# Neoliberalism

## Framework

**Their vision of politics is grounded in nonrealistic impacts that prioritize discussions of things like nuclear war masking over the plight of structural violence in a way that fails to realize the thermonuclear war being pitted against the poor every single day.**

**Mumia Abu Jamal indicates –**

Mumia Abu-Jamal 1998[“A QUIET AND DEADLY VIOLENCE,” 9/19/98, <http://www.mumia.nl/TCCDMAJ/quietdv.htm>]
It has often been observed that **America is a truly violent nation**, as shown by the thousands of cases of social and communal violence that occurs daily in the nation. **Every year**, some **20,000 people are killed by others, and** additional **20,000** folks **kill themselves**. Add to this the non lethal violence that Americans daily inflict on each other, and we begin to see the tracings of a nation immersed in a fever of violence. But, as remarkable, and harrowing as this level and degree of violence is, it is, by far, not the most violent feature of living in the midst of the American empire. **We live**, equally immersed, and to a deeper degree, **in a nation that condones and ignores wide-ranging "structural" violence**, of a kind **that destroys human life with a breathtaking ruthlessness**. Former Massachusetts prison official and writer, Dr. James Gilligan observes; **“By structural violence' I mean the increased rates of death and disability suffered by those who occupy the bottom rungs of society**, as contrasted by those who are above them. Those excess deaths (or at least a demonstrably large proportion of them) are a function of the class structure; and that structure is itself a product of society's collective human choices, concerning how to distribute the collective wealth of the society. These are not acts of God. I am contrasting `structural' with `behavioral violence' by which I mean the non-natural deaths and injuries that are caused by specific behavioral actions of individuals against individuals, such as the deaths we attribute to homicide, suicide, soldiers in warfare, capital punishment, and so on." -- (Gilligan, J., MD, Violence: Reflections On a National Epidemic (New York: Vintage, 1996), 192.) **This form of violence**, not covered by any of the majoritarian, corporate, ruling-class protected media, **is invisible** to us **and because of its invisibility, all the more insidious.** How dangerous is it -- really? Gilligan notes: **"[E]very fifteen years**, on the average, **as many people die because of** relative **poverty as would be killed in a nuclear war** that caused 232 million deaths; **and every** single **year, two to three times as many people die from poverty throughout the world as were killed by the Nazi genocide** of the Jews over a six-year period. **This is**, in effect, **the equivalent of an ongoing,** unending, in fact **accelerating, thermonuclear war, or genocide on the weak and poor every year of every decade,** throughout the world." [Gillitgan, p. 196] Worse still, in a thoroughly capitalist society, much of **that violence became internalized**, turned back on the Self, **because, in a society based on the priority of wealth, those who own nothing are taught to loathe themselves, as if something is** inherently **wrong with themselves, instead of the social order** that promotes this self-loathing. **This** intense self-hatred was often **manifested in familial violence** as **when the husband beats the wife, the wife smacks the son,** and **the kids fight each other. This** vicious, **circular, and invisible violence**, unacknowledged by the corporate media, **uncriticized in** substandard **educational systems, and un- understood by the** very **folks who suffer in its grips, feeds on the** spectacular and **more common forms of violence** that **the system makes** damn sure -that we can recognize and must react to it. This fatal and systematic violence may be called The War on the Poor.It is found in every country, submerged beneath the sands of history, buried, yet ever present, as omnipotent as death. In the struggles over the commons in Europe, when the peasants struggled and lost their battles for their commonal lands (a precursor to similar struggles throughout Africa and the Americas), this violence was sanctified, by church and crown, as the 'Divine Right of Kings' to the spoils of class battle. Scholars Frances Fox-Piven and Richard A Cloward wrote, in The New Class War (Pantheon, 1982/1985): They did not lose because landowners were immune to burning and preaching and rioting. They lost because the usurpations of owners were regularly defended by the legal authority and the armed force of the state. It was the state that imposed increased taxes or enforced the payment of increased rents, and evicted or jailed those who could not pay the resulting debts. It was the state that made lawful the appropriation by landowners of the forests, streams, and commons, and imposed terrifying penalties on those who persisted in claiming the old rights to these resources. It was the state that freed serfs or emancipated sharecroppers only to leave them landless. (52) The "Law", then, was a tool of the powerful to protect their interests, then, as now. It was a weapon against the poor and impoverished, then, as now. It punished retail violence, while turning a blind eye to the wholesale violence daily done by their class masters. **The law** was, and **is,** a tool of state power, **utilized to protect the status quo, no matter how oppressive** that status was, or is. **Systems are** essentially **ways of doing things that have concretized into tradition,** and custom, **without regard to the rightness of those ways. No system that causes this kind of harm to people should be allowed to remain,** based solely upon its time in existence. Systems must serve life, or be discarded as a threat and a danger to life. **Such systems must pass away, so** that **their** great and terrible **violence passes away with them.**

#### Education not neutral

**Van Gorder 7**

Andrew Christian van Gorder, D.Phil., Queen’s College, Belfast Associate Professor of Religious Studies, World Religions Department of Religion, Baylor University “The Pedagogy of the Children of the Oppressors: Educating for Social Justice in the Context of North American Faith-Based Higher Education” Published in the Journal of Transformative Education, May 2007. Paper presented at the Spirituality, Pedagogy and Social Justice Conference, Calvin College, Grand Rapids, MI: September 22, 2005. Second version of paper presented at the Federal University of Bahia, October 19, 2006, Salvador, Bahia (http://www.calvin.edu/kuyers/files/confs/050922/vanGorder.pdf)

Freire maintained that all education comes from a specific point of view and is never neutral.26 The educator is both a politician and an artist who should guard against devolving into a “cold, neutral technician.”27 In terms of education, the orientating point of the powerful is to be “…against the poor… (which) is “the essence of oppression”28 expressed in a never-ending “desire for conquest”29 which expresses itself as “…changing the consciousness of the oppressed and not the situation which oppresses them.”30 This domination leads the vanquished to embrace an “…oppression-hosting conscience”31 where the world-view assumptions of the oppressor become “housed within”32 the victim’s own way of thinking. Education, in both content and delivery,33 become a vicious weapon whereby the subjugated learn to adapt to the world of their oppressor.34

# Security

## Framework

### Value to Life First

**A loss of value to life precedes all other impacts – death is preferable to a valueless life**

**Mitchell '05** [Andrew J. Mitchell, Post-Doctoral Fellow in the Humanities at Stanford University, "Heidegger and Terrorism," Research in Phenomenology, Volume 35, Number 1, 2005 , pp. 171-217]

**Devastation** (Verwistung) **is the process by which the world becomes a desert** (Wfiste), **a sandy expanse that seemingly extends without end**, without landmarks or direction, and is devoid of all life.20 If we follow the dialogue in thinking an ancient Greek notion of "life" as another name for "being," then **the lifeless desert is the being-less desert. The world that becomes a lifeless desert is consequently an unworld from which being has withdrawn**. The older prisoner makes this connection explicit, "The being of an age of devastation would then consist in the abandonment of being" (GA 77: 213). As we have seen, this is a process that befalls the world, slowly dissolving it of worldliness and rendering it an "unworld" (cf. GA 7: 88, 92f./EP, 104, 107f., etc.). Yet this unworld is not simply the opposite of world; it remains a world, but a world made desert. The desert is not the complete absence of world. Such an absence would not be reached by devastation (Verwisiung), but rather by annihilation (Vernichtung); and for Heidegger, **annihilation is far less of a concern than devastation**: "Devastation is more uncanny than mere annihilation [blofle Vernichtung]. **Mere annihilation sweeps aside all things including even nothingness, while devastation on the contrary orders and spreads everything that blocks and prevents**" (WHD, 11/29-30; tin). Annihilation as a thought of total absence is a thought from metaphysics. It is one with a thinking of pure presence: pure presence, pure absence, and. purely no contact between them. During another lecture course on H6lderlin, this time in 1942 on the hymn "The Ister," Heidegger claims that annihilation is precisely the agenda of America in regards to the "homeland," which is here equated with Europe: "We know today that the Anglo-Saxon world of Americanism has resolved to annihilate [zu vernichten] Europe, that is, the homeland, and that means: the inception of the Western world. The inceptual is indestructible [unzersto'rbar]" (GA 53: 68/54; tm). America is the agent of technological devastation, and it operates under the assumptions of presence and absence that it itself is so expert at dissembling. America resolves to annihilate and condemns itself to fdilure in so doing, for the origin is "indestructible." We could take this a step further and claim that only because the origin cannot be annihilated is it possible to destroy it. This possibility of destruction is its indestructible character. It can always be further destroyed, but you will never annihilate it. Americanism names the endeavor or resolution to drive the destruction of the world ever further into the unworld. America is the agent of a malevolent being. This same reasoning explains why the older man's original conception of evil had to be rethought**. Evil is the "devastation of the earth and the annihilation of the human essence that goes along with it"** (GA 77: 207), he said, but this annihilation is simply too easy, too much of an "Americanism." The human essence is not annihilated in evil-who could care about that? Instead it is destroyed and devastated by evil. **Devastation does not annihilate, but brings about something worse, the unworld. Without limit, the desert of the unworld spreads, ever worsening and incessantiy urging itself to new expressions of malevolence. Annihilation would bring respite and, in a perverse sense, relief**. There would be nothing left to protect and guard, nothing left to concern ourselves with-nothing left to terrorize. **Devastation is also irreparable; no salvation can arrive for it**. The younger man is able to voice the monstrous conclusion of this thinking of devastation: "Then malevolence, as which devastation occurs [sich ereignet], would indeed remain a -basic characteristic of being itself" (GA 77: 213, 215; em). The older man agrees, "being would be in the ground of its essence malevolent" (GA 77: 215). Being is not evil; it is something much worse; being is malevolent.

### AT - Consequentialism

**Calculative attempts to assign weight to and compare between alternatives destroys the essence of what these options were in the first place by viewing their meaning solely through their value and makings an authentic relationship impossible.**

**Haynes '08** [John D., Professorial Visiting Fellow School of Information Systems, Technology and Management University of New South Wales, “Calculative Thinking and Essential Thinking in Heidegger’s Phenomenology,” http://wwwdocs.fce.unsw.edu.au/sistm/staff/Heidegger\_calculation\_essential\_March08.pdf]

In Heidegger’s work “What is Metaphysics?” reprinted with an introduction by Heidegger himself in Kaufmann’s Existentialism – From Dostoevesky to Sartre (Kaufmann 1975), we find perhaps in all of Heidegger’s works the clearest rendition of Heidegger’s distinction between calculative thinking and essential thinking. Indeed Heidegger himself returns again and again to this work. Firstly, in relation to calculative thinking, Heidegger says (Kaufmann 1975, pp 261-2): All calculation makes the calculable “come out” in the sum so as to use the sum for the next count. **Nothing counts for calculation save for what can be calculated. Any particular thing is only what it “adds up to”, and any count ensures the further progress of counting. This process is continually using up numbers and is itself a continual self-consumption.** The “coming out” of the calculation with the help of what-is counts as the explanation of the latter’s Being. **Calculation uses every-thing that “is” as units of computation, in advance, and, in the computation, uses up its stock of units.** This consumption of what-is reveals the consuming nature of calculation. Only because number can be multiplied indefinitely ... **is it possible for the consuming nature of calculation to hide behind its “products” and give calculative thought the appearance of “productivity”.... Calculative thought places itself under compulsion to master everything in the logical terms of its procedure.** And of essential thinking, Heidegger says (Kaufmann 1975, pp 263-4): The thought of Being seeks no hold in what-is. Essential thinking looks for the slow signs of the incalculable and sees in this the unforeseeable coming of the ineluctable. Such thinking is mindful of the truth of Being and thus helps the Being of truth to make a place for itself in man’s history. This help effects no results because it has no need of effect. Essential thinking helps as the simple inwardness of existence, insofar as this inwardness, although unable to exercise such thinking or only having theoretical knowledge of it, kindles its own kind. In relation to calculative thinking, Heidegger makes it clear in a further passage (Kaufmann 1975, p 262) that this kind of thinking cannot comprehend itself. One gets a sense of this in view of the notion of calculative thought’s compulsion to master “everything in the logical terms of its procedure” at the tail end of the above quoted passage, but the following passage (Kaufmann 1975, p 262) makes it abundantly clear: It **[calculative thinking] has no notion that in calculation everything calculable is already a whole before it starts working out its sums and products, a whole whose unity naturally belongs to the incalculable which, with its mystery, ever eludes the clutches of calculation. That which,** however, **is always and everywhere closed at the outset to the demands of calculation and**, despite that, **is always closer to man in its enigmatic unknowableness than anything that ‘is’, than anything he may arrange and plan, this can sometimes put the essential man in touch with a thinking whose truth no “logic” can grasp.**

### Ontology First

**Your Framework is built upon fundamental ontological assumptions that our Kritik is designed to call into question. Ontology makes its way into every mode of thought. Everything the aff claims is based off their ontological pressumptions. Without first begging the ontological questions we are stuck in the mindset we originally had and cannot even think of change.**

**Dillon '99** [Michael, Prof. of Politics @ University of Lancaster, Moral Spaces, p. 97-98]

Heirs to all this, we find ourselves in the turbulent and now globalized wake of its confluence. As Heidegger-himself an especially revealing figure of the deep and mutual implication of the philosophical and the political4-never tired of pointing out, **the relevance of ontology to all other kinds of thinking is fundamental and inescapable.** For **one cannot say anything about anything that is, without always already having made assumptions about the is as such. Any mode of thought**, in short, always already **carries an ontology sequestered within it.** **What this ontological turn does** to other regional modes of thought **is** to **challenge the ontology within which they operate. The implications of that review reverberate throughout the entire mode of thought, demanding a reappraisal** as fundamental as the reappraisal ontology has demanded of philosophy. **With ontology at issue, the entire foundations or underpinnings of any mode of thought are rendered problematic.** This applies as much to any modern discipline of thought as it does to the question of modernity as such, with the exception, it seems, of science, which, having long ago given up the ontological questioning of when it called itself natural philosophy, appears now, in its industrialized and corporatized form, to be invulnerable to ontological perturbation. **With its foundations at issue, the very authority of a mode of thought and the ways in which it characterizes** the **critical issues of freedom and judgment (of what kind of universe human beings inhabit, how they inhabit it, and what counts as reliable knowledge for them in it**) **is** also **put in question**. The very ways in which Nietzsche, Heidegger, and other continental philosophers challenged Western **ontology**, simultaneously, therefore **reposed the fundamental and inescapable difficulty,** or aporia, **for human being of decision and judgment**. In other words, **whatever ontology you subscribe to, knowingly or unknowingly, as a human being you still have to act. Whether or not you know or acknowledge it, the ontology you subscribe to will construe the problem of action for you in one way rather than another**. You may think ontology is some arcane question of philosophy, but Nietzsche and Heidegger showed that **it intimately shapes not only a way of thinking, but a way of being**, **a form of life. Decision**, a fortiori political decision, in short, **is no mere technique. It is instead a way of being that bears an understanding of Being, and of the fundaments of the human way of being within it.** **This applies, indeed applies most, to those mock innocent political slaves who claim only to be technocrats of decision making.**