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A2 Feminism

No Alt Solvency

K turns itself – associating men with war and women with peace reinforces hierarchy.

Tickner 1 (J. Ann, prof at the School of International Relations, USC, *Gendering World Politics: Issues and Approaches in the Post–Cold War Era*, p. 59-60) JM

In a context of a male-dominated society, the association of men with war and women with peace also reinforces gender hierarchies and false dichotomies that contribute to the devaluation of both women and peace. The 60 gendered dimensions association of women and peace with idealism in IR, which I have argued is a deeply gendered concept, has rendered it less legitimate in the discourse of international relations. Although peace movements that have relied on maternal images may have had some success, they do nothing to change existing gender relations; this allows men to remain in control and continue to dominate the agenda of world politics, and it continues to render women’s voices as inauthentic in matters of foreign policymaking.

Link – Gendered State

The belief that the state is always-already patriarchal is both a fiction and prevents the women’s movement from securing lasting changes in gender relations.

Deborah L. Rhode, Professor, Stanford Law School; Director, Institute for Research on Women and Gender, Stanford University, April 1994, Harvard Law Review, 107 Harv. L. Rev. 1181, p. 1184-1186

In many left feminist accounts, the state is a patriarchal institution in the sense that it reflects and institutionalizes male dominance. Men control positions of official power and men's interests determine how that power is exercised. According to Catharine MacKinnon, the state's invocation of neutrality and objectivity ensures that, "[t]hose who have freedoms like equality, liberty, privacy and speech socially keep them legally, free of governmental intrusion." n15 In this view, "the state protects male power [by] appearing to prohibit its excesses when necessary to its normalization." n16 So, for example, to the extent that abortion functions "to facilitate male sexual access to women, access to abortion will be controlled by 'a man or The Man.'" n17 Other theorists similarly present women as a class and elaborate the ways in which even state policies ostensibly designed to assist women have institutionalized their subordination. n18 So, for example, welfare programs stigmatize female recipients without providing the support that would enable them to alter their disadvantaged status. n19 In patriarchal accounts, the choice for many women is between dependence  [\*1185]  on an intrusive and insensitive bureaucracy, or dependence on a controlling or abusive man. n20 Either situation involves sleeping with the enemy. As Virginia Woolf noted, these public and private spheres of subordination are similarly structured and "inseparably connected; . . . the tyrannies and servilities of the one are the tyrannies and servilities of the other." n21 This account is also problematic on many levels. To treat women as a class obscures other characteristics, such as race and economic status, that can be equally powerful in ordering social relations. Women are not "uniformly oppressed." n22 Nor are they exclusively victims. Patriarchy cannot account adequately for the mutual dependencies and complex power dynamics that characterize male-female relations. Neither can the state be understood solely as an instrument of men's interests. As a threshold matter, what constitutes those interests is not self-evident, as MacKinnon's own illustrations suggest. If, for example, policies liberalizing abortion serve male objectives by enhancing access to female sexuality, policies curtailing abortion presumably also serve male objectives by reducing female autonomy. n23 In effect, patriarchal frameworks verge on tautology. Almost any gender-related policy can be seen as either directly serving men's immediate interests, or as compromising short-term concerns in the service of broader, long-term goals, such as "normalizing" the system and stabilizing power relations. A framework that can characterize all state interventions as directly or indirectly patriarchal offers little practical guidance in challenging the conditions it condemns. And if women are not a homogenous group with unitary concerns, surely the same is true of men. Moreover, if the state is best understood as a network of institutions with complex, sometimes competing agendas, then the patriarchal model of single-minded instrumentalism seems highly implausible. It is difficult to dismiss all the anti-discrimination initiatives of the last quarter century as purely counter-revolutionary strategies. And it is precisely these initiatives, with their appeal to "male" norms of "objectivity and the impersonality of procedure, that [have created]  [\*1186]  leverage for the representation of women's interests." n24 Cross-cultural research also suggests that the status of women is positively correlated with a strong state, which is scarcely the relationship that patriarchal frameworks imply. n25 While the "tyrannies" of public and private dependence are plainly related, many feminists challenge the claim that they are the same. As Carole Pateman notes, women do not "live with the state and are better able to make collective struggle against institutions than individuals." n26 To advance that struggle, feminists need more concrete and contextual accounts of state institutions than patriarchal frameworks have supplied. Lumping together police, welfare workers, and Pentagon officials as agents of a unitary patriarchal structure does more to obscure than to advance analysis. What seems necessary is a contextual approach that can account for greater complexities in women's relationships with governing institutions. Yet despite their limitations, patriarchal theories underscore an insight that generally informs feminist theorizing. As Part II reflects, governmental institutions are implicated in the most fundamental structures of sex-based inequality and in the strategies necessary to address it.

Link – Military

Distancing feminists from the military ensures they’ll always be outsiders, only able to drag down men not lift up women

Mazur 99 (Diane H. **Mazur** - Associate Professor of Law, U. of Florida. Captain, US Air Force, 1979-83 – 19**99** Spring, 22 Harv. Women's L.J. 39 “A CALL TO ARMS”)

The deliberate distance that legal feminists have created between women and the military has made it difficult for women of legal influence to speak persuasively about the institution. We will never win the war of narrative between "insider" and "outsider" if feminists always remain on the outside. Insider accounts will always have the credibility of expertise, and it is no answer to simply vow to "offer detailed accounts of the partiality and perpetuation of dominant, straight male perspectives." 135 Without participation, it is impossible; legal feminists have not been able to construct factually accurate accounts from a studied distance. Rather than seeking ways to discount the expertise of men, 136 we should instead work to increase the expertise of women.

Students lack discipline to pursue change, the military teaches organization and detail focus that benefits activists

Mazur 99 (Diane H. **Mazur** - Associate Professor of Law, U. of Florida. Captain, US Air Force, 1979-83 – 19**99** Spring, 22 Harv. Women's L.J. 39 “A CALL TO ARMS”)

As law teachers, we see it in the classroom; one might call it the "well . . . whatever" syndrome. When we try to remind students of the critically important nature of some seemingly insignificant fact, event, word, or turn of phrase, the weary but incredulous look we sometimes receive in return is one that speaks, "well . . . whatever." 180 While I am certainly [\*75] not recommending that law students need any form of adversative "law school boot camp," law students would be better off with enhanced skills of "concentration, attention to detail, and, above all, patience." 181 One of the objectives of military training is to scrub from civilians this comfortableness with approximation, and, furthermore, to teach a "Zen-like fetish for minor details" 182 that prevails even under conditions of severe physical stress and mental confusion. A training exercise that, to a feminist legal scholar, might appear to be nothing more than sadistic sport about triviality actually has a point, and it has a fair point. 183 Lack of familiarity with the military has disadvantaged legal feminists in their efforts to advance credible, productive arguments about gender issues in military training, but it has also disadvantaged feminist litigation in a more direct and consequential way. The quality of civil-rights representation depends on more than just expertise in civil-rights litigation; the most effective representation also requires an understanding of relevant factual context in the client's community:

State Key

The state can use its power to further feminist goals.

Tickner 1 (J. Ann, prof at the School of International Relations, USC, *Gendering World Politics: Issues and Approaches in the Post–Cold War Era*, p. 97-98) JM

While the relative absence of women from political institutions has led feminists, particularly Western feminists, to be suspicious of the state, they are also questioning visions of alternative models that advocate the devolution of power up to international governmental institutions, where often there are even fewer women in decision-making positions. Universal norms, such as standards of human rights, articulated at the international level are also being examined for gender bias. Typically, women’s movements, which strive for what they claim is a more genuine form of democracy, have been situated at the local level or in nongovernmental transnational social movements. As discussed in chapter 3, feminists have stressed the importance of these movements, not only in terms of their attempts to place women’s issues on the international agenda, but also in terms of their success in redefining political theory and practice and thinking more deeply about oppressive gender relations and how to reconstitute them. However, certain feminists have begun to question whether women’s participation in these nongovernmental arenas can have sufficient power to effect change; while they remain skeptical of the patriarchal underpinnings of many contemporary states, certain feminists are now beginning to reexamine the potential of the state as an emancipatory institution. Particularly for women and feminists from the South, democratization has opened up some space within which to leverage the state to deal with their concerns; many of them see the state as having the potential to provide a buffer against an international system dominated by its most powerful members. However, a genuinely democratic state, devoid of gender and other oppressive social hierarchies, would require a different definition of democracy, citizenship, and human rights, as well as a different relationship with the international system.

The law can be used to reverse violence. There is nothing inherent in the law that ties our hands

**Butler 97**(Judith, Professor of Rhetoric and Comparative Literature at UC Berkeley**,**Excitable Speech: A Politics of the Performative, Routledge: New York, p. 98)

The state's exercise of this productive discursive function is under­estimated in the writings that favor of hate speech legislation. Indeed, they minimize the possibility of a misappropriation by the law in favor of a view of the law as politically neutral and malleable. **Matsuda argues that law, though formed in racism, can be redirected against racism. She figures the law as a set of "ratchet" tools, describing it in purely in­strumental terms, and discounting the productive misappropriations by which it proceeds. This view invests all power and agency in the sub­ject who would use such an instrument. However reactionary its his­tory, this instrument can be put in the service of a progressive vision, thus "defying the habit of neutral principles to entrench existing power:**' Later she writes: "**nothing inherent in law ties our hands**:' (50) approving of a method of doctrinal reconstruction. In other words, **legal language is precisely the kind of language that can be cited into a re­verse meaning, where the reversal takes a law with a reactionary his­tory and turns it into a law with a progressive aim.**

Perm Solvency

A critically realist approach, such as the perm, is essential to the feminist project

**New 4** (Caroline, Law @ ANU, Critical Realism, www.raggedclaws.com/criticalrealism/archive/ALETHIAv1n1\_new2.pdf)IM

Like most poststructuralist feminists, Butler refers to the wrongs done to women. Yet it is hard to see why cruelties mat- ter, whether suffered by women or men, without some implicit moral realism. Why, for “tactical” reasons, do we want femi- nism to bring together the disparate groups of women? Why not let feminism itself go the way of gender, the target of the “subversive bodily acts” Butler recommends - i.e. of discursive, deconstructive ones? It can only be because Butler, and others, care about the real conditions of women’s lives, and want to see them ameliorated, which only makes sense in terms of a hidden ethic of human needs, and collective interests in the light of these. Again, critical realism has the tools to deconstruct - and thus expose — the limits post-structuralists put on their own decon- structions. The necessity of (critical) realism In this case, as in others, poststructuralists inevitably return to realism. In “Situated Knowledges”, Haraway famously retreats from her earlier view that feminist politics should be grounded, not on the category “woman”, but on an “ironic political myth” of the self as cyborg (1991, 145). Instead, she now returns to the notion of a “successor science”. My problem and “our” problem is how to have simultaneously an account of radical historical contingency for all knowledge claims and know- ing subjects, a critical practice for recognising our own “semiotic technologies” for making meanings, and a no nonsense commitment to faithful accounts of a “real” world... (Haraway 1991, 187). Yet even after this clear statement she adds: “the approach I am recommending is not a version of realism, which has proved a rather poor way of engaging with the world’s active agency” (ibid., 197). She simply does not realise that realism can recognise the his- toricity of theories and knowledge claims without assuming that what is true of our constructions need be true of their referents (Sayer 1997, 468). Feminism makes claims about the nature of social relations, and adduces various sorts of evidence for these. It points out the falsity of dominant accounts of the social world and argues on the basis of rival accounts that deep and wide changes should take place. A realist approach (and an ethically naturalist one) is therefore essential to the feminist project. To deal with the poststruc- turalist challenge, this realism needs to be critical.

Universalization is inescapable – prefer the critical realism of the perm to formulate emancipatory aims

**Poutanen 5** (Seppo, Researcher, Academy of Finland, July 2005, Critical Management Conference, interculture.fsu.edu/pdfs/pirott-quintero%20lispector\_and\_cixous.pdf)IM

The essential object of Tony Lawson’s contribution to the dialogue is to show how ontological analysis in critical realist style is able to benefit the explanatory goals (mainly meaning goals of standpoint epistemology), and critical and emancipatory goals of feminist research. In his first article, which he mostly uses to sketch the content of critical realism, Lawson (1999) notes general aversion among feminists towards realism and suggests a diagnosis of this phenomenon. According to his diagnosis, effective feminist critique of groundless a priori universalizing in research slides easily to a problematic position of opposing generalizing altogether. Lawson suspects feminists to see realism as an ontological underwriter of all false generalizing, and he stresses that only naive realism is prone to back misled universalizations. In contrast, Lawson considers generalizing/universalizing (is) an inescapable part of research and details how understanding the basic ontological nature of (social) reality in the critical realist way can help us to attain moderately correct or justified generalizations. Such generalizations concerning, especially, human nature, needs and interests are, in the view of Lawson, necessarily needed in formulations of emancipatory political aims.

Perm Solvency

Critical realism doesn’t exclude the consideration of femininity – it’s key to effective feminism

**Sayer 4** (Andrew, Lancaster U, UK, Economics Review no. 29, Dec. 6 2004, http://www.paecon.net/PAEReview/issue29/Sayer29.htm)IM

Van Staveren endorses Julie Nelson’s claim that critical realism has a built-in bias against emotion, counterposing this to science and reason. This mistakes realism for positivism. Critical realists Margaret Archer and Andrew Collier insistently reject the opposition of reason and emotion, arguing that emotions have a cognitive element, providing an embodied, usually unarticulated commentary on the world and our situation within it, often providing highly perceptive discriminations among situations (Archer, 2000, 2003; Collier, 2003). Hence both authors emphasize and value the intelligence of emotions. As Martha Nussbaum puts it, emotions are evaluative judgements regarding matters affecting or likely to affect well-being (Nussbaum, 2001). There is no reason why critical realists should not be comfortable with the idea of emotional reason. We are angry or happy about things, proud or ashamed of actions. We are more emotionally affected by the loss of a loved one than the loss of a pencil because the former is more important for our well-being: the differences in emotional responses are rational. Emotional reason involves a largely pre-discursive evaluation of things such as the way others treat us and the effect that this is having or is likely to have on us, for example whether they are respecting or humiliating us, befriending or threatening us. Emotions also reflect our deeply social nature (another universalist claim), for as social beings we are psychologically dependent on others for their recognition, love and approval. Anti-realism may be dominant in feminism, though often through a confusion between realism and positivism, but as I have tried to show, feminists can be realists and realists can be feminists, indeed without realism feminism is vulnerable to being dismissed as a form of relativism. For further arguments on the need of feminism to be realist, I refer readers to the work of Kate Soper (1995a and b), Caroline New (1998, 2003, 2004); and Linda Martín Alcoff (2005).

A2: Link – Universalism

Feminist literature is more universalizing that security discourse

**Sayer 4** (Andrew, Lancaster U, UK, Economics Review no. 29, Dec. 6 2004, http://www.paecon.net/PAEReview/issue29/Sayer29.htm)IM

As regards universalism and appeals to human nature, there are dangers of identifying local and historically-specific characteristics as universal, and of failing to take seriously the remarkable variety of cultural forms, including gender orders, which shape people deeply. In response to the treatment of local variants as universal or as the norm, and the common tendency to naturalise contingent historical forms of domination, it is tempting to reject any notion of human nature. Human beings are indeed extraordinarily diverse, but we should ask what is it about them which enables them to exhibit such variety? Humans can be profoundly culturally shaped in a vast variety of ways, but not just anything can be culturally shaped. A lump of rock cannot take different cultural forms (it may be externally construed in different culturally mediated ways, and used in various ways, but limestone doesn’t change its nature when we think about it differently, any more than the earth changed shape when we decided it was round rather than flat.) Certain other species are capable of cultural variation too, but that just begs the same question: what is it about them which enables this? For it to be possible for anything to be shaped in a particular way (for example by culture) it must be the kind of thing which is susceptible to such shaping, that is, it must have (or have acquired) the affordances and resistances which allow such shaping. As Andrew Collier points out, far from removing the question of human nature, the phenomenon of cultural variety actually poses it. It presupposes a universal human capacity for cultural variation. Thus, a certain kind of universalism – though not uniformity, with which it is often confused – is presupposed by cultural variety (Collier, 2003). In this way, using a structured ontology, we can understand both sameness and difference: we can see that multiple variants and outcomes can be generated on the basis of common structures (see Lawson, 2003, p. 242). The abstract level does, contra van Staveren, “allow for relations and differences”, for social structures are constituted by internal relations and the whole point of abstraction is to tease out relations and differences that enable and constrain the blizzard of empirical data, and to distinguish which things are merely contingently associated and which necessarily or internally related (Sayer, 2000). Moreover, in line with Soper’s point, we need to identify the capacities of humans – and indeed other species - for flourishing and suffering, and their needs (Lawson, 2003), thus enabling critiques of not just economic theories but economic practices in terms of their effect on people’s well-being. This accords with the Aristotelian position of Martha Nussbaum, who has made important contributions to feminist development theory (Nussbaum, 2000). To be sure there are many different forms of flourishing and different cultures provide different conceptions of what constitutes flourishing, and Nussbaum attempts to accommodate this. But not just anything can be passed off as flourishing. If we were to insist that it was purely culturally relative then we would have no warrant for using terms like ‘oppression’. Again we encounter a relation between general human needs and specific, contingent variants, such as the general psychological need for recognition and the innumerable forms that recognition takes in different cultures. This is why Nussbaum describes her conception of the good as a ‘thick vague’ one, for while it includes many conditions of flourishing, they are expressed in terms vague enough to allow for cultural variation and hence avoid ethnocentrism. This also seems compatible with van Staveren’s largely favourable commentary on Aristotle’s and Adam Smith’s discussions of virtues, which mostly abstract from cultural variations (van Staveren, 1999). We cannot avoid some kind of universalism. Different cultures provide different norms but this presupposes that one of the distinctive features of humans is that they can understand, internalise or contest these, often through exploiting tensions and contradictions within cultural discourses, as in the case of the tension between ideals of equality and gender inequalities. The feminist literature, including van Staveren’s own work on the ethic of care presupposes that all humans are in need of care at various times in their lives, albeit in different ways. People are not just beings who have preferences and make choices, but beings who are vulnerable, and dependent on care. Thus all economies depend on, and distribute the provision and receipt of care. One of the contributions of this literature is to improve our economic theories by enriching our understanding of what it is to be human.

A2: Link – Private Sphere

Women’s rights fall within the political sphere – the state will be held politically accountable for violence committed against women

**Armstrong 1** (Sally, Sciences @ U of Toronto, https://tspace.library.utoronto.ca/bitstream/1807/15693/1/MQ63042.pdf)IM

Moreover, the basis of the right to health needs to be fully explored to understand the intent of the authors of the documents and the obligations of the states that are required to implement them in, for example, access to health services that deliver preventative and medical care and proactive health policies that contribute to well being. Is it the right of a girl in Afghanistan to have access to health services? Is it the right of Canadian schoolgirls to regain access to physical and health education? And if so. can any of those rights be implemented with current international and regional Treaties? Considering that most of the documents were written by men and the law wasn’t feminized until a decade ago. Women’s experiences have been marginalized and the experiences of adolescent girls have been virtually ignored. However, in international law there is a difference between State responsibility and State accountability: The State is legally responsible but politically accountable (Cook. 2000). Women's rights invariably fa11 in the political sphere. As well, research conducted post 1979 on women's reproductive health, violence against women and abortion were excluded from the documents. Their inclusion today is problematic because of the power of fundamentalist States such as Saudi Arabia, Iran, Pakistan and the Vatican to delay the debate or even annul the hard-won articles that already exist, if the documents are opened for discussion.

War => Patriarchy

War reproduces patriarchy – creates cultural crises of gender and forces the gendering of every experience

**Workman 96** (Thom, Poli Sci @ U of New Brunswick, YCISS Paper no. 31, p. 4, January 1996, http://www.yorku.ca/yciss/publications/OP31-Workman.pdf)IM

With the loosening of the positivist/Realist hold on international relations and the simultaneous rise of feminist analysis, intellectual space has been created to address war in terms of the social relations of power between men and women. This development places war within a broader patriarchal matrix, and has helped to develop an understanding of war as one (obviously important) manifestation of patriarchal violence. This development also has promoted a more unassuming character with respect to the subject matter itself. The concerns lies less with warfare or its destructive potential (although this concern remains) than it does with the relationship between warfare and the oppression of women. Primary concern, that is, rests less with war than with the reproduction of patriarchy. This paper addresses the gender critique of war directly. It argues that the gender critique of war has racked enough to be able to identify a preliminary thesis regarding war and the reproduction of patriarchy. The altered experiences and practices of war, combined with the sometimes dramatic modifications in gender representations (through propaganda, literature etcetera), are considerable. War produces cultural crises of gender, especially as it throws the historical contingency and cultural arbitrariness of gendered constructs into relief. There is the suggestion that through war traditional gendered constructs can modulate and unwind. An emerging sense of cultural crisis revolving around gender shifts typically accompanies both war and post-war periods. Indeed, much of the initial research on gender and war, in view of the extensive shifts in representations and practices during war, directly or indirectly explores the emancipatory effect of war upon women. To the extent that war is contingent upon such gendered constructs, constructs that the practice itself appears to threaten and endanger, the relationship between war and gender might be said to be paradoxical. The paradoxical dynamic between gender and war, however, is softened by the profundity of the links between war and patriarchy. The gendering of experiences during war, along with the restoration of traditional gendered constructs after war, more than compensate for any war- induced sundering of the patriarchal tapestry. While the practice of war suggests that it might encourage a rupture in the gendered fabric of society, it overwhelmingly contributes to patriarchal reproduction. Questions oriented around the emancipatory potential of war where women are concerned, therefore, run the risk of losing a perspective on the overall role of modern warfare in the reproduction of women's oppression.

War => Patriarchy

Gender oppression does not cause war, it’s the other way around

Goldstein 1 (Joshua, Int’l Rel Prof @ American U, **2001**, War and Gender, p. 412)

First, peace activists face a dilemma in thinking about causes of war and working for peace. Many peace scholars and activists support the approach, “if you want peace, work for justice.” Then, if one believes that sexism contributes to war one can work for gender justice specifically (perhaps among others) in order to pursue peace. This approach brings strategic allies to the peace movement (women, labor, minorities), but rests on the assumption that injustices cause war. The evidence in this book suggests that causality runs at least as strongly the other way. War is not a product of capitalism, imperialism, gender, innate aggression, or any other single cause, although all of these influence wars’ outbreaks and outcomes. Rather, war has in part fueled and sustained these and other injustices.9 So,”if you want peace, work for peace.” Indeed, if you want justice (gender and others), work for peace. Causality does not run just upward through the levels of analysis, from types of individuals, societies, and governments up to war. It runs downward too. Enloe suggests that changes in attitudes towards war and the military may be the most important way to “reverse women’s oppression.” The dilemma is that peace work focused on justice brings to the peace movement energy, allies, and moral grounding, yet, in light of this book’s evidence, the emphasis on injustice as the main cause of war seems to be empirically inadequate. "men of Africa" as a group?) are seen as a group precisely because they are generally dependent and oppressed, the analysis of specific historical differences becomes impossible, because reality is always apparently structured by divisions—two mutually exclusive and jointly exhaustive groups, the victims and the oppressors. Here the sociological is substituted for the biological in order, however, to create the same—a unity of women. Thus, it is not the descriptive potential of gender difference, but the privileged positioning and explanatory potential of gender difference as the origin of oppression that I question. In using "women of Africa" (as an already constituted group of oppressed peoples) as a category of analysis, Cutrufelli denies any historical specificity to the location of women as subordinate, powerful, marginai, central, or otherwise, vis-a-vis particular social and power networks. Women are taken as a unified "Powerless" group prior to the analysis in question. Thus, it is then merely a matter of specifying the context after the fact. "Women" are now placed in the context of the famiiy, or in the workplace, or within religious networks, almost as if these systems existed outside the relations of women with other women, and women with men. The problem with this analytic strategy is that it assumes men and women are already constituted as sexual-political subjects prior to their entry into the arena of social relations. Only if we subscribe to this assumption is it possible to undertake analysis which looks at the "effects" of kinship structures, colonialism, organization of labor, etc., on women, who are already defined as a group apparently because of shared dependencies, but ultimately because of their gender. But women are produced through these very relations as well as being implicated in forming these relations. As Michelle Rosaldo states: " . . . woman's place in human social life is not in any direct sense a product of the things she does (or even less, a function of what, biologically, she is) but the meaning her activities acquire through concrete social interactions."" That women mother in a variety of societies is not as significant as the value attached to mothering in these societies. The distinction between the act of mothering and the status attached to it is a very important one—one that needs to be made and analyzed contextually.

State Good

Critique grounded in discourse fails – it can’t undermine larger power structures.

Brown 1(Wendy, prof Political Science UC Berkeley, *Politics Out of History*, p. 35-37)JM

But here the problem goes well beyond superficiality of political analysis or compensatory gestures in the face of felt impotence. A moralistic, gestural politics often inadvertently becomes a regressive politics. Moralizing condemnation of the National Endowment for the Arts for not funding politically radical art, of the U.S. military or the White House for not embracing open homosexuality or sanctioning gay marriage, or even of the National Institutes of Health for not treating as a political priority the lives of HIV target populations (gay men, prostitutes, and drug addicts) conveys at best naive political expectations and at worst, patently confused ones. For this condemnation implicitly figures the state (and other mainstream institutions) as if it did not have specific political and economic investments, as if it were not the codification of various dominant social powers, but was, rather, a momentarily misguided parent who forgot her promise to treat all her children the same way. These expressions of moralistic outrage implicitly cast the state as if it were or could be a deeply democratic and nonviolent institution; conversely, it renders radical art, radical social movements, and various fringe populations as if they were not potentially subversive, representing a significant political challenge to the norms of the regime, but rather were benign entities and populations entirely appropriate for the state to equally protect, fund, and promote. Here, moralism’s objection to politics as a domain of power and history rather than principle is not simply irritating: it results in a troubling and confused political stance. It misleads about the nature of power, the state, and capitalism; it misleads about the nature of oppressive social forces, and about the scope of the project of transformation required by serious ambitions for justice. Such obfuscation is not the aim of the moralists but falls within that more general package of displaced effects consequent to a felt yet unacknowledged impotence. It signals disavowed despair over the prospects for more far-reaching transformations.

State Good

Benefits for women have long been achieved through the normative discourse of political structures

**Baldwin 97** (Margaret, Assoc. Prof Law @ FSU, Spring 1997, “Public Women and the Feminist State,” 20 Harv. Women’s L.J. 47, p 70)IM

Women have not been strangers to campaigns for and struggles with liberal state democracies. Feminists, especially feminist legal activists, have long participated in and sought benefits for all women within the political and judicial structures of the United State, Canada and the liberal states of Western Europe. The recent celebration of the 75th anniversary of the federal female suffrage in the United States is a reminder of the longevity and persistence of women’s demands for full political rights in this country, while the repeated defeat of a federal constitutional Equal Rights Amendment inspires continued activism. Successful campaigns for anti-discrimination legislation and litigation of gender-equity claims were significant advances for women achieved through the normative discourses and public institutions characteristic of liberal democracies. Women also have struggled in South Africa and in the former Soviet bloc to secure basic democratic guarantees. The continued integrity of the state systems through which these aims have been met is a matter toward which women cannot be indifferent, theoretically or otherwise.

Greater engagement, not rejection, of the modern state is key to solve

**Baldwin 97** (Margaret, Assoc. Prof Law @ FSU, Spring 1997, “Public Women and the Feminist State,” 20 Harv. Women’s L.J. 47, p 98)IM

Feminist political theorists advocate stronger models of group representation and participation as a structural response to this problem. These proposals draw significant inspiration from the role of consciousness-raising in feminist political practice. The intense involvement these proposals require of citizens, together with the locally based institutions upon which they depend, challenge the distanced, formalized decision-making that flattens women’s participation and furthers the false universalism of the interests represented in the public sphere. To that extent, feminists have participated in the localizing discourse characteristic of many modern attacks on the liberal state. Further, feminists often theorize “women” as a distinct political class, both within existing state borders and irrespective of state citizenships, thus advocating a form of nationalist identity independent of territorial affiliation. Women’s interests, and women’s commitments and conflicts, then are already deeply woven into the web of contemporary contests over the nature and future of the liberal state.

Working within dominant institutions subverts descriptive dichotomies, to include women

**Baldwin 97** (Margaret, Assoc. Prof Law @ FSU, Spring 1997, “Public Women and the Feminist State,” 20 Harv. Women’s L.J. 47, p 102)IM

This wide-angle presentation inevitably forfeits the complexity and nuance of a more tightly focused and thoroughly rendered account of a single aspect of women’s public or private experience. Yet I hope to recoup that loss by the gain in theoretical perspective accessed by the broader view. As Carole Pateman has suggested, such a framework may also be able to deconstruct the descriptive dichotomies that ensnare our theoretical imaginations and tell lies about the conditions of women’s real lives. The recognition that women are situated in one form or another “as women” in both private and public spheres already begins to undermine feminism’s typical understanding of women’s central political challenge as the movement from wholesale exclusion to public inclusion. Carole Pateman explains: “A feminist strategy that calls for the integration into citizenship of women’s distinctive contribution … rests on the assumption that ‘women’ and ‘difference’ need to be brought into the political order. The pertinent question is assumed to be whether sexual difference is politically relevant, or how ‘difference’ could be relevant. Thus the vital question is overlooked of how to subvert and change the manner in which women have already been incorporated, and so to transform the relation between ‘equality’ (men) and ‘difference’ (women).” The fact that the public sphere already includes women, even if not as full, self-determining citizens, suggests that the matter of inclusion is already more complicated than a single focus on women’s relegation to the private sphere might imply. Consequently, to the extent that a wide-angle perspective can account for the differential treatment of women within and across the public and private spheres, the more comprehensive the analysis of women’s political situation.

A2 Post Colonial Feminism

Aff - Perm Solvency (1/2)

Perm – Use the aff as a way to shift our focus and allows us to focus on discourse of “coalition” instead of “salvation”.

Abu-Lughod 2(Lila, professor of anthropology and Women's and Gender Studies at Columbia University “Do Muslim women really need saving? Anthropological reflections on cultural relativism and its others” )AQB

Could we not leave veils and vocations of saving others behind and instead train our sights on ways to make the world a more just place? The reason respect for difference should not be confused with cultural relativism is that it does not preclude asking how we, living in this privileged and powerful part of the world, might examine our own responsibilities for the situations in which others in distant places have found themselves. We do not stand outside the world, looking out over this sea of poor benighted people, living under the shadow-or veil-of oppressive cultures; we are part of that world. Islamic movements themselves have arisen in a world shaped by the intense engagements of Western powers in Middle Eastern lives. A more productive approach, it seems to me, is to ask how we might contribute to making the world a more just place. A world not organized around strategic military and economic demands; a place where certain kinds of forces and values that we may still consider important could have an appeal and where there is the peace necessary for discussions, debates, and transformations to occur within communities. We need to ask ourselves what kinds of world conditions we could contribute to making such that popular desires will not be over determined by an overwhelming sense of helplessness in the face of forms of global injustice. Where we seek to be active in the affairs of distant places, can we do so in the spirit of support for those within those communities whose goals are to make women's (and men's) lives better (as Walley has argued in relation to practices of genital cutting in Africa, [1997])? Can we use a more egalitarian language of alliances, coalitions, and solidarity, instead of salvation? Even RAWA, the now celebrated Revolutionary Association of the Women of Afghanistan, which was so instrumental in bringing to U.S. women's attention the excesses of the Taliban, has opposed the U.S. bombing from the beginning. They do not see in it Afghan women's salvation but increased hardship and loss. They have long called for disarmament and for peacekeeping forces. Spokespersons point out the dangers of confusing governments with people, the Taliban with innocent Afghans who will be most harmed. They consistently remind audiences to take a close look at the ways policies are being organized around oil interests, the arms industry, and the international drug trade. They are not obsessed with the veil, even though they are the most radical feminists working for a secular democratic Afghanistan. Unfortunately, only their messages about the excesses of the Taliban have been heard, even though their criticisms of those in power in Afghanistan have included previous regimes. A first step in hearing their wider message is to break with the language of alien cultures, whether to understand or eliminate them. Missionary work and colonial feminism belong in the past. Our task is to critically explore what we might do to help create a world in which those poor Afghan women, for whom "the hearts of those in the civilized world break," can have safety and decent lives.

The permutation is possible – feminists working together solves.

Muthoni 2k (Wanjira, African feminist activist and former lecturer at Nairobi University, in an interview with Susan Arndt, writer for the Chicago Journals, *Signs*, 25(3), Spring, p. 721-722) JM

WM: In my opinion, names are not all that important. What is important is what we do, is the work we are doing. So, depending on the group I am working with, I could say this is feminist work, or African-womanist work, or community work, or whatever. The name emphasizes the way I look at things. But what is more important than the names we choose-- Westernfe minism, Africanf eminism, whatever-is what we are doing and the goal that we are aiming at. I think what is more important is the work and then to look for common ground. We have to find out the common issues. In yesterday's lecture, for instance, there was the question of this story of forceps delivery. I think we could have had a very interesting debate. This comes from a Western country and in Africa not all women have access to a forceps delivery, whereas in the West every woman has access to it. From here, we could have started a common debate - a debate even on those issues. There is a way of reaching consensus on some points and then saying: OK, these are the problems. You concentrate on this, because maybe that is what you specialize in, and you concentrate on, maybe, the economic issue, and you concentrate on the political issue. You know, it is very important that all of us concentrate on our areas of expertise. That is why I do not find that there is a problem.

Aff – Perm Solvency (2/2)

Perm solves best – we can combine third world and western approaches to prevent a better theory that doesn’t result in fragmentation.

Arndt 2k (Susan, writer for the Chicago Journals, *Signs*, 25(3), Spring, p. 720-721) JM

SA: What both of you have written and said has enriched me a lot. Above all, my feminist horizon has been broadened. But still, I want to challenge you. To my mind, there is not "the feminism." Feminism is heterogeneous. Its plurality makes me speak of feminisms. But there is a kind of smallest common denominator of all feminisms. I would describe feminism as the worldview and way of life of women and men who, as individuals, groups, or organizations, actively oppose social structures responsible for discrimination against and oppression of women on the basis of their biological and social gender. Feminists not only recognize the mechanisms of oppression, they also aim at overcoming them. Changes are envisaged in three vital areas: First, social discrimination against women must be ended. Second, gender-specific roles in the family, and with them the oppression and disadvantaging of women in the familial sphere, must be overcome. Third, an amendment of unwholesome individual and collective conceptions of manhood and womanhood is to be striven for. I think that this basic definition may be applied to the African context, too. Ultimately, it even harmonizes with the central idea ofwomanism, doesn't it? I do not want to deny that, due to cultural, economic, and social differences, globally, there are many variations on this feminist theme, that there are culturally specific differences and varieties of feminism. African feminism is one such variety. There is no doubt that, when transferred to the African context, the general understanding of feminism must be modified, since the nature of official discrimination, discrimination within family structures, and discriminatory gender conceptions is defined differently for each given African society. However, is it really inevitable that this specificity results in separatism as is suggested by the concept of African womanism? To my mind, it does not seem helpful to answer the ignorance and cultural imperialism of many Western feminists with the creation of a new term and the foundation of a completely separate or even separatist movement, while leaving feminism undertheorized as it is. For it does nothing to change the "gender- and Western-centeredness" of most white Western feminisms, which poses a serious threat to the survival of the world's feminisms. Moreover, if we have several separated movements, then in a way we weaken our power as women who are concerned with challenging prevailing gender relationships and who aim at an improvement of the situation of women all over the world. Hence, in my opinion it is prudent to lead a discussion among various kinds of feminists in order to redefine it, rather than to split the women's movement by changing the terminology. Another argument against separatism is that once started it is difficult to confine it. This comes already to light with the fact that African women have developed purely African counterconcepts to feminism, while African-American women have proposed womanist concepts for all black women. Similarly, within Africa you have differences, too. Ultimately, South African feminism differs from Nigerian feminism; and the feminism of Igbo and Yoruba women in Southern Nigeria differ from those in the north of Nigeria and so on. To my mind, the apparently endless possibility of founding autonomous groups already shows that ultimately separatism is no solution for anything. Is it really necessary to introduce a new gendercommitted emancipatory concept?

Aff – Discourse Fails

Critique grounded in discourse fails – it can’t undermine larger power structures.

Brown 1(Wendy, prof Political Science UC Berkeley, *Politics Out of History*, p. 35-37)JM

But here the problem goes well beyond superficiality of political analysis or compensatory gestures in the face of felt impotence. A moralistic, gestural politics often inadvertently becomes a regressive politics. Moralizing condemnation of the National Endowment for the Arts for not funding politically radical art, of the U.S. military or the White House for not embracing open homosexuality or sanctioning gay marriage, or even of the National Institutes of Health for not treating as a political priority the lives of HIV target populations (gay men, prostitutes, and drug addicts) conveys at best naive political expectations and at worst, patently confused ones. For this condemnation implicitly figures the state (and other mainstream institutions) as if it did not have specific political and economic investments, as if it were not the codification of various dominant social powers, but was, rather, a momentarily misguided parent who forgot her promise to treat all her children the same way. These expressions of moralistic outrage implicitly cast the state as if it were or could be a deeply democratic and nonviolent institution; conversely, it renders radical art, radical social movements, and various fringe populations as if they were not potentially subversive, representing a significant political challenge to the norms of the regime, but rather were benign entities and populations entirely appropriate for the state to equally protect, fund, and promote. Here, moralism’s objection to politics as a domain of power and history rather than principle is not simply irritating: it results in a troubling and confused political stance. It misleads about the nature of power, the state, and capitalism; it misleads about the nature of oppressive social forces, and about the scope of the project of transformation required by serious ambitions for justice. Such obfuscation is not the aim of the moralists but falls within that more general package of displaced effects consequent to a felt yet unacknowledged impotence. It signals disavowed despair over the prospects for more far-reaching transformations.

Reality creates language, not the other way around.

Fram-Cohen 85 (Michelle, M.A in Comparative Literature at the State U of New York in Binghamton, [enlightenment.supersaturated.com/essays/text/michelleframcohen//possibilityoftranslation.html] AD: 6/28/10)JM

Nida did not provide the philosophical basis of the view that the external world is the common source of all languages. Such a basis can be found in the philosophy of Objectivism, originated by Ayn Rand. Objectivism, as its name implies, upholds the objectivity of reality. This means that reality is independent of consciousness, consciousness being the means of perceiving ?reality, not of creating it. Rand defines language as "a code of visual-auditory symbols that denote concepts." (15) These symbols are the written or spoken words of any language. Concepts are defined as the "mental integration of two or more units possessing the same distinguishing characteristic(s), with their particular measurements omitted." (16) This means that concepts are abstractions of units perceived in reality. Since words denote concepts, words are the symbols of such abstractions; words are the means of representing concepts in a language. Since reality provides the data from which we abstract and form concepts, reality is the source of all words--and of all languages. The very existence of translation demonstrates this fact. If there was no objective reality, there could be no similar concepts expressed in different verbal symbols. There could be no similarity between the content of different languages, and so, no translation. Translation is the transfer of conceptual knowledge from one language into another. It is the transfer of one set of symbols denoting concepts into another set of symbols denoting the same concepts. This process is possible because concepts have specific referents in reality. Even if a certain word and the concept it designates exist in one language but not in another, the referent this word and concept stand for nevertheless exists in reality, and can be referred to in translation by a descriptive phrase or neologism. Language is a means describing reality, and as such can and should expand to include newly discovered or innovated objects in reality. The revival of the ancient Hebrew language in the late 19th Century demonstrated the dependence of language on outward reality. Those who wanted to use Hebrew had to innovate an enormous number of words in order to describe the new objects that did not confront the ancient Hebrew speakers. On the other hand, those objects that existed 2000 years ago could be referred to by the same words. Ancient Hebrew could not by itself provide a sufficient image of modern reality for modern users.

A2 Feminist Jurisprudence

No Alternative Solvency

No Solvency – focus on the state allows non-state actors to elide scrutiny, activists support governmental responsibility and NGOs are worse than the state

**Binion 95** (Gayle, Poli Sci @ UC Santa Barbara, Human Rights Quarterly 17(3), p. 517)IM

It might be argued that the state is not the only powerful actor that wants to limit the reach of human rights to only the "public" domain. The pressure to do so might come as well from the "private" realm. Religious institutions and corporations, for example, have much to gain in the preservation of their autonomy from the illusion of invisibility that the two-spheres theory provides. If human rights concerns are focused solely on the state because of a theory of the insulation of the family as "private," the false illusion of a [End Page 517] dual-institution society is reinforced. Exceptionally powerful bodies beyond the familial patriarchy thereby escape scrutiny. Employers (of women and men) who pay unconscionably low wages for work under inhumane conditions would be unlikely to want international human rights law brought to bear against them. Religious orders with gender, race, or caste disqualification policies would similarly not welcome such attention. Under the two-spheres theory of society these institutions do not exist, and their practices are effectively shielded from international human rights review. Were women's experience the focus of human rights law, attention to the nongovernmental sphere would be heightened, and patterns of social organization and practices that are exploitative, not just of women and not just by familial patriarchs, but also by other powerful bodies, would be brought into bold relief. 29 The denial of the existence of a "private" realm of human rights violations is not limited to those with an apparent vested interest in the status quo. Human rights theorists, such as Alston, not uncommonly fear the dilution of human rights principles if the realms are expanded beyond the traditional. 30 Activist friends of human rights, such as Amnesty International, slow to view women as victims of denials of human rights, have held firm in their view that government must be seen as the perpetrator of the violations in order for their organization to act. 31 Prominent feminist theorists often have argued for only a very circumscribed realm of private human rights abuses. 32 The standard Anglo-American Bill of Rights view of government as the uniquely powerful potential evil-doer is as endemic in the traditional human rights nongovernmental (NGO) community as it is among governments themselves. [End Page 518]

Perm Solvency

Feminist objectives can be achieved successfully through state action

Lovenduski 5 (Joni, Professor of Politics at Birkbeck college, University of London, author of Women and European Politics and Feminizing politics; Cambridge university press)

Since the last quarter of the twentieth century there has been a proliferation of state agencies established to promost womens rights, often called women's policy agencies. WPAs are sometimes termed state feminist. State feminism is a contested term. To some it is an oxymoron. It has been variously defined as the activities of feminists or femocrats in government and administration (Hemes 1987; Sawer 1990), institutionalised feminism in public agencies (Eisenstein 1990; Outshoom 1994), and the capacity of the state to contribute to the fulfilment of a feminist agenda (Sawer 1990; Stetson 1987). In this book we define state feminism as the advocacy of women's movement demands inside the state. The establishment of WPAs changed the setting in which the women's movement and other feminists could advance their aims, as they offered, in principle, the possibility to influence the agenda and to further feminist goals through public policies from inside the state apparatus. WPAs could increase women's access to the state by furthering women's participation in political decision-making, and by inserting feminist goals into public policy. Thus WPAs may enhance the political representation of women. WPAs vary considerably in their capacity, resources and effectiveness, raising questions about the circumstances under which they are most likely to enhance women's political representation. To understand them we need to consider in detail the part they play in processes of incorporating women's interests (substantive representation) into policy-making, a requirement that is particularly important when the decisions are about political representation itself.

Perm solves – the power of the state needs to work in conjunction with power hierarchies, to be understood in the proper context

**Schwartzman 99** (Lisa, Philosophy @ U of NY Stony Brook, Hypatia 14(2), p. 33)IM

In response to this, a liberal might argue that because there are laws—both criminal and civil—preventing harms perpetrated by either the government or by individuals, protection already exists against the systemic harms of racism, [End Page 33] sexism, classism, etc. Whether an individual, group, or government commits these sorts of harms, laws already exist to address them. Focusing on civil law, and on constitutional law in particular, MacKinnon does not deny that the law provides a formal guarantee to respect and protect the rights of individuals to be treated "equally." Nonetheless, the way that liberal theorists interpret and employ these rights often renders them ineffective in bringing justice to people whose oppression is constituted through the operation of racial, sexual, and economic power structures. Without addressing and altering these power structures, MacKinnon argues, the formal granting of the rights to free speech, privacy, freedom, and equality are not going to succeed in bringing about justice and equality for women, or for other members of oppressed groups. 11 Although recent laws that recognize sexual harassment as a problem of sex equality are one exception to this, for the most part the law does not acknowledge explicitly the oppression of women and attempt to remedy it. Rather, the rights of women and members of other oppressed groups are recognized to the extent that the persons in these positions resemble white, upper-middle-class men. Note that MacKinnon is not suggesting that these structures of power are wholly independent of the state or that they will not change unless structures outside the realm of the state change first. MacKinnon sees the power of the state working in conjunction with these specific hierarchies—in both overt and covert ways. Thus, rather than interpreting these liberal rights and freedoms as simply rights against government intervention, MacKinnon argues that they must be understood in the context of inequality and oppression; they must be interpreted in such a way that they can begin to change these structures of oppression and thereby make it possible for people to exercise the formal rights that the Constitution legally grants them.

Perm Solvency

Pure rejection of the state’s provision of rights fails – working within the state is key

**Schwartzman 99** (Lisa, Philosophy @ U of NY Stony Brook, Hypatia 14(2), p. 42)IM

Clearly, it would be easy to interpret MacKinnon's objections to liberal rights theory as a simple rejection of certain rights—like the right to privacy or the right to free speech—if not all rights in general. Dworkin seems to interpret MacKinnon in this way when, in his review of Only Words, he writes: "She [MacKinnon] and her followers regard freedom of speech and thought as an elitist, inegalitarian ideal that has been of almost no value to women, blacks, and others without power; they say America would be better off if it demoted that ideal as many other nations have" (Dworkin 1993, 42). Elsewhere in this same article, Dworkin suggests that MacKinnon sees "equality" and "liberty" as opposed to one another, that she sees them as "competing constitutional value[s]" (1993, 36). On the one hand, Dworkin might be right: MacKinnon [End Page 42] seems to dismiss many of the rights that are currently discussed in liberal political debates. She offers numerous arguments about the way that these rights function to uphold the status quo, to obscure relations of power, and to prevent equality from being achieved. What I have suggested, however, is that this does not mean that she is rejecting "rights" per se, nor does it mean that one who endorses her criticisms of liberal rights theory must reject all use of rights. Although she writes harshly about rights, MacKinnon must be understood as criticizing the way that these rights have been formulated—and even the way that they currently function—outside of a critical analysis of society's structures of power and outside of questions of equality. It is only by asking these sorts of questions and by analyzing the social relations of power (in ways that go well beyond the simplistic individual/government dichotomy) that one could come up with a new conception of rights that would not suffer from the problems of liberalism. The criticisms of liberal rights theory that I have culled from MacKinnon's work do point to the need for an alternative theory of rights. Although I have not explained what a new conception of rights might look like, I have suggested that it would specify concretely the needs and interests of groups of oppressed people. Because liberals define rights abstractly (and because they tend to focus on individual, negative rights), they often take for granted social relations of power. As a result, the rights of people of color, women, working-class people, and other members of oppressed groups tend to be overlooked. The allegedly abstract way that liberal theory formulates and describes the rights to which individuals are said to be entitled often conceals the more concrete content that these rights have come to have in our society. In this way, the rights that upper-middle-class white men value and already enjoy are protected under the guise of treating individual preferences neutrally and protecting abstract rights. To change a system in which certain groups of people already have powers and freedoms that are—at least in practice—unavailable to others, an alternative theory of rights would have to include an analysis of who has power over whom, and it would have to concern itself with attempting to remedy these inequalities through changing society's institutions, practices, and structures of power, not a rejection of the institutions of society, or the provision of rights from the government and Rule of Law.

Using the law to recognize women’s rights is key to solve

**Fellmeth 2k** (Aaron, Int. Rel. @ Yale, Human Rights Quarterly 22(3), p. 658-733)IM

As discussed above, the causes of gender bias in international law are linked to the economic and political disempowerment of women within states, and to the dominance of financial profit over human rights in the international agenda. International law has slowly improved in recognizing women's human rights and is adopting an "ethic of care" to balance the traditional "ethic of justice," but the commitment of states to human rights concerns has not progressed adequately. Many of the poor countries of the world are getting poorer, and, in the vast majority of these less industrialized countries, the social, economic, and political situation of women has not significantly improved relative to men since the end of the Second World War. While attention to women's interests has increased greatly in industrialized states (and continues to improve), rape, the domestic assault of women, and political and economic inequality remain severe problems. 314 Wealthier states should establish a fund and offer technical assistance to less wealthy states to ensure compliance with human rights norms, particularly with respect to women. On the diplomatic level, the richer and more powerful states focus more on international economic matters primarily benefiting men than on pressuring other states--particularly dictatorships--to respect women's rights and other human rights and protect their citizens from gender-based discrimination. The fall of communism seems to have shifted this focus slightly, but there has been no momentous change, despite the fact that the democratic states no longer perceive a need to fund less economically developed states--regardless of their human rights records--to prevent them from falling under the sway of the Soviet Union. The solution to gender bias in international law is, therefore, not only to increase the representation of women in international organizations, but to augment their political and economic representation in the states that compose international society. As long as women are underrepresented in Nepalese politics and business, women's rights will be underenforced in Nepal. Certainly, **any reform within states will be helpful**. But on the international level, states should establish institutions focusing on compliance with human rights norms and women's rights particularly. States' tools [End Page 731] for encouraging women's representation in other states are largely limited to diplomacy and leading by example, and to drafting and adhering to their own treaties codifying the rights of women under international law. However, these treaties must be binding under international law, should disallow derogations, and should require states to take concrete steps toward implementing them.

State Good/Perm Solvency

Feminism has historically made progress through state action and policy making

Edwards 2 (Rebecca, assistant professor of history at Vassar College in Poughkeepsie, New York “Do Feminist Historians Need a Theory of the State?” Muse) PJ

It hardly bears repeating that feminism has made the personal political, and that a decision to leave an abusive husband or refer to God as She can be understood as a political act. The liberating power of this insight has been well explored; what needs to be said is that it has costs. Among them is its tendency to obscure women’s relationships to the state and the ways in which private, cultural, or social acts have led, or failed to lead, to changes in government policy. Referring to almost every action as political makes such analysis more difficult. In my view policy change is the result of politics, which I define here, in the context of Western democracies treated in the books under review, as the process of electing and appointing representatives and making laws and regulations. Of course there can be causal links between individual consciousness, social movements, and elections and policies; defining politics more narrowly can help clarify what they are.

The personal is political – feminists should engage in policy making to undermine patriarchy

Lee 7 (Theresa Man Ling, author, “Rethinking the Personal and the Political: Feminist Activism and Civic Engagement” Muse)

Precisely what is at stake in asking whether feminist politics is congruent with civic engagement? To answer the question, I begin by placing the slogan “the personal is the political” in its historical context. American feminist activist Kathie Sarachild first used the term “consciousness-raising” to mean “the process by which women in small groups could explore the political aspects of personal life” (Rosen 2000, 197). Another activist, Pamela Allen, described how consciousness-raising groups operated: “The group is the first step in transcending the isolation. Here sometimes for the first time in her life a woman is allowed an identity independent of a man’s. *She is allowed to function intellectually* *as a thinker* rather than as a sex object, servant, wife or mother. In short, *the* *group establishes the social worth of the women present*, *a necessity if women are to* *take themselves seriously*” (1970/2000, 280; emphasis added). In particular, Allen emphasized the need for women to teach themselves “to think independently” if the “opening up” and “sharing” were to get past the stage of simply providing therapeutic relief for the participants (280–81). Ultimately, the goal of consciousness-raising was the generation of theory that was “rooted in concrete experience” (277). Theory was important because it facilitated the apprehension of the “totality” of women’s condition, without which effective change at both personal and social levels could not be initiated (280). Canadian feminist activist Anne Crocker echoed a similar understanding of consciousness-raising (1975, 38–39). As a focal point of second-wave activism, consciousness-raising was the first step toward women’s emancipation from patriarchy, which feminists deemed ubiquitous. Underlying this strategic breakthrough was the theoretical insight, originally offered by Simone de Beauvoir, that womanhood is a social and cultural construct: “One is not born, but rather becomes, a woman” (1974, 301). Perhaps more profound was Beauvoir’s use of the Hegelian master-slave dialectic in understanding the dynamics of gender identity. According to Beauvoir, “Humanity is male and man defines woman not in herself but as relative to him; she is not regarded as an autonomous being. . . . She is defined and differentiated with reference to man and not he with reference to her; she is the incidental, the inessential as opposed to the essential. He is the Subject, he is the Absolute—she is the Other” (xviii–xix). Beauvoir’s analysis helped facilitate the second wave by pointing to the need for the feminist cause to go beyond procurement of formal equality (Friedan 1974, 8–9; Beauvoir 1976). Rather, feminism is about women’s living as free and autonomous individuals on women’s terms.

State Good/Perm Solvency

Feminist objectives should be attained through policy action

Lee 7 (Theresa Man Ling, author, “Rethinking the Personal and the Political: Feminist Activism and Civic Engagement” Muse)

I began this essay as an attempt to understand the legacy of the second wave by way of examining the kind of politics “the personal is political” implies. I conclude that there has to be some kind of boundary between the political and the personal because life when totally politicized can only resemble an Orwellian nightmare. In other words, it matters that feminist activism be deployed as civic engagement. Some may consider this position as a regressive act of co-opting an otherwise radical position within a liberal feminist framework. But the case put forth here regarding the politics of the personal does not in any way diminish its political import, which is that empowerment through the politicization of one’s life can only be achieved under one condition and that is, democracy. If anything, such an understanding facilitates the enrichment of feminism as a force of democracy rather than of liberalism, along with its baggage as the exclusive political enclave of white, middle-class women in the West.

State Good

Focus on the individual fails – institutions are key

**Morris 99** (Aldon, Sociology @ Northwestern, Annual Review of Sociology vol. 25, p. 529)IM

The American civil rights movement has had an impact beyond the shores of America. Many of the same reasons the civil rights movement influenced American social movements, appear to also be the source of its influence on in- ternational movements. The major exception is that the civil rights movement did not serve as the training ground for many of the activists who initiated movements outside the United States. What is clear, however, is that numerous international movements were influenced by the US civil rights movement. A similarity that movements share across the world is that they usually must confront authorities who have superior power. The major challenge for such movements is that they must develop a collective action strategy that will generate leverage enabling them to engage in power struggles with powerful opponents. The strategy of nonviolent direct action was first developed by Gandhi in South Africa and then used by Gandhi in the mass movement that overthrew British colonialism in India. Ghandi's use of nonviolence was im- portant to the civil rights movement because some key leaders of the civil rights movement-James Farmer, Bayard Rustin, James Lawson and Glenn Smiley-had studied Gandhi's movement and became convinced that nonvio- lence could be used by African Americans. Additionally, Gandhi became a hero and a source of inspiration for Martin Luther King Jr. It was the American civil rights movement that perfected and modernized nonviolent direct action. Because of this achievement, the civil rights movement was the major vehicle through which nonviolent direct action was spread to other movements inter- nationally. Nonviolent direct action has enabled oppressed groups as diverse as Black South Africans, Arabs of the Middle East, and pro-democracy dem- onstrators in China to engage in collective action. Leaders of these movements have acknowledged the valuable lessons they have learned from the civil rights movement (see Morris 1993). As Tarrow (1994) has pointed out, nonviolent direct action is a potent tool of collective action because it generates disruption and uncertainty that authorities must address. Tarrow captured how nonviolent direct action has spread domestically and internationally following the civil rights movement when he wrote: Because the civil rights movement developed a powerful tactical, ideologi- cal, and cultural repertoire of collective action available to a worldwide audi- ence through mass media and an extensive literature, it has served as a model of collective action nationally and internationally. Awareness of the civil rights movement is so widespread globally that oppressed people in distant lands seek out knowledge of its lessons so they can employ it in their own struggles. Diffusion processes are important in this regard, but they merely complement the active pursuit of information pertaining to the civil rights movement by those wishing to engage in collective action here and abroad. The national anthem of the civil rights movement, "We Shall Overcome," con- tinues to energize and strengthen the resolve of social movements worldwide.

State Good

Must use institutions of the dominant order to make change.

Charlesworth 99(Hilary, prof and dir of the Centre for International and Public Law, Faculty of Law, Australian National U, April, *The American Journal International Law* 93 A.J.I.L. p.380)JM

[\*380] The philosopher Elizabeth Grosz has pointed out that feminist theorizing typically requires an unarticulated balance between two goals. Feminist analysis is at once a reaction to the "overwhelming masculinity of privileged and historically dominant knowledges, acting as a kind of counterweight to the imbalances resulting from the male monopoly of the production and reception of knowledges" and a response to the political goals of feminist struggles. n2 The dual commitments of feminist methods are in complex and uneasy coexistence. The first demands "intellectual rigor," investigating the hidden gender of the traditional canon. The second requires dedication to political change. The tension between the two leads to criticism of feminist theorists both from the masculine academy for lack of disinterested scholarship and objective analysis and from feminist activists for co-option by patriarchal forces through participation in male-structured debates. n3 Feminist methodologies challenge many accepted scholarly traditions. For example, they may clearly reflect a political agenda rather than strive to attain an objective truth on a neutral basis and they may appear personal rather than detached. For this reason, feminist methodologies are regularly seen as unscholarly, disruptive or mad. They are the techniques of outsiders and strangers. Just as nineteenth-century women writers used madness to symbolize escape from limited and enclosed lives, n4 so twentieth-century feminist scholars have developed dissonant methods to shake the complacent and bounded disciplines in which they work. At the same time, most feminists are constrained by their environment. If we want to achieve change, we must learn and use the language and methods of the dominant order.

The state can advance progress – human rights are an example.

Burke-White 4 (William W., Lecturer of Public and International Affairs at Princeton U., *The Harvard Environmental Law Review* v. 17, Spring, p. 266-267)JM

The social beliefs explanation begins from the proposition that individuals within human rights protecting states share a preference for a minimum set of protections of human rights. This assumption is appropriate for two reasons. First, according to liberal political science theory, state policy represents the preferences of some subset of the domestic policy. n100 If the observed state policy is to protect human rights, then at least some subset of the domestic policy must share that preference. Second, even if individuals within a domestic polity seek a variety of differentiated ends, basic respect for human rights allows individuals to pursue--to some degree at least--those ends as they define them. Liberal theory thus suggests that individuals within a human rights respecting state tend to support basic human rights provisions. The next step in the social beliefs argument is to recognize that respect for human rights has an inherently universalist tendency. n101 Unlike cultural or national rights, human rights are just that--human. They apply as much [\*267] to those individuals within a domestic polity as to those outside the polity. Such cosmopolitan liberalism indicates that "the more people are free, the better off all are." n102 The net result is that individuals within a human rights respecting state tend, on the average, to support the human rights of individuals in other states as well. Given a set of universalist human rights values in states that respect human rights, the policy articulated by the government may be one which respects human rights at home and demands their protection abroad. This belief in a thin set of universal human rights may cause the leadership of the state to frame its security policy around that belief structure and to refrain from aggressive acts that would violate the human rights of citizens at home or abroad. As Peter Katzenstein argues, "security interests are defined by actors who respond to cultural factors." n103 Acts of international aggression tend to impinge on the human rights of individuals in the target state and, at least temporarily, limit their freedom. After all, bombs, bullets, death and destruction are not consistent with respect for basic human rights. n104 Framed in the liberal international relations theory terms of policy interdependence, international aggression by State A imposes costs on State B, whose citizens' human rights will be infringed upon by the act of aggression. This infringement in turn imposes costs on citizens in State A, whose citizens have a preference for the protection of the human rights of citizens in both states. This shared value of respect for human rights thus may restrain State A from pursuing international aggression. n105 By contrast, a state which commits gross human rights violations against its own people will not be subject to this restraint. Such violations often occur when the government has been "captured" by a select minority that chooses to violate human rights. If the citizens themselves are not in favor of human rights at home, they are unlikely to be committed to the enforcement of human rights abroad. Where capture occurs, the government is not responsive to the preferences of the domestic polity. In such cases, even if there is a strong preference among citizens to protect human rights at home and abroad, the government is unlikely to respond to those interests and its policies will not be constrained by them.

State Good

The state is key to change - Without it, feminism is vacuous theorizing.

Young 90(Iris Marion, prof of Public and International Affairs at the U of Pittsburgh, *Throwing Like a Girl and Other Essays in Feminist Philosophy and Social Theory*, p. 89-90)JM

Within the context of antifeminist backlash, the effect of gynocentric feminism may be accommodating to the existing structure. Gynocentric feminism relies on and reinforces gender stereotypes at just the time when the dominant culture has put new emphasis on marks of gender difference. It does so, moreover, by relying on many of those aspects of women's traditional sphere that traditional patriarchal ideology has most exploited and that humanist feminists such as Beauvoir found most oppressive--reproductive biology, motherhood, s domestic concerns. Even though its intentions are subversive, such renewed attention to traditional femininity can have a reactionary effect on both ourselves and our listeners because it may echo the dominant claim that women belong in a separate sphere. Humanist feminism calls upon patriarchal society to open places for women within those spheres of human activity that have been considered the most creative, powerful, and prestigious. Gynocentric feminism replies that wanting such things for women implies a recognition that such activities are the most humanly valuable. It argues that in fact, militarism, bureaucratic hierarchy, competition for recognition, and the instrumentalization of nature and people entailed by these activities are basic disvalues.24 Yet in contemporary society, men still have most institutionalized power, and gynocentric feminism shows why they do not use it well. If feminism turns its back on the centers of power, privilege, and individual achievement that men have monopolized, those men will continue to monopolize them, and nothing significant will change. Feminists cannot undermine masculinist values without entering some of the centers of power that foster them, but the attainment of such power itself requires at least appearing to foster those values. Still, without being willing to risk such co optation, feminism can be only a moral position of critique rather than a force for institutional change. Despite its intention, I fear that gynocentric feminism may have the same consequence as the stance of moral motherhood that grew out of nineteenth century feminism a resegregation of women to a specifically women's sphere, outside the sites of power, privilege, and recognition. For me the symptom here is what the dominant culture finds more threatening. Within the dominant culture a middle aged assertive woman's claim to coanchor the news alongside a man appears considerably more threatening than women's claim to have a different voice that exposes masculinist values as body denying and selfish. The claim of women to have a right to the positions and benefits that have hitherto been reserved for men, and that male dominated institutions should serve women's needs, is a direct threat to male privilege. While the claim that these positions of power themselves should be eliminated and the institutions eliminated or restructured is indeed more radical, when asserted from the gynocentric feminist position it can be an objective retreat. Gynocentrism’s focus on values and language as the primary target of its critique contributes to this blunting of its political force. Without doubt, social change requires changing the subject, which in turn means developing new ways of speaking, writing, and imagining. Equally indubitable is the gynocentric feminist claim that masculinist values in Western culture deny the body, sensuality, and rootedness in nature and that such denial nurtures fascism, pollution, and nuclear games. Given these facts, however, what shall we do? To this gynocentrism has little concrete answer. Because its criticism of existing society is so global and abstract, gynocentric critique of values, language, and culture of masculinism can remove feminist theory from analysis of specific institutions and practices, and how they might be concretely structurally changed in directions more consonant with our visions.

State Good

Simple theory fails – we must use institutions.

Charlesworth 99(Hilary, prof and dir of the Centre for International and Public Law, Faculty of Law, Australian National U, April, *The American Journal International Law* 93 A.J.I.L. p.379)JM

[\*379] I have mixed feelings about participating in this symposium as the feminist voice. On the one hand, I want to support the symposium editors' attempt to broaden the standard categories of international legal methodologies by including feminism in this undertaking. On the other hand, I am conscious of the limits of my analysis and its unrepresentativeness -- the particularity of my nationality, race, class, sexuality, education and profession shapes my outlook and ideas on international law. I clearly cannot speak for all women participants in and observers of the international legal system. I also hope that one day I will stop being positioned always as a feminist and will qualify as a fully fledged international lawyer. My reservations are also more general because presenting feminism as one of seven rival methodological traditions may give a false sense of its nature. The symposium editors' memorandum to the participants encouraged a certain competitiveness: we were asked, "Why is your method better than others?" I cannot answer this question. I do not see feminist methods as ready alternatives to any of the other methods represented in this symposium. Feminist methods emphasize conversations and dialogue rather than the production of a single, triumphant truth. n1 They will not lead to neat "legal" answers because they are challenging the very categories of "law" and "nonlaw." Feminist methods seek to expose and question the limited bases of international law's claim to objectivity and impartiality and insist on the importance of gender relations as a category of analysis. The term "gender" here refers to the social construction of differences between women and men and ideas of "femininity" and "masculinity" -- the excess cultural baggage associated with biological sex.

We can use the state to fight against oppression and violence.

Derrida 2K (Jacques, French Philosopher, [http://culturemachine.tees.ac.uk/Cmach/Backissues/j002/articles/art\_derr.htm] AD: 6/28/10)JM

Q: Two essential problems of globalisation are the dissolution of the state and the impotence of politics. In your recently published text 'Cosmopolites de tous les pays, encore un effort!', you develop certain ideas concerning a new right to asylum and a new balance of power between the different places of the political in view of a possible new role of the city. How do you think philosophy could and should react to the problems mentioned with a kind of institutional fantasy? JD: I am not sure I understand what you call 'institutional fantasy'. All political experimentation like the initiative of the 'refugee city', despite its limits and its inevitably preliminary character, has in it a philosophical dimension. It requires us to interrogate the essence and the history of the state. All political innovation touches on philosophy. The 'true' political action always engages with a philosophy. All action, all political decision making, must invent its norm or rule. Such a gesture traverses or implies philosophy. Meanwhile, at the risk of appearing self-contradictory, I believe that one must fight against that which you call the 'dissolution of the state' (for the state can in turn limit the private forces of appropriation, the concentrations of economic power, it can retard a violent depoliticisation that acts in the name of the 'market'), and above all resist the state where it gives in too easily to the nationalism of the nation state or to the representation of socio-economic hegemony. Each time one must analyse, invent a new rule: here to contest the state, there to consolidate it. The realm of politics is not co-extensive with the state, contrary to what one believes nowadays. The necessary repoliticisation does not need to serve a new cult of the state. One ought to operate with new dissociations and accept complex and differentiated practices.

State Good

Critique grounded in discourse fails – it can’t undermine larger power structures.

Brown 1(Wendy, prof Political Science UC Berkeley, *Politics Out of History*, p. 35-37)JM

But here the problem goes well beyond superficiality of political analysis or compensatory gestures in the face of felt impotence. A moralistic, gestural politics often inadvertently becomes a regressive politics. Moralizing condemnation of the National Endowment for the Arts for not funding politically radical art, of the U.S. military or the White House for not embracing open homosexuality or sanctioning gay marriage, or even of the National Institutes of Health for not treating as a political priority the lives of HIV target populations (gay men, prostitutes, and drug addicts) conveys at best naive political expectations and at worst, patently confused ones. For this condemnation implicitly figures the state (and other mainstream institutions) as if it did not have specific political and economic investments, as if it were not the codification of various dominant social powers, but was, rather, a momentarily misguided parent who forgot her promise to treat all her children the same way. These expressions of moralistic outrage implicitly cast the state as if it were or could be a deeply democratic and nonviolent institution; conversely, it renders radical art, radical social movements, and various fringe populations as if they were not potentially subversive, representing a significant political challenge to the norms of the regime, but rather were benign entities and populations entirely appropriate for the state to equally protect, fund, and promote. Here, moralism’s objection to politics as a domain of power and history rather than principle is not simply irritating: it results in a troubling and confused political stance. It misleads about the nature of power, the state, and capitalism; it misleads about the nature of oppressive social forces, and about the scope of the project of transformation required by serious ambitions for justice. Such obfuscation is not the aim of the moralists but falls within that more general package of displaced effects consequent to a felt yet unacknowledged impotence. It signals disavowed despair over the prospects for more far-reaching transformations.

State Good

Benefits for women have long been achieved through the normative discourse of political structures

**Baldwin 97** (Margaret, Assoc. Prof Law @ FSU, Spring 1997, “Public Women and the Feminist State,” 20 Harv. Women’s L.J. 47, p 70)IM

Women have not been strangers to campaigns for and struggles with liberal state democracies. Feminists, especially feminist legal activists, have long participated in and sought benefits for all women within the political and judicial structures of the United State, Canada and the liberal states of Western Europe. The recent celebration of the 75th anniversary of the federal female suffrage in the United States is a reminder of the longevity and persistence of women’s demands for full political rights in this country, while the repeated defeat of a federal constitutional Equal Rights Amendment inspires continued activism. Successful campaigns for anti-discrimination legislation and litigation of gender-equity claims were significant advances for women achieved through the normative discourses and public institutions characteristic of liberal democracies. Women also have struggled in South Africa and in the former Soviet bloc to secure basic democratic guarantees. The continued integrity of the state systems through which these aims have been met is a matter toward which women cannot be indifferent, theoretically or otherwise.

Greater engagement, not rejection, of the modern state is key to solve

**Baldwin 97** (Margaret, Assoc. Prof Law @ FSU, Spring 1997, “Public Women and the Feminist State,” 20 Harv. Women’s L.J. 47, p 98)IM

Feminist political theorists advocate stronger models of group representation and participation as a structural response to this problem. These proposals draw significant inspiration from the role of consciousness-raising in feminist political practice. The intense involvement these proposals require of citizens, together with the locally based institutions upon which they depend, challenge the distanced, formalized decision-making that flattens women’s participation and furthers the false universalism of the interests represented in the public sphere. To that extent, feminists have participated in the localizing discourse characteristic of many modern attacks on the liberal state. Further, feminists often theorize “women” as a distinct political class, both within existing state borders and irrespective of state citizenships, thus advocating a form of nationalist identity independent of territorial affiliation. Women’s interests, and women’s commitments and conflicts, then are already deeply woven into the web of contemporary contests over the nature and future of the liberal state.

Working within dominant institutions subverts descriptive dichotomies, to include women

**Baldwin 97** (Margaret, Assoc. Prof Law @ FSU, Spring 1997, “Public Women and the Feminist State,” 20 Harv. Women’s L.J. 47, p 102)IM

This wide-angle presentation inevitably forfeits the complexity and nuance of a more tightly focused and thoroughly rendered account of a single aspect of women’s public or private experience. Yet I hope to recoup that loss by the gain in theoretical perspective accessed by the broader view. As Carole Pateman has suggested, such a framework may also be able to deconstruct the descriptive dichotomies that ensnare our theoretical imaginations and tell lies about the conditions of women’s real lives. The recognition that women are situated in one form or another “as women” in both private and public spheres already begins to undermine feminism’s typical understanding of women’s central political challenge as the movement from wholesale exclusion to public inclusion. Carole Pateman explains: “A feminist strategy that calls for the integration into citizenship of women’s distinctive contribution … rests on the assumption that ‘women’ and ‘difference’ need to be brought into the political order. The pertinent question is assumed to be whether sexual difference is politically relevant, or how ‘difference’ could be relevant. Thus the vital question is overlooked of how to subvert and change the manner in which women have already been incorporated, and so to transform the relation between ‘equality’ (men) and ‘difference’ (women).” The fact that the public sphere already includes women, even if not as full, self-determining citizens, suggests that the matter of inclusion is already more complicated than a single focus on women’s relegation to the private sphere might imply. Consequently, to the extent that a wide-angle perspective can account for the differential treatment of women within and across the public and private spheres, the more comprehensive the analysis of women’s political situation.

Law Good/Perm Solvency

Laws should be used to promote effective promotion of women’s rights

**Fellmeth 2k** (Aaron, Int. Rel. @ Yale, Human Rights Quarterly 22(3), p. 658-733)IM

The criticism of international law theory itself offered by Charlesworth and her colleagues in the American Journal of International Law is helpful insofar as it identifies a serious systemic procedural inequity that women are significantly (though not entirely) excluded from state participation in the formation of international law. However, this criticism does not offer an alternative theory of law. Nor does it challenge law per se; it merely challenges the equity of the composition of its organs as well as some of the substantive results of the world public order. After all, human rights are only one part of international law. In any case, this criticism is weakened by the fact that most feminists have, so far, largely ignored the progress of the international legal system in its substantive standards protecting women's rights. The argument that international law is really just "international men's law" would have been much more convincing prior to 1945. Charlesworth, Chinkin, and Wright really do not take issue directly with the international legal system except insofar as it reflects the pattern of male dominance at the state level. [End Page 730] A critique of the international legal system must also assess the extent to which international law has incorporated a "woman's voice" reflective of women's experiences and has, in fact, protected the rights it promises them on paper. Such a critique must conclude that, since the Second World War, international law has increasingly emphasized equality, inclusiveness, cooperation, caring about individuals, and other aspects of the ethic of care, but that progress remains inadequate. It is, however, adequate to prove that feminists should not discount reform of existing laws, instead of rejection of them, as a means of progress.

Empirically proven – redistribution of rights is effectively initiated through the state, the feminist movement hasn’t found its medium yet

**Morris 99** (Aldon, Sociology @ Northwestern, Annual Review of Sociology vol. 25, p. 529)IM

The most distinctive aspect of the modem civil rights movement was its demonstration that an oppressed, relatively powerless group, can generate so- cial change, through the oppressive state, with the widespread use of social protest. For nearly two dec- ades, this movement perfected the art of social protest. The far ranging and complex social protest it generated did not emerge immediately. Rather it evolved through time making use of trial and error. By the mid 1950s Southern Black leaders had not yet fully grasped the idea that the fate of Jim Crow rested in the hands of the Black masses. Even though protest against racial inequality occurred throughout the first half of the cen- tury, it tended to be localized and limited in scope. With the exception of the Garvey Movement and A Philip Randolph's March On Washington Move- ment (MOWM), the mass base of the prior protests was too restricted to threaten the Jim Crow order. Both the Garvey and MOWM movements had limited goals and were relatively short lived. By 1950 the legal method was the dominant weapon of Black protest, and it required skilled lawyers rather than mass action. The legal method depended on the actions of elites external to the Black community whereby Blacks had to hope that white judges and Supreme Court justices would issue favorable rulings in response to well-reasoned and well-argued court cases. The 1955 Montgomery, Alabama, year-long mass-based bus boycott and the unfolding decade of Black protest changed all this. These developments thrust the power capable of overthrowing Jim Crow into the hands of the Black community. Outside elites, including the courts, the Federal Government, and sympathetic whites, would still have roles to play. However, massive Black protest dictated that those roles would be in response to Black collective action rather than as catalysts for change in the racial order. A decisive shift in the power equation between whites and Blacks grew out of the struggle to desegre- gate Alabama buses.

Alternative Causes

The problem is enforcement of laws, not the existence of laws in the first place

**Fellmeth 2k** (Aaron, Int. Rel. @ Yale, Human Rights Quarterly 22(3), p. 658-733)IM

Most importantly, reform should be directed to the inadequate enforcement of human rights law. Women suffer disproportionately when human rights laws go underenforced, which may contribute to the perception of patriarchal legal systems. In contrast, the disproportionate emphasis on economic law enforcement benefits men disproportionately, given their control over the world's economic assets. While the international community has not agreed upon the creation of a human rights enforcement authority with direct police powers, law can leverage improvement in state attention to women's interests through a variety of mechanisms, from economic sanctions to public opinion. International fora provide women with the opportunity to broadcast their concerns worldwide, establish women's interests on the international agenda, and engage in a multilogue that may lead to agreement upon human rights norms that transcend cultural differences, as Nader has opined. 315 [End Page 732] An expanding core of human rights, including the rights of women, has traveled from support in public opinion to the rhetoric of elites to international legal instruments and the formation of some monitoring and reporting institutions. It is time for a telling additional step of holding states accountable for the realization of the standards they espouse. Feminists should not gratuitously reject law and its processes. Neglect of the existing tools of law supporting the advancement of women, rejection of "masculine" institutions and social control techniques, or categorical rejection of assistance based upon its source in the "wrong" gender or ethnicity waste a major asset for the advancement of the feminist political and social agendas.

Discourse Doesn’t Shape Reality

Discussions of theoretical academics don’t actually influence policymaking.

Tuathail 96(Gearóid, Professor of Government and International Affairs atVirginia Tech, “The patterned mess of history and the writing of critical geopolitics: a reply to Dalby, Political Geography”, AQB)

While theoretical debates at academic conferences are important to academics, the discourse and concerns of foreign-policy decisionmakers are quite different, so different that they constitute a distinctive problemsolving, theory-averse, policy-making subculture. There is a danger that academics assume that the discourses they engage are more significant in the practice of foreign policy and the exercise of power than they really are. This is not, however, to minimize the obvious importance of academia as a general institutional structure among many that sustain certain epistemic communities in particular states. In general, I do not disagree with Dalby’s fourth point about politics and discourse except to note that his statement-‘Precisely because reality could be represented in particular ways political decisions could be taken, troops and material moved and war fought’-evades the important question of agency that I noted in my review essay. The assumption that it is representations that make action possible is inadequate by itself. Political, military and economic structures, institutions, discursive networks and leadership are all crucial in explaining social action and should be theorized together with representational practices. Both here and earlier, Dalby’s reasoning inclines towards a form of idealism. In response to Dalby’s fifth point (with its three subpoints), it is worth noting, first, that his book is about the CPD, not the Reagan administration. He analyzes certain CPD discourses, root the geographical reasoning practices of the Reagan administration nor its public-policy reasoning on national security. Dalby’s book is narrowly textual; the general contextuality of the Reagan administration is not dealt with. Second, let me simply note that I find that the distinction between critical theorists and poststructuralists is a little too rigidly and heroically drawn by Dalby and others. Third, Dalby’s interpretation of the reconceptualization of national security in Moscow as heavily influenced by dissident peace researchers in Europe is highly idealist, an interpretation that ignores the structural and ideological crises facing the Soviet elite at that time. Gorbachev’s reforms and his new security discourse were also strongly selfinterested, an ultimately futile attempt to save the Communist Party and a discredited regime of power from disintegration. The issues raised by Simon Dalby in his comment are important ones for all those interested in the practice of critical geopolitics. While I agree with Dalby that questions of discourse are extremely important ones for political geographers to engage, there is a danger of fetishizing this concern with discourse so that we neglect the institutional and the sociological, the materialist and the cultural, the political and the geographical contexts within which particular discursive strategies become significant. Critical geopolitics, in other words, should not be a prisoner of the sweeping ahistorical cant that sometimes accompanies ‘poststructuralism nor convenient reading strategies like the identity politics narrative; it needs to always be open to the patterned mess that is human history.

There is nothing outside of discourse, it is simply discourse.

Kaufman 95(Jill, professor, Department of Speech Communication And Dramatic Arts, Central Michigan University “Other ways: Postmodernism and performance praxis” The Southern Communication Journal Vol. 60, Iss. 3; pg. 222, 11 pgs proquest)AQB

If the lack of consistency between postmodernism's self-styled allegiance to the oppositional and its collaboration with the existing state of academic practice were its only shortcoming, it should be enough to prevent us from unquestioningly embracing it as a theory. More disquieting still, however, is its postulation of the way the world around us works. Theory that presumes to talk about culture must stand the test of reality. Or, as Andrew King states, "culture is where we live and are sustained. Any doctrine that strikes at its root ought to be carefully scrutinized" (personal communication, February 11, 1994). If one subjects the premise of postmodernism to scrutiny, the consequences are both untenable and disturbing. In its elevation of language to the primary analysis of social life and its relegation of the de-centered subject to a set of language positions, postmodernism ignores the way real people make their way in the world. While the notion of decentering does much to remedy the idea of an essential, unchanging self, it also presents problems. According to Clarke (1991): Having established the material quality of ideology, everything else we had hitherto thought of as material has disappeared. There is nothing outside of ideology (or discourse). Where Althusser was concerned with ideology as the imaginary relations of subjects to the real relations of their existence, the connective quality of this view of ideology has been dissolved because it lays claim to an outside, a real, an extra-discursive for which there exists no epistemological warrant without lapsing back into the bad old ways of empiricism or metaphysics. (pp. 25-26) Clarke explains how the same disconnection between the discursive and the extra-discursive has been performed in semiological analysis: Where it used to contain a relation between the signifier (the representation) and the signified (the referent), antiempiricism has taken the formal arbitrariness of the connection between the signifier and signified and replaced it with the abolition of the signified (there can be no real objects out there, because there is no out there for real objects to be). (p. 26)

Discourse Doesn’t Shape Reality

Prefer policy analysis – Only way to question social constructions.

Kaufman 95(Jill, professor, Department of Speech Communication And Dramatic Arts, Central Michigan University “Other ways: Postmodernism and performance praxis” The Southern Communication Journal Vol. 60, Iss. 3; pg. 222, 11 pgs proquest)AQB

The fact that government and big business fund approximately 90 percent of sociological study, not to study people in government and big business, but to investigate others who are not in power (Reynolds, 1990), explains how disciplinary emphases are shaped by those in authority. Performing dominance would help to emphasize the institutional conditions of authority and power that, as Merod (1987) declares, "separate people from the democratic control of their environment" (p. 188). Such a study will prove increasingly important in the future when bureaucratic structures of power will control more information about our personal lives. Williams and Sjborg maintain that powerful "Others" are the ones who social scientists are reluctant to understand because "knowledge of such persons could undermine the legitimacy of the upper sectors of society" (1993, p. 190). Performance of power would include narratives of corporate executives, politicians, lawyers, teachers, judges, doctors, researchers, military commanders, public administrators, school officials, and law enforcement personnel. These people are "Other" to many of us, but because their values set the standard for our own comfortable middle class lives, we often do not perceive them as such.(8) Performance of whiteness poses the problem of introducing still another monolithic category to our practice and would thus have to be approached with the kind of caution required for all such performances. Labeling it as such, however, would hold two potential advantages. Performance of whiteness would expand the texts now under consideration to include white supremacy groups, skinheads, and other organizations whose rise in this country and throughout the world should not be ignored. While they usually lack the institutional power of the other groups mentioned, their narratives hold an obvious key to explaining the denial and fear that more subtly motivate those with institutional power. Performance of whiteness and power also offers an opportunity to white people to perceive ourselves as "Other." It enables us to deconstruct what Connor (1989) calls "the very structures of the dominant and marginal" by critiquing the dominant (p.233). As a corollary to performance of whiteness, we might perform the fragmented process by which we build perceptions of someone who is different from us. This performance of our sense of difference might focus upon the political, economic, sexual, and ethnic shards that construct "Otherness." Such a process would help us respond to hook's (1992) proposal to "interrogate the way assuming the position of an outsider looking in, as well as interpreter, can, and often does, pervert and distort one's perspective" (pp. 152-53). As Kozol (1992) recommends: "More people have to concentrate on how we perpetrate the distortions" involved in perceptions of people as "Others."

Discourse of the “other” can create negative images that trivialize the other.

Kaufman 95(Jill, professor, Department of Speech Communication And Dramatic Arts, Central Michigan University “Other ways: Postmodernism and performance praxis” The Southern Communication Journal Vol. 60, Iss. 3; pg. 222, 11 pgs proquest)AQB

I did not want to participate in creating the illusion that if, one, say, goes to an auditorium...and hears someone speak about conditions in one country or another and then has wine and cheese afterward with the person who is speaking and goes home to the life and the life does not change at all...that one has done their part. (pp. 63-64) Consuming audiences tend to respond well to the assurance that there is no threat of real difference that might require change in thought or action. In the service of this reassurance, commodification of other cultures fosters stereotypes. Simplified, static, easily accessible images are packaged and projected, fitting into pre-established frames of reference. These fixed forms, presenting essentialist ideas of a group of people, may be positive as well as negative. As hooks (1990, 1992) points out, good stereotypes and imagery can also be damaging. Romantic and essentialized images of oppressed people can trivialize their struggle. Lumping people together in categories of "Other" can have the same effect. Groups are conferred with clusters of common attributes based primarily upon their relative lack of power within the social hierarchy. Imposition of the "Other" label masks distinctions within a group, such as race, class, sex, age, sexual preference, values, religion, politics, and geographic genealogy. Individuals from marginalized groups object to the double standard by which individuals from the dominant culture can see themselves as unique but thrust upon "Others" the burden of being a spokesperson for the entire group of which their perceived "Otherness" makes them a member (Moore, 1992; White, 1992). In discourses of subjectivity, details about a person matter. As Minh-ha (1989) reasons, details about a person help to rewrite them as subject (42).

Discourse Doesn’t Shape Reality

Using discourse as a logical mode of realities production is impossible.

Rodwell 5(Jonathan, Lecturer in Politics at Manchester Metropolitan University Department of Philosophy and Politics, “Trendy But Empty: A Response to Richard Jackson” )AQB

Next, discourse analysis as practiced exists within an enormous logical cul-de-sac. Born of the original premise that each discourse and explanation has it’s own realities, what results is a theoretical approach in which a critique is actually impossible because by post-structural logic a critique can only operate within it’s own discursive structure and on it’s own terms. If things only exist within specific languages and discourse you must share the basic premises of that discourse to be able to say anything about it. But what useful criticisms can you make if you share fundamental assumptions? Moreover remembering the much argued for normative purposes of Jackson’s case he talks about the effects of naturalizing language and without blushing criticises the dangerous anti-terror rhetoric of George W. Bush. The only problem is Jackson has attempted to illustrate that what is moral or immoral depends on the values and structures of each discourse. Therefore why should a reader believe Richard Jackson’s idea of right and wrong any more than George W. Bush’s? Fundamentally if he wishes to maintain that each discourse is specific to each intellectual framework Jackson cannot criticise at all. By his own epistemological rules if he is inside those discourses he shares their assumptions, outside they make no sense What actually occurs then is an aporia - a logical contraction where a works own stated epistemological premises rob it of the ability to contain any critical force. Such arguments are caught between the desire to maintain that all discursive practices construct their own truths, in which case critiques are not possible as they are merely one of countless possible discursive truths with no actually reason to take then seriously, or an appeal to material reality, but again the entire premises of post structural linguistics rejects the idea of a material reality.**[vii]** In starting from a premise that it is not possible to neutrally describe the real world, the result is that without that real world, discourse analysis actually has nothing to say.

History is the dominant tool that shapes reality.

Rodwell 5(Jonathan, Lecturer in Politics at Manchester Metropolitan University Department of Philosophy and Politics, “Trendy But Empty: A Response to Richard Jackson” )AQB

The issue of the material real world, or ‘evidence’ is actually the issue at the heart of the weakness of post-structural discourse analysis, though it does hold the potential to at least rescue some of it’s usefulness. The problem is simple, in that the only way Jackson or any post-structuralist can operationalise their argument is with an appeal to material evidence. But by the logic of discourse analysis there is no such thing as neutral ‘evidence’. To square this circle many post-struturalist writers do seem to hint at complexity and what post-structural culturalists might call ‘intertextuality’, arguing for ‘favouring a complexity of interactions’ rather than ‘linear causality’**[viii]**. The implication is that language is just one of an endless web of factors and surely this prompts one to pursue an understanding of these links. However, to do so would dangerously undermine the entire post-structural project as again, if there are discoverable links between factors, then there are material facts that are identifiable regardless of language. Consequently, rather than seeking to understand the links between factors what seems to happen is hands are thrown up in despair as the search for complexity is dropped as quickly as it is picked up. The result is one-dimensional arguments that again can say little. This is evident in Jackson’s approach as he details how words have histories and moreover are part of a dialectic process in which ‘they not only shape social structures but are also shaped by them’.[ix] However we do not then see any discussion of whether, therefore, it is not discourse that is the powerful tool but the effect of the history and the social structure itself. Throughout Jackson’s argument it is a top down process in which discourse disciplines society to follow the desire of the dominant, but here is an instance of a dialectic process where society may actually be the originating force, allowing the discourse in turn to actually to be more powerful. However we simply see no exploration of this potential dialectic process, merely the suggestion it exists.

Discourse Doesn’t Shape Reality

Language doesn’t change the material.

Rodwell 5(Jonathan, Lecturer in Politics at Manchester Metropolitan University Department of Philosophy and Politics, “Trendy But Empty: A Response to Richard Jackson” )AQB

Consequently because there is no interaction between the language the culture and the material then there is not much that can actually be done. All that is done is to repeatedly detail the instances where the same tropes occur time and time again and suggest they have an impact.[x] What cannot be explained however is why those tropes exist or how they have an influence. So, for example, Jackson is unable to explain how the idea that the members of the emergency services attending the scene at the World Trade Centre on 9/11 were heroes is a useful trope disciplining the populace via the tool of Hollywood blockbusters and popular entertainments heroes. All he is able to claim is that lots of films have heroes, lots of stories have heroes and people like heroes. All might be true but what exactly is the point? And how do we actually know the language has the prescribed effect? Indeed how do we know people don’t support the villain in films instead of heroes?

Focus on D-Course Fails

Discourses inevitable – We won’t ever be able to escape because language also acts as a barrier.

Eagleton 96(Terry, Distinguished Professor of English Literature at the University of Lancaster “The illusions of postmodernism” Pg. 12)AQB

**Grasping the shape of a totality requires some tiresomely rigorous thought**, which is one reason why those who don't need to do it can revel in ambiguity and indeterminacy. There are those who need to know roughly how things stand with them in order to be free, and those for whom phrases like 'how things stand' smack of objectivism, scientism, phallocentrism, transcendentally disinterested subjects and a number of other creepy affairs. (There would also seem to be those for whom utterances like 'Lord John Russell then became Prime Minister' are insidious instances of 'positivism'.) **In the imagi­nary epoch we are postulating**, we might expect that a good deal of blood and ink would be spilt over questions of epistemology - oddly, in a way, since **this is hardly the most world-shaking area of philosophical inquiry.** But there would presumably be a need to account for how and whether we can know the world in the face of the apparent collapse of some classical epistemological models, a collapse closely related to the loss of a sense of political agency. For practice is of course one of the primary ways in which we encounter the world; and if any very ambitious forms of it are denied us, then it is not long before we will catch ourselves wondering whether there is really anything out there, or at least anything quite so fascinating as ourselves. Perhaps **we are all simply trapped within the prison house of our discourse**. It is a revealing metaphor, which grasps **language as obstacle rather than hori­zon**, and one could imagine a bodily analogy to it: If **only I could get out of my own head I could see whether there was anything out there. If only I could escape from behind the walls of my body I could encounter the world directly. As it is,** I have to operate upon it in this lumbering, long-range fash­ion. But **a body of course just is a way of acting upon the world, a mode of access to it, a point from which a world is coherently organized.** \*A body is where there is something to be done\ as Maurice Merleau-Ponty once put it. **Just the same is true of language, the inside of which is also an outside, whose 'interior' is constituted as a ceaseless opening to an 'exterior', a constant self-surpassing or surge towards objects.**

A2 Imperialsim

Imperialism Good

An imperialist hegemon in society is a necessity, without it our world would see civilization reduce itself to anarchic and barbaric ways of life

Ferguson 4 (Niall, Prof of History at NYU Stern, Foreign Policy, “A World Without Power”, <http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2004/07/01/a_world_without_power>) MAT

Critics of U.S. global dominance should pause and consider the alternative. If the United States retreats from its hegemonic role, who would supplant it? Not Europe, not China, not the Muslim world—and certainly not the United Nations. Unfortunately, the alternative to a single superpower is not a multilateral utopia, but the anarchic nightmare of a new Dark Age. We tend to assume that power, like nature, abhors a vacuum. In the history of world politics, it seems, someone is always the hegemon, or bidding to become it. Today, it is the United States; a century ago, it was the United Kingdom. Before that, it was France, Spain, and so on. The famed 19th-century German historian Leopold von Ranke, doyen of the study of statecraft, portrayed modern European history as an incessant struggle for mastery, in which a balance of power was possible only through recurrent conflict. The influence of economics on the study of diplomacy only seems to confirm the notion that history is a competition between rival powers. In his bestselling 1987 work, The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers: Economic Change and Military Conflict from 1500 to 2000, Yale University historian Paul Kennedy concluded that, like all past empires, the U.S. and Russian superpowers would inevitably succumb to overstretch. But their place would soon be usurped, Kennedy argued, by the rising powers of China and Japan, both still unencumbered by the dead weight of imperial military commitments. In his 2001 book, The Tragedy of Great Power Politics, University of Chicago political scientist John J. Mearsheimer updates Kennedy's account. Having failed to succumb to overstretch, and after surviving the German and Japanese challenges, he argues, the United States must now brace for the ascent of new rivals. “[A] rising China is the most dangerous potential threat to the United States in the early twenty-first century,” contends Mearsheimer. “[T]he United States has a profound interest in seeing Chinese economic growth slow considerably in the years ahead.” China is not the only threat Mearsheimer foresees. The European Union (EU) too has the potential to become “a formidable rival.” Power, in other words, is not a natural monopoly; the struggle for mastery is both perennial and universal. The “unipolarity” identified by some commentators following the Soviet collapse cannot last much longer, for the simple reason that history hates a hyperpower. Sooner or later, challengers will emerge, and back we must go to a multipolar, multipower world. But what if these esteemed theorists are all wrong? What if the world is actually heading for a period when there is no hegemon? What if, instead of a balance of power, there is an absence of power? Such a situation is not unknown in history. Although the chroniclers of the past have long been preoccupied with the achievements of great powers—whether civilizations, empires, or nation-states—they have not wholly overlooked eras when power receded. Unfortunately, the world's experience with power vacuums (eras of “apolarity,” if you will) is hardly encouraging. Anyone who dislikes U.S. hegemony should bear in mind that, rather than a multipolar world of competing great powers, a world with no hegemon at all may be the real alternative to U.S. primacy. Apolarity could turn out to mean an anarchic new Dark Age: an era of waning empires and religious fanaticism; of endemic plunder and pillage in the world's forgotten regions; of economic stagnation and civilization's retreat into a few fortified enclaves.

Imperialism Good

History proves that any future without a dominant expansionist nation acting within global society spurs on a world in which chaos and discontinuity pervades all parts of the globe

Ferguson 4 (Niall, Prof of History at NYU Stern, Foreign Policy, “A World Without Power”, <http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2004/07/01/a_world_without_power>) MAT

Suppose, in a worst-case scenario, that U.S. neoconservative hubris is humbled in Iraq and that the Bush administration's project to democratize the Middle East at gunpoint ends in ignominious withdrawal, going from empire to decolonization in less than two years. Suppose also that no aspiring rival power shows interest in filling the resulting vacuums—not only in coping with Iraq but conceivably also Afghanistan, the Balkans, and Haiti. What would an apolar future look like? The answer is not easy, as there have been very few periods in world history with no contenders for the role of global, or at least regional, hegemon. The nearest approximation in modern times could be the 1920s, when the United States walked away from President Woodrow Wilson's project of global democracy and collective security centered on the League of Nations. There was certainly a power vacuum in Central and Eastern Europe after the collapse of the Romanov, Habsburg, Hohenzollern, and Ottoman empires, but it did not last long. The old West European empires were quick to snap up the choice leftovers of Ottoman rule in the Middle East. The Bolsheviks had reassembled the czarist empire by 1922. And by 1936, German revanche was already far advanced. One must go back much further in history to find a period of true and enduring apolarity; as far back, in fact, as the ninth and 10th centuries. In this era, the remains of the Roman Empire—Rome and Byzantium—receded from the height of their power. The leadership of the West was divided between the pope, who led Christendom, and the heirs of Charlemagne, who divided up his short-lived empire under the Treaty of Verdun in 843. No credible claimant to the title of emperor emerged until Otto was crowned in 962, and even he was merely a German prince with pretensions (never realized) to rule Italy. Byzantium, meanwhile, was dealing with the Bulgar rebellion to the north. By 900, the Abbasid caliphate initially established by Abu al-Abbas in 750 had passed its peak; it was in steep decline by the middle of the 10th century. In China, too, imperial power was in a dip between the T'ang and Sung dynasties. Both these empires had splendid capitals—Baghdad and Ch'ang-an—but neither had serious aspirations of territorial expansion. The weakness of the old empires allowed new and smaller entities to flourish. When the Khazar tribe converted to Judaism in 740, their khanate occupied a Eurasian power vacuum between the Black Sea and the Caspian Sea. In Kiev, far from the reach of Byzantium, the regent Olga laid the foundation for the future Russian Empire in 957 when she converted to the Orthodox Church. The Seljuks—forebears of the Ottoman Turks—carved the Sultanate of Rum as the Abbasid caliphate lost its grip over Asia Minor. Africa had its mini-empire in Ghana; Central America had its Mayan civilization. Connections between these entities were minimal or nonexistent. This condition was the antithesis of globalization. It was a world broken up into disconnected, introverted civilizations. One feature of the age was that, in the absence of strong secular polities, religious questions often produced serious convulsions. Indeed, religious institutions often set the political agenda. In the eighth and ninth centuries, Byzantium was racked by controversy over the proper role of icons in worship. By the 11th century, the pope felt confident enough to humble Holy Roman Emperor Henry IV during the battle over which of them should have the right to appoint bishops. The new monastic orders amassed considerable power in Christendom, particularly the Cluniacs, the first order to centralize monastic authority. In the Muslim world, it was the ulema (clerics) who truly ruled. This atmosphere helps explain why the period ended with the extraordinary holy wars known as the Crusades, the first of which was launched by European Christians in 1095. Yet, this apparent clash of civilizations was in many ways just another example of the apolar world's susceptibility to long-distance military raids directed at urban centers by more backward peoples. The Vikings repeatedly attacked West European towns in the ninth century—Nantes in 842, Seville in 844, to name just two. One Frankish chronicler lamented “the endless flood of Vikings” sweeping southward. Byzantium, too, was sacked in 860 by raiders from Rus, the kernel of the future Russia. This “fierce and savage tribe” showed “no mercy,” lamented the Byzantine patriarch. It was like “the roaring sea … destroying everything, sparing nothing.” Such were the conditions of an anarchic age. Small wonder that the future seemed to lie in creating small, defensible, political units: the Venetian republic—the quintessential city-state, which was conducting its own foreign policy by 840—or Alfred the Great's England, arguably the first thing resembling a nation-state in European history, created in 886.

Hegemony Good

The lack of a unipolar system with a stable, hegemonic power at its core would lead to apolarity, a state of being described by conflict, plagues, piracy, and nuclear war

Ferguson 4 (Niall, Prof of History at NYU Stern, Foreign Policy, “A World Without Power”, <http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2004/07/01/a_world_without_power>) MAT

Could an apolar world today produce an era reminiscent of the age of Alfred? It could, though with some important and troubling differences. Certainly, one can imagine the world's established powers—the United States, Europe, and China—retreating into their own regional spheres of influence. But what of the growing pretensions to autonomy of the supranational bodies created under U.S. leadership after the Second World War? The United Nations, the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, and the World Trade Organization (formerly the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade) each considers itself in some way representative of the “international community.” Surely their aspirations to global governance are fundamentally different from the spirit of the Dark Ages? Yet universal claims were also an integral part of the rhetoric of that era. All the empires claimed to rule the world; some, unaware of the existence of other civilizations, maybe even believed that they did. The reality, however, was not a global Christendom, nor an all-embracing Empire of Heaven. The reality was political fragmentation. And that is also true today. The defining characteristic of our age is not a shift of power upward to supranational institutions, but downward. With the end of states' monopoly on the means of violence and the collapse of their control over channels of communication, humanity has entered an era characterized as much by disintegration as integration. If free flows of information and of means of production empower multinational corporations and nongovernmental organizations (as well as evangelistic religious cults of all denominations), the free flow of destructive technology empowers both criminal organizations and terrorist cells. These groups can operate, it seems, wherever they choose, from Hamburg to Gaza. By contrast, the writ of the international community is not global at all. It is, in fact, increasingly confined to a few strategic cities such as Kabul and Pristina. In short, it is the nonstate actors who truly wield global power—including both the monks and the Vikings of our time. So what is left? Waning empires. Religious revivals. Incipient anarchy. A coming retreat into fortified cities. These are the Dark Age experiences that a world without a hyperpower might quickly find itself reliving. The trouble is, of course, that this Dark Age would be an altogether more dangerous one than the Dark Age of the ninth century. For the world is much more populous—roughly 20 times more—so friction between the world's disparate “tribes” is bound to be more frequent. Technology has transformed production; now human societies depend not merely on freshwater and the harvest but also on supplies of fossil fuels that are known to be finite. Technology has upgraded destruction, too, so it is now possible not just to sack a city but to obliterate it. For more than two decades, globalization—the integration of world markets for commodities, labor, and capital—has raised living standards throughout the world, except where countries have shut themselves off from the process through tyranny or civil war. The reversal of globalization—which a new Dark Age would produce—would certainly lead to economic stagnation and even depression. As the United States sought to protect itself after a second September 11 devastates, say, Houston or Chicago, it would inevitably become a less open society, less hospitable for foreigners seeking to work, visit, or do business. Meanwhile, as Europe's Muslim enclaves grew, Islamist extremists' infiltration of the EU would become irreversible, increasing trans-Atlantic tensions over the Middle East to the breaking point. An economic meltdown in China would plunge the Communist system into crisis, unleashing the centrifugal forces that undermined previous Chinese empires. Western investors would lose out and conclude that lower returns at home are preferable to the risks of default abroad. The worst effects of the new Dark Age would be felt on the edges of the waning great powers. The wealthiest ports of the global economy—from New York to Rotterdam to Shanghai—would become the targets of plunderers and pirates. With ease, terrorists could disrupt the freedom of the seas, targeting oil tankers, aircraft carriers, and cruise liners, while Western nations frantically concentrated on making their airports secure. Meanwhile, limited nuclear wars could devastate numerous regions, beginning in the Korean peninsula and Kashmir, perhaps ending catastrophically in the Middle East. In Latin America, wretchedly poor citizens would seek solace in Evangelical Christianity imported by U.S. religious orders. In Africa, the great plagues of AIDS and malaria would continue their deadly work. The few remaining solvent airlines would simply suspend services to many cities in these continents; who would wish to leave their privately guarded safe havens to go there? For all these reasons, the prospect of an apolar world should frighten us today a great deal more than it frightened the heirs of Charlemagne. If the United States retreats from global hegemony—its fragile self-image dented by minor setbacks on the imperial frontier—its critics at home and abroad must not pretend that they are ushering in a new era of multipolar harmony, or even a return to the good old balance of power. Be careful what you wish for. The alternative to unipolarity would not be multipolarity at all. It would be apolarity—a global vacuum of power. And far more dangerous forces than rival great powers would benefit from such a not-so-new world disorder.

A2: US is Imperialist

Generalizing the US as an empire is untrue; doing so would allow many others to be characterized similarly.

Motyl in 6 (Alexander J., Prof of Poli-Sci at Rutgers Univ, Foreign Affairs, “Empire Falls”, <http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/61764/alexander-j-motyl/empire-falls>, p. 1) MAT

Matthew Connelly begins his contribution to the SSRC's Lessons of Empire with a puzzle: "Scholars of empire have to ask themselves why, after several decades of research and teaching, almost all of it critical of imperialism and its legacies, we seem not to have had the slightest impact." One good answer can be found in the conclusion to George Steinmetz's essay in the same volume: "A preferable way of avoiding having one's work functionalized for empire, to avoid the 'ear of the prince,' is to try to create accounts that are ontologically and epistemologically adequate to the processual, conjunctural, contingent nature of social life, and hence irreducible to simple policy statements." Ontological and epistemological adequacy may not do the trick, but stylistic opacity and intentional irrelevance will surely kill a putative prince's interest in academic writing. Sheldon Pollock's piece wanders even further into academic obscurantism, arguing that "contemporary discussions of the lessons past empires may have for present ones make several assumptions that must come as a surprise to anyone who has followed the debates on historical knowledge over the past few decades. One is that we really can acquire true knowledge of history; another is that this knowledge is useful to us, that we will benefit by acting upon its truth." Oddly enough, the book's editors share some of this skepticism about the relevance of history to the present, writing that "the lessons of studying past empires reinforce a cautious attitude toward claims made about the present." That may be so, but if historians really believe that they have little to say to policymakers, why write such books in the first place? One can draw lessons from the past only if one believes that history is real, that knowledge of history is possible, and that such knowledge can be packaged appropriately. Assuming one accepts these propositions, one then has to identify conceptual similarities between the objects to be compared and the contexts within which they exist and then develop meaningful theories of causality. Lessons of empire can be drawn, in other words, only if the United States is or has an empire and only if the foreign policy environment in which it pursues its supposedly imperial aims is comparable to that of past empires. It is that simple. If the United States is not an empire, or does not have one, there is nothing more to say about this particular subject. In Among Empires, Maier tries to sidestep this problem by claiming that "the United States reveals many, but not all -- at least not yet -- of the traits that have distinguished empires." But if the United States does not share all the defining characteristics of empires, then it is not an empire, and there is little reason to believe that valid lessons of imperial history will apply to it. After all, the United States shares "many, but not all" traits (such as bigness, multiethnicity, and arrogance) with non-empires such as Brazil, Canada, France, and Indonesia, so why not draw lessons from their experiences with equal justification?

A2: US is Imperalist

The US isn’t characterized as an empire now, and it would be conceptually impossible to attempt to become one

Motyl 6 (Alexander J., Prof of Poli-Sci at Rutgers Univ, Foreign Affairs, “Empire Falls”, <http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/61764/alexander-j-motyl/empire-falls>, p. 3) MAT

Not only is the United States not an empire, but it probably could not become one today. Several decades ago, the political scholar Rein Taagepera -- who, distressingly, is not mentioned by any of the authors in the books under review -- plotted the life spans of empires, graphically demonstrating what is now the conventional wisdom: empires have been among the most durable, stable, and successful political entities of all time. Empire actually works -- or, rather, worked -- quite well. Despite empire's long and venerable track record, however, there are strong reasons to think that empire building is no longer a viable political project. Imperial states have acquired territory in three ways: by marriage, by purchase, and by conquest. Marriage no longer works, as no contemporary ruler (not even a dictator) claims to own the territory he rules. Purchase is a dead end, as all the world's land is divided among jealous states and oftentimes empowered populations. Conquest is still possible in principle, and the twentieth century is full of instances in which it was attempted in practice. But the limits of conquest are clear, in the aftermath of Iraq if not before. International and most national norms, for example, now hold that the conquest of foreign nations and states almost certainly involves violations of human rights and the principles of self-determination and cultural autonomy, and is therefore illegitimate. Moreover, nation-states are unusually effective vehicles of mass mobilization and resistance, making sustained conquest harder now than in the past. And a growing aversion to violence militates against the ruthlessness that overcoming resistance requires. The international community may look the other way if mass murder is confined to a localized area of the developing world, such as Darfur, but it is hard to imagine that repeated genocidal policies in the service of imperialist expansion would not provoke severe condemnation and some countermeasures. In sum, while history suggests that being or having an empire is a guarantee of longevity, it also shows that acquiring an empire is probably no longer possible. What has caused the empire vogue recently has been not the sudden appearance of imperially structured U.S. power, but the seemingly arbitrary use of that power. The invasion of Afghanistan did not provoke talk of a U.S. empire, because most people in most countries believed that it was a reasonable response to the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, and because it was the Taliban, not the United States, that was arbitrarily violating widely held norms about human rights, cultural autonomy, democracy, and national self-determination. It was the U.S. invasion of Iraq and the Bush administration's tub-thumping unilateralist rhetoric that made the difference. Empire talk made sense not because the United States suddenly had an empire, but because the exercise of the United States' vast power seemed imperial to some in its potential beneficence and wisdom and imperious to others in its arrogance and arbitrariness. Seen in this light, it comes as no surprise that the authors who are cited the most in Lessons of Empire are Niall Ferguson and the writing team of Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri. Ferguson is an enthusiastic proponent of empire, whereas Hardt and Negri are self-declared foes of it. All three have written books that have been as popular as they are weakly argued and incoherent. The empire talk such authors promote may be of interest to students of "discourses" or intellectual fads, but policy analysts and officials would do well to abandon the term "empire" instead of fetishizing it. Fortunately, that should not be difficult. Before there was empire talk, it was perfectly possible to discuss U.S. foreign policy in nonimperial terms. Michael Mandelbaum has recently shown in his book The Case for Goliath that it still is. Once President George W. Bush leaves office and the United States withdraws from Iraq, empire talk may well go the way of empires themselves. The issues it purported to clarify will remain.

A2: US is Imperalist

The US doesn’t fall under the definition of an empire, and it can’t be characterized as possessing an empire either

Motyl 6 (Alexander J., Prof of Poli-Sci at Rutgers Univ, Foreign Affairs, “Empire Falls”, <http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/61764/alexander-j-motyl/empire-falls>, p. 2) MAT

So does the United States qualify? It would be absurd to say that the 50 states are an empire. Does the United States have an empire? It is too soon to say whether occupied Iraq will become a U.S. colony, although from the way the war has been going, the chances are that it will not. Afghanistan is hardly a U.S. periphery. Puerto Rico's relationship with the mainland might be "colonial," as might Samoa's and Guam's, but a few minor islands make for a pretty dull empire. The United States and its institutions, political and cultural, certainly have an overbearing influence on the world today, but why should that influence be termed "imperial," as opposed to "hegemonic" or just "exceptionally powerful"? McDonald's may offend people, but it is unclear how a fast-food chain sustains U.S. control of peripheral territories. U.S. military bases dot the world and may facilitate Washington's bullying, but they would be indicative of empire only if they were imposed and maintained without the consent of local governments. Hollywood may promote Americanization -- or anti-Americanism -- but its cultural influence is surely no more imperial than the vaunted "soft power" of the European Union. Ronald Grigor Suny thus sensibly concludes his essay in the SSRC volume by noting that if "empire" is defined rigorously, the United States cannot be said to have one. Appropriate lessons might therefore be drawn from comparisons with other polities that have had vast power in the international system, some of which might have been empires, some of which might not. This point is not just academic. If the United States is not an empire, then the lessons of empire are the wrong ones for U.S. policymakers to heed. Maier implicitly acknowledges that "empire" is a dispensable term when he says he wants to investigate U.S. ascendancy without "claiming that the United States is or is not an empire." And indeed, his history of U.S. power could easily have been written without reference to empire. Imagine, then, that policy analysts and scholars stopped applying the label to the United States. Would it make any difference? I think not. The challenges facing the country -- war in Iraq, nuclear weapons in Iran and North Korea, rising authoritarianism in Russia, growing military power in China, the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, terrorism, avian flu, climate change, and so forth -- would be exactly the same, as would U.S. policy options. Allies would still be allies; foreign critics would still express outrage at what they perceive to be American stupidity, arrogance, unilateralism, and the like. Life would go on, and no one -- except for scholars of empire -- would notice the difference.

Alt Fails

The ideology of imperialism is so deeply entrenched in society that the State has been entirely corrupted and prevents any real alternative

Van Elteren 3 (Mel, Associate Professor of Social Sciences at Tilburg University, “US Cultural Imperialism Today” http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/sais\_review/v023/23.2elteren.html) JL

To the extent that advertising constitutes a pervasive public "art form," however, it has become the dominant mode in which thoughts and experiences are expressed. This trend is most evident in U.S. society. While alternative values and ideologies do exist in this culture, it is harder to find representations for them. Advertising distorts and flattens people's ability to interpret complex experiences, and it reflects the culture only partially, and in ways that are biased toward a capitalist idealization of American culture. 47 At this level, goods are framed and displayed to entice the customer, and shopping has become an event in which individuals purchase and consume the meanings attached to goods. The ongoing interpenetration and crossover between consumption and the aesthetic sphere (traditionally separated off as an artistic counter-world to the everyday aspect of the former) has led to a [End Page 182] greater "aestheticization of reality": appearance and image have become of prime importance. Not only have commodities become more stylized but style itself has turned into a valuable commodity. The refashioning and reworking of commodities—which are themselves carefully selected according to one's individual tastes—achieve a stylistic effect that expresses the individuality of their owner. 48 This provides the framework for a more nuanced and sometimes contradictory second order of meaning. The dynamics of cultural change therefore entail both processes of "traveling culture," in which the received culture (in this case globalizing capitalist culture) is appropriated and assigned new meaning locally, and at the same time a "first order" meaning that dominates and delimits the space for second order meanings—thus retaining something of the traditional meaning of cultural imperialism. The latter is, ultimately, a negative phenomenon from the perspective of self-determination by local people under the influence of the imperial culture. Traditional critiques of cultural globalization have missed the point. The core of the problem lies not in the homogenization of cultures as such, or in the creation of a "false consciousness" among consumers and the adoption of a version of the dominant ideology thesis. Rather, the problem lies in the global spread of the institutions of capitalist modernity tied in with the culturally impoverished social imagery discussed above, which crowd out the cultural space for alternatives (as suggested by critical analysts like Benjamin Barber and Leslie Sklair). The negative effects of cultural imperialism—the disempowerment of people subjected to the dominant forms of globalization—must be located on this plane. It is necessary, of course, to explore in more detail how the very broad institutional forces of capitalist modernity actually operate in specific settings of cultural contact. The practices of transnational corporations are crucial to any understanding of the concrete activities and local effects of globalization. A state-centered approach blurs the main issue here, which is not whether nationals or foreigners own the carriers of globalization, but whether their interests are driven by capitalist globalization.

**Alt Fails**

Imperialism doesn’t allow for the space of alternatives to exist

Ali 6 (Tariq, novelist, historian, and commentator on the

current situation in the Middle East, “The new imperialists – Ideologies of Empire”, Ch 3 Pg 51)JL

Then came the total collapse of the Soviet Union and the restoration of a peculiar form of gangster capitalism in the world. Did the triumph of capitalism and the defeat of an enemy ideology mean we were in a world without conflict or enemies? Both Fukuyama and Huntington produced important books as a response to the new situation. Fukuyama, obsessed with Hegel, saw liberal democracy/capitalism as the only embodiment of the “world-spirit” that now marked the “end of history,” a phrase that became the title of his book.3 The long war was over and the restless world-spirit could now relax and buy a condo in Miami. Fukuyama insisted that there were no longer any available alternatives to the American way of life. The philosophy, politics, and economics of the Other – each and every variety of socialism/Marxism – had disappeared under the ocean, a submerged continent of ideas that could never rise again. The victory of capital was irreversible. It was a universal triumph. Huntington was unconvinced, and warned against complacency. From his Harvard base, he challenged Fukuyama with a set of theses first published in Foreign Affairs (“The Clash of Civilizations?” – a phrase originally coined by Bernard Lewis, another favourite of the current administration). Subsequently these papers became a book, The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of the World Order. The question mark had now disappeared. Huntington agreed that no ideological alternatives to capitalism existed, but this did not mean the “end of history.” Other antagonisms remained. “The great divisions among humankind and the dominating source of conflict will be cultural. . . . The clash of civilizations will dominate global politics.”4 In particular, Huntington emphasized the continued importance of religion in the modern world, and it was this that propelled the book onto the bestseller lists after 9/11. What did he mean by the word civilization? Early in the last century, Oswald Spengler, the German grandson of a miner, had abandoned his vocation as a teacher, turned to philosophy and to history, and produced a master-text. In The Decline of the West, Spengler counterposed culture (a word philologically tied to nature, the countryside, and peasant life) with civilization, which is urban and would become the site of industrial anarchy, dooming both capitalist and worker to a life of slavery to the machine-master. For Spengler, civilization reeked of death and destruction and imperialism. Democracy was the dictatorship of money and “money is overthrown and abolished only by blood.”5 The advent of “Caesarism” would drown it in “blood” and become the final episode in the history of theWest.Had the Third Reich not been defeated in Europe, principally by the Red Army (the spinal cord of the Wehrmacht was broken in Stalingrad and Kursk, and the majority of the unfortunate German soldiers who perished are buried on the Russian steppes, not on the beaches of Normandy or in the Ardennes), Spengler’s prediction might have come close to realization. He was among the first and fiercest critics of Eurocentrism, and his vivid worldview, postmodern in its intensity though not its language, can be sighted in this lyrical passage: I see, in place of that empty figment of one linear history, the drama of a number of mighty cultures, each springing with primitive strength from the soil of a mother-region to which it remains firmly bound throughout its whole life-cycle; each stamping its material, its mankind, in its own image; each having its own idea, its own passions, its own life, will and feeling, its own death. Here indeed are colours, lights, movements, that no intellectual eye has yet discovered. Here the Cultures, peoples, languages, truths, gods, landscapes bloom and age as the oaks and stonepines, the blossoms, twigs and leaves. Each Culture has its own new possibilities of self-expression, which arise, ripen, decay and never return.6 In contrast to this, he argued, lay the destructive cycle of civilization:Civilizations are the most external and artificial states of which a species of developed humanity is capable. They are a conclusion, death following life, rigidity following expansion, intellectual age and the stone-built petrifying world city following motherearth . . . they are an end, irrevocable, yet by inward necessity reached again and again. . . . Imperialism is civilization unadulterated. In this phenomenal form the destiny of the West is now irrevocably set. . . . Expansionism is a doom, something daemonic and intense, which grips forces into service and uses up the late humanity of the world-city stage.7

Imperialism Reps Flawed

Describing an empire as a powerful state is flawed: it allows for too broad of a spectrum.

Motyl 6 (Alexander J., Prof of Poli-Sci at Rutgers Univ, Foreign Affairs, “Empire Falls”, <http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/61764/alexander-j-motyl/empire-falls>, p. 1-2) MAT

There is thus no avoiding the definitional question that bedevils all such discussions. One common mistake is to conflate empire and imperialism, even though the first is a type of polity and the second is a type of policy. The distinction gets lost in Jack Snyder's argument, in the SSRC volume, that overexpansion destabilizes the states that practice it. Such a statement is plausible, but why is it a lesson of empire? Overexpansion, after all, is not usually a weakness of established empires, which are exceptionally durable and not necessarily expansionist. Another mistake is to think of empires simply as "big multinational states." But by this definition, the category would have to include Canada. "Big and powerful multinational states" is better, but still too broad, as it would have to include India. Even "great power" does not work, because some empires, such as that of the Hapsburgs, were not terribly strong and because many great powers lack the structural features of empires. Many scholars agree that empires should be defined as polities with a peculiar kind of relationship between a dominant "core" and subordinate and distinctive "peripheries." The core is not simply larger or more powerful than the peripheries, nor does it simply influence them in some heavy-handed manner. It actually rules them, either directly or indirectly, through local surrogates. No less important is the absence of significant relations between or among peripheries. In empires, the peripheries almost exclusively interact through the core. The resulting arrangement resembles a rimless wheel, consisting of a hub and spokes. The idea of all roads leading to Rome accurately describes the imperial structure.

At: Empire Collapse Inevitable

Only a miracle could set the US off its path of global dominance in any conceivable future

Mainland 3 (Grant, Research Specialist at Belfer Center, Harvard University, “American Primacy is a Lesser Evil”, <http://belfercenter.ksg.harvard.edu/publication/1273/american_primacy_is_a_lesser_evil.html>) MAT

Since the U.S.-led war in Iraq, politicians and pundits alike have called increasingly for a return to a "balance of power" or "multipolar world." At the G-8 summit in Evian, French President Jacques Chirac said, "I have no doubt whatsoever that the multipolar vision of the world that I have defended for some time is certainly supported by a large majority of countries throughout the world." Presidents Vladimir Putin and Hu Jintao spoke similarly in Moscow, declaring that "Russia and China stand for a multipolar, just and democratic world order." But a return to multipolarity is as undesirable as it is impractical. Take the question of practicality first. When asked in an interview with The Wall Street Journal about Jacques Chirac's multipolar vision, National Security Adviser Condoleezza Rice responded with her own question: "A multipolar world? What does that mean?" Of course, Rice knows that a multipolar world means one in which at least a few states have roughly equal power - the very antithesis of today's America-dominated structure. But her real question was, what would a return to multipolarity look like? What are Chirac and others really proposing? It's a reasonable question. Would Europe radically ramp up its defense spending? In 2002, the European Union spent about $145 billion on defense in aggregate. The Bush administration's latest budget requests about $400 billion. Even factoring in the impending accession of 10 new states to the EU, could Europe really bridge a $255 billion gap? An alternative path to multipolarity would have the United States slash, say, $200 billion from its defense spending. This scenario strains common sense. Even if some hypothetical U.S president wanted to cut America's military budget in half, would Congress allow it? Would the American people support it? Why would the United States move toward military parity with countries that might not wish us well? It isn't going to happen. But even if it could, a multipolar world would not be a better place. As Rice put it to a British think tank, "Multipolarity is a theory of rivalry. It led to the Great War."

At: Empire Collapse Inevitable

US imperialism can be sustained because of its strong reliance on fair international relations

Ikenberry 4 (John, Professor of Politics and International Affairs at Princeton University “Illusions of Empire: Defining the New American Order” March http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/59727/g-john-ikenberry/illusions-of-empire-defining-the-new-american-order?page=show) JL

The term "empire" refers to the political control by a dominant country of the domestic and foreign policies of weaker countries. The European colonial empires of the late nineteenth century were the most direct, formal kind. The Soviet "sphere of influence" in Eastern Europe entailed an equally coercive but less direct form of control. The British Empire included both direct colonial rule and "informal empire." If empire is defined loosely, as a hierarchical system of political relationships in which the most powerful state exercises decisive influence, then the United States today indeed qualifies. If the United States is an empire, however, it is like no other before it. To be sure, it has a long tradition of pursuing crude imperial policies, most notably in Latin America and the Middle East. But for most countries, the U.S.-led order is a negotiated system wherein the United States has sought participation by other states on terms that are mutually agreeable. This is true in three respects. First, the United States has provided public goods -- particularly the extension of security and the support for an open trade regime -- in exchange for the cooperation of other states. Second, power in the U.S. system is exercised through rules and institutions; power politics still exist, but arbitrary and indiscriminate power is reigned in. Finally, weaker states in the U.S.-led order are given "voice opportunities" -- informal access to the policymaking processes of the United States and the intergovernmental institutions that make up the international system. It is these features of the post-1945 international order that have led historians such as Charles Maier to talk about a "consensual empire" and Geir Lundestad to talk about an "empire of invitation." The American order is hierarchical and ultimately sustained by economic and military power, but it is put at the service of an expanding system of democracy and capitalism.

At: Empire Collapse Inevitable

US power will go uncontested – lack of capable rivals and strong US force

Kagan 2 (Robert, senior associate at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace “End of Dreams, Return of History” June 1 No 144 http://www.hoover.org/publications/policy-review/article/6136) JL

Yet American predominance in the main categories of power persists as a key feature of the international system. The enormous and productive American economy remains at the center of the international economic system. American democratic principles are shared by over a hundred nations. The American military is not only the largest but the only one capable of projecting force into distant theaters. Chinese strategists, who spend a great deal of time thinking about these things, see the world not as multipolar but as characterized by “one superpower, many great powers,” and this configuration seems likely to persist into the future absent either a catastrophic blow to American power or a decision by the United States to diminish its power and international influence voluntarily. 11 The anticipated global balancing has for the most part not occurred. Russia and China certainly share a common and openly expressed goal of checking American hegemony. They have created at least one institution, the Shanghai Cooperation Organization, aimed at resisting American influence in Central Asia, and China is the only power in the world, other than the United States, engaged in a long-term military buildup. But Sino-Russian hostility to American predominance has not yet produced a concerted and cooperative effort at balancing. China ’s buildup is driven at least as much by its own long-term ambitions as by a desire to balance the United States. Russia has been using its vast reserves of oil and natural gas as a lever to compensate for the lack of military power, but it either cannot or does not want to increase its military capability sufficiently to begin counterbalancing the United States. Overall, Russian military power remains in decline. In addition, the two powers do not trust one another. They are traditional rivals, and the rise of China inspires at least as much nervousness in Russia as it does in the United States. At the moment, moreover, China is less abrasively confrontational with the United States. Its dependence on the American market and foreign investment and its perception that the United States remains a potentially formidable adversary mitigate against an openly confrontational approach.

At: Empire Collapse Inevitable

**US hegemony won’t decline – popular hypotheses are incorrect**

Brooks & Wohlforth 8 (Stephen, William, Professor of Government in the Dartmouth College “World Out of Balance: International Relations and the Challenge of American Primacy” http://press.princeton.edu/chapters/i8784.html) JL

Scholars stress that the shift from the bipolarity of the Cold War to the current unipolarity is not an unalloyed benefit for the United States because it comes with the prospect of counterbalancing, increased dependence on the international economy, a greater need to maintain a favorable reputation to sustain cooperation within international institutions, and greater challenges to American legitimacy. The conventional wisdom is that these systno ccquiesce to U.S. hegemony if the [End Page 150] United States displays self-restraint by exercising its predominance multilaterally through international institutions.12 Moreover, the United States’ “soft power”—the purportedly singular attractiveness of its political and economic institutions, and its culture—draws other states into Washington’s orbit.

Consequences > Epistemology

Even if our epistemology is suspect, the presence of impacts large in magnitude requires a default to consequentialism

TYLER COWEN in 2006 The Epistemic Problem Does Not Refute George Mason University Consequentialism Utilitas, Dec2006, Vol. 18 Issue 4, p383-399

Consider this scenario where we have a slight (rational) sense of which beach is better for the invasion. Assume we know that if a windstorm comes that day, beach A is better for the military campaign against Hitler. It so happens that the chance of a windstorm is very small in France at that time of the year, but still the chance of the windstorm is not zero. Otherwise, if no windstorm comes, we have no idea which beach is better for the invasion, although one beach will turn out to be much better than the other beach, ex post. (If we wish, we could stipulate also that beach A also avoids the dog's hroken leg, although we no longer need this henefit to reach a conclusion.) Given that all other matters are held equal, we should invade the beach that will turn out to be better in the windstorm. **Lenman's example assumes that we know literally nothing about the major consequences of our acts; we know only the minor consequence** concerning the dog. **In contrast, the windstorm example assumes that we know a small amount about the major consequences of our acts, albeit not very much. Once we know a small amount about major consequences, however, the case for counting consequences appears more robust**. **And in most real world cases, no matter how great our uncertainty, we do know at least a small amount about major consequences,** if only in stochastic terms. **So the epistemic critique does not much weaken consequentialism when we have some information about some consequences of major importance**.^®

Consequences > Epistemology

Epistemological critique may decrease our ability to know the future with certainty, but this only supports defaulting to any risk of impacts large in magnitude-these are more important than small structural factors

TYLER COWEN in 2006 The Epistemic Problem Does Not Refute George Mason University Consequentialism Utilitas, Dec2006, Vol. 18 Issue 4, p383-399

**The epistemic critique increases the plausibility of what I call 'big event consequentialism'**. In this view, **we should pursue good consequences, but with special attention to consequences that are very important** and very good, or correspondingly, very bad. **This includes stopping the use of nuclear weapons**, saving children from smallpox, **making progress against** global **poverty**, and maintaining or spreading liberal democracy. **Big events**, as I define them, **typically are of significant practical importance,** involve obvious moral issues, and their value is not controversial to benevolent onlookers. In contrast, consider 'small events'. Preventing a broken leg for a single dog, however meritorious an act, is a small event as I define the concept. Making American families wealthier by another $20 also would count as a small event. **We should not count small events for nothing, but epistemic issues may well lower their importance in refiective equilibrium**. Of course we do not need a strict dividing line between big and small events, but rather we can think in terms of a continuum. In some cases a large number of small benefits will sum up to a big benefit, or equal the big benefit in importance. It then can be argued that we should treat the large benefits and the small benefits on a par. If we lift a different person out of poverty one billion times, this is no less valuable than lifting one billion people out of poverty all at once. Here two points are relevant. First, sometimes we are facing a single choice in isolation from other choices, rather than examining a rule or general principle of behavior**.** In this case it does not matter whether or not the small benefits would, if combined in larger numbers, sum up to a greater benefit. The small benefits will not be combined in greater numbers, and we should still upgrade the relative importance of larger benefits in our decision calculus. Second, **not all small benefits sum into equivalence with larger benefits**. **Sometimes one value has a lexical relationship to (all** or some) **other values**. For instance **arguably a large number of canine broken legs, even a very large number, do not sum in value to make a civilization. It does not matter how many dogs and how many broken legs enter the comparison**. In other words, civilization may be a lexical value with respect to canine broken legs. And when lexical elements are present, the mere cumulation of numbers of broken legs does not trump the more significant value. Numerous value relationships have been cited as lexical. A large number of slight headaches, no matter how numerous, may not sum up in value to equal a smaller number of intensely painful deaths or personal tortures." **A very large number of** 'muzak and **potato' lives do not sum to overtake the value of a sophisticated civilization**.^^ Rawls put forward liberty and the difference principle as his lexical values for all political comparisons.^^ For our purposes, we do not require a very strict notion of lexicality for these designations to matter. A big value need not be lexical against a (multiplied) smaller value at all possible margins. Instead **the big value need only be lexical across the comparisons that arise under relevant policy comparisons.** Furthermore a big value need not be lexical in absolute terms against all other smaller values. **We therefore receive further guidance as to which big events are upgraded in the most robust fashion. The big values that receive the most robust upgrading would be those values with some lexical importance**, relative to possible comparisons against other smaller values.^" To sum up these pointsz**, critics of consequentialism would like to establish something like the following: 'We find it hard to predict consequences. Therefore consequences do not matter very much**, **relative to** other **factors, such as deontology** or virtue ethics. **We should abandon consequentialist morality.' But so far epistemic considerations have yet to produce a strong argument for this view. The arguments support a different conclusion, namely downgrading the importance of minor consequences, and upgrading the importance of major consequences. The most robust major consequences are those which carry values with some lexical properties**, and cannot be replicated by a mere accumulation of many small benefits.

\*General Nuclear K Answers\*

Nuclear Reps Good

Using representations of Nuclear War allows us to criticize the existence of dangerous weapons

Foard 97 (Associate Professor of Religion, Arizona State, (James, “Imagining Nuclear Weapons: Hiroshima, Armageddon, and the Annihilation of the Students of Ichijo School,” Journal of the American Academy of Religion, http://jaar.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/reprint/LXV/1/1.pdf TBC 7/1/10)

This ambivalence about Hiroshima has been partially ameliorated by displacing it with Armageddon in our imagination of nuclear weapons In America the images of the atomic bomb, particularly after the Soviet Union's successful test in 1949 (Boyer.341), were pressed into the service of apocalyptic speculations, both scientific and otherwise, a process which has until recently assigned the horror that Hiroshima represented to a superpower war in an imagined future (cf. Pease'562). Specifically, images of a nuclear Armageddon have helped us perform two sorts of cultural tasks fundamental for imagining nuclear weapons: those involving difference and those involving representation. By "difference" I mean both the articulation of what makes nuclear weapons different from other weapons and the consequent reflection on the different human situation engendered by them. By "representation" I mean the expressions which seek to describe the use of nuclear weapons and incorporate that description into structures of meaning Armageddon permits us to define the difference of nuclear weapons by their capacity to destroy the human species in a war that no one will win. It also has suggested to many, particularly literary critics but also some nuclear strategists, that nuclear war is but an imaginary event, divorced from reality, such that all representations are, to use the most famous phrase, "fabulously textual" (Derrida'23).

Imagery of Armageddon is crucial to understanding nuclear weapons

Foard 97 (Associate Professor of Religion, Arizona State, (James, “Imagining Nuclear Weapons: Hiroshima, Armageddon, and the Annihilation of the Students of Ichijo School,” Journal of the American Academy of Religion, http://jaar.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/reprint/LXV/1/1.pdf TBC 7/1/10)

With the end of the Cold War, however, apocalyptic imagery itself appears doomed, as our geo-political situation no longer sustains its plausibility Our images of the nuclear threat are now as obsolete as our strategies. Without such imagery, though, we are left with little to think with in contemplating the meaning of these weapons, a situation that could well prove dangerous Since nuclear weapons now appear to threaten cities more than the human species as a whole, we might do well to return to Hiroshima to discover their difference and the possibilities for their representation. At the very least, doing so will expose the Armageddon imagery as a cultural construct rather than a selfevident fact

Nukespeak doesn’t naturalize nuclear weapons but allow us to challenge them

Foard 97 (Associate Professor of Religion, Arizona State, (James, “Imagining Nuclear Weapons: Hiroshima, Armageddon, and the Annihilation of the Students of Ichijo School,” Journal of the American Academy of Religion, http://jaar.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/reprint/LXV/1/1.pdf TBC 7/1/10)

Despite their deep suspicion of the adequacy of any expressions, the survivors relate their narratives in formal ritual and pilgrimage settings in which their repetition and redundancy seem appropriate. (These are, of course, the public rather than the traditional settings ) They justify their attention to story and place in terms of preserving memory, not because their stories can ever be fully understood, but "to bring peace " Without any clear understanding of what political mechanisms might be required, they claim that the telling of stories itself can, in fact, help do this The experience of the Ichijo people, then, suggests that nuclear talk can neither be fully denied nor fully accommodated into our sense of community over time. The only representation possible, then, strives not to domesticate the experience of the bomb into human memory, but to use the memory of its reality for apotropaic purposes The reality of the bomb is asserted—indeed must be asserted—only so that it can be refused a permanent place in human history

Nuclear Reps Good

We still have to confront nuclear issues, apocalyptic imagery is one way to do so

Foard 97 (Associate Professor of Religion, Arizona State, (James, “Imagining Nuclear Weapons: Hiroshima, Armageddon, and the Annihilation of the Students of Ichijo School,” Journal of the American Academy of Religion, http://jaar.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/reprint/LXV/1/1.pdf TBC 7/1/10)

Since the onset of the superpower conflict, nuclear reflection has yoked itself to the Cold War and indulged itself in opposing human extinction As a consequence, the end of the Cold War has meant the obsolescence of not only our strategies toward but also our images of the nuclear threat Although excluded from our apocalyptic obsession, harder moral issues have been with us since 1945, moral issues that are as pressing now as they were then: Is the instantaneous extinction of cities different from other war death? If using a nuclear weapon (or two) does not endanger the human species, is it permissible under certain conditions? If so, how do we represent such death in our religious and cultural systems of "just war" and other meanings7 Such questions are beyond the range of this historian of religions What is clear is that the efforts of Hiroshima survivors suggest measuring the difference of nuclear death by the impossibility of theodicy, of which the apocalyptic imagination is but one culturally specific and historically bound expression Following such a measurement of difference can help us see that we have not achieved freedom from nuclear danger in the past few years solely because the apocalyptic scenario seems less plausible and that we need new theological and philosophical reflections. Furthermore, the survivors' insistence on the reality of references for nuclear language, in contrast to our own critics' insistence on the opposite, affirms that the use of nuclear weapons is indeed possible because it has already happened. In the end, incorporating these victims' voices can transform our sense of difference and modes of representation to reflect more accurately our post-Cold War situation, when more than ever we should imagine the nuclear threat through Hiroshima rather than Armageddon As the Smithsonian controversy exposed, however, Americans still recoil from peeking under the mushroom cloud

Criticizing nuclear discourse prevents us from confronting pervasive nuclearism

James 94 (Doctoral student in English Literature at the University of Iowa, Clair, “Book Reviews,” Configurations, 2.2, 367-371)

Chaloupka first analyzes the politics of the antinuclear movement, arguing that it has failed to have a larger impact because it shares with pronuclear forces both a "confidence in a world that passes naturally into speech and writing" and, more tellingly, "the identification of a 'values' realm--limited but available for political debate" (p. xiii). Two of the antinuclear positions that he criticizes are the acceptance of survival as a universal value and the idea that nuclear war is unspeakable. Because the pronuclear camp argues that nuclear weapons are necessary for survival in the face of international threat, antinuclear rhetoric based on the need for human survival can either lead to a stalemate position or actually strengthen the other side. In order to emphasize the horrors of nuclear war and thereby discourage people from supporting pronuclear policies, some people would claim that nuclear weapons are "unspeakable": the horrors of nuclear war go beyond the human capacity for description and such a war would leave no survivors to describe it. But Chaloupka argues that the idea of unspeakability, instead of encouraging opposition to nuclear weapons, has silenced the voices of protest and abetted the secrecy surrounding nuclear weapons management. A large portion of the book is devoted to demonstrating how thoroughly and covertly nuclear weapons influence our lives. In one chapter Chaloupka uses Jacques Lacan's analysis of metonymy, which Lacan calls the rhetorical trope of absence and desire, in order to argue that "the computer and the robot are the metonymic processes we use to deal with the nuke" (p. 61). In other words, "in the now out-dated metaphor of rationalism, the computer is the brains of this operation, the bomb the muscle. In its physicality, the robot is the encoded sign of nuclearism" (p. 45). At the same time that industrial robots are replacing humans in factories, fictional humanoid robots have become the model for the ideal human, exhibiting absolute efficiency and self-control--exactly the qualities necessary to operate well a nuclear arsenal. Perhaps the most obvious manifestation of this desire for widespread robot mentality was the popular "Just Say No" campaign, which refused to analyze the cultural conditions that make drug use an attractive alternative to many and instead asked us all, but especially children, to become automatic message machines.

Nuclear Reps Good

Imagery of nuclear extinction motivates political activism toward peace

Pittock 84 (Barrie, Atmospheric Research Scientist, published over 200 articles, Climate Impact Group Chair, CSIRO Senior Scientist, Australian Public Service Medal Winner, http://www.uow.edu.au/~bmartin/pubs/84sanap.pdf AD: 7/1/10) jl

It is difficult to assess the motivation behind Brian's consistent bias towards dismissing the possibility of extinction, but perhaps there is a hint at it in his protest that believing in such a possibility fosters resignation. In my experience most people already feel rather helpless to influence the political process - what they need in order to act politically is the motivation of feeling personally threatened or outraged to the point of anger, plus a sense of hope which we in the peace movement must provide. The key political impact of nuclear winter and the possibility of extinction, however, lies in the way it forces proponents of reliance on nuclear weapons back on deterrence as the only possible rationalisation, and at the same time makes the risks inherent in nuclear deterrence unacceptable to rational human beings. There can in my view be no more radicalising realisation than that the logic of reliance on nuclear weapons leads to extinction, if not now, then some time in the foreseeable future. The possibility of extinction makes a qualitative difference to how we view nuclear weapons.

Depicting nuclear catastrophe is good – it enables us to express our anxieties about dangers

Seed 0 (Professor of English literature at the University of Liverpool, 2000 David, “Imagining the Worst: Science Fiction and Nuclear War,” Journal of American Studies of Turkey, Vol. 11, pp. 39-49 http://ake.ege.edu.tr/new/jast/Number11/Seed.htm TBC 7/1/10)

A number of recurring features emerge from these narratives. In virtually every case the USA plays a reactive role, never attacking first. Secondly, the nation’s capacity to cope with such an attack becomes a test of its morale and for that reason the nuclear aftermath, in the short and long term, occasions an interrogation of cherished national values. Thirdly, because nuclear attack can only be mounted with the latest technology, these novels explore anxieties about problems of control. Finally this fiction expresses a collective horror of ultimate endings. Some human presence persists however tenuous or displaced. Cherished human values like reason might be transposed on to extraterrestrial beings; or reader might play out the role of a survivor through the very act of reading a narrative whose deliverer has died. Ultimately there is an unusual circularity to such narratives. By deploying a whole range of strategies to imagine a dreaded future, they function as warnings against such imminent developments[33]. The more the future fails to develop along these imagined lines, the more necessary is the reconfirmation of these narratives as mere imaginary extrapolations.

Kurasawa – Predictions

Predictions are necessary for pragmatic political change – ignoring humanities ability to make predictions keeps us in a state of political dead-lock

Kurasawa 4 (Fuyuki, Professor of Sociology – York University of Toronto, Constellations, 11(4)) jl

As we float in a mood of post-millennial angst, the future appears to be out of favor. Mere mention of the idea of farsightedness – of trying to analyze what may occur in our wake in order to better understand how to live in the here and now – conjures up images of fortune-telling crystal balls and doomsday prophets, or of eccentric pundits equipped with data-crunching supercomputers spewing forth fanciful prognostications. The future, then, has seemingly become the province of mystics and scientists, a realm into which the rest of us rarely venture. This curious situation goes back to a founding paradox of early modernity, which sought to replace pagan divination and Judeo-Christian eschatology with its own rational system of apprehending time. Thus came into being the philosophy of history, according to which human destiny unfolds teleologically by following a knowable and meaningful set of chronological laws leading to a final state of perfection; Condorcet, Kant, Hegel, and Marx, to name but a few, are the children of this kind of historicism that expresses an unwavering faith in the Enlightenment’s credo of inherent progress over time. Yet in our post-metaphysical age, where the idea of discovering universal and stable temporal laws has become untenable, the philosophy of history lies in ruins. What has stepped into the breach is a variety of sciences of governance of the future, ranging from social futurism to risk management. By developing sophisticated modeling techniques, prognosticators aim to convert the future into a series of predictable outcomes extrapolated from present-day trends, or a set of possibilities to be assessed and managed according to their comparative degrees of risk and reward.1 Although commendable in their advocacy of farsightedness, these scientistic forms of knowledge are hampered by the fact that their longing for surefire predictive models have inevitably come up short. If historicism and scientistic governance offer rather unappealing paradigms for contemplating the future, a turn to the conventional political forecasts of the post-Cold War world order hardly offers more succor. Entering the fray, one is rapidly submerged by Fukuyama’s “end of history,” Huntington’s “clash of civilizations,” Kaplan’s “coming anarchy,” or perhaps most distressing of all, the so-called ‘Bush Doctrine’ of unilateral pre-emption. For the Left, this array of unpalatable scenarios merely prolongs the sense of hope betrayed and utopias crushed that followed the collapse of the socialist experiment. Under such circumstances, is it any wonder that many progressive thinkers dread an unwelcomed future, preferring to avert their gazes from it while eyeing foresight with equal doses of suspicion and contempt? But neither evasion nor fatalism will do. Some authors have grasped this, reviving hope in large-scale socio-political transformation by sketching out utopian pictures of an alternative world order. Endeavors like these are essential, for they spark ideas about possible and desirable futures that transcend the existing state of affairs and undermine the flawed prognoses of the post-Cold War world order; what ought to be and the Blochian ‘Not-Yet’ remain powerful figures of critique of what is, and inspire us to contemplate how social life could be organized differently. Nevertheless, my aim in this paper is to pursue a different tack by exploring how a dystopian imaginary can lay the foundations for a constructive engagement with the future.

Kurasawa – Predictions

Our form of political predictions allows us to avoid catastrophe

Kurasawa 4 (Fuyuki, Professor of Sociology – York University of Toronto, Constellations, 11(4)) jl

Rather than bemoaning the contemporary preeminence of a dystopian imaginary, I am claiming that it can enable a novel form of transnational socio-political action, a manifestation of globalization from below that can be termed preventive foresight. We should not reduce the latter to a formal principle regulating international relations or an ensemble of policy prescriptions for official players on the world stage, since it is, just as significantly, a mode of ethico-political practice enacted by participants in the emerging realm of global civil society. In other words, what I want to underscore is the work of farsightedness, the social processes through which civic associations are simultaneously constituting and putting into practice a sense of responsibility for the future by attempting to prevent global catastrophes. Although the labor of preventive foresight takes place in varying political and socio-cultural settings – and with different degrees of institutional support and access to symbolic and material resources – it is underpinned by three distinctive features: dialogism, publicity, and transnationalism. In the first instance, preventive foresight is an intersubjective or dialogical process of address, recognition, and response between two parties in global civil society: the ‘warners,’ who anticipate and send out word of possible perils, and the audiences being warned, those who heed their interlocutors’ messages by demanding that governments and/or international organizations take measures to steer away from disaster. Secondly, the work of farsightedness derives its effectiveness and legitimacy from public debate and deliberation. This is not to say that a fully fledged global public sphere is already in existence, since transnational “strong publics” with decisional power in the formal-institutional realm are currently embryonic at best. Rather, in this context, publicity signifies that “weak publics” with distinct yet occasionally overlapping constituencies are coalescing around struggles to avoid specific global catastrophes.4 Hence, despite having little direct decision-making capacity, the environmental and peace movements, humanitarian NGOs, and other similar globally-oriented civic associations are becoming significant actors involved in public opinion formation. Groups like these are active in disseminating information and alerting citizens about looming catastrophes, lobbying states and multilateral organizations from the ‘inside’ and pressuring them from the ‘outside,’ as well as fostering public participation in debates about the future. This brings us to the transnational character of preventive foresight, which is most explicit in the now commonplace observation that we live in an interdependent world because of the globalization of the perils that humankind faces (nuclear annihilation, global warming, terrorism, genocide, AIDS and SARS epidemics, and so on); individuals and groups from far-flung parts of the planet are being brought together into “risk communities” that transcend geographical borders.5 Moreover, due to dense media and information flows, knowledge of impeding catastrophes can instantaneously reach the four corners of the earth – sometimes well before individuals in one place experience the actual consequences of a crisis originating in another. My contention is that civic associations are engaging in dialogical, public, and transnational forms of ethico-political action that contribute to the creation of a fledgling global civil society existing ‘below’ the official and institutionalized architecture of international relations.6 The work of preventive foresight consists of forging ties between citizens; participating in the circulation of flows of claims, images, and information across borders; promoting an ethos of farsighted cosmopolitanism; and forming and mobilizing weak publics that debate and struggle against possible catastrophes. Over the past few decades, states and international organizations have frequently been content to follow the lead of globally- minded civil society actors, who have been instrumental in placing on the public agenda a host of pivotal issues (such as nuclear war, ecological pollution, species extinction, genetic engineering, and mass human rights violations). To my mind, this strongly indicates that if prevention of global crises is to eventually rival the assertion of short-term and narrowly defined rationales (national interest, profit, bureaucratic self-preservation, etc.), weak publics must begin by convincing or compelling official representatives and multilateral organizations to act differently; only then will farsightedness be in a position to ‘move up’ and become institutionalized via strong publics.7 Since the global culture of prevention remains a work in progress, the argument presented in this paper is poised between empirical and normative dimensions of analysis. It proposes a theory of the practice of preventive foresight based upon already existing struggles and discourses, at the same time as it advocates the adoption of certain principles that would substantively thicken and assist in the realization of a sense of responsibility for the future of humankind. I will thereby proceed in four steps, beginning with a consideration of the shifting socio-political and cultural climate that is giving rise to farsightedness today (I). I will then contend that the development of a public aptitude for early warning about global cataclysms can overcome flawed conceptions of the future’s essential inscrutability (II). From this will follow the claim that an ethos of farsighted cosmopolitanism – of solidarity that extends to future generations – can supplant the preeminence of ‘short-termism’ with the help of appeals to the public’s moral imagination and use of reason (III). In the final section of the paper, I will argue that the commitment of global civil society actors to norms of precaution and transnational justice can hone citizens’ faculty of critical judgment against abuses of the dystopian imaginary, thereby opening the way to public deliberation about the construction of an alternative world order (IV).

Kurasawa – Predictions

No link to their offense – our paradigm of predictions is comparatively different

Kurasawa 4 (Fuyuki, Professor of Sociology – York University of Toronto, Constellations, 11(4)) jl

When engaging in the labor of preventive foresight, the first obstacle that one is likely to encounter from some intellectual circles is a deep-seated skepticism about the very value of the exercise. A radically postmodern line of thinking, for instance, would lead us to believe that it is pointless, perhaps even harmful, to strive for farsightedness in light of the aforementioned crisis of conventional paradigms of historical analysis. If, contra teleological models, history has no intrinsic meaning, direction, or endpoint to be discovered through human reason, and if, contra scientistic futurism, prospective trends cannot be predicted without error, then the abyss of chronological inscrutability supposedly opens up at our feet. The future appears to be unknowable, an outcome of chance. Therefore, rather than embarking upon grandiose speculation about what may occur, we should adopt a pragmatism that abandons itself to the twists and turns of history; let us be content to formulate ad hoc responses to emergencies as they arise. While this argument has the merit of underscoring the fallibilistic nature of all predictive schemes, it conflates the necessary recognition of the contingency of history with unwarranted assertions about the latter’s total opacity and indeterminacy. Acknowledging the fact that the future cannot be known with absolute certainty does not imply abandoning the task of trying to understand what is brewing on the horizon and to prepare for crises already coming into their own. In fact, the incorporation of the principle of fallibility into the work of prevention means that we must be ever more vigilant for warning signs of disaster and for responses that provoke unintended or unexpected consequences (a point to which I will return in the final section of this paper). In addition, from a normative point of view, the acceptance of historical contingency and of the self-limiting character of farsightedness places the duty of preventing catastrophe squarely on the shoulders of present generations. The future no longer appears to be a metaphysical creature of destiny or of the cunning of reason, nor can it be sloughed off to pure randomness. It becomes, instead, a result of human action shaped by decisions in the present – including, of course, trying to anticipate and prepare for possible and avoidable sources of harm to our successors.

Kurasawa – Predictions

We must embrace an ethic of responsibility toward future generations – this sparks resistence against the predictions they criticize

Kurasawa 4 (Fuyuki, Professor of Sociology – York University of Toronto, Constellations, 11(4)) jl

By contrast, Jonas’s strong consequentialism takes a cue from Weber’s “ethic of responsibility,” which stipulates that we must carefully ponder the potential impacts of our actions and assume responsibility for them – even for the incidence of unexpected and unintended results. Neither the contingency of outcomes nor the retrospective nature of certain moral judgments exempts an act from normative evaluation. On the contrary, consequentialism reconnects what intentionalism prefers to keep distinct: the moral worth of ends partly depends upon the means selected to attain them (and vice versa), while the correspondence between intentions and results is crucial. At the same time, Jonas goes further than Weber in breaking with presentism by advocating an “ethic of long-range responsibility” that refuses to accept the future’s indeterminacy, gesturing instead toward a practice of farsighted preparation for crises that could occur.30 From a consequentialist perspective, then, intergenerational solidarity would consist of striving to prevent our endeavors from causing large-scale human suffering and damage to the natural world over time. Jonas reformulates the categorical imperative along these lines: “Act so that the effects of your action are compatible with the permanence of genuine human life,” or “Act so that the effects of your action are not destructive of the future possibility of such life.”31 What we find here, I would hold, is a substantive and future-oriented ethos on the basis of which civic associations can enact the work of preventive foresight. Having suggested a way to thicken the normative foundations of farsighted cosmopolitanism, I would now like to discuss the socio-cultural strategies that global civil society participants have begun employing in order to create a sense of intergenerational solidarity. Both the moral imagination and reason constitute triggers of farsightedness that have entered public discourse in a variety of settings, with the objective of combatting the myopia of presentism.32 The first of these catalysts appeals to us to carefully ponder our epoch’s legacy, to imagine the kind of world we will leave to future generations (what will social life be like if today’s risks become tomorrow’s reality?). Left dystopianism performs just this role of confronting us with hypothetically catastrophic futures; whether through novelistic, cinematic, or other artistic means, it conjures up visions of a brave new world in order to spark reflection and inspire resistance.33 By way of thick description, dystopian tales call upon audiences’ moral imagination and plunge them into their descendants’ lifeworlds. We step into the shoes of Nineteen Eighty-Four’s Winston Smith or are strongly affected by The Handmaid’s Tale’s description of a patriarchal-theocratic society and The Matrix’s blurring of simulacra and reality, because they bring the perils that may await our successors to life. NGOs and social movements active in global civil society have drawn upon the moral imagination in similar ways, introducing dystopian scenarios less as prophecies than as rhetorical devices that act as ‘wake-up calls.’ Dystopias are thrust into public spaces to jolt citizens out of their complacency and awaken their concern for those who will follow them. Such tropes are intended to be controversial, their contested character fostering public deliberation about the potential cataclysms facing humankind, the means of addressing them, and the unintended and unexpected consequences flowing from present-day trends. In helping us to imagine the strengths and weaknesses of different positions towards the future, then, the dystopian imaginary crystallizes many of the great issues of the day. Amplifying and extrapolating what could be the long-term consequences of current tendencies, public discourse can thereby clarify the future’s seeming opaqueness. Likewise, fostering a dystopian moral imagination has a specifically critical function, for the disquiet it provokes about the prospects of later generations is designed to make us radically question the ‘self-evidentness’ of the existing social order.34 If we imagine ourselves in the place of our descendants, the takenfor- granted shortsightedness of our institutionalized ways of thinking and acting becomes problematic. Indifference toward the future is neither necessary nor inevitable, but can be – and indeed ought to be – changed. Aside from the moral imagination, and given that the idea of gambling with humanity’s future or failing to minimize its possible sources of suffering is logically unsustainable, the appeal to reason represents another main trigger of intergenerational solidarity. Since actual deliberation between current and future generations is obviously impossible, a Rawlsian contractualist thoughtexperiment allows us to demonstrate the soundness of a farsighted cosmopolitanism. If, in the original position, persons were to operate behind a chronological veil of ignorance that would preclude them from knowing the generation to which they belong, it is reasonable to expect them to devise a social order characterized by a fair distribution of risks and perils over time. Conversely, it is unreasonable to expect them to agree to a situation where these burdens would expand over time and thereby be transferred from one generation to the next. “The life of a people,” Rawls writes, “is conceived as a scheme of cooperation spread out in historical time. It is to be governed by the same conception of justice that regulates the cooperation of contemporaries. No generation has stronger claims than any other.”35 Via the practice of preventive foresight, this norm of crossgenerational fairness may acquire sufficient weight.

Kurasawa – Predictions

Acknowledging the dytopic future harms is a catalyst for political action

Kurasawa 4 (Fuyuki, Professor of Sociology – York University of Toronto, Constellations, 11(4)) jl

Returning to the point I made at the beginning of this paper, the significance of foresight is a direct outcome of the transition toward a dystopian imaginary (or what Sontag has called “the imagination of disaster”).11 Huxley’s Brave New World and Orwell’s Nineteen Eighty-Four, two groundbreaking dystopian novels of the first half of the twentieth century, remain as influential as ever in framing public discourse and understanding current techno-scientific dangers, while recent paradigmatic cultural artifacts – films like The Matrix and novels like Atwood’s Oryx and Crake – reflect and give shape to this catastrophic sensibility.12 And yet dystopianism need not imply despondency, paralysis, or fear. Quite the opposite, in fact, since the pervasiveness of a dystopian imaginary can help notions of historical contingency and fallibilism gain traction against their determinist and absolutist counterparts.13 Once we recognize that the future is uncertain and that any course of action produces both unintended and unexpected consequences, the responsibility to face up to potential disasters and intervene before they strike becomes compelling. From another angle, dystopianism lies at the core of politics in a global civil society where groups mobilize their own nightmare scenarios (‘Frankenfoods’ and a lifeless planet for environmentalists, totalitarian patriarchy of the sort depicted in Atwood’s Handmaid’s Tale for Western feminism, McWorld and a global neoliberal oligarchy for the alternative globalization movement, etc.). Such scenarios can act as catalysts for public debate and socio-political action, spurring citizens’ involvement in the work of preventive foresight.

Kurasawa – Predictions

Repoliticization of futurism reclaims critical judgement over threats

Kurasawa 4 (Fuyuki, Professor of Sociology – York University of Toronto, Constellations, 11(4)) jl

On top of their dubious assessments of what is to come, alarmism and resignation would, if widely accepted, undermine a viable practice of farsightedness. Indeed, both of them encourage public disengagement from deliberation about scenarios for the future, a process that appears to be dangerous, pointless, or unnecessary. The resulting ‘depublicization’ of debate leaves dominant groups and institutions (the state, the market, techno-science) in charge of sorting out the future for the rest of us, thus effectively producing a heteronomous social order. How, then, can we support a democratic process of prevention from below? The answer, I think, lies in cultivating the public capacity for critical judgment and deliberation, so that participants in global civil society subject all claims about potential catastrophes to examination, evaluation, and contestation. Two normative concepts are particularly well suited to grounding these tasks: the precautionary principle and global justice.

Predictions don’t mean our impact aren’t true – determining relative risk allow us to make accurate predictions about the future

Kurasawa 4 (Fuyuki, Professor of Sociology – York University of Toronto, Constellations, 11(4)) jl

The evaluative framework proposed above should not be restricted to the critique of misappropriations of farsightedness, since it can equally support public deliberation with a reconstructive intent, that is, democratic discussion and debate about a future that human beings would freely self-determine. Inverting Foucault’s Nietzschean metaphor, we can think of genealogies of the future that could perform a farsighted mapping out of the possible ways of organizing social life. They are, in other words, interventions into the present intended to facilitate global civil society’s participation in shaping the field of possibilities of what is to come. Once competing dystopian visions are filtered out on the basis of their analytical credibility, ethical commitments, and political underpinnings and consequences, groups and individuals can assess the remaining legitimate catastrophic scenarios through the lens of genealogical mappings of the future. Hence, our first duty consists in addressing the present-day causes of eventual perils, ensuring that the paths we decide upon do not contract the range of options available for our posterity.42 Just as importantly, the practice of genealogically inspired farsightedness nurtures the project of an autonomous future, one that is socially self-instituting. In so doing, we can acknowledge that the future is a human creation instead of the product of metaphysical and extra-social forces (god, nature, destiny, etc.), and begin to reflect upon and deliberate about the kind of legacy we want to leave for those who will follow us. Participants in global civil society can then take – and in many instances have already taken – a further step by committing themselves to socio-political struggles forging a world order that, aside from not jeopardizing human and environmental survival, is designed to rectify the sources of transnational injustice that will continue to inflict needless suffering upon future generations if left unchallenged.

Kurasawa – Predictions

Refusal to engage in our predictions allows preventable impacts to materialize – we have an ethical responsibility to engage and adjudicate the consequences of our actions or inactions

Kurasawa 4 (Fuyuki, Professor of Sociology – York University of Toronto, Constellations, 11(4)) jl

In recent years, the rise of a dystopian imaginary has accompanied damning assessments and widespread recognition of the international community’s repeated failures to adequately intervene in a number of largely preventable disasters (from the genocides in the ex-Yugoslavia, Rwanda, and East Timor to climate change and the spiraling AIDS pandemics in parts of sub-Saharan Africa and Asia). Social movements, NGOs, diasporic groups, and concerned citizens are not mincing words in their criticisms of the United Nations system and its member-states, and thus beginning to shift the discursive and moral terrain in world affairs. As a result, the callousness implicit in disregarding the future has been exposed as a threat to the survival of humanity and its natural surroundings. The Realpolitik of national self-interest and the neoliberal logic of the market will undoubtedly continue to assert themselves, yet demands for farsightedness are increasingly reining them in. Though governments, multilateral institutions, and transnational corporations will probably never completely modify the presentist assumptions underlying their modes of operation, they are, at the very least, finding themselves compelled to account for egregious instances of short-sightedness and rhetorically commit themselves to taking corrective steps. What may seem like a modest development at first glance would have been unimaginable even a few decades ago, indicating the extent to which we have moved toward a culture of prevention. A new imperative has come into being, that of preventive foresight. Does this mean that we can expect all impending disasters to be comprehensively addressed before long? Apart from the unabashed assertion of national and commercial interests, at least two other structural factors make such an outcome unlikely within the existing world order. In the first place, because of the decentralized institutional design of global civil society, there exist few coordination mechanisms between its different participants and no single clearing-house for the collection and analysis of information about possible cataclysms – information that could then be transmitted to the general public, governments, or international organizations. Warnings may not always reach these addressees, or may get lost in the clamor of multiple campaigns and messages. The second problem is the asymmetry between the official and unofficial spheres of world politics. Despite mounting evidence that states and multilateral institutions are responding to preventive claims and requests, global civil society remains a weak public deprived of direct decision-making power. It has made important advances in gaining lobbying influence over and access to decision-making bodies, yet its main tool continues to be the mobilization of public opinion to pressure or convince these bodies to act. Until global civil society can convert itself into a strong public, it is not in a position to ensure the translation of demands for prevention from below into prevention from above. We should acknowledge that these two limits pose serious obstacles to a more muscular culture of prevention without meaningful institutional reforms of the global system. At the same time, and in lieu of a major overhaul of the regime of international governance, it would be a mistake to underestimate or simply dismiss the impact of the web of treaties, summits, judicial innovations, and grassroots ‘naming and shaming’ tactics and protest movements that have come to form, in recent years, a vast preventive infrastructure. I have argued that this dynamic is itself constitutive of global civil society and can thus best be appreciated when observed from below. Civic associations are engaging in dialogical, public, transnational struggles to avert catastrophe, cultivating a farsighted and dystopian flavored form of social action that is ethically and politically oriented toward the future. I further claimed that the work of preventive foresight is composed of three sets of practices striving to overcome difficulties constituent of the predicament of our times. Participants in global civil society are engaged in developing an early warning capacity about upcoming crises by collecting evidence, disseminating it, and laboring to have it publicly recognized. This sort of farsightedness responds to the contingent nature of the future without succumbing to the conviction that it is absolutely unknowable and indecipherable. Transnational associative groups are also nurturing intergenerational solidarity, a sense of care for those who will follow us. I suggested that, to adequately combat the presentist and shortsighted indifference toward the future that is typical in the contemporary world, a more explicitly farsighted cosmopolitanism needs to take root within global civil society. Normative thickening of this ideal could be accomplished via the long-term consequentialism of Jonas’s imperative of responsibility, a prospect whose basis we can already find in growing public appeals to the moral imagination and reason to activate our concern for later generations. Lastly, I contended that the work of preventive foresight can parry alarmist misappropriation or resignation by advocating a process of public deliberation that blends the principles of precaution and global justice. A farsighted politics can function through the public use of reason and the honing of the capacity for critical judgment, whereby citizens put themselves in a position to debate, evaluate, and challenge different dystopian narratives about the future and determine which ones are more analytically plausible, ethically desirable, and politically effective in bringing about a world order that is less perilous yet more just for our descendants. Many fora, ranging from local, face-to-face meetings to transnational, highly mediated discursive networks, are sowing the seeds of such a practice of participatory democracy. None of this is to disavow the international community’s rather patchy record of avoiding foreseeable calamities over the last decades, or to minimize the difficulties of implementing the kinds of global institutional reforms described above and the perils of historical contingency, presentist indifference toward the future, or alarmism and resignation. To my mind, however, this is all the more reason to pay attention to the work of preventive foresight in global civil society, through which civic associations can build up the latter’s coordination mechanisms and institutional leverage, cultivate and mobilize public opinion in distant parts of the world, and compel political leaders and national and transnational governance structures to implement certain policies. <CONTINUED>

Kurasawa – Predictions

<CONTINUED>

While seeking to prevent cataclysms from worsening or, better yet, from occurring in the first place, these sorts of initiatives can and must remain consistent with a vision of a just world order. Furthermore, the labor of farsightedness supports an autonomous view of the future, according to which we are the creators of the field of possibilities within which our successors will dwell. The current socio-political order, with all its short-term biases, is neither natural nor necessary. Accordingly, informed public participation in deliberative processes makes a socially self-instituting future possible, through the involvement of groups and individuals active in domestic and supranational public spaces; prevention is a public practice, and a public responsibility. To believe otherwise is, I would argue, to leave the path clear for a series of alternatives that heteronomously compromise the well-being of those who will come after us. We would thereby effectively abandon the future to the vagaries of history (‘let it unfold as it may’), the technocratic or instrumental will of official institutions (‘let others decide for us’), or to gambles about the time-lags of risks (‘let our progeny deal with their realization’). But, as I have tried to show here, this will not and cannot be accepted. Engaging in autonomous preventive struggles, then, remains our best hope. A farsighted cosmopolitanism that aims to avert crises while working toward the realization of precaution and global justice represents a compelling ethico-political project, for we will not inherit a better future. It must be made, starting with us, in the here and now.

Blight – Pragmatism/Policy Making

Neg authors fail, No alt solvency without convincing policy arguments

Blight 88 (James G. Must the Psychology of Avoiding Nuclear War Remain Free and Insignificant? Center for Science and International Affairs, Harvard University TBC 7/2/10)

Psychologists concerned with involving themselves professionally in reducing the risk of nuclear war continue, with only a few exceptions, to live and work in a dream world, a fantasy-land, within which they continue to tell themselves that they are doing just fine, that policymakers are indeed listening, or that, even if they are not, it is simply the bad fortune of nuclear policy types to continue to ignore so much good psychological advice, or that, at the least, psychologists should never give in to the nihilistic pessimism of one such as myself, who seems to have returned from a sojourn in policy-land brainwashed by his new colleagues--the inventors and purveyors of the nuclear arms race. This seems to me to be the gist of the responses to my piece in the January 1987 American Psychologist (AP): Whatever we as psychologists are doing that we believe may help reduce the risk of nuclear war, we should just keep doing it as best we can. We should not listen to Blight. I can vouch for the representativeness of the responses AP has seen fit to print. Since I began writing and speaking on the policy irrelevance of nuclear psychology about a year ago, I have received dozens of letters and phone calls and verbal rejoinders. The main message of these has been: Leave us alone. Let us be, in our cozy world composed exclusively of psychologists. Go back to your foreign policy think tank; turn in your psychological credentials; and stop trying to tell us how to go about our business. I have gotten the message. Except for a few more exchanges like this one, I am finished trying to tell the psychologists of Newcastle that few, if any, in the greater world are interested in buying their coal. I reiterate: There have been some notable exceptions to this rule, but very nearly all psychologists with whom I have had contact about policy relevance and nuclear war have urged me in no uncertain terms to beat it.

Perm Solves – policy relevance is key

Blight 88 (James G. Must the Psychology of Avoiding Nuclear War Remain Free and Insignificant? Center for Science and International Affairs, Harvard University TBC 7/2/10)

The central collective act for which psychologists must answer is their irresponsible failure to remember what is at stake, and to keep that problem primarily in front of their minds, rather than their supposed responsibilities to psychology as such. Milan Kundera has said all this much better than I. Kundera, a Czech emigre living in Paris, has tried to remind us of the truth and profundity of what I call "Kundera's Law": That in order to affect the world of affairs one must have a thickly textured, hands on, complexly informed view of the situation. If one does, then one may call oneself a realist. The alternative is to stand aside from the complex crawl of daily life as it occurs, to spout solutions to whatever problem interests one, and to meet no need greater than one's need to appear brilliant. Kundera wanted us never to forget--indeed, he warned us that it is truly irresponsible to forget--what life was like in his native land before the Nazis overran it, before the Soviets made it a part of their captive Central European Empire. Where Kundera wrote "burden," psychologists ought to read "policy relevance," which, in turn, is (or was) required by the sense of great nuclear danger. According to Kundera, The heaviest of burdens crushes us, we sink beneath it, it pins us to the ground. But... the heavier the burden, the closer our lives come to the earth, the more real and truthful they become . . . . The absolute absence of a burden causes man to be lighter than air, to soar into the heights, take leave of the earth, and become only half-real, his movements as free as they are insignificant. (Kundera, 1985, p. 5) He then posed the pivotal question: "What then shall we choose? Weight or lightness?" (Kundera, 1985, p. 5). I contend that psychologists have chosen lightness, that they would rather be free to proffer ingenious psychological solutions to problems of nuclear risks, rather than to remember why they got into this stuff in the first place, and what that implies for speaking plainly, and with effect, to the people who manage the risks. The burden seems to have been too heavy for most psychologists to bear.

Blight – Pragmatism/Policy Making

Pragamatic policy making is crucial

Blight 88 (James G. Must the Psychology of Avoiding Nuclear War Remain Free and Insignificant? Center for Science and International Affairs, Harvard University TBC 7/2/10)

Based on these considerations, Earle is emboldened by the end of the article to "set forth an alternative framework within which international relations could be conducted" (Earle, 1986, p. 374). By refusing to begin where the policymakers must begin, by beginning instead with the world of his undergraduate students and informed by some introductory psychology, Earle has decided to reinvent international relations. As a purely theoretical enterprise, this is unobjectionable. However, if he believes that this ought to be the prerequisite to reducing the risk of nuclear war, how long does he believe it will take to reinvent the wheel with which leaders drive international politics? If the answer is the correct one--forever!--what has happened to the memory of the fear that drove us all as psychologists to work in this area in the first place? It seems to have been conveniently and irresponsibly forgotten.

Nuclear policy making is key to avoid nuclear holocaust

Blight 88 (James G. Must the Psychology of Avoiding Nuclear War Remain Free and Insignificant? Center for Science and International Affairs, Harvard University TBC 7/2/10)

This, finally, ought to be the goal of all psychologists who recall, or who can be encouraged to recall, why they began to look into nuclear questions: policy-relevant knowledge. Optimism without the knowledge that justifies it is irresponsible. Dietrich Bonhoeffer, a Lutheran theologian hanged by the Nazis, once said that theology, if it is to live significantly, must first die formally, so that it can enter the world that needs it so desperately. The same is true for psychology now. If it is to have any impact on the risk of nuclear war, psychology as such must die, and psychologists must enter as best they can into the stream of life as it is known to nuclear policymakers. In so doing, the discipline of psychology is unlikely to get any credit for helping out, but its practitioners, a kind of invisible college of people devoted to what James called the science of mental life, will have acted responsibly. They will have remembered why they are doing what they are doing--because, at some moment, the world as we know it could be destroyed in a nuclear holocaust

A2: Militarism Bad

Arms control should be militarized to ensure safe denuclearization

LARSEN 2 (Jeffrey senior policy analyst with Science Applications International Corporation in Colorado Springs in Arms Control ed. Jeffrey Larsen p. 6-7 http://www.rienner.com/uploads/47d6f750a53eb.pdf TBC 6/30/10)

First, arms control was conceived as a way to enhance national security. As Hedley Bull explained: “arms control or disarmament was not an end in itself but a means to an end and that end was first and foremost the enhancement of security, especially security against nuclear war.”17 Or as Schelling and Halperin stated near the end of their book: “the aims of arms control and the aims of a national military strategy should be substantially the same.”18 This principle established national security as the dominant goal of arms control, not the reduction of arms per se. In fact it was understood that not all reductions were necessarily useful. There was an explicit recognition that arms control could be harmful if not properly guided by overall national security strategy. Second, the superpowers shared a common interest in avoiding nuclear war; this common interest could and should be the basis for effective arms control agreements. According to Bull, “The fact that the United States and the Soviet Union were locked in a political and ideological conflict, one moreover that sometimes took a military form, did not mean that they could not recognize common interests in avoiding a ruinous nuclear war, or cooperate to advance these common interests.”19 This assumption was one of the most important and controversial conceptual departures from past thinking promulgated by the new arms control theory. Previously, it was assumed that relaxation of political tensions had to precede the achievement of substantive arms control agreements. The founders of traditional arms control theory, in contrast, believed that the threat of global nuclear annihilation was so paramount that it transcended political and ideological differences. It was not necessary to fully resolve political conflicts before proceeding to negotiate arms control agreements; solutions to both could be advanced simultaneously. Third, arms control and military strategy should work together to promote national security. The unity of strategy and arms control was a central tenet of traditional arms control theory. Such unity was essential if arms control and defense policy were to avoid working at cross-purposes. For example, if the implementation of U.S. defense strategy required deploying certain types of weapons that were restricted by arms control agreements, this could defeat the overall purpose of our national security posture and erode the legitimacy of both the arms control process and U.S. defense policy.

Alt Fails – McClean

Abstract philosophizing kills alt solvency – it fails at policy prescription

McClean 1 (David E., “The Cultural Left and the Limits of Social Hope,” Am. Phil. Conf., www.americanphilosophy .org/archives/ past\_conference\_programs/pc2001/Discussion%20papers/david\_mcclean.htm TBC 6/29/10)

Yet for some reason, at least partially explicated in Richard Rorty's Achieving Our Country, a book that I think is long overdue, leftist critics continue to cite and refer to the eccentric and often a priori ruminations of people like those just mentioned, and a litany of others including Derrida, Deleuze, Lyotard, Jameson, and Lacan, who are to me hugely more irrelevant than Habermas in their narrative attempts to suggest policy prescriptions (when they actually do suggest them) aimed at curing the ills of homelessness, poverty, market greed, national belligerence and racism. I would like to suggest that it is time for American social critics who are enamored with this group, those who actually want to be relevant, to recognize that they have a disease, and a disease regarding which I myself must remember to stay faithful to my own twelve step program of recovery. The disease is the need for elaborate theoretical "remedies" wrapped in neological and multi-syllabic jargon. These elaborate theoretical remedies are more "interesting," to be sure, than the pragmatically settled questions about what shape democracy should take in various contexts, or whether private property should be protected by the state, or regarding our basic human nature (described, if not defined (heaven forbid!), in such statements as "We don't like to starve" and "We like to speak our minds without fear of death" and "We like to keep our children safe from poverty"). As Rorty puts it, "When one of today's academic leftists says that some topic has been 'inadequately theorized,' you can be pretty certain that he or she is going to drag in either philosophy of language, or Lacanian psychoanalysis, or some neo-Marxist version of economic determinism. . . . These futile attempts to philosophize one's way into political relevance are a symptom of what happens when a Left retreats from activism and adopts a spectatorial approach to the problems of its country. Disengagement from practice produces theoretical hallucinations"(italics mine).(1) Or as John Dewey put it in his The Need for a Recovery of Philosophy, "I believe that philosophy in America will be lost between chewing a historical cud long since reduced to woody fiber, or an apologetics for lost causes, . . . . or a scholastic, schematic formalism, unless it can somehow bring to consciousness America's own needs and its own implicit principle of successful action." Those who suffer or have suffered from this disease Rorty refers to as the Cultural Left, which left is juxtaposed to the Political Left that Rorty prefers and prefers for good reason. Another attribute of the Cultural Left is that its members fancy themselves pure culture critics who view the successes of America and the West, rather than some of the barbarous methods for achieving those successes, as mostly evil, and who view anything like national pride as equally evil even when that pride is tempered with the knowledge and admission of the nation's shortcomings. In other words, the Cultural Left, in this country, too often dismiss American society as beyond reform and redemption. And Rorty correctly argues that this is a disastrous conclusion, i.e. disastrous for the Cultural Left. I think it may also be disastrous for our social hopes, as I will explain. Leftist American culture critics might put their considerable talents to better use if they bury some of their cynicism about America's social and political prospects and help forge public and political possibilities in a spirit of determination to, indeed, achieve our country - the country of Jefferson and King; the country of John Dewey and Malcom X; the country of Franklin Roosevelt and Bayard Rustin, and of the later George Wallace and the later Barry Goldwater. To invoke the words of King, and with reference to the American society, the time is always ripe to seize the opportunity to help create the "beloved community," one woven with the thread of agape into a conceptually single yet diverse tapestry that shoots for nothing less than a true intra-American cosmopolitan ethos, one wherein both same sex unions and faith-based initiatives will be able to be part of the same social reality, one wherein business interests and the university are not seen as belonging to two separate galaxies but as part of the same answer to the threat of social and ethical nihilism. We who fancy ourselves philosophers would do well to create from within ourselves and from within our ranks a new kind of public intellectual who has both a hungry theoretical mind and who is yet capable of seeing the need to move past high theory to other important questions that are less bedazzling and "interesting" but more important to the prospect of our flourishing - questions such as "How is it possible to develop a citizenry that cherishes a certain hexis, one which prizes the character of the Samaritan on the road to Jericho almost more than any other?" or "How can we square the political dogma that undergirds the fantasy of a missile defense system with the need to treat America as but one member in a community of nations under a "law of peoples?" The new public philosopher might seek to understand labor law and military and trade theory and doctrine as much as theories of surplus value; the logic of international markets and trade agreements as much as critiques of commodification, and the politics of complexity as much as the politics of power (all of which can still be done from our arm chairs.) This means going down deep into the guts of our quotidian social institutions, into the grimy pragmatic details where intellectuals are loathe to dwell but where the officers and bureaucrats of those institutions take difficult and often unpleasant, imperfect decisions that affect other peoples' lives, and it means making honest attempts to truly understand how those institutions actually function in the actual world before howling for their overthrow commences. This might help keep us from being slapped down in debates by true policy pros who actually know what they are talking about but who lack awareness of the dogmatic assumptions from which they proceed, and who have not yet found a good reason to listen to jargon-riddled lectures from philosophers and culture critics with their snobish disrespect for the so-called "managerial class."

Alt Fails – Aff is a Prereq

Only the risk of a link turn – Nuclear Weapons are inherent tools for violence – we should withdraw them to be pragmatic. Keeping the weapons ensure perpetual violence.

SINGHA AND SETHIA 07 (Jasjit & Manpreet, CSIS, International Centre for Peace and Development, Futures 39, 963–972, http://www.icpd.org/defense\_studies/Elimination%20of%20nuclear%20weapons.htm) NAR

The persistence of nuclear weapons long after there is any conceivable justification for their existence is symptomatic of a deeper human dilemma. The very fact that we as human beings can remain complacent and patient in the face of such a gross violation of common sense and human welfare, taken in by facile arguments, lured by assurances that nothing will ever happen, points to a more fundamental problem in the way we think and live. That problem can be traced back to the division between mind and matter conceptualized by Descartes in the 17th Century and embodied in notion of the scientist as a detached observer of the world around him. Somewhere along the way, we have all acquired the scientific outlook of regarding the world around us with impartial detachment, even when that world along with its people and institutions are actively taking steps to destroy themselves and ourselves in the process. Reason has its limits, especially the reason arising from narrow perspectives and egoistic interests, which have no legitimate place in science. Here we sit discussing, analyzing and debating an issue dispassionately when our very lives and those of our children are at stake. It is not a question of morality or idealism. It is a question of pragmatism. The nuclear issue touches upon the very roots of our thinking process. It is a result of the destructive power arising from infinite division, a symbol of the violence arising from the egoistic division of reality into self and not-self. Science has reached the point at which the undivided wholeness of life is revealed. We need to accept and respect that reality and learn to act on it. Our concept of life as a finite or zero sum game consisting of winners and losers is hopelessly out-of-date and inconsistent with the fact that everywhere we see evidence that there is a way for everyone to win, as every member nation and citizen of the European Union stands to win from their growing association. It is time we shift from a finite to an infinite game in international affairs, a game in which the narrow, exclusive concept of competitive security is replaced with an inclusive concept of cooperative security. No longer should the security of each nation be based on enhancing its military capabilities so as to present an increasing threat or apparent threat to other nations. That is a game that generates at least one loser for every winner. It is a game that no nation can ever fully and finally win. The recent efforts to establish a unified European Army are evidence that a different kind of game is possible. The very battlefields which witnessed the most frequent, prolonged and horrible conflicts of the past 10 centuries have become a place where war against neighboring states and even against other nations is becoming increasingly ‘unthinkable’. That example should serve both as profound food for thought as well as an inspiring example for us to ponder and act upon.

Perm Solves – Reps

Combination of concrete improvements and the alternative solve best – The possibility of total extinction can morph human nature into idealistic unity

Zamoshkin 1 (Yuri, Russian Academy of Science, http://www-ee.stanford.edu/~hellman/Breakthrough/book/chapters/zamoshkin.html, AD: 6/30/10) jl

Long- and Short-Range Goals Even among those who actively work to eliminate the threat of nuclear disaster, the obvious discrepancy between ideal and reality can generate contradictory types of behavior. One reaction, typical of some arms control advocates, consists of concentrating attention on concrete and very important steps such as reducing one or another type of weapon, or increasing confidence and mutual understanding between people, but with a complete lack of faith in the ability to achieve the long-range goal of total nuclear disarmament. Another type of reaction is the mirror image of the first. Here, the necessity of achieving the ideal of nuclear disarmament is stressed, but without paying adequate attention to the immediate, concrete measures needed to restore confidence - confidence without which nuclear weapons will not be reduced significantly, much less eliminated. Today, as never before, it is important to have a twofold combination in the peace movement - theoretical and practical, short range and long range. Working for the ideal of nuclear disarmament is not enough by itself. Neither is working to bring about concrete, immediate improvements. Only together do these beliefs and actions provide an effective means for step-­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­by-step advancement along the difficult, contradictory, and lengthy road that leads to the ideal.   Working for the ideal of nuclear disarmament is not enough by itself. Neither is working to bring about concrete, immediate improvements. Only together do these beliefs and actions provide an effective means for step-by-step advancement along the difficult, contradictory, and lengthy road that leads to the ideal."     Politicians as Idealists The existence of the potential for nuclear annihilation creates, for the first time in history, a situation in which the traditional, practical concern of a professional politician for the security of his own nation new, nontraditional way of thinking. The threat of the death of the entire human species, his own country included, may prompt the use of such heretofore idealistic concepts as "unity," "integrity of mankind," and "the preeminence of general human interests over any private interests" as working tools in the search for effective ways of resolving the very practical problems of national security of his own state. The problem of security for one's own state is vividly seen as the problem of creating conditions for universal and equal security for all nations. Political idealism and pragmatism have become one.

The possibility of total extinction combined with the alternative creates a transformative state in which peace is possible

Zamoshkin 1 (Yuri, Russian Academy of Science, http://www-ee.stanford.edu/~hellman/Breakthrough/book/chapters/zamoshkin.html, AD: 6/30/10) jl

This situation, for the first time in history, directly, practically, and not purely speculatively, confronts human thought with the possibility of death for the entire human race. The continuity of history, which earlier had seemed to be a given, suddenly becomes highly questionable. As with the individual, this global grenzsituation may contribute to a "revelation" in human thinking and to a positive change of character previously thought impossible for our species. The global grenzsituation could give rise to the critical self-reflection needed to resolve the contradictions between ideals and political reality. It could prompt rethinking the essence and importance of everything that constitutes the "human experiment." In this unique situation, and the hope that humanity will come to comprehend it, lies the real possibility for ideal to finally be translated into practice.

The permutation allows humanity to be united under a common bond of vulnerability which solves the impacts to the K

Zamoshkin 1 (Yuri, Russian Academy of Science, http://www-ee.stanford.edu/~hellman/Breakthrough/book/chapters/zamoshkin.html, AD: 6/30/10) jl

If we look further, we find that the fragility of humanity's existence extends beyond nuclear weapons, or even conventional war. When the complexity and fragility of the systems needed today to feed, clothe, and nurture humanity are considered, we have all reason to say that the global grenzsituation will hardly disappear after the elimination of nuclear weapons or war. Rather this condition is a new and essential feature of our existence. But nuclear disarmament will be a critical step in that it will show that mankind really is capable of learning to overcome the threats created by his own technological genius.

Perm Solves – Movements

Your alternative doesn’t assume global momentum toward a world without nuclear weapons – combination of political and the alternative result in a transformed world

Evans and Kawaguchi 9 (Gareth and Yoriko - Co-Chairs of the International Commission on Nuclear Non-proliferation and Disarmament, http://beta.thehindu.com/opinion/lead/article26243.ece, AD: 6/30/10) jl

The time is right to make a renewed effort to break the logjam, building the global momentum led by the U.S. and Russia, to ensure that historic opportunities are not lost to indifference. There has been a range of appeals from current and former world leaders and nuclear decision makers urging a renewed effort to move the nuclear disarmament agenda forward: for new cuts to nuclear arsenals, bringing the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) into force and to commence negotiation of a treaty to ban the production of fissile material for weapons use. It is highly significant that President Barack Obama chose to convene this month a special meeting of the United Nations Security Council on nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament.

The International Commission on Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament seeks to contribute to the current global effort, to help build a new momentum to reconsider the role of nuclear weapons in international relations and eventually to eliminate them. This is not an issue which we can allow to be pushed aside by new threats, be they concerns over the global financial crisis or the prospect of pandemics and climate change. The nuclear threat is an ever present danger which must be addressed in parallel. And after a decade of neglect, the issue demands priority attention from our political leaders world-wide.

Indeed nuclear weapons could still be the biggest risk of all to the peace and stability of our world — at the global level and regionally: nuclear weapons arsenals are still huge. The possibility remains that still more countries will acquire them, and the danger persists of their deliberate or accidental use by states or non-state terrorist actors.

That is why we, the Commission, and indeed the international community, were greatly encouraged by the results of the April summit between Presidents Medvedev and Obama. The agreement to pursue a deal on cutting nuclear weapons that would replace the 1991 Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START), Russia should kick start movement on broader disarmament and non-proliferation measures.

Leadership from Russia and the U.S. is crucial, but so too is the commitment of other nuclear armed states if nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament momentum is to be regenerated. But there has to be buy-in from many other international players as well. The moment has to be seized by governments, and civil society activists around the world, working to a common action agenda that is both idealistic and realistically pragmatic. The countries of South Asia have made it clear that they share with most other nations the conviction that every effort should be made to eliminate the world’s store of nuclear weapons. But it is clear that there are still major regional challenges to be addressed to bring about the circumstances whereby this process can be moved forward. The effort has to be global but it must be matched by addressing regional challenges.

Perm Solves – State Key

Perm Do Both: Combining the political process with outside alternatives is critical to creating real political change.

Burke 7 (Pf Politics & International Relations @ U of New South Wales, Sydney, 07 Anthony Burke, Theory & Event, Vol. 10, No. 2)NAR

But is there a way out? Is there no possibility of agency and choice? Is this not the key normative problem I raised at the outset, of how the modern ontologies of war efface agency, causality and responsibility from decision making; the responsibility that comes with having choices and making decisions, with exercising power? (In this I am much closer to Connolly than Foucault, in Connolly's insistence that, even in the face of the anonymous power of discourse to produce and limit subjects, selves remain capable of agency and thus incur responsibilities.88) There seems no point in following Heidegger in seeking a more 'primal truth' of being -- that is to reinstate ontology and obscure its worldly manifestations and consequences from critique. However we can, while refusing Heidegger's unworldly89 nostalgia, appreciate that he was searching for a way out of the modern system of calculation; that he was searching for a 'questioning', 'free relationship' to technology that would not be immediately recaptured by the strategic, calculating vision of enframing. Yet his path out is somewhat chimerical -- his faith in 'art' and the older Greek attitudes of 'responsibility and indebtedness' offer us valuable clues to the kind of sensibility needed, but little more. When we consider the problem of policy, the force of this analysis suggests that choice and agency can be all too often limited; they can remain confined (sometimes quite wilfully) within the overarching strategic and security paradigms. Or, more hopefully, policy choices could aim to bring into being a more enduringly inclusive, cosmopolitan and peaceful logic of the political. But this cannot be done without seizing alternatives from outside the space of enframing and utilitarian strategic thought, by being aware of its presence and weight and activating a very different concept of existence, security and action. This would seem to hinge upon 'questioning' as such -- on the questions we put to the real and our efforts to create and act into it. Do security and strategic policies seek to exploit and direct humans as material, as energy, or do they seek to protect and enlarge human dignity and autonomy? Do they seek to impose by force an unjust status quo (as in Palestine), or to remove one injustice only to replace it with others (the U.S. in Iraq or Afghanistan), or do so at an unacceptable human, economic, and environmental price? Do we see our actions within an instrumental, amoral framework (of 'interests') and a linear chain of causes and effects (the idea of force), or do we see them as folding into a complex interplay of languages, norms, events and consequences which are less predictable and controllable?91 And most fundamentally: Are we seeking to coerce or persuade? Are less violent and more sustainable choices available? Will our actions perpetuate or help to end the global rule of insecurity and violence? Will our thought?

Perm Solves – State Key

Permutation key to solvency – rejecting the use of state power kills alt solvency

Hawkes 87 (Dr. Glenn. W. Hawkes, Executive Director, Parents, Teachers & Students for Social Responsibility, [Bulletin of Atomic Scientists, “Sex, power, and nuclear language,” Sept., v43, no.7, pg. 59-60 TBC 6/30/10)

My third concern is with Conns call for "alternative voices." I agree that we must explore alternatives, and in the process we will no doubt create something of a new language that will guide us on new paths. But there is a strong tendency in the peace community to employ language that is perceived on Main Street, U.S.A., as "alternative"— and thus as unacceptable. We have a rich tradition of exposing nukespeak for what it is, but we have not been skillful in using the public language to our advantage. We have generally avoided using motherhood and apple pic symbols, like the flag. We've seen those symbols abused, and consequently have chosen not to identify with them. Meanwhile, the right wing has successfully manipulated main-stream language to advance its agenda. Just as there is an elitist core of men who monopolize the technostrategic discourse, there is also (to a lesser degree. I think) in the progressive ranks a core of thinkers who tend to use alternative language in a way that diminishes rather than enhances our power. In fact the very idea of possessing political power is often construed as something negative from the activist perspective of which I speak, and from which I hail. The struggle for an alternative future is thus, at times, led by individuals and organizations with an aversion to power politics and a disdain for the public language, a stance that most surely guarantees failure in the political arena. There is an ironic dialectic at work here: the pursuit of alternative futures depends in part upon our understanding and using mainstream symbols. We must use the system to beat the system, employing mainstream language to change mainstream patterns of thought and action. For example, if we are to increase the prospects for a new world order, we might promote nationalism in order to transcend nationalism. We can use any number of historical examples from the founding of our nation: national sovereignty on this continent was pursued in order to preserve the several states, all threatened—as nations are today—with destruction in their condition of disunity. In other words, if we love our nation we must promote a more viable international order to preserve it. It was Jefferson, I think, who always claimed to be a Virginian first and foremost, even after serving as president. He supported national sovereignty because he thought it was the best way to protect and preserve his beloved Virginia. Let's dig out such examples and put them to work in the public language, reinforcing concerns for defense, security, and national interest. Rather than calling for "compelling alternative visions," we should explore "compelling mainstream visions." Changing that one word alerts us to the importance of communicating with the farmer, the auto mechanic, the school teacher, the person selling insurance, and the people who live next door. One way of dealing with the technostratcgic thinkers might be to ignore them while at the same time developing the political clout needed to change national policy.

Perm Solves – Pragmatism

Perm is key – Utopianism fails

Schwartz and Derber 90 (The Nuclear Seduction, http://www.escholarship.org/editions/view?docId=ft1n39n7wg&brand=ucpress TBC 6/30/10)

One reason for the tendency to ignore Lebow's warning is the widespread feeling that, whatever the dangers of political conflict and war, they cannot be eliminated for the foreseeable future. True, peaceful coexistence among nationalities, races, states, and classes is still inconceivable. There is little hope that the leading states will renounce violence as a means to maintain and extend their political power wherever they feel it can succeed. But neither nuclear arms nor war—which together produce the nuclear threat—is likely to disappear soon. The only sensible question to ask is whether chipping away at them can make a difference to the danger. Incremental steps toward the abolition of nuclear weapons, as we have emphasized, are almost meaningless considering the absolute destructive potential and uncontrollability of those that remain. The same is not true of efforts to prevent war and other forms of conventional political violence. Successful incremental steps in this direction matter a great deal—both to those who would have been maimed and killed and to the rest of us, who are thereby spared one more occasion on which events could slip out of hand and terminate civilization. Today George Kennan's proposed 50 percent across-the-board cut in nuclear arms would mean little. A 50 percent cut in superpower military intervention and nuclear risk taking in the Third World might save the planet and would certainly save many lives. The long- term visions of a nonnuclear world and of a world beyond war should not be cast aside. Ultimately they may be the only chance for planetary survival, and they are certainly the only chance for a decent way of life. But we must accept that neither goal can be reached easily or rapidly, and that they may never be reached. We must take what steps we can to reduce the nuclear threat now. Otherwise there may be no long run to worry about.

Perm Solves – Pragmatism

The negative’s alternate can’t generate real change – obtaining a peaceful society requires a way to combat violence. The perm is the best option.

Isaac 2 (Jeffrey C Isaac, Indiana University James H. Rudy Professor of Political Science and Center for the Study of Democracy and Public Life director, Spring 2002, Ends, Means, and Politics,” Dissent Magazine Vol. 49 Issue 2, p35-6)

And yet the left’s reflexive hostility toward violence in the international domain is strange. It is inconsistent with avowals of “materialism” and evocations of “struggle,” especially on the part of those many who are not pacifists; it is in tension with a commitment to human emancipation (is there no cause for which it is justifiable to fight?); and it is oblivious to the tradition of left thinking about ends and means. To compare the debates within the left about the two world wars or the Spanish Civil War with the predictable “anti-militarism” of today’s campus left is to compare a discourse that was serious about political power with a discourse that is not. This unpragmatic approach has become a hallmark of post–cold war left commentary, from the Gulf War protests of 1991, to the denunciation of the 1999 U.S.-led NATO intervention in Kosovo, to the current post–September 11 antiwar movement. In each case protesters have raised serious questions about U.S. policy and its likely consequences, but in a strikingly ineffective way. They sound a few key themes: the broader context of grievances that supposedly explains why Saddam Hussein, or Slobodan Milosevic, or Osama bin Laden have done what they have done; the hypocrisy of official U.S. rhetoric, which denounces terrorism even though the U.S. government has often supported terrorism; the harm that will come to ordinary Iraqi or Serbian or Afghan citizens as a result of intervention; and the cycle of violence that is likely to ensue. These are important issues. But they typically are raised by left critics not to promote real debate about practical alternatives, but to avoid such a debate or to trump it. As a result, the most important political questions are simply not asked. It is assumed that U.S. military intervention is an act of “aggression,” but no consideration is given to the aggression to which intervention is a response. The status quo ante in Afghanistan is not, as peace activists would have it, peace, but rather terrorist violence abetted by a regime—the Taliban—that rose to power through brutality and repression. This requires us to ask a question that most “peace” activists would prefer not to ask: What should be done to respond to the violence of a Saddam Hussein, or a Milosevic, or a Taliban regime? What means are likely to stop violence and bring criminals to justice? Calls for diplomacy and international law are well intended and important; they implicate a decent and civilized ethic of global order. But they are also vague and empty, because they are not accompanied by any account of how diplomacy or international law can work effectively to address the problem at hand. The campus left offers no such account. To do so would require it to contemplate tragic choices in which moral goodness is of limited utility. Here what matters is not purity of intention but the intelligent exercise of power.

Perm Solves – Individuals

Permutation, do both: The affirmative is an individual response to the state’s control of nuclear weapon. We stop engaging in the rhetoric described in the 1NC, that’s the status quo.

Lichterman 9

(lawyer and policy analyst Western States Legal Foundation, 09, Andrew Lichterman, Disarmament work amidst a global economic crisis, 8/6, disarmamentactivist, http://disarmamentactivist.org/wp-content/uploads/2009/08/Lichterman%20Hiroshima%20Day%202009.pdf) NAR

We also must take back our politics from the technocrats and professionals, people with little to sell us except how to sell. Their language of “branding” and “entrepreneurship” pervades the political culture, reaching now far into the so-called “nonprofit” sector and even down to community groups. Far too many mouth the words without thinking about what they mean. They are in fact expressions of the corporate attitudes and practices that have pushed our economy into bankruptcy and our ecosphere to the brink of disaster. The path to a more just and peaceful world will be one of cooperation and solidarity, not more competition. The road to Martin Luther King’s revolution in values will not be “branded” or advertised. We face this dangerous and difficult moment without much in the way of recent analysis and discussion that helps us understand the relationship between nuclear weapons and the structures of a global society and politics that are in crisis and are changing fast. In these circumstances, we must discard much of the “expert” analysis, beginning again with what we know about nuclear weapons, what every human being can know about them. As the Russell- Einstein Manifesto put it over a half century ago, “remember your humanity and forget the rest.” Nuclear weapons represent the threat of unlimited violence, and of willingness to sacrifice the people for the State.6 The decision to acquire nuclear weapons raises to the level of an absolute the willingness of those in power to risk all of us, and everything, to achieve their ends. And it is a decision that in every case has first been taken in secret, with neither the means nor ends open to question, much less choice, by the vast majority of those affected. Both the decision to acquire nuclear weapons and the manner in which it always is taken should tell us that the “state” that we live in significant ways does not “represent” us. We must understand that it represents someone, or something, else– and that our very survival may depend on finding out who or what, and doing something about it. This is what it means for the state we live in to have nuclear weapons, at the simplest and most basic level. It is in this context that educating ourselves and others about the terrible realities of nuclear warfare can have positive meaning. This must not, however, be the end of the discussion, but the beginning. Stopping here, we risk contributing to a climate of fear and hopelessness that can demoralize those we hope to organize, and that can reinforce the fearbased ideologies of those who offer more armaments as the only “practical” form of “security” in a dangerous world. Starting here, we can begin to understand the violence that sustains both stratified societies and the inequities of the global system as a whole.

A2: Reps/Discourse Matters

Our rhetoric is irrelevant – outcomes are the only moral things that have weight in the political process, our intentions are irrelevant.

Isaac 2 (Jeffrey C Isaac, Indiana University James H. Rudy Professor of Political Science and Center for the Study of Democracy and Public Life director, Spring 2002, Ends, Means, and Politics,” Dissent Magazine Vol. 49 Issue 2, p35-6)

Power is not a dirty word or an unfortunate feature of the world. It is the core of politics. Power is the ability to effect outcomes in the world. Politics, in large part, involves contests over the distribution and use of power. To accomplish anything in the political world, one must attend to the means that are necessary to bring it about. And to develop such means is to develop, and to exercise power. To say this is not to say that power is beyond morality. It is to say that power is not reducible to morality. As writers such as Niccolo Machiavelli, Max Weber, Reinhold Niebuhr, and Hannah Arendt have taught. An unyielding concern with moral goodness undercuts political responsibility. The concern may be morally laudable, reflecting a kind of personal integrity, but it suffers from three fatal flaws: (1) it fails to see that the purity of one’s intention does not ensure the achievement of what one intends. Abjuring violence or refusing to make common cause with morally compromised parties may seem like the right thing, but if such tactics entail impotence, then it is hard to view them as serving any moral good beyond the clean conscience of their supporters: (2) it fails to see that in a world of real violence and injustice, moral purity is not simply a form of powerlessness: it is often a form of complicity in injustice. This is why, from the standpoint of politics—as opposed to religion- pacifism is always a potentially immoral stand. In categorically repudiating violence, it refuses in principle to oppose certain violent injustices with any effect: and (3) it fails to see that politics is as much about unintended consequences as it is about intentions: it is the effects of action, rather than the motives of action, this is most significant. Just as the alignment with “good” may engender impotence, it is often the pursuit of “good” that generates evil. This is the lesson of communism on the twentieth century: it is not enough that one’s goals be sincere or idealistic: it is equally important, always, to ask about the effects of pursuing these goals and to judge these effects in pragmatic and historically contextualized ways. Moral absolutism inhibits this judgment. It alienates those who are not true believers. It promotes arrogance. And it undermines political effectiveness.

No Impact – Movements

Nuclear movements fail

Totten 9 (M Samuel, U of Arkansas Professor Review of Not on Our Watch: The Mission to End Genocide in Darfur and Beyond, Genocide Studies and Prevention, Volume 4, Number 1, Spring 2009, http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/genocide\_studies\_and\_prevention/v004/4.1.totten01.html TBC 7/1/10

The authors correctly assert that ‘‘throughout American history, social movements have helped shape our government’s policy on a variety of issues’’ (13), but what they do not seem to appreciate (or do not want to admit, as it would interfere with their argument and their agenda) is that such social movements dealt with single self-contained national issues such as the emancipation of women, the Civil Rights movement, the anti–Vietnam War movement. Some, such as the anti-nuclear movement, had an international focus, but one has to question just how much good the anti-nuclear movement of the 1980s did, given the nuclear arsenals that exist around the world today: both the number of weapons in these arsenals and the number of nations belonging to the so-called nuclear club are slowly but inexorably growing.

AT: Chaloupka

No Alt Solvency – Chaloupka’s method is completely inaccessible through political action

Brians 92 (Paul, Prof Department of English WSU, http://www.wsu.edu/~brians/ntc/NTC8.pdf, AD: 7/1/10) jl

One of Chaloupka’s greatest strengths is this penetration of political and nuclear paradoxes. The survival and accident arguments familiar to the antinuclear camp are riddled with contradiction (3-7, 13-16). Opponents argue for controls and then use them against nukes; proponents justify widespread surveillance and disciplinary measures and then proclaim the advancement of freedom. “Repeatedly, the sign of the paradox presents itself as the characteristic sign of an era that strains to ignore those signs and to present a politics of values in response” (16). And so on throughout the book. It is in this terrain of the paradoxical that Chaloupka affirms postmodernism as a better way to interact with power in a world without absolute values. For both nuclearists and their opponents, he argues, share “more than they dispute” regarding reality and values. (I will return later to this substratum critique of liberal humanistic values and procedures.) The result has been the perpetuation and extension of the “institutions, habits, and contexts” of nuclear arms. The Richland High School (near the Hanford Nuclear Reservation) students who defend their sports name—the Bombers— and their symbol—the mushroom cloud—suggest an alternative attention to “images and problematizations.” Chaloupka would engage “the conundrums and incongruities of the nuclear age” exhibited by both proponents and opponents by employing the philosophy and methods of postmodernism, which he links with postructuralism and deconstructionism (xiii) (à la Michel Foucault) and labels, for the specific context of his book “nuclear criticism.” Postmodernism is poststructuralist (deconstructive) literary analysis intended “to problematize institutions and practices [power] that had become so resistant to criticism” (ix); because nuclear power and all of its adjuncts are textual, enwoven in language, especially in paradoxical language, this new approach of literary criticism offers a new way to “interact with power.” But if the book were only this straightforward throughout. James Soderholm recently asked, “Why do progressive intellectuals often write and speak in a language foreign to the very audience in whose interests they claim to campaign?” He complains of Foucault’s, Fredric Jameson’s, and Gayatri Spivak’s “supernaturally difficult jargon” and “willful obscurantism,” which he contrasts to Vaclav Havel’s direct, non-technical language. Sometimes Chaloupka seems to be trying to out-Baudrillard Baudrillard. For example, he writes sympathetically of Baudrillard’s “notion of contemporary power” as spread “throughout society without acting.” “Such power implodes and leukemizes.... In this instance of power (which clarifies and exemplifies Foucault’s controversial argument), there is no action, intention, or conspiracy . . this is precisely postructuralist power” (17). He means that the nuclear mangers do not escalate to red alert and nuclear holocaust. But what would Baudrillard and Chaloupka have us do short of the bombs that would end all conversation? Yes, understand “how some of our fables have posed a very strange plot” (137). Nuclear opponents (Noam Chomsky notably) have done that extensively. The U.S. National Security State infects everything with systematic intent and action and even conspiracy, as Richard Curry’s and thousands of investigations have shown. So what does Buadrillard/Chaloupka means by non-intentional, non-active postructuralist power in a world of machination?

AT: Chaloupka

Chaloupka’s alternative is politically useless – no mechanism for deployment

Brians 92 (Paul, Prof Department of ENglish WSU, http://www.wsu.edu/~brians/ntc/NTC8.pdf, AD: 7/1/10) jl

The confusion underlying this apparent tangle has two closely related sources: Chaloupka plunges in, dismisses careful initial conceptualization, and defines by accretion. Of course this book’s audience is scholarly, but I do not believe anyone can say what Chaloupka means by “modernism,” without which “postmodernism” becomes a slippery term. In their anthology, Bradbury and McFarlane define modernism as a literary movement between 1890 and 1930. In the Preface to his anthology, Peter Brook describes postmodern as the capitalist world (television, mass production, and consumption) and its opponents. What is modernism to Chaloupka? We are provided a key summary of features near the end: liberal and Marxist commitment to scientific certainty (134). And he is still defining postmodern/postructural/deconstructive and liberal humanist discourse in the last chapter. I do not have space to describe all the reasons why this book makes difficult reading. (Is “nukespeak” criticism “a simple critique of euphemism,” when Hilgartner, et al.’s Nukespeak is a major analysis of secrecy and censorship in the United States?) But let me end mainly positively. By insisting upon the failure of the traditional Enlightenment liberal humanistic, scientific, opposition to nuclear war preparations (Chap. 4 on Star Wars and the Freeze), and by urging an alternative strategy of postmodern irony, he nudges all of us in the peace movement to rethink our assumptions and methods. Liberal humanist antinuclearist politics has offered (referring to Helen Caldicott) “a sober, anti-ironic terrorism of images” (133–34), but has it generally degenerated into finalities that resolve questions, reify value choices, and avoid realistic politics (137)? He too sweepingly dismisses the flexibility and the achievements of the liberal humanist antinuclearists. But of great value, postmodern politics seeks “to delegitimize the subtle, contemporary forms of authority” in both nuclearists and antinuclearists (128), an discards programs but offers ironic possibilities in the face of the paradoxes of power. However, the “discourse that would raise those discomforts in a critical manner has hardly begun to be identified” (138).

Alt can’t solve the links – Chaloupka’s exclusion of non-European perspective ignores the alternative casualties to the Ks impacts

Caputi 95 (Jane, University of New Mexico, American Quarterly, Vol. 47, No. 1, pp. 165-175, JSTOR) jl

While Chaloupka looks almost exclusively to European men such as Baudrillard, Derrida, and Foucault to offer essential insights, he ignores relevant perspectives from those who occupy less privileged realms (and use far more accessible language) but long have "problematized" nuclearism by deconstructing its signs and wrenching it out of traditional Western paradigms. For example, European-American feminist thinkers (including Diana E. H. Russell, Charlene Spretnak, and Carol Cohn) have pointed to the investiture of patriarchal (rapist and domineering) desire/sexuality into nuclear weaponry.4 Simultaneously, feminists of color (including June Jordan, Alice Walker, and Winona LaDuke) have pointed to a continuing legacy of colonialism, environmental racism, and genocide against peoples of color, particularly indigenous peoples, who have been disproportion- ately afflicted by the acknowledged and unacknowledged atomic experi- mentation and development.

AT: Chaloupka

Permutation solves best – the totalizing nature of Chaloupka’s critique fractures effective coalitions against nuclear weapons

Krishna 93 (Sankaran, Professor of Political Science, U of Hawaii, Alternatives 1993, v. 18. p. 400-1) jl

The dichotomous choice presented in this excerpt is straightforward: one either indulges in total critique, delegitimizing all sovereign truths, or one is committed to “nostalgic,” essentialist unities that have become obsolete and have been the grounds for all our oppressions.

In offering this dichotomous choice, Der Derian replicates a move made by Chaloupka in his equally dismissive critique of the move mainstream nuclear opposition, the Nuclear Freeze movement of the early 1980s, that, according to him, was operating along obsolete lines, emphasizing “facts” and “realities,” while a “postmodern” President Reagan easily outflanked them through an illusory Star Wars program (See KN: chapter 4)

Chaloupka centers this difference between his own supposedly total critique of all sovereign truths (which he describes as nuclear criticism in an echo of literary criticism) and the more partial (and issue based) criticism of what he calls “nuclear opposition” or “antinuclearists” at the very outset of his book. (Kn: xvi) Once again, the unhappy choice forced upon the reader is to join Chaloupka in his total critique of all sovereign truths or be trapped in obsolete essentialisms.

This leads to a disastrous politics, pitting groups that have the most in common (and need to unite on some basis against each other. Both Chaloupka and Der Derian thus reserve their most trenchant critique for political groups that should, in any analysis, be regarded as the closest to them in terms of an oppositional politics and their desired futures. Instead of finding ways to live with these differences and to (if fleetingly) coalesce against the New Right, this fratricidal critique is politically suicidal. It obliterates the space for a political activism based on provisional and contingent coalitions, for uniting behind a common cause even as one recognizes that the coalition is comprised of groups that have very differing (and possibly unresolvable) views of reality. Moreover, it fails to consider the possibility that there may have been other, more compelling reasons for the “failure” of the Nuclear Freeze movement or anti-Gulf War movement. Like many a worthwhile cause in our times, they failed to garner sufficient support to influence state policy. The response to that need not be a totalizing critique that delegitimizes all narratives.

The blackmail inherent in the choice offered by Der Derian and Chaloupka, between total critique and “ineffective” partial critique, ought to be transparent. Among other things, it effectively militates against the construction of provisional or strategic essentialisms in our attempts to create space for activist politics. In the next section, I focus more widely on the genre of critical international theory and its impact on such an activist politics.

A2 Prolif K

Solves – Prolif Epistemology Solves

The support of scholars is critical to the success of non-proliferation

KRAUSE 7 (JOACHIM, IR-Christian-Albrechts U., *International Affairs* 83: 3 (2007) 483–499 http://www.politik.uni-kiel.de/publikationen/krause/krauseenlightenment.pdf TBC 6/29/10)

It is no secret that the political agenda of arms control and, in particular, of nuclear non-proliferation has been influenced over the past four decades by the school of liberal arms control. This epistemic community has defined the basic tenets of international arms control and non-proliferation politics. It encompasses not only scholars and researchers, but also a large number of diplomats, politicians, bureaucrats and journalists. Members of this school have shaped US arms control policy since the 1960s, many experts from that community having served various US administrations. But the group has also found adherents outside the United States. International arms control diplomacy has been to a great extent the result of diligent and devoted eff orts by liberal arms controllers from several parts of the world. Without this epistemic community, international arms control and nonproliferation efforts would not have been so successful.

NPT/Arms Control Good

Their argument is premised on 3 faulty assumptions – Arms control agreements have done more good than bad

Yost 7 (David, Naval Postgraduate School Associate Professor, Former DOD Official, Woodrow Wilson International Center Security Studies Fellow, John Hopkins Visiting Scholar, Int'l Affairs, 83.3, http://www.chathamhouse.org.uk/news/view/-/id/370/, AD: 6/30/10) jl

Applying the method of enlightenment correctly to the area of nuclear nonproliferation would require a major effort to critically evaluate ideologies. Liberal arms control-despite its many successes and merits-has devised over the years a whole set of ideological tenets and attitudes. Some of them have been transformed into beliefs that could be termed myths. The most prominent ideological myth of the liberal arms control school is the notion that the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty of 1968 (NPT) was in essence a disarmament agreement, not a non-proliferation treaty. To depict the negotiations as a premeditated effort of enlightenment, here the governments of this world came together to solemnly decide that some of them would be allowed to have some nuclear weapons for an interim period while the others would renounce their possession immediately, is pure. It would be equally wrong to qualify the 'grand bargain' as one between the nuclear haves and the nuclear have-nots. Another myth of the liberal arms control school is the notion that-in order to gain support for the NPT-the superpowers had altered their nuclear weapons strategy in the 1960s. Again, this contention is not borne out by the development of nuclear strategies and doctrines. The third myth is the contention that there was an abrupt shift in US non-proliferation policy as George W. Bush came into power. The major changes in US non-proliferation policy had already started during the Clinton administration and some of them can be traced back to the tenure of President George W. H. Bush senior. They all rejected the changed international environment and represented necessary adjustments of the non-proliferation strategy. The Clinton administration left some of the traditional paths of arms control and rightly undertook some changes that were necessary because traditional instruments of arms control were no longer adequate. The Bush administration continued that policy, but in a more radical way.

Universal vision or bounded rationality?

William Walker's article takes a strongly universalist view of the requirements of nuclear order. It finds recent American administrations deliberately unwilling to maintain international confidence in the necessary collective narrative of eventual universal nuclear disarmament, so causing a crisis of confidence in the Non Proliferation Treaty regime. This commentary examines how far realistically different recent US policies and declarations could have avoided such problems, given certain underlying realities and dynamics surrounding the management of nuclear weapons. It also questions how indispensable abstract universalism will be in containing future nuclear proliferation.

Enlightenment in the second nuclear age

The debate on nuclear proliferation has become increasingly polarized. While there is widespread agreement on the perilous state of the traditional non-proliferation regime, the analyses of the causes differ widely. The liberal arms control community has sought to salvage the eroding non-proliferation regime both by overplaying its importance ('nuclear enlightenment') as well as by blaming the policies of the nuclear weapons states, notably the United States. However, this view rests on several assumptions that have been increasingly revealed as myths: the myth of a universal non-proliferation norm generated largely by the Nonproliferation Treaty; the myth of a direct relationship between nuclear reductions and proliferation; and the myth of US policy being a cause of, rather than a reaction to, the non-proliferation crisis. Clinging to these myths is counterproductive, as it seeks to perpetuate old policies at the expense of new approaches. However, new approaches to non-proliferation are bound to gain in importance, even if they run counter to established arms control dogmas.

NPT/Arms Control Good

Arms control agreements although not perfect have led to incremental reforms that make the world safer

Yost 7 (David, Naval Postgraduate School Associate Professor, Former DOD Official, Woodrow Wilson International Center Security Studies Fellow, John Hopkins Visiting Scholar, Int'l Affairs, 83.3, http://www.chathamhouse.org.uk/news/view/-/id/370/, AD: 6/30/10) jl

'All the king's men'? Refashioning global order

Is the moment auspicious, as William Walker has argued, for a rebirth of the world nuclear ordering project? An auspicious moment would be marked by three key factors. First, the United States would seek to assert significant leadership and moreover would be able to do so on a sustained, bipartisan basis. Second, other actors essential to the project would be ready to lend their thinking and power to this effort. Third, a few key ideas about the management of the emerging challenges of deterrence and abstinence would have emerged and garnered substantial international support. All three factors are lacking today. But the time will come. To accelerate the arrival of the necessary vision and will, the policy and analytical communities should set some priorities and focus on a few hard problems.

Towards an NPT-restrained world that makes economic sense

Because most of the world's proliferators have used the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty's (NPT) call on nations to 'share the benefits of the applications of peaceful nuclear energy' to help justify their nuclear activities, it is unclear just how much any proliferator ultimately has been restrained by these rules. This needs to change but is unlikely, unless the NPT's qualifications on the right to 'peaceful' nuclear energy are read in a much more restrictive fashion to only authorize nuclear projects that are clearly beneficial economically and that truly can be safeguarded against diversion to make bombs. In this regard, our best hope is that, as nations consider how to prevent global warming, they might adopt clear economic guidelines that would compel all energy projects-both nuclear and non-nuclear-to compete economically against one another on a much more level playing field. This would make dangerous, uneconomical nuclear projects far less likely to be pursued, and a centering of the world's security on a proper reading of the NPT much more likely and sustainable. Indeed, unless economic discipline of this sort is attempted internationally, it is quite likely that the continued implementation of the current egregious view of the NPT will only serve to accelerate nuclear proliferation more rapidly than if there was no NPT at all.

Analysing international nuclear order

William Walker's article, 'Nuclear enlightenment and counter-enlightenment', raises fundamental questions about the history of efforts to construct order in international politics in relation to nuclear arms and weapons-related capabilities. However, Walker's 'enlightenment' and 'counter-enlightenment' tropes are clumsy and unsatisfactory tools for analysing contemporary policies concerning nuclear deterrence, non-proliferation and disarmament. Walker holds that in the 1960s and 1970s most of the governments of the world came together in pursuit of 'a grand enlightenment project'. This thesis cannot withstand empirical scrutiny with regard to its three main themes-a supposed US-Soviet consensus on doctrines of stabilizing nuclear deterrence through mutual vulnerability, a notion that the NPT derived from 'concerted efforts to construct an international nuclear order meriting that title', and the view that the NPT embodied a commitment to achieve nuclear disarmament. Walker's criticisms of US nuclear policies since the late 1990s are in several cases overstated or ill-founded. Walker also exaggerates the potential influence of the United States over the policies of other countries. It is partly for this reason that the challenges at hand-both analytical and practical-are more complicated and difficult than his article implies. His work nonetheless has the great merit of raising fundamental questions about international political order.

No Impact – Doesn’t Turn Case – Prolif

Alt Cause – National Pride

Bowman 8 (Bradley L. CFR International Affairs Fellow The ‘Demand-Side’: Avoiding a Nuclear-Armed Iran TBC 7/2/10)

In addition to Iran’s desire for security, national pride and prestige apparently play a major role in Iran’s long-term motivation to acquire a nuclear weapons capability. This is not surprising; nonproliferation scholarship has long identified national pride and prestige as major motivators for pursuing nuclear weapons. For example, these factors played a significant role in the nuclear ‘‘roll forward’’ decisions of Argentina, Brazil, France, India, Indonesia, Libya, and Romania. Today, the fact that five permanent members of the U.N. Security Council also represent the acknowledged nuclear powers under the NPT reinforces the idea that nuclear weapons are a prerequisite to great power status. The fact that several nuclear powers appear to attach great worth to their nuclear programs ‘‘reinforces just how important these weapons can be as sources of power and prestige.’’19

Alt Cause – Domestic Politics

Bowman 8 (Bradley L. CFR International Affairs Fellow The ‘Demand-Side’: Avoiding a Nuclear-Armed Iran TBC 7/2/10)

In addition to the prestige and national pride projected internationally, Iran’s nuclear program has served a useful domestic purpose for the regime in Tehran. Ahmadinejad ran for office on an essentially populist platform, promising various economic reforms. For the most part, Ahmadinejad has been unable to deliver on these promises. In fact, the Iranian economy continues to suffer from spiraling unemployment and inflation. In April 2008, the outgoing Iranian economy minister blamed Ahmadinejad for the country’s economic woes.24 Suggesting the degree of frustration that exists in Iran regarding the economy, 50 leading economists, risking regime retribution, published a harshly worded letter to Ahmadinejad decrying high unemployment and inflation in Iran.25 By focusing on Iran’s nuclear enrichment program, Ahmadinejad has attempted to shift attention away from his economic failures and promote a degree of unity and regime support that would not otherwise exist due to the country’s economic woes. For Ahmadinejad, to a significant extent, the confrontation over Iran’s nuclear program has served to unify the Iranian people around themes of ‘‘Persian pride’’ and to distract them from his economic shortcomings.

Alt Cause – Security Concerns

Bowman 8 (Bradley L. CFR International Affairs Fellow The ‘Demand-Side’: Avoiding a Nuclear-Armed Iran TBC 7/2/10)

An Iranian desire for security appears to drive long-term Iranian interest in obtaining a nuclear weapons capability. One need not delve into the long history of British, Russian, and American involvement in Iran to appreciate the Iranian desire for security from foreign intervention in domestic affairs. In just the last three decades, Iraq invaded Iran, the United States encircled Iran by invading Iraq and Afghanistan, and the United States threatened Tehran with regime change. To appreciate the central role that security plays in motivating the apparent Iranian nuclear weapons program, each of these events deserves additional attention.

No Impact – Doesn’t Turn Case – Prolif

Multiple alt causes to proliferation

Bowman 8 (Bradley L. CFR International Affairs Fellow The ‘Demand-Side’: Avoiding a Nuclear-Armed Iran TBC 7/2/10)

Since the advent of nuclear weapons at the end of World War II, 29 states have pursued nuclear arsenals. However, 18 of these states willingly abandoned their programs—a decision often called nuclear ‘‘rollback.’’2 These 18 case studies provide ample evidence that states can be dissuaded from pursuing nuclear weapons when the international community—and often the United States in particular—addresses the motivations behind the state’s quest for nuclear weapons. A review of these case studies offers four particularly important lessons. First, rarely is there a single explanation for a nation’s decision to pursue nuclear weapons. According to a National Defense University (NDU) study, the most influential ‘‘roll forward’’ factors have been: assessment of threat, breakdown of global nonproliferation norms, national pride and unity, personal leadership, strategic deterrent, and perceived weakening of security alliances.3

No Impact – Doesn’t Turn Case – Prolif

Proliferation reps don’t cause prolif – 5 Empirical Alt Causes

Garden 1 (Professor Sir Timothy Indiana University 1 March http://www.tgarden.demon.co.uk/writings/articles/2001/010301nuc.html TBC 7/2/10)

Insecurity The most common strategic reason for developing a nuclear weapon capability is insecurity. If a state feels extremely threatened, it may see a nuclear capability as its only defense. This will be particularly the case if the perceived threat is itself nuclear (or more lately perhaps Biological). The first nuclear weapon programme was developed as the answer to the potential development of atomic weapons by Germany in World War 2, and was continued for similar fears about the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union developed its nuclear capability as part of its armoury against a hostile West. China saw itself as vulnerable to a surprise attack from the United States, and it needed nuclear capability to deter such an attack. Israel saw itself as surrounded by enemies who wanted to sweep it into the sea. Iraq sees itself at risk from Israeli nuclear weapons, and from western nuclear powers and potentially from Iran. Similarly Iran fears Iraq, Israel and the United States. India saw itself vulnerable to Chinese nuclear weapons in any war, and Pakistan saw itself at risk from Indian weapons. International isolation can increase a state’s sense of insecurity, and therefore its need for a nuclear capability. This was the case for South Africa in apartheid times, and has been true of North Korea, Iran, Iraq and Libya at various times. The international isolation today will normally deepen if there are signs of a nuclear weapon programme under development, and this may reinforce the belief that such weapons are needed. On the other hand an extended security arrangement with a friendly nuclear power reduces the need to undertake a national nuclear programme. Aids to Victory While the acquisition of nuclear weapons for reasons of insecurity will primarily be centred on deterring nuclear attack, the weapons have also been seen as warfighting capabilities. The United States used them against the Japanese in order to secure victory in 1945. The use of them against Russia and China may also have been contemplated. Certainly the use of nuclear weapons in the Korean War was considered by President Truman. The Soviet Union had a military strategy which incorporated its tactical nuclear weapons into its warfighting doctrine. It can also be argued that the NATO doctrine of flexible response recognised nuclear weapons as having some utility in war. However, the main purpose of this doctrine was to reinforce deterrence rather than conceive of victory over the Warsaw Pact through nuclear use. While military victory through the use of nuclear weapons may have been a conceptual possibility in the early days, it is unlikely to be a convincing rationale for acquisition today, given the likelihood of massive retaliation by another nuclear state. Status and Influence A powerful motivation for acquiring nuclear weapons has been the effect on national status and prestige. Britain seems to have thought least deeply about the implications of embarking on a post-war programme independent from the United States. There was a natural assumption that it would need to have atomic weapons in order to retain its place as a leading world power. Similarly France saw the need for a nuclear capability to underpin its return to the world stage as a leading player. Given that each of the five permanent members of the security council are also the first five nuclear weapon states, the association of national status and influence with nuclear weapons is visible to others. It is possible that India may have had such motivation in its bid to become the regional leader. It certainly feels that its population and economy merit much greater international influence than it is accorded. However, the changing international approach to proliferation means that India has not gained greater international status from its weapons. Indeed it is likely to have put back the possibility of it gaining permanent security council membership. Argentina and Brazil may also have been looking for status from their programmes. If prestige is a declining factor in nuclear weapon acquisition, influence still remains important. In the post Cold War world, potential intervention by the more powerful international actors is a threat that worries a number of smaller countries. There is an assumption that this threat can be much reduced by the ownership of strategic weapons of mass destruction. The question is asked 'Would NATO have intervened in Kosovo against a nuclear armed Serbia?'. Iraq, Iran, North Korea, Libya and Taiwan can all use this thinking to justify weapons acquisition. Bigger Bang for your Buck In the early days, both American and British governments argued that nuclear weapons could provide a cheaper military capability than large conventional forces. John Foster Dulles is credited with boasting that they could give a 'bigger bang for a buck'. While the absolute cost of building an atomic bomb has dropped over the years, this argument is a less significant factor. Nuclear weapons do not replace conventional forces given their lack of utility for warfighting in the modern world. While the direct research, development and production costs may be much reduced, the economic implications for aspirant nuclear states can be adverse. The international community may show its disapproval of a nuclear programme through the use of economic sanctions as has been seen in Iraq. Nevertheless Iran seems to have decided that a nuclear programme may save it from spending more on conventional forces. Internal Civilian and Military Pressures

**[CONTINUED]**

No Impact – Doesn’t Turn Case – Prolif

**[CONTINUED]**

While nations will justify their nuclear weapon programmes for external security reasons, there are often internal domestic pressures driving the procurement. The main drive in Britain immediately after World War 2 came from the military establishment. It was bureaucratic momentum that kept the French programme in being before de Gaulle came to power. Pakistan officials made it clear that they would have to respond quickly to India’s test as much for domestic political reasons as anything else. Today it is more difficult to envisage the decision to embark on a nuclear weapon programme as being taken as routinely as it was by Britain. The international community ensures that any state has to weigh up all the factors before taking on the restrictions which will inevitably follow. Internal pressures may accelerate (or inhibit) a programme which is already in being. They will also have an effect on the decision to remain a nuclear weapon state. Thus South Africa was able to stop its programme as part of its new internal structure. Britain has reduced its capability to just four submarines with missiles, and has no tactical weapons left. Yet internal political issues make it very difficult for it to go to the final step of nuclear disarmament. Just in Case An important consideration in nuclear doctrine is an inability to predict the future. China has never had a particularly consistent or logical nuclear doctrine. I appears that it wished to ensure that it had nuclear capability in case it became crucially important at some time in the future. Britain and France both used the arguments that they reinforced deterrence by being second centres of decision. If the Soviet Union were to think that the United States would not risk nuclear retaliation in order to defend Europe, then the French and British nuclear weapons entered the deterrence equation. They increase Soviet uncertainty and strengthened deterrence. Today the British nuclear force is entirely justified as an insurance policy against an uncertain future. While such arguments are used to retain nuclear weapons, they are insufficiently strong to be the primary drivers in the acquisition of such capabilities today, given the international difficulties that a potential proliferator faces.

AT: Nuclear Reps Bad – AT: Nuclear Apartheid

Nuclear apartheid arguments are wrong – the K replicates racial hierarchies through effacing difference with broad generalizations of nuclear haves and have-nots

Biswas 1 (Shampa, Whitman College Politics Professor, Alternatives 26.4, http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\_hb3225/is\_4\_26/ai\_n28886584/, AD: 7/1/10) jl

Where does that leave us with the question of "nuclear apartheid"? As persuasive as the nuclear-apartheid argument may be at pointing to one set of global exclusions, its complicity in the production of boundaries that help sustain a whole other set of exclusions also makes it suspect. It is precisely the resonances of the concept of apartheid, and the strong visceral response it generates, that gives it the ability to bound and erase much more effectively. In one bold move, the nuclear-apartheid argument announces the place of nuclear weaponry as the arbiter of global power and status, and how its inaccessibility or unavailability to a racialized Third World relegates it forever to the dustheap of history. It thus makes it possible for "Indians" to imagine themselves as a "community of resistance." However, with that same stroke, the nuclear-apartheid position creates and sustains yet another racialized hierarchy, bringing into being an India that is exclusionary and oppressive. And it is precisely the boldness of this racial signifier that carries with it the ability to erase, mask, and exclude much more effectively. In the hands of the BJP, the "nuclear apartheid" position becomes dangerous--because the very boldness of this racial signifier makes it possible for the BJP to effect closure on its hegemonic vision of the Hindu/Indian nation. Hence, this article has argued, in taking seriously the racialized exclusions revealed by the use of the "nuclear apartheid" position at the international level, one must simultaneously reveal another set of racialized exclusions effected by the BJP in consolidating its hold on state power. I have argued that comprehending the force and effect of the invocation of "race" through the nuclear-apartheid position means to understand this mutually constitutive co-construction of racialized domestic and international hierarchical orders.

AT: Nuclear Apartheid – Turns Racism

The concept of the Nuclear Apartheid replicates the colonial logic of oppression their K criticizes

Biswas 1 (Shampa, Whitman College Politics Professor, Alternatives 26.4, http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\_hb3225/is\_4\_26/ai\_n28886584/, AD: 7/1/10) jl

It is clear that the concept of apartheid draws its enunciative force from the category of race, and I will argue that the deployment of the nuclear-apartheid position by the Indian government points to a racially institutionalized global hierarchy. In other words, scrutinizing the nuclear-apartheid position means at the very least taking seriously the manner in which the deployment of such a racial signifier by the Indian government is able to unsettle a certain taken-for-granted terrain in the conduct of international relations and in the writing of the discipline. What happens if we take seriously the opposition of the Indian government to some of the most prominent international arms-control treaties, such as the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) and the Comprehensive Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT), as well as its decision in 1998 to declare itself as a nuclear-weapons state (NWS) despite the emerging global norms against nuclearization and the threat of economic sanctions, in the name of nuclear apartheid-- using perhaps one of the most potent racial signifiers of our contemporary times to register its frustrations with, and resistance to, the unequal distribution of global warfare resources? Rather than simply dismissing this position because of the level of abhorrence that has come to be attached to weapons of mass destruction, I argue that there is an epistemic gain from seeing the Indian decision to test as a statement against a racialized inequitable global order.

However, despite the critical leverage that the category of apartheid as used by the Indian government carries, the category itself is analytically problematic, and its deployment is politically disturbing in other ways. On the one hand, as the article will show, there are a whole host of ways in which the concept of apartheid that lays implicit claim to certain inalienable democratic entitlements is simply untenable, given the fundamentally undemocratic character of nuclear weapons. At the same time, the political implications of India's nuclearization under the aggressive, exclusivist regime of the Hindu nationalist party (the BJP), does not bode well either for regional security or for the global disarmament agenda. But much more importantly, this article argues that the use of race through the nuclear-apartheid position can also simultaneously mask a series of exclusions--domestically and internationally--and indeed in its use by the BJP government comes to play a "racialized, boundary-producing" role tha t maintains that division at the expense of marginalized sections of the Indian population. In addition to exploring the usefulness of "race" as a category of analysis in examining the BJP's imagination of the Hindu/Indian nation, I also look at how the BJP draws on a racist global discourse on Islam and Muslims. Recently, critical-security scholars within JR have raised and problematized quite compellingly the questions of "whose security?" and "what kind of security?" does nuclear/military security provide. (2) Taking seriously the global racialized exclusions that the nuclear-apartheid position points to, I want to problematize the implicit referent (i.e., the Hindu/Indian nation) in whose name this position is being deployed by the BJP and raise questions about the political interests that are served by this deployment.

The nuclear apartheid argument simply generates new forms of racialization

Biswas 1 (Shampa, Whitman College Politics Professor, Alternatives 26.4, http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\_hb3225/is\_4\_26/ai\_n28886584/, AD: 7/1/10) jl

The ultimate purpose of this article, then, is to interrogate, critically, the category of nuclear apartheid as deployed by the Indian government in order to think through how the silence on race within the field of international relations enables and constrains its deployment as a postcolonial resource, and what implications that offers for peace and justice. The article begins with discussing the security environment and the domestic political context within which the decision to test was made. This first section of the article looks at the rise of Hindu nationalism in contemporary Indian politics, finding the immediate trigger to the tests in this domestic political environment, and scrutinizes the realist "external threats" argument from within this context. The next section of the article presents and analyzes the nuclear-apartheid position as articulated with respect to the two prominent arms-control treaties--the Comprehensive Test-Ban Treaty and the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty--and points to the global structural and racial hierarchies that make possible the effective deployment of such a position by the Indian government. Finally, the article turns to a deconstruction of the nuclear-apartheid position to demonstrate both its analytical paucities as well as the political function it serves in the contemporary Indian context in effecting "new kinds of racializations." I conclude with some reflections on conceptualizing race within global politics and the implications of taking race seriously for issues of peace and justice.

AT: Nuclear Apartheid – N/W Outwieghs

Impacts of nuclear weapons outweighs – The idea of nuclear equality destroys accountability

Biswas 1 (Shampa, Whitman College Politics Professor, Alternatives 26.4, http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\_hb3225/is\_4\_26/ai\_n28886584/, AD: 7/1/10) jl

At one level, as Partha Chatterjee has pointed out, the concept of apartheid relates to a discourse about "democracy." (49) To use apartheid to designate the unequal distribution of nuclear resources then is also simultaneously to draw attention to the undemocratic character of international relations--or, more literally, the exclusion of a group of people from some kind of legitimate and just entitlement. More specifically, to talk in terms of nuclear haves and have-nots is to talk in terms of a concept of democratic justice based on the "possession" (or lack thereof) of something. "Apartheid," as Sumit Sarkar points out, "implies as its valorised Other a notion of equal rights." (50) But that this something is "nuclear weapons" complicates the issue a great deal. If the vision of democracy that is implicit in the concept of nuclear apartheid implies a world of "equal possession" of nuclear weapons, a position implied in the Indian decision to test, that is a frightening thought indeed. Yet surely even India does not subscribe to that vision of democracy. "Would India," asks Sarkar, "welcome a nuclearised Nepal or Bangladesh?" (51) If Jaswant Singh is serious that "the country"s national security in a world of nuclear proliferation lies either in global disarmament or in exercise of the principle of equal and legitimate security for all," (52) then it should indeed support the "equal and legitimate" nuclearization of its neighbors, which is extremely unlikely given its own demonstrated hegemonic aspirations in the South Asian region. (53) Further, if India does indeed now sign the NPT and the CTBT, and sign them in the garb of a nuclear power as it wants to do, what does that say about its commitment to nuclear democracy? Even if India and Pakistan were to be included in the treaties as NWSs, all that would do is expand the size of the categories, not delegitimize the unequal privileges and burdens written into the categories themselves.

A2: Kato

AT: Kato – No Testing

Kato needs to do some updates – Nuclear weapons testing is exclusively virtual now

IEEE Spectrum 5 (Tech News, http://spectrum.ieee.org/energy/nuclear/nuclear-testing-goes-virtual. AD: 7/2/10) jl

In October, the U.S. National Nuclear Security Administration officially dedicated two state-of-the-art supercomputers that should allow the United States' nuclear weapons arsenal to be kept in working order without the need for underground testing. One of those is now the fastest computer ever built.

According to the NNSA, a new IBM BlueGene/L and an IBM Purple system have been successfully installed and tested at the recently completed Terascale Simulation Facility at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, in California. Nuclear scientists will use the two supermachines to run three-dimensional simulations at dizzying speeds to achieve much of the nuclear weapons analysis that was formerly accomplished by underground nuclear testing, capping a long campaign to use virtual testing in place of physical weapons detonations.

"The unprecedented computing power of these two supercomputers is more critical than ever to meet the time-urgent issues related to maintaining our nation's aging nuclear stockpile without testing," said NNSA Administrator Linton F. Brooks. "Purple represents the culmination of a successful decade-long effort to create a powerful new class of supercomputers. BlueGene/L points the way to the future and the computing power we will need to improve our ability to predict the behavior of the stockpile as it continues to age."

Brooks announced on 27 October that the BlueGene/L had performed a record 280.6 trillion floating-point operations per second on the industry standard Linpack benchmark test suite. The Linpack test is used to determine the performance of the world's fastest computers, which are ranked in the routinely updated Top 500 list. The new record doubles the previous top performance, achieved in March by an earlier configuration of this same Livermore BlueGene/L system.

This computing advance is a significant accomplishment. It should improve the prospects of the United States' agreeing to permanently stop physical nuclear weapons testing, under the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, which was concluded in 1996. And on a related front, the award of this year's Nobel Peace Prize to the Vienna-based International Atomic Energy Agency and its director general, Mohamed ElBaradei [see William Sweet's news commentary "The Atomic Energy Agency's Peace Prize"] is a victory for the defenders of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. Taken together, virtual testing technology and the reaffirmation of the importance of nuclear arms control promise to make the real world a safer place.

The US virtual tests now – no physical tests

Labott 10 (Elise, Senior State Department Producer for CNN, http://www.cnn.com/2010/POLITICS/04/16/nuclear.testing/index.html, AD: 7/2/10) jl

At Livermore, you can cut the explosives in half by laser without melting or sparking. We learned that this means you don't disturb the atoms inside the high explosive. Goodwin said the test vibrates the atoms at a rate of a millionth-billionth of a second, so fast that heat and shock waves can't be conducted. This removes the atoms one at a time from the high explosive and provides a more accurate reading of the condition of the explosive.

"We found failure modes in the stockpile that we could never have found with nuclear testing because we're able to do these massive simulations," he said. "These are the largest calculations that man has ever done."

All of these simulations are cataloged on Livermore's [supercomputers](http://topics.cnn.com/topics/supercomputers), which are some of the fastest in the world. Michel McCoy, the lab's associate director for computation, showed us around the supercomputer rooms, which he calls the lab's "crown jewel." There, thousands of computers pull together all of the physics necessary to model a nuclear weapon's reliability and safety.

Did I mention these computers are fast? We are talking about a hundred trillion operations per second. It is about to get even faster, with a new computer system called the petaflop, which would be able to do about a quintillion operations per second. McCoy said even that isn't fast enough for what the U.S. needs to do to fix the nuclear weapons as they age.

We ended our day at Livermore's National Ignition Facility, where the world's largest laser generates the temperatures and pressures found only in stars, the sun and in nuclear weapons. The equipment looks like a spaceship about to take off.

This summer, NIF will begin experiments that will focus the energy of 192 giant laser beams on a tiny target filled with hydrogen fuel. The goal is to obtain fusion energy, which is what powers the sun and stars.

Inside the target chamber, the target that each of the lasers needs to hit is smaller than the diameter of a human hair. The director of the NIF, Edward Moses, showed us a full-scale target, which can fit in his hand. Inside a little gold can is a red dot the size of a pencil eraser. There, Moses said, "the isotopes of hydrogen sit ... and get ready to be blown to bits."

"We can model parts of physical processes that go on inside a weapon without testing," Moses said. "This is the only place in the world where you can get to the nuclear phase of the weapon without blowing up a bomb."

In fact, we found that at Livermore, scientists could learn more about what's going on inside a nuclear weapon without actually testing it than they can with a nuclear test. Every night, the control room, modeled on NASA's command center, runs a laser experiment using 2,000 computers and 60,000 control points.

A2: Kato – No Uranium Mining

Current and future mining bans prevent harvesting of uranium

Spencer and Loris 8 (Jack – Research Fellow in Nuclear Energy, and Nicolas – Research Assistant in the Thomas A. Roe Institute for Economic Policy Studies at The Heritage Foundation., http://www.policyarchive.org/handle/10207/bitstreams/13605.pdf, AD: 7/2/10) jl

Despite rising energy prices, government at all levels continues to deny Americans access to significant portions of the nation's energy resources. These legislative, bureaucratic, and procedural barriers are even more bizarre considering growing calls for energy independence. This affects uranium mining as well as Alaskan oil drilling, off-shore gas exploration, and wind farms. Ironically, Virginia has a rich history of supporting nuclear power and continues to depend on it today. Its ban on uranium mining demonstrates the impact that anti-nuclear propaganda has had on the population. Virginia gets 38 percent of its electricity from four nuclear reactors and will likely be among the first to build a new reactor in the United States. Beyond that, Virginia hosts a variety of other nuclear-related industries, including the nuclear qualified Newport News naval shipyard, which is one of the nation's only two with that capability. Virginia will surely not be the only place in the U.S. that attempts to prohibit access to uranium reserves as rising demand spurs exploration activities. Three decades of anti-nuclear propaganda continues to influence the public perception of nuclear power.

AT: Kato – No Impact – Radiation

Radiation is everywhere – even high levels of radiation have no impact on health

Wigg 7 (David, Associate Professor of Radiation Oncology, Clinical Radiobiology Unit, Cancer Services, Royal Adelaide Hospital, Australasian Radiology Volume 51 Issue 1, http://www.boldenterprise.com.au/bio/bigbang.pdf , AD: 7/2/10) jl

Natural background radiation comes from cosmic sources (approximately 0.39 mSv per annum), terrestrial sources (0.58 mSv p.a.), inhaled sources especially radon (1.26 mSv p.a.), and ingested sources (0.29 mSv p.a.). Typical total annual values vary between 1.0 and 3.5 mSv (average 2.4 mSv p.a.). In some regions the background radiation is up to 100 times higher. No adverse genetic or other harmful effects including cancer formation have been observed in plants, animals or humans in these areas despite such exposure for countless generations (1). Our own bodies also contain radioactive potassium 40 and carbon 14 which disintegrate with a combined total of about 7500 disintegrations per second.

Even the radiation from nuclear weapons has no effect or can be beneficial

Ray 8 (Ben, freelance writer working in Louisville and Lexington, http://www.environmentalgraffiti.com/ecology/positive-effects-of-nuclear-radiation/1066, AD: 7/2/10) jl

National Geographic has announced that the ARC Centre for Coral Reef Studies has surveyed the 1.2-mile crater from the hydrogen bomb tests at Bikini Atoll and discovered something phenomenal: the corals are bouncing back from nuclear annihilation.

How is this even possible? The [first round](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Operation_Crossroads) of tests there sank 13 warships the U.S. Navy itself wanted to get rid of after World War II. Radiation is poison to every living thing. What could have possibly happened?

As it happens, radiation may not be the end of the world after all. How bad is radiation, really?

First there's this news out of Chernobyl--the surrounding ecosystems are thriving, and, while the enthusiasm is tempered, I'll reprint the key quote here:

"By any measure of [ecological](http://www.environmentalgraffiti.com/ecology/positive-effects-of-nuclear-radiation/1066) function these ecosystems seem to be operating normally," Morris told Nature. "The biodiversity is higher there than before the accident." How has this happened, given that radiation levels are still too high for humans to return safely? Morris thinks that many of the organisms mutated by the fallout have died, leaving behind those that have not suffered problems with growth and reproduction. "It's [evolution](http://www.environmentalgraffiti.com/ecology/positive-effects-of-nuclear-radiation/1066) on steroids.

That only explains the ability of nature to make up for man's complete screw-ups, however. Edward Calabrese, a professor at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst, claims that radiation may fall into a concept called hormesis: poisons that are lethal at high doses, are beneficial in low ones. Calabrese has spent his career studying the concept, and universally found that low doses of toxins lead to longer lifespans and enhanced growth-- as well as that high doses kill.

AT: Kato – Hormesis

Radiation increases immune system stability and decreases the risk of cancer

Luckey 8 (T.D, Professor Emeritus of the University of Missouri, http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2592990/, AD: 7/2/10)jl

Media reports of deaths and devastation produced by atomic bombs convinced people around the world that all ionizing radiation is harmful. This concentrated attention on fear of miniscule doses of radiation. Soon the linear no threshold (LNT) paradigm was converted into laws. Scientifically valid information about the health benefits from low dose irradiation was ignored. Here are studies which show increased health in Japanese survivors of atomic bombs. Parameters include decreased mutation, leukemia and solid tissue cancer mortality rates, and increased average lifespan. Each study exhibits a threshold that repudiates the LNT dogma. The average threshold for acute exposures to atomic bombs is about 100 cSv. Conclusions from these studies of atomic bomb survivors are:

One burst of low dose irradiation elicits a lifetime of improved health.

Improved health from low dose irradiation negates the LNT paradigm.

Effective triage should include radiation hormesis for survivor treatment.

“The collected data strongly suggest that low-level radiation is not harmful, and is, in fact, frequently ‘apparently beneficial’ for human health.”

—[Kondo, 1993](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2592990/#b7-drp-06-0369)

Most people believe the LNT (linear no threshold) paradigm for radiation and its corollary: all ionizing radiation is harmful. The devastation and harm from atomic bombs in Japan dominated the media and confirmed the LNT dogma for people around the world. The LNT dogma must be true: it is in our texts; it is taught in schools and universities; it is constantly assumed in the media; and it is the law in many countries.

However, there is a fallacy. As the French philosopher, Jean de la Bruyere (1645–1696), noted: “The exact contrary of what is generally believed is often the truth.” ([Bruyere, 1688](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2592990/#b4-drp-06-0369)). In order to make them believe the LNT dogma, radiobiologists have consistently misled students, physicians, professors, the media, the public, government advisory boards, and heads of nations. About thirty specific examples of this deception have been presented ([Luckey, 2008a](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2592990/#b14-drp-06-0369)).

This report reviews unpublicized studies of low dose exposures from atomic bombs in Japanese survivors. The consistent benefits from low dose exposures to radiation from atomic bombs negate the LNT paradigm and indicate a single exposure to low dose irradiation produces a lifetime of improved health.

Over 3,000 case studies disprove your claim – no scientific basis for their impacts

Luckey 8 (T.D, Professor Emeritus of the University of Missouri, http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2592990/, AD: 7/2/10)jl

Focus on harm from miniscule doses of ionizing radiation has blinded people to the benefits of low doses of ionizing radiation. For over a century it has been known that exposure of whole organisms to low doses of ionizing radiation consistently induces biopositive effects. These are recorded in over 3,000 reports ([Luckey 1980](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2592990/#b9-drp-06-0369), [1991](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2592990/#b10-drp-06-0369), [Muckerheide, 2002](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2592990/#b19-drp-06-0369)). No statistically valid scientific report was found in which low doses of ionizing radiation showed harm for genetically normal humans or laboratory animals. Thus, the LNT dogma has no scientific support from whole body exposures in humans or laboratory animals. The elite committee of the French Academies of Sciences and the National Academy of Medicine agreed: “In conclusion, this report doubts the validity of using LNT in the evaluation of the carcinogenic risk of low doses (<100 mSv) and even more for very low doses (10 mSv).” ([Auringo et al, 2005](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2592990/#b1-drp-06-0369)).

Nuclear Crisis Turns the K

Nuclear crisis turns the K – causes political repression and tyranny

Martin 82 (Professor of Social Sciences in the School of Social Sciences, Media and Communication at the University of Wollongong, 1982 Brian, “How the Peace Movement Should be Preparing for Nuclear War,” Bulletin of Peace Proposals, Vol. 13, No. 2, 1982, pp. 149-159 TBC 7/2/10)

In addition to the important physical effects of nuclear war there would be important indirect political effects. It seems very likely that there would be strong moves to maintain or establish authoritarian rule as a response to crises preceding or following nuclear war. Ever since Hiroshima, the threat of nuclear destruction has been used to prop up repressive institutions, under the pretext of defending against the 'enemy'.[3] The actuality of nuclear war could easily result in the culmination of this trend. Large segments of the population could be manipulated to support a repressive regime under the necessity to defend against further threats or to obtain revenge. A limited nuclear war might kill some hundreds of thousands or tens of millions of people, surely a major tragedy. But another tragedy could also result: the establishment, possibly for decades, of repressive civilian or military rule in countries such as Italy, Australia and the US, even if they were not directly involved in the war. The possibility of grassroots mobilisation for disarmament and peace would be greatly reduced even from its present levels. For such developments the people and the peace movements of the world are largely unprepared.

Preventing nuclear war key to social justice

Martin 82 (Professor of Social Sciences in the School of Social Sciences, Media and Communication at the University of Wollongong, 1982 Brian, “How the Peace Movement Should be Preparing for Nuclear War,” Bulletin of Peace Proposals, Vol. 13, No. 2, 1982, pp. 149-159 TBC 7/2/10)

The primary objective of national security bureaucracies in the event of nuclear war is survival of the state apparatus. This has two components: continued defence against the outside enemy, and defence against challenges raised by the native population. The health and welfare of the general population is a secondary consideration, mainly important in its effects on the two primary goals. This emphasis is reflected in preparations for the survival of key officials, for continuity of official decision-making apparatuses and communications, and for quelling 'civil disturbances'. In the absence of any significant countervailing force, a nuclear war will not be the end of war but the beginning of the age of many nuclear wars. Although nuclear war may lead to mass revulsion, there will also be strong government and citizen pressures for retaliation, revenge, efforts to 'do better next time' and not to be caught unprepared. The rise of Nazism after World War I should point to the danger. Scenarios for World Wars IV, V, VI and so forth may be repulsive, but cannot be discounted solely for that reason. During World War II, several key groups in the US developed plans for the post-war world.[5] More generally, post-war political and economic considerations played a large role in many decisions, military and otherwise, during the war. The same pattern is being and will be replayed prior to and during a nuclear war. It is not for lack of anything better to do that nuclear strategists have elaborated numerous scenarios for nuclear war, recovery and future wars. During and after a nuclear crisis or war, powerful interest groups will attempt to sway developments through management of the news, mobilisation of sympathetic groups, creating scapegoats, suppressing dissent, and using many other mechanisms familiar to us today. If these developments are to be opposed, peace activists need to be prepared to act during nuclear crisis and nuclear war and afterwards. Preparation for nuclear war by the peace movement could increase the chances of success in struggles for social justice, especially in the poor countries, during a period of chaos in the rich countries resulting from nuclear war or nuclear crisis.

Nuclear Crisis Turns the K

Nuclear crisis would lead to oppression of minority groups

Martin 82 (Professor of Social Sciences in the School of Social Sciences, Media and Communication at the University of Wollongong, 1982 Brian, “How the Peace Movement Should be Preparing for Nuclear War,” Bulletin of Peace Proposals, Vol. 13, No. 2, 1982, pp. 149-159 TBC 7/2/10)

As mentioned earlier, one likely consequence of nuclear war, or even the threat of it, is declaration of states of emergency by national governments, detention of 'subversives' (trade union leaders, leaders of opposition parties, leaders of leftist groups, ethnic groups, feminists, etc.), and perhaps formal military rule. Plans, infrastructure and methods for such repressive measures already exist in many countries, having been developed to defend the status quo against various citizen based initiatives.[7] Furthermore, many plans for government action in the event of nuclear war seem specifically oriented to perpetuate the state structure rather than to defend people. The peace movement as well as the general population are not prepared for these contingencies, partly because nuclear war is seen as 'the end'. Yet if significant segments of the population were able to resist repression, to push for democratic initiatives and establish an alternative voice to that of the state in a nuclear emergency, the government and military would be much more reluctant to risk the occurrence of nuclear war. When the population is prepared, a nuclear war becomes a threat to the government itself as well as to the population. Resistance to repression is important now as well as in a nuclear emergency, and hence preparation, training and strategising with this aim in mind serves a double purpose, and also links peace movement activities with other social movements.

\*A2: Numbing K\*

Fear Good – Nukes

Fear is a constructive emotion for peace

Lifton 1 (Robert Jay Spring, Illusions of the Second Nuclear Age World Policy Journal, http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\_hb6669/is\_1\_18/ai\_n28841497/?tag=content;col1 TBC 7/1/10)

The trouble is that in other ways the dangers associated with nuclear weapons are greater than ever: the continuing weapons-centered policies in the United States and elsewhere; the difficulties in controlling nuclear weapons that exist under unstable conditions (especially in Russia and other areas of the former Soviet Union); [2] and the eagerness and potential capacity of certain nations and "private" groups to acquire and possibly use the weapons. In that sense, the nuclear quietism is perilous. Or, to put the matter another way, we no longer manifest an appropriate degree of fear in relation to actual nuclear danger. While fear in itself is hardly to be recommended as a guiding human emotion, its absence in the face of danger can lead to catastrophe. We human animals have built-in fear reactions in response to threat. These reactions help us to protect ourselves--to step back from the path of a speeding automobile, or in the case of our ancestors, from the path of a wild animal. Fear can be transmuted into constructive planning and policies: whether for minimizing vulnerability to attacks by wild animals, or for more complex contemporary threats. Through fear, ordinary people can be motivated to pursue constructive means for sustaining peace, or at least for limiting the scope of violence. Similarly, in exchanges between world leaders on behalf of preventing large--scale conflict, a tinge of fear--sometimes more than a tinge--can enable each to feel the potential bloodshed and suffering that would result from failure. But with nuclear weapons, our psychological circuits are impaired. We know that the weapons are around--and we hear talk about nuclear dangers somewhere "out there"--but our minds no longer connect with the dangers or with the weapons themselves. That blunting of feeling extends into other areas. One of the many sins for which advocates of large nuclear stockpiles must answer is the prevalence of psychic numbing to enormous potential suffering, the blunting of our ethical standards as human beings.

Fear of nuclear weapons has prevented their use – deterrence has checked conflict.

**Rajaraman 2** (Professor of Theoretical Physics at JNU, 2002 [R., “Ban battlefield nuclear weapons,” 4/22/2, *The Hindu*, http://www.hinduonnet.com/thehindu/2002/04/22/stories/2002042200431000.htm[

There were a variety of different reasons behind each of these examples of abstinence from using nuclear weapons. But one major common factor contributing to all of them has been an ingrained terror of nuclear devastation. The well documented images of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the awesome photographs of giant mushroom clouds emerging from nuclear tests in the Pacific and the numerous movies based on nuclear Armageddon scenarios have all contributed to building up a deep rooted fear of nuclear weapons. This is not limited just to the abhorrence felt by anti-nuclear activists. It permeates to one extent or another the psyche of all but the most pathological of fanatics. It colours the calculations, even if not decisively, of the most hardened of military strategists. The unacceptability of nuclear devastation is the backbone of all deterrence strategies. There is not just a fear of being attacked oneself, but also a strong mental barrier against actually initiating nuclear attacks on enemy populations, no matter how much they may be contemplated in war games and strategies. As a result a taboo has tacitly evolved over the decades preventing nations, at least so far, from actually pressing the nuclear button even in the face of serious military crises.

Fearing nuclear weapons is the only way to prevent nuclear omnicide.

**Harvard Nuclear Study Group** **83** (“Living With Nuclear Weapons,” p. 47)

The question is grisly, but nonetheless it must be asked. Nuclear war [sic] ca**nnot be avoided simply by refusing to think about it**. Indeed the task of reducing the likelihood of nuclear war should begin with an effort to **understand how it might start**. When strategists in Washington or Moscow study the possible origins of nuclear war, they discuss “scenarios,” imagined sequences of future events that could trigger the use of nuclear weaponry. Scenarios are, of course, speculative exercises. They often leave out the political developments that might lead to the use of force in order to focus on military dangers. That nuclear war scenarios are even more speculative than most is something for which we can be thankful, for it reflects humanity’s fortunate lack of experience with atomic warfare since 1945. But imaginary as they are, nuclear scenarios can help identify problems not understood or dangers not yet prevented because they have not been foreseen.

Fear Good – Nukes

Absent fear of nuclear war, use of nuclear weapons becomes inevitable.

**Beres** **98**. Professor of Political Science at Purdue University. Louis Rene, American University International Law Review, lexis.

Fear and reality go together naturally. Unless both Indian and Pakistani decision-makers come to acknowledge the mutually intolerable consequences of a nuclear war in South Asia, they may begin to think of nuclear weapons not as instruments of deterrence, but as "ordinary" implements of warfighting. [40](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=d8702167be5246310fe1182a76473ec2&csvc=bl&cform=bool&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVzb-zSkAV&_md5=428e79743141f1211f375dcf66dd4608#n40) With such an erroneous view, reinforced by underlying commitments to Realpolitik [41](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=d8702167be5246310fe1182a76473ec2&csvc=bl&cform=bool&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVzb-zSkAV&_md5=428e79743141f1211f375dcf66dd4608#n41) and nationalistic fervor, [42](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=d8702167be5246310fe1182a76473ec2&csvc=bl&cform=bool&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVzb-zSkAV&_md5=428e79743141f1211f375dcf66dd4608#n42) they might even begin to take steps toward the atomic brink from which retreat would no longer be possible. "In a dark time," says the poet Theodore Roethke, "the eye begins to see." [43](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=d8702167be5246310fe1182a76473ec2&csvc=bl&cform=bool&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVzb-zSkAV&_md5=428e79743141f1211f375dcf66dd4608#n43) Embedded in this ironic observation is an important mes [\*515]  sage for India and Pakistan. Look closely at the expected consequences of a nuclear war. Look closely at the available "arsenal" of international legal measures, at available treaties, customs, and general principles. [44](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=d8702167be5246310fe1182a76473ec2&csvc=bl&cform=bool&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVzb-zSkAV&_md5=428e79743141f1211f375dcf66dd4608#n44) Do not be lulled into complacence by anesthetized and sanitized accounts of nuclear warfighting. Acknowledge the mutually beneficial expectations of world order.

Plan Solves Fear

Advocating a plan to address harms of nuclear war overcomes impact of numbing.

**Sandman and Valenti 86** (Peter and JoAnn, Professor of Human Ecology at Rutgers and Preeminent Risk Communications Expert published over 80 articles and books on various aspects of risk communication, Scared stiff — or scared into action, , Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, January 1986, pp. 12–16, http://www.psandman.com/articles/scarstif.htm)

WHEN THE MOVEMENT against nuclear weapons celebrates its heroes, a place of honor is reserved for Helen Caldicott, the Australian pediatrician who revived Physicians for Social Responsibility (PSR) in 1978 and made it the vehicle for her impassioned antinuclear crusade. In countless communities since then, Caldicott has briskly narrated the devastation that would result if a small nuclear warhead exploded right here and now. Thousands of activists trace their movement beginnings to a Helen Caldicott speech, wondering if it wouldn't help reverse the arms race just to make everyone sit through that speech — and each week hundreds of activists do their best to give the speech themselves. Nonetheless, PSR Executive Director Jane Wales, while acknowledging a huge debt to Caldicott, said in 1984 that the time for the “bombing runs” (as insiders call the speech) was past. “We knew it was past when someone interrupted the speech one evening, actually interrupted it, and said, ’We know all that, but what can we do?’” In a 1985 newsletter, similarly, Sanford Gottlieb of United Campuses to Prevent Nuclear War warned that many students were “being numbed by the emphasis on nuclear blast, fire and radiation” in courses on nuclear war and were therefore “feeling more impotent and depressed than before the class began.”(1) Perhaps the first broad awareness that shock therapy may not be the best therapy came, ironically, in 1983 in the weeks preceding the broadcast of the television film The Day After, when Educators for Social Responsibility and others worried that the program might do children more harm than good. The Day After turned out to be less frightening than expected, but other films (Threads, Testament, and Caldicott’s own The Last Epidemic) raise the same worry — and not just for children. In the following analysis of the fear of nuclear Armageddon and its implications for antinuclear advocacy, we will argue that most people are neither apathetic about nuclear war nor actively terrified of it but rather, in Robert Jay Lifton’s evocative phrase, “psychically numbed”; that it is ineffective to frighten audiences who have found a refuge from their fears in numbness; and that there exist more effective keys to unlocking such paralysis. THE CENTRAL ENIGMA of antinuclear activism is why everyone is not working to prevent nuclear war. Activists who can understand those who disagree about what should be done are bewildered and frustrated by those who do nothing. Such inaction is objectively irrational; as Caldicott asked in a 1982 cover article in Family Weekly, “Why make sure kids clean their teeth and eat healthy food if they’re not going to survive?”(2) Advocates of all causes chafe at their neighbors’ lack of interest. When the issue is something like saving whales or wheelchair access to public buildings, the problem is usually diagnosed as apathy. Psychiatrist Robert Winer argues that the same is true of the nuclear threat, which most of us experience as remote, impersonal, and vague. For Winer, “one of the genuinely tragic aspects of the nuclear situation is that immediacy may be given to us only once and then it will be too late to learn.”(3) There is obviously some truth to this view. When asked to describe their images of nuclear war, people do tend to come up with abstractions — and those with more concrete, immediate images are likely to be antinuclear activists.

No Root Cause

The idea of a single vital internal link causes over determination which ignores the litany of factors that may motivate are – you should prefer the plan to their overarching link claims

Sagan 0 (Scott, Department of Polisci @ Stanford, www.sscnet.ucla.edu/polisci/faculty/trachtenberg/cv/sagan.doc, AD: 7/1/10) jl

To make reasonable judgements in such matters it is essential, in my view, to avoid the common "fallacy of overdetermination." Looking backwards at historical events, it is always tempting to underestimate the importance of the immediate causes of a war and argue that the likelihood of conflict was so high that the war would have broken out sooner or later even without the specific incident that set it off. If taken too far, however, this tendency eliminates the role of contingency in history and diminishes our ability to perceive the alternative pathways that were present to historical actors.

The point is perhaps best made through a counterfactual about the Cold War. During the 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis, a bizarre false warning incident in the U.S. radar systems facing Cuba led officers at the North American Air Defense Command to believe that the U.S. was under attack and that a nuclear weapon was about to go off in Florida.[[1]](#footnote-1) Now imagine the counterfactual event that this false warning was reported and believed by U.S. leaders and resulted in a U.S. nuclear "retaliation" against the Russians. How would future historians have seen the causes of World War III? One can easily imagine arguments stressing that the war between the U.S. and the USSR was inevitable. War was overdetermined: given the deep political hostility of the two superpowers, the conflicting ideology, the escalating arms race, nuclear war would have occurred eventually. If not during that specific crisis over Cuba, then over the next one in Berlin, or the Middle East, or Korea. From that perspective, focusing on this particular accidental event as a cause of war would be seen as misleading. Yet, we all now know, of course that a nuclear war was neither inevitable nor overdetermined during the Cold War.

Alt Fails – Pyschology

Psycholoanalysis does not explain nuclear risks and if it did, even an effective project could not solve.

Blight 86 (james, political psychology, vol 7 no 4 1986. 617-660, JSTOR) jl

But nuclear depth psychology is distinguished principally by the em-phasis its advocates place upon deep psychological processes, the pathology of which is believed to explain an arms race they regard as patently irrational -in the sense that the end toward which they believe it is taking us, nuclear war, is the very inverse of the goal sought by advocates of a vigorous nuclear weapons competition between the superpowers. In short, nuclear depth psychologists believe that what they take to be our present and escalating nuclear danger can be traced to problems in our collective think-ing about nuclear war and nuclear deterrence and that these problems are deep and usually outside the awareness of those who make and execute nuclear policy. They thus conceptualize risk of nuclear war as mainly a psychological problem: If we could alter the way we think in fundamental ways, chiefly by shifting to a less parochial, more global perspective, the deep psychopathology would be cured, the arms race would be terminated, and the risk of nuclear war could be greatly reduced, perhaps ultimately even to zero. Two schools of thought dominate nuclear depth psychology. I will characterize them within the terminology suggested by Holt (1984, pp. 211-212). On the one hand, there are the cognitivists, those who believe that the deep psychopathology driving the arms race is a pathology of personal cognition, albeit one involving the cognitions of a great many leaders in the United States and the Soviet Union. To put the point somewhat colloquial-ly, but pointedly: Cognitivists believe the arms race is crazy because crazy people are running it. As we shall see presently, this approach to the pro-blem of nuclear risk has led many people straightaway to the view that the cure for superpower psychopathology is not fundamentally different in kind from the psychotherapeutic process required to cure any sort of psychological illness involving thought disorder. For most cognitivists, not only may the problem of nuclear risk be conceptualized psychologically, but so also may the cure, which is some process akin to psychotherapy. The other principal school of nuclear depth psychology is that of the interactionists. Advocates of this view tend to believe that there is no evidence suggesting the presence of widespread pathology in the cognitions of the individual leaders of either superpower. Rather, they argue that the deep psychopathology is more abstract, embodied in what they take to be a pathological relationship between the two countries. Within what nuclear depth psychologists take to be crazy patterns of interaction between the super-powers, especially institutionalized mistrust and assumptions of ubiquitous hostile intent, the leaders are seen as functioning quite rationally, as a rule, and one of the forms taken by their rational adaptation to a crazy system is participation in the nuclear arms race. Thus, according to the interactionists, if risk of nuclear war is to be reduced significantly, the quality of the super-power relationship must be changed fundamentally, and this implies a mainly political, rather than psychotherapeutic, cure for superpower psychopathology. The most famous cognitivist among nuclear depth psychologists is Helen Caldicott. Categorical and self-righteous in her assertions, shrill in her writing and speaking, Caldicott might easily be ignored by serious students of nuclear psychology if it weren't for her astonishing popularity. She is a best-selling author, a speaker who is much in demand, a founding member of the reestablished Physicians for Social Responsibility (PSR) and, more recent-ly, a driving force behind Women's Action for Nuclear Disarmament (WAND). Thus one must assume that a great many people have, in Caldicott, found a voice commensurate in content and tone with their own deep fears and beliefs about risk of nuclear war (but see Coles, 1984). Caldicott's writing is filled with ad hominem psychological assaults like the following: The definition of a paranoid patient is someone who imagines a certain scenario in his or her own mind, decides (with no objective evidence) that this is exactly what someone else is thinking, and then decides to act on that notion. The paranoid delusions projected onto the Russian leaders come straight from the minds of American strategists and leaders, and these ideas probably reflect exactly what the Americans are planning to do themselves and bear little relationship to Soviet strategy or reality. (1984, pp. 174-175). Leading candidates for this diagnosis of paranoia are, according to Caldicott, "so-called broad-minded intellectuals who sat on Reagan's M X Commission" (The Scowcroft Commission). Moreover, she asserts, "such fantasy thinking is still practiced at the highest levels of government, including President Reagan and Defense Secretary Weinberger, and is overt paranoia" (1984, p. 174). One may find similar diagnoses in Kovel ( "paranoid madness"; 1983, p. 84) and Menninger( "exhibitionistic drunken gesturing of two suicidal giants"; 1983, p. 350). Unfortunately for Caldicott and her cognitivist colleagues, however, her
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Alt Fails – Pyschology
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diagnoses are simply, demonstrably wrong. The Soviet shave avast nuclear arsenal; their missiles and bombers really are aimed at us; they really do have rather precise plans for using them to destroy us in a nuclear war (see, e.g., Holloway, 1985; Meyer, 1985). However this state of affairs may have come about, our leaders do not simply imagine the Soviet nuclear threat. It is real, as anyone who examines the evidence may see. In moving from her analysis of the problem of nuclear risk-crazy leaders-to her therapeutic prescriptions for a cure, Caldicott's irrelevance to the world of nuclear policy-making becomes total. Because she believes that deeply sick people are driving the risk of nuclear war upward, she must choose between two broad prescriptive alternatives: something akin to political revolution, by which our leaders, at any rate, would be forcibly replaced; or therapy, by which they would be healed. Kovel (1983) leans toward the former alternative; Caldicott, however, favors some novel forms of therapy, such as a kind of marriage counseling, in which each superpower would be required to "pledge "its "troth "to the other (1984, p. 292), monthly wrestling matches between "the men who control the superpowers...to alleviate the built-up aggressions" (p. 305), and parental advice to "grow up and become responsible nations" (p. 337). One may at first wonder whether Caldicott puts forward such suggestions as these seriously but, noting the unrelentingly humorless tone of her writing, one suspects that she does. But because her cognitivist diagnoses are patently false, and because the realization of her prescription is so wildly improbable, the likelihood that the course she advocates w ill actually l ead to a reduction in the risk of nuclear war ought to be rated at very nearly zero.

Alt Fails – Pyschology

Psychology is totally irrelevant to nuclear policymakers – alternative are too unrealistic for political action

Blight 87 (James, Presently Prof. IR – Brown U. Watson Institute for International Studies, Former Cognitive Psychologist, PhD History of Behavioural Science – U. New Hampshire, Faculty Fellow and National Endowment for Humanities Research Fellow – Harvard U. and Lecturer – Harvard JFK School of Government, American Psychologist, 41:1, January, p. 12-29) jl

Predictably, clinicians among the nuclear depth psychologists tend to view the U.S.-Soviet relationship as psychopathological, whereas the experimentalists are inclined to hold that, based on scientifically derived data gathered from quarters other than international politics, the relationship is defective and likely to produce upward movement in a spiral of nuclear risk. I will argue here that these differences between the clinical and experimental formulations of nuclear depth psychology are neither as large nor as important as the much greater conceptual divide that separates the views of both groups from the policymaker's typical understanding of the requirements for managing and reducing the risk of nuclear war. Metaphorically, the present situation is something like an exemplification of Whorf's (1956) hypothesis: Nuclear depth psychologists of all persuasions, on the one hand, and nuclear policymakers and analysts on the other, speak different languages of nuclear risk, with the psychologists holding that the forces that drive risk of nuclear war upward are "deeper" than, or beyond, the awareness of policymakers. The respective psychological realities of psychologists and policymakers are thus very different, and this has led to the central dilemma of nuclear depth psychology: It is ignored almost universally in the policy community at just the time when interest in nuclear issues among psychologists is greater than it has ever been. Why this should be so and what ought to be done about it constitute the leading questions of this essay. Summary of the Argument: The Nuclear Depth Psychologists' Fallacy and What to Do About It Let us begin with the policy-relevant question: What is to be done about the problem thus formulated by nuclear depth psychologistsma deeply pathological superpower relationship, which drives an arms race, which, in turn, drives the risk of nuclear war ever higheff There has been no shortage of solutions. Indeed, the recent great and general awakening among psychologists to the prospect of a major nuclear war has sparked an unprecedented, creative explosion of "solutions." Yet many of these are difficult to take seriously, because they are either impossibly ambitious or pitifully inconsequential. Among those least likely to succeed are a catl for what amounts to a worldwide political revolution (Kovel, 1983), a worldwide transformation in our patterns of behavior (Skinner, 1982), or the initiating of meetings between American and Soviet psychologists (Klineberg, such proposals are necessarily or intrinsically bad. The point is that either the probability of their occurrence is so low or the probability of their having any noticeable effect on U.S.-Soviet nuclear policy is so vanishingly small, that they cannot begin to satisfy the members of a group like the nuclear depth psychologists, who seem universally to believe that risk of nuclear war is much too high at present and is rising fast. The point has been made poignantly by Wagner (1985). In a useful, critical review of psychological approaches to reducing the risk of nuclear war, he admired that the solutions put forward are too often "overwhelming and paralyzing" (p. 533). "Where we go," he said, " . . . is unclear" (p. 533). And so it is.

Alt Fails – Pyschology

Psychoanalysis is too counter-intuitive to be used in effective policy making – it will be ignored

Blight 87 (James, Presently Prof. IR – Brown U. Watson Institute for International Studies, Former Cognitive Psychologist, PhD History of Behavioural Science – U. New Hampshire, Faculty Fellow and National Endowment for Humanities Research Fellow – Harvard U. and Lecturer – Harvard JFK School of Government, American Psychologist, 41:1, January, p. 12-29) jl

But the policy irrelevance of depth psychological solutions to the problem of nuclear risk is not restricted only to those that seem obviously extrav~nt or ineffectual. It applies also to psychological solutions that are widely regarded in the psychological community as having great potential policy relevance, due in part to their having been substantiated by a good deal of empirical research and in part to the apparent complementarity between psychologists' approaches to the problem and throe of nuclear policymakers. The following example is meant to illustrate the point (argued at length below) that even the best and brightest psychological solutions to the problem of nuclear risk are remarkably beside the policymaker's point and thus quite unlikely to affect the poficymaking process. Probably the best known and most highly regarded attempt (among psychologists) to grapple psychologically with risk of nuclear war is Charles E. Osgood's (1962) "Graduated and Reciprocated Initiatives in Tension Reduction," or GRIT. It is in many ways the locus classicus of nonclinical nuclear depth psychology. According to Osgood, the key problem is the arms race, which at the psychological level is exemplified in a spiral of mutual mistrust, which in turn leads in his view to tension and fear, which, finally, leads to further stein in the arms race. And it is the arms race itself, in Osgood's view, that continually raises the risk of nuclear war. Here, in sum, is Osgood's assessment, solution, and evaluation of the probability of successfifily reversing the arms race with GRIT: An arms race is obviously a tension-increasing system; it is a spiral of terror. By reversing one of the characteristics of an arms race, we may be able to transform it into a ~ of trust- This would be a graduated and reciprocated unilaterally initiated, internation system that was tension-decreasing in nature [GRIT]... with anything like the energy now being thrown into the arms race, GRIT would be feasible. (Osgood, 1986, p. 196) Worked out in fine-grained detail by Osgood and many others, GRIT has become the solid core of received wisdom for psychologists who, working now a quarter century after the publication of Osgood's An Alternative to War or Surrender, seek to bring their professional knowledge directly to bear on the risk of nuclear war. What, then, is fallacious in Osgood's assumption that GRIT is "feasible"? Why, after nearly 25 years, does GRIT (and its many successors) still strike those few members of the nuclear policy community who have studied it as unreal and irrelevant? An answer to this critical question may be approached in a more exact manner by comparing Osgood's rationale for GRIT with the following summary statement of the central goal of nuclear strategy: deterrence by means of crisis stability. Thomas C. Schelling, writing at almost the same time as Osgood, specified more clearly than anyone else, and probably more influentially, the policymaker's conceptual ground rules for the maintenance of nuclear deterrence. It is widely accepted that the United States has the military power virtually to obliterate the USSR, and vice versa... But \_9 . . we are worried about whether a surprise attack might have such prospects of destroying the power to retaliate as to be undeterred itself by the threat of retaliation... There is a difference between a balance of terror in which either side can obliterate the other and one in which both sides can do it, no matter who strikes first. It is not the "balance"--the sheer equality or symmetry in the situationmthat constitutes nuclear deterrence; it is the stability of the balance. The balance is stable only when neither, in striking first, can destroy the other's ability to strike back. (Schelling, 1960, p. 232) To Schelling~ as to entire generations of nuclear strategists, nuclear war is prevented by means of deterfence, which is a function of the credibility and "audibility" of threats that, finally, are computed mainly on the basis of a net assessment of the relative capabilities and vulnerability of warheads, delivery vehicles, and command and control systems. No one----certainly not SchellingDwould claim that these principles have always guided our nuclear policy in practice (Schelling, 1985/ 1986). But almost all nuclear policymakers have argued over the years that Schelling's principles of strategic stability ought to have guided their decisions, in principle. What needs to be noticed first and appreciated about these formulations of Osgood and Schelling is how utterly incommensurable they are with respect to the determinants of risk of nuclear war. Using a method one might call fear assessment, Osgood attributed the rising risk of war to deep fear and tension caused by continued participation in the arms race. To Schelling, however, risk of war has little to do with any hypothetical psychological strain and everything to do with coming off second best in a net threat assessment. To characterize the conceptual gulfbetwegn them in its starkest form, Osgood (and most psychologists) believe that any nuclear war will likely be caused by threats, whereas Schelling (and most policymakers and analysts) believe it will be prevented by them. No wonder that GRIT, a pillar of received wisdom among psychologists, is regarded as a curiosity among policymakers. It is important to notice, finally, why GRIT and its descendants are so wide of the mark of policy relevance. It is because they represent a "depth" psychology, an attempt at psychological unveiling of processes that are deeper than the conscious experience of nuclear policymakers. The implicit claim is that efforts to deter nuclear war by the maintenance of strategic stability, which seems to policymakers to be the cornerstone of war prevention, are "really" the very opposite--they are the likely cause of nuclear war. Psychologists tend to see this as a tale of two zeitgeists, one superficial and false (the policymakers') and one deep and true (the psychologists'). Obviously policymakers have had none of this. They are in fact much more likely to echo the remark of the Viennese journalist Karl Kraus, who described the original depth psychology this way: "Psychoanalysis is that spiritual disease ofwhich it considers itself to be the cure" (cited in Janik & Toulmin, 1973, p. 75). The lack of seriousness with which nuclear policymakers have viewed schemes like GRIT seems to prove the point rather conclusively. This point cannot be emphasized too much; its unravelling represents the critical thrust of this article: Nuclear depth psychology does not lead to policy-relevant conclusions. It is a conceptual cul-de-sac within which psychologists are likely to remain endlessly trapped, without a reasonable hope of contributing to the reduction of nuclear risks, the fear of which drove them into the nuclear arena in the first place. If psychologists seek a realistic hope of influencing nuclear policy, they must, as I argue in the last two sections, begin again after they have divested themselves of their spurious nuclear depth psychology.

Alt Fails – Pyschology

Psychoanalytic alternatives are politically irrelevant – It’s viewed as too unreal and alien

Blight 87 (James, Presently Prof. IR – Brown U. Watson Institute for International Studies, Former Cognitive Psychologist, PhD History of Behavioural Science – U. New Hampshire, Faculty Fellow and National Endowment for Humanities Research Fellow – Harvard U. and Lecturer – Harvard JFK School of Government, American Psychologist, 41:1, January, p. 12-29) jl

The nub of their central error was captured many years ago by William James. He called it, on one occasion, "the psychologists' fallacy par excellence," which confi.~ts in "confusion of his own standpoint with that of the mental fact about which he is making his report" (James, 1890, Vol. 1, p. 196). "We must," cautioned James, "be very careful, therefore, in discussing a state of mind from the psychologists' point of view, to avoid foisting into its own ken matters that are only there for ours" (James, 1890, Vol. 1, p. 197). But this is precisely what nuclear depth psychologists have not done. In Jamesian terms (James, 1890, Vol. 1, pp. 221-223), our nuclear policymakers are well acquainted with the fear of crises leading potentially to nuclear war, and thus they spend much of their time thinking about the determinants of strategic stability in such a way as to try to drive downward the probability that deterrence will fail. This, schematically, is the psychological reality of the nuclear policymakers. It bears no resemblance whatever to the "reality" that nuclear depth psychologists seek to attribute to them: Acquaintance with pathological suspicion and attention to arms "racing," each of which is ultimately attributable to superpower psychopathology. This, finally, is responsible for the policy irrelevance of the whole approach: Its premises are totally alien, psychologically completely unreal, to those who actually manage the nuclear risks. In an 1899 essay, James generalized this problem of egocentric psychologism by calling it "a certain blindness in human beings" that leads to the "injustice of our opinions, so far as they deal with the significance of alien lives" (James, 1899/1977a, pp. 629-630). His remedy was tolerance, based on a radically empirical approach to human knowledge. The more we understand what the lives of others are really like, from the inside, the more likely we are, James believed, to formulate a problem in a way that is appropriate to its context and thus pertinent to plausible solutions. This essay is conceived as just such a Jamesian exercise--in nuclear radical empiricism--of clearing away some of the fallacious depth-psychological assumptions that are leading nowhere. It is also, finally, an attempt to respond to the provocative challenge issued recently by Morawski and Goldstein (1985) to develop a policy-relevant psychology of avoiding nuclear war by engaging in "blunt honesty about the influence of politics, the constraints of methodology, and the risks of expertise" (p. 283). My belief is that if we psychologists are honest with ourselves, if we begin to acknowledge the hard reality of political variables, if we try to face up to the limitations of the analogy between world politics and the consulting room or laboratory, and if we begin to face the fact that nuclear policymakers are almost oblivious to psychology as such, then we will want to chart a new course, one that will begin with phenomenological analyses of nuclear crises (Blight, 1985a, in press-a, in press-b). If we thus try to enter the "alien lives" of those who manage the nuclear risks under which we all must live, we may indeed begin to assist them in lowering the likelihood of a catastrophic nuclear war.1984).

Alt Fails – Pyschology

They have to prove the alternative overcomes political opposition otherwise it solves zero of their links

Blight 87 (James, Presently Prof. IR – Brown U. Watson Institute for International Studies, Former Cognitive Psychologist, PhD History of Behavioural Science – U. New Hampshire, Faculty Fellow and National Endowment for Humanities Research Fellow – Harvard U. and Lecturer – Harvard JFK School of Government, American Psychologist, 41:1, January, p. 12-29) jl

The central fact to be faced by advocates of nuclear depth psychology is this: Nuclear policymakers are almost totally uninterested in any advice offered them by psychologists. Remonstrate as we might, in seeking to bring to bear clinical insights and scientific research that we believe to be both paradigmatically true and pragmatically pertinent to nuclear risks, there is no one listening at the policy end of what we hoped would be a conversation. In a recent timely article, Teflock took note of this "steely resistance" and observed that for policymakers, "the problems for which solutions are being proposed [e.g., Osgood's GRIT] are not widely understood or ~iTed to be problems" (Tetlock, 1986, p. 560). The discouraging but realistic conclusion Tetlock (1986) drew from thi~ central fact of policymakers' profound disinterest in psychology is that, no matter how relevant or potentially relevant psychologists believe their ideas to be, the prospects for what he calls psychologically based "procedural reform" are practically nil (p. 560). Thus psychology remains functionally irrelevant to the nuclear policy-making process.

Alt Fails – Backlash

Critique of nuclear weapons causes backlash among policymakers

Lifton 1 (Robert Jay Spring, Illusions of the Second Nuclear Age World Policy Journal, http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\_hb6669/is\_1\_18/ai\_n28841497/?tag=content;col1 TBC 7/1/10)

The good news about nuclearism is that it has been subjected to a great wave of intellectual and ethical criticism, and that it is no longer a respectable ideology in most thinking environments. It has become what the weapons scholar Sheldon Unger, in The Rise and Fall of Nuclearism, calls a "tarnished faith." The bad news, as Unger (along with others) also makes clear, is that such a sensible nuclear critique--what we can call ideological backsliding--does not extend to our present policymakers, nor for that matter to many leaders throughout the world. That is, nuclearism is all too alive, though I would not say well, among decisionmakers whose countries already possess, or wish to possess, these mystical objects. Here it is important to keep in mind the double character of the weapons. They are physical entities that are unprecedentedly murderous and at the same time they are perversely spiritualized objects. Nuclearism, then, is a beleaguered ideology, still in flux. Ideologies, like people, can be most d angerous when threatened and under duress. From that standpoint, the very force of the contemporary critique of nuclear weapons now being put forward by thoughtful and dedicated world statesmen could lead less thoughtful, less compassionate leaders and groups to reassert their devotion to and deification of nuclear weapons.

Alt Fails – Cooptation

The alternative is too abstract and allows political cooptation

Summers 91 (Craig, Mt Allison U – Psych, http://www.wsu.edu/~brians/ntc/NTC6.pdf, AD: 6/30/10) jl

People with different political agendas could make completely different conclusions using the material in Nuclear Madness. It is also the case that completely different premises and images could be used to arrive at the same conclusions. A discussion of sexual and pornographic images of the nuclear threat in Rosenbaum (1978) is equally metaphorical. It is descriptive, but not explanatory. Perhaps no real explanation is necessary in Nuclear Madness, though, or even any conclusions on religious thinking or psychological processes. Chernus’s description of “the bomb” as “a symbol of neurotic ambivalence” (p. 67; also 56, 61) is almost just an abstract, artistic image. This would be okay if presented this way in the introduction. As it is, though, we are misled from the title on into thinking that this book will provide an understanding of psychological perceptions and responses to the nuclear threat.

Aff Answers – Permutation

Pure rejection causes a crash landing – Powerful elites will be more aggressive without the perm

Lifton and Falk 82 (Robert – Professor Psychology at John Jay College, Richard – Professor of International Law at Princeton, *Indefensible Weapons*, p. 264-265) jl

This great struggle for global transformation encompasses normal politics, but it is also far broader than any strictly political experience, resembling more the emergence of a new religion or civilization on a global scale than a change, however radical, in the personnel or orientation of political leaders. In essence, as the transformation proceeds, the ground of politics will shift, and by shifting, will cause turmoil and confusion as new tendencies grow stronger, while the old structures, despite being undermined, remain in place and may through the desperate efforts of their stalwarts, embark on even more aggressive and adventurist paths. The avoidance of a crash landing of the old order is obviously a high priority under these circumstances. One form of constructive politics in such a setting are forms of thought and action that incorporate positive aspects of the past rather than insisting on its utter repudiation of a complete break. The pain of transition could be considerably eased by regarding attitudes of reconciliation as a cardinal virtue alongside those of perseverance and commitment.

Complete rejection causes a crash landing

Lifton and Falk 82 (Robert – Professor Psychology at John Jay College, Richard – Professor of International Law at Princeton, *Indefensible Weapons*, p. 247-48) jl

Since popular movements are difficult to sustain (Americans being particularly prone to quick disillusionment), it is essential that its guiding spirits possess and impart a vision of what needs to be done, and how to do it. There is a special requirement present here, as well. To oppose nuclearism effectively does impose a difficult and special requirement that we connect tactical demands with a commitment to perseverance in pursuit of essential long-range objectives. Either without the other will collapse: the moral passion that gives grassroots politics its edge depends largely on an overall repudiation of nuclearism in any form, while the emphasis on attainable goals builds needed popular confidence that victories over nuclear forces are possible, that ordinary people can mobilize and wield decisive power, and that a path can be eventually found to overcome once and for all, the nuclear menace.

AT: Deterrence = “Hostage Holding”

This analogy not only doesn’t make any sense but nuclear weapons have made societies safer from massive conventional conflict

Shaw 84 (William, London School of Economics, Ethics, Political and Social Philosophy Professor, Ethics, 94.2, JSTOR) jl

On closer inspection, however, this line of reasoning is less conclusive than Ramsey and Lackey think. First, their analogies involve kidnapping, yet "holding hostage" the opposed population with nuclear weapons in no way limits its movement or activities. The mere pointing of French ICBMs at Soviet cities, scary as it may be, restricts no Soviet citizen's liberty. Soviet civilians are not being tied to bumpers or wired to explosives; their lives of joy and sorrow will unfold much the same whether or not they are "held hostage."7 Second, McCoy need not claim a "right" to threaten the Hatfield child (let alone to kidnap him), in the sense of putting Hatfield under an obligation not to remove his child from that threat. Rather, McCoy need only advance the weaker claim that he has no obligation not to threaten conduct harmful to Hatfield's child in order to dissuade Hatfield from an immoral action. Does Hatfield's child have some right, which could furnish the ground of this putative obligation, not to have his life made the basis of a threat directed at his father (indeed the child himself may not know about the threat), or do the denizens of Leningrad have a right not to have French missiles pointed their way? Talk of rights is frequently rather loose these days, but even so it is hard to see what would be the basis of these supposed rights. Third, does McCoy's threat actually increase the chance of Hatfield's child dying, as Lackey assumes? If McCoy's threat were a bluff, then it would not enhance the child's danger. On the other hand, if the threat is real but deters successfully, then no harm comes to the youngster. Has his chance of dying nonetheless been increased? The answer will obviously depend upon the circumstances, but if the predictable response to Hatfield's actions involves some risk to his family in any case (perhaps they will inevitably be endangered when he is pursued), then McCoy's threat may in fact lower the actual, though perhaps not the perceived, risk to Hatfield's child. Many people assume that the nuclear era has made our lives more perilous, but if it were the case that the American hydrogen arsenal has prevented not just nuclear war, but a conventional conflict between the United States and the Soviet Union that would have occurred in a non-nuclear post-World War II world, then it may actually have increased not only our safety, but the safety of the civilians held "hostage" in the USSR.

AT: Deterrence = “Hostage Holding”

Nuclear coercion is extremely rare

Beardsley & Asal 9 (Kyle – Emory, Victor – NYU, *Jnl of Confl Resolution*, 53:2, p. 278-9)

Use of atomic weapons, however, has not been attempted since 1945, and they are rarely explicitly threatened (Betts 1987). Whether they can be credibly threatened as coercive devices remains in question because the potential costs to the user are prodigious, especially against another nuclear state. A substantial literature exists attempting to explain how nuclear weapons can be useful for coercive diplomacy in light of such credibility issues (e.g., Schelling 1966; Powell 1987, 1988, 1990; Snyder and Diesing 1977). Such studies tend to explain only how nuclear weapons can be used in deterrence, with the ability to compel left in doubt. Zagare and Kilgour (2000) have also pointedly observed that much of this “classical deterrence”

literature uses irrational constructs to explain how rational actors threaten higher risk of escalation to make a foe to back down.

They’re not credible threats and that applies even to nonnuclear states

Beardsley & Asal 9 (Kyle – Emory, Victor – NYU, *Jnl of Confl Resolution*, 53:2, p. 279)

We cannot, however, take as given that nuclear weapons actually increase the expected conflict costs of conflict. While this is something that has often been argued, there are few systematic empirical tests for whether the observed world conforms to what one would expect if nuclear weapons do increase costs of conflict. Some scholars discount the role that nuclear weapons have played in increasing an opponent’s

costs of conflict and stabilizing peace. Mueller (1988) has argued that nuclear weapons are actually irrelevant, as they can never credibly be threatened. Geller (1990) has also argued that nuclear weapons are generally irrelevant against nonnuclear actors and finds that nuclear-weapon states are unable to deter nonnuclear states from aggression. Proliferation pessimists such as Sagan (2003) argue that some decision makers, particularly military leaders, will not weigh the costs the same way as civilian leaders.

Nukes make war threats less likely simply bc of the risks involved

Beardsley & Asal 9 (Kyle – Emory, Victor – NYU, *Jnl of Confl Resolution*, 53:2, p. 281)

While the costs of the maximum-escalation scenarios will increase in the shadow of nuclear weapons, the associated probabilities should decrease. The size of these weapons and their clumsy inability to not cause horrific damage even when used in a limited sense make them an unlikely option in war. Against a nuclear opponent, especially one with second-strike capabilities, the costs to the using state would likely be in the form of a catastrophic response. Such a threat of retaliation from a nuclear adversary is obvious, but there are also substantial costs to using nuclear weapons against a nonnuclear state. The use of nuclear weapons can hinder the using state from pursuing some of its strategic objectives, such as winning the support of an adversary’s domestic population or even gaining control of a disputed area that becomes irradiated. Beyond these instrumental incentives, Tannenwald (1999, 2005) has traced the development of a nuclear taboo, in which there are substantial normative costs to a first-strike nuclear attack. Once the nuclear taboo is established, decision makers may never consider using a nuclear first strike because it simply always lies outside of the range of possible appropriate actions or they risk sanction from the greater international or domestic communities for violating a deeply rooted norm.

A2: Lifton

Lifton’s wrong – he labels different opinions disorders and simplifies reality into moral absolutes

DEL SESTO 00 (CRISTINA November 18, 2000 NY Times http://www.nytimes.com/2000/11/18/arts/champion-of-human-survival-tries-to-awaken-academics-to-a-nuclear-menace.html?pagewanted=1 TBC 7/1/10)

Dr. Lifton's psychological analysis has its critics. Theodore Postol, professor of science, technology and national security policy at M.I.T., said that Dr. Lifton and those who subscribe to his approach tended to ascribe psychological disorders to those whose opinions differed from their own. ''Characterizing existential dilemmas in psychological terms strikes me as not capturing the problem,'' said Mr. Postol, who is also a speaker at the nuclear conference. ''Lifton talks of psychic-numbing. There's numbing for all kinds of things. I'm not sure what that tells us. The real world is complex and sometimes none of the choices we have are good ones. If Attila the Hun is coming through, it's not a matter of being moral. It's kill or be killed.''

A2: Lifton

Lifton’s failure to confront the material realities of power gut solvency

Kovel 84 (Joel, Against the state of nuclear terror, Comm-UC-SD, google books TBC 7/1/10)

That Lifton dwells on our imaging of the world rather than upon how we actively make it, automatically puts everything in a passive light. We receive reality instead of construct it; and so the way it is constructed, and for whose profit and benefit, becomes secondary. The stage of history shifts from the real world to the mental registration of that world. Therefore, psychic numbing, which is surely Lifton's leading concept (in The Broken Connection, his major theoretical work, he claims that numbing "undermines the most fundamental psychic process," and is "the essential mechanism of mental disorder"), at its most extreme "consists of the mind being severed from its own psychic /brms"(italics Lifton's).'3 Since these "forms" are only images, their source in reality becomes a matter of some indifference. Thus, we see why for Lifton the actual presentation of the bomb doesn't matter very much. All that is required is that there be a bomb out there to provide a collective focus for numbing. Paradoxically, this is a quantitative kind of psychohistory, for all its concern with the imagination. The concrete history of the bomb, and the critically different meanings given to it by people in different social places, are cancelled out by the one denominator, the form of "bombness." A psychology whose central concept is imaging is a poor psychology, opaque to the great forces that actually move people in the world: self-interest, sexuality, dependency on others. There is not a mention in Indefensible Weapons, for example, of the essential sexual element in militarism. Yet as any viewing of Stanley Kubrick's great film. Dr. Strangelove, can instantly clarify, there is much more to nuclearism than numbing and the search for immortality. Lifton, however, will have nothing of such coarse realities. Thus even the nuclear state of being is inadequately treated. Lifton's insights help insofar as they give some shape to the inchoate dread that characterizes life under the nuclear state. Beyond this point, however, they trail off into pious exhortation. The politics of psychotechnocracy basically come down to a variety of psychotherapy. Therapy is, after all, the specific technology of psychology; and if one's appreciation of the world does not extend beyond psychologism, then one's prescription for changing the world cannot extend beyond the technology of psychologizing. In practice this amounts to nothing more than the mouthing of worthy sentiments and the reassurance that one is after all on the side of the angels. In fact, Lifton scarcely ever descends to the particulars of what changing the nuclear state would really entail. Given the degree of Lifton's indifference to its actual structure, it is not too hard to understand why he would place one of his more concrete discussions of the pitfalls in the path of a non-nuclear world in a footnote to his contribution to Indefensible Weapons. It might be worthwhile to consider this passage in full: Part of the awareness (that we would be safer without nuclear weapons than with their insane accumulation! must include anticipation of possible responses from those in power. They too would be the subject of a change in consciousness, and that possibility must be ardently pursued. But they could also react with a resurgence of nuclearism all the more primitive because of its gnawing disbelief in itself. They could then take steps to repress the new awareness, whether by attempting to dishonor, threaten or otherwise undermine those who became associated with it, or by further control of information and manipulation of media. In this way our society could become dangerously divided into antagonistic camps embracing and rejecting precisely this awareness. For that reason its dissemination needs to be as broad and encompassing as we can make it, so that rather than further divide, the awareness can serve to unify disparate groups within our society.1\* This is the politics of therapy. It seeks change through elevation of consciousness, or "awareness," as if an act of imagination would directly transform history. It completely ignores the fact that "those in power" are shaped by the power they serve, and assumes instead that they promote nuclear weapons because of their own distorted awareness of them, specifically "nuclearism" (which to Iifton is the belief that immortality can be attained through the power of the bomb). Put another way, Lifton has no conception that these people serve empire and capital, i.e. a worldwide system of oppression, the military juggernaut that enforces it, and the homegrown monster known as the military-industrial complex with its accomplices in government and the academy. Because of his inattention to these gross realities, Lifton can blithely offer awareness and warn us about the divisiveness it could cause—as though our society were not already "dangerously divided," by the schisms inherent in power, into "antagonistic camps." Not the camps of one kind of awareness or another, but the camp of those whose power has led them to use nuclear weaponry as enforcers and that of everyone else who is the victim of that power. One is the camp of the subject of history and the other that of history's object; one camp for those who have monopolized reason, science and technology and the other camp for those who have not.

AT: Martin – N/W = Extinction

Brian is wrong – doesn’t assume combustible material injected into the stratosphere

Pittock 84 (Barrie, Atmospheric Research Scientist, published over 200 articles, Climate Impact Group Chair, CSIRO Senior Scientist, Australian Public Service Medal Winner, http://www.uow.edu.au/~bmartin/pubs/84sanap.pdf AD: 7/1/10) jl

Next Brian attacks Jonathan Schell for discussing the implications of human extinction in The Fate of the Earth. Brian never acknowledges that Schell quite explicitly said that human extinction is not a certainty (see Schell p. 93), and ignores the powerful arguments which Schell advances for regarding the mere possibility of human extinction as important. These are developed further in Schell's more recent articles in The New Yorker (Jan. 2 & 9, 1984). Brian then claims that the scientific basis of the ozone depletion problem has "almost entirely evaporated". In fact, while we now know that the nuclear winter effect is almost certainly far more serious than ozone depletion, the ozone depletion problem has not been dismissed except in so far as the trend to smaller warheads may limit the quantity of oxides of nitrogen injected into the 2 stratosphere by the nuclear explosions themselves. Ozone depletion could in fact end up being more serious due to injections of combustion products, including smoke, into the stratosphere.

Every claim made by Brian assumes unrealistic scenarios – the possibility for extinction is high

Pittock 84 (Barrie, Atmospheric Research Scientist, published over 200 articles, Climate Impact Group Chair, CSIRO Senior Scientist, Australian Public Service Medal Winner, http://www.uow.edu.au/~bmartin/pubs/84sanap.pdf AD: 7/1/10) jl

Brian claims that the impact on populations nearer the Equator, such as in India, "does not seem likely to be significant". Quite to the contrary, smoke clouds are likely to spread into the tropics within a matter of weeks and would probably lead to below freezing temperatures for months on end. Populations and the ecology in such regions are the least able to withstand such a climatic onslaught and must be very seriously affected. Then he says that major ecological destruction "remains speculative at present". Is he suggesting that a sudden and prolonged plunge to below freezing temperatures, with insufficient light for photosynthesis, might have little harmful effect, or is he denying the reality of "nuclear winter"? There have been a number of specific criticisms of the various published papers on nuclear winter, but after more than two years in print there has been no criticism which has substantially altered the basic conclusions. The most prominent criticism has come from John Maddox, editor of Nature (307, 121: 1984), who completely failed to take account of the vital difference in optical properties of soot and volcanic dust (La Marche and Hirschboeck, 1984). Principal uncertainties exist as to the war scenarios, the fraction of soot in the smoke, the height of injection of the smoke, the amount which would be removed by washout in the initial plumes, and the later rate of removal. In most cases the published papers made assumptions which tended to under-estimate the effects, especially with regard to the height of injection of the smoke and its lifetime. Two possible exceptions are the war scenarios, in which the so-called "baseline" case may be too large by a factor of 2, and perhaps the particle coagulation rates if the initial plumes are not rapidly dispersed. My judgement now is that the initial effects would be much as described in the published papers, even with a 2,000 megatonne war, except that the lifetime of the effects could well turn out to be years rather than months. I will discuss the technical details elsewhere. Brian goes on to suggest that the worst effects might be avoided by "migration to coastal areas, away from the freezing continental temperatures", but fails to realise that the huge temperature gradients induced between the continents and oceans will cause violent storms to lash these coastal zones, which in any case are likely to be subject to a strong outflow of cold air from the continental interiors. Brian then invokes the advantages of turning to grain rather than meat to extend "reserves of food". The fact is of course that in the event of a nuclear winter any human survivors will have little choice but to eat whatever food is available, be it meat or grain. But where are there huge grain reserves sufficient to feed the survivors for one or more years, and will such reserves survive in convenient proximity to the human survivors? Is Brian going to seriously 3 advocate creating grain reserves sufficient to feed a couple of thousand million people for one or two years?

A2: Chernus – Non-Falsifiable

Chernus’s ignorance of empirical research makes his argument non-falsifiable and useless

Summers 91 (Craig, Mt Allison U – Psych, http://www.wsu.edu/~brians/ntc/NTC6.pdf, AD: 6/30/10) jl

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

A2: Chernus – Alt No Solve

Alt can’t solve the links – ignore larger motivation in the military industrial complex

Summers 91 (Craig, Mt Allison U – Psych, http://www.wsu.edu/~brians/ntc/NTC6.pdf, AD: 6/30/10) jl

This is a book that relies heavily on lofty language and philosophical jargon (e.g., “radical finitude”, p. 53). Relating mythological terms like “the underworld” (p. 254) to nuclear deterrence is about as useful to a real understanding of the nuclear threat as former U.S. President Reagan’s references to “the evil empire.” These grandiose descriptions fail to recognize simple economic realities. The scientific-military-industrial complex and the nuclear industry are often supported simply because they provide companies and shareholders with profits, and employees with jobs. Therefore, it may not be that numbing occurs because of the magnitude of the threat, but that rationalization occurs because of vested interests in the threat. It would therefore be worth considering whether there is any difference between numbing in the hibakusha that survived Hiroshima, and rationalization (or numbing) for questionable work that pays well. This distinction may perhaps be studied empirically. As with imagery, there are also empirical studies that could have been considered in any book dealing with these types of psychological mechanisms (e.g., Festinger & Carlsmith, 1959 and all of the subsequent studies validating cognitive dissonance).

A2: Chernus – Disproven

Chernus’s method relies on out dated and disproven psychoanalytic theory

Summers 91 (Craig, Mt Allison U – Psych, http://www.wsu.edu/~brians/ntc/NTC6.pdf, AD: 6/30/10) jl

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

AT: Chernus – AT: Root Cause

Psychology is not the root cause and even if it was policy makers would ignore it

Blight 87 (James, Presently Prof. IR – Brown U. Watson Institute for International Studies, Former Cognitive Psychologist, PhD History of Behavioural Science – U. New Hampshire, Faculty Fellow and National Endowment for Humanities Research Fellow – Harvard U. and Lecturer – Harvard JFK School of Government, American Psychologist, 41:1, January, p. 12-29) jl

The central, salient assumption of all nuclear depth psychologists is that our "thinking" may be regarded as a kind of independent variable (or cause), whereas risk of nuclear war, evidenced in a spiraling arms race, is the dependent variable (or effect). This formulation, consistent with, and in many instances derived from, Einstein's manifesto, is radically different from the way nuclear policymakers tend to approach the problem. The policymaker is inclined to regard risk of nuclear war as both a cause and an effect: a cause of the manner of piecemeal, cautious thinking required to manage international affairs, and an effect of deeply rooted, hardly understood factors that operate to maintain the quasi-anarchic nationstate system. The functional result of this discrepancy is that the main causal arrow for each group is nearly the reverse of what the other takes it to be. Nuclear depth psychologists seek to alter our thinking, thus altering a particular international relationship and lowering nuclear risks. Policymakers, on the other hand, see their main task as managing nuclear risks within the context of an essentially unalterable international situation that determines the form, if not all of the content, of our manner of thinking. An obvious, if superficial, conclusion to be drawn from these considerations is that nuclear depth psychologists and nuclear policymakers see the problem of nuclear risk very differently, in fact almost inversely. This is no doubt why members of the policy community have, by and large, concluded that the arguments of the depth psychologists are irrelevant to the management of nuclear risks (Klineber~ 1984, p. 1248). But a closer examination of the psychological assumptions underlying each approach reveals the reasons not only why the formulations and prescriptions of nuclear depth psychology seem strange and irrelevant to policy makers but also why they really are irrelevant and are likely to remain so. In taking such a closer look we may get a clearer picture of why the policymakers' formulation accounts for the historical record whereas the clinical diagnosis and prescriptions of the depth psychologists do not.

\*A2: Weaponitis\*

Link Turn – Arms Control Good

Arms control reduces sovereignty and promotes cooperation

LARSEN 2 (Jeffrey senior policy analyst with Science Applications International Corporation in Colorado Springs in Arms Control ed. Jeffrey Larsen p. 3-4 http://www.rienner.com/uploads/47d6f750a53eb.pdf TBC 6/30/10)

The founding premise of traditional arms control theory—that arms control can be an important adjunct to national security strategy—has, in practice, not always been obvious or consistently observed because arms control is inherently a counterintuitive approach to enhancing security. As Kerry Kartchner has written, arms control makes national security dependent to some degree on the cooperation of prospective adversaries. It often involves setting lower levels of arms than would otherwise appear prudent based on a strict threat assessment. It mandates establishing a more or less interactive relationship with potential opponents and, in the case of mutual intrusive verification and data exchanges, exposes sensitive national security information and facilities to scrutiny by foreign powers. It requires seeking and institutionalizing cooperation where the potential for conflicts of interest seemingly far outweigh common objectives. It is fundamentally a high-stakes gamble, mortgaging national survival against little more than the collateral of trust and anticipated reciprocal restraint, often in a geopolitical context fraught with political hostility and tension. It is, in fact, a voluntary (and not always reversible) delimitation of national sovereignty. Viewed from this perspective, arms control is not obviously better than its alternative—unilaterally providing for one’s own security.14 What compels the United States and other nations, then, to structure so much of their national security posture on an approach that seemingly contradicts a country’s natural instincts toward self-sufficiency and selfpreservation? An answer to this apparent paradox is that arms control allows security to be established by negotiation at levels of weapons lower than would be the case if these levels were determined unilaterally. The mere act of negotiating arms control also may lead to better communication, deepened understanding, and reduced hostility among adversaries.

**Impact Turn – Deterrence Works**

**Deterrence Works, even against rouge states – and even if it doesn’t, abandoning deterrence causes a reliance on ‘preventive war’ which is worse.**

Record 4 (Jeffery Record, former professional staff member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, *Policy Analysis,* no. 519, July 8th 2004, http://www.comw.org/qdr/fulltext/0407record.pdf, Nuclear Deterrence, Preventive War, and Counterproliferation)

To substitute preventive war for deterrence is to ignore the fact that traditional nuclear deterrence was directed at states already armed with nuclear weapons and was aimed at deterring their use in time of crisis or war; it was not enlisted as a means deterring the acquisition of nuclear weapons. That task was, at least until 9/11, left primarily to the regime established by the 1968 Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, also known as the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT), and to the U.S. policy of providing nuclear guarantees to allies that might otherwise have felt the need to develop their own nuclear weapons. The administration’s security strategy is further challenged by the broader question of whether it is possible over the long run to prevent proliferation of WMD on the part of states determined to acquire them. Traditional nonproliferation policy implied that nuclear proliferation could be contained and treated all proliferation as undesirable despite evidence that it could be stabilizing as well as destabilizing.3 Moreover, as the American experience with Iraq has shown, preventive war is a costly and risky enterprise subject to the law of unintended consequences. And it is not at all self-evident that preventive war is necessary, at least against states (as opposed to nonstate entities); on the contrary, preventive war may actually encourage proliferation, although the impact of Operation Iraqi Freedom on North Korean and Iranian attitudes toward nuclear weapons remains as yet unclear. In the final analysis, it is not the mere presence of WMD in hostile hands—but rather their use—that kills and destroys. Accordingly, if their use can be deterred—and the evidence suggests that deterrence does work against rogue states if not terrorist organizations, then deterrence of their use is manifestly a much more attractive policy option than war to prevent their acquisition. That is not to deny the inherent difficulty of maintaining credible deterrence, especially against adversaries whose culture and values are alien to our own. Deterrence is a psychological phenomenon, and as such is inherently unstable. Nor can one ignore the impossibility of proving the negative. The success of deterrence is measured by events that do not happen, and one cannot demonstrate conclusively that an enemy refrained from this or that action because of the implicit or explicit threat of unacceptable retaliation. The argument here is that deterrence should continue to be the policy of first resort in dealing with hostile states acquiring or seeking to acquire WMD and that preventive war—as opposed to preemptive military action aimed at disrupting an imminent attack—is almost always a bad and ultimately self-defeating option. Richard K. Betts at Columbia University observes that past American arguments for preventive war against the Soviet Union and Mao’s China “proved terribly wrong.”4

**Impact Turn – Deterrence Works**

Deterrence is only effective why we are credible – plan returns credibility,

Record 4 (Jeffery Record, former professional staff member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, *Policy Analysis,* no. 519, July 8th 2004, http://www.comw.org/qdr/fulltext/0407record.pdf, Nuclear Deterrence, Preventive War, and Counterproliferation)

With respect to nuclear deterrence, nuclear strategist Albert Wohlstetter, in his seminal January 1959 Foreign Affairs article, “The Delicate Balance of Terror,” put it in a nutshell: “To deter an attack means being able to strike back in spite of it. It means, in other words, a capability to strike second.”8 Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara explained U.S. policy in 1968: The cornerstone of our strategic policy continues to be to deter deliberate nuclear attack upon the United States or its allies. We do this by maintaining a highly reliable ability to inflict unacceptable damage upon any single aggressor or combination of aggressors at any time during the course of a strategic nuclear exchange, even after absorbing a surprise first strike. This can be defined as our assured-destruction capability. Assured destruction is the very essence of the whole deterrence concept. We must possess an actual assured destruction capability, and that capability also must be credible. . . . If the United States is to deter a nuclear attack on itself or its allies, it must possess an actual and a credible assured-destruction capability.9 The key to such a capability was possession of secure retaliatory capabilities—that is, second- strike forces that could “ride out” the enemy’s first strike and in turn inflict unacceptable damage on the enemy’s homeland. Such capabilities would in essence make the enemy’s first strike an act of national suicide. Continued McNamara: When calculating the force required, we must be conservative in all our estimates of both a potential aggressor’s capabilities and his intentions. Security depends on assuming a worst possible case, and having the ability to cope with it. In that eventuality we must be able to absorb the total weight of nuclear attack on our country—on our retaliatory forces, on our command and control apparatus, on our industrial capacity, on our cities, and on our population— and still be capable of damaging the aggressor to the point that his society would be simply no longer viable in twentieth-century terms. That is what deterrence of nuclear aggression means. It means the certainty of suicide to the aggressor, not merely to his military forces, but to his society as a whole.10 It remains unclear whether the Soviet Union fully accepted the logic of assured destruction, which was based on the American assumption of rational decision making on both sides, and on the more specific assumption that the Soviets would, in the face of nuclear threats, behave reasonably by U.S. standards.11 What is clear is that until the mid- 1960s the United States enjoyed a substantial superiority in both first- and second-strike nuclear forces, and that subsequent Soviet attainment of quantitative superiority in landbased first-strike capabilities vis-à-vis the United States never effectively compromised the security of America’s devastating secondstrike capabilities. By the early 1970s a condition of mutually assured destruction had emerged, prompting American nuclear strategists to assume that neither the United States nor the Soviet Union “would ever be sufficiently motivated, foolish, ignorant, or incoherent to accept the risk of nuclear war; both would be rational when it came to calculating the potential costs and benefits in the conduct of their foreign policies.

Abandoning deterrence causes the rise of preventive war – allows the rise of aggressive nations like Japan in WW2.

Record 4 (Jeffery Record, former professional staff member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, *Policy Analysis,* no. 519, July 8th 2004, http://www.comw.org/qdr/fulltext/0407record.pdf, Nuclear Deterrence, Preventive War, and Counterproliferation)

Preventive war is thus prompted, not by a looming enemy attack, but rather by longrange calculations about power relationships, and it is attractive to states that believe themselves to be in decline relative to a rising adversary. Preventive war assumes that conflict with the rising state is inevitable, and therefore striking before the military balance worsens becomes imperative. Thus, the Japanese in 1941 not only assumed the inevitability of war with the United States but also the necessity to attack before America’s growing rearmament tipped the military balance hopelessly against Japan. The Japanese were well aware of America’s enormous latent military power and felt compelled to strike before it was fully mobilized. On the eve of Pearl Harbor, Japanese naval and air power was unrivaled in East Asia; France, Britain, and the Netherlands were no longer in a position to defend their empires in the region; and the Soviet threat to Japan had vanished with Hitler’s invasion of Russia. Never again would Japan enjoy such a favorable military position relative to her enemies in East Asia.64 Though one can question Copeland’s thesis that the perceived necessity for preventive war is the root cause of all major great power wars, preventive wars are certainly far more numerous than preemptive military actions. Indeed, notes Richard Betts, “preventive wars . . . are common, if one looks at the rationales of those who start wars, since most countries that launch an attack without an immediate provocation believe their actions are preventive.” 65 Preventive war is thus hard to distinguish from aggression, which explains why it, unlike preemption, has no legal sanction. As foreign policy analyst David Hendrickson at Colorado College observes, preventive war “is directly contrary to the principle that so often was the rallying cry of American internationalism in the twentieth century,” during the first half of which “doctrines of preventive war were closely identified with the German and Japanese strategic traditions.”

**Impact Turn – Deterrence Works**

Deterrence works and deters rogue states – better than preventive war which tries to uphold American primacy.

Record 4 (Jeffery Record, former professional staff member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, *Policy Analysis,* no. 519, July 8th 2004, http://www.comw.org/qdr/fulltext/0407record.pdf, Nuclear Deterrence, Preventive War, and Counterproliferation)

The real issue, however, is whether the United States should initiate wars against rogue states to prevent their acquisition of nuclear weapons. The United States did so against Iraq and has declared a use-of-force doctrine that includes preventive war as a means of counterproliferation that in turn serves the stated goal of perpetual global military primacy. Military primacy is of course a necessary prerequisite for preventive war. For the United States, however, preventive war can rarely if ever be a more attractive policy choice than deterrence—unless one has completely lost confidence in deterrence. Yet that seems to be just what has happened. The terrorist attacks of 9/11 persuaded the Bush administration that nuclear deterrence was of little use against fanatical nonstate terrorist organizations and insufficient to prevent rogue states from using WMD, including nuclear weapons, against the United States. The view is that such weapons are, for both terrorist organizations and rogue states, weapons of first choice rather than last resort, and therefore that anticipatory U.S. military action is the safest policy response. While there is general agreement that a suicidal enemy is exceptionally difficult (if not impossible) to deter or dissuade, rogue state regimes have displayed an overriding determination to survive and therefore to accommodate the realities of power. They may in fact seek nuclear weapons for the same basic reason that other states have: to enhance their security (as of course they themselves define it). A. F. Mullins at the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory asks: Why do countries seek to acquire nuclear weapons? Not for reasons markedly different from those that drive them to seek conventional weapons: to defend against or to deter attack; to compel submission or perhaps to carry out an attack; or to play a self-defined role in the international system (i.e., to gain status or prestige, either in the context of an alliance or in regional or global politics).124 The assumption that rogue states seek nuclear weapons solely for offensive purposes (coercion, blackmail, attack) serves the argument for preventive war against them, but it ignores the deterrent/defensive functions those weapons also perform, as well as the record of rogue state non-use of WMD against hated enemies capable of inflicting unacceptable retaliation. That record demonstrates that deterrence has worked. In the case of Iraq, Iran, and other Gulf states, nuclear weapons acquisition motives include deterrence of another regional power (a powerful motive for blood enemies Iraq and Iran vis-àvis each other), strategic equality with Israel, and deterrence of intervention by outside powers, especially (in the post-Soviet era) the United States. It is eminently plausible, as Mullins observes, that “a Gulf state might believe that, by obtaining a nuclear capability that could put at risk the forces deployed for intervention by outside powers or that could put at risk the cities of any regional state providing bases for these forces, it could deter an intervention.”125 Anthony Blinken at the Center for Strategic and International Studies contends that “Putting military preemption at the heart of national security policy signals America’s enemies that their only insurance policy against regime change is to acquire WMD as quickly as possible, precipitating the very danger Washington seeks to prevent.”126 Indeed, the underlying objective of preventive war as a means of counterproliferation may well be to prevent rogue states from deterring the United States. This objective certainly supports the declared goal of perpetuating U.S. global military primacy; the president has stated that rogue states seek nuclear weapons “to attempt . . . to prevent us from deterring [their] aggressive behavior.”127 Rogue state possession of nuclear weapons is thus seen as a threat not so much to the United States itself but rather to the U.S. freedom of military action necessary to sustain U.S. global military primacy. (Not surprisingly, missile defenses—which are a significant component of the administration’s defense policy—are also seen to enhance U.S. freedom of action by denying rogue states the ability to hold U.S. cities hostage and thereby deter U.S. use of force against rogue states.)128 International relations theorist Robert L. Jervis at Columbia University, writing on the eve of the Iraq War, concluded that “it is clearly a mistake to jump from the fact that Saddam is evil to the conclusion that his possession of WMD threatens the United States and world peace,” and then asked the following two questions: “Would Saddam’s nuclear weapons give him greater influence in the region, especially in the face of resistance by a much more powerful United States? Could these weapons do anything other than deter an unprovoked attack on him?”129 Jervis concluded that, “Absent an American attack, the U.S. should be able to protect itself by the combination of the credibility of its threat to retaliate and Saddam’s relatively low motivation to strike.”130 Of course, the United States 23 In the case of Iraq, Iran, and other Gulf states, nuclear weapons acquisition motives include deterrence of another regional power, strategic equality with Israel, and deterrence of intervention by outside powers did attack Iraq in 2003, but Saddam Hussein had no nuclear weapons, or even, it seems, chemical weapons, to fire or not to fire, thus leaving a critical question unanswered. We do know, however, that he withheld use of his ample stocks of chemical munitions against Israel and coalition forces in the Gulf War under clear threat of nuclear retaliation.

**Impact Turn – Deterrence Works**

Nuclear weapons provide protection from counter-enlightenment ideals – they stop aggressive nations.

KRAUSE 7

(JOACHIM KRAUSE, 2007 The Author(s). Journal Compilation © 2007 Blackwell Publishing Ltd/The Royal Institute of International Aff airs, *“Enlightenment and nuclear order”*, p.485-86, http://www.politik.uni-kiel.de/publikationen/krause/krauseenlightenment.pdf)NAR

Had the US embarked on mutual assured destruction as the guiding principle of its nuclear weapons doctrine, it could not have deterred the Soviet Union from an invasion of western Europe. The result would have been the collapse of the nuclear non-proliferation regime, since this was based on a credible extended deterrence for states that otherwise would have gone nuclear. It is true that there is a historical link between nuclear non-proliferation and deterrence; but this link is not the one claimed by adherents of the liberal arms control school. Rather, the readiness of the United States to pursue nuclear deterrence options even under conditions of an increasing Soviet nuclear threat made it possible for nuclear weapons candidates to refrain from pursuing nuclear weapons options of their own.30 It sounds paradoxical, but the often criticized nuclear arms race was, on the US side, a desperate attempt to uphold extended deterrence under adverse conditions, and was thus responsible for the continued effectiveness of the nuclear nonproliferation regime. This logic is almost incomprehensible for many liberal arms controllers, since it totally contradicts another of their most cherished tenets: that arms races are always dangerous and that arms races cause wars. Again, these notions are hardly reconcilable with historic facts. The only war that was conspicuously preceded by an arms race—the naval arms race between Germany and Great Britain—was the First World War. There is, however, hardly anything to suggest that that war broke out because of that arms race, or that the naval competition between Germany and Great Britain was of great relevance for the outcome of that war. All the evidence available, as well as scholarly works, militate against this notion, although it has been repeated time and again and was a widely held view in the 1920s and 1930s. The damage that could be caused by such ideologies became evident in the late 1930s: the outbreak of the Second World War was facilitated by the pacifism of the western powers. The armaments efforts by the Third Reich after 1933 went on for many years without eliciting adequate responses by the governments of Great Britain and France—not to speak of the United States— because public opinion in these countries was so much in favour of avoiding an arms race. In Britain and America especially, most people wanted to negotiate instead of preparing themselves for war, and the pacifist movements were most instrumental in perpetuating that momentum.31 The result was that any option of building up a credible deterrent against Hitler’s expansionist schemes between 1934 and 1938 was forfeited.32 Winston Churchill, who was one of the first to warn against the armaments efforts of the Third Reich, later called the Second World War the ‘unnecessary war’. He continued by writing that ‘there never was a war more easy to stop than that’.33 This war ended with 35 million dead in Europe alone. The East–West conflict saw an armaments competition, but it was not the cause of that conflict and it did not do much harm. On the contrary, the armaments competition provided scope for the intrinsic weakness of the communist regimes to become apparent. It resulted in a stalemate which, as Philip Bobbitt rightly put it, ‘gave the political systems of the Warsaw Pact states enough time to collapse of their own inner inefficiency and self-disgust’.34 One of the reasons members of the liberal arms control community tend to ignore these historical facts is that they have a generally negative attitude towards nuclear weapons. For William Walker, nuclear weapons are an ‘unintended consequence of the scientific enlightenment’. He calls them ‘intrinsically illegitimate and dangerous’ and claims that it was the wish of ‘mankind’ to abolish them. Again, this runs counter to all established facts of history. Walker overlooks the fact that nuclear weapons were developed during the Second World War as the final line of defence of the last remaining powers that upheld the idea of enlightenment against the storm of forces that were the end-product of different sorts of counter- enlightenment: Nazi Germany and the authoritarian and racist Japanese regime. Nuclear weapons ended the war in the Asian theatre and later became the most efficient weapon to defend the West against another powerful force of counter-enlightenment—the Soviet Union. Without US nuclear weapons, the political breathing space for enlightenment would have vanished in Europe some 50 years ago.

**Impact Turn – Deterrence Works**

Deterrence Succeeds – plan instills fear only in attacking, not fear in U.S. in co-existence.

Zins 91 (Daniel, The Nightmare Considered: Critical Essays on Nuclear War Lit, ed. Nancy Anisfield, p. 133, Atlanta College of Art)NAR

What Wilmer fails to realize, however, is that there may be two very different kinds of fear, and that it may not be in a nation's best interests to attempt to induce both of these in an adversary. In his important discussion of "dissuasion versus appeasement," Dietrich Fischer writes: "It is often said about potential opponents that the only language they understand is military strength. This may be true in some cases, but there must be a clear distinction as to when that strength should be applied. A potential aggressor should feel afraid if he attacks a country, but only then" (38). But what is important to keep in mind is that deterrence as it appears to be understood by most Americans—that the leaders of the Soviet Union would be unlikely to initiate a nuclear attack against the United States because sufficient second-strike capability would remain to annihilate the aggressor— has long been only one purpose of our immense nuclear arsenal. For that purpose merely, far fewer nuclear weapons would surely suffice, even if the Soviets were to retain their own absurdly redundant arsenal. Why, then, the obsession not only with the chimerical pursuit of "superiority" but also with parity or maintaining the "nuclear balance"? When he discovers that Trent is unable to comprehend why we need even more nuclear weapons, Wilmer informs him that he recently gave a talk at Princeton on this very topic.

A2 Orientalism K

Perm Solvency

Only the perm solves- it’s impossible to exclude the state

Foucault 88 (Michel, French Sociologist, “On Criticism” in Michel Foucault: Politics Philosophy Culture Interviews and other writings 1977-  1984)

D.E. You mean it will be possible to work with this government? FOUCAULT: We must escape from the dilemma of being either for or against. After all, it is possible to face up to a government and remain standing. To work with a govern ment implies neither subjection nor total acceptance. One may work with it and yet be restive. I even believe that the two things go together.D.E. After Michel Foucault the critic, are we now going to see Michel Foucault the reformist? After all, the reproach was often made that the criticism made by intellectuals leads to nothing. FOUCAULT First I’ll answer the point about “that leads to nothing.” There are hundreds and thousands of people who have worked for the emergence of a number of problems that are now on the agenda. To say that this work produced nothing is quite wrong. Do you think that twenty years ago people were considering the problems of the relationship between mental illness and psychological normality, the problem of prison, the problem of medical power, the problem of the relationship between the sexes, and so on, as they are doing today? Furthermore, there are no reforms as such. Reforms are not produced in the air, independently of those who carry them out. One cannot not take account of those who will have the job of carrying out this transformation. And, then, above all, I believe that an opposition can be made between critique and transformation, “ideal” critique and “real” transformation. A critique is not a matter of saying that things are not right as they are. It is a matter of pointing out on what kinds of assumptions, what kinds of familiar, unchallenged, uncon sidered modes of thought the practices that we accept rest. We must free ourselves from the sacrilization of the social as the only reality and stop regarding as superfluous something so essential in human life and in human relations as thought. Thought exists independently of systems and structures of discourse. It is something that is often hidden, but which always animates everyday behavior. There is always a little thought even in the most stupid institutions; there is always thought even in silent habits. Criticism is a matter of flushing out that thought and trying to change it: to show that things are not as self-evident as one believed, to see that what is accepted as self-evident will no longer be accepted as such. Practicing criticism is a matter of making facile gestures difficult. In these circumstances, criticism (and radical criticism) is absolutely indispensable for any transformation. A transformation that remains within the same mode of thought, a transformation that is only a way of adjusting the same thought more closely to the reality of things can merely be a superficial transformation. On the other hand, as soon as one can no longer think things as one formerly thought them, transformation becomes both very urgent, very difficult, and quite possible. It is not therefore a question of there being a time for criticism and a time for transformation, nor people who do the criticism and others who do the transforming, those who are enclosed in an inaccessible radicalism and those who are forced to make the necessary concessions to reality. In fact I think the work of deep transformation can only be carried out in a free atmosphere, one constantly agitated by a permanent criticism. D.E. But do you think the intellectual must have a programmatic role in this transformation? FOUCAULT A reform is never only the result of a process in which there is conflict, confrontation, struggle, resistance. To say to oneself at the outset: what reform will I be able to carry out? That is not, I believe, an aim for the intellectual to pursue. His role, since he works specifically in the realm of thought, is to see how far the liberation of thought can make those transformations urgent enough for people to want to carry them out and difficult enough to carry out for them to be profoundly rooted in reality. It is a question of making conflicts more visible, of making them more essential than mere confrontations of interests or mere institutional immobility. Out of these conflicts, these confrontations, a new power relation must emerge, whose first, temporary expression will be a reform. If at the base there has not been the work of thought upon itself and if, in fact, modes of thought, that is to say modes of action, have not been altered, whatever the project for reform, we know that it will be swamped, digested by modes of behavior and institutions that will always be the same.

Perm Solvency

Blanket rejection can’t solve

SAID 3 (Edward, Prof. of English/Comparative Lit., Columbia U., “Preface.” Orientalism. p. xxviii)

This is not to say that the cultural world has simply regressed on one side to a belligerent neoOrientalism and on the other to blanket rejectionism. The recent United Nations World Summit in Johannesburg, for all its limitations, did in fact reveal a vast area of common global concert whose detailed workings on matters having to do with the environment, famine, the gap between advanced and developing countries, health, and human rights, suggest the welcome emergence of a new collective constituency that give the often facile notion of "one world" a new urgency. In all this, however, we must admit that no one can possibly know the' extraordinarily complex unity of our globalized world, despite the reality that, as I said at the outset, the world does have a real interdependence of parts that leaves no genuine opportunity for isolation.

Compromise key to solve

Spencer 6 (Robert, NYT Bestselling author on Islam, http://media.web.britannica.com/ebsco/pdf/23/23648989.pdf, date accessed: 7/8/2010) AJK

We postcolonial critics should have the courage to heed Said's proposition that the problem with American imperialism is not that it is too universalist, but on the contrary, that it is not universalist enough. Our opponent is not universalism, in other word, but a provincial, two-faced caricature of it. The apparent universalism of the Bush administration is in fact nothing of the sort. Insofar as its talk of freedom, democracy and human rights is not merely a smokescreen sent up to conceal more unseemly motivations, America's missionaiy universalism represents a circumscribed view of the world that propagates systems, priorities and courses of action that further only the special interests of American elites.'" Hymning the virtues of unregulated business activity, privatised public sen'ices and cursory forms of democracy betrays a worldview far too parochial to be described accurately as universalist. So narcissistic is this particular vision ofthe world that, far from being characterised by the global sympathies and self-conscious mindset of humanism, it actually has more in common with the cast iron certainties of religious belief. Of great relevance, therefore, to the humanist as he or she operates in the public sphere is not just the idea of humanistic or democratic criticism but also Said's earlier notion of secular criticism, which was set out in *Beginnings* and, most persuasively, in *The World, the Text, and the Critic,* and which reverberates in these late essays. Said's secularism is a powerful antidote to the selfrighteous, double-dealing piety of orthodox humanism. He proclaims the need to resist abstract doctrines that claim all the incontestability of God-given truth and he attests the veiy urgent requirement to apply oneself instead to a perspicacious and watchfully self-conscious engagement with the world. In the present context secularism involves rejecting the sort of fanatical selfcertainty hrought into relief by Gregoiy Thielmann, director ofthe US State Department's bureau of intelligence until his 'retirement' in 2002, when he remarked that '[the Bush] administration has had a faith-based intelligence attitude ,,, "We know the answers, give us the intelligence to support those answers'"," The disciples of that 'faith-based' worldview credit it with the impregnable, fact-proof authority of divine scripture. Gathered about the maundering president and his blowhard lieutenants, therefore, are the most garrulous but unselfconscious votaries. Theirs is a clueless executive, 'advised' (or al; least sweet-talked) by corrupted intellectuals like Fawaz Gerges, Richard Perle and Norman Podhoretz as well as the usual minstrels like Francis Fukuyama, Fouad Ajami and Bernard Lewis, an unctuous crowd assembled at court to admire the emperor's new humanitarian clothes and deliver their wrong-headed waffle about a clash of civilisations. Seemingly devoid of conscience and evidently without accountability, these thinkers (if thinking is what they are doing) issue jeremiads against the evildoers and declaim from their pulpits the merits of America's divinely sanctioned power.

Said Defense- Ontology

Said’s theory of Orientalism isn’t fully developed- unanswered questions of current ontological conditions

Spanos 96 (William, Professor of comparative literature at Binghampton,

Culture and Colonization: The Imperial Imperatives of the Centered Circle, p. 172, date accessed: 7/7/2010) AJK

Given the political sterility of the studied localism of much of our criticism, especially as represented by New Historicists, such as Stephen Greenblatt, and by the odd parochialism of even some of our best critics, such as Raymond Williams, Edward Said's globalization of cultural criticism is uniquely powerful and enabling. Insofar as the ontology informing the in-dissoluble relay between culture and imperialism has been left unthought, there is still work to be done. Even the power of Said's visionary critical humanism leaves unthought the ontological conditions of global power re-lations precipitated by the end of the cold war. The failure of postcolonial critics to think the ontological site not only thins out its critique of the iden-tity (nationalist) politics of the various colonial and postcolonial discourses but, equally important, renders even Said's recommendation for "an emer-gent non-coercive culture" (Cl, 334) a kind of despairing lyrical yearning of a "damaged life," a yearning that, however suggestive, lacks the fully persuasive force of an ontologically grounded theory.

Said’s theory of Orientalism isn’t fully developed- ontological representations aren’t addressed

Spanos 96 (William, Professor of comparative literature at Binghampton,

Culture and Colonization: The Imperial Imperatives of the Centered Circle, date accessed: 7/7/2010) AJK

Nevertheless, I believe that Said's valuable meditation on the cul-ture/imperialism nexus betrays a fundamental limitation, one that may be the inadvertent consequence of his quite justified effort to extricate criticism (especially American) from the rarefied web of academic professionalism in order to put it to work in the world. I mean his resistance to "travelling theory"-an institutionalized discursive practice separated from the origi-nal occasion of crisis and thus devoid of historical specificity and practical effectivity--especially to his reluctance to theorize his commitment to the decentered subject.5 As a result, Said fails to adequately articulate the absolute continuity--however uneven in any particular historical occasion, including the present--between ontological representation (metaphysics: the perception and ordering of the being of Being, the differences that tem-porality always already disseminates, from above or after the process), cultural production (the re-presentation of individual and social experience as narrative), and imperialism (the "conquest" and incorporation of extra-territorial constituencies--the provincial "others"--within the self-identical framework of the "conquering" metropolis). To put this knowledge/power relay between metaphysics, culture, and imperialism in the metaphorics en-demic to the hegemonic discourse and practice of Western imperialism, Said is blinded by his enabling insight into the "worldliness"o f the cultural text to the indissoluble relation between the circle, culture, and coloniza-tion in etymological and historical usage and practice.6 This blindness is not a disabling limitation of Said's momentous critical genealogical project. But insofar as it leaves vague that which would allow an oppositional dis-course to intervene precisely where the "end-of-history"d iscourse is both strongest and most vulnerable, Said's project needs to be supplemented by putting ontological representation back into play in the process of thinking the imperial depth and scope of the New World Order.

Said Defense- Ontology

Said’s analysis on Orientalism is useless without an interrogation of ontology

Spanos 96 (William, Professor of comparative literature at Binghampton,

Culture and Colonization: The Imperial Imperatives of the Centered Circle, date accessed: 7/7/2010) AJK

Edward Said's rethinking of colonization in texts from Orientalism to Culture and Imperialism sets out with a deep recognition of the ambivalence of humanist culture's Eurocentrism—even if not of its ontological "ground.'9In his work throughout this part of his career, in which he shows that the alleged universality of humanist cultural p roductionis historically specific and its globalr each paradoxically provincial, Said achieves an es- 9. See EdwardW .Said, "Secular Criticism,"in The World, the Text,a nd the Critic, 21-22. This text offers an excellent example of Said's well-knownli ne of argumentv is-6-vis the Eurocentrismo f humanists tudies. 142 boundary2 / Spring1 996 trangement effect of persuasive force. In overdetermining Western human-ist scholarship and cultural production, he overlooks and renders practically invisible, however, the inextricably connected and more fundamental ques-tion of the specifically colonized "Others" all along the continuum of being-a continuum we have seen Dussel to acknowledge as well. Said too often minimizes, if he does not entirely efface, the role that ontology-the anthro-pologos and its centering, accommodational force-plays in the ideologi-cal relay he thematizes. I want to recall that the anthropological phase of the ontotheological tradition, significantly called "the Enlightenment,"is the phase that witnesses the (re)emergence of a Eurocentric imperialism that represents itself (as in the case of Hegel) as being founded on the "truth" of being or (as in the case of the United States's intervention in Vietnam) as a project of "winning the hearts and minds" of extraterritorial others to the essential principles informing its "way of life." Said claims that humanist culture is complicitous with imperialism; if this claim is to have any validity, it behooves the genealogist of imperialism to look deeper into the historical and ideological origins of humanist culture than Said has done thus far.10 Agenealogy of imperialism must con-front not simply humanist culture but humanism as such. It must view with suspicion the assumption of virtually all modern theoreticians and practitioners of humanism that this discourse derives a putatively disinterested and free inquiry from classical Greece.1 Reading the history of humanism against the grain will show how crucial ontological representation-and its figuration-is in the relay of dominations that Said and others who follow him delimit to Western cultural production and the imperial project.

Said Defense- Useless Theory

Said’s analysis is hypocritical and illogical

Warraq 6 (Ibn, founded the Institute for the Secularization of Islamic Society, http://www.islam-watch.org/IbnWarraq/EdwardSaid.htm, date accessed: 7/8/2010) AJK

There are, as I shall show, several contradictory theses buried in Said’s impenetrable prose, decked with post-modern jargon ("a universe of representative discourse", "Orientalist discourse") (and some kind editor really ought to explain to Said the meaning of "literally" and the difference between scatological and eschatological), and pretentious language which often conceals some banal observation, as when Said talks of "textual attitude", when all he means is "bookish" or "bookishness". Tautologies abound, as in "the freedom of licentious sex ". Or take the comments here: "Thus out of the Napoleonic expedition there issued a whole series of textual children, from Chateaubriand’s Itinéraire to Lamartine’s Voyage en Orient to Flaubert’s Salammbô, and in the same tradition, Lane’s Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians and Richard Burton’s Personal Narrative of a Pilgrimage to al-Madinah and Meccah. What binds them together is not only their common background in Oriental legend and experience but also their learned reliance on the Orient as a kind of womb out of which they were brought forth. If paradoxically these creations turned out to be highly stylized simulacra, elaborately wrought imitations of what a live Orient might be thought to look like, that by no means detracts from the strength of their imaginative conception or from the strength of European mastery of the Orient, whose prototypes respectively were Cagliostro, the great European impersonator of the Orient, and Napoleon, its first modern conqueror." What does Said mean by "out of the Napoleonic expedition there issued a whole series of textual children" except that these five very varied works were written after 1798? The pretentious language of textual children issuing from the Napeolonic expedition covers up this crushingly obvious fact. Perhaps there is a profound thesis hidden in the jargon, that these works were somehow influenced by the Napoleonic expedition, inspired by it, and could not have been written without it. But no such thesis is offered. This arbitrary group consists of three Frenchmen, two Englishmen, one work of romantic historical fiction, three travel books, one detailed study of modern Egyptians. Chateaubriand’s Itinéraire (1811) describes superbly his visit to the Near East; Voyage en Orient (1835) is Lamartine’s impressions of Palestine, Syria, and Greece; Salammbô (1862) is Flaubert’s novel of ancient Carthage; Lane’s Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians (1836) is a fascinating first-hand account of life in Egypt, particularly Cairo and Luxor, written after several years of residence there, Burton’s account of his audacious visit to Mecca was first published in three volumes between 1855-6. Lane and Burton both had perfect command of Arabic, Classical and Colloquial, while the others did not, and Lane and Burton can be said to have made contributions to Islamic Studies, particularly Lane, but not the three Frenchmen. What on earth do they have in common? Said tells us that what binds them together is "their common background in Oriental legend and experience but also their learned reliance on the Orient as a kind of womb out of which they were brought forth ". What is the background of Oriental legend that inspired Burton or Lane? Was Flaubert’s vivid imagination stimulated by "Oriental legend", and was this the same legendary material that inspired Burton, Lane and Lamartine? "Learned reliance on the Orient as a kind of womb..." is yet another example of Said’s pretentious way of saying the obvious, namely that they were writing about the Orient about which they had some experience and intellectual knowledge.. Orientalism is peppered with meaningless sentences. Take, for example, "Truth, in short, becomes a function of learned judgment, not of the material itself, which in time seems to owe its existence to the Orientalist". Said seems to be saying :‘Truth’ is created by the experts or Orientalists, and does not correspond to reality, to what is actually out there. So far so good. But then "what is out there" is also said to owe its existence to the Orientalist. If that is the case, then the first part of Said’s sentence makes no sense, and if the first part is true then the second part makes no sense. Is Said relying on that weasel word "seems" to get him out of the mess? That ruse will not work either; for what would it mean to say that an external reality independent of the Orientalist’s judgment also seems to be a creation of the Orientalist? That would be a simple contradiction. Here is another example: "The Orientalist can imitate the Orient without the opposite being true." Throughout his book, Said is at pains to point out that there is no such thing as "the Orient", which, for him, is merely a meaningless abstraction concocted by Orientalists in the service of imperialists and racists. In which case, what on earth could "The Orient cannot imitate the Orientalist" possibly mean? If we replace "the Orient" by the individual countries, say between Egypt and India, do we get anything more coherent? No, obviously not : "India, Egypt, and Iran cannot imitate the Orientalists like Renan, Bernard Lewis, Burton, et al.". We get nonsense whichever way we try to gloss Said’s sentence.  Contradictions At times, Said seems to allow that the Orientalists did achieve genuine positive knowledge of the Orient, its history, culture, languages, as when he calls Lane’s work Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians "a classic of historical and anthropological observation because of its style, its enormously intelligent and brilliant details"; or when he talks of "a growing systematic knowledge in Europe about the Orient", since Said does not have sarcastic quotation marks around the word knowledge, I presume he means there was a growth in genuine knowledge. Further on, Said talks of Orientalism producing "a fair amount of exact positive knowledge about the Orient". Again I take it Said is not being ironical when he talks of "philological discoveries in comparative grammar made by Jones,...". To give one final example, Said mentions Orientalism’s "objective discoveries". Yet, these acknowledgements of the real discoveries made by Orientalists are contradicted by Said’s insistence that there is no such thing as "truth"; or when he characterizes Orientalism as "a form of paranoia, knowledge of another kind, say, from ordinary historical knowledge". Or again, "it is finally Western ignorance which becomes more refined and complex, not some body of positive Western knowledge which increases in size and accuracy". At one point Said seems to deny that the Orientalist had acquired any objective knowledge at all, and a little later he also writes, "the advances made by a ‘science’ like Orientalism in its academic form are less objectively true than we often like to think". It is true that the last phrase does leave open the possibility that some of the science may be true though less than we had hitherto thought. Said also of course wholeheartedly endorses Abdel Malek’s strictures against Orientalism, and its putatively false "knowledge" of the Orient. In his 1994 Afterword, Said insists that he has "no interest in, much less capacity for, showing what the true Orient and Islam really are". And yet he contradicts this outburst of humility and modesty, when he claims that, "[The Orientalist’s] Orient is not the Orient as it is, but the Orient as it has been Orientalized", for such a formulation assumes Said knows what the real Orient is. Such an assumption is also apparent in his statement that "the present crisis dramatizes the disparity between texts and reality". In order to be able to tell the difference between the two, Said must know what the reality is. This is equally true when Said complains that "To look into Orientalism for a lively sense of an Oriental’s human or even social reality...is to look in vain".

Said Defense- Useless Theory

Said’s analysis of Orientalism is severely lacking- four reasons

McLeod (John, University of Leeds, “Beginning postcolonialism”, p. 47-50, date accessed: 7/8/2010) AJK

1.*Orientalism* is ahistorical. The major criticism of Orientalism from which several of the others stem, concerns its capacity to make totalizing assumptions about a vast, varied expanse of representations over a very long period of history. As Dennis Porter describes it in his essay of 1983, ‘*Orientalism* and its Problems’ (in Colonial Discourse and Post- Colonial Theory, ed. Williams and Chrisman, pp. 150-61), Said posits the ‘unified character of Western discourse on the Orient over some two millennia, a unity derived from a common and continuing experience of fascination with and threat from the East, of its irreducible otherness’ (p. 152). Said’s examples of Orientalist writing range from the Italian poet Dante writing in the early fourteenth century up to twentieth-century writers. Can it be true that they all hold essentially the same latent assumptions? Can such a massive archive of materials be so readily homogenized? Has nothing changed? Said’s view takes in a broad, generalizing sweep of history but attends little to individual historical moments, their anomalies and specifics. As John MacKenzie points out in his book *Orientalism: History, Theory and the Arts* (Manchester University Press, 1995), Said’s history of Orientalism is perhaps ‘in itself essentially ahistorical because it glosses over the variable factors that make historical moments unique, such as the ‘contrasting economic and social circumstances of different territories’ (p. 11). In these terms, we could say that Said privileges latent Orientalism over manifest Orientalism by neglecting to think whether the representations of the Orient made by those in the West at particular moments might modify or challenge the enduring assumptions of the Orient. MacKenzie argues that Western artists have approached the Orient at various moments with perfectly honourable intentions and ‘genuine respect’ (p. 60) for other peoples, in order to learn from and value their cultures. Not everybody looked down upon the Orient so crudely. This was no doubt true in some cases. However, in fairness to Said, MacKenzie is too trusting of the examples of ‘benign’ Orientalist art he reproduces and fails to grasp the point that even the most gracious and respectful artist may unwittingly reproduce Orientalist assumptions. If Said’s work privileges the latent aspect of Orientalism, MacKenzie pays it too scant attention and forgets that the road to hell is often paved with good intentions. It does not necessarily follow that a sympathetic representation of the Orient or the Oriental will automatically be free from the latent assumptions of Orientalism. 2. Said ignores resistance by the colonized. This is another major criticism of Orientalism. If Said is to be believed, Orientalism moves in one direction from the active West to the passive East. But he rarely stops to examine how Oriental peoples received these representations, nor how these representations circulated in the colonies themselves. In what ways did the colonized peoples respond to Orientalist representations? Did they readily submit to the colonisers’ view of themselves? How might they have contested Orientalism and brought it to crisis? As Patrick Williams and Laura Chrisman have argued in their introduction to *Colonial Discourse and Post-Colonial Theory,* there is little notion of the colonized subject as a *constitutive* agent (p. 16) with the capacity for political resistance. And in the words of Aijaz Ahmad, one of Said’s fiercest critics, Said never thinks about how Western representations ‘might have been received, accepted, modified, challenged, overthrown or reproduced by the intelligentsias of the colonized countries’ (In Theory: Classes, Nations, Literatures, Verso, 1992, p. 172). In these terms, Said stands accused of writing out the agency and the voice of colonized peoples from history as he never stops to consider the challenges made to dominant discourses. In so doing, his work is in danger of being just as ‘Orientalist’ as the field he is describing by not considering alternative representations made by those subject to colonialism. 3. Said ignores resistance within the West. According to Said, ‘every European, in what he could say about the Orient, was consequently a racist, an imperialist, and almost totally ethnocentric’ (*Orientalism*, p. 204). This is certainly a sweeping statement. What about those within the West who opposed colonialism and were horrified by the treatment of colonized peoples? As Dennis Porter argues, Orientalism leaves no room to accommodate what he calls, adapting a term from Antonio Gramsci, ‘counter hegemonic thought’ (‘*Orientalism* and its Problems’, p. 152); that is, opinions contrary to the dominant views within the West which contest the authority of Orientalist representations. 4. Said ignores gender differences. As we noted previously, Said argues that Orientalist representations were made in the main by men. This explains why the Orient is a specifically male fantasy and is often represented in feminine terms. Said maintains that in Orientalist writing ‘women are usually the creatures of a male power-fantasy. They express unlimited sensuality, they are more or less stupid, and above all they are willing’ (*Orientalism,* p. 207). But did Western women write about the Orient? And if they did, did they also resort to the same stereotypes? As Sara Mills has argued importantly in

<Continues…>

Said Defense- Useless Theory

<Continued…>

*Discourses of Difference: An Analysis of Women’s Travel Writing and Colonialism* (Routledge, 1992), many women travelled to the colonies and made their own observations in a variety of writings, but Said rarely looks at women’s writing in *Orientalism.* However, it is not just a case of ‘adding in’ women’s writings to Said’s theory in order to fill the gaps in his more male-centered study. Mills points out that the position of women in relation to Orientalism is often different to that of men because of the tensions between the discourses of colonialism and the discourses of gender. Looking at late Victorian and early twentieth century travel writing by Western women, Mills maintains that these women were, at one level, *empowerered*  by colonialism due to the superior position they perceived themselves to hold in relation to colonized peoples. Yet, not unlike colonized peoples, women were *disempowered* due to the inferior position they were placed in in relation to Western men. This might make available, if only fleetingly, a partial and problematic accord between the Western woman traveler and the colonized peoples she encountered. Her position in relation to the colonized is not the same as the Western male. Hence, the intersection of colonial and patriarchal discourses often places Western women in a contradictory position. They occupy a dominant position due to colonialism, but a subordinate place in patriarchy. Women ‘cannot be said to speak from outside colonial discourse, but their relation to it is problematic because of its conflict with the discourses of “femininity”, which were operating on them in an equal, and sometimes stronger, measure. Because of these discursive pressures, their work exhibits contradictory elements which may act as a critique of some of the components of other colonial writings’ (*Discourses of Difference*, p. 63). Women’s writing about the colonies may not be so readily explained with recourse to Said’s theory of Orientalism due to its particular contradictions borne out of the contrary positions frequently held by women. (We will consider these issues again in Chapter 6.) As Sara Mills’s argument above suggests, the various criticisms of Said’s work collectively give the impression that colonial discourses are multiple, precarious and more ambivalent than Said presumes in Orientalism. They do not function with the smoothness or the complete success that he awards the totalizing concept of Orientalism. Colonial discourses, then, are by no means homogenous or unitary. Said is certainly right to identify a series of representations about the Orient which functioned to justify and perpetuate the propriety of colonial rule, but these representations were not monolithic, static and uncontested.

Said Defense- Flawed Theory

Said’s analysis of “Orientalism” is flawed and inconsistent

Roosa 95 (John, “Literary Approach to a Complex Relationship”, Social Scientist Vol. 23 No 1/3, date accessed: 7/8/2010) AJK

The questions concerning the relationship between culture and imperialism that Said has posed in his most recent book are important and complex. They are ones that many of us have faced in thinking about imperialism. Said's own attempt to answer these questions is , I think, deeply flawed, but it is rich with ideas. As a beginning, his writing may help us think through the problems in an alternative way. In this very brief review, I'll indicate what I see to be a few of the fundamental problems with his analysis. Said's basic approach into the vast topic of culture and imperialism is to review British and French novels of the nineteenth to mid-twentieth century. Said considers novels to be 'immensely important in the formation of imperial attitudes, references and experiences' (p. xii). Novels may indeed be 'particularly interesting to study' (p. xii) but the reader is not given any evidence that novels were important at a mass level in Britain and France. How many people actually read lengthy novels in the largely illiterate European countries of the nineteenth century? Novels should certainly be studied but their significance as determinants or representations of empire should not be inflated. In following Said through his literary approach to imperialism, the reader may well forget what is missing: a study of popular culture and everyday practice, whether in Europe or in the colonies. Said has made an advance over his book Orientalism (1978) by intertwining a reading of European writers with writers of the colonies. He is now willing to admit that he made a serious error in omitting the voices of the colonised in his previous book. In C&I, Said places the European texts side by side with those from colonies. For example, Camus's novels, in which France's possessions in North Africa play a significant part, are discussed in conjunction with Fanon's writings on the Algerian struggle for independence. This methodology produces much of what is valuable in the book and is a clear departure from the often vindictive and vague readings of European writers presented in Orientalism. It is strange, however, that most of Said's non-European texts are by activists or historians, and not novelists. In discussing European imperialism, he adopts an almost exclusively literary approach but when discussing the resistance to imperialism, he moves into a more political and historical account. In so doing, he omits even mentioning the truly great anti-imperialist novelists from the British and French colonies, e.g. Prem Chand in India and Osmane Sembene in Senegal. Most of the non-European novelists he does mention are modern day 'cosmopolitan' novelists whose writing is more for consumption in Europe than in the countries of their origin. e.g. Salman Rushdie, a particular favorite of Said. It is encouraging to read Said's discussions of C.L.R. James and Fanon, two great anti-imperialist activists who are routinely ignored or vilified in European and American writings. But when the book's focus is on level, almost 200 pages to Dickens, Conrad, Austen, Kipling, and Camus, it is disheartening to see virtually no discussion of non-European novelists. The study of British and French novels is actually the core of the book and the section concerning the non-European 'resistance' to empire-a confused rambling and repetitive section covering only ninety pagesappears to be tacked on as an afterthought. Thus, after reducing the study of culture to the novel, Said is not even consistent enough to study the non-European novel and compare it with the European.

Said Defense- Out of Context

Said builds portions of his theory on a faulty and out of context Marx quote

Richardson 90 (Michael, “Reflections on Orientalism”, Anthropology Today Vol. 6 No. 4, date accessed: 7/8/2010) AJK

At this point, a consideration of the relation of reci-procity to representation is called for. We have already noted the use made by Said of Marx's phrase 'they can-not represent themselves; they must be represented'. This phrase is also used as an epigraph to the book and is clearly one of its central themes. Yet if we refer to the context in which Marx himself made this comment, we find that the implications for Marx are radically different from those that Said seeks to establish. Given the importance this phrase has for Said it is perhaps useful here to give the context of Marx's own argu-ment. Marx was considering not the Orient but the peasantry.H e was concerned with understandinga con-crete historical context: the failure of the revolution of 1848 and in this specific quotation he was looking at the relation of the peasantry to the Bonapartist party. He wrote: 'Insofar as these small peasant proprietors are merely connected on a local basis, and the identity of their interests fails to produce a feeling of commu-nity, national links, or a political organization, they do not form a class. They are therefore incapable of assert-ing their class interests in their own name, whether through a parliament or through a convention. They cannot represent themselves; they must be represented. Their representative must appear simultaneously as their master, as an authority over them, an unrestricted government power that protects them from the other classes and sends them rain and sunshine from , 12above'. If there are implications in this for the Orien-talist debate, they are certainly not the ones that Said himself takes up. What will be immediately apparent here is that for Marx this relation is dynamic: the peasantry are not acted upon but rather actively seek such representation and use it for their own purposes. The relation between the Bonapartist party and the con-servative peasantry is thus reciprocal: they need each other. It goes without saying that the idealist conclusion that Said draws here 'if the Orient could represent it-self, it would; since it cannot, the representation does the job...' would be wholly foreign to Marx. Indeed it reveals a curious naivety on the part of Said as to how people actually perceive images. Does he really believe that anyone actually thinks that images of the Orient are commensurate with what the Orient is actually like? Indeed it is arguable that it is only academic literary critics (whose work is by definition concerned pri-marily with representation)w ho would mistake a repre-sentation for the thing it represented. Said would, however, wish to extend such a critique further to dissolve the subject/object relation altogether, something that is not unique to him but is rather a post-modernist stance. It certainly cuts to the heart of the anthropological project, since a relation of self to other is fundamental in anthropology and it is difficult to see how anthropology can possibly take form unless it en-gages with the complex dialectical relation between dis-tanciation and familiarity that the subject/object relation implies. If at its root this relation is unable to entertain the possibility of reciprocity, then anthropology must resign itself to producing images that bear no relation to the object of study. Worse, such images could only function ideologically and involve falsification in a power context. However, in this context Said fails to justify, or even argue, the presupposition that enables him to establish the monolithic nature of the object of his study: the European subject that has created Orientalism. What is the nature of this subject: Where did it originate? And how and why? Such 'willed, human work' as he calls it can hardly be born from empty space. Given the nature of his critique, it would seem incumbent upon him to at least address these issues. The fact that he does not do so emphasizes even more the 'Orientalist' nature of his own project: Orientalism is a given to be analysed; as such it becomes Said's own 'Other'. Thus, within his own work, the self/other relation remains intact. Even if we allow for the possibility of the dissolving of the self/other relation, it must still be asked whether this can be done except by means of a tautological sleight of hand. He has certainly not taken on board the philosophical underpinning of this relation, which is contained in Hegel's anthropology and most notably in his treatment of the relation of master and slave13, for in Hegel's terms what is fundamental is reciprocity. In fact, it is more than reciprocal, it is symbiotic: the real-ity of the slave is the master; the reality of the master is the slave. Nleither are free agents: each needs the other to complete his relation to the world. But this separa-tion is also necessary for any sort of lucidity; without it undifferentiation and entropy take over. But in Hegel's terms, the differentiation between master and slave is, at root, illusory: it is the interplay of the relation, not its fixity, that is of importance. In Hegel's terms, then, Orientalism could be changed only by the Orient itself acting upon the relation. The Orient would have to rec-ognize itself, something that Said refuses to accept. However, if the relation remains static then Orientalism will not, indeed cannot, change its ideological charac-ter. In this respect a critique such as Said's, acting solely on the form by which the subject master asserts its ascendancy, can change only the form and not the substance of such domination. Indeed it must become subsumed within the dominant subject; it must of ne-cessity become part of the dominating ideology. In this respect Simon Leys was not merely being malicious when he wrote acidly: 'Orientalism could obviously have been written by no one but a Palestinian scholar with a huge chip on his shoulder and a very dim under- ,1 4 standingo f the Europeana cademic tradition.

Said Defense- Out of Context

Said’s theory manipulates quotes and theories out of context to arrive at a flawed conclusion

Richardson 90 (Michael, “Reflections on Orientalism”, Anthropology Today Vol. 6 No. 4, date accessed: 7/8/2010) AJK

Both Said and Fabian are, of course, part of the groundswell of contemporary criticism that takes refuge in the so-called 'post-modem condition', founded in a dubious Nietzschean subjectivism. Said dutifully quotes Nietzsche in defining truth as a 'mobile army of meta-phors', but refuses to recognize the problematic that Nietzsche himself recognized in such a definition. How rarely do we hear Nietzsche's own corollary to this statement: 'The falseness of a judgement is to us not an objection to a judgement; it is here perhaps that our language sounds strangest. The question is to what ex-tent it is life-advancing, life-preserving, species-preserv-ing, perhaps even species-breeding.. 17. Furthermore, Nietzsche recognized that truth and falsehood existed in dialogic relation to each other. If one accepts that truth is nothing but a 'mobile army of metaphors' then one must, as Nietzsche recognized, establish a centring position that enables the relative value of a particular 'lie' to be qualitativized. Both Said and Fabian, in com-mon with post-modernism in general, fall into the trap of all subjectivism and conflate general and specific cri-tiques in a way thaf de-legitimizes both. The direction of the 'deconstructive' impulse in contemporary criti-cism is not negation but rather its subversion, to the extent that genuine negation becomes impossible. In his La Conquete de 1'Am&rique, Tzvetan Todorov has attempted a critique that has some similarities with Said's, but in the opposite direction. He has considered the conquest of Mexico not in the terms we know so well, in which the double violence (Aztec and Spani-ard) still has power to shock, but in terms of human sympathy: "'To ignore history", as the adage goes, is to risk repeating it, but it is not through knowing history that we know what to do. We are both like and not like the Conquistadores;t heir example is instructive,b ut we can never be sure that we would not behave like them, or that we are not in the process of imitating them as we adapt to new circumstances. But their history can be exemplary for us because it allows us to reflect on our-selves, to discover resemblances: once more the knowl-edge of self passes through that of the other'18. It is surely in this affirmation that anthropology ought to base itself. In considering one of the Conquistadores, Cabeza de Vaca, Todorov notes that he had 'reached equally a neutral point, not because he was indifferent to the two cultures, but because he was able to ex-perience both internally; for him there was no longer a "they" around him. Without becoming an Indian, he had ceased to be completely Spanish' . This flow of an individual between cultures constitutes the am-bivalence of the anthropological experience, a relation that is never simple and never easy. But within this re-lation a dialogue is possible between cultures in which, as Todorov suggests, 'no-one has the last word, where none of the voices reduces the other to a simple object and in which neither takes advantage of his exteriority 2 0in relation to the other'. But it is also the reality of the Western conquest that has established the possi-bility for such dialogue and communication. It is in the recognition of this fact that anthropological knowledge needs to be founded. For anthropology, the critiques of Said and Fabian bring attention to our need to remain alert to our own social context. In addition to the usually assigned moral requirements towards the society one is studying, one also needs to be aware both of the institutional frame-work in which one is working and also of one's subser-vience to one's own culture. This is so no matter how strong the affinity anthropologists may feel with the people studied: if it weren't they would not return to write up their ethnographies. While we need to be aware also of the danger of turning the 'Other' into an ill-defined universal, we need at the same time to be conscious of the contrary danger of relativizing the 'Other' to the extent that the context of the ethno-graphic encounter in time and space is lost, and both observer and observed are reduced to a common de-nominator in which it becomes increasingly difficult to extricate one from the other. In this context the very real problems of repre-sentation that undoubtedly need to be addressed are in danger of being subsumed by following the spurious direction in which Said has led the debate. Perception is not determined by Orientalism, or by anything else. It is of course true that our perceptions of the part of the world we have named as the Orient are conditioned by the representations that scholars and artists have estab-lished of that part of the world. We need to understand how such representations have functioned in practice and in this respect Said has provided some valuable raw material for a genuine consideration of what he convinces is a specific ideological construction that can be called 'Orientalism'. Such an ideology has deter-mined nothing, however, and it is surely a dangerous illusion to believe that it ever has done.

Said Defense- Out of Context

Lack of context results in a confused and confusing theory of Orientalism

Roosa 95 (John, “Literary Approach to a Complex Relationship”, Social Scientist Vol. 23 No 1/3, date accessed: 7/8/2010) AJK

Said repeatedly insists on the need to place British and French novels in an earthly, global context' and, more specifically, in the context of empire. As a criticism of old-school literary studies which wished to see art as a purely aesthetic object, in a world apart, Said's argument is valid. But it is also platitudinous. The difficult question is the method in which the connection is made between literature and the 'real world.' So let us consider 'imperialism', the phenomenon to which Said says European literature should be affiliated. Said defines the term 'imperialism' as the practice of 'dominating a distant territory'. If Said was studying imperialism from ancient Egypt to the present then perhaps this would have been a sufficient definition. But he is studying nineteenth century imperialism of that century's two leading capitalist powers. That imperialism was not just about 'dominating distant territories'; it was about exploiting them within a capitalist economy. European imperialism of the nineteenth century obviously had something to do with capitalism. Said does mention a list of writers on the political economy of imperialism, Lenin, A.G. Frank, Samir Amin, Walter Rodney, Harry Magdoff, among others, writers whose works precisely turned upon the question of the relationship between capitalism and imperialism. Said avoids taking any position in their debate upon the excuse of studying culture, not political economy. But Said, by ignoring the debate entirely, is left seeing imperialism as divorced from capitalism. His terms of discussion are 'nations' and 'national cultures', without a word on class. In fact, Said thinks imperialism may have emerged out of, was caused by, the will to dominate behind the 'national cultures' of Europe (cf. pp. 8, 15, 61). Said is so confused on the causes and functioning of imperialism that he fears his argument that imperialism was 'integrative' may represent a 'vast system building or totalistic theory' (p. 4). He need not worry, the argument is merely a platitude; it is not even a theory. Said is unable to see the relationship between exploitation within Europe, (which in the nineteenth century was more brutal than many people recognise now,) and imperial exploitation. If literature should be connected to its political context then this would apply to Said's own text. What are his own worldly affiliations? Said would like to position himself in the middle, reading both European and non-European writers with a mixture of admiration and criticism. In the 'loud antagonisms of the polarized debate of pro- and anti-imperialists, 'he would like to be the sober-headed individual calling for tolerance, peaceful interchange and calm dialogue (p. 29). Said's general principle is to denounce cultural and national chauvinisms, whether they arise in Europe or in the mid- East, and to demand that we be self-critical and vigilant against our own self-pride turning into chauvinism. While Said's generous attitude is admirable, it is also ethereal. Said wants to speak in the name of all humanity and avoid taking any sides. In a particularly bizarre passage he argues that 'the organization of political passions . . . lead[s] inevitably to mass slaughter, and if not to literal mass slaughter then certainly to rhetorical slaughter.' (p. 28). Said says political organization leads inevitably to mass murder, then contradicts himself that the process may not be inevitable and then invents a perfectly meaningless concept 'rhetorical slaughter'. Such confusing passages litter the entire book. Said, as a literary critic, is preoccupied with books and intellectuals and has great difficulty presenting a clear political position. By the end of the book he is posing 'homeless wanderers, nomads, vagrants' (p. 403), those living on the margins of the world's nation-state system, as the basis of a new politics of liberation. And he is posing a new breed of intellectuals, deconstructivists, post-modernists, as those 'distilling then articulating the predicaments . . . [of] mass deportation, imprisonment, population transfer, collective dispossession, and forced immigrations.' (p. 403) Said sees all of these problems as stemming from nationalism and imperialism. I would certainly agree with Said that we need to find a new internationalist politics but the liberation of which Said speaks is simply the liberation from nationalism, not from capitalism. Capitalists themselves, through all the free trade agreements now underway, are in the business now of dissolving many aspects of the national and forcing a worldwide trend of economic expropriations. And they would be quite happy to read Said's injunctions to study and understand other cultures (p. 21,408). But their internationalism is completely different from the internationalism of the working class and the poor. Said is incapable of distinguishing between the two. As for nationalism, Said fails to see that, as protection from the exploitation of capital, the nation-state may still play a positive role. In the book's typical trivial style, Said speaks of the world as 'one global environment' incapable of bearing any longer' 'selfish and narrow interests-patriotism, chauvinism, ethnic, religious, and racial hatreds.' (p. 21) Perhaps one will soon find Said's writing being quoted by multinational corporations.

Said Offense- Conclusions bad

Said’s research and analytic methods are flawed- means his conclusions are faulty

Ning 97 (Wang, Professor of English and Comparative Literature at Peking University, http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/new\_literary\_history/v028/28.1wang\_n.html, date accessed: 7/8/2010) AJK

As quite a few Eastern and Western scholars have already noticed, however, the "Orient" and "Orientalism" constructed by Said have their inevitable limitations, which lie chiefly in their geographical, cultural, and literary aspects. It is these limitations that provide us Third World scholars and critics with a theoretical basis on which to question and reconsider his Orientalism. First, we should point out its geographical limitation, which is restricted by his family background, as well as his scope of knowledge and learning. As is well known, the "Orient," geographically speaking, covers at least the wide areas of Asia, Africa, and Australia, but in Said's book, the boundary line stops at the Near East and Middle East. Such regions as Southeast Asia and such important Oriental countries as China, India, and Japan are seldom touched upon; they pose a serious limitation to his theory although he has added certain corrective analyses in his new book Culture and Imperialism. Second, his "Orient" or "Orientalism" also has its ideological and cultural limitations. As far as its ideological and cultural significance is concerned, the "Western" idea or culture that we usually deal with in effect refers to the ideology or cultural concepts based on the bourgeois value standard prevailing in Western Europe and North America, while those contrary to them are normally regarded as the "Oriental" concepts. It is on the basis of this striking difference in ideology and culture that the East and the West were in a state of opposition during the cold-war period after World War II; with the end of the cold war, East-West relations have entered a post-cold war period, during which, according to Samuel Huntington, "The great divisions among humankind and the dominating source of conflict will be cultural. Nation states will remain the most powerful actors in world affairs, but the principal conflicts of global politics will occur between nations and groups of different civilizations. The clash of civilizations will dominate global politics." 6 Among Oriental cultures, the "most prominent form of this cooperation is the Confucian-Islamic connection that has emerged to challenge Western interests, values and power" (45). Huntington has here correctly grasped the two origins of Oriental cultures, the Arab countries and China, which have, especially the latter, been overlooked by Said. Moreover, due to the limitations of other geographical and ideological factors, Said's Orientalism, in the sense of Oriental studies, naturally leads to his limitation in comparative literature studies: the texts he discusses are mostly from the English or english -speaking world rather than from the non-English-speaking or other Third-World countries, while comparative literature is not only cross-national and interdisciplinary but also cross-cultural and cross-linguistic. In this way, the limitations of his research as well as that of all the postcolonial academic [End Page 61] studies are obviously discernible. It is true that to conduct comparative literature studies from the postcolonial perspective could break through the boundary line of geography and disciplines, but cannot break through the boundary line of languages, which is the very problem that we Oriental scholars of comparative literature and cultural studies must solve in our research.

Said Offense- Conclusions bad

Said’s conclusions perpetuate misconceptions

Habib 5 (Irfan, a former Chairman of the Indian Council of Historical Research, http://www.isj.org.uk/index.php4?id=141&issue=108 , date accessed: 7/8/2010) AJK

I would not take more space to press the point that Said’s concept of ‘Orientalism’ is both far too general and far too restricted, and the limits of his definition are so set and the actual selection so executed that his conclusions are thereby simply predetermined. I would also not go into the other fundamental questions that Aijaz Ahmad has raised about Said’s method in his essay, ‘Orientalism and After’ (In Theory, Delhi, 1994, pp159-220). But one further problem with Said that needs certainly to be taken up is his notable lack of rigour in terms of documentation and logic; and I illustrate this by the treatment he metes out to Karl Marx. On a preliminary page of his Orientalism, Said puts two short quotations, the first of which is from Marx: ‘They cannot represent themselves; they must be represented.’ An innocent reader will surely assume that Marx is here implying that Oriental peoples are incapable of representing themselves, and so Europeans (better still, European Orientalists) must speak for them. And, indeed, on p21, quoting Marx’s words in original German, Said explicitly furnishes this precise context for his words. There is a double sense in which this use of the quotation is unethical and irresponsible. The quoted words are taken from a passage in Marx’s Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte, where he speaks not of the position of Eastern peoples, but of the poverty-stricken smallholding peasants of France at a particular juncture in the mid-19th century. Since these peasants could not unite, they were ‘incapable of enforcing their class interest in their own name, whether through a parliament or through a convention. They cannot represent themselves, they must be represented. Their representative must at the same time appear as their master…’ (K Marx and F Engels, Selected Works, Moscow, 1950, vol I, p303). Not only does Said thus coolly substitute eastern peoples for French peasants; by a sleight of hand he also converts Marx’s word ‘representation’, meaning political representation, into ‘depiction’ (The Oriental people cannot depict themselves, and so the Orientalists’ ‘representation does the job’—p21). The exploitation of Marx’s quotation does not even end with this double misuse. On p293, Said makes the still more audacious statement that Marx had used the quoted phrase ‘for Louis Napoleon’, as if Louis Napoleon had made any claims to represent or depict Orientals. Further on, quite forgetting what context he had given to Marx’s quotation on p21, Said alleges in the ‘Afterword’ to the 1995 edition (p335), that by putting the quotation as one of the book’s epigraphs, he, on his part, meant to refer to ‘the subjective truth insinuated by Marx…which is that if you feel you have been denied the chance to speak your truth, you will try extremely hard to get that chance!’ One fears to voice the suspicion that Said had never cared to read the original passage of the Eighteenth Brumaire, and had just picked up the quotation from some secondary source. Even so, the range of manifestly wrong meanings so confidently ascribed to the same words, on different spurs of the moment, is incredible. So much for the short ‘epigraph’. Marx as a subject of Said’s study (pp153-156) also offers further examples of the cavalier way in which Said can stuff anyone he dislikes or wishes to belittle into his nasty basket of ‘Orientalists’. Much has already been said on this matter by Aijaz Ahmad in his essay, ‘Marx on India: a Clarification’ (In Theory, as above, pp221-242). He shows that Said builds his interpretation on just two passages taken from Marx’s two articles published in the New York Tribune in 1853, and seems to be unacquainted with what Marx wrote elsewhere on India. Here it must be added that while Marx necessarily relied on (the quite extensive) European reports on India, the picture that he drew out of it, of the social and economic devastation that British rule caused in India, was largely his own—and this was hardly an ‘Orientalist’ enterprise under Said’s definition. Moreover even in Marx’s second essay, apparently consulted by Said, there is a passage looking forward to the Indians overthrowing ‘the English yoke’ (K Marx and F Engels, Collected Works, vol 12, Moscow, 1979, p221). Marx also writes in the very same article of ‘the profound hypocrisy and inherent barbarism of bourgeois civilisation [which] lies unveiled before our eyes, turning from its home where it assumes respectable forms, to the colonies where it goes naked.’ And yet, again and again in his book, Said sneers at Marx as being, at the end of the day, a pro-colonial ‘Orientalist’. So we are told, ‘This Orientalism can accommodate Aeschylus, say, and Victor Hugo, Dante and Karl Marx’ (p3). The view that ‘Indians were civilisationally, if not racially, inferior’ is indirectly ascribed to Marx on page 14. On page 102 Said goes so far as to put Marx among those writers who could use all the following ‘generalities unquestioningly’: ‘An Oriental lives in the Orient, he lives a life of Oriental ease, in a state of Oriental despotism, and sensuality, imbued with a feeling of Oriental fatalism.’ The italicised words constitute a fantastic misrepresentation of Karl Marx’s writings on Asia. But Said does not still stop here. On p231 he puts Marx among those who held that ‘an Oriental man was first an Oriental and only second a man’—a meaningless formula seemingly coined simply to belittle Marx. III Such reckless rhetoric cannot but create grave suspicions about Said’s general credibility. Here it must be made clear that it cannot be any serious critic’s case that colonialism and imperialism have not promoted a particular kind of

<Continues…>

Said Offense- Conclusions bad

<Continued…>

writing about the East; the real point of criticism is that not only does Said unreasonably use the term ‘Orientalism’ to represent only this particular class of writing, but he also goes on to tar with the same brush the entire corpus of learned writing on the Orient, which in common parlance constitutes the product of Orientalism. This is a clever device, and verve and verbosity tend to conceal the resort to a verbal confusion pure and simple. Said himself tells us (‘Afterword’, pp341-342) that the late Professor Albert Hourani, while agreeing with much of his criticism of a part of the writing on the Orient, protested that the criticism was not applicable to a large part of Orientalist writing, and yet now after Said’s Orientalism, the very word Orientalism has ‘become a term of abuse’. How much Said has been successful here was borne upon me while reading a recent article by a western ‘Orientalist’, Carl W Ernst. This author claims credit, without any sense of embarrassment, for ‘foreign scholars who alone had the resources and the motivation’ to analyse an Islamicised Yogic text. The claim has all the marks of a self-satisfied sense of western superiority that Said treats as the trademark of ‘Orientalism’. Yet Ernst himself dubs early theories of a possible Indian origin of Sufism as ‘early Orientalist theories’ (‘The Islamicisation of Yoga in the Amrtakunda Translations’, Journal of Royal Asiatic Society, 3rd series, vol 13, part 2, London, 2003, p226, italics mine). ‘Orientalist’ here just does duty for what one thinks is wrong: otherwise, how can there be any indication of western superiority in an ‘Orientalist’ theory that places the source of Islamic sufism in early Indian beliefs rather than, say, Christian mysticism? ‘Orientalism’ as a word has thus been so degraded that anyone can use it for anything one disapproves of, even when the disapprover may himself be a dyed in the wool ‘Orientalist’! Despite Said’s denials that it was not his intention to protect chauvinistic or conservative beliefs in Asia, especially in relation to Islam, one can see that any critical or historical view of any aspect of Islam by any western scholar is yet taken by him as reflective of a sense of western superiority and so a kind of ‘Orientalist’, colonial discourse. The hypersensitivity goes to such an extent that the word ‘Mohammedan’, used in place of ‘Islamic’, as in ‘Mohammedan Law’, is held to be an ‘insulting’ designation (p66): Said obviously forgets that innumerable Muslim scholars down the centuries have also spoken (in Persian) of Din-i Muhammadi (Muhammedan faith), or Shari‘at-i Muhammadi (Muhammedan law), without at all being conscious of any insult implied in such use of the Prophet’s name. But with the aggressive stance of modern Islamic ‘orthodoxy’, the word ‘Mohammedan’ is quickly disappearing from books, and even from titles of works by authors long dead: thus Goldziher’s Mohammedanische Studien and H A R Gibb’s Mohammedanism now reappear in print respectively as Muslim Studies (English translation) and Islam in editions by established academic publishers. An innocent designation becomes disreputable the moment it is found to be tainted through association with that pernicious weed, ‘Orientalism’.

Said’s writing is unsubstantiated and erroneous

Lippman 81 (Thomas, Middle East Journal, date accessed: 7/8/2010) AJK

The cogency of Said's argument, however, is undermined by the narrowness of his focus, his arroganta nd hectoringt one, unsubstantiateda s-sertions and numerous inaccuracies. Most of his conclusions are based on the per-formance of the American media during the Iranian revolution and the captivity of the hos-tages.Certainly that performance was flawed,but Said fails to demonstrate that it was, as he claims, characteristic of Western coverage of crises in the Islamic world. It would have been instructive to make a brief comparison with how the French media covered the war in Algeria, say, or what the British reported about Egypt during the Suez affair, neither of which he mentions. Said thinks that the errors he finds in press and diplomatic analysis of events in Iran reflect a collective American antipathy to Islam. There may be such antipathy, but Said ought to ac-knowledge that the same criticisms were rightly made of coverage of events in Vietnam, Chile and Africa, where "fear of 'Mohammedanism'"(p . 5) was not involved. Finding the American press to be a handmaiden of American government policy and asserting that "never before has an international trouble spot like Iran been covered so instantaneously and so regularly as it has by the media" (p. 25), Said seems to have slept through the Vietnam war. Said's choice of facts and incidents to support his argument is selective and duplicitous. It is not true, as he asserts, that President Sadat offered to "give the United States bases on his territory" and that therefore "most of what is reported out of Egypt by the media effectively makes his point of view on matters Egyptian, Arab and regional seem like the correct one" (p. 112). (In fact, it is hard to think of any political opposition so tooth-less as that of Egypt that is so successful in having its views disseminated by the Western press.)I t is not true that "only recently have there been overt references to Israeli religious fanaticism, and all of these have been to the zealots of Gush Emunim" (p. 31). It is not true that the press ascribed Saudi Arabia's refusal to endorse the Camp David accords to some "peculiarly Islamic logic" (p. 30). There is no credible evidence for Said's statement that the Christian factions in Lebanon have been "armed and supported" by the United States (p. 138). And it is preposterous to assert that "assiduous research has shown that there is hardly a primetime television show with-out several episodes of patently racist and insult-ing caricatures of Muslims" (p. 69). Said appears to have written this denunciation of American correspondents without interview-ing any, and he knows little about the decision-making processes of the media. He complains that "anything falling outside the consensus defi-nition of what is important is considered irrele-vant to United States interests and to the media's definition of a good story" (p. 142). If the charge against them is that their coverage emphasizes American interests and "good stories," most edi-tors and writers would happily plead guilty.

Said Offense- Orientalist

Said’s analysis is largely irrelevant, save when it actually furthers Orientalism

Richardson 90 (Michael, “Reflections on Orientalism”, Anthropology Today Vol. 6 No. 4, date accessed: 7/8/2010) AJK

That Said feels under no compunction to justify his change of opinion here is indicative of his methodological approach. As he felt no necessity to explain what it was specifically that made the work of Geertz ad-mirable in the first place so, it appears, he is not called upon to explain a radical change of opinion. In 1978 he had been seeking to place himself within 'Western' dis-course, almost in the role of a radical reformer. By 1983, he is clearly seeking to orient his critique differ-ently, seeking to find a place within a 'space' of anti-imperialist studies, in which the work of Geertz does not fit. This much is apparent in his article 'Orientalism Revisited?' in which he plays down the originality of his own study, to place it in a line of anti-colonialist writers who seem to have nothing but this, and the fact that Said approves them, in common10. What he is keen to establish is a catch-all critique providing the means to dispose of what he finds objectionable and to praise whatever he approves. This is exactly the power rela-tion that he accuses the Orientalists of constructing in relation to the Orient. Unlike the Orient itself, however, contemporary Orientalists have the power to answer back, and not surprisingly they have not hesitated to do so. Said's pathetic response to some of these counter-blasts indicates the weakness of his position, which he is incapable of defending, except by constantly shifting his ground. The more substantial question raised (or, one could equally argue, hidden) by Said's critique is the nature of reciprocity between subject and object. In this re-spect the extent that Said has adequately represented what the Orientalists themselves have said is largely ir-relevant. His argument rather stands or falls on his denial of such a reciprocal relationship. Orientalism was imposed upon the Orient: it was a European pro-ject, more or less consciously elaborated, in which Orientalists were nothing but passive pawns. Whether or not Orientalist representations were accurate or not thereby becomes somewhat irrelevant. The problem here is that if reciprocity between sub-ject and object is impossible then, by the same token, the object cannot challenge the subject by developing alternative models. In fact, since the object has no real existence, being only a conceptualization of the sub-ject's mind, it can never be a question of the former acting upon the latter. However, this just will not do, as Said has to recognize in the conclusion to his book, since to leave the matter there would be to freeze the relation in empty space. There could be no way of ever changing it. The only way out of the impasse is for the subject to develop representations of the object that would represent the object more faithfully. Given the extent of Said's critique, however, it is difficult to see how this can ever possibly occur. The best that can be achieved is that the representation should concur with Said's own understanding. But then by what right can Said stand as a representative of the Orient? He is con-sequently forced into a position that relies on precisely the same discourse that he is criticizing. Whether or not the 'Orientalists' are guilty of the central charge that Said makes against them, of believing that the Orient 'cannot represent itself, it must be represented' (and it cannot be said that he proves his case on this point) it would certainly appear that Said himself believes it; indeed such a belief is inscribed at the heart of his pro-ject. Furthermore, his own critique relies on just as much mis-representation of Orientalists as he accuses them of making in their representations of the Orient. In Said's terms, in fact, his own conceptualization of 'Orientalists' is as pure an example of 'Orientalism' as one could wish for!

Said Offense- Orientalist

Said’s concept of Orientalism recreates Orientalism

Landow 02(“Edward W. Said's Orientalism” George P. Landow, Professor of English and Art History, Brown University 18 March, 2002, Political Discourse- Theories of Colonialism and Post-Colonialism http://www.postcolonialweb.org/poldiscourse/said/orient14.html)

Drawing upon the methods of feminist criticism of the 1970s, Said's Orientalism did much to create the field of postcolonial studies by teaching us to "read for the gap," placing texts in broad political contexts. Despite its obviously valid points about weaknesses of Euro-American thought, its appeal for Western intellectuals, and its liberating effect on intellectuals from former countries that were colonized, this seminal book has some major flaws: Though enormously effective as a polemic, Orientalism is very shoddy as scholarship, and yet it presents itself as a corrective to flawed scholarship. The book completely neglects China, Japan, and South East Asia, and it has very little to say about India. Although purporting to be a study of how the West treats all of the East, the book focuses almost entirely upon the Middle East. Its generalizations about "the Orient" therefore repeat the very Orientalism it attacks in other texts! It is bizarrely forgiving of French Orientalist writers like Nerval and Flaubert. Orientalism is an orientalist text several times over, and in two ways commits the major errors involved with the idea of the Other: First, it assumes that such projection and its harmful political consequences are something that only the West does to the East rather than something all societies do to one another. (I am surely not the only teacher who has had heard Asian-American students returning from their parent's country of origin exclaim, "Everything Said says the West does to the East, the East does to the West!") Because Orientalism is apparently based on very little knowledge of the history of European and Non-European imperialism, it treats Western colonialism as unique. This point, like the previous one, makes perfect sense if one takes Said's pioneering book largely as a political polemic, for in that case such omissions might be forgivable. One expects more from criticism and scholarship, particularly politically motivated criticism and scholarship.

Said Offense- Advocates Violence

Said encouraged violence in a text littered with misrepresentations and contradictions

Pryce-Jones 8 (David, staff writer for The New Criterion, <http://www.newcriterion.com/articles.cfm/enough-said-3743>, date accessed: 7/9/2010) AJK

Edward Said was an outstanding example of an intellectual who condemned the West root and branch while taking every advantage of the privileges and rewards it has to offer. In its dishonesty and exercise of double standards, his was truly a cautionary tale of our times. Born in Jerusalem in 1935, he laid claims to be a Palestinian, dispossessed by Zionist Jews, and therefore an archetypal Third World victim. In sober fact, he was the son of an American father, a member of a prosperous Christian family with extensive business interests in Egypt. Undoubtedly an intelligent and civilized man with one side of his personality, he became a professor of comparative literature at Columbia University. Yet with his other side, he wrote speeches for Yasser Arafat in the 1970s, and was far and away the most vociferous advocate for the Palestine Liberation Organization. Although he knew the history of persecution that lay behind Zionism, he could not accept Israel as anything but an injustice that had to be put right in bloodshed. On the pretext of victimhood, but from the safety of New York, he urged others to kill and be killed. When Arafat professed (falsely as it turned out) to be willing to make peace with Israel, Said broke with him, insisting on armed struggle. At the end of his life, this professor of a subject within the humanities was photographed throwing a stone from Lebanese soil against the boundary with Israel. The contradictory aspects of the man came together in Orientalism, a book Said published in 1978. The thesis was that every Westerner who had ever studied or written about the Middle East had done so in bad faith. From ancient Greece through the medieval era to the present, the work of historians, grammarians, linguists, and even epigraphists had been “a rationalization of colonial rule.” There was no colonial rule in the lifetimes of the majority of these scholars, so they must have been “projecting” what was to come. For Said, these highly eclectic individuals were all engaged in a long-drawn conspiracy, international but invisible, to establish the supremacy of the West by depicting an East not only inferior but static and incapable of change. At bottom, here was the vulgar Marxist concept that knowledge serves only the interest of the ruling class. Said had also latched on to Michel Foucault, with his proposition—modishly avant-garde at the time—that there is no such thing as truth, but only “narratives” whose inventor is putting across his point of view. This reduces facts to whatever anyone wishes to make of them. Omitting whatever did not fit, misrepresenting evidence, and making unwarranted generalizations, Said committed the very sin for which he was accusing Westerners—of concocting a “narrative” to serve his purposes. As he summed up: “Every European, in what he could say about the Orient, was consequently a racist, an imperialist.” The “narrative” shaped a conclusion particularly crucial to Said. Europeans included Jews and later Israelis, and they were therefore integral to the conspiracy to do down Orientals and ensure that Palestinians were prime victims of racism and imperialism. Palestinian violence and terror was therefore natural and legitimate.

Said Offense- Flawed Theory

Said’s theory of Orientalism is based on lies and misrepresentations

Pryce-Jones 8 (David, staff writer for The New Criterion, <http://www.newcriterion.com/articles.cfm/enough-said-3743>, date accessed: 7/9/2010) AJK

Discussion of inconvenient facts soon began to expose piecemeal Said’s “narrative.” An Israeli scholar, Justus Reid Weiner, uncovered the extent to which Said had been romancing his own victimhood. Leaving Jerusalem as a young boy before Israel became independent, he had grown up in Cairo and been educated at its most prestigious British-run college. His credentials as a Palestinian refugee and a spokesman demanded more than a stretch of the imagination. It was not the Zionists who had dispossessed the Said family, it turned out, but Nasser when he expropriated the property of all foreigners including theirs. The victim of Arab nationalism, Said was nevertheless its most ardent defender, and this psychological inversion is the most mystifying thing about him. Perversity of the sort may perhaps illuminate the psychological process whereby so many kindred intellectuals misplace hatred and guilt, admiring those who injure them and condemning those who might protect them. Said did not live long enough to read Robert Irwin’s book For Lust of Knowing, published early in 2006. This thorough rebuttal of Said is a monument of genuine scholarship, examining who the Orientalists were, how historically they advanced their disciplines all over Europe, and what their achievements have been. At the outset, Irwin calls Said’s book “a work of malignant charlatanry,” and he demonstrates the point calmly; in contrast to Said, he is free from either spite or arrogance. (Stephen Schwartz, another informed critic, also deploys the words “malignant charlatan” to describe Said.) Irwin’s account of the founding of chairs in European universities for the sake of studying and translating Eastern languages and literary texts is particularly strong. Dedicated scholars handed down to their successors a tradition of learning and research. Even Christian churchmen and apologists among them were prepared to pursue knowledge objectively. Some of Said’s critics have had Arab or Muslim origins, for instance Sadiq al-Azm, Fouad Ajami, and Kanan Makiya, and Said treated them all as though they were traitors. He would surely have issued another personal fatwa in his usual style of bluster and insult against Ibn Warraq, whoseDefending the West further demolishes in close detail the Saidian “narrative.” Originally from the Indian subcontinent, Ibn Warraq is the author of a previous book, Why I Am Not A Muslim. This is a scrupulously documented examination of the life and teaching of the Prophet Muhammad, of the Qur’an and its sources, and the resulting culture. As he sees it, intolerance and ignorance, and all manner of taboos, have been deliberately preserved and cultivated down the centuries, doing the faithful no service, and creating what he openly calls the totalitarian nature of Islam. Like the earlier book, Defending the West rests on very wide reading in several languages; there are almost a hundred pages of footnotes. The impact is all the more solid because the tone expresses neither ridicule nor anger but only determination to get at the truth. The book mounts its demolition of Said from several angles. To begin with, Said’s pseudo-Foucault style often descends into meaningless verbiage and contradiction. Said’s selectivity and failure to take historical context into consideration also lead him astray wildly. Out of laziness or carelessness, he makes egregious historical blunders. For instance, at the time when Said is accusing the British of imperialism in the Middle East, the actual overlords were the Ottoman Turks. And if British and French Orientalists were imperial agents by definition, how come Germany had no Middle East empire when its Orientalists were the most distinguished and original of all? And what about Ignaz Goldziher, the founding father of modern Orientalism and ready to consider converting to Islam, but Hungarian, therefore from a country with no imperialist aims in the Middle East?

Said Offense- Flawed Theory

*Orientalism* is full of faulty assumptions, manipulations, and misrepresentations

Berkowitz 8 (Peter, Tad and Dianne Taube Senior Fellow at Stanford, “Answering Edward Said”, Policy Review, date accessed: 7/9/2010) AJK

Like the book it introduces, the preface exhibits a master propagandist at work, as he weaves together moderate and reasonable pronouncements with obscurantist rhetoric and sophisticated invective. But Said puts even his moderate and reasonable pronouncements in the service of immoderate and unreasonable conclusions. For instance, he couples an elegant defense of humane studies with a vehement condemnation of the Bush administration and Ariel Sharon's government. It is one thing to condemn Bush and Sharon. But he insists that the condemnation is intimately connected to the defense of serious scholarship in the humanities. Indeed, in the guise of presenting to a new generation his critique of the decisive contribution that the West's scholarly study of the East allegedly made to the West's subjugation of the East, Said insinuates that literary cultivation itself issues in an implacable opposition to American and Israeli Middle East foreign policy. I say "insinuates" because such arguments for the link as Said puts forward in the preface crumble upon inspection. Said begins by contending that since its first publication, Orientalism has been subject to "increasing misrepresentation and misinterpretation." But he never bothers to identify the misrepresentations and misinterpretations--or, for that matter, to acknowledge a single flaw that might have been brought to his attention in the 25 years since his book's publication, wide dissemination and discussion in the West, and translation into 36 languages including Hebrew and Vietnamese. Said leaves it to the reader to conjecture where his critics might have gone astray. Perhaps he had in mind those who charge that Orientalism exploits the ignorance, panders to the passions, and plays to the prejudices of credulous American intellectuals only too ready to believe the worst about their intellectual forbears and their nation. Such critics contend that the book seduced a generation of historians, anthropologists, sociologists, and political theorists into believing falsely that for two centuries Western scholarship devoted to understanding the languages, history, art, and ideas of the Arab and Muslim Middle East distorted and degraded the peoples under examination and provided inspiration and justification for their intellectual and political conquest. If Said had such critics in mind, his preface does nothing to allay their charges and, in the space of 16 pages, much to prove their point. On the one hand, Said stresses the importance of "continuing to have faith in the ongoing and literally unending process of emancipation and enlightenment that, in my opinion, frames and gives direction to the intellectual vocation." He emphasizes that while he has "never taught anything about the Middle East" (his emphasis), his "training and practice" as "a teacher of the mainly European humanities" fits him for "the kind of deliberately meditated and analyzed study that this book contains, which for all its urgent worldly references is still a book about culture, ideas, history, and power, rather than Middle East politics tout court." He deplores that "Reflection, debate, rational argument, moral principle based on a secular notion that human beings must create their own history have been replaced by abstract ideas that celebrate American or Western exceptionalism, denigrate the relevance of context, and regard other cultures with derisive contempt." On the other hand, Said descends into incoherent theorizing and rank vilification to deride the history of U.S. and Israeli conduct in the Middle East. To illustrate the trendy notion that "neither the term Orient nor the concept of the West has any ontological stability," he declares, without a shred of supporting evidence or the slightest effort to make explicit the connection, that following the outbreak of the Second Intifada in September 2000, "Israeli F-16s and Apache helicopters [were] used routinely on defenseless civilians as part of their collective punishment." Along the same lines, to demonstrate that the Orient and the West are "supreme fictions," Said cavalierly effaces the vital distinction between terrorist attacks on civilians and wars by liberal democracies against terrorist organizations and ruthless dictators: "The suicide bombing phenomenon has appeared with all its hideous damage, none more lurid and apocalyptic of course than the events of September 11 and their aftermath in the wars against Afghanistan and Iraq." Furthermore, notwithstanding his call for intellectual civility, he accuses the Bush administration of coming under the influence of "intellectual lackeys," chief among them Princeton University professor emeritus Bernard Lewis and Johns Hopkins University School of Advanced International Studies scholar Fouad Ajami. Despite their diverse and worldly backgrounds--Lewis is a British-born Jew and Ajami is of Lebanese Shiite origins--both these eminent scholars are, in Said's judgment, hopelessly naive and incurably racist. What they "seem incapable of understanding," he declares, "is that history cannot be swept clean like a blackboard, clean so that 'we' might inscribe our own future there and impose our own forms of life for these lesser people to follow." Of course, contrary to Said, the premise that informs Lewis's and Ajami's writings on American foreign policy and undergirds Bush administration democracy promotion efforts is that Arabs and Muslims are not lesser peoples but full members of the human family, equal in rights and as deserving as any other people of living in freedom and dignity. In the preface's closing lines, Said contrives an obscene moral equivalence by declaring that "the human, and humanistic, desire or enlightenment and emancipation" are menaced by "the incredible strength of the opposition to it that comes from the Rumsfelds, Bin Ladens, Sharons, and Bushes of this world." Said's brand of propaganda is particularly insidious. Although he presents himself as a heroic defender of liberal learning and systematic scholarship, he conjures egregious misrepresentations and promulgates toxic misunderstandings, thereby undermining the separation between scholarly vocation and partisan pleading in defense of which he purports to write. Nor is such an outcome incidental to Orientalism's larger project. Said aims to persuade that for hundreds of years Western scholars of the East, like U.S. and Israeli political leaders today, have been blinded to the realities of Arab life and the wider Muslim world by the very principles that lie at the heart of the West. Furthermore, he wants readers to believe that these principles compel the West to vanquish and oppress Arabs and Muslims. To succeed, Said must anesthetize his readers' critical faculties and incite their resentment of Western power and preeminence.

A2 Schmitt K

Exception Bad – Bare Life

Allowing the sovereign to label people and assign them to a given identity puts people into ‘bare life’ – to be killed without any repercussion.

McLoughlin 10 (Daniel McLoughlin, doctoral candidate in Philosophy in the University of New South Wale, "The Sacred and the Unspeakable: Giorgio Agamben's Ontological Politics." Theory & Event 13.1 (2010) Project MUSE)

Drawing on Carl Schmitt's definition of the sovereign as "he who decides on the exception,"7Homo Sacer argues that the inclusion of bare life in the political realm is effected by sovereign power.8 While, for the most part, law relates to life through juridico-political categories (citizen, minor, resident alien), Agamben asserts that when the limit of the political is at stake, the law will be suspended to preserve the prevailing order when this aim can no longer be attained through legal norms. In the exception, then, the application of law to life is suspended, stripping life of juridical status. Agamben's term for the life that dwells in this anomie is "bare life," as, from the perspective of the legal system, the withdrawal of legal recognition and protection reduces life to the bare fact of its existence. The relation between bare life and law is, like the relation between zoe and the bios politikos in Greek thought, one of inclusive exclusion, or relation of non-relation, for bare life is included in the law only insofar as it is set outside it. The consequence of this juridical relation is, then, that bare life is absolutely exposed to death, for it may be killed by anyone without legal repercussion.

Exception Bad – Bare Life

**Allowing the sovereign to assign identity to people leads to a recreation of the holocaust on the global scale.**

Norris 0 (Andrew Norris. "Giorgio Agamben and the Politics of the Living Dead." Diacritics 30.4 (2000): 38-58. Project MUSE.) NAR

With the rise of sovereignty we witness the rise of a form of life that corresponds to it. "The sovereign sphere [sfera] is the sphere in which it is permitted to kill without committing homicide and without celebrating a sacrifice [sacrificio], and sacred life [sacra]—that is, life that may be killed but not sacrificed—is the life that has been captured in this sphere" [83]. Agamben does not define the sacred in terms of "what is set apart for worship of the deity." He is interested in the more fundamental question of the logic of sacrifice (from Latin sacrificium, from sacr-, sacer, holy, cursed) as revealed in the life that is sacred (from Latin sacrare, also from sacr-, sacer). What Agamben terms sacred life is, like the sovereign, both within and without the legal order (or, as its etymology suggests, both holy and cursed). It is inside the legal order insofar as its death can be allowed by that order; but it is outside it insofar as its death can constitute neither a homicide nor a sacrifice. But where sovereignty is a form of power that occupies this threshold, sacred life is nothing more than a life that occupies this threshold, a life that is excluded and included in the political order. Here this takes the form not, as in Aristotle, of a metaphysical puzzle, but rather of a mute helplessness in the face of death. "Sacredness is . . . the originary form of the inclusion of bare life [nuda vita] in the judicial order, and the syntagm homo sacer names something like the originary 'political' relation, which is to say, bare life insofar as it operates in an inclusive exclusion as the referent of the sovereign decision" [85]. This is the explicit revelation of the metaphysical requirement that politics establish a relation with the nonrelational [cf. note 8]. Indeed, the sovereign decision is the realization of the ambiguity of the distinction between bare and political life. It is law (political life) that is not law (insofar as it steps outside of the strictures and limitations of formal law) dealing with bare life (that is, nonpolitical life), and insofar as it does so that nonpolitical (bare) life it treats is political. The result is the paradox of a sacrifice that is dedicated to no legal or religious end [114] but that participates in and affirms the economy or logic of the legal/religious system as a metaphysical, political system. Where in René Girard's superficially similar account of sacrifice the victim is a scapegoat for the murderous desires of the community that unites around her, here the stakes are considerably higher. Instead of an act of self-protection on the part of the community [Girard 4, 101-02], sacrifice is the performance of the metaphysical assertion of the human: the Jew, the Gypsy, and the gay man die that the German may affirm his transcendence of his bodily, animal life. 22 [End Page 47] [Begin Page 49] Contemporary instances of this threshold life abound, from refugees and people in concentration camps to "neomorts" and figures in "overcomas" whom we are tempted to turn into organ farms. Perhaps the clearest example is that of people in camps forcibly subjected to extreme medical tests and prisoners who have been condemned to death who are asked to "volunteer" for the same: The particular status of the VPs [Versuchspersonen] was decisive: they were persons sentenced to death or detained in a camp, the entry into which meant the definitive exclusion from the political community. Precisely because they were lacking almost all the rights and expectations that we characteristically attribute to human existence, and yet were still biologically alive [biologicamente ancora vita], they came to be situated at a limit zone [una zona-limite] between life and death, inside and outside, in which they were no longer anything but bare life [nuda vita]. Those who are sentenced to death and those who dwelt in camps are thus in some way unconsciously assimilated to homines sacres, to a life that may be killed without the commission of homicide. Like the fence of the camp, the interval between death sentence and execution [End Page 49] delimits an extratemporal and extraterritorial threshold [soglia] in which the human body is separated from its normal [normale] political status and abandoned, in a state of exception [in stato di eccezione], to the most extreme misfortunes. [159] When, in the United States, men condemned to death have been offered the possibility of parole in exchange for "volunteering" to undergo tests that could not be imposed upon those with full rights of citizenship [156-57], the reasoning was quite understandable, and even attractive in its economy and "fairness": given that the person has been condemned to die, he has essentially already lost his life. As far as the law is concerned his life is no longer his own, and in that sense he is a "living dead man" [131]. Hence there will be no crime against him if his life is "lost" again. But neither will that death be the imposition of the death penalty. Indeed, it is precisely insofar as he awaits execution that he remains alive: his life remains only to be taken from him in the moment of punishment. Death in the experiment thus reveals the paradoxes of death row as a sphere that delayed penalty makes possible, that of the threshold between life and death. 23 When the threshold of death row holds more than one or two victims, the result is the camp. Historically developing out of martial law, it is itself an included exclusion from the penal system [20, 166-67]. If the Aristotelian distinction between polis life and bare life with which we began was meant to secure and define the human, the total politicization of life that is the camp signals the collapse of this project. <CONTINUED>

Exception Bad – Bare Life

<CONTINUED>

Agamben's characterization can be understood as an attempt to more systematically work out Arendt's paradoxical claim that "life in the concentration camps . . . stands outside of life and death" [Origins of Totalitarianism 444]. Here the exception becomes the norm—or, to be more precise, the distinction between the two is wholly effaced. "The camp is the space [lo spazio] of this absolute impossibility of deciding [decidere] between fact and law, rule and application, exception and rule, which nevertheless incessantly decides [decide] between them" [173]. In the name of the health of the body of the nation, in the attempt to produce a single and undivided people [179], and in response to the decision of the Führer, whose own body has itself become one with the law [184], the nation takes on the endless task of its self-delineation; that is, it moves into the threshold that defines it, a threshold that has awaited it since Aristotle's Politics. [End Page 50] Now, the mere existence of camps and of Versuchspersonen does not in itself signal the need for as sweeping and fundamental a critique of the tradition as Agamben's. For one might well conclude that what is called for is simply a reassertion of human rights as understood by the tradition; or, to put the point on the explanatory level, that the genocides and rape camps of contemporary politics are conceptually of a piece with the transgressions of James II and other "Beasts of Prey" and "noxious creatures." After all, Agamben himself characterizes the Versuchspersonen in just these terms: it is "precisely because they were lacking almost all the rights and expectations that we characteristically attribute to human existence" and yet were still alive that they could "be situated at a limit zone between life and death." On this account the horrors of modernity are nothing more than violations of the norms of the tradition—a tradition that simply needs to be reasserted, rather than criticized or deconstructed. And this response might seem sufficient even if one accepts, as Agamben does, Arendt's argument in The Origins of Totalitarianism that the emergence of the camps signals the extreme limitations of the politics of human rights. Arendt's argument is that the direct defense of human rights will alone be insufficient. On her account what is needed is rather a recognition of the ultimate basis of civil rights—what she terms the "right to have rights." 24 This basis Arendt finds in political action. Properly understood, human rights are civil rights: they are based on forms of human action, not a set of moral truths about the laws of God or nature. It is as political, not legal, actors that we are granted rights; and it is through political action that we defend those rights. But in the present case we might interpret this as nothing but a call to indirectly defend human rights, and not at all to question the distinction between political life and bare life upon which the conception of rights rests.

Exclusion Bad

Moral motivations for exclusionary actions don’t explain everything- political actions seek to ‘eliminate’ the enemy

Lee 7 (Fred, grad student in political science, Theory and Event, Vol. 10 Issue 1, Muse) my

In summary I would emphasize two interpretative implications of the theoretical staging of the Japanese internment above. First, the determination of military necessity encodes a racial state of exception, rather than miscodes a factual situation that might justify it. For Nishiura Weglyn and the CWRIC, the state acted inexcusably without reference to the fact of loyalty -- but this normative construction from the start makes less intelligible how the state acted with reference to the fact of sovereignty. Secondly, the sovereign decision that the Japanese were the enemy race was not just politically motivated but essentially political. For Daniels and Rentlen, the state's treatment of Japanese Americans epitomized American racism. Yet explanations based on racism -- as in wartime intensified fears, (un)conscious motivation, or anxiously-repeated stereotypes -- at best locate the psychological or social origins of the internment, but for lack of adequate conceptual distinctions necessarily fall short of the political specificity of the race question. The friend/enemy distinction and the state of exception disclose the distinct logic of sovereignty at work in the internment otherwise easily overlooked: the racial enemy must be 'eliminated' according to decisions that would restore the 'normal' situation. My argument pushes the conception of the interment as racial politics to its limit, where it posits the concept of politicized race.

Exclusion Bad

Identifying “enemies” unconsciously draws in moral imperatives and justifies violence against them- empirically proven in Japanese internment camps

Lee 7 (Fred, grad student in political science, Theory and Event, Vol. 10 Issue 1, Muse) my

Predating America's declaration of war on Japan, the Yellow Peril figured the Japanese as a racial danger within the territory of the state as a matter of danger. What Homer Lea and more broadly the Yellow Peril stood for in the cultural domain, President Franklin D. Roosevelt and Commanding General John L. DeWitt of the WDC represented in the political domain. As decision makers, Roosevelt authorized the executive order, whereas the authorized DeWitt distinguished sharply between all Japanese and non-Japanese enemy aliens in executing that order in March-August 1942. Public Proclamations No. 1 and 2 mentioned German and Italian aliens in addition to "any person of Japanese Ancestry" when establishing Military Areas No. 1-6 and various strategic zones where enemies might be prohibited. Public Proclamation No. 3 imposed a curfew -- not generally enforced on the still-mentioned German or Italian aliens -- on all Japanese Americans within Military Area No. 1 and the prohibited zones. Public Proclamation No. 4 set the stage for the evacuation in forbidding "all alien Japanese and persons of Japanese ancestry" from leaving Military Area No. 1 where some 90% of the population resided. Executing Civilian Exclusion Orders, the military then relocated over one hundred thousand Japanese Americans into assembly centers while German and Italian aliens and citizens remained en masse. Again and again DeWitt proclaimed these actions to be authorized as matters of "military necessity." When it became apparent that no states outside of the Military Areas would allow the Japanese to resettle freely within their borders, the exclusion program almost inevitably turned into indefinite internment.17 Historians have extensively narrated the processes by which Roosevelt, DeWitt and other government officials arrived at these decisions.18 However the decision-making process is not essential to my account, as my story concerns not the causes but the effects of these made-decisions. Essential instead is Schmitt's question of sovereignty, that is, "who decides on exception." In setting up this question, Schmitt opposes the normal situation of public safety and order to the state of the exception in which the existence of the state is endangered; the former situation is the presupposition of the legal norm's application, whereas the later is characterized by the suspension of the legal norm. Sovereign then is the entity that decides whether the normal or exceptional situation exists, defining "what constitutes public order and safety" and "determining when they are disturbed."19 As that which decides upon the norm/exception distinction, Schmitt must insist that the decision on the exception cannot derive from the legal norm, since "the exception, which is not codified in the existing legal order... cannot be circumscribed factually and made to conform to preformed law."20 Rather the decision on the exception sets the limit of the law's application and reveals the sovereign as belonging to, but at the same time standing beside, the legal order in having the concrete "authority to suspend valid law."21 The determination of when the exceptional situation exists and how to restore the normal situation is accordingly decisionist, as opposed to normative, in Schmitt's opinion. In response to the internment redress movement of the 1980s, the Commission on the Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians (CWRIC) report takes the absence of 'true' military necessity as the relevant fact: the internment occurred "despite the fact that not a single documented act of espionage, sabotage or fifth column activity was committed by an American citizen of Japanese ancestry or by a resident Japanese alien on the West Coast."22 The CWRIC presents the fact of no fifth column activity as decisive in undermining the claim of military necessity; yet the fact of no military necessity by any revisionist or even reasonable standard is only normatively relevant. But posing the authority to decide on military necessity as the relevant fact brackets the question of whether military necessity 'really' existed. The question then shifts from whether or not the state needed to do what it claimed was necessary, to scrutinizing what the state in-deed did in claiming that necessity. It is a mistake to see military necessity only as a justification, although it surely functioned as one 'after the fact' of decision. The declaration of military necessity was not a denotative utterance that referred to existent situation of fact, but a performative utterance of the WDC, an entity invested by the authority of EO 9066 with the power to proclaim that situation into existence.23 Put simply, the state decided that an exceptional situation existed in the face of a determined 'danger.' This statement can neither attack nor defend military necessity as a justification because it treats military necessity as a sovereign decision on the exception.24 What's more, this framing of the facts avoids the problem of responding to the WDC's charge of Japanese American disloyalty -- for although the intentions behind such a response are more often than not admirable, an answer to that charge can only be as perverted as the question itself. The sovereign not only decides on the state of exception, but also decides on the friend/enemy distinction that conceptually defines the politicaLink - as Schmitt defines it, "the specific political distinction to which political actions and motives can be reduced is that between friend and enemy."25 If the stakes of the norm/exception distinction are the legal order and its limits, then the ultimate stakes of the friend/enemy distinction are life and death. Though conceptually distinct, Schmitt interrelates war and the political as mutual presuppositions. War presupposes "that the political decision has already been made as to who the enemy is," while the possibility of war is the "leading presupposition" of the political.26 <CONTINUED>

Exclusion Bad

<CONTINUED>

The enemy is not the figure hated or considered morally inferior by the friend, but is rather the figuration of the possibility of violent conflict between armed collectivities. The extremity of enmity then correlates to the intensity of political conflict, although the enemy as a category has no necessary content. As a formal distinction, the political only refers to the highest degree of (dis)association between groups, and these groupings might divide along class, religious, racial or any other lines. However only a grouping of sufficient quantitative intensity can qualify as political, and moreover, only in this qualification is any social antagonism 'politicized' in the more familiar phrase. Once this occurs, the political distinction takes control or is overriding: "The real friend-enemy grouping is existentially so strong and decisive that the nonpolitical antithesis, at precisely the moment at which it becomes political, pushes aside and subordinates its hitherto purely nonpolitical criteria and motives to the conditions and conclusions of the political situation at hand."27 The pervasive figuration of race as racism in American popular and academic discourse precisely elides the crucial distinction between political and non-political forms of (dis)association. Indeed, even Alison Dundes Renteln's unconventional psychoanalysis of the internment is entirely conventional in this respect when it argues that "a deeply rooted fear of sexual congress between the races consciously or unconsciously motivated some of the actions which led to the internment of 120,000 Japanese Americans... A combination of the ideas of eugenics and virulent racism... was partly responsible for the occurrence of one of America's worst civil liberties disasters."28 Within the necessity-rights circle, Rentlen collapses the difference between the specter of racial miscegenation and the concrete declaration of racial enmity by turning the former into a (partial) cause of (the several actions that produced) the later. Thus maintaining the distinction between the political and the social from the outset not only re-politicizes the overly psychologized question of race, but shifts our analysis away from the (pre-political) causes of the decision to intern towards the structuring friend/enemy distinctions of the Japanese internment. All this initial staging then stands or falls on this simple premise: the state politicized race in the decision that the Japanese Americans were enemies and this identification of 'danger' coincided with the decision on the state of exception.29

Sovereign Power Bad

Schmitt’s idea of freedom justifies infinite violence- sovereign engages in “necessary killing” with no defined end

Dillon 8 (Michael, prof. of politics,Theory and Event, Vol. 11 No. 2, Muse) my

Preoccupied with the problematic of order and its entailments, Schmitt largely elides the problematic and entailments of the freedom of signification which are logically anterior to it. Factically free, modern man does not discover the law, Schmitt agrees, but he makes the law, Machiavelli maintains, by finding within himself the republican virtue (virtù), rather than the unmediated decisional will, required to do so. Freedom's virtù is ultimately underwritten by the polysemous freedom of the sign - that radically contingent undecidability which ultimately defines evental time itself. The Schmittean sovereign is somehow supposed magisterially to transcend the sign. Criticizing traditional definitions of sovereignty as, "the highest, legally independent, underived power," for example, Schmitt argues that this "is not the adequate expression of a reality but a formula, a sign, a signal. It is infinitely pliable, and therefore in practice, depending on the situation, either extremely useful or completely useless."4 Continuously stressing the "concrete situation",5 as if it arrives un-signed, Schmittean sovereignty unaccountably escapes the undecidability of the sign, however, as it decides the exception.6 "The exception in jurisprudence is analogous to the miracle in theology"7; a miraculous seeming without seeming which Machiavelli would immediately see-through. Machiavelli knows that lethal violence is never unmediated. Indeed 'cruelty well-used' is precisely this; killing as political signification. Machiavellian man enacts his freedom, instead, therefore, through his capacity not simply to read but also, and above all, to constantly re-write the signs of the times via a continuous calculus of necessary killing. Sign and sex are always powerfully related in Machiavelli also. Virtù is violent political semiotics as sexual potency; indeed, if we follow Machiavelli the dramatist, sexual potency is a play of political semiotics. For that reason I deliberately maintain the vocabulary of 'man. Subsequent sections analyse the nature of this Machiavellian moment of modern factical freedom. They do so, first, as a strategic moment. That strategic moment is acted-out, second, in the form of a war for, and through, the radically undecidable power of the sign. Factical freedom as semiotic battlespace is continuously required to signify how much killing is enough. But it can never resolve this strategic predicament because the very contingency of evental time, upon which its freedom relies, denies it the possibility of ever securely computing the strategic calculus of necessary killing which ultimately defines its moment. When asked to say how much killing is enough, whatever it replies, factical freedom is equipped to give only one answer: more.

Universalism Good

Universalism must be practiced by the sovereign- enemy distinction inevitably draws in moral undertones- Japanese internment camps prove

Lee 7 (Fred, grad student in political science, Theory and Event, Vol. 10 Issue 1, Muse) my

The protestation of assimilation-loyalty made no difference in Ozawa's citizenship case; nor did similar claims find a sympathetic audience in the aftermath of Pearl Harbor. When the patriotic Japanese American Citizens League (JACL) wired the White House to affirm their loyalty, the State Department -- the cabinet division traditionally dealing with foreign delegations -- responded with "your desire to cooperate has been noted."33 Although from opposite sides of the foreigner/citizen distinction, in both cases the attempt to prove 'desert' of citizenship by loyalty failed. In both cases, Japanese Americans found themselves excluded from citizenship: the Issei barred from citizenship de jure in the case of Ozawa and the Nisei stripped of it de facto during World War II. In the midst of the internment at a November 1942 emergency conference, the preamble to the JACL constitution then understandably hyperbolized its commitment to Americanism: WE, AMERICAN CITIZENS OF JAPANESE ANCESTRY, in order to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States of America and the principles for which it stands against all enemies, foreign and domestic; to foster and spread the true spirit of Americanism; to build the character of our people morally, spiritually and socially on American ideals and traditions; to speed the ultimate and complete assimilation of the Japanese American into the America cultural pattern... ESTABLISH THIS CONSTITUTION FOR THE JACL.34 By emulating the syntactical and paratextual form of the United States constitution, the JACL constitution performs the Americanism of its content: the founding document of the JACL roots itself in the political founding of America. The pronominal phrase "we, American citizens" cuts the citizen Nisei from the alien Issei implied in the prepositionally downplayed "Japanese ancestry." In its content, the JACL constitution affirms loyalty to the state as its first raison d'etre and assimilation (to American ideals, traditions, and culture) as its second. The relationship between these two reasons-for-being is not one of simple adjacency, but one suggestive of proof -- the promise to eradicate difference bolsters the pledge of loyalty. Albeit in an opposed valence the decider DeWitt also constellated assimilation, loyalty and citizenship in his February 1942 recommendation to exclude all Japanese from the Pacific Coast. "The Japanese race," he pronounced, "is an enemy race." Even amongst the citizen population "the racial strains are undiluted... That Japan is allied with Germany and Italy in this struggle is no ground for assuming that any Japanese, barred from assimilation by convention as he is... will not turn against this nation when the final test of loyalty comes."35 Whereas DeWitt even acknowledged that "convention" prevented Japanese American assimilation, this euphemism for racial discrimination is not dispositive; whatever its source, the non-assimilation of the Japanese signals the danger of Japanese disloyalty. By implication, only assimilation might signify Japanese loyalty. "Enemy race" then designates the unassimilated-potential disloyal that cuts across the citizen/non-citizen divide: the association of non-assimilation and disloyalty constitutes negatively the enemy's enmity and positively (yet tacitly) the friend's amity. In its most reduced form, this specifically political meaning of race elevated the question of difference from the nation into the question of disloyalty to the state. All too-abstract citizenship made no difference for the decisive issue of assimilation. Thus the state of exception caught the Japanese American citizen within the suspension of the norm of citizenship.36 Legally the Nisei still had standing but little else by way of the civil rights.37 Ruling on the curfew, the Supreme Court deferred to the state's determination of military necessity in Hirabayashi v. United States (1943) in finding that the constitution granted the executive and legislative powers "wide scope for the exercise of judgment and discretion in determining the nature and extent of ... threatened injury or danger." Therefore state actions that ensured the public safety were "not to be condemned merely because in other and in most circumstances racial distinctions are irrelevant."38 The Court did not sanction the state of exception so much as perform it in frankly naming the racial distinction as an exceptional measure. In contrast to this clarity, the Supreme Court in Korematsu v. United States (1944) seemed confused as to if and how the exclusion orders involved race.39 On the one hand, the Court introduced the opinion by noting that "all legal restrictions which curtail the civil rights of a single racial group are immediately suspect." Yet on the other hand, the Court concluded the opinion by denying the significance of "racial prejudice" in this case, since "Korematsu was not excluded from the Military Area because of hostility to him or his race."40 The 'strict-scrutiny' standard (as it later came to be known) seemed to classify the case as racial, yet the denial of its applicability gave just the opposite impression: the Court paradoxically suspended the law in its very articulation. Conflating the political enemy with the hated adversary, the Court's psychologization of race (dis)avowed the state of exception which excepted the raced figure from the normal application of the law. Delivered concurrently with Korematsu, the majority opinion of Ex Parte Endo (1944) similarly equivocated on the role of race in the detainment program: the state had "no authority to subject citizens who are concededly loyal [for ex. Endo] to its leave procedures to detainment" because "loyalty is a matter of the heart and mind, not of race, creed or color."41 Yet while loyalty might not be a matter of race, surely race was made into a matter of loyalty. In this case the Court decided that the writ of habeas corpus applied to a loyal citizen after the racial state of exception suspended it for all Japanese Americans. However, the Court refused to rule on the suspension of the norm for anyone other than those "concededly loyal to its leave procedure." So in limiting the issue to the exceptional, the Court silently articulated the corresponding suspension of the norm for the excepted. Finally, I should note that the Court delivered the Korematsu and Endo opinions immediately after Public Proclamation No. 21 ended the exclusion on December 17 1944 and announced the closing of the camps. The timing of these decisions attests to the Roosevelt administration's influence in foreclosing the possibility of a Court-ordered camp closing, but more significantly to a paradoxical normalization of the state of exception in constitutional law.42

Universalism Good

Universal principles in social policy are critical to improving the standard of living.

Anttonen and Sipila 9 (Anneli and Jorma, profs of social policy, http://www.nova.no/asset/3723/1/3723\_1.pdf) my

If we want to see some light in the tunnel, we assume that there will be more political space for democratic decision making and pure national interests. The nation state’s comeback in difficult times may feed the spirit of universalism, just as wartime. As unemployment and the risk of social exclusion will increase rapidly there will need for activities that show the spirit of social inclusion. Such developments may influence social policies when the crisis is over. General economic considerations are much more positive towards the universal programs. Although expensive the universal programs improve in many ways the basis of economy. Services for children and youth, especially education, are supposed to be valuable investments in human capital (source) and the universal cash benefits do not impede participation in labour force in the form of ‘income traps’ as the residual benefits do (source). The administrative efficiency of universal programs is marvelous compared to selective programs and those who need the benefit also receive it (sources; Bergh 2004).

Liberalism Solves War

Political solutions that weren’t based on antagonism have empirically solved conflict

Scheuerman 6 (William E, Professor of Political Science at Indiana University, Constellations, Vol. 13, No. 1, EBSCO) jl

Schmitt describes the broadening of traditional legal protections to include partisans and guerrillas as the product of a “humane conscience,” but he ultimately underlines its deep incongruities (22–23). In fact, he concludes with the dramatic assertion that the “normative regulation” of irregular combatants is “juridically impossible” (25). No coherent legal regulation of the irregular fighter, it seems, is achievable. International law obscures this harsh fact with vague language and open-ended legal clauses, but “regular law” never can successfully contain or regulate the phenomenon of “irregular fighter.” Regular law and irregular combatant are like oil and water: they simply do not mix. By necessity, the irregular combatant will remain a legal black hole where – or so Schmitt implies – no legal norm can realistically provide a modicum of predictability. Schmitt offers three reasons in support of this view. First, he implicitly relies on the stock argument that “authentic” politics necessarily elides legal regulation: when conflicts involve “existentially” distinct collectivities faced with “the real possibility of killing,” the attempt to tame such conflicts by juridical means is destined to fail, or at least badly distort the fundamental (political) questions at hand. Insofar as the partisan fighter represents one of the last vestiges of authentic (i.e., Schmittian) politics in an increasingly depoliticized world, he has to dub any attempt to regulate the phenomenon at hand as misguided and maybe even dangerous. Yet this argument relies on Schmitt’s controversial model of politics, as outlined eloquently but unconvincingly in his famous Concept of the Political. To be sure, there are intense conflicts in which it is naïve to expect an easy resolution by legal or juridical means. But the argument suffers from a troubling circularity: Schmitt occasionally wants to define “political” conflicts as those irresolvable by legal or juridical devices in order then to argue against legal or juridical solutions to them. The claim also suffers from a certain vagueness and lack of conceptual precision. At times, it seems to be directed against trying to resolve conflicts in the courts or juridical system narrowly understood; at other times it is directed against any legal regulation of intense conflict. The former argument is surely stronger than the latter. After all, legal devices have undoubtedly played a positive role in taming or at least minimizing the potential dangers of harsh political antagonisms. In the Cold War, for example, international law contributed to the peaceful resolution of conflicts which otherwise might have exploded into horrific violence, even if attempts to bring such conflicts before an international court or tribunal probably would have failed.22

International norms check inevitable conflict

Scheuerman 6 (William E. Survey Article: Emergency Powers and the Rule of Law After 9/11\* Political Science, Indiana University, Bloomington The Journal of Political Philosophy: Volume 14, Number 1, 2006, pp. 61–84) TBC 7/10/10

For Schmitt, legal restraints on emergency power are not only misconceived because they fail to anticipate novel crises; they are also inappropriate because the emergency situation may necessitate absolute state power, and hence the surrender of rudimentary legal restraints on its exercise. Basic threats to the survival of the polity legitimize extreme and even violent measures. In Schmitt’s theory, this view depends on a dreary portrayal of the political universe as consisting of a series of ruthlessly competitive collectivities, each of which faces off against existentially defined “others” who pose an imminent life-or-death threat.23 The international system pits such entities against one another in a brutal fight for survival. International political life still contains starkly violent elements akin to those underscored by Schmitt. Yet it also institutionalizes competing elements which function to correct his bleak picture. Even great powers like the United State are increasingly subject to those mechanisms: “the United States, like it or not, is being brought into the ambit of international norms.”24 When we conceive of the international arena as at least partially rule-guided and legally organized, Schmitt’s postulate that the competitive struggle for survival requires potentially unbounded expressions of state power becomes less self-evident as well. Since the international system now contains a number of limited yet meaningful legal mechanisms for conflict resolution, it is by no means as self-evident as Schmitt asserts that dire crises may require dictatorial power. Because existing international legal institutions already provide some legal devices for combating terrorism, for example, liberal democracies may not be forced to pursue authoritarian or violent measures in order to do so.

Alt = War

Schmitt’s idea of ‘friends’ is flawed- he only creates enemies.

Pourciau 5 (Sarah, grad student at Princeton, MLN, Vol. 120, No. 5, pg. 1066-1090, Muse) my

Schmitt’s understanding of collective identity, as a second level of existence that transcends the bodily self, harmonizes perfectly with the theory of self-definition he will eventually develop in The Concept of the Political. But his simple equation of collective identity with political existence, his apparent assumption that a politics of decision necessarily implies a deciding people, evades the dilemma posed by the liberal conundrum and makes it impossible for him to phrase the question that needs asking. Liberalism, which has repeatedly proven itself capable of decisions about the enemy and must therefore be considered political, nevertheless fails to generate a collective identity except in the most banal, numerical sense; in order to support the claim that a politics of acknowledgment forges unity of meaning where liberal politics merely counts votes, Schmitt needs to do more than describe this unity. He needs to define it—in the Schmittian sense of a criterion by which it could be distinguished from its opposite. The question of the relation linking the various bodily “components” of the political self is, of course, in reality a question concerning the meaning of Freund—a question I have thus far evaded by replacing the Freund of the Freund/Feind opposition with the notion of political selfhood. The terminological substitution made it possible to speak, with Schmitt, of a political entity rendered indivisibly one by the power of the political decision. As the need for the substitution makes eminently clear, however, the notion of Freund preferred by Schmitt is far from unproblematic, and the difficulties it calls into being point directly toward an unresolved difficulty at the center of the political “self.” Unlike the word “enemy,” which refers to a unity directed outward toward the object of its hostility, the concept of friendship necessarily implies a plurality of possible friends with whom the friend under investigation could be “friendly.” It therefore introduces into the heart of a seemingly unproblematic formal opposition the very obstacle that Schmitt’s theory ultimately fails to overcome, for despite all his work on the notion of representation, the question of internal relation—of relations among “friends” within the confines of the political self—remains disturbingly undertheorized in his political analyses.16

Alt Fails

The fully rational and calculative state has never existed in history- even the most calculating regimes followed some norms: Alt does nothing.

Scheuerman 96 (William E., The Review of Politics, Vol. 58 No. 2, Spring 1996, pg. 299-332, JSTOR) my

Schmitt believes that the primordial status of the norm-less will is demonstrated, as we saw above, by a host of practical examples. But is the political and historical evidence quite as unambiguous as he suggests? We surely might endorse some elements of Schmitt's deprecatory account of mechanical theories of judicial action in which the decision vanishes as an independent object of inquiry. By the same token, we need to ask whether judicial decision making could ever take a fully norm-less form; even the fascist legal model enthusiastically supported by Schmitt during much of the 1930s entailed a "normative" agenda, albeit a rabidly nationalistic and deeply illiberal one.53 The idea of a legal system without a crucial "normativistic" component is as problematic as Kelsenian positivism's vision of a legal system without coercive, political elements. In modern political history, constitution-making often does presuppose explosive moments of political struggle in which a particular political entity "differentiates" itself from an alien "foe." Yet such struggles hardly occur in a normative vacuum: competing practical ideals and "normativities" obviously play a crucial role even in the most violent, life-threatening political moments-in revolutions, civil wars, and state of emergencies. For that matter, does constitutional history really present us with even a single example of a normatively unregulated pouvoir constituant? Even the Jacobins and Bolsheviks accepted the legitimacy of some procedural rules and norms; even the most disturbing features of modern revolutionary politics express some normative ideals and aspirations, however unattractive they may be. Jacobins and Bolsheviks represent a worrisome variety of "normativism," but their actions hardly embody "a pure decision not based on reason and discussion and not justifying itself."

The idea of the ‘general legal norm’ is too general – norms may develop, killing the alt.

Scheuerman 96 (William E., The Review of Politics, Vol. 58 No. 2, Spring 1996, pg. 299-332, JSTOR) my

But perhaps this is a bit unfair to Schmitt. Surely, his Weimar- era writings devote substantial attention to the task of defining the liberal rule of law, which Schmitt rightly considers the centerpiece of liberal constitutionalist thinking. Schmitt repeatedly argues that only the generality of the legal norm satisfies the conditions of the rule of law-ideal, for judicial independence "in the face of an individual measure is logically inconceivable."42 Legislative action in the form of an individual act destroys any meaningful distinction between judicial and administrative decision-making. When state action is directed at a particular object or individual, judicial activity no longer differs qualitatively from inherently discretionary, situation-specific modes of administrative action; a core element of the rule of law, the idea of determinate, norm-based judicial action, thus becomes obsolete. Normativism quickly turns out to be more slippery than is initially apparent. Like Schmitt's concept of normativism, his definition of general law is too open-ended. For the most part, the concept of general law in Schmitt simply precludes the legal regulation of an individual object (a particular bank or newspaper, for example). But at other junctures, general law is seen as being incompatible with legal "dispensations and privileges, regardless of what form they take"-in short, with virtually any form of more or less specialized legislative activity.43 The latter view is more far- reaching than the former: whereas the former provides a rather minimal restraint on governmental activity, the latter might imply that the rule of law is incompatible with much legislation essential to the modern welfare state. That most normativistic of liberal constitutional normativities-the idea of the general legal norm- is never consistently defined in Schmitt's writings.

Alt Fails

Alt Fails – It’s arbitrary nature entrenches the harms of liberalism

Gross 0 (Oren , Assistant Professor, Tel Aviv University, Faculty of Law, May 2000, Cardozo Law Review,  21 Cardozo L. Rev. 1825, p. 1867-1868 Lexis) TBC 7/10/10

Schmitt's alternative model, which he offers as a replacement to the liberal model, introduces as much predictability as the sovereign's whim. If liberalism's fault inheres in the normative and utopian nature of its structures, Schmitt's fault lies with the apologetic overtones of his proposals. n132 Against liberalism's rigidity, Schmitt puts forward an all too flexible alternative. Whatever the sovereign decides is legitimate. There is no substantive content against which legitimacy of such actions can be measured - not even Hobbes's minimalist principle of self-preservation. Despite Schmitt's attacks against the content-neutrality of liberalism and positivism, his theory, in the last [\*1852] account, is nihilistic. n133 In its purest form, a decision emerges out of nothing, i.e., it does not presuppose any given set of norms, and it does not owe its validity or its legitimacy to any preexisting normative structure. No such structure, therefore, can attempt to limit the decision's scope in any meaningful way. n134 Similarly, since the decision is not the product of any abstract rationality, but is rather reflective of an irrational element, it cannot - by definition - be bound by any element found in the rational dimension. n135 As William Scheuerman pointedly notes: A rigorous decisionist legal theory reduces law to an altogether arbitrary, and potentially inconsistent, series of power decisions, and thus proves unable to secure even a modicum of legal determinacy. It represents a theoretical recipe for a legal system characterized by a kind of permanent revolutionary dictatorship ... Decisionism, at best, simply reproduces the ills of liberal legalism, and, at worst, makes a virtue out of liberalism's most telling jurisprudential vice. n136

Alt fails – the international sphere has shifted to make Schmitt’s analyses inapplicable

Scheppele 4 (Kim Lane, Prof of Comparative Law and Professor of Sociology @ U of Pennsylvania, 6 U. Pa. J. Const. L. 1001) jl

In this Article, I have tried to explain why the logic of Schmitt's analyses no longer work as a practical matter to justify states of exception, even when it is clear to the international community that something fundamental has changed in the world system since 9/11. The institutional elaboration of a new international system that has occurred since Schmitt's time make his ideas seem all the more dangerous, and yet all the more dated. There are simply fewer states in the world willing to tolerate either Schmitt's conception of politics or his conception of the defining qualities of sovereignty. Schmitt's philosophy has, in short, been met with a different sociology. For his ideas to be either persuasive or effective, they must be more than internally coherent or even plausible; they must be loosed in a context in which they can win against other competing ideas. Precisely because of the horrors of the twentieth century, much of the international community that has entrenched both democracy and the rule of law has turned away from these extra-legal justifications for states of exception. Instead, such states have attempted to embed exceptionality as an instance of the normal, and not as a repudiation of the  [\*1083]  possibility of normality. Only the United States, with its eighteenth-century constitution and Cold War legacy of exceptionalism, seems to be soldiering on in this new legal space of conflict unaware that the defining aspect of the new sovereignty is that even the new sovereign is bound by rules.

Alt Fails – People

Schmitt assumes politics are divorced from human decisions – all humans have bias, means the alt can’t solve.

Scheuerman 96 (William E., The Review of Politics, Vol. 58 No. 2, Spring 1996, pg. 299-332, JSTOR) my

Second, Schmitt merely reverses Kelsen's juxtaposition of legal science (and its emphasis on the legal norm) to the problem of concrete political power (the will). But he never questions the value of making this juxtaposition in the first place. Very much like Kelsen, Schmitt repeatedly conceives of the "will" as something altogether distinct from the "norm". At the outset of Constitutional Theory, he emphatically observes that the will, "in contrast to mere norms," is something "existential" (seinsmiifige) and thus qualitatively distinct from the "ought" (Sollen) character of norms. "The concept of the legal order contains two totally different elements: the normative element of the law and the existential (seinsmii3ige) element of a concrete order" (emphasis added].48 Later, he adds that "the word 'will' describes-in contrast to every form of dependence on normative and abstract rightness-the essentially existential nature of the basis of [legal] validity."49 The 1922 Political Theology is even more blunt on this point: validity derives from a "pure decision not based on reason and discussion and not justifying itself, that is ... an absolute decision created out of nothingness."50 Schmitt simply turns Kelsen's worldview on its head. For Kelsen, the normative element of law (conceived of as distinct from state authority) is the centerpiece of legal experience, whereas Schmitt posits that the (decisionistically conceived) will constitutes its core. This shift fails to save Schmitt from the errors of his positivist opponent. Schmitt criticizes Kelsen's value-relativism and worries about its nihilistic overtones.51 But is this not even a better description of Schmitt's own restatement of Kelsen's positivism, particularly in light of Schmitt's uncritical view of the "pure decision not based on reason or discussion and not justifyingitself"? Schmitt perceptively comments that Kelsen's conception of the legal system in terms of "pure normativity" smacks of the realm of make-believe. But what about Schmitt's own "pure" decision, his "will" free of all conceivable normative restraints? Admittedly, Schmitt's extremely open-ended conception of the "normative" makes it difficult to imagine exactly what constitutes a "pure decision" or "norm-less will." But a naive question may be in order here: is it not the case that the human will always and inevitably expresses itself in accordance with some type of norm or "normativistic" outlook? As Max Weber comments at the outset of Economy and Society, human action entails that the "acting individual attaches a subjective meaning to his behavior-be it overt or covert, omission or acquiescence."52 This meaning may be simple or complicated, attractive or repellent, liberal or illiberaLink - in any event, our common world is constituted by means of purposeful human action, by modes of human activity having a practical or normative significance for us. Meaning-constitutive human activity inevitably structures the social world, and facticity and normativity thus inevitably overlap in such a way as to render Schmitt's concept of the will-less norm as one-sided and truncated as Kelsen's corresponding norm-less will. Schmitt's idea of the norm-less will deceptively suggests the possibility of a form of unbridled subjectivity probably incompatible with the basic principles of any identifiably human form of subjectivity. Animals and automatons may act outside the parameters of "normative" concerns. But humankind cannot.

Alt Fails – Liberalism

Schmitt’s critique of liberalism fails- doesn’t address details of liberal thinking under the banner of “normativism”

Scheuerman 96 (William E., The Review of Politics, Vol. 58 No. 2, Spring 1996, pg. 299-332, JSTOR) my

As we saw above, Schmitt attributes the ills of liberal constitutionalism to its purported normativism. Recent commentators have interpreted Schmitt's use of this term (and many related ones, such as "normativity" and "normativization") as an instrument for criticizing universalistic elements of liberalism (liberal ideas about the basic equality of all persons, for example). But this reading probably attributes a degree of precision missing from Schmitt's own usage.40 Normativism refers for Schmitt to a tremendous diversity of distinct ideas: it includes early liberal conceptions of natural law as well as modem legal positivism, robust and unabashedly (universalistic) moral ideals as well as value-relativistic theoretical positions, the rule of law (or: rule of legal norms) and liberal aspirations to subject politics to normative (or moral) concerns, diverse liberal views on the origins of constitutional government alongside a panoply of liberal conceptions of judicial decision making. Although Schmitt offers countless examples of "normativism," "normativization," and "normativities," he never defines these terms with any real specificity. The reader will look at Schmitt's massive oeuvre in vain for an adequate definition of what they precisely entail. However effective as a rhetorical instrument for discrediting liberalism, the concept of normativism simply does not provide as solid a basis for Schmitt's ambitious critique as he believes. Repeatedly, Schmitt crudely subsumes distinct liberal ideas under the (vague) category of normativism. This precludes him from formulating an adequately subtle interpretation of liberal ideals and their distinguishing characteristics; by grouping vastly different versions of liberal thinking (Montesquieu and Kelsen, for example) under the rubric of normativism, Schmitt has already taken substantial steps towards "demonstrating" the intellectual incoherence of liberalism even before he has even begun to articulate any real criticisms of liberal ideals. Furthermore, the straw man of normativism simply does not allow Schmitt to capture the essence of liberal constitutionalism in the first place. As any reader of Aristotle's Politics is well aware, modern liberals hardly stand alone in their praise of the rule of law; as Aquinas shows so well, the attempt to subject politics to "normativistic" (universalistic) moral ideals was essential to medieval Christian political thought. Yet Schmitt's use of the term normativism makes it difficult to determine what makes Locke or Kelsen more "normativistic" than Plato, Aristotle, Aquinas, or any of a host of competing classical authors.41 Schmitt's attack on "normativism" may offer a starting point for criticizing the mainstream of western political thought, but it is hardly the best way to identify and criticize the specific ills of liberal constitutionalism.

Alt Fails – Identity

Even Schmittian criticism strips subjects of their political identities – this causes total war

Scheuerman 6 (William E, Professor of Political Science at Indiana University, Constellations, Vol. 13, No. 1, EBSCO) jl

To be sure, this empirical claim derives in part from Schmitt’s odd postwar theses about the theoretical centrality of concrete space and territoriality. Yet it is also easy to see why Schmitt believed that the historical experience of partisan or guerrilla warfare corroborated his theoretical expectations. In Schmitt’s historical narrative, partisans can be found throughout history. They only take on real significance in the Napoleonic Wars, however, when guerrilla forces posed a deadly challenge to French armies in Spain, Tyrol, and Russia. For Schmitt, these early localized “national” fighters represent a pristine example of partisan warfare, and he delights in recalling the fact that substantial segments of Napoleon’s armies were bogged down in skirmishes with untrained Spanish country yokels, who waged a brutal irregular war that substantially raised the costs of the French occupation. They are paradigmatic for another reason as well: their telluric character stands in stark contrast to the universalizing impulses of the Napoleonic project, which Schmitt interprets as having inherited core features of the Enlightenment legacy of the French Revolution. In his view, the fundamental flaw plaguing recent left-wing guerrilla movements is that they risk abandoning the telluric attributes of their historical predecessors. Although they rest on deep ties to the agrarian population and exploit “the geographical specificity of the country,” and ideological appeal is defensive and particularistic (e.g., their opposition to US imperialism and its globalizing aspirations), modern guerrilla movements are probably destined to shed their telluric roots (50).8 First, their Marxist orientation exists in deep tension with any serious political or theoretical emphasis on the significance of concrete space or territory. Like its liberal Enlightenment cousin, Marxism ultimately leaves no room for this approach. Lenin is thus a more authentic Marxist than Mao, Schmitt suggests, but his inconsistencies as a Marxist simultaneously made Mao better able to appreciate the political and military opportunities of partisan warfare (40–41). Second, modern technology works to counteract an authentically telluric brand of partisan warfare. Mobility in contemporary military affairs rests on advanced technology which clashes badly with the deeply rooted localism of the classical partisan fighter, the original backwoods Spanish guerrillero: even the autochthonous partisan of agrarian origin is drawn into the force-field of irresistible technical-industrial progress. His mobility is so enhanced by motorization that he runs the risk of complete dislocation. (14) When successful guerrilla warfare relies on forms of technology which dramatically compress space and time, his intimate relationship to a concrete locality is lost (48–50). He no longer fights with the farmer’s pitch fork and butcher’s knife; now he needs machine guns and advanced explosives. Dependent on complex technology, and tied to global movements having their own universalistic aspirations (e.g., world revolution), the modern-day partisan fighter losses his telluric character and becomes “a transportable, replaceable cog in the wheel of a powerful world-political machine” (14). Why is this trend so threatening to the identity of the partisan? It renders him indistinguishable from his foes, whose universalistic aspirations he increasingly mirrors: both American liberals and their revolutionary guerrilla opponents claim to speak in the name of a (mythical) unified humanity. In this way, partisans abandon the special connection to concrete territoriality which Schmitt considers essential to their political intensity, jettisoning their healthy political instincts for the fictional normative or moral ideal of the “community of humankind.” Unlike the anti-Napoleonic freedom fighters of Spain or Tyrol, they now disingenuously and self-righteously wage wars “in the name of humanity,” and thus are likely to reproduce the terrible ills of Enlightenmentbased political worldviews which, in Schmitt’s account, engender the horrors of modern total war.9 For this reason, The Partisan, no less than Schmitt’s other works after 1945, ultimately remains a deeply nostalgic book. Even though postwar guerrilla movements initially provide some reason to hope that an authentic mode of politics is alive and well, his study ends on a cautious note, strongly suggesting that the most sophisticated mode of guerrilla warfare in modern times was found among the telluric peasants of early nineteenth century counterrevolutionary Spain, but hardly among the revolutionary movements of 1960s Southeast Asia or Latin and South America.

Alt Fails – Moralism

Even a politics grounded in enmity can justify moralistic violence

Scheuerman 6 (William E, Professor of Political Science at Indiana University, Constellations, Vol. 13, No. 1, EBSCO) jl

Münkler also suggests that Schmitt ultimately failed sufficiently to separate two fundamentally different types of partisan or guerrilla fighter. On the one hand, we find backwards-looking partisans who fight in the name of tradition,15 seek the reestablishment of customary law, and wage a defensive battle against modernizing political and social forces. They best correspond to the telluric quality of partisan warfare described by Schmitt. In sharp contrast to Schmitt, however, Münkler believes that it these “reactionary” partisans who most destructively murder innocent civilians and discard any distinction between legal and illegal combatant. For them, the political foe is an absolute enemy whose physical elimination is justified: they understand themselves as the only true representatives of authentic customs and traditions which their political enemies are simply unable to express or share. In their eyes, the enemy is truly an “existentially alien other.” Notwithstanding the weird case of John Walker Lindh, can a young US soldier ever really partake of the communitarian ethos of “authentic” Islam as interpreted by the Taliban or other extremist groups? On the other hand, guerrilla movements, typically of the left, promise a utopian future, wage an offensive battle (e.g., third world and global revolution), and are driven by a coherent political ideal more than an appeal to tradition. In part because partisans of this type ultimately want to convince political opponents of the justice of their cause and bring them over to their side, they shy away from indiscriminate violence. In communist ideology, even the bourgeois can become a party member: Friedrich Engels, after all, was one of the “fathers of scientific communism,” as school children once memorized in the eastern bloc.16

Alt Fails – Turns into Liberalism

The alt turns the K- flawed conception of the political means political thought will include liberalism

Moore 7 (Thomas, U of Edinborough, Mastery and Dominion: Carl Schmitt's Juridical Concept of the Political, www.era.lib.ed.ac.uk/handle/1842/1532)

This thesis examines the juridical framing of the political in the thought of Carl Schmitt. The purpose of this discussion is to draw attention to the fundamental inconsistencies that are present in Schmitt’s thinking on the political. These inconsistencies arise from Schmitt’s desire to advance a concept of the political that can be understood autonomously in terms of the friend-and-enemy grouping. This thesis argues that Schmitt’s concept of the political should not be understood autonomously but in terms of a juridical ethic of mastery and dominion. Schmitt’s desire to ground the political in an autonomous field of meaning—where the political achieves mastery over all other domains—reduces the political down to a juridical moment. Schmitt fails in his mission to construct an autonomous concept of the political, primarily because theology frames Schmitt’s analysis of sovereignty. Moreover, Schmitt’s concept of the political presupposes the state and a decisionist discourse of sovereignty. Schmitt’s decisionism is expressed in terms of a sublime, symbolising the highest region of both political conduct and knowledge. For Schmitt, mastery and dominion are the core values of the political. This has severe implications for the concept of legality and the democratic functioning of the state. Thinking beyond a juridical formula unleashes political thought from the strictures of both proceduralism (liberalism) and decisionism (authoritarianism). This reflexive approach to the political—present in the work of Foucault, Butler, and Mouffe—allows for the shared regime of mastery and dominion to be critically reformulated. Without the imperative of mastery—the unilateral control of conduct by the subject—political thought is freed from the need to exercise dominion and can focus on the ways in which the subject can be constituted in less exclusionary ways.

Link Turn

The status quo’s policies totalize the enemy and present him to be annihilated- the plan shifts away from this

Specter 4 (Matthew, Ph.D candidate in modern European history, 4/26, http://www.politicaltheory.info/essays/specter.htm) my

The Bush administration was born under a Schmittian star. The Supreme Court's judgment in Bush v Gore (2000) delivered the presidency to Bush through one of the most indefensible readings of constitutional law in American history. So bald was this political instrumentalisation of constitutional law, that it would have made Carl Schmitt blush. Aside from the circumstances of its birth, three features of Bush Administration policy make the label Schmittian seem a good fit. First, their decision to define the attacks of September 11 as acts of war reflects an understanding of Schmitt´s belief that politics requires an enemy, preferably a state. Second is their strategy towards international law: formally reject it, or find a way to interpret it in your favor. Third is their use of what Schmitt called the state of exception, or state of emergency to suspend normal constitutional protections. In this category one can put the attacks on civil liberties represented by the so-called Patriot Act, and the illegal detention of terrorist suspects in Guantanamo Bay. Critics of US foreign policy since WWII have long understood the mobilising function of the Communist threat. With the collapse of the USSR, the global military presence of the US required a new justification. Popular culture and intellectuals alike struggled to fill the void that had been filled by the "evil empire." Political scientist Francis Fukuyama eulogised this condition in his 1989 work, arguing that the apparent triumph of liberal democracy and capitalism marked the "end of history." The next major intellectual effort to orient the U.S. in the post-Cold War world was political scientist Samuel Huntington's The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order (1996), which has obtained a renewed audience after 9-11. Huntington and Fukuyama's works both contain a Schmittian accent: Fukuyama's is in the characterisation of the triumphant liberal bourgeois order as a world without meaningful politics, political causes for which one would be prepared to die. This pathos of conflict is Schmittian. The same pathos of conflict can be found in Huntington's vision of an inevitable clash between regional power-blocs aligned on cultural lines. Before 9-11, the Bush administration had been casting about for an enemy, and seemed to have settled on China. The advantage of formulating the enemy as "terrorists and the states that support them," was that it gave the administration more discretion to choose whom to attack. Schmitt's treatise on The Concept of the Political was a deep and unsparing critique of liberalism. Schmitt believed that liberalism was not a political theory because it had no "positive" theory of the state. In constitutionalism, he saw only "negative" mechanisms for controlling or separating power. As he writes, liberalism "in a very systematic fashion negates or evades the political…there exists no liberal politics, only a liberal critique of politics." (CP, 70) According to Schmitt, all states have internal and external enemies. Being political means being able to recognise threats to the existence of the state. Since in the extreme case, the defense of the state involves physical killing, Schmitt makes of this extremity the defining criterion of "the" political. As he has famously written: "The specific…distinction to which political actions and motives can be reduced is that between friend and enemy… The friend, enemy and combat concepts receive their real meaning precisely because they refer to the real possibility of physical killing." (CP, 33) The problem with liberalism, argues Schmitt, is that liberalism denies the existence of true, mortal enemies. "Liberalism…has attempted to transform the enemy into a competitor from the viewpoint of economics into a competitor and from the intellectual point of view into a debating adversary." (CP, 28) Schmitt emphasizes the concreteness of political judgment, repudiating the idea that neutral or disinterested parties can or should make political decisions. "Only the actual participants can correctly recognize, understand and judge…whether the adversary intends to negate his opponent’s way of life and therefore must be repulsed or fought in order to preserve one’s own form of existence." (CP, 27) In formulating its propaganda selling the wars on Iraq and Afghanistan, the Administration picked up on the essentially Schmittian insight that an enemy is not someone you negotiate with; an enemy must be totally annihilated. Al Qaeda was said to want to "destroy our whole way of life". Saddam Hussein's alleged weapons of mass destruction were represented as a "grave and gathering threat." In his book An End to EviLink - How to Win the War on Terror (2003), Richard Perle, one of the neoconservatives making policy in the White House, alleges that the US faces "intolerable threats" from the states who "sponsor" terrorism, and/or are seeking nuclear weapons: Iran, North Korea, Syria, Libya, and Saudi Arabia. The Bush Administration's most notorious tag-lines also have a Schmittian flavor: the "axis of evil," and the "you're either with us or against us" speeches.

No Link – Terror

Nuclear weapons and terrorism distort the traditional purpose of war- regardless of our rationale it isn’t worth risking extinction.

Palombella 07 (Gianluigi, Prof. of Legal Studies, EUI Working Papers, http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=987250) my

If war is not an end in itself, but rather the intimate logic of political- type social relations among States, it has a precise relation with the nature of the world order, it is a sort of recourse to the supreme decision for the manifestation or re-production of the order. War produces new forms of social political order, and redefines the scenarios of coexistence, though along the lines of the friend-enemy dual concept. However, the evolution of the world as well as that of technological capacities and the appearance of non-state actors in the scenario of international conflict, seem to deprive war of its once current meaning. The effort to understand war through peace, i.e. through the idea of which social relations the war should produce, does not seem either epistemologically or critically prone to any success. This happens when it becomes impossible to see peace as the outcome of every war, when “the” war changes nature, so much so that it represents a type of conflict that cannot be “won” and maybe not even “concluded”. This is highlighted by changes in war, up to the XX and XXI centuries. The risk of nuclear conflict and global terrorism promote a change in paradigm that deprives war of the possibility to be what it should be: it removes its ultimative character. When the hypothesis of a nuclear war emerges, war cools down, it denies itself, and actors are no longer able to stake everything. The nuclear conflict and terrorism deprive war of its traditional identity and prevent it from being conducted sensibly. Its “solemn” functions disappear: i.e. functions related on the one hand to the chivalrous confrontation between sovereign States and on the other to the affirmation of a “final” dominium, and therefore to the purpose to “re-order” the world, to undergo the cyclic redefinition of the “sense” of international political reality. War, instead, threatens nuclear destruction, or an endless repetition and dissemination, in forms totally uncontrollable by States, through terrorism

No Link – Heg

Spreading hegemony and democracy ensures a break from moral righteousness – collapsing and breaking this ‘double-bind’ leads to global problems.

Buck-Morss 8 (Susan, prof. of political philosophy and social theory, Cultural Critique, Vol. 69, Spring 2008, pg. 145, Muse) my

With U.S. global dominance at the end of the Cold War, the scene was set for the perfect storm, a doubling of the state of exception, as nomic and national sovereignties converged in the same geographic space. When it becomes a matter of U.S. national interest to preserve its own global hegemony—hegemony that was solidified by a onetime, contingent historical event, that is, the implosion of the Soviet Union that left the United States by default as the sole global superpower— then both the globe and the nation are caught in a double bind: We are told that the general universalism of U.S. moral principles needs to be suspended to meet the threat to this country’s particular, national–democratic sovereignty, while at the same time, the law and constitutional guarantees specific to the United States need to be suspended domestically to “spread democracy” abroad. This is the self-contradictory and self-defeating situation in which we have been placed by the U.S. government today. The problem was brought to a head by the terrorist attacks of Al-Qaeda, and in my closing comments I will attempt to sketch out the implications. Al-Qaeda is engaged in postnational politics, which makes it immune from the historically specific, Western logic of national sovereignty based on territorial states. But it is preglobal politics, because of the exclusiveness of its sense of community. Like the medieval European nomos, it is based on the idea of religious legitimation: Its founding principle is the sovereignty of God. Like the U.S. nomos, its bid for global hegemony appeals to the general universalism of moral right. The limitations of both these conceptions of global order have been demonstrated historically, and radical Islam has not (yet) indicated its capacity, or its will to overcome them. But is the alternative the universalization of the principle of national sovereignty as advocated by the United States, and does it justify continued U.S. global hegemony in order to achieve this? If the United States, having been accidentally granted by history a time of global hegemony, had reversed its imperial past and insisted on practicing its own universal principles rather than suspending them, if it had not argued that on the basis of national interests it could not ratify the Kyoto agreements, could not join the International Criminal Court, could not assent to UN control of the disarmament process in Iraq— if, in short, the United States, as the means for spreading democracy, had actually practiced democracy on a global scale, the answer might be yes. But precisely such a practice of democracy has been seen as inimical to the national interests of the United States. U.S. democratic legitimacy as a sovereign nation is on a collision course with U.S. hegemonic legitimacy as a nomic sovereign. This collision has the force to break the old nomos—without, however, when it crumbles, being capable of guaranteeing a new order to replace it. The double indemnity that the world faces when these two sovereign principles collide, seen from the seat of power, leads the sovereign himself into a double bind. And this has important implications for political praxis—important, because the problem is not exclusively that of the Republican administration. It is no accident that the Democratic Party finds very little in principle that it would change in U.S. foreign policy, were it to win the presidency, as the protection of U.S. hegemonic status within a U.S.–instigated global world order is not (yet) considered by any mainstream candidate to be negotiable.

Perm

Permutation: Even if the friend-enemy distinction is good, using it exclusively causes conflict. The perm is the best option.

Thorup 6 (Mikkel Thorup, Ph.D. dissertation @ the Institute of Philosophy and the History of Ideas, January, 2006, “In Defence of Enmity – Critiques of Liberal Globalism,” p. 39-40, TH) NAR

This text is mainly about the potential dangers of the liberal approach to politics. But this is not turning it into an unqualified defence or advocacy of the conflict perspective. As an illustration of the dangers of what we can call ‘manichean decisionism’, I’ll briefly mention an article on Schmitt’s concept of the political by Bernard Willms (1991), in which he classifies two traditions of political thinking: political realism and political fictionalism (try to guess his position!). Political fictionalism “subordinates politics to ‘higher’ principles or ‘truths’”, whereas political realism is “the permanently repeated attempt to conceive of politics as what in fact it is” (1991: 371). It is a (unintended) caricature on the self-professed realist’s sense of superiority because of their courage and ability to confront the really real reality: Political fictionalisms help to satisfy man’s need for consolation, edification, hope and sense, tending to veil real conditions of government. The political realist seeks to identify necessities – irrespective of their severity and without consideration for any need for deceit under the existing government. (1991: 371-2) This is the kind of reductionism of the political that I want to avoid. Working with Schmitt’s categories and critiques entails a danger of falling in the (very self-comforting) trap of proclaiming only one true and ‘hard’ version of the political and of dismissing all others as fictions and wishful thinking. Primacy of the political becomes primacy of foreign policy, organized violence etc. The political is effectively reduced to a few areas – which is just what liberalism is criticized for doing. The friend/enemy distinction or conflictuality may often be a dominant feature of the political, but that is not to say that it is then the political. As Ankersmit (1996: 127) says, that would be the same as making the unavoidability of marital disagreements into the very foundation of marriage as such. I want instead to argue that the political contains a number of styles, sides, variants (or whatever one want to call it) that can very loosely and ideal-typically be grouped in two main forms: Politics as conflict and politics as technique, where neither of them can claim exclusivity. So, I want to avoid a sterile discussion of what the political really is. My interest is far more the various styles of the political that are operative in political debate. Schmitt and many other conflict theoreticians do not see the other face of the political as anything other than a ‘secondary’, ‘dependent’, ‘corrupted’ expression of politics. Liberals tend to exclude politics as conflict, confining it to other spaces in time or geography, as aberration or relapse. What the two concepts each do is to highlight a certain aspect of the political, and my claim is that they are elements of a unity. There’s a certain pendulum process at work and I’ll give that a number of expressions, which basically states the not very controversial thought that the political world is located between the extremes of repetition and break, stability and change, regime and revolution, or, as I prefer to call them, technique and conflict. Depoliticization, then, is a way to describe the attempts to or methods of making repetition, stability and regime universal and eternal – to place areas, practices and actors beyond change and critique – whereas repoliticization describes the opposite movement – disruption, change, recreation of the entire social space.

War Not Inevitable

War is only inevitable if we accept the ‘us’ – ‘them’ mentality. If we accept each other as humans we can all be under the same banner.

Coon 00 (Carl Coon, Humanist, http://www.progressivehumanism.com/war.html) NAR

I believe war was inevitable as long as the main organizing principle of human society, above the level of family and tribe, was humanity's division into groups that identified themselves by their cultural distinctiveness. We have seen how such groups naturally drifted into conflict with each other throughout human history. But this was because the winners in these conflicts were usually the ones with intense internal loyalty and solidarity. How about the other principle, that winners tend to get bigger and more inclusive? Hasn't that produced a qualitative change by now? Yes, and therein lies hope for the future. The culmination of the natural trend for distinctive groups to grow larger was the nation state. World War II was the last act of a long era of human experience that started with the dawn of the Neolithic. Now we are beginning the next, third phase, where culturally identified groups will no longer play the central role in achieving human progress that they have played right up through the middle of the twentieth century. We're not transforming ourselves willingly, or even for the most part consciously, but we're doing it anyway because we have to. We've been pushed by new threats of our own making, notably the population explosion, increasingly obvious environmental challenges, and the threat of nuclear war leading to mutual annihilation. Like our ancestors ten thousand years ago, we are being forced by the results of our own actions and successes to mutate into a new kind of society based on a new organizing principle. The transition has been evident in our own experiences, in our lifetimes, in the United States and a few other places where old-fashioned cultures have been mixed and blended and have lost their harsher outlines. The signs are all around us. Think about it, reflect on the implications of globalization, the internet, the new concept of universal human rights, the political incorrectness of ethnic humor, the growth of transnational economic institutions and regional political ones, new thinking about gender relations... It all is part of a massive change in the way people live and think. We are crashing through a kind of social sound barrier. We are doing it right now, it is happening in our lifetimes. We are witnessing the birth of a new kind of global society. The course for all of us who want to make that brave new world more just and humane is simply this: get rid once and for all of the old culture-bound ways of thinking, first in ourselves and then in anyone else we can persuade. Move to a new level of "us vs. them", where we include all humanity in our definition of "us". Does this mean the end of human progress? Certainly not, any more than the dawn of the Neolithic meant the end of human progress. Competition will continue in the future, but it won't be between cultures, it will be between ideas, schools of thought, philosophies; we shall argue about our goals and how best to achieve them, but we need not enter into armed conflict. We'll know better. We are at a new beginning, and the view ahead, though cloudy, is rich with promise. War will continue for a while, certainly during the rest of our lives, but it will no longer be functional in an evolutionary sense, and it will wither away as everyone comes to realize and accept the essential unity of humankind.

A2: Humanism Bad

**There is a biological truth to being human – we can hold this fact to unite us beyond identity**

Coon 5 (Carl Coon, Humanist, http://www.progressivehumanism.com/Humanismandrace.html) NAR

The view that race is a human construct, not a biological reality, established itself as politically correct during and after the Second World War, as a reaction to the crimes of the Nazis, carried out against Jews, gypsies, and others that their persecutors identified in racial terms. And it was not only the Nazis who were committing ugly acts of racial discrimination. Our own blacks were still getting lynched and our whole country was going through a kind of crisis of conscience. From the liberal point of view, rooting out racism became a crusade, to be waged with any and all available weapons. Under these circumstances it was perhaps inevitable that mainstream liberals, including many anthropologists and other academic authorities, decided to shoot the messenger, and root out any systematic study of race as well as racial discrimination. Scientists with established expertise on racial differences were ignored or worse, while a larger body of biologists, geneticists, and anthropologists assembled a hodgepodge of “evidence” to support their contention that the problem was all in the minds of the offending “racists.” Throughout this period, advances in the biological sciences, particularly in medicine, provided increasingly compelling evidence that the human species is in fact a species like other species, with a tendency to evolve sub-specific variations within populations that live far apart and where, over the generations, there has been time to adapt to different environments. This reality continues to intrude on the fantasies of the politically correct. It is rather like the denials of the Bush administration about global warming, that are getting chipped away by an increasingly comprehensive body of scientific evidence. Just the other day the Washington Post frontpaged a decision by the FDA to approve a drug “...to treat heart failure in African Americans.” The unanimous decision to approve the drug was followed by a majority vote to authorize labeling it as specifically intended for our black population. That labeling crossed the line of political correctness and instantly drew fire, with reactions like the following: “There is no scientific basis on which to claim race-specific efficacy...” “The effort to stereotype this drug as a race drug needs to be universally decried...” Those were ones the Post reported; presumably there were other angry reactions. The drug had been laboriously tested. It appeared to offer no benefit to the general public but was extraordinarily effective among African Americans. This should come as no surprise, as the medical profession has long been aware of various physiological differences between American blacks and whites. One has the sense that the political establishment was less shocked by the fact that this particular racial difference existed, as by the fact that an official agency should publicly recognize its existence. Now this is where humanists should step in and raise a warning signal. We do, after all, believe in the scientific method. We recognize that no answers are perfect in this imperfect world, but that answers arrived at through the laborious method of analysing and testing and cross-checking and testing again are more likely to work for us than answers obtained through some process of revelation or wishful thinking. This is just as important a core value of the humanist world view as the belief that all people are important and deserve a shot at the good things of life. What are we, anyway, if our perception of reality is based on revelation not science? There is a quick and easy way out of this dilemma. We have only to refer to the following quote from Humanist Manifesto II: “We deplore racial, religious, ethnic, or class antagonisms. Although we believe in cultural diversity and encourage racial and ethnic pride, we reject separations which promote alienation and set people and groups against each other; we envision an integrated community where people have a maximum opportunity for free and voluntary association.” In other words, race exists, and when it is used as a way of whipping up antagonisms between groups it is bad. By implication, however, the simple fact that people are different, and part of the difference is racial, is not inherently bad. It is certainly not something to be swept under the rug if possible and generally deplored. It is an integral part of the diversity that makes our species so interesting.

Schmitt = Nazi

Schmitt is a Nazi- believes Jews are responsible for every crisis

Holmes 93 (Stephen, The Anatomy of Antiliberalism, pg. 38-9, Google Books) my

Once the Nazis seized power, he declared triumphantly that the liberal illusion was now doomed to disappear. Germans “have now realized that liberal constitutions are the typical disguise in which foreign domination appears." Perfidious Jewish writers smuggled liberal constitutional principles into Wilhelminian Germany, weakening the monarchy and preparing for the great disaster of 1918; now their noxious influence could be expunged. In his famous article defending the Rohm purge, Schmitt yet again asserted that liberalism had crippled the imperial regime, overprotecting the private sphere and preventing officials from crushing mutineers. At last, in 1933, German victimization had engendered its healthy opposite; "all moral indignation about the scandal of such a collapse has concentrated itself in Adolf Hitler.'" Schmitt's growing celebrity eventually provoked the envy of party hacks, particularly in the SS. Accused of being insincerely antisemitic, he redeemed himself by hosting a conference on "German jurisprudence at war with the Jewish spirit." Published on October 15, 1936, in the official Deutsche Juristen-Zeitung, Schmitt's closing speech was a masterful performance, if he was merely engaged, as his apologists contend, in a hypocritical attempt to please authorities. Holding Jews accountable for a moral crisis in the West, he described them as “the deadly enemy of every genuine productivity of every other people.” To help sustain “the undamaged purity of the German people,” law faculties must create “a German jurisprudence no longer infected by Jews." To avoid the "atrocious suggestion” that German students should use Jewish ideas, books by Jews must be yanked from the shelves and confined to a special section labeled “Judaica." Airy anti-semitic discussions, by which “no individual Jew feels himself personally touched,” are ineffective. Only a detailed public register of Jewish scholars will permit a “cleansing" of German jurisprudence. Footnotes should read, for example: Kelsen, Hans, Jew. “The very mention of the word Jewish will be a wholesome exorcism.”’

The political is not defined by conflict– their affirmation of agonistic conflict is indistinguishable from Schmitt’s Nazism

Gross 0 (Oren , Assistant Professor, Tel Aviv University, Faculty of Law, May 2000, Cardozo Law Review,  21 Cardozo L. Rev. 1825, p. 1867-1868 Lexis) TBC 7/10/10

For Carl Schmitt, normalcy is of little, if any, interest; the exception - emergency and crisis - is what consumes his entire attention. Schmitt has been described as: The outstanding legal theorist of the notion of exception, hence much less a thinker of the norms reflecting normalcy - that is to say laws - than the outspoken legitimizer of the form and practice of measure: acts unilaterally taken by the executive in a state of political despair, as stipulated in a separate legal tradition of martial law, of etat de siege, and of Ausnahmezustand. n190 Schmitt's theory revolves entirely around pathological cases of legal and political orders. His worldview is apocalyptic, inasmuch as he identifies politics with permanent crisis and conflict. n191 Schmitt is confronted with a grave situation in his own country in the early 1920s. His initial attempt to offer one constitutional solution to Germany's troubles takes him in the direction of adopting the model of the commissarial dictatorship. Yet, within a short time, he changes his earlier position and, in [\*1867] 1922, he formulates his radical theory of the exception, which is so succinctly summed up by the opening statement in Political Theology: "Sovereign is he who decides on the exception." n192 Political Theology was originally published in March, 1922. Its second edition, published twelve years later, in 1934, remained, according to the author's own testimony, "unchanged." n193 In fact, in the preface to the second edition, Schmitt invites his readers to "judge to what extent this short publication... has withstood the test of time." n194 When viewed against the history of the Weimar Republic, this lack of change is significant in itself. Schmitt obviously finds no reason to rethink his theory, despite the rise to power of the National Socialist Party and the nomination of Adolf Hitler as chancellor some ten months before Schmitt extends this "invitation to judge" to his readers. Even those who may wish to argue that Schmitt was not fully aware of the dangerous implications of his own theory in 1922, will be hard pressed to argue the same with respect to his clear statements twelve years later. Schmitt's exceptionalism is indefensible as a normative project. His challenge to liberalism's perceived inadequacy in dealing with the state of exception leads him to set his sights solely on the exception to the utter disregard of the normal - the rule. However, Schmitt's attack on liberalism does seem to have a point, insofar as real world practice is concerned. It is this aspect of Schmitt's writing which ought to interest us and which is still significant today.

Schmitt = Nazi

This isn’t just an ad-hom – Schmitt was a Nazi whose ideas directly killed millions. Reject any normative claim emanating from a reading of Schmitt

Gross 0 (Oren , Assistant Professor, Tel Aviv University, Faculty of Law, May 2000, Cardozo Law Review,  21 Cardozo L. Rev. 1825, p. 1867-1868 Lexis) TBC 7/10/10

For ten out of twelve people in my paternal grandfather's immediate family in Poland (four of them young children) the Final Solution exercised by the murderous Nazi machine was no political exercise, nor a theoretical debate. It was their "existential negation." Unlike Carl Schmitt, they did not live to be 96 years old or fulfill their individual potential, because they were decreed to be the public enemy, and for so many of Schmitt's ilk, also a very private enemy. My maternal grandfather, who completed his Ph.D. in law in Germany and practiced there, was luckier. He merely lost his career, not his life, on the altar of homogeneity of the legal profession - necessary, according to Schmitt, in order to achieve determinacy and predictability in the legal order. There are times when academics do not enjoy the privilege of [\*1868] not taking sides and not expressing positions. And when they do, their words and actions matter and they stand accountable for them. Carl Schmitt expressed his positions clearly and acted upon them. All those who continue to debate his legacy must remember at all times that this is not some exercise conducted in the ivory towers of academia with which we are involved. It is a matter of life, and even more so, of death. "Theoretical discussions never take place in a vacuum and there can be no philosophical thought without political consequences." n195

Schmitts own contradictory theories lapse back into fascism

Gross 0 (Oren, Assistant Professor, Tel Aviv University, Faculty of Law,   
21 Cardozo L. Rev. 1825, Lexis) jl

From a normative perspective, Schmitt's theory, simply put, is indefensible. [n14](http://www.lexisnexis.com/us/lnacademic/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1278777793360&returnToKey=20_T9717311048&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.607687.5481712838" \l "n14) In this article, I engage in an internal evaluation of his theory of the exception. Such a critique - taking Schmitt's own goals, parameters, and criteria as our reference point - drives substantial holes into his theoretical corpus. For all the rhetoric of Schmitt and his disciples and defenders, his theory proves to be a crude version of nihilism. Yet, this approach is hidden behind the veneer of overt aspiration to legal determinacy [n15](http://www.lexisnexis.com/us/lnacademic/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1278777793360&returnToKey=20_T9717311048&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.607687.5481712838" \l "n15) and to substantive, semireligious content of the legal order. [n16](http://www.lexisnexis.com/us/lnacademic/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1278777793360&returnToKey=20_T9717311048&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.607687.5481712838" \l "n16) Among other things, Schmitt challenges liberalism for being negligent, if not outright deceitful, in disregarding the state of exception, and in pretending that the legal universe is governed by a complete, comprehensive, and exceptionless normative order. [n17](http://www.lexisnexis.com/us/lnacademic/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1278777793360&returnToKey=20_T9717311048&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.607687.5481712838" \l "n17) Following the guidance of the natural sciences - which, according to Schmitt, do not recognize the possibility of exceptions in the natural world - liberalism presents us with a legal world view that is based on universalism, generalities, and utopian normativeness, without allowing for the possibility of exceptions. Against liberalism's intellectual dishonesty, Schmitt offers an alternative that is allegedly candid and transparent. However, Schmitt's project does not comply with his own yardsticks of legitimacy. His theory falls  [\*1829]  prey to the very same basic challenge which he puts to liberalism. Schmitt's rhetoric of norm and exception does not adequately reflect the real thrust of his theory, which calls for the complete destruction of the normal by the exception. Taken to its logical extreme, Schmitt's intellectual work, especially as reflected in his Political Theology [n18](http://www.lexisnexis.com/us/lnacademic/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1278777793360&returnToKey=20_T9717311048&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.607687.5481712838" \l "n18) and The Concept of the Political, [n19](http://www.lexisnexis.com/us/lnacademic/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1278777793360&returnToKey=20_T9717311048&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.607687.5481712838" \l "n19) forms the basis not only for a normless exception, but also for an authoritarian exceptionless exception. Part I of this article focuses on these themes.

A2: Not Our Schmitt

You can’ separate Schmitt from is authoritarian conclusions – it all relies on the same assumptions

Scheuerman 6 (William E, Professor of Political Science at Indiana University, The Journal of Political Philosophy, Vol. 14, No. 1, EBSCO) jl

Yet a rich array of contemporary analysts of emergency power now apparently considers it possible to accept some of Schmitt’s theoretical claims without endorsing his authoritarian conclusions. In particular, Schmitt’s contention that emergency power is incapable of being effectively contained or restrained by legal and constitutional norms—in Schmitt’s own terms, the idea that the exception necessarily explodes the confines of any general norm—has garnered a number of disciples, none of whom apparently considers Schmitt’s own authoritarianism a necessary consequence. Because of their significance to the present debate, I begin with a critical review of Schmitt’s core ideas about emergency powers (Sec. I), before systematically interrogating attempts to employ those ideas in the aftermath of 9/11. Unfortunately, those who embrace Schmitt’s ideas about emergency power inevitably generate internal conceptual dilemmas that undermine their professed commitments to the rule of law (Sec. II). After underscoring the weaknesses of this approach, I examine some more fruitful attempts to synthesize emergency power and liberal democracy. They start with the anti-Schmittian thesis that emergency power can in fact be successfully legalized, and that legal and constitutional mechanisms for emergency power need not self-destruct. Unfortunately, these proposals are plagued by a series of unstated yet problematic assumptions concerning executive power, the immediate carrier of any emergency government (Sec. III).

Schmitt Kills Democracy

Schmitt destroys democracy

Scheuerman 6 (William E. Survey Article: Emergency Powers and the Rule of Law After 9/11\* Political Science, Indiana University, Bloomington The Journal of Political Philosophy: Volume 14, Number 1, 2006, pp. 61–84) TBC 7/10/10

Tushnet’s proposal is even more vulnerable to some of the criticisms directed against Gross. Most obviously, a model which condones executive crisis measures beyond the bounds of the law while disparaging the possibility of legal controls altogether hardly seems supportive of the rule of law. Tushnet’s radical democratic allusions to a “mobilized citizenry” obviously distinguishes him from Schmitt. Yet his sharp conceptual juxtaposition of democratic politics to traditional elements of liberal legality (e.g., the idea of a people acting “out of [legal] doors”) echoes Schmitt’s attempt to draw a bright line between democracy and liberalism. As has been widely noted in the secondary literature in Schmitt, however, this leaves Schmitt with a portrayal of democracy amounting to little more than mass-based authoritarian rule, in which “the people” become a plaything of their rulers. Democracy without civil liberties, the rule of law, or constitutionalism is not, in fact, democracy, but instead most likely rule of the mob by politically manipulative elites. The same can probably be expected of a democracy in which the citizenry lacks effective legal restrains on executive emergency action. Given Tushnet’s endorsement of some of Schmitt’s ideas, it might be useful for him better to explain how his model of crisis government would help secure us from yet another variety of executive-centered mass rule. Recent political history provides examples galore of political leaders relying on the specter of crises—real or otherwise—to generate “vigilant” public support while undertaking illegal and unconstitutional action. Authoritarian emergency government and some measure of popular mobilization are by no means necessarily opposed.

A2 Security K

**A2: Self-Fulfilling Prophecy**

The plan will not create violence because the action is defensive securitization, not offensive.

Montgomery 6 (Evan, Research Fellow at Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments, *International Security*, Vol. 31, No. 2, pp. 151-185)

Defensive realists also rely on two particular variables—the offense-defense balance and offense-defense differentiation—to explain when states can and will reveal their motives.10 Specifically, when defense is distinguishable from and more effective than offense, benign states can adopt military postures that provide for their security without threatening others. Combining both variables yields six ideal-type conditions, yet only one—offense-defense differentiation and a neutral offense-defense balance—clearly allows security seekers to communicate their motives without increasing their vulnerability. Offense- defense differentiation is a necessary condition for reassurance without vulnerability, as benign and greedy states will each be able to choose military postures that visibly reflect their preferences.

Offensive vs defensive securitization actions can have very different impacts – defensive actions create reassurance of peace between nations.

Montgomery 6 (Evan, Research Fellow at Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments, *International Security*, Vol. 31, No. 2, pp. 151-185)

Because a state’s military posture serves as an indicator of its likely behavior, the offense-defense balance also affects how states perceive their rivals. Defensive realists maintain that a state’s security policies are determined in part by its assessment of others’ intentions and motives.16 Hard-line strategies are generally chosen when others are thought to be hostile. For example, states are more likely to balance against than bandwagon with adversaries believed to be “unalterably aggressive.”17 Most realists would agree, moreover, that these beliefs are largely a function of a state’s military posture. Barry Posen notes that, “in watching one another, states tend to focus on military doctrines and military capabilities,” and “take these capabilities at face value.”18 This suggests that, at a minimum, the offense-defense balance communicates information about others’ immediate intentions. When offense has the advantage, states believe that others are more likely to attack. When defense has the advantage, states know that others are less likely to do so. The security dilemma can therefore be exacerbated or mitigated absent any knowledge of others’ underlying motives; the choice of offensive or defensive postures can indicate what a state will do, but those postures may themselves be the result of structural pressures rather than state preferences.

Defensive securitization efforts can lead to mutual assurance and certainty – Gorbachev proves.

Montgomery 6 (Evan, Research Fellow at Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments, *International Security*, Vol. 31, No. 2, pp. 151-185)

Even before the reductions in strategic nuclear weapons achieved in the 1991 Strategic Arms Reduction Talks treaty, military reassurance played an important role in altering the prevalent belief that the Soviet Union was an aggressive state. Gorbachev’s concessions rejected the general logic of defensive realism—relative losses in capabilities could be accepted if an increase in security was the net result.126 The impact of offense-defense variables on Soviet re- assurance would also seem to be evident: the large defensive advantage afforded by nuclear deterrence allowed Gorbachev to sacrifice the Soviet Union’s offensive conventional capability, which helped to reduce uncertainty over Soviet motives while leaving its security undiminished. Gorbachev’s own views suggest this logic; possession of nuclear weapons implied that “if one country engages in a steady arms buildup while the other does nothing, the side that arms will all the same gain nothing.”127 Yet this cannot be entirely correct, because U.S. policymakers did not act as though defense was overwhelmingly strong or that nuclear weapons ruled out a military conflict. Rather, the success of Gorbachev’s efforts depended on the belief among NATO members that the Soviet Union’s conventional forces did indeed constitute an offensive capability that posed a genuine threat to Western Europe. If this were not the case, the reduction of those forces would have done little to make the United States and its allies less fearful and more secure and would not have demonstrated benign motives.

A2: Self-Fulfilling Prophecy

Modern security measures and discourses make war highly unlikely, and allow for peaceful reassurance between countries.

Jervis 1 (Robert, Prof. of International Politics at Columbia Univ., *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 96, No. 1, March 2002, pp. 1-14)

Predictions about the maintenance of the Community are obviously disputable (indeed, limitations on people’s ability to predict could undermine it), but nothing in the short period since the end of the Cold War points to an unraveling. The disputes within it do not seem to be increasing in number or severity and even analysts who stress the continuation of the struggle for world primacy and great power rivalries do not expect fighting [Huntington 1993; Kupchan forthcoming; Waltz 1993, 2000; however, Calleo (2001), Layne (2000), and Mearsheimer (1990, 2001) are ambiguous on this point]. If the United States is still concerned with maintaining its advantages over its allies, the reason is not that it believes that it may have to fight them but that it worries that rivalry could make managing world problems more difficult (Layne 2000; New York Times, March 8, 1992, 14; May 24, 1992, 1, 14). The Europeans’ effort to establish an independent security force is aimed at permitting them to intervene when the United States chooses not to (or perhaps by threatening such action, to trigger American intervention), not at fighting the United States. Even if Europe were to unite and the world to become bipolar again, it is very unlikely that suspicions, fears for the future, and conflicts of interest would be severe enough to break the Community. A greater threat would be the failure of Europe to unite coupled with an American withdrawal of forces, which could lead to “security competition” within Europe (Art 1996a; Mearsheimer 2001, 385–96). The fears would focus on Germany, but their magnitude is hard to gauge and it is difficult to estimate what external shocks or kinds of German behavior would activate them. The fact that Thatcher and Mitterrand opposed German unification is surely not forgotten in Germany and is an indication that concerns remain. But this danger is likely to constitute a self-denying prophecy in two ways. First, many Germans are aware of the need not only to reassure others by tying themselves to Europe, but also to make it unlikely that future generations of Germans would want to break these bonds even if they could. Second, Americans who worry about the residual danger will favor keeping some troops in Europe as the ultimate intra-European security guarantee. Expectations of peace close off important routes to war. The main reason for Japanese aggression in the 1930s was the desire for a self-sufficient sphere that would permit Japan to fight the war with the Western powers that was seen as inevitable, not because of particular conflicts, but because it was believed that great powers always fight each other. In contrast, if states believe that a security community will last, they will not be hypersensitive to threats from within it and will not feel the need to undertake precautionary measures that could undermine the security of other members. Thus the United States is not disturbed that British and French nuclear missiles could destroy American cities, and while those two countries object to American plans for missile defense, they do not feel the need to increase their forces in response. As long as peace is believed to be very likely, the chance of inadvertent spirals of tension and threat is low. Nevertheless, the point with which I began this section is unavoidable. World politics can change rapidly and saying that nothing foreseeable will dissolve the Community its not the same as saying that it will not dissolve (Betts 1992). To the extent that it rests on democracy and prosperity (see below), anything that would undermine these would also undermine the Community. Drastic climate change could also shake the foundations of much that we have come to take for granted. But it is hard to see how dynamics at the international level (i.e., the normal trajectory of fears, disputes, and rivalries) could produce war among the leading states. In other words, the Community does not have within it the seeds of its own destruction. Our faith in the continuation of this peace is in- creased to the extent that we think we understand its causes and have reason to believe that they will continue. This is our next topic.

A2: Self-Fulfilling Prophecy

Current international conditions make war unthinkable – the self-fulfilling prophecy claims are fundamentally false.

Jervis 1 (Robert, Prof. of International Politics at Columbia Univ., *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 96, No. 1, March 2002, pp. 1-14)

My explanation for the development and maintenance of the Community combines and reformulates several factors discussed previously. Even with the qualifica- tions just discussed, a necessary condition is the belief that conquest is difficult and war is terribly costly. When conquest is easy, aggression is encouraged and the security dilemma operates with particular vicious- ness as even defensive states need to prepare to attack (Van Evera 1999). But when states have modern armies and, even more, nuclear weapons, it is hard for anyone to believe that war could make sense. Of course statesmen must consider the gains that war might bring as well as its costs. Were the former to be very high, they might outweigh the latter. But, if anything, the expected benefits of war within the Community have declined, in part because the developed countries, including those that lost World War II, are generally satisfied with the status quo.16 Even in the case that shows the greatest strain—U.S.–Japanese relations—no one has explained how a war could pro- vide anyone much gross, let alone net, benefit: it is hard to locate a problem for which war among the Commu- nity members would provide a solution. The other side of this coin is that, as liberals have stressed, peace within the Community brings many gains, especially economic. While some argue that the disruption caused by relatively free trade is excessive and urge greater national regulation, no one thinks that conquering others would bring more riches than trad- ing with them. Despite concern for relative economic gain (Grieco 1990; Mastanduno 1991) and economic disputes, people believe that their economic fates are linked more positively than negatively to the rest of the Community. Of course costs and benefits are subjective, depend- ing as they do on what the actors value, and changes in values are the third leg of my explanation. Most political analysis takes the actors’ values for granted because they tend to be widely shared and to change slowly. Their importance and variability become clear only when we confront a case such as Nazi Germany, which, contrary to standard realist conceptions of na- tional interest and security, put everything at risk in order to seek the domination of the Aryan race. The changes over the last 50–75 years in what the leaders and publics in the developed states value are striking. To start with, war is no longer seen as good in itself (Mueller 1989); no great power leader today would agree with Theodore Roosevelt that “no triumph of peace is quite so great as the supreme triumph of war” (quoted by Harbaugh 1961, 99). In earlier eras it was commonly believed that war brought out the best in individuals and nations and that the virtues of dis- cipline, risk-taking, and self-sacrifice that war required were central to civilization. Relatedly, honor and glory used to be central values. In a world so constituted, the material benefits of peace would be much less important; high levels of trade, the difficulty of mak- ing conquest pay, and even nuclear weapons might not produce peace. Democracy and identity also operate through what actors value, and may be responsible in part for the decline in militarism just noted. Compromise, consideration for the interests of others, respect for law, and a shunning of violence outside this context all are values that underpin democracy and are reciprocally cultivated by it. The Community also is relatively homogeneous in that its members are all democracies and have values that are compatibly similar. It is important that the values be compatible as well as similar: a system filled with states that all believed that war and domi- nation was good would not be peaceful.17 One impulse to war is the desire to change the other country, and this disappears if values are shared. The United States could conquer Canada, for example, but what would be the point when so much of what it wants to see there is already in place? Central to the rise of the Community is the decline in territorial disputes. Territory has been the most com- mon cause and object of conflicts in the past, and we have become so accustomed to their absence within the Community that it is easy to lose sight of how drastic and consequential this change is (Diehl 1999; Hensel 2000; Huth 1996, 2000; Kacowicz 1998; Vasquez 1993; Zacher 2001). Germans no longer care that Alsace and Lorraine are French; the French are not disturbed by the high level of German presence in these provinces. The French, furthermore, permitted the Saar to return to Germany and are not bothered by this loss, and in- deed do not feel it as a loss at all. Although during the Cold War the West Germans refused to renounce their claims to the “lost territories” to the east, they did so upon unification and few voices were raised in protest. Today the United Kingdom is ready to cede Northern Ireland to the Irish Republic if a referendum in the six counties were to vote to do so.

A2: Self-Fulfilling Prophecy

Securitization is inevitable, but does not always create war, and this can be applied even more so to the US’ situation.

Taliaferro 1 (Jeffrey W., Assoc. Prof. of Political Science at Tufts Univ., *International Security*, Vol. 25, No. 3, pp. 128-161)

The security dilemma is inescapable, but it does not always generate intense competition and war. In addition to the gross distribution of power in the international system, other material factors, which I refer to as “structural modifiers,” may increase or decrease the likelihood of conoict.27 These include the offense-defense balance in military technology, geographic proximity, access to raw materials, international economic pressure, regional or dyadic military balances, and the ease with which states can extract resources from conquered territory.28 Defensive realists assume that structural modifiers have a greater influence on the likelihood of international conflict or cooperation than does the gross distribution of power. The gross distribution of power refers to the relative share of the international system’s material capabilities that each state controls. Polarity, or the number of great powers in the international system, is the most common measure of the gross distribution of power. Structural modifiers, on the other hand, refer to the relative distribution of capabilities that enable individual states to carry out particular diplomatic and military strategies. This in turn influences the severity of the security dilemma between particular states or in regional subsystems. Thus one may think of the structural modifiers as mediating the effects of systemic imperatives on the behavior of states.29 Consider, for example, offense-defense theory and balance-of-threat theory. It makes little sense to speak of a systemwide offense-defense balance in military technology. The possession of particular military technologies and weapons systems influences the relative ease with which a state can attack or hold territory. The objective offense-defense balance affects the strategies of individual states and the interaction between pairs of states; it does not change the gross distribution of power in the international system.30 Similarly, balance-of- threat theory does not posit that states always balance against the greatest threat in the international system. Rather they generally balance against states that pose an immediate threat to their survival.31 Defensive realism, in both its neorealist and neoclassical realist variants, challenges notions that the security dilemma always generates intense conflict. In this respect, defensive realism corrects deductive flaws both in Waltz’s core model and in offensive realism. Waltz holds that anarchy and the need for survival often force states to forgo mutually beneficial cooperation. At a mini- mum, cooperation is difficult because states are sensitive to how it affects their current and future relative capabilities.32 Cooperation often proves to be impossible, particularly in the security arena, because states have every incentive to maintain an advantage over their competitors.33 Some offensive realists go further in arguing that cooperation can put a state’s survival in jeopardy. John Mearsheimer argues that anarchy leaves little room for trust because “a state may be unable to recover if its trust is betrayed.”34 Defensive realism faults these arguments for being incomplete. Cooperation is risky, but so is competition. States cannot be certain of the outcome of an arms race or war beforehand, and losing such a competition can jeopardize a state’s security. Waltz’s balance-of-power theory and Mearsheimer’s offensive realism require that states evaluate the risks of cooperation and competition, but they do not explain variation in competitive or cooperative behavior.35 This has implications for both foreign policy and international outcomes. The defensive variants of neorealism and neoclassical realism specify the conditions under which cooperative international outcomes and less competitive state behavior, respectively, become more likely. According to offense- defense theory proponents, at the operational and tactical level, improvements in firepower (e.g., machine guns, infantry antitank weapons, surface-to-air missiles, and tactical nuclear weapons) should favor the defense because attackers are usually more vulnerable and detectable than are well-prepared de- fenders. At the strategic level, the anticipated high costs and risks of conquests should deter even greedy leaders.36 The nuclear revolution—specifically the development of secure second- strike capabilities by the declared nuclear states—provides strong disincentives for intended war.37 This does not mean that pairs of nuclear-armed states will not engage in political-military competition in third regions or limited conventional conflict short of all-out war.38 Rather it suggests that intended (or premeditated) wars—wars that break out as the result of a calculated decision by at least one party to resort to the massive use of force in the pursuit of its objectives—become highly unlikely.39 Conversely, if the offense dominates, then states have an incentive to adopt aggressive strategies. Similarly, states’ abilities to extract resources from conquered territory influence the likelihood of international conflict. Where industrial capacity, strategic depth, or raw materials are cumulative, defensive realists would expect states to pursue expansionist policies.40 According to Mearsheimer, states must constantly worry about their survival because potential competitors may try to eliminate them at any time. He argues, “States operate in both an international political environment and an international economic environment, and the former dominates the latter in cases where the two come into conoict.”41 This implies that states will heavily discount the future by favoring short-term military preparedness over longer- term objectives, such as economic prosperity, when and if the two goals conoict.42 Again, defensive realism finds this argument lacking and specifies the conditions under which states are more likely to heavily discount the future and prefer short-term military preparedness to long-term economic prosperity. For example, where geography provides defense from invasion or blockade, defensive neoclassical realism would expect a state to favor long-term objectives. Similarly, a state with relatively weak neighbors can afford to take a longer- term perspective and devote a greater portion of its national resources to domestic programs. A relatively benign threat environment removes the incentives for the development of strong central institutions within the state. For example, geographic separation

from Europe and the relative weakness of Canada and Mexico allowed the United States to survive the last 150 years of its independence without developing strong state institutions (i.e., a large standing army, an efficient tax system, and a large central bureaucracy).43

A2: Discourse First

Discourse is not determinative

Mearsheimer 95 (John, Prof. of Poli Sci at the Univ. of Chicago, *International Security*, Vol. 19, No. 3, Winter 1994-1995, pp. 5-49)

Critical theory provides few insights on why discourses rise and fall. Thomas Risse- Kappen writes, "Research on. . . 'epistemic communities' of knowledge-based transnational networks has failed so far to specify the conditions under which specific ideas are selected and influence policies while others fall by the wayside."156Not surprisingly, critical theorists say little about why realism has been the dominant discourse, and why its foundations are now so shaky. They certainly do not offer a well-defined argument that deals with this important issue. Therefore, it is difficult to judge the fate of realism through the lens of critical theory. Nevertheless, critical theorists occasionally point to particular factors that might lead to changes in international relations discourse. In such cases, however, they usually end up arguing that changes in the material world drive changes in discourse. For example, when Ashley makes surmises about the future of realism, he claims that "a crucial issue is whether or not changing historical conditions have disabled longstanding realist rituals of power." Specifically, he asks whether "developments in late capitalist society;" like the "fiscal crisis of the state," and the "internationalization of capital," coupled with "the presence of vastly destructive and highly automated nuclear arsenals [has] de- prived statesmen of the latitude for competent performance of realist rituals of power?"157 Similarly, Cox argues that fundamental change occurs when there is a "disjuncture" between "the stock of ideas people have about the nature of the world and the practical problems that challenge them." He then writes, "Some of us think the erstwhile dominant mental construct of neorealism is inadequate to confront the challenges of global politics today."158 It would be understandable if realists made such arguments, since they believe there is an objective reality that largely determines which discourse will be dominant. Critical theorists, however, emphasize that the world is socially constructed, and not shaped in fundamental ways by objective factors. Anarchy, after all, is what we make of it. Yet when critical theorists attempt to explain why realism may be losing its hegemonic position, they too point to objective factors as the ultimate cause of change. Discourse, so it appears, turns out not to be determinative, but mainly a reflection of developments in the objective world. In short, it seems that when critical theorists who study inter- national politics offer glimpses of their thinking about the causes of change in the real world, they make arguments that directly contradict their own theory, but which appear to be compatible with the theory they are challenging.159

AT: Security Discourse Bad

**Treating security as a speech act means there are an infinite number of security threats, making it impossible to solve. The word “security” is not itself harmful, only when used by actors in positions to make security choices, it doesn’t apply to us.**

**Williams 3** (Michael C., university of Whales, “Words, Images, Enemies: Securitization and

International Politics”, [*International Studies Quarterly*](http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublication?journalCode=intestudquar), Vol. 47, No. 4) CC

This stance allows the Copenhagen School to argue simultaneously for both an expansion and a limitation of the security agenda and its analysis. On the one hand, treating security as a speech-act provides, in principle, for an almost indefinite expansion of the security agenda. Not only is the realm of possible threats enlarged, but the actors or objects that are threatened (what are termed the "referent objects" of security) can be extended to include actors and objects well beyond the military security of the territorial state. Accordingly, the Copenhagen School has argued that security can usefully be viewed as comprising five "sectors," each with their particular referent object and threat agenda (Buzan, Waever, and de Wilde, 1998).6 In the "military" sector, for example, the referent object is the territorial integrity of the state, and the threats are overwhelmingly defined in external, military terms. In the "political" sector, by contrast, what is at stake is the legitimacy of a governmental authority, and the relevant threats can be ideological and sub-state, leading to security situations in which state authorities are threatened by elements of their own societies, and where states can become the primary threat to their own societies. Even further from an exclusively military-territorial focus is the concept of "societal" security, in which the identity of a group is presented as threatened by dynamics as diverse as cultural flows, economic integration, or population movements. Conversely, while treating security as a speech-act allows a remarkable broadening of analysis, securitization theory seeks also to limit the security agenda. Security, the Copenhagen School argues, is not synonymous with "harm" or with the avoidance of whatever else might be deemed malign or damaging (Buzan et al., 1998:2-5, 203-12). As a speech-act, securitization has a specific structure which in practice limits the theoretically unlimited nature of "security." These constraints operate along three lines. First, while the securitization process is in principle completely open (any "securitizing actor" can attempt to securitize any issue and referent object), in practice it is structured by the differential capacity of actors to make socially effective claims about threats, by the forms in which these claims can be made in order to be recognized and accepted as convincing by the relevant audience, and by the empirical factors or situations to which these actors can make reference. Not all claims are socially effective, and not all actors are in equally powerful positions to make them. This means, as Buzan and Waever put it, that the "Conditions for a successful speech-act fall into two categories: (1) the internal, linguistic-grammatical-to follow the rules of the act (or, as Austin argues, accepted conventional procedures must exist, and the act has to be executed according to these procedures); and (2) the external, contextual and social-to hold a position from which the act can be made ('The particular persons and circumstances in a given case must be appropriate for the invocation of the particular procedure invoked')" (Buzan et al., 1998:32). The claims that are likely to be effective, the forms in which they can be made, the objects to which they refer, and the social positions from which they can effectively be spoken are usually deeply "sedimented" (rhetorically and discursively, culturally, and institutionally) and structured in ways that make securitizations somewhat predictable and thus subject to probabilistic analysis (Waever, 2000)-and not wholly open and expandable. Finally, while empirical contexts and claims cannot in this view ultimately determine what are taken as security issues or threats, they provide crucial resources and referents upon which actors can draw in attempting to securitize a given issue.

Security discourse isn’t inherently bad—presenting it in debate allows the negative attributes to be avoided.

Williams 3 (Michael, Professor of International Politics at the University of Wales, “Words, Images, Enemies: Securitization and International Politics,” *International Studies Quarterly*, 47(4), AD: 7-10-9) BL

I have argued thus far that recognizing the roots of securitization theory within the legacy of a Schmittian-influenced view of politics explains a number of its key and most controversial features. Charges of an ethically and practically irresponsible form of objectivism in relation to either the act of securitization or the concept of societal security are largely misplaced. Locating the speech-act within a broader commitment to processes of discursive legitimation and practical ethics of dialogue allows the most radical and disturbing elements of securitization theory emerging from its Schmittian legacy to be offset. Seen in this light, the Copenhagen School is insulated from many of the most common criticisms leveled against it.

AT: Security Discourse Bad

**Treating Security as a speech act ruins the meaning of what security threats actually are and trivializes security, making it impossible to actually evaluate threats.**

**Williams 3** (Michael C., university of Whales, “Words, Images, Enemies: Securitization and

International Politics”, [*International Studies Quarterly*](http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublication?journalCode=intestudquar), Vol. 47, No. 4) CC

A second major criticism of the Copenhagen School concerns the ethics of securitization. Simply put, if security is nothing more than a specific form of social practice-a speech-act tied to existential threat and a politics of emergency-then does this mean that anything can be treated as a "security" issue and that, as a consequence, any form of violent, exclusionary, or irrationalist politics must be viewed simply as another form of "speech-act" and treated "objectively"? Questions such as these have led many to ask whether despite its avowedly "constructivist" view of security practices, securitization theory is implicitly committed to a methodological objectivism that is politically irresponsible and lacking in any basis from which to critically evaluate claims of threat, enmity, and emergency.29 A first response to this issue is to note that the Copenhagen School has not shied away from confronting it. In numerous places the question of the ethics of securitization are discussed as raising difficult issues.

Threats = Real – Generally and Historically

Dogmatic realism leads us to universal truth- security threats exist.

Kwan and Tsang 1 (Kai-Man, Department of Religion and Philosophy, Hong Kong Baptist University, Kowloon Tong, Hong Kong, Eric W. School of Business Administration, Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan, U.S.A, December, *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 22, No. 12 (Dec., 2001), pp. 1163-1168, “Realism and Constructivism in Strategy Research: A Critical Realist Response to Mir and Watson”,) CH

The problem with Mir and Watson here is again their failure to distinguish different kinds of real- ism. It is important to distinguish a dogmatic realist from a critical realist. Both believe that theories can be true or false, and rigorous scientific research can move us progressively towards a true account of phenomena. Dogmatic realists further believe that current theories correspond (almost) exactly to reality, and hence there is not much room for error or critical scrutiny. This attitude is inspired by (but does not strictly follow from) a primitive version of positivism which believes in indubitable observations as raw data and that an infallible scientific method can safely lead us from these data to universal laws. In contrast, critical realists, though believing in the possibility of progress towards a true account of phenomena, would not take such progress for granted. Exactly because they believe that reality exists independently of our minds, our theories, observations and methods are all fallible. Critical realists also insist that verification and falsification are never conclusive, especially in social sciences. So critical testing of theories and alleged universal laws need to be carried out continuously. A more detailed description of critical realism, which is now a growing movement transforming the intellectual scene.

**A2: Epistemology K**

Their relativist approach is self-contradictory.

Kwan and Tsang 1 (Kai-Man, Department of Religion and Philosophy, Hong Kong Baptist University; Eric W., School of Business Administration, Wayne State University; *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 22, No. 12, Dec., 2001, pp. 1163-1168)

However, the blame for the confusion partly lies on the side of constructivists, who rarely make clear the above distinction. Mir and Wat- son have this problem too. Although they mention briefly the different types of constructivism, they do not state explicitly which type they subscribe to. Sometimes they speak as moderate constructivists. For example, they state that the ‘identification of some of the inadequacies of the realist paradigm must not be seen as a critique of realism itself’ (Mir and Watson, 2000: 947). They believe that ‘(c)onstructivist theories decenter the concept of a “natural” organizational science, but do not blindly embrace a philosophy of relativism’ (2000: 950). On the other hand, these disclaimers sometimes seem to be contradicted by their other sayings. For instance, they say, ‘According to constructivists, the philosophical positions held by researchers determine their findings’ (2000: 943). They further mention that such a constructivist approach suggests that ‘organizational “reality” (Astley, 1985) or the truth that academic disciplines avow (Can- nella and Paetzold, 1994) is socially constructed’ (2000: 943). If philosophical positions determine research findings, then reality has no input to and control over scientific research. Each and every one of various incommensurable philosophical positions will determine its own findings. No research findings can be neutrally assessed, criticized or falsified. Besides being rather implausible, this view quickly leads to epistemological relativism, as confirmed by their Fig. 11 (which includes epistemological relativism within the zone of constructivism). Furthermore, they quote Foucault approvingly: ‘We must conceive analysis as a *violence* we do to things, or in any case as a practice which we *impose upon* them’ (2000: 942, emphasis added), and later make a Foucaultian point themselves: ‘Researchers are never “objective” or value-neutral. Constructivists subscribe to the view that theory is discursive and power-laden’ (2000: 943). If it is the case, again it is hard to see how scientific research can be objective. So despite their disclaimers, Mir and Watson at times do lean towards an unacceptable form of antirealism and relativism. (Owing to space limitations, we are not going to discuss the reasons why relativism is unacceptable. Mir and Watson themselves also seem to have reservations about relativism.) In the end, because Mir and Watson fail to distinguish different types of constructivism, and to clarify where they stand exactly, their characterization of constructivism is shot through with internal contradictions.

Alt fails - Discursive focus generates epistemological blind spots and won’t alter security structures

Hyde-Price 1 (Adrian, Professor of International Politics at Bath, *Europes new security challenges*, page 39) KSM

Securitization thus focuses almost exclusively on the discursive domain and eschews any attempt to determine empirically what constitutes security concerns. It does not aspire to comment on the reality behind a securitization discourse or on the appropriate instruments for tackling security problems. Instead, it suggests that security studies – or what Waever calls securitization studies –should focus on the discursive moves whereby issues are securitized. The Copenhagen school thus emphasizes the need to understand the “speech acts” that accomplish a process of securitization. Their focus is on the linguistic and conceptual dynamics involved, even though they recognize the importance of the institutional setting within which securitization takes place. The concept of securitization offers some important insights for security studies. However, it is too epistemologically restricted to contribute to a significant retooling of security studies. On the positive side, it draws attention to the way in which security agendas are constructed by politicians and other political actors. It also indicates the utility of discourse analysis as an additional tool of analysis for security studies. However, at best, securitization studies can contribute one aspect of security studies. It cannot provide the foundations for a paradigm shift in the subdiscipline. Its greatest weakness is its epistemological hypochondria. That is, its tendency to reify epistemological problems and push sound observations about knowledge claims to their logical absurdity. Although it is important to understand the discursive moves involved in perception of security in, say, the Middle East, it is also necessary to make some assessment of nondiscursive factors like the military balance or access to freshwater supplies. For the Copenhagen school, however, these nondiscursive factors are relegated to second place. They are considered only to the extent that they facilitate or impede the speech act. In this way, the Copenhagen school is in danger of cutting security studies off from serious empirical research and setting it adrift on a sea of floating signifiers.

A2: Realism isn’t Viable

Realism, while not perfect, is the best available system.

Desch 99 (Michael C., Assoc. Prof of International Commerce at Univ. of Kentucky, *International Security*, Vol. 24, No. 1, pp. 156-180)

I appreciate the opportunity to respond to the comments on “Culture Clash”1 by John Duffield, Theo Farrell, and Richard Price.2 I begin by briefly summarizing the main claims of my original article and pointing out several issues about which we more or less agree. The bulk of my response, however, examines what I see as the central issue in this debate—whether culturalism can supplant realism—and indicates why I and their arguments unconvincing. My main objective in writing “Culture Clash” was to assess the latest wave of cultural approaches to security studies. As the letters by Duffield, Farrell, and Price make clear, scholars who employ cultural approaches see themselves as challenging— and ultimately replacing—the dominant realist paradigm. By contrast, I concluded that although cultural theories might be able to supplement realism, there is little reason to believe they will supplant it. This is because cultural theories do not do a better job than realism at explaining how the world works. The letters by Duffield, Farrell, and Price raise four issues about which we do not in fact disagree. One charge is that I regard comparing theories as a “zero-sum game, where there is room for one, and only one, theory that must be declared the ‘best’ and ‘prevail’” (Price, p. 169). However, my argument that cultural theories could supplement realism explicitly acknowledges that both approaches may be of value. A second charge is that I employ a “double standard in assessing the relative merits of cultural and realist approaches” (Duffield, p. 156). In fact, I believe that rival theories should be held to the same standard.3 My preference for realism rests on its ability to outperform cultural theories even in those cases where cultural approaches should be at an advantage. The third charge is that I reject cultural theories because they exhibit various conceptual flaws (e.g., vague definitions of key terms, lack of generalizability, and contradictions within the cultural family of theories) while failing to acknowledge that realist theories display similar weaknesses. I did mention these potential conceptual problems in my article, but I explicitly stated that “they do not present insurmountable obstacles” to the development and testing of cultural theories.4 Moreover, I freely acknowledge that realism too has conceptual problems that I also believe can be surmounted through careful scholarship. A final charge (Farrell, p. 162) is that I advocate single case studies, a position supposedly incompatible with Imre Lakatos’s method of assessing rival research programs through “sophisticated falsiacation.”5 I did not advocate single cases instead of large-n studies but simply argued that when comparing rival theories, scholars must be sure to include cases in which competing theories make distinct predictions. This is a widely accepted principle among methodologists and not at all incompatible with Lakatos’s approach.6 The real issue in this debate is whether culturalism can supplant or merely supplement realism in explaining the real world of international politics. In other words, which approach is most consistent with the typical behavior of states?

A2: Realism is Outdated

Realism is still a viable system in the 21st century – power systems will stay unchanged.

Mearsheimer 2 (John, Prof. of Poli Sci at the Univ. of Chicago, *Realism and Institutionalism in International Studies,* pp. 23-33)

Despite the end of the cold war, the basic structure of the international system remains largely unchanged. States are still the key actors in world politics, and they continue to operate in an anarchic system. It is difficult to find a serious scholar who argues that the United Nations or any other international institution has coercive leverage over the great powers or is likely to have it anytime soon. Moreover, not only is there no plausible replacement for the state on the horizon, but there is little interest anywhere in the world for doing away with the state and putting an alternative political arrangement in its place. Nothing is forever, but there is good reason to think that the sovereign state’s time has not yet passed. If the basic structure of the system has not changed since, 1990, we should not expect state behavior in the new century to be much different from what it was in the past centuries. In fact, there is abundant evidence that states still care deeply about power and will compete for it among themselves in the foreseeable future. Furthermore, the danger still remains that security competition might lead to war, neither of which has gone away with the disappearance of the Soviet Union. To illustrate this point, consider that the United States has fought two wars since the end of the Cold War- Iraq(1991) and Kosovo (1999)- and it came dangerously close to going to war against North Korea in 1994. Although the United States now spends more on defense than the next six countries combined, U.S. officials do not seem to think this is enough. Indeed, both candidates in the 2000 presidential campaign advocated spending even more money on the Pentagon. Thus, there is little reason to think that states no longer care about their security. Furthermore, it is hard to imagine anyone arguing that security competition and war are outmoded in (1) South Asia, where India and Pakistan are bitter enemies, are armed with nuclear weapons and are caught up in a raging dispute over Kashmir; (2) the Persian Gulf, where Iraq and Iran are bent on acquiring nuclear weapons and show no signs of becoming status quo powers; and (3) Africa, where interstate conflict appears to have increased since the end of the cold war. One might concede, however, that these regions remain mired in the old ways of doing business and argue instead that it is security competition and war among the system’s great powers, not minor powers such as Pakistan and Iran, that is passé. Therefore, Europe and Northeast Asia (NEAsia), where there are clusters of great powers are the places where realist logic no longer has much relevance. But this argument does not stand up to scrutiny. There is a large literature on security in North East Asia after the Cold War, and almost every author recognizes that power politics is alive and well in the region and that there is good reason to worry about armed conflict. The thought of Japan seriously rearming strikes fear in the heart of virtually every country in Asia, and if China continues to grow economically and militarily over the next few decades, there is likely to be intense security competition between China and its neighbors, as well as the United States. According to one expert, China “may well be the high church of realpolitik in the post-Cold War world.” Apparently the Chinese have not gotten the word that realism has been relegated to the scrap heap of history. Furthermore, the United States is in a position today where it might gind itself in a war with North Korea or with China over Taiwan. In short, NEAsia is a potentially dangerous place, where security competition is a central element of interstate relations. Possible the best evidence that power politics is still relevant in NEAsia is that the United States maintains one hundred thousand troops in the region and plans to keep them there for a long time. If NEAsia were a zone of peace, those American forces would be unnecessary and they could be sent home and demobilized, saving the U.S. taxpayer an appreciable sum of money. Instead, they are kept in place to help pacify a potentially volatile region.

Perm Solves – Strategic Reversibility

Power is strategically reversible – The resistance to state power counteracts the disciplinary power at the heart of their impacts

Campbell 98 (David- PHD, Prof of cultural & poli geog @ U of Durham, *Writing Security*, p.257-258,ET)

The possibility of rearticulating danger leads us to a final question: what modes of being and forms of life could we or should we adopt? To be sure, a comprehensive attempt to answer such a question is beyond the ambit of this book. But it is important to note that asking the question in this way mistakenly implies that such possibilities exist only in the future. Indeed, the extensive and intensive nature of the relations of power associated with the society of security means that there has been and remains a not inconsiderable freedom to explore alternative possibilities. While traditional analyses of power are often economistic and negative, Foucault's understanding of power emphasises its productive and enabling nature.36 Even more importantly, his understanding of power emphasizes the ontology of freedom presupposed by the existence of disciplinary and normalizing practices. Put simply, there cannot be relations of power unless subjects are in the first instance free: the need to institute negative and constraining power practices comes about only because without them freedom would abound. Were there no possibility of freedom, subjects would not act in ways that required containment so as to effect order.37 Freedom, though, is not the absence of power. On the contrary, because it is only through power that subjects exercise their agency, freedom and power cannot be separated. As Foucault maintains: At the very heart of the power relationship, and constantly provoking it, are the recalcitrance of the will and the intransigence of freedom. Rather than speaking of an essential freedom, it would be better to speak of an `agonism' — of a relationship which is at the same time reciprocal incitation and struggle; less of a face-to-face confrontation which paralyzes both sides than a permanent provocation.38 The political possibilities enabled by this permanent provocation of power and freedom can be specified in more detail by thinking in terms of the predominance of the `bio-power' discussed above. In this sense, because the governmental practices of biopolitics in Western nations have been increasingly directed towards modes of being and forms of life — such that sexual conduct has become an object of concern, individual health has been figured as a domain of discipline, and the family has been transformed into an instrument of government — the on-going agonism between those practices and the freedom they seek to contain, means that individuals have articulated a series of counter-demands drawn from those new fields of concern. For example, as the state continues to prosecute people according to sexual orientation, human rights activists have proclaimed the right of gays to enter into formal marriages, adopt children, and receive the same health and insurance benefits granted to their straight counterparts. These claims are a consequence of the permanent provocation of power and freedom in biopolitics, and stand as testament to the 'strategic reversibility' of power relations: if the terms of governmental practices can be made into focal points for resistances, then the 'history of government as the "conduct of conduct" is interwoven with the history of dissenting "counter- conducts" '.39 Indeed, the emergence of the state as the major articulation of 'the political' has involved an unceasing agonism between those in office and those they ruled. State intervention in everyday life has long incited popular collective action, the result of which has been both resistance to the state and new claims upon the state. In particular, 'The core of what we now call "citizenship" . . . consists of multiple bargains hammered out by rulers and ruled in the course of their struggles over the means of state action, especially the making of war.'40 In more recent times, constituencies associated with women's, youth, ecological, and peace movements (among others) have also issued claims upon society.

Perm Solves – A2: Security is Totalizing

Absolute claims about security must be questioned.

Burke 7 (Anthony, Senior Lecturer in International Relations at the University of New South Wales, Sydney, June 2007, *What security makes possible: Some thoughts on critical security studies*)

The Copenhagen School’s analyses open a door, however briefly, to an important insight. Security is contingent and not universal. However they fail to push beyond that into an analysis that could put the deeper ontological claims and construction of security into question, that could reveal its wider sociological function and power, and most importantly, that could be put into the service of a normatively progressive politics (whether that takes the name of security or not).49 Put briefly, this is the critical project which has motivated my own research over the last decade. This project requires walking a tricky path between what Matthew McDonald has called the ‘reconstructive’ and ‘deconstructive’ agendas in security studies.50 Many writers argue that they simply cannot be reconciled. From the reconstructive end, Booth has been sharply critical of some poststructuralist work on security which he thinks fails to acknowledge, or create space for, an agenda which resignifies security in terms of social justice or emancipation. He comments that: the poststructuralist approach seems to assume that security cannot be common or positive-sum but must always be zero-sum, with somebody’s security always being at the cost of the insecurity of others. [Hence] security itself is questioned as desirable goal … They also tend to celebrate insecurity, which I regard as a middle-class affront to the truly insecure.51 In some ways this critique—which cites writings by Michael Dillon and James Der Derian as examples—is appropriate. He might also have included in this list an article published in 2000 by Costas Constantinou.52 While in some ways he misunderstands what they are searching for (a route out of generalised politics of alienation and fear, which make them as critical of realism as he is) it is important to remind ourselves of the legitimate and almost universal concern of individuals and communities for secure and stable lives. It is for this reason that in my own work I have often endorsed the normative arguments of the Welsh School, Tickner, the Secure Australia Project or the UNDP’s 1994 *Human development report*. It might be possible to read Booth’s comments as a critique of my argument in the introduction to *In fear of security*, which challenges realist policy discourses for generating Orwellian practices of security that sacrifice the security of others. I, however, am implicitly working with a contrasting human security ideal. This, manifestly, is not a celebration of insecurity. The power of statist ontologies of security nevertheless led me to wonder if it might be better to speak of the human needs and priorities named by security in their specificity: conflict prevention and resolution, human rights, land and women’s rights, the right to control one’s own economic destiny, etc. My concern was, and remains, that security’s ‘perversion’ into a ‘metaphysical canopy for the worst manifestations of liberalmodernity’ has been too final and damaging.53 We live in a world where security will continue to remain one of the most powerful signifiers in politics, and we cannot opt out of the game of its naming and use. It must be defined and practiced in normatively better ways, and kept under continual scrutiny.

**Perm Solves**

**Emancipative goals must be combined with pragmatic policies to be beneficial. Singapore proves.**

Gurbachan 8 (Singh, Strategy Studies @ Harvard, MIT *Reconciling Emancipation and Critical Security Studies*)

If we were to ask whether Singapore is an emancipated society, most Singaporeans may initially grumble on certain issues, but in the main will agree that we have come a long way and are emancipated in our own ways. However internationally many may disagree as Singapore has often been on the news for it strict laws, the death penalty, caning, lack of a credible opposition, lack of tolerance for political dissent and the list can go on. Yet in a short span 40 years Singapore has progressed from a third world country to one of the most dynamic and advance nation in South-east Asia. How has this been possible?I would like to suggest that **the government of Singapore have taken a pragmatic as well as an emancipatory approach in its policies. When Singapore first gained independence, the priority then was to build a strong diversified economy and a credible defence capability.** Having recently separated from Malaysia in 1965, Singapore faced a significant communist insurgency and experienced racial violence. The threat to her security were real. Being small and having hardly any natural resources, with the exception of a deep-water port, **the economic situation was also extremely uncertain. The first Prime Minister** of Singapore, Mr Lee Kuan Yew, **then realized that what were needed were a strong government and a stable political environment, to quickly build up the economy and a credible defence capability**. Singapore has judiciously spent a sizable portion of about 31 % of its government operating expenditure or 5 % of GDP of defence. **Having a disproportionate and diverse racial mix, many of Singapore’s policies from the beginning have been emancipatory**. Although Singapore had a much larger Chinese population (fluctuating around 70%) the National language was from the beginning chosen to be Malay and the National Anthem until today is sung in Malay. Realizing that if the voting system was left alone and went along racial lines, the minority would have been left out of the political process. The Government introduced a then novel concept of Group Parliamentary Constituencies, where a 3-member team will need to have a member from the minority community to qualify to contest. While viewed with skepticism by certain quarters, the government created a President Office and non-constituency Member of Parliament to serve as a check and balance on its reserve commitments and policies. While initially focused only on allowing mother tongue education for Malay, Tamil and Chinese, the Government has in recent times allowed teaching of other mother languages like Punjabi and Hindi. **Realizing that a closely-knit multi-racial society is crucial for long term stability of the country, the government even made unpopular decisions to ensure the subsidised housing programme had a proportionate mix of the difference races. The government has also not hesitated to implement unpopular policies (for example the littering, chewing gum ban and smoking controls) that were deemed to be in the long-term interest or collective well being of the country. The government has judiciously provided a liberal private space for its diverse religious and ethnic groups while never hesitating to enforce a strict control on the shared common space.** Some of the policies on the common space that were initially viewed by western countries as encroaching on personal freedom are ironically nowadays being enforced in the western countries as well e.g. smoking ban in certain public places.To summarise, **had the government of Singapore not taken a largely pragmatic and emancipatory approach, this country may not have been able to achieve the economic success and national progress in such a short span of time. It had to always adopt a judicious balance of at times encroaching on certain civil liberties in the interest of the greater community and at other times even liberalising** the showing pornographic movies in a generally conservative society.

**Perm Solves**

**Perm solves by creating emancipation through pragmatic action.**

Gurbachan 8 (Singh, Strategy Studies @ Harvard, MIT *Reconciling Emancipation and Critical Security Studies*)

There is a need to adopt a more multidisciplinary and multicultural approach towards human emancipation. Some of the ideas of the postmodernist and indeed even as suggested by Alker the ‘antiessentialist ‘securitisation’ approach’(Alker 2005: 189) of the Copenhagen School. This could lead to a better managed and prioritized humanity security. **While the ultimate goal may be human emancipation, the way towards it will have to start from a perspective of pragmatic economic and social realities. Rather then freeing all humans from wants, it is felt that a better approach would be to free them from any lack of opportunities. Not everyone wants to be the President of United States of America or would feel emancipated by working hard all his life just to enjoy a rich lifestyle. Implicit in this approach is the need to achieve one’s desires according to ones’ effort. Also, from an entrepreneurial perspective, some degree of threat is useful in motivating self improvement. A complete removal of any threat could ultimately work against emancipation.** Mark Neufeld suggest that a useful strategy to adopt for emancipation is to focus on how security issues are framed in political discourse from both traditional and expanded perspectives and ‘how specific values are made socially concrete in this process, and how people both act and are acted upon in the process of history unfolding. The concern here is with identifying the political projects different notions of security may serve and, perhaps most importantly, the role of security discourse in policy-making, implementation and legitimation (Neufeld 2004: 109-123). **In this highly interdependent capitalist world order, we may all in one way or another become subservient to it.** This was probably why, in *Dialectic Enlightenment,* **Horkheimer and Adorno were pessimistic about humans ever achieving emancipation. Industrialization and the social norms may have brought us to a point of no return.** Indeed the only way ahead may seek the emancipatory echoes from of the arts.

Realism bridges the gap between the critique and the need for pragmatic action.

Murray 97 (Alastair J.H., Politics Department, University of Wales Swansea, *Reconstructing Realism* p.

202-3)

If the cosmopolitan‑communitarian debate seems at times to be avoiding practical questions by going around in circles, the critical literature seems at times to be utterly unsure whether there are such things as practical questions. Yet, unless international relations theory is to become a purely intellectual exercise devoid of practical relation, such concerns must be juxtaposed to a consideration of the problems posed by the current framing of international politics. Ultimately, the only result of the post‑positivist movement's self‑styled 'alternative' status is the generation of an unproductive opposition between a seemingly mutually exclusive rationalism and reflectivism. Realism would seem to hold out the possibility of a more constructive path for international relations theory. The fact that it is engaged in a normative enquiry is not to say that it abandons a concern for the practical realities of international politics, only that it is concerned to bridge the gap between cosmopolitan moral and power political logics. Its approach ultimately provides an overarching framework which can draw on many different strands of thought, the 'spokes' which can be said to be attached to its central hub, to enable it to relate empirical concerns to a normative agenda. It can incorporate the lessons that geopolitics yields, the insights that neorealism might achieve, and all the other information that the approaches which effectively serve to articulate the specifics of its orientation generate, and, once incorporated within its theoretical framework, relate them both to one another and to the requirements of the ideal, in order to support an analysis of the conditions which characterise contemporary international politics and help it to achieve a viable political ethic. Against critical theories which are incomprehensible to any but their authors and their acolytes and which prove incapable of relating their categories to the issues which provide the substance of international affairs, and against rationalist, and especially neorealist, perspectives which prove unconcerned for matters of values and which simply ignore the relevance of ethical questions to political action, realism is capable of formulating a position which brings ethics and politics into a viable relationship. It would ultimately seem to offer us a course which navigates between the Scylla of defending our values so badly that we end up threatening their very existence, and the Charybdis of defending them so efficiently that we become everything that they militate against. Under its auspices, we can perhaps succeed in reconciling our ideals with our pragmatism.

**Perm Solves**

The perm solves through critical realism

Fairclough 5 (Norman, [emeritus Prof. of Linguistic](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Emeritus_Professor)s @ [Lancaster University](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lancaster_University), "Discourse Analysis in Organization Studies: The Case for Critical Realism" European Group for Organizational Studies *Organization Studies*, Vol. 26, No. 6 page  3)

I shall take a critical stance towards one prominent tendency within the work which has been carried out in the study of organizational discourse, on the grounds that it equates a shift in focus towards discourse in organization studies with the adoption of postmodernist and extreme social constructivist positions. My position is that commitment to such positions does not in any way follow from a commitment to giving discourse analysis its proper place within organization studies. I shall argue instead for a critical realist position which is moderately socially constructivist but rejects the tendency for the study of organization to be reduced to the study of discourse, locating the analysis of discourse instead within an analytically dualist epistemology which gives primacy to researching relations between agency (process, and events — see note 1) and structure on the basis of a realist social ontology. I shall argue that this form of critical discourse analysis has more to offer organization studies than broadly postmodernist work on organizational discourse. In the final section of the paper, I shall justify this argument through a discussion of organizational change. So, in sum, this paper is simultaneously an argument that the analysis of discourse is an essential and unavoidable part of organization studies, and an argument against certain prominent forms of discourse analysis which are currently carried out within organization studies.

Perm Solves

**Perm solves best by implementing critical realism, which captures the best of both realism and critical theory while avoiding the link to the creation of external threats.**

Kwan and Tsang 1 (Kai-Man, Department of Religion and Philosophy, Hong Kong Baptist University; Eric W., School of Business Administration, Wayne State University; *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 22, No. 12, Dec., 2001, pp. 1163-1168)

We also agree with Mir and Watson ‘that theory and practice are fundamentally interlinked’ (2000: 943) but again this point is not particularly constructivist. They further emphasize that ‘(r)esearch occurs within a “community” of scholarship where mutually held assumptions are deployed to create “conversations” ’(2000:943). So‘research, and in particular strategic management research, is a public, social practice, and hence that knowledge is the product, not of isolated individuals, but of intersubjective relations between members of research communities’ (2000: 950). These sayings correctly draw us to the much neglected fact that knowledge is a communal endeavor. To take into account this fact, some philosophers are try-ing to develop a kind of social epistemology to replace traditional epistemology, which is heavily individualistic (Schmitt, 1987, 1994). Needless to say, we do not think that this development entails antirealism either. We agree that ‘(c)onstructivist historical analysis helps us place theories in context, rather than turn them into axioms that transcend the con- fines of time and space’ (2000: 950). However, we have already pointed out that critical realism also tries hard to avoid hasty overgeneralizations. To conclude, critical realism can accommodate the insights offered by Mir and Watson’s constructivism while eschewing the traps of radical constructivism or relativism. Mir and Watson’s argument that constructivism forms an improvement over realism is invalid, as far as critical realism is concerned. Before Mir and Watson can successfully clarify and resolve the problems of their constructivism, it is premature to move the constructivist tradition into the mainstream of strategy research.

Perm solves best by implementing defensive realism, allowing us to rationally analyze different situations and decide the best action for that situation – this avoids the link to traditional security thinking and threat creation.

Jervis 99 (Robert, Prof. of International Politics at Columbia Univ., *International Security*, Vol. 24, No. 1, Summer ’99, pp. 42-63)

I have sought to clear away some of the underbrush obscuring the differences between realist and neoliberal schools of thought. The former, especially in its defensive variant, does not deny the possibility of cooperation. Cooperation does need to be explained, but it is a puzzle rather than an anomaly.53 That is, although realists do need to explain the conditions that lead to cooperation, its existence is not necessarily discrepant with the approach any more than the existence of conflict disconfirms neoliberalism. But neoliberals see more conflict as unnecessary and avoidable than do realists. The contrast is greater with offensive realists, who believe that the compelling nature of the international environment and the clash of states’ preferences over outcomes put sharp limits on the extent to which conflict can be reduced by feasible alternative policies. Defensive realists believe that a great deal depends on the severity of the security dilemma and the intentions of the actors, which leads these scholars to a position that is not only between the offensive realist and neoliberal camps but is also contingent, because prescriptions depend heavily on a diagnosis of the situation.

**No Link – A2: State Bad**

They can’t eliminate the state and non-statist solutions are unproductive deployments of power – They matter

Buzan 4 (Barry , December, Montague Burton Prof. of International Relations @ the London School of Economics and honorary prof. @ the University of Copenhagen, "Realism vs. Cosmopolitanism" http://www.polity.co.uk/global/realism-vs-cosmopolitanism.asp

**A.Mc.:** But would not a realist response be that the very issues David seeks to highlight are largely marginal to the central dilemmas of world politics: the critical issues of war and peace, life and death.

**B.B.:** Again, that is a difficult question for realism because in traditional realism there was a rather clear distinction between 'high' and 'low' politics, high politics being about diplomacy and war, and low politics being about economics and society and many issues like the weather and disease. And because of the change in the importance of the different sectors that I mentioned earlier, this becomes problematic for realism. But the realists have been fairly agile. The realist line of defence would be that in most areas of world politics - again the emphasis on politics - states are still the principle authorities. And there is nothing that stops them from co-operating with each other. Thus, realists, or at least a good proportion of realists, can live quite comfortably with the idea of international regimes in which states, as the basic holders of political authority in the system, get together sometimes with other actors, sometimes just with other states, to discuss issues of joint concern, and sometimes they can hammer out of a set of policies, a set of rules of the game, which enable them to co-ordinate their behaviour. Now, this certainly does not feel like traditional power politics realism. You can think of it to some extent in terms of power politics by looking at issue power; who are the big players in relation to any big issue? Who are the people who have any kind of control? Who loses out?, etc.. There is, therefore, an element of power politics in this whole notion of regimes, and it does retain a strong element of state centrism. I think the realist would say: if you discount the state, where is politics? Where is it located? You cannot eliminate politics, as some liberals sometimes seem to do. To wish the state away, to wish politics away, is not going to generate results. The good dyed-in-the-wool realist would argue that power politics is a permanent condition of human existence. It will come in one form or another, in one domain or another, in relation to one issue or another, but it will always be there. It will be politics and it will be about relative power. And at the moment the state is still an important player in the game.

States are the key actors who solve violence – plan accesses this best.

Weingast 9 (Barry, senior fellow at the Hoover Institution and \Professor in the Department of Political Science at Stanford U, “Why are developing countries so resistant to the rule of law,” February 2009, accessed 7/10/09, http://cadmus.eui.eu/dspace/bitstream/1814/11173/1/MWP\_LS\_2009\_02.pdf ) KSM

All states must control the fundamental problem of violence. In natural states, a dominant coalition of the powerful emerges to solve this problem. The coalition grants members privileges, creates rents through limited access to valuable resources and organizations, and then uses the rents to sustain order. Because fighting reduces their rents, coalition members have incentives not to fight so as to maintain their rents. Natural states necessarily limit access to organizations and restrict competition in all systems. Failing to do so dissipate rents and therefore reduces the incentives not to fight. We call this order the natural state because for nearly all of the last 10,000 years of human history – indeed, until just the last two centuries – the natural state was the only solution to the problem of violence that produced a hierarchical society with significant wealth. In comparison with the previous foraging order, natural states produced impressive economic growth, and even today we can see the impressive wealth amassed by many of the early civilizations. In contrast to open access orders, however, natural states have significant, negative consequences for economic growth.

**No Link – A2: State Bad**

State-based approaches to violence exist and are successful at reducing violence.

UN Secretary General 6 (“Ending violence against women: from words to action,” October 9, 2006, Accessed 7/10/09, http://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/vaw/launch/english/v.a.w-exeE-use.pdf) KSM

Many States have developed good or promising practices to prevent or respond to violence against women. State strategies to address violence should promote women’s agency and be based on women’s experiences and involvement, and on partnerships with NGOs and other civil society actors. Women’s NGOs in many countries have engaged in innovative projects and programmes, sometimes in collaboration with the State. Generic aspects of good or promising practices can be extracted from a variety of experiences around the world. Common principles include: clear policies and laws; strong enforcement mechanisms; motivated and well-trained personnel; the involvement of multiple sectors; and close collaboration with local women’s groups, civil society organizations, academics and professionals. Many governments use national plans of action — which include legal measures, service provision and prevention strategies — to address violence against women. The most effective include consultation with women’s groups and other civil society organizations, clear time lines and benchmarks, transparent mechanisms for monitoring implementation, indicators of impact and evaluation, predictable and adequate funding streams, and integration of measures to tackle violence against women in programmes in a variety of sectors.

AT: No VTL

“No value to life” accepts the philosophical premise of Nazi Germany style murders and concentration camps that respect for life does not entail preserving life

Neeley 94 (Steven, Assistant Professor at Saint Francis College, “THE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO SUICIDE, THE QUALITY OF LIFE, AND THE "SLIPPERY-SLOPE": AN EXPLICIT REPLY TO LINGERING CONCERNS”, 28 Akron L. Rev. 53,) NS

The final solution in the United States and other western societies will be unlike the final solution in Nazi Germany in its details, but not unlike it in its horror. And I fear that some who now live will experience this final solution. They will live to see the day they will be killed. Variations of the "slippery-slope" argument as applied to suicide and euthanasia are abundant. Beauchamp has argued, for example, that at least from the perspective of rule utilitarianism, the wedge argument against euthanasia should be taken seriously. Accordingly, although a "restricted-active-euthanasia rule would have some utility value" since some intense and uncontrollable suffering would be eliminated, "it may not have the highest utility value in the structure of our present code or in any imaginable code which could be made current, and therefore may not be a component in the ideal code for our society . . . . For the disutility of introducing legitimate killing into one's moral code (in the form of active euthanasia rules) may, in the long run, outweigh the utility of doing so, as a result of the eroding effect such a relaxation would have on rules in the code which demand respect for human life. " Beauchamp then continues down a now-familiar path: If, for example, rules permitting active killing were introduced, it is not implausible to suppose that destroying defective newborns (a form of involuntary euthanasia) would become an accepted and common practice, that as population increases occur the aged will be even more neglectable and neglected than they now are, that capital punishment for a wide variety of crimes would be increasingly tempting, that some doctors would have appreciably reduced fears of actively injecting fatal doses whenever it seemed to them propitious to do so . . . . A hundred such possible consequences might easily be imagined. But these few are sufficient to make the larger point that such rules permitting killing could lead to a general reduction of respect for human life.

**Saying that life can be “valued” is intrinsically an act of commodification. It treats people like a nice car or house, justifying leaving people in the dust once they are no longer productive.**

**Davis 1** (Dena, Professor of bioethics at Cleveland State University, “Is Life of Infinite Value?”, *Kennedy Institute of Ethics Journal*, Vol. 11, No. 3) CC

The main reason that some people so resist the idea that life cannot be valued in quantified ways is the fear of two consequences. First, there is a fear that talking about life as something that can be valued, balanced against other things, and so on, leads to “commodification.” In other words, to place a value on life means bringing it into the marketplace as one more “thing,” like a car or a house, that can be traded at will. This seems disrespectful and inimical to the ways in which we do value life in our culture, whether it is valued in religious terms (as a gift from God), or in secular (as the sine qua non for every other valuable thing we experience, from pleasure to courage to family). Even the least religious among us can stand in awe of this thing that we humans are powerless to create. In this thinking, all value is market value; the only way to resist commodification is to insist that something is of infinite value. Second, there is the fear that, once life becomes value-able, it can be traded off by others in ways that will lead inevitably to a slippery slope wherein we cut off resources for those who are no longer “productive.”

AT: No VTL

Their “no value to human life” claim discursively replicates the logic for genocide – spain proves

Caldwell 96 (Julie Northern Kentucky University Law Review, 24 N. Ky. L. Rev. 81) NS

Calling Indians "savages" meant that "Indians were sufficiently different from whites to be regarded as less than persons and not protected by any moral or legal standards." Mohawk, supra note 6, at 54 (citing Milner S. Ball, Constitution, Court, Indian Tribes, 1 Am. B. Found. Res. J. 49 (1987)). The fact that in 1550, the Spanish Crown held a debate "to determine whether or not Indians were true human beings" is incredibly ironic, considering the "unspeakable violence of the Spanish conquest" which resulted in the deaths of an estimated 70 million Natives. Id. at 4849. "None of the great massacres of the twentieth century can be compared to this hecatomb." Id. at 48 (citing Tzvetan Todorow, The Conquest of America 133 (Harper & Row) (1982)).

VTL argument reduces human life to a single quantifiable purpose and legitimizes a framework of state sanctioned violence

Coleson 97 (Richard J.D., *Issues in Law and Medicine*, Summer, 13 Issues L. & Med. 3) NS

Frustrated with the ethic of "preserving every existence, no matter how worthless," Dr. Alfred Hoche in 1920 wrote, expectantly: "A new age will arrive--operating with a higher morality and with great sacrifice--which will actually give up the requirements of an exaggerated humanism and overvaluation of mere existence." 8 Issues in Law & Med. at 265. Euthanasia proponents of our day, too, seek with great zeal to usher in a new age. They speak, in words echoing from a distant age, that it is cruel to deprive those who are suffering from their desired means to peace and freedom from pain. Like Binding, they scold: "Not granting release by gentle death to the incurable who long for it: this is no longer sympathy, but rather its opposite." Id. at 254. The early promoters of euthanasia appeared to be sincere in their belief in the virtues of merciful death. Today's promoters of physician-assisted suicide may also be sincere, but it is a sincerity born of an unpardonable carelessness. Unlike their predecessors, euthanasia proponents today have the benefit of the lesson of history, which has taught the true nature of physician-assisted killing as a false compassion and a perversion of mercy. History warns that the institution of assisted-death gravely threatens to undermine the foundational ethic of the medical profession and the paramount principle of the equal dignity and inherent worth of every human person.

VTL ignores rape victims

Edwards 96 (Daphne, Professor at the Golden Gate Law School, 26 Golden Gate U.L. Rev. 241]) NS

For most of you, rape is the most serious life crisis you will have to face, with few exceptions. It is a time of overwhelming turmoil, confusion, and disorganization. You may be concerned about the way you are feeling in response to the rape. You've probably never felt the extreme and conflicting emotions you do now-the fears, the rage, the panic attacks, or the worthlessness. You may even be afraid that you are "going crazy," or that you will never recover and be able to go on with life again. But you will. What you are experiencing is normal after a very serious life crisis.

Fear Good

Fear of nuclear war is key to preventing it.

Futterman 94 (J. A. H., Physicist at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, “Meditations on the Bomb,” http://www.dogchurch.org/scriptorium/nuke.html, AD: 7/11/09) jl

But the inhibitory effect of reliable nuclear weapons goes deeper than Shirer's deterrence of adventurer-conquerors. It changes the way we think individually and culturally, preparing us for a future we cannot now imagine. Jungian psychiatrist Anthony J. Stevens states, [15]

"History would indicate that people cannot rise above their narrow sectarian concerns without some overwhelming paroxysm. It took the War of Independence and the Civil War to forge the United States, World War I to create the League of Nations, World War II to create the United Nations Organization and the European Economic Community. Only catastrophe, it seems, forces people to take the wider view.

Or what about fear? Can the horror which we all experience when we contemplate the possibility of nuclear extinction mobilize in us sufficient libidinal energy to resist the archetypes of war? Certainly, the moment we become blasé about the possibility of holocaust we are lost. As long as horror of nuclear exchange remains uppermost we can recognize that nothing is worth it. War becomes the impossible option. Perhaps horror, the experience of horror, the consciousness of horror, is our only hope. Perhaps horror alone will enable us to overcome the otherwise invincible attraction of war."

Thus I also continue engaging in nuclear weapons work to help fire that world-historical warning shot I mentioned above, namely, that as our beneficial technologies become more powerful, so will our weapons technologies, unless genuine peace precludes it. We must build a future more peaceful than our past, if we are to have a future at all, with or without nuclear weapons — a fact we had better learn before worse things than nuclear weapons are invented. If you're a philosopher, this means that I regard the nature of humankind as mutable rather than fixed, but that I think most people welcome change in their personalities and cultures with all the enthusiasm that they welcome death — thus, the fear of nuclear annihilation of ourselves and all our values may be what we require in order to become peaceful enough to survive our future technological breakthroughs.

In other words, when the peace movement tells the world that we need to treat each other more kindly, I and my colleagues stand behind it (like Malcolm X stood behind Martin Luther King, Jr.) saying, "Or else." We provide the peace movement with a needed sense of urgency that it might otherwise lack.

Action Good

We have an ethical obligation to act – if the future is uncertain, we must do everything we can to intervene.

Kurasawa 4 (Fuyuki, Professor of Sociology @ York University of Toronto, “Cautionary Tales: The Global Culture of Prevention and the Work of Foresight,” http://www.yorku.ca/kurasawa/Kurasawa%20Articles/Constellations%20Article.pdf, AD: 7/11/09) jl

In addition, farsightedness has become a priority in world affairs due to the appearance of new global threats and the resurgence of ‘older’ ones. Virulent forms of ethno-racial nationalism and religious fundamentalism that had mostly been kept in check or bottled up during the Cold War have reasserted themselves in ways that are now all-too-familiar – civil warfare, genocide, ‘ethnic cleansing,’ and global terrorism. And if nuclear mutually assured destruction has come to pass, other dangers are filling the vacuum: climate change, AIDS and other diseases (BSE, SARS, etc.), as well as previously unheralded genomic perils (genetically modified organisms, human cloning). Collective remembrance of past atrocities and disasters has galvanized some sectors of public opinion and made the international community’s unwillingness to adequately intervene before and during the genocides in the ex-Yugoslavia and Rwanda, or to take remedial steps in the case of the spiraling African and Asian AIDS pandemics, appear particularly glaring. Returning to the point I made at the beginning of this paper, the significance of foresight is a direct outcome of the transition toward a dystopian imaginary (or what Sontag has called “the imagination of disaster”).11 Huxley’s Brave New World and Orwell’s Nineteen Eighty-Four, two groundbreaking dystopian novels of the first half of the twentieth century, remain as influential as ever in framing public discourse and understanding current techno-scientific dangers, while recent paradigmatic cultural artifacts – films like The Matrix and novels like Atwood’s Oryx and Crake – reflect and give shape to this catastrophic sensibility.12 And yet dystopianism need not imply despondency, paralysis, or fear. Quite the opposite, in fact, since the pervasiveness of a dystopian imaginary can help notions of historical contingency and fallibilism gain traction against their determinist and absolutist counterparts.13 Once we recognize that the future is uncertain and that any course of action produces both unintended and unexpected consequences, the responsibility to face up to potential disasters and intervene before they strike becomes compelling. From another angle, dystopianism lies at the core of politics in a global civil society where groups mobilize their own nightmare scenarios (‘Frankenfoods’ and a lifeless planet for environmentalists, totalitarian patriarchy of the sort depicted in Atwood’s Handmaid’s Tale for Western feminism, McWorld and a global neoliberal oligarchy for the alternative globalization movement, etc.). Such scenarios can act as catalysts for public debate and socio-political action, spurring citizens’ involvement in the work of preventive foresight. Several bodies of literature have touched upon this sea-change toward a culture of prevention in world affairs, most notably just-war theory,14 international public policy research,15 and writings from the risk society paradigm.16 Regardless of how insightful these three approaches may be, they tend to skirt over much of what is revealing about the interplay of the ethical, political, and sociological dynamics that drive global civil society initiatives aimed at averting disaster. Consequently, the theory of practice proposed here reconstructs the dialogical, public, and transnational work of farsightedness, in order to articulate the sociopolitical processes underpinning it to the normative ideals that should steer and assist in substantively thickening it. As such, the establishment of a capacity for early warning is the first aspect of the question that we need to tackle.

Action Good

We have an ethical responsibility to attempt to deter potential suffering – it’s the only way to express genuine solidarity

Kurasawa 4 (Fuyuki, Professor of Sociology @ York University of Toronto, “Cautionary Tales: The Global Culture of Prevention and the Work of Foresight,” http://www.yorku.ca/kurasawa/Kurasawa%20Articles/Constellations%20Article.pdf, AD: 7/11/09) jl

By contrast, Jonas’s strong consequentialism takes a cue from Weber’s “ethic of responsibility,” which stipulates that we must carefully ponder the potential impacts of our actions and assume responsibility for them – even for the incidence of unexpected and unintended results. Neither the contingency of outcomes nor the retrospective nature of certain moral judgments exempts an act from normative evaluation. On the contrary, consequentialism reconnects what intentionalism prefers to keep distinct: the moral worth of ends partly depends upon the means selected to attain them (and vice versa), while the correspondence between intentions and results is crucial. At the same time, Jonas goes further than Weber in breaking with presentism by advocating an “ethic of long-range responsibility” that refuses to accept the future’s indeterminacy, gesturing instead toward a practice of farsighted preparation for crises that could occur.30 From a consequentialist perspective, then, intergenerational solidarity would consist of striving to prevent our endeavors from causing large-scale human suffering and damage to the natural world over time. Jonas reformulates the categorical imperative along these lines: “Act so that the effects of your action are compatible with the permanence of genuine human life,” or “Act so that the effects of your action are not destructive of the future possibility of such life.”31 What we find here, I would hold, is a substantive and future-oriented ethos on the basis of which civic associations can enact the work of preventive foresight. Having suggested a way to thicken the normative foundations of farsighted cosmopolitanism, I would now like to discuss the socio-cultural strategies that global civil society participants have begun employing in order to create a sense of intergenerational solidarity. Both the moral imagination and reason constitute triggers of farsightedness that have entered public discourse in a variety of settings, with the objective of combatting the myopia of presentism.32 The first of these catalysts appeals to us to carefully ponder our epoch’s legacy, to imagine the kind of world we will leave to future generations (what will social life be like if today’s risks become tomorrow’s reality?). Left dystopianism performs just this role of confronting us with hypothetically catastrophic futures; whether through novelistic, cinematic, or other artistic means, it conjures up visions of a brave new world in order to spark reflection and inspire resistance.33 By way of thick description, dystopian tales call upon audiences’ moral imagination and plunge them into their descendants’ lifeworlds. We step into the shoes of Nineteen Eighty-Four’s Winston Smith or are strongly affected by The Handmaid’s Tale’s description of a patriarchal-theocratic society and The Matrix’s blurring of simulacra and reality, because they bring the perils that may await our successors to life.

Predictions Good

We must use realism to test the probability of theories and predict events in international relations – the world is our laboratory.

Mearsheimer 1 [John J. Prof. of Poli Sci at U Chicago. *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*. Pg 7-8] JL

Despite these hazards, social scientists should nevertheless use their theories to make predictions about the future. Making predictions helps inform policy discourse, because it helps make sense of events unfolding in the world around us. And by clarifying points of disagreement, making explicit forecasts helps those with contradictory views to frame their own ideas more clearly. Furthermore, trying to anticipate new events is a good way to test social science theories, because theorists do not have the benefit of hindsight and therefore cannot adjust their claims to fit the evidence (because it is not yet available). In short, the world can be used as a laboratory to decide which theories best explain international politics. In that spirit, I employ offensive realism to peer into the future, mindful of both the benefits and the hazards of trying to predict events.

A2: Calculation Bad

Just because we can’t know the future doesn’t mean we shouldn’t try and prevent disaster – The Future is a result of actions we make now, including crisis prevention

Kurasawa 4 (Fuyuki, Professor of Sociology @ York University of Toronto, “Cautionary Tales: The Global Culture of Prevention and the Work of Foresight,” http://www.yorku.ca/kurasawa/Kurasawa%20Articles/Constellations%20Article.pdf, AD: 7/11/09) jl

When engaging in the labor of preventive foresight, the first obstacle that one is likely to encounter from some intellectual circles is a deep-seated skepticism about the very value of the exercise. A radically postmodern line of thinking, for instance, would lead us to believe that it is pointless, perhaps even harmful, to strive for farsightedness in light of the aforementioned crisis of conventional paradigms of historical analysis. If, contra teleological models, history has no intrinsic meaning, direction, or endpoint to be discovered through human reason, and if, contra scientistic futurism, prospective trends cannot be predicted without error, then the abyss of chronological inscrutability supposedly opens up at our feet. The future appears to be unknowable, an outcome of chance. Therefore, rather than embarking upon grandiose speculation about what may occur, we should adopt a pragmatism that abandons itself to the twists and turns of history; let us be content to formulate ad hoc responses to emergencies as they arise. While this argument has the merit of underscoring the fallibilistic nature of all predictive schemes, it conflates the necessary recognition of the contingency of history with unwarranted assertions about the latter’s total opacity and indeterminacy. Acknowledging the fact that the future cannot be known with absolute certainty does not imply abandoning the task of trying to understand what is brewing on the horizon and to prepare for crises already coming into their own. In fact, the incorporation of the principle of fallibility into the work of prevention means that we must be ever more vigilant for warning signs of disaster and for responses that provoke unintended or unexpected consequences (a point to which I will return in the final section of this paper). In addition, from a normative point of view, the acceptance of historical contingency and of the self-limiting character of farsightedness places the duty of preventing catastrophe squarely on the shoulders of present generations. The future no longer appears to be a metaphysical creature of destiny or of the cunning of reason, nor can it be sloughed off to pure randomness. It becomes, instead, a result of human action shaped by decisions in the present – including, of course, trying to anticipate and prepare for possible and avoidable sources of harm to our successors. Combining a sense of analytical contingency toward the future and ethical responsibility for it, the idea of early warning is making its way into preventive action on the global stage. Despite the fact that not all humanitarian, technoscientific, and environmental disasters can be predicted in advance, the multiplication of independent sources of knowledge and detection mechanisms enables us to foresee many of them before it is too late. Indeed, in recent years, global civil society’s capacity for early warning has dramatically increased, in no small part due to the impressive number of NGOs that include catastrophe prevention at the heart of their mandates.17 These organizations are often the first to detect signs of trouble, to dispatch investigative or fact-finding missions, and to warn the international community about impending dangers; to wit, the lead role of environmental groups in sounding the alarm about global warming and species depletion or of humanitarian agencies regarding the AIDS crisis in sub-Saharan Africa, frequently months or even years before Western governments or multilateral institutions followed suit. What has come into being, then, is a loose-knit network of watchdog groups that is acquiring finely tuned antennae to pinpoint indicators of forthcoming or already unfolding crises. This network of ‘early warners’ are working to publicize potential and actual emergencies by locating indicators of danger into larger catastrophic patterns of interpretation, culturally meaningful chains of events whose implications become discernable for decision-makers and ordinary citizens (‘this is why you should care’).18 Civic associations can thus invest perilous situations with urgency and importance, transforming climate change from an apparently mild and distant possibility to an irreversible and grave threat to human survival, and genocide from a supposedly isolated aberration to an affront to our common humanity.

AT: Root Cause

Focus on the root cause of war is ineffective and increases conflict

Woodward 7 (Susan, senior research fellow at the Centre for Defense Studies, King's College, London, and from 1990 to 1999, senior fellow at the Brookings Institution “Do the Root Causes of Civil War Matter? On Using Knowledge to Improve Peacebuilding Interventions”, *Journal of Intervention and State Building*, volume 1, No. 2, AD: 7-11-09)MT

In sum, the policy interest in stopping the violence of civil wars has led to substantial advances in what we know about their causes, but current policies tend to be based on research that has been superseded and that, in any case, proposed competing arguments. If effective peacebuilding depends on addressing ‘root causes’ and the knowledge on which those policies are based is wrong, then our interventions may do more harm than we would by ignoring causes altogether.

Furthermore, if the root causes of any civil war lie in international factors, even partially \_/ for example, the changing global economic context, the instability of a neighbourhood, the strategic policies of major powers, the economic policies supported by donors and banks, the conditions for aid or trade \_/ then the focus of peacebuilding must include those international conditions or actions, not just domestic transformation. While the regional security context of a country in conflict has been incorporated into some peacebuilding strategies, such as the regional stabilization annex (1B) of the Dayton peace accord for Bosnia-Herzegovina and its implementation by the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe and further regional arms

control negotiations in Vienna, or the agreement on cooperation between Afghanistan and its neighbours facilitated by Lakhdar Brahimi in 2002, for the most part the international conditions and policies that figure most prominently in analyses of root causes are beyond the reach of a peace operation or worse,

the external actors who would have to make changes will not and insist that local actors bear full responsibility for the violence. Most important, the parties themselves will not agree about the ‘root causes’ of their war. That is the nature of civil war. Not only is civil war a highly complexphenomenon, such that there is no single cause in the sense promoted by thethree influential schools of explanation, but the fuel that provokes and prolongs a war includes fundamental disagreements over its cause (and thus respectiveresponsibilities for its start and resolution). Crucial to the way a conflict ends are the parties’ campaigns to win external support (including intervention) for their side by shaping outsiders’ perceptions of the cause of the war. Academic expertsoften lend their support to these campaigns without full disclosure that theyhave taken on an advocacy role. One reason that military victories tend to be

more stable than negotiated or assisted endings (Licklider 1993) may be that victors impose their explanation and can, thus, terminate the competition over cause and responsibility. Otherwise, the politics of the immediate post-war period is suffused with (if not actually driven by) a continuing contest over

interpretations, relative responsibilities and guilt, and search for external support for one origin and cause over others. While policy makers tend(impatiently, one must acknowledge) to dismiss academic research on groundsthat ‘experts do not agree’, these disagreements pale in intensity andconsequence in the face of the inevitable disagreements among the parties.

AT: Root Cause

There is no root cause of war- too many factors to consider

Smith 89 (Robert, *Warfare and Diplomacy in Pre-Colonial West Africa*, pg. 141, AD: 7-11-09) MT

As Quincy Wright concludes, Wars arise because of the changing relations of numerous variables- technological, physic, social, and intellectual. There is no single cause of war. This multiplicity of variables which characterizes most human situation, suggests that the search for generalizations about the causes of war, in pre-colonial West Africa or elsewhere, or at any time, has only a limited value and interest.

Alt Fails – Discourse

Their alt can’t solve the aff discourse or the overall regime of truth described by realist thought

Williams 3 (Michael, Prof. of International Politics at the Univ. of Wales, *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 47, No. 4, pp. 511-531)

This stance allows the Copenhagen School to argue simultaneously for both an expansion and a limitation of the security agenda and its analysis. On the one hand, treating security as a speech-act provides, in principle, for an almost indefinite expansion of the security agenda. Not only is the realm of possible threats enlarged, but the actors or objects that are threatened (what are termed the ‘‘referent objects’’ of security) can be extended to include actors and objects well beyond the military security of the territorial state. Accordingly, the Copenhagen School has argued that security can usefully be viewed as comprising five ‘‘sectors,’’ each with their particular referent object and threat agenda (Buzan, Wæver, and de Wilde, 1998).6 In the ‘‘military’’ sector, for example, the referent object is the territorial integrity of the state, and the threats are overwhelmingly defined in external, military terms. In the ‘‘political’’ sector, by contrast, what is at stake is the legitimacy of a governmental authority, and the relevant threats can be ideological and sub-state, leading to security situations in which state authorities are threatened by elements of their own societies, and where states can become the primary threat to their own societies. Even further from an exclusively military-territorial focus is the concept of ‘‘societal’’ security, in which the identity of a group is presented as threatened by dynamics as diverse as cultural flows, economic integration, or population movements. Conversely, while treating security as a speech-act allows a remarkable broadening of analysis, securitization theory seeks also to limit the security agenda. Security, the Copenhagen School argues, is not synonymous with ‘‘harm’’ or with the avoidance of whatever else might be deemed malign or damaging (Buzan et al., 1998:2–5, 203–12). As a speech-act, securitization has a specific structure which in practice limits the theoretically unlimited nature of ‘‘security.’’ These constraints operate along three lines. First, while the securitization process is in principle completely open (any ‘‘securitizing actor’’ can attempt to securitize any issue and referent object), in practice it is structured by the differential capacity of actors to make socially effective claims about threats, by the forms in which these claims can be made in order to be recognized and accepted as convincing by the relevant audience, and by the empirical factors or situations to which these actors can make reference. Not all claims are socially effective, and not all actors are in equally powerful positions to make them. This means, as Buzan and Wæver put it, that the ‘‘Conditions for a successful speech-act fall into two categories: (1) the internal, linguistic-grammatical-to follow the rules of the act (or, as Austin argues, accepted conventional procedures must exist, and the act has to be executed according to these procedures); and (2) the external, contextual and social-to hold a position from which the act can be made (‘The particular persons and circumstances in a given case must be appropriate for the invocation of the particular procedure invoked’)’’ (Buzan et al., 1998:32). The claims that are likely to be effective, the forms in which they can be made, the objects to which they refer, and the social positions from which they can effectively be spoken are usually deeply ‘‘sedimented’’ (rhetorically and discursively, culturally, and institutionally) and structured in ways that make securitizations somewhat predictable and thus subject to probabilistic analysis (Wæver, 2000)Fand not wholly open and expandable. Finally, while empirical contexts and claims cannot in this view ultimately determine what are taken as security issues or threats, they provide crucial resources and referents upon which actors can draw in attempting to securitize a given issue.

Alt Fails – Generally

Security discourse is inevitable.

Williams 3 (Michael, Prof. of International Politics at the Univ. of Wales, *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 47, No. 4, pp. 511-531)

The first, and simplest point is that in some ways the Copenhagen School treats securitization not as a normative question, but as an objective process and possibility. Very much like Schmitt, they view securitization as a social possibility intrinsic to political life. In regard to his concept of the political, for example, Schmitt once argued,

It is irrelevant here whether one rejects, accepts, or perhaps finds it an atavistic remnant of barbaric times that nations continue to group themselves according to friend and enemy, or whether it is perhaps strong pedagogic reasoning to imagine that enemies no longer exist at all. The concern here is neither with abstractions nor normative ideals, but with inherent reality and the real possibility of making such a distinction. One may or may not share these hopes and pedagogic ideals. But, rationally speaking, it cannot be denied that nations continue to group themselves according to the friend–enemy antithesis, that the distinction still remains actual today, and that this is an ever present possibility for every people existing in the political sphere (1996 [1932]: 28).30 In certain settings, the Copenhagen School seems very close to this position. Securitization must be understood as both an existing reality and a continual possibility. Yet equallyclearly there is a basic ambivalence in this position, for it raises the dilemma that securitization theory must remain at best agnostic in the face of any securitization**,** even, for example, a fascist speech-act (such as that Schmitt has often been associated with) that securitizes a specific ethnic or racial minority. To say that we must study the conditions under which such processes and constructions emerge and become viable is important but incomplete, for without some basis for avoiding this process and transforming it the Copenhagen School appears to risk replicating some of the worst excesses made possible by a Schmittian understanding of politics.

Critical theory is not able to predict the outcome of desecuritization – the alternative is nothing more than wishful thinking.

Mearsheimer 95 (John, Prof. of Poli Sci at the Univ. of Chicago, *International Security*, Vol. 19, No. 3, Winter 1994-1995, pp. 5-49)

There is another problem with the application of critical theory to international relations. Although critical theorists hope to replace realism with a discourse that emphasizes harmony and peace, critical theory per se emphasizes that it is impossible to know the future. Critical theory, according to its own logic, can be used to undermine realism and produce change, but it cannot serve as the basis for predicting which discourse will replace realism, because the theory says little about the direction change takes. In fact, Cox argues that although "utopian expectations may be an element in stimulating people to act ... such expectations are almost never realized in practice."160 Thus, in a sense, the communitarian discourse championed by critical theorists is wishful thinking, not an outcome linked to the theory itself. Indeed, critical theory cannot guarantee that the new discourse will not be more malignant than the discourse it replaces. Nothing in the theory guarantees, for example, that a fascist discourse far more violent than realism will not emerge as the new hegemonic discourse.

Alt Fails – Generally

Saying that states can cooperate if securitization discourse were to stop is unrealistic and naïve – it wishes away the fundamental problem of uncertainty, which would lead back into realism.

Copeland 2K (Dale C., Assoc. Prof. in Dept. of Govt. and Foreign Affairs at Univ. of Virginia, *International Security*, Vol. 25, No. 2, Fall 2000, pp. 187-212)

The question of uncertainty is critical to understanding the differences between structural realism and constructivism, and where Wendt’s analysis misses the mark. Consider first uncertainty regarding the other’s present intentions. Wendt is aware that this kind of uncertainty challenges his point that the current distribution of interests drives the way anarchy plays itself out. He counters that, at least in the modern environment, the “problem of other minds” is not much of a problem. States today can indeed learn a great deal about what the other is doing and thinking. That knowledge may not be “100 percent certain,” Wendt argues, “but no knowledge is that” (p. 281, emphasis in original). To assume a worst-case scenario and to treat the other as hostile may be more dangerous than adopting a conciliatory policy, because it creates a self-fulfilling prophecy of mutual mistrust (pp. 281, 107–109, 360). This counterargument has serious flaws. In essence, it is an effort to assume away the problem—that there really is no problem of other minds—and it is weak on three grounds. First, Wendt’s view that states typically know a lot about the other’s motives is an unsupported empirical statement based only on a reading of the contemporary situation. Even if it were true for the majority of states today—and it certainly does not capture the reality between the states that count, such as the United States and China—his point cannot be retrofitted into the previous five centuries that constitute the focus of Wendt’s analysis. In sum, if uncertainty about present intentions was rampant during these five hundred years, it (along with shifts in relative power) may explain a great deal about changes in conflict and cooperation over time. Second, Wendt’s view is inconsistent with his recognition that states often do have difficulty learning about the other. The very problem Ego and Alter have in first communicating is that “behavior does not speak for itself.” It must be interpreted, and “many interpretations are possible” (p. 330). This point is reinforced by Wendt’s epistemological point of departure: that the ideas held by actors are “unobservable” (chap. 2). Because leaders cannot observe directly what the other is thinking, they are resigned to making inferences from its behavior. Yet in security affairs, as Wendt acknowledges, mistakes in inferences—assuming the other is peaceful when in fact it has malevolent intentions—could prove “fatal” (p. 360). Wendt accepts that the problem facing rational states “is making sure that they perceive other actors, and other actors’ perception of them, correctly” (p. 334, emphasis in original). Yet the book provides no mechanism through which Ego and Alter can increase their confidence in the correctness of their estimates of the other’s type. Simply describing how Ego and Alter shape each other’s sense of self and other is not enough.22 Rational choice models, using assumptions consistent with structural realism, do much better here. In games of incomplete information, where states are unsure about the other’s type, actions by security-seeking actors that would be too costly for greedy actors to adopt can help states reduce their uncertainty about present intentions, thus moderating the security dilemma.23 Wendt cannot simply argue that over time states can learn a great deal about other states. It is what is not “shared,” at least in the area of intentions that remains the core stumbling block to cooperation. Third, Wendt’s position that the problem of other minds is not much of a problem ignores a fundamental issue in all social relations, but especially in those between states, namely, the problem of deception. In making estimates of the other’s present type, states have reason to be suspicious of its diplomatic gestures—the other may be trying to deceive them. Wendt’s analysis is rooted in the theory of symbolic interactionism, but he does not discuss one critical aspect of that tradition: the idea of “impression management.” Actors in their relations exploit the problem of other minds for their own ends. On the public stage, they present images and play roles that often have little to do with their true beliefs and interests backstage.24 In laying out his dramaturgical view of Ego and Alter co-constituting each other’s interests and identities, Wendt assumes that both Ego and Alter are making genuine efforts to express their true views and to “cast” the other in roles that they believe in. But deceptive actors will stage-manage the situation to create impressions that serve their narrow ends, and other actors, especially in world politics, will understand this.25 Thus a prudent security-seeking Ego will have difficulty distinguishing between two scenarios: whether it and Alter do indeed share a view of each other as peaceful, or whether Alter is just pre- tending to be peaceful in order to make Ego think that they share a certain conception of the world, when in fact they do not.26 Wendt’s analysis offers no basis for saying when peaceful gestures should be taken at face value, and when they should be discounted as deceptions.27 When we consider the implications of a Hitlerite state deceiving others to achieve a position of military superiority, we understand why great powers in history have tended to adopt postures of prudent mistrust.

Alt Fails – Generally

The alternative’s focus on interpretations leads to an endless, useless cycle of “floating signifiers” that results in a nihilistic world.

Jarvis 2K (Darryl S. L., Assoc. Prof. of Public Policy at Univ. of Singapore, *International Relations and the Challenge of Postmodernism,*, pp. 199-200)

As scholars reconstituted under this "appropriate posture," or in later writings a "critical posture of estrangement," we would be condemned to read, to play with words, to interpret without purpose, and to sit amid a solipsistic intertext where words, meanings, referents, signifiers, authors, and subjects have no meaning or reality other than those we would con¬struct individually." With the knowledge that there is no true knowledge because of the absence of secure ground upon which to build knowledge, we would abandon the Enlightenment project and squander away our time in linguistic play as "floating signifiers" vied for our attention among the simulacra of images that each of us consumed. Knowing that we could not know, the task at hand would devolve into one of repudiating the entire stock of knowledge, understanding, and practices that constitute International Relations and developing instead an historical amnesia that favored "a view from afar, from up high."" Even interpretation, Ashley insists, a method permissible to most postmodernists, would eventually have to be abandoned along with theory." Since "there is no there there" to be explained, and since interpretation would be but another method of affixing intrinsic meaning to a metaphysical nonreality, it too would have to be abandoned. In this newly constituted enterprise, nothing would await discovery, nothing would have intrinsic meaning, nothing would actually be present other than "absence," and hence nothing could be named. The state would not really exist, subjects would be transcendental fabrications who chase their empty identity throughout history, and history would be a mere interpretation, yet another "practice of domination."44 Within this nihilistic chasm, subversive postmodernists would have us devolve our disciplinary enterprise into a form of philosophical mentalism, an attempt "to resist the metaphysical temptation in our culture, to assume that something so important must be namable and that the name must indicate a definite referent, an already differentiated identity and source of meaning that just awaits to be named."'" Only minds situated amid their various contexts would exist and reality would be constituted not through the "realm of immediate sense experience" or "by direct observation of an independently existing world of 'facts," but through the thoughts of the mind." What, then, would we be left with and what could this newly constituted enterprise offer? As Ashley freely admits, it could offer little. It could not "claim to offer an alternative position or perspective" since there would be no secure ontological ground upon which these could be established.47 Nor could it offer alternative interpretations save it would attempt to impose "interpretation upon interpretation" and capture history by imposing fixed meanings and understandings. Least of all could it offer theory, the very tyranny of modernist narratives that tends to "privilege" and "marginalize." Absent any theoretical legacy or factual knowledge, we would be forced into an endless intertextual discourse predicated on the consumption of words and the individual thoughts they evoke: a kind of purified anarchism albeit in a perpetual state of self-dispersal." We would live in a world of relativistic knowledge claims, each "true" to those that think it, but its truthfulness unobtainable to those who would read it or wish to communicate it. Above all, we would be left without theory- knowledge as a basis for decision, judgment, prescription, and action, sur¬rendering us to "a view from afar, from up high." But as Nicholas Onuf asks, "What does this leave for dealing with those close at hand?'

Alt Fails – Generally

By trying to prevent security, we secure the status quo.

Dillon 96 (Michael, Prof@Lancaster, *Politics of Security*, p.30-31)JFS

Security cannot be taken as an unproblematic ontological predicate of the political because the question of ontology has itself become so problematical since the radical problematisation of the very tradition in which it has hitherto been thought. That problematisation, and its implications for thinking politics, is what I want to explore next. Consequently we cannot understand the inception and operation of (inter)national politics of security by reference to the expression of that predicate in self-consciousness, the biological individual, the community/nation/people, or the egotistical subject. Just as certainty is never certain of itself, (inter)national security never succeeds in securing itself. For each consists in exactly the same demand, which redoubles with any act that might satisfy it.One of the virtues of approaching security through a philosophy of the limit lies in the way such thinking is concerned not with the discernment of meta­physical truth but the decipherment of value, not with the production of reliable knowledge but the exposure of the processes of valuation and the foreclosure of possibilities effected by regimes of truth as power—knowledge. Such a posture emphasises that (inter)national security names a process of valuation and so alerts us to what is being devalued as well. And that such a process is not a simple monolithic determination of values, but sets in motion a dynamic play of (de)valuation in its preoccupation with calculation.While we have no greater provocation than the terminal paradox of our (inter)national politics of security to doubt the truth and the value (the truth-value) of security, it is perfectly obvious also that thinking the limit is itself, however, a dangerous game. For to doubt the truth and value of security seems to deny us the very means of survival in the most lethal of circumstances; particularly when it does not come equipped with a promise that we can secure an escape from (in)security, danger or a final overcoming of the violence which threatens, and is always threatened by, the agonal mortal life of human being.`There are no dangerous thoughts', said one of the very few contemporary political philosophers — Hannah Arendt — whose work was deeply influenced by Heidegger.47 'Thinking itself', she concluded, 'is dangerous'.48 Heidegger, too, called the ontological difference — which is the very thought that re-opens the question of the political — 'the most dangerous matter for thought'.49 But 'non- thinking', Arendt nonetheless also cautioned, 'which seems so recommendable a state for political and moral affairs, also has its perils'.50 To think and not to think, especially where the matter for thought is the question of the political, are therefore equally dangerous things to do. All this, then, is very dangerous talk.51 However, even if it is inevitably dangerous, it is dangerous in different ways and for different reasons.

Alt Fails – State Link

**Crit. Sec. Studies criticizes the idea of security, but contradicts itself by still maintaining the power of the state to securitize an issue. It does not change the root of the problem but rather shifts the focus to the essential character of identity.**

Gurbachan 8 (Singh, Strategy Studies @ Harvard, MIT *Reconciling Emancipation and Critical Security Studies*)

**The Copenhagen School has been criticized for not going far enough to totally break away from the realist state centric notion of security**. Together with Wæver and de Wilde, **Buzan have retained state–centrism by arguing that to securitize an issue is to render it** “so important that it should not be exposed to the normal haggling of politics but **should be dealt with decisively by top leaders prior to other issues**” (Buzan, Ole Wæver & Wilde 1998: 29). **The School is also accused of merely shifting to other positivist epistemology by labeling identity as having an ‘essential character’** (McSweeney 1996: 84) or as a given. **While the military and political sectors, the referent object may be the state, in the societal sector the referent object is identity**, or ‘more specifically, **it is about the sustainability, within acceptable conditions** for evolution, **of traditional patterns** of language, culture, association, and religious and national identity and custom’ (O. Wæver et al. 1993: 23). While acknowledging that **through a ‘speech act’ any referent object could be under threat and become a security concern, addressing of the threat by the state is to solve a security problem and not necessarily to encourage/realise emancipatory tendencies.** Booth counters the state or society centric notion of security of the Copenhagen School by highlighting that ‘it is illogical to spend excessive amounts of money and effort to protect the house against flood, dry rot and burglars if this is at the cost of the well-beings of the inhabitants’(Booth 1991: 320).

Alt Fails – Ontology

Reconstructive Ontological claims within Security become problematic because there can be no objective Truth meaning no alternative ground that can be established.

Mustapha 9 (Jennifer, Department of Political Science McMaster University

*An Analytical Survey of Critical Security Studies: Making the Case for a (Modified) Post-structuralist Approach*)

Nevertheless, while The amoral nihilist straw-figure is an over-represented caricature, the real question is whether or not it is actually a danger. I would argue that the answer is *yes*. There is relevance in these broader concerns, and they cannot be simply brushed off as the folly of two ships passing in the night, where critiques of postmodernism are made on the basis of fundamentally different “external grounds”. **Too often, in response to critique, postmodern theorists appear to counter that their critics simply “don’t get it” and demur any engagement with them**. This is deeply unsatisfying and is actually at odds with the larger post-structuralist ethic that recognizes contingency, subjectivity and indeterminacy. It is arguable that the proponents of a postmodern or more broadly post-structuralist ethic must themselves engage with these concerns in order to remain intellectually genuine. In what follows, I attempt to do so. As mentioned, the particular postmodern approach in question eschews the making of ontological claims on the basis that to do otherwise is to be inconsistent with the project of deconstruction**. Furthermore, ontological claims are seen as inherently problematic because all knowledge is situated knowledge, and there is nothing that can be objectively known to be True. In other words, all constructed foundations are seen as being inherently modernist and necessarily invoking unreflexive claims about what “Is”, and this is seen as anathema to the postmodern project. Moreover, this perspective sees all post-structuralist critique as necessarily arriving at this postmodern place.** As Richard K. Ashley (1989) argues, “post-structuralism cannot claim to offer an alternative position or perspective, **because there is no alternative ground upon which it might be established**” (p. 278, emphasis added). He goes on to assert that “the task of post-structural social theory is not to impose a general interpretation, a paradigm of the sovereignty of man, as a guide to the transformation of life on a global scale… post-structuralism eschews grand designs, transcendental grounds, or universal projects of human-kind” (Ashley 1989, p. 284). Ashley is unabashed about his position that the “better course” (p. 313) is to persistently ask questions of the “how” rather than the “what” (pp. 281-283) and that the “work of thought” (p. 313, emphasis in original) is paramount. This type of postmodern deconstruction then, becomes an end in and of itself, rather than a means to the end of reconstructing novel ontologies. As such, its epistemological and methodological commitments become its ontological commitments.

**Alt Fails – Value to Life**

The alt can’t restore value to life

Gurbachan 8 (Singh, Strategy Studies @ Harvard, MIT *Reconciling Emancipation and Critical Security Studies*)

We only have this one Earth. **Time is running out for us to seriously address the future challenges of Earth’s finite resources, large population growths, urbanization and meeting humanitarian needs.** The times of infighting are over; **there is in the distant future a looming catastrophe of even greater proportion then the global nuclear war**. Hopefully with the recent emergence of the major global energy crisis the world leaders will be more serious in advancing a more humanity oriented critical approach towards a more cooperative and peaceful world order. **The term emancipation** while useful in advancing the critical human perspective, unfortunately **suffers from being culturally from a western origin. One man’s emancipation may be another’s sense of insecurity. It also conjures a notion of utopian idealism that could lose touch with current realities**. However, emancipation is sine qua non to the critical security thinking of at least the Frankfurt and Welsh School, and some might want to argue ultimately all critical approaches. **Indeed ultimately emancipation may be the only justification in providing an alternative to the positivist traditional theory of state and military centric power dominated anarchic world order. Without the ability to claim that a better world is possible or even conceivable, there is no means by which the present can be criticized.**Critical Security Studies will need to start delving in the specifics and take a more practical approach in advancing the approach. While there are signs that indeed this is being done by Booth and Vale in South Africa and also by Joseph Ruane and Jennifer Todd in Northern Ireland(Joseph Ruane & Todd 2005: 14), more needs to be done ‘if critical security studies are to flourish and lead to a revisioning of security in world politics’(Eli Stamnes & Jones). **In the pursuit of emancipation, proponents of CSS must also be mindful of not building another world order that is also far detached from the current or future reality.**

**Alt Fails – Value to Life**

Their conception of the value to life is culturally specific and undesirable because it ignores equally powerful desire for order

Gurbachan 8 (Singh, Strategy Studies @ Harvard, MIT *Reconciling Emancipation and Critical Security Studies*)

The main criticism levied against emancipation is that it conjures a sense of utopian ideal that is far detached from the practical real world. In this real world of scarce resources, emancipation could well create anarchy. There are practical difficulties in trying to achieve that notion that ‘I am not truly free until everyone is free’ (Booth 1991: 322) across nations. With finite and disproportionate endowment of resources in the world, how will it be practically possible to get countries to liberate all mankind without jeopardizing their own survivability in the long run? By asking the well endowed nations or citizens to part with some of their wealth could in some cases create the very fear that emancipation was meant to eradicate. The concept also assumes that humans are by nature good and that their tendencies towards greed, lust survival and lying are controllable. Tarry argues that it is an ‘excessively broad conceptualization that encompasses the perceptions of all people, the definition becomes analytically meaningless as a tool for understanding the phenomena it is intended to capture. Secondly, in practice, the emancipation of humanity could be used to create a condition of anarchy, where violence is legitimized, and existing divisions between people are exacerbated’(Tarry 1998). Mohammed Ayoob criticizes Booth’s definition as it ‘refuses to acknowledge that a society or group can be emancipated without being secure or vice versa….Such semantic acrobatics tend to impose a model of contemporary Western politics…that are far removed from Third World realities. ‘To posit emancipation as synonymous with security and panacea for all the ills plaguing Third World states can be the height of naivete’ (Ayoob 1997: 121-146). Here, it is difficult to disagree with Ayoob as the origin of the phrase ‘emancipation’ indeed has direct links to western theology or symbolises the eradicating of slavery in America. A possible way ahead may be to change it to ‘Humanism’ or any other universal phrase. Sarah Tarry argues that since Booth ‘characterizes states as being "means and not ends," he would consider the Canadian State to be a threat to the distinct Québecois identity. This emancipation of the sovereigntists would, however, be in fierce opposition to Québec nationalists and the ROC who would freely choose to have Québec remain within the federation. As both choices are equally legitimate among equal individuals, it is difficult to imagine how this contradiction could be resolved in such a manner as to not make all Canadians more insecure’(Tarry 1998). Similar contradictory arguments could also be advanced for Kashmir, Kosovo and even post-war Iraq. It could therefore be argued that while the notion of emancipation in the abstract may be promising, it has often failed to offer a practical way forward in specific situations. Tan See Seng argues that while ‘the desire for such an end to all power is understandable in the light of liberal proclivity to valuate power in negative terms, it nonetheless seems to me a fallacy to imagine the possibility of political thinking and acting without power (Tan May 2001). Adopting a purely normative approach also runs the risk of adopting those norms that were historically acceptable and could be argued to be more humane, depending on the perspective. Slaves in the past or in today’s context housemaids (at least the way they are often being abused) may still stand a better chance towards emancipation with their employers than in their own poverty stricken countries. There also is serious conflict of interest between the capitalism and emancipation. One aims to maximize returns and profits while the other aims to maximize distribution of wealth. While not necessarily totally world apart, there are major challenges. Flat organizational trends suggest that more wealth could be created by less power or hierarchy, more creativeHowever, I felt that Booth may not have gone far enough in being specific as what is universal or common humanity? Granted that power and order are secondary to emancipation, how can a community determine and know for sure that it has struck the right balance between power and emancipation such that its would not create another potentially anarchic situation. How can a community distinguish between what are needs and what are desires? The desires of human can be unending. How can we practically reconcile the differences between cultural value systems that belief and those that do not belief in the death penalty as a form of deterrence? Whatever the decision, someone will be feeling insecure. How do we reconcile a belief system that claims that theirs is the only real God and all other images and manifestation of God are evil spirits? What happens if the cost of an emancipated solution far outweighs the benefits to the whole community? I believe the way ahead, as has been alluded to but not emphasized by Ken Booth is a managed diffusion of power. However this should be done without compromising overall efficiency necessary for the long term survival of the community. In this real world there are more pressing problems of economic growth and development. Countries will need to prioritize industrial and infrastructure development to sustain the economic growth rather then strive to prioritise to meet the unique and often conflicting needs of all communities. Critical Studies proponents must be mindful that in the short run this approach will inevitably require some compromising of the emancipatory logic.

Alt Turn - Exclusion

Their critical approach to security necessarily turns in on itself – it recreates the exclusions that it attempts to cross over by targeting specific audiences.

Mutimer 9 (David, Assoc. Prof. of Poli Sci at York Univ., *Studies in Social Justice*, Vol. 3, No. 1, pp. 9-22)

Most critical scholarship in International Relations begins, in some sense, f**rom Robert Cox’s observation that all theory is for someone and for some purpose.** (Cox, 1986, p. 207) **It is rarely noted that this means, necessarily, that theory is also against someone and against their purposes.** While rarely noted**, it would generally not be seen as overly problematic by critical theorists if it were, because the assumption is that critical theory is for the oppressed, for the excluded, and is therefore against the oppressor, against those on the inside keeping the deserving out**. But who are the deserving? Our reflex is that they are any that are kept out, but here is the point at which the discussion I have just followed gains its significance. The various forms of critical theorizing about security identify those deserving by identifying whom it is their theory is for. By effecting exclusions from the critical project, the different forms of theorizing produce some as doubly excluded: they are outside, but not deserving. Emancipatory critical theory is revealed to be against not only the oppressors, those inside guarding the gates, but against some of those on the outside as well. As Christine Sylvester puts it:When critical people of all persuasions and locations forget to recognize that critical comes in many forms, when they designate some critical analysts as ‘other participants’, fall into the habit encouraged by camp IR to focus narrowly and rally around a few thinkers, when they forget that feminists are dissidents too and that women are in security peril the world round . . . they are in trouble . . . ” (Sylvester, 2007, p. 556) The conclusion is unavoidable, then, that each of the positions I have surveyed is “in trouble,” as each effects just such exclusions of other forms of critique and the insecure outsiders for whom those others speak. Booth’s post-Marxism privileges those excluded on the basis of class, but the disparagement of post-structuralism effects an excision of not only the writers but the varied forms of identity for whom they write. These multiple and overlapping forms of identity include, but are not limited to, those constituted by race, sexual orientation and, of course, gender. The CASE Collective, even in its aim to be inclusive, excludes feminists and the insecure women for whom they write, as well as the non-Europeans who may also write for subjects other than those that are the focus of European authors. The question that remains, of course, is whether we can escape the production of exclusions in our attempts at critical (security) scholarship. My answer is that no, we cannot. By speaking for some we necessarily speak against others, and the range of those who face oppression, those for whom critical scholarship is written, is too great for them all to be written for at once. My corollary to this observation is that there will be different outsiders who most need critical theory at different times and in different places. In taking this step, I make clear my own choice amongst the inclusions and exclusions I have surveyed, for from this corollary follows a post- structural critical ethos. While we cannot avoid effecting exclusions in our work, we can resist the temptation to effect them *a priori.* Rather, we need to turn our critical gazes constantly on ourselves to ask if, at each time and in each place, we are theorizing for those most in need. Doing so acknowledges that other outsiders will be excluded by our choices, but has at least the benefit of doing so in a limited and contingent fashion.

Alt Turn - Violence

Security discourse is inevitable—rejection risks replicating the harms.

Williams 3 (Michael, Professor of International Politics at the University of Wales, “Words, Images, Enemies: Securitization and International Politics,” *International Studies Quarterly*, 47(4), AD: 7-10-9) BL

It is irrelevant here whether one rejects, accepts, or perhaps finds it an atavistic remnant of barbaric times that nations continue to group themselves according to friend and enemy, or whether it is perhaps strong pedagogic reasoning to imagine that enemies no longer exist at all. The concern here is neither with abstractions nor normative ideals, but with inherent reality and the real possibility of making such a distinction. One may or may not share these hopes and pedagogic ideals. But, rationally speaking, it cannot be denied that nations continue to group themselves according to the friend–enemy antithesis, that the distinction still remains actual today, and that this is an ever present possibility for every people existing in the political sphere (1996 [1932]: 28).30 In certain settings, the Copenhagen School seems very close to this position. Securitization must be understood as both an existing reality and a continual possibility. Yet equally clearly there is a basic ambivalence in this position, for it raises the dilemma that securitization theory must remain at best agnostic in the face of any securitization, even, for example, a fascist speech-act (such as that Schmitt has often been associated with) that securitizes a specific ethnic or racial minority. To say that we must study the conditions under which such processes and constructions emerge and become viable is important but incomplete, for without some basis for avoiding this process and transforming it the Copenhagen School appears to risk replicating some of the worst excesses made possible by a Schmittian understanding of politics.

**Rejecting security discourse replicates radical realpolitik.**

Williams 3 (Michael, Professor of International Politics at the University of Wales, “Words, Images, Enemies: Securitization and International Politics,” *International Studies Quarterly*, 47(4), AD: 7-10-9) BL

I would like to suggest that it is in response to these issues, and in regard to the realm of ethical practice, that the idea of security as a speech-act takes on an importance well beyond its role as a tool of social explanation. Casting securitization as a speechact places that act within a framework of communicative action and legitimation that links it to a discursive ethics that seeks to avoid the excesses of a decisionist account of securitization. While the Copenhagen School has been insufficiently clear in developing these aspects of securitization theory, they link clearly to some of the most interesting current analyses of the practical ethics of social-constructivism. As Thomas Risse (2000) has recently argued, communicative action is not simply a realm of instrumental rationality and rhetorical manipulation. Communicative action involves a process of argument, the provision of reasons, presentation of evidence, and commitment to convincing others of the validity of one’s position. Communicative action (speech-acts) are thus not just given social practices, they are implicated in a process of justification. Moreover, as processes of dialogue, communicative action has a potentially transformative capacity. As Risse puts it: Argumentative rationality appears to be crucially linked to the constitutive rather than the regulative role of norms and identities by providing actors with a mode of interaction that enables them to mutually challenge and explore the validity claims of those norms and identities. When actors engage in a truth-seeking discourse, they must be prepared to change their own views of the world, their interests, and sometimes even their identities. (2000: 2)31 As speech-acts, securitizations are in principle forced to enter the realm of discursive legitimation. Speech-act theory entails the possibility of argument, of dialogue, and thereby holds out the potential for the transformation of security perceptions both within and between states. The securitizing speech-act must be accepted by the audience, and while the Copenhagen School is careful to note that ‘‘[a]ccept does not necessarily mean in civilized, dominance-free discussion; it only means that an order always rests on coercion as well as on consent,’’ it is nonetheless the case that ‘‘[s]ince securitization can never only be imposed, there is some need to argue one’s case’’(Buzan et al., 1998: 23), and that ‘‘[s]uccessful securitization is not decided by the securitizer but by the audience of the security speech-act: does the audience accept that something is an existential threat to a shared value? Thus security (as with all politics) ultimately rests neither with the objects nor with the subjects but among the subjects’’(1998:31). It is via this commitment to communicative action and discursive ethics, I would like to suggest, that the Copenhagen School seeks to avoid the radical realpolitik that might otherwise seem necessarily to follow from the Schmittian elements of the theory of securitization. Schmitt appeals to the necessity and inescapability of decision, enmity, and ‘‘the political.’’ He appeals to the mobilizing power of myth in the production of friends and enemies, and asserts the need for a single point of decision to the point of justifying dictatorship. He mythologizes war and enmity as the paramount moments of political life.32

Alt Fails – Reject Bad

Resistance Fails.

D’Cruz 1 (Carolyn LaTrobe University, Australia, “What Matter Who's Speaking?" Authenticity and Identity in Discourses of Aboriginality in Australia,” *Jouvert*, Volume 5, Issue 3, http://english.chass.ncsu.edu/jouvert/v5i3/cdcr.htm AD: 7/11/09) NS

When Hollinsworth tackles the problem of essentialism, he argues that identifying an Aboriginal essence in terms of 'biological descent,' for instance, can unintentionally lend itself to right-wing populism, which creates a hierarchy of authenticity based on racist assumptions about categorisations such as full blood, half caste, and so on. This effectively derides some Aboriginal people with 'mixed ancestry.' He argues that there are similar problems of creating a hierarchy of authenticity with definitions of identity that situate an Aboriginal essence in terms of 'cultural continuity' (cultural commonalities in terms of heritage, and ways of doing things). While Hollinsworth does show an awareness that the means of defining Aboriginality is seeped in Australia's racist history, he curiously acts as if it were possible to simply choose the most appropriate way for authenticating identity, by rejecting the above classifications for what he calls 'Aboriginality as resistance.' This latter category professedly describes an 'oppositional culture' to common experiences of dispossession and racism. Though he warns against the tendency to essentialise this 'discourse' of resistance, Hollinsworth contends that 'Aboriginality as resistance' is "the most inclusive, dynamic and least readily domesticated by state co-option" ("Discourses" 151). Yet his choice to settle on a preferred category begs the question as to how such a selection can disentangle itself from its complicity with state co-option, as it is such domestication of identity that has *produced* such resistance and opposition in the first place.

Rejection is counterproductive. Realism synthesizes critical theories in order to provide for the possibility of transition.

Murray 97 (Alastair J.H. Politics Department, University of Wales Swansea, *Reconstructing Realism*, p. 178-9) NS

In Wendt’s constructivism, the argument appears in its most basic version, presenting an analysis of realist assumptions which associate it with a conservative account of human nature. In Linklater's critical theory it moves a stage further, presenting an analysis of realist theory which locates it within a conservative discourse of state‑centrism. In Ashley's post‑structuralism it reaches its highest form, presenting an analysis of realist strategy which locates it not merely within a conservative statist order, but, moreover, within an active conspiracy of silence to reproduce it. Finally, in Tickner's feminism, realism becomes all three simultaneously and more besides, a vital player in a greater, overarehing, masculine conspiracy against femininity. Realism thus appears, first, as a doctrine providing the grounds for a relentless pessimism, second, as a theory which provides an active justification for such pessimism, and, third, as a strategy which proactively seeks to enforce this pessimism, before it becomes the vital foundation underlying all such pessimism in international theory. Yet, an examination of the arguments put forward from each of these perspectives suggests not only that the effort to locate realism within a conservative, rationalist camp is untenable, but, beyond this, that realism is able to provide reformist strategies which are superior to those that they can generate themselves. The progressive purpose which motivates the critique of realism in these perspectives ultimately generates a bias which undermines their own ability to generate effective strategies of transition. In constructivism, this bias appears in its most limited version, producing strategies so divorced from the obstacles presented by the current structure of international politics that they threaten to become counter‑productive. In critical theory it moves a stage further, producing strategies so abstract that one is at a loss to determine what they actually imply in terms of the current structure of international politics. And, in post‑modernism, it reaches its highest form, producing an absence of such strategies altogether, until we reach the point at which we are left with nothing but critique. Against this failure, realism contains the potential to act as the basis of a more constructive approach to international relations, incorporating many of the strengths of reflectivism and yet avoiding its weaknesses. It appears, in the final analysis, as an opening within which some synthesis of rationalism and reflectivism, of conservatism and progressivism, might be built.

Violence Inevitable

Us vs. Them mentality is genetically encoded and inevitable.

Fisbein and Dess 3 (Harold D., Nancy, Ph. D. University of Cincinnati psychology, Ph.D. Occidental College psychology *Evolutionary psychology and violence: a primer for policymakers and public policy advocates* Ed. - Richard W. Bloom, Nancy Kimberly Dess pg.157-158)

This chapter deals with an evolutionary analysis of intercultural conflict. The core assumption is that genes determine some aspects of human social behavior Our genes make all of our social behavior possible, but because of our evolutionary design—as social primates and, later, as tribally organized hunters and gatherers—we have inherited a genetic structure that makes certain kinds of attitudes and social behavior inevitable. Further, the occurrence of some of these attitudes and behaviors makes the development of prejudice and discrimination toward members of other cultures highly likely. These attitudes and behaviors constitute an "us versus them" psychology that is genetically determined. On the basis of the current state of knowledge, it is highly likely that particular processes are genetically coded that normally ensure that the evolved social behaviors (phenotypic characteristics) will develop. For example, neither English nor Spanish is coded in the genes, but language-inducing processes are. If a child is reared in an English-speaking community, she'll learn English. If she's reared in an American Sign Language (ASL) community, she'll learn ASL. Either outcome can occur because language-inducing processes that have evolved in the species have developed in the individual. Although debate continues over whether these processes are modular or generic and about exactly how human communication is unique, that children's great facility for learning human language is an evolutionary legacy is clear

Violence Inevitable – History.

Shaw and Wong 89 (R. Paul, Yuwa, Ph.D. Senior population and development economist UNPF, Ph.D. Simon Fraser University *Genetic Seeds of Warfare: Evolution, Nationalism, and Patriotism* pg. 3)

What kinds of evidence convey war proneness? Some social scientists view the frequency of warfare among "primitive” tribes and "modern" nations as the most persuasive data. Montagu (1976) cites evidence of some 14,500 wars during the last 5,600 years of recorded history, or 2.6 wars per year. From his tally, only 10 of 185 generations have known uninterrupted peace. Burke (1975) makes a similar point; there have been only 268 years of peace during the last 3,400 years of history. Peace thus comprises only 8% of the entire history of recorded civilization. More recently, the Correlates of War Project at the University of Michigan shows there is virtually no evidence of a secular trend up or down in the incidence of warfare between 1816 and 1977 (Singer and Small 1972; Singer 1981). This suggests that war proneness is a "constant" in modern history. Since World War II, Valzelli (1981) notes there have been more than 150 wars, scrimmages, coups d'etat, and revolutions. During this period of "deceitful peace," he reports an average of 12 acts of war occurring simultaneously per year, with only 26 days of actual peace. Some 25 million humans were killed during the last 35 years, more than the total number of soldiers killed during the two world wars.

Violence Inevitable

Conflict serves multiple evolutionary functions.

Shaw and Wong 89 (R. Paul, Yuwa, Ph.D. Senior population and development economist UNPF, Ph.D. Simon Fraser University *Genetic Seeds of Warfare: Evolution, Nationalism, and Patriotism* pg. 10-11)

Do ritualized aggression and lethal conflict serve similar functions among humans? Alcock (1978), an evolutionary biologist, concludes that most threatening or violent disputes are employed to resolve contested ownership over scarce or potentially limiting resources. Eibl-Eibesfeldt (1979), an ethologist, interprets intergroup aggression as a means of sorting out territorial disputes or status in a ranking order, van den Berghe (1978), a sociologist, sees primitive and early societal warfare as a rational means of gaining livestock, women and slaves, gaining or keeping territory, or gaining, controlling, and exploiting new territory. Among nations, Knorr {1966, 1977), a political scientist, argues that the use of force is an allocative mechanism by which competition among states is resolved. Choucri and North (1975) demonstrate that much international conflict is the result of the interactive effects of population and technology demanding resources beyond national borders. And two military historians, Wright (1935) and Gray (1974), conclude that warfare and arms races seek to preserve solidarity under the status quo by augmenting nations\* influence, prestige, and power over social and economic resources in the world community. Perhaps the most outstanding testimony that modern warfare serves accepted functions is its institutionalization — to the extent that it now operates within a cadre of laws defining states of war and peace and prescribes rules of conduct for each. Several military historians define war as a legal condition which permits two or more hostile groups to carry on conflict by armed force. Emphasis on the term legal connotes societal acceptance and approval (Wright 1935; Kennedy 1972; J.T.Johnson 1981). Margaret Mead (1968) observes that modern warfare requires an organization for killing, the willingness of individuals to die on behalf of other members, the approval of individuals within the societies concerned, and an agreement that it is a legitimate way of solving problems. If we strip away the vagaries of different analytical approaches and academic jargon, we find that most anthropologists, sociologists, historians, economists, and political scientists agree that modern-day arms races, military threats, and use of violence by groups at various levels of organization serve to enforce, protect, or extend power (for example, Andreski 1968; von Clauscwitz 1976; Garnett 1970; Blaincy 1973; Hammond 1975; Midlarsky 1975; Falger 1987). And, in this context, any distinction between economic and political power is unreal. Every conflict involves power, and power depends on control over scarce or potentially limiting physical and nonphysical resources.

Violence is inevitable – Evolution.

Shaw and Wong 89 (R. Paul, Yuwa, Ph.D. Senior population and development economist UNPF, Ph.D. Simon Fraser University *Genetic Seeds of Warfare: Evolution, Nationalism, and Patriotism* pg. 12,14)

An evolutionary approach is essential to understanding humanity’s propensity for warfare for one reason. Behavioral strategies to enhance biological goals of survival, reproduction, and genetic fitness have not evolved independently of humanity's environment — they have coevolved. To decipher the "deep structure" of warfare propensities it is thus crucial to bear in mind that evolution always involves adaptation to past, not present, environments. Moreover, most genetic evolution of human behavior has occurred over a span of hundreds of thousands of years prior to civilization (see Figure 1.3). This means that a legacy of aggression and lethal conflict has adapted to serve humans for 99% of their existence. During the same period, structures of the brain and processes of cognition that are attuned to aggress ion/war fare have evolved. Viewing the coevolution of genes, mind, and culture with this legacy in mind suggests that the cultural explosion of modern times may not, as yet, have fully taken on a life of its own. Why? Because modern culture and many of its uses may be constrained or guided by humanity's evolutionary legacy including adaptations which have evolved to serve previous environments. Some of these formerly adaptive predispositions may well be maladaptive today. As we shall see, merely recognizing this possibility is not likely to be sufficient for their abandonment.

Violence Inevitable

Understanding violence as an aberration in human behavior prevents us from predicting it.

Fox 94 (Robin, University Professor of Social Theory at Rutgers, *The Challenge of Anthropology: Old Encounters and New Excursions*, pg. 88-89)

The assumption that violence is a disease is to make it the analog of diarrhea. But, what if it is in fact an analog of digestion, or of some subprocess like metabolization, ingestion, or excretion? There is no future, in this case, in looking for its “causes” since it doesn’t have any. It is just what the organism does as part of its routine of living. One can examine sequences within the routine and see where it fits (what its “functions” are); or, one can ask “ethological” questions about how it came to be there in the first place – evolutionary and adaptational questions. What is it for? What are its adaptational advantages? What survival value does it give the organism? – and so on. But “causal” questions are simply inapplicable. If we make this analytical mistake when looking at sequences of behavior involving violence at some point, then we will ask, What caused this violence to occur? and expend a lot of mental energy trying to find an answer on the analogy of, Why did diarrhea occur? But if we look at the same sequence in the ethological framework – as we do in “agonistic encounters” between animals of the same species, for example – we can predict fairly accurately when, in the escalation process, violence will occur. It is a natural, expectable, predictable, inevitable part of the process. It is not diarrhea. It is metabolization, if you like.

Conflict inevitable – power imbalances.

Horgan 9 (John, May, Scientific American Journalist, Taming Humanity's Urge to War: Must lethal conflict be an inevitable part of human culture?, *Scientific American,* May 2009 )

Harvard University anthropologist Richard Wrangham agreed with de Waal that primate violence is not compulsive, or “instinctual,” but is “extremely sensitive to context.” One of the most robust predictors of violence between two groups of primates, Wrangham proposed, is an imbalance of power. Chimps from one troop invariably attack individuals from a rival troop when the attackers have an overwhelming number advantage and hence a minimal risk of death or injury. Although humans are much less risk-averse than chimps, Wrangham asserted, human societies—from hunter-gatherers to modern nations such as the U.S.—also behave much more aggressively toward rival groups when they are confident they can prevail. Reducing imbalances of power between nations, Wrangham said, should reduce the risk of war.

War inevitable – culture.

Angier 3 (Natalie, November 11, *New York Times*, Is War Our Biological Destiny?)

Archaeologists and anthropologists have found evidence of militarism in perhaps 95 percent of the cultures they have examined or unearthed. Time and again groups initially lauded as gentle and peace-loving -- the Mayas, the !Kung of the Kalahari, Margaret Mead's Samoans, -- eventually were outed as being no less bestial than the rest of us. A few isolated cultures have managed to avoid war for long stretches. The ancient Minoans, for example, who populated Crete and the surrounding Aegean Islands, went 1,500 years battle-free; it didn't hurt that they had a strong navy to deter would-be conquerors. Warriors have often been the most esteemed of their group, the most coveted mates. And if they weren't loved for themselves, their spears were good courtship accessories. This year, geneticists found evidence that Genghis Khan, the 13th century Mongol emperor, fathered so many offspring as he slashed through Asia that 16 million men, or half a percent of the world's male population, could be his descendants. Wars are romanticized, subjects of an endless, cross-temporal, transcultural spool of poems, songs, plays, paintings, novels, films. The battlefield is mythologized as the furnace in which character and nobility are forged; and, oh, what a thrill it can be. ''The rush of battle is a potent and often lethal addiction,'' writes Chris Hedges, a reporter for The New York Times who has covered wars, in ''War Is a Force That Gives Us Meaning.'' Even with its destruction and carnage, he adds, war ''can give us what we long for in life.'' ''It can give us purpose, meaning, a reason for living,'' he continues. Nor are humans the only great apes to indulge in the elixir. Common chimpanzees, which share about 98 percent of their genes with humans, also wage war: gangs of neighboring males meet at the borderline of their territories with the express purpose of exterminating their opponents. So many males are lost to battle that the sex ratio among adult chimpanzees is two females for every male.

Violence Inevitable – A2: You Justify…

We don’t justify atrocities, don’t moralize facts.

Fisbein and Dess 3 (Harold D., Nancy, Ph. D. University of Cincinnati psychology, Ph.D. Occidental College psychology *Evolutionary psychology and violence: a primer for policymakers and public policy advocates* Ed. - Richard W. Bloom, Nancy Kimberly Dess pg.159)

Finally, that certain psychological processes are genetically determined does not mean that the attitudes and behaviors arising from those processes are morally correct. Whether moral rectitude can be derived from evolutionary reasoning is beyond the scope of this chapter. However, even scholars who argue that inquiry into human evolution is morally informative (e.g., Arnhart, 1998) do not suggest that a genomic basis, ancestral adaptive advantage, or species-wide inclination constitutes moral justification, and no such suggestion is made here. The issue is whether the psychological processes underlying in-tercultural conflict are illuminated by understanding our species' natural history and, if so, how this understanding might inform attempts to modify or redirect them in ways deemed socially useful through legitimate means. Specifically, we assume here that reducing violence and increasing intergroup harmony will be socially useful, and that influencing public policy is a legitimate means of advancing this agenda.

**Postmodernism Fails**

**Postmodernism is trapped by its own obscurity and contradictions – the alternatives can’t be discerned.**

Jarvis 2K (Darryl S. L., Assoc. Prof. of Public Policy at Univ. of Singapore, *International Relations and the Challenge of Postmodernism,*, pp. 55-56)

Such textual and intellectual sabotage, however, serve their purpose, perplexing modernists who often seem bereft of responses to it. Traditional theorists like Christopher Norris or Alex Callinicos, for instance, display bewilderment at the ethereality, theoretical brevity, and reluctance of postmodernists to enunciate their epistemic motif beyond the errant practices of deconstruction." Above all they are disenchanted at the unwillingness of postmodernists to abide by established rules for intellectual engagement: how does one rationally assess postmodern theory when postmodernists eschew all references to rationalist discourse? But they miss the point. Confusion, dissonance, and disruption are the point of postmodern discourse. Postmodernism can thus be understood as political resistance rather than theoretical innovation; a means of stepping outside the established practices of (Western) scholarship and infusing it with critical insight. The incorporeal nature of language destabilization, for example, allows post- modernists to attack the rigidities of modernist discourse, particularly the sanctums of logic and reason, and escape the "victimization" which they argue has led to their "exile," "marginalization," and "disempowerment." Ethereality therefore becomes a political act of nonconformity, and textual deconstruction a way of "undoing" and challenging the power hierarchy of modernist theory that presupposes conformity in method, logic, knowledge, and interpretation. One of the primary objectives of much postmodernist scholarship thus concerns itself with a form of deconstructive pluralism, deliberately designed to destabilize, or at least to challenge, the system(s) of knowledge premised upon Western rationalism and derived from the Enlightenment. Where the project of modern political theory might be said to concern itself with the good society, to inventing rules, norms, standards, and defining objectives on the basis of some master blueprint or universal grand strategy, postmodern theory might be said to be its arch rival, committed to seeing an end to this (modernist) project. Yet the alternatives it offers are all but invisible, especially when its aetiological basis is hidden beneath a complicated developmental historiography punctuated only by a disposition toward continental philosophy (in particular, French post- structuralist theory). Instead, postmodernists prefer the ether of the unspecified to the vexed realities of inscribed practices, disciplinary specialization, or concision in method and technique, and appeal to an as-yet unspecified set of other criteria as the appropriate vehicles for understanding postmodern theory. Consequently, postmodernism continues to suffer from ill-defined parameters that betray an incomplete conception of itself and an inclination to self-contradiction, discursiveness, irreverence, and complicated forms of expression and self-explanation."

Postmodernism assumes the moral high-ground to shield itself from criticism while casting contradictory insults on other thought processes.

Jarvis 2K (Darryl S. L., Assoc. Prof. of Public Policy at Univ. of Singapore, *International Relations and the Challenge of Postmodernism,*, pp. 123)

As Robert Gilpin points out, to believe Ashley is to believe that realists, realism, modernists, and those who profess rationalistic thinking practices "are all card-carrying members of an insidious and rather danger­ous conspiracy that, like Socrates, is indoctrinating youth (read graduate stu­dents) in false and dangerous ways of thinking."" For Gilpin, Ashley has assumed the mantle of a kafkaesque prosecutor who, in a self-enclosed, self- absorbed treatise, insulated as much by obtuse logic as needless jargon, has accused realists and modernists alike with intellectual treachery that approaches a pernicious evil. Collectively, however, such allegations have served their purpose, intimidating those who would protest against the pro­testers by closing off, silencing, or ascribing pejorative overtones to certain topics, debates, or issues now considered modernist, hierarchical, statist, sov­ereignist, realist, patriarchal, technical, structuralist, objectivist, positivist, foundationalist, or rationalist. These words are now lumped together into an amorphous whole, assumed inseparable and issued in condemnation. As Gilpin again notes, this "is polemical innuendo designed to scare easily cor­ruptible graduate students away from the likes of such alleged protofascists as Bob Keohane and George Modelski."" And this, I think, is the crux of the matter: political sophistry disguised as theoretical discourse. Ashley, along with Walker, has executed an exceedingly clever political maneuver by invoking the theme of victimization, allowing them the freedom to allege horrendous crimes but in the absence of any substantive evidence. Indeed, this has become a trademark of their discourse where, against alleged intel­lectual treachery, they assume the moral highground, all the time sheltering from the probing eye of criticism by labeling themselves victims Only the truly treacherous would dare bully the victim, subject them to yet more heinous ridicule, "violence," and "threats." Only the truly foolish would dare incur the wrath of the new vigilantism of political correctness. Presented with such options, few have felt compelled to reply to the likes of Ashley and Walker, and those who have are roundly dismissed for their intellectual impurity and moral culpability.

**Postmodernism Fails**

**Postmodernism defeats its own legitimacy through its insistence on relativism.**

Jarvis 2K (Darryl S. L., Assoc. Prof. of Public Policy at Univ. of Singapore, *International Relations and the Challenge of Postmodernism,*, pp. 130-131)

While the relevance of Ashley's poststructuralist theory is cause for con­cern, more disconcerting is its implicit nihilism. Not unexpectedly, Ashley rejects this, insisting that his discourse is not nihilistic but antifoundation­alist. Upon closer inspection, however, this position proves both unsus­tainable and self-defeating. By rejecting foundationalism and all truth claims derived through the application of reason, Ashley unwittingly aban‑dons theory, knowledge, and human practices to the ether of relativism and subjectivism. And by insisting that there "is no extratextual referent that can be used as a basis for adjudicating theoretical disputes," Ashley depreciates thought, theory, and knowledge to the particular outcomes of certain linguistic, interpretivist, and textual techniques." Ashley is thus forced to conclude that truth, purpose, and meaning can only be textually inferred and never universally or eternally proclaimed. One theory becomes as good as any another theory and a particular truth claim no bet­ter or worse than other truth claims Objective evaluation becomes impos­sible and, with it, any claim to a science of international politics. All that we might hope for is a subjective interpretivism, where, amid a vacuous intersection of texts, we each reach our own conclusions. This position is both alarming and perplexing: alarming in that it moves us closer to the abyss of ethical relativism and perplexing since it undermines the intelligibility, legitimacy, and logic of Ashley's own writ­ings. As Chris Brown notes, postmodern approaches end up destroying themselves. Demolishing the thought of modernity by rejecting founda­tionalism is a self-subverting theoretical stance since it prevents "any new thought taking the place from which the old categories have been ejected."' Tony Porter is even more adamant, noting that the poststruc­tural rejection of foundationalism inevitably reduces concepts like truth and reality to subjective intertextual interpretations. Intellectual thought, let alone the possibility of an intersubjective consensus on issues like pur­pose, meaning, ethics, or truth, becomes impossible. Rather than create new thought categories or knowledge systems, poststructuralists simply devolve knowledge into a series of infinitesimal individual interpretations. Yet the issue is at best a mute one. Refuting the notion of truth is non­sensical. As William Connolly observes, "Do you not presuppose truth (reason, subjectivity, a transcendental ethic, and so on) in repudiating it? If so, must you not endorse the standard unequivocally once your own presupposition is revealed to you?" Obviously, notes Connolly, the answer is a resounding "yes, yes, yes, yes."'

**Postmodernism Fails**

Postmodernism’s insistence on interpretations can never translate into the real world – the oppression that it claims to solve still remains.

Jarvis 2K (Darryl S. L., Assoc. Prof. of Public Policy at Univ. of Singapore, *International Relations and the Challenge of Postmodernism,*, pp. 196-198)

Let us for a moment, however, reflect on this "research program," on the importations of textual analysis and deconstructive theory, and what they might do to theoretical endeavor and the discipline of International Relations. Let us, for example, pose a few rudimentary questions that, despite their simplicity, go to the very essence of subversive postmod­ernism's relevance and utility to the study of international politics. What, for example, is "ambiguous" about war or "ironic" about peace? How does the admission of uncertainty change the face of theory, or how does textuality alter our experiences of the realities of international politics, of death squads, civil war, or autocratic rule? Why, suddenly, are irony, uncertainty, ambiguity, and textuality the prized attributes of theoretical endeavor? Are these to be our new epistemological motifs by which we judge the quality and usefulness of theory and research programs in Inter­national Relations? Are the problems of international politics and the answers to them hidden amid literary devices like paradox or the textual chicanery of double entendre? Will the practices of regional aggression dis­played by Saddam Hussein, for example, be thwarted through textual rereadings of security texts, or the acrimonious diplomatic exchanges between the United States and Iraq? Can we change the course of politi­cal outcomes, avert the use of force, or persuade others to disavow aggres­sion though textual reinterpretation? If we believe Ashley, Hoffman, Walker, Sylvester, or James Der Der­ian, for example, then the answer is yes, in which case international theory must transpose itself into a form of literary criticism and employ the tools of textual deconstruction, parody, and the style of discontinuous narratives as a means of pondering the depths of interpretation. In doing so, how­ever, we would approach the writings of Richard Ashley, who, utilizing such methods, can apprise students of international politics only of the fact that "there are neither right interpretations nor wrong," there are just "interpretations imposed upon interpretations.""In what sense, however, can this approach be at all adequate for the subject of International Relations? What, for example, do the literary devices of irony and textuality say to Somalian refugees who flee from famine and warlords or to Ethiopian rebels who fight in the desert plains against a government in Addis Abbaba? How does the notion of textual deconstruction speak to Serbs, Croats, and Muslims who fight one an­other among the ruins of the former Yugoslavia? How do totalitarian nar­ratives or logocentric binary logic feature in the deliberations of policy bureaucrats or in the negotiations over international trade or the formula­tions of international law? Should those concerned with human rights or those who take it upon themselves to study relationships between nation- states begin by contemplating epistemological fiats and ontological disputes? How does the reification of interpretivism and relativism assist such people in their understandings, problems, judgments, negotiations, and disputes? Is Ashley, for example, suggesting that we simply announce to those in the fray of international politics that there are neither right interpretations nor wrong, there are just interpretations imposed upon interpretations. Is this to be the epiphany of subversive postmodern international theory, its penultimate contribution to those who suffer on the margins for whom they professes great concern? I am, of course, being flippant. Yet we do have a right to ask such questions of subversive postmodernists if only because they portend to a moral highground, to insights otherwise denied realists, modernists, positivists, and mainstream international relations scholars. We have every right to ask, for example, how subversive postmodern theory speaks to the practical problems endemic to international relations, to the actors and players who constitute the practices of world politics, or how literary devices and deconstructive readings help us better picture world society.

Deconstructionism Fails

Postmodernist Deconstructionism creates real world apathy and ends in the fictional world of discourse.

Mustapha 9 (Jennifer, Department of Political Science McMaster University

*An Analytical Survey of Critical Security Studies: Making the Case for a (Modified) Post-structuralist Approach*)

Importantly, I seek to highlight **the relevance of ontological theorizations in debates about the meaning and definition of “security.”** In doing so, I hope to **call attention to the many nuances of the critical security** **studies literature** and ultimately argue the benefits of employing a (modified) post-structuralist approach to understanding security. **This “modification” is necessary because there is an inclination within some critical post-structuralist approaches to conflate epistemological commitments with ontological ones**. This can be observed in what is arguably an unsustainable leap of reasoning, **where** acknowledgement of **the indeterminacy of competing truth claims turns into an unwillingness to make any claims at all. In other words, the subject of security risks becoming invisible in the wake of continuous contestations about the dangers of essentialism and about the meaning of security itself.** This is problematic on several fronts, such as in the context of critical approaches that make emancipatory declarations on behalf of the individual. The good news is that this is not necessarily the logical end-point of post-structuralist critiques, nor is it an indictment against the overall benefit of employing them. Furthermore, this analysis is not meant to detract from the core intention of a post-structuralist ethic, which seeks to interrogate and deconstruct the very meaning of security and the ways in which it is talked about. Nevertheless, I argue that **deconstruction is only a first step**, and as Baudrillard and Lotringer (1987) have observed “discourse is discourse, but the operations, strategies, and schemes played out there are real.” I hope to demonstrate why **this reflection is crucial to an intellectually genuine post-structuralist ethic and is an important corrective against the straw-figure postmodernist who becomes an amoral nihilist trapped in discourse, unwilling to meaningfully engage the status quo on the basis of our allegedly inherent inability to make Truth claims**. While this straw-figure is often disingenuously and unfairly evoked in critiques of “postmodernism”, this does not absolve the proponents of critical post-structuralist security approaches from engaging with these concerns. That is part of what this essay seeks to do. Using Stephen K. White’s (2000) arguments for the viability of “weak ontologies,” I suggest that **a critical post-structuralist approach need not be anathema to the making of claims, nor should it be seen as suffering from a paralytic disjuncture from the “real world”.** Rather, maintaining critical commitments can mean being reflexive about the inter-subjectivity and indeterminacy of the claims that *are* ultimately made, and of being accountable to them. Notably, due to the emphasis on ontology, the “map” of critical security studies employed here looks different from the more common formulations of the field, such as those employed by Ken Booth (2005) and Krause and Williams (1996).

Deconstructionism Fails

Critical Securities studies are trapped within the confines of discourse, unable to meaningfully engage with the status quo.

Mustapha 9 (Jennifer, Department of Political Science McMaster University

*An Analytical Survey of Critical Security Studies: Making the Case for a (Modified) Post-structuralist Approach*)

**In critical security studies**, this type **of postmodern approach often goes beyond simply challenging the presuppositions of realism via deconstruction, and further argues that *any* construction or affirmation of ontological foundations is itself problematic and undesirable, as is any re-visioning of alternative security futures. This is because the modernist trap of reification/ essentialism is seen as intrinsic to *any* ontology, and therefore, ontological claims in and of themselves are to be avoided**. Furthermore, any revisioning of alternative security futures is understood to necessarily cause violences. Hence, while much of critical security studies is preoccupied with the construction of alternative security futures, the anti-essentialist postmodern approach tends to see that the appropriate role of theory resides solely in destabilizing the concepts of modernity. “Security,” then, is seen less as something that must be sought out and more as a practice that must be interrogated. This is because it is the practice of security, ostensibly that of the state, which is understood to be the source insecurity. Notably however, this postmodern approach also tends to avoid the term “insecurity” since it is too often deployed in its modernist incarnations. In fact, the idea of “insecurity” cast in a postmodern light is equated with uncertainty and contingency rather than corporal danger; as such it can be seen as part and parcel of the human condition, and is not necessarily something than can or should be avoided (Huysmans 1998). Instead, the focus in postmodern critical security is shifted towards the underlying structural violences and unequal power relations of modernity. This is a powerful contribution to security studies, as many other critical approaches are not equipped to engage with these questions on such a basic foundational level. Again, it is difficult to lump together so many complex ideas under one banner, but there *are* shared themes that emerge in a “postmodern” reading of critical security, many of which are laudable. Nevertheless, the postmodern approach I have outlined is not without its problems- **most notably surrounding the question of ontology- which has ethical and political implications.** In my introduction, I **evoked the straw-figure postmodern “who becomes an amoral nihilist trapped in discourse, unable to meaningfully engage with the status quo.” I pointed out that this straw-figure is often unfairly evoked by those that wish to disingenuously deny the contributions of poststructuralist deconstruction and postmodern critique**.13

Realism Inevitable

The realist balance of power is a concept created from diplomatic necessity – no alternative system can fill that same role.

Guzzini 98 (Stefano, Senior Researcher at the Danish Institute for International Studies, *Realism in International Relations and International Political Economy*, pp. 231)

Hedley Bull (1977) writes that although we do, of course, know that there is no such a thing as a balance of power, it is a concept we cannot do without. He is right in a double sense. First, the balance of power is a concept that diplomats use to make their trade. Second, for the first reason and only this, the observer cannot do without it. Power might not be fungible, but diplomats work on measures to give power a translatable meaning. Traditional compensation politics must rely on some measure across different power sectors. Before diplomats can count, they must decide what counts. Hence, the balance of power or any equilibrium idea of this kind is based upon a social construction, sometimes an agreemen,. of the diplomatic community. They share a common measure of power although they would be hard-pressed to define it exactly. Hence, as with the security discourse, measurement of power is a political act. The diplomats who represent states endowed with one particular power resource will do their best to enhance the Uitler's value. The Soviet government's stress on military, and not economic, factors was a case in point. The rush for mass-destructive weapons is as much a concern of security as a question of power in the sense of acquiring a resource which is commonly considered to be at the top rank. The prestige, in turn, is traded for particular compensations or attentions. Sometimes, such agreements on measures and treatments, if generally shared, might diplomatically recreate something similar to the supposedly mechanical balance of power (Kivi 1996). On the second level of observation, the existence of balance of power as a social construct means that we cannot simply forget about it because we found out that no mechanical balance exists. The concept does not refer to anything in the objective structures of the international system. It is a fallacy to think that since it is reproduced in the diplomatic culture, it must correspond to an objectified reality, a fallacy which has daunted much realist writings, both scientific and classical. But it is a device used by diplomats, and as such it exists, and is consequential for international politics. In his inaugural lecture in Zurich, the Swiss scholar Daniel Frei (1969) urged his fellow political scientists to help practical policy with a neutral and measurable concept of power. He was perfectly aware both of the practical needs of such a concept and of its difficult scientific underpinning. This lucid text shows the political value of concepts which travel between the academic and the political community. Power is a device used by academics and as such has effects on the production of knowledge and the reproduction of the traditional diplomatic culture.

**Realism Inevitable**

**The power politics of realism enter into any possible system – even a critical approach leads back into realism.**

Murray 97 (Alastair J.H., Prof. of Poli. Theory at Univ. of Edinburgh, *Reconstructing Realism: Between Power Politics and Cosmopolitan Ethics*, pp. 130)

The other members of the group varied in their emphases, but there are clear parallels to this formulation in their conceptions which suggest its employment as a framework to assist understanding. The extent to which power infuses all social relations, the extent to which all social structures are marred by relations of domination and subordination, forms a pervasive theme throughout their work. It was this awareness of the intrusion of power into all social relations that generated their emphasis on 'the inevitable imperfections of any organization that is entangled with the world. l 1 " As Morgenthau once put it, the ideal 'can never be fully translated into political reality but only at best approximated ... there shall always be an element of political domination preventing the full realization of equality and freedom'. "9 The principal focus of this critique of the corrupting influence of power was, of course, international relations. Here, economic and legal mechanisms of domination are ultimately reduced to overt violence as the principal mechanism of determining political outcomes. The diffusion of power between states effectively transforms any such centrally organized mechanisms into simply another forum for the power politics of the very parties that it is supposed to restrain. As Kennan put it: ‘The realities of power will soon seep into anv legalistic structures which we erect to govern international life. They will permeate it. They will become the content of it; and the structure will replace the form.' 1:1 The repression of such power realities is, however, impossible; the political actor must simply 'seek their point of maximum equilibrium'. This conception of the balance of ultimately aimed, in Morgenthau’s words, 'to maintain the stability of the system without destroying the multiplicity of the elements composing it'. First, it was designed to prevent universal domination, to act as a deterrent to the ambitions of any dominant great power and as a safeguard against any attempt to establish **its** sway over the rest of the system.]-'4 Second, it was designed to preserve the independence and freedom of the states of the system, particularly the small states. **1"** I Only through the operation of the balance of power between great powers can small powers gain any genuine independence and any influence in the international system.1-" However, as Morgenthau pointed out, whilst, in domestic society, the balance of power operates in a context characterized by the existence of a degree of consensus and by the presence of a controlling central power, these factors are lacking in international relations and, thus, the balance is both much more important and yet much more flawed, the maintenance of equilibrium being achieved at the price of large-scale warfare and periodic eliminations of smaller states.] 7

Realism Inevitable

States inherently compete with each other through any means necessary – realism is the only possible system.

Mearsheimer 1 (John, Prof. of Poli Sci at the Univ. of Chicago, *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*,  
pp. 35)

All states are influenced by this logic, which means that not only do they look for opportunities to take advantage of one another, they also work to ensure that other states do not take advantage of them. After all, rival states are driven by the same logic, and most states are likely to recognize their own motives at play in the actions of other states. In short, states ultimately pay attention to defense as well as offense. They think about conquest themselves, and they work to check aggressor states from gaining power at their expense. This inexorably leads to a world of constant security competition, where states are willing to lie, cheat, and use brute force if it helps them gain advantage over their rivals. Peace, if one defines that concept as a state of tranquility or mutual concord, is not likely to break out in this world.

States naturally act based upon external influences of competition – this forces realism to be the only viable system of international relations.

Mearsheimer 1 (John, Prof. of Poli Sci at the Univ. of Chicago, *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*,  
pp. 17)

This gloomy view of international relations is based on three core beliefs. First, realists, like liberals, treat states as the principal actors in world politics. Realists focus mainly on great powers, however, because these **states dominate and shape international politics and they also cause the deadliest wars.** Second, realists believe that **the behavior of great powers is influenced mainly by their external environment, not by their internal characteristics**. The structure of the international system, which all slates must deal with, largely shapes their foreign policies. Realists tend mint to draw sharp distinctions between “good” and “bad” states, because **all great powers act according to the same logic regardless of their culture, political system, or who runs the government**.27 It is therefore difficult to discriminate among states, save for differences in relative power. In essence, great powers are like billiard balls that vary only in size.28 Third, realists hold that **calculations about power dominate states’ thinking, and** that **states compete for power among themselves. That competition sometimes necessitates going to war,** which is considered an acceptable instrument of statecraft. To quote Carl von Clausewitz, the nineteenth-century military strategist, **war is a continuation of politics by other means**.29 Finally, a zero-sum quality characterizes that competition, sometimes making it intense and unforgiving. **States may cooperate with each other on occasion, but at root they have conflicting interests.**

\*\*\*A2: SPANOS\*\*\*

Education Reform 1NC

We believe that a focus on challenging American Exceptionalism in the educational academy is preferable to the Affirmative’s focus on military posture.

Education reform is critical to allow for discourses to challenge US hegemony

Spanos 84 (William V. The Uses and Abuses of Certainty: A Caviling Overture Source: boundary 2, Vol. 12/13, Vol. 12, no. 3 - Vol. 13, no. 1, On Humanism and the University I: The Discourse of Humanism (Spring - Autumn, 1984), pp. 1-17 ) TBC 7/9/10

In 1974, at the behest of Derek Bok, the new president of Harvard University, a faculty committee chaired by the new Dean of Arts and Sciences, Henry Rosovsky, undertook "a major review of the goals and strategies of undergraduate education at Harvard."' In 1978, when it had become clear that "there was wide agreement that the 1 proliferation of courses [in the previous decade] had eroded the purpose of the existing General Education Program" ("RCC," p. 1), the Task Force submitted its "Report on the Core Curriculum" to the Harvard Faculty, a report, it believed, which was grounded in "a standard [of education] that meets the needs of the late twentieth century" ("RCC," p. 2). After a brief period of deliberation, during which the media, on the basis of its promise to renew American socio- political life, inflated the "curricular reform" at Harvard into an educational event of national significance, the Harvard Faculty adopted the "Report." As if waiting for such a sign from the pharmakos, colleges and universities throughout the country began to fellow suit. This momentum in higher education-in which the reformation of the humanities curriculum is related to the recuperation of the good health the nation apparently lost during the turbulent decade of the Vietnam War, the years, that is, of the civil rights and student protest movements-comes to culmination and clear focus in the report on the humanities in education published in November, 1984 by William J. Bennett, Chairman of the National Endowment for the Humanities and, subsequently, Secretary of Education in the Reagan Administration. In this report, significantly entitled "To Reclaim a Legacy," Chairman Bennett deplores the disarray into which higher education-especially the teaching of the humanities curricu- lum-has fallen as a consequence of what he says was "a collective loss of nerve and faith on the part of both faculty and academic administrators during the late 1960's and early 1970's":2 Although more than 50 percent of America's high school graduates continue their education at American colleges and universities, few of them can be said to receive there an adequate education in the culture and civilization of which they are members. Most of our college graduates remain shortchanged in the humanities-history, literature, philosophy, and the ideals and practices of the past that have shaped the society they enter. The fault lies principally with those of us whose business it is to educate these students. We have blamed others, but the responsibility is ours. ... It is we the educators-not scientists, business people, or the general public-who too often have given up the great task of transmitting a culture to its rightful heirs. Thus, what we have on many of our campuses is an unclaimed legacy, a course of studies in which the humanities have been siphoned off, diluted, or so adulterated that students graduate knowing little of their heritage. ("RL," p. 16) As a "survivor" of what in The Wall Street Journal he has called the 2 "shattering of the humanities,"'3 Bennett predictably invokes and re- affirms the Word of the Father of modern Anglo-American Human- ism-"the best that has been said, thought, written, and otherwise ex- pressed about the human experience" ("RL," p. 17)-and, focalizing the increasing demand both within and without the academy for the restoration of the core curriculum, calls for the reclaiming of the "un- claimed" legacy of which our students are the "rightful heirs": ...the humanities can contribute to an informal sense of community by enabling us to learn about and become participants in a common culture, share- holders in our civilization. But our goal should be more than just a common culture-even television and the comics can give us that. We should instead want all students to know a common culture rooted in civilization's lasting vision, its highest shared ideals and aspirations, and its heritage. ("RL," p. 17) That higher education is in a state of crisis goes without saying. But this thematic should not divert our attention from the pharmakon that Bennett and other influential humanists are not only espousing but increasingly forcing on the academy in the name of right reason. For this recuperation of the humanistic curriculum-however self-evident as a cure it may seem to those of the humanist persuasion-is, in the view of many others equally com- mitted to preparing the young for life in the last third of the twentieth century, precisely, if generally, the cause of the "sickness" that af- flicts the cultural and socio-political life of the modern Western nation states. To say, as Bennett explicitly and the Harvard Faculty and Administration implicitly do, that the shattering of the humanities curriculum was the disastrous result of a "collective loss of nerve and faith" on the part of educators "during the late 1960's and early 1970's" is to practice a sleight of hand which not only ignores the student protest movement both here and in Europe that implicated higher education with the State's war against Vietnam. It also ignores a number of emergent oppositional discourses that have found the "disinterested" inquiry of Humanism to be a logo- ethno- and phallo- centric ideology the function of which is to legitimate and relegitimate Western hegemony in the face of knowledge explosions that also activate the dormant desires for enfranchisement of hitherto repressed others (those different from "us"). Is this the unsaid socio- political agenda that finally lies behind Bennett's insistent equation of the humanities with the Western, indeed, American, heritage and his demand, as official cultural spokesman of the Reagan Administration, that the American university reclaim a "lost" legacy?

Education Reform Key

We must focus on the Academia – it is at the root of liberal violence towards the third world

Spanos 93 (William V. Prof of English and comparative lit at Binghamton U Heidegger and Criticism: Retrieving the Cultural Politics of Destruction pg. 229-230)

What does need to be thematized, however, is the remarkable symmetry between Frankel's and Arnold Davidson's representations of the truth/power nexus. Frankel's liberal humanist discourse justifies the university in the context of the American intervention in Vietnam in precisely the Kantian terms invoked by Davidson to discredit Heidegger's project to "overcome philosophy": "Specific" practices at Columbia University may have contributed to the "evils" the students were combatting; but if these specific practices were at all culpable—and it is not certain to Frankel that this was the case—they were the consequence of the betrayal of its unworldly principle of autonomous reason, of its "Kantian" Heidegger, Nazism, and the "Repressive Hypothesis" sence, and thus correctable. For "force," according to Frankel, is in essence "alien to [the American university's] habits and . . . lethal to it." In thus defending the idea of the university as a value-free space, Frankel also assumes a view of the relationship between the pursuit of truth and the practices of power which Davidson invokes centrally in order to condemn as "unpardonable" Heidegger's "staggering" identification of a technologized agriculture and the Nazi gas chambers and death camps: the "incommensurability"—the radical difference—between knowledge production and the violent practices of power. "Force that is merely latent [i.e., the beneficial constraints of laws produced by autonomous reason]," he declares, "has a different social and psychological significance from force that is actively employed. Force that is employed subject to strict legal restrictions is not the same genre with force that does not recognize such limits." What I am suggesting in thus invoking Foucault's analysis of the repressive hypothesis in the context of the American liberal humanists' radical differentiation of knowledge production (the university) from the relay of technological instruments (weapons) that devastated Vietnam and its people's culture is the following: Davidson's typically humanist condemnation of Heidegger's project to "overcome" philosophy and his consequent equation of the technologization of agriculture and the production of corpses in the gas chambers and the death camps is a remarkably parochial (ethnocentric), if not calculatedly duplicitous, strategy. Understood in this American context, to put it alternatively, Heidegger's project and his "pronouncement," whatever its limitations vis-a-vis specificity, takes on a quite different—a far more justifiable—significance from that attributed to it by his humanist prosecutors. For the humanist representation of these leaves unsaid Heidegger's thematization of the modern Occident's reduction of truth as aletheia to truth as adequaetio intellectus et rei (an originary or dialogic thinking to derivative or monologic "philosophy"), and its reduction of being (the indissoluble lateral continuum from the subject through language and culture to the economy and the political state) to a universally technologized "standing reserve." This humanist representation also overlooks the critique of Occidental discursive practices, especially since the Enlightenment, enabled by Foucault and by poststructuralism or posthumanism at large: the critique, I want to reiterate, that Heidegger's interrogation of the discourse of humanism catalyzed.65

Education Reform Key

Education reform is critical to allow for discourses to challenge US hegemony

Spanos 84 (William V. The Uses and Abuses of Certainty: A Caviling Overture Source: boundary 2, Vol. 12/13, Vol. 12, no. 3 - Vol. 13, no. 1, On Humanism and the University I: The Discourse of Humanism (Spring - Autumn, 1984), pp. 1-17 ) TBC 7/9/10

In 1974, at the behest of Derek Bok, the new president of Harvard University, a faculty committee chaired by the new Dean of Arts and Sciences, Henry Rosovsky, undertook "a major review of the goals and strategies of undergraduate education at Harvard."' In 1978, when it had become clear that "there was wide agreement that the 1 proliferation of courses [in the previous decade] had eroded the purpose of the existing General Education Program" ("RCC," p. 1), the Task Force submitted its "Report on the Core Curriculum" to the Harvard Faculty, a report, it believed, which was grounded in "a standard [of education] that meets the needs of the late twentieth century" ("RCC," p. 2). After a brief period of deliberation, during which the media, on the basis of its promise to renew American socio- political life, inflated the "curricular reform" at Harvard into an educational event of national significance, the Harvard Faculty adopted the "Report." As if waiting for such a sign from the pharmakos, colleges and universities throughout the country began to fellow suit. This momentum in higher education-in which the reformation of the humanities curriculum is related to the recuperation of the good health the nation apparently lost during the turbulent decade of the Vietnam War, the years, that is, of the civil rights and student protest movements-comes to culmination and clear focus in the report on the humanities in education published in November, 1984 by William J. Bennett, Chairman of the National Endowment for the Humanities and, subsequently, Secretary of Education in the Reagan Administration. In this report, significantly entitled "To Reclaim a Legacy," Chairman Bennett deplores the disarray into which higher education-especially the teaching of the humanities curricu- lum-has fallen as a consequence of what he says was "a collective loss of nerve and faith on the part of both faculty and academic administrators during the late 1960's and early 1970's":2 Although more than 50 percent of America's high school graduates continue their education at American colleges and universities, few of them can be said to receive there an adequate education in the culture and civilization of which they are members. Most of our college graduates remain shortchanged in the humanities-history, literature, philosophy, and the ideals and practices of the past that have shaped the society they enter. The fault lies principally with those of us whose business it is to educate these students. We have blamed others, but the responsibility is ours. ... It is we the educators-not scientists, business people, or the general public-who too often have given up the great task of transmitting a culture to its rightful heirs. Thus, what we have on many of our campuses is an unclaimed legacy, a course of studies in which the humanities have been siphoned off, diluted, or so adulterated that students graduate knowing little of their heritage. ("RL," p. 16) As a "survivor" of what in The Wall Street Journal he has called the 2 "shattering of the humanities,"'3 Bennett predictably invokes and re- affirms the Word of the Father of modern Anglo-American Human- ism-"the best that has been said, thought, written, and otherwise ex- pressed about the human experience" ("RL," p. 17)-and, focalizing the increasing demand both within and without the academy for the restoration of the core curriculum, calls for the reclaiming of the "un- claimed" legacy of which our students are the "rightful heirs": ...the humanities can contribute to an informal sense of community by enabling us to learn about and become participants in a common culture, share- holders in our civilization. But our goal should be more than just a common culture-even television and the comics can give us that. We should instead want all students to know a common culture rooted in civilization's lasting vision, its highest shared ideals and aspirations, and its heritage. ("RL," p. 17) That higher education is in a state of crisis goes without saying. But this thematic should not divert our attention from the pharmakon that Bennett and other influential humanists are not only espousing but increasingly forcing on the academy in the name of right reason. For this recuperation of the humanistic curriculum-however self-evident as a cure it may seem to those of the humanist persuasion-is, in the view of many others equally com- mitted to preparing the young for life in the last third of the twentieth century, precisely, if generally, the cause of the "sickness" that af- flicts the cultural and socio-political life of the modern Western nation states. To say, as Bennett explicitly and the Harvard Faculty and Administration implicitly do, that the shattering of the humanities curriculum was the disastrous result of a "collective loss of nerve and faith" on the part of educators "during the late 1960's and early 1970's" is to practice a sleight of hand which not only ignores the student protest movement both here and in Europe that implicated higher education with the State's war against Vietnam. It also ignores a number of emergent oppositional discourses that have found the "disinterested" inquiry of Humanism to be a logo- ethno- and phallo- centric ideology the function of which is to legitimate and relegitimate Western hegemony in the face of knowledge explosions that also activate the dormant desires for enfranchisement of hitherto repressed others (those different from "us"). Is this the unsaid socio- political agenda that finally lies behind Bennett's insistent equation of the humanities with the Western, indeed, American, heritage and his demand, as official cultural spokesman of the Reagan Administration, that the American university reclaim a "lost" legacy?

Education Reform Key

Education is at the heart of militarism – Reform is key

Giroux 6 (Henry A. The Emerging Authoritarianism in the United States: Political Culture Under the Bush/Chaney Administration Henry A. Giroux the Global TV Network Chair in English and Cultural Studies at McMaster U symploke 14.1/2 (2006) 98-151) TBC 7/9/10

The growing influence of a military presence and ideology in American society is made visible, in part, by the fact that the United States has more police, prisons, spies, weapons, and soldiers than at any other time in its history. The radical shift in the size, scope, and influence of the military can also be seen in the redistribution of domestic resources and government funding away from social programs into military-oriented security measures at home and abroad. As Richard Falk has pointed out, "The US Government is devoting huge resources to the monopolistic militarization of space, the development of more usable nuclear weapons, and the strengthening of its world-girdling ring of military bases and its global navy, as the most tangible way to discourage any strategic challenges to its preeminence" (para. 22). According to journalist George Monbiot, the U.S. federal government "is now spending as much on war as it is on education, public health, housing, employment, pensions, food aid and welfare put together" (para. 12). Meanwhile, the state is being radically transformed into a national security state, increasingly put under the sway of the military-corporate-industrial-educational complex. The military logic of fear, surveillance, and control is gradually permeating our public schools, universities, streets, media, popular culture, and criminal justice system. Since the events of 9/11 and the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, the military has assumed a privileged place in American society. President Bush not only celebrates the military presence in American culture, he cultivates it by going out of his way to give speeches at military facilities, talk to military personnel, and address veterans groups. He often wears a military uniform when speaking to "captive audiences at military bases, defense plants, and on aircraft carriers" (Mariscal para. 7). He also takes advantage of the campaign value of military culture by using military symbolism as a political prop in order to attract the widest possible media attention. One glaring instance occurred on May 1, 2003, when Bush landed in full aviator flight uniform on the USS Abraham Lincoln in the Pacific Ocean, where he officially proclaimed the end of the Iraq war. There was also his secret trip to Baghdad to spend [End Page 124] Thanksgiving Day 2003 with the troops, an event that attracted world-wide coverage in all the media. But Bush has done more than take advantage of the military as a campaign prop to sell his domestic and foreign policies. His administration and the Republican Party, which up to recently controlled all three branches of government, have developed a "dangerous and unprecedented confluence of our democratic institutions and the military" (Baker 38). Writing in Harper's Magazine, Kevin Baker claims that the military "has become the most revered institution in the country" (37). Soon after the Iraq War, a Gallup Poll reported that over 76% of Americans "expressed 'a great deal' or 'quite a lot' of confidence in their nation's military." Among a poll of 1,200 students conducted by Harvard University, 75% believed that the military most of the time would "do the right thing." In addition, the students "characterized themselves as hawks over doves by a ratio of two to one" (Baker 37). Given this pro-military attitude among university students, it should not surprise us that the Bruin Alumni Association at the University of Los Angeles, California, has targeted professors it describes as "radical" and posted their names on its Web site under the heading "The Dirty Thirty." The group is headed by former student and right-wing ideologue, Andrew Jones, whose "Open Letter from the Bruin Alumni Association" describes its mission as combating "an exploding crisis of political radicalism on campus" and defines radicalism as holding any dissenting view of the war in Iraq, supporting affirmative action, or opposing "President Bush, the Republican Party, multi-national corporations, and even our fighting men and women." The Bruin Alumni Association does more than promote "McCarthy-like smears," intolerance, and anti-intellectualism through a vapid appeal for "balance"; it also offers $100 prizes to any students willing to provide information on their teachers' political views (Fogg). Of course, this has less to do with protesting genuine demagoguery than it does with attacking any professor who might raise critical questions about the status quo or hold the narratives of power accountable. A narrowing view of politics and a growing support of the military have coincided with an attack on higher education by right-wing ideologues such as David Horowitz and Lynne Cheney (spouse of Vice President Dick Cheney), who view it as a "weak link" in the war against terror and a potential fifth column.13 Horowitz also acts as the figurehead for various well-funded and orchestrated conservative student groups such as the Young Americans and College Republicans, [End Page 125] which perform the groundwork for his "Academic Bill of Rights" policy that seeks out juicy but rare instances of "political bias"—whatever that is or however it might be defined—in college classrooms. These efforts have resulted in considerable sums of public money being devoted to hearings in multiple state legislatures, most recently in Pennsylvania, in addition to helping impose, as the Chronicle of Higher Education put it in "Forum: A Chilly Climate on Campuses," a "chilly climate" of self-policing of academic freedom and pedagogy. Popular fears about domestic safety and internal threats accentuated by endless terror alerts have created a society that increasingly accepts the notion of a "war without limits" as a normal state of affairs. But fear and insecurity do more than produce a collective anxiety among Americans, exploited largely to get them to believe that they should vote Republican because it is the only political party that can protect them. In addition to producing manufactured political loyalty, such fears can also be manipulated into a kind of "war fever." The mobilization of war fever, intensified through a politics of fear, carries with it a kind of paranoid edge, endlessly stoked by government alerts and repressive laws and used "to create the most extensive national security apparatus in our nation's history" <CONTINUED>
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(Rosen 2003b, para. 5). It is also reproduced in the Foxified media, which, in addition to constantly marketing the flag and interminably implying that critics of American foreign policy are traitors, offer up seemingly endless images of brave troops on the front line, heroic stories of released American prisoners, and utterly privatized commentaries on those wounded or killed in battle. Time Magazine embodied this representational indulgence in military culture by naming "The American Soldier" as the "Person of the Year" for 2003. Not only have such ongoing and largely uncritical depictions of war injected a constant military presence in American life, they have also helped to create a civil society that has become more aggressive in its warlike enthusiasms. But there is more at work here than either the exploitation of troops for higher ratings or an attempt by right-wing political strategists to keep the American public in a state of permanent fear so as to remove pressing domestic issues from public debate. There is also the attempt by the Bush administration to convince as many Americans as possible that under the current "state of emergency" the use of the military internally in domestic affairs is perfectly acceptable, evident in the increasing propensity to use the military establishment "to incarcerate and interrogate suspected terrorists and 'enemy combatants' and keep them beyond the reach of the civilian judicial system, even if they are American citizens" (R. Kohn 174-175). It is also evident in the federal government's attempt to try terrorists in military courts, and to detain prisoners "outside the provisions of the Geneva Convention as prisoners of war . . . at the U.S. [End Page 126] Marine Corps base at Guantanamo, Cuba because that facility is outside of the reach of the American courts" (R. Kohn 174-5). As military values, ideology, and a hyper-masculine aesthetic begin to spread out into other aspects of American culture, citizens are recruited as foot soldiers in the war on terrorism, urged to spy on their neighbors' behaviors, watch for suspicious-looking people, and supply data to government sources in the war on terrorism. Major universities intensively court the military establishment for Defense Department grants and in doing so become less open to either academic subjects or programs that encourage rigorous debate, dialogue, and critical thinking. In fact, as higher education is pressured by both the Bush administration and its jingoistic supporters to serve the needs of the military-industrial complex, universities increasingly deepen their connections to the national security state in ways that are boldly celebrated. For instance, Pennsylvania State University (in addition to Carnegie Mellon University, the University of Pennsylvania, Johns Hopkins University, and a host of other public institutions) has entered into a formal agreement with the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) in order to "create a link between [a] leading research university and government agencies." Graham Spanier, Penn State president and head of the new National Security Higher Education Advisory Board, stated that the collaboration "sends a positive message that leaders in higher education are willing to assist our nation during these challenging times" (Pennsylvania State University).

Schools are key cites for military indoctrination

Giroux 6 (Henry A. The Emerging Authoritarianism in the United States: Political Culture Under the Bush/Chaney Administration Henry A. Giroux the Global TV Network Chair in English and Cultural Studies at McMaster U symploke 14.1/2 (2006) 98-151) TBC 7/9/10

Schools represent one of the most serious public spheres to come under the influence of military culture and values. Zero-tolerance policies turn public schools into prison-like institutions, as students' rights increasingly diminish under the onslaught of new disciplinary measures. Students in many schools, especially those in poor urban areas, are routinely searched, frisked, subjected to involuntary drug [End Page 127] tests, maced, and carted off to jail. Elissa Gootman in a 2004 report on schools in New York City claims that "In some places, schools are resorting to zero-tolerance policies that put students in handcuffs for dress code violations" (C14). As educators turn over their responsibility for school safety to the police, the new security culture in public schools has turned them into "learning prisons," most evident in the ways in which schools are being "reformed" through the addition of armed guards, barbed-wired security fences, and lock-down drills (Chaddock 15). In 2003, the police in Goose Creek, South Carolina, conducted an early morning drug-sweep at Stratford High School. When the officers arrived, they drew guns on students, handcuffed them, and made them kneel facing the wall (Lewin A16). No drugs were found in the raid. Though this incident was aired on the national news, there was barely any protest from the public. It gets worse. Some schools are actually using sting operations in which undercover agents pretend to be students in order to catch young people suspected of selling drugs or committing any one of a number of school infractions. The consequences of such actions are far reaching. As Randall Beger points out: Opponents of school-based sting operations say they not only create a climate of mistrust between students and police, but they also put innocent students at risk of wrongful arrest due to faulty tips and overzealous police work. When asked about his role in a recent undercover probe at a high school near Atlanta, a young-looking police officer who attended classes and went to parties with students replied: "I knew I had to fit in, make kids trust me and then turn around and take them to jail." (124) The militarization of public high schools has become so commonplace that even in the face of the most flagrant disregard for children's rights, such acts are justified by both administrators and the public on the grounds that they keep kids safe. In Biloxi, Mississippi, surveillance cameras have been installed in all of its 500 classrooms. The school's administrators call this "school reform," but none of them have examined the implications of what they are teaching kids who are put under constant surveillance. The not-so-hidden curriculum here is that kids can't be trusted and that their rights are not worth protecting. At the same time, students are being educated to passively accept military sanctioned practices organized around maintaining control, surveillance, and unquestioned authority, all conditions central to a police state and proto-fascism.
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Focus on education is key to promoting true participation and resistance

Giroux 6 (Henry A. The Emerging Authoritarianism in the United States: Political Culture Under the Bush/Chaney Administration Henry A. Giroux the Global TV Network Chair in English and Cultural Studies at McMaster U symploke 14.1/2 (2006) 98-151) TBC 7/9/10

The liberal democratic vocabulary of rights, entitlements, social provisions, community, social responsibility, living wage, job security, equality, and justice seem oddly out of place in a country where the [End Page 139] promise of democracy has been replaced by casino capitalism, a winner-take-all philosophy suited to lotto players and day traders alike. As corporate culture extends even deeper into the basic institutions of civil and political society, buttressed daily by a culture industry largely in the hands of concentrated capital, it is reinforced even further by the pervasive fear and public insecurity regarding the possibility that the future holds nothing beyond a watered-down version of the present. As the prevailing discourse of neoliberalism seizes the public imagination, there is no vocabulary for progressive social change, democratically inspired vision, or critical notions of social agency to expand the meaning and purpose of democratic public life. Against the reality of low-wage jobs, the erosion of social provisions for a growing number of people, the expanding war against young people of color at home, and empire-building wars abroad, the market-driven juggernaut of neoliberalism continues to mobilize desires in the interest of producing market identities and market relationships that ultimately sever the link between education and social change while reducing agency to the obligations of consumerism. As neoliberal ideology and corporate culture extend even deeper into the basic institutions of civil and political society, there is a simultaneous diminishing of non-commodified public spheres—those institutions such as public schools, independent bookstores, churches, noncommercial public broadcasting stations, libraries, trade unions, and various voluntary institutions engaged in dialogue, education, and learning—that can address the relationship of the individual to public life, foster social responsibility, and provide a robust vehicle for public participation and democratic citizenship. As media theorists, Edward Herman and Robert McChesney observe, non-commodified public spheres have historically played an invaluable role "as places and forums where issues of importance to a political community are discussed and debated, and where information is presented that is essential to citizen participation in community life" (3). Without these critical public spheres, corporate power often goes unchecked and politics becomes dull, cynical, and oppressive.20 Moreover, the vacuum left by diminishing democracy is filled with religious zealotry, cultural chauvinism, xenophobia, and racism—the dominant tropes of neoconservatives and other extremist groups eager to take advantage of the growing insecurity, fear, and anxiety that result from increased joblessness, the war on terror, and the unraveling of communities. In this context, neoliberalism creates the economic, social, and political instability that helps feed both the neoconservative and the religious Right movements and their proto-fascist policy initiatives. [End Page 140]

Vietnam Focus Bad

Focusing on Vietnam invokes humiliation which makes interventionist wars inevitable and forecloses the possibility for peace

Mendible 7 (Myra, Florida Gulf Coast U., Radical Pyschology, vol 7,

http://www.radicalpsychology.org/vol7-1/mendible.html) TBC 7/9/10

In a victory speech following the 1991 Persian Gulf War, President George H. W. Bush proclaimed it a proud day to be American. The president’s speech officially heralded a new structure of feeling in America, one more suited to an imperial power’s spectacular reemergence on the world stage. It pronounced an official end to the “Vietnam syndrome,” a malaise that had presumably stricken the American psyche for over 16 years. The war had been the antidote for what ailed us, Bush’s speech assured us, the means to restore the nation’s honor and reclaim its rightful status. Americans could finally trade in the sackcloth of humiliation for the mantle of pride. By God, we had “kicked the Vietnam syndrome once and for all” (Bush, para. 15). There are several problems, of course, with this version of history and with the ways that the “we” is constituted in its narrative. This essay is concerned with the extent to which Vietnam consistently plays out in popular memory as a psychodrama of humiliation, casting America in the role of victim and producing certain alignments and associations in the citizenry. Bush’s speech capitalized on a set of assumptions that have long dominated public discourse about the war. News pundits, filmmakers, and political leaders alike have exploited the evocative power of this humiliation tale, invoking its stock characters and compensatory themes to elicit predictable responses in target audiences. This affective logic binds subjects to cycles of compensatory violence, fueling militaristic strains in America’s political culture and setting the stage for a series of wars and interventions. I hope to show how this humiliation dynamic structures conflicts in ways that short-circuit the consideration of peaceful options.

Focus on Vietnam causes a fear of casualties that make inevitable intervention worse – They don’t solve exceptionalism, they send it underground

Weisbrot 2 (Andrew, Ctr for Econ & Pol Res, http://www.cepr.net/index.php/op-eds-&-columns/op-eds-&-columns/vietnam-syndrome-is-alive-and-thriving/) TBC 7/9/10

What our politicians fear, but nobody wants to talk about, are the political consequences of American casualties. This is not because Americans are lacking in courage; as the heroic actions of the firefighters and others at the site of the World Trade Center showed, there is no shortage of people who are willing to risk their lives for the sake of their fellow citizens. But since Vietnam, there has been a widespread mistrust of American foreign policy. During the war, we were told that we were helping the Vietnamese -- saving them and the world from communism. This turned out to be a huge lie, with terrible consequences. Millions discovered that the United States was really fighting a dirty colonial war that the French had abandoned. Recent revelations have only reinforced this mistrust, as well as the worst picture imaginable of that war: the atrocities committed by former Senator Bob Kerrey, for example, or historian Michael Beschloss's analysis of President Lyndon Johnson's tapes, showing that he knew as early as 1965 that the war in Vietnam could not be won -- yet continued to send tens of thousands of Americans to die there. In the post-Vietnam era, Washington has mainly contracted out the dirty work -- mass murder in Guatemala and El Salvador, or trying to overthrow the government of Nicaragua in the 1980s. But whether the US military was directly involved -- as it was in the invasions of Grenada and Panama, the Persian Gulf War and Kosovo -- or not, it is a sordid record. In general, US officials lied about the purpose of their interventions, and none of them had much to do with US national security. For these reasons, public support for the "War on Terrorism" is miles wide but only an inch deep. Our political leaders want to use this crusade the way they used the "War Against Communism," and more recently, the "War on Drugs" in Colombia: as an excuse for the violence and brutality that are necessary to police a worldwide empire. It remains to be seen how much of this they can get away with, or whether they will expand the current war to countries such as Iraq, Somalia, Iran or elsewhere. But they know one thing very well: they cannot allow the US casualty count to rise very high before people begin to question their motives.

Vietnam Focus Bad

Obsession with Vietnam will center American policy debates on military power, causing a right-wing backlash and continually eschewing diplomatic solutions

Kane 9 (John, U of Sydney, Australian J of Intl Affs, 63.4, informa Professor in the Department of Politics and Public Policy at Griffith University) TBC 7/9/10

Kissinger was surely correct about this. The problem with American military power after Vietnam was not that it had been significantly diminished—it had not—but that it had been somehow emasculated, creating an enduring dissensus between rightist 'hawks' and leftist 'doves'. The former, arguing that the full extent of America's military might had not even been deployed in Vietnam, were deeply resentful of what they regarded as the domestic betrayal that had produced an unnecessary defeat and wished to wipe out the humiliation of Vietnam through convincing and wholehearted assertions of American power. This required, too, the restoration of presidential authority, sapped by popular and congressional distrust after Vietnam and Watergate. Such hawkish dreams were largely frustrated by the persistence among populace and politicians of the 'Vietnam syndrome', but their influence would be increasingly felt as more radical kinds of conservative gained ascendancy over the liberal wing of the Republican Party following the fall of Nixon.6 Meanwhile, the Democrats, after the candidacy of George McGovern in 1972, moved further Left to become the party of injured American innocence, as suspicious and fearful of military power as had been America's peace activists earlier in the twentieth century. The result was not merely dissensus on foreign policy but an obsession with either the possibilities or dangers of military power that, in the long run, elevated the military dimension of international relations above the diplomatic. Discussions of foreign policy post-Vietnam tended to revolve endlessly around the question of when and how the use of military force could be justified. (It is sobering to think that the famous Weinberger-Powell Doctrine, with its insistence on strictly national interests, overwhelming force, a swift victory and a clean exit might have precluded American participation in World War II.) It was not surprising, then, that when an ultra-conservative administration came to power in 2000, its foreign policy team should be made up of figures whose predilection was for military rather than diplomatic affairs. Most had spent their government careers either in the armed forces or as Department of Defense bureaucrats striving to build America's military strength (in Donald Rumsfeld's case, to reshape it for a new era). It was strange, but telling, that those with actual army or navy experience—the State Department's Colin Powell and Richard Armitage, respectively, who had both served in Vietnam—were the cautious ones with respect to military force, while the men they contemptuously referred to as the 'chicken hawks'—Dick Cheney and Donald Rumsfeld, Paul Wolfowitz and his aide 'Scooter' Libby, all at Defense—were conservative ideologues ready and willing to wield it when the occasion arose, as it did after September 11, 2001. None had the background of a Dean Acheson or an Averill Harriman, or the propensities of even a George Marshall who, though an indomitable old soldier, left his most considerable mark in the field of diplomacy (Mann 2004: 273-4).

Their Vietnam link emboldens opposition to Iraq and Afghanistan, making conflict worse and killing millions

Kirkpatrick 9 (Jeanne, CFR, 10-14, The incurable Vietnam syndrome

http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2009/10/14/opinion/main5383848.shtml.) TBC 7/9/10

Barack Obama, however, hasn't been saying anything about light at the end of the tunnel. The president, who (mercifully) came of age after the Vietnam war, seemingly put the kibosh on these mindless comparisons on September 15 when he said, in response to a question, "You never step into the same river twice. And so Afghanistan is not Vietnam." Yet the evocation of Vietnam keeps cropping up among the president's aides and supporters, who warn, as E.J. Dionne did in an October 5 Washington Post column, that involvement in Afghanistan could harm the president's domestic agenda as badly as the Vietnam war harmed LBJ's Great Society. It has been widely reported that the "must read" book in the White House now is Lessons in Disaster: McGeorge Bundy and the Path to War in Vietnam by Gordon Goldstein, a study of the Kennedy-Johnson national security adviser and his role in the war. And a Times of London correspondent wrote on September 24 that "one senior official" in the White House, while speaking to him, "introduced the word 'Vietnam' into a discussion of Afghanistan." Far be it from me--a military historian--to dispute the usefulness of history in policymaking. Properly applied, the study of past wars can be essential in guiding the course of current and future conflicts. But the key is to take lessons selectively and intelligently and not become enthralled by lazy reasoning along the lines of "Vietnam was an American war; X is an American war; therefore, X will be another Vietnam." The Vietnam conflict featured a variety of factors that are absent in Afghanistan and Iraq. North Vietnam was a disciplined, one-party state with one of the world's largest and most battle-hardened armies. It had the legitimacy that came from a struggle against French colonialism and the support of two superpowers, China and Russia. Almost all of its resources from 1954 to 1975 were devoted to one goal--the annexation of South Vietnam.<CONTINUED>
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Given such a formidable foe, which was able to confront us not only with black-clad guerrillas but also with regulars riding tanks, the U.S. defeat becomes more explicable and less replicable. The Iraqi guerrillas, Sunni and Shiite, were formidable in their own right, but they were no Viet Cong. Neither are the Taliban. They are more likely to engage in sustained firefights than were Al Qaeda in Iraq or the Mahdi Army, but they are incapable of maneuvering in battalion-, brigade-, or division-sized formations as the Vietnamese Communists routinely did. Even company-sized attacks are rare in Afghanistan. The Taliban, like their Iraqi counterparts, prefer to strike with IEDs, which take little courage to plant. Although the Taliban, like the Viet Cong, enjoy cross-border havens, they do not receive anywhere close to the same degree of support from Pakistan that the Viet Cong got from North Vietnam. They don't even receive as much outside support as the mujahedeen did during their 1980s war against the Soviet Army in Afghanistan. Nor are they monolithic, as the Viet Cong were. The very term "Taliban" is a misnomer. It is used to describe loosely affiliated bands of insurgents who have no unified command structure of the kind that Hanoi imposed on its forces. Thus there is little danger of coordinated, countrywide attacks like the 1968 Tet Offensive. None of the Afghan insurgent groups enjoys anywhere close to the prestige and legitimacy, either at home or abroad, that the Viet Cong were able to garner in their fight against first France and then the United States. Mullah Omar is no Ho Chi Minh. Neither is Jalaluddin Haqqani. Are there nevertheless lessons from Vietnam that will help us fight the Taliban and other present-day foes? Undoubtedly. But the right lesson to draw is not that "we can't win." In fact, in Vietnam between 1968 and 1972 we did more or less win (a point elaborated by historian Lewis Sorley in his 1999 book A Better War: The Unexamined Victories and Final Tragedy of America's Last Years in Vietnam), but we failed to stick it out. If the United States had continued supporting Saigon with substantial aid after the signing of the Paris Peace Accords in 1973 to counter the aid Moscow and Beijing were providing to Hanoi, the likelihood is that South Vietnam would still exist--just as South Korea still exists. The Vietnam experience demonstrates the importance of using sound counterinsurgency tactics based on protecting the population rather than the conventional "search and destroy" methods employed in the early years of that war, which resulted in massive casualties for both sides (as well as for civilians) and ultimately squandered America's commitment to continue the fight. Somewhat in the mold of General Creighton Abrams, who took command in Vietnam in 1968, General Stanley McChrystal has inherited a conventional war effort that he is determined to convert into a population-centric counterinsurgency effort. The difference is that the Afghan National Army and the International Security Assistance Force are far smaller and less capable than their Vietnam war counterparts, the Army of the Republic of Vietnam and Military Assistance Command-Vietnam. Therefore implementing a counterinsurgency strategy will require more troops. If the White House agrees, it will be imperative to send a substantial number of reinforcements quickly rather than repeating one of the mistakes of the Vietnam days when Lyndon Johnson escalated gradually. That allowed the enemy to adjust to American tactics and made it impossible to wrest the initiative on the battlefield. The Vietnam experience also shows the importance of not holding Third World allies to an impossible standard. The Kennedy administration helped overthrow Ngo Dinh Diem in 1963, and South Vietnam never had another ruler who was as strong or legitimate. That is a lesson worth keeping in mind as so many critics insist that progress in Afghanistan requires replacing Hamid Karzai, who is supposedly too discredited to help us win. New York Times columnist Frank Rich writes, for instance, that "Karzai, whose brother is a reputed narcotics trafficker, is a double for Ngo Dinh Diem." Let us hope he does not suffer Diem's fate. If the United States were to be seen as complicit in Karzai's removal, that would make it as difficult for his successors to gain legitimacy as it was for Diem's successors. Another crucial point to take away from Vietnam is the importance of willpower in warfare. North Vietnam was much smaller than the United States, but its desire to prevail was much greater. If it is parallels to Vietnam that you seek, look at the wavering in the White House today. In some respects it is reminiscent of the Johnson and Nixon administrations, which showed themselves more interested in ending than in winning the war. If President Obama ultimately decides not to make a serious and prolonged commitment to Afghanistan, he will be making the same mistake so many Democrats did in the early 1970s when they claimed that we could get out of Vietnam with no damage to our country or the region. We now know that America's defeat was a tragedy for the people of Southeast Asia, with millions of Cambodians slain in the "killing fields" and hundreds of thousands of Vietnamese "boat people" taking to the seas on leaky rafts. It also did incalculable damage to America's standing in the world, encouraging our enemies from Tehran to Managua to step up attacks on our allies. It took us a full decade to recover, and even now we are still dealing with some of the fallout from that period, such as the Iranian revolution. The consequences of defeat in Afghanistan would undoubtedly be just as severe, if very different.

Turn – Empathy

The alternative makes empathy for other people impossible, depriving them of reflective consideration.

Norris 94 (Christopher, Professor of the History of Ideas, University of Wales, TRUTH AND THE ETHICS OF CRITICISM, , p.87-8)

This is what distinguishes Montaigne's scepticism from the wholesale varieties currently in vogue among postmodernists, New Historicists, and others. It works on a principle directly counter to the 'radical alterity' thesis: that is to say, on the assumption that however deep such cultural differences may run, they are still (in William Empson's fine phrase) 'a small thing by comparison with our common humanity'. The trouble with the current anti-humanist doxa is that it swings so far against those bad old forms of quasi-universalist subject-centred thought that it leaves no room for treating other subjects - including the victims of colonial oppression - as in any way capable of reasoned enquiry or reflective moral awareness. At this point scepticism passes over into cynicism, or the critique of prejudice into another (just as damaging) kind of prejudice that regards all truth-claims and ethical values as relative to this or that 'discourse', or again, as mere products of the will-to-power in its protean manifestations.

Empathy is crucial to an ethical mode of being in the world – turns the K

Rulka-Hathaway 1 (Kathleen M. August AN ARGUMENT FOR THE INTRODUCTION OF MORAL DISCUSSION INTO THE FORUM OF MARRIAGE AND FAMILY THERAPY http://minds.wisconsin.edu/bitstream/handle/1793/39229/2001rulkahathk.pdf.txt;jsessionid=dcoz8y096e8y?sequence=2 ) TBC 7/9/10

When caring is fostered, empathy is born and there is a positive influence on the inherent strength of the family. Empathy is the ability to be aware and attuned to another. This empathy, as Berkowitz and Grych (1998) observe, is one of the fundamental elements of morality, along with conscience, moral reasoning, and altruism. Empathic behavior brings one outside the self, able to live in relationship with others and in community. Daniel Goleman (1995) writes that empathy builds on self-awareness, a quality that enables one to be aware of self in relation to the other. It becomes a way of being present in the world and is one of the foundational bedrocks of humans' capacity 22 for moral reasoning. Goleman (1995) posits that the emotional attunement of empathy promotes caring for the other. He writes that the roots of morality are found in empathy, that humanity’s ability to empathize allows people to connect with one another, to share the pain, and to reach out and help. He explores the root of empathy, the Greek empatheia and elucidates this term meaning ?feeling into? (98). Goleman posits this attunement as reciprocal, part of the ?rhythm of relationship? (100). Carol Bly (1996) takes the notion of empathy further in her book Changing the Bully Who Rules the World: Reading & Thinking About Ethics. She postulates that empathy can be a tool by which people in power are stopped from wanting to exploit as much as they would otherwise. She stresses the importance of teaching empathy in steps that one might practice, but asserts that people cannot grow and change, until they have felt ?heard out,? (83) by a caring and benignant mentor who supports the process. She posits this as being essential because, The purpose of any kind of empathy is to give someone a chance to have his or her story heard, because many people have never had this experience. She explicates further, ?Since they have never had the experience of being heard out themselves, they haven?t developed a taste for hearing out anyone else,? (84). Berkowitz and Grych (1998), seem to believe that parents can be taught how to foster the development of empathy and a moral nature. Furthermore, they write, early and middle childhood is "when these characteristics develop " (371). They agree with Aristotle in that moral agents need self-control, which enables one to put emotional reactiveness aside so as to be interested in and concerned for others. This social interaction is critical to psychological health. How is an empathic and moral consideration of others fostered in the development of individuals? One has to consider an intellectual development within an ethical realm encompassing consideration for others. Weinstein (1995) convincingly 23 argues that ethical consideration requires a rational approach to values and emotional concerns and is critically important to the strength and vitality of all human relationships. A strong ethical and moral foundation then serves as an internal control on the behavior of persons, and encourages a building of trust between all people. Within this realm of morality, the nature of social exchange and cooperation is defined, that which makes social existence and justice possible.

Turn – Genocide

Heidegger justifies genocide

Ross 10 (Kelley L., Ph.D., retired from the Dept of Phil at LA Valley College http://www.friesian.com/rockmore.htm) TBC 7/9/10

A recent book, Heidegger, The Introduction of Nazism Into Philosophy in Light of the Unpublished Seminars of 1933-1935, by Emmanuel Faye [translated by Michael B. Smith, foreword by Tom Rockmore, Yale University Press, 2009], features ever more disturbing revelations about Heidegger. This stuff is pretty damning. I was willing to believe that Heidegger, with his own "metaphysical" form of Nazism, did not subscribe to Nazi theoretical racism. Indeed, we find Richard Wolin (who forcefully argues the connection between Heidegger's philosophy and his politics) saying in 2001: [Heidegger] never subscribed to the racial anti-Semitism espoused by the National Socialists. To him this perspective was philosophically untenable, insofar as it sought to explain "existential" questions in reductive biological terms. For Heidegger, biology was a base exemplar of nineteenth-century materialism -- a standpoint that needed to be overcome in the name of "Existenz" or "Being." [Heidegger's Children, Princeton University Press, p.6] However, Faye convincingly demonstrates that Heidegger did subscribe to "the racial anti-Semitism espoused by the National Socialists," wishing to avoid Darwinian "biological" racism, not just because of Ninteenth century "materialism," but because it was too Anglo-Saxon and "Liberal." His own "metaphysical" racism, a "spiritual" racism, was not unique to him and was in fact legitimized by some statements from Hitler himself. This provided a Heideggerian theoretical basis for Anti-Semitism. In an epigraph to this page, we see Heidegger speaking of the need for identifying an Enemy, even creating one, with the goal of "total extermination." If we are looking for a Heideggerian justification for genocide, this looks like it. Also, the apologistic narrative for Heidegger is that he dropped out of Nazi politics after resigning the Rectorship (Wolin also seems to accept this). But it was not true. Faye shows that Heidegger first of all was appointed to a legal commission (he had taught a seminar in Nazi law) which may actually have been responsible for many of the Nuremburg Laws of 1935. Then he was appointed to the editorial committee that was overseeing the Nazi era edition of Nietzsche's complete works, which is one reason why Heidegger was giving Nietzsche seminars later in the 1930s. Both of these were significant appointments for Nazi academics, and Heidegger got them for being politically reliable, not because he was suddenly disillusioned with politics, or Nazi politics.

Heidegger is complicit in genocide

Hodge 95 (Joanna, Prof of Phil at Manchester Metro U, Heidegger and ethics, Google Books pg. 82) TBC 7/9/10

There is in this speech a shocking and resonating silence about Nazism and the genocidal destruction of Jewish communities and homes. Heidegger seems outrageously content to elaborate his own responses to homelessness and fails to think that the history of the persecution of Jews in Europe may be intertwined with a failure in the history of Europe and its philosophy to think through to this homelessness, now understood not as a social or economic condition but as an ontological feature of what it is to be human. Heidegger identifies a failure within the European tradition to address this homelessness in the loss of a relation to being. He does not consider that this failure may lead to a hostile projection not just into the world but onto peoples with specific markings in relation to conceptions of exile and homelessness: gypsies and Jews. There are two possibilities: either this failure to address the German transformation of European anti-Semitism into organized murder blocks Heidegger's capacity to think in terms of a revival of ethics, or his insensitivity to ethical issues grounds both this silence and that failure to make the transition from questioning metaphysics to questioning ethics. This resonating silence concerning the Holocaust is also evident in the "Letter on humanism\*. Heidegger starts by setting a threefold process in play: restoring thoughtfulness to thought; restoring meaning to language; and thereby cumulatively retrieving a sense of the location in which human beings find themselves, establishing a relation for human beings to themselves in a context greater than their own activity. This process of thinking leads Heidegger to reassess his own work in highly positive terms, but it does not lead him to reassess his involvement with Nazism. The theme of a transformation of philosophy into another kind of thinking is stated at the end of the 'Letter on humanism':

Turn – Genocide

Heidegger’s philosophy causes genocide

Rockmore 91 (Tom On Heidegger’s Nazism and Philosophy Dusquesne University Prof of Phil http://publishing.cdlib.org/ucpressebooks/view?docId=ft6q2nb3wh;brand=ucpress) TBC 7/9/10

Heidegger's failure to denounce, or even to acknowledge, Nazi practice can be interpreted as an oblique resistance to the practical consequences of his theoretical commitment. He was obviously unwilling to acknowledge the failure of his turn to Nazism, not for mere psychological reasons, but on good philosophical grounds; for his turn to Nazism was grounded in his own theory of Being, which he never abandoned. For the same reason, he was also unwilling to abandon National Socialism, or at least an ideal form of it, because of his continued interest in certain points where his thought converged with Nazism, including the coming to be of the Germans as German and the confrontation with technology. Heidegger's insensitivity to the effects of Nazism in practice is coupled, then, with a residual theoretical enthusiasm for a form of Nazism in theory. In Heidegger's writings on technology, at least two passages indicate a striking insensitivity to human suffering. Heidegger, who understood technology as a form of disclosure, was careful to conceal and not to reveal some of his most deeply held views about the technological process. There is a passage in the original version of Heidegger's essay, "The Question concerning Technology," which originated as a lecture in 1949 under the title "Enframing" but which was altered in the version published in 1954.[126] In the version published during Heidegger's lifetime, the text, which was clearly changed to conceal an earlier formulation, retains only seven words in the translation, five in the revised text: "Agriculture is now the mechanized food industry."[127] This banal point hardly reveals the startling claim embedded in the original manuscript, which only became available some seven years after Heidegger's death. The original passage reads as follows: "Agriculture is now a mechanised food industry, in essence the same as the manufacturing of corpses in gas chambers and extermination camps, the same as the blockade and starvation of nations, the same as the production of hydrogen bombs."[128] From a strictly Heideggerian point of view, this passage is literally correct, since he maintains that all of modernity suffers from the turn away from Being which leads to the hegemony of technology. Yet this passage is disturbing, in part because of Heidegger's manifest insensitivity, in a period when he emphasizes the Ereignis , to the most catastrophic moral Ereignis of our time: the Holocaust. Heidegger, who is sensitive to Being, is startlingly insensitive to human being. There is further a manifest conceptual mistake in simply considering all forms of technology as indistinguishably alike. For Heidegger has failed to consider, and certainly failed to comprehend, the relation of technology to the event of the Holocaust: the unparalleled way in which all available technological resources were harnessed, and new ones were invented, specifically to commit genocide . No amount of liberal handwringing at this late date should be allowed to obscure Heidegger's incapacity, not only to respond to, but even to comprehend, the Holocaust through his theory of technology.[129] His theory, hence, fails the test of experience.

Turn – Nazism

Spanos doesn’t avoid Heidegger’s Nazism

Perkin 93 (Theorizing the Culture Wars Dr. J. Russell Postmodern Culture http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/postmodern\_culture/v003/3.3r\_perkin.html) TBC 7/7/10

Spanos's extensive reliance on Heidegger raises a political question that he doesn't adequately face. The humanists are lambasted for every ethnocentricity that they committed; Babbitt, perhaps not without justification, is described as having embodied "a totalitarian ideology" (84). But the book is defensive and evasive on the topic of Heidegger's political commitments. Spanos seems to think he can testily dismiss those who bring up this matter as enemies of posthumanism, and his treatment of the topic consists mainly in referring readers to an article he has published elsewhere. But the problem remains: Heidegger's ontological critique, when translated into the political sphere, led him to espouse Nazi ideology. If Heidegger is to be praised as the thinker who effected the definitive radical break with humanism, surely the question of his politics should be faced directly in this book.

Perm – Alt is totalizing

The alternatives totalizing rejection of techne is naive and dangerous. Reflective action avoids mastery but holds out the possibility of freedom.

Lovitt 77 (William, Professor of German, Cal State-Sacramento, introduction to Martin Heidegger's THE QUESTION CONCERNING TECHNOLOGY AND OTHER ESSAYS, 1977, p.xxxiii.)

Man needs above all in our age to know himself as the one who is so claimed. The challenging summons of Enframing "sends into a way of revealing" (QT 24). So long as man does not know this, he cannot know himself; nor can he know himself in relation to his world. As a consequence he becomes trapped in one of two attitudes, both equally vain: either he fancies that he can in fact master technology and can by technological means -- by analyzing and calculating and ordering -- control all aspects of his life; or he recoils at the inexorable and dehumanizing control that technology is gaining over him, rejects it as the work of the devil, and strives to discover for himself some other way of life apart from it. What man truly needs is to know the destining to which he belongs and to know it as a destining, as the disposing power that governs all phenomena in this technological age.

The absolutist negativism of the K prevents change

Pasquale 5 (Frank L., Ph.D., a cultural anthropologist Secular Humanist Bulletin, Feb. 10 Volume 20, Number 3. Absolute Thinking in an Inabsolute World http://secularhumanism.org/index.php?section=library&page=pasquale\_20\_3&back=http://secularhumanism.org/lib/list.php%3Fpublication%3Dshb) TBC 7/7/10

For my own part, I have grown weary of extremist thinking, whether purely right/wrong, black/white, good/evil, either/or, us/them, absolute, or absolutely relative. Western history and philosophy sometimes seem to me a succession of presumptuous pretensions to certainty. Such thinking has led to great achievements, but also untold destruction. It provided an impetus for great adventure and oppressive imperialism. It envisioned shining cities on a hill, and a purified “race” of superior humans (minus those deemed “unfit”). To view ourselves as absolutely, unchangeably prejudiced, judgmental, selfish, oppressive, or evil is as dangerous and as empirically indefensible as to think ourselves perfect or capable of perfection. By doing so, we lapse back into an age-old habit of framing the world in dueling absolutes. (Remember Manichaeanism? How about Bushism?) But we are not absolutely good, nor absolutely evil; we are capable of both and generally interested in improving. We make small advances here and lapse back there. Our ethics and values are neither fixed and eternal nor absolutely relative but an approximate reflection of our nature (such as we dimly perceive it at this point in species evolution), our needs, and our shared aspiration to live lives worth living. While it is essential that we remain skeptically aware of our many failings and foibles, we should not deny our incremental advancements, our ethical aspirations, or our potential for goodness and nobility, imperfect as these may be. At the very least, to deny such advancements is to negate the contributions of those whose lives were devoted to promoting a precious self-fulfilling prophecy of human decency and justice, regardless of power, class, culture, skin color, or metaphysical stance. At the worst, it is to frame a dismal world and a self-fulfilling prophecy where power alone is the greatest “good,” where we are forever consigned to an original sin of destructive judgmentalism without hope of improvement, and where all “religious” people and phenomena constitute a uniform evil that must be obliterated without a trace. I had thought that humanism represented a repudiation of such thinking, but perhaps I was mistaken.

Perm Solves – Criticizing humanism should make available possibilities other than totalizing negation.

Lewandowski 94 (Joseph, Department of Comparative Literature at SUNY Binghamton, PHILOSOPHY & SOCIAL CRITICISM, Vol. 20., No. 3, 1994, p. 112)

Thus Spanos's intervention into the question of 'theory' is bound up with his (and Heidegger's) much larger critical opposition to humanism. Though a thorough explication of such a critique of humanism is beyond the scope of this review, I think it salient to note that opposition to humanism—to the privileging of a sovereign subject over and against a distinct world of manipulable objects—for Spanos (or Heidegger) does not generally suggest negation (anti-humanism). The de-structuring of humanism is not a call for nihilism. Quite the contrary. To paraphrase Heidegger in the "Letter on Humanism' (a text which resides just beneath the surface of all of Spanos's thinking in Heidegger and Criticism) an opposition to humanism in no way implies a defense of the inhuman but rather opens other vistas.

Perm – Alt is totalizing

Spanos makes totalizing assumptions which he repeats – Perm is key

Perkin 93 (Theorizing the Culture Wars Dr. J. Russell Postmodern Culture http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/postmodern\_culture/v003/3.3r\_perkin.html) TBC 7/7/10

Another problem is that the book makes huge historical assertions that have the effect of lessening difference, even while it attacks the metaphysical principle "that identity is the condition for the possibility of difference and not the other way around" (4; emphasis in original). This is something Spanos has in common with some followers of Derrida who turn deconstruction into a dogma, rather than realizing that it is a strategy of reading that must take account of the particular logic of the texts being read. Spanos asserts that the classical Greeks were characterized by "originative, differential, and errant thinking" (105), which every subsequent age, beginning with the Alexandrian Greek, through the Romans, the Renaissance, the Enlightenment, and the Victorians, and right up to the present, misunderstood in a reifying and imperialistic appropriation. This not only implies a somewhat simplistic reception-history of ancient Greek culture; it also, significantly, perpetuates a myth--the favourite American myth that Spanos in other contexts attacks in the book--of an original period of innocence, a fall, and the possibility of redemption.

Perm Solves – Spanos’s dogmatism destroys the alt

Perkin 93 (Theorizing the Culture Wars Dr. J. Russell Postmodern Culture http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/postmodern\_culture/v003/3.3r\_perkin.html) TBC 7/7/10

My final criticism is that Spanos, by his attempt to put all humanists into the same category and to break totally with the tradition of humanism, isolates himself in a posture of ultraleftist purity that cuts him off from many potential political allies, especially when, as I will note in conclusion, his practical recommendations for the practical role of an adversarial intellectual seem similar to those of the liberal pluralists he attacks. He seems ill-informed about what goes on in the everyday work of the academy, for instance, in the field of composition studies. Spanos laments the "unwarranted neglect" (202) of the work of Paulo Freire, yet in reading composition and pedagogy journals over the last few years, I have noticed few thinkers who have been so consistently cited. Spanos refers several times to the fact that the discourse of the documents comprising The Pentagon Papers was linked to the kind of discourse that first-year composition courses produce (this was Richard Ohmann's argument); here again, however, Spanos is not up to date. For the last decade the field of composition studies has been the most vigorous site of the kind of oppositional practices The End of Education recommends. The academy, in short, is more diverse, more complex, more genuinely full of difference than Spanos allows, and it is precisely that difference that neoconservatives want to erase. By seeking to separate out only the pure (posthumanist) believers, Spanos seems to me to ensure his self-marginalization. For example, several times he includes pluralists like Wayne Booth and even Gerald Graff in lists of "humanists" that include William Bennett, Roger Kimball and Dinesh D'Souza. Of course, there is a polemical purpose to this, but it is one that is counterproductive. In fact, I would even question the validity of calling shoddy and often inaccurate journalists like Kimball and D'Souza with the title "humanist intellectuals." Henry Louis Gates's final chapter contains some cogent criticism of the kind of position which Spanos has taken. Gates argues that the "hard" left's opposition to liberalism is as mistaken as its opposition to conservatism, and refers to Cornel West's remarks about the field of critical legal studies, "If you don't build on liberalism, you build on air" (187). Building on air seems to me precisely what Spanos is recommending. Gates, on the other hand, criticizes "those massively totalizing theories that marginalize practical political action as a jejune indulgence" (192), and endorses a coalition of liberalism and the left. The irony is that in the last chapter, when he seeks to provide some suggestions for oppositional practice, Spanos can only recommend strategies which are already common in the academy, especially in women's studies and composition. He praises the pedagogical theory of Paulo Freire, which as I have noted is hardly an original move; he recommends opposition to the structures of the disciplines, and oppositional practices within the curriculum. But again, many liberal as well as left academics are already teaching "against the grain," enlarging the canon and experimenting with new methods of teaching. I have been teaching full-time for five years now, and the texts my younger colleagues and I teach, and the way we teach them, constitute something radically different from the course of studies during my own undergraduate and even graduate career. Women's studies, which is not mentioned much in The End of Education, has provided a great deal of exciting interdisciplinary work. Gates's book shows in detail how African-American studies has constituted not only an oppositional discourse, but one that has started to reconfigure the dominant discourse of American studies.

Perm Solvency

Perm Solves – Meditative thinking can correct calculation but both are sometimes necessary.

Kockelmans 85 (Joseph, Penn State philosopher, HEIDEGGER AND SCIENCE, 1985, p.254.)

This ambivalent attitude in regard to modern science and technology, which says at the same time yes and no, corresponds to the two modes of thinking we have referred to earlier. Calculative thinking will help us to use our resources effectively; meditative thinking will help us in making certain that technicity will not overpower us. Meditative thinking will thus make it possible for us to come to come to a freedom in regard to things that lets things be (Gelassenheit), by maintaining an openness to the mystery that is hidden in modern technicity.

The perm solves. It recognizes the totalizing capacity of language but holds out the possiblity of using it to criticize and change the world.

Lewandowski 94 (Joseph, Department of Comparative Literature at SUNY Binghamton, PHILOSOPHY & SOCIAL CRITICISM, Vol. 20., No. 3, 1994, p. 119)

Spanos rightly rejects the 'textuality' route in Heidegger and Criticism precisely because of its totalizing and hypostatizing tendencies. Nevertheless, he holds on to a destructive hermeneutics as disclosure. But as I have already intimated, disclosure alone cannot support a critical theory oriented toward emancipation. I think a critical theory needs a less totalizing account of language, one that articulates both the emphatic linguistic capacity to spontaneously disclose worlds—its innovative 'worlding' possibilities—and its less emphatic, but no less important, capacity to communicate, solve problems, and criticize the world. The essential task of the social critic—and any literary theory that wants to be critical—is to couple world disclosure with problem-solving, to mediate between the extra-ordinary world of 'textuality' and the everyday world of 'texts'. In this alternative route, literary theory may become the kind of emancipatory oriented critical theory it can and should be.

The permutation is capable of embracing disclosure in such a way as to fundamentally alter our relationship with being, simultaneously pursuing emancipatory politics.

Lewandowski 94 (Joseph, Department of Comparative Literature at SUNY Binghamton, PHILOSOPHY & SOCIAL CRITICISM, Vol. 20., No. 3, 1994, p. 120)

In his 1981 acceptance speech upon receipt of the Adorno prize, Jurgen Habermas formulates the positive and emancipatory possibilites of the coupling of world disclosure and problem-solving that I have only briefly suggested here. Habermas raises the question of the relationship between aesthetic (disclosive) experiences and life problems. When a disclosive experience is used "…to illuminate a life historical situation and is related to life problems, it enters into a language game which is no longer that of the aesthetic critic. The aesthetic experience then not only renews the interpretation of our needs in whose light we perceive the world. It permeates as well our cognitive significations and our normative expectations and changes the manner in which all these moments refer to one another." When the literary theorist (or 'aesthetic critic') can discern in texts world-disclosive possibilities and critically use them to illuminate, begin to criticize and solve life-historical problems—problems of cross-cultural representation for example—then he or she has entered into a very different language game, one that is not merely a hypostatized 'sterile game' of deconstructing or de-structuring 'texts'. Here, then, in such a 'high'-stakes language game, the constellation of disclosive experiences, cognitive significations and normative expectations is reconfigured. Such a transformative reconfiguration opens up not simply the abyss, the indeterminacy, or the destructive will to power that seems to infect every aspect of modernity, but rather the possibility of linking the insights gained in aesthetic experience to everyday practice in genuinely emancipatory ways.

Perm Solvency

Perm Solves – the alternative cant be an excuse for objectivity

Lewandowski 94 (Joseph, Department of Comparative Literature at SUNY Binghamton, PHILOSOPHY & SOCIAL CRITICISM, Vol. 20., No. 3, 1994, p. 117-8)

But radicalized or not, Spanos's trading of any possibility of 'determinate truth' for Heideggerian disclosure as eventing of truth/untruth robs his critical theory of the necessary yardstick needed to measure 'emancipation.' Heidegger's disclosure is a cyrptonormative truth: it is an event before which any critical judgement necessarily fails. Disclosure is not a process of inquiry, but rather a revealing/concealing that befalls or overtakes us. In his eagerness to draw out the enabling features and 'post'-humanist dimension of Heidegger's disclosure, Spanos fails to see the inevitable and internal limits to truth as disclosure. Gadamer encounters similar problems, despite his keen insights, when he holds on to a Heideggerian disclosure that too often undermines the power of critical reflection. And the postmodern Italian philosopher Giannia Vattimo encounters a related problem when he attempts to take leave of modernity and proclaim a liberating postmodernity via Heidegger's disclosure. But while a purely aesthetic theory interested in 'textuality' can quite justifiably be grounded in truth as disclosure (as American deconstructionism of Vattimo's il pensiero debole is) a truly critical theory interested in emancipation simply cannot: some types of 'emancipation' are false and need to be rejected. Texts may very well 'disclose' worlds in the same way that, say, the Greek temple does for Heidegger. But a genuinely critical theory needs to be able to say what worlds are better or worse for actual agents in actual worlds—a need, I might add, that Spanos is constantly aware of and typifies in his denunciation of American imperialism in Vietnam (and elsewhere) in Heidegger and Criticism.

Perm Solves – Action must be grounded in a new version of humanism which absorbs post-structuralism

Orr 99 (Caley Michael University of Colorado, Boulder http://www.janushead.org/JHspg99/orr.cfm) TBC 7/7/10

Perhaps the gravest consequence of the structuralist paradigm is the deconstruction of volition. With no apparent absolute ground upon which to stand and make decisions, how can humans decide on any course of action, especially regarding moral and ethical issues? Derrida provides a keen observation into the ethical structure of Western metaphysics, but his deconstruction of any sort of system makes it impossible to choose a program of action based on logical grounds. The heaviest blow to any comprehensive perspective of the world comes with the deconstruction of the Self. How can we have certain objective knowledge of the world if we do not have a concrete self from which to begin our investigations? The re-establishment of some of the Humanist ideals, modified by what insights the Post-Structuralist tradition has offered, should remedy this epistemological and ethical crisis, if it can be properly formulated. The reconstruction of the concept of a concrete self, the redefinition of the meaning of meaning and an explication of the role of faith in the realization of the ideal of objective meaning are fundamental goals in what we call the Renaissance of Meaning and the formulation of a New Humanism. Upon close pragmatic inspection, the concept of a concrete self is seen to have survived the relativistic onslaught of structuralist and deconstructionalist criticism. What has risen from the ashes of these schools of thought are two basic propositions: 1. The concept of Self is an illusion of the structure of consciousness. 2. The Self is an actual concrete entity existing within a conscious being. (Essentially the binary opposite of proposition 1) Because of the pragmatic consequence of action, these two propositions can be collapsed into one, and, for all practical purposes, the existential claim about the Self (i.e. proposition 2) can be held to be true. Whether or not the Self is an illusion or not is immaterial; what matters is that the conscious being acts as if a concrete self exists by performing all of the actions that necessarily require the positing of a self (i.e. all of the acts of volition-- willing, desiring, speaking etc). Another example of this method is implicit in such systems as Euclidean geometry. The geometer posits certain abstract entities, such as points and lines, from which one derives theorems that correspond with our empirical experience of the world. It matters little whether those entities “truly” exist. For all practical purposes, they do, because of the pragmatic consequence of action. Other parallels include theoretical entities in physics such as atoms and subatomic particles, as well as more profound objects such as black holes. These entities have meaning according to the consequences which follow from their postulation.

Perm Solvency – Epistemology

Perm Solves – We can combine epistemologies

Olssen 4 (Mark Professor of Political Theory and Education University of Surrey Culture and learning: access and opportunity in the classroom Google Books pg. 244-5) TBC 7/7/10

A number of commentators have noted that in their critique of knowledge, post-modernists invariably characterize it as “positivist.” The typical version of positivism that is attacked is one that locates truth outside society and presents it as accessible through a “neutral” language that is a direct representation of the external world. The post-modernist view of the inseparability of knowledge and knowers is then used to challenge the claims of the natural sciences that they can provide access to truth that is outside society and history. The implications of this polarization between post-modernism and a positivist view of science is termed by Alexander “the epistemological dilemma,” which he summarizes as follows: Either knowledge … is unrelated to the social position and intellectual interests of the knower, in which case general theory and universal knowledge are viable, or knowledge is affected by its relation to the knower, in which case relativistic and particularistic knowledge can be the only result. This is a true dilemma because it presents a choice between two equally unpalatable alternatives, (However) The alternative to positivist theory is not resigned relativism and the alternative to relativism is not positivist theory. Theoretical knowledge can never be anything other than the socially rooted efforts of historical agents. But this social character does not negate the possibility of developing either generalized categories or increasingly disciplined, impersonal and critical modes of evaluation. (Alexander, 1995, p. 91) We endorse Alexander’s view that there is an alternative to this polarization and will explore it in some detail later. Next however, we turn to other problems of post-modernism as a critical social theory and in particular, its concept of knowledge. Post-modernism reduces knowledge to a simple monolithic form that is then held to be hegemonic. However, as Collins argues in his encyclopedic Sociology of Philosophies (Collins, 1998), it is only rarely and under exceptional conditions that the certainty of knowledge is hegemonic in any intellectual fields are typically structured by competing traditions and positions and that the dominance of one is only ever partial and transient. Indeed, for Collins, the reality of competing traditions is one of the conditions for the objectivity of knowledge. In contrast, post-modernism polarizes present and absent meanings leading to an inevitably schematic and partial view of knowledge. The manner in which post-modernists typically equate science with positivism, despite the fact, at least in its cruder forms, positivism has never been widely accepted as a theory of science, is an example of this. Philosophers such as Toulmin as well as sociologists have, since the 1970’s, shown that locating knowledge socially does not lead to the abandonment of truth and objectivity. It is in these developments that we can find a way out of Alexander’s “epistemological dilemma.”

Perm Solves – Science can be included in constructivist approaches

Cupchik 1 (Gerald Professor at the University of Toronto Scarborough FQS Vol 2, No 1 feb (2001): Qualitative and Quantitative Research: Conjunctions and Divergences http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/968/2112) TBC 7/8/10

A reconciliation of positivism and constructivism can only be accomplished by eliminating the arbitrary boundaries and assumptions that separate them. Getting rid of concerns about truth and apprehension is a good place to start. Constructivists take for granted the notion that truth is relative to individuals and communities. But what about "scientists"? While they may be in search of first principles of "nature," scientists also know that individual events are indeterminate and that theories are always being replaced over the course of time. Therefore the notion of "truth" may be a hold over of religious concerns about ultimate realities which are knowable only by deities. Social scientists need not have such pretensions and can be forgiven if they place truth to the side and get on with their business of understanding and relating to the natural and social worlds. [4]

Perm Solvency – Epistemology

Perm Solves – Positivism isn’t a contradictory epistemology

Cupchik 1 (Gerald Professor at the University of Toronto Scarborough FQS Vol 2, No 1 feb (2001): Qualitative and Quantitative Research: Conjunctions and Divergences http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/968/2112) TBC 7/8/10

Even the concept of validity need not isolate the positivist and constructionist scholarly communities. Both communities express a concern for ecological validity, the extent to which a finding meaningfully reflects an event or process in the world. Both also bear the burdens of their doctrinal commitments. In the case of positivism, precise operational definitions can so deplete a phenomenon of its richness and texture that it all but disappears in the rush to actuarial prediction. On the other hand, constructionists can so link a phenomenon with a particular interpretive context that it runs the risk of being isolated within collective solipsism. The two communities therefore have different albatrosses dangling from their epistemological necks. In the case of positivism, measurement can transform meaning into nothingness. For constructivists, the priestly use of impenetrable language can generate meaning, but only for the initiated. [6] Inquiry can be treated as a kind of action (NELSON, MEGILL, & McCLOSKEY 1987) engaged in by researchers in the process of generating knowledge. This systematic and systemic activity extends to all phases of the research project, from the noticing of a phenomenon, to framing the research problem, decisions about method, the collection and analysis of data, the interpretation of findings and their communication in oral and written forms, and reflections on the outcome of the project both by the researcher and various audiences. Reconciliation must begin with a shared notion of social phenomena in-the-world and therefore of what is "real." Just as people can share the "facts" of everyday "reality," even while differing in interpretations of their meaning, positivist and constructivist "realities" are not necessarily foundationally incompatible. [7]

Perm Solvency – Ontology

Perm solves – the ontology of positivism is complementary to the kritik

Cupchik 1 (Gerald Prof at U of Toronto Scarborough FQS Vol 2, No 1 feb (2001): Qualitative and Quantitative Research: Conjunctions and Divergences http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/968/2112) TBC 7/8/10

Constructivist Realism is therefore a position which acknowledges that social phenomena exist in communities quite independently of professional researchers. These real phenomena will be observed and named by members of the natural community, and understood by experienced or wiser people of good judgment. Scholars can approach this real world each in their own way. An empathic approach would be one in which an attempt is made to understand these phenomena holistically and from the perspective of the participants. It is here that a qualitative method can be used to exhaustively tap all perspectives. But, to the extent that the scholar comes from outside the community, there will be speculative leaps in the search for a coherent account of the phenomenon. A sympathetic approach involves an expression of interest in the community and a sincere desire to work productively with its real phenomena. The questions asked are more limited and external to the social system and the quantitative models that are brought to bear are but a pale shadow of the original phenomenon. Precision is gained but at the loss of subtlety. [30] Both types of scholars are selective of their facts and ultimately engage in acts of construction. Both begin with a concrete world and step into another world of abstraction. The same criterion of value can be applied to both kinds of constructions. If we hold the real social phenomenon in one hand with an extended arm and interpose our theoretical accounts with the other hand, as lenses focused on the phenomenon, is it brought more clearly into view? If our abstract concepts do not account for patterns in the lived-world then our theories lack in value, however they are derived. But if the in-depth examination of a phenomenon helps clarify patterns that lie within it and these patterns are formally described, then the qualitative and quantitative approaches will have done their duty; richness and precision will have complemented each other. [31] I have argued in this paper that the fundamental goal of social research should be to reveal the processes that underlie observed social phenomena. Social phenomena are multilayered events as is the inquiring mind of the social scientist. Qualitative method should not be seen as providing access to the "meaning" of individual events, texts, and so on. Rather, understood within the tradition of observation in natural history, qualitative method provides a basis for "thick" description. This rich source of data is most productive when it focuses on events or episodes in which the phenomenon in question is well represented. To the extent that the interviewer and the respondent share an ongoing reference point, it makes it easier to locate the respondent's concrete discourse in a meaningful abstract theoretical context of interest to the interviewer. This enhanced intersubjectivity provides a basis for reconciling the problematic of realism-relativism in a "grounded" fashion (RENNIE 1995; 1998; 2000). [32] Quantitative method can yield insights to the extent that evocative stimuli design are presented to relevant groups and the resulting statistical interactions help tease out the underlying processes. Statistically significant effects can draw our attention to socially meaningful events which are then re-examined in descriptive depth. This interplay between descriptive richness and experimental precision can bring accounts of social phenomena to progressively greater levels of clarity. Together, qualitative and quantitative methods provide complementary views of the phenomena and efforts at achieving their reconciliation can elucidate processes underlying them. Constructivist realism is an ontological position that accommodates the best of positivism and interpretivism.1) [33]

Alt Fails

Decontextualized criticism of policy action leads to marginalization

Lynn 98 (Laurence E., Jr. The University of Chicago A Place at the Table: Policy Analysis, Its Postpositive Critics, and the Future of Practice DRAFT January 25, http://harrisschool.uchicago.edu/about/publications/working-papers/pdf/wp\_99\_01.pdf) TBC 7/8/10

The postpositivist critique of policy analysis as hopelessly “stuck” in a narrowly positivist mode of practice strikes a false note, however. That critique tends to be based on a decontextualized caricature, virtually a parody, of policy analysis training and practice. Not surprisingly, policy analysis practitioners tend, as Durning notes, to ignore the “tools of tyranny” rant. Durning would like to sneak some new postpositivist methods by unsuspecting practitioners, but it will not work. Until postpositivists can be persuaded to tell the story of actual practice and its shortcomings truthfully, it will be too easy to dismiss them as either Maoists or “tools of anarchy,” and the good ideas embedded in their critique will be lost.

Spanos Fails – Heidegger cannot articulate a political connection

Lewandowski 94 (Joseph, Dept of Comparative Lit at SUNY Binghamton, PHILOSOPHY & SOCIAL CRITICISM, Vol. 20., No. 3, 1994, p. 110-119) TBC 7/8/10

While the attempt to make literary theory critical in this innovative union of Heidegger and Foucault is laudable, Spanos’s ‘retrieving’ of Heidegger shares many of the problems that faced an earlier generation of critical theorists interested in Heidegger (here I am thinking of Marcuse), and many of the problems that face contemporary philo-sophical hermeneutics (here I am thinking mostly of Gadamer and Vattimo). Remember that Marcuse's dissatisfaction with Heidegger grew, in fact, not simply out of Heidegger's political engagements but more so out of his failure to link his fundamental ontology to any historically concretized praxis (a problem Spanos is aware of, as I suggested earlier, but never resolves via genealogy — a point I shall return to shortly). Heidegger never has much to say about agents and their capacity for historically realizable emancipation: for Heidegger, it is always a freedom that possesses man, a historical destiny that awaits or calls us, and not the other way around. Thomas McCarthy raises this problematic in his essay on 'Heidegger and Critical Theory': Heidegger, Marcuse wrote, 'remained content to talk of the nation's link with destiny, of the "heritage" that each individual has to take over, and of the community of the "generation", while other dimensions of facticity were treated under such categories as "they" and "idle talk" and relegated in this way to inauthentic existence. [He] did not go on to ask about the nature of this heritage, about the people's mode of being, about the real processes and forces that are history.' (p. 96) The point to be made here is that Heidegger's politics are not the only (or necessarily the largest) obstacle to coupling him with critical theory. Hence much of Spanos's energetic defense of Heidegger against his 'humanist detractors' (particularly in his defiant concluding chapter, 'Heidegger, Nazism, and the "Repressive Hypothesis": The American Appropriation of the Question') is misdirected. For as McCarthy rightly points out, 'the basic issues separating critical theory from Heideggerean ontology were not raised post hoc in reaction to Heidegger's political misdeeds but were there from the start. Marcuse formulated them in all clarity during his time in Freiburg, when he was still inspired by the idea of a materialist analytic of Dasein' (p. 96, emphasis added). In other words, Heidegger succumbs quite readily to an immanent critique. Heidegger's aporias are not simply the result of his politics but rather stem from the internal limits of his questioning of the 'being that lets beings be\*, truth as disclosure, and destruction of the metaphysical tradition, all of which divorce reflection from social practice and thus lack critical perspective.

Alt Fails

Spanos can’t articulate an emancipatory alternative

Lewandowski 94 (Joseph, Dept of Comparative Lit at SUNY Binghamton, PHILOSOPHY & SOCIAL CRITICISM, Vol. 20., No. 3, 1994, p. 110-119) TBC 7/8/10

Spanos, however thinks Foucault can provide an alternative materialist grounding for an emancipatory crticial theory that would obviate the objections of someone such as Marcuse. But the turn to Foucault is no less problematic than the original turn to Heidegger. Genealogy is not critical in any real way. Nor can it tame or augment what Spanos calls Heidegger's 'overdetermination of the ontological site'. Foucault\*s analysis of power, despite its originality, is an ontology of power and not, as Spanos thinks, a 'concrete diagnosis' (p. 138) of power mechanisms.3 Thus it dramatizes, on a different level, the same shortcomings of Heidegger's fundamental ontology. The 'affiliative relationship' (p. 138) that Spanos tries to develop between Heidegger and Foucault in order to avoid the problem Marcuse faced simply cannot work. Where Heidegger ontologizes Being, Foucault ontolo-gizes power. The latter sees power as a strategic and intentional but subjectless mechanism that 'endows itself and punches out 'docile bodies', whereas the former sees Being as that neutered term and no-thing that calls us. Foucault (like Spanos) never works out how genealogy is emancipatory, or how emancipation could be realized collectively by actual agents in the world. The 'undefined work of freedom\* the later Foucault speaks of in 'What Is Enlightenment?' remained precisely that in his work.4 The genealogy of power is as much a hypostatization as is fundamental ontology: such hypostatizations tend to institute the impossibility of practical resistance or freedom. In short, I don't think the Heideggerian 'dialogue' with Foucault sufficiently tames or complements Heidegger, nor does it make his discourse (or Foucault's, for that matter) any more emancipatory or oppositional. Indeed, Foucault's reified theory of power seems to undermine the very notion of 'Opposition', since there is no subject (but rather a 'docile' body) to do the resisting (or, in his later work, a privatized self to be self-made within a regime of truth), nor an object to be resisted. As Said rightly points out in The World, the Text, and the Critic, 'Foucault more or less eliminates the central dialectic of opposed forces that still underlies modern society\* (p. 221, emphasis added). Foucault's theory of power is shot through with false empirical analyses, yet Spanos seems to accept them as valid diagnoses. Spanos fails to see, to paraphrase Said's criticisms of Foucault's theory of power, that power is neither a spider's web without the spider, nor a smoothly functioning diagram (p. 221).

Alt fails – general rejection of metaphysics ignores important context

Perkin 93 (Theorizing the Culture Wars Dr. J. Russell Postmodern Culture http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/postmodern\_culture/v003/3.3r\_perkin.html) TBC 7/7/10

There are further problems with the narrative built into The End of Education. Humanism is always and everywhere, for Spanos, panoptic, repressive, characterized by "the metaphysics of the centered circle," which is repeatedly attacked by reference to the same overcited passage from Derrida's "Structure, Sign, and Play in the Discourse of the Human Sciences"--not coincidentally one of the places where Derrida allows himself to make large claims unqualified by their derivation from reading a particular text. In order to make this assertion, Spanos must show that all apparent difference is in fact contained by the same old metaphysical discourse. Thus, within the space of four pages, in the context of making absolute claims about Western education (or thought, or theory), Spanos uses the following constructions: "whatever its historically specific permutations," "despite the historically specific permutations," "Apparent historical dissimilarities," "Despite the historically specific ruptures." (12-15) Western thought, he repeats, has "always reaffirmed a nostalgic and recuperative circuitous educational journey back to the origin" (15). This over-insistence suggests to me that Spanos is a poor reader of Derrida, for he is not attentive to difference at particular moments or within particular texts. He seems to believe that one can leap bodily out of the metaphysical tradition simply by compiling enough citations from Heidegger, whereas his rather anticlimactic final chapter shows, as Derrida recognizes more explicitly, that one cannot escape logocentrism simply by wishing to.

Alt Fails

The alternative is circular – Revealing fails

Bartok 84 (Philip J. Dept of Phil U of Notre Dame FOUCAULT’S ANALYTIC OF FINITUDE AND THE “DEATH” OF PHENOMENOLOGY) TBC 7/8/10

For Foucault, it is ultimately phenomenology’s very foundation in the contents of actual experience that leads it into trouble. The phenomenological project was born out of Husserl’s rejection of psychologism, but on Foucault’s view phenomenology’s roots in psychology remain all too apparent. For him, “[t]he phenomenological project continually resolves itself, before our eyes, into a description - empirical despite itself - of actual experience, and into an ontology of the unthought that automatically short-circuits the primacy of the ‘I think.’”12 Phenomenology, holding in tension the empirical and the transcendental, the epistemological and the ontological, is ultimately a “discourse of mixed nature” which succeeds only in “fulfilling with greater care the 6 hasty demands laid down when the attempt was made to make the empirical, in man, stand for the transcendental.”13 The realm of experience studied by phenomenology is supposed to be both specific enough to serve as the subject of a precise descriptive language (i.e. of a descriptive psychology), and sufficiently removed from such specificity to be able to provide foundations for all experience. It is Foucault’s contention that the domain of experience simply cannot fulfill both of these roles simultaneously. Phenomenology either attempts to merely reduce the transcendental to the empirical or it remains caught in an “endless oscillation” between empirical and transcendental modes of discourse.14 For Foucault, this oscillation is indicative of the fundamental ambiguity of phenomenological discourse, an ambiguity configured for it by the analytic of finitude.

A2: Alt – Do Nothing

Sometimes it is preferrable to act. Doing nothing is still a choice, we shouldnt be blind to the consequences.

Padrutt 92 (Hanspeter, psychiatrist, Daseinanalytisches Institut, Zurich, HEIDEGGER AND THE EARTH, Ladelle McWhorter, ed., 1992, p.31.)

Once in a while the conceptual interplay of theory and praxis is put against this attempt. From the philosophical point of view the so-called practical or political dimension of the attempt is rejected, whereas from the ecological point of view the so-called theoretical, philosophical dimension is rejected. But deeper reflection and decisive action do not need to contradict each other. Those who shield themselves from the political consequences might one day be confronted with the fact that no decision is still a decision that can have consequences. And those who believe that they need not bother about thinking fail to recognize that no philosophy is also a philosophy e.g., a cybernetic worldview -- that also has consequences

Ontology Focus Bad – Genocide

Heidegger’s privileging of ontology is complicit in atrocities

Committee on Public Safety 96 (The writers subsume their individual names within the denomination of "Committee" in deference to the indivisibility of the work presented Levinasian Scholars "My Place in the Sun" Reflections On The Thought Of Emmanuel Levinas Diacritics 26.1 (1996) 3-10 Project Muse) TBC 7/7/10

At the heart of Levinas's critique of Heidegger is the reproof that the question of man has become submerged in the question of being, and thus that the recovery of the meaning of being entails the forgetting of the meaning of the human. Heidegger's Letter on Humanism (Brief über den Humanismus), published in 1947, in which he claims that "what is essential is not humanity, but being" [Brief 24] is offset by the title of Levinas's work, published in the same year, in which he shows how the anonymity of existence, or being, is redeemed only by the existent, or be-ing; hence, De l'existence à l'existant, from existence to the existent--denoting a sense of direction, lost needlessly in Lingis's translation of the title as Existence and Existents. Levinas depicts the anonymity of being through the il y a, in which the impersonality of the verb mirrors the subjectless horror of existence. The anonymity of the il y a is "saved" ultimately only through the face of the other for whom one is always inescapably responsible. It is not that Levinas retreats from the ontological (the domain of Sein or being) to the ontic (the domain of the Seienden or be-ings), or that he rejects being in favor of some pre-Heideggerian idealist notion of the subject. Rather, his emphasis on the passage from the bare meaning of être or existence to l'étant or existent gropes toward what finally comes to signify the ethical, whereby the anonymity of the infinitive is overcome by the priority of the participial being-for-another-existent and the subject deposed rather than posed [EI 50]. "I am wary of that debased word 'love,'" he remarks again to Nemo, "but the responsibility for the other, being-for-the-other, seemed to me, even at that time [1947], to put an end to the anonymous and senseless rumbling of being" [EI 51]. Only in the most practical and mundane of obligations to the other is ontology rendered ethical and humane. This horror invoked by the anonymous il y a is not to be confused with Heideggerian anguish before death, or care for being. Levinas describes how the original De l'existence appeared in a cover on which were inscribed the words "where it is not a question of anxiety" [EI 47]. One could scarcely ask for a more explicit derangement of fundamental ontology, in the light of a horror of the il y a which had become historically incarnated for him: "None of the generosity which the German counterpart of the 'there is,' the 'es gibt,' is said to contain was displayed between 1933 and 1945," he writes later [DL 375]. There is no mistaking his imputation of ideological implications of complicity between Heideggerian Sein and modern genocide. They are related, not by happenstance but as the fundamental possibility of each other. Invoking the Platonic concept of the good beyond being (epekeina ts ousias), Levinas contests the notion that nothingness is a privation of being and that evil is a privation of the good, insisting that evil itself is a positive mode of being. Being can be more primally terrible than simply not-being. In brief, the distance between Heideggerian ontology and Levinasian ethics can be measured by the difference between an inquiry into being qua being (ti to on) and an inquiry into humanity itself (ti bioteon)--a distance which, as Heidegger himself observes in his Letter [Brief 22], is paradoxically both farther away than any individual be-ing and yet nearer than any be-ing could ever be.

Ontology Focus Bad – Genocide

Heideggerian focus on Ontology leads to genocide

Committee on Public Safety 96 (The writers subsume their individual names within the denomination of "Committee" in deference to the indivisibility of the work presented Levinasian Scholars "My Place in the Sun" Reflections On The Thought Of Emmanuel Levinas Diacritics 26.1 (1996) 3-10 Project Muse) TBC 7/7/10

Heidegger's depiction of human being as fundamentally in relation makes of otherness a condition of Dasein's possibility. To master one's own relation to being means to master one's own relation to another: "Dasein's understanding of being already entails the understanding of others, because its being is being-with" [SZ 1.4.§26]. In this sense, then, Miteinandersein, being-with-one-other, is a being with oneself also. Levinas critiques this notion of Miteinandersein for depicting the self and the other as related side by side, mediated through a third common term--the truth of being [TA 18-19]. In contrast, Levinas posits the relation of the face to face, that is, between two, and with no third term, no external authority. Once three are involved, we enter the universe of the one and the many and, hence, of "the totalizing discourse of ontology" [Kearney 57-58]. Only in the ethical relation of two can the self encounter the other immediately without recourse to an anonymous and faceless collectivity. Describing ethics as a "meontology" [Kearney 61], Levinas argues that its openness to the other is prior to ontology's closure upon itself. It is not that Heidegger's rupture with Western metaphysics through fundamental ontology went too far, but that it did not go far enough. It ushered in a philosophy of identity based on bonds and on consanguinity without fully confronting the advent of otherness in the epiphany of the human face. How, wonders Levinas, can fundamental ontology embrace the consanguineous body yet refuse the face? By repudiating idealism's abstract human nature, fundamental ontology gave vent to what rationalism, as the self-proclaimed universal mark of "humanity," had been repressing all along: "the hatred of a man who is other than myself," the very essence, that is, of anti-Semitism [DL 361]. For Levinas, the unthought of Heidegger's ontology comes to light in the death camps. They are related as being and be-ings themselves are related, within a hermeneutic circle where it is impossible to inquire about the one without understanding it in terms of the other. As Heidegger observed in the introduction to Being and Time, such concrete inquiry, if taken as a formal concept from the perspective of analytic logic, can only beg the question [SZ Einleitung 1.§2]. But just as he seeks to think the relation between being and be-ings in a manner more rigorous than the conceptual, so Levinas relates fundamental ontology and [End Page 6] anti-Semitism as each other's condition of possibility. From as early as the essay translated here, but repeated often, Levinas prophesied that the advent of fundamental ontology was of historic moment, and that philosophy after Heidegger could never be innocent again. Alongside the Jews, Enlightenment rationalism also perished in the Holocaust. With the Holocaust, the Jew (re)entered history; after two millennia of being represented as the great refusers of the present, as atavists of the Old Law, left behind by the New, the Jew now became contemporaneous. Their testament typologized away into the shadowy prefigurement of what is to come and has already come, the Jew became the fulfillment of the present, in a literalness beyond all metaphor [DL 170-77]. Thus it is that, through genocide, Levinas saw history and philosophy mediated. Not since dialectical materialism have we encountered such an audacious literalness, such theoreticization of historical concreteness.

Ontology Focus Bad – Freedom

Their obligation to Being is a structuralism that destroys capacity for human freedom.

Wolin 90 (Richard, Professor of Modern European Intellectual History, Rice, THE POLITICS OF BEING, 1990, p.153-4.)

Heidegger's incapacity to comprehend the concept of freedom is merely a logical outgrowth of his post-Kehre radical antihumanism. The philosophical economy of Seinsgeschichte necessitates that the autonomy of human conduct be negated, for in this way alone can Heidegger reconceptualize Dasein as an abject and pliable conduit for Being's "coming to presence." In order to secure Dasein's compliance with the goals of Seinsgeschichte, it must be divested of the capacity for free action. Thus, in his 1936 Schelling lecture, Heidegger essentially proclaims the obsolescence of "freedom" as a viable philosophical category--that is, when understood from the "essential" standpoint of Seinsgeschichte: "From the originary perspective of the history of Being, 'freedom' has forfeited its role. For Being [Seyn] is more originary than the totality of beings and subjectivity."

This structural logic guarantees a life not worth living.

Wolin 90 (Richard, Professor of Modern European Intellectual History, Rice, THE POLITICS OF BEING, 1990, p.154)

The project of human freedom, incessantly belittled by "essential thinking," receives its inspiration from the conviction that "it is more honest, courageous, self-clairvoyant, hence a higher mode of life, to choose in lucidity than it is to hide one's choices behind the supposed structure of things." In this respect, the concept of freedom, as it has been handed down to us on the basis of the Greek ideal of autonomic or self-rule, represents an indispensable touchstone of the Western tradition: it has become a sine qua non for the ideal of a meaningful human existence. And thus, in a far from trivial sense, we view a life led under conditions of "unfreedom" as a life deprived of an essential prerequisite for the fulfillment of human potential. It would be a life bereft of those autonomous capacities of decision and choice on the basis of which alone we are able to identify and define our projects as our projects. We are of course simultaneously defined by a preexisting network of values, institutions, and belief-systems, which have themselves been shaped and handed-down by the members of a given community or group. Yet, it is our capacity to "choose in lucidity" as to which among these would endow our projects with direction and significance that forms the indispensable basis of a meaningful human life.

Ontology Focus Bad – Conservative

Focus on Ontology entrenches status quo thinking

Strathausen 6 (Carsten University of Missouri-Columbia Carsten, “A Critique of Neo-Left Ontology”, PMC 16.3, muse) TBC 7/9/10

Ontological argument is static, undialectical, and unhistorical. It apodictically posits a truth that, following Adorno, can only be thought in and through a continuous process of self-critical reflection. The truth about ontology, therefore, is its untruth and philosophical sterility. Ontology begets ideology, because it refuses to think through and beyond contradiction the way dialectics does. Instead, Heidegger allegedly praises the mere existence of paradox as if it were truth itself. In doing so, ontology succumbs to the apologetic "affirmation of power" (136), and Adorno spends numerous pages on Heidegger's use of the predicate "is" to substantiate this claim.5 The brute fact that the world exists and that Being "is," so Adorno, seduces Heidegger to abandon dialectical reflection in favor of mere tautologies that refuse to mediate between the constitutive poles of subject and object, Being and beings. Instead, ontology ultimately collapses the two into one. "The whole construction of [Heidegger's] ontological difference is a Potemkin Village" (122), Adorno concludes, because this alleged difference only serves to advocate the self-identity and self-righteousness of the way things always already are in the beginning and will have been in the end. In Heidegger, "mediation [succumbs] to the unmediated identity of what mediates and what is being mediated" (Adorno 493).

Focus on Ontology prevents change

Strathausen 6 (Carsten University of Missouri-Columbia Carsten, “A Critique of Neo-Left Ontology”, PMC 16.3, muse) TBC 7/9/10

Given the prominence of Althusserian Marxism in France at the time of Bourdieu's essay, his structuralist terminology ("relative autonomy"; "overdetermination"; "structure of the field of productivity") and its proclaimed difference from the critical apparatus of the Frankfurt School should not be overrated. True, Bourdieu speaks of "habitus" while Adorno speaks of "ideology"; Bourdieu regards Heidegger as a "practical operator" (64) who mediates between politics and philosophy, whereas Adorno refers to him as a "reflection" ["Widerhall"] or "sign" ("Abdrücke" (73)] of the social in the realm of philosophy. But the crucial point remains that both Adorno and Bourdieu read Heidegger's ontology as the unconscious expression of a dynamic social process whose dynamics it fails to reflect. This failure is constitutive of ontological discourse, whose preference for stasis over movement, ground over horizon, Being over becoming is but an expression of a human "desire" (69) caused by a world that, in reality, never stands still. In short: while most critics today read Heidegger's philosophy as a deconstruction of Western metaphysics and essentialist ontology avant la lettre, this is precisely not how Bourdieu, Adorno, or several leading Marxists understood his work. For them, ontology is an inherently conservative, if not reactionary concept. Marxist theory, it follows, should dispense with ontology and turn toward this changing world instead.6 "Always historicize" is its motto, and the "persistence of the dialectic" (Fredric Jameson) testifies to the reflective nature of Marxist thought. It is an attempt literally to think after ["nach-denken"] the real, material events that define human experience and collective practice. Hence, Étienne Balibar and Fredric Jameson continue to argue that "there is no Marxist philosophy and there never will be" (1). Rather, Marxism should "be thought of as a problematic" (Jameson, "Actually" 175) that continues to develop and change along with the object of its inquiry, namely capitalism. Only the dialectical method is able to keep pace with history as it mediates between the constitutive poles of subject and object, Being and becoming.7 Thus, Marxists do "philosophy in a materialist way," as Pierre Macherey puts it (8). The goal, after all, is not to interpret the world, but to change it.

A2: Ontology First

Prioritizing Ontology prevents change to current atrocities

Jarvis 0 (Darryl S. L. Natl. U of Singapore “international relations and the challenge of postmodernism p 128-129 Google Books) TBC 7/8/10

More is the pity that such irrational and obviously abstruse debate should so occupy us at a time of great global turmoil. That it does and continues to do so reflects our lack of judicious criteria for evaluating theory and, more importantly, the lack of attachment theorists have to the real world. Certainly it is right and proper that we ponder the depths of our theoretical imaginations, engage in epistemological and ontological debate, and analyze the sociology of our knowledge.37 But to suppose that this is the only task of international theory, let alone the most important one, smacks of intellectual elitism and displays a certain contempt for those who search for guidance in their daily struggles as actors in international politics. What does Ashley's project, his deconstructive efforts, or valiant fight against positivism say to the truly marginalized, oppressed, and destitute? How does it help solve the plight of the poor, the displaced refugees, the casualties of war, or the emigres of death squads? Does it in any way speak to those whose actions and thoughts comprise the policy and practice of international relations? On all these questions one must answer no. This is not to say, of course, that all theory should be judged by its technical rationality and problem-solving capacity as Ashley forcefully argues. But to suppose that problem-solving technical theory is not necessary—or is in some way bad—is a contemptuous position that abrogates any hope of solving some of the nightmarish realities that millions confront daily. As Holsri argues, we need ask of these theorists and their theories the ultimate question, "So what?" To what purpose do they deconstruct, problematize, destabilize, undermine, ridicule, and belittle modernist and rationalist approaches? Does this get us any further, make the world any better, or enhance the human condition? In what sense can this "debate toward [a] bottomless pit of epistemology and metaphysics" be judged pertinent, relevant, helpful, or cogent to anyone other than those foolish enough to be scholastically excited by abstract and recondite debate.

Survival comes before ontology –a true relationship with being awareness of the limits of our existence

Robbins 99 (Brent Dean, Asst. Prof. of Psychology, Point Park U, 1999 “Medard Boss,” http://mythosandlogos.com/Boss.html) TBC 7/9/10

"Death is an unsurpassable limit of human existence," writes Boss (119). Primarily, however, human beings flee from death and the awareness of our mortality. But in our confrontation with death and our morality, we discover the "relationship" which "is the basis for all feelings of reverance, fear, awe, wonder, sorrow, and deference in the face of something greater and more powerful." (120). Boss even suggests that "the most dignified human relationship to death" involves keeping it--as a possibility rather than an actuality--constantly in awareness without fleeing from it. As Boss writes: "Only such a being-unto-death can guarantee the precondition that the Dasein be able to free itself from its absorption in, its submission and surrender of itself to the things and relationships of everyday living and to return to itself." (121) Such a recognition brings the human being back to his responsibility for his existence. This is not simply a inward withdrawal from the world--far from it. Rather, this responsible awareness of death as the ultimate possibility for human existence frees the human being to be with others in a genuine way. From this foundation--based on the existentials described above--Boss is able to articulate an understanding of medicine and psychology which gives priority to the freedom of the human being to be itself. By freedom, Boss does not mean a freedom to have all the possibilites, for we are finite and limited by our factical history and death. Yet within these finite possibilities, we are free to be who we are and to take responsibility for who we are in the world with others and alongside things that matter.

A2: Ontology First

Ethics comes before Ontology – Value to Life

Cohen 1 (Richard A., the Isaac Swift Prof of Judaic Studies at UNC at Charlotte, pg. 15 “Ethics, Exegesis, and Philosophy: Interpretation after Levinas,” Google Books) TBC 7/9/10

Philosophy as ethical exegesis - discovering the ethical in the ontological, seeing the lower in the light of the higher, not anthropology but ethics - is attuned to this deeper, weightier, truer history that defies straightforward language and is refractory to the light of publicity. Its commitments are not to visible history alone, the history of historiography, but rather to a more insecure but deeper history, that of the humanity of the human. The human is not a biological or a rational category. Rather, the human emerges when and where morality is at work. Humanity is not a given but an achievement, an accomplishment, an elevation. Moral rectitude and justice are rare enough for philosophy also to miss them. Ethical exegesis is philosophy attentive to responsibilities beyond epistemology, and higher than the aesthetic celebration of the spectacle of be-ing or its language. It is thinking bound to the "difficult freedom" of moral responsibilities and obligations - for fellow humans, for sentient life, and finally for all of creation in all its diversity. And as such it is wisdom, or the quest for wisdom -philosophy. Just as the aesthetic dimension is not by itself evil (or good), one cannot say that the aesthetic life is false (or true). Like good and evil, truth and falsity are not its standard. They are standards of epistemology. Epistemology need not refrain from judging aesthetics, but neither epistemology nor aesthetics has the right to the last word. Ethics, in contrast, can and must remind us that the aesthetic life is inferior to the moral life. The aesthetic world -however spectacular, grand, or beautiful - is too small a world. When aesthetics takes itself for a world it becomes precious, as in Huysmans, or both precious and precocious, as in Heidegger and Derrida, or fascist, its true moral face. And let there be no doubt, the aesthetic life revolves around the self, is indeed its very cult. And thus it is essentially linked to death or, by dialectical rebound, linked to youth, for the self by itself is a mortal being. Regarding not die truth but the superiority of morality, of ethical commitment ("either/or") over aesthetic disengagement ("both/and"), Kierkegaard has written penetrating and moving tributes to this wisdom. The great nineteenth-century German Orthodox rabbi and scholar, Samson Raphael Hirsch, in the Jewish tradition, commenting on Proverbs (chapter two, "Wise Men and Fools"), notes that the word that text opposes to "wisdom" (Hebrew: chockmah), namely, "foolishness" (Hebrew: olai), "is related to oulaiy 'perhaps/ and ahfal-, 'darkness'."6 Again, Levinas's "temptation of temptation," the perhaps, the maybe, the possible, opposed to and by the actual, the here, the now, not the real but the moral "demands of the day." No one would oppose beauty, to be sure, but when self-regard becomes disregard for others - and surely it tends in this direction - then aesthetic desires become evils, hardening rather than softening the heart. There are worthier, nobler tasks. Ethical exegesis - penetrating through the spectacle and its display of signs to its human dimension, the dimension of suffering and moral demand - articulates the fragile but overpowering solidarity of a human community on the difficult road of redemption. It will say and say again the rupture of the masks of being demanded by morality and of justice. Beyond but through morality, ethical exegesis will also dare to suggest, obliquely, to be sure, the glimmer of another exigency -spirit, inspiration, absolution - more intense, higher, brighter, illuminating and not illuminated by the light of sun, moon and stars. Micah 6:8: "For he has told thee, oh humans, what is good, and what the Lord thy God does require of thee, but to do justice and to love mercy and to walk humbly with thy God." Not a "proof text," to be sure, but a confirmation. The difference putting ethics first makes is of no less consequence than that which, according to Husserl, separates philosophy and psychology. That difference was at once the greatest chasm and yet barely discernible, in that the findings of these two disciplines would be strictly parallel to one another, so parallel that a sentence from one could be transposed word for word into the other, yet their significance would be entirely different. Philosophy - in this case ethics, what I am calling ethical exegesis - would be the absolute source of all meaning, hence the ground of psychology and sociology and all the sciences, social or natural. While not another epistemological grounding of epistemology, ethical exe- gesis nonetheless still has the pretension to provide the reason for philosophy. But "reason" in the sense of "end," "purpose," "aim" - what is most important, most significant. Without returning to pre-modern philosophy, without imposing one arbitrary onto-theo-logy or another, without making a fetish of science or of its drifting, and most especially without the pretended "second innocence" of aesthetic celebration, ethical exegesis - in moral responsibilities and obligations, and in the call to justice built upon these - supplies a reason for philosophy, a reason for knowledge and a reason for living. No doubt this is a very large claim. And in this sense, this is an ambitious book. Very simply: nothing is more significant than serving others. All other significations, in all other registers, derive from this deepest or highest significance.

Science Good

Scientific modes of knowledge are self-correcting and true

Cohen Manion and Morrison 7 (Louis, Lawrence, Keith R. B. Research methods in education Google Books pg. 6-7) TBC 7/7/10

A further means by which we set out to discover truth is research. This has been defined by Kerlinger (1970) as the systematic, controlled, empirical and critical investigation of hypothetical proposition\* about the presumed relations among natural phenomena. Research has three characteristics in particular which distinguish it from the first means of problem-solving identified earlier, namely, experience. First, whereas experience deals with events occurring in a haphazard manner, research is systematic and controlled, having its operations on the inductive-deductive model outlined above. Second, research is empirical. The scientist turns to experience for validation. As Kerlinycr (1970) puts it, subjective, personal belief has, to have a reality check against objective, empirical facts and tests. And third, research is self-correcting. Not only does the scientific method have built-in mechanisms to protect scientists from error as far as is humanly possible, but also their procedures and results are open 10 public scrutiny by fellow professionals. Incorrect results in time will he found and either revised or discarded (Mouly Research is a combination of both experience and reasoning and must be regarded as the most successful approach to the discovery of truth, particularly as far as the natural sciences are concerned (Burg 1963).'

Science is true – the alternative ontology does not correspond to reality

Cobern 90 (William W., November,. Ph.D. Assistant Prof of Sci Ed A Critical Look at Radical Constructivism and Science Teacher Education EDUCATION RESEARCH WILL NOT PROFIT FROM RADICAL CONSTRUCTIVISM) TBC 7/8/10

The radical constructivist having grown tired of the quest to know reality declares reality unimportant. It is only the construction, in and of itself, that is important. To carry further the artistic metaphor, radically constructed knowledge is a form of modernism similar to modern art: Modernism ... denies the primacy of an outside reality, as given. It seeks either to rearrange that reality, or to retreat to the self's interior, to private experience as the source of its concerns and aesthetic preoccupations ... There is an emphasis on the self as touchstone of understanding and on the activity of the knower rather than the character of the object as the source of knowledge ... Thus one discerns the intentions of modern painting ... to break up ordered space ... to bridge the distance between object and spectator, to "thrust" itself on the viewer and establish itself immediately by impact. (Bell, 1976, p.110,112) As with a Wassily Kandinsky painting, there is no intention to represent the natural world. The value of the art is in its impact. The value of radically constructed knowledge is in its viability. One does not worry that knowledge match reality, only that knowledge allow the useful prediction of experience, its impact. But when it does so predict, what metaphysic does viability reinforce? The eminent physicist Cecil Frank Powell noted, "all our experience of the development of science suggests that there is indeed an order in nature which we can discover..." (1972, p.5). I am inclined to think that viability reinforces the estimation that knowledge is approaching reality, and in fact undermines radical constructivism. In sum, the argument here is that a knowable, objective reality is a key feature of the historical Western world view, and one that was crucial for the birth and nurture of modern science. In 1991, a radical constructivist will do science because the power of experimental science has been previously established in the years since Galileo. One has cause to doubt that in an earlier age radical constructivism would have motivated the exploration of something that had no known potential. Furthermore, even if one were now to adopt radical constructivism the viability test that it offers may actually undermine the first principles of radical constructivism, rather then support them. Perhaps one should say, the success of science undermines radical constructivism for all but those who have an a priori commitment to radical constructivism. In fact, I would go so far as to say, the real issue at hand is a priori commitments to different ontological positions. Westerners have for centuries lived with the difficulties of realism. The question is thus, why would one choose to make an a priori commitment to radical constructivism?

Science Good – Ontology

An ontology cannot grasp a Nature prior to judgment – only science recognizes this

Bachelard 90 (Suzanne A prof of phil at the Sorbonne Study of Husserl's Formal and Transcendental Logic Google Books) TBC 7/8/10

Logic, as science of science, as the theory which serves as norm for science, must be, specifically, the instrument for the criticism of principles which grounds science in its genuineness. It must consider the judgments which make up a science as requiring criticism and authentication by this criticism. From the fact of this critical focus, logic thematizes the sphere of judgments considered in themselves. Its apophantic focus results from this. Thus we return to the traditional orientation of logic conceived of as theory of judgment and. in particular, as theory of predicative judgment. "With this supposed as such, the mere correlate of the 'supposing\* or 'opining' (often spoken of as the opinion. S<iga), we have now laid hold of what is called the judgment (apophansis) in traditional logic and is the theme of apophantic logic" (126). We can say that, as science of science, logic has an ontological focus and that, as science of science, it has an apophantic focus. As science of the second degree it forms judgments about judgments. Thus the province of judgments becomes a proper thematic field. And this thematic field is the field emphasized by logic, for the fact of being a science of the second degree is for it the characteristic fact. For science the object would be the immediate theme and the judgment the intermediate theme. Logic, on the contrary, directs itself only mediately toward the object, toward the existent itself, and it directs itself immediately toward judgments "as suppositions of something existent."'1 Apophantics and ontology are hence two different thematic focuses of one and the same science. As Erfahrung und Urteil says in very condensed terms, . . . the difficult problems concerning the relationship between formal apophantics and formal ontology, i.e., their belongingness together and indeed their inner unity In the face of which their separation proves to be precursory, frests] upon differences of attitude only rather than upon differences in their fields.1 This venture into the intentionality which governs scientific judging is typical of a phenomenological examination which is not content with "positive" investigations, i.e.. investigations exclusively directed toward the objective data, as the sciences are; and Division B, where this examination is presented, rightly calls itself a phenomenological clarification of the twofold character of formal logic as formal apophantics and formal ontology. But there is no reason to believe that simply by following this subjective direction of examination we have reached the level of transcendental research. The cognizing subjectivity to which Husserl refers remains a "natural" subjectivity since it is as yet not separated from the presuppositions attaching to the natural attitude; only the transcendental reduction will reveal these presuppositions. The uncovering of them will be the task of Part II of Formal and Transcendental Logic. For the moment there is the question of explicating the genuine sense of the sciences and logic within the natural attitude. Which is the attitude of science. Division B of Part I offers us an intentional epistemology and not a transcendental phenomenology. This is why Husserl. taking the cognition of Nature as the example of scientific cognition, says that "of course one must not fall back on the Nature already given by sheer experience before all thinking" (118). Here there is no question of parenthesizing the productions of science. To be sure, we say that Nature is in itself, that it exists before our act of judgment. But we can qualify it by our act of judgment. And that we know about it we have from our activity of judging. What is more, only if we go on synthetically to make our experiencing itself and its productions a theme of judgment, can we have original knowledge of the fact that this (harmoniously flowing) experiencing already bears "implicitly" in itself, "before" our thinking . . . , the being-sense of Nature, as the same sense that thinking explicates (119). To be sure, one can say that what is implicit was already there prior to its being explicated, but one only knows that it is there when it has been explicated. The sense of the judgment cannot be determined by an experience of Nature which is not involved in the activity of judgment. Nature as form-of-scientific-judgment will have, to be sure, under it Nature as form-of-experience, but Husserl says in an astonishing formulation: "[T]he under-it is at the same time an in-it" (i 18). The notion of Nature prior to any act of judging is a meaningless notion if one does not conceive it beginning from the predicative sphere, and "by the judger, qua judger, only that Nature is accepted which is categorially formed in the judging" (i 18).

Positivism Good

Positivism is best – self correcting and it uses observable regularities to inform action – focus on epistemology causes a retreat from policy relevance

Houghton 8 (David Patrick Ass. Prof. of IR at UCF, Positivism ‘vs’ Postmodernism: Does Epistemology Make a Difference? International Politics (2008) 45) TBC 7/8/10

As long ago as 1981, Yale Ferguson and Richard Mansbach effectively laid the influence of the dogmatic behaviouralism of the 1960s to rest in their book The Elusive Quest, signaling the profound disillusionment of mainstream IR with the idea that a cumulative science of international relations would ever be possible (Ferguson and Mansbach, 1988). The popularity of the ‘naïve’ form of positivism, wed to a view of inexorable scientific progress and supposedly practiced by wide-eyed scholars during the 1960s, has long been a thing of the past. Postmodernists hence do the discipline something of an injustice when they continue to attack the overly optimistic and dogmatic form of positivism as if it still represented a dominant orthodoxy which must somehow be overthrown. Equally, supporters of the contemporary or 'neo-' version of positivism perform a similar disservice when they fail to articulate their epistemological assumptions clearly or at all. Indeed, the first error is greatly encouraged by the second, since by failing to state what they stand for, neo-positivists have allowed postmodernists to fashion a series of 18 straw men which burn rapidly at the slightest touch. Articulating a full list of these assumptions lies beyond the scope of this article, but contemporary neo-positivists are, I would suggest, committed to the following five assumptions, none of which are especially radical or hard to defend: (1) that explaining and/or understanding the social and political world ought to be our central objective; (2) that - subjective though our perceptions of the world may be - many features of the political world are at least potentially explainable. What remains is a conviction that there are at least some empirical propositions which can be demonstrably shown to be ‘true’ or ‘false’, some underlying regularities which clearly give shape to international relations (such as the proposition that democracies do not fight one another); (3) that careful use of appropriate methodological techniques can establish what patterns exist in the political world, even if these patterns are ultimately transitory and historically contingent; (4) that positive and normative questions, though related, are ultimately separable, though both constitute valid and interesting forms of enquiry. There is also a general conviction (5) that careful use of research design may help researchers avoid logical pitfalls in their work. Doubtless, there are some who would not wish to use the term 'positivism' as an umbrella term for these five assumptions, in which case we probably require a new term to cover them. But to the extent that there exists an 'orthodoxy' in the field of International Relations today, this is surely it. Writing in 1989, Thomas Biersteker noted that “the vast majority of scholarship in international relations (and the social sciences for that matter) proceeds without conscious reflection on its philosophical bases or premises. In professional meetings, lectures, seminars and the design of curricula, we do not often engage in serious reflection on the philosophical bases or implications of our activity. Too often, 19 consideration of these core issues is reserved for (and largely forgotten after) the introductory weeks of required concepts and methods courses, as we socialize students into the profession” (Biersteker, 1989). This observation – while accurate at the time – would surely be deemed incorrect were it to be made today. Even some scholars who profess regret at the philosophically self-regarding nature of contemporary of IR theory nevertheless feel compelled to devote huge chunks of their work to epistemological issues before getting to more substantive matters (see for instance Wendt, 1999). The recent emphasis on epistemology has helped to push IR as a discipline further and further away from the concerns of those who actually practice international relations. The consequent decline in the policy relevance of what we do, and our retreat into philosophical self-doubt, is ironic given the roots of the field in very practical political concerns (most notably, how to avoid war). What I am suggesting is not that international relations scholars should ignore philosophical questions, or that such ‘navel gazing’ is always unproductive, for questions of epistemology surely undergird every vision of international relations that ever existed. Rather, I would suggest that the existing debate is sterile and unproductive in the sense that the various schools of thought have much more in common than they suppose; stated more specifically, postpositivists have much more in common than they would like to think with the positivists they seek to condemn. Consequently, to the extent that there is a meaningful dialogue going on with regard to epistemological questions, it has no real impact on what we do as scholars when we look at the world ‘out there’. Rather than focusing on epistemology, it is inevitably going to be more fruitful to subject the substantive or ontological claims made by positivists (of all metatheoretical stripes) and postpositivists to the cold light of day. Substantive theoretical and empirical claims, 20 rather than ultimately unresolvable disputes about the foundations of knowledge, ought to be what divide the community of international relations scholars today.

Positivism Good

Explicit, clear, causal theories of international relations are better – 5 reasons

Walt 5 (Stephen prof of intl studies at U of Chicago, Annu Rev Polit Sci 8 23-48, the relationship between theory and policy in international relations) TBC 7/8/10

First and most obviously, a good theory should be logically consistent and empirically valid, because a logical explanation that is consistent with the available evidence is more likely to provide an accurate guide to the causal connections that shape events. Second, a good theory is complete; it does not leave us wondering about the causal relationships at work (Van Evera 1997). For example, a theory stating that “national leaders go to war when the expected utility of doing so outweighs the expected utility of all alternative choices” (Bueno de Mesquita & Lalman 1992) may be logically impeccable, but it does not tell us when leaders will reach this judgment. Similarly, a theory is unsatisfying when it identifies an important causal factor but not the factor(s) most responsible for determining outcomes. To say that “human nature causes war,” or even that “oxygen causes war,” is true in the sense that war as we know it cannot occur in the absence of these elements. But such information does not help us understand what we want to know, namely, when is war more or less likely? Completeness also implies that the theory has no “debilitating gaps,” such as an omitted variable that either makes its predictions unacceptably imprecise or leads to biased inferences about other factors (Nincic & Lepgold 2000, p. 28). A third desideratum is explanatory power. A theory’s explanatory power is its ability to account for phenomena that would otherwise seem mystifying. Theories are especially valuable when they illuminate a diverse array of behavior that previously seemed unrelated and perplexing, and they are most useful when they make apparently odd or surprising events seem comprehensible (Rapaport 1972). In physics, it seems contrary to common sense to think that light would be bent by gravity. Yet Einstein’s theory of relativity explains why this is so. In economics, it might seem counterintuitive to think that nations would be richer if they abolished barriers to trade and did not try to hoard specie (as mercantilist doctrines prescribed). The Smith/Ricardo theory of free trade tells us why, but it took several centuries before the argument was widely accepted (Irwin 1996). In international politics, it seems odd to believe that a country would be safer if it were unable to threaten its opponent’s nuclear forces, but deterrence theory explains why mutual vulnerability may be preferable to either side having a large capacity to threaten the other side’s forces (Wohlstetter 1957, Schelling 1960, Glaser 1990, Jervis 1990). This is what we mean by a powerful theory: Once we understand it, previously unconnected or baffling phenemona make sense. Fourth, at the risk of stating the obvious, we prefer theories that explain an important phenomenon (i.e., something that is likely to affect the fates of many people). Individual scholars may disagree about the relative importance of different issues, but a theory that deals with a problem of some magnitude is likely to garner greater attention and/or respect than a theory that successfully addresses a puzzle of little intrinsic interest. Thus, a compelling yet flawed explanation for great power war or genocide is likely to command a larger place in the field than an impeccable theory that explains the musical characteristics of national anthems. Fifth, a theory is more useful when it is prescriptively rich, i.e., when it yields useful recommendations (Van Evera 1997). For this reason, George advises scholars to “include in their research designs variables over which policymakers have some leverage” (George 2000, p. xiv; also Glaser & Strauss 1967, Stein 2000). Yet Annu. Rev. Polit. Sci. 2005.8:23-48. Downloaded from arjournals.annualreviews.org by University of California - Santa Cruz on 11/30/07. For personal use only. a theory that does not include manipulable variables may still be useful to policy makers. For example, a theory that explained why a given policy objective was impossible might be very useful if it convinced a policy maker not to pursue such an elusive goal. Similarly, a theory that accurately forecast the risk of war might provide a useful warning to policy makers even if the variables in the theory were not subject to manipulation. Finally, theories are more valuable when they are stated clearly. Ceteris paribus, a theory that is hard to understand is less useful simply because it takes more time for potential users to master it. Although academics often like to be obscure (because incomprehensibility can both make scholarship seem more profound and make it harder to tell when a particular argument is wrong), opacity impedes scientific progress and is not a virtue in theoretical work. An obscure and impenetrable theory is also less likely to influence busy policy makers.

Positivism Good

Positivist empiricism is crucial to prevent policy failure and anti-democratic ideology

Lynn 98 (Laurence E., Jr. U of Chicago A Place at the Table: Policy Analysis, Its Postpositive Critics, and the Future of Practice DRAFT January 25, http://harrisschool.uchicago.edu/about/publications/working-papers/pdf/wp\_99\_01.pdf) TBC 7/8/10

To policy analysts, the counterfactual is the world that frustrated Charles Schultze and Alice Rivlin, a world with no one at the table to add clarity, thoughtful analysis, and an awareness of alternatives and opportunity costs to the discussion, a world dominated by the inertia of government and by “military requirements,” professional medical judgment, the sanctity of subsidies, and the superiority of sentiment. To the postpositivists, the counterfactual appears to be a politics wholly reconstituted around empowered and informed citizens. Postpositivists evidently believe that eliminating positivist practice and the institutions that sustain it will improve the prospects for unimpeded discourse and deliberation undistorted by elite bias. This difference seems to me to be captured in the following thought experiment. Suppose that conventional, “positivist” policy analysis, wherever and by whom it is currently practiced , could be surgically removed from the body politic. That is, suppose that policy analysis as practiced in the planning, program development, and budget offices of federal, state, and local agencies, in the General Accounting Office, the Congressional Research Service, and the Congressional Budget Office, in The Brookings Institution and the American Enterprise Institute, at the Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation, Mathematica Policy Research, the Center for Budget and Policy Priorities, and the Urban Institute, at the Institute for Research on Poverty and the Joint Center for Poverty Research — together with its most prominent practitioners — Henry Aaron, Mary Jo Bane, David Ellwood, Judith Gueron, Robert Greenstein, Rebecca Maynard, Robert Reischauer, Alice Rivlin, and Isabelle Sawhill, with their positivist penchant for facts, causal models, instrumental rationality, evaluation of alternatives and evidence based practice — could be excised from government and sent to the collective farm to do honest work. Postpositivists, who cast such institutions and individuals as either ineffectual or the enemies of democracy, would, I assume, argue that the elimination of these “tools of tyranny” would contribute toward improving the climate and prospects for communicative practice based on postpositivist epistemologies. There would be grounds for greater optimism concerning policies that reflect the values and ideas of informed citizens. Bias toward the policies, constituencies, and power of the centralized state would no longer be able to distort public dialogue, reify agency views of the world, and stifle the processes of deliberation. In contrast, traditional policy analysts would view the consequences very differently. Send policy analysts to the collective farm and, in an inevitably interest-dominated, hierarchical political world, nontransparent methods would again go unchallenged and become even more pervasive. Secrecy, obscurantism, corruption, deception, distortion, unfounded assertion, dishonesty, narrow ambition, ideological excess and all the other temptations to which flesh is heir might well be even more widely and securely practiced. The postpositivist dream of “unimpeded discourse” could easily become a nightmare of discourse impeded not by policy analysts claiming expertise but by a host of other anti-democratic elements inimical to informed discussion and empowered citizens. Careful attention must be paid to the design of institutions that promote cooperation at various levels of social discourse (Ostrom 1998), but this is a positivist project that postpositivists could scarcely be expected to endorse.

A2: Positivism Bad

Positivism does not rely on constructions and isn’t exclusive

Cupchik 1 (Gerald Prof at U of Toronto Scarborough FQS Vol 2, No 1 feb (2001): Qualitative and Quantitative Research: Conjunctions and Divergences http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/968/2112) TBC 7/8/10

The central goal of this paper is to demonstrate the complementary roles played by quantitative and qualitative methods in the analysis of social phenomena. Quantitative and qualitative methods are generally practiced by scholars from radically different disciplines and it is assumed "that the claim of compatibility, let alone one of synthesis, cannot be sustained" (SMITH & HESHUSIUS 1986, p.4). LINCOLN and GUBA (2000) have similarly argued that the ontological foundations of positivist and interpretivist paradigms that underlie these methods are fundamentally incommensurable. The basis for this argument is revealed in their account of the "Basic Beliefs (Metaphysics) of Alternative Inquiry Paradigms." Positivism's ontology is termed "naive realism"—reality is deemed both "real" and "apprehendable," while postpositivism's "critical realism" maintains that "'real' reality" is "probabilistically apprehendable." LINCOLN and GUBA reject any absolutist criteria for "judging either 'reality' or validity" (p.167). Critical theory offers "historical realism," a "virtual reality shaped by social, political ..., and gender values; crystalized over time" (p.165). Finally, constructivism represents "local and specific constructed realities" (p.165) wherein social phenomena are products of "meaning-making activities of groups and individuals" (p.167). [1] To build bridges between different social ontologies, we must engage in a transcendental act of reflection and look for similarities in the midst of supposed differences. On face value, positivism holds that the observer is separate from the observed and that findings are "true," whereas constructivism is transactionally oriented with its findings subjectively tinged and "created" (LINCOLN & GUBA 2000). But if physical scientists acknowledge HEISENBERG's principle that phenomena are transformed in the act of measurement, then the positivist observer is never really independent of the phenomenon under investigation. Similarly, the principle of indeterminacy holds that events in the world are open-ended and, hence, one cannot account for all the variance in a given episode, physical or social. So positivist scientists are well aware of the fact that they are not independent of a world that cannot be fully predicted. [2] On the other hand, in discussing "orienting to the phenomenon," BEACH (1990) argued that the "social order, evident in and through the detailed and contingent activities of societal members, exists independently of social scientific inquiry (p.217). Thus, even while individuals and communities might construct interpretations of events that reflect relative values and interests, the underlying phenomena do not rely on them for existence. Both positivist and constructivist researchers are therefore engaged, though they responsibly endeavor to develop principles and accounts which are not restricted by arbitrary biases. The researcher is in-the-world at each stage of a project, shaping it and being shaped by phenomena in it, and by pressures from communities of scholars. [3]

Phenomenology Fails

Phenomenology fails – it turns into limited anthropology

Bartok 84 (Philip J. Dept of Phil U of Notre Dame FOUCAULT’S ANALYTIC OF FINITUDE AND THE “DEATH” OF PHENOMENOLOGY) TBC 7/8/10

In support of Foucault’s argument it should be noted that Husserl readily admits that in its attempt to move beyond the empirical to the transcendental, transcendental phenomenology does not leave behind the horizon of empirical contents, but merely wins for the data in this horizon a transcendental rather than an empirical significance. From its starting point in the natural attitude, the transcendental phenomenological reduction merely effects a “readjustment of viewpoint”, one which preserves a “thoroughgoing parallelism” between a phenomenological psychology and a transcendental phenomenology: “[T]o each eidetic or empirical determination on the one side there must correspond a parallel feature on the other”.15 But for Husserl, the full sense of the “transcendental” is achieved only through the application of both transcendental phenomenological and eidetic reductions, that is, in the in the discovery of the essential features of pure conscious experience.16 The eidetic reduction too departs from the empirical, taking a fact, whether in the natural attitude or in transcendentally purified consciousness, as the starting point for systematic variation in pure fantasy.17 Taken together, the transcendental phenomenological and eidetic 7 reductions lead the phenomenologist from the empirical starting point of the natural attitude to a description of the essences of pure conscious experience. Against this attempt to move from the empirical to the transcendental Foucault suggests that, [i]t is probably impossible to give empirical contents transcendental value, or to displace them in the direction of a constituent subjectivity, without giving rise, at least silently to an anthropology - that is, to a mode of thought in which the rightful limitations of acquired knowledge . . . are at the same time the concrete forms of existence, precisely as they are given in that same empirical knowledge.18

Phenomenology fails – we can’t transcend purely empirical ideas

Bartok 84 (Philip J. Dept of Phil U of Notre Dame FOUCAULT’S ANALYTIC OF FINITUDE AND THE “DEATH” OF PHENOMENOLOGY) TBC 7/8/10

Foucault’s line of argument here is most plausibly understood as an internal objection to Husserl’s approach: Transcendental phenomenology fails to achieve the (transcendental) aims set out for it by Husserl himself. The transcendental reduction fails insofar as it merely effects something like a shift of vision, attempting to assign transcendental significance to what are, by Husserl’s own admission, merely empirical contents. If Foucault’s archaeological analysis of the character of the modern episteme is adequate, this failure was inevitable given the fact that Husserl’s project was configured by an episteme characterized by the analytic of finitude. Given the problematic dual status of “man” under this episteme, Husserlian phenomenology cannot help but devolve into an anthropology.

Phenomenology fails – ontology factually doesn’t come first

Searle 5 (John, Prof Berkeley The Phenomenological Illusion SCHRIFTENREIHE- WITTGENSTEIN GESELLSCHAFT, VOL 34, pages 17-38 http://socrates.berkeley.edu/~jsearle/PhenomenologicalIllusion.pdf) TBC 7/9/10

The observer independent is ontologically primary, the observer dependent is derivative. Now here is the interest of all this for the present discussion: Heidegger has the ontology exactly backwards. He says the ready-to-hand is prior, the present-at-hand is derivative. The hammers and the dollar bills are prior to the sheets of paper and the collection of metal molecules. Why does he say this? I think the answer is clear; phenomenologically the hammer and the dollar bill typically are prior. When using the hammer or the dollar bill, we don’t think much about their basic atomic structure or other observer independent features. In short, Heidegger is subject to the phenomenological illusion in a clear way: he thinks that because the ready-to-hand is phenomenologically prior it is ontologically prior. What is even worse is that he denies that the ready-to-hand is observer relative. He thinks that something is a hammer in itself, and he denies that we create a meaningful social and linguistic reality out of meaningless entities. Rather he says we are “always already” in a meaningful world. Here is what he says: The kind of Being which belongs to these entities is readiness-to-hand. But this characteristic is not to be understood as merely a way of taking them, [my italics] as if we were talking such “aspects” into the “entities” which we proximally encounter, or as if some world-stuff which is proximally present-at-hand in itself were “given subjective colouring” in this way. (Heidegger 1962, 101) This seems wrong. If you take away the rhetorical fl ourishes in his prose, the view that he says is false, is the correct view. The characteristic of being money or a hammer is precisely a “way of taking them”. Such features as being money or being a hammer are observer relative and in that sense the object is “given subjective coloring” when we treat it as a hammer. Heidegger’s views are expressions of his rejection of the basic nature of the basic facts.

Phenomenology Fails

Alt doesn’t solve – intention does not affect action the way they assume

Searle 5 (John, Prof Berkeley The Phenomenological Illusion SCHRIFTENREIHE- WITTGENSTEIN GESELLSCHAFT, VOL 34, pages 17-38 http://socrates.berkeley.edu/~jsearle/PhenomenologicalIllusion.pdf) TBC 7/9/10

Another example of the phenomenological illusion comes out in Merleau- Ponty’s discussion of skillful coping, which he calls “motor intentionality”. (Merleau-Ponty 1962) The idea is that because there are all kinds of routine actions, such as walking or driving a car, that do not have the concentrated focused consciousness of intentionality, of the kind you get for example when you are giving a lecture, that therefore they have a different kind of intentionality altogether. If it feels different then it must be different. But if you look at the actual conditions of satisfaction there is no difference in the logical structure. To see this, contrast doing a type of action as skillful coping and doing it as concentrated deliberate action. For example, normally when I get up and walk to the door I do it without special concentration or deliberation. Skillful coping. But suppose I do it and concentrate my attention on doing it. Deliberate action. The cases as described, though they feel different, are logically similar. In both cases I am acting intentionally and in both there are causally self referential conditions of satisfaction. I succeeded in what I was trying to do only if my intentions in action caused the bodily movements. It is a clear case of the phenomenological illusion to suppose that different phenomenology implies a different kind of intentionality with a different logical structure.

Phenomenology relies on a perceptual illusion

Searle 5 (John, Prof Berkeley The Phenomenological Illusion SCHRIFTENREIHE- WITTGENSTEIN GESELLSCHAFT, VOL 34, pages 17-38 http://socrates.berkeley.edu/~jsearle/PhenomenologicalIllusion.pdf) TBC 7/9/10

Why are these points not obvious? I think the answer is the phenomenological illusion. In general these features are not present to the phenomenology. We do not, when playing tennis have a conscious experience of having propositional representations of conditions of satisfaction and we do not consciously think of ourselves as embodied consciousnesses in interaction with the world. The phenomenological illusion can even give us the impression that the tennis racket is somehow part of our body; and indeed when we are playing tennis or skiing, the tennis racket or the skis seem more like an extension of the body than they seem like instruments. But this, of course, is a phenomenological illusion. In fact there are no nerve endings in the tennis racket, nor in the skis; but if you get good at skiing or playing tennis it will seem almost as if there are. It does not seem like you are an embodied brain engaged with a world; rather it seems like you and the world form a single unity, and of course there is no propositional content running consciously through your head. But all the same, the entire logical apparatus of intentionality applies. If you describe the phenomenology and stop there, you miss the underlying logical structures

Phenomenology fails - Phenomenologists rely on a tautological understanding of basic facts

Searle 5 (John, Prof Berkeley The Phenomenological Illusion SCHRIFTENREIHE- WITTGENSTEIN GESELLSCHAFT, VOL 34, pages 17-38 http://socrates.berkeley.edu/~jsearle/PhenomenologicalIllusion.pdf) TBC 7/9/10

As far as I can tell (and I may be mistaken about this) because of their failure to recognize the primacy of the basic facts, the phenomenologists seem to be unable to give a de re reading of references to objects. They hear the references to the basic facts, about molecules, for example, as always already inside the scope of the “present-at-hand” (or some other phenomenological) operator, and they hear the references to hammers and money, etc. as always already inside the scope of the “ready-to-hand” (or some other phenomenological) operator. Look at the quote from Dreyfus above. “Heidegger holds that there is no way to account for referring and truth starting with language as occurent sounds …” But that is precisely how one has to account for meaning, reference, truth, etc. because we know before we ever start on the philosophical problems that the speech act is performed by making “occurent sounds”, marks, etc. The inadequacy of existential phenomenology could not be stated more clearly: Dreyfus is in effect saying that the Heideggerian cannot state the solution because he cannot hear the question.

Phenomenology Fails

Phenomenology – facts can be detatched from their perspectives

Searle 5 (John, Prof Berkeley The Phenomenological Illusion SCHRIFTENREIHE- WITTGENSTEIN GESELLSCHAFT, VOL 34, pages 17-38 http://socrates.berkeley.edu/~jsearle/PhenomenologicalIllusion.pdf) TBC 7/9/10

On the same page, the following sentence occurs: “It seemed to me that both the external, logical, god-like claim that, for there to be a social world, the brute facts in nature must somehow acquire meaning, and the internal phenomenological description of human beings as always already in a meaningful world, were both correct but in tension.” (Dreyfus 1999, 12) The reference to “god-like” reveals that once again he thinks that the stance is part of the phenomenon, that the brute facts only exist from a certain stance or from a point of view, either godlike or “detached, logical”, as the case might be. Now, this is a very deep mistake, and it is a foundational mistake. Where brute, observer independent facts are concerned, there is no point of view built into their ontology. The basic facts exist apart from any stance or point of view.

Phenomenology is wrong – there are objective facts

Searle 5 (John, Prof Berkeley The Phenomenological Illusion SCHRIFTENREIHE- WITTGENSTEIN GESELLSCHAFT, VOL 34, pages 17-38 http://socrates.berkeley.edu/~jsearle/PhenomenologicalIllusion.pdf) TBC 7/9/10

The picture that Dreyfus seems to have is that institutional facts exist from one point of view and brute facts exist from another point of view. But that is wrong. Brute facts simply exist. No point of view is necessary. Institutional facts exist from a point of view of the participants in the institution and their participation in the institution creates the facts. But where Dreyfus cites a “tension” there is no tension. There is no tension at all in supposing that the piece of paper in my hand is both a piece of paper and a ten dollar bill. There is a philosophical problem, as to how human beings create an institutional reality by imposing status functions on brute facts. I ask the question, How do we get from the brute facts to the institutional facts? How does the mind impose status functions on the phenomena? The logical form of that question is: Given that there is a brute reality of observer independent phenomena, phenomena that have an absolute existence, independent of any human attitudes, stances, etc., how do such phenomena acquire status functions? The reference to brute phenomena is de re, it has wide scope occurrence. The problem is that the phenomenologist tends not to hear the de re occurrence. Thus Dreyfus hears the question as asking: From the detached logical point of view there exist brute facts, from the active participants point of view there exist institutional facts. What is the relation between them? Now there does seem to be a “tension” because there is now a problem about reconciling the detached logical point of view with the active participant’s point of view. Nothing has wide scope or de re occurrence. That is the perspectivalism that I have tried to identify.

The fact that basic truths change does not mean that truth is relative

Searle 5 (John, Prof Berkeley The Phenomenological Illusion SCHRIFTENREIHE- WITTGENSTEIN GESELLSCHAFT, VOL 34, pages 17-38 http://socrates.berkeley.edu/~jsearle/PhenomenologicalIllusion.pdf) TBC 7/9/10

There is an objection one frequently hears that goes as follows: What I call the basic facts are just what happens to be widely believed at a certain point in history, a “contemporary given” as Dreyfus calls them. But they were not always believed in the past and it is quite likely that they will be superseded in the future. So there are no timeless absolute basic facts; there are just beliefs that people think are true relative to their time and place. This mistake is prominent in Thomas Kuhn, for example. (Kuhn 1962) But the answer to it is this. It is only on the assumption of a non-relative, absolute reality that it is worthwhile to change our opinions in the first place. We are trying to get absolute non-relative truths about an absolute non-relative reality. The fact that we keep changing our opinions as we learn more only makes sense given the assumption that our aim is the description of an absolute non-relative world. The fact of opinion change is an argument against relativism, not an argument for it. It is quite likely that our conception of what I have been calling the basic facts will be improved on, and that at least some of our present conceptions will become obsolete. This does not show that there are no basic facts, nor that the basic facts only have a relative existence, but that their absolute existence does not by itself guarantee that at any point in our history we have accurately stated them. The facts don’t change, but the extent of our knowledge does

Post-Positivism Bad

Postpositivism would cause disaster – misinformation, conservatism, and essentialism

Lynn 98 (Laurence E., Jr. U of Chicago A Place at the Table: Policy Analysis, Its Postpositive Critics, and the Future of Practice DRAFT January 25, http://harrisschool.uchicago.edu/about/publications/working-papers/pdf/wp\_99\_01.pdf) TBC 7/8/10

If having convictions that are invulnerable to challenge and unavailable to verification is a virtue, then, it seems to me, postpositivists are urging us to reenter a dark, pre-enlightenment age dominated by the clash of metaphysical absolutes in which issues are settled by essentialist assertions, power and maneuver, and deliberate distortion or outright suppression of issues and opposition. It will be a politics of absolutist claims, bad numbers, and worse arguments, of emotion and unreason, of the survival of the most determined with the most to gain. Conservatives who set about dismantling the data-collection capacity of executive agencies in order to rob liberal policy analysis of its life’s blood, who are acting on what they believe to be a normative and critical analysis of social dysfunction (e.g., a retreat from God), and who advocate deliberation among citizens that is uncorrupted by the kind of social science research too readily available in The Green Book, would seem to be exempt from most postpositivist criticism. Presumably if, following rules of discourse and choice agreed to by all, a community wishes to misinvest public resources, silence politically incorrect or divisive voices, and allow selfappointed local elites to pursue their ambitions without restraint, then their wisdom should neither be criticized nor contested by postpositivists. Indeed, as far as I can tell, there are no valid grounds for doing so. Grass roots intimidation and prejudice expressed through shouting in ordinary language are, at least, authentic.

Post-positivism fails – policy making

Lynn 98 (Laurence E., Jr. The University of Chicago A Place at the Table: Policy Analysis, Its Postpositive Critics, and the Future of Practice DRAFT January 25, http://harrisschool.uchicago.edu/about/publications/working-papers/pdf/wp\_99\_01.pdf) TBC 7/8/10

By this standard, the postpositivist derogation is a failure. The postpositive caricature of policy analysis is chilling, but false, so strained, so far removed from the ethos of policy analysis as generally taught and practiced, that most practitioners are justified in paying little or no attention to what they regard as esoteric, pedantic irrelevance. Moreover, the postpositivist penchant for constructing, as Edmund Wilson might put it, “imaginary systems [that are] as antithetical to the real one as possible” and for using these imaginary systems as a normative template for practice is so obviously subservient to a political agenda as to void its claim to authority as an undistorted epistemological critique of actual practice.

Policy making is self-correcting

Lynn 98 (Laurence E., Jr. The University of Chicago A Place at the Table: Policy Analysis, Its Postpositive Critics, and the Future of Practice DRAFT January 25, http://harrisschool.uchicago.edu/about/publications/working-papers/pdf/wp\_99\_01.pdf) TBC 7/8/10

Policy analysis as a professional practice has been and must continue to be ethically committed to (1) improving public policy through “bringing to the table” an informed voice undistorted by a material interest in policy outcomes and (2) public policy discourse, both internal and external to agencies, that is conducted with intellectual integrity and a respect for democratic institutions. Policy analysts are obligated to recognize and adapt to changes in the environments and contexts of their practice, to acknowledge well-founded criticisms of their methods and professional conduct, and to being realistic concerning both the advantages and limitations of the tools at their disposal. Policy analysis is and will remain pragmatic and crafty. For this reason policy analysis practice will continue to be driven by problems as they arise in context. Admittedly, these contexts are more often than not hierarchical, often polarized, and always interest-driven rather than the kind of idealized contexts envisioned by postpositivists. But public policy making is far less “federal” and hierarchical than it used to be, and decades of right-of-center politics have shifted interest decisively from public programs to incentives, choice, and quasi-markets. The exigencies of the political world will continue to insure a reality check on practice, and practice will evolve accordingly.

Humanism Good

Frameworks of human rights allow for incremental changes to improve value to life

Pasquale 5 (Frank L., Ph.D., a cultural anthropologist Secular Humanist Bulletin, Feb. 10 Volume 20, Number 3. Absolute Thinking in an Inabsolute World http://secularhumanism.org/index.php?section=library&page=pasquale\_20\_3&back=http://secularhumanism.org/lib/list.php%3Fpublication%3Dshb) TBC 7/7/10

All value is not completely relative to power. Assuredly, it remains so in much too great a measure. But it is not so in the absolute. The notion of fundamental human rights represents an endeavor on the part of human beings to establish global consensus on the quality of life or minimum treatment that all human beings deserve. It would be foolish to deny that such rights are widely being violated or that the powerful often reserve the right to violate them most. The current power of the U.S. government enables it to waive such rights with respect to suspected “enemy combatants” or “potential terrorists,” whether in violation of its own laws, United Nations charters, or Geneva conventions. But those much less powerful are able to appeal to standards from which to criticize such behavior as excessive and unjust. Such standards rest upon the recognition of certain enduring, though not absolute or eternal, attributes and aspirations of human beings. They rest upon commitments to protect the innocent and to incrementally improve the quality of human life regardless of personal characteristics, political advantage, or disadvantage.

Humanism and scientific thought is essential to prevent extinction and retain value to life

AMA 73 (American Humanist Association Humanist Manifesto II http://www.americanhumanist.org/who\_we\_are/about\_humanism/Humanist\_Manifesto\_II) TBC 7/7/10

The next century can be and should be the humanistic century. Dramatic scientific, technological, and ever-accelerating social and political changes crowd our awareness. We have virtually conquered the planet, explored the moon, overcome the natural limits of travel and communication; we stand at the dawn of a new age, ready to move farther into space and perhaps inhabit other planets. Using technology wisely, we can control our environment, conquer poverty, markedly reduce disease, extend our life-span, significantly modify our behavior, alter the course of human evolution and cultural development, unlock vast new powers, and provide humankind with unparalleled opportunity for achieving an abundant and meaningful life. The future is, however, filled with dangers. In learning to apply the scientific method to nature and human life, we have opened the door to ecological damage, over-population, dehumanizing institutions, totalitarian repression, and nuclear and bio-chemical disaster. Faced with apocalyptic prophesies and doomsday scenarios, many flee in despair from reason and embrace irrational cults and theologies of withdrawal and retreat. Traditional moral codes and newer irrational cults both fail to meet the pressing needs of today and tomorrow. False "theologies of hope" and messianic ideologies, substituting new dogmas for old, cannot cope with existing world realities. They separate rather than unite peoples. Humanity, to survive, requires bold and daring measures. We need to extend the uses of scientific method, not renounce them, to fuse reason with compassion in order to build constructive social and moral values. Confronted by many possible futures, we must decide which to pursue. The ultimate goal should be the fulfillment of the potential for growth in each human personality - not for the favored few, but for all of humankind. Only a shared world and global measures will suffice. A humanist outlook will tap the creativity of each human being and provide the vision and courage for us to work together. This outlook emphasizes the role human beings can play in their own spheres of action. The decades ahead call for dedicated, clear-minded men and women able to marshal the will, intelligence, and cooperative skills for shaping a desirable future. Humanism can provide the purpose and inspiration that so many seek; it can give personal meaning and significance to human life.

Humanism Good

Humanism can be used to criticize imperialism

Siddiqi 5 (Edward Said, humanism, and secular criticism Alif: Journal of Comparative Poetics, Annual, Yumna http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\_hb6554/is\_25/ai\_n29205117/pg\_10/?tag=content;col1 TBC 7/7/10)

Humanism is disclosure; it is agency; it is immersing oneself in the element of history; it is recovering what Vico calls the topics of mind from the turbulent actualities of human life, "the uncontrollable mystery on the bestial floor," and then submitting them painstakingly to the rational process of judgment and criticism.... For what is crucial to humanistic thought, even in the very act of sympathetically trying to understand the past, is that it is a gesture of resistance and critique. (41) Said attributes to humanism a dynamic, secular, and critical quality that, he fears, is being eroded in the sphere of learning, and in the world at large. He extols the humanist scholar as a historically attuned critic who is not so much interested in preserving a European tradition, as Said's invocation of "great" European scholars might suggest on a superficial reading, but is, rather, committed to the pursuit of human freedom in a truly expansive sense that is based on an "[expanded] ... understanding of human history to include all those Others constructed as dehumanized, demonized opponents by imperial knowledge and a will to rule." (42) In singling out the figure of Freud as representative here, Said is following a logic that Mufti traces so well in relation to Auerbach: the figure of the exiled German Jew who faces world catastrophe and who--as Said notes--comments: "But the struggle is not over yet." (43) Reflecting in 2003 on Orientalism, twentry-five years after its publication, Said again identifies himself as a humanist: My idea in Orientalism is to use humanistic critique to open up the fields of struggle, to introduce a longer sequence of thought and analysis to replace the short bursts of polemical thought-stopping fury that so imprison us. I have called what I try to do "humanism," a word I continue to use stubbornly despite the scornful dismissal of the term by sophisticated post-modern critics. By humanism I mean first of all attempting to dissolve Blake's mind-forg'd manacles so as to be able to use one's mind historically and rationally for the purpose of reflective understanding. Moreover humanism is sustained by a sense of community with other interpreters and other societies and periods: strictly speaking therefore, there is no such thing as an isolated humanist. (44)

Humanism is key to solving imperialism

Siddiqi 5 (Edward Said, humanism, and secular criticism Alif: Journal of Comparative Poetics, Annual, Yumna http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\_hb6554/is\_25/ai\_n29205117/pg\_10/?tag=content;col1 TBC 7/7/10)

Said speaks with a sense of tremendous urgency of the need to revivify humanism as a rational, secular, historically-minded communitarian enterprise that may stand as a shield against the "fragmented knowledge available on the internet and in the mass media" which nationalist and religious orthodoxies often disseminated by the mass media as they focus ahistorically and sensationally on the distant electronic wars that give viewers the sense of surgical precision, but in fact obscure the terrible suffering and destruction produced by modern warfare. (45) Said directly connects the decline of humanistic studies with the depredations of Western and especially US foreign policy. In the same essay, Said writes: "... [H]umanism is the only and I would go so far as saying the final resistance we have against the inhuman practices and injustices that disfigure human history" (n. pag.).

Humanism Good

Deconstruction of humanist values causes atrocities

Ketels 96 (Violet B., Associate Professor of English at Temple University, “‘Havel to the Castle!’ The Power of the Word,” 548 Annals 45, November, JSTOR) TBC 7/9/10

T HE political bestiality of our age is abetted by our willingness to tolerate the deconstructing of hu- manist values. The process begins with the cynical manipulation of lan- guage. It often ends in stupefying murderousness before which the world stands silent, frozen in impotent "attentism"-a wait-and-see stance as unsuited to the human plight as a paci- fier is to stopping up the hunger of a starving child. We have let lapse our pledge to the 6 million Jewish victims of the Holo- caust that their deaths might some- how be transfiguring for humankind. We allow "slaughterhouse men" tac- tical status at U.N. tables and "cast down our eyes when the depraved roar past."' Peacemakers, delegated by us and circumscribed by our fears, temporize with thugs who have re- vived lebensraum claims more boldly than Hitler did. In the Germany of the 1930s, a demonic idea was born in a demented brain; the word went forth; orders were given, repeated, widely broad- cast; and men, women, and children were herded into death camps. Their offshore signals, cries for help, did not summon us to rescue. We had become inured to the reality of hu- man suffering. We could no longer hear what the words meant or did not credit them or not enough of us joined the chorus. Shrieking victims per- ished in the cold blankness of inhu- mane silence. We were deaf to the apocalyptic urgency in Solzhenitsyn's declara- tion from the Gulag that we must check the disastrous course of his- tory. We were heedless of the lesson of his experience that only the unbending strength of the human spirit, fully taking its stand on the shifting frontier of encroaching violence and declaring "not one step further," though death may be the end of it--only this unwavering firmness offers any genuine defense of peace for the individ- ual, of genuine peace for mankind at large.2 In past human crises, writers and thinkers strained language to the breaking point to keep alive the memory of the unimaginable, to keep the human conscience from forget- ting. In the current context, however, intellectuals seem more devoted to abstract assaults on values than to thoughtful probing of the moral di- mensions of human experience. "Heirs of the ancient possessions of higher knowledge and literacy skills,"3 we seem to have lost our nerve, and not only because of Holocaust history and its tragic aftermath. We feel insecure before the empirical absolutes of hard science. We are intimidated by the "high modernist rage against mi- mesis and content,"4 monstrous prog- eny of the union between Nietzsche and philosophical formalism, the grim proposal we have bought into that there is no truth, no objectivity, and no disinterested knowledge.5 Less certain about the power of language, that "oldest flame of the humanist soul,"6 to frame a credo to live by or criteria to judge by, we are vulnerable even to the discredited Paul de Man's indecent hint that "wars and revolutions are not empiri- cal events... but 'texts' masquerad- ing as facts."7 Truth and reality seem more elusive than they ever were in the past; values are pronounced to be mere fictions of ruling elites to retain power. We are embarrassed by virtue. Words collide and crack under these new skeptical strains, dissolv- ing into banalities the colossal enor- mity of what must be expressed lest we forget. Remembering for the fu- ture has become doubly dispiriting by our having to remember for the pres- ent, too, our having to register and confront what is wrong here and now. The reality to be fixed in memory shifts as we seek words for it; the memory we set down is flawed by our subjectivities. It is selective, decep- tive, partial, unreliable, and amoral. It plays tricks and can be invented. It stops up its ears to shut out what it does not dare to face.s Lodged in our brains, such axioms, certified by science and statistics, tempt us to concede the final irrele- vance of words and memory. We have to get on with our lives. Besides, memo- ries reconstructed in words, even when they are documented by evidence, have not often changed the world or fended off the powerful seductions to silence, forgetting, or denying. Especially denying, which, in the case of the Holocaust, has become an obscene industry competing in the open market of ideas for control of our sense of the past. It is said that the Holocaust never happened. Revision- ist history with a vengeance is pur- veyed in words; something in words must be set against it. Yet what? How do we nerve to the task when we are increasingly disposed to cast both words and memory in a condition of cryogenic dubiety? Not only before but also since 1945, the criminality of govern- ments, paraded as politics and fat- tening on linguistic manipulation and deliberately reimplanted mem- ory of past real or imagined griev- ance, has spread calamity across the planet. "The cancer that has eaten at the entrails of Yugoslavia since Tito's death [has] Kosovo for its locus," but not merely as a piece of land. The country's rogue adventurers use the word "Kosovo" to reinvoke as sacred the land where Serbs were defeated by Turks in Memory of bloody massacres in 1389, sloganized and distorted in 1989, demands the bloody revenge of new massacres and returns civilization not to its past glory but to its gory tribal wars. As Matija Beckovic, the bard of Serb na- tionalism, writes, "It is as if the Ser- bian people waged only one battle-by widening the Kosovo charnel-house, by adding wailing upon wailing, by counting new martyrs to the martyrs of Kosovo. .. . Kosovo is the Serbian-ized history of the Flood-the Ser- bian New Testament."10 A cover of Siiddeutsche Zeitung in 1994 was printed with blood donated by refugee women from Bosnia in an eerily perverse afterbirth of violence revisited."11 We stand benumbed before multi- plying horrors. As VAclav Havel warned more than a decade ago, re- gimes that generate them "are the avant garde of a global crisis in civi- lization." The depersonalization of power in "system, ideology and appa- rat," pathological suspicions about human motives and meanings, the loosening of individual responsibility, the swiftness by which disastrous events follow one upon another "have deprived us of our conscience, of our common sense and natural speech and thereby, of our actual human- ity."12 Nothing less than the transfor- mation of human consciousness is likely to rescue us.

Anti-Humanism Bad

Anti-humanism causes Nazism

Hicks 9 (Stephen, Dr of Phil Heidegger, Anti-Humanism, and the Left, http://www.stephenhicks.org/2009/11/30/heidegger-anti-humanism-and-the-left/) TBC 7/9/10

And of Heidegger’s more abstract philosophical commitments, i.e., his stance against reason and modernity, Black says: “what remained consistent throughout, from the Letter on Humanism to the Question Concerning Technology, was that veiled, abstracted, but nonetheless, resonant critique of modernity, and the human-centred rationality he discerned at its fallen heart … . His thought resonates not because he was a Nazi, but because his criticism of modernity echoes many of today’s anti-modern trends.” Exactly right. Heidegger’s Nazism is a particular application of his broader anti-humanism, and his philosophical influence has to be understood from that level of abstraction and generality. Heideggerian anti-humanism can be applied particularly in a number of ways, so that is why we find his continued resonance with today’s postmodernists, left environmentalists, neo-Luddites, and man-hating animal activists, and the rest.

US Good

The US is the end-all be-all of values. Without us, everyone is dead. Opposing the US is sado-masochism.

NOORANI, 5 (Yaseen U OF AZ, TUCSON, The Rhetoric of Security, *CR: The New Centennial Review* 5.1 (2005) 13-41 Project Muse) TBC 7/7/10

Without the United States everyone is dead. Why should this be? The reason is that the United States fully embodies the values underlying world peace—"freedom, democracy, and free enterprise" (*National Security* 2002, i)—and is the key to their realization in the global domain. These values are [End Page 30] universal, desired by all and the standard for all. "[T]he United States must defend liberty and justice because these principles are right and true for all people everywhere" (*National Security* 2002, 3). The fact that the United States "possesses unprecedented—and unequaled—strength and influence in the world" (1) cannot therefore be fortuitous. It cannot but derive from the very founding of the United States in universal principles of peace and its absolute instantiation of these principles. This results in "unparalleled responsibilities, obligations, and opportunity" (1). In other words, the United States as a nation stands, by virtue of its internal constitution, at the forefront of world history in advancing human freedom. It is the subject of history. Its own principle of organization is the ultimate desire of humanity, and the development of this principle is always at its highest stage in and through the United States. For this reason, the values of the United States and its interests always coincide, and these in turn coincide with the interests of world peace and progress. The requirements of American security reflect "the union of our values and our national interests," and their effect is to "make the world not just safer but better" (1). The United States therefore is uniquely charged by history to maintain and advance world peace and universal freedom. America is a nation with a mission, and that mission comes from our most basic beliefs. We have no desire to dominate, no ambitions of empire. Our aim is a democratic peace—a peace founded upon the dignity and rights of every man and woman. America acts in this cause with friends and allies at our side, yet we understand our special calling: This great republic will lead the cause of freedom. (Bush 2004a) America can lead the cause of freedom because it *is* the cause of freedom. "American values and American interests lead in the same direction: We stand for human liberty" (Bush 2003b). For this reason, it has no "ambitions," no private national interests or aspirations that would run contrary to the interests of the world as a whole. It undertakes actions, like the invasion of Iraq, that further no motive but the cause of humanity as a whole. "We have no ambition in Iraq, except to remove a threat and restore control of [End Page 31] that country to its own people" (Bush 2003a). In this way, the United States is distinct from all other nations, even though all of humanity espouses the same values. Only the United States can be depended upon for ensuring the endurance of these values because they are the sole basis of its existence. "Others might flag in the face of the inevitable ebb and flow of the campaign against terrorism. But the American people will not" (*NSCT* 2003, 29). Any threat to the existence of the United States is therefore a threat to the existence of the world order, which is to say, the values that make this order possible. It is not merely that the United States, as the most powerful nation of the free world, is the most capable of defending it. It is rather that the United States is the supreme agency advancing the underlying principle of the free order. The United States is the world order's fulcrum, and therefore the key to its existence and perpetuation. Without the United States, freedom, peace, civil relations among nations, and the possibility of civil society are all under threat of extinction. This is why the most abominable terrorists and tyrants single out the United States for their schemes and attacks. They know that the United States is the guardian of liberal values. In the rhetoric of security, therefore, the survival of the United States, its sheer existence, becomes the *content* of liberal values. In other words, what does it mean to espouse liberal values in the context of the present state of world affairs? It means to desire fervently and promote energetically the survival of the United States of America. When the world order struggles to preserve its "self," the self that it seeks to preserve, the primary location of its being, is the United States. Conferring this status upon the United States allows the rhetoric of security to insist upon a threat to the existence of the world order as a whole while confining the non-normative status that arises from this threat to the United States alone. The United States—as the self under threat—remains external to the normative relations by which the rest of the world continues to be bound. The United States is both a specific national existence struggling for its life and normativity itself, which makes it coextensive with the world order as a whole. For this reason, any challenge to U.S. world dominance would be a challenge to world peace and is thus impermissible. We read in *The National Security Strategy* that the United States [End Page 32] will "promote a balance of power that favors freedom" (*National Security* 2002, 1). And later, we find out what is meant by such a balance of power. The relationship between the United States and the world order, then, is similar to the relationship in Hobbes between the Leviathan and the civil society that it embodies and represents. The individual members of this civil society are collectively the author of all of the acts of the Leviathan. Yet they have no authority to influence or oppose the actions of the Leviathan, because they have contracted with each other to give over all of their powers to it.

US Good

The only risk of international violence is a world in which the U.S. succumbs to internal criticism of hegemony

Sowell 6 (Thomas Sowell, Senior fellow at Stanford’s Hoover Inst., “Where is the West?” 11-19-2006, http://jewishworldreview.com/cols/sowell110906.php3) TBC 7/7/10

European nations protesting Saddam Hussein's death sentence, as they protested against forcing secrets out of captured terrorists, should tell us all we need to know about the internal degeneration of western society, where so many confuse squeamishness with morality. Two generations of being insulated from the reality of the international jungle, of not having to defend their own survival because they have been living under the protection of the American nuclear umbrella, have allowed too many Europeans to grow soft and indulge themselves in illusions about brutal realities and dangers. The very means of their salvation have been demonized for decades in anti-nuclear movements and protesters calling themselves "anti-war." But there is a huge difference between being anti-war in words and being anti-war in deeds. How many times, in its thousands of years of history, has Europe gone 60 years without a major war, as it has since World War II? That peace has been due to American nuclear weapons, which was all that could deter the Soviet Union's armies from marching right across Europe to the Atlantic Ocean. Having overwhelming military force on your side, and letting your enemies know that you have the guts to use it, is being genuinely anti-war. Chamberlain's appeasement brought on World War II and Reagan's military buildup ended the Cold War. The famous Roman peace of ancient times did not come from negotiations, cease-fires, or pretty talk. It came from the Roman Empire's crushing defeat and annihilation of Carthage, which served as a warning to anyone else who might have had any bright ideas about messing with Rome. Only after the Roman Empire began to lose its own internal cohesion, patriotism and fighting spirit over the centuries did it begin to succumb to its external enemies and finally collapse. That seems to be where western civilization is heading today. Internal cohesion? Not only does much of today's generation in western societies have a "do your own thing" attitude, defying rules and flouting authority are glorified and Balkanization through "multiculturalism" has become dogma. Patriotism? Not only is patriotism disdained, the very basis for pride in one's country and culture is systematically undermined in our educational institutions at all levels. The achievements of western civilization are buried in histories that portray every human sin found here as if they were peculiarities of the west. The classic example is slavery, which existed all over the world for thousands of years and yet is incessantly depicted as if it was a peculiarity of Europeans enslaving Africans. Barbary pirates alone brought twice as many enslaved Europeans to North Africa as there were Africans brought in bondage to the United States and the American colonies from which it was formed. How many schools and colleges are going to teach that, going against political correctness and undermining white guilt? How many people have any inkling that it was precisely western civilization which eventually turned against slavery and began stamping it out when non-western societies still saw nothing wrong with it? How can a generation be expected to fight for the survival of a culture or a civilization that has been trashed in its own institutions, taught to tolerate even the intolerance of other cultures brought into its own midst, and conditioned to regard any instinct to fight for its own survival as being a "cowboy"? Western nations that show any signs of standing up for self-preservation are rare exceptions. The United States and Israel are the only western nations which have no choice but to rely on self-defense — and both are demonized, not only by our enemies but also by many in other western nations. Australia recently told its Muslim population that, if they want to live under Islamic law, then they should leave Australia. That makes three western nations that have not yet completely succumbed to the corrosive and suicidal trends of our times. If and when we all succumb, will the epitaph of western civilization say that we had the power to annihilate our enemies but were so paralyzed by confusion that we ended up being annihilated ourselves?

Interventionism Good

Interventionism is key to solve genocide

McMaster 3 (Brigadier General H. R. Hoover Institution 3 Feb 17 http://www.hoover.org/pubaffairs/dailyreport/archive/2848556.html.) TBC 7/9/10

Although the dangers of careless military activism are easy to imagine, the cost of passivity is more difficult to discern. In the 1990s, the Vietnam syndrome helped delay and limit U.S. military intervention in the Balkans. Those delays and limits extended murderous Serbian repression and actually accelerated ethnic cleansing in Kosovo. Failure to intervene militarily often permits humanitarian crises to continue and leads to more dangerous conflicts.

Cartesian Subject Good

No Link – Heidegger mischaracterizes Descartes’ autonomous subject

Beavers 90 (Anthony F. Descartes beyond Transcendental Phenomenology Preliminary Comments on Heidegger’s Critique of the Cartesian Project Ph.D. Prof of Phil U of Evansville http://faculty.evansville.edu/tb2/PDFs/TransPhen.pdf ) TBC 7/8/10

It is true that Descartes does not question the meaning of the Being of the sum; it is not on these grounds that I disagree with Heidegger. Part of the project of Being and Time requires Heidegger to undertake an analysis of that Being which he himself is. This being, we are told, is the Being of the cogito sum. But as Being and Time progresses, the reader discovers that the mode of thinking is but one mode of human being. Thus, Dasein (Heidegger's "human being") is not merely the sum of cogitationes. It is equiprimordially that being who experiences moods and who engages in discourse. What I hope to show is that the same is true for Descartes, who never made the mistake of equating himself in the concreteness of his lived experience with the ego cogito, and that if Descartes were to "question the meaning of the Being of the sum," his investigation would come closer to Heidegger's existential phenomenology than to Husserl's transcendental variety. Nevertheless, Heidegger continually criticizes Descartes for limiting the scope of the human being to the cogito sum, an object of thought that shows up as a necessary condition for representation. For Heidegger, the danger of this equation is that the human being is understood along the lines of an object, like any other object, and not as the privileged being who has its being as an issue for it. In the language of Being and Time, Descartes' understanding of the self is of an object present-at-hand, or so Heidegger claims. In what follows, I hope to show that this characterization of Descartes' understanding of the self is mistaken. Descartes simply did not hold the view that Heidegger assigns to him. To critics of Heidegger, such a charge might not seem at all surprising or worthy of our attention. It is commonly held that Heidegger made similar mistakes respecting many philosophers, including not only the early Greek ones, Anaximander, Parmenides and Heraclitus, but also the German ones, especially Kant and Nietzsche. What should it matter if we add Descartes to this long and distinguished list? But the error made here in this case is different. This is because, first of all, Heidegger rarely criticizes another philosopher with the force he wages against Descartes; generally he tries to show how right a philosopher is, promoting him to the level of a spokesman for his particular historical epoch, even if this philosopher does not understand the depth of his own philosophy with regard to the question of Being or the true implications of his own thinking. Secondly, and more importantly, the popular view of Descartes suggests that, at least in this one case, Heidegger was right.

No Link – Descartes’ subject doesn’t preclude Heideggerian embodiment

Beavers 90 (Anthony F. Descartes beyond Transcendental Phenomenology Preliminary Comments on Heidegger’s Critique of the Cartesian Project Ph.D. Prof of Phil U of Evansville http://faculty.evansville.edu/tb2/PDFs/TransPhen.pdf ) TBC 7/8/10

I hope to show that if Descartes were to question that Being which he himself is, he would not start with the ego cogito; he would begin instead with an examination of the mind/body composite, something which, in essence, cannot be questioned in the context of the Meditations. What is surprising, as we shall see, is that, for Descartes, the mind/body composite is "understood" by us in everyday life, in our passions, and in conversation or discourse. The means to "understanding" this self of daily life is remarkably close to those suggested by Heidegger, though, to be sure, Descartes is far from developing a precise vocabulary to talk about such things. What is at stake in this examination? If I am correct, then Heidegger's critique of Descartes is reduced to the charge that he did not take up the right (that is, Heidegger's) project. We may as well charge Kant for not working in systematic theology or Plato for not writing poetry instead of philosophy, though I suspect that, in a manner of speaking, Heidegger does make this charge against Plato. More to the point, however, if I am correct, then Heidegger's critique is misplaced; it should have been directed to other aspects of Descartes' thinking and, if it had been so, Descartes, like Kant and Hegel, might have been shown in a more positive light.

A2: Knowledge Flawed

The imperfections in human knowledge prove the necessity of science

Edwords 8 (Fred director of comm.. and of planned giving for the AHA http://www.americanhumanist.org/who\_we\_are/about\_humanism/The\_Humanist\_Philosophy\_in\_Perspective) TBC 7/7/10

Though we take a strict position on what constitutes knowledge, we aren’t critical of the sources of ideas. Often intuitive feelings, hunches, speculation, and flashes of inspiration prove to be excellent sources of novel approaches, new ways of looking at things, new discoveries, and new concepts. We don’t disparage those ideas derived from religious experience, altered states of consciousness, or the emotions; we merely declare that testing these ideas against reality is the only way to determine their validity as knowledge. 5. Human knowledge isn’t perfect. We recognize that the tools for testing knowledge—the human senses and human reason—are fallible, thus rendering tentative all our knowledge and scientific conclusions about the nature of the world. What’s true for our scientific conclusions is even more so for our moral choices and social policies; these latter are subject to continual revision in the light of both the fallible and tentative nature of our knowledge and constant shifts in social conditions.

\*\*A2 Terror Talk\*\*

AFF – AT: Reps Bad

The substantial impact of terrorist measures needs to be countered – terrorism spreads like a disease not because US response

Finklestein, 6 (Daniel, Exec Editor @ The Times, 8/23/6, http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/comment/columnists/daniel\_finkelstein/article616813.ece) JPG

But while I think he makes an open and shut case against panic, when it comes to the need for a vigorous policy to combat terrorism Professor Mueller’s maths is less convincing. First, the probability of an event is not really the thing you should be worrying about. In his excellent book Fooled by Randomness, the mathematician and Wall Street trader Nassim Nicholas Taleb discusses what he calls the issue of asymmetry. He explains (rather impatiently since he regards the issue as obvious) that you may believe, say, that financial markets will probably go up, while you behave, sensibly, as if they will go down. The reason? Because you think it very likely that they will go up a little, but, in the unlikely event that they go down, you think they will go down a great deal. “How could people miss such a point?” he complains. “Why do they confuse probability and expectation, that is probability and probability times the payoff?” The probability of, say, a nuclear terrorist attack might be tiny but the consequences, the “payoff” as it were, would be huge. It is expectation, not probability, that should determine policy towards terrorism. The second problem with Mueller’s paper is simple: the low incidence of terrorist outrages occurred when there was already a firm policy in place to prevent it. His argument, the “bloody nuisance” argument, depends on the idea that, without additional measures domestically and internationally, the number of terrorist incidents is unlikely to rise greatly. There is, however, lots of evidence that crime doesn’t work like that. Instead of falling gently or rising gently in response to policy measures, crime behaves like a contagious disease. Potential offenders catch the idea of offending from each other. And just like a disease that starts with only a few people and becomes an epidemic, once it reaches a tipping point the amount of criminal behaviour explodes. If successful suicide bombings became even slightly more common, can we really be confident that other fundamentalists would not copy that behaviour? We already know that ordinary suicides increase when there are front-page stories about people killing themselves. And if there were such an increase, might it escalate as one group copies another? So Matthew Parris is right but also wrong. Without minimising the horrendous suffering of individuals, terrorism might well be little more than a “big bloody nuisance”. But should we treat it as if that was all it was? Absolutely not.

AFF – AT: Reps Bad

Terrorism has to be defined in order to establish an effective response

TTSRL 8 (Transnational Terrorism, Security and the Rule of Law, policy Brif no. 2, 10/1/8, www.transnationalterrorism.eu/tekst/publications/WP3%20Del%204.pdf) JPG

Where natural sciences use numbers to communicate an idea, social sciences use words. Unlike numbers, however, words mean different things to different people. Where anyone with a basic education is able to add “4” to “5” and come to the same result, if we ask a group of people to discribe “freedom”, we may end up with many different results depending on the particular persons’ origin, culture, and experience. Words such as “freedom” do not have the same meaning for everybody and such differences obviously hamper communication. Therefore, when studying terrorism, it is necessary to have a look at what different people, states, and international organizations mean when they use the word “terrorism” in their everyday speeches or documents. Without understanding the exact meaning of the term, it is hardly possible to analyze what consequences there are to intranational and international relations. Without a common agreement on the notion, there can hardly be any common steps to counter terrorism, whether at the domestic or the international level. This study should serve as an overview of how people, states and international organizations define terrorism. In chapters two and three, we shall analyze the academic discourse and have a look at what the common attributes that scholars ascribe to terrorism are. Whereas the second chapter uses a positive way of defining the notion – that is, it asks what terrorism is -, chapter three approaches the task from the other direction and asks what terrorism is not. Namely it searches for differences between terrorism and two related terms, organized crime and political violence. In order to articulate general statements, theories and recommendations, scholars try to group similar phenomena together according to common qualities. As we shall see, terrorism has got many facets that may serve as a basis for such classification. Chapter four focuses on several important typologies that have been reflected in academic literature. The academic discourse is important for our understanding of terrorism and for imbedding it in the theory. But although academia reflects reality, academia does not constitute reality. In order to analyze the current situation and obstacles in international cooperation on counter-terrorism, it is thus also necessary to ask how the term “terrorism” is understood in different legal frameworks. Chapter five deals with the international level, paying special attention to the European Union’s efforts to reach a common definition of terrorism. Chapter six, then, focuses on the level of member states and draws conclusions from similarities and differences found in the nation states’ legal orders.

AFF – Threats Real

Terrorist threats are real – only by honing our fear of terror can we reduce the violence

Seymour 8 (JJ, writer @ Self Help Recordings, 10/10/8,

http://ezinearticles.com/?Fear-of-Terrorism---How-to-Overcome-Terrorism-Fear-For-Good&id=1574000) JPG

Fear of terrorism is a serious matter in the post-9/11 world. As more and more political powers develop powerful nuclear weapons, and as large-scale war becomes more and more impracticable, military conflict--more and more often--takes the form of brief, violent attacks on civilians and infrastructure. Indeed, panic and fear are implied by the very word, "terrorism." The aim of a terrorist attack is to overwhelm a country's population with terror, and thus achieve one's organization's political aims. Thus, it is unsurprising that many people who live in countries that have suffered from recent terrorist attacks have developed a real phobia of being unexpectedly shot at, bombed, or taken hostage by various rogue military groups. Even people who live far from the major centers of terrorist activity have become paranoid, to the extent that their phobia interferes with their ability to lead normal lives.A Complex TerrorWhether you live near or far from previous terrorist activity, the fear of terrorist political acts entails many complicated emotions. That feeling of dread we experience when we hear the news of yet another attack is a potent cocktail of guilt, anger, confusion, and helplessness. When we listen to news of tragedy, we often regret how ignorant we are of what is going on elsewhere in the world. No matter how frequently we read the news, and from how many different sources (on the Internet and elsewhere), it's never frequently enough; our sources are never reliable enough.So Many QuestionsWe wonder, isn't there anything we can do? Would these attacks have been prevented if only we got involved in politics, if we knew more? Should we enter the world of politics or high finance, become major political players? Should we hide out in the desert, and live off canned food? Are we just so much sheep for the slaughter? Is it better to just bury our heads in the sand, to tune out these dire reports? The closer we live to the attacks, the more intense these feelings become.Take Control Of Your Fear Of Terrorism To be sure, terrorism poses a major world problem. The problem is at once political, economic, philosophical, and practical. So far, it's a problem without any obvious answers. However, perhaps the first step to grappling with this complex problem is to take control of your fear. Does the stuff you hear on the news put you into a state of unthinking panic? Well, how do you think those German citizens felt, when they voted a man named Adolf Hitler into power? To be an empowered citizen, you need to take control of your fear--and the best way to do this is with hypnotherapy and NLP.

Terrorist threats are real – only by identifying terrorists can we respond to threats

Jenkins 98 (Brian Michael, analyst @ RAND, “Countering the New Terrorism,” pp. vi-vii, 1998,

www.rand.org/pubs/monograph\_reports/MR989/index.html) JPG

Defining “international terrorism” was a necessary prerequisite for mobilizing international support against terrorism and could be viewed as a noble effort against piracy provided an historical precedent – and the conventions governing war. It also served U.S. national interests in that the principal terrorist threat to the United States came not from terrorist attacks inside the United States but rather from terrorist attacks on American citizens and facilities abroad. The chronology of international terrorism reinforced this concern by showing that U.S. citizens and facilities were the number one target in international incidents of terrorism. The United States had no mandate to intervene in the internal conflicts of other nations, but when that violence spilled over into the international community, it became a legitimate international concern

AFF – Link - “Terrorist” Good

Defining terrorism is critical in solving it – this outweighs your root cause arguments

TTSRL 8 (Transnational Terrorism, Security and the Rule of Law, policy Brif no. 2, 10/1/8, www.transnationalterrorism.eu/tekst/publications/WP3%20Del%204.pdf) JPG

Yet the real business can be spoiled, some authors claim, by the lack of a universally agreed definition of terrorism. ‘An objective definition of terrorism is not only possible: it is also indispensable to any serious attempt to combat terrorism,’ holds Ganor (quoted in Schmid, 2004a: 375). He thus reiterated his earlier statement on the importance of this issue, in which he had declared that a common understanding of what constitutes terrorism is important, among other purposes, for 1) a development of common international strategies, 2) effective results of the international mobilization against terrorism, 3) enforcement of international agreements against terrorism, and 4) effective extradiction procedures (Ganor, 1998). Similarly, Schmid also points to a positive role of a universal definition in coordinating the states’ anti-terrorist strategies, quoting Dean and Alexander, who consider the absence of a universal definition of terrorism as the main factor likely to encourage future terrorism – more eminent than, e.g., disagreement as to the root causes, religionization of politics or exploitation of the media (Schmid, 2004a: 378). However, the focus is here shifted from the academia to the fields of strategic and legal discourse, and Ganor and Schmid’s statements therefore cannot be considered as proper arguments in favour of the universal academic definition of terrorism. Nonetheless, they pave the way to the conclusion that in fact, there is a search going on not for one universal definition of terrorism, but for manifold definitions of terrorism, which, in each of the fields listed above (academic, strategic and legal), are required to play a peculiar role and therefore focus on various issue areas in their quest. Whereas the strategic discourse may be assumed to be primarily concerned with terrorism as a method of combat, in the legal discourse, the focus rests rather with those who can be punished for commiting terrorist acts, the perpetrators. In the absence of a universal legal definition, capabilities of prosecuting those who commit terrorist crimes are limited – nullum crimen sine lege – and the extradition channels are obstructed.

Terror discourse is key to an effective response to terrorism

Albrechtsen 9 (Janet, writer @ The Australian, 7/9/9, http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2009/07/29/language\_police\_terrorize\_common\_sense.html) JPG

Would someone kindly lock up these language police for crimes against the English language? An attack is what happened in Jakarta when innocent hotel guests were murdered at the J.W. Marriott and Ritz-Carlton hotels. And it is, quite literally, the bleeding obvious to point out that the perpetrators of the carnage are a group of Islamist militants who twist the tenets of Islam to suit their ideological purposes. They seek to bring down democracy in Indonesia and punish Western nations for fighting the Taliban and al-Qa'ida, with the ultimate aim of creating an Islamic caliphate. Yet while these terrorists go to great lengths to promote their Muslim identity and their militant Islamist ideology, it seems we are not allowed to mention that now. There is nothing wrong with crafting careful language when dealing with terrorism. For years political leaders have used terms such as Islamist terrorist or Islamo-fascist to carefully distinguish militants from the vast majority of peace-loving Muslims. But there is a difference between being careful and being cowardly. The kind of zealous language policing endorsed by the Victoria Police and the Multicultural Foundation encourages us to hide from the truth. Their new whitewash language is not just daft, it's dangerous. Clarity of language is a critical tool if we are serious about uncovering and understanding militant Islam. After so many attacks and the murder of so many innocent people, why would we cower from identifying the drivers of their Islamist extremism? Yet there was too much cowering and not enough clarity from Attorney-General Robert McClelland when he addressed the Australian Strategic Policy Institute last week. Endorsing the language police's Lexicon of Terrorism project, the A-G's speech was littered with references to "violent extremism", "violent extremists", "violent extremist messages", "extremist beliefs" and "extremist ideology". McClelland was too frightened to construct a sentence that included the word Islamism. Instead he quoted from Ed Husain, in his book The Islamist, who has no problem referring to "Islamist extremists". Apparently the A-G believes it is acceptable for a Muslim to speak with factual accuracy but the rest of us must resort to meaningless generalities for fear of radicalising Muslim youth.

AFF – Link – “Terrorist” Good

No link and turn – their evidence assumes a totalizing image of terrorism – not responding to terrorism risks destructive violence

Black 4 (Donald, Professor of the Social Sciences at the University of Virginia, Sociological Theory, Vol. 22, No. 1, Mar. 2004, pp. 14-25, Jstor) JPG

Social space has various dimensions-horizontal (such as degrees of intimacy and integration); vertical (inequality); corporate (involvement of groups); cultural (such as language and religion); and normative (social control). The multidimensional location and direction of social life predicts and explains its behavior. Conflicts with more distant adversaries (such as strangers) attract more law and punishment (Black 1976:4048), for example, and ideas with more distant subjects (such as nonhumans) are more scientific and successful (Black 2000a:349-61).' The social geometry of conflicts thus explains litigiousness and punitiveness, and the social geometry of ideas explains their scienticity and success. Now consider violence. Violence is the use of force, and most violence is social control: It defines and responds to deviant behavior. Much is self-help-the handling of a grievance with aggression, such as the beating of a child who misbehaves, the killing of a spouse who is unfaithful, or the rioting of prisoners against their guards (see Black 1983, 1990:74-79). Violent self-help includes everything from pushing or slapping an individual to bombing a city or exterminating an ethnic group (see generally Black 2002d). Such violence partly resembles law. For example, both are forms of justice; their distribution is highly precise; and they sometimes obey similiar geometrical principles. Just as distant conflicts attract more law and punishment than close conflicts, for instance, so they attract more violence. Consider the use of weapons: Hold constant the conflict (such as an insult or theft), and the lethality of weapons is a direct function of social distance, both relational and cultural (Black 2002d:4-10). Other dimensions of social geometry are relevant to the occurrence and nature of violence as well, such as whether a grievance is downward (against an inferior); upward (against a superior): lateral (against an equal); collective (by or against a group); outward (against a marginal); or inward (against someone more integrated). Violence might appear to be an unpredictable outburst or unexplainable explosion, but it arises with geometrical precision. It is unpredictable and unexplainable only if we seek its origins in the characteristics of individuals (such as their beliefs or frustrations) or in the characteristics of societies, communities, or other collectivities (such as their cultural values or level of inequality). But violent individuals and violent collectivities do not exist: No individual or collectivity is violent in all settings at all times, and neither individualistic nor collectivistic theories predict and explain precisely when and how violence occurs (see Black 1995:852-58; 2002d:l-3). Violence occurs when the social geometry of a conflict--the conflict structure-is violent. Every form of violence has its own structure, whether a beating structure, dueling structure. lynching structure, feuding structure, genocide structure-or terrorism structure (see, e.g., Black 1990:7&79; Baumgartner 1992; Senechal de la Roche 1996, 1997; Cooney 1998; Black 2002d). Structures kill and maim, not individuals or collectivities. The relationship between law and relational distance is curvilinear. with the least law across the shortest and longest distances (such as bctween members of the same household and between nations). The same applies to the relationship between law and cultural distance (Black 1976:4046.73-78). Pure terrorism is self-help by organized civilians ~vhocovert1.y injlict mass violence on other civilians (see Senechal de la Roche 1996:101-05; Ganor 1998, 2001). This definition is what Max Weber calls an "ideal typex-a specification of something in its purest sense (see Weber [I9041 1949:89-112; [I9221 1964:89, 110). Pure terrorism also includes foiled plans, attempts, and threats to inflict mass violence on civilians, such as a 1995 plan by Arab Muslims to blow up simultaneously 11 airplanes bound for the United States from Asia; a 1993 attempt by Arab Muslims to blow up the World Trade Center in New York City; and a 2002 threat by Chechen Muslims to blow up a theater in Moscow. Although pure terrorism has all the elements above, terrorism occurs in lesser degrees as well, such as by unorganized civilians or against government officials. But here I address pure terrorism alone. Like much other violence, pure terrorism is social control. It belongs to the same family as law, gossip, ostracism, ridicule, and other processes that define and respond to deviant behavior. It is self-help, the handling of a grievance with aggression. Although it partly resembles other self-help, including many homicides and assaults in everyday life (Black 1983, 1998:xiv-xvi; see also Cooney 1998), terrorism is collec- tive violence-a group project-and in this respect resembles rioting, lynching, and vigilantism (see Senechal de la Roche 1996). Like rioting and feuding, it entails a logic of collective liability: Vulnerability attaches to a social location (such as a particular nationality, religion, or ethnicity) rather than to wrongful conduct by those attacked (see Black 1987:49-50, 55-57; Senechal de la Roche 1996:10345). Like feuding, too, pure terrorism is recurrent, a series of episodes over time. But unlike most feuding, terrorism kills or maims not merely a person or two but a large number, possibly hundreds or thousands. It is mass violence. And it is normally unilateral-one-sided rather than reciprocal (see Black 1984:5-6; 1995:855, n. 130; Senechal de la Roche 1996:101-02). Pure terrorism is not only collective but well organized-more organized than the crowds in riots or lynchings (Senechal de la Roche 1996:103-05). Although vigilantism is similarly unilateral, recurrent, and organized, it targets only those deemed guilty of a particular offense rather than any member of a social location (Senechal de la Roche 1996:103-05; see also 118-21). The covert nature of terrorism likewise distinguishes it from most vigilantism, rioting, and lynching. Terrorists operate underground, possibly alone, though as agents of an organization. Pure terrorism is more war-like than most collective violence, including individual killings by organized groups (such as assassinations of Spanish government officials by Basque nationalists in the 20th century) or mass killings by unorganized individuals (such as a 1995 bombing of a U.S. government building in Oklahoma. Its typically interethnic and sometimes international character is war-like as well. Yet pure terrorism is not true warfare. It is a form of quasi-warfare (compare Huntington 1996:216-17). Because terrorists may wield highly destructive weapons (conceivably biological, chemical, or nuclear) capable of killing numerous civilians of both sexes and all ages, terrorism may resemble episodes of conventional warfare. But unlike conventional warfare, terrorism is unilateral and covert rather than bilateral and overt, and its targets are civilian rather than military. It also lacks the game-like elements of some cause the Basque assassinations and the Oklahoma City bombing had governmental targets, neither qualifies as pure terrorism (which has only civilian targets). In addition, the former was not mass violence, and the latter was not an organizational action warfare (known as rules of war), such as the wearing of uniforms, nonviolence by and toward those who surrender, and the exclusion of weapons regarded as inhumane or unfair (see, e.g., Loy and Hesketh 1995; Walzer 2000:4&47). Conventional warfare commonly has a well-defined beginning (such as a declaration of war) and conclusion (such as the surrender of one side), and former enemies may resume normal relations when it ends. But terrorists seldom take prisoners (except for ransom) and often kill those they take. And imprisoned terrorists may wait only for another chance for more attacks, possibly ignoring peace treaties by their representatives. Terrorism is effect- ively interminable-unless it succeeds. Pure terrorism operates on a small scale with hit-and-run tactics akin to guerrilla warfare, though guerrillas mainly launch attacks from relatively inaccessible rural hideouts while terrorists camouflage themselves as ordinary civilians in urban and other active settings to strike in the midst of their enemy.3More importantly, in its pure form guerrilla warfare has military targets, while pure terrorism has civilian targets (see Ganor 1998). Even so, those popularly known as guerrillas may some- times engage in terrorism (when they attack civilians), and those popularly known as terrorists may sometimes engage in guerrilla warfare (when they attack military facilities or personnel).

Defining terror is critical to defeating terrorism and limits extremeties of violence

Johns 4 (John H., Ret. Brig. Gen., 10/17/4, www.nsijjohns.com/images/Terrorism.pdf) JPG

If a belligerent wishes to brand acts of terrorism against it as immoral, it must find a definition that distinguishes the type of terrorism used by it and its allies from that of its adversaries. In the case of the current "war against terrorism," declared by President Bush, this presents problems. It is useful to rally the American people by stating the effort in moralistic terms of good versus evil and rejecting any suggestion that terrorism is any way morally justified. Another way to isolate the Islamic terrorists is to define terrorism to exclude actions of nations or their military. Recent definitions by U.S. Government Agencies in fact offer such definitions, restricting the label to non-nation activity. This has the convenience of putting our use of military force outside the bounds of terrorism. This restricted definition, of course, denies legitimacy to the only means of violence available to the weak and takes away the reciprocal advantage. Terrorism is the force of choice for domestic dissidents and the militarily weak in international affairs because it gives them an asymmetrical advantage, especially if they cannot be readily identified. Non-nation groups conduct much of international terrorism such as the 9-11 acts. While they may have the support of governments, these connections are difficult to prove. This limits the counter-terrorist efforts because over reaction against broad targets can generate more hostility and lose moral legitimacy for the counter terrorism effort. More will be said on this regarding the Iraq war.

Word-smithing to exclude one side's use of terrorism may appeal to the militarily powerful and their followers, but non-nation terrorist groups may argue that the ends justify the means if their terrorist acts result in a change in policies that they label as unjust. Moreover, the current enemies of the United States may argue that U.S. policies themselves involve a form of economic and military terrorism - economic sanctions against Iraq from 1991 to the recent invasion, sanctions against Cuba, etc. and militarily against the Palestinians (through Israel as a proxy), Nicaragua, etc. It all depends on whose ox is being gored; one person's terrorist is another's freedom fighter. Surveys consistently show that much of the Islamic world views terrorists against Israel as "freedom fighters." President Reagan labeled the Islamic terrorists fighting the Russians in Afghanistan in the 80s (including the Taliban, a member of which was Osama bin Laden) as "freedom fighters." They are now "terrorists." Again, it depends on whose ox is being gored.

In all conflicts, each side is convinced of its moral high ground. It then becomes a contest for convincing target audiences that you have the moral high ground. In the current war, the audiences include the American public, the populations in which the enemy operates, and the world community. Thus, the task in the current "war on terrorism" is to convince these target audiences that ours is the moral and just cause. In order to keep support among the populations in which they operate and draw their recruits, the terrorists will have to win the moral argument. The evidence so far is that the terrorists are winning except in the United States and Israel.

It should be clear to the reader that the central theme of this essay is that victory in the "war on terrorism" will be achieved only if we win the hearts and minds of several target audiences. To date, we appear to be losing that battle among some audiences. A crucial question is: are we losing the battle because of our failure to communicate effectively, or must we reexamine some of our policies? This question is best answered by looking at specific target audiences. In doing this, we must keep in mind that borders between these audiences are porous. Unlike wars of the past, where nations could more or less separate these audiences, what is said to one audience is likely to be available to the others. The message that appeals to one may alienate another. Truly, this is the age of global communications.

AFF – AT: Reps Matter

Language doesn’t generate more terrorism – not using appropriate terms limits responses to terrorism

Albrechtsen 9 (Janet, writer @ The Australian, 7/9/9, http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2009/07/29/language\_police\_terrorize\_common\_sense.html) JPG

The suggestion from McClelland and senior police that using terms such as Islamo-fascists may drive young Muslims into the arms of jihadists is dubious. I'm willing to wager that those drawn to violence have other matters on their minds and other forces pulling them towards violence than the language employed by Westerners. If we submit a questionnaire to young would-be jihadists asking them to list, on a scale of one to 100, the reasons they might choose jihad over, say, becoming a pastry chef or a train driver, I'm guessing none are going to suggest they are fed-up with the way Westerners used the term Islamo-fascist. Instead, they may list matters such as hating democracy, achieving glory for Islam and Muslims, destroying the infidel enemies around them, wanting to bring to account those countries that sent infidel troops to Iraq and Afghanistan, and so on. That's what the present generation of Islamist terrorists tells us and it may be useful to take them at their word. In the A-G's woolly world, how exactly does a newspaper report on Islamic militancy if the only acceptable phrase is "violent extremism"? The Australian's Sally Neighbour has done a stellar job reporting on the role played by Islamic boarding schools such as al-Mukmin at Ngruki in Solo, Central Java, in the violent campaign to set up an Indonesian Islamic state. Described by its co-founder and Jemaah Islamiah leader Abu Bakar Bashir as "a crucible for the formation of cadres of mujaheddin" with a mission "to nurture zeal for jihad so that love for jihad and martyrdom grow in the soul of the mujaheddin", it becomes clear that Islam is used to fuel violence among young Muslim men. As Neighbour reported last week, "The Ngruki school and others linked to JI -- chiefly the Darul Syahadah ('house of martyrs') and Al Muttaqin schools, both in Central Java -- have produced no less than dozens of young recruits linked to a string of terrorist attacks, starting with the first Bali bombings in 2002." Would the A-G have us refrain from reporting the truth, that a handful of radical Islamic schools is a breeding ground for Islamist terrorists? There are no such sensibilities about calling a spade a bloody shovel when Christian extremists firebomb abortion clinics. No concerns about wholesale branding of Christianity by using the Christian word. Nor is there a fear that using the word will radicalise young Christians. In other areas, too, we don't shy away from using descriptors to explain extremism. The US Department of Homeland Security had no misgivings about producing an intelligence assessment in April headed Right-wing Extremism: Current Economic and Political Climate Fueling Resurgence in Radicalisation and Recruitment. The nine-page report, which predicts a surge in violence given the present economic and political climate of the US, is littered with references to "right-wing terrorist and extremist groups". Yet when it comes to militant Islam, we are asked to whitewash our language, tiptoeing around the truth for fear of offending and radicalising Muslims. One might have been forgiven for thinking we had long ago rejected this nonsense of letting the Islamist tail wag the Western dog. Since September 11, politicians of all hues have been falling over themselves to make it clear that the perpetrators of violence are fringe-group Islamist extremists who exploit Islam for their own ideological, anti-Western purposes. Politicians have made it clear specifically to praise, and seek the support of, moderate Muslims. Wait on. Dellal told The Age that we should also avoid using the term "moderate Muslim" because it suggested to Muslims that they were not true to their faith. When the word moderate is labelled as a menacing, you know the thin blue line of the language police has become a perilously thick one.

AFF – AT: Reps Matter

Focus on representation fails

Collins 98 (Patricia Hill, Prof of Sociology @ U of Maryland, College Park, Fighting Words: Black Women and the Search for Justice, p. 136)

Social **theories that reduce** hierarchical **power relations to the level of representation**, performance, or constructed phenomena not only **emphasize the likelihood that** resistance will fail **in the face of a pervasive hegemonic presence, they** also **reinforce perceptions** that local, **individualized micropolitics constitutes the most effective terrain of struggle. This** emphasis on the local **dovetails** nicely **with increasing emphasis on the “personal” as a source of power and** with **parallel attention to subjectivity. If politics becomes reduce to the “personal,” decentering relations of ruling in** academia and other **bureaucratic structures seem** increasingly unlikely. As Rey Chow opines, “What **these intellectuals are** doing is **robbing the terms of oppression of their critical and oppositional import, and thus** depriving the oppressed **of** even **the vocabulary of protest and rightful demand**” (1993, 13). Viewing decentering as a strategy situated within a larger process of resistance to oppression is dramatically different from perceiving decentering as an academic theory of how scholars should view all truth. When weapons of resistance are theorized away in this fashion, one might ask, who really benefits?

Post-modern insistence on discourse precludes understanding issues like war and peace

Walt 91 (Stephen M., prof of IR @ Harvard, International Studies Quarterly, Vol. 35, No. 2 (Jun., 1991), pp. 211-239)

On the whole, security studies have profited from its connection to real-world issues**;** the main advances of the past four decades have emerged from efforts to solve important practical questions. If security studies succumbs to the tendency for academic disciplines to pursue “the trivial, the formal, the methodological, the purely theoretical**,** the remotely historical—in short, the politically irrelevant” (Morgenthau, 1966:73**),** its theoretical progress and its practical value will inevitably decline. Among other things, it means that security studies should remain wary of **the** counterproductive tangents that have seduced other areas of international studies, most notably the “post-modern” approach to international affairs (Ashley, 1984; Der Derian and Shapiro, 1989; Lapid, 1989). Contrary to their proponents’ claims, post-modern approaches have yet to demonstrate much value for comprehending world politics**;** to date, these works are mostly criticism and not much theory**.** 26 As Robert Keohane has noted, until these writers “have delineated . . . a research program and shown . . . that it can illuminate important issues in world politics, they will remain on the margins of the field**”** (Keohane, 1988:392). In particular, issues of war and peace are too important for the field to be diverted into a prolix and self-indulgent discourse that is divorced from the real world.

AFF – AT: Discourse 1st

Policy analysis should trump discourse – most effective way to challenge power

Taft-Kaufman 95 (Jill, Speech prof @ CMU, Southern Comm. Journal, Spring, v. 60, Iss. 3, “Other Ways”)

The postmodern passwords of "polyvocality," "Otherness," and "difference," unsupported by substantial analysis of the concrete contexts of subjects, creates a solipsistic quagmire. The political sympathies of the new cultural critics, with their ostensible concern for the lack of power experienced by marginalized people, aligns them with the political left. Yet, despite their adversarial posture and talk of opposition, their discourses on intertextuality and inter-referentiality isolate them from and ignore the conditions that have produced leftist politics--conflict, racism, poverty, and injustice. In short, as Clarke (1991) asserts, postmodern emphasis on new subjects conceals the old subjects, those who have limited access to good jobs, food, housing, health care, and transportation, as well as to the media that depict them. Merod (1987) decries this situation as one which leaves no vision, will, or commitment to activism. He notes that academic lip service to the oppositional is underscored by the absence of focused collective or politically active intellectual communities. Provoked by the academic manifestations of this problem Di Leonardo (1990) echoes Merod and laments: Has there ever been a historical era characterized by as little radical analysis or activism and as much radical-chic writing as ours? Maundering on about Otherness: phallocentrism or Eurocentric tropes has become a lazy academic substitute for actual engagement with the detailed histories and contemporary realities of Western racial minorities, white women, or any Third World population. (p. 530) Clarke's assessment of the postmodern elevation of language to the "sine qua non" of critical discussion is an even stronger indictment against the trend**.** Clarke examines Lyotard's (1984) The Postmodern Condition in which Lyotard maintains that virtually all social relations are linguistic, and, therefore, it is through the coercion that threatens speech that we enter the "realm of terror" and society falls apart. To this assertion, Clarke replies**:**  I can think of few more striking indicators of the political and intellectual impoverishment of a view of society that can only recognize the discursive. If the worst terror we can envisage is the threat not to be allowed to speak, we are appallingly ignorant of terror in its elaborate contemporary forms. It may be the intellectual's conception of terror (what else do we do but speak?), but its projection onto the rest of the world would be calamitous..**..(**pp. 2-27) The realm of the discursive is derived from the requisites for human life, which are in the physical world, rather than in a world of ideas or symbols.(4) Nutrition, shelter, and protection are basic human needs that require collective activity for their fulfillment. Postmodern emphasis on the discursive without an accompanying analysis of how the discursive emerges from material circumstances hides the complex task of envisioning and working towards concrete social goals (Merod, 1987). Although the material conditions that create the situation of marginality escape the purview of the postmodernist, the situation and its consequences are not overlooked by scholars from marginalized groups. Robinson (1990) for example, argues that "the justice that working people deserve is economic, not just textual" (p. 571). Lopez (1992) states that "the starting point for organizing the program content of education or political action must be the present existential, concrete situation" (p. 299). West (1988) asserts that borrowing French post-structuralist discourses about "Otherness" blinds us to realities of American difference going on in front of us (p. 170). Unlike postmodern "textual radicals" who Rabinow (1986) acknowledges are "fuzzy about power and the realities of socioeconomic constraints" (p. 255), most writers from marginalized groups are clear about how discourse interweaves with the concrete circumstances that create lived experience. People whose lives form the material for postmodern counter-hegemonic discourse do not share the optimism over the new recognition of their discursive subjectivities, because such an acknowledgment does not address sufficiently their collective historical and current struggles against racism, sexism, homophobia, and economic injustice. They do not appreciate being told they are living in a world in which there are no more real subjects. Ideas have consequences. Emphasizing the discursive self when a person is hungry and homeless represents both a cultural and humane failure. The need to look beyond texts to the perception and attainment of concrete social goals keeps writers from marginalized groups ever-mindful of the specifics of how power works through political agendas, institutions, agencies, and the budgets that fuel them.

AFF – AT: Discourse 1st

The claim that language merely influences reality is not enough to reject us

Roskoski & Peabody 91 (Matthew, Joe, Florida State University, “Critique of Language Argument,”)

Before we begin to discuss the validity of the hypothesis, we ought first to note that there are two varieties of the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis. The strong version claims that language actually creates reality, while the weak version merely claims that language influences reality in some way (Grace). As Bloom has conceded, the strong version - "the claim that language or languages we learn determine the ways we think" is "clearly untenable" (Bloom 275). Further, the weak form of the hypothesis will likely fail the direct causal nexus test required to censor speech. The courts require a "close causal nexus between speech and harm before penalizing speech" (Smolla 205**)** and we believe debate critics should do the same. We dismiss the weak form of the hypothesis as inadequate to justify language "arguments" and will focus on the strong form.

AFF - Perm

Discourse must be combined with interventions at the policy level to change the knowledge economy of terrorism

Graham et. al. 4 (Phillip W., Sen. Public Health Researcher @ RTI International, Discourse and Society, 2004, 15(2-3). pp. 199-221., Muse) JPG

Martin and Rose (2003) suggest that the challenge for discourse analysis is to show how emancipation, as well as domination, is achieved through discourse; that an analytical focus on ‘hegemony’ must be balanced with a focus on discourses of empowerment—discourses designed to ‘make peace, not war’, that successfully ‘redistribute power without necessarily struggling against it’ (2003: 264; cf Martin, 1999); and that analysis needs to move away from ‘demonology’ and ‘deconstruction’ towards the design of ‘constructive’ discourse (Martin, in press). These are certainly important considerations for the theory and practice of discourse analysis. At least as important to our mind are clear understandings of macro-social, -cultural, and -economic changes, all of which can be seen quite clearly from a discourse-historical perspective—in a process of historical *reconstruction*—to grasp human history as a seamless, unbroken whole. It has become clear that in what is called “a global knowledge economy”, meanings and their mediations perform increasingly important and overt political-economic functions (cf. Graham, 2002; Fairclough and Graham, 2002). The sole social function of academics is, and always has been, ‘to influence discourse’ (David Rooney, personal correspondence)—that is all we can do as academics, whether through teaching, writing, or through the manifold arts of activism. Feudalism was tied to land and militarism; mercantilism was tied to gold and mercenary armies; capitalism was tied to ownership of productive apparatus and imperialism; corporatism is tied to the ownership of legal fictions—money, corporations, and intellectual property—and ‘information warfare’, all of which are products of discourse (Graham, 2002). Each of these developments—each stage in the ‘phylogenesis’ of western economic systems (Martin, 2003: 266)—has tended towards an increasing reliance on abstract- discursive rather than brute-physical coercion in the maintenance of inequalities.The current political economic system, as transitional as it may be, is undoubtedly the most discourse- and media-reliant system in history, precisely because of its size and the high levels of abstraction that both support it and constitute the bulk of its commodities (Graham, 2000). Understanding this means understanding the importance and potential of discursive interventions. The Pentagon’s ‘Total Information Awareness’ program fully recognises this (DARPA, 2003). Similarly, whichever group perpetrated the attacks on the World Trade Centre and the Pentagon also fully recognised it: the attacks were directed at symbolic centres of a globally hegemonic system and were designed specifically for their mass media impact. Merely exposing facts and breaking silences (as per Chomsky and Pilger) is not enough either; the current malaise is primarily axiological (values-based). Discursive interventions at the axiological level are necessary in the policy field, in the multiple fields of mass media, and in every local field. Ours is a discourse-based global society, a discourse-based global economy, and a discourse-based global culture. Consequently, humanity has never been so close to realising our ‘species-being’ (Marx, 1844/1975: ch 4)—our universal humanity—whilst simultaneously being so close to achieving self-annihilation. Discursive interventions will necessarily be decisive in the outcome between these two paths.

AFF – Alt No Solve

The alternative fails – it doesn’t engage problems and justifies the oppression of the status quo

Hanson 4 (Victor Davis, historian @ Stanford, City Journal Spring 2004, http://www.city-journal.org/html/14\_2\_the\_fruits.html) JPG

Rather than springing from realpolitik, sloth, or fear of oil cutoffs, much of our appeasement of Middle Eastern terrorists derived from a new sort of anti-Americanism that thrived in the growing therapeutic society of the 1980s and 1990s. Though the abrupt collapse of communism was a dilemma for the Left, it opened as many doors as it shut. To be sure, after the fall of the Berlin Wall, few Marxists could argue for a state-controlled economy or mouth the old romance about a workers’ paradise—not with scenes of East German families crammed into smoking clunkers lumbering over potholed roads, like American pioneers of old on their way west. But if the creed of the socialist republics was impossible to take seriously in either economic or political terms, such a collapse of doctrinaire statism did not discredit the gospel of forced egalitarianism and resentment against prosperous capitalists. Far from it. If Marx receded from economics departments, his spirit reemerged among our intelligentsia in the novel guises of post-structuralism, new historicism, multiculturalism, and all the other dogmas whose fundamental tenet was that white male capitalists had systematically oppressed women, minorities, and Third World people in countless insidious ways. The font of that collective oppression, both at home and abroad, was the rich, corporate, Republican, and white United States. The fall of the Soviet Union enhanced these newer post-colonial and liberation fields of study by immunizing their promulgators from charges of fellow-traveling or being dupes of Russian expansionism. Communism’s demise likewise freed these trendy ideologies from having to offer some wooden, unworkable Marxist alternative to the West; thus they could happily remain entirely critical, sarcastic, and cynical without any obligation to suggest something better, as witness the nihilist signs at recent protest marches proclaiming: “I Love Iraq, Bomb Texas.” From writers like Arundhati Roy and Michel Foucault (who anointed Khomeini “a kind of mystic saint” who would usher in a new “political spirituality” that would “transfigure” the world) and from old standbys like Frantz Fanon and Jean-Paul Sartre (“to shoot down a European is to kill two birds with one stone, to destroy an oppressor and the man he oppresses at the same time”), there filtered down a vague notion that the United States and the West in general were responsible for Third World misery in ways that transcended the dull old class struggle. Endemic racism and the legacy of colonialism, the oppressive multinational corporation and the humiliation and erosion of indigenous culture brought on by globalization and a smug, self-important cultural condescension—all this and more explained poverty and despair, whether in Damascus, Teheran, or Beirut. There was victim status for everybody, from gender, race, and class at home to colonialism, imperialism, and hegemony abroad. Anyone could play in these “area studies” that cobbled together the barrio, the West Bank, and the “freedom fighter” into some sloppy global union of the oppressed—a far hipper enterprise than rehashing Das Kapital or listening to a six-hour harangue from Fidel. Of course, pampered Western intellectuals since Diderot have always dreamed up a “noble savage,” who lived in harmony with nature precisely because of his distance from the corruption of Western civilization. But now this fuzzy romanticism had an updated, political edge: the bearded killer and wild-eyed savage were not merely better than we because they lived apart in a pre-modern landscape. No: they had a right to strike back and kill modernizing Westerners who had intruded into and disrupted their better world—whether Jews on Temple Mount, women in Westernized dress in Teheran, Christian missionaries in Kabul, capitalist profiteers in Islamabad, whiskey-drinking oilmen in Riyadh, or miniskirted tourists in Cairo. An Ayatollah Khomeini who turned back the clock on female emancipation in Iran, who murdered non-Muslims, and who refashioned Iranian state policy to hunt down, torture, and kill liberals nevertheless seemed to liberal Western eyes as preferable to the Shah—a Western-supported anti-communist, after all, who was engaged in the messy, often corrupt task of bringing Iran from the tenth to the twentieth century, down the arduous, dangerous path that, as in Taiwan or South Korea, might eventually lead to a consensual, capitalist society like our own.

AFF – Alt No Solve

Defining terrorism is key to prevent abuses of it – the alternative allows cooption

TTSRL 8 (Transnational Terrorism, Security and the Rule of Law, policy Brif no. 2, 10/1/8, www.transnationalterrorism.eu/tekst/publications/WP3%20Del%204.pdf) JPG

The first reason is that the absence of a commonly accepted definition invites abuse. In view of the delegitimization, stigmatization and securitization issues discussed in the next section, this seems to be a serious case for expanding a common understanding of terrorism. Double standards and the might makes right principle applied both in the international and domestic scene – styling resistance movements, guerillas or mere political opposition as “terrorists” - have in recent times become a favourite instrument of authoritarian governments to legitimize crushing those actors abroad – in which the label “terrorism” is used as a powerful instrument in the hands of the stronger. This should be, it can be argued, prevented on normative grounds. The academia, which ought to be critical towards the realm of politics – even if it cannot be detached from it – should then play a crucial role in the deconstruction of similar processes. Yet, to meet such expectations, it should possess useful instruments of analysis. In line with the “strategic” argument outlined above, Jessica Stern of Harvard University also concedes that ‘how we define terrorism profoundly influences how we respond to it’. Yet she adds another reason in favour of the definition – its relevance for theory and research: ‘The definition inevitably determines the kind of data we collect and analyze, which in turn influences our understanding of trends and our predictions about the future’ (1999: 12). The same argument is presented by Schmid, who speaks of the universalist definition as a prerequisite of a ‘responsible theory’ (2006: 3). Such arguments may be radicalized: arbitrariness in definitions as points of departure for research perhaps not only influences academics’ results and hinders their comparability, but it also generates a sense of uncertainty that the participants in the discourse talk about, indeed, the same phenomenon at any given point of time, which limits their potential for cooperation. Uniformly defining terrorism in the academia thus seems relevant both in theoretical and practical terms. From the theoretical point of view, such clarification would provide a paradigmatic stable point of departure for the research on terrorism – instead of the current state of confusion where results of individual researchers and teams can be compared or complement each other only to a limited extent. From the practical point of view, it would contribute to mitigating the ambiguities associated with the term that invite abuse.

AFF – Hardline Response Good

Letting radical Islam fester is what created terrorist problems – setting a violent precedent undermines terrorism

Hanson 4 (Victor Davis, historian @ Stanford, City Journal Spring 2004, http://www.city-journal.org/html/14\_2\_the\_fruits.html) JPG

What went wrong with the West—and with the United States in particular—when not just the classical but especially the recent antecedents to September 11, from the Iranian hostage-taking to the attack on the USS Cole, were so clear? Though Americans in an election year, legitimately concerned about our war dead, may now be divided over the Iraqi occupation, polls nevertheless show a surprising consensus that the many precursors to the World Trade Center and Pentagon bombings were acts of war, not police matters. Roll the tape backward from the USS Cole in 2000, through the bombing of the Khobar Towers and the U.S. embassies in East Africa in 1998, the first World Trade Center bombing in 1993, the destruction of the American embassy and annex in Beirut in 1983, the mass murder of 241 U.S. Marine peacekeepers asleep in their Lebanese barracks that same year, and assorted kidnappings and gruesome murders of American citizens and diplomats (including TWA Flight 800, Pan Am 103, William R. Higgins, Leon Klinghoffer, Robert Dean Stethem, and CIA operative William Francis Buckley), until we arrive at the Iranian hostage-taking of November 1979: that debacle is where we first saw the strange brew of Islamic fascism, autocracy, and Middle East state terrorism—and failed to grasp its menace, condemn it, and go to war against it. That lapse, worth meditating upon in this 25th anniversary year of Khomeinism, then set the precedent that such aggression against the United States was better adjudicated as a matter of law than settled by war. Criminals were to be understood, not punished; and we, not our enemies, were at fault for our past behavior. Whether Carter’s impotence sprang from his deep-seated moral distrust of using American power unilaterally or from real remorse over past American actions in the cold war or even from his innate pessimism about the military capability of the United States mattered little to the hostage takers in Teheran, who for some 444 days humiliated the United States through a variety of public demands for changes in U.S. foreign policy, the return of the exiled Shah, and reparations. But if we know how we failed to respond in the last three decades, do we yet grasp why we were so afraid to act decisively at these earlier junctures, which might have stopped the chain of events that would lead to the al-Qaida terrorist acts of September 11? Our failure was never due to a lack of the necessary wealth or military resources, but rather to a deeply ingrained assumption that we should not retaliate—a hesitancy al-Qaida perceives and plays upon.

AFF – Hardline Response Good

Military responses solve terrorism by ending their operational capacity

Byman 5 (Daniel L., Sen. Fellow in Foreign Policy @ Saban Center, 4/15/5,

http://www.brookings.edu/events/2005/0415terrorism.aspx) JPG

Nevertheless, Dr. Ganor suggested that it was worth pondering whether the Boomerang Effect really exists. The "pro" side points to such incidents as the wave of Hamas bombings that occurred in Israel after the 1996 assassination of Hamas' chief bomb maker, Yehia Ayash (known as "the Engineer"), which was widely attributed to Israel. For these analysts, the determining factor of terrorism is motivation. Specifically, a terrorist group will launch an attack in response to a specific event. However, other analysts argue that terrorist groups do not base their attacks on motivational factors but conduct attacks when they have the opportunity to do so—thus for them, only capability really matters. Although the terrorist groups may claim their attacks are in response to specific counterterrorism measures, they likely would have occurred regardless. These analysts point to the absence of any increase in terrorist attacks following Israel's targeted killing of Hamas leader, Sheik Ahmed Yassin in 2004. If motivation was the source of terrorism, one would think the killing of Yassin would generate high levels of attacks. Therefore, the fact that attacks did not occur seems to suggest that the operational capability of the terrorist group was severely damaged. Dr. Ganor argued that effective counterterrorism policies are those that, on a case by case basis, account for the determining factor of terrorism—whether it be motivation or operational capacity. If the key factor is operational capability, then counterterrorism policies should heavily favor military strikes. If the key factor is motivation, then counterterrorism policies should refrain from aggressive military strikes. Dr. Ganor then indicated his belief that Hezbollah's activity is dependent on motivation whereas Hamas, Islamic Jihad, and Islamic Jihad are driven by their respective operational capabilities.

Harsh rhetoric solves the impact of the kritik

Riley 1 (Denise, Professor of English & American Studies @ U of East Anglia, Diacritics, Vol. 31, No. 4 (Winter, 2001), pp. 41-53, JStor) JPG

This sonorousness of vindictive words might help to characterize how, say, racist speech works on and in its targets. But doesn't such speculation also risk becoming an advocacy for the cultivation of insensitivity on the part of those liable to get hurt-or worse, a criticism of their linguistic vulnerability: "They just shouldn't be so linguistically sensitive"? There's much to be said for studiously practicing indifference. But the old playground chant of "sticks and stones may break my bones, but words can never hurt me" was always notoriously untrue. The success of the tactics of indifference will also depend on the vicissitudes of the words' fate in the world, which is beyond my control. I change, too. As the terrain upon which malevolent accusation falls, I am malleable, while the harsh words themselves under go their own alterations across time, and so their import for me weakens or intensifies accordingly. At times the impact of violent speech may even be recuperable through its own incantation; the repetition of abusive language may be occasionally "redemptive" through the irony of iteration, which may drain the venom out of the original insult and neutralize it by displaying its idiocy. Yet angry interpellation's very failure to always work as intended (since at particular historical moments, I may be able to parody, to weaken by adopting, to corrode its aim), is alsoexactlywhat,atothertimes,worksforit.Inanyevent,interpellationoperateswith a deep indifference as to where the side of the good may lie, and we can't realistically build an optimistic theory of the eventual recuperability of harm. Here there's no guaranteed rationality, nor any inescapable irrationality Repetition breeds its own confident mishearing, but its volatile alterations lean towards neither automatic amelioration nor inevitable worsening.

AFF – Hardlined Response Good

Not challenging terrorism is seen as appeasement – signals tolerance to violent action

Hanson 4 (Victor Davis, historian @ Stanford, City Journal Spring 2004, http://www.city-journal.org/html/14\_2\_the\_fruits.html) JPG

Even when Middle Easterners regularly blew us up, the Clinton administration, unwilling to challenge the new myth of Muslim victimhood, transformed Middle Eastern terrorists bent on destroying America into wayward individual criminals who did not spring from a pathological culture. Thus, Clinton treated the first World Trade Center bombing as only a criminal justice matter—which of course allowed the United States to avoid confronting the issue and taking on the messy and increasingly unpopular business the Bush administration has been engaged in since September 11. Clinton dispatched FBI agents, not soldiers, to Yemen and Saudi Arabia after the attacks on the USS Cole and the Khobar Towers. Yasser Arafat, responsible in the 1970s for the murder of a U.S. diplomat in the Sudan, turned out to be the most frequent foreign visitor to the Clinton Oval Office. If the Clintonian brand of appeasement reflected both a deep-seated tolerance for Middle Eastern extremism and a reluctance to wake comfortable Americans up to the danger of a looming war, he was not the only one naive about the threat of Islamic fascism. Especially culpable was the Democratic Party at large, whose post-Vietnam foreign policy could not sanction the use of American armed force to protect national interests but only to accomplish purely humanitarian ends as in the interventions in Haiti, Somalia, and Bosnia. Indeed, the recent Democratic primaries reveal just how far this disturbing trend has evolved: the foreign-policy positions of John Kerry and Howard Dean on Iraq and the Middle East were far closer to those of extremists like Al Sharpton and Dennis Kucinich than to current American policy under George W. Bush. Indeed, buffoons or conspiracy theorists like Noam Chomsky, Michael Moore, and Al Franken often turned up on the same stage as would-be presidents. When Moore, while endorsing Wesley Clark, called an American president at a time of war a “deserter,” when the mendacious Sharpton lectured his smiling fellow candidates on the Bush administration’s “lies” about Iraq, and when Al Gore labeled the president’s action in Iraq a “betrayal” of America, the surrender of the mainstream Democrats to the sirens of extremism was complete. Again, past decorum and moderation go out the window when the pretext is saving indigenous peoples from American oppression. The consensus for appeasement that led to September 11, albeit suppressed for nearly two years by outrage over the murder of 3,000, has reemerged in criticism over the ongoing reconstruction of Iraq and George Bush’s prosecution of the War on Terror.

AFF – AT: Turns the Case

Without a hardline response, terrorism will breed more terrorism

Dershowitz 6 (Alan, prof of Law @ Harvard, 1/16/6, http://www.boston.com/news/globe/editorial\_opinion/oped/articles/2006/01/16/terrorism\_confusing\_cause\_effect/) JPG

WHATEVER ANYONE might think of the artistic merits of Steven Spielberg's new film ''Munich," no one should expect an accurate portrayal of historical events. ''Munich" portrays a squad of Mossad agents, led by a fictional character named Avner Kauffman, tracking down and killing the Black September terrorists who had perpetrated the massacre of Israeli athletes at the 1972 Olympics. As the movie progresses, Avner becomes increasingly disillusioned with his mission. His chief concern is that counterterrorism only incites more terrorism, which in turn provokes reprisals. The last shot in the movie rests on the World Trade Center, suggesting a connection between the Middle East's ''cycle of violence" and the Sept. 11 attacks. Deepak Chopra wrote that the movie ''draws a trail that leads directly to the attacks of 9/11." The trouble with this ''cycle of violence" perspective is that it confuses cause and effect. The period immediately preceding Munich was plagued by airline terrorism, including the blowing up of a Swiss airliner that killed all 47 passengers and crew, and dozens of deadly hijackings. Palestinian hijackings were successful because even when the hijackers were captured, they were quickly released as soon as Palestinian terrorists hijacked another airplane. This long pattern of high-publicity, low-risk hijackings is what encouraged Black September to up the ante by infiltrating the Olympic Village in Munich. As I wrote in my book ''Why Terrorism Works," ''Based on the reaction to international terrorism over the previous four years, the terrorists planning the Munich operation could expect to succeed in attracting the world's attention and be relatively certain that if any of the terrorists were captured, they would not be held for long." In short: Terrorism works because it is successful, and success begets repetition.

1. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)