## 1NC

### Topicality

#### A topical affirmative must defend statutory or judicial restrictions on war powers authority of the president in one of the topically designated list areas

#### Resolved means to enact by law

Words and Phrases 64

Permanent Edition

Definition of the word “resolve,” given by Webster is “to express an opinion or determination by resolution or vote; as ‘it was resolved by the legislature;” It is of similar force to the word “enact,” which is defined by Bouvier as meaning “to establish by law”.

#### Vote neg—they undermine debate’s transformative potential—

Extra t

#### 1. Preparation and clash—changing the topic after the fact manipulates balance of prep, which structurally favors the aff because they speak last and permute alternatives—strategic fairness is key to engaging a well-prepared opponent

### China DA

#### Obama’s ignoring human rights with China now – he doesn’t think he has the moral authority

Roth 10

Kenneth Roth, Foreign Affairs, Executive Director of Human Rights Watch, “Empty Promises: Obama's Hesitant Embrace of Human Rights”, 89 Foreign Aff. 10 2010 //jchen

Similarly, in China, Obama followed in the footsteps of successive U.S. presidents by downplaying the importance of human rights in favor of promoting trade, economic ties, and diplomatic cooperation. Before a handpicked audience of "future Chinese leaders" in Shanghai, he spoke of the United States' journey up from slavery and the struggles for women's and workers' rights, making clear that the United States, too, has a far-from-perfect human rights record. He affirmed the United States' bedrock belief "that all men and women are created equal, and possess certain fundamental rights." However, in a question-and-answer session, he seemed to suggest that China's draconian "great firewall" on the Internet was a reflection of different "traditions," rather than demanding that itbe torn down. That remark led to a storm of criticism from Chinese bloggers, and Obama left the country appearing to be in thrall to Chinese economic power and barely interested in risking anything to protect the rights of the 1.3 billion Chinese still living under a dictatorship. In a speech at Georgetown University a few weeks later, Secretary of State Hillary Clinton justified this approach as "principled pragmatism," and administration officials have spoken privately of building up political capital to press China on human rights in the future. But there is no such pressure today. From Clinton's February 2009 statement that human rights "can't interfere" with other U.S. interests in China to Obama's refusal to meet with the Dalai Lama in October, Washington has consistently failed to confront China's authoritarian rulers on questions of religious and political freedom.

#### Closing Gitmo restores credibility – causes resurgence of US international influence

Shattuck, 08, MA International Law Cambridge & CEO of the John F. Kennedy Library Foundation, served as assistant secretary of state for democracy, human rights and labor, and ambassador to the Czech Republic in the Clinton administration,

John, 8/2 “How US can get its groove back,” http://www.boston.com/bostonglobe/editorial\_opinion/oped/articles /2008/08/02/how\_us\_can\_get\_its\_groove\_back/) atw

One of the biggest challenges facing the next president is how to restore US credibility in the world. Despite military assets unparalleled in history, US global standing has hit rock bottom. The United States government is widely perceived today to be a violator of human rights. A poll conducted by the British Broadcasting Corp. last year in 18 countries on all continents revealed that 67 percent disapproved of US detention and interrogation practices in Guantanamo. Another poll in Germany, Great Britain, Poland, and India found that majorities or pluralities condemned the United States for torture and other violations of international law. A third poll by the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations showed that majorities in 13 countries, including traditional allies, believe "the US cannot be trusted to act responsibly in the world." The gap between America's values and its actions has severely eroded US global influence. How does it get it back? First, by obeying the law. The United States was founded on the rule of law. Human rights are defined and protected by the Constitution and international treaties ratified and incorporated into domestic law. By flouting basic rules - such as habeas corpus, the Convention Against Torture, and the Geneva Conventions - the US government has created a series of "law-free zones." In these zones detainees have been abused, thousands held indefinitely without charges, and human rights trampled on. Second, by practicing what we preach. The United States loses credibility when it charges others with human rights violations that it is also committing. The State Department routinely criticizes other countries for engaging in torture, detention without trial, and warrantless electronic surveillance, despite its own recent abysmal record in these areas. Fortunately, history shows that US influence in the world can be restored when its values and policies are brought into alignment. A series of bipartisan human rights initiatives during five recent presidencies - three Republican and two Democratic - enhanced the stature of American foreign policy. President Gerald Ford signed the Helsinki Accords, leading to international recognition of the cause of human rights inside the Soviet bloc. President Jimmy Carter mobilized democratic governments to press for release of political prisoners by repressive regimes. President Ronald Reagan signed the Convention Against Torture and persuaded the Senate to ratify it. President George H.W. Bush joined with other governments in the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe to nurture new democracies of the post-Cold War era. And President Bill Clinton worked with NATO and the UN to implement the Genocide Convention and bring an end to the human rights catastrophe in the Balkans. The next president can restore US influence by reconnecting the nation's values and policies on human rights and the rule of law. He should announce three initiatives.

#### Refocusing on human rights entrenches an ideological divide and reignites a cool war

Feldman 13

Noah Feldman, Bemis Professor of International Law at Harvard Law School, senior adjunct fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations, Salon, 5/19/13, “How Guantanamo affects China: Our human rights hypocrisies ”, http://www.salon.com/2013/05/19/how\_guantanamo\_affects\_china\_our\_human\_rights\_hypocrisies/ //jchen

How Guantanamo affects China: Our human rights hypocrisies

In May 2012, Secretary of State Hillary Clinton and Secretary of Treasury Timothy Geithner were poised to make a rare double visit to China for a high-level strategic and economic dialogue. The presence of both of these key cabinet officials at a delicate moment in the relationship between the two countries marked the importance of the issues. For once, economic interdependence and geopolitics were on the agenda at the same moment.

But on April 22, in the tiny village of Dongshigu in the eastern Shandong province, something happened that would eclipse the visit. Chen Guangcheng, a blind dissident lawyer-activist, managed to scale a high wall to escape the building where he had been under house arrest for two years. Chen broke his foot in the process, yet over the next several days, with the help of other activists, he managed to make his way four hundred miles to Beijing, where he was taken into the U.S. embassy. On April 27, when he was inside the embassy, a YouTube video was posted in which Chen informed Premier Wen Jiabao that he had escaped and demanding punishment for the local officials who had detained him.

In the days that followed, Chen’s future became an international incident of the highest order. Chen first insisted he did not want to leave China. Then, after he was transferred to a Chinese hospital to have his foot treated, he changed his mind. In an emblematic piece of cool war theater, Chen, from his hospital bed, used a borrowed mobile phone to address an open hearing of the U.S. Congress in Washington. He told the congressmen — and the world — that he was worried for his family’s safety and wanted to come to the United States.

Chen’s predicament, featured for days on the front pages of the U.S. press, drew Western eyes away from the secretarial visit. Finally, after days of intense negotiations between ranking U.S. diplomats and their Chinese counterparts, Chen obtained permission to travel to the United States as a special student, a “solution” that spared China the embarrassment of having Chen granted asylum status. The pressing questions of politics and economics that were supposed to be the subject of the visit were ignored, replaced by the subject of human rights.

The Chen Guangcheng episode hints at the hugely complicated and hugely important way that human rights will figure in the cool war. The United States showed a willingness to put human rights issues front and center, even when other issues were supposed to be on the table. The upstaging of a major diplomatic encounter by a focus on China’s human rights violations may conceivably have been planned by someone within the U.S. government, since the whole story of Chen’s escape seems highly improbable without help. Even if the timing of Chen’s escape was accidental, the U.S. embassy still had to decide to take Chen in, creating an inevitable crisis. Either way, the United States knowingly put human rights first in a highly public forum.

From the Chinese standpoint, the whole episode must have been frustrating and embarrassing. Enormous diplomatic resources went into discussing the fate of one previously little-known human rights activist. Instead of being treated respectfully as a rising global power, China was being scolded as a rights violator. The United States seemed to be using human rights to weaken China and give itself an edge in discussions between them.

The emerging historical moment is creating a new context for the rhetoric and practice of human rights. For the first time since the fall of the Soviet Union, the United States now has a major incentive to promote the international human rights agenda. So long as China continues to violate human rights, there may be no better ideological tool for the United States to gain advantage under cool war circumstances.

#### Causes US China War – ideology is comparatively more important than other interests

Feldman 13

Noah Feldman is Bemis Professor of International Law at Harvard Law School, senior adjunct fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations, “Cool War”, 2013 //jchen

The Cold War was a battle of ideals. Communism and liberal de-mocracy each claimed the moral high ground, and each claimed to be superior in practice. As systems, they were mutually exclusive. Only one side could win.

Will the cool war be ideological in the same way? Today, is either China or the United States advocating a universal ideology meant to apply to everyone everywhere? If not, then perhaps in the absence of ideological struggle, the two nations could craft a kind of competitive partnership. Each would have its sphere of influence and shared responsibility for maintaining global security and stability. An Asia dominated by China could be counterbalanced by a West dominated by the United States. Everyone would get along. There would be neither cold war nor cool war. Each would be a “responsible stakeholder” in the international system, as Robert Zoellick, George W. Bush’s deputy secretary of state, optimisti¬cally put it in 2007.

This scenario of shared maintenance of the international order sounds appealing. For the United States, after all, being the sole superpower has had its drawbacks. The financial burden of main¬taining global stability has been high. Even more costly have been America’s unforced errors during two decades of unquestioned dominance. A strategic counterpart might help keep it honest. One reason that the United States invaded Iraq and Afghanistan was that it could.

But if cool war ideologies are sufficiently universal and mutually exclusive, they will pose genuine barriers to peaceful, cooperative strategic coexistence. Ideas about how people should be governed and what states are for exert a tremendous influence on international politics. Political ideas are among the tools we use to define what our interests are. These ideas can be even more important than what realists describe as enduring interests. In interna¬tional affairs, as in every area of life, interests are not facts like the laws of nature. They are, rather, objectives that we choose based on our ideas—the product of what we believe our interests to be.

Of course, countries with very different political ideas and sys¬tems cooperate with one another for mutual benefit. The United States and Saudi Arabia have been close allies for decades despite the fact that one is a democracy with no established religion and the other is an Islamic monarchy. Each side has something the other wants. The United States offers security and a market, and Saudi Arabia offers oil. Even countries at war with each other can reach limited agreements in narrow domains.1

But when political ideologies are opposed and aggressive, then any accommodation cannot be more than temporary—an opportunity for both sides to gather resources for the final battle between them. Cooperation strengthens the enemy and is therefore not to be undertaken except under limited, exceptional circumstances and to avoid disastrous breakdown, like the modest cooperation between the Soviet Union and the United States during the Cold War.

#### Extinction.

White 11 [Mr. Hugh White is professor of strategic studies at the Australian National University in Canberra and a visiting fellow at the Lowy Institute in Sydney. The Obama Doctrine WSJ, 11/25/11 http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970204452104577057660524758198.html]

One risk is that escalating strategic competition will disrupt the vital economic relationship between the U.S. and China. Many hope that the two countries' deep interdependence will prevent their rivalry getting out of hand. But that will only happen if both sides are willing to forgo strategic objectives to protect their economic cooperation. With the Obama Doctrine, the President has declared that he has no intention of doing that. Why should we expect the Chinese to act any different? So it is more likely that escalating rivalry will soon start to erode economic interdependence between the two nations, at great cost to both. The other risk is the growing chance of conflict. A war with China over Taiwan or the Spratly Islands is simple to start but hard to end, and could very easily escalate. China is a nuclear-armed power capable of destroying American cities, and the threshold for nuclear exchanges in a U.S.-China clash might be dangerously unclear and disastrously low.

### Terror DA

#### Their criticism of indefinite detention policy leads to the end of indefinite detention

Davis 7 Morris D., third chief prosecutor for the Guantanamo military commissions; “In Defense of Guantanamo Bay” 117 Yale Law Journal Pocket Part 21; August 13, 2007

Am I ashamed of the picture I see of Guantanamo Bay and the military commissions? Absolutely not. There are those who¶ want to sell a false and ugly picture of the facilities and the process, and they have been very successful in manipulating public¶ opinion while we on the other side have been largely ineffective. If they continue to succeed in generating a false sense of¶ collective shame, then perhaps public pressure will become so great that the political process will bend and cause a change of¶ course. In my opinion, that would be unfortunate and unnecessary. Even some of the most vocal critics claim they are not soft¶ on terrorism and do not want to set terrorists free, but they believe Guantanamo Bay and military commissions have become¶ such liabilities that we need to look for other alternatives. Perhaps if we do a better job of educating the public about the truth,¶ we will demonstrate that there is nothing wrong with the alternatives currently in use. We have a good story to tell, and we¶ should not be ashamed to tell it. I see in Guantanamo a clean, safe, and humane facility to detain enemy combatants and a fair¶ process to adjudicate the guilt or innocence of those alleged to have committed crimes defined by Congress and the laws of war.¶ To paraphrase a quote from Jane Austen's Pride and Prejudice, there is nothing more deceitful than the contrived indignation¶ of those intent on closing Guantanamo Bay by any means necessary. Blow away the smoke of their hyperbole, and look again¶ through clear eyes. The picture looks much better than you were led to believe.

#### They lead to the release dangerous terrorists that destabilize Yemen

Daskal 13 Jennifer, fellow and adjunct professor at Georgetown Law Center; senior counterterrorism counsel, Human Rights Watch; counsel to the assistant attorney general for national security at the Department of Justice; “Don’t Close Guantánamo” *New York Times*; January 10, 2013; <http://www.nytimes.com/2013/01/11/opinion/dont-close-guantanamo.html>

IN 2010, I was branded a member of the “Al Qaeda 7” — a notorious label attached to Department of Justice lawyers who were mocked by critics claiming they had “flocked to Guantánamo to take up the cause of the terrorists.” My crime: I advocated for the closure of the detention facility — a position that has also been taken up by the likes of former President George W. Bush, former Secretary of Defense Robert M. Gates and former Secretary of State Colin L. Powell — and for more humane living conditions for those imprisoned there.¶ At the time, I reacted defensively. I was indignant. I insisted on the legitimacy of my convictions. But even then the writing was on the wall. For a core group of detainees, closing Guantánamo would not mean release or prosecution, as most human rights and civil liberties groups have long advocated. Rather, it would mean relocation to the United States, or elsewhere, for continued detention.¶ Now, almost four years later, I have changed my mind. Despite recognizing the many policy imperatives in favor of closure, despite the bipartisan support for this position, and despite the fact that 166 men still languish there, I now believe that Guantánamo should stay open — at least for the short term.¶ While I have been slow to come to this realization, the signs have been evident for some time. Three years ago, Barack Obama’s administration conducted a comprehensive review of the Guantánamo detainees and concluded that about four dozen prisoners couldn’t be prosecuted, but were too dangerous to be transferred or released. They are still being held under rules of war that allow detention without charge for the duration of hostilities.¶ Others happened to hail from Yemen. Although many of them were cleared for transfer, the transfers were put on indefinite hold because of instability in Yemen, the fear that some might join Al Qaeda forces, and Yemen’s inability to put adequate security measures in place.¶ While the specific numbers have most likely shifted over time, the basic categories persist. These are men whom the current administration will not transfer, release or prosecute, so long as the legal authority to detain, pursuant to the law of war, endures.

#### Yemeni instability causes war

Berger et al 2012(May, Lars Berger, Lecturer in politics and contemporary history of the middle east at the university of salford/Manchester, Maurice Doring, MA in political science, international law and philosophy from the University of Bonn, Sven-Eric Fikenscher, research fellow at Geothe University, Ahmed Salf, Exeutive Director of the Sheba Center for Strategic Studies, Ahmed Al-Wahishi, Executive Secretary of the Yemeni International Affairs Center, “Yemen and the Middle East Conference The Challenge of Failing States and Transnational Terrorism”, <http://usir.salford.ac.uk/22952/1/Yemen_and_the_Middle_East_Conference.pdf>)

 While in a geographical and political sense Yemen is far from being a central actor in the envisioned MEC, its political future could easily shape the gathering on several levels. First, the Middle East Conference aims at establishing a WMD/DVs Free Zone. On the one hand, Yemen is a party to all three legal documents banning weapons of mass destruction: the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention (BTWC), and the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC). In addition, Sana’a has embraced the Gulf Cooperation Council’s (GCC) call for a Gulf WMD Free Zone, independent of Israeli nuclear policy. On the other hand, when it comes to the problématique of WMD and proliferation, Yemen might store chemical weapons, depending on whether rumors about the use of nerve gas against anti- government protesters in early 2011 turn out to be true. In addition, Yemen imported various WMD-capable aircraft and missiles and probably still operates most of them (see Table No. 1). In the aircraft realm, Yemeni decision-makers from the North, the South, and the unifi ed country alike have mostly received Soviet/Russian fighter jets and bombers. 1 The current level of instability and the threat of further deterioration could thus spoil any serious arms control effort in Yemen. This is particularly troublesome since the country, given its history and affiliation with the Arab League, will have to be part of far- reaching regional disarmament initiatives. The prospect of an Arab state with an uncontrolled chemical arsenal is likely to affect Israeli and Iranian calculations with regard to the MEC. Both states are suspicious of the Arab League and tensions between Iran and Saudi Arabia, which is particularly influential in Yemen, have recently worsened. Second, with a long history as one of the region’s eminent weapons markets, Yemen has the potential to serve as a major gateway for illicit weapons, both conventional and unconventional, entering the Arab peninsula and other parts of the Arab East. If the situation escalates, states with an interest in such technology might, for instance, try to obtain missiles and their spare parts or attempt to gain access to sensitive material from the country’s suspected chemical warheads. This could contribute to the prolif- eration of delivery systems as well as WMD thereby undermining the MEC. In 2011, protesters seized an army base in Sana’a, while Al-Qaeda in the Arab Peninsula (AQAP) has, on a frequent basis, been able to temporarily control several cities and launch deadly assaults on military bases in the southern province of Abyan. Such developments could offer AQAP the chance to use existing dual-use laboratories or even to build their own facilities capable of producing biological and chemical material in remote areas under their control. Third, Yemen has the potential to play a more prominent role in the ongoing tensions between Saudi Arabia and Iran. Riyadh has a long history of attempts to shape the course of political events in Yemen with which it shares a 1,800 km-long border. Saudi Arabia’s different reactions to domestic calls for change in Bahrain and Syria have made clear that it is viewing the ‘Arab Spring’ primarily through the lens of its long-running conflict with Iran. From a Saudi point of view, instability in Yemen opens up the specter of increased Iranian influence at a time when Tehran’s foothold in the Arab world’s northern tier comes under strain in the context of the popular uprising against the Assad regime in Syria. a number of narrowly foiled terrorist attacks on U.S. targets and the 2009 Fort Hood shooting in Texas have shifted global attention towards Yemen’s status as the home to Al-Qaeda in the Arab Peninsula. Continuing instability in Yemen allows AQAP to regroup and pose a direct threat to the security of Saudi Arabia and other countries on the Arab peninsula. It also puts AQAP into a position to intensify its support for the ‘home-grown’ attempted terrorist attacks the United States has witnessed over the last couple of years. In short, Yemen’s instability has the potential to allow transnational actors to undermine the security arrangements which the region’s state actors might contemplate as part of the envisioned MEC.

### Cap K

#### What’s so unique about Guantamo? While the affirmative spends all of its energy worrying about a few hundred prisoners in an “exceptional” situation, the working-class is being starved, burnt, poisoned, and shot to death by capitalism.

Johns 2005 (Guantánamo Bay and the Annihilation of the Exception The European Journal of International Law Vol. 16 no.4 © EJIL 2005; all rights reserved Lecturer, University of Sydney Faculty of Law,)

By assuming the affect of exceptionalism, the normative order of Guantánamo Bay has soaked up critical energies with considerable effectiveness, for it is the exception that rings liberal alarm bells. Accordingly, the focus falls on less than 600 persons being abused in Cuba, rather than upon the millions subjected to endemic sexual, physical and substance abuse in prisons across the democratic world. In a similar way, attention is captured by the violation of rights of asylum-seekers, rather than by the over-representation of immigrants in the most informal and vulnerable sectors of the contemporary economy.99

#### Their myopic focus on a particular manifestation of oppression does not provide a specific explanation for the broader linking of struggles – inhibits the possibility for transformative politics.

Heideman 12 [Paul M. Heideman Rutgers University, Newark, pmheideman@gmail.com Historical Materialism Volume 20, Issue 2, pages 210- 221 Beyond Black and White: Transforming African-American Politics, Manning Marable, Second Edition, London: Verso, 2009]

This theorisation of transformative politics is further weakened by its failure to specify any agency that could bring it about. Marable comes close to specifying such an agency with his repeated call to look to ‘the most oppressed sectors of our society’ for a vision of social transformation (pp. xv, 80, 310). Such a call is clearly inadequate. It simply does not follow that the most oppressed sectors of society are best positioned to carry out its most thorough remaking. The homeless, for example, are certainly among the most oppressed groups in the United States (especially in the age of the destruction of free public space and the social safety-net), yet this position does not automatically impart the most radical dynamics to their struggle. Indeed, struggles for squatters’ rights and shelters very rarely break out of localised confrontations with municipal authorities. 8 Additionally, Marable offers no account of how the disparate struggles of the oppressed (for example, the fight against anti-immigrant racism and the fight for the rights of the disabled) are to be unified, beyond the assertion that every confrontation with inequality automatically is linked to every other. Such an inadequate account of social-movement agency deeply weakens whatever strengths Marable’s theory of transformative politics may possess.

#### The continued existence of capitalism forms the basis for all inequalities and oppressions. We do not deny that racialized violence happens and is important to address, but absent a rejection of the class system racism will continue to be deployed as a means to divide and rule the working class and to preserve increasingly wide material disparities.

Taylor 11 [Keeanga-Yamahtta Taylor, doctoral candidate in the department of African-American studies at Northwestern University, Race, class and Marxism, January 4, 2011 http://socialistworker.org/2011/01/04/race-class-and-marxism]

Marxists argue that capitalism is a system that is based on the exploitation of the many by the few. Because it is a system based on gross inequality, it requires various tools to divide the majority--racism and all oppressions under capitalism serve this purpose. Moreover, oppression is used to justify and "explain" unequal relationships in society that enrich the minority that live off the majority's labor. Thus, racism developed initially to explain and justify the enslavement of Africans--because they were less than human and undeserving of liberty and freedom. Everyone accepts the idea that the oppression of slaves was rooted in the class relations of exploitation under that system. Fewer recognize that under capitalism, wage slavery is the pivot around which all other inequalities and oppressions turn. Capitalism used racism to justify plunder, conquest and slavery, but as Karl Marx pointed out, it also used racism to divide and rule--to pit one section of the working class against another and thereby blunt class consciousness. To claim, as Marxists do, that racism is a product of capitalism is not to deny or diminish its importance or impact in American society. It is simply to explain its origins and the reasons for its perpetuation. Many on the left today talk about class as if it is one of many oppressions, often describing it as "classism." What people are really referring to as "classism" is elitism or snobbery, and not the fundamental organization of society under capitalism. Moreover, it is popular today to talk about various oppressions, including class, as intersecting. While it is true that oppressions can reinforce and compound each other, they are born out of the material relations shaped by capitalism and the economic exploitation that is at the heart of capitalist society. In other words, it is the material and economic structure of society that gave rise to a range of ideas and ideologies to justify, explain and help perpetuate that order. In the United States, racism is the most important of those ideologies.

#### The unchecked spread of neoliberal capitalism necessitates extermination in the name of profit – ensures poverty and environmental and cultural destruction, culminating in eventual extinction.

Cole 11 [Dr. Mike Cole is Emeritus Research Professor in Education and Equality at Bishop Grosseteste University College Lincoln, Lincoln, UK. His most recent book is Racism and Education in the U.K. and the U.S.: towards a socialist alternative (New York and London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011 RACISM AND EDUCATION IN THE U.K. AND THE U.S. Palgrave Macmillan (June 7, 2011), pgs. 180-182]

Neo-liberal capitalism, in being primarily about expanding opportunities for large multinational companies, has undermined the power of nation¬states and exacerbated the negative effects of globalization on such services as healthcare, education, water and transport (Martinez and Garcia, 2000). However, the current hegemonic role of business in schooling is para¬mount in convincing workers and future workers that socialism is off the agenda. Marxist educators and other Left radicals should expose this myth. Students have a right to discuss different economic and political systems such as twenty-first-century democratic socialism. This is particularly press¬ing given the current economic recession. It is easier in general for discussion in schools to embrace issues of gender, “race,” disability, sexual orientation, and social class when social class relates just to attainment than to address social class in the context of overthrowing capitalism, and replacing it with world democratic socialism, where participatory democracy is central. The latter may thus be seen as the last taboo, and, of course, understandably so. It is time to move forward and bring such discussions into schools, colleges, and universities, Marxist and other Left educators can make the case that such considerations are a perfectly reasonable democratic demand. Global capitalism is out of control, and the very survival of our planet is dependent on dialogical education that considers the socialist alternative, an alternative distanced from the distortions of Marx by Stalinism. No longer can socialism be divorced from environmental and ecologi¬cal issues. McLaren and Houston (2005, p, 167) have argued that “escalat¬ing environmental problems at all geographical scales from local to global have become a pressing reality that critical educators can no longer afford to ignore.” They go on to cite “the complicity between global profiteering, resource colonization, and the wholesale ecological devastation that has become a matter of everyday life for most species on the planet.” Following Kahn (2003), they state the need for “a critical dialogue between social and eco-justice” (McLaren and Houston 2005, p. 168). They call for a dialec¬tics of ecological and environmental justice to reveal the malign interaction between capitalism, imperialism, and ecology that has created widespread environmental degradation that has dramatically accelerated with the onset of neo-liberalism. World capitalism’s environmentally racist (Bullard et al., 2007) effects in both the “developing” and “developed” world should be discussed openly and freely in the educational institutions. As far as the “developing world” is concerned, there are, for example, such issues as the environmentally dev-astating method of extraction of natural resources utilized by multinational corporations in numerous “developing” countries that have devastated eco-systems and destroyed cultures and livelihoods (World Council of Churches, 1994, cited in Robinson, 2000), with toxic waste polluting groundwater, soil and the atmosphere (e.g., Robinson, 2000). In addition, there is trans¬boundary dumping of hazardous waste by developed countries to develop¬ing nations, usually in sub-Sahara Africa (e.g., Ibitayo et al., 2008; see also Blanco, 2010 on Latin America). As far as the “developed” world is concerned, in the U.S., for example, people of color are concentrated around hazardous waste facilities-more than half of the nine million people living within two miles of such facilities are minorities (Bullard et al., 2007). Finally, there is the ubiquitous issue of climate change, itself linked to the totally destructive impact of capitalism. Joel Kovel (2010) has described cli-mate change as “a menace without parallel in the whole history of humanity.” However, on a positive note, he argues that “[it]s spectacular and dramatic character can generate narratives capable of arousing general concern and thus provide a stimulus to build movements of resistance.” Climate change is linked to loss to the planet of living things—also a rallying point for young people. For Marxist educators, this provides a good inroad for linking envi¬ronment, global capitalism, and arguments for the socialist alternative. As Kovel (2010) puts it, only within the framework of a revolutionary ecoso- cialist society can we deal with the twinned crises of climate change and spe¬cies loss—and others as well—within a coherent program centered around the flourishing of life.” Capitalism and the destruction of the environment are inextricably linked, to the extent that it is becoming increasingly apparent that saving the environment is dependent on the destruction of capitalism. Debate should therefore include a consideration of the connections between global capital¬ism and environmental destruction, as well as a discussion of the socialist alternative. The need for environmental issues to be allied to socialism is paramount. As Nick Beams (2009) notes, all the “green” opponents of Marxism view “the overthrow of the capitalist system by means of the socialist revolution as the key to resolving the problems of global warming” as either “unrealis¬tic,” “not immediate enough,” or believe that socialism is hostile to nature. Beams (ibid.) argues that, in reality, “the system of market relations is based on the separation of the producers from the means of production, and it is this separation—-the metabolic rift between [human beings] and nature— that is the source of the crisis.” In other words, instead of the real producers of wealth (the working class) having control over what they produce and rationally assigning this to human need, goods are irrationally produced for profit. Beams (ibid.) quotes Marx (1894 [1966] p. 959) as follows: Freedom. ..can consist only in this, that socialised man, the associated pro¬ducers, govern the human metabolism with nature in a rational way, bringing it under their collective control instead of being dominated by it as a blind power; accomplishing it with the least expenditure of energy and in conditions most worthy and appropriate for their human nature. As Beams (2009) concludes, “[f]ar from Marx being outdated, the world has, so to speak, caught up with Marx.”

#### You should endorse the best political strategy for addressing all manifestations of exploitation and oppression. Debates about transforming society must center on what constitutes the best method for addressing ongoing struggles

McGregor 13 [Sheila McGregor Marxism and women’s oppression today International Socialism Issue: 138 Posted: 10 April 13 http://www.isj.org.uk/index.php4?id=885&issue=138]

Revolutionary socialists take part in all struggles against exploitation and oppression, whether they are against austerity measures, sexual violence, the impact of war, police racism or the growth of fascist organisations, attempting to unite the maximum number of forces in any given struggle. At the same time, revolutionary socialists are concerned not only with combatting the particular effects of exploitation and oppression, but also with taking the struggle forward so as to break the very chains of exploitation, which give rise to all forms of oppression. Thus involvement in struggle is both a practical question of how best to build a protest or strike and an ideological question of how to win those you are struggling alongside to an understanding that it is not enough to win over the particular struggle, but that what is required is a revolutionary transformation of society. When people embark on a struggle over an issue, they usually come with a mixture of ideas about the society they live in, what they are fighting for and how best to achieve their goal. Inherent in any struggle is a debate about how to take it forward. Struggles against sexism are no exception to this.

#### Only beginning with class relations can eliminate the ideological machinery which legitimizes and extends class domination and Islamophobic practices. Materialist critique of the historical relationship between the means of production and the process of racialization in the United States should mark the starting point of the transformation of exploitative class and market relations.

San Juan 8 [E. San Juan, Jr., Filipino American literary academic, mentor, cultural reviewer, civic intellectual, activist, writer, essayist, video/film maker, editor, and poet whose works related to the Filipino Diaspora in English and Filipino languages have been translated into German, Russian, French, Italian, and Chinese.[2] As an author of books on race and cultural studies,[3] he was a “major influence on the academic world”.[2] He was the director of the Philippines Cultural Studies Center in Storrs, Connecticut in the United States.[1] In 1999, San Juan, Jr. received the Centennial Award for Achievement in Literature from the Cultural Center of the Philippines because of his contributions to Filipino and Filipino American Studies.[2] FROM RACE/RACISM TO CLASS STRUGGLE: On Critical Race Theory Posted on October 4, 2008 FROM RACE TO CLASS STRUGGLE: A RE-TURN OF CRITICAL RACE THEORY, THE PHILIPPINES MATRIX PROJECT http://philcsc.wordpress.com/2008/10/04/from-raceracism-to-class-struggle-on-critical-race-theory/]

Given its composition, and the pervasive climate of reaction, the Forum could not of course endorse a radical approach that would focus on the elimination of the exploitation of labor (labor power as commodity) as a necessary first step. Given its limits, it could not espouse a need for a thoroughgoing change of the material basis of social production and reproduction—the latter involving the hegemonic rule of the propertied bloc in each society profiting from the unequal division of labor and the unequal distribution of social wealth—on which the institutional practices of racism (apartheid, discrimination, genocide) thrive. “Race is the modality in which class is lived,” as Stuart Hall remarks concerning post-1945 Britain (Solomos 1986, 103). Without the political power in the hands of the democratic-popular masses under the leadership of the working class, the ideological machinery (laws, customs, religion, state bureaucracy) that legitimizes class domination, with its attendant racist practices, cannot be changed. What is required is a revolutionary process that mobilizes a broad constituency based on substantive equality and social justice as an essential part of the agenda to dissolve class structures; any change in the ideas, beliefs, and norms would produce changes in the economic, political and social institutions, which would in turn promote wide-ranging changes in social relations among groups, sectors, and so on. Within a historical-materialist framework, the starting point and end point for analyzing the relations between structures in any sociohistorical totality cannot be anything else but the production and reproduction of material existence. The existence of any totality follows transformation rules whereby it is constantly being restructured into a new formation (Harvey 1973). These rules reflect the dialectical unfolding of manifold contradictions constituting the internal relations of the totality. Within this conflicted, determinate totality, race cannot be reduced to class, nor can class be subsumed by race, since those concepts express different forms of social relations. What is the exact relation between the two? This depends on the historical character of the social production in question and the ideological-political class struggles defining it. In his valuable treatise, The Invention of the White Race, Theodore Allen has demonstrated the precise genealogy and configuration of racism in the U.S. It first manifested itself when the European colonial settlers based on private property in land and resources subdued another social order based on collective, tribal tenure of land and resources, denying the latter any social identity—“social death” for Native Americans. We then shift our attention to the emergence of the white race and its system of racial oppression with the defeat of Bacon’s Rebellion in 1677 and the establishment of a system of lifetime hereditary bond servitude (for African Americans): “The insistence on the social distinction between the poorest member of the oppressor group and any member, however propertied, of the oppressed group, is the hallmark of racial oppression” (Allen 1997, 243). In effect, white supremacy defining the nature of civil society was constructed at a particular historical conjuncture demanded by class war. The result is a flexible and adjustable system that can adjust its racial dynamics in order to divide the subordinates, resist any critique of its ideological legitimacy, and prevent any counter-hegemonic bloc of forces from overthrowing class rule. Class struggle intervenes through its impact in the ideological-political sphere of civil society. Racial categories operate through the mediation of civil society which (with the class-manipulated State) regulate personal relations through the reifying determinations of value, market exchange, and capital. Harry Chang comments on the social mediation of racial categories: “Blacks and whites constitute social blocks in a developed setting of ‘mass society’ in which social types (instead of persons) figure as basic units of economic and political management…The crucial intervention of objectification, i.e., relational poles conceived as the intrinsic quality of objects in relation, must not be neglected here. Racial formation in a country is an aspect of class formation, but the reason races are not classes lies in this objectification process (or fetishization)” (1985, 43). Commodity fetishism enables the ideology of racism (inferiority tied to biology, genetics, cultural attributes) to register its effects in common-sense thinking and routine behavior in class-divided society (Lukacs 1971). Because market relations hide unequal power relations, sustained ideological critique and transformative collective actions are imperative. This signifies the heuristic maxim of “permanent revolution” (Lefevbre 1968, 171) in Marxist thought: any long-term political struggle to abolish capitalism as a system of extracting surplus value through a system of the unequal division of labor (and rewards) needs to alter the institutions and practices of civil society that replicate and strengthen the fetishizing or objectifying mechanism of commodity production and exchange (the capitalist mode of production). If racism springs from the reification of physical attributes (skin color, eye shape) to validate the differential privileges in a bourgeois regime, then the abolition of labor-power as a commodity will be a necessary if not sufficient step in doing away with the conditions that require racial privileging of certain groups in class-divided formations. Racism is not an end in itself but, despite its seeming autonomy, an instrumentality of class rule.

#### Centering class in our analysis does not deny individuals’ experiences of racism and violence. Instead, beginning from the question of class as primary antagonism enables more effective struggles against race and other manifestations of oppression.

Smith 6 [Sharon Smith is also the author of Women and Socialism: Essays on Women’s Liberation (Haymarket Books, 2005). Her writings appear regularly in Socialist Worker newspaper and the ISR. Race, class, and "whiteness theory" ISR Issue 46, March–April 2006 http://isreview.org/issues/46/whiteness.shtml]

Meyerson counters this set of assumptions, proposing that Marx’s emphasis on the centrality of class relations brings oppression to the forefront, as a precondition for working-class unity: Marxism properly interpreted emphasizes the primacy of class in a number of senses. One, of course, is the primacy of the working class as a revolutionary agent—a primacy which does not, as often thought, render women and people of color “secondary.” Such an equation of white male and working class, as well as a corresponding division between a “white” male working class identity and all the others, whose identity is thereby viewed as either primarily one of gender and race or hybrid, is a view this essay contests all along the way. The primacy of class means that building a multiracial, multi-gendered international working-class organization or organizations should be the goal of any revolutionary movement: the primacy of class puts the fight against racism and sexism at the center. The intelligibility of this position is rooted in the explanatory primacy of class analysis for understanding the structural determinants of race, gender and class oppression. Oppression is multiple and intersecting but its causes are not.18 Designating class as the primary antagonism in capitalist society bears no inference on the “importance” of racism, as Roediger claims. Marxism merely assumes a causal relationship—that white supremacy as a system was instituted by capital, to the detriment of labor as a whole. Marxist theory rests on the assumption that white workers do not benefit from a system of white supremacy. Indeed, Marx argued of slavery, the most oppressive of all systems of exploitation, “In the United States of America, every independent workers’ movement was paralyzed as long as slavery disfigured part of the republic. Labor cannot emancipate itself in the white skin where in the black it is branded.”19 Marx was not alone in assuming that racism, by dividing the working class along ideological lines, harmed the class interests of both white and Black workers. Abolitionist Frederick Douglass stated unambiguously of slaveholders, “They divided both to conquer each.”20 Douglass elaborated, “Both are plundered and by the same plunderers. The slave is robbed by his master, of all his earnings above what is required for his physical necessities; and the white man is robbed by the slave system, because he is flung into competition with a class of laborers who work without wages.”21 Capitalism forces workers to compete with each other. The unremitting pressure from a layer of workers—be they low-wage or unemployed—is a constant reminder that workers compete for limited jobs that afford a decent standard of living. The working class has no interest in maintaining a system that thrives upon inequality and oppression. Indeed, all empirical evidence shows quite the opposite. When the racist poll tax was passed in the South, imposing property and other requirements designed to shut out Black voters, many poor whites also lost the right to vote. After Mississippi passed its poll tax law, the number of qualified white voters fell from 130,000 to 68,000.22 The effects of segregation extended well beyond the electoral arena. Jim Crow segregation empowered only the rule of capital. Whenever employers have been able to use racism to divide Black from white workers, preventing unionization, both Black and white workers earn lower wages. This is just as true in recent decades as it was 100 years ago. Indeed, as Shawki points out of the 1970s, “In a study of major metropolitan areas Michael Reich found a correlation between the degree of income inequality between whites and Blacks and the degree of income inequality between whites.”23 The study concluded: But what is most dramatic—in each of these blue-collar groups, the Southern white workers earned less than Northern Black workers. Despite the continued gross discrimination against Black skilled craftsmen in the North, the “privileged” Southern whites earned 4 percent less than they did. Southern male white operatives averaged…18 percent less than Northern Black male operatives. And Southern white service workers earned…14 percent less than Northern Black male service workers.”24 Racism against Blacks and other racially oppressed groups serves both to lower the living standards of the entire working class and to weaken workers’ ability to fight back. Whenever capitalists can threaten to replace one group of workers with another—poorly paid—group of workers, neither group benefits. Thus, the historically nonunion South has not only depressed the wages of Black workers, but also lowered the wages of Southern white workers overall—and prevented the labor movement from achieving victory at important junctures. So even in the short term the working class as a whole has nothing to gain from oppression.

### Case

#### No unending executive adventurism – reject their Bush-era evidence.

Aziz 13 [Omer, graduate student at Cambridge University, is a researcher at the Center for International and Defense Policy at Queen’s University, “The Obama Doctrine's Second Term,” Project Syndicate, 2-5, http://www.project-syndicate.org/blog/the-obama-doctrine-s-second-term--by-omer-aziz]

The Obama Doctrine’s first term has been a remarkable success. After the $3 trillion boondoggle in Iraq, a failed nation-building mission in Afghanistan, and the incessant saber-rattling of the previous Administration, President Obama was able to reorient U.S. foreign policy in a more restrained and realistic direction. He did this in a number of ways. First, an end to large ground wars. As Defense Secretary Robert Gates put it in February 2011, anyone who advised future presidents to conduct massive ground operations ought “to have [their] head examined.” Second, a reliance on Secret Operations and drones to go after both members of al Qaeda and other terrorist outfits in Pakistan as well as East Africa. Third, a rebalancing of U.S. foreign policy towards the Asia-Pacific — a region neglected during George W. Bush's terms but one that possesses a majority of the world’s nuclear powers, half the world’s GDP, and tomorrow’s potential threats. Finally, under Obama's leadership, the United States has finally begun to ask allies to pick up the tab on some of their security costs. With the U.S. fiscal situation necessitating retrenchment, coupled with a lack of appetite on the part of the American public for foreign policy adventurism, Obama has begun the arduous process of burden-sharing necessary to maintain American strength at home and abroad. What this amounted to over the past four years was a vigorous and unilateral pursuit of narrow national interests and a multilateral pursuit of interests only indirectly affecting the United States. Turkey, a Western ally, is now leading the campaign against Bashar al-Assad’s regime in Syria. Japan, Korea, India, the Philippines, Myanmar, and Australia all now act as de facto balancers of an increasingly assertive China. With the withdrawal of two troop brigades from the continent, Europe is being asked to start looking after its own security. In other words, the days of free security and therefore, free riding, are now over. The results of a more restrained foreign policy are plentiful. Obama was able to assemble a diverse coalition of states to execute regime-change in Libya where there is now a moderate democratic government in place. Libya remains a democracy in transition, but the possibilities of self-government are ripe. What’s more, the United States was able to do it on the cheap. Iran’s enrichment program has been hampered by the clandestine cyber program codenamed Olympic Games. While Mullah Omar remains at large, al Qaeda’s leadership in Afghanistan and Pakistan has been virtually decimated. With China, the United States has maintained a policy of engagement and explicitly rejected a containment strategy, though there is now something resembling a cool war — not yet a cold war — as Noah Feldman of Harvard Law School puts it, between the two economic giants. The phrase that best describes the Obama Doctrine is one that was used by an anonymous Administration official during the Libya campaign and then picked up by Republicans as a talking point: Leading From Behind. The origin of the term dates not to weak-kneed Democratic orthodoxy but to Nelson Mandela, who wrote in his autobiography that true leadership often required navigating and dictating aims ‘from behind.’ The term, when applied to U.S. foreign policy, has a degree of metaphorical verity to it: Obama has led from behind the scenes in pursuing terrorists and militants, is shifting some of the prodigious expenses of international security to others, and has begun the U.S. pivot to the Asia-Pacific region. The Iraq War may seem to be a distant memory to many in North America, but its after-effects in the Middle East and Asia tarnished the United States' image abroad and rendered claims to moral superiority risible. Leading From Behind is the final nail in the coffin of the neoconservatives' failed imperial policies.

#### They don’t solve– European fill-in leads to worse Islamaphobic policies being enacted.

Antepli 12 [Imam Abdullah AntepliMuslim Chaplain, Duke University, Islamophobia: America Becoming Europe, 2/8/12,

http://www.huffingtonpost.com/imam-abdullah-antepli/islamophobia-america-becoming-europe\_b\_1247167.html]

Islamophobia, defined as unfounded and irrational fear of Islam as a religion and Muslims as a people, has been on the rise both in Europe and the U.S. for various reasons. The types of Islamophobia seen on either side of the Atlantic were significantly different from each other in terms of their manifestations and impacts, up until two or three years ago. If I have to summarize this in simple terms, the European Islamophobia has always been somewhat systemic and more mainstream. There are laws passed to protect "enlightened" European civilization against "primitive" Muslim cultures or to prevent the general "Islamization of Europe." The faces and voices of Islamophobia in Europe that call for action against this "imminent threat" often had no difficulty finding tremendous support from their fellow Europeans. Several radical political parties that use this anti-Muslim message as their central mission have gained significant representation in various European parliaments. Many academics who beat the "Muslims out!" drum have been promoted in various European universities. Whenever we American Muslims used to complain about instances of Islamophobia to our European Muslim brothers and sisters, they would immediately ask us to count our blessings because what they go through is a lot harder to deal with and much more difficult to overcome.

#### Their rejection of objective truth makes it impossible to challenge racism and sexism.

Nussbaum, 01 (Martha, Ernst Freund Distinguished Service Professor of Law and Ethics at the University of Chicago, *New Literary History* 32.4 (2001) 883-906, Muse)

Such observations might lead us to reject the concept of objectivity altogether, and to argue that the purported norms of truth and objectivity are never anything more than a mask worn by power for its own ends. Some postmodernist thinkers have taken this course. I agree with Satya Mohanty (and Noam Chomsky) that such a conclusion is both premature and pernicious. No good arguments lead us to jettison altogether the normative notion of objectivity; and we badly need to cling to such a norm, if we want to show why certain arguments, say, about sex difference or racial difference, are bad science. We need to cling to the norm in politics and ethics as well, if we want to show why certain views are justifiable and others (racism, sexism) are not. Even the norm of respect for difference and pluralism is itself, of course, a definite and controversial norm, and thus we cannot defend it against those who attack it if we embrace either cultural relativism or a Foucauldian view [8](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/new_literary_history/v032/32.4nussbaum.html" \l "FOOT8) that there is nothing more to truth than local expressions of power. On the question of objectivity in science and ethics, my sympathies (and arguments insofar as I have them) lie basically with Putnam: we do have available to us a quite robust conception of objectivity both in science and in ethics, and we do not need to rely, in articulating this notion, on any problematic notion of the given, or unmediated access to reality. Where interests are concerned, we may follow Putnam's pragmatist turn and suggest that though all truth may be in a sense interested, infused by human needs and projects and the way that those needs and projects shape theorizing and even observation, this does not mean that all interests are on a par and anything goes. We have plenty of room for a distinction between illegitimate bias and legitimate interests, both in science and in ethics, and thus for a distinction between the merely or illicitly or biasedly subjective and the objective. Allen Wood's essay in this issue offers one attractive account of that distinction in ethics.

#### Though social science is never perfect, our author’s rigorous scholarship allows us to make functioning assessments about Middle Eastern politics

Halliday 93

Fred Halliday, IR at LSE, 93, “ ‘Orientalism’ and its Critics” British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies 20(2) pp.145-146

The Middle East is not unique, except possibly in the content of the myths that are propagated about it, from within and without. The political, economic, social and cultural activities of the peoples of this region have their peculiarities and differences, as much between each other , as in terms of one Middle East contrasted with the outside world. Material concerns, jokes, the pleasures of good food, and the horrors of political oppression, are theirs as much as any other peoples in the world. The development of social science in general will never be completed, and each specific issue, or country, or incident, poses questions for it. But we are no more precluded by our concepts from understanding the Middle East, and no more limited in our ideas, whatever their origins, than in addressing any other area of the world. In normative terms, we have, perhaps, allowed the discussion to be too inffected by relativism and doubt as to the validity of universal standards, in the face of a mistaken, and often self-interested, critique of imperialism and Western norms. Perhaps I could sum this up by adapting a slogan: *na gharbzadegi, na sharqzadegi*, neither westoxification nor eastoxification. Let us therefore go beyond this unnecessarily polarized and in some ways methodologically impoverished debate and continue with the job of studying these societies. I have warned against the perils of tafsir, but I will end with the words from the Qur’an that can be easily and I hope not too arbitrarily interpreted to justify this enterprise, wa ja’alnakum shu’uban wa-qaba’ila li-ta’arafu. ‘And I have created peoples and trives so that they could get to know each other.’42 That could be the motto for our necessarily unfinished, and unfinishable, endavour.

#### There is no perfectly rational subject or perfectly accessible truth, but we can make reasonable predictions about international actors

Miller 2 (Katherine Miller, Prof. of Communication at Texas A&M, Communication theories: Perspectives, processes, and contexts, 2002, p 35-36)

If positivism, in its classical and logical forms, is largely rejected, what philosophical foundation should take its place as a framework for social research? Very different answers to this question have been proposed. Some social researchers argue that flaws in the positivist foundation require a radically different philosophy of sci- encee, one in which the realist ontology, objec- ive epistemology, and value-free axiology of positivism are vehemently rejected and replaced with forms of inquiry that honor nominalism, subjectivism, and omnipresent values. The posi- tions of these scholars are discussed in great detail in Chapters 4 and 5 as we consider interpretive and critical petspectives on communication theory. However, some scholars believe that a rejection of positivism does not require a total rejection of realism, objectivity, and the scientific goal of value-free inquiry. However, these scholars reject the notion of absolute truth, reject the unassailable foundation of observation, and reject the assumption of an always steady and upward accumulation of knowledge. In these rejections, scholars have forged a new philosophy of science that D. C. Phillips (1987, 1990, 1992) has called post-positivism. The metatheoretical tenets of this position are discussed in the next section. Metatheoretical Commitments Ontology In Chapter 2, we discussed three ontological positions: the realist, the nominalist, and the social constructionist. To summarize, a realist believes in a hard and solid reality of physical and social objects, a nominalist proposes that the reality of social entities exists only in the names and labels we provide for them, and a social constructionist emphasizes the ways in which social meanings are created through historical and contemporary interaction. Both the realist and the social constructionist positions make contributions to the ontology of post-positivist researchers in the communication discipline. Researchers in the post-positivist tradition can be seen as realists in that they support the position that phenomena exist independent of our perceptions and theories about them (Phillips, 1987). However, this realism is tempered by the argument that humans cannot fully apprehend that reality and that the driving mechanisms in the social and physical world cannot be fully understood. As J. D. Smith (1990, p. 171) states, "Realism is essential . . . because it poses 'at least in principle, a standard by which all human societies and their beliefs can be judged: they can all have beliefs about the world which turn out to be mistaken'" (Trigg, 1985, p. 22). Phillips argues, however, that a post-positivist ontology does not deny the notions inherent in approaches advocating a "social construction of reality" (Berger & Luckmann, 1967). Rather, Phillips (1990) draws the distinction between beliefs about the reality and the objective reality (pp. 42-43). Making this distinction allows a post-positivist scholar to appreciate (and investigate) multiple realities that are constructed by social collectives through communicative inter-action. For example, a post-positivist scholar could study the ways that beliefs about the imminent end of the world influence the behaviors of mountain survivalists, members of cults, and fundamental religious groups. However, the fact that a social group has arrived at certain beliefs about the world does not make those beliefs about the social or physical world necessarily true. As Phillips (1990) notes, "It is clear that Freudians believe in the reality of the id and superego and the rest, and they act as if these are realities; but their believing in these things does not make them real" (p. 43). It could be further argued that post-positivism is consistent with social constructionist views in two important ways. First, many post-positivists would argue that the process of social construction occurs in relatively patterned ways that are amenable to the type of social scientific investigation undertaken by post-positivists. Individuals have free will and creativity but they exercise that creativity in ways that are often (though not always, certainly) patterned and predictable. In the field of mass communication, Barbara Wilson (1994) argues convincingly for this point regarding her own study of children's responses to the mass media: I believe that children's interpretations and responses are as richly individualistic as snow-flakes. However, I also believe that there are common patterns that characterize a majority of young viewers and that those patterns are as predictable and explainable as the basic process by which all those unique snowflakes are formed from water, (p. 25) Second, many post-positivists would argue that social constructions are regularly reified and treated as objective by actors in the social world. Thus, it is reasonable to study the impact of these reified constructions on our communicative lives. Tompkins (1997) has made this argument with regard to his organizational communication research with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA): The engineers, scientists, managers, bureau-crats, and other kinds of members did not believe in a socially constructed world. They believed the rockets they made did in fact go to the moon. Moreover, they believed that NASA and the contractor firms who worked for them were real. They believed that these organizations could succeed or fail by objective criteria and that their bosses could hire or fire, reward or penalize individuals—actions with real consequences, (p. 369) Thus, a social constructionist ontology is consistent with a post-positivist position that emphasizes both the patterned nature of the social construction process and the regular and predictable effects that reified social constructions have on social actors. Thus, the ontology of post-positivism is not necessarily the belief in a hard, immutable, and unchanging social world implied in a strict realist stance. Rather, a post-positivist ontology entails a belief in regularity and pattern in our interactions with others. The ways in which these regularities and patterns are studied within post-positivist theory are considered in the next section.

#### Islamophobia’ portrays all Muslims as defined by Islam—locks in discrimination and anti-Muslim alarmism

Halliday, professor of international relations – London School of Economics, ‘99

(Fred, “`Islamophobia’ reconsidered,” *Ethnic and Racial Studies* Volume 22, Number 5, p. 892-902, September)

No subject in contemporary public discussion has attracted more confused discussion than that of relations between ‘Islam’ and the West. Whether it be the discussion of relations between Muslim states and non- Muslim countries, or that of the relations between non-Muslims and Muslims within Western countries, the tendency has on both sides been, with some exceptions , towards alarmism and simplification. Alarmism has concerned the ‘threat’ which, from one side, ‘Islam’ poses to the non- Muslim world, and on the other, which ‘the West’ poses to Muslims. Non- Muslim simplification involves many obvious issues: terrorism – as if most Muslims are terrorists or most terrorists are Muslims; the degree of aggressiveness found in the Muslim world and the responsibility of Muslims for this; the willingness of Muslims to allow for diversity, debate, respect for human rights. It is not only the sensationalist media, but also writers with an eye to current anxieties of the reading public, such as V. S. Naipaul and Samuel Huntington, who reinforce such misrepresentation. Muslim simplification is itself two-sided: on the one hand, a stereotyping of the ‘West’; on the other, the assertion of a unitary identity for all Muslims, and of a unitary interpretation of text and culture. The core simplification involves these very terms themselves: ‘the West’ is not a valid aggregation of the modern world and lends itself far too easily to monist, conspiratorial presentations of political and social interaction. But nor is the term ‘Islam’ a valid shorthand for summarizing how a billion Muslims, divided into over éfty states, and into myriad ethnicities and social groups, relate to the contemporary world, to each other or to the non-Muslim world. To get away from such simpliécations is, however, virtually impossible, since both those opposed to ‘Islam’ and those invoking it adhere to such labels. Moreover, as much of this literature shows, those who are most intent on critiquing standard Western prejudices about the Muslim world themselves fall back on another set of simplifcations. Instead of fearing or hating anti-Muslim stereotypes, we are now invited to respect, understand, study ‘Islam’. Islamophobia, Eurocentrism, stereotyping The literature under review here ranges across several aspects of this question. The Runnymede and Wilton Park reports identify misinterpretations, above all in the West, of the Muslim world and advocate a more tolerant, informed, relation to the Muslim world. They reèect an approach derived, on the one hand, from race relations and, on the other, from inter-faith dialogue. They both set current frictions in the context of the long historical relations between Muslims and the Christian world, both identify the role of the media in reinforcing stereotypes, both advocate greater discussion between communities. Most signiécantly, perhaps, they accept the term ‘Islam’ as a denomination of the primary identity of those who are Muslims; they avoid discussion of the diversities within Muslim societies, on ethnic grounds or on the interpretation of the Muslim tradition and on its application to the contemporary world.

## 2NC – CAP

#### Indefinite Detention is not spurred by racism, but rather the authoritarian neoliberal state which pre-empts dissent

Loo 13

Dennis Loo Associate Professor of Sociology at Cal Poly Pomona, 4/27/13, "Courting Catastrophe: Neoliberalism's Provoking of Disasters on the Micro and Macro Levels", http://dennisloo.com/Sample-Data-Articles/courting-catastrophe-neoliberalism-s-provoking-of-disasters-on-the-micro-and-macro-levels.html //jchen

As they laud their respect for the rule of law and for democracy and liberty, neoliberals have been systematically insulating the government and corporate world, especially the highest executive levels, from the people’s opinions and voices, creating an executive that is not accountable or even supervised by any other governmental branch or by the People. This reflects a momentous shift in governmental norms worldwide that begin in the 1970s known as public order policies that treat everyone as a suspect and where governmental coercion can be used upon you pre-emptively, even if you have committed no crime. What was displayed as a dystopian future in the film Minority Report, in other words, is now the emergent standard of governance. These policies have been instituted under the signboard of the “war on terror” but their inception date from before 9/11 and are not being carried out because of anti-state terrorism. This explains the adoption of expressly fascist laws such as Obama’s open use of assassination of those he alone has designated as enemies of the state and the National Defense Authorization Act of 2012 that, upon Obama’s request, included American citizens picked up on U.S. soil as among those who can, simply by accusation, be arrested and held indefinitely without a right to challenge their detention.

Neoliberals’ insistence on what amounts to dictatorial powers and their campaign to override the rule of law is necessary because if their true agenda were publicly unveiled, it would go down to ignominious defeat since their agenda means the relentless exploitation of the vast majority of humanity and the pillaging of the environment. Neoliberal policies systematically stick it to the public and deprive them of the means to life. Given this, there is no way that they can stay in power if they don’t utilize increasingly unfettered forms of power. That explains the yawning gap between what they’re doing and what they are saying about what they’re doing: they can only get their way through misrepresentation, manipulation, and force. Authorities’ forcible evictions of the Occupy encampments in spite of and in fact, in significant respect, due to the popularity of Occupy, are an example of authorities’ intolerance for dissent and exposés of their policies.

#### Indefinite detention policies are created by the financialization of society and culture, which justifies the authoritarian state that strips away rights in order to protect wealth

Giroux 12

Henry Giroux, American scholar and cultural critic, 10/2/12, “Henry A. Giroux: Why Don't Americans Care About Democracy at Home?”, http://truth-out.org/opinion/item/11872-henry-a-giroux-why-dont-americans-care-about-democracy-at-home //jchen

At the same time, the financialization of the economy and culture has resulted in the poisonous growth of monopoly power, predatory lending, abusive credit card practices and misuses of CEO pay. The false but central neoliberal tenet that markets can solve all of society's problems has no way of limiting the power of money and has given rise to "a politics in which policies that favor the rich ... have allowed the financial sector to amass vast economic and political power."[24] As Joseph Stiglitz points out, there is more at work in this form of governance than a pandering to the wealthy and powerful: There is also the specter of an authoritarian society "where people live in gated communities," large segments of the population are impoverished or locked up in prison and Americans live in a state of constant fear as they face growing "economic insecurity, health care insecurity [and] a sense of physical insecurity."[25] In other words, the authoritarian nature of neoliberal political governance and economic power is also visible in the rise of a national security state in which civil liberties are being drastically abridged and violated.

As the war on terror becomes a normalized state of existence, the most basic rights available to American citizens are being shredded. The spirit of revenge, militarization and fear now permeates the discourse of national security. For instance, under Presidents Bush and Obama, the idea of habeas corpus with its guarantee that prisoners have minimal rights has given way to policies of indefinite detention, abductions, targeted assassinations, drone killings and an expanding state surveillance apparatus. The Obama administration has designated 46 inmates for indefinite detention at Guantanamo because, according to the government, they can be neither tried nor safely released. Moreover, another "167 men now confined at Guantanamo ... have been cleared for release yet remain at the facility."[26]

With the passing of the National Defense Authorization Act in 2012, the rule of legal illegalities has been extended to threaten the lives and rights of US citizens. The law authorizes military detention of individuals who are suspected of belonging not only to terrorist groups such as al-Qaeda but to "associated forces." As Glenn Greenwald points out, this "grants the president the power to indefinitely detain in military custody not only accused terrorists, but also their supporters, all without charges or trial."[27] The vagueness of the law allows the possibility of subjecting US citizens who are considered in violation of the law to indefinite detention. Of course, that might include journalists, writers, intellectuals and anyone else who might be accused because of their dealings with alleged terrorists. Fortunately, US District Judge Katherine Forrest of New York agreed with Chris Hedges, Noam Chomsky and other writers who have challenged the legality of the law. Judge Forrest recently acknowledged the unconstitutionality of the law and ruled in favor of a preliminary barring of the enforcement of the National Defense Authorization Act.[28]

The anti-democratic practices at work in the Obama administration also include the US government's use of state secrecy to provide a cover or prevent being embarrassed by practices that range from the illegal use of torture to the abduction of innocent foreign nationals. Under the rubric of national security, a shadow state has emerged that eschews transparency and commits unlawful acts. Given the power of the government to engage in a range of illegalities and to make them disappear through an appeal to state secrecy, it should come as no surprise that warrantless wiretapping, justified in the name of national security, is on the rise at both the federal and state levels. For instance, the New York City Police Department "implemented surveillance programs that violate the civil liberties of that city's Muslim-American citizens [by infiltrating] mosques and universities [and] collecting information on individuals suspected of no crimes."[29] And the American public barely acknowledged this shocking abuse of power. Such anti-democratic policies and practices have become the new norm in American society and reveal a frightening and dangerous move toward a 21st century version of authoritarianism.

#### A2: Butler

Wilkie 2 Rob, Assistant Professor of Cultural and Digital Studies, University of Wisconsin—La Crosse; “Judith Butler's "Guantánamo Bay": A Marxist Critique” *Red Critique* vol. 4; May/June, 2002; http://redcritique.org/MayJune02/TextandClass/judithbutlersguantanamobay.htm

In her essay, "Guantánamo Limbo", (The Nation, April 1, 2002), Judith Butler argues for the development of a more "nuanced" and "ethical" theory of international human rights. "Nuanced" and "ethical" are code words on the contemporary academic left for a subtle form of opportunism that textualizes the existing conditions and demonstrates their intricate layeredness but after many interpretive twists arrives at a verdict that legitimizes the ruling power structures in a new rhetoric. Judith Butler has not only mastered this technique, but has helped popularize it into a new form of red-baiting against those who dare to question the priority of rhetoric over class (a questioning she rejects out-of-hand as "left conservatism").¶ In "Guantánamo Limbo", Butler textualizes the Geneva Convention's "bias" for non-nomadic, nation-state combatants, arguing that the Geneva Convention accords function "as a civilizational discourse" (20) that "aid and abet" (22) the Bush administration's brutal acts of repression in Afghanistan and the U.S. This all sounds very "radical" and even progressive. But, and this is the politics of this subtle progressiveness, she concludes that the United States is essentially not acting outside of international law by indefinitely imprisoning hundreds of alleged Al Qaeda and Taliban, because they are not recognized by international law either: "The Geneva Conventions and the United States both engage in the questionable practice of distributing rights of protection differentially, depending upon a prisoner's affiliation with a state-based military operation" (22).¶ Butler's "conclusion" (never mind that such conclusion is obtained by discursive violence that fixes the meaning of the "non-nomadic", "nation-",) that the Geneva accords and the repressive actions of the Bush administration are merely two articulations of the same interests is justified as an enlightened, "left complexity". Her argument is, however, an instance of left intellectuals (following the example of Antonio Negri and others) providing a progressive alibi for imperialism—an alibi which "subtly" (and to the relief of the powerful) renders the line between oppressors and oppressed in a constant state of "limbo" and indeterminacy. Declaring as "outdated" and "unfashionable" political binaries such as "rich" and "poor", "North" and "South", "democracy" and "fascism", "socialism" and "capitalism",… post-political theorists such as Butler instead posit that, given the inevitability of the domination of global capital, political oscillation represents the only freedom from dogmatism. By obscuring the class interests behind the Bush administration's attack on democracy and, instead, turning the issue of democracy from the struggle for economic justice to the impossibility of textual representation, Butler erases the basis for collective political praxis and, in its place, substitutes a "fluctuating" and "flexible" post-politics that, not accidentally, always reiterates in a culturally radical idiom the clichés of the powerful.¶ Butler's call for a "post-national" politics repeats, in a post-bureaucratic language, the policies of the G-8, which favor a world-without-borders in which capital can travel without any restrictions. "Guantánamo Limbo" normalizes social contradictions and states that the U.S. attack on Afghanistan is not an effect of competing class interests (over who will own, control, and profit from the natural and social resources in the Middle East and central Asia), but rather the after-effect of outdated discourses and fixed ideas. In other words, there would be a more "just" war in Afghanistan if the combatants were just recognized as "combatants". Despite rhetorical distancing, Butler's left reading of the "war" echoes the theories of such right-wing writers as Samuel Huntington (The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order) by getting rid of class and treating "war" as a purely cultural matter—a view that one can find in much more direct form at "freerepublic.com" every day of the week.

#### Their use of language as a model for politics obscures class conflict.

Anderson, 83 (Perry, is a member of the editorial committee of New Left Review, and the author of Passages from Antiquity to Feudalism (1974), Lineages of the Absolutist State (1974), Considerations on Western Marxism (1976), and Arguments within English Marxism (1980). In the Tracks of Historical Materialism. P 90-93)

These local objections, conclusive as they may be for the disciplines in question, nevertheless do not in themselves convey the general reason why language is no fitting model for any other human practice. We can see the distance between them· most clearly, perhaps, if we recollect Levi-Strauss's argument in The Savage Mind that language provides an apodictic experience of a totalizing and dialectical reality anterior and exterior to the consciousness and will of any speaking subject, whose utterances on the contrary are never conscious totaliz­ ations of linguistic laws. But in fact the relation between langue and parole is a peculiarly aberrant compass for plotting the diverse positions of structure and subject in the world outside language. This is so for at least three basic reasons. Firstly, linguistic structures have an ex­ ceptionally low coefficient of historical mobility, among social institu­ tions. Altering very slowly and, with few and recent exceptions, unconsciously, they are in that respect quite unlike economic, political or religious structures, whose rates of change - once the threshold of class society has been reached - have generally been incomparably faster. Secondly, however, this characteristic immobility of language as a structure is accompanied by a no less exceptional inventivity of the subject within it: the obverse of the rigidity of langue is the volatile liberty of parole. For utterance has no material constraint whatever: words are free, in the double sense of the term. They cost nothing to produce, and can be multiplied and manipulated at will, within the laws of meaning. All other major social practices are subject to the laws of natural scarcity: persons, goods or powers cannot be generated ad libitum and ad infinitum. Yet the very freedom of the speaking subject is curiously inconsequential : that is, its effects on the structure in return are in normal circumstances virtually nil. Even the greatest writers, whose genius has influenced whole cultures, have typically altered the language relatively little. This, of course, at once indicates the third peculiarity of the structure-subject relationship in language: namely, the subject of speech is axiomatically individual- 'don't speak all together' being the customary way of saying that plural speech is non-speech, that which cannot be heard. By contrast, the relevant subjects in the domain of economic, cultural, political or military structures are first and foremost collective: nations, classes castes, groups, generations. Precisely because this is so, the agency of these subjects is capable of effecting profound transformations of those structures. This fundamental distinction is an insurmountable barrier to any transposition of linguistic models to historical processes of a wider sort. The opening move of structuralism, in other words, is a speculative aggrandisement of language that lacks any comparative credentials.

#### Reject Gibson-Graham – they were bought off by imperialists.

Wendland 6 [Joel Wendland, editor of Political Affairs, a Marxist magazine, “Book Review: A Postcapitalist Politics, by J.K. Gibson-Graham,” Political Affairs, 12/27/06, http://www.politicalaffairs.net/article/articleview/4602/]

While their excavation of important cooperative projects provides worthwhile lessons for people interested in socialist alternatives to capitalism and imperialism that look beyond no longer existing models for a broader socialist concept, there is a disturbing element to this book as evidenced by the location of this book within the framework of those very relationships that Gibson-Graham ignore. For example, in the preface to this book, Gibson-Graham acknowledge the receipt of a grant from the Australian Agency for International Development (AusAID) for the research on Jagna. While Gibson-Graham are likely to regard their relationship to AusAID as an innocent one – something like, we used their money for our own subversive purposes – the relationship is fraught with negative implications. According to Australian economist Tim Anderson, under the right-wing Howard government, AusAID’s explicit mission has been transformed from promoting general international "poverty reduction" projects to providing resources to such projects linked to Australia’s "national interest." Anderson notes that prior to Howard AusAID served as a mechanism (within the international jurisdiction of the IMF and World Bank) to impose neoliberal imperatives on regional countries. In other words, aid from AusAid came with "good governance" conditions that have come to typify neoliberal projects funded by wealthy countries. Under Howard, however, this role has shifted from merely forcing aided countries to adhere the general principles of the globalizing project (austerity, shrinking public sectors, etc.) to also promoting specific Australian interests such as Australian based corporate enterprises. To be blunt, the role of AusAid, according to Anderson, has become one of promoting Australian imperialism among its neighbors in the Asian Pacific islands. Reading Gibson-Graham and their affiliation with Australian imperialism in the light of Said’s project mentioned at the opening of this review is revealing. Thus we may see why Gibson-Graham’s relationship to AusAID is not innocent. Indeed, read with the linkage Said sought to expose in mind, it is possible to understand why Gibson-Graham have rejected socialist alternatives to capitalism and national liberationist alternatives to imperialism. Specifically, by mapping non-capitalist and underdeveloped sectors in Jagna and discouraging socialist, broad class, international and national alternatives, Gibson-Graham’s work aids in opening the Philippines to Australia’s imperialist agenda.

#### 3. Their argument is a strawman – reject it.

Poitevin 1 [Rene, Professor of Sociology at NYU, Socialist Review,

http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\_qa3952/is\_200101/ai\_n8932891/?tag=mantle\_skin;content]

The End of Capitalism (As We Knew It) begs another question: Who are they going after? Is it capitalism or is it Marx? Their book spends so much time on what is supposedly wrong with Marxism that at times it reads more like The End of Marxism As We Knew It. This approach is typical of a pattern that, to quote Wendy Brown, "responds less to the antidemocratic forces of our time than to a ghostly philosophical standoff between historically abstracted formulations of Marxism and liberalism. In other words, this effort seeks to resolve a problem in a (certain) history of ideas rather than a problem in history."19 Simply put, postmodern Marxist politics has more to do with the micropolitics of the ivory tower than with the plight of the workers who clean their campuses. However, once it becomes clear that a necessary condition for the primacy of postmodern theory and politics is that Marxism has to go (otherwise you do not have to become a postmodern to address their concerns), J.K. Gibson-Graham's anti-Marxist hostility, while actively embracing the Marxist label in order to render it useless, makes a lot of sense. And once again, all this is done with impeccable logic: Given that Marxism is still the only doctrine that calls for the systematic overthrow of capitalism, getting rid of Marx(ism) is also to get rid of the need for revolution with a big "R."20 One of the problems with trying to make the case for postmodern Marxism is that in order to get rid of Marxism and declare its tradition obsolete, you have to distort its legacy by constructing a straw man. This straw man-reading of Marx is predicated upon the double maneuver of collapsing Marxist history into Stalinism, on the one hand, and reducing Marxist theory to "essentialism," "totality," and "teleology," on the other. As J.K. Gibson-Graham themselves acknowledge, without any regrets, "Indeed, as many of our critics sometimes charge, we have constructed a 'straw man.'"21 What is left out of their quasi-humorous dismissal of Marxism is the complicity of such a straw man in the long history of red-baiting and anti-Marxist repression in this country and around the world.

## 1NR

### Case

#### Islamophobia’ portrays all Muslims as defined by Islam—locks in discrimination and anti-Muslim alarmism

Halliday, professor of international relations – London School of Economics, ‘99

(Fred, “`Islamophobia’ reconsidered,” *Ethnic and Racial Studies* Volume 22, Number 5, p. 892-902, September)

No subject in contemporary public discussion has attracted more confused discussion than that of relations between ‘Islam’ and the West. Whether it be the discussion of relations between Muslim states and non- Muslim countries, or that of the relations between non-Muslims and Muslims within Western countries, the tendency has on both sides been, with some exceptions , towards alarmism and simplification. Alarmism has concerned the ‘threat’ which, from one side, ‘Islam’ poses to the non- Muslim world, and on the other, which ‘the West’ poses to Muslims. Non- Muslim simplification involves many obvious issues: terrorism – as if most Muslims are terrorists or most terrorists are Muslims; the degree of aggressiveness found in the Muslim world and the responsibility of Muslims for this; the willingness of Muslims to allow for diversity, debate, respect for human rights. It is not only the sensationalist media, but also writers with an eye to current anxieties of the reading public, such as V. S. Naipaul and Samuel Huntington, who reinforce such misrepresentation. Muslim simplification is itself two-sided: on the one hand, a stereotyping of the ‘West’; on the other, the assertion of a unitary identity for all Muslims, and of a unitary interpretation of text and culture. The core simplification involves these very terms themselves: ‘the West’ is not a valid aggregation of the modern world and lends itself far too easily to monist, conspiratorial presentations of political and social interaction. But nor is the term ‘Islam’ a valid shorthand for summarizing how a billion Muslims, divided into over éfty states, and into myriad ethnicities and social groups, relate to the contemporary world, to each other or to the non-Muslim world. To get away from such simpliécations is, however, virtually impossible, since both those opposed to ‘Islam’ and those invoking it adhere to such labels. Moreover, as much of this literature shows, those who are most intent on critiquing standard Western prejudices about the Muslim world themselves fall back on another set of simplifcations. Instead of fearing or hating anti-Muslim stereotypes, we are now invited to respect, understand, study ‘Islam’. Islamophobia, Eurocentrism, stereotyping The literature under review here ranges across several aspects of this question. The Runnymede and Wilton Park reports identify misinterpretations, above all in the West, of the Muslim world and advocate a more tolerant, informed, relation to the Muslim world. They reèect an approach derived, on the one hand, from race relations and, on the other, from inter-faith dialogue. They both set current frictions in the context of the long historical relations between Muslims and the Christian world, both identify the role of the media in reinforcing stereotypes, both advocate greater discussion between communities. Most signiécantly, perhaps, they accept the term ‘Islam’ as a denomination of the primary identity of those who are Muslims; they avoid discussion of the diversities within Muslim societies, on ethnic grounds or on the interpretation of the Muslim tradition and on its application to the contemporary world.

#### Their critique is based on a poorly-researched caricature of terrorism studies --- they over-focus on minute biases while ignoring our overwhelming, objective, and self-reflexive evidence

Schmid 9 - Chair in International Relations; the Director of the Centre for the Study of Terrorism and Political Violence at St. Andrews University(Alex, Perspectives on Terrorism, v.3, issue 4, Book Review of “Critical Terrorism Studies. A new research agenda. by Richard Jackson”, <http://www.terrorismanalysts.com/pt/index.php?option=com_rokzine&view=article&id=96>

\*We do not endorse ableist language

The editors accuse, in their introduction  “the orthodox field” of orthodox terrorism studies of functioning “ideologically in the service of existing power structures”, with their academic research. Furthermore, they claim that orthodox scholars are frequently being used “to legitimise coercive intervention in the global South….” (p.6). The present volume is edited by three authors associated with the Centre for the Study of Radicalisation and Contemporary Political Violence (CSRV) in the Department of International Politics in Aberystwyth (Wales, UK). They also happen to be editors of a new Routledge journal “Critical Studies on Terrorism’ . The “critical” refers principally but not exclusively to the “Frankfurt-via-Welsh School Critical Theory Perspective”. The twelve contributors are not all equally “critical” in aHabermasian sense. The programmatic introduction of the editors is followed by two solid chapters from Magnus Ranstorp (former Director of CSTPV, St. Andrews, and currently Director of the Centre for Asymmetric Threat Studies at the Swedish National Defence College) and Andrew Silke (formerly with the UK Home Office and now Field Leader for Criminology at the University of East London). They both rightfully criticize some of the past sins and present shortcomings of the field of Terrorism Studies. One of them approvingly quotes Marc Sageman who observed that “disagreements among experts are the driving force of the scientific enterprise”. Such disagreements, however, exist among “orthodox” scholars like Sageman and  Hoffman or Pape and Abrams. In that sense, the claim by some critical theorists that the field of traditional Terrorism Studies is ossified without them, is simply is not true. One of the problems with many of the adherents of the “critical” school is that the focus is almost exclusively on the strawman they set up to shoot – “orthodox” terrorism discourse rather than on the practitioners of terrorism. Richard Jackson claims that “…most of what is accepted as well-founded ‘knowledge’ in terrorism studies is, in fact, highly debatable and unstable” (p.74), dismissing thereby almost four decades of scholarship as “based on a series of ‘virulent myths’, ‘half-truths’ and contested claims…biased towards Western state priorities” (p.80). For him “terrorism is…a social fact rather than a brute fact” and “…does not exist outside of the definitions and practices which seek to enclose it, including those of the terrorism studies field” (pp.75-76). He objects to prevailing “problem-solving theories of terrorism” in favour of an approach that questions “ the status quo and the dominant acts within it” (p.77). Another contributor, J.A. Sluka, argues, without offering any proof,  that “terrorism is fundamentally a product of social inequality and state politics” (p. 139). Behind many of the critical theorists who blame mainstream terrorism research for taking ‘the world as it finds it’ there is an agenda for changing the status quo and overthrowing existing power structures. There is, in itself, nothing wrong with wanting a new and better world order. However, it is not going to be achieved by using an alternative discourse on terrorism and counter-terrorism. Toros and Gunning, contributors of another chapter, state that “the sine qua non of Critical Theory is emancipation” (p. 99) and M. McDonald als puts “emancipation as central to the study of terrorism” (p.121). However, there is not a single word on the non-emancipated position of women under Islam in general or among the Taliban and their friends from al-Qaeda in particular. One of the strength (some argue weakness) of Western thinking is its ability for self-criticism – something largely absent in the Muslim world. In that sense, this volume falls within a Western tradition. However, self-criticism should not come at the cost of not criticising   adversaries by using the same yardstick. In this sense, this volume is strangely silent about the worldview of those terrorists who have no self-doubts and attack the Red Cross,  the United Nations, NGOs and their fellow Muslims with equal lack of scruples. A number of authors in the volume appear to equate terrorism uncritically with political violence in general while in fact it is more usefully thought of as one of some twenty sub-categories of  political violence - one characterized by deliberate attacks on civilians and non-combatants in order to intimidate, coerce or otherwise manipulate  various audiences and parties to a conflict. Part of the volume advocates reinventing the wheel. J. Gunning, for instance, recommends to employ Social Movement Theory for the study of terrorism. However, that theory has been employed already explicitly or implicitly by a number of more orthodox scholars, e.g. Donatella della Porta. Many “critical” statements in the volume are unsupported by convincing evidence, e.g. when C. Sylvester and S. Parashar state “The September 11 attacks and the ongoing war on terror reinforce gender hierarchy and power in international relations” (p.190). Jackson claims that the key question  for critical terrorism theory is “who is terrorism research for and how does terrorism knowledge support particular interests?” (p.224) It does not seem to occur to him that he could have studied this question by looking at the practitioners of terrorism and study al-Qaeda’s ideological writings and its training  and  recruiting manuals. If CTS is a call for “making a commitment to emancipatory praxis central to the research enterprise” (R. Jackson et al, p. 228), CTS academics should be the first on the barricades against jihadists who treat women not as equals and who would, if they get their way, eradicate freedom of thought and religion for all mankind. It is sad that some leading proponents of Critical Terrorism Studies appear to be in fact uncritical and blind on one eye.

### China DA

#### Any confrontation can spark a war – escalation is fast, imminent and probable

Goldstein 13

Avery Goldstein, David M. Knott Professor of Global Politics and International Relations at UPenn, research focuses on international relations, security studies, and Chinese politics, Senior Fellow at the Foreign Policy Research Institute in Philadelphia, Foreign Affairs, September/October 2013 Issue, “China’s Real and Present Danger: Now Is the Time for Washington to Worry, ” http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/139651/avery-goldstein/chinas-real-and-present-danger?cid=nlc-this\_week\_on\_foreign\_affairs-101013-chinas\_real\_and\_present\_danger\_4-101013&sp\_mid=43534099&sp\_rid=amFja2llY2hlbjEzQGdtYWlsLmNvbQS2 //jchen

Much of the debate about China’s rise in recent years has focused on the potential dangers China could pose as an eventual peer competitor to the United States bent on challenging the existing international order. But another issue is far more pressing. For at least the next decade, while China remains relatively weak compared to the United States, there is a real danger that Beijing and Washington will find themselves in a crisis that could quickly escalate to military conflict. Unlike a long-term great-power strategic rivalry that might or might not develop down the road, the danger of a crisis involving the two nuclear-armed countries is a tangible, near-term concern -- and the events of the past few years suggest the risk might be increasing.

Since the end of the Cold War, Beijing and Washington have managed to avoid perilous showdowns on several occasions: in 1995–96, when the United States responded to Chinese missile tests intended to warn Taiwanese voters about the danger of pushing for independence; in 1999, when U.S. warplanes accidentally bombed the Chinese embassy in Belgrade during the NATO air assault on Serbia; and in 2001, when a U.S. spy plane collided with a Chinese fighter jet, leading to the death of the Chinese pilot and Beijing’s detention of the U.S. plane and crew. But the lack of serious escalation during those episodes should not breed complacency. None of them met the definition of a genuine crisis: a confrontation that threatens vital interests on both sides and thus sharply increases the risk of war. If Beijing and Washington were to find themselves in that sort of showdown in the near future, they would both have strong incentives to resort to force. Moreover, the temptations and pressures to escalate would likely be highest in the early stages of the face-off, making it harder for diplomacy to prevent war.

THIN RED LINES

It might seem that the prospects for a crisis of this sort in U.S.-Chinese relations have diminished in recent years as tensions over Taiwan have cooled, defusing the powder keg that has driven much Chinese and U.S. military planning in East Asia since the mid-1990s. But other potential flash points have emerged. As China and its neighbors squabble over islands and maritime rights in the East China and South China seas, the United States has reiterated its treaty commitments to defend two of the countries that are contesting China’s claims (Japan and the Philippines) and has nurtured increasingly close ties with a third (Vietnam). Moreover, the Obama administration’s “pivot,” or “rebalancing,” to Asia, a diplomatic turn matched by planned military redeployments, has signaled that Washington is prepared to get involved in the event of a regional conflict.

China might be less cautious about triggering a crisis -- and less cautious about firing the first shot if a crisis ensued.

Also, the United States insists that international law affords it freedom of navigation in international waters and airspace, defined as lying beyond a country’s 12-mile territorial limit. China, by contrast, asserts that other countries’ military vessels and aircraft are not free to enter its roughly 200-mile-wide “exclusive economic zone” without express permission -- a prohibition that, given Beijing’s territorial claims, could place much of the South China Sea and the airspace above it off-limits to U.S. military ships and planes. Disputes over freedom of navigation have already caused confrontations between China and the United States, and they remain a possible trigger for a serious crisis.

It is true that China and the United States are not currently adversaries -- certainly not in the way that the Soviet Union and the United States were during the Cold War. But the risk of a U.S.-Chinese crisis might actually be greater than it would be if Beijing and Washington were locked in a zero-sum, life-and-death struggle. As armed adversaries on hair-trigger alert, the Soviet Union and the United States understood that their fundamentally opposed interests might bring about a war. After going through several nerve-racking confrontations over Berlin and Cuba, they gained an understanding of each other’s vital interests -- not to be challenged without risking a crisis -- and developed mechanisms to avoid escalation. China and the United States have yet to reach a similar shared understanding about vital interests or to develop reliable means for crisis management.

#### It’s the biggest impact – outweighs all other scenarios

Washington Times 11

Eli Lake staff writer, article is about James Clapper Director of National Intelligence, 3/10/11, “China deemed biggest threat to U.S.: Russia second, DNI chief says”, <http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2011/mar/10/china-deemed-biggest-threat-to-us/?page=all> //jchen

China’s nuclear arsenal poses the most serious “mortal threat” to the United States among nation states, Director of National Intelligence James Clapper told the Senate on Thursday.

In candid testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee, Mr. Clapper said he considered China the most significant threat among nation states, with Russia posing the second-greatest threat. He later clarified the comments by saying he did not assess that China or Russia had the intention to launch an attack on the United States.

The testimony contrasts with statements by Obama administration officials who have sought to highlight the dangers of Iran and North Korea while paying less attention to China and Russia.

Mr. Clapper said he does not assess that North Korea and Iran pose greater strategic threats because they lack the forces that Russia and China have that could deliver a nuclear attack on the United States.

North Korea has tested at least twice a multistaged long-range missile capable of hitting the United States. On Tuesday, Sen. James M. Inhofe, Oklahoma Republican, told a conference in Washington that analysts estimate that Iran would be able to deliver a payload by missile to the U.S. East Coast by 2015.

Asked by Sen. Joe Manchin III, West Virginia Democrat, what country he viewed as the greatest adversary of the United States, Mr. Clapper said: “Probably China, if the question is pick one nation state.”

He added, “We have a treaty, the New START treaty, with the Russians. I guess I would rank them a little lower because we don’t have such a treaty with the Chinese.”

China, according to successive Pentagon reports to Congress, is building up its strategic nuclear forces and has spurned offers from the administration to begin talks on nuclear arms, missile defenses, space and cyberweapons, as well as an international agreement to limit the production of fissile material.

#### Obama won’t pressure China until he closes Guantanamo

Kessler 10

Glenn Kessler, chief State Department reporter for nine years, traveling around the world with three different Secretaries of State, veteran diplomatic correspondent, Washington Post, 7/22/10, “Clinton, Gates offer distinct messages on human rights in Asia,” http://voices.washingtonpost.com/checkpoint-washington/2010/07/perhaps\_it\_is\_a\_coincidence.html atw

Clinton, on her first overseas trip, caused waves when she said promotion of human rights in China would have to take a back seat issues such as climate change and the financial crisis. Administration officials at the time said the White House was taking a more subtle approach on human rights, first seeking to reestablish U.S. credibility by pledging to close the detention center at Guantanamo Bay**,** Cuba, and then working behind the scenes to advance change overseas.

#### Obama’s ignoring human rights with China now – he doesn’t think he has the moral authority

Roth 10

Kenneth Roth, Foreign Affairs, Executive Director of Human Rights Watch, “Empty Promises: Obama's Hesitant Embrace of Human Rights”, 89 Foreign Aff. 10 2010 //jchen

Similarly, in China, Obama followed in the footsteps of successive U.S. presidents by downplaying the importance of human rights in favor of promoting trade, economic ties, and diplomatic cooperation. Before a handpicked audience of "future Chinese leaders" in Shanghai, he spoke of the United States' journey up from slavery and the struggles for women's and workers' rights, making clear that the United States, too, has a far-from-perfect human rights record. He affirmed the United States' bedrock belief "that all men and women are created equal, and possess certain fundamental rights." However, in a question-and-answer session, he seemed to suggest that China's draconian "great firewall" on the Internet was a reflection of different "traditions," rather than demanding that itbe torn down. That remark led to a storm of criticism from Chinese bloggers, and Obama left the country appearing to be in thrall to Chinese economic power and barely interested in risking anything to protect the rights of the 1.3 billion Chinese still living under a dictatorship. In a speech at Georgetown University a few weeks later, Secretary of State Hillary Clinton justified this approach as "principled pragmatism," and administration officials have spoken privately of building up political capital to press China on human rights in the future. But there is no such pressure today. From Clinton's February 2009 statement that human rights "can't interfere" with other U.S. interests in China to Obama's refusal to meet with the Dalai Lama in October, Washington has consistently failed to confront China's authoritarian rulers on questions of religious and political freedom.

#### Guantanamo undermining credibility – prevents us from criticizing others

The Guardian (London) 2005

1/14, “Bush under fire over human rights: Watchdog says US setting bad example,” lexis>

The torture and degrading treatment of prisoners in Iraq, Afghanistan, and Guantanamo Bay have undermined the credibility of the US as a defender of human rights and opponent of terrorism, the New York-based Human Rights Watch says in its annual report.  
"The US government is less and less able to push for justice abroad because it is unwilling to see justice done at home**,**" says Kenneth Roth, the group's executive director.  
The report comes as the Bush administration prepares for inauguration next week. The administration has shown little interest in moderating its aggressive approach to its "global war on terror".   
Yesterday's scathing report argues that the US has weakened its own moral authority at a time that authority is most needed, "in the midst of a seeming epidemic of suicide bombings, beheadings, and other attacks on civilians and noncombatants."

#### Guantanamo killed cred/ability to criticize

Karns 08

Margaret P. Karns is Professor of Political Science at the University of Dayton, “Multilateralism Matters Even More”, SAIS Review of International Affairs > Volume 28, Number 2, Summer-Fall 2008, http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/sais\_review/v028/28.2.karns.html //jchen

This essay has alluded to several actions taken by the Clinton and Bush II Administrations that seriously eroded the credibility of the U.S. commitment to multilateralism and raised fears around the world of a new era of sole superpower unilateralism. The U.S. Senate’s failure in 1998 to ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty—the first such treaty failure since the League of Nations in 1919—the United States’ debt to the UN from 1995 to 2001, and the United States’ blatant decision to go to war against Iraq in 2003 in the face of UN Security Council opposition had particularly damaging effects. These actions were a primer on how not to win friends or maintain the credibility of the US commitments to multilateralism. The Bush Administration became Exhibit A following the publication of the 2002 National Security Strategy with its provocative ideas about preemptive use of force. In March 2003, President Bush stated, “When it comes to our security, we really don’t need anybody’s permission.”20 In a strict or narrow sense, of course, the president was on firm ground. The UN Charter clearly affirms the right of collective and self-defense in Article 51. The administration had neither convinced much of the American public and Congress, however, nor the international community. The images of torture of Iraqi prisoners at Abu Ghraib, evidence of CIA secret detention centers, and the questionable legality of the handling of detainees at Guantanamo have so stained the US’ already weak record on international human rights norms that the US now has little credibility in criticizing other countries’ human rights records.

John Ikenberry has noted, “America’s ‘new unilateralism’ has unsettled world politics. . . . At no other time in modern history has a single state loomed so large over the rest of the world. . . . [with] the growth of American power . . . it is easier for the United States to resist or ignore these states.”21 Not only has the Bush Administration attacked arms control agreements, but it has firmly resisted new types of agreements that do not in its view adequately protect US freedom of action with escape clauses or veto rights.

#### Obama thinks it’s important
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In the days leading up to Obama’s first election, he said “our legitimacy is reduced when we’ve got a Guantanamo that is open, when we suspend habeas corpus – those kinds of things erode our moral claims that we are acting on behalf of broader universal principles.” Following the election, he described his plan to close Guantanamo as “an effort to regain America’s moral stature in the world.”

#### Gitmo undercuts our authority
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Tony Cheng, Al Jazeera, 10/20/08, “China decries US 'moral authority' ”, http://www.aljazeera.com/news/americas/2008/10/20081020132346256814.html //jchen

Nonetheless, it is undeniable that the US has lost some of its moral authority during George Bush's term in office.

Once regarded as the world's policeman, the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, and abuses of prisoners at Abu Ghraib have damaged global perceptions, something that many Americans seem to feel acutely.

"Holding people without trial for years on end at Guantanamo, using secret prisons and blackhole sites for interrogations, subjecting people to torture, the US doesn't have a leg to stand on in criticising other governments for those practices when it itself is engaged in them," says Alison Parker of Human Rights Watch.

#### No willingness to tackle human rights now
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Human rights activists called on the Obama administration Tuesday to become more engaged in Chinese human rights violations. Chinese political dissident Chen Guangcheng, who is best known for filing a lawsuit against the Chinese government over the excessive enforcement of China’s one child per family policy, told his story of persecution and eventual escape from China, and called for more U.S. involvement in human rights violations. “While I so am grateful for Mr. John Kerry the Secretary of State, and his effort to help me and my family members in this regard, we have not seen any obvious progress [on human rights violations],” Chen said during a news conference at the National Press Club in Washington, D.C.. “So I call on the President, Mr. Obama, to extend the foundation of the United States to protect human rights and to promote democracy world wide.” Chen said that he is especially concerned with the case of his own nephew. When he left China, the Chinese government promised they would not retaliate by harming or harassing Chen’s family. Yet, the activist said that among many other acts of violence and intimidation, his family compound has been raided, his brother beaten, and his nephew has been arrested and convicted of attempted murder. When three “thugs” and a Communist party leader forced their way into Chen”s family compound, his nephew attempted to defend himself with a kitchen knife. He cut one of his attackers and was then taken away to jail where he was quickly tried for attempted murder. Chen’s nephew was not allowed to use his family’s attorney during his trial, he was not allowed to cross examine witnesses, and there was no real opportunity to appeal his case. Chen called on the Obama administration and world governments to demand the Chinese government follow through on the no-retaliation promise they made to him and the U.S. government. Panel members Jared Genser, Founder of Freedom Now, and Sophie Richardson, the China Director at Human Rights Watch, also lamented many Chinese human rights violations. China continues the practice of re-education through labor and has enforced strict online speech regulations which have gotten a high school student thrown in jail for a short amount of time. Both activists shared Chen”s conviction that the true solution to these human rights violations is getting the Obama administration more involved. Richardson feels that there is so much more the U..S can do to protect activists in China. “For the U.S., human rights in China remains an issue to be managed not a problem to be solved,” said Richardson. “I think we continue to see a lack of commitment, a lack of willingness, by very senior officials…to address these issues.”’

#### No pushback from Obama on human rights now
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(Reuters) - Chinese political dissident Chen Guangcheng urged U.S. President Barack Obama on Tuesday to raise the continued harassment of his family with Chinese authorities. Chen, who is blind, took refuge in the United States last year. He said authorities were still harassing and detaining family members in China, despite promises made to Washington that they would be left alone. "We have not seen any obvious progress in this regard," Chen told reporters in Washington, emphasizing the need for Obama to defend U.S. principles of democracy and human rights worldwide. "I would like to see him to talk (over) this case with the Chinese president, Mr. Xi Jinping," he said through an interpreter.

#### Obama’s not prioritizing human rights criticism now
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WASHINGTON — US lawmakers took Beijing to task Wednesday for its "deplorable" human rights record, while advocates called on President Barack Obama to personally engage with the Chinese on rights cases.

Four human rights defenders, including Chinese Uighur rights defender Rebiya Kadeer, testified to the House Foreign Affairs Committee about what they said are deteriorating conditions in China and Tibet.

But as an example of what committee chair Ileana Ros-Lehtinen called the "tentacles of Chinese security" extending beyond that country's borders, the most prominent witness due to testify, dissident Chen Guangcheng who was recently allowed to move to the United States, declined to appear, apparently out of fear of reprisal against relatives back in China.

"We're all aware that the Chinese record on human rights and the rule of law remains deplorable," Howard Berman, the committee's ranking Democrat, told the hearing.

"Chinese authorities remain hyper-vigilant about tamping down anything that smacks of political or social dissent, including criticism of the government and exposure of official wrongdoing."

The hearing comes after this week's annual US-China talks on human rights, and while some of the advocates said such a dialogue was vital to keep pressure on Beijing, they all called for the White House to do more.

"At the highest levels it has not been a priority," Jared Genser, founder of US-based non-profit group Freedom Now, told lawmakers.

"President Obama and Secretary (of State Hillary) Clinton must personally engage on Chinese human rights cases and make full use of the bully pulpit, something they have only done to date on rare occasions," he added.

#### Disad turns this – the plan gives neocons the perfect chance to China bash and warmonger over arbitrary human rights records. We’re saying the US is at fault for causing hostilities, not China

Pan, Department of Political Science and International Relations at Australian National University, ‘6 (Chengxin, March 22-25, “‘A Window of Opportunity’? Neoconservatives’ Grand Strategy and Implications for U.S.-China Relations,” Paper for the 47th Annual Convention of the International Studies Association, http://64.112.226.70/ one/isa/isa06/index.php?cmd=Download+Document&key=unpublished\_manuscript&file\_index=4&pop\_up=true&n\_click\_key=true&attachment\_style=attachment&PHPSESSID=00f13cd20b6adc226504d38baf4cc233)

In this way, it could threaten to realise China’s utmost political nightmare. In such a scenario, analysts (Pinsker 2003: 357) suggest that ‘not even the most explicit US deterrence posture is likely to deter a concerted Chinese military campaign against Taiwan’. Consequently, Michael Swaine (2003: 6) observes that for the U.S. to follow this policy path without realising its potential impact on the larger U.S.-China relationship is to ‘play a very dangerous game’. This is dangerous in that this Taiwan policy is almost a sure recipe for further escalation of mutual hostility. For example, in response to ‘Operation Summer Pulse 04’, one Chinese military source said that all this ‘leaves China with no choice but to start and end the war with lightning speed’ (Ching Cheong 2004). The China-Russia joint military exercises in August 2005 may also be seen in this light, partly in response to ‘Operation Summer Pulse 04’, and partly reflective of China’s growing concern over the U.S.-Japan alliance (Wu 2005/06). With Condoleezza Rice’s recent visits to Chile, Peru, and Australia to prepare for another round of joint military exercise in the Pacific in mid-2006 (Richardson 2006: 17), one can only wonder what new reactions China may come up with next time around. It is mistaken to conclude that the current Bush administration’s China policy has already been dominated by the neocons. Just as Sino-American relations are complex, so is America’s China policy. For example, represented by Deputy Secretary of State Robert Zoellick, there is a strong current of thought in the United States that China should and can become a ‘responsible stakeholder’ in the international system (Zoellick 2005). Meanwhile, for its part, Beijing has tried hard to maintain a good relationship with Washington, which was a central message conveyed by Hu Jintao during his recent U.S. visit. Consequently, a conflict between the two countries is by no means inevitable. Nevertheless, as illustrated in this paper, despite their preoccupation with Iraq and the Middle East in general, the neocons have never lost sight of China, which they see as both a military and a moral threat to their vision of America’s benevolent global hegemony. In the past two years, their renewed focus on China has been particularly evident. More importantly, while the neocons’ policy on Iraq may have lost much of its credibility, their grand vision of an unparalleled American hegemony in general and their China policy in particular are far from being discredited. Quite the contrary, as evidenced by the recent resurgence of China-bashing in the United States, China may well provide a welcome lightning rod for the neocons to both get away with their Iraq debacle and regain political initiative. Against this background, the paper has also examined the policy implications of the neoconservative China strategy, arguing that this strategy is closely linked to an emerging policy triad of supporting Taiwan independence, encircling Beijing with military alliances, and strengthening U.S. military readiness vis-à-vis China. In doing so, the paper argues that instead of capitalising on a window of opportunity to usher in a new American century without a peer competitor, the neoconservative China strategy could accelerate mutual hostility and conflict between the two great powers, resulting in a dangerous self-fulfilling prophecy. Given the profound consequences of such confrontation and neoconservatism’s enduring influence in U.S. foreign policy tradition, it is now time to take the connection between neoconservatism and China more seriously.

#### Deterrence fails – conventional forces incentivize brinkship and nuclear escalation
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The fact that both sides have nuclear arsenals would help keep the situation in check, because both sides would want to avoid actions that would invite nuclear retaliation. Indeed, if only nuclear considerations mattered, U.S.-Chinese crises would be very stable and not worth worrying about too much. But the two sides’ conventional forces complicate matters and undermine the stability provided by nuclear deterrence. During a crisis, either side might believe that using its conventional forces would confer bargaining leverage, manipulating the other side’s fear of escalation through what the economist Thomas Schelling calls a “competition in risk-taking.” In a crisis, China or the United States might believe that it valued what was at stake more than the other and would therefore be willing to tolerate a higher level of risk. But because using conventional forces would be only the first step in an unpredictable process subject to misperception, missteps, and miscalculation, there is no guarantee that brinkmanship would end before it led to an unanticipated nuclear catastrophe.

#### Nuclear deterrence actually lowers the threshold for conventional war
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China, moreover, apparently believes that nuclear deterrence opens the door to the safe use of conventional force. Since both countries would fear a potential nuclear exchange, the Chinese seem to think that neither they nor the Americans would allow a military conflict to escalate too far. Soviet leaders, by contrast, indicated that they would use whatever military means were necessary if war came -- which is one reason why war never came. In addition, China’s official “no first use” nuclear policy, which guides the Chinese military’s preparation and training for conflict, might reinforce Beijing’s confidence that limited war with the United States would not mean courting nuclear escalation. As a result of its beliefs, Beijing might be less cautious about taking steps that would risk triggering a crisis. And if a crisis ensued, China might also be less cautious about firing the first shot.

#### Miscalculation likely – ambiguous redlines make the situation more dangerous than the Cold War
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Neither China nor the United States has clearly defined its vital interests across broad areas of the western Pacific. In recent years, China has issued various unofficial statements about its “core interests” that have sometimes gone beyond simply ensuring the territorial and political integrity of the mainland and its claim to sovereignty over Taiwan. Beijing has suggested, for example, that it might consider the disputed areas of the East China and South China seas to be core interests.

Washington has also been vague about what it sees as its vital interests in the region. The United States hedges on the question of whether Taiwan falls under a U.S. security umbrella. And the United States’ stance on the maritime disputes involving China and its neighbors is somewhat confusing: Washington has remained neutral on the rival sovereignty claims and insisted that the disputes be resolved peacefully but has also reaffirmed its commitment to stand by its allies in the event that a conflict erupts. Such Chinese and U.S. ambiguity about the “redlines” that cannot be crossed without risking conflict increases the chances that either side could take steps that it believes are safe but that turn out to be unexpectedly provocative.

MORE DANGEROUS THAN THE COLD WAR?

Uncertainty about what could lead either Beijing or Washington to risk war makes a crisis far more likely, since neither side knows when, where, or just how hard it can push without the other side pushing back. This situation bears some resemblance to that of the early Cold War, when it took a number of serious crises for the two sides to feel each other out and learn the rules of the road. But today’s environment might be even more dangerous.

#### Lack of military parity increases the risk
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The balance of nuclear and conventional military power between China and the United States, for example, is much more lopsided than the one that existed between the Soviet Union and the United States. Should Beijing and Washington find themselves in a conflict, the huge U.S. advantage in conventional forces would increase the temptation for Washington to threaten to or actually use force. Recognizing the temptation facing Washington, Beijing might in turn feel pressure to use its conventional forces before they are destroyed. Although China could not reverse the military imbalance, it might believe that quickly imposing high costs on the United States would be the best way to get it to back off.

#### Lack of effective communication ensures crisis escalation
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COMMUNICATION BREAKDOWN

A U.S.-Chinese crisis might also be more dangerous than Cold War showdowns because of the unreliability of the existing channels of communication between Beijing and Washington. After the Cuban missile crisis, the Soviet Union and the United States recognized the importance of direct communication between their top leaders and set up the Moscow–Washington hot line. In 1998, China and the United States also set up a hot line for direct communication between their presidents. But despite the hot line’s availability, the White House was not able to contact China’s top leaders in a timely fashion following the 1999 Belgrade embassy bombing or the 2001 spy-plane incident. China’s failure to use the hot line as intended might have reflected the reluctance of its leaders to respond until they had reached an internal consensus or until they had consulted widely with their military. The delay might also have reflected China’s difficulties in coordinating policy, since China lacks a dependable counterpart to the U.S. National Security Council. Whatever the reason, experience suggests that frustrating delays in direct communication are likely during what would be the crucial early moments of an unfolding U.S.-Chinese crisis.

Instead, communication between the two countries might initially be limited to either public statements or tacit signals sent through actions. But public statements are aimed at multiple audiences, and nationalist passions in either China or the United States, as well as pressure from allies, might force either side to take a more aggressive public stance than it actually felt was warranted. Absent direct and confidential communication, the two countries might be unable to discuss politically sensitive proposals. They might also be unable to share information that could help head off a disastrous escalation, such as classified details about military capabilities or military maneuvers already under way.

Communicating through actions is also problematic, with many possibilities for distortion in sending messages and for misinterpretation in receiving them. Chinese analysts seem to overestimate how easy it is to send signals through military actions and underestimate the risks of escalation resulting from miscommunication. For example, the analysts Andrew Erickson and David Yang have drawn attention to Chinese military writings that propose using China’s antiship ballistic missile system, designed for targeting U.S. aircraft carriers, to convey Beijing’s resolve during a crisis. Some Chinese military thinkers have suggested that China could send a signal by firing warning shots intended to land near a moving U.S. aircraft carrier or even by carefully aiming strikes at the command tower of the U.S. carrier while sparing the rest of the vessel. But as the political scientist Owen Coté has noted, even a very accurate antiship ballistic missile system will inevitably have some margin of error. Consequently, even the smallest salvo of this kind would entail a risk of inadvertent serious damage and thus unintended escalation.