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Do your remember? Do you?

How after 9/11, all the cats in America became sad?

Tears were just rolling down their faces. You'd see one sitting under a tree, tilting its head in that way they have, and then you'd notice its lower lip trembling. We've got two cats at our house, and one of those fake birds on a string, but back then, when you'd whip that bird across the floor, right under their noses, they'd just look at you like: Now? Are you serious?

I mean--yes, of course, we were all sad, it was a terrible time, but the cats were just over the--you'd see two or three in a group, in a field, supine, stretched out full-length, sobbing.  
And the thing was, at first--well, there was a lot going on. We were all just running around, shouting, "Did you hear?" and "Jesus, Jesus!," sitting in front of the TV for hours, finding it impossible to believe, over and over. It was like a whole new world.

And as someone pointed out, okay, the cats are sad, but cats don't actually do that much anyway, and the things they do--sit on the couch exuding domesticity or whatever, sprint over when you open a can of catfood, ignore you when you call them--can basically be done just as well sad as happy.

So we went about our business. The business, at that point, being: Figure out how to go on living. By now this was beginning of October, Ground Zero still smoldering. You'd go down there and the smell, the smell of burned rubber, other smells, it was just--Jesus, remember?--the cards, the notes, from the wives, the kids, already fading in the sun--

Which is when we noticed the water. I don't mean tap water. The tap water remained fine. It seemed to be mostly the river water that was--it was, to just come out and say it: flowing backwards. You'd go to a spot where formerly there'd been a beautiful waterfall and there'd be all the water, on the downhill side, kind of surging against the rock, trying to get up. It was heart-rending. And I am not one who would normally describe water as "heart-rending." Even in your driveway, if you were washing the car, the water would run UP the driveway, toward the garage, and would kind of huddle there against the door. Honestly. Somebody--I think it was Roger K., a roofer who lives near me, said it first: That water looks sad. And it did. I turned off the hose, a few of us gathered round, and sure enough, the water looked heartbroken. It was kind of--you couldn't say sobbing, exactly, you know, "heaving in sobs," but there was a kind of, I would call it, surging thing going on, a kind of lapping thing, like it was hurling itself against the garage, in sorrow or--it was actually kind of horrible. Gave you goose-bumps. You expect a kind of neutrality from your water, and when that is not the case...I'm sorry, it's creepy.

So now it's middle of October, nobody feeling right at all.

Which is when the flesh of the cows of the field turned bitter.

The farmers weren't saying much about it at first--they have a living to make, I don't hold it against them--but pretty soon...it was a rust taste. At least that's how I experienced it. And finally the farmers admitted it: Sometime in early October, the cows had literally, all at once, dropped down on their front legs, front...knees or whatever--"as if," one farmer said on the news, "in grief."

You couldn't eat the meat, no way. And the milk--no. It didn't make you sick, exactly, but it left an aftertaste...

Christ, this is too much, we all began saying, we have to--we have to do something!

But what, we did not know.

Then it was early November and we were walking out to the car, to go pick apples, trying our best to live life, you know, and my wife says: What's with these leaves, anyway? And that was true: everything was still green. We thought, well, it happens, global warming, whatever, give it a week. So we gave it a week: Everything still as green as deep summer.

I got out my ladder, went up into the maple in my yard, saw what I saw, came down, got Roger K., asked him to come up too, and although yes, even to me, who was there, it sounds, at this distance, nutty--the leaves, on closer examination, appeared to be in some kind of torment. How should I describe it? They were kind of...crinkling up, then relaxing, crinkling, relaxing: a guy clenching and unclenching his fist.

It was then that Roger K. and I, up in the tree, heard a kind of voice. It was--sure, yes, obviously--the wind, and yet...not. Not really. I mean, not only. Because as we listened carefully--I remember that Roger, in his astonishment (I was astonished too, believe me) reached over and put his hand on my shoulder--as we listened, we heard words. Words in English, female voice, seemed to me:

Strike back, the voice was saying.

It was like a lightning bolt. I almost fell out of the tree. How do you ignore that? We called friend after friend, they went up the ladder, came down, called their friends (some of whom drove over from other towns, other states even) and so many--I wouldn't say every person, but SO many of them heard the voice, that soon--and the other notable thing was, it wasn't just us, not just my tree. Apparently this was happening all over the country. And it wasn't just trees. In Michigan a schoolteacher heard the swings in the playground saying it. The surf all up and down the California coast was reported to be saying it. On the Internet you can find--I've listened to it several times--a tape this guy in New Mexico made of Interstate 40, and it is crystal clear what that highway is saying.

Of course, of course! we all felt. What has been making us so sad is this powerless, passive feeling. That much sadness, no one can just take it. Something has to be done with all this emotion.

This thing was done to us. We have to do something. We have to strike back.

We resolved to do so. You could feel it in the air: Purpose, direction--flags appeared on car antennas, people's eyes got brighter. The cats got the spring back in their step and suddenly mice were no longer safe. Water began doing what water is supposed to do--seismologists detected the sound of thousands of first waves slapping down over thousands of restored waterfalls. The leaves changed, gloriously as I remember it, feeling to us like the miracle that leaf-change actually is. We thought: Wow, orange trees, red trees, yellow freaking trees, we are, all of us, alive again, alive still.

One night around that time, lying in bed, kids asleep, wife asleep, wind outside blowing through the trees forming, blessedly, no words at all--I realized that in our relief and excitement, no one had asked--of the wind, the swingsets, the ocean, the highway--no one had asked what, suddenly, seemed to me a few reasonable questions:

Strike back against whom? And where? And how? And to what end?

I thought about waking my wife. But it was late and we had to work next day, and I thought: the 'who' and the 'where' and the 'how' and the 'to what end?'--that is not now, that is later, that is yet to be decided, by the people who decide such things, people who are, like us, of good will, only more powerful, and know things we don't, and will proceed with discretion, in the full measure of time.

But when I woke next morning, it had already begun.

#### That was the cats of 9/11 by George Saunders.

#### We must tell stories against authority, and keep telling them.

#### Literature takes us outside of ourselves in a way that can create new ethical possibilities. Literature, by destabilizing both our identities and faith in the war on terror, makes systems of power tremble. The act of storytelling disrupts the intellectual foundations the war on terror, drastically limiting the authority of the executive in the process

Gorelick 8 [Nate, PHD @ buffalo, Ceda champion, one of my favorite lab leaders of all time. Once gave a lecture titled “the sexual rebuttal” that pretty much changed the game forever. “Imagining Extraordinary Renditions:¶ Terror, Torture and the Possibility of an Excessive Ethics in Literature” Theory and Event, Volume 2 Issue 11]

This does not imply that language itself is only destructive, or that its only possibility is that of total negation. On the contrary, "Speech, in this sense," according to Blanchot, "is the promised land where exile fulfills itself in sojourn since it is not a matter of being at home there but of being always Outside, engaged in a movement wherein the Foreign offers itself, yet without disavowing itself."[58](http://muse.jhu.edu.proxy.library.emory.edu/journals/theory_and_event/v011/11.2.gorelick.html" \l "f58) The recognition of our own exile within language necessarily tears us away from the fantasy of the home -- from the security of a concretized existence -- to which we have grown accustomed, but it also affirms the strangeness within which we find ourselves and others: "The words exodus and exile indicate a positive relation with exteriority, whose exigency invites us not to be content with what is proper to us (that is, with our power to assimilate everything, to identify everything, to bring everything back to our I)."[59](http://muse.jhu.edu.proxy.library.emory.edu/journals/theory_and_event/v011/11.2.gorelick.html" \l "f59) To understand our exile within language is thus also to acknowledge that "the order of the realities in which we become rooted," the social and cultural contexts within which we recognize the familiar, the same, or the home, "does not hold the key to all the realities to which we must respond."[60](http://muse.jhu.edu.proxy.library.emory.edu/journals/theory_and_event/v011/11.2.gorelick.html" \l "f60)

Blanchot himself turned to literature as the space within which to articulate an ethical concern for this excess, this radically other, this Outside. The writer of literature -- he or she who, properly speaking, renders categories such as "fiction" and "non-fiction" meaningless -- begins to write from a particular position within and in relation to language, but "he must destroy language in its present form and create it in another form, denying books as he forms a book out of what other books are not."[61](http://muse.jhu.edu.proxy.library.emory.edu/journals/theory_and_event/v011/11.2.gorelick.html" \l "f61) The writing of the book is transformative, and gives the writer over to the ungraspable excess of the unfamiliar, the new, or the deceptively intelligible; "it is an infinite source of new realities, and because of these new realities existence will be something it was not before."[62](http://muse.jhu.edu.proxy.library.emory.edu/journals/theory_and_event/v011/11.2.gorelick.html" \l "f62) Writing is the negation of what is, the appropriation of existence in favor of its absence; it is the privileging of artifice and non-presence; it is not a project of consciousness, illumination, rationalization; it is "the obsession of the night... the consciousness of the night, which lies awake watching for a chance to surprise itself"; it is the manifestation of "existence without being" -- literature is the experience of the other night.[63](http://muse.jhu.edu.proxy.library.emory.edu/journals/theory_and_event/v011/11.2.gorelick.html" \l "f63)

Again, this experience is not pure negation, for with this negation comes the profound affirmation of "a concern for the reality of things, for their unknown, free, and silent existence."[64](http://muse.jhu.edu.proxy.library.emory.edu/journals/theory_and_event/v011/11.2.gorelick.html" \l "f64) Literature cultivates an affirmation of the other night, an affirmation opposed to the obsessed, unprincipled, totalizing and colonizing light of day. "In this way, it sympathizes with darkness, with aimless passion, with lawless violence, with everything in the world that seems to perpetuate the refusal to come into the world."[65](http://muse.jhu.edu.proxy.library.emory.edu/journals/theory_and_event/v011/11.2.gorelick.html" \l "f65) It is the acknowledgment of the interminable opacity of existence, and an affirmation of this opacity through the production of new existences, new relations, new possibilities for non-rational or non-ordered meaning. As Levinas himself says of Blanchot's literature: "To introduce meaning into Being is to go from the Same to the Other (Autre ), from Self to Other (Autrui ), it is to give sign, to undo the structures of language."[66](http://muse.jhu.edu.proxy.library.emory.edu/journals/theory_and_event/v011/11.2.gorelick.html" \l "f66) Without this introduction -- this meaning that attempts to explode the confines of pre-figured systems of signification -- language is reduced to a reflection of order, sameness, and identification. Literature is the space of pure possibility, the affirmation of excess, exteriority and strangeness, and without it "the world would know only the meanings which inspire official records or the minutes of the board meetings of Limited Companies."[67](http://muse.jhu.edu.proxy.library.emory.edu/journals/theory_and_event/v011/11.2.gorelick.html" \l "f67)

Blanchot's ethical injunction, then, does not imply the possibility or even the desirability of total representational non-violence. Representation, as literature reveals, is always violent: it is a violence against the beings it represents, and it is a violence against existence itself. But this violence may also contain the uncontrollable affirmation of that which escapes the light of reason; it may negate the radical negation of the Enlightenment and occupy itself instead with the other night against which order, truth, and control fanatically rage. Literature provides an experience of language that opens the writing or reading self to the radical contingency of her or his own identity, and to the exile within language from which the Foreign might be received in its Foreignness, without domestication or containment.

IV. Conclusion: The Excess of Responsibility

Images of abomination from Abu Ghraib ought to reveal that something at the heart of the autonomous subject remains radically other, and that the violent pursuit of liberty, security, total control and stability cannot extinguish this alterity. Instead, this pursuit inevitably gives rise to a hysterical objectification, to torture as a desperate grasp for an impossibly total visibility. However, the public reception and global dissemination of these images demonstrate the necessity for broader critique; to focus exclusively on that which can be seen is to sensationalize suffering, to isolate it as a structurally insignificant event, and to privilege the panopticism characteristic of the systems of thought from which torture is viewed as a strategic and necessary means to a greater end.

It is, of course, vitally important to expose the wretched secrets of the state, to reveal that American soldiers have been ordered to invent and impose acts of dehumanizing cruelty against prisoners in Iraq. To do otherwise is to retreat from the field of public discourse and to surrender the grounds of representation to the state. The question which arises from these revelations -- at Abu Ghraib, in Guantanamo Bay, or throughout the hidden archipelago of extraordinary rendition -- concerns how the conscientious critic, disgusted by these most recent manifestations of a cumbersome and blood-stained history, ought to treat the opportunity to respond. Blanchot's own ethical-literary gesture suggests that a meaningful responsibility to alterity may first require an alienation from the self; literature cultivates the experience of exile from which this alienation emerges, reveals the contingency of subjectivity, privileges non-knowledge and opacity over enlightenment and transparency, negates existence in favor of possibility, "So that, fallen away from my self, foreign to myself, what is affirmed in my place is the foreignness of the other who is autrui : man as absolutely other, foreign and unknown."[68](http://muse.jhu.edu.proxy.library.emory.edu/journals/theory_and_event/v011/11.2.gorelick.html" \l "f68) Critical responsibility thus lies in turning literature against the language of truth and authority, asserting and reasserting its transformative potential as the space within which language itself comes to presence as the trace of the night from which it emerged.

Because extraordinary rendition demonstrates that torture is by no means unusual or anomalous, and that even the most sacred of humanist truths may be suspended in the name of their own preservation, it is ethically incumbent upon the concerned literary critic to elaborate a critique of those larger social and historical structures within which specific atrocities are embedded.[69](http://muse.jhu.edu.proxy.library.emory.edu/journals/theory_and_event/v011/11.2.gorelick.html" \l "f69) Literature may provide the grounding for this critique, but within it we also discover new modes of thinking and speaking, new linguistic configurations, new, strange and profoundly foreign ways of being. All of this should indicate that the rational world ordering, the "thingification," objectification and securitization enabling institutionally regulated torture, militarist expansionism, terrorist aggression and morally totalized nationalism, are not natural or inevitable. Literature makes these systems tremble, sends a shudder from the excess that no system of absolute knowledge can contain, and enjoins the critic to care for this excess as the source of, and possibility for, an ethical encounter with alterity. The crisis in representation, the constant policing of the line between the visible and the invisible, is both constitutive of the political and dismissive of the ethical; it determines the powers and limits of military authority and public complacency, both within the United States and abroad, and it limits possibilities for ethical or moral considerations within its rigid framework of intelligibility. It is no doubt necessary to specifically contextualize criticism relative to the visible and the invisible -- thus, the focus here on the legal and political specificity of extraordinary rendition -- but to call into question the very epistemic foundations upon which this field of vision and deliberation is based is to level a far more profound challenge to representational authority than could otherwise be performed exclusively from within the already determined limits of public discourse. Literature can provide the space for this question; in the face of escalating international violence, it can call us away from home, away from the familiar and its fantasy of security; it can speak to us in our exile, affirming our existence not as a static event, but rather as an experience, a movement, and an interminable encounter with that which exceeds the power to comprehend, to control, or to imagine.

#### The United States Federal Government should substantially increase statutory and/or judicial restrictions on the war powers authority of the President of the United States to engage in targeted killing; indefinite detention; and introduction of the United States Armed Forces into hostilities.

#### We’ll defend this plan, but *not* as a starting point--legal action is an end point that must be informed by changing the epistemic foundations of our thinking itself. Relying merely on legal institutions is insufficient. You should vote aff if you think our fiction is an effective challenge to executive authority.

Gorelick 8 [Nate, PHD @ buffalo, Ceda champion, one of my favorite lab leaders of all time. Once gave a lecture titled “the sexual rebuttal” that pretty much changed the game forever. “Imagining Extraordinary Renditions:¶ Terror, Torture and the Possibility of an Excessive Ethics in Literature” Theory and Event, Volume 2 Issue 11]

Extraordinary rendition, torture, the war on terror and the security of the state are thus various nodal points within the larger epistemology of liberal humanism -- a humanism that produces its dark chambers in its flight from the black void at its own core. Césaire's "thingification" is the product of this flight. It would therefore be misguided to assume that the violence endemic to the war on terror can be cured by simply exposing its contradictions. If images from Abu Ghraib become a common rallying cry against American militarism for disparate political factions around the globe, this cry is unheeded. If legal challenges to abominable state violence are successful, inventive re-interpretations of the law emerge, or lawlessness is simply driven underground. Instead, it is necessary to challenge the systems of thought from which these practices emerge; the task of criticism must be to interrupt the epistemology of the burrow.

The dark chamber (extraordinary rendition) ought to be understood as a metaphor for this epistemology, and ethical criticism must expose the totality of violence that this metaphor represents without enabling morally totalizing recuperations of the larger world ordering project currently embodied and deployed by the United States. Such a project entails a reconfiguration of the political terrain, or a reconstitution of the limits of political antagonism, but it also implies the need for an even more profound challenge to the ways in which discourses and representations of "self" and "other" are constituted. The task is not simple: as Michael J. Shapiro suggests, "Recognition of the extraordinary lengths to which one must go to challenge a given structure of intelligibility, to intervene in resident meanings by bringing what is silent and unglimpsed into focus, is an essential step toward opening up possibilities for a politics and ethics of discourse."[45](http://muse.jhu.edu.proxy.library.emory.edu/journals/theory_and_event/v011/11.2.gorelick.html" \l "f45) If, however, an ethical regard is rendered possible through the work of rigorous critique -- through the establishment of a critical distance between the critic and the object of criticism -then the question for critique concerns the very nature of the ethical itself.

Because the crisis in representation by which the dark chamber is constantly being suppressed is constitutive of politics as such, then the problem, as Coetzee reminds us, is "how not to play the game by the rules of the state, how to establish one's own authority, how to imagine torture and death on one's own terms."[46](http://muse.jhu.edu.proxy.library.emory.edu/journals/theory_and_event/v011/11.2.gorelick.html" \l "f46) Coetzee's suggestion that torture and death might be "imagined" implies that an effective intervention should not adopt a strategy of representational verisimilitude -- the goal should not be to take and disseminate photographs of Uzbek or Russian torture chambers, or to produce comprehensive, anatomical descriptions of horrendous state-sanctioned violence. Such efforts risk a different kind of satisfaction than that which is demonstrated by a smiling prison guard at Abu Ghraib, a voyeuristic pleasure in consuming images of a suffering other and a dangerous appropriation of that suffering as something to be easily understood and made one's own. The image thus commodified, its subject's pain is reduced to a political bargaining chip, a source for aesthetic elaboration, a sensational news item; the singularly unrepresentable experience of torture -- the reason for which it is inexcusable -- is polluted by its representation.

So, it is necessary to expose and criticize torture, but the brutality of the experience must somehow be represented in its unrepresentability. A criticism in search of ethical possibilities, in whatever form, must find ways to avoid "either looking on in horrified fascination as the blows fall or turning one's eyes away."[47](http://muse.jhu.edu.proxy.library.emory.edu/journals/theory_and_event/v011/11.2.gorelick.html" \l "f47) It must situate itself at the level of epistemology, rather than fixating on singular eruptions of violence and state brutality. Otherwise, critique is already "play[ing] the game by the rules of the state," operating within the dialectic of visibility endemic to the epistemology of the burrow.

Because the current world crisis testifies to the legacy of colonialism, Postcolonial theory might provide a useful starting point for relevant ethical critique. Postcolonial critiques of the will to knowledge by which subject populations are devalued and rendered controllable indicate that merely rendering the dark chamber visible is simply not enough; a critical commitment to total visibility risks complicity with empire because it obfuscates the failure and frustration, the other night, at the core of any project in search of total intelligibility. Édouard Glissant suggests the possibility of an ethics of responsible relation here, in the question of representation; what is needed, according to Glissant, is a commitment not to intelligibility, but to opacity, to a respect for the unknowable and irreducible otherness of the other. Against liberal humanist panopticism and the obsession with rendering the universe knowable and governable by sovereign truths, "The thought of opacity distracts me from absolute truths whose guardian I might believe myself to be."[48](http://muse.jhu.edu.proxy.library.emory.edu/journals/theory_and_event/v011/11.2.gorelick.html" \l "f48) This vision of ethical relation, abstract though it may be, is radical because "Thought of self and thought of other here become obsolete in their duality."[49](http://muse.jhu.edu.proxy.library.emory.edu/journals/theory_and_event/v011/11.2.gorelick.html" \l "f49)
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### 2AC Framework

#### And, Fiction is MORE effective at changing beliefs than non-fiction—we lower our guard and stories create empathy—numerous studies prove—key to politics and public interest

Gottschall, 2013 [Jonathan Gottschall teaches English at Washington & Jefferson College and is the author of The Storytelling Animal: How Stories Make Us Human. Find him at jonathangottschall.com. Jonathan Gottschall: Why fiction is good for you ¶ http://www.dallasnews.com/opinion/sunday-commentary/20120525-jonathan-gottschall-why-fiction-is-good-for-you.ece]

Is fiction good for us? We spend huge chunks of our lives immersed in novels, films, TV shows and other forms of fiction. Some see this as a positive thing, arguing that made-up stories cultivate our mental and moral development. But others have argued that fiction is mentally and ethically corrosive. It’s an ancient question: Does fiction build the morality of individuals and societies, or does it break it down?

This controversy has been flaring up — sometimes literally, in the form of book burnings — ever since Plato tried to ban fiction from his ideal republic. In 1961, Federal Communications Commission Chairman Newton Minow famously said that television was not working in “the public interest” because its “formula comedies about totally unbelievable families, blood and thunder, mayhem, violence, sadism, murder, Western bad men, Western good men, private eyes, gangsters, more violence and cartoons” amounted to a “vast wasteland.” And what he said of TV programming has also been said, over the centuries, of novels, theater, comic books and films: They are not in the public interest.

Until recently, we’ve only been able to guess about the actual psychological effects of fiction on individuals and society. But new research in psychology and broad-based literary analysis is finally taking questions about morality out of the realm of speculation.

This research consistently shows that fiction does mold us. The more deeply we are cast under a story’s spell, the more potent its influence. In fact, fiction seems to be more effective at changing beliefs than nonfiction, which is designed to persuade through argument and evidence. Studies show that when we read nonfiction, we read with our shields up. We are critical and skeptical. But when we are absorbed in a story, we drop our intellectual guard. We are moved emotionally, and this seems to make us rubbery and easy to shape.

But perhaps the most impressive finding is just how fiction shapes us: mainly for the better, not for the worse. Fiction enhances our ability to understand other people; it promotes a deep morality that cuts across religious and political creeds. More peculiarly, fiction’s happy endings seem to warp our sense of reality. They make us believe in a lie: that the world is more just than it actually is. But believing that lie has important effects for society — and it may even help explain why humans tell stories in the first place.

It’s not that hard to see why social critics have often been dismayed by fiction. We spend a huge amount of time lost in stories, with the average American spending four hours per day watching television.

And if the sheer time investment were not enough, there’s the content. Since fiction’s earliest beginnings, morally repulsive behavior has been a great staple of the stories we tell. From the sickening sexual violence of The Girl With the Dragon Tattoo to the deranged sadism of Shakespeare’s Titus Andronicus, to Oedipus stabbing his eyes out in disgust, to the horrors portrayed on TV shows like Breaking Bad and CSI — throughout time, the most popular stories have often featured the most unpleasant subject matter. Fiction’s obsession with filth and vice has led critics of different stripes to condemn plays, novels, comic books and TV for corroding values and corrupting youth.

Moreover, it’s clear that these stories really can change our views. As psychologist Raymond Mar writes, “Researchers have repeatedly found that reader attitudes shift to become more congruent with the ideas expressed in a [fictional] narrative.” For example, studies reliably show that when we watch a TV show that treats gay families nonjudgmentally (say, Modern Family), our own views on homosexuality are likely to move in the same nonjudgmental direction. History, too, reveals fiction’s ability to change our values at the societal level, for better and worse. For example, Harriet Beecher Stowe’s Uncle Tom’s Cabin helped bring about the Civil War by convincing huge numbers of Americans that blacks are people and that enslaving them is a mortal sin. On the other hand, the 1915 film The Birth of a Nation inflamed racist sentiments and helped resurrect an all but defunct Ku Klux Klan.

So those who are concerned about the messages in fiction, whether they are conservative or liberal, have a point. Fiction is dangerous because it has the power to modify the principles of individuals and whole societies.

But fiction is doing something that all political factions should be able to get behind. Beyond the local battles of the culture wars, virtually all storytelling, regardless of genre, increases society’s fund of empathy and reinforces an ethic of decency that is deeper than politics.

For a long time, literary critics and philosophers, along with the novelist George Eliot, have argued that one of fiction’s main jobs is to “enlarge men’s sympathies.” Recent lab work suggests they are right. The psychologists Mar and Keith Oatley tested the idea that entering fiction’s simulated social worlds enhances our ability to connect with actual human beings. They found that heavy fiction readers outperformed heavy nonfiction readers on tests of empathy, even after they controlled for the possibility that people who already had high empathy might naturally gravitate to fiction. As Oatley puts it, fiction serves the function of “making the world a better place by improving interpersonal understanding.”

Follow-up studies have reached similar conclusions. For example, one study showed that 4- to 6-year-old children who were exposed to a large number of children’s books and films had a significantly stronger ability to read the mental and emotional states of other people.

Similarly, Washington & Lee psychologist Dan Johnson recently had people read a short story that was specifically written to induce compassion in the reader. He wanted to see not only if fiction increased empathy, but whether it would lead to actual helping behavior. Johnson found that the more absorbed subjects were in the story, the more empathy they felt, and the more empathy they felt, the more likely the subjects were to help when the experimenter “accidentally” dropped a handful of pens — highly absorbed readers were twice as likely to help out.

“In conclusion,” Johnson writes, “it appears that curling up with a good book may do more than provide relaxation and entertainment. Reading narrative fiction allows one to learn about our social world and as a result fosters empathic growth and pro-social behavior.”

Similarly, novelists such as Leo Tolstoy and John Gardner have contended that fiction is morally beneficial, and here, too, research is bearing them out. While fiction often dwells on lewdness, depravity and simple selfishness, storytellers virtually always put us in a position to judge wrongdoing, and we do so with gusto.

As the Brandeis literary scholar William Flesch argues, fiction all over the world is strongly dominated by the theme of poetic justice. Generally speaking, goodness is endorsed and rewarded, and badness is condemned and punished. Stories, from modern films to ancient fairy tales, steep us all in the same powerful norms and values. True, antiheroes, from Milton’s Satan to Tony Soprano, captivate us, but bad guys are almost never allowed to live happily ever after. And fiction generally teaches us that it is profitable to be good.

Take a study of television viewers by the Austrian psychologist Marcus Appel. Appel points out that for a society to function properly, people have to believe in justice. They have to believe that there are rewards for doing right and punishments for doing wrong. And, indeed, people generally do believe that life punishes the vicious and rewards the virtuous. But one class of people appears to believe these things in particular: those who consume a lot of fiction.

In Appel’s study, people who mainly watched drama and comedy on TV — as opposed to heavy viewers of news programs and documentaries — had substantially stronger “just-world” beliefs. Appel concludes that fiction, by constantly exposing us to the theme of poetic justice, may be partly responsible for the sense that the world is, on the whole, a just place.

This is despite the fact, as Appel puts it, “that this is patently not the case.” As people who watch the news know very well, bad things happen to good people all the time, and most crimes go unpunished. In other words, fiction seems to teach us to see the world through rose-colored lenses. And the fact that we see the world that way seems to be an important part of what makes human societies work.

All these questions about the effects of fiction lead up to one big one: Why are humans storytelling animals at all? Why are we, as a species, so hopelessly addicted to narratives about the fake struggles of pretend people? Evolution is a ruthlessly utilitarian process. How has the seeming luxury of fiction — the apparent waste in time and creative energy — not been eliminated by the evolutionary process?

One possibility is that fiction has hidden benefits that outweigh its costs. For instance, anthropologists have long argued that stories have group-level benefits. Traditional tales, from hero epics to sacred myths, perform the essential work of defining group identity and reinforcing cultural values.

Along with three colleagues, the literary scholar Joseph Carroll and the psychologists John Johnson and Dan Kruger, I wanted to explore the possibility that fiction generally — not just folk tales — may act as a kind of social glue among humans, binding fractious individuals together around common values. So we asked hundreds of literary scholars and avid readers to respond to a questionnaire about 19th-century British novels.

We asked them to answer questions about the motives and personalities of characters, and to classify them as protagonists or antagonists; we also asked questions that explored how readers felt about these characters. The results showed that antagonists and protagonists had sharply differentiated personalities. Antagonists were overwhelmingly driven by motives of power, wealth and prestige. They didn’t care about winning mates, making friends or even helping their own kin. They were loveless, emotionally isolated egomaniacs. The protagonists, meanwhile, were keen on romance and eager to help their friends and relatives.

These results, which will be published in a book called Graphing Jane Austen, may seem unsurprising: In short, our heroes are heroes. But our findings were consistent with the work of anthropologist Chris Boehm, who studies social dynamics in hunter-gatherers. Boehm notes that hunter-gatherers are egalitarian, with all members of the tribe coming together to suppress bully-boy behavior in individuals. The same kind of dynamic applies in the simulated social worlds of Victorian novels. The bad guys in these ultra-“civilized” Victorian novels were like the bullies in a hunter-gatherer band, while the good guys were self-effacing and cooperative.

Our survey respondents reacted to the characters as though they were real people: They admired the protagonists, disliked the antagonists, felt happy when the good guys succeeded and felt sad or angry when they were threatened. By simulating a world where anti-social behavior is strongly condemned and punished, these novels were promoting ancient human values. And from these books, and from fiction more broadly, readers learn by association that if they are more like the protagonists, they’ll be more likely to live happily ever after.

Fiction is often treated like a mere frill in human life, if not something worse. But the emerging science of story suggests that fiction is good for more than kicks. By enhancing empathy, fiction reduces social friction. At the same time, story exerts a kind of magnetic force, drawing us together around common values. In other words, most fiction, even the trashy stuff, appears to be in the public interest after all.

#### B. Framing-- policy is based entirely on moral frames and metaphors—practicing how we ought to deploy those frames EVERY DAY is essential to political efficacy

Karlin and Lakoff, 2013 [Professor Lakoff has been a co-founder of a number of scientific movements: Generative Semantics in the 1960's; Cognitive Science and Cognitive Linguistics in the 1970's; and the Neural Theory of Thought and Language in the 1990's.¶ Since the publication of "Moral Politics" in 1996, he has been a public intellectual, bringing results from the cognitive and brain sciences into our understanding of politics. He has spoken twice to each of the Democratic Senatorial and House retreats and to both caucuses. He is a popular speaker on political issues. From the late 1990's until 2008, he served as a founding senior fellow of the Rockridge Institute, a think tank dedicated to revealing the nature of political discourse and improving it. Over the years, he has worked with hundreds of NGO's and foundations on virtually the full range of social issues, working to improve an understanding of social issues and how to communicate effectively about them. “George Lakoff: Progressives Need to Use Language That Reflects Moral Values¶ “¶ <http://www.truth-out.org/progressivepicks/item/12401-george-lakoff-progressives-need-to-use-language-that-reflects-moral-values>]

Mark Karlin: Why are conservatives so successful in "framing" much of the national political discussion?

George Lakoff: They've been working at it for over three decades. They understand the importance of morally-based framing, the importance of language, the importance of repeating language, the importance of not using the opposition's language, and the importance of an extensive communication system that operates daily everywhere, election or no election.

Mark Karlin: Can you explain how this played itself out in the public perception of the Affordable Healthcare Act (which the Republican Party successfully branded as Obamacare). In particular, can you explain why most Americans support a large number of the specific provisions of healthcare reform, but resoundingly have opposed the bill as a concept in polls?

George Lakoff: The specific provisions of the act were chosen (via polling) to be provisions that most Americans (60-80 percent) liked - and they still like those provisions (e.g., no preconditions). Conservatives never attacked those provisions. For example, they never said there should be preconditions. Instead, they shifted to a different part of the brain, changing the framing from a practical medical care framing to a moral framing. They used two moral frames: freedom and life, with the slogans "government takeover" and "death panels." They repeated these slogans over and over, until their moral framing came to dominate the public discourse. Less than half of Americans support the whole plan, while 60 to 80 percent support its provisions.

Mark Karlin: What are the limitations of rational discourse and presenting public policy proposals as reasonable in electoral politics? How do certain narratives ignite an emotional response that overrides a logical argument?

George Lakoff: The question presupposes a classical view of "rational argument," namely the use of classical logic (e.g., mathematical logic) in the service of self-interest.

But that is not how real rationality works. Political argument starts with moral framing - what is assumed to be right, not wrong or morally irrelevant. Conservatives and liberals differ on what is right. Real rational argument uses the logic of frames and metaphors, as well as the use of emotion in setting goals. For example, poor conservatives may care more about their moral identity as conservatives than about their financial self-interest. This is not "irrational;" it is a matter of what is most important to a given individual — moral identity or financial self-interest.

Mark Karlin: You've talked and written repeatedly about progressives and Democrats reinforcing and thus legitimatizing conservative memes and concepts. You refer to this as bringing the elephant in the room. How does this play out in the creation of the parameters of the national political debate?

George Lakoff: Over three decades, conservatives have framed taxes not as money that is required to be spent so that our citizens as a whole can thrive, but rather as money taken out of individuals' pockets by the government and wasted on people who don't deserve it. More recently, the deficit has been framed in terms of two conservative metaphors that define a conservative frame. The metaphors are:

1) The Nation's Wealth Is the Government's Wealth,

and

2) The National Budget Is a Family Budget.

Right now, America is at a peak of wealth: American individuals and corporations, collectively, are richer than they have ever been. But most of that wealth is concentrated at the top, and the most wealthy want to keep as much of that wealth as they can, rather than to yield a fair portion of it to provide what is needed to the citizenry as a whole, whose work has provided that wealth.

In a family, when you have a great deal of debt, it is usually wise to spend less. The metaphors define a conservative frame for economic policy.

But in a government, it is wise to spend more on what expands the economy - public works, education, and basic research. Economic expansion of this sort, rather than a cut in spending on those things, is what economics recommends for a government, as liberals have observed.

Mark Karlin: Many of us on the left tend to think of political conversation as taking place on the verbal level only. But as a species, we absorb and process information through a variety of ways. One key additional impact on us - especially in politics in the television age - is gesture and visual image. Was Reagan a model of this - sort of the apogee of metaphoric narrative, visual image (including his Hollywood look and carefully staged sets) and gesture?

George Lakoff: Reagan understood what voters found important in a president: moral values, connection with the public, clarity of communication, the appearance of authenticity (saying what he believes), trust that he will do what he says, strength of character, and a personal identification with him. This is often mistaken by liberals as "likeability."

Image plays an important role in these matters. Do your gestures match what you are saying? If not, then you're not saying what you believe and your inappropriate gestures give you away. Al Gore, for example, had gestures that did not fit what he was saying, which allowed conservatives to attack his veracity in general.

Mark Karlin: Given the major party debates are now over, what is your take on how the two candidates might have visually been perceived if the sound were turned off. Let's take, for example, the first and second presidential debates.

George Lakoff: In the first debate, Obama looked down a lot, showed low energy, and appeared unengaged, while Romney stood tall, appeared to be in authority and in control. In the second debate, Obama went on the offensive, took authority, and Romney became defensive.

Mark Karlin: You have emphasized over the years many Republicans being attracted to a strict paternal authoritarian model of national government. Can you think of one exception to that theory in the last 50 years among GOP presidential candidates? I can't.

George Lakoff: I can't either.

Mark Karlin: I'd like to bring up a point that you often point out. In "The Little Blue Book" (co-authored with Elizabeth Wehling) and your other past works dealing with "framing," you are not proposing any short term fixes. Your theories - born of your internationally recognized research as a professor of cognitive linguistics at Berkeley - are dependent upon building a long-term foundation. Is that right?

George Lakoff: That's right. You think with your brain. Everything you can understand requires the right brain circuitry. To learn anything at all, the neural circuitry in your brain has to change. That usually takes a while. Most synaptic change is slow.

Mark Karlin: On your ["The Little Blue Book" blog](http://www.thelittleblueblog.org/framing-basics/) you have a section on the basics of "framing." You have a set of guidelines, including this one: "Facts have no meaning outside of frames, metaphors, and moral narratives. Always discuss facts within moral frames, because people do not reason outside of those moral frames." Can you elaborate on that concept?

George Lakoff: Everything you understand is a matter of framing. And what counts as a fact depends on the frame used in understanding. For example, Mitt Romney claimed that President Obama cut $716 billion from Medicare. Is that a fact?

In the president's frame, the $716 billion was a reduction in "waste" over the next 10 years, where "waste" is taken to mean money not spent on health care but instead going to "excess" profits for drug companies and certain hospitals. That cut in "waste" meant that there would be $712 billion more to cover real health care needs, including extending Medicare's full solvency from 2016 to 2024. If you think that it is moral for seniors to have their medical needs covered as fully as possible, then this was a good thing to do; it is not a cut in what Medicare is there for; instead it is an increase in what Medicare is there for.

Now consider Romney's framing. Romney sees corporate profits as morally good, and spending on people in need as violating personal responsibility and giving people things they should be able to provide for themselves, which he sees as morally bad. The Bush Medicare program included a drug program that allowed drug companies to make huge profits from Medicare - money that could have been spent on actual medical care for seniors. Romney assumes this was morally right. Technically, the $716 billion was scheduled to be spent via Medicare on drug company profits over the next decade. Romney saw the elimination of those profits as "taking $716 billion out of Medicare." Instead it will be spent on seniors who need care, technically via the Affordable Care Act, which Romney sees as immoral. Romney frames the $716 billion as being taken out of Medicare and put into Obamacare.

Here you can see that the agreed-on number, $716 billion reassigned, is understood as two different "facts," with two different moral values, depending on framing.

Mark Karlin: For many years, BuzzFlash (now BuzzFlash at Truthout) has thought of you as a prophet of sorts, a Jeremiah. Why does it appear that so many national Democratic and progressive leaders don't follow your advice on communicating on the basis of values and morals?

George Lakoff: What I do is apply what has been learned from the brain and cognitive sciences to the study of political discourse. It's just ordinary science, no magic, no prophesy.

My book "Don't Think of an Elephant" was used widely in the 2006 and 2008 elections. I watched the 2012 Democratic convention and noticed that the framing in the speeches was better than in any convention I've ever watched. That tells me that the lessons from the work that I and others have done on framing has been widely absorbed by the speechwriters, communications directors and many of the political leaders. That's a major step forward and I'm delighted.

But there's still more to be done. This election is mainly about the major moral divide in this country. I've been writing about it since 1996 in "Moral Politics," but that moral divide has not yet been overtly discussed in public discourse. There are a number of reasons for this.

First, it requires the knowledge that most thought is unconscious. This finding is just beginning to permeate into the pop science press, but hasn't made it into the political media. Thus, the fact that all politics is moral and that political framing uses largely unconscious moral framing is not widely recognized.

Second, it requires some knowledge about unconscious metaphorical thought. Though I and other cognitive linguists around the world have made deep discoveries about how metaphorical thought works, it has still barely made it into the pop science press.

Third, there is the difference in the education of liberals and conservative communicators. When liberals go to college they tend to study political science, law, economics, and public policy, where the cognitive and brain sciences are rarely taught. Instead they study enlightenment reason and the rational actor model, assuming that rational thought consists of consciously-used classical logic about self-interest, with language as neutrally fitting the world. This is an inadequate theory///

of reason and language, which leads to many liberals thinking that what is moral is universal and can be taken for granted, and that all one has to do is present the facts and people will reason to the right conclusion. It keeps not happening. This theory of reason often leads liberals to misunderstand framing as just a matter of words, a search for slogans, when it is really the study of the moral basis of policy and the deep truths on which policy is based.

Conservative communication specialists know better, since they have often studied marketing and marketing professors know that people really think in terms of frames, metaphors, images, narratives, and emotion. Though liberals are slowly catching up, they are still behind when it comes to two things: expressing the nature of the moral divide, and stating the very general deep truths that link moral principles to specific policies. It was to remedy this that Elisabeth Wehling and I wrote "The Little Blue Book" and op-eds on [www.thelittleblueblog.org](http://www.thelittleblueblog.org).

No matter who wins this election, "The Little Blue Book "will still be needed by Democrats. The conservatives are not going away. Our moral ideals, our ideas, and our language have to be brought into public discourse. Communication politics is not just about elections. It needs to be practiced effectively every day everywhere if the progressive ideals on which this country was founded are to be revived for an overwhelming majority of Americans.

Get "The Little Blue Book" with a minimum contribution to Truthout. [Click here](https://members.truth-out.org/bgift103-gift/choose-type-donation).

George Lakoff is the Richard and Rhoda Goldman Distinguished Professor of

Cognitive Science and Linguistics at the University of California at Berkeley, where he has taught since 1972. He previously taught at Harvard and the University of Michigan.

#### Fiction is key to decisionmaking by training us to cope with complexity and ambiguity

Djikic, Oatley & Moldoveanu 13 - Maja Djikic Ph.D. is a Senior Research Associate and the Director of Self-Development Lab at Rotman School of Management , Keith Oatley professor emeritus of cognitive psychology at the University of Toronto & Mihnea C. Moldoveanu University of Toronto (“Opening the Closed Mind: The Effect of Exposure to Literature on the Need for Closure”, Creativity Research Journal, 25:2, 149-154)

The need for cognitive closure is a need to reach a quick conclusion in decision-making and an aversion to ambiguity and confusion. It encourages ‘‘seizing’’ on an early statement or proposition in the process of acquiring knowledge, followed by rigidly ‘‘freezing’’ on the seized item, and remaining impervious to additional information (Kruglanski & Webster, 1996, p. 265). Two general properties of this need are an urgency to reach a conclusion, and a rigidity or viscosity of the conclusion that is reached. Heightened need for closure, which causes reliance on early information cues and a corresponding reduction in internally generated hypotheses (Mayseless & Kruglanski, 1987), is among the biases that have been posited as impedances to rationality (Stanovich, West, & Toplak, 2011). Paradoxically, the smaller the number of alternative hypotheses, the greater is the thinker’s conﬁdence in their validity (Kelley, 1971; Kruglanski & Webster 1991, Webster, 1993). The quality of the subjects’ information also suffers, because the pressure of seizing causes one to seek more prototypical information about categories, rather than diagnostic information that enables one to differentiate among categories (Kruglanski & Mayseless, 1988; Trope & Bassok, 1983). Furthermore, heightened need for cognitive closure seems to lead to a preference for considering smaller amounts of information before making ﬁnal decisions (Choi, Koo, Choi, & Auh, 2008; Ford & Kruglanski, 1995; Houghton & Grewal, 2000) and a reliance on simple, rather than complex, cognitive structures when interpreting or making sense of that information (Van Hiel, 2001; Van Hiel & Mervielde, 2003). It is not only rationality, but creativity as well, that is impeded by the heightened need for closure. Research has shown that individuals high on the need for closure produced objects and ﬁgures that were judged to be less creative by independent judges than individuals who are low in the need for closure (Rocchi, 1998). In a group setting, both situational manipulation of need for closure (through time pressure) and individual differences in the need for closure lead to less creativity and ideational ﬂuidity (Chirumbolo, Livi, Mannetti, Pierro, & Kruglanski, 2004). If having a closed mind can affect both rationality and creativity, the question becomes: Can anything be done to reduce the need for cognitive closure, and help open the closed mind? This article deals with whether reading ﬁctional literature can affect the need for cognitive closure. The framework here is built on the insight that ﬁctional literature can be conceptualized as a cognitive and emotional simulation in which the travails of ﬁctional characters are run on minds and brains, as a computer application runs on a computer’s operating system and hardware (Oatley, 1999). Although cognitive processes involved in reading ﬁction are very similar to cognitive processes in everyday life (Gerrig, 1998), the two differ in important ways. Unlike in everyday life, the thinking a person engages in while reading ﬁction does not necessarily lead him or her to a decision, and therefore has tendencies neither of urgency nor permanence that propel the need for cognitive closure. Furthermore, while reading, the reader can simulate the thinking styles even of people he or she might personally dislike: One can think along and even feel along with Humbert Humbert in Lolita, no matter how offensive one ﬁnds this character. The kind of thinking that persons do while reading simulates thinking in real life so closely that Zwann (2004) hypothesized that reading automatically activates neural events similar to those occurring in the lives of the characters one reads about. This double release—of thinking through events without concern for urgency and permanence and thinking in ways that are different than one’s own—may produce effects of opening the mind. One question tackled in this study is whether reading nonﬁctional texts such as essays has effects on belief processing that are different from those of reading ﬁctional texts such as short stories. In both cases, a reader tries to understand another’s thinking (and feeling). The difference, though, is that in nonﬁction there is a clear delineation between the author’s and the reader’s opinions, such that the reader is either persuaded or not by the author’s arguments and stances. With nonﬁction, changing or not changing the content of one’s belief system is still bound by permanence and, in at least some cases, by urgency, because one’s opinion, once settled upon, can have implications for decision making. The content of one’s belief system may change, but metacognitive processes may be unaffected. With ﬁction it was hypothesized that there may be greater ﬂexibility of a meta-cognitive kind. It was previously found that whether a text was nonﬁction or ﬁction made no difference to whether changes occurred in participants’ self perceived personality when they read the text; only the text’s artistic level affected personality (Djikic, Oatley & Carland, 2012). In this article, there is a different, meta-cognitive question in relation to beliefs. Is ﬁction, speciﬁcally, able to open closed minds? A second question tackled is whether, as compared with reading a nonﬁctional essay, reading a ﬁctional short story would have a stronger effect when habitual nonﬁction readers are asked to read it, because they would thereby be introduced to a nonhabitual manner of thinking, or whether, on the contrary, the effect may be stronger for habitual ﬁction readers. Both these questions are tested in this study. Participants were asked to read either an essay or a short story, chosen from a set that was controlled for length, complexity, and interest level. Also measured was the amount of nonﬁction and ﬁction that participants engaged in reading habitually. The ﬁrst hypothesis was that, as compared with those who read an essay, participants who read a ﬁctional story would show reduced need for cognitive closure, and the second hypothesis was that there would be differences in this effect as a function of whether people tended habitually to read more non-ﬁction or ﬁction. METHOD Participants One hundred1 university students at the University of Toronto participated in the experiment (69 women). The age range for the participants was between 18 and 53 (M¼21.7, SD¼5.74). The average number of years participants spent speaking English in English-speaking environment was between 4 and 53 (M¼17.8, SD¼6.98). No data on ethnic or racial belonging were collected. The campus, located in downtown Toronto, is highly multicultural. Participants were recruited through posters that were posted on bulletin boards all across University of Toronto (libraries, classrooms, social spaces), in which they were offered $20 to participate in a study. Interested participants were instructed to contact the experimenters through e-mail. Participants were treated in accordance with American Psychological Association and Canadian Psychological Association’s ethical standard for treatment of human participants. Instruments Demographics questionnaire Participants were asked for their gender, age, and number of years they had spent speaking English in English-speaking environments. Author Recognition Test–Revised (ART-R; Mar, Oatley, Hirsh, dela Paz, & Peterson, 2006). The original version of the ART questionnaire was designed by Stanovich and West (1989), and it offers a good measure of exposure to print during a participant’s lifetime. ART predicts reading comprehension and oral language skills (Mol & Bus, 2011); it correlates with diary-based and other measures of reading (Allen, Cipielewski, & Stanovich, 1992) and also correlates with direct behavioral measure of reading behavior (West, Stanovich, & Mitchell, 1993). Respondents are asked to check off from a list of names those they recognize as authors. Guessing and social desirability effects are discouraged by letting the respondents know that some names are not authors (they are foils). Mar et al. (2006) revised the original ART to include 50 writers of ﬁction only, 50 writers of nonﬁction only, and 40 foils. Four participants who checked more than two foils were excluded from analyses. Type of writing: Essays and short stories. Essays and short stories were chosen from anthologies. For the most part, they were from the ﬁrst half of the 20th century. The criteria for inclusion were that they had to be around 6,000 words, a length that was successfully used previously in a study of reading ﬁction (Djikic, Oatley, Zoeterman, & Peterson, 2009b). They were by known authors. Essays and short stories were chosen so that the subject matter varied across the chosen set. The authors and titles of essays and stories are presented in Table 1. The readability (level of reading difﬁculty) of each text was measured by the Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level score. This score is calculated for a text by the following formula: (.39ASL)þ(11.8ASW)15.59, where ASL is average sentence length (the number of words divided by the number of sentences), and ASW is average number of syllables per word (the number of syllables divided by the number of words). The greater the reading, difﬁculty the higher the grade level (thus, children in higher grades at school can read more difﬁcult texts). In their original form, the essays generally had longer sentences and more polysyllabic, rare words than short stories. This meant a potential presence of a confounding variable. If the readability of the essays and short stories were not the same, it would be impossible to know whether any experimental effect was due to the exposure to the variable of essay versus short story or to the exposure to the text of higher versus lower readability. Given that making essays more readable could be done less invasively than making short stories less readable, the essays were modiﬁed. Modiﬁcations were undertaken to reduce the overall length of some of them, and to increase their readability until, overall, the eight essays were of the same average length and in the same range of Flesch-Kincade readability scores as the eight short stories. The readability was increased in three ways: long sentences were divided, low frequency words were replaced with more common synonyms, and complex syntax was simpliﬁed. The short stories were left unmodiﬁed. Need for Closure Scale (NFCS; Kruglanski, Webster, & Klem, 1993). This 42-item scale measures the need for closure across ﬁve different subscales: preference for order and structure (e.g., ‘‘I think that having clear rules and order at work is essential for success’’); discomfort with ambiguity (e.g., ‘‘I don’t like situations that are uncertain’’); decisiveness (e.g., ‘‘I would describe myself as indecisive’’); predictability (e.g., ‘‘I like to have friends who are unpredictable’’), and closedmindedness (e.g., ‘‘I dislike questions which can be answered in many different ways’’). Past research indicated that the NFCS has excellent convergent and discriminant validity, with test–retest reliability of .86, and high internal consistency, with Cronbach’s alpha of .84 (Webster & Kruglanski, 1994). Procedure and Manipulation Checks Procedure. Participants were ushered into a cubicle and seated at a desk. They were given a package to complete. First, they completed seven questionnaires, including the demographics questionnaire and the ART-R. Then, they were asked to read either an essay or a short story. After answering content questions about the text they had read, and rating it on how artistic and interesting they found it, participants ﬁlled out another set of eight questionnaires, which included the NFCS. It was hoped that the multiplicity of questionnaires, both before and after participants had read the text, would mask the purpose of the experiment and prevent demand characteristics. Participants were then fully debriefed and received $20 for their participation. The participants, instruments, and procedure for this study were the same as those described by Djikic, Oatley and Carland (2012), but in our study data was analyzed on a different outcome variable than previously: the NFCS. Each participant was randomly assigned to read either an essay or a short story, each of which bore the heading of its title (but not author). After reading, each participant was given ﬁve short questions about the text’s content to test whether he or she had read and understood the text. The questions were factual rather than interpretative. Six participants got three or more answers of the ﬁve incorrect; they were considered not to have read the text in its entirety and were excluded from statistical analyses. Level of Interest and Artistic Merit Following reading of the text, participants were asked to report how interesting and how artistic they found the text, on Likert scales from 0 to 10 (0¼not at all, 10¼extremely). The measure of level of interest was necessary to ensure that one set of texts—essays or stories—was not systematically more interesting than the other. The measure of artistic merit was included to tell whether any effects were due to the sheer fact of the text being nonﬁction or ﬁction, or whether it could be due to the artistry of the writing. Completion of the NFCS After they had completed the scales of level of interest and artistic merit, participants completed the NFCS. To protect against the social desirability bias, an additional 5-item lie scale was included (e.g., ‘‘I have never known someone I didn’t like’’); 7 participants scored over 15 on this scale, and their data were not used in the analyses. Overall, 13 participants (6 who did not demonstrated they had read the text, and 7 who scored to high on the lie scale) were excluded from analyses. RESULTS To test whether there are any potential confounds regarding length and the complexity of essays and short stories, t-tests were conducted. There was no signiﬁcant difference between the average length of short stories (Mss¼5,616, SDss¼1,525) and essays (Me ¼5,088, SDe ¼1,137), t(14)¼.79, p¼.45, and no signiﬁcant difference in readability, as measured by Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level, t(14)¼ .04, p¼.97 (Mss¼7.2, SDss¼1.7; Me ¼7.2, SDe ¼.62). To test whether there were signiﬁcant differences in level of interest and artistic merit between essays and short stories, a one-way ANOVA was conducted, and it showed no signiﬁcant difference between the groups of those who read an essay and those who read a short story, F(1, 85)¼.92, p¼.34 (level of interest), and F(1,85)¼.39, p¼.53 (artistic merit). The potential confound of the participants ﬁnding either essays or short stories more interesting or artistic was thus avoided. Finally, a reliability analysis for NFCS showed Cronbach’s alpha value as .77 for the entire scale. Alpha values for the subscales were .74 (order), .78 (predictability), .72 (decisiveness), .62 (ambiguity), and .56 (closed mindedness). To test the central hypothesis, a univariate analysis (general linear model) was conducted, with type of writing (essay or short story) as a ﬁxed factor, and level of interest and artistic merit as covariates. Type of writing was found to be a signiﬁcant predictor, F(1, 83)¼4.21, p<.05, R 2 ¼.10. That is to say, as compared with those who read an essay (M¼3.97, SD¼.44), participants who read a short story had signiﬁcantly lower scores on the NFCS (M¼3.79, SD¼.37); t(85)¼ 2.13, p<.05. This decrease in the need for cognitive closure was effected mainly by the decrease in the two subscales of the NFCS, need for order, t(85)¼ 2.22, p<.05 (one-tailed), and discomfort with ambiguity, t(85)¼ 1.87, p<.05 (one-tailed). Difference on other subscales did not reach signiﬁcance. Neither of covariates reached signiﬁcance, though there appeared to be trends: F(1,83)¼3.73, p¼.06 for level of interest, and F(1,83)¼2.49, p¼.12 for artistic merit. Pearson’s bivariate correlation between the need for closure and level of interest, r(85)¼ .17, p¼.11, and between the need for closure and artistic merit was r(85)¼.08, p¼.47. The means and standard deviations for ART were M¼4.59, SD¼4.40 for nonﬁction and M¼6.41, SD¼7.62 for ﬁction. Nonﬁction and ﬁction scores were signiﬁcantly positively correlated, r(85)¼.72, p<.01, and this conﬁrms previous ﬁndings (Mar et al., 2006) that people who read a lot of non-ﬁction also tend to read a lot of ﬁction. To test the second hypothesis, a median split was performed such that those who scored above the median on ART-nonﬁction were classiﬁed as high nonﬁction readers, and those who scored below the median as low nonﬁction readers. Low nonﬁction readers did not differ from high nonﬁction readers in need for closure when they read an essay, but there was a signiﬁcant difference when they read a short story: t(41)¼ 2.21, p<.05, such that high nonﬁction readers showed lower need for closure than low nonﬁction readers. A similar classiﬁcation was made into high-ﬁction readers and low ﬁction readers, for those scoring above and below the median, respectively. As in the previous analysis, although there was no signiﬁcant difference between the groups for those who read an essay, high ﬁction readers (as compared with low ﬁction readers) who read a short story had a lower need for closure, t(41)¼ 2.59, p<.05. It appears that high readers (of both nonﬁction and ﬁction) beneﬁted from reading a short story rather than an essay, in terms of lowering their self-reported need for closure. DISCUSSION The principal hypothesis was supported. When compared to reading an essay, reading a literary short story led to a signiﬁcant short-term decrease in participants’ self-reported need for cognitive closure. The effect did not depend on the artistic properties of the text (some essays were judged more artistic than some short stories), but on the genre—the type of writing—of the text that was read: essay or short story. When one reads ﬁctional literature, one is encouraged to simulate other minds, and is thereby released from concerns for urgency and permanence. As was found in testing the subscales of the NFCS, this occurred principally by means of a decreased need for order and a decreased discomfort with ambiguity. Since only short-term decreases on the need for closure were produced, it is reasonable to ask whether the suspension of urgency and permanence that reduced the need for cognitive closure ends as soon as one closes a book and returns to an everyday life that requires quick opinions and decision making. The next step in the investigation of this phenomenon will be to ﬁnd how long the single-exposure effect lasts, and, if steady-state changes can be induced, how much exposure to literature is needed to achieve long-term decreases. In taking this next step, it should also be investigated whether and how far a decreased need for closure that follows exposure to literary ﬁction generalizes to a greater openness of mind when faced with problems of reasoning or creativity. From the simulation perspective, the decrease in the need for closure may depend on the same meta-cognitive processes that usually make opening the mind so difﬁ- cult. Reading ﬁction often prompts one toward thinking from a different perspective, from the point of view of (at least one) other person. It is likely that only when experiences of this kind accumulate to reach some critical mass would they lead to long-term changes of metacognitive habits. Given the suboptimal information processing strategies that result from premature need for closure, exposure to literature may offer a pedagogical tool to encourage individuals to become more likely to open their minds. There are two additional potential beneﬁts of reading ﬁction as a systematic way of opening minds. Experiential and practice strategies with a potential to change meta-cognitive processes, as shown by Arkes, Christensen, Lai, and Blumer (1987) and Arkes, Faust, Guilmette, and Hart (1988), involve manipulating situations in ways that are labor and time intensive for trainers. By contrast, literary ﬁction can be read in participants’ own time, and only occasional encouragement may be needed. A second beneﬁt is that reading ﬁction can affect even individuals with highly developed cognitive mechanisms of defense against anxiety (Djikic, Oatley, Zoeterman, & Peterson, 2009b). The effect may occur because it does not rely on confrontational or instructive methods. When reading about ﬁctional characters, one does not feel the need of defend one’s own perspective. One can simulate the workings of other minds without the fear of undermining one’s own. An additional result suggested by this experiment is that it is the most frequent readers (of both nonﬁction and ﬁction) who are likely to experience the most beneﬁcial effects of exposure to literature. This is encouraging with regards to pedagogical interventions in professions such as law, medicine, and business, in which training demands extensive nonﬁction reading, but at the same time requires people to become insightful about others and their perspectives. Although non- ﬁction reading allows students to learn the subject matter, it may not always help them in thinking about it. A physician may have an encyclopedic knowledge of his or her subject, but this may not prevent the physician from seizing and freezing on a diagnosis, when additional symptoms point to a different malady (Groopman, 2008). There is a small literature on the inﬂuence of premature closure on decision-making in medical diagnosis (Warner, Najarian, & Tierney, 2010), and police investigation (Ha¨kka¨nen, Ask, Kebbell, Alison, & Granhag, 2009). It highlights closure effects that may be beneﬁcially addressed through exposure to ﬁctional literature, which can balance practitioners’ extensive content knowledge with the development of meta-cognitive habits that favor improved information processing, so this, in turn, may have applications in professional ﬁelds. CONCLUSION It is hoped that this experiment will stimulate further investigation into the potential of literature in opening closed minds, as well as give one a pause to think about the effects of current cut-backs of education in the arts and humanities. In ancient Greece, all students, no matter their future profession, had to know Homer by heart. The method may seem outdated, yet one may still wonder how such an immersion in literature may have contributed to the education of philosophers, mathematicians, and writers who, although separated from present time by two-and-a-half millennia, developed minds whose supple and agile turns are still admired.

### 2ac gwot

#### Their repetition of terrorist threats reinforces stereotypes and leads to a fearful, securitized, islamophobia. Their disadvantage fuels calls to war and is academically suspect.

Streuner and Willis, 2009 [Dr. Erin Steuter a nd Dr. De borah Wills Depart ment o f Soci ology Mount Allis on Univer sity rin Steuter and Deborah Wills are the authors of At Wa r with Meta phor: Media Propaganda and Racism in th e Wa r on Terr or (Lexington Books, 2008). Erin Steuter is an a ssociate professor of Soci ology where she specializes in examining the ideological repr esentations of the ne ws. Recip ient of multiple awards for her teaching and r esearch, her research and published works have appeared in Political Communication and Persuasion , Canadian Jo urnal of Communication , Journal of American and Comparative C ultures , a nd other noted academic journals. Deborah Wills is an associa te professor of English at Mount Allison University . “iscourses of Dehumanization: Enemy Construction and Canadian Media Complicity in the Framing of the War on Terror “http://www.gmj.uottawa.ca/0902/v2i2\_steuter%20and%20wills.pdf]

One of the least visible bu t most ideological ly-charged choices in W ester n medi a’s coverage of the Afg han and Iraqi war s is its “consistent disinterest in nonviolent Muslim perspectives” (Gottsc halk and Greenberg 2007). As Peter Go ttschalk and Gabriel Greenberg (2007) point out, moderate voices from the Mu slim community are routinely omitted from news coverage, an absence that confirms public stereotyping of all Muslims as extremist. While this omission pre-dates September11, it has intensified since; domestic news sources “seldom mention the terms ‘Muslim’ or ‘Islam’ except in the context of conflict, violence, and bloodshed” (G ottschalk and Greenberg 2007).

Constructing the Enemy Media coverage of the events of 9/11 and the subsequent coverage of the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq are critically shaped by pre-existing, Is lamophobic frames that reflect neo-colonial assumptions (Henry & Tator, 2002; Kellner, 2004; Norris, Kern & Just, 2003; Nacos, 2002; Paletz, 1992; Picard, 1993). Karim argues that a coherent set of journalistic narratives have emerged regarding “Muslim terrorism” (2003: 81) narratives that reinforce stereotypes of murderous Muslims and advance limited and often inaccurate information about Islam. Edward Said (1997) similarly argues that the image of Is lam in Western media is laden “not only [with] patent inaccuracy but also expressions of unres trained ethnocentrism, cultural and even racial hatred” (Said, 1997: ii). He notes that “malicious generalizations about Islam have become the last acceptable form of denigration of foreign cultu re in the West; what is said about the Muslim mind, or character, or religion, or culture as a whole cannot now be said in mainstream discussion about Africans, Jews, other Orientals, or Asians” (Ibid: 12). Journalist David Lamb concurs, noting that Arabs are now “caricatur ed in a manner once reserved for blacks and Hispanics” (cited in Lester & Ross, 2003: 76).

Elizabeth Poole observes that in the media’s discussion of the War on Terror, anti-Western violence is “seen to evolve out of something inherent in the [Muslim] religion” (Poole, 2002: 4). As several studies have documented, after the events of 9/11, North American media intensified their depictions of prevailing st ereotypes about Arabs and Muslims (Pintak, 2006; Inbaraj, 2002; McChesney, 2002). Pintak contends that the bias in American media after 9/11 constitutes “jihad journalism”, adding that such slanted coverage became “the hallmark of the post-9/11 era” (Pintak, 2006: 42-44). The media’s dominant narrative, according to McChesney, portrays “a benevolent, democratic and peace-loving nation brutally attacked by insane evil terrorists who hate the United States for its fr eedoms” (McChesney, 2002: 43). Its chief message is that the U.S. “must immediately increase its military and covert forces, locate the surviving culprits and exterminate them” in order to “root out the global terrorist cancer” (Ibid). This dominant narrative’s reliance on disease metaphors poi nts to one of the key features of North American and European media coverage of th e wars in Afghanistan and Iraq and the War on Terror in general: the patterned and systematic dehumanization of Muslims (Kuttab, 2007; Esses, Veenvliet, Hodson & Mihic, 2008)

.

Philip Knightly’s (1975) and Sam Keen’s ( 1991) pioneering work on enemy construction analyzes the persistence of animal images of the enemy in media propaganda. The construction of the enemy as a dehumanized Other is much more than a representational strategy performed by the news media; its results can be global in reach. Said’s work lays much of the groundwork for current analyses of the media’s fabrication of the enemy-Other; it argues that colonial and imperial projects depend on the way we characterize those we see as deeply and oppositionally different from ourselves. Over time, these characterizations are systematized and grouped into an organized body of thought, a repertoire of words and images so often repeated that it comes to seem like objective knowledge. Orientalism, the distorting lens created by this process, offers a framework through which the West examines what it perceives as the foreign or alien, Erin Steuter and Deborah Wills 12 consistently figuring the East as the West’s invers e: barbaric to its civilized, superstitious to its rational, medieval to its modern. While We stern citizens are defined by their essential uniqueness and individuality, those of the East are constructed in metaphoric terms that emphasize their indistinguishability; the language of Western media discourse typically emphasizes mass over singularity when it represents the East.

In times of conflict, when constructions of the Other conflate with constructions of the enemy, this pattern intensifies. As Lori A. P eek points out, the processes of defining the enemy and defining the Other have a lot in common, in that they “sometimes lead to devastating outcomes” (Peek, 2004: 28). Presenting the enemy- Other as an indistinguishable mass is an essential strategy in the process of enemy fabrication; wartime images traditionally stress this indistinguishability, as evidenced in Frank Capra’s 1945 propaganda film, Know Your Enemy: Japan , which claimed all Japanese resembled “photographic reprints off the same negative” (Dower, 1986: 18), a message visually reinforced by inter-cutting scenes of a steel bar being hammered in a forge with scenes of regimented Japanese mass activity, the visual correlative of a race lacking individual identity.

Such representations operate most visibly in overt propaganda, but devolve so thoroughly into public discourse that they influence the media’s rhetorical choices. Middle-Eastern identities are confused and eroded; Rayan El Amine notes that the Islamic menace “has replaced the red menace, and the ‘evil empire’ of the cold war ha s become the . . . ‘evil doers’ of the Arab and Muslim world” (2005). The metaphors employed in Canadian newspaper headlines further and solidify such attitudes, compressing difference into unanimity by employing a vocabulary of indistinguishability. Unlike the civilized citizens of the West, who are prim arily identified with culture rather than with nature , the hordes of the East are represented as being as natural as insects and as undifferentiated as a hive or swarm. The headlines gathered here clearly indicate an ongoing equation of the Muslim Other with swarming insects and massing rodents, a metaphoric conflation that is especially resilient and persistent. As Merskin notes, we did not see “the end of enemy construction with the war in Iraq. The stereotype was carried from the Taliban, bin Laden, and terrorists to the axis of evil and Hussein. Since the occupation of Iraq, the evil Arab image shifted to . . . ‘crazed’ Ira qis opposed to U.S. occupation” (2004: 60). Such images are not, as Merskin argues, simply an issue of journalistic imbalance and unfair representations, but speak to fundamental questions of why such images are so necessary and prevalent.

#### This leads to an apocalyptic violence, insistent on defending the nation at all costs—that makes annihilation possible

Lifton 3 [Robert Jay Lifton, Visiting Professor of Psychiatry at Harvard Medical School, previously Distinguished Professor of Psychiatry and Psychology at the Graduate School and Director of The Center on Violence and Human Survival at John Jay College of Criminal Justice at the City University of New York, 2003 (Superpower Syndrome: America’s Apocalyptic Confrontation With The World, Published by Thunder’s Mouth Press / Nation Books, ISBN 1560255129, p. 1-4)]

The apocalyptic imagination has spawned a new kind of violence at the beginning of the twenty-first century. We can, in fact, speak of a worldwide epidemic of violence aimed at massive destruction in the service of various visions of purification and renewal. In particular, we are experiencing what could be called an apocalyptic face-off between Islamist\* forces, overtly visionary in their willingness to kill and die for their religion, and American forces claiming to be restrained and reasonable but no less visionary in their projection of a cleansing war-making and military power. Both sides are [end page 1] energized by versions of intense idealism; both see themselves as embarked on a mission of combating evil in order to redeem and renew the world; and both are ready to release untold levels of violence to achieve that purpose. The war on Iraq—a country with longstanding aspirations toward weapons of mass destruction but with no evident stockpiles of them and no apparent connection to the assaults of September 11—was a manifestation of that American visionary projection. The religious fanaticism of Osama bin Laden and other Islamist zealots has, by now, a certain familiarity to us as to others elsewhere, for their violent demands for spiritual purification are aimed as much at fellow Islamics as at American “infidels.” Their fierce attacks on the defilement that they believe they see everywhere in contemporary life resemble those of past movements and sects from all parts of the world; such sects, with end-of-the-world prophecies and devout violence in the service of bringing those prophecies about, flourished in Europe from the eleventh through the sixteenth century. Similar sects like the fanatical Japanese cult Aum Shinrikyo, which released sarin gas into the Tokyo subways in 1995, have existed—even proliferated—in our own time. The American apocalyptic entity is less familiar to us. Even if its urges to power and domination seem historically recognizable, it nonetheless represents a new constellation of forces bound up with what I’ve come to think of [end page 2] as “superpower syndrome.” By that term I mean a national mindset—put forward strongly by a tight-knit leadership group—that takes on a sense of omnipotence, of unique standing in the world that grants it the right to hold sway over all other nations. The American superpower status derives from our emergence from World War II as uniquely powerful in every respect, still more so as the only superpower left standing at the end of the Cold War in the early 1990s. More than merely dominate, the American superpower now seeks to control history. Such cosmic ambition is accompanied by an equally vast sense of entitlement, of special dispensation to pursue its aims. That entitlement stems partly from historic claims to special democratic virtue, but has much to do with an embrace of technological power translated into military terms. That is, a superpower—the world’s only superpower—is entitled to dominate and control precisely because it is a superpower. The murderous events of 9/11 hardened that sense of entitlement as nothing else could have. Superpower syndrome did not require 9/11, but the attacks on the Twin Towers and the Pentagon rendered us an aggrieved superpower, a giant violated and made vulnerable, which no superpower can permit. Indeed, at the core of superpower syndrome lies a powerful fear of vulnerability. A superpower’s victimization brings on both a sense of humiliation and an angry determination to restore, or even [end page 3] extend, the boundaries of a superpower-dominated world. Integral to superpower syndrome are its menacing nuclear stockpiles and their world-destroying capacity. Throughout the decades of the Cold War, the United States and the Soviet Union both lived with a godlike nuclear capacity to obliterate the cosmos, along with a fear of being annihilated by the enemy power. Now America alone possesses that world-destroying capacity, and post-Soviet Russia no longer looms as a nuclear or superpower adversary. We have yet to grasp the full impact of this exclusive capacity to blow up anyone or everything, but its reverberations are never absent in any part of the world. The confrontation between Islamist and American versions of planetary excess has unfortunately tended to define a world in which the vast majority of people embrace neither. But apocalyptic excess needs no majority to dominate a landscape. All the more so when, in their mutual zealotry, Islamist and American leaders seem to act in concert. That is, each, in its excess, nurtures the apocalypticism of the other, resulting in a malignant synergy. \* In keeping with general usage, Islamist refers to groups that are essentially theocratic and fundamentalist, and at times apocalyptic. Islamic is a more general ethnic as well as religious term for Muslims. The terms can of course overlap, and “Islamic state” can mean one run on Islamist principles.

#### Terrorism is politically motivated—only our radical action of stepping back and taking blame can address the real grievences

Blum, 2004[Willian, William Blum is an author, historian, and renowned critic of U.S. foreign policy. He is the author of [*Killing Hope: U.S. Military and CIA Interventions Since World War II*](http://williamblum.org/books/killing-hope/) and [*Rogue State: A Guide to the World’s Only Superpower*](http://williamblum.org/books/rogue-state/). In early 2006, Blum briefly became the subject of widespread media attention when [Osama bin Laden](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Osama_bin_Laden) issued [a public statement](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/19_January_2006_Osama_bin_Laden_tape) in which he quoted Blum and recommended that all Americans read [*Rogue State: A Guide to the World's Only Superpower*](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Rogue_State:_A_Guide_to_the_World%27s_Only_Superpower). As a result of the mention sales of his book greatly increased. "I was quite surprised and even shocked and amused when I found out what he'd said," Blum said. "I was glad. I knew it would help the book's sales and I was not bothered by who it was coming from. If he shares with me a deep dislike for certain aspects of US foreign policy, then I'm not going to spurn any endorsement of the book by him. I think it's good that he shares those views and I'm not turned off by that."[[4]](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/William_Blum#cite_note-4) On the Bin Laden endorsement Blum stated "This is almost as good as being an Oprah book."[[1]](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/William_Blum#cite_note-Montgomery-1) <http://williamblum.org/chapters/freeing-the-world-to-death/myth-and-denial-in-the-war-against-terrorism>]

It dies hard. It dies very hard. The notion that terrorist acts against the United States can be explained by envy and irrational hatred, and not by what the United States does to the world – i.e., US foreign policy – is alive and well. The fires were still burning intensely at Ground Zero when Colin Powell declared: “Once again, we see terrorism, we see terrorists, people who don’t believe in democracy …” [1](http://williamblum.org/chapters/freeing-the-world-to-death/myth-and-denial-in-the-war-against-terrorism#fn-1-a) George W. picked up on that theme and ran with it. He’s been its leading proponent ever since September 11 with his repeated insistence, in one wording or another, that terrorists are people who hate America and all that it stands for, its democracy, its freedom, its wealth, its secular government.” (Ironically, the president and Attorney General John Ashcroft probably hate our secular government as much as anyone.) Here he is more than a year after September 11: “The threats we face are global terrorist attacks. That’s the threat. And the more you love freedom, the more likely it is you’ll be attacked.” [2](http://williamblum.org/chapters/freeing-the-world-to-death/myth-and-denial-in-the-war-against-terrorism#fn-2-a) The American Council of Trustees and Alumni, a conservative watchdog group founded by Lynne Cheney, wife of the vice-president, announced in November 2001 the formation of the Defense of Civilization Fund, declaring that “It was not only America that was attacked on September 11, but civilization. We were attacked not for our vices, but for our virtues.” [3](http://williamblum.org/chapters/freeing-the-world-to-death/myth-and-denial-in-the-war-against-terrorism#fn-3-a) In September 2002, the White House released the “National Security Strategy”, purported to be chiefly the handiwork of Condoleezza Rice, which speaks of the “rogue states” which “sponsor terrorism around the globe; and reject basic human values and hate the United States and everything for which it stands.” In July of the following year, we could hear the spokesman for Homeland Security, Brian Roehrkasse, declare: “Terrorists hate our freedoms. They want to change our ways.” [4](http://williamblum.org/chapters/freeing-the-world-to-death/myth-and-denial-in-the-war-against-terrorism#fn-4-a) Thomas Friedman the renowned foreign policy analyst of the New York Times would say amen. Terrorists, he wrote in 1998 after two US embassies in Africa had been attacked, “have no specific ideological program or demands. Rather, they are driven by a generalized hatred of the US, Israel and other supposed enemies of Islam.” [5](http://williamblum.org/chapters/freeing-the-world-to-death/myth-and-denial-in-the-war-against-terrorism#fn-5-a) This idée fixe – that the rise of anti-American terrorism owes nothing to American policies – in effect postulates an America that is always the aggrieved innocent in a treacherous world, a benign United States government peacefully going about its business but being “provoked” into taking extreme measures to defend its people, its freedom and its democracy. There consequently is no good reason to modify US foreign policy, and many people who might otherwise know better are scared into supporting the empire’s wars out of the belief that there’s no choice but to crush without mercy – or even without evidence – this irrational international force out there that hates the United States with an abiding passion. Thus it was that Afghanistan and Iraq were bombed and invaded with seemingly little concern in Washington that this could well create many new anti-American terrorists. And indeed, since the first strike on Afghanistan in October 2001 there have been literally scores of terrorist attacks against American institutions in the Middle East, South Asia and the Pacific, more than a dozen in Pakistan alone: military, civilian, Christian, and other targets associated with the United States, including the October 2002 bombings in Bali, Indonesia, which destroyed two nightclubs and killed more than 200 people, almost all of them Americans and their Australian and British allies. The following year brought the heavy bombing of the US-managed Marriott Hotel in Jakarta, Indonesia, the site of diplomatic receptions and 4th of July celebrations held by the American Embassy. Even when a terrorist attack is not aimed directly at Americans, the reason the target has been chosen can be because the country it takes place in has been cooperating with the United States in its so-called “War on Terrorism”. Witness the horrendous attacks of recent years in Madrid, Turkey and Saudi Arabia. A US State Department report on worldwide terrorist attacks showed that the year 2003 had more “significant terrorist incidents” than at any time since the department began issuing statistics in 1982; the 2003 figures do not include attacks on US troops by insurgents in Iraq. [6](http://williamblum.org/chapters/freeing-the-world-to-death/myth-and-denial-in-the-war-against-terrorism#fn-6-a) Terrorists in their own words The word “terrorism” has been so overused in recent years that it’s now commonly used simply to stigmatize any individual or group one doesn’t like, for almost any kind of behavior involving force. But the word’s raison d’être has traditionally been to convey a political meaning, something along the lines of: the deliberate use of violence against civilians and property to intimidate or coerce a government or the population in furtherance of a political objective. Terrorism is fundamentally propaganda, a very bloody form of propaganda. It follows that if the perpetrators of a terrorist act declare what their objective was, their statement should carry credibility, no matter what one thinks of the objective or the method used to achieve it. Let us look at some of their actual declarations. The terrorists responsible for the bombing of the World Trade Center in 1993 sent a letter to the New York Times which stated, in part: “We declare our responsibility for the explosion on the mentioned building. This action was done in response for the American political, economical, and military support to Israel the state of terrorism and to the rest of the dictator countries in the region.” [7](http://williamblum.org/chapters/freeing-the-world-to-death/myth-and-denial-in-the-war-against-terrorism#fn-7-a) Richard Reid, who tried to ignite a bomb in his shoe while aboard an American Airline flight to Miami in December 2001, told police that his planned suicide attack was an attempt to strike a blow against the US campaign in Afghanistan and the Western economy. In an e-mail sent to his mother, which he intended her to read after his death, Reid wrote that it was his duty “to help remove the oppressive American forces from the Muslims land.” [8](http://williamblum.org/chapters/freeing-the-world-to-death/myth-and-denial-in-the-war-against-terrorism#fn-8-a) After the bombings in Bali, one of the leading suspects – later convicted – told police that the bombings were “revenge” for “what Americans have done to Muslims.” He said that he wanted to “kill as many Americans as possible” because “America oppresses the Muslims”. [9](http://williamblum.org/chapters/freeing-the-world-to-death/myth-and-denial-in-the-war-against-terrorism#fn-9-a) In November 2002, a taped message from Osama bin Laden began: “The road to safety begins by ending the aggression. Reciprocal treatment is part of justice///

. The [terrorist] incidents that have taken place … are only reactions and reciprocal actions.” [10](http://williamblum.org/chapters/freeing-the-world-to-death/myth-and-denial-in-the-war-against-terrorism#fn-10-a) That same month, when Mir Aimal Kasi, who killed several people outside of CIA headquarters in 1993, was on death row, he declared: “What I did was a retaliation against the US government” for American policy in the Middle East and its support of Israel. [11](http://williamblum.org/chapters/freeing-the-world-to-death/myth-and-denial-in-the-war-against-terrorism#fn-11-a) It should be noted that the State Department warned at the time that the execution of Kasi could result in attacks against Americans around the world. [12](http://williamblum.org/chapters/freeing-the-world-to-death/myth-and-denial-in-the-war-against-terrorism#fn-12-a) It did not warn that the attacks would result from foreigners hating or envying American democracy, freedom, wealth, or secular government. Similarly, in the days following the start of US bombing of Afghanistan there were numerous warnings from US government officials about being prepared for retaliatory acts, and during the war in Iraq, the State Department announced: “Tensions remaining from the recent events in Iraq may increase the potential threat to US citizens and interests abroad, including by terrorist groups.” [13](http://williamblum.org/chapters/freeing-the-world-to-death/myth-and-denial-in-the-war-against-terrorism#fn-13-a) Another example of the difficulty the Bush administration has in consistently maintaining its simplistic idée fixe: In June 2002, after a car bomb exploded outside the US Consulate in Karachi, killing or injuring more than 60 people, the Washington Post reported that “US officials said the attack was likely the work of extremists angry at both the United States and Pakistan’s president, Gen. Pervez Musharraf, for siding with the United States after September 11 and abandoning support for Afghanistan’s ruling Taliban.” [14](http://williamblum.org/chapters/freeing-the-world-to-death/myth-and-denial-in-the-war-against-terrorism#fn-14-a) George W. and others of his administration may or may not believe what they tell the world about the motivations behind anti-American terrorism, but, as in the examples just given, some officials have questioned the party line for years. A Department of Defense study in 1997 concluded: “Historical data show a strong correlation between US involvement in international situations and an increase in terrorist attacks against the United States.” [15](http://williamblum.org/chapters/freeing-the-world-to-death/myth-and-denial-in-the-war-against-terrorism#fn-15-a) Former US president Jimmy Carter told the New York Times in a 1989 interview: We sent Marines into Lebanon and you only have to go to Lebanon, to Syria or to Jordan to witness first-hand the intense hatred among many people for the United States because we bombed and shelled and unmercifully killed totally innocent villagers – women and children and farmers and housewives – in those villages around Beirut. … As a result of that … we became kind of a Satan in the minds of those who are deeply resentful. That is what precipitated the taking of our hostages and that is what has precipitated some of the terrorist attacks. [16](http://williamblum.org/chapters/freeing-the-world-to-death/myth-and-denial-in-the-war-against-terrorism#fn-16-a) Colin Powell has also revealed that he knows better. Writing of this same 1983 Lebanon debacle in his memoir, he forgoes clichŽs about terrorists hating democracy: “The U.S.S. New Jersey started hurling 16-inch shells into the mountains above Beirut, in World War II style, as if we were softening up the beaches on some Pacific atoll prior to an invasion. What we tend to overlook in such situations is that other people will react much as we would.” [17](http://williamblum.org/chapters/freeing-the-world-to-death/myth-and-denial-in-the-war-against-terrorism#fn-17-a) The ensuing retaliatory attack against US Marine barracks in Lebanon took the lives of 241 American military personnel. The bombardment of Beirut in 1983 and 1984 is but one of many examples of American violence against the Middle East and/or Muslims since the 1980s. The record includes: the shooting down of two Libyan planes in 1981 the bombing of Libya in 1986 the bombing and sinking of an Iranian ship in 1987 the shooting down of an Iranian passenger plane in 1988 the shooting down of two more Libyan planes in 1989 the massive bombing of the Iraqi people in 1991 the continuing bombings and sanctions against Iraq for the next 12 years the bombing of Afghanistan and Sudan in 1998 the habitual support of Israel despite the routine devastation and torture it inflicts upon the Palestinian people the habitual condemnation of Palestinian resistance to this the abduction of “suspected terrorists” from Muslim countries, such as Malaysia, Pakistan, Lebanon and Albania, who are then taken to places like Egypt and Saudi Arabia, where they are tortured the large military and hi-tech presence in Islam’s holiest land, Saudi Arabia, and elsewhere in the Persian Gulf region the support of undemocratic, authoritarian Middle East governments from the Shah of Iran to the Saudis. “How do I respond when I see that in some Islamic countries there is vitriolic hatred for America?” asked George W. “I’ll tell you how I respond: I’m amazed. I’m amazed that there’s such misunderstanding of what our country is about that people would hate us. I am – like most Americans, I just can’t believe it because I know how good we are.” [18](http://williamblum.org/chapters/freeing-the-world-to-death/myth-and-denial-in-the-war-against-terrorism#fn-18-a) It’s not just people in the Middle East who have good reason for hating what the US government does. The United States has created huge numbers of potential terrorists all over Latin America during a half century of American actions far worse than what it’s done in the Middle East. If Latin Americans shared the belief of radical Muslims that they will go directly to paradise for martyring themselves in the act of killing the great Satan enemy, by now we might have had decades of repeated terrorist horror coming from south of the border. As it is, there have been many non-suicidal terrorist attacks against Americans and their buildings in Latin America over the years. To what extent do Americans really believe the official disconnect between what the US does in the world and anti-American terrorism? One indication that the public is somewhat skeptical came in the days immediately following the commencement of the bombing of Iraq on March 20 of this year. The airlines later announced that there had been a sharp increase in cancellations of flights and a sharp decrease in future flight reservations in those few days. [19](http://williamblum.org/chapters/freeing-the-world-to-death/myth-and-denial-in-the-war-against-terrorism#fn-19-a) In June, the Pew Research Center released the results of polling in 20 Muslim countries and the Palestinian territories that brought into question another official thesis, that support for anti-American terrorism goes hand in hand with hatred of American society. The polling revealed that people interviewed had much more “confidence” in Osama bin Laden than in George W. Bush. However, “the survey suggested little correlation between support for bin Laden and hostility to American ideas and cultural products. People who expressed a favorable opinion of bin Laden were just as likely to appreciate American technology and cultural products as people opposed to bin Laden. Pro- and anti-bin Laden respondents also differed little in their views on the workability of Western-style democracy in the Arab world.” [20](http://williamblum.org/chapters/freeing-the-world-to-death/myth-and-denial-in-the-war-against-terrorism#fn-20-a) The Iraqi resistance The official Washington mentality about the motivations of individuals they call terrorists is also manifested in current US occupation policy in Iraq. Secretary of War Donald Rumsfeld has declared that there are five groups opposing US forces – looters, criminals, remnants of Saddam Hussein’s government, foreign terrorists and those influenced by Iran. [21](http://williamblum.org/chapters/freeing-the-world-to-death/myth-and-denial-in-the-war-against-terrorism#fn-21-a) An American official in Iraq maintains that many of the people shooting at US troops are “poor young Iraqis” who have been paid between $20 and $100 to stage hit-and-run attacks on US soldiers. “They’re not dedicated fighters,” he said. “They’re people who wanted to take a few potshots.” [22](http://williamblum.org/chapters/freeing-the-world-to-death/myth-and-denial-in-the-war-against-terrorism#fn-22-a) With such language do American officials avoid dealing with the idea that any part of the resistance is composed of Iraqi citizens who are simply demonstrating their resentment about being bombed, invaded, occupied, and subjected to daily humiliations. Some officials convinced themselves that it was largely the most loyal followers of Saddam Hussein and his two sons who were behind the daily attacks on Americans, and that with the capture or killing of the evil family, resistance would die out; tens of millions of dollars were offered as reward for information leading to this joyful prospect. Thus it was that the killing of the sons elated military personnel. US Army trucks with loudspeakers drove through small towns and villages to broadcast a message about the death of Hussein’s sons. “Coalition forces have won a great victory over the Baath Party and the Saddam Hussein regime by killing Uday and Qusay Hussein in Mosul,” said the message broadcast in Arabic. “The Baath Party has no power in Iraq. Renounce the Baath Party or you are in great danger.” It called on all officials of Hussein’s government to turn themselves in. [23](http://williamblum.org/chapters/freeing-the-world-to-death/myth-and-denial-in-the-war-against-terrorism#fn-23-a) What followed was several days of some of the deadliest attacks against American personnel since the guerrilla war began. Unfazed, American officials in Washington and Iraq continue to suggest that the elimination of Saddam will write finis to anti-American actions. Another way in which the political origins of terrorism are obscured is by the common practice of blaming poverty or repression by Middle Eastern governments (as opposed to US support for such governments) for the creation of terrorists. Defenders of US foreign policy cite this also as a way of showing how enlightened they are. Here’s Condoleezza Rice: [The Middle East] is a region where hopelessness provides a fertile ground for ideologies that convince promising youths to aspire not to a university education, a career or family, but to blowing themselves up, taking as many innocent lives with them as possible. We need to address the source of the problem. [24](http://williamblum.org/chapters/freeing-the-world-to-death/myth-and-denial-in-the-war-against-terrorism#fn-24-a) Many on the left speak in a similar fashion, apparently unconscious of what they’re obfuscating. This analysis confuses terrorism with revolution. In light of the several instances mentioned above, among others which could be cited, of US officials giving the game away, in effect admitting that terrorists and guerrillas may be, or in fact are, reacting to actual hurts and injustices, it may be that George W. is the only true believer among them, if in fact he is one. The thought may visit leaders of the American Empire, at least occasionally, that all their expressed justifications for invading Iraq and Afghanistan and for their “War on Terrorism” are no more than fairy tales for young children and grown-up innocents. But officialdom doesn’t make statements to represent reality. It constructs stories to legitimize the pursuit of interests. And the interests here are irresistibly compelling: creating the most powerful empire in all history, enriching their class comrades, remaking the world in their own ideological image. Being the target of terrorism is just one of the prices you pay for such prizes, and terrorist attacks provide a great excuse for the next intervention, the next expansion of the empire, the next expansion of the military budget. A while ago, I heard a union person on the radio proposing what he called “a radical solution to poverty – pay people enough to live on.” Well, I’d like to propose a radical solution to anti-American terrorism – stop giving terrorists the motivation to attack America. As long as the imperial mafia insist that anti-American terrorists have no good or rational reason for retaliation against the United States for anything the US has ever done to their countries, as long as US foreign policy continues with its bloody and oppressive interventions, the “War on Terrorism” is as doomed to failure as the war on drugs has been. If I were the president, I could stop terrorist attacks against the United States in a few days. Permanently. I would first apologize – very publicly and very sincerely – to all the widows and orphans, the impoverished and the tortured, and all the many millions of other victims of American imperialism. Then I would announce to every corner of the world that America’s global military interventions have come to an end. I would then inform Israel that it is no longer the 51st state of the union but -ññ oddly enough -ññ a foreign country. Then I would reduce the military budget by at least 90% and use the savings to pay reparations to the victims and repair the damage from the many American bombings, invasions and sanctions. There would be more than enough money. One year’s military budget in the United States is equal to more than $20,000 per hour for every hour since Jesus Christ was born. That’s one year. That’s what I’d do on my first three days in the White House. On the fourth day, I’d be assassinated.

#### The risk of nuclear terrorism is vanishingly small --- terrorists must succeed at each of twenty plus stages --- failing at one means zero risk.

**Mueller ‘10** (John, Woody Hayes Chair of National Security Studies at the Mershon Center for International Security Studies and a Professor of Political Science at The Ohio State University, A.B. from the University of Chicago, M.A. and Ph.D. @ UCLA, *Atomic Obsession – Nuclear Alarmism from Hiroshima to Al-Qaeda*, Oxford University Press, Accessed @ Emory)

LIKELIHOOD In his thoughtful, influential, and well-argued 2004 book, Nuclear Terrorism: The Ultimate Preventable Catastrophe—a work Nicholas Kristof of the New York Times finds "terrifying"—Graham Allison relayed his "considered judgment" that "on the current path, a nuclear terrorist attack on America in the decade ahead is more likely than not." He repeated that judgment in an article published two years later—albeit without reducing the terminal interval to compensate—and he had presumably relied on the same inspira-tional mechanism in 1995 to predict: "In the absence of a determined program of action, we have every reason to anticipate acts of nuclear terrorism against American targets before this decade is out."1 He has quite a bit of company in his perpetually alarming conclusions. In 2003, UN Ambassador John Negroponte judged there to be a "a high probability" that w&Jjjn two years al-Qaeda would attempt an attack using a nuclear or other weapon of mass destruction. When some 85 foreign policy experts were polled by -Senator Richard Lugar in 2004 and 2005, they concluded on aver-age that there was a 29 percent likelihood a nuclear explosion would occur somewhere in the world within the next ten years, and they overwhelmingly anticipated that this would likely be carried out by terrorists, not by a government. And in 2007, physicist Richard Garwin put the likelihood of a nuclear explosion on an American or European city by terrorist or other means at 20 percent per year, which would work out to 87 percent over a ten-year period.2 In late 2008, after working for six months and interviewing more than 250 people, a congressionally mandated task force, the Commission on the Prevention of Weapons of Mass Destruction Proliferation and Terrorism (possibly known as COPWOMDPAT to its friends) issued its report, portentously entitled World at Risk. It led by expressing the belief that "unless the world community acts decisively and with great urgency, it is more likely than not that a weapon of mass destruction will be used in a terrorist attack somewhere in the world by the end of 2013." Although the report is careful to reassure its readers that it does not intend to frighten them about the current state of terrorism and weapons of mass destruction, it failed miserably in that admirable goal almost immediately. Representative Ellen Tauscher (D-Calif.), chairwoman of the Strategic Forces Subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee, proclaimed shortly after the report was issued, that it "scared the pants off of most of us."3 In its dire forecast, the report's phraseology echoes, of course, Allison's formulation of 2004, and this may owe something to the fact that he was one of the commission's nine members. There are a couple of differences, however. In Allison's earlier rendering, bad things happen only if we stay on "the current path." Thus, should bad things fail to occur, this happy result could be taken as proof that we somehow managed somewhere along the line to alter our path, and who, pray, will be able exactly to designate what a "current path" actually is (or was)? The commission, in stark contrast, claims bad things are likely to happen "unless the world community acts decisively and with great urgency" something, experience suggests, that is next to impossible. On the other hand, the commission artfully broadens its definition of bad things from Allison's "acts of nuclear terrorism against American targets" to the use of a "weapon of mass destruction" by terrorists "some-where in the world." As one critic points out, there is certainly a good chance that someone somewhere will release some germs, killing few, if any, or, as insurgents have done in Iraq, ineffectually lace the occasional bomb with chlorine. Although no normal person would consider either act to constitute "mass destruction," the report can, strictly speaking, claim vindication. Actually, the report is on even safer ground. A man in Rockford, Illinois, who purchased some bogus hand grenades from an FBI informant with the intent to detonate them at a local shopping mall, has been convicted of attempting to use weapons of mass destruction under laws that creatively define hand grenades to be weapons of mass destruction.4 Even those who decidedly disagree with such scary-sounding, if somewhat elusive, prognostications about nuclear terrorism often come out seeming like they more or less agree. In his Atomic Bazaar, William Langewiesche spends a great deal of time and effort assessing the process by means of which a terrorist group could come up with a bomb. Unlike Allison—and, for that matter, the considerable bulk of accepted opinion—he concludes that it "remains very, very unlikely. It's a possibility, but unlikely." Also: The best information is that no one has gotten anywhere near this. I mean, if you look carefully and practically at this process, you see that it is an enormous undertaking full of risks for the would-be terrorists. And so far there is no public case, at least known, of any appreciable amount of weapons-grade HEU [highly enriched uranium] disappearing. And that's the first step. If you don't have that, you don't have anything. The first of these bold and unconventional declarations comes from a book discussion telecast in June 2007 on C-SPAN and the second from an inter-view on National Public Radio. Judgments in the book itself, however, while consistent with such conclusions, are expressed more ambiguously, even coyly: "at the extreme is the possibility, entirely real, that one or two nuclear weapons will pass into the hands of the new stateless guerrillas, the jihad-ists, who offer none of the retaliatory targets that have so far underlain the nuclear peace" or "if a would-be nuclear terrorist calculated the odds, he would have to admit that they are stacked against^ffen," but they are "not impossible."5 The previous chapter arrayed a lengthy set of obstacles confront-: v ,„ ing the would-be atomic terrorist—often making use in the process of Langewlesche's excellent reporting. Those who warn about the likelihood of a terrorist bomb contend that a terrorist group could, if often with great difficulty, surmount each obstacle—that doing so in each case is, in Langewiesche's phrase, "not impossible."6 But it is vital to point out that, while it may be "not impossible" to surmount each individual step, the likelihood that a group could surmount a series of them could quickly approach impossibility. If the odds are "stacked against" the terrorists, what are they? Lange-wiesche's discussion, as well as other material, helps us evaluate the many ways such a quest—in his words, "an enormous undertaking full of risks"— could fail. The odds, indeed, are stacked against the terrorists, perhaps massively so. In fact, the likelihood a terrorist group will come up with an atomic bomb seems to be *vanishingly small*. ARRAYING THE BARRIERS Assuming terrorists have some desire for the bomb (an assumption ques-tioned in the next chapter), fulfillment of that desire is obviously another matter. Even the very alarmed Matthew Bunn and Anthony Wier contend that the atomic terrorists' task "would clearly be among the most difficult types of attack to carry out" or "one of the most difficult missions a terrorist group could hope to try" But, stresses the CIA's George Tenet, a terrorist atomic bomb is "possible" or "not beyond the realm of possibility." In his excellent discussion of the issue, Michael Levi ably catalogues a wide array of difficulties confronting the would-be atomic terrorist, adroitly points out that "terrorists must succeed at every stage, but the defense needs to succeed only once," sensibly warns against preoccupation with worst-case scenarios, and pointedly formulates "Murphy's Law of Nuclear Terrorism: What can go wrong might go wrong." Nevertheless, he holds nuclear terrorism to be a "genuine possibility," and concludes that a good defensive strategy can merely "tilt the odds in our favor."7 Accordingly, it might be useful to take a stab at estimating just how "difficult" or "not impossible" the atomic terrorists' task, in aggregate, is— that is, how far from the fringe of the "realm of possibility" it might be, how "genuine" the possibilities are, how tilted the odds actually are. After all, lots of things are "not impossible." It is "not impossible" that those legendary monkeys with typewriters could eventually output Shakespeare.8 Or it is "not impossible"—that is, there is a "genuine possibility"—that a colliding meteor or comet could destroy the earth, that Vladimir Putin or the British could decide one morning to launch a few nuclear weapons at Ohio, that an underwater volcano could erupt to cause a civilization-ending tidal wave, or that Osama bin Laden could convert to Judaism, declare himself to be the Messiah, and fly in a gaggle of mafioso hit men from Rome to have himself publicly crucified.9 As suggested, most discussions of atomic terrorism deal in a rather piecemeal fashion with the subject—focusing separately on individual tasks such as procuring HEU or assembling a device or transporting it. However, as the Gilmore Commission, a special advisory panel to the president and Congress, stresses, setting off a nuclear device capable of producing mass destruction presents "Herculean challenges," requiring that a whole series of steps be accomplished: obtaining enough fissile material, designing a weapon "that will bring that mass together in a tiny fraction of a second" and figuring out some way to deliver the thing. And it emphasizes that these merely constitute "the minimum requirements." If each is not fully met, the result is not simply a less powerful weapon, but one that can't produce any significant nuclear yield at all or can't be delivered.10 Following this perspective, an approach that seems appropriate is to catalogue the barriers that must be overcome by a terrorist group in order to carry out the task of producing, transporting, and then successfully detonating an improvised nuclear device, an explosive that, as Allison acknowledges, would be "large, cumbersome, unsafe, unreliable, unpredictable, and inefficient." Table 13.1 attempts to do this, and it arrays some 20 of these— all of which must be surmounted by the atomic aspirant. Actually, it would be quite possible to come up with a longer list: in the interests of keeping the catalogue of hurdles down to a reasonable number, some of the entries are actually collections of tasks and could be divided into two or three or more. For example, number 5 on the list requires that heisted highly enriched uranium be neither a scam nor part of a sting nor of inadequate quality due to insider incompetence, but this hurdle could as readily be rendered as three separate ones. In contemplating the task before them, woixftlsbe atomic terrorists effectively must go through an exercise that looks much like this. If and when they do so, they are likely to find the prospects daunting and accordingly uninspiring or even terminally dispiriting. "

### Schmitt

#### Reject their totalizing root cause claims—precludes alt solvency

Chandler 2008 (David, David Chandler is Professor of International Relations at the University of Westminster in Centre for the Study of Democracy, “The Revival of Carl Schmitt in International Relations: The Last Refuge of Critical Theorists?”, <http://www.davidchandler.org/pdf/journal_articles/Millennium%20-%20Schmitt%20published.pdf>, Hemanth)

\*we don’t endorse the ableist language

In this reading, Schmitt’s position is fundamentally the same, but in mirror-image form, as that of the neo-conservatives who advocate US imperialism dressed up as a ‘war for humanity’. First, Schmitt’s position is held to be as blind to the victims of state violence, in the name of ‘national interests’, as neo-conservatives are to the victims of inter-state violence in the name of ‘human rights’. Secondly, while the neo-cons might argue that humanitarian intervention against sovereignty is always right, Schmittian anti-cosmopolitans are held to argue that it is always wrong – the position of both is then equated and seen to be equally antipolitical; that is, not based on political debate or upon the needs of the people concerned. The correct solution, for Devetak, is the context-based, case-by-case approach based on critical Habermasian dialogue, rooted in the politics of civil society. Eschewing the dogmatism and idealism of either side of the ‘for and against intervention’ debate, and engaging in political dialogue on the specifics of the case, critical cosmopolitanism is held to come away with its ethics and its political radicalism intact.

#### The Alternative Devolves Into Fascism – Even if Schmitt Was NOT a Nazi, Their Advocacy Would Get Co-Opted

Noorani 5 – Assistant Professor in the Department of Near Eastern Studies at the University of Arizona [Yaseen, “The Rhetoric of Security,” 2005, CR: The New Centennial Review, 5.1, p. 20-22]

Schmitt’s critique of liberal normativity is beset with contradictions and unfounded assumptions, beginning with its own foundation in the liberal notion of the state of war.8 What his critique helps us to understand is not so much the opposition between the political (self-preservation) and the normative that it argues, but rather, how these two conditions must hang together in a paradoxical embrace. This contradictory union of the amoral and moral lies at the heart of liberal social contract theory and is the rhetorical key to the U.S. war on terror. It is also the rock upon which Schmitt’s “political” founders in an instructive manner. Schmitt attempts to obscure the ultimately normative nature of the concept of “the people” while relying on this normativity nonetheless. The commonly accepted right of individual self-preservation apparently has an intuitive basis in our recognition of a fundamental natural drive for self-preservation. We normally regard a living person, or other organism, as a self-evident fact and believe that by its constitution such an organism senses when its life is in danger and acts to save itself. A “people” and its state, however, is not of this nature. As Chantal Mouffe points out in the passage quoted above, the identity of “the people” is subject to political contestation. Different individuals and groups have conflicting ideas about the nature of their nation, who is included within it, what its values are. As a result, they also have conflicting ideas about what constitutes a threat to the nation’s existence. Schmitt’s argument is based on his assumption that “the people” is a pre-given entity, a natural kind whose existence is just as self-evident as that of an individual person. This people or nation is the fundamental unit of self-preservation, of life and death antagonisms among human beings. Therefore, Schmitt rejects any kind of internal antagonism, i.e., political division, within the people. The nation/state must be fully unified in order to fulfill its purpose by protecting its members from possi- ble extinction (Schmitt 1996, 28–32). One corollary of this view is that the enemy of the people is self-evident—the nation whose life is threatened by this enemy spontaneously recognizes it, and there is no scope for argument, persuasion, or moral judgement concerning the matter. The enemy is the other, the stranger; and it is sufficient for his nature that he is, in a specially intense way, existentially something different and alien, so that in the extreme case conflicts with him are possible. These can neither be decided by a previously determined general norm nor by the judgment of a disinterested and therefore neutral third party. (27) A second corollary of this view is that the government of a people is the direct expression of this people’s being and as such is fully entitled to deter- mine who enemies are, both foreign and domestic, as well as when and how to wage wars against them (46). The fascist implications of these views are obvious. Anything is permitted for the sake of self-preservation, the “peo- ple” is the self that must be preserved, and the state is the people’s “agency” empowered to protect it. Despite Schmitt’s essentialist mysticism of the people, it is clear that the existence of a nation, its identity, is not self-evident but determined by the political contestation that Schmitt so much hates. This is because “the people” or nation is not a preconstituted organism but a moral ideal invoked for political purposes. Schmitt admits as much when he states that a people goes to war in order to preserve its “way of life.”9 Schmitt does not define his notion of a “people” but stipulates that it is the collective unit of self-preservation, the only unit that engages in life and death antagonisms and thus the only political unit. Unlike Hobbes, Schmitt does not derive political association and the state from the desire of individuals for self- preservation. Rather, it is the self-preservation of the “people” that is of ultimate importance, and individuals can be sacrificed for it. What is of ultimate value, therefore, more value than individual lives, is a given people’s “way of life.” This is the self-evident self that people should be willing to die to preserve. Schmitt has left the biological realm of necessity here and entered the moral. A way of life can only be valuable as the way things ought to be. It is a norm whose meaning and content is open to debate. People have to be persuaded and convinced that it is worth dying for. Moreover, the attribution of a specific way of life to a nation is always a political act. It is an assertion that all members of this nation adhere to a certain norm that is the identity of this nation, thus delegitimizing those who espouse or promote different norms. The call to war, therefore, is political in the sense of internal politics because in identifying a threat to the nation’s existence, its “way of life,” those who call to war assert a particular conception of what constitutes the nation’s way of life and attempt to establish this conception’s normativity for all members of the nation. Contrary to Schmitt’s claims, we see that whenever states or others call upon a population to go to war, they adduce existential and moral justifications at the same time, and indeed the two can never fully be distinguished. We see this even in the exemplary cases approvingly invoked by Schmitt. He cites the supposed life and death strug- gle of Christianity and Islam during the Middle Ages (Schmitt 1996, 30).10 The mutual moral condemnation here as a justification for wars is appar- ent. Schmitt also cites with great approbation a speech made by Cromwell illustrating recognition of irreducible enmity with regard to Spain (68). But this speech explicitly attributes the enmity that Cromwell calls upon his compatriots to feel towards and recognize in Spain to the ungodliness (papacy) of the Spanish and the godliness of the English. It is an enmity rooted in God’s moral strictures. A “way of life” is not a living organism in its facticity but an ambiguous norm open to contestation, redefinition, and even repudiation. This means that the non-normative status of self-preser- vation, acceded to the life of an individual person, is attached in the case of nations to a normative ideal.11

#### A solely friend-enemy dichotomy is too totalizing and results in paranoid violence and miscalc—the war on terror makes this a uniquely bad time for the alt

Reinhard 05, Kenneth Reinhard, Associate Professor of English and Comparative Literature at UCLA, Toward a Political Theology of the Neighbor,” The Neighbor: Three Inquires in Political Theology, 2005, p. 14-17//MC

The figure of the enemy in Schmitt's 1932 The Concept of the Political is drained of all animus. The enemy, according to Schmitt, is not evil: The distinction of friend and enemy denotes the utmost degree of intensity of a union or separation, of an association or dissociation. . . . The political enemy need not be morally evil or aesthetically ugly; he need not appear as an economic competitor, and it may even be advantageous to engage with him in business transactions. But he is, nevertheless, the other, the stranger; and it is sufficient for his nature that he is, in a specifically intense way, existentially something different and alien, so that in the ex­treme case conflicts with him are possible. . . . Only the actual participants can cor­rectly recognize, understand, and judge the concrete situation and settle the extreme case of conflict. Each participant is in a position to judge whether the adversary in­tends to negate his opponent's way of life and therefore must be repulsed or fought in order to preserve one's own form of existence.10 The political emerges in a process that seems to have, on the one hand, the characteristics of formal logic, the "union or separation" of two groups, friends and enemies; and, on the other, an intensely personal, existential moment of "recognition," "understanding," and "judgment" for the particular subjects involved. The Friend and the Enemy form twin imagos for the national and subjective ethos, figures of positive and negative political ontology by which the interior "we" (the "I" and its friends) is identified as such, as distinguished from the exterior "they." If the "extreme case" of battle to the death with the enemy is the formal scene always on the horizon, as in the Hegelian dialectic of intersubjec­tivity, the decision to engage in war is radically contingent, not deter­mined by any necessity. The act of war, in this sense, is the exception that proves the political rule, the self-identity of the state. And it is pre­cisely insofar as this decisive act is always that of an individual subject, the "actual participants" in conflict, that subjectivity too becomes an in­stance of self-sovereignty." One problem with this account of the political, where we divide the world into friends we identify with and enemies we define ourselves against, is that it is fragile, liable to break down or even to invert and oscillate in the face of complex situations. But it is precisely in its inadequacy to the world we live in that Schmitt’s account of the friend-enemy distinction is most useful: today, we find ourselves in a world from which the political may have already disappeared, or at least has mutated into some strange new shape. A world not anchored by the "us" and "them" oppositions that flourished as recently as the Cold War is one subject to radical instability, both subjectively and politically. The disappearance of the enemy results in something like global psychosis: since the mirroring relationship between Friend and Enemy provides a form of stability, albeit one based on projective identifications and repudiations, the loss of the enemy threatens to destroy what Lacan calls the "imaginary tripod" (trepied imaginaire) that props up the psychotic with a sort of pseudo-subjectivity, until something causes it to collapse, resulting in full-blown delusions, hallucinations, and paranoia. 12 Hence, for Schmitt, a world without enemies is much more dangerous than one where one is surrounded by enemies. As Derrida writes, the disappearance of the enemy opens the door for "an unheard-of violence, the evil of a malice knowing neither measure nor ground, an unleashing incommensurable in its unprecedented—therefore monstrous—forms; a violence in the face of which what is called hostility, wars, conflict, enmity, cruelty, even hatred, would regain reassuring and ultimately appeasing contours because they would be identifiable." 13 America today is desperately unsure about both its enemies and its friends, and hence deeply uncertain about itself. The rhetoric of the so-called war on terror is a sign of the disappearance of the traditional, localizable enemy: the terrorist does not have the stabilizing function that Schmitt associates with the enemy, but to declare war on him [or her] is to attempt to resuscitate the enemy's failing animus. [gender modified] Derrida's argument in The Politics of Friendship is not so much that we have entered into a historical period where the friend-enemy polarity has broken down, but that it is an inherently unstable opposition. Der­rida's account of how the enemy and friend come to displace and infect each other in his reading of Schmitt leads him to propose "a step (not) beyond the political": Let us not forget that the political would precisely be that which thus endlessly binds or opposes the friend-enemy/enemy-friend couple in the drive or decision of death.... A hypothesis, then: and what if another lovence (in friendship or in love) were bound to an affirmation of life, to the endless repetition of this affirmation, only in seeking its way ... in the step beyond the political, or beyond that political as the horizon of fini­tude the philein beyond the political or another politics for loving.14 This other "politics for loving" that Derrida hypothesizes, this love both beyond and not-beyond the political, must still remain in the vicinity of the theological if it is to be significant, in Schmitt's terms, and not merely a fantasy of some purely secular politics. I would like to suggest that such a politics can be located in the figure of the neighbor—the fig­ure that materializes the uncertain division between the friend /family/ self and the enemy/stranger/other. There is an element of this political theology of the neighbor that we can already point to in Derrida's comments on Schmitt's reference to Je­sus's call to "love your enemies" in Matthew. For Schmitt, this biblical reference points to a linguistic distinction in Greek and Latin (but not German or English) between the private inimicos, who may indeed be loved or hated, and the public hostis, the political enemy, who, accord­ing to Schmitt, is not an object of affect. But as Derrida points out in a reading of this passage in The Gift of Death, the full line from Matthew that Schmitt refers to involves a crucial reference to the neighbor: "Ye have heard that it hath been said, Thou shalt love thy neighbor, and hate thine enemy. But I say unto you, Love your enemies, bless them that curse you . . ." (5 : 43- 44). Jesus cites Leviticus 19:18, the commandment to "love thy neighbor as thyself," but adds to it something not present in the Hebrew Bible, a directive to "hate thine enemy," in order to make it seem that he is undoing a piece of legal vengeance and, in proclaim­ing Love your enemies, is asserting its opposite. In fact, the biblical passage in Leviticus Jesus refers to has just specifically forbidden ven­geance.15 Jesus acts here as a sovereign, in declaring an exception ("love your enemies") to a law ("hate thine enemy") that he himself has con­fected; Jesus's commandment to love the enemy must be perceived as not merely new, but antinomian, in violation of the preexisting legal code. Jesus's act of suspending a law that did not previously exist is not merely his exercise of the sovereign prerogative of exception, but an act of political-theological creation ex nihilo, truly a polemical "miracle." Although Jesus's rhetorical technique here would seem to be that of par­adoxical reversal, the first part of the verse, the injunction to love the neighbor, is not challenged, but persists, extended in the series of acts of love that follows ("bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you"). Indeed, rather than being inverted, it will be purified of particularism and appropriated as a central tenet of the new Christian political theology. For Schmitt, the line from Matthew is meant to clarify the difference between the public enemy and the various enmities that occur privately and are not part of the political as such. Jesus, he points out, uses the word inimicus or ekhthros for the enemy we are enjoined to love, and this must be distinguished from the true enemy, the hostis or polemios. As Derrida indicates, Schmitt's disturbing example is that the Christian state can have Islam as its enemy, but still love the Muslim as its neigh­bor.16 But Derrida argues that it is precisely in this enemy, the one who constitutes the political for Schmitt, that the trace of the neighbor ma­terializes: "An identifiable enemy—that is, one who is reliable to the point of treachery, and thereby familiar. One's fellow man, in sum, who could almost be loved as oneself. . . . This adversary would remain a neighbor, even if he were an evil neighbor against whom war would have to be waged."17 The implication of Derrida's comment is that the neighbor who is to be loved as ourself cannot be relegated to a private, pre- or extrapolitical realm, insofar as a similar, if not identical, structure of reflexivity also determines the relationship to the public enemy, who, as reliably "identifiable," is loved (or hated) as ourself. Thus, Derrida points out a possibility of "semantic slippage and inversion" in Schmitt's political theology: the enemy can also be a friend, and the friend is sometimes an enemy. The border between them, and between the pub­lic and private realms they are associated with, is "fragile, porous, con­testable," and to this extent "the Schmittian discourse collapses" and against the threat of that ruin, it takes form.18 Schmitt's theory of the exception recapitulates the first two structural moments in providential history by describing the sovereign's political miracles as acts of "creation" and "revelation": if "creation" corresponds to the reestablishment of the polis in the superlegal sovereign act that terminates the civic crisis and the threat of chaos, "revelation" is the ar­ticulation of the constitution or civic law that holds open and maps the contours of the political space established by creation. Cast in the light of revelation, the essence of the law is located in its exceptional rather than normative function.19 However, Schmitt does not include among the metaphors that fill out his structural analogy what would tradi­tionally be the final act of the drama of political theology: the eschato­logical conclusion when the earthly kingdom fashioned and chartered by God falls into ruin through human depredation, to be replaced by a heavenly kingdom that will last forever. For Walter Benjamin, who maintained a dialogue with Schmitt on these issues, redemption is fi­nally the only theological category that has real significance for poli­tics." In his "Theologico-Political Fragment," Benjamin extends the account of allegorical signification he developed in his book on the Ger­man Trauerspiel to theorize the redemptive logic of political theology: "The order of the profane assists, through being profane, the coming of the Messianic Kingdom. The profane, therefore, although not itself a cat­egory of this Kingdom, is a decisive category of its quietest approach. . . . For nature is Messianic by reason of its eternal and total passing away." 21 The world we live in contains figures of redemption not in the examples of charity and acts of neighbor-love we might find here and there, but in the signs of transitoriness that we see everywhere: natural decay, cultural ruin, political disintegration—the eternity of entropy only. Benjamin's account of the political theology of redemption is insistently material and consistently focused on the transformations of temporality. In his late essay "Theses on the Philosophy of History," Benjamin places cen­tral importance on redemption, not as a religious correlative for the Marxist dream of a classless society, but as a kind of temporal bomb which the historical materialist can throw into teleological historicism "in order to blast a specific era out of the homogeneous course of " his- tory.22 Redemption is not the final cause of history, but the interruption of the false totality of historical causality and contextualization by acts of critical creation and constellation. Given Schmitt's right-wing sympathies, it is not surprising that his ac­count of political theology does not invoke the language of redemption, which so frequently serves as a metaphor for political liberation. But it is precisely in redemption that we can find the possibility of a political theology other than that of the friend-enemy dyad—a political theology of the neighbor. In the Star of Redemption, his articulation of the three primal elements of human, world, and God into the three basic rela­tionships of creation, revelation, and redemption, Franz Rosenzweig ar­gues that redemption enters into the world through the act of neighbor-love, as the condition for messianic transformation, social revolution, and the radical revaluation of all values." For Rosenzweig, messianic temporality is not indefinitely postponed to the future, but happens now, as an incursion into the presentness of the present by the nearness of the neighbor: "If then a not-yet is inscribed over all redemptive uni­son, there can only ensue that the end is for the time being represented by the just present moment, the universal and highest by the approxi­mately proximate. The bond of the consummate and redemptive bond­ing of man and the world is to begin with the neighbor and ever more only the neighbor, the well nigh-nighest [zuneichst der Nachste and immer wieder nur der Neichste, das zu-nachst Nachste]." 24 For Rosenzweig, love of the neighbor is not merely the first step on the path to redemption, the good deed that might help make the world a better place in some hypo­thetical future, but its realization now, the immanent production of its transcendental conditions. The nearness of the neighbor materializes the imminence of redemption, releasing the here and the now from the fetters of teleology in the infinitesimal calculus of proximity." […continues…] Lacan's repeated insistence on the "mystery" of Freud's utterance, "They love their delusions as they love themselves," suggests that he is in­trigued by Freud's claim to have found "the secret" of paranoia not only in terms of the hidden content it might reveal, but also as mystery, oc­clusion of knowledge. Freud is himself clearly interested in the original injunction's grammatical structure, its formal cadence, in which the par­allelism between neighbor and self prepares for his substitution of delusion for neighbor. But whereas both the original scriptural text and Freud's modifications of it in Draft H (and implicitly in the Project for a Scientific Psychology) seem to suggest the dialectical reciprocity and substitutabil­ity of their terms (whether between self and neighbor for the subject of the Levitical injunction, self and Nebenmensch for the normal neurotic, or self and delusion in the formula of paranoia), this apparent symmetry is misleading. The paranoid projection is not the result of a representa­tional or figurative act; on the contrary, it is precisely the tropological function of the as that the paranoiac rejects in loving his delusion as himself—as Lacan writes, "He literally loves it like himself." 62 In refusing to tolerate the proximity of the Nebenmensch, the paranoiac literalizes what should have been a figure according to the paternal imperative and fixates on a real neighbor, not as a trope of the Nebenmensch, but as the refusal to trope as such.63 We can map the structure of psychosis described by Freud and Lacan across the dual axes of political theology: on the one hand, we have seen how the symptoms of psychosis, especially in its paranoid manifesta­tions, tend to cluster along what we can think of as the horizontal axis defined by the imperative to love the neighbor. The vicious gossip and penetrating gaze of the neighbor become the site of overwhelming af‑fect—love, hate, and fear commingled in fragments of the social rela­tionship. On the other hand, the presence or absence of the primary sig­nifier of the symbolic order that Lacan calls "the Name-of-the-Father," the determining condition of psychosis, correlates with the vertical rela­tionship implied by the commandment to love God, the theological im­perative underlying the exceptional powers of sovereignty. In his read­ing of Racine's Athaliah, Lacan describes this signifier as the "quilting point" [le point de capiton] that organizes the symbolic structure of the play: "everything radiates out from and is organized around this signi­fier," which, in the paradigmatic case of Athaliah, is "fear," in the phrase "fear of God." Lacan writes that this signifier is "particularly ambiva­lent," easily shifting into its correlative divine affect, love; unlike the classical fear of the gods, "The fear of God . . . is the principle of wisdom and the foundation of the love of God. Moreover, this tradition is pre­cisely our own." 64 Lacan argues that we live in a world radically trans­formed by the advent of monotheism and the condensation in it of a pri­mal signifier that anchors us in a relationship with an exceptional God. And, according to Lacan, this has nothing to do with whether or not a particular individual believes: monotheism enacts a material and histor­ical break that is absolute and irrecusable and that structures subjectiv­ity thereafter. In Freud's discussion of the case of Daniel Paul Schreber, we see that for Dr. Schreber "love of God" in its most obscene literal form (the fantasy of being fucked by God) takes the place of his failed rela­tionship to the symbolic order and his inability to assume his position in it as judge. According to Lacan, it is significant that this failure, in Schreber's case and many others, occurs in the political sphere: Further still, the father's relation to this law [promulgated by the Name-of-the-Father] must be considered in itself, for one will find in it the reason for that paradox, by which the ravaging effects of the paternal figure are to be observed with particular frequency in cases where the father really has the function of a legislator or, at least has the up­per hand, whether in fact he is one of those fathers who makes the laws or whether he poses as the pillar of the faith, as a paragon of integrity and devotion, as virtuous or as a virtuoso, by serving a work of salvation, of whatever object or lack of object, of nation or of birth, of safeguard or salubrity, of legacy or legality, of the pure, the impure or of empire [du pur, du pire ou de l'empire], all ideals that provide him with all too many opportunities of being in a posture of undeserving, inadequacy, even of fraud, and, in short, of excluding the Name-of-the-Father from its position in the signifier.65 The signifier of the Father is "sovereign" in its rule over the subject pre­cisely insofar as it is the exception to the rules that govern the movement of signification. There is a point, at least hypothetically, when the sub­ject hovers between neurosis and psychosis, even perhaps a zero degree where "primal repression," the installation of the paternal signifier, and "foreclosure," the failure to install such a signifier, have not yet been dis­tinguished.66 And this is the point when the subject is called upon to de­cide whether primal repression or foreclosure will define the political economy of his or her psyche. Lacan poses the distinction between neurosis and psychosis as a ques­tion of love: "Where does the difference between someone who is psy­chotic and someone who isn't come from? It comes from the fact that for the psychotic a love relation that abolishes him as subject is possible insofar as it allows a radical heterogeneity of the Other. But this love is also a dead love." 67 Although the psychotic fails to separate himself from the other's signifiers, because of the unbearable intensity of the affect they arouse, it is this inability that at the same time enables him to ex­perience the Other in its purity, or "radical heterogeneity." Unlike the model of love for the dead neighbor that Kierkegaard presents as exem­plary of love, the psychotic's love is itself dead, petrified in the fullness of its encounter with the real Other. Whereas such an encounter with the absolute alterity of the neighbor is paradigmatic of ethics for Levi­nas, for Lacan it is neither ethical nor real love. Neurosis and psychosis represent two asymmetrical modes of the failure to love the neighbor: whereas the neurotic becomes an autonomous subject of desire in turn‑ing away from the impossibility of the command to love the neighbor, the psychotic fails to achieve subjectivity while succeeding in experi­encing the other as radically other, loving the neighbor not wisely, but too well.

#### Emnity creates more destructive wars than liberal humanitarianism.

Scheuerman 4 [William Scheuerman, Political Science at Indiana, “International Law as Historical Myth,” *Constellations*, 11 (4) p. 542-544]

According to the concluding chapters of the Nomos der Erde, it is the United States that inherits the imperial mantle of the British “sea-power” by combining universalistic liberalism with dreams of global economic domination. In altogether unambiguous terms, Schmitt makes the rise of the US from a regional to global power primarily responsible for the re-moralization of warfare that occurred in the twentieth century and allegedly prepared the way for its innumerable wartime atrocities. It is the Americans, he repeatedly underscores in the work’s final chapters, who have initiated a series of moralistic regressions in international law that fall behind the great intellectual accomplishments of Thomas Hobbes and the jus publicum europaeum. They fail to acknowledge the dangers of crude moralistic conceptions of warfare and embrace a discriminatory conception of war. Consequently, they plunge international relations back into civil war, in which the carefully constructed civilizing achievements of the jus publicum europaeum are irresponsibly discarded. Just as significant, the United States discards the European preference for regionalism in international law—in Schmitt’s terminology, a sufficiently homogeneous Raum-based system of interstate relations—for the liberalistic fiction of a heterogeneous universal global system of legality that represents a cloak for US world domination. Schmitt offers a fascinating and oftentimes perceptive account of why the idiosyncrasies of American political development rendered the US susceptible to such intellectual mistakes, but his real focus, of course, is more than the messianic excesses of US political and legal thinking. In the final analysis, it is the busybody interventionist liberalism of the United States Schmitt considers culpable for the destruction of the basically pacific European system of jus publicum europaeum. At times offering little more than a warmed-over version of his Nazi era claim that Hitler was waging a defensive war against the universalistic (and thereby for Schmitt necessarily imperialistic) United States,20 a central theme of Nomos der Erde is that the United States—and not, of course, Germany—posed the greatest threat to world peace in the twentieth century. II. Separating the Wheat from the Chaff Schmitt’s apology for Germany’s troubled role in mid-century international politics might legitimately lead a politically and historically sensible reader to recoil in disgust from Nomos der Erde. Nonetheless, Schmitt’s stylized vision of the jus publicum europaeum initially appears to rest on solid historical evidence. As Theodore Rabb has noted, “there is general scholarly agreement that war become ‘milder’ and ‘more civilized’ in the late seventeenth century, and that particular credit must go to the improvement of discipline, military academies, and the creation of standing armies.”21 As Schmitt argues in Nomos der Erde, the rationalization of the modern state apparatus went hand-in-hand with a relative domestication of warfare, and the “decline of religion as a stimulus to violence,” 22 widely noted by historians of this period, might be taken as empirical support for Schmitt’s claim that only a “de-moralized” concept of war can minimize its potential horrors. In the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, European states typically engaged in “delimited warfare, fought with limited means for limited objects,” resulting in a substantial improvement in the military treatment of civilians during wartime.23 “More and more, then, soldiers were now hemmed in by clearly defined official criteria and requirements against which their actions could be judged.”24 A common European aristocratic ethos in the officer corps facilitated the movement away from the horrors of earlier religiously based political conflict, as wars increasingly became akin to aristocratic duels.25 Of course, as Schmitt himself concedes, the relative civility of European interstate relations operated alongside terrible acts of violence committed against non- European peoples. In addition, the development of the modern state apparatus, improvement of military discipline, and rise of professionalized standing armies ultimately helped bring about unprecedented capacities for organized state violence, even if such violence was no longer typically unleashed against fellow Europeans in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.26 This is by no means the only oversight in Schmitt’s account, however. He conveniently downplays inconvenient historical events that mesh poorly with his nostalgic gloss. For example, in the Seven Years War (1756–63), one of Schmitt’s own paradigmatic examples of an absolutist “land-power,” Prussia, lost 180,000 soldiers and one-ninth of the country’s entire population; Frederick himself conceded that his subjects “had nothing left except the miserable rags which covered their nakedness.”27 Armies still spread terrible diseases: in 1771, soldiers returning from battles with Turks on the south Russian steppe spread a plague that killed 60,000 in Moscow, 14,000 in Kiev, and 10,000 in the Ukraine.28 A closer look at the jus publicum europaeum quickly suggests that this “golden age” not only permitted and perhaps even required the exploitation, enslavement, and slaughter of non-Europeans around the globe, but that it still engendered significant misery for those living on the European continent itself.

### K-2

#### Yeah, your argument is radical in what it SAYS. Sadly, the WAY YOU SAY IT adheres closely to the hegemonic conventions you hope to change—because of this fidelity all the neg does is insulate the very structures it hopes to change

**Shugart, 2002** [An Appropriating Aesthetic: Reproducing Power in the Discourse of Critical Scholarship Communication Theory Thirteen: Three August 2003 Helene A.]

Ono and Sloop’s reservations coincided with the standards of conventional scholarship that Nothstine et al. identified—a distancing of the critic from the conditions and consequences of the text. The apparent allegiance to theory—albeit poststructuralist—that Ono and Sloop noted also reflected the “scientization” that Nothstine et al. described as central to the professionalization (and thus **homogenization**) that characterized the scholarly tradition. Echoing this sentiment, in her critique of critical scholarship— what she referred to as “**canon-busting ‘new scholarship’”** (p. 64)— Barbara Foley (1990) apparently **observed a continuance of traditional scholarship’s standard of highly specialized, balkanized, and insulated academic expertise:** The logic of the new scholarship ***ought***to extend to a critique of those institutions that help to maintain hegemony. But **it can actually end up legitimating the hegemonic view that campuses are apolitical centers where disinterested** research and pedagogy take place. (p. 75) Clearly, these critics all were cognizant of the fact that **simply shifting the focus of the critic is not sufficient to realize a critical scholarship**; **this must occur in tandem with radical conceptual changes regarding what con stitutes knowledge** **and**, accordingly, **qualifies as scholarship////**

. As controversial as this idea was and, to some extent, continues to be, many contemporary outlets for scholarship in the field of rhetorical criticism have proved themselves relatively amenable to it, if sometimes grudgingly. It is no longer unusual to read a piece of rhetorical criticism in which the critic overtly situates herself/himself in relation to the text or describes her/his political investment in the telos of the critical project. As McKerrow (1989) and Ono and Sloop (1995) predicted, this has changed the face of criticism dramatically. However, in this essay, I argue that the conceptual changes reflected in the contemporary scholarship of critical rhetoric are to some extent limited in their capacity to undo the dialectic of control peculiar to traditional scholarship—a dialectic that is largely inherent in the aesthetic conventions of that scholarship.

#### The fact that capitalism commodifies literature and art is what makes them valuable as a tool of critical resistance—art and literature have the unique ability to exist within dominant structures while simultaneously critiquing and reforming them—the perm has *the most* revolutionary potential

**Winchock,2010** [Dylan. Professor of English at  [Binghamton University (SUNY)](http://www.ratemyprofessors.com/SelectTeacher.jsp?sid=958). Rated 4.8/5 on “ratemyprof”. Also got bonus points for “Hotness”,Copyright 2010 by Dylan WinchockSobriquet Magazine #66Volume 16, Number 5 <http://www.sobriquetmagazine.com/winchock.html>]

The modernist desire for autonomous art is in many ways mirrored in the avant-garde by a Marxist demand that culture be placed firmly within the superstructure.  **Art**, in this perspective, is nothing more than another aspect of life determined by the underlying and universalizing economic base.  **Aesthetics** subordinated to the base have no real power in and of themselves, **but** for Raymond Williams, **such a model is extremely limiting and unrealistic** (Williams 19).  Instead, he suggests that we understand the arts as an individual imagining only accessible to the world in material ways.  Our ideas are transmitted to others through paper, stone, canvas, and language (to name a few); and to exclude this material process from the more privileged processes of labor and capital is to **overlook its importance in producing our understanding** of the economic base (62).  The superstructure and base cannot be separated from each other; aesthetics cannot be simply pulled away from its other cultural and political counterparts (81).  However, neither should art be thought of as a perfect mirror of the base.  Art is rather a representation of the economic conditions in which we live; and as a representation, it is in a position to both confirm and **negotiate** **with** economically-based ideology.

Williams suggests that if a major medium for representation, such as art, is found in the superstructure, but can successfully critique the base, then **the superstructure itself has more revolutionary potential than orthodox Marxists believe.**  The superstructure**, instead of being** **a** simple base-determined **location of reification, becomes a location of resistance.** Williams' move away from *ideological*theory and toward a theory of hegemonic *process*allows art room to express itself beyond the language of society's dominant group:

A lived hegemony is always a process.  It is not, except analytically, a system or a structure.  It is a realized complex of experiences, relationships, and activities, with specific and changing pressures and limits. . . . The reality of any hegemony, in the extended political and cultural sense, is that, while by definition it is always dominant, it is **never** either **total** or **exclusive** (112-13).

This hegemonic process thus creates a space of negotiation, an ability to maintain some sense of agency outside of the dominant group, no matter how marginal that agency might seem.  The superstructure, while often reinforcing the base and reifying its subjects, is also the space of representation for the subordinate groups in society; and it is these **subordinate** **groups** who are in a position to produce **an effective avant-garde** in the context of a postmodern base.

The shifting of the avant-garde into a postmodernist position is largely due to the loosening of the base-as-determinant model.  Williams explains that there is no simple binary between old and new.  He favors an inter-relational perspective over the alleged breaks with the past that were so favored in modernism, orthodox Marxism, and the historical avant-garde (121).  As part of the hegemonic process, cultural and economic shifts occur through a gradual negotiation, rather than all at once.  The dominant is of course the most directly influential, **but from the limits of the dominant are always the voices of the residual and the emergent.**  The residual, which was formed in the past but is still active in the current hegemony (122), does not disappear simply because the dominant claims to have broken free from the old.  The emergent - new values, practices and relationships that challenge the dominant position as such - do not spring up overnight: even wildcat strikes and so-called spontaneous revolutions build up to a flash point over time and through dialog with the dominant.  These palimpsests of influence shape each other, and in this way, the avant-garde can move into the context of postmodernity, layering ideas that it brings from modernism with newer concepts of postmodernism.

What must be sought in a postmodern avant-garde is agency through marginality, power in the position of the subordinate////

.  The subordinate finds itself forced to speak itself through the context of the dominant.  However, the hegemonic process shows that **the subordinate can still produce a space of negotiation**.  Michel de Certeau, in *Practices of Everyday Life*, claims that the rules of the dominant society are etched into the very space within which we live (de Certeau 21-22).  The reader of this space need not be passive: "[The reader] insinuates into another person's text the ruses of pleasure and appropriation: [s]he poaches on it, is transported into it, pluralizes himself in it like the internal rumblings of one's body." (xxi)  The marginal and subordinate may be forced to reside in a repressive space by the dominant; however, it **can superimpose its own readings upon the spatial text,** appropriating that space for its own use.  This is a plurality in which the dominant order does not disappear, but rather is contested by a new 'reading' (30).

### 2ac prez flex

No impact to prez powers

**Healy 11**

Gene Healy is a vice president at the Cato Institute and the author of The Cult of the Presidency, The CATO Institute, June 2011, "Book Review: Hail to the Tyrant", http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/book-review-hail-tyrant

Legal checks “have been relaxed largely because of the need for centralized, relatively efficient government under the complex conditions of a modern dynamic economy and a highly interrelated international order.” What’s more, the authors insist, America needs the legally unconstrained presidency both at home (given an increasingly complex economy) and abroad (given the shrinking of global distances).

These are disputed points, to say the least. If Friedrich Hayek was at all correct about the knowledge problem, then if anything increasing economic complexity argues for less central direction. Nor does the fact that we face “a highly interrelated international order” suggest that we’re more vulnerable than we were in 1789, as a tiny frontier republic surrounded by hostile tribes and great powers. Economic interdependence — and the rise of other modern industrial democracies — means that other players have a stake in protecting the global trading system.

Posner and Vermuele coin the term “tyrannophobia,” which stands for unjustified fear of executive abuse. That fear is written into the American genetic code: the authors call the Declaration of Independence “the ur-text of tyrannophobia in the United States.” As they see it, that’s a problem because “the risk that the public will fail to trust a well-motivated president is just as serious as the risk that it will trust an ill-motivated one.” They contend that our inherited skepticism toward power exacerbates biases that lead us to overestimate the dangers of unchecked presidential power. Our primate brains exaggerate highly visible risks that fill us with a sense of dread and loss of control, so we may decline to cede more power to the president even when more power is needed.

Fair enough in the abstract — but Posner and Vermuele fail to provide a single compelling example that might lead you to lament our allegedly atavistic “tyrannophobia.” And they seem oblivious to the fact that those same irrational biases drive the perceived need for emergency government at least as much as they do hostility towards it. Highly visible public events like the 9/11 attacks also instill dread and a perceived loss of control, even if all the available evidence shows that such incidents are vanishingly rare. The most recent year for which the U.S. State Department has data, 2009, saw just 25 U.S. noncombatants worldwide die from terrorist strikes. I know of no evidence suggesting that unchecked executive power is what stood between us and a much larger death toll.

Posner and Vermuele argue that only the executive unbound can address modernity’s myriad crises. But they spend little time exploring whether unconstrained power generates the very emergencies that the executive branch uses to justify its lack of constraint. Discussing George H.W. Bush’s difficulties convincing Congress and the public that the 1991 Gulf War’s risks were worth it, they comment, “in retrospect it might seem that he was clearly right.” Had that war been avoided, though, there would have been no mass presence of U.S. troops on Saudi soil — “Osama bin Laden’s principal recruiting device,” according to Paul Wolfowitz — and perhaps no 9/11.

Posner and Vermuele are slightly more perceptive when it comes to the home front, letting drop as an aside the observation that because of the easy-money policy that helped inflate the housing bubble, “the Fed is at least partly responsible for both the financial crisis of 2008-2009 and for its resolution.” Oh, well — I guess we’re even, then.

Sometimes, the authors are so enamored with the elegant economic models they construct that they can’t be bothered to check their work against observable reality. At one point, attempting to show that separation of powers is inefficient, they analogize the Madisonian scheme to “a market in which two firms must act in order to supply a good,” concluding that “the extra transaction costs of cooperation” make “the consumer (taxpayer) no better off and probably worse off than she would be under the unitary system.”

But the government-as-firm metaphor is daffy. In the Madisonian vision, inefficiency isn’t a bug, it’s a feature — a check on “the facility and excess of law-making … the diseases to which our governments are most liable,” per Federalist No. 62. If the “firm” in question also generates public “bads” like unnecessary federal programs and destructive foreign wars — and if the “consumer (taxpayer)” has no choice about whether to “consume” them — he might well favor constraints on production.

From Franklin Roosevelt onward, we’ve had something close to vertical integration under presidential command. Whatever benefits that system has brought, it’s imposed considerable costs — not least over 100,000 U.S. combat deaths in the resulting presidential wars. That system has also encouraged hubristic occupants of the Oval Office to burnish their legacies by engaging in “humanitarian war” — an “oxymoron,” according to Posner. In a sharply argued 2006 Washington Post op-ed, he noted that the Iraq War had killed tens of thousands of innocents and observed archly, “polls do not reveal the opinions of dead Iraqis.”

Syria destroys the da

David Rothkoph, CEO and editor at large of Foreign Policy, 8/3/13, The Gamble, www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2013/08/31/the\_gamble?page=full

Obama has reversed decades of precedent regarding the nature of presidential war powers -and whether you prefer this change in the balance of power or not, **as a matter of quantifiable fact** he is transferring greater responsibility for U.S. foreign policy to a Congress that is more divided, more incapable of reasoned debate or action, and more dysfunctional than any in modern American history. Just wait for the Rand Paul filibuster or similar congressional gamesmanship.

The president's own action in Libya was undertaken without such approval. So, too, was his expansion of America's drone and cyber programs. Will future offensive actions require Congress to weigh in? How will Congress react if the president tries to pick and choose when this precedent should be applied? At best, the door is open to further acrimony. At worst, the paralysis of the U.S. Congress that has given us the current budget crisis and almost no meaningful recent legislation will soon be coming to a foreign policy decision near you. Consider that John Boehner was instantly more clear about setting the timing for any potential action against Syria with his statement that Congress will not reconvene before its scheduled September 9 return to Washington than anyone in the administration has been thus far.

Perhaps more importantly, what will future Congresses expect of future presidents? If Obama abides by this new approach for the next three years, will his successors **lack the ability to act quickly** and on their own? While past presidents have no doubt abused their War Powers authority to take action and ask for congressional approval within 60 days, we live in a volatile world; sometimes security requires swift action. The president still legally has that right, but Obama's decision may have done more -for better or worse -to **dial back the imperial presidency** than anything his predecessors or Congress have done for decades.

5. America's international standing will likely suffer.

As a consequence of all of the above, even if the president "wins" and persuades Congress to support his extremely limited action in Syria, the perception of America as a nimble, forceful actor on the world stage and that its president is a man whose word carries great weight is **likely to be diminished**. Again, like the shift or hate it, **foreign leaders can do the math.** Not only is post-Iraq, post-Afghanistan America less inclined to get involved anywhere, but when it comes to the use of U.S. military force (our one indisputable source of superpower strength) **we just became a whole lot less likely to act** or, in any event, act quickly. Again, good or bad, that is a stance that is likely to **figure into the calculus of those who once feared provoking the United States**.

A final consequence of this is that it seems ever more certain that Obama's foreign policy will be framed as so anti-interventionist and **focused on disengagement from world affairs** that **it will have major political consequences in 2016**. The dialectic has swung from the interventionism of Bush to the leaning away of Obama. Now, the question will be whether a centrist synthesis will emerge that restores the idea that the United States can have a muscular foreign policy that remains prudent, capable of action, and respects international laws and norms. Almost certainly, that is what President Obama would argue he seeks. But I suspect that others, including possibly his former secretary of state may well seek to define a different approach. Indeed, we may well see the divisions within the Democratic Party on national security emerge as key fault lines in the Clinton vs. Biden primary battles of 2016. And just imagine Clinton vs. Rand Paul in the general election.

#### Obama ceded presidential power on Syria --- this ties the hands of future presidents.

CNN, 9/4/2013. “Is Obama setting bad precedent for future presidents?” http://www.cnn.com/2013/09/04/politics/obama-syria-precedent/index.html.

President Barack Obama's abrupt change of course and decision to ask Congress to authorize a strike on Syria won praise from some who have bitterly opposed his foreign policy. But in his surprise decision, did Obama cede presidential power?

Over the last 50 years, presidents have successfully consolidated power when it comes to foreign affairs, especially when use of the U.S. military is concerned. Some say the concession to Congress sets a new precedent that bodes well for future Congresses and not so well for future presidents.

"This is a big deal and will tie the hands of future presidents," said Peter Spiro, law professor at Temple University.

Spiro said this is the first time a president has sought authorization from Congress for a limited military mission. He said it will limit the flexibility of future presidents to make quick decisions, potentially putting U.S. national security at risk.

#### Unitary executive weakens the presidency

John W. Dean 9, former Counsel to the President, Chief Minority Counsel to the Judiciary Committee of the United States House of Representatives, the Associate Director of a law reform commission, and Associate Deputy Attorney General of the United States, graduate fellowship from American University to study government and the presidency, before entering Georgetown University Law Center, 1/9/09, <http://writ.news.findlaw.com/dean/20090109.html>

During the past eight years, President Bush has asserted presidential power in a singular fashion, drawing on the concept of a “unitary executive” who has unquestioned authority in times of war and is not beholden to international laws or treaties. This unusually broad interpretation of the Constitution provided the rationale for actions after the Sept. 11 terrorist attacks, including the establishment of military tribunals to try enemy combatants, the authorization of warrantless electronic surveillance of Americans and the assertion that the president may use any interrogation technique he deems necessary to protect national security. There is a widespread perception that Bush’s actions have collectively strengthened the presidency and fundamentally altered the balance of power between the executive and legislative branches. Bush, in many ways, embodies the concept of an “imperial presidency” as sketched by historian Arthur M. Schlesinger Jr. in the 1970s to describe chief executives who push their power to the absolute limit. But many experts believe Bush’s assertions of power have left the presidency fundamentally weaker, both for legal and political reasons. His boldest step, the order to convene military tribunals, was declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court in 2006. The warrantless surveillance program triggered a host of as-yet-unresolved legal challenges and antagonized Congress, making it unlikely that Obama, for pragmatic reasons, would risk a similarly daring policy without sensitivity to legal precedents or clear-cut authorization by the legislative branch. In general, the experts predict, Obama will derive more clout and influence by dialing back Bush’s conception of executive power and taking a more circumscribed view of the presidency. Bush’s actions “made the institution of the presidency more suspect in the eyes of Congress,” said Stephen J. Wayne, a presidential scholar at Georgetown University. “I think it’s generated a lot of resentment that will result in Congress demanding more collaboration from the president. Obama knows how the Senate works and understands the needs of members. His thinking is based on bringing groups together and unity, and that means give and take, not just pronouncing.”

## \*\*\* 1AR

### WoT

#### All war on terror evidence is suspect – terrorism-security complex narrows our debates to meaningless factoids.

Glenn **GREENWALD** Columnist @ Salon – Winner IF Stone Award for Investigative Journalism and Online Journalism Association Award **‘11**

http://www.salon.com/2011/12/05/politifact\_and\_the\_scam\_of\_neutral\_expertise/

But the real import of PolitiFact‘s analysis is that it relies entirely on two supposedly neutral legal “experts”: The Brooking Institution’s Benjamin Wittes and University of Texas Law School’s Robert Chesney, both of whom co-founded and write together on the “Lawfare” blog (along with former Bush DOJ lawyer Jack Goldsmith). That duo mocks as “nonsense” and “preposterous” Paul’s view that these new AUMF standards vest the President with dangerous levels of discretion. They ridicule Paul’s concerns even as Chesney admits that “Paul fairly points out the lack of a definition of associated forces.” PolitiFact then blindly relies upon what these two experts told them to declare Paul’s concerns to be “largely false.” The notion that these two individuals — or anyone like them — are entitled to be treated as neutral, ideology-free experts is what is “preposterous nonsense.” But this is a common means of deceit in our political discourse: depicting highly biased, ideologically rigid establishment advocates as some kind of neutral expert-arbiters of fact, even though they’re **drenched** **in all sorts of biases and ideological objectives**. I recently wrote about this with regard to the conceit of establishment journalists that they are “objective” even though they ooze all sorts of obvious, serious establishment biases. Identically, Paul Krugman and Brad DeLong, among others, recently pointed out that a slew of economists typically referred to as “technocrats” — as though they are merely ideology-free, objective administrators and experts — are, in fact, hard-core ideologues. This is exactly true of the two “experts” on whom PolitiFact relies to conclude that there is nothing particularly worrisome in the new AUMF language, and **it’s true of most “national security and Terrorism experts**” paraded by media outlets to justify the government’s conduct. Just on the level of credentials, in what sense is Wittes — who, just by the way, is not a lawyer and never studied law — more of an expert on these matters than, say, Ron Paul or Kevin Drum? And why are the pronouncements of Robert Chesney that this AUMF language is not dangerously permissive more authoritative than the views on the same topic of ACLU lawyers or Professor Hafetz, who say exactly the opposite? Both Wittes and Chesney are perfectly well-versed in these issues, but so are countless others who have expressed Paul’s exact views. Why is the Wittes/Chesney opinion that these AUFM standards are perfectly narrow and trustworthy — and that’s all it is: an opinion — treated by PolitiFact as factually dispositive, while the views of Paul and those who agree with him are treated as false? That is preposterous nonsense. But this is the **cult of contrived neutrality** that dominates so much political and media narrative. One of these objective experts, Wittes, works for a think tank lavishly funded by Haim Saban, who described himself this way: On the issues of security and terrorism I am a total hawk. I’m a Democrat for the reinforcement of the Patriot Act. It’s not strong enough. The A.C.L.U. can eat their heart out, but they are living in the 1970′s. We should all have ID’s. You betcha. What do you have to hide? Some friends of mine on the left side think I’m crazy. . . . I’m a one-issue guy and my issue is Israel. Wittes — unsurprisingly — has a long history of cheerleading for some of the worst War on Terror excesses and those who committed them, as well as advocating for even more extreme measures than we’ve seen so far. Identically, Chesney has expended substantial energy over the years publicly defending many of the most controversial aspects of the Bush/Cheney — now Bush/Cheney/Obama — War on Terror. The name of their blog — “Lawfare” — is a word used to mock the notion that law should interfere with the glories of war. There is nothing less surprising in the world than the fact that these two dismiss as paranoia and hysteria concerns over the government’s excessive detention powers. \* \* \* \* \* This is how this contrived neutrality scam typically functions. Wittes and Chesney are not pure neocons, which is why they are able to parade around as objective arbiters. But they are every bit as ideological as Bill Kristol; it’s just a **mildly different ideology**. What they are are standard defenders of government prerogatives, dutiful servants of political power, wholesale cheerleaders for American exceptionalism, masquerading under the banner of “centrism.” They are full-throttled believers in the War on Terror. One can agree or disagree with them all one wants, but one cannot reasonably depict them as even slightly more neutral or objective than Ron Paul, and they are certainly not above-the-fray arbiters who can descend down and authoritatively resolve political disputes. This **contrived neutrality** is a common scam in our political discourse, and it frequently shapes our national security and civil liberties debates. There is a whole insular, rotted culture based in Washington — they refer variously to themselves as the Foreign Policy Community or “natsec” experts and they’re found at think tanks, a small set of academic institutions (which serve as feeders for government agencies), and establishment media outlets — who have endless, amiable, **self-flattering** **debates** with themselves **within an extremely narrow range of opinion**. But even when they **feign disagreement**, it’s all grounded in the same common nationalistic **assumptions**. What they are, above all else, are **devotees to political power**. They’re the classic royal court courtiers and hangers-on. They’ll **question** the **tactics** of American foreign policy endlessly (are we fighting this war the right way?), but **never the ends**, and most especially never America’s right to do what it wants in the world and the right of its government to seize ever more power in the name of those wars. They’re free to express those views, but — like the bevy of bias-ridden establishment journalists, economic “technocrats,” and the sham Terrorism expert community — they’re anything but neutral, objective and ideology-free. One trick they use to prevent anyone from talking about the embedded biases and operating dynamics of their insular culture is to **proclaim these discussions off-limits** on the **ground of incivility.** The last time I wrote about the Brookings culture and funding sources, Wittes wrote a series of petulant posts declaring that he would never again engage or mention me (since then, he has responded to what I’ve written several times while childishly refusing to use my name, even once re-printing a response to a column of mine from a cowardly “senior administration lawyer” insisting on (and receiving) anonymity who did the same: “He Whose Name Must Not Be Mentioned”). They try to create **rules** in the **name of civility** where you are forced to accept and honor their expertise and objectivity — you must simply ignore and never mention the cultural, financial and careerist incentives they have to spout pro-government, authoritarian views (recall what Les Gelb said about why they often are pro-war) — so that their expertise, objectivity and good faith remain unquestioned. If you do anything other than pretend that they are Beacons of Bias-Free Objectivity — if you analyze the mandated orthodoxies in their world and the cultural pressures to accept and spout those orthodoxies — then you’re engaged in **unfair** “personal attacks” and will prompt outcries from the fellow devotees of their National Security priesthood. You’re not permitted to question their objectivity or expertise. We’re all supposed to pretend that war cheerleaders at Brookings and similar think tanks are honorable “scholars” and good faith, ideology-free experts — like the leading Democratic Saban-funded cheerleader for the Iraq War and now leading agitator for the Iranian Threat — or else we’re proving how crass, gauche and mean we are: how unSerious. This is the scam of contrived neutrality and objective expertise which PolitiFact fell for in condemning Ron Paul’s perfectly rational statements as “largely false”: Ben Wittes and Bobby Chesney said there was nothing to worry about and such concerns about detention abuses were “preposterous”! What more proof do you need? The objective “centrist” expert hath thus decreed it, and thus is it proven.

### AT: Human Nature is Self-Interested

#### This is a link—the assumption that humans are self-interested guarantees extinction and is disproven by recent scientific evidence—the communications revolution enables the creation of a cosmopolitan identity.

Rifkin 10—a senior lecturer at the Wharton School’s Executive Education Program at the University of Pennsylvania—the world’s #1 ranked business school, author, an advisor to the European Union since 2002, the founder and chairperson of the Third Industrial Revolution Global CEO Business Roundtable [January 11, 2010, Jeremy Rifkin, “‘The Empathic Civilization’: Rethinking Human Nature in the Biosphere Era,” http://www.huffingtonpost.com/jeremy-rifkin/the-empathic-civilization\_b\_416589.html]

The problem runs deeper than the issue of finding new ways to regulate the market or imposing legally binding global green house gas emission reduction targets. The real crisis lies in the set of assumptions about human nature that governs the behavior of world leaders--assumptions that were spawned during the Enlightenment more than 200 years ago at the dawn of the modern market economy and the emergence of the nation state era.

The Enlightenment thinkers--John Locke, Adam Smith, Marquis de Condorcet et. al.--took umbrage with the Medieval Christian world view that saw human nature as fallen and depraved and that looked to salvation in the next world through God’s grace. They preferred to cast their lot with the idea that human beings’ essential nature is rational, detached, autonomous, acquisitive and utilitarian and argued that individual salvation lies in unlimited material progress here on Earth.

The Enlightenment notions about human nature were reflected in the newly minted nation-state whose raison d’être was to protect private property relations and stimulate market forces as well as act as a surrogate of the collective self-interest of the citizenry in the international arena. Like individuals, nation-states were considered to be autonomous agents embroiled in a relentless battle with other sovereign nations in the pursuit of material gains.

It was these very assumptions that provided the philosophical underpinnings for a geopolitical frame of reference that accompanied the first and second industrial revolutions in the 19th and 20th centuries. These beliefs about human nature came to the fore in the aftermath of the global economic meltdown and in the boisterous and acrimonious confrontations in the meeting rooms in Copenhagen, with potentially disastrous consequences for the future of humanity and the planet.

If human nature is as the Enlightenment philosophers claimed, then we are likely doomed. It is impossible to imagine how we might create a sustainable global economy and restore the biosphere to health if each and every one of us is, at the core of our biology, an autonomous agent and a self-centered and materialistic being.

Recent discoveries in brain science and child development, however, are forcing us to rethink these long-held shibboleths about human nature. Biologists and cognitive neuroscientists are discovering mirror-neurons--the so-called empathy neurons--that allow human beings and other species to feel and experience another’s situation as if it were one’s own. We are, it appears, the most social of animals and seek intimate participation and companionship with our fellows.

Social scientists, in turn, are beginning to reexamine human history from an empathic lens and, in the process, discovering previously hidden strands of the human narrative which suggests that human evolution is measured not only by the expansion of power over nature, but also by the intensification and extension of empathy to more diverse others across broader temporal and spatial domains. The growing scientific evidence that we are a fundamentally empathic species has profound and far-reaching consequences for society, and may well determine our fate as a species.

What is required now is nothing less than a leap to global empathic consciousness and in less than a generation if we are to resurrect the global economy and revitalize the biosphere. The question becomes this: what is the mechanism that allows empathic sensitivity to mature and consciousness to expand through history?

The pivotal turning points in human consciousness occur when new energy regimes converge with new communications revolutions////

, creating new economic eras. The new communications revolutions become the command and control mechanisms for structuring, organizing and managing more complex civilizations that the new energy regimes make possible. For example, in the early modern age, print communication became the means to organize and manage the technologies, organizations, and infrastructure of the coal, steam, and rail revolution. It would have been impossible to administer the first industrial revolution using script and codex.

Communication revolutions not only manage new, more complex energy regimes, but also change human consciousness in the process. Forager/hunter societies relied on oral communications and their consciousness was mythologically constructed. The great hydraulic agricultural civilizations were, for the most part, organized around script communication and steeped in theological consciousness. The first industrial revolution of the 19th century was managed by print communication and ushered in ideological consciousness. Electronic communication became the command and control mechanism for arranging the second industrial revolution in the 20th century and spawned psychological consciousness.

Each more sophisticated communication revolution brings together more diverse people in increasingly more expansive and varied social networks. Oral communication has only limited temporal and spatial reach while script, print and electronic communications each extend the range and depth of human social interaction.

By extending the central nervous system of each individual and the society as a whole, communication revolutions provide an evermore inclusive playing field for empathy to mature and consciousness to expand. For example, during the period of the great hydraulic agricultural civilizations characterized by script and theological consciousness, empathic sensitivity broadened from tribal blood ties to associational ties based on common religious affiliation. Jews came to empathize with Jews, Christians with Christians, Muslims with Muslims, etc. In the first industrial revolution characterized by print and ideological consciousness, empathic sensibility extended to national borders, with Americans empathizing with Americans, Germans with Germans, Japanese with Japanese and so on. In the second industrial revolution, characterized by electronic communication and psychological consciousness, individuals began to identify with like-minded others.

Today, we are on the cusp of another historic convergence of energy and communication--a third industrial revolution--that could extend empathic sensibility to the biosphere itself and all of life on Earth. The distributed Internet revolution is coming together with distributed renewable energies, making possible a sustainable, post-carbon economy that is both globally connected and locally managed.

In the 21st century, hundreds of millions--and eventually billions--of human beings will transform their buildings into power plants to harvest renewable energies on site, store those energies in the form of hydrogen and share electricity, peer-to-peer, across local, regional, national and continental inter-grids that act much like the Internet. The open source sharing of energy, like open source sharing of information, will give rise to collaborative energy spaces--not unlike the collaborative social spaces that currently exist on the Internet.

When every family and business comes to take responsibility for its own small swath of the biosphere by harnessing renewable energy and sharing it with millions of others on smart power grids that stretch across continents, we become intimately interconnected at the most basic level of earthly existence by jointly stewarding the energy that bathes the planet and sustains all of life.

The new distributed communication revolution not only organizes distributed renewable energies, but also changes human consciousness. The information communication technologies (ICT) revolution is quickly extending the central nervous system of billions of human beings and connecting the human race across time and space, allowing empathy to flourish on a global scale, for the first time in history.

Whether in fact we will begin to empathize as a species will depend on how we use the new distributed communication medium. While distributed communications technologies-and, soon, distributed renewable energies - are connecting the human race, what is so shocking is that no one has offered much of a reason as to why we ought to be connected. We talk breathlessly about access and inclusion in a global communications network but speak little of exactly why we want to communicate with one another on such a planetary scale. What’s sorely missing is an overarching reason that billions of human beings should be increasingly connected. Toward what end? The only feeble explanations thus far offered are to share information, be entertained, advance commercial exchange and speed the globalization of the economy. All the above, while relevant, nonetheless seem insufficient to justify why nearly seven billion human beings should be connected and mutually embedded in a globalized society. The idea of even billion individual connections, absent any overall unifying purpose, seems a colossal waste of human energy. More important, making global connections without any real transcendent purpose risks a narrowing rather than an expanding of human consciousness. But what if our distributed global communication networks were put to the task of helping us re-participate in deep communion with the common biosphere that sustains all of our lives?

The biosphere is the narrow band that extends some forty miles from the ocean floor to outer space where living creatures and the Earth’s geochemical processes interact to sustain each other. We are learning that the biosphere functions like an indivisible organism. It is the continuous symbiotic relationships between every living creature and between living creatures and the geochemical processes that ensure the survival of the planetary organism and the individual species that live within its biospheric envelope. If every human life, the species as a whole, and all other life-forms are entwined with one another and with the geochemistry of the planet in a rich and complex choreography that sustains life itself, then we are all dependent on and responsible for the health of the whole organism. Carrying out that responsibility means living out our individual lives in our neighborhoods and communities in ways that promote the general well-being of the larger biosphere within which we dwell. The Third Industrial Revolution offers just such an opportunity.

If we can harness our empathic sensibility to establish a new global ethic that recognizes and acts to harmonize the many relationships that make up the life-sustaining forces of the planet, we will have moved beyond the detached, self-interested and utilitarian philosophical assumptions that accompanied national markets and nation state governance and into a new era of biosphere consciousness. We leave the old world of geopolitics behind and enter into a new world of biosphere politics, with new forms of governance emerging to accompany our new biosphere awareness.

The Third Industrial Revolution and the new era of distributed capitalism allow us to sculpt a new approach to globalization, this time emphasizing continentalization from the bottom up. Because renewable energies are more or less equally distributed around the world, every region is potentially amply endowed with the power it needs to be relatively self-sufficient and sustainable in its lifestyle, while at the same time interconnected via smart grids to other regions across countries and continents.

When every community is locally empowered, both figuratively and literally, it can engage directly in regional, transnational, continental, and limited global trade without the severe restrictions that are imposed by the geopolitics that oversee elite fossil fuels and uranium energy distribution.

Continentalization is already bringing with it a new form of governance. The nation-state, which grew up alongside the First and Second Industrial Revolutions, and provided the regulatory mechanism for managing an energy regime whose reach was the geosphere, is ill suited for a Third Industrial Revolution whose domain is the biosphere. Distributed renewable energies generated locally and regionally and shared openly--peer to peer--across vast contiguous land masses connected by intelligent utility networks and smart logistics and supply chains favor a seamless network of governing institutions that span entire continents.

The European Union is the first continental governing institution of the Third Industrial Revolution era. The EU is already beginning to put in place the infrastructure for a European-wide energy regime, along with the codes, regulations, and standards to effectively operate a seamless transport, communications, and energy grid that will stretch from the Irish Sea to the doorsteps of Russia by midcentury. Asian, African, and Latin American continental political unions are also in the making and will likely be the premier governing institutions on their respective continents by 2050.

In this new era of distributed energy, governing institutions will more resemble the workings of the ecosystems they manage. Just as habitats function within ecosystems, and ecosystems within the biosphere in a web of interrelationships, governing institutions will similarly function in a collaborative network of relationships with localities, regions, and nations all embedded within the continent as a whole. This new complex political organism operates like the biosphere it attends, synergistically and reciprocally. This is biosphere politics.

The new biosphere politics transcends traditional right/left distinctions so characteristic of the geopolitics of the modern market economy and nation-state era. The new divide is generational and contrasts the traditional top-down model of structuring family life, education, commerce, and governance with a younger generation whose thinking is more relational and distributed, whose nature is more collaborative and cosmopolitan, and whose work and social spaces favor open-source commons. For the Internet generation, "quality of life" becomes as important as individual opportunity in fashioning a new dream for the 21st century.

The transition to biosphere consciousness has already begun. All over the world, a younger generation is beginning to realize that one’s daily consumption of energy and other resources ultimately affects the lives of every other human being and every other creature that inhabits the Earth.

The Empathic Civilization is emerging. A younger generation is fast extending its empathic embrace beyond religious affiliations and national identification to include the whole of humanity and the vast project of life that envelops the Earth. But our rush to universal empathic connectivity is running up against a rapidly accelerating entropic juggernaut in the form of climate change. Can we reach biosphere consciousness and global empathy in time to avert planetary collapse?

### Schmitt

#### Non-universalist and illiberal states fight total wars. Their alternative can’t solve.

Scheuerman 4 [William Scheuerman, Political Science at Indiana, “International Law as Historical Myth,” *Constellations*, 11 (4) p. 544-546]

The most revealing divergence between Schmitt’s Nomos der Erde and recent research on the history of international relations lies elsewhere, however. As noted, Schmitt argues that the golden age of the jus publicum europaeum only came to a conclusion at the outset of the twentieth century, as the United States exploded onto the world scene and unleashed its deadly brand of messianic universalism on unsuspecting European victims. At the end of the eighteenth century, French revolutionary armies posed a major challenge to the traditional state system, Schmitt concedes, but far-sighted nineteenth-century European statesmen (e.g., political reactionaries like Metternich and Bismarck) were ultimately able to counter the French revolutionary challenge and stabilize the traditional jus publicum europaeum. In the twentieth century, however, the political leaders of a weakened European order failed to accomplish the same task, and sound continental European ideals of international law were not only consequently discarded, but Europe itself was soon rendered subservient to American power. Schmitt’s historical periodization of the rise and fall of the jus publicum europaeum constitutes a key building block for his book’s deeply rooted anti-Americanism, according to which the United States—as that world power which systematically synthesizes awesome military power with liberal universalism—not only played a decisive role in destroying a sound Hobbesian system of European interstate relations, but now menaces humanity to a greater degree than recent totalitarian dictatorships. The anti-American thrust of the overall argument probably only works if Schmitt can plausibly link the emergence of the United States as a global power to the decline of the jus publicum europaeum: situating both events at the outset of the twentieth century allows him to do so. Not surprisingly, this periodization is the most idiosyncratic feature of Schmitt’s account. Most historians of international relations suggest that key features of the traditional European state system were in shambles long before the appearance of the United States as a major player in global politics. They also interpret the resurgence of total warfare, where civilians are subjected to horrible state violence, as occurring before World War I. This is a complicated and by no means uncontroversial historical question, but two issues in the recent literature are particularly revealing in the context of Schmitt’s argument. First, much of this historical literature works to underline the highly selective and crudely partisan character of Schmitt’s analysis of the resurgence of total war. The standard interpretation is that the trend towards total warfare—characterized in this context by a full-scale mobilization of society for warfare, as well as the blurring of the distinction between combatants and non-combatants—occurred in quite different political contexts in the nineteenth century. Thus, it is tendentious to see the roots of total warfare in liberal international law let alone a specifically messianic American version of liberalism. According to Schmitt, for example, Bismarck represented the “last statesman of European international law,” a lonely heroic fighter who struggled to ward off dangerous non-European threats to traditional European great power politics.32 Yet some of the recent literature describes Bismarck as a far more complex figure, and arguably a destabilizing one in relation to the European state system, in part because of his pivotal role in the emergence of a distinct style of warfare that revolutionized European political affairs. In fact, one of the forerunners to the terrible world wars of the twentieth century was the Franco-Prussian War of 1870–71, in which Prussia reaped the benefits of mass mobilization and lightning-fire technologies, stunning its military rivals on the continent and spurring them to imitate Prussian military innovations. As Philip Bobbitt has pointed out, Prussia led the way in Europe in militarizing every aspect of society while exploiting technological innovations—the railways, telegraphs, and the standardization of machine tools—in order to bring about “dizzying increases in the speed and mobility of military dispositions.” 33 Schmitt is right to see a foreshadowing of more recent forms of warfare in the US Civil War.34 However, he ignores the fact that recent total war builds at least as clearly on the militarization of Prussian society that accompanied Germany’s role as a late modernizer. As a prominent military history notes, “[a]fter 1871 the Prussian institutions—conscription, strategic railways, mobilization techniques, above all the General Staff—were copied by every state in continental Europe. Thirty years later, after disastrous experiences in South Africa and Cuba, Britain and the United States adapted the model to their own needs.”35 Schmitt’s book is remarkably silent about this decisive feature of recent military development. The reason for this oversight is obvious enough: it allows him to underplay the existence of a potential link between modern dictatorship and total war. After all, it was dictatorships, at least as commonly as liberal democracies, which perfected the horrible techniques of total war in the twentieth-century: recall the Japanese invasion of China, or Nazi Germany’s aerial bombings against the Spanish Republic and, subsequently, slaughter of innocent civilians in World War II. It is telling that in Schmitt’s own account (at least in its Nazi-era rendition), the Axis powers represented paradigmatic cases of political entities that had broken decisively with the “decadent” legacy of liberal universalism.

#### Enmity creates absolute foes that drive unlimited conflict.

Scheuerman 4 [William Scheuerman, Political Science at Indiana, “International Law as Historical Myth,” *Constellations*, 11 (4) p. 546-547]

Second, Schmitt’s odd periodization obscures the fundamental changes to traditional European interstate relations generated by the emergence of the modern nation-state. As Bobbitt has succinctly observed, the appearance of the nation-state was accompanied by the strategic style of total war. If the nation governed the state, and the nation’s welfare provided the state’s reason for being, then the enemy’s nation must be destroyed—indeed, that was the way to destroy the state. . . . [F]or the nation-state it was necessary to annihilate the vast resources of men and material that a nation could throw into the field . . . . 36 It was the idea of a “nation in arms” that not only posed a direct threat to earlier absolutist images of “king’s wars,” but also opened the door to many pathologies of modern warfare: the full-scale mobilization of the “nation” and subsequent militarization of society, and killing of “enemy” civilians. The European nation-state and total war may represent two sides of the same coin.37 Of course, for Schmitt’s purposes it is useful that the idea of the “nation in arms” first takes the historical stage in the context of the French Revolution and its commitment to universalistic ideals of liberty, equality, and fraternity.38 Nation-state-based democracy is indeed a normatively ambivalent creature, resting on an uneasy synthesis of universalistic liberal democratic ideals with historically contingent notions of shared cultural identity, language, history, and ethnos.39 Although Schmitt and his followers predictably try to link the horrors of modern warfare to the growing significance of universalistic liberal-democratic ideals, a more persuasive empirical case can be made that those horrors can be traced to highly particularistic and exclusionary ideas of national identity, according to which the “other”—in this case, outsiders to the “national community”—came to be perceived as representing life-and-death foes in the context of crisis-ridden industrial capitalism and the increasingly unstable interstate system of the nineteenth century. Such ideas of national identity ultimately took the disastrous form of the “inflamed nationalism and ethnic truculence” that dominated European politics by the late nineteenth century and ultimately culminated in World War I.40 Nationalism and ethnic truculence played a key role in the destruction of the traditional European balance of power system since they required a fundamental reshuffling of state borders in accordance with “national identity”; of course, this question had been of marginal significance in the absolutist interstate system. In this context as well, one of Schmitt’s heroes, Bismarck, in reality played a role very different from that described by Schmitt in Nomos der Erde: “the last statesman” of the jus publicum europaeum not only helped forge a unified German nation-state, but in order to do relied on total warfare while undermining the traditional European system of states, in part because it rested on state forms (e.g., the diverse, polyglot Russian and Austro-Hungarian Empires) fundamentally distinct from the modern nation-state.41 On this matter as well, Schmitt’s analysis is either openly misleading or revealingly silent. Perhaps his own unabashed enthusiasm for rabid ethnonationalism in the context of National Socialism helps explain this silence.42