and economic competitiveness is key to hegemony

Khalilzad 95 (Zalmay, fellow at RAND, “Losing the moment? The United States and the World after the Cold War?” Washington Quarterly, volume: 18, Spring) HD

The United States is unlikely to preserve its military and technological dominance if the U.S. economy declines seriously. In such an environment, the domestic economic and political base for global leadership would diminish and the United States would probably incrementally withdraw from the world, become inward-looking, and abandon more and more of its external interests. As the United States weakened, others would try to fill the Vacuum. To sustain and improve its economic strength, the United States must maintain its technological lead in the economic realm. Its success will depend on the choices it makes. In the past, developments such as the agricultural and industrial revolutions produced fundamental changes positively affecting the relative position of those who were able to take advantage of them and negatively affecting those who did not. Some argue that the world may be at the beginning of another such transformation, which will shift the sources of wealth and the relative position of classes and nations. If the United States fails to recognize the change and adapt its institutions, its relative position will necessarily worsen.

#### Competitiveness is key to hegemony- new technologies and industries need to be created

Martino 7 (Rocco, Senior Fellow at the Foreign Policy Research Institute, http://www.fpri.org/orbis/5102/martino.innovationamericanleadership.pdf 7/3/11) HD

Much of the foreign policy discussion in the United States today is focused upon the dilemma posed by the Iraq War and the threat posed by Islamist terrorism. These problems are, of course, both immediate and important. However, America also faces other challenges to its physical security and economic prosperity, and these are more long-term and probably more profound. There is, ﬁrst, the threat posed by our declining competitiveness in the global economy, a threat most obviously represented by such rising economic powers as China and India.1 There is, second, the threat posed by our increasing dependence on oil imports from the Middle East. Moreover, these two threats are increasingly connected, as China and India themselves are greatly increasing their demand for Middle East oil.2 The United States of course faced great challenges to its security and economy in the past, most obviously from Germany and Japan in the ﬁrst half of the twentieth century and from the Soviet Union in the second half. Crucial to America’s ability to prevail over these past challenges was our technological and industrial leadership, and especially our ability to continuously recreate it. Indeed, the United States has been unique among great powers in its ability to keep on creating and recreating new technologies and new industries, generation after generation. Perpetual innovation and technological leadership might even be said to be the American way of maintaining primacy in world affairs. They are almost certainly what America will have to pursue in order to prevail over the contemporary challenges involving economic competitiveness and energy dependence. There is therefore an urgent need for America to resume its historic emphasis on innovation. The United States needs a national strategy focused upon developing new technologies and creating new industries. Every successful strategy must deﬁne an objective or mission, determine a solution, and assemble the means of execution. In this case, the objective is economic superiority; the solution is new industries which build upon the contemporary revolution in information technology; and the means of execution will have to include a partnership of industry, government, and people.

### Competition Good- Econ

#### **Competition good- improves products and helps the economy**

Mankiw, Harvard University, professor of economics, 12

(N. Gregory, 4-14-12, The New York Times, “Competition Is Healthy for Governments, Too,” <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/04/15/business/competition-is-good-for-governments-too-economic-view.html?_r=3>, accessed 7-14-12, LH)

SHOULD governments — of nations, states and towns — compete like business rivals?

The question is simpler to ask than to answer. But it reflects why conservatives and liberals disagree on many big issues facing the nation.

Most everyone agrees that competition is vital to a well-functioning market economy. Since the days of Adam Smith, economists have understood that the invisible hand of the marketplace works only if producers of goods and services vie with one another. Competition keeps prices low and provides an incentive to improve and innovate.

Granted, competition is not always good for producers. I produce economics textbooks. I curse the fact that my competitors are constantly putting out new, improved editions that threaten my market share. But knowing that I have to keep up with the Paul Krugmans and the Glenn Hubbards of the world keeps me on my toes. It makes me work harder, benefiting the customers — in this case, students. The upshot is that competition among economics textbooks makes learning the dismal science a bit less dismal.

For much the same reason, competition among governments leads to better governance. In choosing where to live, people can compare public services and taxes. They are attracted to towns that use tax dollars wisely. Competition keeps town managers alert. It prevents governments from exerting substantial monopoly power over residents. If people feel that their taxes exceed the value of their public services, they can go elsewhere. They can, as economists put it, vote with their feet.

The argument applies not only to people but also to capital. Because capital is more mobile than labor, competition among governments significantly constrains how capital is taxed. Corporations benefit from various government services, including infrastructure, the protection of property rights and the enforcement of contracts. But if taxes vastly exceed these benefits, businesses can — and often do — move to places offering a better mix of taxes and services.

### AT: Krugman

#### The definition of competition has changed since Krugman’s writings

Hay, University of Sheffield, political analysis professor, 10

(Colin, 10-8-10, Oxford Journals, “The ‘dangerous obsession’ with cost competitiveness…and the not so dangerous obsession with competitiveness,” <http://cje.oxfordjournals.org/content/early/2011/05/12/cje.ber006.full>, accessed 7-14-12, LH)

Yet it is nonetheless credible to think that Krugman's warnings have not fallen on deaf ears. For, although the language of competitiveness persists, arguably the content of such competitiveness discourse has changed quite profoundly in the intervening period of time. To see this, it is important to remind ourselves of the initial target of Krugman's assault on the misappropriation of the concept of competitiveness. Tellingly, this was not Ronald Reagan (and his advisors), whose Presidential Commission on Industrial Competitiveness still provides the standard definition of the term amongst policy-makers (Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, 1985), but Jacques Delors.

#### Krugman is in denial- countries compete and the U.S. is losing

Ezell, Information Technology and Innovation Foundation, Senior Analyst, 11

(Stephen, 1-26-11, The Innovation Files, “Krugman Flat Wrong that Competitiveness is a Myth,” <http://www.innovationfiles.org/krugman-flat-wrong-that-competitiveness-is-a-myth/>, accessed 7-14-12, LH)

In a Sunday op-ed in the New York Times, “[The Competition Myth](http://www.nytimes.com/2011/01/24/opinion/24krugman.html?_r=2&ref=opinion&adxnnlx=1295864282-JTZumlkxQg%20tFyDJCu26ww&pagewanted=print),” Paul Krugman argues that “competitiveness” is a myth, a bad metaphor, a fundamentally misleading goal, and that it doesn’t make “any sense to view our current woes as stemming from a lack of competitiveness.” About this, Krugman is absolutely, dead-on, 100 percent wrong. For the reality is that the perilous state of the American economy has everything to do with faltering U.S. competitiveness—and more than that—much to do with the abject refusal of neoclassical economists like Krugman himself to recognize that competitiveness is an issue, that countries compete, and that U.S. economic policy should be directly designed to bolster the competitiveness of U.S. organizations and industries.

Krugman’s like the young boy who finds himself losing a race with his buddies and who stops and yells, “I’m not racing!” Better to simply pretend that you aren’t racing than to lose. For if you can convince yourself that you aren’t in a race, you sure sleep better at night than if you admitted you were in a competition and were losing…That is, until you wake up one morning having lost ten million manufacturing jobs, have 10% unemployment, and have a horrifically bad trade balance. Moreover, when you refuse to even believe that you’re in a race, it’s a sure sign that you’re going to lose, as evidenced by the fact that the United States ranks 40th of out of 40 countries and regions in improving its innovation competitiveness over the past decade, as ITIF’s [Atlantic Century](http://www.itif.org/files/2009-atlantic-century.pdf) report found.

#### Krugman is incorrect- competition between countries is critical

Ezell, Information Technology and Innovation Foundation, Senior Analyst, 11

(Stephen, 1-26-11, The Innovation Files, “Krugman Flat Wrong that Competitiveness is a Myth,” <http://www.innovationfiles.org/krugman-flat-wrong-that-competitiveness-is-a-myth/>, accessed 7-14-12, LH)

First, an increasingly globalized economy means that countries have become price takers—not price makers—on international markets. In other words, companies now shop the world for the best locations to situate their globally mobile innovation activity, such as where to locate R&D facilities or build new factories. These companies look for which countries offer the best pools of talent (skilled scientists and engineers and a highly educated, highly skilled populace); which have the most attractive tax laws in terms of low corporate tax rates and generous and stable R&D tax credits; which have the most robust physical and digital infrastructures, the latter especially in terms of fixed and mobile broadband, electric smart grids, or intelligent transportation systems; which have the best high-skill immigration policies; the deepest pools of capital; the best funding for R&D; the easiest place to start a business; etc.. Collectively, these attributes constitute a nation’s innovation ecosystem, and governments play a legitimate and crucial role in shaping their nation’s innovation ecosystem. In fact, it is these innovation ecosystems on which countries increasingly compete. As Greg Tassey, a Senior Economist at the Department of Commerce National Institute of Standards and Technology argues, “Competition among governments has become a critical factor in determining which economies win and which lose in the increasingly intense process of creative destruction.”

But Krugman refuses to see this because “only companies compete.” This raises a consequent challenge again explained by Tassey: “Another underlying problem is that U.S. firms are attempting to compete largely as independent entities against a growing number of national economies in Europe and Asia in which government, industry, and a broad infrastructure (technical, education, economic, and information) are evolving into increasingly effective technology-based ecosystems.” Or as Wayne Johnson, Hewlett Packard’s Director of Worldwide Strategic University Customer Relations, said at a 2008 conference, “We in the United States find ourselves in competition not only with individuals, companies, and private institutions, but also with governments and mixed government-private collaborations.” In other words, the United States has a collection of players (businesses) running around competing against other players (nations) that are well equipped, well coached, and running specific plays.

#### **Krugman’s wrong- economic predictions prove**

Lott, Fox News, political commentator, 4-12-12

(John, 4-12-12, Fox News, “Krugman’s bad predictions,” <http://www.foxnews.com/opinion/2012/04/12/krugman-bad-prediction/>, accessed 7-14-12, LH)

Few prominent economists have a worse record predicting the impact of Obama’s economic policies than Paul Krugman.  Writing for the New York Times and touting his close [“genuine contact”](http://www.freshdialogues.com/2009/12/09/%20paul-krugman-transcript-will-climate-legislation-kill-the-economy/) with the “smart” economists and others in the Obama administration and the Democratic congressional leadership, Krugman has been, and remains, Obama’s most important champion. Not only has he been defending Obama’s Keynesian-type deficit-spending, but he has been advocating still more of [these same failed policies](http://www.amazon.com/gp/product/1118186176/ref=nosim/?tag=johnrlotttrip-20).

The economy just can’t gain ground. Thirty-four months since the "recovery" started in June 2009 and the actual number of jobs have increased by [just 0.4%](http://www.foxnews.com/opinion/2012/04/06/team-obama-and-phantom-jobs-that-never-were/). Hardly making up for the 5.5 percent drop in jobs from the peak. Given Krugman’s continued prominence in supporting Obama during the coming election, the best way of evaluating the advice is going to give voters is to see how accurate his claims have been up to this point.

It is important to realize just how terrible Krugman’s record has been. He predicted on CNBC: [“I am still guessing that we will peak out at around 9 percent [unemployment] and that would be late this year.”](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2009/02/17/paul-krugman-stimulus-too_n_167721.html)  He assured listeners that double-digit unemployment was “not the most likely event” and “Actually, we are already seeing some positive effects [from the Stimulus].” With unemployment peaking at 10.1 percent and still above 9 percent over two-and-a-half years after he predicted it would peak, Krugman was wrong on both counts.

Krugman’s predictions were also filled with personal attacks against those with whom he disagreed. In March 2009, when Greg Mankiw, the chair of George W. Bush’s Council of Economic Advisers, and some conservative economists questioned what they called Obama’s [“overly optimistic” growth predictions](http://johnrlott.blogspot.com/2009/03/bet-too-far.html), Paul Krugman questioned their honesty. In a New York Times blog post titled the “Roots of Evil,” Krugman attacked Mankiw as “more than a bit of deliberate obtuseness” and that “we can expect fast growth.”

How many more rosy predictions coming from Paul Krugman can we afford?

Yet, our economic growth has not even come close to what Obama and Krugman predicted. It has also been much slower than past economic recoveries. This last year Obama predicted that GDP would grow at 4 percent, while in fact it was less than half of that -- just 1.7 percent.

Mankiw challenged Krugman to a bet over whether the Obama prediction was right, but, despite all Krugman’s abusive rhetoric, he never responded. Krugman must be glad that he never bet his money to back up his claims of “evil” or “deliberate” misinformation, but he never tempered his rhetoric.

Amazingly, despite his track record against conservatives, Krugman didn’t flinch in late 2010 when he claimed: [“It’s also worth pointing out that everything the right said about why Obamanomics would fail was wrong.”](http://johnrlott.blogspot.com/2010/12/paul-krugman-is-dishonest-idiot.html)

Krugman’s predictions were no more accurate for other countries. He criticized the reduction in German government spending in June 2010 as a [“huge mistake,” and said: “budget cuts will hurt your economy and reduce revenues [by reducing economic growth].”](http://www.nytimes.com/2010/06/18/opinion/18krugman.html?_r=2) Yet, more than a year later, Germany’s unemployment rate continued falling, dropping by 0.7 percentage points between June 2010 and August 2011. And as of June 2011, German GDP during 2011 grew at 3 percent, almost twice as fast as our own GDP growth. Germany accomplished the lower unemployment and higher growth rates without burdening its children with the massively higher debt that Obama and Krugman advocated.

But you get some idea why Krugman predictions have so been consistently wrong by understanding that he just thinks government spending is free. He also thought that the 9/11 attacks [“could even do some economic good” by stimulating the economy because “all of a sudden, we need some new office buildings” and “rebuilding will generate at least some increase in business spending.”](http://www.nytimes.com/2001/09/14/opinion/reckonings-after-the-horror.html)  Let’s the buildings and spend the money on something else.

Digging ditches and filling them in again leaves people no better off. Krugman has a different view: [“If we discovered that space aliens were planning to attack and we needed a massive buildup to counter the space alien threat and really inflation and budget deficits took secondary place to that, this slump would be over in 18 months. And then if we discovered, oops, we made a mistake, there aren’t any aliens, we’d be better off.”](http://johnrlott.blogspot.com/2011/08/so-i-thought-that-krugman-believed-that.html)external-link

The federal government’s publicly held debt has almost doubled in just over three years.  How many more rosy predictions coming from Paul Krugman can we afford?

### AT: Causes Protectionism/Bad Policies

#### **Competition doesn’t lead to protectionism or bad policies**

Hay, University of Sheffield, political analysis professor, 10

(Colin, 10-8-10, Oxford Journals, “The ‘dangerous obsession’ with cost competitiveness…and the not so dangerous obsession with competitiveness,” <http://cje.oxfordjournals.org/content/early/2011/05/12/cje.ber006.full>, accessed 7-14-12, LH)

Periodic refresher courses in the basic tenets of Ricardian trade theory are probably very good for policy-makers. Yet whilst Krugman's famous warnings about the dangerous obsession of competitiveness are, in this context, as relevant and important today as they have ever been, this does not make his diagnosis of the link between competitiveness discourse and protectionism unproblematic. Competitiveness can become an obsession; and, like most obsessions, it can become dangerous. But there is nothing inevitable about this. There may well once have been something of a tendency for policy-makers invoking the language of competitiveness to assume that the competition between national economies is akin to that between businesses for market share and, in so doing, to turn the positive-sum trade game into a zero-sum turf battle. Yet it is neither inevitable that they will conceive of competitiveness in such terms nor, insofar as they do, that they will translate such assumptions into policy in the form of the defensive protectionism Krugman anticipates. Good policy, in other words, can be woefully misinformed; just as a more realistic depiction of the terms of international trade (such as might please Krugman) is no guarantee of effective or appropriate policy choices.

## Thayer- Domination Inevitable

### Evolution = Domination Inevitable

#### Evolutionary biology proves domination is inevitable

Thayer 4

[Bradley, Associate Professor for the Department of Defense & Strategic Studies and a former Fellow @ the Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs at the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University, Darwin and International Relations: On the Evolutionary Origins of War and Ethnic Conflict]

Evolutionary theory allows realists to advance offensive realist arguments without seeking an ultimate cause in either the anarchic international state system or in theological or metaphysical ideas. Realism based on evolutionary theory reaches the same conclusions, but the ultimate causal mechanism is different: human evolution in the anarchic and perilous conditions of the late-Pliocene, Pleistocene, and most of the Holocene epochs. Specially, evolutionary theory explains why humans are egoistic, strive to dominate others, and make in-group/out-group distinctions. These adaptations in turn serve as a foundation for offensive realism. The central issue here is what causes states to behave as offensive realists predict. Mearsheimer advances a powerful argument that anarchy is the fundamental cause of such behavior. The fact that there is no world government compels the leaders of states to take steps to ensure their security, such as striving to have a powerful military, aggressing when forced to do so, and forging and maintaining alliances. This is what neorealists call a self-help system: leaders of states are forced to take these steps because nothing else can guarantee their security in the anarchic world of international relations. I argue that evolutionary theory also offers a fundamental cause for offensive realist behavior. Evolutionary theory explains why individuals are motivated to act as offensive realism expects, whether an individual is a captain of industry or a conquistador. My argument is that anarchy is even more important than most scholars of international relations recognize. The human environment of evolutionary adaptation was anarchic; our ancestors lived in a state of nature in which resources were poor and dangers from other humans and the environment were great-so great that it is truly remarkable that a mammal standing three feet high-without claws or strong teeth, not particularly strong or swift-survived and evolved to become what we consider human. Humans endured because natural selection gave them the right behaviors to last in those conditions. The environment produced the behaviors examined here: egoism, domination, and the in-group/out-group distinction. These specific traits are sufficient to explain why leaders will behave, in the proper circumstances, as offensive realists expect them to behave. That is, even if they must hurt other humans or risk injury to themselves, they will strive to maximize their power, defined as either control over others (for example, through wealth or leadership) or control over ecological circumstances (such as meeting their own and their family’s or tribe’s need for food, shelter, or other resources). Evolutionary theory explains why people seek control over environmental circumstances-humans are egoistic and concerned about food-and why some, particularly males, will seek to dominate others by maintaining a privileged position in a dominance hierarchy. Clearly, as the leaders of states are human, they too will be influenced by evolutionary theory as they respond to the actions of other states and as they make their own decisions.

### Thayer Prodicts

#### Controversy is not a reason to reject a position.

Thayer, Baylor University, political science professor, 1

(Bradley, Summer 2001, “Correspondence: Start the Evolution without Us,” International Security, Volume: 26, p. 187-198, ATP)

Bell and MacDonald argue that sociobiology is a controversial subject. Controversy, however, does not make a theory flawed, nor is it a necessary or sufficient condition for outright rejection. The important issue is whether any controversy is anchored in scientific fact that discredits the theory or science. Evolutionary theory is strongly supported by scientific fact, and there is a consensus among evolutionary theorists that evolution through natural selection applies to humans—this was one of Darwin's most revolutionary insights—and that natural selection operates as an ultimate cause of human behavior. More specifically, Bell and MacDonald argue that no consensus exists to explain the interplay of evolutionary and environmental causes of human behavior. To the contrary: Both are inextricably linked and necessary to explain human behavior.3 To address this issue in any detail, we need additional information. This might include, for example, identifying the behavior that we seek to explain and determining the appropriate level of analysis. Evolutionary theory cannot explain why the Thirty Years' War lasted thirty years. It can, however, offer ultimate causal explanations of other behavior of interest to scholars of international politics, such as warfare.

#### There is nothing inherently wrong with functionalism

Thayer, Baylor University, political science professor, 1

(Bradley, Summer 2001, “Correspondence: Start the Evolution without Us,” International Security, Volume: 26, p. 187-198, ATP)

Relying on the work of Stephen Jay Gould and Richard Lewontin, Bell and MacDonald argue that explanations of human behavior grounded in sociobiology are unacceptably functionalist and prone to the post hoc, ergo propter hoc fallacy. In response, I make three brief rebuttals. First, like controversy there is nothing inherently wrong with functionalism as a theory of explanation. An explanation's usefulness depends on numerous factors, including: the issue under examination, the context of the explanation, and whether the explanation is testable. Second, Gould and Lewontin do not argue that human behavior is independent of natural selection. They agree with Darwin that natural selection is "the most important of evolutionary mechanisms," although unlike major evolutionary theorists, they suggest that natural selection cannot explain the development of all traits or physiology, a position not supported by major evolutionary theorists. As Ernst Mayr, the dean of evolutionary biology, writes, "Gould and Lewontin's proposals are not 'alternatives to the adaptationist program,' but simply legitimate forms of it" and, like it, "are ultimately based on natural selection."3 This is a major reason why Mayr concludes that "little is wrong with the adaptationist program as such, contrary to the claims of Gould and Lewontin. Third, the post hoc, ergo propter hoc charge might be valid if adaptationist explanations were untestable. But as the distinguished evolutionary theorist George Williams argues, adaptationism, like other scientific programs, is testable because it considers multiple hypotheses and compares them with the empirical evidence, just as any scientific program would.7 Competing hypotheses can be checked against empirical evidence. Moreover, any explanation must be consistent with what is known about the trait being examined. For example, in his discussion of the pony fish's glow, Williams notes that scientists must explain, among other things, "when [it’s] light would be turned on, [and] what kind of light it would emit."8 Thus adaptationist explanations do not just explain traits; they also explain why such traits are maintained. The criticism of Gould and Lewontin notwithstanding, Williams concludes that adaptationism "continues to be a powerful method for the discovery of important facts about living organisms."9

#### Most theorists agree that natural selection works on the level of the gene

Thayer, Baylor University, political science professor, 1

(Bradley, Summer 2001, “Correspondence: Start the Evolution without Us,” International Security, Volume: 26, p. 187-198, ATP)

Bell and MacDonald also argue that evolutionary theorists disagree about the Level at which natural selection operates. Although there is indeed some debate over this issue, the consensus among contemporary evolutionary theorists is that evolution works at the level of the gene. They also agree that for almost all animals, including humans, the individual is important because the phenotype must survive long enough to reproduce and possibly pass to posterity favorable genetic mutations. On the other hand, some evolutionary theorists suggest that natural selection can operate at the group level (group selection). The ultimate resolution of this debate does not prevent the use of evolutionary theory in international relations, however, any more than scholarship in international politics is encumbered by its levels of analysis. Which is more valuable is often an empirical question. Thus, as with any science, evolutionary theory has its share of disagreements, but rather than being a problem, this should be taken as an indication of its robustness.

#### Their attacks are predicated on a misconception of Thayer’s theory

Thayer, Baylor University, political science professor, 1

(Bradley, Summer 2001, “Correspondence: Start the Evolution without Us,” International Security, Volume: 26, p. 187-198, ATP)

In response, it is important to underscore what theories can and cannot accomplish. Evolutionary theory, for example, can provide an ultimate causation of behavior. It cannot elucidate why a particular animal did something at a particular time, Just as neorealism cannot explain why a given state undertook a specific policy at a specific lime. This does not mean that neorealism has little or no explanatory leverage, and is to misunderstand the role of theory in international politics. So it is for evolutionary theory to explain the behavior of a particular animal is to move from an ultimate to a proximate explanation. Combining insights drawn from evolutionary theory with those drawn from environmental factors, scholars can then explicate this behavior. Thus the false dichotomy between nature and environment should be rejected.

In "Bringing in Darwin," I did not seek to establish that evolutionary causes of behavior trump environmental causes One does not trump the other. Rather I suggested that evolutionary theory can assist the study of certain issues in international politics (e.g., warfare and ethnic conflict). Evolutionary theorists often use the metaphor of a cake to make this point. Just as all the ingredients in a recipe are required to make the cake, so too are evolutionary and environmental causes necessary to explain behavior. Once this is understood, scholars will no longer believe that a methodological test is necessary or desirable to determine what is wholly genetic or environmental.

#### Thayer doesn’t contradict himself, his theory is more nuanced than they give it credit for.

Thayer, Baylor University, political science professor, 1

(Bradley, Summer 2001, “Correspondence: Start the Evolution without Us,” International Security, Volume: 26, p. 187-198, ATP)

Bell and MacDonald also contend that my argument offers "contradictory predictions about what types of behavior evolutionary pressures generate" because, they submit, I maintain that humans are egoists who often act submissively in dominance hierarchies but at other times may act altruistically. But I did not argue that this was the totality of human behavior or that evolutionary theory can explain all. Indeed it seems obvious that humans and other animals are capable of these behaviors—and many more—given the right circumstances. It is important to stress this point. Evolutionary theory explains why individual animals are egoistic, why they may live in a dominance hierarchy, or why they may be altruistic. It does not submit that animals solely pursue these types of behaviors, because an explanation of specific individual action requires incorporating environmental causes. Thus, when Bell and Mc write that Thayer's account cannot tell us when individual humans will behave egotistically, submissively, or altruistically" is to misunderstand evolutionary theory, ultimate causation, and the value of theories. Furthermore, Bell and MacDonald argue that I did not describe the mechanisms to "conclusively sketch" how "individual motivations aggregate to social groups " My succinct answer is that evolutionary theory can provide insight into human group behavior, although precisely how depends in part on the empirical issue being examined.