# Militarism

#### Debating about government policy towards Latin America and its relationship to specific policies is key to building an epistemic community that can educate the public and policymakers about the dangers of US Military expansion into the region--- this strategy has empirically generated substantive change

Blanke 10 – (Svenja, “Civic Foreign policy” Doctoral Thesis paper in the Department of History and Cultural Studies, Edited and verified by Prof. Dr. Knud Krakau and Prof. Dr. Willi-Paul Adams. Krakau”s quals: Masters in Public Administration at Harvard, Research assistant and Lecturer at the Institute for Foreign Policy / Research Centre for International Law and Comparative Public Law at the University of Hamburg, visiting professor in Political Science at the University of Trier, Professor of Modern History with special reference to North American History at the Free University of Berlin, Fellow in residence at the Smithsonian Institution in Washington, DC , was a Visiting Fellow at Stanford University.

Paul Adams is a specialist in politics and society of North America. He multiple PhDs and has been a professor at many universities such as the UChig, and worked at the John F. Kennedy Institute for North American Studies. The Organization of American Historians awards since 2003 every two years to Willi Paul Adams Award for the best book on American history, Available online @ http://www.diss.fu-berlin.de/diss/servlets/MCRFileNodeServlet/FUDISS\_derivate\_000000000975/1\_Kapitel1.PDF?hosts=)//ghs-mm

Conclusion: The Civic Factor in… increasingly interdependent ¶ world.

#### Extinction

Boggs 5 - (Carl, mil·i·ta·rism, n, A military state or condition; reliance on military force in administering government, Professor of Social Science at National University, Imperial Delusions p. xxi-xxv, Published 2005)//ghs-mm

The ceaseless global … out of control.

#### Militarism outweighs

Kirk 08 (Gwyn, Women for Genuine Security, “Gender and U.S. Bases in Asia-Pacific”, http://www.fpif.org/articles/gender\_and\_us\_bases\_in\_asia-pacific)//ghs-mm

Militarism is a … appropriating the masculinized role.

#### Public spheres of discussion like the debate space have empirically changed government policies related to Latin America. An example is the public debates over Latin America policies after Spains collapse of influence in the Americas that led to nation-building

Piccato 13 – (Pablo, “Public sphere in Latin America: A map of the historiography” Pablo Piccato, professor of History at Columbia University, specializes in Mexican history. He has worked on the political and cultural history of Mexico, and on the history of crime. He is currently working on an overview of crime in Mexico during the twentieth century. Director of the Institute of Latin American Studies, Associate at the Latin American Studies Association, member of the Council of Latin American History, PhD from UTA, MA from UTA, BA from Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Mexico City, Published 6/12/2013, Available online @ http://www.columbia.edu/~pp143/ps.pdf)//ghs-mm

16 Public sphere in Latin American … of¶ enlightened discussions.

#### The 1973 Chilean Human Rights Crisis was resolved by growing academic debates like the ones we are having here. It is the dissemination of information about USFG-Latin American policy that created the groups necessary to CHANGE government policy

Blanke 10 – (Svenja, “Civic Foreign policy” Doctoral Thesis paper in the Department of History and Cultural Studies, Edited and verified by Prof. Dr. Knud Krakau and Prof. Dr. Willi-Paul Adams. Krakau”s quals: Masters in Public Administration at Harvard, Research assistant and Lecturer at the Institute for Foreign Policy / Research Centre for International Law and Comparative Public Law at the University of Hamburg, visiting professor in Political Science at the University of Trier, Professor of Modern History with special reference to North American History at the Free University of Berlin, Fellow in residence at the Smithsonian Institution in Washington, DC , was a Visiting Fellow at Stanford University.

Paul Adams is a specialist in politics and society of North America. He multiple PhDs and has been a professor at many universities such as the UChig, and worked at the John F. Kennedy Institute for North American Studies. The Organization of American Historians awards since 2003 every two years to Willi Paul Adams Award for the best book on American history, Available online @ http://www.diss.fu-berlin.de/diss/servlets/MCRFileNodeServlet/FUDISS\_derivate\_000000000975/1\_Kapitel1.PDF?hosts=)//ghs-mm

3.1.2 The Latin American Context: … on Latin America. ¶

#### The only link between individuals and government policies is public engagement through debates. Discussions of Latin America policies can boost Latin American Democracy

Piccato 13 – (Pablo, “Public sphere in Latin America: A map of the historiography” Pablo Piccato, professor of History at Columbia University, specializes in Mexican history. He has worked on the political and cultural history of Mexico, and on the history of crime. He is currently working on an overview of crime in Mexico during the twentieth century. Director of the Institute of Latin American Studies, Associate at the Latin American Studies Association, member of the Council of Latin American History, PhD from UTA, MA from UTA, BA from Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Mexico City, Published 6/12/2013, Available online @ http://www.columbia.edu/~pp143/ps.pdf)//ghs-mm

Sabato’s use¶ of “civil society”… the public sphere.

#### First-hand experience with social movements demonstrates that inexperience with specific policy advocacy undermines their political efficacy

Frank **Bedek**, Economic and Social Historian, McMaster University, “Why I Don’t Do Demonstrations Anymore,”PIRGspectives, Spring 19**99**, www.opirg.org/mcmaster/spring99.htm#demo

I've attended, or … discourage their participants.

# Iraq DA

#### The last thing our political agenda needs is more personal conviction or ignoring rules---the war in Iraq was enabled precisely because of a lack of planning---Wolfowitz, Feith, and Bush fought the war based on their personal faith in the process---real policy arguments were ignored and made irrelevant in a strikingly similar fashion to the aff

**Gary** Kamiya**, senior journalist for *Salon*, October** 2005 **(http://dir.salon.com/story/books/review/2005/10/07/packer/index1.html?pn=1)**

In Packer's account, … achieve the war.'"

#### This is the pre-eminent political task of our time---failure to inform ourselves about the policy process guarantees an endless cycle of Iraqs---the impact is the neoconservative annihilation of the planet

KELLNER**,** PF SOCIAL SCIENCES – UCLA, 3

**[DOUGLAS, An Orwellian Nightmare: Critical Reflections on the Bush Administration”,** [**http://www.gseis.ucla.edu/faculty/kellner/essays/orwelliannightmare.pdf**](http://www.gseis.ucla.edu/faculty/kellner/essays/orwelliannightmare.pdf)**]**

After the collapse … of a human being.

#### . Lack of a plan - the central obstacle to anti-war critics has been the neocons’ lack of a plan

David Corn, Washington editor of *The Nation*, 11/22/06 (http://www.tompaine.com/articles/2006/11/22/iraqs\_reality\_bandwagon.php)

For many who … of 40,000 troops.

# Consumption PIK

First, We concur with them that “representations and exposition are the organizing principles behind the debate which we can challenge to alter power.” The words we choose to use, our discourse, have meaning and shape reality. This is proven by the Agamben evidence.

Second, We do not take umbrage with the overhelming majority of the 1AC, including the argument that the “only option becomes the extermination of all life” when the “world is reduced to bare life in an attempt to rid the public sphere of all risk” and that the value of death is nullified when there is a “biopolitical determination of the threshold beyond which life ceases to have juridical value.”

Third, We draw your attention to the very first argument that they make. They say “little is done to curtail consumption.” Although it only constitutes a total of five words, this statement speaks volumes about their own biopolitical project and attempt to enforce their own biopolitical determination of the threshold beyond which life ceases to have juridical value. The premise the consumption needs to be curtailed or should be curtailed undergirds their statement that “little is done to curtail consumption.” In making this statement, they have become the experts of life and have assumed the role of the sovereign, confronting the problem drug user which justifies the very same military style interventions they have criticized, all in the name of the life and health of the population and, in turn, reduced the so-called problem drug user to bare life.

Coyles, University of Central Lancashire, 9 (William, “The Bare Life of the ‘Problem Drug User’: an Analysis of the Neo-Liberal State Responses to ‘Problem Drug Users’,” Internet Journal of Criminology, http://www.internetjournalofcriminology.com/Coyles\_Problem\_Drug\_User.pdf)

This paper examines the intelligibility of the neo-liberal state’s war on the ‘problem drug user’ within Foucauldian analyses of liberal bio-political regimes of governance. In the modern era, with the epistemic shift to bio-power, the order of power has become imbued with a rationality which derives its principles from those of warfare. The ‘problem drug user’ has become the subject of quasi-military style interventions in the name of the life and health of the population. These interventions are exercised at the level of the ‘problem drug user’s’ life as their form of existence has been ‘disallowed to the point of death’ within an advanced-liberal Britain. The use of such authoritarian strategies is not antithetical to the liberal project of ‘government through freedom’ but is integral to it. Within neo-liberal ‘governmentality’, only certain populations who have reached the ‘maturity of their rational faculties’ are considered amenable to governance within late modern ‘circuits of inclusion’. The pathological ‘problem drug user’ has been led to their improvement by the neo-liberal state in the guise of a benevolent despot. The modern state utilises its sovereign power of deduction to render the ‘problem drug user’s’ bare life amenable to bio-political investment by the ‘experts of life’ in a ‘localisation without order’ outside of the political community termed by Agamben (1995) as camp. It is argued that the Cognitive Behavioural Therapy setting within the late modern prison is the materialisation of this state of exception. Within this permanent spatial arrangement the ‘experts of life’ assume the role of the sovereign, confronting the problem drug user (who assumes the status of homo sacer) in a fundamental biopolitical relationship where through a series of practical exercises they are incited to enfold authority and ‘subjectify’ themselves. The telos embodied within this strategy of control is the freedom of the subject and their re-insertion into ‘circuits of inclusion’ where rational and prudent subjects of self interest are ‘governed through freedom’.

Fourth, They have engaged in an attempt to enforce their own rules of what constitutes the normal – The consumption of drugs must be curtailed in their world because it constitutes an abnormality that must be corrected. This authoritarian move is justified by their determination that those who consume drugs are incapable of exercising freedoms in a responsible and prudent manner. Those who consume drugs are excluded from the benefits of citizenship and are rduced to bare life. They have taken on the role of the sovereign state waging a war against the abnormality of drug use. We, on the other hand, not only embrace the narcorrido, but also the counterdiscursive offensive of the so-called problem drug user as a “rebellion against” the Affirmative’s and sovereign state’s “political system sustained on exceptionalism.”

Coyles, University of Central Lancashire, 9 (William, “The Bare Life of the ‘Problem Drug User’: an Analysis of the Neo-Liberal State Responses to ‘Problem Drug Users’,” Internet Journal of Criminology, http://www.internetjournalofcriminology.com/Coyles\_Problem\_Drug\_User.pdf)

Within late modern Britain a salient ‘dialectic of freedom and control’ (Garland, 2001: 197-198) has become discernible within neo-liberal regimes of governance. This has been evidenced by consecutive Conservative and Labour governments’ implementation of an anti-statist strategy with regard to the economic realm and thus accentuating the market based freedoms of late modernity whilst a concomitant statist, authoritarian strategy has been applied to those populations incapable of exercising these freedoms in a ‘responsible’ and ‘prudent manner’. Indeed, these market based freedoms are increasingly dependent upon the continuous surveillance and control of those ostracised populations of ‘high risk’ expelled from late modern ‘circuits of inclusion’ (Rose, 2000) where ‘rational’ subjects are ‘governed through freedom’. Within neo-liberal crime control rationality the ‘problem drug user’ has emerged as an intractably ‘risky’ subject, resistant to governmental control within ‘circuits of freedom’ due to a range of ontological abnormalities. A variety of paralegal and quasi-military responses have been deemed necessary with regard to this population, “not so much in the name of law and order, but in the name of the community that they threaten” (ibid: 334). In a bio-political era in which the liberal democratic state has repatriated the supposedly ‘inalienable’ rights of life and liberty to the ‘sovereign subject’ of advanced liberalism, the ‘problem drug user’ appears to be excluded from such benefits of citizenship with an emasculating raft of punitive drugs legislation reducing this population to bare life. It appears that the conventions of the rule of law must be suspended indefinitely for the protection of society from a subject whose very nature appears to exclude them from neo-liberal circuits of freedom and civility. Official discourse concerning ‘drug-related crime’ is instructive in elucidating the governmental rationality which suffuses neo-liberal state responses to ‘problem drug users’. Such discourse is often permeated with the imagery of war which augurs of the clear and present danger posed by the ‘enemy within’ to the ‘security’ and ‘freedoms’ of the ethical and prudent majority. This hyperbolic and apocalyptic narrative is evident in this HM Treasury Release (2001) which signalled an increase to the Home Office budget in its ‘fight’ against drugs; …..hardly a family is unaffected by the evil of drugs….Drug related crime blights our communities. It destroys families and young lives and fuels a wide range of criminal activity, including burglary and robbery…We won’t tolerate the menace of drugs in our communities- it causes misery and costs lives…This new money will enable agencies to step up their fight against drugs and the crime it breeds. It will get dealers off our kids’ backs and into prison and help safeguard our communities. Within such discourse the war against drugs often appears as a war or battle being waged against drug users. Nietzsche’s hypothesis promulgates the notion that the basis of the power relationship lies in a war like clash between forces” (Foucault, 2003: 16). These forces can include not only the non-discursive but also the discursive as claims to ‘truth’ become an imposition of force. As Foucault exclaims, “discourse is not simply that which translates struggles or systems of power, but is the thing for which and by which there is struggle, discourse is the power which is to be seized” (Foucault, 1984: 110). Rather than viewing the official discourse of ‘drug related crime’ as a discourse of ‘truth’ in the absolute sense, it appears that it should be viewed as the discourse of a battle being waged between a dominant group or ‘nation’ who comprise the state and an ‘other’ nation or ‘enemy within’ whose intractable abnormality hinders the perpetual struggle towards the universalisation of the state. In an effort to comprehend neo-liberal state responses to ‘problem drug users’ the proceeding exposition will utilise a Foucauldian methodology to examine how the order of power has become suffused by a logic which derives its principles from those of warfare. It shall be shown that the problematisation of the ‘problem drug user’s’ pathological form of existence within neo-liberal strategies of control is not simply due to the biological and economic threat that they pose to the vitality and strength of the population but less saliently, it is due to their resilience and incompatibility to the neo-liberal project of ‘government through freedom’. This exposition shall delineate how in late modernity, with the entry of life into the order of power, the ‘problem drug user’s’ aberrant form of existence has come to be waged upon the political strategies of the neo-liberal state. The work of Italian philosopher Giorgio Agamben (1995) shall be drawn upon to illustrate how the ‘problem drug user’s’ aberrant form of life is coercively rendered amenable to the neo-liberal project of ‘government through freedom’ through a process of bio-political investment in a ‘localisation without order’ situated outside of the political community known as camp. It shall be posited that camp is materialised in the cognitive behavioural therapy setting in the contemporary prison system where the ‘experts of life’ assume the role of the sovereign and confront the bare life of the problem drug user in a fundamental bio-political relationship. The political technologies utilised by the ‘experts of life’ to ‘subjectify’ the ‘problem drug user’ and render him/her conducive to governmental power and ethical and prudent self government within ‘circuits of inclusion’ shall be examined with reference to Giles Deleuze (1988) and his notion of the enfolding of authority. To conclude, it shall be suggested that resistance to the perpetual war of normalisation and pacification, waged upon that ‘other nation’ in which the ‘problem drug user’ is said to be located, should take the form of a counterdiscursive offensive. It shall be argued that this offensive should seek to introduce discontinuity into the institution of state sovereignty and allow those populations who refuse the ‘love of power’ by exercising a radical form of autonomy to remain free of the immanent form of subjection that is engendered by bio-political investment. This subjection is often facilitated by the sovereign power of deduction when dealing with intractable populations such as the problem drug user.

Finally, While they embrace the very draconian responses to the so-called problem drug users that they have attempted to criticize in relation to the narcocorrido, we have established a counter-discourse that represents the view from below. While they have taken on the role of sovereign state and its militaristic interventions into the lives of the so-called problem drug user to improve the security of the state’s circuits of inclusion, our counter discourse weakens and introduces discontinuity into the institution of state sovereignty. It results in a deligitimisation of and emancipation from the institution of state sovereignty which allows radical forms of freedom to thrive.

Coyles, University of Central Lancashire, 9 (William, “The Bare Life of the ‘Problem Drug User’: an Analysis of the Neo-Liberal State Responses to ‘Problem Drug Users’,” Internet Journal of Criminology, http://www.internetjournalofcriminology.com/Coyles\_Problem\_Drug\_User.pdf)

It has become apparent throughout the preceding arguments that the draconian responses of the neo-liberal state to ‘problem drug users’ in late modern Britain are precipitated by the imperviousness of this intractable population to the bio-political imperatives and governmental crime control strategies of the state. It has been shown that the epistemic shift to bio-power, a ‘regime of power’ which pursues ‘care of the living’ through the dissemination of principles derived form war, transformed the ‘war of domination’ which raged between the multiple nations and ‘races’ within the geo-political territory of the sovereign into a war of ‘normalisation and pacification’ waged by the dominant ‘race’ against all abnormality constituted within the social body. As the dominant ‘nation’, the bourgeoisie, seize the apparatus of the state and colonise and invert the partisan historcio-political discourse of the dispossessed, a form of state ‘racism’ is born which introduces a break into the domain of life between who will be forced to live and who will be allowed to die. The sovereign power of deduction is realigned to the life administering regime of bio-power, as the raison d’état of the bio-political state becomes to increase the strength and vitality of the nation and by implication the state. The bourgeoisie, who have appropriated the institutions of war, seek to become the only ‘race’ as there begins a perpetual struggle towards the universalisation of the state. The ‘problem drug user’ situated with that sub-nation at the nadir of the social strata constitutes a sub-nation who drains the biological and economic vitality and strength of the population. They have therefore become the subject of a series of militaristic interventions in the name of the life and health of the population. With the entry of life into the order of power at the threshold of the modern bio-political era these interventions are exercised at the level of life or existence. The ‘problem drug user’s’ form of life has been ‘disallowed to the point of death’ within contemporary British society as the coercive leverage of the criminal justice system has been utilised to coerce them into treatment and governmental programmes which seek to modify their very ontology. It has been shown that the ‘problem drug user’ not only constitutes a biological and economic threat to the population but that their very form of existence poses a threat to the neo-liberal project of ‘government-at-a-distance’. Neo-liberalism, as an advanced form of ‘governmentality’, conceptualises the problem drug user as an especially dangerous subject incapable of exercising the market freedoms of late modernity in a prudent and responsible manner. Neo-liberal ‘governmentality’ views the artificial relation of competition as the driving force behind the free market and as such this necessitates a constant intervention by the state on the conditions of the market i.e. the interests, desires and aspirations of the population. This imbues the order of power with a rationality which holds that the government of the population is reliant upon the ability of the state to cultivate and shape a certain form of subjectivity or ontology amenable to incentivised manipulation by governmental power. The governmental power exercised within the neo-liberal project of ‘government-at-a-distance’ is therefore “exercised only over free subjects and only in so far as they are free” (Foucault, 1982:221). Thus homo economis is the idealised subject of advanced liberalism, capable of incentivised prudentialism and ethical and rational self government within ‘circuits of inclusion’ where subjects are ‘governed through freedom’. However, the ‘problem drug user’ is un-amenable to the neoliberal project of ‘government through freedom’ due to their pathological form of existence as they are governed by ‘instinct’ rather than ‘reason’ due to their to the strategies deployed by the ‘new criminologies of everyday life’ such as situational control. Governmental power cannot reach into the ‘crimenogenic situation’ and ‘subjectivise’ a subject who is pathological rather than rational due to drug addiction. The neo-liberal project of ‘government through freedom’ is only suitable for improved populations that have reached the maturity of their rational faculties. Neoliberal governmentality does not assume that all populations are capable of the responsible, prudent and ethical conduct of homo-economis. Some populations such as the ‘problem drug user’ must be led to their own improvement by a good despot full of the ‘spirit of improvement’. Thus the neo-liberal state assumes the role of a benevolent despot; in order to set the ‘problem drug user’ free they must first be bound. Considered un-amenable to governance within ‘circuits of inclusion’ and also incapable of ethical and prudent self-government the ‘problem drug user’ must be ‘incapacitated’ within ‘circuits of exclusion’, usually involving prison, until the risk they pose can be rendered governable. The psychiatric expert specifies the materiality which juridical power must ‘get a hold of’ and transform in the problem drug users pre-sentence report- the psycho-ethical double of the offence which finds it materiality in the drug user’s ontology. This facilitates the production of the ‘problem drug user’s’ bare life as it enables juridical power to punish something which is not an offence but rather an aberrant form of existence. In order to transform this aberrant form of existence, through bio-political investment (previously hindered by the radical autonomy of the problem drug user) the bio-political state must first instrumentally use its sovereign power of deduction to reduce the ‘problem drug user’ to bare life. The CBT setting within the prison system is the space where the state of exception assumes a permanent spatial arrangement and is where the bare life of the problem drug user is caught in the political order but outside of the political community. Within this space which can be accurately defined as camp, sovereign power and bio-power intersect. The ‘problem drug user’, now homo sacer, is the hidden point of this intersection. Camp is the space where the ‘problem drug user’s’ intractable form of life is bio-politically invested in a neo-liberal order which cannot function without instrumentally utilising its sovereign right to reduce the potentiality of all forms of life to the universalising subject of homo-economis. Within camp the ‘experts of life’ incite the ‘problem drug user’ to modify and manipulate their own ontology by disseminating cognitive skills to be adopted as ‘technologies of the self’ through bio-political practices which ‘enfold authority’. When the ‘problem drug user’ has been ‘subjectified’ and rendered capable of incentivised responsibility and ethical and prudent self government within neo-liberal ‘circuits of inclusion’ they will be deemed eligible for release. The appearance of camp within an advanced-liberal Britain is a sign of the growing impotence of the British states bio-political project. The need of the state to revert to sovereign political technologies in order to render the ‘problem drug user’ biopolitically investable is a vivid example of how radical forms of existence can reduce the immanence of modern power in relation to the biological and ontological existence of the subject to a relationship of exteriority and transcendence. This relationship at least allows for freedom, bio-political saturation of body and soul allows only for subjection without an exterior. However, the plight of the ‘problem drug user’, who refuses the specific form of life offered by the ‘experts of life’ only to be coercively forced to accept it within camp, suggests that the bio-political regime has squared its inadequacies by utilising its ancient sovereign right of deduction to achieve its bio-political goals. The application of the ‘sovereign death function’ to the ‘problem drug user’ whose form of existence is disallowed to the point of death in advanced liberal Britain, is legitimised by the bio-political end of improving the strength and vitality of the population and shoring up the security of neo-liberal ‘circuits of inclusion’. The ‘problem drug user’ is seen as a legitimate target for such coercive treatment by the ‘symbiotic subjectivity’ of the nation and state. It is essential that future research in this area generates counter-discourses which represent the view from below and give voice to the ‘poor words’ and subjugated narratives of that dispossessed and maligned ‘other nation’ where the ‘problem drug user’ is located. These counter discourses can weaken and introduce discontinuity into the institution of state sovereignty just as the historico-political discourses of the once dispossessed bourgeoisie did at the threshold of the modern bio-political-era. The delegitimisation and emaciation of the institution of state sovereignty will allow for the radical forms of freedom characteristic of late modernity to thrive as the hidden regulator for the inscription of life in the order- camp, will be deprived of bare life to bio-politically invest. Thus those who wished to resist the loving embrace of power would be free to do so. However, it should be noted that the ‘kings head’ can never be cut off completely. If the institution of state sovereignty where to be weakened sufficiently enough as to allow for another ‘nation’ or ‘race’ to seize control of the apparatus of the state, it is to be hoped that a society is born in which the demonic synthesis of sovereign power and bio-power is permanently dissociated.