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#### Rejecting strategic predictions of threats makes them inevitable – decision makers will rely on preconceived conceptions of threat rather than the more qualified predictions of analysts

Fitzsimmons, 07 (Michael, Washington DC defense analyst, “The Problem of Uncertainty in Strategic Planning”, Survival, Winter 06-07, online)

But handling even this weaker form of uncertainty is still quite challeng- ing. If not sufficiently bounded, a high degree of variability in planning factors can exact a significant price on planning. The complexity presented by great variability strains the cognitive abilities of even the most sophisticated decision- makers.15 And even a robust decision-making process sensitive to cognitive limitations necessarily sacrifices depth of analysis for breadth as variability and complexity grows. It should follow, then, that in planning under conditions of risk, variability in strategic calculation should be carefully tailored to available analytic and decision processes. Why is this important? What harm can an imbalance between complexity and cognitive or analytic capacity in strategic planning bring? Stated simply, where analysis is silent or inadequate, **the personal beliefs of decision-makers** **fill the void**. As political scientist Richard Betts found in a study of strategic sur- prise, in ‘an environment that lacks clarity, abounds with conflicting data, and allows no time for rigorous assessment of sources and validity, ambiguity allows intuition or wishfulness to drive interpretation ... The greater the ambiguity, the greater the impact of preconceptions.’16 The decision-making environment that Betts describes here is one of political-military crisis, not long-term strategic planning. But a strategist who sees uncertainty as the central fact of his environ- ment brings upon himself some of the pathologies of crisis decision-making. He invites ambiguity, takes conflicting data for granted and **substitutes a priori scepticism about the validity of prediction** for time pressure as a rationale for discounting the importance of analytic rigour. It is important not to exaggerate the extent to which data and ‘rigorous assessment’ can illuminate strategic choices. Ambiguity is a fact of life, and scepticism of analysis is necessary. Accordingly, the intuition and judgement of decision-makers will always be vital to strategy, and attempting to subordinate those factors to some formulaic, deterministic decision-making model would be both undesirable and unrealistic. All the same, there is danger in the opposite extreme as well. Without careful analysis of what is relatively likely and what is relatively unlikely, what will be the possible bases for strategic choices? A decision-maker with no faith in prediction is left with little more than a set of worst-case scenarios and his existing beliefs about the world to confront the choices before him. Those beliefs may be more or less well founded, but if they are not made explicit and subject to analysis and debate regarding their application to particular strategic contexts , they remain only beliefs and premises, rather than rational judgements. Even at their best, such decisions are likely to be poorly understood by the organisations charged with their implementation. At their worst, such decisions may be poorly understood by the decision-makers themselves

**Anti-nuclear rhetoric is key to convincing leaders to change their opinions – it’s the only way to solve**

**Babst 97**, retired government scientist and Coordinator of the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation's Accidental Nuclear War Studies program, Krieger, President of the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation, and Aldridge, former aerospace engineer, now leads the Pacific Life Research Center, ’97 (Dean, David, and Bob, November, “The self-destructiveness of nuclear weapons: a dangerous and costly mental block” Canadian Business and Current Affairs, Vol 29 No 97 p 11-19)

There is **worldwide reluctance to think about the self-destructive consequence of the use of nuclear weapons**. Though understandable, this reluctance **is dangerous and costly. It prevents public discourse and political engagement by citizens of the nuclear-weapons states concerning one of the most important issues of our time. The lack of public attention in nuclear-weapons states to the self-destructiveness of nuclear weapons has allowed humankind to place itself in danger of annihilation**, and to spend some $8 trillion over the course of the nuclear age doing so. **Denial of the dangers or likelihood of nuclear-weapons use has created a dangerous mental block that must be overcome. We owe it to ourselves and to our posterity to break through this mental block and directly confront the dangers of annihiliaton**, including self-annihilation, **inherent in reliance on nuclear arsenals**. We reasoned that **if the citizens in nuclear-weapons states understood that the use of a hundred or so nuclear weapons could turn the world into an unbearable place in which to live, they would take a less complacent view of maintaining nuclear arsenals.** We believed that **an awareness of the self-destructive consequences of the use of nuclear arsenals would lead to a general understanding that nuclear weapons are a source of insecurity rather than security. This understanding**, we reasoned, **would lead to a desire to rid the world of nuclear weapons as soon as possible.** We discovered, however, that **virtually nothing was being published on the subject of the self-destructive consequences of the use of nuclear weapons. The fact that an issue as important as this one was not even being discussed in the mass media alerted us to the existence of widespread public denial regarding this issue**. We also realized that **the issue of nuclear arsenals and their use was not even entering into public debate during elections in the nuclear-weapons states**. As we looked into this situation further, we found many other indications of public denial of the suicidal dangers of nuclear arsenals. We have listed some of these indications below.

### K – Biopower

#### The Role of the Ballot is Policy Simulation

Hodson 10 Derek, professor of education – Ontario Institute for Studies @ University of Toronto, “Science Education as a Call to Action,” Canadian Journal of Science, Mathematics and Technology Education, Vol. 10, Issue 3, p. 197-206

\*\*note: SSI = socioscientific issues

The final (fourth) level of sophistication in this issues-based approach is concerned with students findings ways of putting their values and convictions into action, helping them to prepare for and engage in responsible action, and assisting them in **developing the skills**, attitudes, and values **that will enable them to** take control of their lives, **cooperate with others to bring about change**, and work toward a more just and sustainable world in which power, wealth, and resources are more equitably shared. Socially and environmentally responsible behavior will not necessarily follow from knowledge of key concepts and possession of the “right attitudes.” As Curtin (1991) reminded us, it is important to distinguish between caring about and caring for. It is almost always much easier to proclaim that one cares about an issue than to do something about it. Put simply, our values are worth nothing until we live them. Rhetoric and espoused values will not bring about social justice and will not save the planet. We must change our actions. A politicized ethic of care (caring for) entails active involvement in a local manifestation of a particular problem or issue, exploration of the complex sociopolitical contexts in which the problem/issue is located, and attempts to resolve conflicts of interest. FROM STSE RHETORIC TO SOCIOPOLITICAL ACTION Writing from the perspective of environmental education, Jensen (2002) categorized the **knowledge** that is **likely to promote sociopolitical action** and encourage pro-environmental behavior into four dimensions: (a) **scientific and technological knowledge** that informs the issue or problem; (b) knowledge about the underlying social, political, and economic issues, conditions, and structures and how they contribute to creating social and environmental problems; (c) knowledge about how to bring about changes in society through direct or indirect action; and (d) knowledge about the likely outcome or direction of possible actions and the **desirability of those outcomes.** Although formulated as a model for environmental education, it is reasonable to suppose that Jensen's arguments are applicable to all forms of SSI-oriented action. Little needs to be said about dimensions 1 and 2 in Jensen's framework beyond the discussion earlier in the article. With regard to dimension 3, students need knowledge of actions that are likely to have positive impact and knowledge of how to engage in them. **It is essential** that they gain robust knowledge of the social, legal, and **political system(s)** that prevail in the communities in which they live and develop a clear understanding of how **decisions** are **made within** local, regional, and **national government** and within industry, commerce, and the military. Without knowledge of where and with whom power of decision making is located and awareness of the **mechanisms by which decisions are reached**, **intervention is not possible.** Thus, the curriculum I propose requires a concurrent program designed to achieve a measure of political literacy, including knowledge of how to engage in collective action with individuals who have different competencies, backgrounds, and attitudes but share a common interest in a particular SSI. Dimension 3 also includes knowledge of likely sympathizers and potential allies and strategies for encouraging cooperative action and group interventions. What Jensen did not mention but would seem to be a part of dimension 3 knowledge is the nature of science-oriented knowledge that would enable students to appraise the statements, reports, and arguments of scientists, politicians, and journalists and to present their own supporting or opposing arguments in a coherent, robust, and convincing way (s

ee Hodson [2009b] for a lengthy discussion of this aspect of science education). Jensen's fourth category includes awareness of how (and why) others have sought to bring about change and entails formulation of a vision of the kind of world in which we (and our families and communities) wish to live. It is important for students to explore and develop their ideas, dreams, and aspirations for themselves, their neighbors and families and for the wider communities at local, regional, national, and global levels—a clear overlap with futures studies/education. An essential step in cultivating the critical scientific and technological literacy on which **sociopolitical action depends** is the application of a social and political critique capable of challenging the notion of technological determinism. We can control technology and its environmental and social impact. More significantly, we can control the controllers and redirect technology in such a way that adverse environmental impact is substantially reduced (if not entirely eliminated) and issues of freedom, equality, and justice are kept in the forefront of discussion during the **establishment of policy**.

#### Drone discussions break down symbolic representations of global issues—Macro-political discussion key

Green and Bernal 13 [May 29th, Droning Toward the Boundless War, Volume 25, Issue 2, Pages 212-218, Published authors under, Peace Review: A Journal of Social Justice, <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/10402659.2013.785324>]

War reminds us of our disconnection from one another. If we begin with acknowledging our common humanity, war comes when those small differences between us become amplified. We fail to see in the eyes of another that they are our brothers and sisters. We remove ourselves from the intimacy of knowing what war brings. Through the quiet embrace of an illusion, we fail to see the blood spilled by “them” as also our blood. The irony of war is that it provides a kind of curious veil that places our individual and collective anxiety about death “out there” into someone who will die on our behalf and kill so that we may live. What we consider to be vital in our lives is increasingly about ideologies, resources, and dominance. Behind this veil is an admixture of beliefs that our life is better than those who have become the enemy. What many of us seek unconsciously to protect is not so much life in the sense of our physical safety; rather, it has become more about a way of life where war keeps the balance of the scales tipped to our advantage a bit longer.¶ Our human differences were once about the survival of one tribe over another, one kingdom ruling another, and one nation conquering its neighbor. Warfare was for millennia face-to-face, where club and spear and sword were the implements of the mortal wound. Then with the bullet and the bomb, the mine and the missile, death from war became a more distant affair. The impact of taking a life became visible only in its aftermath. As the distance increased so did the lethality of weaponry. One bomb could kill 100,000. Within two decades in the era of the Cold War, humans had created the capacity to kill ourselves many times over. Yet these wars remained nation against nation. The “other” was one that had a flag, a people, and lands that were within generally recognized boundaries. Through the Geneva Convention, there were rules of war. A World Court was also established to prosecute those who violated these international agreements.¶ On September 11, 2001, war changed. With the beginning of the War on Terrorism, the United States entered the new era of the boundless war. No longer was the enemy another nation-state. What evolved as a consequence was a movement into a transitional space where no rules and no laws of war can any longer be found. With the collapse of the World Trade Center twin towers in New York came a descent into a different way of waging war. Initially, many of the elements remained the same. The United States took action against the Taliban government of Afghanistan for harboring training camps for Al Qaeda. In many respects, this “boots on the ground” approach to warfare had the trappings of modern conventional struggles. Troops were deployed with all the latest tactical support to take on an elusive enemy in a far away land. One powerful nation-state sought to reap justice through war from another nation-state deemed responsible for attacking the sovereignty and sanctity and safety of its people. This decade of action was designed to help Americans believe something was being done to quell the threat of terrorist attacks and implicitly to offer an assurance that the horror of 9/11 would somehow never again reach the shores of the nation. The shadowy adversary, if not vanquished, was so depleted, according to the politicians, that their ability to assault our way of life was dramatically diminished.¶ What is less visible is how the boundaries of the War on Terror morphed into something different where the psychological nature of war shifted once more. Much as The Bomb with its horrific dimensions made death in war a devastating fact for some distant enemy, so it is that the drone has become its more technologically precise and sophisticated counterpart. From thousands of miles away, “assets” can be deployed to eliminate “targets” who are deemed to pose an imminent threat to the United States. The face of the enemy is no longer seen. The hands that guide the lethal cargo do so remotely on a computer screen where the deadly action once executed has the appearance akin to a graphically intense video game. With no troops of “our” own placed in harms way, fewer deaths of innocents as “collateral damage,” and more precise elimination of sworn enemies, collective complacency about the practice was implicitly endorsed by 66 million Americans—if not more—at the last presidential election. The thorny legal complexities of this new terrain of war are placed in abeyance, in part because of the anxiety that is alleviated through the drones of war.¶ At an unconscious level, the named but faceless enemy, consistently presented as top operatives of terrorist organizations, becomes the projective repository of the threat to our way of life. They are the objects that evoke our death anxiety. They remind us that our way of life, and thereby the only life we have come to know, is threatened. They have attacked our symbols of military might and economic power. They have killed those who represent these pillars of our way of being. In this respect, the literal becomes the symbolic. The war on “them,” wherever they may be and whatever nation-state they may call their home, reduces in relevance. A drone crosses all these boundaries, as the lethal action of the surgical strike becomes just because the enemy combatant is one who lives in the shadows and therefore can be pursued there.¶ The rationale for the absence of outcry has deep unconscious antecedents in the most primitive ego defenses. The seemingly antiseptic elimination of targets allows for denial to become normative. Violence viewed through a flat screen has become entertainment, even when practiced at our own hands. When neutralizing an Al Qaeda leader looks the same as scoring a kill on Call of Duty, we can easily deny how we are complicit in a violent action of war. As such a threshold of consciousness that allows us to function in denial, relatively free of death anxiety in our day-to-day lives, remains intact. By seeing a puff on a screen rather than the riddled bodies of the defeated enemy, the connection to our own common mortality is displaced and placed at a distance. They enemy on the other side of the screen become the holders of death, quite literally, while symbolically representing the preservation of our way of life through their demise.¶ The role of the boundless war also provides an endless supply of targets for projection. While given the current name of “Islamic extremists,” this label is less important than how they become icons on which our fears about our mortality can be projected. In the illusion of a war that is not like what war once was and an enemy that is not an army like the troops of the past and a location that has no national borders or discrete regions, the ambiguity becomes a further expression of the boundlessness. War waged in this “No Man's Land” is rendered invisible, denied, and sufficiently subtle so as to remain unconscious to those who benefit from its execution.¶ When the New York Times wrote an expose revealing the appearance of corrupt financial activity on the part of those ascending to power in China, they came under attack. Within days of the publication of the stories, the Times reported a breach in the security of its electronic files. Through malicious code that was introduced into their server by an unsuspecting employee, some distant party began to search files, steal passwords, and target specific reporters. Suspected in these attacks was the Chinese government, known for its ambivalence about press freedoms.¶ These incidents are not isolated. During the summer of 2012, a number of U.S. financial institutions reported “delivery of service” attacks, ones where a flood of data overwhelms an organization's servers to the point that routine business transactions are disrupted. The Iranian government, despite repeated denials, was suspected in these actions. Perhaps an extension of what drones represent in terms of warfare, cyberattacks may be a new frontier in the boundless war. No longer is life itself directly attacked; rather, ideologies and ways of life become the new mortal symbolic targets.The anxiety that comes through such an approach to war means that what is perceived as necessities of life in much of the West—electric power, running water, Internet access—each increasingly controlled by virtual means, can be brought down by infiltration of hackers in distant lands. As with drones where international boundaries are no longer a limit on who may be seen as the enemy, the alleged actions of Iran and China suggest that corporate entities and private citizens who represent assaults on a people can be attacked.¶ One consequence of globalization is that the virtual distance between us is radically reduced to be a click or two away on a device that is often in our pocket or purse. It also means that tools of the emerging warfare may well soon be in each of our hands. Surveillance tools and sources to launch a cyberattack are carried in our cell phone.¶ The boundless war finds its justification in our perceived differences. We wage deadly violence through a kind of zero-sum social logic that views resources as finite. The need to destroy the “other” to access these resources comes through the tacit and often unconscious agreement with similar others that says “they” are a threat to “us.” This kind of paranoid stance allows war to be waged to ensure no disruption in the symbol and source of what “our” group values and perceives it needs. The paradox is in how virtual reality concurrently allows us to know the extent of the global inequities. We in the West operate with the reasonable concern that “they” will not long tolerate this kind of imbalance.¶ Nonetheless, we speak primarily to their threat to us and point to lives lost in terrorist attacks as the rationale for the boundless war. Little corresponding attention is given to the degradation of the environment, the forced migrations, the imposition of government structures, and other evidence of dominance that seed discontent in generations of the “other.” What gets enacted is the fear of death rather than any deeper examination of the mutuality of shared human interests. Death anxiety taps into a greater existential question about what to do with our lives and a more general unease about the unavoidable trajectory toward our own death. Differences in a group's way of life can in this instance be understood as more than cultural nuance. As such, the further paradox is that the boundless war gives life meaning and helps satisfy the human impulse to alleviate existential angst and the certainty of our death by killing the other who threatens this denial.¶ On a healthy level, various cultural symbols such as country, race, or a religious tradition can serve as very positive elements in human meaning-making. They create the fiber of a functioning civil society where debate, discussion, participation, coexistence, and learning are the norm. Under circumstances of threat or significant levels of uncertainty, however, there may be a regressive tendency to attach allegiance to these symbols to an extent that destruction, death, and domination is justified and even celebrated.¶ From a psychological perspective, many conditions contribute to the creation of the boundless war. As referenced previously, globalization reduces the distance between us. Under this condition, there is a virtual intimacy in knowing that we can instantaneously be in touch and face-to-face with someone on the other side of the planet. It is this form of connection that gives substance to our experience of a common humanity. Yet, it is also this same means that can remind us of the inequities and injustices abound. Ideally, consciousness of the experience of the other can bring about greater compassion, empathy, understanding, and identification with our fellow human beings. In other instances, the starkness of the differences may first lead to recoiling into the familiar. Reaching out to the world can be replaced by a regressive return to known narratives that reinforce our view or the world. Those small differences become the beginning of the alienation of one from another. As such, a cycle of displacement of anxieties and projection of fears gets enacted and often perpetuated through war.¶ The small deaths that happens when our point of view of way of being is not understood or recognized by the “other” is like a little war. In seeking to affirm our cherished reality and deeply held belief, the necessity to find those who share our worldview creates coalitions of belonging. These connections form the basis of shared identity, common language, and preferred ways of knowing where our boundaries end and the realm of the “other” begins. There was a time when one could claim access to resources such as people, land, or wealth as the measure of supremacy in such disputes. In the age of the virtual, increasingly there is equity in the capacity to find one's people and that critical mass needed to battle forces that were once invisible.¶ What makes this condition so critical in a time of boundless war is that such coalitions are like shifting sands. Most will find themselves with multiple allegiances and many factors to balance in the quest to keep the fear of death at bay. When the discourse around us becomes increasingly divisive and fear is used to bring the like-minded in line with one another, an either–or mentality becomes like a psychological refugee camp in a world where our interdependence because increasingly undeniable. Boundless war is known to be nowhere and everywhere. We are its victims and its propagators. With no longer a bomb shelter that can protect us nor a country whose boundaries are secure enough to stop the world from closing in on us, a kind of schizoid state that gives us the fleeting solace of self-sufficiency shields us from the deeper and starker reality. From this psychological bunker of virtual walls, we allow the boundless war to drone on, as we remain unconscious.¶ Locating the coordinates and governing social logic that structure the context under which we live and inform our lives reveals a system that operates under a number of principles that currently remain supreme. Globalization spreads to all corners of the world and with it the primacy of profit seeking, wealth accumulation, and the struggle for control of depleting resources. This quest, which has many traits of an addictive process, serves to maintain the lifestyle of an unrestrained consumer culture. What becomes valued are those actions that play a role in mass production and monetary gain. What is compromised is a relational, environmental, ethical, or aesthetic orientation to one another that promotes compassion and helps us sustain our deeper shared human connection.¶ In a globalizing world, tremendous levels of expanding inequality exist at a time when there are great amounts of wealth. This reality suggests an inability to meet some basic human needs despite consciousness of our deeper interconnectedness and interdependence.These conditions have created a situation in both the developed and developing world where a growing sector of the population is becoming alienated from meaning. Our role within the global economy comes with certain by-products and social ills that become translated into a compulsion toward aggression. The cost is the kind of cooperative empathy capable of nurturing diverse environments and addressing inequities for which there is a current collusion to deny.¶ Daily participation within this broader macro system creates the necessary triggers that can expand the relationship we have with anxiety. Our need to reduce this anxiety means reducing the social symbols that link us. The trade-off is in the boundless war, the safety valve for our collective emotional rationalizations. Through drones and loss of boundaries of the nation-state to pursue the enemy, we can justify any number of aggressions on to the “other.” In the boundless war, ongoing financial crises, citizen debt, and the break down of social and public investment accompany a perpetual war that is not only borderless but also ongoing. We are always fighting someone “out there” that threatens our safety and our way of life even to the point where we have to give up civil liberties. Our authority figures become unaccountable when there is constant vigilance and a concentration of power in the name of safety to battle an enemy that has no border. Our justifications and tolerance for destruction deepen when the virtuality of technology and the materiality of human life continue to overlap in a way that can obscure the human connection we actually share on this same planet.

The kritik creates a distinction between biological and political life that destroys value to life

Fassin, 10 - Social Science Prof at Princeton (Didier, “Ethics of Survival: A Democratic Approach to the Politics of Life” Humanity: An International Journal of Human Rights, Humanitarianism, and Development, Fall, Vol 1 No 1, Project Muse)//dm

Conclusion Survival, in the sense Jacques Derrida attributed to the concept in his last interview, not only shifts lines that are too often hardened between biological and political lives: it opens an ethical space for reflection and action. Critical thinking in the past decade has often taken biopolitics and the politics of life as its objects. It has thus unveiled the way in which individuals and groups, even entire nations, have been treated by powers, the market, or the state, during the colonial period as well as in the contemporary era. However, through indiscriminate extension, this powerful instrument has lost some of its analytical sharpness and heuristic potentiality. On the one hand, the binary reduction of life to the opposition between nature and history, bare life and qualified life, when systematically applied from philosophical inquiry in sociological or anthropological study, erases much of the complexity and richness of life in society as it is in fact observed. On the other hand, the normative prejudices which underlie the evaluation of the forms of life and of the politics of life, when generalized to an undifferentiated collection of social facts, end up by depriving social agents of legitimacy, voice, and action. The risk is therefore both scholarly and political. It calls for ethical attention. In fact, the genealogy of this intellectual lineage reminds us that the main founders of these theories expressed tensions and hesitations in their work, which was often more complex, if even sometimes more obscure, than in its reduced and translated form in the humanities and social sciences today. And also biographies, here limited to fragments from South African lives that I have described and analyzed in more detail elsewhere, suggest the necessity of complicating the dualistic models that oppose biological and political lives. Certainly, powers like the market and the state do act sometimes as if human beings could be reduced to “mere life,” but democratic forces, including from within the structure of power, tend to produce alternative strategies that escape this reduction. And people themselves, even under conditions of domination, [End Page 93] manage subtle tactics that transform their physical life into a political instrument or a moral resource or an affective expression. But let us go one step further: ethnography invites us to reconsider what life is or rather what human beings make of their lives, and reciprocally how their lives permanently question what it is to be human. “The blurring between what is human and what is not human shades into the blurring over what is life and what is not life,” writes Veena Das. In the tracks of Wittgenstein and Cavell, she underscores that the usual manner in which we think of forms of life “not only obscures the mutual absorption of the natural and the social but also emphasizes form at the expense of life.”22 It should be the incessant effort of social scientists to return to this inquiry about life in its multiple forms but also in its everyday expression of the human.

Biopower is inevitable

Wright, 08 - Fellow at the Centre for Global Political Economy (Nathan,“Camp as Paradigm: Bio-Politics and State Racism in Foucault and Agamben”, http://ccjournal.cgu.edu/past\_issues/nathan\_wright.html)//dm

Perhaps the one failure of Foucault’s that, unresolved, rings as most ominous is his failure to further examine the problem of bio-political state racism that he first raises in his lecture series, Society Must Be Defended. At the end of the last lecture, Foucault suggests that bio-power is here to stay as a fixture of modernity. Perhaps given its focus on the preservation of the population of the nation it which it is practiced, bio-power itself is something that Foucault accepts as here to stay. Yet his analysis of bio-politics and bio-power leads inevitably to state-sanctioned racism, be the government democratic, socialist, or fascist. As a result, he ends the lecture series with the question, “How can one both make a bio-power function and exercise the rights of war, the rights of murder and the function of death, without becoming racist? That was the problem, and that, I think, is still the problem.” It was a problem to which he never returned. However, in the space opened by Foucault’s failure to solve the problem of state racism and to “elaborate a unitary theory of power” (Agamben 1998, 5) steps Agamben in an attempt to complete an analysis of Foucauldian bio-politics and to, while not solve the problem of state racism, at least give direction for further inquiry and hope of a politics that escapes the problem of this racism.

**Democracy and economic liberalization checks their impacts**

**O’Kane 97  (“Modernity, the Holocaust, and politics”, Economy and Society, February, ebsco)**

Chosen policies cannot be relegated to the position of immediate condition (Nazis in power) in the explanation of the Holocaust.  Modern bureaucracy is not ‘intrinsically capable of genocidal action’ (Bauman 1989: 106).  Centralized state coercion has no natural move to terror.  In the explanation of modern genocides it is chosen policies which play the greatest part, whether in effecting bureaucratic secrecy, organizing forced labour, implementing a system of terror, harnessing science and technology or introducing extermination policies, as means and as ends. As Nazi Germany and Stalin’s USSR have shown, furthermore, those chosen policies of genocidal government turned away from and not towards modernity.  The choosing of policies,however, is not independent of circumstances.  An analysis of the history of each case plays an important part in explaining where and how genocidal governments come to power and analysis of political institutions and structures also helps towards an understanding of the factors which act as obstacles to modern genocide.  But it is not just political factors which stand in the way of another Holocaust in modern society.  Modern societies have not only pluralist democratic political systems but also economic pluralism where workers are free to change jobs and bargain wages and where independent firms, each with their own independent bureaucracies, exist in competition with state-controlled enterprises.  In modern societies this economic pluralism both promotes and is served by the open scientific method.  By ignoring competition and the capacity for people to move between organizations whether economic, political, scientific or social, Bauman overlooks crucial but also very ‘ordinary and common’ attributes of truly modern societies.  It is these very ordinary and common attributes of modernity which stand in the way of modern genocides.

**Foucault’s concept of resistance is only possible in a world without violence—the aff is a pre-requisite for the alternative.**

**Bevir, 99** – Department of Political Science @ University of Newcastle – 1999 (Mark, “Foucault and Critique:

Deploying Agency against Autonomy, Political Theory, Volume 27 No. 1, Page 65 February 1999, JSTOR)

Perhaps we might say, therefore, that power or pastoral-power recognizes the value of the subject as an agent, whereas violence or discipline attempts to extinguish the capacity of the subject for agency. Although Foucault, of course, never describes things in quite these terms, he does come remarkably close to doing so. In particular, he defines violence, in contrast to power, as aiming at domination or as a physical constraint that denies the ability of the other to act: “where the determining factors saturate the whole there is no relationship of power,” rather “it is a question of a physical relationship of constraint.”27 Similarly, he defines power, in contrast to violence, as able to come into play only where people have a capacity to act, perhaps even a capacity to act freely: “power is exercised over free subjects, and only insofar as they are free,” by which “we mean individual or collective subjects who are faced with a field of possibilities in which several ways of behaving, several reactions and diverse comportments may be realized.”28 If we thus accept that power always treats the subject as an agent, whereas violence always attempts to extinguish the capacity of the subject for agency, we can see why Foucault’s later work on power emphasises that power, unlike violence, necessarily entails a capacity for resistance. To treat someone as an agent, one has to recognise that they can do other than one wishes—they can resist. Power can exist only where people have a capacity to act freely, and so only where they can resist that power. Perhaps, therefore, we should define as violent any relationship—whether overtly violent or not—in which an individual has his action determined for him. Violence manifests itself in any relationship between individuals, groups, or societies in which one denies the agency of the others by seeking to define for them actions they must perform. Power, in contrast, appears in any relationship—although no overtly violent relationship could meet the following requirement—in which an individual does not have his action determined for him. Power manifests itself whenever individuals, groups, or societies act as influences on the agency of the subject without attempting to determine the particular actions the subject performs. Here a rejection of autonomy implies that power is ineliminable, while a defence of agency implies that power need not degenerate into violence. Foucault’s final work on the nature of governmentality suggests, therefore, that society need not consist solely of the forms of discipline he had analysed earlier. Society might include an arena in which free individuals attempt only to influence one another. I hope my discussion of Foucault’s theory of governmentality has pointed to the way in which a distinction between violence and power might provide us with normative resources for social criticism absent from his earlier work. Provided we are willing to grant that the capacity for agency has ethical value—and this seems reasonable enough—we will denounce violent social relations and champion instead a society based on a more benign power.

### DA – Politics

#### No deal, and Obama won’t help

LA Times 9/10/2013 (House GOP playing with fire by tying debt ceiling to Obamacare, http://www.latimes.com/opinion/opinion-la/la-ol-gop-defunding-obamacare-plan-shifts-toward-delaying-it-20130910,0,4825515.story)

Having said that, Cantor's proposal still amounts to playing a game of chicken with the Senate and Obama over the debt limit. We watched this movie before, when the new House GOP majority held the debt ceiling hostage in 2011. Obama played along that time, trying to reach a "grand bargain" with Republicans that would reduce deficits by cutting spending, paring entitlements and raising taxes. Those negotiations fell through, however, and the long stalemate spooked Standard & Poor's enough for the agency to downgrade the federal government's credit. Oh, and yes, the stock market plummeted by almost 16% and the economy sputtered. Democrats successfully blamed the whole affair on Republican brinkmanship, helping Obama retain the White House and his party hold onto the Senate.¶ This go-round, Obama insists that he won't negotiate over the debt ceiling. He wants a clean bill that raises the limit, no matter how unpalatable that may be for Republicans. Meanwhile, House Speaker John A. Boehner (R-Ohio) continues to demand that any debt limit bill include measures to reduce the deficit, just as Congress did last time.¶ The two sides are so far apart -- again -- on the debt ceiling that even the informal talks the White House was holding with selected Senate Republicans have fallen through for lack of common ground. By seeking to throw Obamacare into the mix, Cantor may help Congress get past its first fiscal hurdle. But he only makes the second one harder to overcome.

No budget deal now-A shutdown is inevitable

Green, 9/11 [“A Government Shutdown Just Became More Likely,” <http://www.businessweek.com/articles/2013-09-11/a-government-shutdown-just-became-more-likely>, ALB]

Republican leaders in the House canceled a test vote this afternoon that was¶ supposed to pave the way for continued funding of the federal government, which is set to expire at month’s end. This makes a government shutdown more likely—Republican leaders folded because they couldn’t marshal enough support from within their own party.¶ The reason for the intra-GOP fight is that the party is of two minds about how—and really whether—to keep trying to kill the Affordable Care Act. Conservatives aligned with the Tea Party, including lawmakers affiliated with the Heritage Foundation, want to kill the law at any price. Establishment Republicans in the House leadership don’t want to have a knock-down, drag-out fight over Obamacare that might force a government shutdown.¶ So House Majority Leader Eric Cantor unveiled a measure to that pretended to strike a blow against Obamacare, but really did nothing of the sort—although it did all but guarantee the government would keep running come October 1. The ploy relied on a gimmick allowing the House to vote on a continuing resolution to fund the government that also stripped out funding for Obamacare. That’s exactly what Tea Party conservatives are demanding. But—and here’s the catch—Cantor’s rule contained an “enrollment correction,” a parliamentary procedure that allows a bill’s author to add instructions that determine what happens once it leaves the House and goes to the Senate. Cantor’s instructions would have cleaved the bill in two: a measure to defund Obamacare, and a “clean” funding bill to keep the government running. The Senate likely would have voted down the defund measure and passed its counterpart. Presto: crisis defused.¶ Except that House Republicans serious about killing Obamacare refused to go along in big enough numbers that House Speaker John Boehner and Cantor didn’t think they had the votes to pass their plan. And with no clear fallback—a continuing resolution that legitimately strips Obamacare funding would probably die in the Senate—a shutdown is now more likely.

**CR Won’t Pass and Obama’s Not Pushing It**

**Dumain, 9/11** [Emma, covers House leadership for Roll Call, “House GOP Leaders to Pass Spending Bill,” <http://blogs.rollcall.com/218/are-house-gop-leaders-facing-another-internal-revolt-on-spending/>, ALB]

House Republican leaders have pushed consideration of a short-term spending bill until next week over what appears to be yet another problem getting votes from their own party.¶ With conservatives crying foul and vowing to oppose the spending bill, GOP sources on Wednesday afternoon acknowledged that leaders need more time to convince rank-and-file lawmakers to support the plan they outlined Tuesday. Sources also blamed other factors, such as continued debate on the situation in Syria, for the delay.¶ “This was just announced yesterday and we always anticipated 72 hours would not likely be enough time to work on this complicated plan,” said one GOP leadership aide. “So we’ll take an extra couple days to work on it.”¶ The plan, as presented to members, would involve passing a continuing resolution to run through Dec. 15 at the current sequester levels. It would be sent to the Senate along with a concurrent resolution demanding the chamber take an up-or-down vote on defunding Obamacare before it can consider the stop-gap spending bill.¶ But that plan has been panned by many tea-party-inspired members, who were tweeting about their opposition using the hashtag “hocuspocus.” Others have said it is a “gimmick” and not a serious attempt to defund the health care law.¶ Influential conservative advocacy groups have pledged to key vote even the rule on this iteration of the CR; Club for Growth President Chris Chocola released a statement asking whether this is just a news story ripped from the headlines of the satirical newspaper The Onion.¶ With opposition mounting, the prospect of passing the CR with just Republican support was looking grim on Wednesday.

**Budget deal won’t happen now**

**Montgomery, 9/11** [Lori, The Washington Post, “House conservatives fight GOP leaders’ budget bill,” pg. google news, ALB]

House Republicans battle over leaders' new budget bill House Republicans battle over leaders' new budget bill. After a fight to keep the government open, another looms to allow it to continue paying its debts.¶ House Republican leaders unveiled a plan Tuesday to keep the government open past Sept. 30, but they were scrambling to build support within their own ranks after conservatives savaged the proposal for failing to defund President Obama's health initiative.¶ The plan, as presented to the party's rank and file in a closed-door meeting Tuesday morning, calls for the government to be funded at current levels through Dec. 15, continuing the sharp budget cuts known as the sequester.¶ It would also include a resolution to defund the Affordable Care Act, commonly known as Obamacare. But the Democratic-controlled Senate could vote that down and send the underlying budget bill on to the White House for Obama's signature, avoiding a government shutdown when the new fiscal year begins Oct. 1.¶ House Speaker John A. Boehner (R-Ohio) and Majority Leader Eric Cantor (R-Va.) told reporters the strategy was aimed at keeping the government open while forcing Senate Democrats to stage a vote on the health law, which is hugely unpopular among some voters.¶ "We will send to the Senate the provision which says, up or down, are you for defunding Obamacare or not?" Cantor said. "The House has taken a stand numerous times on its opinion of Obamacare. It's time for the Senate to stand up and tell their constituents where they stand on this atrocity of a law."¶ Tea party activists and conservative political groups were unconvinced. For weeks, they have pressed Boehner to shut down the government or refuse to raise the debt limit unless Obama agrees to undermine his signature legislative achievement. On Tuesday, a flurry of angry e-mails from the Club for Growth and the Senate Conservatives Fund flooded Capitol Hill inboxes, threatening to punish lawmakers who support Boehner's gambit.¶ "First Boehner betrayed us by supporting Obama's war in Syria. Now he wants to trick you into supporting ObamaCare," said an e-mail to supporters from Matt Kibbe, president of FreedomWorks, a political group once run by a friend of Boehner's, former House majority leader Richard K. Armey (R-Tex.). "Boehner is jumping through hoops to help Barack Obama and betray the American people."¶ Meanwhile, Sen. Ted Cruz (R-Tex.) blasted the plan at a tea party rally on Capitol Hill. "If House Republicans go along with this strategy," he said, "they will be complicit in the disaster that is Obamacare."¶ The noisy protests were hitting the mark with some lawmakers. "There's going to be tremendous pressure on the conference to vote against this idea," said Rep. John Fleming (R-La.), who said he would not support the budget bill because Boehner and Cantor refused to commit to push for a one-year delay of Obamacare as part of the forthcoming fight over the federal debt limit.¶ Others said they were inclined to support the budget strategy, arguing that Republicans have little hope of winning the battle to stop Obamacare. "By and large, people understand Obamacare is not our creation," said Rep. Tim Griffin (R-Ark.). "We're doing the best we can to stop this, and this may be our best option."¶ House Minority Whip Steny H. Hoyer (D-Md.) said Democrats would not support the budget bill. Aside from the provision regarding Obamacare, Hoyer said, the plan to continue the sequester is "totally unacceptable and irresponsible."

#### Plan is unpopular

Washington Post 2011 (12/28, Under Obama, a drone network, lexis)

The Obama administration's counterterrorism accomplishments are most apparent in what it has been able to dismantle, including CIA prisons and entire tiers of al-Qaeda's leadership. But what the administration has assembled, hidden from public view, may be equally consequential.¶ In the space of three years, the administration has built an extensive apparatus for using drones to carry out targeted killings of suspected terrorists and stealth surveillance of other adversaries. The apparatus involves dozens of secret facilities, including two operational hubs on the East Coast, virtual Air Force cockpits in the Southwest and clandestine bases in at least six countries on two continents.¶ Other commanders in chief have presided over wars with far higher casualty counts. But no president has ever relied so extensively on the secret killing of individuals to advance the nation's security goals.¶ The rapid expansion of the drone program has blurred long-standing boundaries between the CIA and the military. Lethal operations are increasingly assembled a la carte, piecing together personnel and equipment in ways that allow the White House to toggle between separate legal authorities that govern the use of lethal force.¶ In Yemen, for instance, the CIA and the military's Joint Special Operations Command pursue the same adversary with nearly identical aircraft. But they alternate taking the lead on strikes to exploit their separate authorities, and they maintain separate kill lists that overlap but don't match. CIA and military strikes this fall killed three U.S. citizens, two of whom were suspected al-Qaeda operatives.¶ The convergence of military and intelligence resources has created blind spots in congressional oversight. Intelligence committees are briefed on CIA operations, and JSOC reports to armed services panels. As a result, no committee has a complete, unobstructed view.¶ With a year to go in President Obama's first term, his administration can point to undeniable results: Osama bin Laden is dead, the core al-Qaeda network is near defeat, and members of its regional affiliates scan the sky for metallic glints.¶ Those results, delivered with unprecedented precision from aircraft that put no American pilots at risk, may help explain why the drone campaign has never attracted as much scrutiny as the detention or interrogation programs of the George W. Bush era. Although human rights advocates and others are increasingly critical of the drone program, the level of public debate remains muted.¶ Senior Democrats barely blink at the idea that a president from their party has assembled such a highly efficient machine for the targeted killing of suspected terrorists. It is a measure of the extent to which the drone campaign has become an awkward open secret in Washington that even those inclined to express misgivings can only allude to a program that, officially, they are not allowed to discuss.¶ Sen. Dianne Feinstein (D-Calif.), chairman of the Select Committee on Intelligence, described the program with a mixture of awe and concern. Its expansion under Obama was almost inevitable, she said, because of the technology's growing sophistication. But the pace of its development, she said, makes it hard to predict how it might come to be used.¶ "What this does is it takes a lot of Americans out of harm's way . . . without having to send in a special ops team or drop a 500-pound bomb," Feinstein said in an interview in which she was careful to avoid explicit confirmation that the programs exist. "But I worry about how this develops. I'm worried because of what increased technology will make it capable of doing."¶ Another reason for the lack of extensive debate is secrecy. The White House has refused to divulge details about the structure of the drone program or, with rare exceptions, who has been killed. White House and CIA officials declined to speak for attribution for this article.

#### Drones destroy the economy

The Daily Sheeple 13 (2013, China’s “Drone Swarms” Highlight Global Robotic Warfare Arms Race, <http://www.thedailysheeple.com/chinas-drone-swarms-highlight-global-robotic-warfare-arms-race_032013#sthash.RE9Y98Or.dpuf>)

Despite their stated concern for humanity and desire to foster global economic opportunity, drones and robots are already eliminating many jobs, including military personnel and affiliated tech work. Autonomous intercommunicating systems are being developed by the U.S. and now apparently the Chinese with the capability for unilateral threat assessment and war theater decision making. It is often cited that robotic warfare lessens the dangers to humans, but at some level it becomes an outright replacement, such as DARPA’s amazingly human PETMAN and other warbots. Next generation drones have the stated goal of reducing or eliminating the human element altogether as the promotional video from General Atomics below highlights for 2017.¶ Similar to the machines in a factory, robots don’t have human frailties such as sickness, tiredness, mental health issues, clouded judgement based on emotions … or conscience. Where do the human resources of war go when they have been outsourced?¶ It is possible that during the initial phases, it will appear as a boon to the economy, but the cascading effect of a global robotic arms race is likely to reach a tipping point and get out of hand very quickly.¶ Clearly, even as resistance to drones in American skies heats up, especially following the Rand Paul / Eric Holder debate about the constitutionality of killing Americans on U.S. soil, the military-industrial complex continues to invest in robotic warfare as though global proliferation is a foregone conclusion. The world’s two leading superpowers and the feedback loop they have created ensure it.