## 2AC

### 2AC – CTP

#### The personal is political

Colebrook, 2 (Claire Colebrook; Understanding Deleuze, Pg. xxxviii)

Human freedom became *the* problem. If human beings are free, does this mean that there is some ultimate ‘man’ who can be liberated from the forces of production; or does radical freedom mean that there is no longer any human essence to which politics can appeal? All this came to a head in the student sit-ins and disruptions of 1968. There were protests throughout Europe in the late 1960s which were random, unthought out, and motivated not by the economically defined class of workers so much as by students and intellectuals. In the aftermath of these disruptions it was realised that politics was no longer the affair of economic classes and large or ‘molar’ groupings. **Local disruptions** at the level of knowledge, ideas and identity could **transform the political terrain.** Deleuze and others opened the politics of the virtual: it was no longer accepted that actual material reality, such as the economy, produced ideas. Many insisted that the virtual (images, desires, concepts) was directly productive of social reality. This overturned the simple idea of ideology, the idea that images and beliefs were produced by the governing classes to deceive us about our real social conditions. We have to do away with the idea that there is some ultimate political reality or actuality which lies behind all our images. Images are not just surface effects of some underlying economic cause; images and the virtual have their own autonomous power. This is where structuralism and post-1968 politics intersected. We need to see our languages and systems of representation not just as masks or signs of the actual, but as fully real powers in their own right. The way we think, speak, desire and see the world is itself political; it produces relations, effects, and organises our bodies.

#### Already ceded

Neocleous 8Mark Neocleous, Prof. of Government @ Brunel, *Critique of Security*

Eliding the distinction between military practice and the everyday political administration of civil society thereby helps in ‘securing’ a general willingness among the citizenry to submit to wartime discipline and emergency powers on a permanent basis. It is this project of total war, total security and permanent emergency that requires the constant reiteration of the existence of fear and danger. Key ﬁgures in the national security state such as Nitze and Acheson came to use the various drafts of NSC documents, and especially NSC-68, to simultaneously promote more aggressive foreign policies and to frighten Americans into supporting those policies.35 By 1949 one Cold Warrior could openly employ a Kierke gaardian frame and state that the ‘reign of insecurity’ means that ‘anxiety is the ofﬁcial emotion of our time’.36 This anxiety permeated all the way through the national security state in the early Cold War and after. From panic over the Soviet Union to concern over the‘loss’ of China all the way down to‘the posture of the world’s most powerful state in the 1980s, a sumo wrestler, as it were, perched on a chair at the sight of a socialist Nicaraguan mouse appearing “on its doorstep” (which is to say, approximately the distance which separates London from Albania)’,37 the national security state has constantly exhibited one insecurity, fear or anxiety after another, turning the entire social symbolic system surrounding national security into the alter image of a collectively anticipated spectacle of disaster.38 In peddling the fear of disintegration and crisis, the ideology of security is the paranoid style in politics writ large. Writing about this paranoid style, both Richard Hofstadter and E. H. Gombrich have noted that unlike the clinically paranoid person who sees the hostile and conspiratorial world in which he is living as directed against him, the spokespersons of the paranoid style ﬁnd it directed against a nation, a culture, a way of life. In its most abstract mode this style involves the constant scanning of the social and political environment for signs conﬁrming the wicked threat, and involves imaginative leaps conjuring up a vast and sinister conspiracy, a huge and hidden machinery of inﬂuence set in motion to undermine and destroy a way of life. The style also tends to be convinced that the nation is infused with a terror network of enemy agents taking over the institutions of civil society in a concerted effort to paralyse the resistance of loyal citizens.39 If we see in paranoia a type of investment of a social formation, as Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari suggest, then one can read a politics structured around security as deeply paranoid.40 I have shown elsewhere how this style also operates with the metaphor of disease, with the health of the body politic supposedly being ruined by the ‘disease’ of communism: ‘world communism is like a malignant parasite’, says Kennan, ‘which feeds only on diseased tissue’ while the Soviet Union ‘bear[s] within itself germs of creeping disease’.41 We might add here that such disease is also a form of dis-ease – a profound insecurity about the state, its mode of accumulation, and its place in world order. The ideology of national security is in this sense both hypochondriac and paranoid. In both hypochondria and paranoia, perception is as important as reality. John Lewis Gaddis notes that by around 1950 key ﬁgures in the US were coming to the view that because insecurity could manifest itself in psychological as well as physical terms it could have a wide and indeterminate range of sources, and the implications of this were startling: ‘world order, and with it American security, had come to depend as much on perceptions of the balance of power as on what that balance actually was’. This was not just a question of the perceptions of statesmen and generals: ‘they reﬂected as well mass opinion, foreign as well as domestic, informed as well as uninformed, rational as well as irrational.’42 The Cold War, as an ‘imaginary war’43 was to therefore be a war of the imagination. To win this war meant disciplining (and, as we shall shortly see, punishing) the imagination, a process which centred on the constant reiteration of national (in)security. Indeed, one might say that if we are talking about the human imagination and its fears, then there is nothing that might not be transformed into a ‘clear and present danger’, and thus nothing that might escape becoming a security issue. The national security state would simultaneously be the national insecurity state – permanently. At ﬁrst sight such a reading might appear to suggest a problem for states: after all, surely anxiety, fear and insecurity are bad? But for the party of order and security, disorder and insecurity always have their uses. If, as Kennan once put it, ‘complete security . . . will never be achieved’,44 and if insecurity is driven by myriad fears, myths and purported dangers, then what better way to develop and embellish the national security state, and to justify the constant re-ordering of domestic civil society and international order, than to encouragethose very fears and insecurities in the ﬁrst place? As one of the major supporters and prime movers behind the Marshall Plan, Senator Vandenberg, put it, the administration really had to ‘scare hell out of the American people’.45 The manipulation of insecurity thus becomes a primary stake in the struggle for power and the exercise of domination. This is foreign policy as a discourse of danger and an evangelism of fear.46 The real danger is then less the feeling of insecurity and much more that the people might not be sufﬁciently afraid. This is perhaps partly what the authors of NSC-68 meant when they stated that even if there were no Soviet threat, the same policy would probably be pursued. In this sense the Cold War might be read as a mutually agreeable explanation for the constant reiteration of the need for security and the permanent ‘improvement’ of the security apparatus – on both sides. As Diana Johnstone and Ben Cramer put it writing about the more than 1,200 US bases in Europe throughout the Cold War,‘if the danger [of Soviet invasion] never really existed, then it can be argued that a primary mission of U.S. forces in Europe in reality has been to maintainthe Soviet threat . . . The Soviet and U.S “threats” maintained each other, and thus their double military hegemony over the European continent’.47This might also explain why the US spent a large proportion of the Cold War literally feeding its enemy, being one of the largest suppliers of wheat and coarse grains and other imports, as well as various loans and credits to Eastern European satellites. It would almost seem as if it the US needed the Soviet Union’s continued existence as tangible explanation for the anxiety it claimed to experience and as justiﬁcation for the national security state and the proliferation of one ‘security measure’ after another.48 And if it were to disappear then a replacement would have to be found: one must never allow the system to‘run out of demons’.49 Writing in 1953, after having lived through some of these key political developments in the US and having been engaged in debating with fascist political and legal theorists in Germany, Franz Neumann commented that the integrating element of liberal democ racy purports to be a moral one, whether it be freedom or justice. ‘But there is opposed to this a second integrating principle of a political system: fear of an enemy’. Such fear, he notes, is a key feature of fascist political thought, which ‘asserts that the creation of a national com munity is conditioned by the existence of an enemy whom one must be willing to exterminate physically’. His reference here is to Carl Schmitt’s Concept of the Political, in which Schmitt asserts that ‘the speciﬁc political distinction to which political actions and motives can be reduced is that between friend and enemy’, a distinction which ‘denotes the utmost intensity of a union or separation, of an asso ciation or dissociation’ and which receives its real meaning by opening up the possibility of war and death.50 Neumann comments that when the concepts of ‘enemy’ and ‘fear’ come to constitute the energetic principles of politics, democracy becomes impossible and the system is ripe for dictatorship. We might add that this strategic deployment of fear is fundamental to the ideology of security. To help shape this fear and its deployment, the security state employed a rhetorical strategy focused on the moral ﬁbre and identity of the American people.51 NSC-68 presented a more or less standard version of American exceptionalism rooted in the unquestioned virtues of the American way of life. The opening sections of the topsecret national security memorandum in particular go to some lengths to outline and elaborate the key differences between‘the fundamental purpose of the US’, namely freedom, and‘the fundamental design of the Kremlin’, namely slavery. The idea of‘freedom’ was reiterated via one of the standard tropes in nationalist discourse, namely by invoking the bonds of community between the living and the dead embodied in the authority of the Constitution, thereby situating the national security state in the context of a long American tradition.52 The assertion of this identity was consciously linked to the authori tative texts that were/are invoked in US political discourse to silence dissent and to continually reafﬁrm the benevolence of the American idea of freedom. NSC-68 and related national security documents from the period are replete with references to the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, The Federalist, God-given rights,53 and the historical duties of America. Just as Roosevelt in the mid-1930s had argued that the freedoms Americans so cherished required the kind of social security he was planning to offer, so now national security was to be thought of in the same terms. This (re-)imagined community of America was then used to distinguish ‘American identity’ from the ‘other’ – between ‘us’ and ‘them’; ‘good’ versus ‘evil’; the US as a ‘country’ compared to the USSR as a ‘fortress’; the ‘marvelous diversity, deep tolerance and lawfulness of the free society’ compared to the ‘slave state’; and so on – in a prime expression of the ways in which the politics of security is inextricably bound up with the technologies of cultural difference and an exemplary case of identity as a strategy of containment. This American identity was seen as an outcome of the exceptional and consensual nature of American history, which had to be re-imagined in such a way that obfuscated its former reliance on the slave trade, its relationship with Nazi Germany, its early positive relationship with the Soviet regime and its willing ness to happily agree with the Soviet leadership at Yalta in 1945 about how to divide Europe and share the spoils in East Asia. In an exem plary instance of history as ideology, American political and cultural ‘tradition’ would thereby be placed in a different moral universe from the‘slavery’ of the Communist system.54

### 2AC – Commodification

#### Even if they win a link argument, some level of speaking for Others is inevitable and can be productive – the affirmative is a prerequisite to hearing the voice of the marginalized

Marino 2k5(Lauren Marino, Macalester Department of Philosophy; “Speaking for Others,” Macalester Journal of Philosophy: Vol. 14: Iss. 1, Article 4)

If the self is located within language games the there is a commonality between those who share language games. This removes some of the barriers between selves and I do have access to the experience of those with whom I share language games. Sharing language games means sharing experience. I am able to speak for those who language games I play. There are some problems with this understanding. Alcoff thinks membership in a group is not precise or determinate. It is unclear which groups I could belong to and which of those groups I should single out to affiliate myself. More importantly, membership in a group doesn’t necessarily mean an authority to speak for the whole group. However, if we accept that the self is constituted within language, then those who share language games with me have direct access to my experience in away that no one can ever have access to a Cartesian mind. We do not need to ask for absolute identity, language and experience between speakers but just a commonality. Furthermore, Bernstein argues that we cannot speak without speaking for other people. 6 The speaker’s location is necessarily a location in relation to other people. The relationship cannot be removed, and we cannot avoid it. Speaking at all makes speaking for others inevitable. We return to the intuitive response to the struggle of oppressed groups: have the group speak for itself. Speaking becomes a type of agency in which I construct myself because contrary to a Cartesian self, selves do not exist prior to or separate from language. To lose my speech is to lose myself. The oppressed have the ability to communicate with each other and through their language game they are able to discuss their struggle with one another. Sharing languages games enables the oppressed to a specific, limited dimension of power. Their language game will always fail to communicate their struggle to those who have not been initiated into it. They have direct access to the experience of oppression and their agency, but they can only reach their own group. Those on the margin cannot reach those in the center. On the other hand, those in the center, the elites, share a language that can reach the majority of society. It is a language game they are familiar with and can use adeptly. However, they do not have the experience with or access to the language game of the oppressed. They have the power to use their language but nothing to say. The catch-22 is the choice between a group who embodies the agency and the dimensions of political struggle against oppression without a way to communicate it to the larger community, and a group with the language to reach society but is ignorant of the political struggle. There lies a need for a synergy between the experience of the oppressed on the margins and the language game of those in the center. The synergy requires a speaker who comes from the oppressed but has knowledge of the language game of the center. Such a person could incorporate the experience of the oppressed into a new language game that could be accessed by those in power. The concern is what is lost and sacrificed in translation. If the language games are so disparate that initiation in one, offers no insight into the rules of the other, than there is doubt that translation can be done at all. If translation cannot be done, the best to be hoped for is cooption forcing the margins into the mainstream.

### 2AC – Schmitt

#### Western politics is not built on friend/enemy but rather bare life/political existence

Agamben 98 – professor of philosophy at university of Verona (Giorgio, Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life, pg. 8, gendered language under erasure)

The question “In what way does the living being have lan­guage?” corresponds exactly to the question “In what way does bare life dwell in the polis?*”* The living being has *logos* by taking away and conserving its own voice in it, even as it dwells in the *polis* by letting its own bare life be excluded, as an exception, within it. Politics therefore appears as the truly fundamental structure of Western metaphysics insofar as it occupies the threshold on which the relation between the living being and the logos is realized. In the “politicization” of bare life—the metaphysical task par excellence— the humanity of living man is decided. In assuming this task, modernity does nothing other than declare its own faithfulness to the essential structure of the metaphysical tradition. The funda­mental categorial pair of Western politics is not that of friend/enemy but that of bare life/political existence, zoe/ bios, exclu­sion/inclusion. There is politics because man is the living being who, in language, separates and opposes himself to his own bare life and, at the same time, maintains himself in relation to that bare life in an inclusive exclusion.

#### The alternative is the state of exception – makes the aff’s impacts inevitable

Boersma, 5(Jess Boersma teaches courses in Peninsular literatures, critical thought, and Spanish language at U of NC, “What About Schmitt? Translating Carl: Schmitt’s Theory of Sovereignty as Literary Concept”, published in *Discourse*, 27.2&3, Spring & Fall 2005, pp. 215-227 (Article), accessed 7/16/13, projectMUSE)

It would be too hasty to conclude that Schmitt’s current critical standing indicates any kind of resolution of the polemics between left and right regarding the legacy of his legal thought and his political association with the Nazi party. It almost goes without saying that the extreme right has taken pains to revive the friend-enemy distinction, developed in Schmitt’s The Concept of the Political and, in many cases, has reduced it further to a friend-foe distinction in order to justify strategies of total war and cultural, religious, and ethnic cleansing.3 On the other side of the spectrum, Giorgio Agamben, in his Homo Sacer series argues that the possibly tyrannical consequences of Schmitt’s thinking on the friend-enemy distinction and the sovereign decision are not isolated to the followers of the ‘‘Crown Jurist of the Third Reich,’’ but rather are only too alive and well within the practices of present day liberal democratic states.4 Let me give one quick example of Agamben’s line of thought in the form of biopolitics and the sovereign decision. In Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life Agamben argues that the state of exception is fast becoming the rule, with the consequence that the state of nature and the state of law are nearly indistinguishable (38). Rather than a pure Hobbesian state of nature of all against all, the sovereign state maintains the monopoly over violence and yet the demand for obedience is no longer contingent upon the guarantee of protection. In Remnants of Auschwitz, the Nazi concentration camp is shown to be the end result of a legal process which produces a separation between the living being (zoe) and the speaking being (bios) with the aim ‘‘no longer to make die or to make live, but to survive’’ (155). Agamben then seeks to illustrate how states of exception have played out in American history by following the sovereign decisions of presidents Abraham Lincoln, Woodrow Wilson, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and George W. Bush. In the last case, he states that as a result of September 11 ‘‘Bush is attempting to produce a situation in which the emergency becomes the rule, and the very distinction between peace and war (and between foreign and civil war) becomes impossible’’ (State of Exception 22). Evidence for Agamben’s claims would appear to be provided externally by the suspended legal status of the Guanta´- namo prisoners; and internally by the recent ethical and legal battles over the coma case of Terri Schiavo (whose last name happens to mean slave in Italian), along with the present debates between the legislative and the executive branches in which Attorney General Alberto Gonzales has defended the constitutional legality of President Bush’s decision to not fully disclose matters regarding domestic spying.5

#### Schmitt’s politics lead to Nazism – don’t discard the obvious in favor of his apologists

Farr, 9

Evan, With Friends Like These...Carl Schmitt, Political Ontology, and National Socialism, PhD Student in Political Science, University of Virginia Graduate Student Conference, http://www.virginia.edu/politics/grad\_program/print/Farr\_gradconference09.pdf

3: Schmitt’s Nazism: Interlude or Inevitability? Carl Schmitt’s membership in the Nazi Party from 1933 to 1936 is the most obvious problem for his apologists, and it has spawned a thriving body of literature seeking to demonstrate that his involvement with the Third Reich was negligible.49 According to his defenders, if Schmitt was a Nazi he was only a Nazi of opportunity, stringing along the NSDAP leadership (especially Hermann Goering) in order to retain his academic posts. Like Heidegger or Pound, Schmitt is forgiven his transgression for the sake of ostensibly non-fascist work elsewhere. This section will argue that it is a **mistake to discount Schmitt’s Nazism** as an opportunistic interlude. Although he certainly did not share the millenarian, mystical mania marking the hardcore Nazi ideologues, the ontological commitments described in the foregoing section predisposed Schmitt to **sympathize with a totalitarian – and ultimately genocidal – regime**.

### 2AC – FW

#### Their complaint is with the form rather than the content of the 1AC – translating this complaint into a rule plays into sovereign hands which turns decisionmaking and guts education

Steele 10 – Associate Professor of Political Science at the University of Kansas

(Brent, Defacing Power: The Aesthetics of Insecurity in Global Politics pg 109-111, dml)

The rules of language and speaking can themselves **serve to conceal truth** in world politics. I begin here with the work of Nicholas Onuf (1989), which has inspired constructivists to engage how “language is a rule-governed activity” (Wilmer 2003: 221). Rules help construct patterns and structures of language exchanges, and “without these rules, language becomes meaningless” (Gould 2003: 61). From the work of Onuf, we recognize that rules **do more** than set appropriate boundaries for language, as the ¶ paradigm of political society is aptly named because it links irrevocably the sine qua non of society— the availability, no, the unavoidability of rules— and of politics— the persistence of asymmetric social relations, known otherwise as the condition of rule. (1989: 22) ¶ **Rules lead to rule**— what Onuf (1989) titles the “rule-rules coupling.” Thus, linguistic rules **demarcate relations of power** and serve to **perpetuate the asymmetry** of social relations. The structure of language games is valued because it provides order and continuity. But because those rules are obeyed so **frequently** and **effortlessly**, they are hard to recognize as forms of authority. ¶ Where does the need for such continuity arise? As mentioned in previous chapters, Giddensian sociology suggests that the drive for ontological security, for the securing of self-identity through time, can only be satisfied by the screening out of chaotic everyday events through routines, which are a “central element of the autonomy of the developing individual” (Giddens 1991: 40). Without routines, individuals face chaos, and what Giddens calls the “protective cocoon” of basic trust evaporates (ibid.). Yet, as I have discussed in my other work (2005, 2008a) and as Jennifer Mitzen notes (2006: 364), rigid routines can **constrain agents in their ability to** **learn new information**. This is what the rhythmic strata of aesthetic power satisfies. In the context it creates for parrhesia, these routines, connected to an agent’s sense of Self, **shield that agent from the truth**.4 “The shallowness of our routinized daily existence,” Weber once stated, “consists indeed in the fact that the persons who are caught up in it do not become aware, and above all **do not wish** to become aware, of this partly psychologically, part pragmatically conditioned motley of irreconcilably antagonistic values” (1974: 18). The need for such rhythmic continuity spans all social organizations, including scholarly communities (thus we refer to such communities as “disciplines”). ¶ The function of these rules creates a similar problematic faced by the parrhesiastes who is attempting to “**shock**” these structured rules and habits of the targeted agent. Because the parrhesiastes may find the linguistic rules or at least “styles” or language used by the targeted power to be part of the problem (the notion that one must be “tactful,” for instance), she or he must perform a balancing act between two goals. **First,** the parrhesiastes must **challenge the conventions** that serve to simplify and even conceal the truth the parrhesiastes is speaking. **Second,** the parrhesiastes **must observe** some of these speaking rules, part of which may themselves be responsible for or derivate toward the style of the Self that needs to be challenged by the parrhesiastes. Favoring the first, the parrhesiastes is prone to being ignored as irrational, as someone “on the fringe” or even unintelligible or, in the words of Harry Gould already noted, “meaningless.” Favoring the second moves the parrhesiastes away from the truth attempting to be told or at least obscures the truth with the language of nicety. As developed by Epicurean philosopher Philodemus, parrhesia existed within this spectrum: at times, it bordered on “harsh frankness” that was “not mixed with praise”; at other times, the frankness was more subdued (Glad 1996: 41). 5 As the examples of Cynic and academic-intellectual parrhesia provided later in this chapter illustrate, different manifestations of truth-telling as a form of counterpower occupy different spaces along this spectrum— balancing between abiding by these conventions of decorum and style; the need to provide forceful, decloaked truth; or, in the case of Cynic parrhesia, flauntingly contradicting the conventions altogether. ¶ The parrhesiastes will most likely face charges of the first order (ignoring convention) **regardless of the manner** in which parrhesia is delivered. If, indeed, “the truth hurts” and if the target of such truth cannot deny the facts being delivered, the **most convenient option** for the victim **is to blame** “**the way**” in which the parrhesiastes said something, knowing full well that it was **the substance** of what that person said that was, for the victim, inappropriate or, more to the point, inconvenient.

#### “Resolved” means to reduce through mental analysis

Random House Unabridged Dictionary, 6

(http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/resolved)

Resolve: 1.To come to a definite or earnest decision about; determine (to do something): I have resolved that I shall live to the full. 2.to separate into constituent or elementary parts; break up; cause or disintegrate (usually fol. by into). 3.to reduce or convert by, or as by, breaking up or disintegration (usually fol. by to or into). 4.to convert or transform by any process (often used reflexively). 5.to reduce by mental analysis (often fol. by into).

### AT: Decisionmaking

#### Their claims about portable skills rely on an understanding of education which frames subjects as units of rationality to be bettered through civilizing practices. This form of dispassionate subject construction eliminates care and dooms millions to suffering and death.

**Mourad, 1**

/Roger Jr., Director of Institutional Research at Washtenaw College and teaches at the University of Michigan. His academic credentials include a Ph.D. in Higher Education, M.A. in Philosophy of Education, and J.D. in Law, all from the University of Michigan. He is the author of *Postmodern Philosophical Critique and the Pursuit of Knowledge in Higher Education* ~Westport: Greenwood, 1997! and several recent journal publications on epistemological, ethical, and legal issues pertaining to the nature and structure of institutionally organized education and its relation to the social good, “Education After Foucault: The Question of Civility” *Teachers College Record Volume* 103, Number 5, October 2001, pp. 739–759/

EDUCATION FOR IMPROVEMENT, OR “KICKING THE DOG” Too many lost names too many rules to the game Better find a focus or you’re out of the picture.48 The idea that the fundamental issue of the just civil state is to find the right balance between preserving individual freedom and constraining individual threat has served as a tacit foundation within which belief and debate about educational philosophy, policy, and practice develop. This statement is not intended to suggest that there is some direct and specific historical connection that can be unequivocally demonstrated to exist between foundational political theory and mainstream educational theories and practices. However, I want to propose that there is a compatibility between them that has important consequences for a new critique of organized formal education. In the remainder of this paper, my aim is to argue that the tenor of the theories that I have summarized is endemic in the ordinary ways that we think about and engage in organized education. How is the idea of the basic human being that is posed as the fundamental social, political, and pedagogic problem for modern civilization, this human being that must be managed in order to keep it from harming itself and others, played out in educational presuppositions? The tacit, unchallenged belief is that through education, the human being must be made into something better than it was or would be absent a formal education. There are all kinds of versions of this subject and of what it should become: potential achiever, qualified professional, good citizen, “leader,” independent actor, critical thinker, change agent, knowledgeable person. In all cases, the subject before education is viewed to be, like the subject before civilization, something in need of being made competent—and safe—in the mind of the educator. From this vantage point, the pedagogic relationship between teacher and student, between competent adult and incompetent child ~or adult!, contains within it a possibility that it seeks to overcome, namely, a rejection of the socialization program of the former by the latter. There is an implicit conflict between individuals as soon as the student walks into the school or college classroom door from outside the civility that the teacher would have that student become. It must be resolved, or contained in some way; and this is done immediately by rendering the student a rule follower ~a follower of the social order!both in and out of the classroom. Or the student must be rendered a challenger of the social order, in favor of an order that overcomes oppression—to become a competent comrade. The individual must be taught how to be an individual in accordance with this balance. Being an individual means being “free”—it means being “self-determined,” it means competing, and it means obeying the law. This is the case, even if the teaching is done with kindness and sensitivity. The responsibility for dealing with suffering and limitation lies almost solely with this individual, not the state. In fact, if suffering is viewed at all, it tends to be viewed as something that is good for the individual to endure or to fight in order to overcome it. Limitation is not acknowledged, unless the individual is deemed disadvantaged in some way, and the remedy tends to be to provide the person with an opportunity to become competent. Is it any wonder that parents of children with disabilities, aided by many educators, often must fight for educational and other services? This situation simply reflects that the basic logic of organized formal education and, more generally, the state, is not predicated upon a recognition that the human being is susceptible to suffering or that the state’s reason for being should be to care for people. If caring for its inhabitants were the basic purpose of the civil state, then there would be no need to fight for this recognition. Is it any wonder that the education of the ordinary child is mainly training for a far-off, abstract future that is destined to be better than life at present? Why must school be about overcoming anything? We talk about equipping children and adults to “solve problems.” Yet, problems do not fall from the sky; they do not exist as such until a human being gives them a name. In contrast, the concept of contention suggests that the practical role of reason should be used to understand the human being as subject to suffering and to act accordingly as moral agents. That is very different from an educational philosophy, policy, and practice that views reason as an instrument by which to overcome obstacles and to conform to the social order. It may be argued that modern education is about reason, about how to think and live reasonably and, therefore, how to live well and to care for oneself and for others. Yet it is commonly expressed that we live in a “complex world” and that children and adults must “learn how to learn,” in order to “succeed in a world of rapid change.” The question that needs to be asked is: Why should a person have to? In effect, education expects the human being to have an unlimited ability to think and act with reason sufficient to cope with increasingly complex situations that require individual intellect to adequately recognize, evaluate, and prioritize alternative courses of action, consider their consequences, and make good decisions. For the most part, the increasing complexity of civil society and the multiplicity of factors that intellect is expected to deal with in different situations are not questioned in education. Is this what education is rightly about? Education is as much about the use of intelligence to avoid suffering and feelings of limitation and about fending off feelings of fear as it is about learning. It is about acting upon other people and upon the civil order to deal with perceived threats. One must be an “active learner” or else. Why? The individual must be acted upon and rendered into an entity that engages reality in the ways that are deemed just by many educators, lawmakers, and others with a stake in the perpetuation of the given social order. Thus, the individual is exhorted to “do your best,” “make an effort,” “earn a grade,” “be motivated,” “work hard,” “overcome obstacles,” “achieve.” Why should education be about any of these things? Unfortunately, the culture of scholarship is thoroughly consistent with these precepts. When we question them, we challenge the ends that they serve but not the ideas themselves. We believe that education is rightly about improvement. This philosophy of improvement is not necessarily consistent with enhancement of living. It often has the opposite effect. How is this result justified? Certainly, it can feel good to accomplish something or to overcome obstacles. Does that mean that adversity should be a positive value of the civil state? The modern idea, beginning with Descartes and established through Lockean empiricism ~and made pedagogic by Rousseau’s Emile!, that anyone can be rational leads quickly to the idea that everyone is responsible for being wholly rational, as that word is understood according to the social order. The perpetuation of the given social order in education as elsewhere is about gaining advantage and retaining power. It is about cultural politics and about marginalization of various groups and about class and about socializing children to believe in capitalism as if it is a natural law. Yet under the analysis that I have made here, these major problems are symptoms of something more basic. The more basic problem that I have emphasized here is inextricable from the problem of the just civil state. It is about the intense pressures on people to think and act in ways that serve broader interests that are not at all concerned with their well-being in a variety of contexts including psychological, social, economic, political, and cultural. It is no answer to ground pedagogy in the notion of “building community.” The idea that something must be built implies that something must be made better in order for it to be tolerated. Moreover, “community” carries with it the prerequisite that one be made competent to be a member— again, the presumption that something must be done to the person to make it better in some way. I do not mean to say that educators have bad intent. I do mean that this ethos of betterment through competency will inevitably fail to fulfill the dreams of reformers and revolutionaries. It does not consider the human being as an entity to care for but rather as something to be equipped with skills and knowledge in order to improve itself. This failure is not only because there are millions of children and adults that live in poverty in the wealthiest countries in human history. It is because the state of mind that can tolerate such suffering is the same state that advances and maintains the ethos of civility as betterment, rather than civility as caring for people because they are subject to suffering. The alternative that I have only introduced in a very abbreviated way under the rubric that I called “contention” is intended to be pragmatic in the ways that Foucault and Richard Rorty are pragmatic in their respective approaches to the subject of the state.49 It is intended to address an unacceptable state of contemporary Western civilization, namely, its repetitive and even escalating incidence of disregard for suffering and harm in many forms, despite intellectual, social, medical, legal, educational, scientific, and technological “progress.” We have had two hundred years of modern educational principles, and two hundred years of profound suffering along with them. The problem of the individual calls for a new formulation and for a proper response—one that cares for the individual rather than makes it competent. The “modern project” of betterment through competency and opportunity must be challenged and replaced by an emotionally intelligent ethos that expressly and fundamentally acknowledges suffering and limitation in philosophy, policy, and practice.

#### Traditional conceptions of government fiat misrepresent the process of government decisionmaking, and are neither educational nor predictable

Claude 1988 (Inis, Professor of Government and Foreign Affairs, University of Virginia, States and the Global System, pages 18-20)

This view of the state as an institutional monolith is fostered by the notion of sovereignty, which calls up the image of the monarch, presiding over his kingdom. Sovereignty emphasizes the singularity of the state, its monopoly of authority, its unity of command and its capacity to speak with one voice. Thus, France wills, Iran demands, China intends, New Zealand promises and the Soviet Union insists. One all too easily conjures up the picture of a single-minded and purposeful state that decides exactly what it wants to achieve, adopts coherent policies intelligently adapted to its objectives, knows what it is doing, does what it intends and always has its act together. This view of the state is reinforced by political scientists’ emphasis upon the concept of *policy* and upon the thesis that governments derive policy from calculations of national interest. We thus take it for granted that states act internationally in accordance with rationally conceived and consciously constructed schemes of action, and we implicitly refuse to consider the possibility that alternatives to policy-directed behaviour may have importance–alternatives such as random, reactive, instinctual, habitual and conformist behaviour. Our rationalistic assumption that states do what they have planned to do tends to inhibit the discovery that states sometimes do what they feel compelled to do, or what they have the opportunity to do, or what they have usually done, or what other states are doing, or whatever the line of least resistance would seem to suggest. Academic preoccupation with the making of policy is accompanied by academic neglect of the execution of policy. We seem to assume that once the state has calculated its interest and contrived a policy to further that interest, the carrying out of policy is the virtually automatic result of the routine functioning of the bureaucratic mechanism of the state. I am inclined to call this the *Genesis* theory of public administration, taking as my text the passage: ‘And God said, Let there be light: and there was light’. I suspect that, in the realm of government, policy execution rarely follows so promptly and inexorably from policy statement. Alternatively, one may dub it the Pooh-Bah/Ko-Ko theory, honouring those denizens of William S. Gilbert’s Japan who took the position that when the Mikado ordered that something e done it was as good as done and might as well be declared to have been done. In the real world, that which a state decides to do is not as good as done; it may, in fact, never be done. And what states do, they may never have decided to do. Governments are not automatic machines, grinding out decisions and converting decisions into actions. They are agglomerations of human beings, like the rest of us inclined to be fallible, lazy, forgetful, indecisive, resistant to discipline and authority, and likely to fail to get the word or to heed it. As in other large organizations, left and right governmental hands are frequently ignorant of each other’s activities, official spokesmen contradict each other, ministries work at cross purposes, and the creaking machinery of government often gives the impression that no one is really in charge. I hope that no one will attribute my jaundiced view of government merely to the fact that I am an American–one, that is, whose personal experience is limited to a governmental system that is notoriously complex, disjointed, erratic, cumbersome and unpredictable. The United States does not, I suspect, have the least effective government or the most bumbling and incompetent bureaucracy in all the world. Here and there, now and then, governments do, of course perform prodigious feats of organization and administration: an extraordinary war effort, a flight to the moon, a successful hostage-rescue operation. More often, states have to make do with governments that are not notably clear about their purposes or coordinated and disciplined in their operations. This means that, in international relations, states are sometimes less dangerous, and sometimes less reliable, than one might think. Neither their threats nor their promises are to be taken with absolute seriousness. Above all, it means that we students of international politics must be cautious in attributing purposefulness and responsibility to governments. To say the that the United States was informed about an event is not to establish that the president acted in the light of that knowledge; he may never have heard about it. To say that a Soviet pilot shot down an airliner is not to prove that the Kremlin has adopted the policy of destroying all intruders into Soviet airspace; one wants to know how and by whom the decision to fire was made. To observe that the representative of Zimbabwe voted in favour of a particular resolution in the United Nations General Assembly is not necessarily to discover the nature of Zimbabwe’s policy on the affected matter; Zimbabwe may have no policy on that matter, and it may be that no one in the national capital has ever heard of the issue. We can hardly dispense with the convenient notion that Pakistan claims, Cuba promises, and Italy insists, and we cannot well abandon the formal position that governments speak for and act on behalf of their states, but it is essential that we bear constantly in mind the reality that governments are never fully in charge and never achieve the unity, purposefulness and discipline that theory attributes to them–and that they sometimes claim.

#### Switch-side debate creates worse decision making by lending credibility to Rightist fascism

Kahn, 10 (Richard Kahn, Assistant Professor of Educational Foundations and Research at the University of North Dakota, Critical Pedagogy, Ecoliteracy, and Planetary Crisis: The Ecopedagogy Movement, 2010, pp. 9-11)

Worse still, though, is that here environmental literacy has not only been co-opted by corporate state forces and morphed into a progressively-styled, touchy-feely method for achieving higher scores on standardized tests like the ACT and SAT, but in an Orwellian turn it has come to stand in actuality for a real illiteracy about the nature of ecological catastrophe, its causes, and possible solutions. As I will argue in this book, our current course for social and environmental disaster (though highly complex and not easily boiled down to a few simple causes or strategies for action) must be traced to the evolution of: an anthropocentric worldview grounded in what the sociologist Patricia Hill Collins (1993) refers to as a matrix of domination (see chapter 1); a global technocapitalist infrastructure that relies upon market-based and functionalist versions of technoliteracy to instantiate and augment its socio- economic and cultural control (see chapters 2 and 3); an unsustainable, reductionistic, and antidemocratic model of institutional science (see chapter 4); and the wrongful marginalization and repression of pro-ecological resistance through the claim that it represents a “terrorist” force that is counter to the morals of a democratic society rooted in tolerance, educational change, and civic debate (see chapter 5). By contrast, the environmental literacy standards now showcased at places like the Zoo School as “Hall- marks of Quality” (Archie, 2003, p. 11) are those that consciously fail to develop the type of radical and partisan subjectivity in students, that might be capable of deconstructing their socially and environmentally deleterious hyper-individualism or their obviously socialized identities that tend toward 10 Critical Pedagogy, Ecoliteracy, and Planetary Crisis state-sanctioned norms of competition, hedonism, consumption, marketization, and forms of quasi-fascistic patriotism. Just as Stapp (1969) theorized environmental literacy as a form of political moderation that could pacify the types of civic upheaval, that occurred during the Civil Rights era, now too during the tendentious political atmosphere that has arisen as the legacy of the George W. Bush presidency, being environmentally literate quite suspiciously means learning how to turn the other cheek and listen to “both sides” of an issue—even when the issue is the unprecedented mass extinction of life taking place on the planet. In a manner that accords more with Fox News than Greenpeace, a leading environmental literacy pamphlet (Archie, 2003) emphasizes that “Teaching and learning about the environment can bring up controversies that must be handled in a fair and balanced manner in the classroom” (p. 11). Later in the document a teacher from Lincoln High School in Wisconsin is highlighted in order to provide expert advice in a similar fashion: “I’d say the most important aspect of teaching about the environment is to look at all aspects involved with an issue or problem. Teach from an unbiased position no matter how strong your ideas are about the topic. Let the kids make decisions for themselves” (p. 12), she implores. This opinion is mirrored by the Environmental Education Division of the Environmental Protection Agency (a federal office, created by the Bush administration, dedicated to furthering environmental literacy), which on its own website underscores as “Basic Information” that “Environmental education does not advocate a particular viewpoint or course of action. Rather, it is claimed that environmental education teaches individuals how to weigh various sides of an issue through critical thinking and it enhances their own problem-solving and decision-making skills.”10 Yet, this definition was authored by an administration trumping for a wider right-wing movement that attempts to use ideas of “fair and balanced” and “critical thinking” to occlude obvious social and ecological injustices, as well as the advantage it gains in either causing or sustaining them. This same logic defending the universal value of nonpartisan debate has been used for well over a decade by the right to prevent significant action on global warming. Despite overwhelming scientific acceptance of its existence and threat, as well as of its primarily anthropogenic cause, those on the right have routinely trotted out their own pseudo-science on global warming and thereby demanded that more research is necessary to help settle a debate on the issue that only they are interested in continuing to facilitate. Ecopedagogy: An Introduction 11 Likewise, within academic circles themselves, powerful conservatives like David Horowitz have the support of many in government who are seeking to target progressive scholars and viewpoints on university and college campuses as biased evidence of a leftist conspiracy at work in higher education (Nocella, Best & McLaren, Forthcoming). In order to combat such alleged bias, “academic freedom” is asserted as a goal in which “both sides” of academic issues must be represented in classrooms, departments, and educational events. The result of this form of repressive tolerance (see chapter 5) is simply to impede action on matters worth acting on and to gain further ideological space for right-wing, corporate and other conservative-value agendas.11 It is clear, then, that despite the effects and growth of environmental education over the last few decades, it is a field that is ripe for a radical reconstruction of its literacy agenda. Again, while something like environmental education (conceived broadly) should be commended for the role it has played in helping to articulate many of the dangers and pitfalls that modern life now affords, it is also clear that it has thus far inadequately surmised the larger structural challenges now at hand and has thus tended to intervene in a manner far too facile to demand or necessitate a rupture of the status quo. What has thereby resulted is a sort of crisis of environmental education generally and, as a result, the prevailing trends in the field have recently been widely critiqued by a number of theorists and educators who have sought to highlight their limitations.

### AT: Institutions

#### You should be an informed citizen, not the government – they shut down critical thinking and deliberation

Steele, 10 – Associate Professor of Political Science at the University of Kansas

(Brent, Defacing Power: The Aesthetics of Insecurity in Global Politics pg 130-132, dml) [gender/ableist language modified with brackets]

When facing these dire warnings regarding the manner in which academic-intellectuals are seduced by power, what prospects exist for parrhesia? How can academic-intellectuals speak “truth to power”? It should be noted, first, that the academic-intellectual’s **primary purpose** should not be to re-create a program to replace power or even to develop a “research program that could be employed by students of world politics,” as Robert Keohane (1989: 173) once advised the legions of the International Studies Association. Because academics are denied the “full truth” from the powerful, Foucault states, we must **avoid a trap** into which governments would want intellectuals to fall (and often they do): “**Put yourself in our place and tell us what you would do**.” This is **not a question** in which one has to answer. To make a decision on any matter requires a knowledge of the facts **refused us**, an analysis of the situation we aren’t allowed to make. There’s the trap. (2001: 453) 27 This means that any alternative order we might provide, this hypothetical “research program of our own,” will also become imbued with authority and **used for mechanisms of control**, a matter I return to in the concluding chapter of this book. When linked to a theme of counterpower, academic-intellectual parrhesia suggests, **instead**, that the academic should use his or her pulpit, their position in society, to be a “friend” “who **plays the role** of a parrhesiastes, of a truth-teller” (2001: 134). 28 When speaking of then-president Lyndon Johnson, Morgenthau gave a bit more dramatic and less amiable take that contained the same sense of urgency. **What the President needs**, then, is an intellectual ~~father~~-confessor, who dares to remind him[/her] of **the brittleness of power**, of its arrogance and ~~blindness~~ [ignorance], of its **limits** and **pitfalls**; who tells him[/her] how empires rise, decline and fall, how power turns to folly, empires to ashes. He[/she] ought to **listen to that voice** and **tremble**. (1970: 28) The primary purpose of the academic-intellectual is therefore not to just effect a moment of counterpower through parrhesia, let alone stimulate that heroic process whereby power realizes the error of its ways. So those who are skeptical that academics ever really, regarding the social sciences, make “that big of a difference” **are missing the point**. As we bear witness to what unfolds in front of us and collectively analyze the testimony of that which happened before us, the purpose of the academic is to “**tell the story**” of what actually happens, to document and faithfully capture both history’s events and context. “The intellectuals of America,” Morgenthau wrote, “can do only one thing: live by the standard of truth that is their peculiar responsibility as intellectuals and by which men of power will ultimately be judged as well” (1970: 28). This will take time, 29 but if this happens, if we seek to uncover and practice telling the truth free from the “**tact**,” “**rules**,” and **seduction** that constrain its telling, then, as Arendt notes, “humanly speaking, no more is required, and **no more can reasonably be asked**, for this planet to remain a place **fit for human habitation**” ([1964] 2006: 233).

### AT: Predictable Limits

#### [ ] Their insistence upon the truth of their framework is contrived and ignores the historical contingency of debate – we should embrace this contingency rather than closely guarding the borders of our activity

Johnston, 96 (Ian Johnston, Malaspina College; "There’s Nothing Nietzsche Couldn’t Teach Ya About the Raising of the Wrist,"http://www.mala.bc.ca/~~johnstoi/introser/nietzs.htm)

When Nietzsche looks at Europe historically what he sees is that different games have been going on like this for centuries. He further sees that many of the participants in any one game have been aggressively convinced that their game is the "true" game, that it corresponds with the essence of games or is a close match to the wider game they imagine going on in the natural world, in the wilderness beyond the playing fields. So they have spent a lot of time producing their rule books and coaches' manuals and making claims about how the principles of their game copy or reveal or approximate the laws of nature. This has promoted and still promotes a good deal of bad feeling and fierce arguments. Hence, in addition any one game itself, within the group pursuing it there have always been all sorts of sub-games debating the nature of the activity, refining the rules, arguing over the correct version of the rule book or about how to educate the referees and coaches, and so on. Nietzsche's first goal is to attack this dogmatic claim about the truth of the rules of any particular game. He does this, in part, by appealing to the tradition of historical scholarship which shows that these games are not eternally true, but have a history. Rugby began when a soccer player broke the rules and picked up the ball and ran with it. American football developed out of rugby and has changed and is still changing. Basketball had a precise origin which can be historically located. Rule books are written in languages which have a history by people with a deep psychological point to prove: the games are an unconscious expression of the particular desires of inventive games people at a very particular historical moment; these rule writers are called Plato, Augustine, Socrates, Kant, Schopenhauer, Descartes, Galileo, and so on. For various reasons they believe, or claim to believe, that the rules they come up with reveal something about the world beyond the playing field and are therefore "true" in a way that other rule books are not; they have, as it were, privileged access to reality and thus record, to use a favorite metaphor of Nietzsche's, the text of the wilderness. In attacking such claims, Nietzsche points out, the wilderness bears no relationship at all to any human invention like a rule book (he points out that nature is "wasteful beyond measure, without purposes and consideration, without mercy and justice, fertile and desolate and uncertain at the same time; imagine indifference itself as a power--how could you live according to this indifference. Living--is that not precisely wanting to be other than this nature" (Epigram 9). Because there is no connection with what nature truly is, such rule books are mere "foreground" pictures, fictions dreamed up, reinforced, altered, and discarded for contingent historical reasons. Moreover, the rule books often bear a suspicious resemblance to the rules of grammar of a culture (thus, for example, the notion of an ego as a thinking subject, Nietzsche points out, is closely tied to the rules of European languages which insist on a subject and verb construction as an essential part of any statement). So how do we know what we have is the truth? And why do we want the truth, anyway? People seem to need to believe that their games are true. But why? Might they not be better if they accepted that their games were false, were fictions, having nothing to do with the reality of nature beyond the recreational complex? If they understood the fact that everything they believe in has a history and that, as he says in the Genealogy of Morals, "only that which has no history can be defined," they would understand that all this proud history of searching for the truth is something quite different from what philosophers who have written rule books proclaim. Furthermore these historical changes and developments occur accidentally, for contingent reasons, and have nothing to do with the games, or any one game, shaping itself in accordance with any ultimate game or any given rule book of games given by the wilderness, which is indifferent to what is going on. And there is no basis for the belief that, if we look at the history of the development of these games, we discover some progressive evolution of games towards some higher type. We may be able, like Darwin, to trace historical genealogies, to construct a narrative, but that narrative does not reveal any clear direction or any final goal or any progressive development. The genealogy of games indicates that history is a record of contingent change. The assertion that there is such a thing as progress is simply one more game, one more rule added by inventive minds (who need to believe in progress); it bears no relationship to nature beyond the sports complex. Ditto for science. So long as one is playing on a team, one follows the rules and thus has a sense of what constitutes right and wrong or good and evil conduct in the game, and this awareness is shared by all those carrying out the same endeavour. To pick up the ball in soccer is evil (unless you are the goalie); and to punt the ball while running in American football is permissible but stupid; in Australian football both actions are essential and right. In other words, different cultural communities have different standards of right and wrong conduct. These are determined by the artificial inventions called rule books, one for each game. These rule books have developed the rules historically; thus, they have no permanent status and no claim to privileged access.