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====They aren~’t topical –====

==== "economic engagement" is limited to expanding economic ties====

Çelik 11 – Arda Can Çelik, Master~’s Degree in Politics and International Studies from Uppsala University, Economic Sanctions and Engagement Policies, p. 11

Introduction

Economic engagement policies are strategic integration behaviour which involves with the target state. Engagement policies differ from other tools in Economic Diplomacy. They target to deepen the economic relations to create economic intersection, interconnectness, and mutual dependence and finally seeks economic interdependence. This interdependence serves the sender stale to change the political behaviour of target stale. However they cannot be counted as carrots or inducement tools, they focus on long term strategic goals and they are not restricted with short term policy changes.(Kahler%26Kastner,2006) They can be unconditional and focus on creating greater economic benefits for both parties. Economic engagement targets to seek deeper economic linkages via promoting institutionalized mutual trade thus mentioned interdependence creates two major concepts. Firstly it builds strong trade partnership to avoid possible militarized and non militarized conflicts. Secondly it gives a leeway lo perceive the international political atmosphere from the same and harmonized perspective. Kahler and Kastner define the engagement policies as follows "It is a policy of deliberate expanding economic ties with and adversary in order to change the behaviour of target state and improve bilateral relations ".(p523-abstact). It is an intentional economic strategy that expects bigger benefits such as long term economic gains and more importantly; political gains. The main idea behind the engagement motivation is stated by Rosecrance (1977) in a way that " the direct and positive linkage of interests of stales where a change in the position of one state affects the position of others in the same direction.

====Vote negative –====

====A limited topic of discussion that provides for equitable ground is key to productive inculcation of decision-making and advocacy skills in every and all facets of life – even if their position is contestable that~’s distinct from it being valuably debatable – this still provides room for flexibility, creativity, and innovation, but targets the discussion to avoid mere statements of fact – T debates solve your offense====

Steinberg and Freeley 08 – \*Austin J. Freeley is a Boston based attorney who focuses on criminal, personal injury and civil rights law, AND \*\*David L. Steinberg , Lecturer of Communication Studies @ U Miami, Argumentation and Debate: Critical Thinking for Reasoned Decision Making pp45-

Debate is a means of settling differences, so there must be a difference of opinion or a conflict of interest before there can be a debate. If everyone is in agreement on a tact or value or policy, there is no need for debate: the matter can be settled by unanimous consent. Thus, for example, it would be pointless to attempt to debate "Resolved: That two plus two equals four," because there is simply no controversy about this statement. (Controversy is an essential prerequisite of debate. Where there is no clash of ideas, proposals, interests, or expressed positions on issues, there is no debate. In addition, debate cannot produce effective decisions without clear identification of a question or questions to be answered. For example, general argument may occur about the broad topic of illegal immigration. How many illegal immigrants are in the United States? What is the impact of illegal immigration and immigrants on our economy? What is their impact on our communities? Do they commit crimes? Do they take jobs from American workers? Do they pay taxes? Do they require social services? Is it a problem that some do not speak English? Is it the responsibility of employers to discourage illegal immigration by not hiring undocumented workers? Should they have the opportunity- to gain citizenship? Docs illegal immigration pose a security threat to our country? Do illegal immigrants do work that American workers are unwilling to do? Are their rights as workers and as human beings at risk due to their status? Are they abused by employers, law enforcement, housing, and businesses? I low are their families impacted by their status? What is the moral and philosophical obligation of a nation state to maintain its borders? Should we build a wall on the Mexican border, establish a national identification can%21, or enforce existing laws against employers? Should we invite immigrants to become U.S. citizens? Surely you can think of many more concerns to be addressed by a conversation about the topic area of illegal immigration. Participation in this "debate" is likely to be emotional and intense. However, it is not likely to be productive or useful without focus on a particular question and identification of a line demarcating sides in the controversy. To be discussed and resolved effectively, controversies must be stated clearly. Vague understanding results in unfocused deliberation and poor decisions, frustration, and emotional distress, as evidenced by the failure of the United States Congress to make progress on the immigration debate during the summer of 2007.

Someone disturbed by the problem of the growing underclass of poorly educated, socially disenfranchised youths might observe, "Public schools are doing a terrible job%21 They are overcrowded, and many teachers are poorly qualified in their subject areas. Even the best teachers can do little more than struggle to maintain order in their classrooms." That same concerned citizen, facing a complex range of issues, might arrive at an unhelpful decision, such as "We ought to do something about this" or. worse. "It~’s too complicated a problem to deal with." Groups of concerned citizens worried about the state of public education could join together to express their frustrations, anger, disillusionment, and emotions regarding the schools, but without a focus for their discussions, they could easily agree about the sorry state of education without finding points of clarity or potential solutions. A gripe session would follow. But if a precise question is posed—such as "What can be done to improve public education?"—then a more profitable area of discussion is opened up simply by placing a focus on the search for a concrete solution step. One or more judgments can be phrased in the form of debate propositions, motions for parliamentary debate, or bills for legislative assemblies. The statements "Resolved: That the federal government should implement a program of charter schools in at-risk communities" and "Resolved: That the state of Florida should adopt a school voucher program" more clearly identify specific ways of dealing with educational problems in a manageable form, suitable for debate. They provide specific policies to be investigated and aid discussants in identifying points of difference.

To have a productive debate, which facilitates effective decision making by directing and placing limits on the decision to be made, the basis for argument should be clearly defined. If we merely talk about "homelessness" or "abortion" or "crime~’\* or "global warming" we are likely to have an interesting discussion but not to establish profitable basis for argument. For example, the statement "Resolved: That the pen is mightier than the sword" is debatable, yet fails to provide much basis for clear argumentation. If we take this statement to mean that the written word is more effective than physical force for some purposes, we can identify a problem area: the comparative effectiveness of writing or physical force for a specific purpose.

Although we now have a general subject, we have not yet stated a problem. It is still too broad, too loosely worded to promote well-organized argument. What sort of writing are we concerned with—poems, novels, government documents, website development, advertising, or what? What does "effectiveness" mean in this context? What kind of physical force is being compared—fists, dueling swords, bazookas, nuclear weapons, or what? A more specific question might be. "Would a mutual defense treaty or a visit by our fleet be more effective in assuring Liurania of our support in a certain crisis?" The basis for argument could be phrased in a debate proposition such as "Resolved: That the United States should enter into a mutual defense treatv with Laurania." Negative advocates might oppose this proposition by arguing that fleet maneuvers would be a better solution. This is not to say that debates should completely avoid creative interpretation of the controversy by advocates, or that good debates cannot occur over competing interpretations of the controversy; in fact, these sorts of debates may be very engaging. The point is that debate is best facilitated by the guidance provided by focus on a particular point of difference, which will be outlined in the following discussion.

====Turns the AFF – a predictable topic forces pre-round internal-reflective deliberation which is the only way to convince people of the legitimacy of the 1ac====

Goodin and Niemeyer 03 – (Robert and Simon, Australian National University, "When Does Deliberation Begin, Internal Reflection versus Public Discussion in Deliberative Democracy" Political Studies, Volume 50, p 627-649, WileyInterscience)

What happened in this particular case, as in any particular case, was in some respects peculiar unto itself. The problem of the Bloomfield Track had been well known and much discussed in the local community for a long time. Exaggerated claims and counter-claims had become entrenched, and unreflective public opinion polarized around them. In this circumstance, the effect of the information phase of deliberative processes was to brush away those highly polarized attitudes, dispel the myths and symbolic posturing on both sides that had come to dominate the debate, and liberate people to act upon their attitudes toward the protection of rainforest itself. The key point, from the perspective of ~’democratic deliberation within~’, is that that happened in the earlier stages of deliberation – before the formal discussions (~’deliberations~’, in the discursive sense) of the jury process ever began. The simple process of jurors seeing the site for themselves, focusing their minds on the issues and listening to what experts had to say did virtually all the work in changing jurors~’ attitudes. Talking among themselves, as a jury, did very little of it. However, the same might happen in cases very different from this one. Suppose that instead of highly polarized symbolic attitudes, what we have at the outset is mass ignorance or mass apathy or non-attitudes. There again, people~’s engaging with the issue – focusing on it, acquiring information about it, thinking hard about it – would be something that is likely to occur earlier rather than later in the deliberative process. And more to our point, it is something that is most likely to occur within individuals themselves or in informal interactions, well in advance of any formal, organized group discussion. There is much in the large literature on attitudes and the mechanisms by which they change to support that speculation.31 Consider, for example, the literature on ~’central~’ versus ~’peripheral~’ routes to the formation of attitudes. Before deliberation, individuals may not have given the issue much thought or bothered to engage in an extensive process of reflection.32 In such cases, positions may be arrived at via peripheral routes, taking cognitive shortcuts or arriving at ~’top of the head~’ conclusions or even simply following the lead of others believed to hold similar attitudes or values (Lupia, 1994). These shorthand approaches involve the use of available cues such as ~’expertness~’ or ~’attractiveness~’ (Petty and Cacioppo, 1986) – not deliberation in the internal-reflective sense we have described. Where peripheral shortcuts are employed, there may be inconsistencies in logic and the formation of positions, based on partial information or incomplete information processing. In contrast, ~’central~’ routes to the development of attitudes involve the application of more deliberate effort to the matter at hand, in a way that is more akin to the internal-reflective deliberative ideal. Importantly for our thesis, there is nothing intrinsic to the ~’central~’ route that requires group deliberation. Research in this area stresses instead the importance simply of ~’sufficient impetus~’ for engaging in deliberation, such as when an individual is stimulated by personal involvement in the issue.33 The same is true of ~’on-line~’ versus ~’memory-based~’ processes of attitude change.34 The suggestion here is that we lead our ordinary lives largely on autopilot, doing routine things in routine ways without much thought or reflection. When we come across something ~’new~’, we update our routines – our ~’running~’ beliefs and pro cedures, attitudes and evaluations – accordingly. But having updated, we then drop the impetus for the update into deep-stored ~’memory~’. A consequence of this procedure is that, when asked in the ordinary course of events ~’what we believe~’ or ~’what attitude we take~’ toward something, we easily retrieve what we think but we cannot so easily retrieve the reasons why. That more fully reasoned assessment – the sort of thing we have been calling internal-reflective deliberation – requires us to call up reasons from stored memory rather than just consulting our running on-line ~’summary judgments~’. Crucially for our present discussion, once again, what prompts that shift from online to more deeply reflective deliberation is not necessarily interpersonal discussion. The impetus for fixing one~’s attention on a topic, and retrieving reasons from stored memory, might come from any of a number sources: group discussion is only one. And again, even in the context of a group discussion, this shift from ~’online~’ to ~’memory-based~’ processing is likely to occur earlier rather than later in the process, often before the formal discussion ever begins. All this is simply to say that, on a great many models and in a great many different sorts of settings, it seems likely that elements of the pre-discursive process are likely to prove crucial to the shaping and reshaping of people~’s attitudes in a citizens~’ jury-style process. The initial processes of focusing attention on a topic, providing information about it and inviting people to think hard about it is likely to provide a strong impetus to internal-reflective deliberation, altering not just the information people have about the issue but also the way people process that information and hence (perhaps) what they think about the issue. What happens once people have shifted into this more internal-reflective mode is, obviously, an open question. Maybe people would then come to an easy consensus, as they did in their attitudes toward the Daintree rainforest.35 Or maybe people would come to divergent conclusions; and they then may (or may not) be open to argument and counter-argument, with talk actually changing minds. Our claim is not that group discussion will always matter as little as it did in our citizens~’ jury.36 Our claim is instead merely that the earl iest steps in the jury process – the sheer focusing of attention on the issue at hand and acquiring more information about it, and the internal-reflective deliberation that that prompts – will invariably matter more than deliberative democrats of a more discursive stripe would have us believe. However much or little difference formal group discussions might make, on any given occasion, the pre-discursive phases of the jury process will invariably have a considerable impact on changing the way jurors approach an issue. From Citizens~’ Juries to Ordinary Mass Politics? In a citizens~’ jury sort of setting, then, it seems that informal, pre-group deliberation – ~’deliberation within~’ – will inevitably do much of the work that deliberative democrats ordinarily want to attribute to the more formal discursive processes. What are the preconditions for that happening? To what extent, in that sense, can findings about citizens~’ juries be extended to other larger or less well-ordered deliberative settings? Even in citizens~’ juries, deliberation will work only if people are attentive, open and willing to change their minds as appropriate. So, too, in mass politics. In citizens~’ juries the need to participate (or the anticipation of participating) in formally organized group discussions might be the ~’prompt~’ that evokes those attributes. But there might be many other possible ~’prompts~’ that can be found in less formally structured mass-political settings. Here are a few ways citizens~’ juries (and all cognate micro-deliberative processes)37 might be different from mass politics, and in which lessons drawn from that experience might not therefore carry over to ordinary politics: • A citizens~’ jury concentrates people~’s minds on a single issue. Ordinary politics involve many issues at once. • A citizens~’ jury is often supplied a background briefing that has been agreed by all stakeholders (Smith and Wales, 2000, p. 58). In ordinary mass politics, there is rarely any equivalent common ground on which debates are conducted. • A citizens~’ jury separates the process of acquiring information from that of discussing the issues. In ordinary mass politics, those processes are invariably intertwined. • A citizens~’ jury is provided with a set of experts. They can be questioned, debated or discounted. But there is a strictly limited set of ~’competing experts~’ on the same subject. In ordinary mass politics, claims and sources of expertise often seem virtually limitless, allowing for much greater ~’selective perception~’. • Participating in something called a ~’citizens~’ jury~’ evokes certain very particular norms: norms concerning the ~’impartiality~’ appropriate to jurors; norms concerning the ~’common good~’ orientation appropriate to people in their capacity as citizens.38 There is a very different ethos at work in ordinary mass politics, which are typically driven by flagrantly partisan appeals to sectional interest (or utter disinterest and voter apathy). • In a citizens~’ jury, we think and listen in anticipation of the discussion phase, knowing that we soon will have to defend our views in a discursive setting where they will be probed intensively.39 In ordinary mass-political settings, there is no such incentive for paying attention. It is perfectly true that citizens~’ juries are ~’special~’ in all those ways. But if being special in all those ways makes for a better – more ~’reflective~’, more ~’deliberative~’ – political process, then those are design features that we ought try to mimic as best we can in ordinary mass politics as well. There are various ways that that might be done. Briefing books might be prepared by sponsors of American presidential debates (the League of Women Voters, and such like) in consultation with the stakeholders involved. Agreed panels of experts might be questioned on prime-time television. Issues might be sequenced for debate and resolution, to avoid too much competition for people~’s time and attention. Variations on the Ackerman and Fishkin (2002) proposal for a ~’deliberation day~’ before every election might be generalized, with a day every few months being given over to small meetings in local schools to discuss public issues. All that is pretty visionary, perhaps. And (although it is clearly beyond the scope of the present paper to explore them in depth) there are doubtless many other more-or-less visionary ways of introducing into real-world politics analogues of the elements that induce citizens~’ jurors to practice ~’democratic deliberation within~’, even before the jury discussion gets underway. Here, we have to content ourselves with identifying those features that need to be replicated in real-world politics in order to achieve that goal – and with the ~’possibility theorem~’ that is established by the fact that (as sketched immediately above) there is at least one possible way of doing that for each of those key features.

====That~’s key to critical thinking which is a portable educational skill – outweighs your offense====

Harrigan 08 – (Casey, Associate Director of Debate at UGA, Master~’s in Communications – Wake Forest U., "A Defense of Switch Side Debate", Master~’s thesis at Wake Forest, Department of Communication, May, pp. 6-9)

Additionally, there are social benefits to the practice of requiring students to debate both sides of controversial issues. Dating back to the Greek rhetorical tradition, great value has been placed on the benefit of testing each argument relative to all others in the marketplace of ideas. Like those who argue on behalf of the efficiency-maximizing benefits of free market competition, it is believed that arguments are most rigorously tested (and conceivably refined and improved) when compared to all available alternatives. Even for beliefs that have seemingly been ingrained in consensus opinion or in cases where the public at-large is unlikely to accept a particular position, it has been argued that they should remain open for public discussion and deliberation (Mill, 1975). Along these lines, the greatest benefit of switching sides, which goes to the heart of contemporary debate, is its inducement of critical thinking. Defined as "reasonable reflective thinking that is focused on deciding what to believe or do" (Ennis, 1987, p.10), critical thinking learned through debate teaches students not just how advocate and argue, but how to decide as well. Each and every student, whether in debate or (more likely) at some later point in life, will be placed in the position of the decision-maker. Faced with competing options whose costs and benefits are initially unclear, critical thinking is necessary to assess all the possible outcomes of each choice, compare their relative merits, and arrive at some final decision about which is preferable. In some instances, such as choosing whether to eat Chinese or Indian food for dinner, the importance of making the correct decision is minor. For many other decisions, however, the implications of choosing an imprudent course of action are potentially grave. As Robert Crawford notes, there are "issues of unsurpassed important in the daily lives of millions upon millions of people...being decided to a considerable extent by the power of public speaking" (2003). Although the days of the Cold War are over, and the risk that "The next Pearl Harbor could be ~’compounded by hydrogen" (Ehninger and Brockriede, 1978, p.3) is greatly reduced, the manipulation of public support before the invasion of Iraq in 2003 points to the continuing necessity of training a well-informed and critically-aware public (Zarefsky, 2007). In the absence of debate-trained critical thinking, ignorant but ambitious politicians and persuasive but nefarious leaders would be much more likely to draw the country, and possibly the world, into conflicts with incalculable losses in terms of human well-being. Given the myriad threats of global proportions that will require incisive solutions, including global warming, the spread of pandemic diseases, and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, cultivating a robust and effective society of critical decision-makers is essential. As Louis Rene Beres writes, "with such learning, we Americans could prepare...not as immobilized objects of false contentment, but as authentic citizens of an endangered planet" (2003). Thus, it is not surprising that critical thinking has been called "the highest educational goal of the activity" (Parcher, 1998). While arguing from conviction can foster limited critical thinking skills, the element of switching sides is necessary to sharpen debate~’s critical edge and ensure that decisions are made in a reasoned manner instead of being driven by ideology. Debaters trained in SSD are more likely to evaluate both sides of an argument before arriving at a conclusion and are less likely to dismiss potential arguments based on his or her prior beliefs (Muir 1993). In addition, debating both sides teaches "conceptual flexibility," where decision-makers are more likely to reflect upon the beliefs that are held before coming to a final opinion (Muir, 1993, p,290). Exposed to many arguments on each side of an issue, debaters learn that public policy is characterized by extraordinary complexity that requires careful consideration before action. Finally, these arguments are confirmed by preponderance of empirical research demonstrating a link between competitive SSD and critical thinking (Allen, Berkowitz, Hunt and Louden, 1999; Colbert, 2002, p.82).

=Rufo K=

Their role of the ballot argument overextends the political by claiming that this debate space represents something more than a competition for a win. Arguing that the ballot carries discursive significance is the same logic as the discourse theory of citizenship which claims every action is political.

Rufo and Atchison 11 – (Ken Rufo, Ph.D. in Rhetoric from the University of Georgia, Jarrod Atchison, Ph.D. in Rhetoric from the University of Georgia, Review of Communication, Vol. 11, No. 3, July 2011, pp. 193215)

Laclau (1996) has written about the inherent emptiness at the heart of the hegemonic formulation, and here we would suggest that the political as a conceptual edifice enjoys the same fundamental insolvency. For Laclau, these empty signifiers exist ~’~’because any system of signification is structured around an empty place resulting from the impossibility of producing an object, which, nonetheless, is required by the systematicity of the system~’~’ (p. 40). An empty signifier structures the relations between agents that comprise the larger system via their relation to each other, but does so while supplying none of the substance that structures those relations. As such, the political has ceased to be a regional category ... the political is, in some sense, the anatomy of the social world, because it is the moment of the institution of the social ... which involves, as we know, the production of empty signifiers in order to unify a multiplicity of heterogeneous demands in equivalential chains. (Laclau, 2005, p. 154) Understood this way, it would be a mistake to think that the political is constituted by an aggregate of individual components: policy makers, citizens, civic institutions, and so on. Instead, the political provides a constitutive conceptual umbrella that then makes possible the thinking of the citizen as that entity, that idiot, that is always already both a member of the body politic and its inadequate and life-threatening missing piece. To summarize, the best way to reconcile the various disciplinary deployments of the citizen thus far culled from the pages of our communication journals is to understand the citizen as epiphenomenal. This is to say that the citizen operates/appears discursively as an after effect of our thinking of the political, or put differently, that the political body produces the individual citizen as a function of its own incompleteness, rather than being the as-yet-incomplete project of a multitude of quasi-functioning citizens. This explanation provides a way of understanding citizens and citizenship commensurate with the use of these terms in our own discipline~’s research efforts; the question of whether or not this reflects some objective determination about the contours of politics can be left for others to decide.

Asen~’s argument proceeds from an acknowledgment of the participation gap we noted previously, and the attendant concerns that American democracy is under threat from an absence of citizen participation. Too often, Asen avers, these discourses key on accounts of what qualifies as citizenship and then proceed to inquire whether these qualities or practices are present in sufficient numbers to indicate a healthy political order. For Asen (2004), this approach dooms itself to failure and obsolescence: ~’~’Rather than asking what counts as citizenship, we should ask: how do people enact citizenship?~’~’ (p. 191). By focusing on how people enact citizenship, Asen suggests, we can develop a process-oriented, discourse theory of citizenship that sees citizenship as a series or mode of public engagement(s), rather than the specific and rarefied domain of a few privileged acts. Citizens can thus enact their citizenship through practices as diverse as voting, which Asen dubs the ~’~’quintessential act of citizenship~’~’ (p. 205), blogging, conversing with neighbors, buying a particular cup of coffee, and so on. And the ~’~’so on~’~’ goes on and on and on; as Asen puts it, a ~’~’mode cannot be contained easily. As a mode citizenship cannot be restricted to certain people, places or topics~’~’ (p. 195). Hence, the major motivation behind Asen~’s work: to think and affirm political subjectivity in a way that minimizes or even precludes the exclusion of citizens from the possibility of public engagement (pp. 192194). He writes that ~’~’a discursive conception of citizenship may offer one case ... of an affirmative articulation of public subjectivity~’~’ (p. 192). This begs certain questions about the nature of subjectivity, intention, and agency, of course\*questions Asen believes are answered or addressed, in part, by the idea of process and modality. In addition, Asen also makes plain his interest in theorizing ~’~’subjectivity through citizenship, ~’~’ a claim that effectively circumscribes some of the larger debates about subjectivity by placing them within the context of the process of public engagement in a ~’~’democratic~’~’ articulation of the political. And we should make clear that, for Asen, the larger horizon against which citizenship is to be understood is that of public engagement and democracy. 6 Asen (2004) writes of situating democracy via the discourse theory of citizenship; he writes of democratic renewal and of democracy~’s spirit manifesting ~’~’in its most quotidian enactments~’~’ (p. 196). Drawing on Dewey~’s notion that ~’~’democracy~’s the idea of community life itself, ~’~’ Asen explains that a democracy means that individuals participate, groups work together to liberate ~’~’individual potential, ~’~’ and that ~’~’human interaction~’~’ in its broadest sense ~’~’secures democracy~’~’ (2004, p. 197; 2002, p. 345). The discourse theory of citizenship is at the same time a theorizing (or presupposition) about the nature of the political itself, at least in as much as the political is understood as being broadly democratic, and as an invocation or extrapolation of publicness from what might otherwise be private circumstances (e.g., choosing a consumer good or debating with neighbors over dinner).

History demonstrates to us that this over-extension carries with it the seeds of tyranny instead of resistance

Rufo and Atchison 11 – (Ken Rufo, Ph.D. in Rhetoric from the University of Georgia, Jarrod Atchison, Ph.D. in Rhetoric from the University of Georgia, Review of Communication, Vol. 11, No. 3, July 2011, pp. 193215)

A Fascism of/and the Political If our feeling of foreboding seems absurd, it does so because of two historical trends. The first is the apotheosis of the political in the 19th and 20th centuries, starting with massive spread of enfranchisement and the increasing demand for inclusion within the political process. Hence, slogans like ~’~’everything is politics~’~’ or ~’~’the personal is political, ~’~’ wherein the implication is that every action carries with it political realities, consequences, or overtones. One~’s choice of church, a kindness to a stranger, the goods or services we consume, the entertainment we enjoy, the food we eat, the way we dress, the way we vote, the way we argue, what we argue about\*all are political acts. The political has become so pervasive that it has become commonplace to assume its status as the unsurpassable master horizon of our age. Carl Schmitt, writing in the early 1930s, was one of the first to warn against the overextension of the political. Its encroachment into areas of life that were not, at one point, obviously political resulted in an interpenetration of the state and society, a condition he called the total state. Therein ostensibly neutral domains\*religion, culture, education, the economy\*then cease to be neutral in the sense that they do not pertain to state and to politics. As a polemical concept against such neutralizations and depoliticalizations of important domains appears the total state, which potentially embraces every domain. This results in the identity of state and society. In such a state, therefore, everything is at least potentially political.... (Schmitt, 1996, p. 22) For advocates of this penetration, what is happening is a recognition of certain political realities, but for Schmitt the total state made impossible any real accounting of the political, because in the absence of any sphere absolutely distinct from the political, the political lost its specific meaning. While some might contend that the failure to recognize the political ramifications results in a hidden politics, Schmitt countered, ~’~’In actuality it is the total state which no longer knows anything absolutely nonpolitical...~’~’ (p. 25). What becomes hidden in the total state, in other words, is the very character of the political itself. For Schmitt, the political is to be defined by the distinction between friend and enemy, a distinction that added significant conceptual clarity but that also misconstrued the limits of the political in its relationship to the community. In some ways, it might be more accurate to suggest that Schmitt offered an historically contingent accounting for the political for the time in which he was writing, wherein the friend and enemy distinction was the sine qua non of international relations. But the friend and the enemy can be more broadly understood as figures that produce particular instantiations of community, of a polis, and that pose that community as a question of relation to other equally posed communities. It is here that the work of Lacoue-Labarthe and Nancy (1997) compliments Schmitt, as they understand the political as the question of the figure of a community, or of figuration in general. Put differently, Nancy and Lacoue-Labarthe see the political ~’~’as the will ... to realize an essence-in-common on the basis of a figure of that in-common~’~’ (p. xxii). The figure, whatever it might be, or the process of figuration that makes identification with a common figure possible in the first place, constitutes a horizon of intelligibility that over determines what we think of as a politics. The figure of the friend, and the figure of the enemy, or the immigrant, or the terrorist, provides a sort of ontological shorthand that produces and structures particular political arrangements. Railing against ~’~’the sense of the obviousness (the blinding obviousness) of politics, the ~’everything is political~’...~’~’ (p. 112), Nancy and Lacoue-Labarthe suggest what is needed is a more rigorous questioning and determination of the political, in its specific essence. The figure of the citizen, so prominently on display in the work of our field, prompts exactly these sorts of questions, in that any determination of the citizen is necessarily a determination of the extent and comportment of the political per se.

Vote negative – their consistent call for you to use your ballot to support change is the over-extension of the political that always focuses on increasing political participation. Before you consider using your ballot in the name of change you must confront the fascist nature of holding our entire community hostage to their inspection.

Rufo and Atchison 11 – (Ken Rufo, Ph.D. in Rhetoric from the University of Georgia, Jarrod Atchison, Ph.D. in Rhetoric from the University of Georgia, Review of Communication, Vol. 11, No. 3, July 2011, pp. 193215)

The mention of fascism is of particular importance here in this debate. As a field, we are entering an era of thinking about the ~’~’public~’~’ determined on the one hand by a theoretical interrogation of how discourses circulate and constitute a variety of publics and on the other hand a material explosion of distribution channels and media saturation that ensure the robustness with which discourses circulate. The American people are increasingly offered more ways to contribute, to participate, to receive news, to listen and read pundits and commentators of all stripes, to see entertainment~’s political function, to be conscious of their consumer choices for the sake of labor, partisanship, the environment, and so on. We are seeing, then, a massive opportunity for inclusion within the public/political realm, in a way that parallels the growth of mass communications media and enfranchisement in the 19th and 20th centuries. This is the cosmic soup from which Fascism first emerged, an ~’~’invention created afresh for the era of mass politics~’~’ (Paxton, 2004, p. 16). We cannot help but be concerned, amidst talk of Minute Men militias and Tea Parties, about what may emerge as a result of the current changes. Hence, our interest in promoting a note of caution. We think it time to ask ourselves as a discipline: when do we reach a point of oversaturation, when citizen participation in the political becomes less determined by the danger of lack and more determined by the danger of excess? Nancy (2008) suggests that ~’~’Every time the ~’political~’ refers to such a totalizing property, there is indeed ~’totalitarianism. ~’ That is to say, the horizon of this thought is that of a ~’political~’ absorption or assumption of every sphere of existence~’~’ (p. 25). 8 Perhaps this seems too strongly worded, but it nonetheless matches the historical record for fascist states. Paxton (2004) summarizes that record thusly: fascist regimes tried to redraw so radically the boundaries between private and public that the private sphere almost disappeared. Robert Ley, head of the Nazi Labor Office, said that in the Nazi state, the only private individual was someone asleep. For some observers, this effort to have the public sphere swallow up the private sphere entirely is indeed the very essence of fascism. (p. 144)

=Cap Bad K=

Resistance to white supremacy can~’t be a unifying concept- using it as a rallying point is counterproductive and undermines efforts to challenge capitalism.

M. Cole, research professor in education and equality at Bishop Grosseteste University College Lincoln, 11-23-07 http://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/story.asp?storyCode=311222%26sectioncode=26

The problem with standard critical race theory is the narrowness of its remit, says Mike Cole. One of the main tenets of critical race theory is that "white supremacy" is the norm in societies rather than merely the province of the racist right (the other major tenet is primacy of "race" over class). There are a number of significant problems with this use of the term "white supremacy". The first is that it homogenises all white people together in positions of power and privilege. Writing about the US, critical race theorist Charles Mills acknowledges that not "all whites are better off than all non-whites, but ... as a statistical generalisation, the objective life chances of whites are significantly better". While this is, of course, true, we should not lose sight of the life chances of millions of working-class white people. To take poverty as one example, in the US, while it is the case that the number of black people living below the poverty line is some three times that of whites, this still leaves more than 16 million "white but not Hispanic" people living in poverty there. In the UK, there are similar indicators of a society underpinned by rampant colour-coded racism, with black people twice as poor as whites, and those of Pakistani and Bangladeshi origin more than three times as poor as whites. Once again, however, this still leaves some 12 million poor white people in the UK. That such statistics are indicative of racism, however, is beyond doubt, and to interpret them it is useful to employ the concept of "racialisation". Given that there is widespread agreement among geneticists and social scientists that "race" is a meaningless concept, racialisation describes the process by which people are falsely categorised into distinct "races". Statistics such as these are indicative of racialised capitalism rather than white supremacy. A second problem with "white supremacy" is that it is inherently unable to explain non-colour-coded racism. In the UK, for example, this form of racism has been and is directed at the Irish and at gypsy/traveller communities. There is also a well-documented history of anti-Semitism, too. It is also important to underline the fact that Islamophobia is not necessarily triggered by skin colour. It is often sparked by one or more (perceived) symbols of the Muslim faith. Finally, a new form of non- colour-coded racism has manifested itself recently in the UK. This has all the hallmarks of traditional racism, but it is directed towards newly arrived groups of people. It has been described by A. Sivanandan, director of the Institute of Race Relations, as "xeno-racism". It appears that there are some similarities in the xeno-racialisation of Eastern European migrant workers and the racialisation of Asian and black workers in the immediate postwar period, a point I address in my latest book. "White supremacy" is counterproductive as a political unifier and rallying point against racism. John Preston concluded an article in The Times Higher advocating critical race theory ("All shades of a wide white world", October 19) by citing the US journal Race Traitor , which seeks the "abolition of the racial category ~’white~’". Elsewhere, Preston has argued "the abolition of whiteness is ... not just an optional extra in terms of defeating capitalism (nor something which will be necessarily abolished post-capitalism) but fundamental to the Marxist educational project as praxis". Indeed, for Preston, "the abolition of capitalism and whiteness seem to be fundamentally connected in the current historical circumstances of Western capitalist development". From my Marxist perspective, coupling the "abolition of whiteness" to the "abolition of capitalism" is a worrying development that, if it gained ground in Marxist theory, would most certainly further undermine the Marxist project. I am not questioning the sincerity of the protagonists of "the abolition of whiteness", nor suggesting in any way that they are anti-white people but merely questioning its extreme vulnerability to misunderstanding. Anti-racists have made some progress in the UK at least in making anti- racism a mainstream rallying point, and this is reflected, in part, in legislation. Even if it were a good idea, the chances of making "the abolition of whiteness" a successful political unifier and rallying point against racism are virtually non-existent. The usage of "white supremacy" should be restricted to its everyday meaning. To describe and analyse contemporary racism we need a wide- ranging and fluid conception of racism. Only then can we fully understand its multiple manifestations and work towards its eradication.

Race oppression is used by capital to ideologically justify economic exploitation—the eradication of racism requires a totalizing critique of capitalism.

Young 06 ~~[Robert, Red Critique, "Putting Materialism Back into Race Theory," Winter/Spring, http://www.redcritique.org/WinterSpring2006/puttingmaterialismbackintoracetheory.htm~~]

This essay advances a materialist theory of race. In my view, race oppression dialectically intersects with the exploitative logic of advanced capitalism, a regime which deploys race in the interest of surplus accumulation. Thus, race operates at the (economic) base and therefore produces cultural and ideological effects at the superstructure; in turn, these effects—in very historically specific way—interact with and ideologically justify the operations at the economic base [[~~[1~~]-http://www.redcritique.org/WinterSpring2006/printversions/puttingmaterialismbackintoracetheory.htm]]. In a sense then, race encodes the totality of contemporary capitalist social relations, which is why race cuts across a range of seemingly disparate social sites in contemporary US society. For instance, one can mark race difference and its discriminatory effects in such diverse sites as health care, housing/real estate, education, law, job market, and many other social sites. However, unlike many commentators who engage race matters, I do not isolate these social sites and view race as a local problem, which would lead to reformist measures along the lines of either legal reform or a cultural-ideological battle to win the hearts and minds of people and thus keep the existing socio-economic arrangements intact; instead, I foreground the relationality of these sites within the exchange mechanism of multinational capitalism. Consequently, I believe, the eradication of race oppression also requires a totalizing political project: the transformation of existing capitalism—a system which produces difference (the racial/gender division of labor) and accompanying ideological narratives that justify the resulting social inequality. Hence, my project articulates a transformative theory of race—a theory that reclaims revolutionary class politics in the interests of contributing toward a post-racist society. In other words, the transformation from actually existing capitalism into socialism constitutes the condition of possibility for a post-racist society—a society free from racial and all other forms of oppression. By freedom, I do not simply mean a legal or cultural articulation of individual rights as proposed by bourgeois race theorists. Instead, I theorize freedom as a material effect of emancipated economic forms. I foreground my (materialist) understanding of race as a way to contest contemporary accounts of race, which erase any determinate connection to economics. For instance, humanism and poststructuralism represent two dominant views on race in the contemporary academy. Even though they articulate very different theoretical positions, they produce similar ideological effects: the suppression of economics. They collude in redirecting attention away from the logic of capitalist exploitation and point us to the cultural questions of sameness (humanism) or difference (poststructuralism). In developing my project, I critique the ideological assumptions of some exemplary instances of humanist and poststructuralist accounts of race, especially those accounts that also attempt to displace Marxism, and, in doing so, I foreground the historically determinate link between race and exploitation. It is this link that forms the core of what I am calling a transformative theory of race. The transformation of race from a sign of exploitation to one of democratic multiculturalism, ultimately, requires the transformation of capitalism.

They present an inaccurate picture of the past

First, British taxation policies gave rise to a class of capitalists after the American Revolution – creating the conditions for chattel slavery

Merrill 95 ~~[Michael, teaches at Rutgers Labor Education Center, Putting "Capitalism" in Its Place: A Review of Recent Literature, The William and Mary Quarterly, Third Series, Vol. 52, No. 2 (Apr., 1995), pp. 315-326~~]

Allan Kulikoff makes a similar argument in The Agrarian Origins of American Capitalism, singling out the American Revolution and the ratification of the federal Constitution as "key events in the diffusion of capitalism throughout America" (p. 103). In his view, the regions colonial relationship with Great Britain had set chafing limits on investment opportunities in the colonies. The War for Independence removed this barrier to development and created a "new class of financial and industrial capitalists" (p. 105). The Constitution outlawed a range of local and interstate restraints on trade. It also satisfied property owners that the state and federal governments would protect their interests. According to Kulikoff, their faith proved well placed, as Congress and state legislatures soon offered "potent encouragement" (p. 109) to capitalist development by regulating markets to capital~’s advantage, financing internal improvements, expanding the banking system, encouraging freer trade, issuing patents to foster innovations, providing support for continued westward expansion, and refusing to nullify judicial adaptations of the common law that favored a more developmental view of property rights. These policies "transformed productive relations" (ibid.), giving rise to antagonistic classes of capitalists and wage earners and promoting the explosive growth of slavery. The ideology of the American Revoltuion, in Kulikoff~’s view, gave further impetus to the development of capitalism, which he defines as that mode of production where labor power, but not labor, is a commodity, bought and sold in the market like any other product or service. When gentlemen Revolutionaries in the coloinies Attacked Parliament~’s communalist idea of virtual representation in favor of a more individualistic notion of direct representation, their arguments indirectly emboldened common folk to embrace a vision of individual rights that rejected "all communal authority not sustained by popular demand" (p. 115). This political individualism, in turn, helped legitimate capitalism by linking public virtue to private interest, elevating "private ~~[property~~] rights" over the "social rights inherent in traditional natural law" (ibid.), and giving wider currency to the "classical liberal ideas of free trade, unfettered development, and contractual labor" (p. 118). Such "bourgeois individualism" rooted political rights in property ownership – if only of one~’s self – and reduced liberty to the freedom to buy and sell property, including the capitalized labor of slaves and the commodified labor power of wage workers. The American Revolution thus not only "created the American bourgeoisie" but also diffused a "bourgeois" ideology throughout the whole society, setting the stage for capitalism~’s "ultimate victory" (p. 126). At the same time, Kulikoff draws attention to the Revolutions~’ other progeny—in particular, a self-conscious class of yeomen farmers and artisans who "resisted capitalist entrepreneurs, using Revolutionary ideology to legitimate their place in political and economic life" (p. 129). Most seventeenth-century immigrants to North America, he argues, "dreamed of regaining land they or their parents had lost" (p. 37). The relatively easy access to real property in the colonies helped many white immigrants realize this dream, encouraging the creation of a yeomen class of small property holders across the continent (p. 39). By the time of the Revolution, "while a diminishing proportion of Englishment were freeholders, as many as two-thirds of eighteenth-century white adult male colonists owned land" (p. 66). The mobilization of this class of small farmers and artisans during the Revolutionary War radicalized the struggle against Great Britain and transformed the high-flown phrases of the Declaration of Independence into a defense of "the rights of mechanics and the poor to gain equal access to justice, property, and citizenship" (p. 116). With important differences between the North and the South, yeomen remained the dominant power in much of the country through the Civil War: "One can speak," Kulikoff writes, "of a yeoman social formation in the North ~~[and~~] of yeoman classes within a slave social formation in the South" (p. 35 n. 5). Kulikoff also has much to say about a range of other issues. Agrarian Origins of American Capitalism has a stimulating discussion of the wartime recruitment policies of Virginia~’s Revolutionary government, concluding that (at least in this regard) the patriotic planter elite, on balance, lived up to its professed egalitarian ideals. Two essays explore the ways in which the migration patterns of free persons and the forced relocation of slaves, both to and within North America, were related to the exigencies of the capitalist world economy during the first half of the nineteenth century. Reduced to the simplest possible terms, Kulikoff holds that immigrants (that is, nonslaves, including indentured servants and redemptioners) migrated to North America in an attempt to stay a step ahead of what Marx called "primitive accumulation," or the expropriation by capitalists of the "means of production" (especially land) of small producers—in effect, to escape capitalism. Slaveowners, on the other hand, bought and sold slaves in their attempts to supply the rising demand for plantation products made possible, if not actually caused by, the accumulation of capital—in effect, to serve capitalism.

Second, white supremacy was involved but was subordinate to capitalism

Comissiong 10 ~~[Solomon Comissiong, educator, community activist, author, public speaker and the host of the Your World News radio program, The Death of Capitalism, Daily Journal (Opinion), Politics May 31, 2010, [[http://dailycensored.com/2010/05/31/the-death-of-capitalism/-http://dailycensored.com/2010/05/31/the-death-of-capitalism/]]

One does not have to be a doctor, or play one on TV, to understand that in order to have a chance at eradicating any malady from the body you must find its root cause. The physician must figure out what is causing the sickness before they can prescribe the proper measures towards treating the ailing body. One thing modern medicine has taught us is that early detection with any illness is advantageous to the body. If the sickness is not detected relatively early, the chances of full recovery lessen with each passing day. In some cases, the prognosis is grim. Far too often people find out way too late that they have been living with a disease that has been slowly destroying their body. Routine checkups have become important in detecting potential aliments that many of us are not adept in diagnosing. However, much like a human body, societies can fall victim to socially oriented diseases that function much like cancers. Take for instance the curious case of the United States, which is a country that has been infected with a pernicious disease for quite some time now. However, the US has failed to take notice of the telltale signs that something is wrong with its body (society). And without any doctors within its limited HMO network, that it is willing to listen to; the US continues to put itself in almost predictable peril. Capitalism is the disease that continually decimates the fragile American society. Capitalism is a very interesting yet destructive disease. Like a malignant tumor within the human body—capitalism, if not aggressively removed, will metastasize throughout a given society slowly eroding any semblance of humanity. Interestingly enough, as it eats away at any potential for that society to treat its members like valued human beings, it convinces even the most devalued citizens that its existence is not harmful to their overall well being. It does this all the while robbing them of basic human rights such as free quality health care, livable wages (not minimum) decent public education, and affordable housing. These are things that elude most people within the US, the so-called Land of Milk and Honey. However, in many other countries, especially those not inebriated off of the capitalism elixir, things like quality health care are seen as rights, not privileges. Most members of American society are treated like scum by their government and the ruling class which controls their government, all in the name of the almighty dollar. The rapidly declining US currency reigns supreme in America. Profits before people is the unofficial mantra sung by most democrats and republicans. Their actions vividly indicate who their base really is—corporate America. After all it is corporate America that supplements their incomes, as well as finances their campaigns of fabricated propaganda. Corporate America, which includes the flawed US media system, continues to masterfully convince the American public that capitalism is good for them, their families and their communities. Many poor Americans, ironically, have even become capitalism~’s most ardent supporters meanwhile being worked like dogs for a minimum wage, dreadful benefits, and no worker rights to think of. They blindly support the vile capitalist system, in large part, because they are products of the American propagandistic public educational system where myriad of destructive values are inculcated into their subconscious. Critical thought is rarely endorsed, especially when it might mean that students begin to question their government and the economic system that controls their country. And as we now see in the not-so-great state of Texas, capitalism has made it easier for textbooks to be systematically altered in an effort to erroneously rewrite history. The rewriting of that history will make no mention of capitalism or a critical analysis of it in contrast to other systems like socialism. This will probably ensure that masses of American youth will reside within the same tiny "box" that many of their parents do. As America~’s schools become more and more corporatized, you can best bet that capitalism is the driving force that makes it all so appealing. Profit before people means just that, even when the well being of children is at stake. Once capitalism has begun to aggressively permeate a society it does not cease to distinguish who its victims are—all that matters is the bottom line. With no sort of critical analysis of capitalism, within America~’s public school systems, more and more impoverished children will grow to embrace it, even when it is destroying their communities. Children from America~’s impoverished communities are never supposed to know why their neighborhoods and schools are so vastly unequal compared to those in opulent milieus. They are supposed to believe that their community is deserving of such extreme neglect from their so-called government. They are taught to believe that if they simply work hard enough they can rise up above poverty and "make it". Youth from indigent neighborhoods, especially those of color, are supposed to imbibe that "American Dream", which is nothing more than an American Lie. Capitalism has a clever way of masking what it really is and what it really does, kind of like a chameleon. Therefore, homeless youth are not taught how capitalism was the driving force behind their parents~’ home getting foreclosed because of banks~’ rapacious amoral greed. They may never learn how capitalism played a major role in their uncle losing his life due to a lack of health care. They probably won~’t even be told how and why their city~’s school system accepted tens of millions of dollars from Wal-Mart simply so that the unethical corporation may commodify their education. Will these youth ever learn that the life blood of chattel slavery was capitalism? Good ole fashioned racism and white supremacy were prime players as well, but without capitalism driving the profits of owning slaves and the free wages that came with it; it (chattel slavery) would have died off long before it did. Like the devil, capitalism and its vastly minute beneficiaries, never miss an opportunity to convince the masses of how "harmless and good" they are supposed to be. The small minority that actually benefit from capitalism also control the government, the media, and school systems. Their propaganda machine is formidable and ostensibly effective.

The end of slavery just meant other means of economic exploitation – focus on racial binaries allows the ruling 1% to continue unchallenged

McPherson 11 ~~[professor emeritus of natural resources and the environment at the University of Arizona, where he taught and conducted research for 20 years; "the people vs. the united states," 2-13, http://guymcpherson.com/2011/02/the-people-vs-the-united-states/~~]

Our economy devotes more resources to entertaining us, to making us feel happy, than any other economy in history, yet millions of us feel more empty and desperate than ever before. This is a fact. And increasingly, many are rejecting the official reasons, and the Prozac and miracle diets that come with them. This time, we are not going to bring out our set of statistics and argue about who is right. These illegal and angry reactions to the system could be as wrong as possible, and still they would keep on happening. Our existence is a fact. This time, we will not try to justify ourselves, but to explain why we exist, to illuminate the lines of a civil war that may be approaching. As much as the media want us to believe otherwise, lines of this civil war do not run between red states and blue states, but between above and below, between the governors and the governed. Up until now we have been slandered and dismissed as the terrorists, the crazies, the criminals, the confused. We want you to know who we really are, why we exist, so that when the time comes, you can choose sides. Democracy hides a war … … a war against all of us. How can we make sense of a system that asks us to vote for our leaders, and then puts surveillance cameras on street corners to watch our movements, uses cell phones to track us, scans all our emails and phone conversations? The common-sense answer fed to us by the media is that the system is trying to protect us. We are constantly threatened by criminals and terrorists, and the most basic purpose of government is to keep us safe. But the FBI is staking out shopping malls, asking frightened mothers to submit their children~’s fingerprints and DNA to add to the database, just in case. NSA super computers are reading everyone~’s emails and listening to everyone~’s phone calls. It is apparent that the government sees all of us as the potential criminal, the potential terrorist. They are treating us increasingly like the civilian population during the war in Vietnam: as the breeding ground for the subversives. In the eyes of the government, we are the enemy. Military advisers explaining "fourth generation warfare" confirm this fact: "the distinction between war and peace will be blurred to the vanishing point. It will be nonlinear, possibly to the point of having no definable battlefields or fronts. The distinction between ~’civilian~’ and ~’military~’ may disappear. Targets may be more in the civilian than the military sector." The fact that today~’s enemies are not opponent states but populations means that the military has to restructure itself to engage in greater surveillance and constant warfare. Victory is no longer won on a battlefield, but politically and morally. The democracy that the US military is installing in Iraq teaches us something very important about democracy. A major goal of the invasion was to restructure Iraqi society, to create a foundation of rules that affect the operation of the free market, foreign investments, production, intellectual property, and so on. This policy objective has not changed, even as power in Iraq shifts from Pentagon directives to political parties and election campaigns. This shows that democracy is not an instrument that allows people to change the foundations of their society. Or, as a US Supreme Court Justice said almost 200 years ago, "Conquest gives a title the Courts of the conqueror cannot deny." He was referring to the lands stolen from the Native Americans, and how Native Americans cannot use the law to win their lands back. "~~[Conquest~~] becomes the law of the land and cannot be questioned." The same applies to the unpaid labor of African slaves, the poorly paid labor of European immigrants, or the restructuring of Iraqi society. These too "cannot be questioned." Another interesting thing about democratization in Iraq is that from the beginning it has been part of a plan to defeat the Iraqi resistance. Installing democracy equals stealing support from the insurgents. A successful insurrection would allow the Iraqis to question the law of the land, to change the foundations of their society, to deny the title of conquest. By accepting democracy, they give up this possibility. What do they get in return? The leaders of various demographics would get a piece of the pie. They would get to enter into the government, exchanging the power to determine their lives for privilege, benefits, influence in the system. All they have to do is control their followers. Thus, democracy defeats the insurrection by dividing it, producing a nation into distinct demographics with competing interests, and each demographic into leaders and followers, representatives and voters. Democracy creates foxes to rule the henhouse. Democratic rights, the privilege of voting for politicians, don~’t seem to conflict at all with a steady increase in State power, with an increasing militarization of police and a frightening use of new technologies to spy on all of us. Democracy is becoming ever more Orwellian. Just recently, the US government gave even more money to Israel, this time to develop brain scanners that could essentially read people~’s minds, measuring their biological reactions to seeing images of terrorists or disorders on a TV screen to see whether they were frightened or sympathetic. In other words, people walking through public space are already being bombarded by the old-fashioned form of mind control, television, and now the government will be able to remotely scan their brainwaves to make sure they are responding the way they are supposed to — by sympathizing with the authorities and being afraid of those of us who are at war with the system. Those guilty of thought-crime will be singled out for greater surveillance. Once tested in Israel, the device would be brought to the US, just as the US imported sound guns that can deafen an entire crowd to control protesters in Pittsburgh. Warfare is so compatible with the present system, the US government is able to wage two major wars simultaneously without any major disruptions. If the news media stopped talking about Iraq and Afghanistan one day, everyone would forget about these wars except for those who have family members overseas. World War II was a major interruption to society, as the entire population had to be mobilized to support the war efforts. The two simultaneous wars today are hardly noticeable; we were already mobilized to support warfare when they began. If this process is so invisible, what other wars might be escaping our notice? The US government devotes as much money to surveillance, policing, and imprisonment as to a war overseas. Does this machinery of social control constitute a war on the home-front? And if the media are constantly talking about every new case of police violence or torture within prison walls as isolated incidents, would we be able to connect the dots and understand that the problem is systemic, that there~’s a war going on? NATO, which was supposed to protect us from the Soviet Union but which has only been growing since the end of the Cold War, has agreed that all member states (including, of course, the US), should regularize the domestic use of the military by 2020, for disaster response, emergency management, and crowd control. The "state of exception" is giving way to democracy as permanent occupation. In Chicago, some politicians are talking about bringing the National Guard into the streets this summer. They talk about protecting the citizens from crime, but in reality it~’s an experiment to see if we submit to being occupied. The United States was founded on genocide, on stolen land. Democracy doesn~’t change the fact that the present system has to preserve the original crime, regardless of the results of any elections. For surviving Native peoples, participating in the democratic system means submitting to the conquest. For the descendants of African slaves, participating in democracy means agreeing to the rules of the system that kidnapped them. For people of European ancestry, following the rules means submitting to a system that colonized them so long ago even the memory of it has been lost. There~’s a reason why so many Europeans didn~’t have land or money or freedom and could be tricked by the myth of an empty continent, just waiting for colonization. That reason went across the ocean with them. It built the new marbled monuments, modeled on the Greek slave-democracy and the Roman Empire. We~’re fooled into thinking we~’re all the same, or alternately that we~’re divided by our allegiance to the right-wing or the left-wing, or divided by our skin color, when the real force that divides us is that which exploits, which alienates, which imprisons, all to defend the 1% who own everything. The most important question of democracy, the question the media never ask, has to do with minorities. How is it that this top 1%, who have so little in common with the rest of us, who never have to work, who own all the social wealth that all of us have created and that all of us rely on for survival, who own the institutions that educate and inform us, always end up in the majority every time it comes down to a vote? The answer is simple: if the elite can determine what questions are asked, the answers are irrelevant. After a protest in which police and demonstrators clash, the media, encouraging free speech, pose a poll: did the police do their job well? There is no way to answer this question that communicates total opposition to the police themselves. One can only pat them on the back, or demand they receive better training. The elite will never ask a question whose possible answers do not reaffirm their power. "If manual labor were so pleasant, the rich would keep it for themselves." (Mark Twain) Property is theft … … work is blackmail. And they know it. The masters of this society know that the current social order, in which they wield power, is imposed by maintaining a conspiracy of hypocrisy. Millionaire radio jockeys presume to teach us the value of hard work, and we stay in line filling out applications for McDonald~’s or Target. The history of the economy is the history of theft. Look at the piece of land you~’re standing on. It used to be worked by people who knew how to provide for themselves and their communities without destroying the environment. The possibility of dignified life and work was killed by the companies that organized colonizing armies and brought over labor gangs of indebted European immigrants or kidnapped African slaves. In both cases, we see the pattern of forced dependence. People who are actually working in a dignified way, which is to say, for themselves, for their communities, at their own pace, are prevented from doing so through organized violence. Land that had belonged to everyone is divided up and usurped by the elite, the forebears of many of those who are still wealthy today. African communities that are self-sufficient are invaded and destroyed. Later, China is brought into the global economy by addicting its population to opium. Even after colonization, labor was little more than a tax. Give up a certain amount, more if you were black and less if you were white, and keep the rest to feed yourself. You could still see the product of your labor, and nourish yourself with it. But then something happened. Slavery gradually ended — not in a sudden moment of liberation, as the history books tell it, but through decades of sharecropping and chain gangs (and the chain gangs still haven~’t ended). But no one was liberated. Rather, black and white were transformed into machines. Where~’s the use in outright slavery when the bank can own your house, the boss can own your time, the credit card company or collection agency contracted by the university or the hospital can own your future, fashion companies can own your insecurities, Hollywood producers can own your heart, and the newspapers can own your mind? Each tiny little person today represents a colossal celebration: the unification of the entire owning class. They all own a piece of you, and what you think of as your life is little more than you scrambling around to appease their needs. The factory system makes workers a part of the process. The rhythm of their life is made to shape the needs of the machine. The service sector jobs of today go even further, making demands of our very moods. No longer do we owe our bosses merely a certain amount of product, or even a certain amount of time, but a measured quantity of enthusiasm. Service with a smile. We can~’t imagine a more intimate form of violence. We~’re not even allowed to be depressed by our total lack of power over our own lives. Already by the age of five, the sullen and the impatient ones are screened out for Prozac and Ritalin. All of the kids diagnosed with disorders are suddenly "cured" when they are allowed to organize their own lives, or determine their own rhythms. But once the needs of the economy send them back to work, back to school, suddenly they relapse and have to go back on the pills.

The short term drive for profit necessitated by capitalism corrupts rational decision making- this is the only avenue to extinction

Marko 03 (Anarchism and Human Survival: Russell~’s problem., May 14, 2003, [[https://www2.indymedia.org.uk/en/2003/05/68173.html-https://www2.indymedia.org.uk/en/2003/05/68173.html]])

There exist three threats to survival namely nuclear war, ecological change and north-south conflict. All three I would argue can be traced to a single source that being the pathological nature of state capitalism. What is frightening is that eventual self induced extinction is a rational consequence of our system of world order much like the destruction of the system of world order prior to 1914 was a rational consequence of its internal nature. I shall focus in this essay on nuclear war, the most immediate threat. In doing so we will come to appreciate the nexus between this threat, globalisation and north-south conflict. Currently we are witnessing a major expansion in the US global military system. One facet of this expansion is the globalisation of US nuclear war planning known as "adaptive planning". The idea here is that the US would be able to execute a nuclear strike against any target on Earth at very short notice. For strategic planners the world~’s population is what they refer to as a "target rich environment". The Clinton era commander of US nuclear forces, Admiral Mies, stated that nuclear ballistic missile submarines would be able to "move undetected to any launch point" threatening "any spot on Earth". What lies at the heart of such a policy is the desire to maintain global strategic superiority what is known as "full spectrum dominance" previously referred to as "escalation dominance". Full spectrum dominance means that the US would be able to wage and win any type of war ranging from a small scale contingency to general nuclear war. Strategic nuclear superiority is to be used to threaten other states so that they toe the party line. The Bush administration~’s Nuclear Posture Review stipulated that nuclear weapons are needed in case of "surprising military developments" not necessarily limited to chemical or biological weapons. The Clinton administration was more explicit stating in its 2001 Pentagon report to Congress that US nuclear forces are to "hedge against defeat of conventional forces in defense of vital interests". The passage makes clear that this statement is not limited to chemical or biological weapons. We have just seen in Iraq what is meant by the phrase "defense of vital interests". Washington is asserting that if any nation were to have the temerity to successfully defend itself against US invasion, armed with conventional weapons only, then instant annihilation awaits. "What we say goes" or you go is the message being conveyed. Hitler no doubt would have had a similar conception of "deterrence". It should be stressed that this is a message offered to the whole world after all it is now a target rich environment. During the cold war the US twice contemplated using nuclear weapons in such a fashion both in Vietnam, the first at Dien Bien Phu and during Nixon administration planning for "operation duck hook". In both cases the main impediments to US action were the notion that nuclear weapons were not politically "useable" in such a context and because of the Soviet deterrent. The Soviet deterrent is no more and the US currently is hotly pursuing the development of nuclear weapons that its designers believe will be "useable" what the Clinton administration referred to as low yield earth penetrating nuclear weapons and what the Bush administration refers to as the Rapid Nuclear Earth Penetrator. Such strategic reforms are meant to make nuclear war a more viable policy option, on the basis that lower yields will not immediately kill as many innocent people as higher yield weapons. This is known as the lowering of the threshold of nuclear war. The development of the RNEP draws us closer to the prospect of nuclear war, including accidental nuclear war, because lower yields will lower the barrier between conventional and nuclear war. There will exist no real escalatory firewall between these two forms of warfare which means that in any conventional crisis involving nuclear powers, there will exist a strong incentive to strike first. A relationship very similar to the interaction between the mobilisation schedules of the great powers prior to 1914. There exist strong parallels between US nuclear planning and the German Imperial Staff~’s Schlieffen plan. Lowering the threshold of nuclear war will also enhance pressures for global nuclear proliferation. If the US is making its arsenal more useable by working towards achieving a first strike capability, then others such as Russia and China must react in order to ensure the viability of their deterrents. Moreover, the potential third world targets of US attack would also have greater incentive to ensure that they also have a nuclear deterrent. It is also understood that the development of these nuclear weapons may require the resumption of nuclear testing, a key reason for the Administration~’s lack of readiness to abide by the CTBT treaty, which is meant to ban nuclear testing. The CTBT is a key feature of contemporary global nuclear non proliferation regimes for the US signed the CTBT in order to extend the nuclear non proliferation treaty (NPT) indefinitely. Abandoning the CTBT treaty, in order to develop a new generation of more "useable" nuclear weapons that will lower the threshold of nuclear war, will place the NPT regime under further strain and greatly increase the chances of further nuclear proliferation. There exists a "deadly connection" between global weapons of mass destruction proliferation and US foreign policy. One may well ask what has all this to do with state capitalism? Consider the thinking behind the militarisation of space, outlined for us by Space Command; "historically military forces have evolved to protect national interests and investments – both military and economic. During the rise of sea commerce, nations built navies to protect and enhance their commercial interests. During the westward expansion of the continental United States, military outposts and the cavalry emerged to protect our wagon trains, settlements and roads". The document goes on, "the emergence of space power follows both of these models". Moreover, "the globalization of the world economy will continue, with a widening between ~’haves~’ and ~’have nots~’. The demands of unilateral strategic superiority, long standing US policy known as "escalation" or "full spectrum" dominance, compel Washington to pursue "space control". This means that, according to a report written under the chairmanship of Donald Rumsfeld, "in the coming period the US will conduct operations to, from, in and through space" which includes "power projection in, from and through space". Toward this end, Washington has resisted efforts in the UN to create an arms control regime for space. As a result there will inevitably arise an arms race in space. The importance of this simply cannot be over-emphasised. Throughout the nuclear age there have been a number of close calls, due to both human and technical error, that almost lead to a full scale nuclear exchange between Washington and Moscow. These glitches in command and control systems were ultimately benign because both sides had early warning satellites placed in specialised orbits which could be relied upon to provide real time imagery of nuclear missile launch sites. However the militarisation of space now means that these satellites will become open game; the benign environment in space will disappear if the militarisation of space continues. Thus if the US were to "conduct operations to, from in and through space" it will do see remotely. Technical failure may result in the system attacking Russian early warning satellites. Without question this would be perceived by the Russian~’s as the first shot in a US nuclear first strike. Consider for instance a curious event that occurred in 1995. A NASA research rocket, part of a study of the northern lights, was fired over Norway. The rocket was perceived by the Russian early warning system as the spear of a US first strike. The Russian system then began a countdown to full scale nuclear response; it takes only a single rocket to achieve this effect because it was no doubt perceived by Russian planners that this single rocket was meant to disable their command and control system as a result of electromagnetic pulse effects. To prevent the loss of all nuclear forces in a subsequent follow on strike the Russian~’s would need to launch a full scale response as soon as possible. Because the US itself has a hair trigger launch on warning posture a Russian attack would be followed by a full scale US attack; the US has a number of "reserve options" in its war plans, thus such an accidental launch could trigger a global chain of nuclear release around the globe. Calamity was averted in 1995 because Russia~’s early warning satellites would have demonstrated that there was no launch of US nuclear forces. If these satellites were to be taken out then this ultimate guarantee disappears; the Russian ground based radar system has a number of key holes that prevent it from warning of an attack through two key corridors, one from the Atlantic the other from the Pacific. In the future if an event such as 1995 were to occur in space the Russians no longer would have the level of comfort provided by its space based assets. The militarisation of space greatly increases the chances of a full scale accidental nuclear war. The militarisation of space is intimately linked with US strategic nuclear forces, for the previous command covering space, known as Space Command, has merged with the command responsible for nuclear forces, Strategic Command. Upon merger, the commander of Strategic Command stated, "United States Strategic Command provides a single war fighting combatant command with a global perspective, focused on exploiting the strong and growing synergy between the domain of space and strategic capabilities." The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff added, "this new command is going to have all the responsibilities of its predecessors, but an entirely new mission focus, greatly expanded forces and you might even say several infinite areas of responsibility." In other words, we are witnessing the integration of strategic conventional, nuclear and space planning into the command responsible for overseeing US nuclear forces. In turn these forces become an ordinary facet of US strategic planning, severing the break between conventional and nuclear war. The link between the increase in threats to survival and state capitalism (as well as globalisation) was provided for us by the old Space Command as noted above. We may justly also conclude that US nuclear weapons provide a shield, or "shadow", enabling the deployment of offensive military firepower in what Kennedy era commander General Maxwell Taylor referred to as the key theatre of war, namely "under-developed areas". This shield was made effective by "escalation dominance", as noted above, now known as "full spectrum dominance". It is this facet of US strategic policy that compels Washington place such a premium on nuclear superiority and nuclear war fighting. The link between US nuclear strategy and the global political economy is intimate. US nuclear weapons, both during and after the cold war, have acted as the ultimate guarantors of US policy, which is concerned with managing the world capitalist system in the interests of dominant domestic elites. Nuclear weapons provide the umbrella of power under which the system is able to function in much the same way that Karl Polanyi in his classic work, The Great Transformation, argued that the balance of power functioned in the service of the world capitalist system in the 19th century. The "great restoration" of the world capitalist system, under the rubric of "liberal internationalism", and the onset of the nuclear age in the wake of the second world war, are not merely coincidental. To understand the contours of contemporary world order is to appreciate the deep nexus between the two. Military superiority is necessary because of threats to "stability". It is to be expected that a system of world order constructed for the benefit of an elite core of corporate interests in the US will not go down well with the world~’s population, especially in key regions singled out for capital extraction such as the Middle East and Latin America. Planners recognise that the pursuit of capital globalisation and the consequent widening of the gap between rich and poor would be opposed by the globe~’s population. Absolute strategic superiority is meant to keep the world~’s population quite and obedient out of sheer terror, as Bush administration aligned neo-conservative thinkers have argued it is better that Washington be feared rather than loved. As they have asserted, after world war two US hegemony had to be "obtained", now it must be "maintained" (Robert Kagan and William Kristol). It is only natural that this "maintenance operation" should be a militaristic one given that the US has a comparative advantage in the use of force; a nuclear global first strike capability would give Washington an absolute advantage. Should anyone get out of line, possibly threatening to spread the "virus" of popular social and economic development, force is to be used to restore "credibility" to beat down the threat of a better example. The US pursues a dangerous nuclear strategy because such a strategy in its terms is "credible". Anarchists are well aware of this important aspect of international relations given the events of the Spanish Civil War. Such a situation is no joke, for this was precisely the fear of Kennedy era planners that led to the Cuban Missile Crisis. Washington sought to return Cuba to the "Latin American mode" fearing that Cuba would set an example to the population of Latin America in independent social and economic planning conducted in the interests of the population rather than US capital. In response to the Castro takeover the US engaged in one of the most serious terrorist campaigns of recent times, meant as a prelude to invasion in order to ensure "regime change" thereby teaching the people of the region the lesson that "what we say goes". One of the key reasons why Khrushchev sought to place nuclear missiles in Cuba was to deter a US invasion and to achieve strategic parity with Washington. Throughout the Cuban Missile Crisis many potential flashpoints almost lead to a full-scale nuclear exchange between the Soviet Union and the US, how close we came to annihilation is only now being fully realised. These are not matters for idle speculation: destruction almost occurred in the past and may very well occur in the future; even cats have only nine lives. This is a matter of great contemporary significance because of the current geographical expansion of the US military system. One of the most significant results of the invasion of Afghanistan was the expansion of the US military system into Central Asia, including into some former Soviet republics. The Russians have traditionally considered this to be their version of the Western hemisphere. If a "great game" were to develop in the region between Russia and the US (perhaps also Pakistan, China and India all nuclear powers, Turkey which sits under US "extended deterrence" and Iran, a potential nuclear power) then such a "great game" may become a nuclearised great game. Indeed the standoff in Kashmir may have global consequences if a system of alliance politics were to develop in the region between the globe~’s nuclear powers, especially as the threshold of nuclear war is being lowered. In this sense Central Asia may develop into a global version of the link between the Balkans and central alliance systems prior to 1914. Of even greater concern is the further expansion of the US military system into the Middle East following the invasion of Iraq. Washington has already foreshadowed a desire to construct permanent military bases in Iraq in order to facilitate intervention into the region. Both Iran and Syria are potential targets of US attack. Iran may decide upon the nuclear option in order to deter the globe~’s leading rogue state. This could be potentially explosive because it is well known that Israel posses a significant nuclear force. Israel has always feared that its paymaster would ultimately abandon it. In response Israel has reportedly developed a "samson option" nuclear targeting strategy. The idea is that Israel would target Russia with its nuclear weapons (Israel has developed delivery systems with an excessive range capability), which would lead to a full-scale nuclear exchange between Moscow and Washington. In essence Israel is saying: we should be allowed to continue repressing the Palestinians if not we have the "samson option". Furthermore, in order to facilitate intervention into these regions the US has began a programme to shift the basing of its military forces into "new Europe" that is Eastern Europe. Washington for instance pushed Romania into NATO for this very reason. Placing military forces in Eastern Europe no doubt would give the Russians some cause for concern. After Kosovo Russia conducted large-scale war games assuming an invasion through "new Europe". The game ended with the release of nuclear weapons. Indeed, expanding the US military system up to the border of Belarus may be dangerous for it is quite possible that Russia extends nuclear deterrence to Minsk; for instance Russia is building a new ground based strategic early warning radar in Belarus. This may all become a series problem in the future because of what the US Geological Survey refers to as "the big rollover": the time at which the world oil market changes from a buyers market into a sellers market (which may occur in the next 15-20 years). Washington has always regarded the oil resources of the Middle East as "the most stupendous material prize in world history" which is a key lever of US global dominance. The big rollover will ensure that Middle Eastern oil reserves will become an even more significant lever of world control placing greater premium on US control over the political development of the Arab world. In 1967, 1970 and 1973 strategic developments in the Middle East were overshadowed by nuclear weapons. In fact the events of 1970 and 1973 convinced many, such as Henry Kissinger, that the US needed to strive to retain nuclear superiority and reverse the condition of strategic parity with Moscow. This ultimately lead to the Carter-Reagan build-up of the late 1970s and early 1980s; a build-up which easily could have been disastrous. The militarisation of space, the development of so called "useable" nuclear weapons, the globalisation of the US nuclear planning system, the hair trigger alert status of the globe~’s nuclear forces and the expansion of the US military system into Central Asia and the Middle East possibly triggering a "great game" in these regions between nuclear powers, not to mention military expansion into "new Europe", all seriously increase the threats to our long term (indeed short term) survival. Washington~’s aggressive nuclear strategy is not only meant to deter democracy abroad; it is also meant to deter democracy at home. In 1956 the author of NSC 68 and one of the chief ideologues behind the Carter-Reagan nuclear build-up, Paul Nitze, made a distinction between what he referred to as "declaratory" nuclear weapons policy and "actual" nuclear weapons policy. For anybody interested in unravelling truth from fiction the distinction is critical. In Nitze~’s words, "the word ~’policy~’ is used in two related but different senses. In one sense, the action sense, it refers to the general guidelines, which we believe should and will govern our actions in various contingencies. In the other sense, the declaratory sense, it refers to policy statements which have as their aim political and psychological effects". The most important target audience of declaratory policy is the American population, the so-called "internal deterrent". Consider for instance the key nuclear proliferation planning document of the cold war era, the Gilpatric report delivered to President Johnson. In it Gilpatric spelt out the threat that nuclear proliferation poses to US security: "as additional nations obtained nuclear weapons our diplomatic and military influence would wane, and strong pressures would arise to retreat to isolation to avoid the risk of involvement in nuclear war". So if it were seen by the population that the pursuit of foreign policy, conducted in the interests of domestic elites, would increase the threat of nuclear war then the internal deterrent may become dangerously aroused possibly calling off the show. In the strategic literature this is referred to as "self-deterrence". In other words US non proliferation policy was meant to "lock in" US strategic dominance so that the domestic population would not become dangerously aroused whilst providing Washington the freedom of action necessary to brandish its nuclear superiority over others. This sentiment was reflected in the Bush administration~’s Nuclear Posture Review, "nuclear capabilities also assure the US public that the United States will not be subject to coercion based on a false perception of U.S. weakness among potential adversaries." Many strategic thinkers have argued that the greatest threat to US hegemony or "unipolarity" is the internal "welfare role" and the populations lack of understanding for the burdens of Empire, in other words popular democracy. One of the reasons that the Reagan administration pursued "Star Wars" a programme to render nuclear weapons "impotent and obsolete" was to outflank the domestic and global peace movements that were gathering pace as a result of the administration~’s pursuit of potentially apocalyptic nuclear policies (the very same people have their fingers on the button again). It was well recognised that the Star Wars programme would have increased the chances of a nuclear exchange between Moscow and Washington, just as today the pursuit of short term interests is known to have potentially serious international consequences, such as increase in conflict and global weapons of mass destruction proliferation. The ruling class is well aware of the adverse impact the pursuit of its own sectional interests will have on international order. It pursues those interests with renewed zeal anyway. As far as the ruling class is concerned the greatest threat we face is not nuclear war, it is popular democracy. As Adam Smith observed of a previous mercantile system, applicable to today~’s system of state-corporate mercantilism, "it cannot be very difficult to determine who have been the contrivers of this whole mercantile system; not the consumers, we may believe, whose interest has been entirely neglected; but the producers, whose interest has been so carefully attended to; and among this latter class our merchants and manufacturers have been by far the principal architects." Policy Smith observed, "comes from an order of men, whose interest is never exactly the same with that of the public, who have generally an interest to deceive and even to oppress the public, and who accordingly have, upon many occasions, both deceived and oppressed it." This raises an interesting issue, namely that the pursuit of Armageddon is quite rational. The dominant institutions of capitalism place a premium on short-term greed. Rational participatory planning incorporating long-term concerns such as human survival are of no interest to these pathological institutions. What matters is short-term profit maximisation. One can see this most clearly in the case of such "externalities" as ecological change where the desire to pursue short-term profit undermines the long-term viability of the system itself (also us as a species; indeed many have surmised that we are in the era of the sixth great extinction of life on Earth this time human induced). The fact that the institutional structures of society compel the ruling classes to pursue highly dangerous "security" policies that are another "externality" of the system of state capitalism compels the population to constrain and eventually overthrow these institutions because apocalypse is institutionally rational.

Vote negative to step outside the system of reformism and demand a real revolution we eradicate racism from its core

Harman 97 ~~[Chris Harman 97, Editor of the Socialist Worker 1997 Economics of the madhouse, Pg 99-100~~]

~’A reprise in the early 21st century of the conditions in the early part of this century. Such is the danger that confronts the world if we cannot deal with the present crisis concludes Will Hutton in his book The State We~’re In. Those conditions included two world wars, the rise of Nazism, the collapse o democracy across most of Europe, the victory of Stalinism, the death camps and the gulag. If they were to be repeated in a few years time there is no doubt it would be on a much more horrific scale that even Hitler could not imagine. We would indeed be facing a future of barbarism, if not the destruction of the whole of humanity. Warnings of such a future are not to be treated lightly. Already the crisis of the 1990~’s has begun to unleash the same barbaric forces we saw in the 1930~’s. In one country after another political adventurers who support the existing system are making careers for themselves by trying to scapegoat ethnic or religious minorities. In the Russia, the Hitler admirer, racist, and proponent of nuclear war, Zhirinovsky got 24 percent of the vote in the November 1993 poll. In Bombay, another Hitler admirer, Bal Thackercey, runs the state government, threatening to wage war against the Muslim minority. In turkey the government and the military wage a war against the Kurdish fifth of the population, while the fascists try to incite Sunni Muslims to murder Alawi Muslims. In Rwanda the former dictator unleashed a horrific slaughter of Tutsis by Hutus, while in neighboring Burundi there is the threat of slaughter of Hutus by Tutsis. All this horror has its origins in the failure of market capitalism to provide even minimally satisfactory lives for the mass of people. Instead is leaves a fifth of the worlds~’ population under nourished and most of the rest doubting whether they will be able to enjoy tomorrow the small comforts that allowed to them today Both the out and out defenders of ruling class power and today~’s timid cowed reformists tell us there is no alternative to this system. But if that is true then there is no hope for humanity. Politics becomes merely about having the deckchairs on the titanic while making sure no one disturbs the rich and privileged as they dine at the captains table. But there is an alternative. The whole crazy system of alienated labor is a product of what we do. Human beings have the power to seize control of the ways of creating wealth and to subordinate them to our decisions, to our values. We do not have to leave them to the blind caprice of the market to the mad rush of the rival owners of wealth in their race to keep ahead of each other. The new technologies that are available today, far from making out lives worse have the potential to make this control easier. Automated work processes could provide us with more leisure, with more time for creativity and more change to deliberate where the world is going. Computerism could provide us with the unparalleled information about the recourses available to satisfy our needs and how to deploy them effectivly But this alternative cannot come from working within the system, from accepting the insane logic of the market, of competitive accumulation, of working harder in order to force someone else to worker harder or lose their job. The alternative can only come from fighting against the system and the disastrous effect its logic has on the lives of the mass of people.

# 2nc

First, switch-side debate—only our interpretation guarantees that we take positions that we don~’t agree with to facilitate debate on both sides. This promotes deliberation that~’s key to prevent extinction

Stannard 2006 (Matt, Department of Communication and Journalism, University of Wyoming, Spring 2006 Faculty Senate Speaker Series Speech, April 18, http://theunderview.blogspot.com/2006/04/deliberation-democracy-and-debate.html)

\*human society, and threats are complex—deliberation keeps us from apocalyptic rhetoric \*instead create perspective from diverse viewpoints

The complexity and interdependence of human society, combined with the control of political decisionmaking—and political conversation itself—in the hands of fewer and fewer technological "experts," the gradual exhaustion of material resources and the organized circumvention of newer and more innovative resource development, places humanity, and perhaps all life on earth, in a precarious position. Where we need creativity and openness, we find rigid and closed non-solutions. Where we need masses of people to make concerned investments in their future, we find (understandable) alienation and even open hostility to political processes. The dominant classes manipulate ontology to their advantage: When humanity seeks meaning, the powerful offer up metaphysical hierarchies; when concerned masses come close to exposing the structural roots of systemic oppression, the powerful switch gears and promote localized, relativistic micronarratives that discourage different groups from finding common, perhaps "universal" interests. Apocalyptic scenarios are themselves rhetorical tools, but that doesn~’t mean they are bereft of material justification. The "flash-boom" of apocalyptic rhetoric isn~’t out of the question, but it is also no less threatening merely as a metaphor for the slow death of humanity (and all living beings) through environmental degradation, the irradiation of the planet, or the descent into political and ethical barbarism. Indeed, these slow, deliberate scenarios ring more true than the flashpoint of quick Armageddon, but in the end the "fire or ice" question is moot, because the answers to those looming threats are still the same: The complexities of threats to our collective well-being require unifying perspectives based on diverse viewpoints, in the same way that the survival of ecosystems is dependent upon biological diversity. In Habermas~’s language, we must fight the colonization of the lifeworld in order to survive at all, let alone to survive in a life with meaning. While certainly not the only way, the willingness to facilitate organized democratic deliberation, including encouraging participants to articulate views with which they may personally disagree, is one way to resist this colonization.

Second, policy relevance—Role playing is the best way to promote critical policy analysis and well-informed students

Schaap 2005 (Andrew, University of Melbourne, Politics, Vol 25 Iss 1, February)

Learning political theory is largely about acquiring a vocabulary that enables one to reflect more critically and precisely about the terms on which human beings (do and should) co-operate for and compete over public goods, symbolic and material. As such, political theory is necessarily abstract and general. But, competency in political theory requires an ability to move from the general to the particular and back again, not simply by applying general principles to particular events and experiences but by reflecting on and rearticulating concepts in the light of the particular. Role play is an effective technique for teaching political theory because it requires that students employ political concepts in a particular context so that learning takes place as students try out new vocabularies together with their peers and a lifelong learner in the subject: their teacher.

And, it turns the Aff—failure to play Devil~’s advocate undermines persuasion and there~’s no offense because it doesn~’t cause role confusion

Luckhardt and Bechtel 1994 (C. Grant and William, How to do Things with Logic, p 179)

\*keeps away tunnel vision—stick with one idea \* only having open-mindedness solves considerations

This diagram indicates that first the arguers present their argument(s) for the conclusion in which they believe, here represented as A. Then the arguers formulate the best argument(s) possible for the exact opposite conclusion. If they argue in the first demonstration that, say, the best diagnosis for a patient is cholera, then as a second argumentative step the arguers will present the case for the best diagnosis not being cholera. As a third step, this strategy requires that the arguers then critique this second demonstration as well as possible. If that critique is successful, then the original demonstration stands, and the conclusion that follows is the original one, A. Why, you might wonder, would anyone ever want to engage in what may appear to be logical gymnastics? The answer is that this strategy is useful in two ways. As a method for discovering the truth of a matter, it is often extremely helpful in warding off the intellectual malady called "tunnel vision." This is the tendency we all have to stick to our first view of a matter, failing to recognize contrary evidence as it comes in, and thus failing to revise our view to be consistent with it. In extreme cases of tunnel vision contrary evidence to one~’s original view may even be noticed but be treated as confirming the original view. Requiring medical students who believe the patient has cholera to present the best case against this diagnosis will often cause them to rethink the case they had originally made. The conclusion in the end may still be the same as the original diagnosis—cholera—but now it will be a conclusion that has taken other options seriously. The devil~’s advocate strategy has much to recommend in terms of its persuasiveness. Having demonstrated to your audience that you are aware of a case to be made against A, but that that case must fail, you will be perceived as having been extremely open-minded in your considerations. And you will have been open-minded, provided that you do not hedge in your demonstration of –A. You are not being a true devil~’s advocate if your demonstration of –A is so weak that it is easily criticized in the third step. It is very tempting to hedge your demonstration of –A in this way, but also dangerous, for it invites your audience to point out that there is a better case against A than the one you have presented.

====Broad limits are terrible, several reasons –====

====a. turn exclusion – ethical obligation to vote negative====

Rowland 84 – (Robert C., Baylor U., "Topic Selection in Debate", American Forensics in Perspective Ed. Parson, p. 53-4)

The first major problem identified by the work group as relating to topic selection is the decline in participation in the National Debate Tournament (NDT) policy debate. As Boman notes: There is a growing dissatisfaction with academic debate that utilizes a policy proposition. Programs which are oriented toward debating the national policy debate proposition, so-called "NDT" programs, are diminishing both in scope and size. This decline in policy debate is tied, many in the work group believe, to excessively broad topics. The most obvious characteristic of some recent policy debate topics is extreme breadth. A resolution calling for regulation of land use literally and figuratively covers a lot of ground. National debate topics have not always been so broad. Before the late 1960s the topic often specified a particular policy change. The move from narrow to broad topics has had, according to some, the effect of limiting the number of students who participate in policy debate. First, the breadth of topics has all but destroyed novice debate. Paul Gaske argues that because the stock issues of policy debate are clearly defined, it is superior to value debate as a means of introducing students to the debate process. Despite this advantage of policy debate, Gaske believes that NDT debate is not the best vehicle for teaching beginners. The problem is that broad topics terrify novice debaters, especially those who lack high school debate experience. They are unable to cope with the bre ath of the topic and experience "negophobia," the fear of debating negative. As a consequence, the educational advantages associated with teaching novice through policy debate are lost: "Yet all of these benefits fly out the window as rookies in their formative stage quickly experience humiliation at being caught without evidence or substantive awareness of the issues that confront them at a tournament." The ultimate result is that fewer novices participate in NDT, thus lessening the educational value of the activity and limiting the number of debaters who eventually participate in more advanced divisions of policy debate. In addition to noting the effect on novices, participants argued that broad topics also discourage experienced debaters from continued participation in policy debate. Here, the claim is that it takes so much time and effort to be competitive on a broad topic that students who are concerned with doing more than just debate are forced out of the activity. Gaske notes, that "broad topics discourage participation because of insufficient time to do requisite research." The final effect may be that entire programs wither cease functioning or shift to value debate as a way to avoid unreasonable research burdens. Boman supports this point: "It is this expanding necessity of evidence, and thereby research, which has created a competitive imbalance between institutions that participate in academic debate." In this view, it is the competitive imbalance resulting from the use of broad topics that has led some small schools to cancel their programs.

====b. refusing limits is totalitarian – endless criticism will crowd out diversity and radical change – turns the AFF====

Feldman 98 – Feldman, Assoc Prof Management Policy – Case Western U, ~’98

(Steven P, "Playing with the Pieces: Deconstruction and the Loss of Moral Culture," Journal of Management Studies Vol. 35 Iss. 1, p. 59-79)

Cultural authority imposes upon its members the awesome dichotomy between a meaningful and a meaningless life (Rieff, 1987). Postmodernists, in scorning cultural authority, are opposing the dynamics of culture. Culture opposes the primacy of possibility — that is, the ability of man/woman to express everything and therefore nothing. Culture acts through authority to narrow possible meanings. Narrowing meaning is the dynamic of culture. Without this dynamic, culture cannot exist. This is not totalitarian oppression. Totalitarianism operates to destroy meaning in order to annihilate even the possibility of principled resistance. That is what is totalizing about totalitarianism (Arendt, 1950).

Authority, on the contrary, is always given, or it is fraudulent (Rieff, 1985). Authority is given not because people are dupes, tricked into controlling themselves for some systemic conspiracy, but because through the hierarchical ordering of culture they find their way to purposeful behaviour (Durkheim, ~~[1925~~] 1973) and a feeling of self-respect that makes life meaningful and worthwhile (Cooley, 1922; Rieff, 1985; Sullivan, 1950).

Authority, then, is essential to culture. It protects social life from the primacy of possibility that surrounds every culture. Possibility is the opposite of cultural authority. Cultural diversity cannot be an unlimited goal; its limitation is the central problem of culture (Plato, 1968). No culture can tolerate unlimited diversity without being destroyed. Diversity can only exist inside a culture as a limited range of possibility. Without this ~’imaginary wall~’, individual and social purpose is impossible (Durkheim, ~~[1925~~] 1973). Deprivation must be the first and final function of culture. Likewise, a culture composed of continuous criticism cannot possibly carry out its meaning—defining function. To exist, culture must in some respects remain beyond criticism. The notion of being beyond criticism is unthinkable to the modern mind, with its depthless distrust of authority. This is why faith is not even conceived of as a possibility in the modern—postmodern debate between realism and relativism. The repression of faith evidences not only the endless transitional condition of modern social life, but precisely the fallacy of postmodern ~’openness~’. Complete openness, like complete individuality, is impossible.

Postmodernism is, ironically, an example of cultural repression. To be meaningful, culture must repress what it is not. Postmodernism must repress the idea of faith, because the mere idea of being beyond doubt is contradictory to the postmodern vision of cultural openness. This is why the postmodern discussion stops at belief: belief can be doubted, faith cannot. Herein lies the problem of management ethics. Without a collective capacity for enduring commitment, management ethics becomes vulnerable to the endless rationalizations of the critical intellect. Parker~’s (1995b) ambivalent search for truth (faith) was intolerable to the critical intellects of his colleagues. Where Parker sought truth, they could only feel/see power: ~’~~[W~~]here, oh where, is some recognition of the role of power?~’ (Carter, 1995, p. 574). Power is to criticism what truth is to faith. Only truth can stabilize a management ethics.

====c. turns the ability to create social change – turns the AFF ====

Feldman 98 – Feldman, Assoc Prof Management Policy – Case Western U, ~’98

(Steven P, "Playing with the Pieces: Deconstruction and the Loss of Moral Culture," Journal of Management Studies Vol. 35 Iss. 1, p. 59-79)

Language thus becomes the key villain in an implicit, undemocratic plot hidden deep within organizational culture. Potential voices have been repressed, and the repression is not even recognized. Cooper (1989,p. 483) refers to this use of language by the cultural process as a ~’mystification~’ carried out by a ~’violent hierarchy~’. The ~’violent hierarchy~’ has little to do with top management; it is the repressiveness of language that silences potential voices in organizations. Cooper (1989) follows Derrida in a wish to ~’overturn~’ this hierarchy.

I will make four points concerning the process of deconstruction. First, Cooper~’s belief that organization always harbours its opposite, disorganization, within itself is misleading. The idea of antithetical meanings being active in words is Freud~’s (1957). The crucial concept here is repression. Derrida~’s removal of the process of repression from social reality and positing it solely in language is indeed questionable. Language takes on a life of its own independent of the people who use it. This reification of language loses the driving force of repression in the Freudian sense, that is, the socialization process by which the individual is narrowed into a member of a culture. As John O~’Neill (1988) points out, in this view language never has a local value. But this is exactly what language does have in everyday life. This can be clearly seen in the use of deconstruction in the field of organization theory. Joanne Martin (1990), for example, uses a single paragraph from a speech to make far-ranging assertions about the suppression of feminism in an organization and organizations in general without any attempt to demonstrate the assertions empirically. Deconstruction thus licenses generalization independent of empirical evidence, making it impossible to evaluate the logic and coherence of the argument.

Second, Cooper~’s view that the will to organize originates in an inherent ambivalence in language is reductionistic. Clearly, as Gellner (1979) states, social reality is complex and there are many factors that lead to organizational activities. Postmodernism~’s reification of language ignores, for example, the influences of economic scarcity, geographical conditions, and demographic influences. Even some animal groups organize for hunting and/or safety. Certainly they are not motivated by existential ambivalences in language.

Third, Stephen Linstead does not ask the question why semantic closure is needed as a ~’heuristic device~’ in human life. If he did, he would realize that communities as well as organizations require the ~’inertial force~’ of tradition to hold together in a given form over time (Shils, 1981, p. 25). Without this force, trust and depth of experience would become difficult to say the least. In any case, Linstead~’s acceptance of semantic closure for learning but rejection of it as a way of life is contradictory, because learning assumes a way of fife. Thus, here too, the presumption of a world of openness cannot be a world at all.

Fourth, Cooper~’s characterization of cultural authority as a ~’violent hierarchy~’ is obviously a condemnation of authority. The condemnation is based on the assumption that language is ~’undecidable~’ and thus any hierarchy is repressive. Repression is seen unfavourably because some meanings are ~’privileged~’ while others are denied expression. This argument is misleading because without repression, no meaning is possible. Linstead (1993b, p. 111), for example, wants to reconceptualize the oppositional nature of culture as a ~’mutually supportive pivotal point around which meaning turns~’. This will perhaps have no detrimental effect on organizations, since its practical absurdity will be ignored by everyone ~’except academics. In the area of business ethics, however, Linstead and Grafton-Small~’s (1992,p. 341) goal of reconceptualizing cultural opposition as ~’cohabitation~’, ~’joining~’, and ~’both/and~’ is more dangerous because it attacks precisely the dividing line between right and wrong. It is an attack on moral authority and the capacity of organizations to define and enforce moral limits. Limits exist not fundamentally to oppress the weak, but to define the good. Deconstructionists, by pushing the democratization of meaning to the extreme because of their inability to distinguish between power and authority, forget the lesson of the French Revolution: democracy requires limits, too. This can also be seen in collegial organization, which, without a moral consensus, can easily break down to destructive levels of envy and self-interest (Hirschhorn, 1993).

====They make debate worse – their standard makes it harder for underfunded programs, because big schools can manipulate the topic to cut tons of performative strategies. A clearly limited topic is best for these programs – asking for the ballot sends the wrong signal that minorities can~’t beat the game on its own terms====

Asen 02 – Assistant Professor of Communication at the University of Wisconsin (Robert, "Imagining in the Public Sphere" Philosophy %26 Rhetoric, 2002, Vol. 34 Issue 4) Ebsco

Attention to imagining reveals that including more and more voices in multiple public spheres—a form of direct inclusion—is an indispensable but by itself insufficient reformulation of critical models of the public sphere. As with other discursive norms and practices, imagining may inform interactions even in ostensibly accessible forums. The consequences of collective imagining appear in the doubly disabling tendencies of representation that absent some people from public discourse and yet present them through disabling images. Counterpublic agents encounter these negative images as they enter previously foreclosed forums. Yet disabling tendencies of representation should not prompt a scholarly flight from imagining and its representational power. A flight of this sort would retum public sphere scholarship to a reconstructed bourgeois public sphere as a singular public forum in which everyone—at least in principle—is free to participate. Existing scholarship has demonstrated that such a sphere would most likely betray its legitimating discourses at the level of direct exclusions. A flight from representation also would require a renunciation of political legitimacy, identity formation, cultural diversity, and needs interpretation as appropriate topics of public discourse, for these are social goods. More hopefully, representation ought not to be disavowed because imagining need not be disabling. Counterpublics may interact with wider publics to construct affirmative images of themselves and others that may engender discourses capable of advancing the multiple aims of discourse in the public sphere. Scholars may contribute to this process by elucidating how various forums may exclude potential participants in voice, body, and imagination.