## 1NC

### Framework

#### A. Our framework – debate should be a site for contest over government proposals. This requires that the affirmative present a predictable plan of action and defends that their policy should be adopted by the United States federal government.

#### B. Our interpretation most predictable given the wording of the resolution:

#### 1. The topic is defined by the phrase following the colon – the USFG is the agent of the resolution, not the individual debaters

Webster’s Guide to Grammar and Writing – 2K <http://ccc.commnet.edu/grammar/marks/colon.htm>

Use of a colon before a list or an explanation that is preceded by a clause that can stand by itself. Think of the colon as a gate, inviting one to go on… If the introductory phrase preceding the colon is very brief and the clause following the colon represents the real business of the sentence, begin the clause after the colon with a capital letter.

#### 2. “Resolved” expresses intent to implement the plan

American Heritage Dictionary 2K [www.dictionary.com/cgi-bin/dict.pl?term=resolved](http://www.dictionary.com/cgi-bin/dict.pl?term=resolved)

To find a solution to; solve … To bring to a usually successful conclusion

#### 3. “Should” denotes an expectation of enacting a plan

American Heritage Dictionary – 2K [www.dictionary.com]

3 Used to express probability or expectation

#### “The USFG” is the government in Washington D.C.

Microsoft Encarta Online Encyclopedia 2K [http://encarta.msn.com]

“The federal government of the United States is centered in Washington DC.”

#### And, our definition excludes action by smaller political groups or individuals.

#### **Black’s Law Dictionary** Seventh Edition Ed. Bryan A. Garner (chief) 19**99**

Federal government **1.** A national government that exercises some degree of control over smaller political units that have surrendered some degree of power in exchange for the right to participate in national political matters.

#### D. Reasons to prefer -

#### 1.) Ground – The aff will always win that the principles of their advocacy are good in the abstract – we can only debate the merits of their framework if they defend the specific consequences of political implementation

#### Michael Ignatieff, Carr professor of human rights at Harvard, 2004 Lesser Evils p. 20-1

As for moral perfectionism, this would be the doctrine that a liberal state should never have truck with dubious moral means and should spare its officials the hazard of having to decide between lesser and greater evils. A moral perfectionist position also holds that states can spare their officials this hazard simply by adhering to the universal moral standards set out in human rights conventions and the laws of war. There are two problems with a perfectionist stance, leaving aside the question of whether it is realistic. The first is that articulating nonrevocable, nonderogable moral standards is relatively easy. The problem is deciding how to apply them in specific cases**.** What is the line between interrogation and torture, between targeted killing and unlawful assassination, between preemption and aggression? Even when legal and moral distinctions between these are clear in the abstract, abstractions are less than helpful when political leaders have to choose between them in practice. Furthermore, the problem with perfectionist standards is that they contradict each other. The same person who shudders, rightly, at the prospect of torturing a suspect might be prepared to kill the same suspect in a preemptive attack on a terrorist base. Equally, the perfectionist commitment to the right to life might preclude such attacks altogether and restrict our response to judicial pursuit of offenders through process of law. Judicial responses to the problem of terror have their place, but they are no substitute for military operations when terrorists possess bases, training camps, and heavy weapons. To stick to a perfectionist commitment to the right to life when under terrorist attack might achieve moral consistency at the price of leaving us defenseless in the face of evildoers. Security, moreover, is a human right, and thus respect for one right might lead us to betray another.

#### 2.) Topical Education – By manipulating the topic to access their political project they skirt debate about the implementation of policies by the government. Their education is distrusting of institutional study and pragmatic reform. Even if their intentions are noble, their message results in fascist totalitarianism

#### Martin Lewis, Assistant Professor at George Washington, 1992 Green Delusions p. 258

A majority of those born between 1960 and 1980 seem to tend toward cynicism, and we can thus hardly expect them to be converted en masse to radical doctrines of social and environmental salvation by a few committed thinkers. It is actually possible that a radical education may make them even more cynical than they already are. While their professors may find the extreme relativism of subversive postmodernism bracingly liberating, many of today's students may embrace only the new creed's rejection of the past. Stripped of leftist social concerns, radical postmodernism's contempt for established social and political philosophy—indeed, its contempt for liberalism—may well lead to right-wing totalitarianism. When cynical, right-leaning students are taught that democracy is a sham and that all meaning derives from power, they are being schooled in fascism, regardless of their instructors' intentions. According to sociologist Jeffrey Goldfarb (1991), cynicism is the hallmark—and main defect—of the current age. He persuasively argues that cynicism's roots lie in failed left- and right-wing ideologies—systems of thought that deductively connect "a simple rationalized absolute truth ... to a totalized set of political actions and policies" (1991:82). Although most eco-radicals are anything but cynical when they imagine a "green future," they do take a cynical turn when contemplating the present political order. The dual cynical-ideological mode represents nothing less than the death of liberalism and of reform. Its dangers are eloquently spelled out by Goldfarb (1991:9): "When one thinks ideologically and acts ideologically, opponents become enemies to be vanquished, political compromise becomes a kind of immorality, and constitutional refinements become inconvenient niceties.

#### 3) Limits – there are limitless contexts or avenues through which they could purport to advocate the plan. Our interpretation limits debate to promote politically relevant dialogue and structured communication.

#### Donald S. Lutz, Professor of Polisci at Houston, 2K Political Theory and Partisan Politics p. 39-40

Aristotle notes in the Politics that political theory simultaneously proceeds at three levels—discourse about the ideal, about the best possible in the real world, and about existing political systems.4 Put another way, comprehensive political theory must ask several differ­ent kinds of questions that are linked, yet distinguishable. In order to understand the interlocking set of questions that political theory can ask, imagine a continuum stretching from left to right. At the end, to the right, is an ideal form of government, a perfectly wrought con­struct produced by the imagination. At the other end is the perfect dystopia, the most perfectly wretched system that the human imagi­nation can produce. Stretching between these two extremes is an infi­nite set of possibilities, merging into one another, that describe the logical possibilities created by the characteristics defining the end points. For example, a political system defined primarily by equality would have a perfectly inegalitarian system described at the other end, and the possible states of being between them would vary prima­rily in the extent to which they embodied equality. An ideal defined primarily by liberty would create a different set of possibilities be­tween the extremes. Of course, visions of the ideal often are inevitably more complex than these single-value examples indicate, but it is also true that in order to imagine an ideal state of affairs a kind of simpli­fication is almost always required since normal states of affairs invari­ably present themselves to human consciousness as complicated, opaque, and to a significant extent indeterminate. t A non-ironic reading of Plato's Republic leads one to conclude that the creation of these visions of the ideal characterizes political philoso­phy. This is not the case. Any person can generate a vision of the ideal. One job of political philosophy is to ask the question "Is this ideal worth pursuing?" Before the question can be pursued, however, the ideal state of affairs must be clarified, especially with respect to con­ceptual precision and the logical relationship between the proposi­tions that describe the ideal. This pre-theoretical analysis raises the vision of the ideal from the mundane to a level where true philosophi­cal analysis, and the careful comparison with existing systems can proceed fruitfully. The process of pre-theoretical analysis, probably because it works on clarifying ideas that most capture the human imagination, too often looks to some like the entire enterprise of political philosophy.5 However, the value of Jean-Jacques Rousseau's concept of the General Will, for example, lies not in its formal logical implications, nor in its compelling hold on the imagination, but on the power and clarity it lends to an analysis and comparison of ac­tual political systems. Among other things it allows him to show that anyone who wishes to pursue a state of affairs closer to that summed up in the concept of the General Will must successfully develop a civil religion. To the extent politicians believe theorists who tell them that pre-theoretical clarification of language describing an ideal is the essence and sum total of political philosophy, to that extent they will properly conclude that political philosophers have little to tell them, since politics is the realm of the possible not the realm of logical clarity. However, once the ideal is clarified, the political philosopher will begin to articulate and assess the reasons why we might want to pursue such an ideal. At this point, analysis leaves the realm of pure logic

and enters the realm of the logic of human longing, aspiration, and anxi­ety. The analysis is now limited by the interior parameters of the human heart (more properly the human psyche) to which the theorist must appeal. Unlike the clarification stage where anything that is logical is possible, there are now definite limits on where logic can take us. Appeals to self-destruction, less happiness rather than more, psychic isolation, enslavement, loss of identity, a preference for the lives of mollusks over that of humans, to name just a few possibilities, are doomed to failure. The theorist cannot appeal to such values if she or he is to attract an audience of politicians. Much political theory in­volves the careful, competitive analysis of what a given ideal state of affairs entails, and as Plato shows in his dialogues the discussion between the philosopher and the politician will quickly terminate if he or she cannot convincingly demonstrate the connection between the political ideal being developed and natural human passions. In this way, the politician can be educated by the possibilities that the politi­cal theorist can articulate, just as the political theorist can be educated by the relative success the normative analysis has in "setting the hook" of interest among nonpolitical theorists. This realm of discourse, domi­nated by the logic of humanly worthwhile goals, requires that the theorist carefully observe the responses of others in order not to be seduced by what is merely logical as opposed to what is humanly rational. Moral discourse conditioned by the ideal, if it is to be suc­cessful, requires the political theorist to be fearless in pursuing norma­tive logic, but it also requires the theorist to have enough humility to remember that, if a non-theorist cannot be led toward an ideal, the fault may well lie in the theory, not in the moral vision of the non-theorist.

#### 4.) Framework provides a-priori reasons to vote negative. You must use your ballot to ratify constraints on discourse to preserve a politically-enabling discussion

#### Ruth Lessl Shively, Assoc Prof Polisci at Texas A&M, 2K *Political Theory and Partisan Politics* p. 179

To put this point another way, it turns out that to be open to all things is, in effect, to be open to nothing. While the ambiguists have commendable reasons for wanting to avoid closure—to avoid specify­ing what is not allowed or celebrated in their political vision—they need to say "no" to some things in order to be open to things in general. They need to say "no" to certain forms of contest, if only to protect contest in general. For if one is to be open to the principles of democracy, for example, one must be dogmatically closed to the prin­ciples of fascism. If one would embrace tolerance, one must rigidly reject intolerance. If one would support openness in political speech and action, one must ban the acts of political intimidation, violence or recrimination that squelch that openness. If one would expand delib­eration and disruption, one must set up strict legal protections around such activities. And if one would ensure that citizens have reason to engage in political contest—that it has practical meaning and import for them—one must establish and maintain the rules and regulations and laws that protect democracy. In short, openness requires certain clear limits, rules, closure. And to make matters more complex, these structures of openness cannot simply be put into place and forgotten. They need to be taught to new generations of citizens, to be retaught and reenforced among the old, and as the political world changes, to be shored up, rethought, adapted, and applied to new problems and new situations. It will not do, then, to simply assume that these structures are permanently viable and secure without significant work or justification on our part; nor will it do to talk about resisting or subverting them. Indeed, they are such valuable and yet vulnerable goods that they require the most unflag­ging and firm support that we can give them.

### Antipolitics

Their criticism of Imperialism is anti-political

Shaw 2 (Martin, Professor of International Relations – University of Sussex, Uses and Abuses of Anti-Imperialism in the Global Era, 4-7, http://www.martinshaw.org/empire.htm)

It is worth asking how the politics of anti-imperialism distorts Western leftists' responses to global struggles for justice. John Pilger, for example, consistently seeks to minimise the crimes of Milosevic in Kosovo, and to deny their genocidal character - purely because these crimes formed part of the rationale for Western intervention against Serbia. He never attempted to minimise the crimes of the pro-Western Suharto regime in the same way. The crimes of quasi-imperial regimes are similar in cases like Yugoslavia and Indonesia, but the West's attitudes towards them are undeniably uneven and inconsistent. To take as the criterion of one's politics opposition to Western policy, rather than the demands for justice of the victims of oppression as such, distorts our responses to the victims and our commitment to justice. We need to support the victims **regardless of whether Western governments take up their cause or not**; we need to judge Western power not according to a general assumption of 'new imperialism' but according to its actual role in relation to the victims. The task for civil society in the West is not, therefore to oppose Western state policies as a matter of course, à la Cold War, but to mobilise **solidarity** with democratic oppositions and repressed peoples, against authoritarian, quasi-imperial states. It is to demand more effective global political, legal and military institutions that genuinely and consistently defend the interests of the most threatened groups. It is to grasp the contradictions among and within Western elites, conditionally allying themselves with internationalising elements in global institutions and Western governments, against nationalist and reactionary elements. The arrival in power of George Bush II makes this discrimination all the more urgent. In the long run, we need to develop a larger politics of global social democracy and an ethic of **global responsibility** that address the profound economic, political and cultural inequalities between Western and non-Western worlds. We will not move far in these directions, however, unless we grasp the life-and-death struggles between many oppressed peoples and the new **local imperialisms, rather than** subsuming all regional contradictions into the **false synthesis of a new Western imperialism**.

Embracing anti-politics turns their efforts and cedes politics to the right.

Boggs ’97 (CARL BOGGS – Professor and Ph.D. Political Science, National University, Los Angeles -- Theory and Society 26: 741-780)

The false sense of empowerment that comes with such mesmerizing impulses is accompanied by a loss of public engagement, an erosion of citizenship and a depleted capacity of individuals in large groups to work for social change. As this ideological quagmire worsens, urgent problems that are destroying the fabric of American society will go unsolved -- perhaps even unrecognized -- only to fester more ominously into the future. And such problems (ecological crisis, poverty, urban decay, spread of infectious cannot be understood outside the larger social and global context diseases, technological displacement of workers) of internationalized markets, finance, and communications. Paradoxically, the widespread retreat from politics, often inspired by localist sentiment, comes at a time when agendas that ignore or side-step these global realities will, more than ever, be reduced to impotence. In his commentary on the state of citizenship today, Wolin refers to the increasing sublimation and dilution of politics, as larger numbers of people turn away from public concerns toward private ones. By diluting the life of common involvements, we negate the very idea of politics as a source of public ideals and visions.74 In the meantime, the fate of the world hangs in the balance. The unyielding truth is that, even as the ethos of anti-politics becomes more compelling and even fashionable in the United States, it is the vagaries of political power that will continue to decide the fate of human societies. This last point demands further elaboration. The shrinkage of politics hardly means that corporate colonization will be less of a reality, that social hierarchies will somehow disappear, or that gigantic state and military structures will lose their hold over people's lives. Far from it: the space abdicated by a broad citizenry, well-informed and ready to participate at many levels, can in fact be filled by authoritarian and reactionary elites -- an already familiar dynamic in many lesser- developed countries. The fragmentation and chaos of a Hobbesian world, not very far removed from the rampant individualism, social Darwinism, and civic violence that have been so much a part of the American landscape, could be the prelude to a powerful Leviathan designed to impose order in the face of disunity and atomized retreat. In this way the eclipse of politics might set the stage for a reassertion of politics in more virulent guise -- or it might help further rationalize the existing power structure. In either case, the state would likely become what Hobbes anticipated: the embodiment of those universal, collec- tive interests that had vanished from civil society.75

Moving away from anti-politics is vital to check extinction

Small ‘6 (Jonathan, former Americorps VISTA for the Human Services Coalition,“Moving Forward,” *The Journal for Civic Commitment*, Spring, http://www.mc.maricopa.edu/other/engagement/Journal/Issue7/Small.jsp)

What will be the challenges of the new millennium? And how should we equip young people to face these challenges? While we cannot be sure of the exact nature of the challenges, we can say unequivocally that humankind will face them together. If the end of the twentieth century marked the triumph of the capitalists, individualism, and personal responsibility, the new century will present challenges that require collective action, unity, and enlightened self-interest. Confronting global warming, depleted natural resources, global super viruses, global crime syndicates, and multinational corporations with no conscience and no accountability will require cooperation, openness, honesty, compromise, and most of all solidarity – ideals not exactly cultivated in the twentieth century. We can no longer suffer to see life through the tiny lens of our own existence. Never in the history of the world has our collective fate been so intricately interwoven. Our very existence depends upon our ability to adapt to this new paradigm, to envision a more cohesive society. With humankind’s next great challenge comes also great opportunity. Ironically, modern individualism backed us into a corner. We have two choices, work together in solidarity or perish together in alienation. Unlike any other crisis before, the noose is truly around the neck of the whole world at once. Global super viruses will ravage rich and poor alike, developed and developing nations, white and black, woman, man, and child. Global warming and damage to the environment will affect climate change and destroy ecosystems across the globe. Air pollution will force gas masks on our faces, our depleted atmosphere will make a predator of the sun, and chemicals will invade and corrupt our water supplies. Every single day we are presented the opportunity to change our current course, to survive modernity in a manner befitting our better nature. Through zealous cooperation and radical solidarity we can alter the course of human events. Regarding the practical matter of equipping young people to face the challenges of a global, interconnected world, we need to teach cooperation, community, solidarity, balance and tolerance in schools. We need to take a holistic approach to education. Standardized test scores alone will not begin to prepare young people for the world they will inherit. The three staples of traditional education (reading, writing, and arithmetic) need to be supplemented by three cornerstones of a modern education, exposure, exposure, and more exposure. How can we teach solidarity? How can we teach community in the age of rugged individualism? How can we counterbalance crass commercialism and materialism? How can we impart the true meaning of power? These are the educational challenges we face in the new century. It will require a radical transformation of our conception of education. We’ll need to trust a bit more, control a bit less, and put our faith in the potential of youth to make sense of their world. In addition to a declaration of the gauntlet set before educators in the twenty-first century, this paper is a proposal and a case study of sorts toward a new paradigm of social justice and civic engagement education. Unfortunately, the current pedagogical climate of public K-12 education does not lend itself well to an exploratory study and trial of holistic education. Consequently, this proposal and case study targets a higher education model. Specifically, we will look at some possibilities for a large community college in an urban setting with a diverse student body. Our guides through this process are specifically identified by the journal Equity and Excellence in Education. The dynamic interplay between ideas of social justice, civic engagement, and service learning in education will be the lantern in the dark cave of uncertainty. As such, a simple and straightforward explanation of the three terms is helpful to direct this inquiry. Before we look at a proposal and case study and the possible consequences contained therein, this paper will draw out a clear understanding of how we should characterize these ubiquitous terms and how their relationship to each other affects our study. Social Justice, Civic Engagement, Service Learning and Other Commie Crap Social justice is often ascribed long, complicated, and convoluted definitions. In fact, one could fill a good-sized library with treatises on this subject alone. Here we do not wish to belabor the issue or argue over fine points. For our purposes, it will suffice to have a general characterization of the term, focusing instead on the dynamics of its interaction with civic engagement and service learning. Social justice refers quite simply to a community vision and a community conscience that values inclusion, fairness, tolerance, and equality. The idea of social justice in America has been around since the Revolution and is intimately linked to the idea of a social contract. The Declaration of Independence is the best example of the prominence of social contract theory in the US. It states quite emphatically that the government has a contract with its citizens, from which we get the famous lines about life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Social contract theory and specifically the Declaration of Independence are concrete expressions of the spirit of social justice. Similar clamor has been made over the appropriate definitions of civic engagement and service learning, respectively. Once again, let’s not get bogged down on subtleties. Civic engagement is a measure or degree of the interest and/or involvement an individual and a community demonstrate around community issues. There is a longstanding dispute over how to properly quantify civic engagement. Some will say that today’s youth are less involved politically and hence demonstrate a lower degree of civic engagement. Others cite high volunteer rates among the youth and claim it demonstrates a high exhibition of civic engagement. And there are about a hundred other theories put forward on the subject of civic engagement and today’s youth. But one thing is for sure; today’s youth no longer see government and politics as an effective or valuable tool for affecting positive change in the world. Instead of criticizing this judgment, perhaps we should come to sympathize and even admire it. Author Kurt Vonnegut said, “There is a tragic flaw in our precious Constitution, and I don’t know what can be done to fix it. This is it: only nut cases want to be president.” Maybe the youth’s rejection of American politics isn’t a shortcoming but rather a rational and appropriate response to their experience. Consequently, the term civic engagement takes on new meaning for us today. In order to foster fundamental change on the systemic level, which we have already said is necessary for our survival in the twenty-first century, we need to fundamentally change our systems. Therefore, part of our challenge becomes convincing the youth that these systems, and by systems we mean government and commerce,have the potential for positive change.Civic engagement consequently takes on a more specific and political meaning in this context. Service learning is a methodology and a tool for teaching social justice, encouraging civic engagement, and deepening practical understanding of a subject. Since it is a relatively new field, at least in the structured sense, service learning is only beginning to define itself. Through service learning students learn by experiencing things firsthand and by exposing themselves to new points of view. Instead of merely reading about government, for instance, a student might experience it by working in a legislative office. Rather than just studying global warming out of a textbook, a student might volunteer time at an environmental group. If service learning develops and evolves into a discipline with the honest goal of making better citizens, teaching social justice, encouraging civic engagement, and most importantly, exposing students to different and alternative experiences, it could be a major feature of a modern education. Service learning is the natural counterbalance to our current overemphasis on standardized testing. Social justice, civic engagement, and service learning are caught in a symbiotic cycle. The more we have of one of them; the more we have of all of them. However, until we get momentum behind them, we are stalled. Service learning may be our best chance to jumpstart our democracy. In the rest of this paper, we will look at the beginning stages of a project that seeks to do just that.

### Case

#### Heg is good—Studies prove conflicts have been decreasing because of it

**Drezner 05** [Daniel, Gregg Easterbrook, Associate Professor of International Politics at the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy at Tufts University, “War, and the dangers of extrapolation,” may 25]

Daily explosions in Iraq, massacres in Sudan, the Koreas smakestaring at each other through artillery barrels, a Hobbesian war of all against all in eastern Congo--combat plagues human society as it has, perhaps, since our distant forebears realized that a tree limb could be used as a club. But here is something you would never guess from watching the news: War has entered a cycle of decline. Combat in Iraq and in a few other places is an exception to a significant global trend that has gone nearly unnoticed--namely that, for about 15 years, there have been steadily fewer armed conflicts worldwide. In fact, it is possible that a person's chance of dying because of war has, in the last decade or more, become the lowest in human history.  Is Easterbrook right? He has a few more paragraphs on the numbers:  The University of Maryland studies find the number of wars and armed conflicts worldwide peaked in 1991 at 51, which may represent the most wars happening simultaneously at any point in history. Since 1991, the number has fallen steadily. There were 26 armed conflicts in 2000 and 25 in 2002, even after the Al Qaeda attack on the United States and the U.S. counterattack against Afghanistan. By 2004, Marshall and Gurr's latest study shows, the number of armed conflicts in the world had declined to 20, even after the invasion of Iraq. All told, there were less than half as many wars in 2004 as there were in 1991.  Marshall and Gurr also have a second ranking, gauging the magnitude of fighting. This section of the report is more subjective. Everyone agrees that the worst moment for human conflict was World War II; but how to rank, say, the current separatist fighting in Indonesia versus, say, the Algerian war of independence is more speculative. Nevertheless, the Peace and Conflict studies name 1991 as the peak post-World War II year for totality of global fighting, giving that year a ranking of 179 on a scale that rates the extent and destructiveness of combat. By 2000, in spite of war in the Balkans and genocide in Rwanda, the number had fallen to 97; by 2002 to 81; and, at the end of 2004, it stood at 65. This suggests the extent and intensity of global combat is now less than half what it was 15 years ago.  Easterbrook spends the rest of the essay postulating the causes of this -- the decline in great power war, the spread of democracies, the growth of economic interdependence, and even the peacekeeping capabilities of the United Nations.  Easterbrook makes a lot of good points -- most people are genuinely shocked when they are told that even in a post-9/11 climate, there has been a steady and persistent decline in wars and deaths from wars. That said, what bothers me in the piece is what Easterbrook leaves out.  First, he neglects to mention the biggest reason for why war is on the decline -- there's a global hegemon called the United States right now. Easterbrook acknowledges that "the most powerful factor must be the end of the cold war" but he doesn't understand *why*it's the most powerful factor. Elsewhere in the piece he talks about the growing comity among the great powers, without discussing the elephant in the room: the reason the "great powers" get along is that the United States is much, much more powerful than anyone else. If you quantify power only by relative military capabilities, the U.S. is a great power, there are maybe ten or so middle powers, and then there are a lot of mosquitoes.[*If the U.S. is so powerful, why can't it subdue the Iraqi insurgency?--ed*. Power is a relative measure -- the U.S. might be having difficulties, but no other country in the world would have fewer problems.] Joshua Goldstein, who knows a thing or two about this phenomenon, made this clear in a Christian Science Monitor op-ed three years ago:  We probably owe this lull to the end of the cold war, and to a unipolar world order with a single superpower to impose its will in places like Kuwait, Serbia, and Afghanistan. The emerging world order is not exactly benign – Sept. 11 comes to mind – and Pax Americana delivers neither justice nor harmony to the corners of the earth. But a unipolar world is inherently more peaceful than the bipolar one where two superpowers fueled rival armies around the world. The long-delayed "peace dividend" has arrived, like a tax refund check long lost in the mail. The difference in language between Goldstein and Easterbrook highlights my second problem with "The End of War?" Goldstein rightly refers to the past fifteen years as a "lull" -- a temporary reduction in war and war-related death. The flip side of U.S. hegemony being responsible for the reduction of armed conflict is what would happen if U.S. hegemony were to ever fade away. Easterbrook focuses on the trends that suggest an ever-decreasing amount of armed conflict -- and I hope he's right. But I'm enough of a realist to know that if the U.S. should find its primacy challenged by, say, a really populous non-democratic country on the other side of the Pacific Ocean, all best about the utility of economic interdependence, U.N. peacekeeping, and the spread ofdemocracy are right out the window.  UPDATE: To respond to a few thoughts posted by the commenters:  1) To spell things out a bit more clearly -- U.S. hegemony important to the reduction of conflict in two ways. First, U.S. power can act as a powerful if imperfect constraint on pairs of enduring rivals (Greece-Turkey, India-Pakistan) that contemplate war on a regular basis. It can't stop every conflict, but it can blunt a lot of them. Second, and more important to Easterbrook's thesis, U.S. supremacy in conventional military affairs prevents other middle-range states -- China, Russia, India, Great Britain, France, etc. -- from challenging the U.S. or each other in a war. It would be suicide for anyone to fight a war with the U.S., and if any of these countries waged a war with each *other,* the the prospect of U.S. intervention would be equally daunting.

**It makes the world more peaceful**

**Busby 12** [Get Real Chicago IR guys out in force, Josh, Assistant Professor of Public Affairs and a fellow in the RGK Center for Philanthropy and Community Service as well as a Crook Distinguished Scholar at the Robert S. Strauss Center for International Security and Law. <http://duckofminerva.blogspot.com/2012/01/get-real-chicago-ir-guys-out-in-force.html>]

Is Unipolarity Peaceful? As evidence, Monteiro provides metrics of the number of years during which great powers have been at war. For the unipolar era since the end of the Cold War, the United States has been at war 13 of those 22 years or 59% (see his Table 2 below). Now, I've been following some of the discussion by and about Steven Pinker and Joshua Goldstein's [work](http://www.nytimes.com/2011/12/18/opinion/sunday/war-really-is-going-out-of-style.html?pagewanted=all) that suggests the world is becoming more peaceful with interstate wars and intrastate wars becoming more rare. I was struck by the graphic that Pinker used in a Wall Street Journal [piece](http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424053111904106704576583203589408180.html) back in September that drew on the Uppsala Conflict Data, which shows a steep decline in the number of deaths per 100,000 people. How do we square this account by Monteiro of a unipolar world that is not peaceful (with the U.S. at war during this period in Iraq twice, Afghanistan, Kosovo) and Pinker's account which suggests declining violence in the contemporary period? Where Pinker is focused on systemic outcomes, Monteiro's measure merely reflect years during which the great powers are at war. Under unipolarity, there is only one great power so the measure is partial and not systemic. However, Monteiro's theory aims to be systemic rather than partial. In critiquing Wohlforth's early work on unipolarity stability, Monteiro notes: Wohlforth’s argument does not exclude all kinds of war. Although power preponderance allows the unipole to manage conflicts globally, this argument is not meant to apply to relations between major and minor powers, or among the latter (17). So presumably, a more adequate test of the peacefulness or not of unipolarity (at least for Monteiro) is not the number of years the great power has been at war but whether the system as a whole is becoming more peaceful under unipolarity **compared** to previous eras, including wars between major and minor powers or wars between minor powers and whether the wars that do happen are as violent as the ones that came before. Now, as Ross Douthat pointed [out](http://douthat.blogs.nytimes.com/2011/10/17/steven-pinkers-history-of-violence/), Pinker's argument isn't based on a logic of benign hegemony. It could be that even if the present era is more peaceful, unipolarity has nothing to do with it. Moreover, Pinker may be wrong. Maybe the world isn't all that peaceful. I keep thinking about the places I don't want to go to anymore because they are violent (Mexico, Honduras, El Salvador, Nigeria, Pakistan, etc.) As Tyler Cowen [noted](http://marginalrevolution.com/marginalrevolution/2011/10/steven-pinker-on-violence.html), the measure Pinker uses to suggest violence is a per capita one, which doesn't get at the absolute level of violence perpetrated in an era of a greater world population. But, if my read of other [reports](http://www.hsrgroup.org/human-security-reports/20092010/graphs-and-tables.aspx) based on Uppsala data is right**,** war is becoming more rare and less deadly (though later [data](http://www.pcr.uu.se/research/ucdp/charts_and_graphs/) suggests lower level armed conflict may be increasing again since the mid-2000s). The apparent violence of the contemporary era may be something of a presentist bias and reflect our own lived experience and the ubiquity of news media .Even if the U.S. has been at war for the better part of unipolarity, the deadliness is declining, even compared with Vietnam, let alone World War II. Does Unipolarity Drive Conflict? So, I kind of took issue with the Monteiro's premise that unipolarity is not peaceful. What about his argument that unipolarity drives conflict? Monteiro suggests that the unipole has three available strategies - defensive dominance, offensive dominance and disengagement - though is less likely to use the third. Like Rosato and Schuessler, Monteiro suggests because other states cannot trust the intentions of other states, namely the unipole, that minor states won't merely bandwagon with the unipole. Some "recalcitrant" minor powers will attempt to see what they can get away with and try to build up their capabilities. As an aside, in Rosato and Schuessler world, unless these are located in strategically important areas (i.e. places where there is oil), then the unipole (the United States) should disengage. In Monteiro's world, disengagement would inexorably lead to instability and draw in the U.S. again (though I'm not sure this necessarily follows), but neither defensive or offensive dominance offer much possibility for peace either since it is U.S. power in and of itself that makes other states insecure, even though they can't balance against it.

#### Your AFF cherry picks evidence

Marijke Breuning 09 (professor of political science at the University of North Texas) December 2009 “Thinking Critically About Security Studies” International Studies Review Volume 11, Issue 4, Pages 792-794

In their zeal to critique conspicuous consumption and the American love affair with the SUV, Simon Dalby and Matthew Paterson resort to the familiar argument that the Dutch consume less oil because they choose "to walk, ride bicycles, or take the train" (p. 184). They forget to mention that this is an easy choice in a very densely populated country with public transportation plentiful in most locations, whereas gas is pricey and parking expensive (and difficult to find)—just as public transportation is preferred by many in New York City but generally not an option for residents of the many small towns of the American Midwest. These examples are typical of the interpretations offered in the volume's chapters. Greater reflection on initial judgments might have enabled the authors to arrive at deeper insights. Finally, there is the issue of assumptions. The contributors share a conviction that their perceptions are on target. There is no serious consideration of alternative explanations. Moreover, the explanations tend to attribute a unity of purpose to decisions made by disparate entities (e.g., government, business, and media) and occasionally resemble conspiracy theories. For instance, Marie Thorsten implies that TV shows such as 24 are designed to facilitate citizens' acceptance of the Bush administration's position that torture was both effective and acceptable. She does not consider the possibility that such shows may also turn people against such tactics or that they simply may have little impact because viewers understand them to be fictional entertainment. She also does not consider that the appearance of this show may have been a lucky happenstance for its creator, not something done by design and collusion. Ultimately, critical security studies as presented in this volume is remarkably uncritical. Careful investigation and considered judgment is replaced with the affirmation of foregone conclusions. More is required to successfully address contemporary security challenges.

#### Uncertainty justifies realism – even under a cooperative framework, the malleability of discourse proves that leaders will always calculate action based on capability

#### Copeland 6, Associate Professor and Director Dept. of Government and Foreign Affairs @ University of Virginia (Dale, “The Constructivist Challenge to Structural Realism: A Review Essay”, Constructivism and International Relations, Alexander Wendt and His Critics)

Notwithstanding Wendt’s important contributions to international relations theory, his critique of structural realism has inherent flaws. Most important, it does not adequately address a critical aspect of the realist worldview: **the problem of uncertainty.** For structural realists, it is states’ uncertainty about the present and especially the future intentions of others that makes the levels and trends in relative power such fundamental causal variables. Contrary to Wendt’s claim that realism must smuggle in states with differently constituted interests to explain why systems sometimes fall into conflict, neorealists argue that uncertainty about the other’s present interests—whether the other is driven by security or nonsecurity motives—**can be enough to lead security-seeking states to fight**. This problem is exacerbated by the incentives that actors have to deceive one another, an issue Wendt does not address. Yet even when states are fairly sure that the other is also a security seeker, they know that it might change its spots later on. States must therefore worry about any decline in their power, lest the other turn aggressive after achieving superiority. Wendt’s building of a systemic constructivist theory—and his bracketing of unit-level processes—thus presents him with an ironic dilemma. It is the very mutability of polities as emphasized by domestic-level constructivists—that states may change because of domestic processes independent of international interaction—that makes prudent leaders so concerned about the future. If diplomacy can have only a limited effect on another’s character or regime type, **then leaders must calculate the other’s potential to attack later should it acquire motives for expansion**. In such an environment of future uncertainty, levels and trends in relative power will thus act as a key constraint on state behavior. The problem of uncertainty complicates Wendt’s efforts to show that anarchy has no particular logic, but only three different ideational instantiations in history—as Hobbesian, Lockean, or Kantian cultures, depending on the level of actor compliance to certain behavioral norms. By differentiating these cultures in terms of the degree of cooperative behavior exhibited by states, Wendt’s analysis reinforces the very dilemma underpinning the realist argument. If the other is acting cooperatively, how is one to know whether this reflects its peaceful character, or is just a façade **masking aggressive desires**? Wendt’s discussion of the different degrees of internalization of the three cultures only exacerbates the problem. What drives behavior at the **lower levels of internalization** is precisely what is not shared between actors—their private incentives to comply for short-term selfish reasons. This suggests that the neorealist and neoliberal paradigms, both of which emphasize the role of uncertainty when internalization is low or nonexistent, remain strong competitors to constructivism in explaining changing levels of cooperation through history. And because Wendt provides little empirical evidence to support his view in relation to these competitors, the debate over which paradigm possesses greater explanatory power is still an open one.

#### The impact is the rise of Hitlerite states – the possibility of deception and different discursive interpretations means constructivist theory could prove fatal

#### Copeland 6, Associate Professor and Director Dept. of Government and Foreign Affairs @ University of Virginia (Dale, “The Constructivist Challenge to Structural Realism: A Review Essay”, Constructivism and International Relations, Alexander Wendt and His Critics)

#### Second, Wendt’s view is inconsistent with his recognition that states often do have difficulty learning about the other. The very problem Ego and Alter have in first communicating is that ‘behavior does not speak for itself. It must be interpreted, and ‘many interpretations are possible’ (330). This point is reinforced by Wendt’s epistemological point of departure: that the ideas held by actors are ‘unobservable’ (chap. 2). Because leaders cannot observe directly what the other is thinking, they are resigned to making inferences from its behavior. Yet in security affairs, as Wendt acknowledges, mistakes in inferences—assuming the other is peaceful when in fact it has malevolent intentions—could prove ‘fatal’ (360). Wendt accepts that the problem facing rational states ‘is making sure that they perceive other actors, and other actors’ perception of them, correctly’ (334, emphasis in original). Yet the book provides no mechanism through which Ego and Alter can increase their confidence in the correctness of their estimates of the other’s type. Simply describing how Ego and Alter shape each other’s sense of self and other is not enough.21 Rational choice models, using assumptions consistent with structural realism, do much better here. In games of incomplete information, where states are unsure about the other’s type, actions by security-seeking actors that would be too costly for greedy actors to adopt can help states reduce their uncertainty about present intentions, thus moderating the security dilemma.22 Wendt cannot simply argue that over time states can learn a great deal about other states. It is what is not ‘shared’, at least in the area of intentions, that remains the core stumbling block to cooperation. Third, Wendt’s position that the problem of other minds is not much of a problem ignores a fundamental issue in all social relations, but especially in those between states, namely, the problem of deception. In making estimates of the other’s present type, states have reason to be suspicious of its diplomatic gestures—the other may be trying to deceive them. Wendt’s analysis is rooted in the theory of symbolic interactionism, but he does not discuss one critical aspect of that tradition: the idea of ‘impression management’. Actors in their relations exploit the problem of other minds for their own ends. On the public stage, they present images and play roles that often have little to do with their true beliefs and interests backstage.23 In laying out his dramaturgical view of Ego and Alter co-constituting each other’s interests and identities, Wendt assumes that both Ego and Alter are making genuine efforts to express their true views and to ‘cast’ the other in roles that they believe in. But deceptive actors will stage-manage the situation to create impressions that serve their narrow ends, and other actors, especially in world politics, will understand this.24 Thus a prudent security-seeking Ego will have difficulty distinguishing between two scenarios: whether it and Alter do indeed share a view of each other as peaceful, or whether Alter is just pretending to be peaceful in order to make Ego think that they share a certain conception of the world, when in fact they do not.25 Wendt’s analysis offers no basis for saying when peaceful gestures should be taken at face value, and when they should be discounted as deceptions.26 When we consider the implications of a Hitlerite state deceiving others to achieve a position of military superiority, we understand why great powers in history have tended to adopt postures of prudent mistrust.

#### No impact – threat construction isn’t sufficient to cause wars

**Kaufman 09**, Prof Poli Sci and IR – U Delaware,

(Stuart J, “Narratives and Symbols in Violent Mobilization: The Palestinian-Israeli Case,” *Security Studies* 18:3, 400 – 434)

Even when hostile narratives, group fears, and opportunity are strongly present, war occurs **only if these factors are harnessed.** Ethnic narratives and fears must combine to create significant ethnic hostility among mass publics. Politicians must also seize the opportunity to manipulate that hostility, evoking hostile narratives and symbols to gain or hold power by riding a wave of chauvinist mobilization. Such mobilization is often spurred by prominent events (for example, episodes of violence) that increase feelings of hostility and make chauvinist appeals seem timely. If the other group also mobilizes and if each side's felt security needs threaten the security of the other side, the result is a security dilemma spiral of rising fear, hostility, and mutual threat that results in violence. **A virtue of** this **symbolist theory is that symbolist logic explains why** ethnic **peace is more common than ethnonationalist war.** Even if hostile narratives, fears, and opportunity exist, severe violence usually can still be avoided if ethnic elites skillfully define group needs in moderate ways and collaborate across group lines to prevent violence: this is consociationalism.17 War is likely only if hostile narratives, fears, and opportunity spur hostile attitudes, chauvinist mobilization, and a security dilemma.

#### Friend/Enemy distinctions are key to prevent the worst forms of biopolitical violence—genocide and total war are the outcome of a politics where former enemies become inhuman others

Thorup, lecturer and at the Institute of Philosophy and History of Ideas at the univ of Aarhus in Denmark, in ‘6

[Mikkel, In Defense of Enmity – Critiques of Liberal Globalism, Ph.D. Dissertation]

Another register in which the lines are blurred or rather non-existent is in the biopolitical enmity as theorized by Michel Foucault (2003; Kelly 2004) and Giorgio Agamben (1998). Here, we most clearly see the blurring of lines. In the biopolitical enmity, the enemy is named in biological and psychological terms and the enemy is found within the social body. The line between an inside, the friends, and an outside, the enemies, is no longer meaningful. The enemy lives among us and the biopolitical state takes it upon itself to single out those, who threaten the health of the community. This concept of enmity is also highly discriminatory. It establishes a hierarchy of worthy life and starts to talk about 'life unworthy of being lived' and its annihilation (Agamben 1998: 136), most dramatically and tragically executed in the Nazi concentration and euthanasia program but for both Foucault and Agamben a constitutive element in modernity. The goal of a biopolitical war is not to reach a modus vivendi with the enemy but to eliminate him. This is a total war: ... the enemies who have to be done away with are not adversaries in the political sense of the term; they are threats, either external or internal, to the population and for the population. In the biopower system, in other words, killing or the imperative to kill is acceptable only if it results not in a victory over political adversaries, but in the elimination of the biological threat to and the improvement of the species or race. (Foucault 2003: 256, my italics) What the biopolitical enmity makes clear is the normalization of the exceptional, as the biopolitical state declares war on parts of its own population, not only in form of extermination but also quarantining of the sick, surveillance, exclusions, imprisonments, institutionalization of the abnormal etc. The heroic battles are replaced by micro-technologies that maximize the mortality of some groups and minimize it for others. Instead of individual killings, we get what Ernst Fraenkel with a very precise expression called 'civil death' (1969: 95) or what Foucualt called 'statistical death'. The sovereign does not manifest himself in splendid displays of power, public executions, but in the actions of the secret police, disappearances and extermination camps (Foucault 2003: chap. 11). The biopolitical state emerges, where racism and statism meets. It is no longer: 'We have to defend ourselves against society', but 'We have to defend society against all the biological threats posed by the other, the subrace, the counterrace that we are, despite ourselves, bringing into existence' ... we see the appearance of a State racism: a racism that society will direct against itself, against its own elements and its own products. This is the internal racism of permanent purification (Foucault 2003: 61-2)

#### Presidential leadership key to human space exploration

Sebathier et al. 09 (a senior associate with the CSIS Technology and Public Policy Program. From 2004 to 2009, he was senior fellow and director for space initiatives at CSIS. He is also senior adviser to the SAFRAN group and consults internationally on aerospace and telecommunications. Mr. Sabathier has written more than 50 articles and reports and lectured at a variety of conferences and symposiums. He has also taught space transportation systems at the University Paul Sabatier in Toulouse. He received his degree from École Centrale de Nantes in France and performed research work at the Colorado School of Mines with a grant from Martin Marietta Astronautics. (Vincent G, November 9th, Center for Strategic and International Studies, “Commentary on the Augustine Committee Report on the Future of Human Space Exploration,” http://csis.org/files/publication/091109\_Sabathier\_AugustineCommittee\_0.pdf)

After many months of speculation, numerous meetings, articles, and suggestions, the Review of U.S. Human Space Flight Plans Committee (aka the Augustine Committee) has released its reports providing options to the administration for consideration in plotting the course of human exploration through the rest of the decade and beyond. The report is, within the bounds of the mission presented in its charter, generally sound and is in broad agreement with CSIS’s May 2009 report Mid- and Long-Term Prospects for Human Spaceflight. While there are a few overarching conclusions that deserve special attention, before exploring the key findings and integrated options presented in the Augustine Committee report, one thing is clear above all else: a successful or meaningful space program in the United States will require strong presidential leadership. The most ambitious, exciting, and enduring projects in the history of the U.S. space program were all born out of strong presidential leadership: Kennedy for the Apollo program, Reagan and Clinton for the International Space Station. President Obama has a clear opportunity to leave a profound legacy for generations yet to come. Moreover, the critical state of the human space exploration program means that a failure of presidential leadership in this critical period will, in all likelihood, spell the beginning of the end of U.S. leadership in space.¶ First, space exploration is inescapably a global effort. Other nations now can match, or in some cases, exceed the technological capabilities of the U.S. space program. If the U.S. president is willing to take a strong role in guiding NASA leadership in a global program of exploration (but without a domineering posture), building on shared benefit, mutual interdependence, and creation of a global architecture, exploration could become and remain a healthy, vibrant global enterprise. Well thought out engagement of international partners in a manner appropriate to today’s geopolitical realities could yield useful soft-power benefits while ensuring the health of a strong human spaceflight program. Experience throughout the history of the space program – from Kennedy and the Apollo program to Reagan and Clinton support of the International Space Station – demonstrates that healthy civil space programs absolutely require strong presidential leadership.¶ Second, commercial spaceflight capabilities continue to mature. In the very long term, a human space exploration program will not be viable if the commercial sector is neither able nor relied upon to provide more and more basic services. Without commercial engagement, exploration will continue to push the footprint of human presence further and further outward, continually expanding the scale of government obligations, rather than keeping civil space programs focused on the frontiers of exploration. Expenditure of limited NASA resources on recurrent, repetitive, well-understood operational tasks is and will continue to be an inefficient use of the agency’s core competencies and unique skills. Furthermore, failure to make effective use of existing commercial capabilities will not help sustain an industrial base in need of income to sustain vital RDT&E efforts.¶ Third, should NASA continue to address the exploration challenges of the next century using antiquated Cold War, 1960s- era organizational structures and approaches, it is likely that the fundamental problems that have plagued it over past decades will continue in the future. Unless strong measures are taken to change the way NASA does business, we should expect to see future gaps in space exploration capabilities, a weak sense of mission, and a growing difficulty in maintaining a lead in space exploration against those countries better adapted to the political, economic, and technological realities of the twenty-first century.

**Solves inevitable human extinction**

Objective Observer ‘3 [“The Case for Colonizing Mars”, July, <http://www.theobjectiveobserver.com/articles/space01.shtml>]

Homo sapiens, human beings, have to be one of the least intelligent species on the planet. I realize that this statement flies in the face of most scientific evidence given the large brain capacity of homo sapiens, the use of tools by homo sapiens and the fact that homo sapiens can engage in abstract thought. However, all of these traits make it that much more unlikely and fantastic that homo sapiens as a species continue to largely ignore the colonization of Mars. One simple fact screams out for human beings to colonize Mars with all due haste. That fact makes it crystal clear that the Earth has a deplorable track record when it comes to its ability to support life. Consider that 99.9% of all species that have ever existed on planet Earth are extinct. Now, when you look at that fact, please also consider that this does not mean that .1% of species have survived since the dawn of time. The .1% figure simply represents species that have yet to go extinct. In other words, we happen to have some species alive and thriving on the Earth today. Those species by and large evolved relatively recently. Thus, the .1% figure is not really a survival rate but rather a percentage of all species that have ever existed on the Earth that currently happen to be alive. Another way of viewing this is in terms of survival rate as a function of time instead of as a function of species. If we were to look at all species that have existed during the last 10 years, the survival rate would be close to or at 100%. In other words, of all the species that have existed on planet Earth for the last 10 years, no extinctions have occurred. If we were to look at species that have existed for the last 1,000 years that 100% figure would drop slightly due to extinctions such as the dodo and the passenger pigeon. Looking at the survival rate species that have existed for the last 10,000 years, that 100% figure would be even less and as we go further and further back in time, the survival rate would approach or become zero. Therefore, we can state as a certainty that the longer a species exists on the Earth, the more likely it becomes that that species will become extinct and this continues until that species’ extinction is a certainty. What causes these extinctions? Irrelevant. I am not here to debate the cause of animal extinctions. There are many theories regarding why extinctions occur. The most popular today being that asteroids and/or comets randomly strike the Earth every millennia or so and serve as a first strike that initiates extinction. Asteroids and comets are currently blamed for many of Earth’s mass extinctions throughout its history. However, regardless of whether extinctions occur by asteroid, by comet or by some other as yet unknown device, the fact that 99.9% of species that have ever existed on the Earth are extinct remains the same. Consider also that human beings are on the top of the food chain, quite similar to dinosaurs in their day. Why is this relevant? Well, for one simple fact. Land extinctions tend to kill off the large, dominate animals at the top of the food chain while some of the smaller animals near the bottom of the food chain survive. Oddly enough, mass extinctions seem to happen in reverse in the ocean, the smaller animals at the bottom of food chain become extinct and the ones at the top of food chain tend to survive. This may actually explain why intelligence evolved first on land instead of in the oceans, but that is the subject of a different essay. Of course, one might argue that there has never been a species of animal on the Earth that was so intelligent, so diverse and so well adapted to its environment as are homo sapiens. Thus, the argument is that if there is going to be a species that survives a mass extinction, homo sapiens have the best chance. However, this argument is rather full of logical errors in reasoning. First, in terms of diversity and adaptation, homo sapiens rather pale in comparison to other successful organisms such as all of the species of dinosaurs. Second, there is absolutely no evidence that intelligence has anything to do with surviving a mass extinction. Thus, we have a few simple scientific facts that human beings have been quite aware of for several decades that make it perfectly clear to any reasonable mind that human beings WILL become extinct if they remain solely on planet Earth. And yet, human beings by and large are doing very little to colonize Mars. And by very little, I do not mean to denigrate those individuals that have written on this subject or those at NASA and other agencies around the world that are working right now on all of the problems associated with colonizing Mars. However, what I am proposing is to make the colonization of Mars a priority of the United States and world governments second only to national defense. This last argument is sure to spark protests and outrage from many different sectors I am sure. I can hear the arguments now. “We have enough problems to solve here on Earth first before we start trying to colonize other planets.” “Why not put resources into deflecting or destroying asteroids and comets instead of colonizing Mars?” “We do not have the technology to colonize Mars.” “Why not colonize the oceans?” Why not colonize the Moon?” “We have no evidence that colonizing Mars will avoid human extinction.” I will address each of the arguments in turn. “We have enough problems to solve here on Earth first before we start trying to colonize other planets.” This statement is very true, human society is fraught with all kinds of problems. However, all other problems pale in comparison to the extinction of the species. The reason is simple. If homo sapiens as a species becomes extinct, all other problems are irrelevant. “Why not put resources into deflecting or destroying asteroids and comets instead of colonizing Mars?” This one is quite simple. First, one should know that we probably only know of about 5% of the asteroids and/or comets that pose a severe threat to the Earth. If one of those asteroids within that 5% was going to hit the Earth, we would have some warning; maybe enough to come up with and successfully execute a plan to deflect it. However, for the other 95%, we would have little or no warning. Second, we do not know for a certainty that asteroids or comets cause mass extinctions. We have some pretty good evidence that points to this, but nothing certain. Mass extinctions might be caused by viruses or some as yet unknown device. The only certainty in preserving the human species is to expand beyond the bounds of planet Earth. “We do not have the technology to colonize Mars”. Yes we do. We are 100 or perhaps a 1,000 times more prepared today to tackle the problem of Mars colonization than we were to tackle the problem of landing on the moon. Our society is perhaps the best prepared it has ever been throughout its entire history to tackle such an exploration and colonization. Quite simply, we have the technology today to begin terraforming and permanently colonizing Mars. In addition, it has already been proven that when nations make certain well-defined goals and objectives top priority, the problem is solved with surprising rapidity. This can be seen with the development of the atomic bomb as well as the Apollo program to land on the moon. “Why not colonize the oceans?” This argument stems from the fact that ocean extinctions tend to occur in reverse of land extinctions. That is, the big, dominant animals at the top of the food chain tend to survive ocean mass extinctions. First, human beings are not native to the oceans and therefore, the normal “rules” would not apply. Second, big, dominant animals do go extinct in the oceans. Third, 99.9% of all species that have ever inhabited the earth, on land and on water have gone extinct. Expanding to an ocean environment does not change that fact. “Why not colonize the Moon?” Indeed, this seems reasonable. It gets our species off of planet Earth and the Moon is a lot closer than Mars. However, the Moon lacks the ability to support a self-sustaining human colony. A Moon colony would be much too dependent on Earth for its very existence. This does not mean that we should not pursue a permanent Moon colony. Indeed, a permanent Moon colony may be a crucial step in colonizing Mars. However, a Moon colony cannot serve as a replacement for Mars colonization. “We have no evidence that colonizing Mars will avoid human extinction.” This is absolutely true. However, we know for a fact that it is a certainty that if we remain solely on planet Earth we will go extinct. We also know that creating a self-sustaining colony on another planet is the best and perhaps only way to avoid extinction. And Mars is the most likely candidate within our solar system for colonization.

#### Util’s key

Harries 94 (Owen, Editor @ The National Interest Power and Civilization, The National Interest, Spring, lexis)

Performance is the test. Asked directly by a Western interviewer, “In principle, do you believe in one standard of human rights and free expression?”, Lee immediately answers, “Look, it is not a matter of principle but of practice.” This might appear to represent a simple and rather crude pragmatism. But in its context it might also be interpreted as an appreciation of the fundamental point made by Max Weber that, in politics, it is “the ethic of responsibility” rather than “the ethic of absolute ends” that is appropriate. While an individual is free to treat human rights as absolute, to be observed whatever the cost, governments must always weigh consequences and the competing claims of other ends. So once they enter the realm of politics, human rights have to take their place in a hierarchy of interests, including such basic things as national security and the promotion of prosperity. Their place in that hierarchy will vary with circumstances, but no responsible government will ever be able to put them always at the top and treat them as inviolable and over-riding. The cost of implementing and promoting them will always have to be considered.]

#### That’s the most moral framework

Evans 5 (Rebecca, Torture: Does It Make Us Safer? Is It Ever OK? A Human Rights Perspective. The Ethics of Torture. 2005. The New Press.)

Other scholars forward a different kind of utilitarian argument, criticizing the moral perfectionism of absolutists who prefer to “let justice be done though the heavens fall” (Levinson 2004). From this perspective, “far greater moral guilt falls on a person in authority who permits the deaths of hundreds of innocents rather than choosing to ‘torture’ one guilty or complicit person” (Elshtain 2004: 87). In order to thwart threats to national security and save the lives of the many, the rights of the one or the few must be sacrificed. Torture of enemy soldiers or terrorists is therefore justified in order to extract vital information that could prevent future attacks and save innocent lives (Bowden 2003: 53-54; Posner 2004: 293-294). This line of justification often focuses on a philosophical discussion of extreme cases—ticking bomb scenarios—in which torturing one guilty or complicit person prevents the deaths of thousands if not millions of innocents. Such theoretical examples have been reflected in popular culture, including television shows such as 24 that suggest that torture is both necessary and effective in obtaining information urgently required to avert a looming catastrophe (Green 2005).

#### It’s key to optimal decision making

Weiss 99 (Thomas G, Prof Poli Sci – CUNY Grad Center “Principles, Politics, and Humanitarian Action,” Ethics and International Affairs 13.1)

Scholars and practitioners frequently employ the term “dilemma” to describe painful decision making but “quandary” would be more apt.27A dilemma involves two or more alternative courses of action with unintended but unavoidable and equally undesirable consequences. If consequences are equally unpalatable, then remaining inactive on the sidelines is an option rather than entering the serum on the field. A quandary, on the other hand, entails tough choices among unattractive options with better or worse possible outcomes. While humanitarians are perplexed, they are not and should not be immobilized. The solution is not indifference or withdrawal but rather appropriate engagement. The key lies in making a good faith effort to analyze the advantages and disadvantages of different alloys of politics and humanitarianism, and then to choose what often amounts to the lesser of evils.¶ Thoughtful humanitarianism is more appropriate than rigid ideological responses, for four reasons: goals of humanitarian action often conflict, good intentions can have catastrophic consequences; there are alternative ways to achieve ends; and even if none of the choices is ideal, victims still require decisions about outside help. What Myron Wiener has called “instrumental humanitarianism” would resemble just war doctrine because contextual analyses and not formulas are required. Rather than resorting to knee-jerk reactions to help, it is necessary to weigh options and make decisions about choices that are far from optimal.¶ Many humanitarian decisions in northern Iraq, Somalia, Bosnia, and Rwanda—and especially those involving economic or military sanctions— required selecting least-bad options. Thomas Nagle advises that “given the limitations on human action, it is naive to suppose that there is a solution to every moral problem. “29 Action-oriented institutions and staff are required in order to contextualized their work rather than apply preconceived notions of what is right or wrong. Nonetheless, classicists continue to insist on Pictet’s “indivisible whole” because humanitarian principles “are interlocking, overlapping and mutually supportive. . . . It is hard to accept the logic of one without also accepting the others. “30¶ The process of making decisions in war zones could be compared to that pursued by “clinical ethical review teams” whose members are on call to make painful decisions about life-and-death matters in hospitals.sl The sanctity of life is complicated by new technologies, but urgent decisions cannot be finessed. It is impermissible to long for another era or to pretend that the bases for decisions are unchanged. However emotionally wrenching, finding solutions is an operational imperative that is challenging but intellectually doable. Humanitarians who cannot stand the heat generated by situational ethics should stay out of the post-Cold War humanitarian kitchen.¶ Principles in an Unprincipled World¶ Why are humanitarians in such a state of moral and operational disrepair? In many ways Western liberal values over the last few centuries have been moving toward interpreting moral obligations as going beyond a family and intimate networks, beyond a tribe, and beyond a nation. The impalpable moral ideal is concern about the fate of other people, no matter how far away.szThe evaporation of distance with advances in technology and media coverage, along with a willingness to intervene in a variety of post–Cold War crises, however, has produced situations in which humanitarians are damned if they do and if they don’t. Engagement by outsiders does not necessarily make things better, and it may even create a “moral hazard by altering the payoffs to combatants in such a way as to encourage more intensive fighting.“33¶ This new terrain requires analysts and practitioners to admit ignorance and question orthodoxies. There is no comfortable theoretical framework or world vision to function as a compass to steer between integration and fragmentation, globalization and insularity. Michael Ignatieff observes, “The world is not becoming more chaotic or violent, although our failure to understand and act makes it seem so. “34Gwyn Prins has pointed to the “scary humility of admitting one’s ignorance” because “the new vogue for ‘complex emergencies’ is too often a means of concealing from oneself that one does not know what is going on. “3sTo make matters more frustrating, never before has there been such a bombardment of data and instant analysis; the challenge of distilling such jumbled and seemingly contradictory information adds to the frustration of trying to do something appropriate fast.¶ International discourse is not condemned to follow North American fashions and adapt sound bites and slogans. It is essential to struggle with and even embrace the ambiguities that permeate international responses to wars, but without the illusion of a one-size-fits-all solution. The trick is to grapple with complexities, to tease out the general without ignoring the particular, and still to be inspired enough to engage actively in trying to make a difference.¶ Because more and more staff of aid agencies, their governing boards, and their financial backers have come to value reflection, an earlier policy prescription by Larry Minear and me no longer appears bizarre: “Don’t just do something, stand there! “3sThis advice represented our conviction about the payoffs from thoughtful analyses and our growing distaste for the stereotypical, yet often accurate, image of a bevy of humanitarian actors flitting from one emergency to the next.¶

#### There’s no reason their stance can benefit the other—What’s good for the other must be determined by the way in which we choose to act for the other—Our Framing is key

Balkin 94 (J. M, Professor of Law at the University of Texas, March, Michigan Law Review, 92 Mich. L. Rev. 1131, p. 1137-1138)

Like Derrida, I am also concerned with deconstruction's possible relationship to justice. In this essay, I offer an extended critique of Derrida's views in order to make two basic points about the relationship between justice and deconstruction. First, Derrida offers deconstructive arguments that cut both ways: Although one can use deconstructive arguments to further what Derrida believes is just, one can also deconstruct in a different way to reach conclusions he would probably find very unjust. One can also question his careful choice of targets of deconstruction: One could just as easily have chosen different targets and, by deconstructing them, reach conclusions that he would find abhorrent. Thus, in each case, what makes Derrida's deconstructive argument an argument for justice is not its use of deconstruction, but the selection of the particular text or concept to deconstruct and the way in which the particular deconstructive argument is wielded. I shall argue that Derrida's encounter with justice really shows that deconstructive argument is a species of rhetoric, which can be used for different purposes depending upon the moral and political commitments of the deconstructor.

## 2NC

### Heg Good

Heg solves great power war and dampens all global violence

Brooks et al 13

Stephen G. Brooks is Associate Professor of Government at Dartmouth College, John Ikenberry is the Albert G. Milbank Professor of Politics and International Affairs at Princeton University in the Department of Politics and the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs. He is also a Global Eminence Scholar at Kyung Hee University, William C. Wohlforth is the Daniel Webster Professor in the Department of Government at Dartmouth College, International Security, Winter 2012/2013, "Don’t Come Home, America", MIT Press Journals

Assessing the Security Benefits of Deep Engagement Even if deep engagement’s costs are far less than retrenchment advocates claim, they are not worth bearing unless they yield greater benefits. We focus here on the strategy’s major security benefits; in the next section, we take up the wider payoffs of the United States’ security role for its interests in other realms, notably the global economy—an interaction relatively unexplored by international relations scholars. A core premise of deep engagement is that it prevents the emergence of a far more dangerous global security environment. For one thing, as noted above, the United States’ overseas presence gives it the leverage to restrain partners from taking provocative action. Perhaps more important, its core alliance commitments also deter states with aspirations to regional hegemony from contemplating expansion and make its partners more secure, reducing their incentive to adopt solutions to their security problems that threaten others and thus stoke security dilemmas. The contention that engaged U.S. power dampens the baleful effects of anarchy is consistent with influential variants of realist theory. Indeed, arguably the scariest portrayal of the war-prone world that would emerge absent the “American Pacifier” is provided in the works of John Mearsheimer, who forecasts dangerous multipolar regions replete with security competition, arms races, nuclear proliferation and associated preventive war temptations, regional rivalries, and even runs at regional hegemony and full-scale great power war.72 How do retrenchment advocates, the bulk of whom are realists, discount this benefit? Their arguments are complicated, but two capture most of the variation: (1) U.S. security guarantees are not necessary to prevent dangerous rivalries and conflict in Eurasia; or (2) prevention of rivalry and conflict in Eurasia is not a U.S. interest. Each response is connected to a different theory or set of theories, which makes sense given that the whole debate hinges on a complex future counterfactual (what would happen to Eurasia’s security setting if the United States truly disengaged?). Although a certain answer is impossible, each of these responses is nonetheless a weaker argument for retrenchment than advocates acknowledge. The first response flows from defensive realism as well as other international relations theories that discount the conflict-generating potential of anarchy under contemporary conditions.73 Defensive realists maintain that the high expected costs of territorial conquest, defense dominance, and an array of policies and practices that can be used credibly to signal benign intent, mean that Eurasia’s major states could manage regional multipolarity peacefully without the American pacifier. Retrenchment would be a bet on this scholarship, particularly in regions where the kinds of stabilizers that nonrealist theories point to—such as democratic governance or dense institutional linkages—are either absent or weakly present. There are three other major bodies of scholarship, however, that might give decisionmakers pause before making this bet. First is regional expertise. Needless to say, there is no consensus on the net security effects of U.S. withdrawal. Regarding each region, there are optimists and pessimists. Few experts expect a return of intense great power competition in a post-American Europe, but many doubt European governments will pay the political costs of increased EU defense cooperation and the budgetary costs of increasing military outlays.74 The result might be a Europe that is incapable of securing itself from various threats that could be destabilizing within the region and beyond (e.g., a regional conflict akin to the 1990s Balkan wars), lacks capacity for global security missions in which U.S. leaders might want European participation, and is vulnerable to the influence of outside rising powers. What about the other parts of Eurasia where the United States has a substantial military presence? Regarding the Middle East, the balance begins to swing toward pessimists concerned that states currently backed by Washington— notably Israel, Egypt, and Saudi Arabia—might take actions upon U.S. retrenchment that would intensify security dilemmas. And concerning East Asia, pessimism regarding the region’s prospects without the American pacifier is pronounced. Arguably the principal concern expressed by area experts is that Japan and South Korea are likely to obtain a nuclear capacity and increase their military commitments, which could stoke a destabilizing reaction from China. It is notable that during the Cold War, both South Korea and Taiwan moved to obtain a nuclear weapons capacity and were only constrained from doing so by a still-engaged United States.75 The second body of scholarship casting doubt on the bet on defensive realism’s sanguine portrayal is all of the research that undermines its conception of state preferences. Defensive realism’s optimism about what would happen if the United States retrenched is very much dependent on its particular—and highly restrictive—assumption about state preferences; once we relax this assumption, then much of its basis for optimism vanishes. Specifically, the prediction of post-American tranquility throughout Eurasia rests on the assumption that security is the only relevant state preference, with security defined narrowly in terms of protection from violent external attacks on the homeland. Under that assumption, the security problem is largely solved as soon as offense and defense are clearly distinguishable, and offense is extremely expensive relative to defense. Burgeoning research across the social and other sciences, however, undermines that core assumption: states have preferences not only for security but also for prestige, status, and other aims, and they engage in trade-offs among the various objectives.76 In addition, they define security not just in terms of territorial protection but in view of many and varied milieu goals. It follows that even states that are relatively secure may nevertheless engage in highly competitive behavior. Empirical studies show that this is indeed sometimes the case.77 In sum, a bet on a benign postretrenchment Eurasia is a bet that leaders of major countries will never allow these nonsecurity preferences to influence their strategic choices. To the degree that these bodies of scholarly knowledge have predictive leverage, U.S. retrenchment would result in a significant deterioration in the security environment in at least some of the world’s key regions. We have already mentioned the third, even more alarming body of scholarship. Offensive realism predicts that the withdrawal of the American pacifier will yield either a competitive regional multipolarity complete with associated insecurity, arms racing, crisis instability, nuclear proliferation, and the like, or bids for regional hegemony, which may be beyond the capacity of local great powers to contain (and which in any case would generate intensely competitive behavior, possibly including regional great power war). Hence it is unsurprising that retrenchment advocates are prone to focus on the second argument noted above: that avoiding wars and security dilemmas in the world’s core regions is not a U.S. national interest. Few doubt that the United States could survive the return of insecurity and conflict among Eurasian powers, but at what cost? Much of the work in this area has focused on the economic externalities of a renewed threat of insecurity and war, which we discuss below. Focusing on the pure security ramifications, there are two main reasons why decisionmakers may be rationally reluctant to run the retrenchment experiment. First, overall higher levels of conflict make the world a more dangerous place. Were Eurasia to return to higher levels of interstate military competition, one would see overall higher levels of military spending and innovation and a higher likelihood of competitive regional proxy wars and arming of client states—all of which would be concerning, in part because it would promote a faster diffusion of military power away from the United States. Greater regional insecurity could well feed proliferation cascades, as states such as Egypt, Japan, South Korea, Taiwan, and Saudi Arabia all might choose to create nuclear forces.78 It is unlikely that proliferation decisions by any of these actors would be the end of the game: they would likely generate pressure locally for more proliferation. Following Kenneth Waltz, many retrenchment advocates are proliferation optimists, assuming that nuclear deterrence solves the security problem.79 Usually carried out in dyadic terms, the debate over the stability of proliferation changes as the numbers go up. Proliferation optimism rests on assumptions of rationality and narrow security preferences. In social science, however, such assumptions are inevitably probabilistic. Optimists assume that most states are led by rational leaders, most will overcome organizational problems and resist the temptation to preempt before feared neighbors nuclearize, and most pursue only security and are risk averse. Confidence in such probabilistic assumptions declines if the world were to move from nine to twenty, thirty, or forty nuclear states. In addition, many of the other dangers noted by analysts who are concerned about the destabilizing effects of nuclear proliferation—including the risk of accidents and the prospects that some new nuclear powers will not have truly survivable forces—seem prone to go up as the number of nuclear powers grows.80 Moreover, the risk of “unforeseen crisis dynamics” that could spin out of control is also higher as the number of nuclear powers increases. Finally, add to these concerns the enhanced danger of nuclear leakage, and a world with overall higher levels of security competition becomes yet more worrisome. The argument that maintaining Eurasian peace is not a U.S. interest faces a second problem. On widely accepted realist assumptions, acknowledging that U.S. engagement preserves peace dramatically narrows the difference between retrenchment and deep engagement. For many supporters of retrenchment, the optimal strategy for a power such as the United States, which has attained regional hegemony and is separated from other great powers by oceans, is offshore balancing: stay over the horizon and “pass the buck” to local powers to do the dangerous work of counterbalancing any local rising power. The United States should commit to onshore balancing only when local balancing is likely to fail and a great power appears to be a credible contender for regional hegemony, as in the cases of Germany, Japan, and the Soviet Union in the midtwentieth century. The problem is that China’s rise puts the possibility of its attaining regional hegemony on the table, at least in the medium to long term. As Mearsheimer notes, “The United States will have to play a key role in countering China, because its Asian neighbors are not strong enough to do it by themselves.”81 Therefore, unless China’s rise stalls, “the United States is likely to act toward China similar to the way it behaved toward the Soviet Union during the Cold War.”82 It follows that the United States should take no action that would compromise its capacity to move to onshore balancing in the future. It will need to maintain key alliance relationships in Asia as well as the formidably expensive military capacity to intervene there. The implication is to get out of Iraq and Afghanistan, reduce the presence in Europe, and pivot to Asia— just what the United States is doing.83 In sum, the argument that U.S. security commitments are unnecessary for peace is countered by a lot of scholarship, including highly influential realist scholarship. In addition, the argument that Eurasian peace is unnecessary for U.S. security is weakened by the potential for a large number of nasty security consequences as well as the need to retain a latent onshore balancing capacity that dramatically reduces the savings retrenchment might bring. Moreover, switching between offshore and onshore balancing could well be difficult. Bringing together the thrust of many of the arguments discussed so far underlines the degree to which the case for retrenchment misses the underlying logic of the deep engagement strategy. By supplying reassurance, deterrence, and active management, the United States lowers security competition in the world’s key regions, thereby preventing the emergence of a hothouse atmosphere for growing new military capabilities. Alliance ties dissuade partners from ramping up and also provide leverage to prevent military transfers to potential rivals. On top of all this, the United States’ formidable military machine may deter entry by potential rivals. Current great power military expenditures as a percentage of GDP are at historical lows, and thus far other major powers have shied away from seeking to match top-end U.S. military capabilities. In addition, they have so far been careful to avoid attracting the “focused enmity” of the United States.84 All of the world’s most modern militaries are U.S. allies (America’s alliance system of more than sixty countries now accounts for some 80 percent of global military spending), and the gap between the U.S. military capability and that of potential rivals is by many measures growing rather than shrinking.85 In the end, therefore, deep engagement reduces security competition and does so in a way that slows the diffusion of power away from the United States. This in turn makes it easier to sustain the policy over the long term.

**Loss of hegemony causes global instability**

**Kagan 12**, Senior Fellow at Brookings (Robert, 3/14/12 “America has made the world freer, safer and wealthier” CNN,<http://us.cnn.com/2012/03/14/opinion/kagan-world-america-made/index.html?hpt=hp_c1>)

We take a lot for granted about the way the world looks today -- the widespread freedom, the unprecedented global prosperity (even despite the current economic crisis), and the absence of war among great powers. In 1941 there were only a dozen democracies in the world. Today there are more than 100. For four centuries prior to 1950, global GDP rose by less than 1 percent a year. Since 1950 it has risen by an average of 4 percent a year, and billions of people have been lifted out of poverty. The first half of the 20th century saw the two most destructive wars in the history of mankind, and in prior centuries war among great powers was almost constant. But for the past 60 years no great powers have gone to war. This is the world America made when it assumed global leadership after World War II. Would this world order survive if America declined as a great power? Some American intellectuals insist that a "Post-American" world need not look very different from the American world and that all we need to do is "manage" American decline. But that is wishful thinking. If the balance of power shifts in the direction of other powers, the world order will inevitably change to suit their interests and preferences. Take the issue of democracy. For several decades, the balance of power in the world has favored democratic governments. In a genuinely post-American world, the balance would shift toward the great power autocracies. Both China and Russia already protect dictators like Syria's Bashar al-Assad. If they gain greater relative influence in the future, we will see fewer democratic transitions and more autocrats hanging on to power. What about the free market, free trade economic order? People assume China and other rising powers that have benefited so much from the present system would have a stake in preserving it. They wouldn't kill the goose that lays the golden eggs. But China's form of capitalism is heavily dominated by the state, with the ultimate goal being preservation of the ruling party. Although the Chinese have been beneficiaries of an open international economic order, they could end up undermining it simply because, as an autocratic society, their priority is to preserve the state's control of wealth and the power it brings. They might kill the goose because they can't figure out how to keep both it and themselves alive. Finally, what about the long peace that has held among the great powers for the better part of six decades? Many people imagine that American predominance will be replaced by some kind of multipolar harmony. But multipolar systems have historically been neither stable nor peaceful. War among the great powers was a common, if not constant, occurrence in the long periods of multipolarity in the 16th, 17th, and 18th centuries. The 19th century was notable for two stretches of great-power peace of roughly four decades each, punctuated, however, by major wars among great powers and culminating in World War I, the most destructive and deadly war mankind had known up to that point. The era of American predominance has shown that there is no better recipe for great-power peace than certainty about who holds the upper hand. Many people view the present international order as the inevitable result of human progress, a combination of advancing science and technology, an increasingly global economy, strengthening international institutions, evolving "norms" of international behavior, and the gradual but inevitable triumph of liberal democracy over other forms of government -- forces of change that transcend the actions of men and nations. But there was nothing inevitable about the world that was created after World War II. International order is not an evolution; it is an imposition. It is the domination of one vision over others -- in America's case, the domination of liberal free market principles of economics, democratic principles of politics, and a peaceful international system that supports these, over other visions that other nations and peoples may have. The present order will last only as long as those who favor it and benefit from it retain the will and capacity to defend it. If and when American power declines, the institutions and norms American power has supported will decline, too. Or they may collapse altogether as we transition into another kind of world order, or into disorder. We may discover then that the United States was essential to keeping the present world order together and that the alternative to American power was not peace and harmony but chaos and catastrophe -- which was what the world looked like right before the American order came into being.

**Primacy has resulted in the lowest level of war in history – best statistics prove**

**Owen 11** [John Owen, Associate professor in the University of Virginia's Department of Politics, recipient of fellowships from the Olin Institute for Strategic Studies at Harvard, and the Center for International Security and Cooperation at Stanford, and the Center of International Studies at Princeton, PhD in international relations from Harvard, February 11, 2011, “Don’t Discount Hegemony, [www.cato-unbound.org/2011/02/11/john-owen/dont-discount-hegemony/](http://www.cato-unbound.org/2011/02/11/john-owen/dont-discount-hegemony/)]

Andrew Mack and his colleagues at the Human Security Report Project are to be congratulated. Not only do they present a study with a striking conclusion, driven by data, free of theoretical or ideological bias, but they also do something quite unfashionable: they bear good news. Social scientists really are not supposed to do that. Our job is, if not to be Malthusians, then at least to point out disturbing trends, looming catastrophes, and the imbecility and mendacity of policy makers. And then it is to say why, if people listen to us, things will get better. We do this as if our careers depended upon it, and perhaps they do; for if all is going to be well, what need then for us? Our colleagues at Simon Fraser University are brave indeed. That may sound like a setup, but it is not. I shall challenge neither the data nor the general conclusion that violent conflict around the world has been decreasing in fits and starts since the Second World War. When it comes to violent conflict among and within countries, things have been getting better. (The trends have not been linear—Figure 1.1 actually shows that the frequency of interstate wars peaked in the 1980s—but the 65-year movement is clear.) Instead I shall accept that Mack et al. are correct on the macro-trends, and focus on their explanations they advance for these remarkable trends. With apologies to any readers of this forum who recoil from academic debates, this might get mildly theoretical and even more mildly methodological. Concerning international wars, one version of the “nuclear-peace” theory is not in fact laid to rest by the data. It is certainly true that nuclear-armed states have been involved in many wars. They have even been attacked (think of Israel), which falsifies the simple claim of “assured destruction”—that any nuclear country A will deter any kind of attack by any country B because B fears a retaliatory nuclear strike from A. But the most important “nuclear-peace” claim has been about mutually assured destruction, which obtains between two robustly nuclear-armed states. The claim is that (1) rational states having second-strike capabilities—enough deliverable nuclear weaponry to survive a nuclear first strike by an enemy—will have an overwhelming incentive not to attack one another; and (2) we can safely assume that nuclear-armed states are rational. It follows that states with a second-strike capability will not fight one another. Their colossal atomic arsenals neither kept the United States at peace with North Vietnam during the Cold War nor the Soviet Union at peace with Afghanistan. But the argument remains strong that those arsenals did help keep the United States and Soviet Union at peace with each other. Why non-nuclear states are not deterred from fighting nuclear states is an important and open question. But in a time when calls to ban the Bomb are being heard from more and more quarters, we must be clear about precisely what the broad trends toward peace can and cannot tell us. They may tell us nothing about why we have had no World War III, and little about the wisdom of banning the Bomb now. Regarding the downward trend in international war, Professor Mack is friendlier to more palatable theories such as the “democratic peace” (democracies do not fight one another, and the proportion of democracies has increased, hence less war);the interdependence or “commercial peace” (states with extensive economic ties find it irrational to fight one another, and interdependence has increased, hence less war); and the notion that people around the world are more anti-war than their forebears were. Concerning the downward trend in civil wars, he favors theories of economic growth (where commerce is enriching enough people, violence is less appealing—a logic similar to that of the “commercial peace” thesis that applies among nations) and the end of the Cold War (which end reduced superpower support for rival rebel factions in so many Third-World countries). These are all plausible mechanisms for peace. What is more, none of them excludes any other; all could be working toward the same end. That would be somewhat puzzling, however. Is the world just lucky these days? How is it that an array of peace-inducing factors happens to be working coincidentally in our time, when such a magical array was absent in the past? The answer may be that one or more of these mechanisms reinforces some of the others, or perhaps some of them are mutually reinforcing. Some scholars, for example, have been focusing on whether economic growth might support democracy and vice versa, and whether both might support international cooperation, including to end civil wars. We would still need to explain how this charmed circle of causes got started, however. And here let me raise another factor, perhaps even less appealing than the “nuclear peace” thesis, at least outside of the United States. That factor is what international relations scholars call hegemony—specifically American hegemony. A theory that many regard as discredited, but that refuses to go away, is called hegemonic stability theory. The theory emerged in the 1970s in the realm of international political economy. It asserts that for the global economy to remain open—for countries to keep barriers to trade and investment low—one powerful country must take the lead. Depending on the theorist we consult, “taking the lead” entails paying for global public goods (keeping the sea lanes open, providing liquidity to the international economy), coercion (threatening to raise trade barriers or withdraw military protection from countries that cheat on the rules), or both. The theory is skeptical that international cooperation in economic matters can emerge or endure absent a hegemon. The distastefulness of such claims is self-evident: they imply that it is good for everyone the world over if one country has more wealth and power than others. More precisely, they imply that it has been good for the world that the United States has been so predominant. There is no obvious reason why hegemonic stability theory could not apply to other areas of international cooperation, including in security affairs, human rights, international law, peacekeeping (UN or otherwise), and so on. What I want to suggest here—suggest, not test—is that American hegemony might just be a deep cause of the steady decline of political deaths in the world. How could that be? After all, the report states that United States is the third most war-prone country since 1945. Many of the deaths depicted in Figure 10.4 were in wars that involved the United States (the Vietnam War being the leading one). Notwithstanding politicians’ claims to the contrary, a candid look at U.S. foreign policy reveals that the country is as ruthlessly self-interested as any other great power in history. The answer is that U.S. hegemony might just be a deeper cause of the proximate causes outlined by Professor Mack. Consider economic growth and openness to foreign trade and investment, which (so say some theories) render violence irrational. American power and policies may be responsible for these in two related ways. First, at least since the 1940s Washington has prodded other countries to embrace the market capitalism that entails economic openness and produces sustainable economic growth. The United States promotes capitalism for selfish reasons, of course: its own domestic system depends upon growth, which in turn depends upon the efficiency gains from economic interaction with foreign countries, and the more the better. During the Cold War most of its allies accepted some degree of market-driven growth. Second, the U.S.-led western victory in the Cold War damaged the credibility of alternative paths to development—communism and import-substituting industrialization being the two leading ones—and left market capitalism the best model. The end of the Cold War also involved an end to the billions of rubles in Soviet material support for regimes that tried to make these alternative models work. (It also, as Professor Mack notes, eliminated the superpowers’ incentives to feed civil violence in the Third World.) What we call globalization is caused in part by the emergence of the United States as the global hegemon.

**Social science proves heg is good**

**Wohlforth 09**

professor of government at Dartmouth (William, “Unipolarity, Status Competition, and Great Power War,” World Affairs, January, project muse)

The upshot is a near scholarly consensus that unpolarity’s consequences for great power conflict are indeterminate and that a power shift resulting in a return to bipolarity or multipolarity will not raise the specter of great power war. This article questions the consensus on two counts. First, I show that it depends crucially on a dubious assumption about human motivation. Prominent theories of war are based on the assumption that people are mainly motivated by the instrumental pursuit of tangible ends such as physical security and material prosperity. This is why such theories seem irrelevant to interactions among great powers in an international environment that diminishes the utility of war for the pursuit of such ends. Yet we know that people are motivated by a great many noninstrumental motives, not least by concerns regarding their social status. 3 As John Harsanyi noted, “Apart from economic payoffs, social status (social rank) seems to be the most important incentive and motivating force of social behavior.”4 This proposition rests on much firmer scientific ground now than when Harsanyi expressed it a generation ago, as cumulating research shows that humans appear to be hardwired for sensitivity to status and that relative standing is a powerful and independent motivator of behavior.5 [End Page 29] Second, I question the dominant view that status quo evaluations are relatively independent of the distribution of capabilities. If the status of states depends in some measure on their relative capabilities, and if states derive utility from status, then different distributions of capabilities may affect levels of satisfaction, just as different income distributions may affect levels of status competition in domestic settings. 6 Building on research in psychology and sociology, I argue that even capabilities distributions among major powers foster ambiguous status hierarchies, which generate more dissatisfaction and clashes over the status quo. And the more stratified the distribution of capabilities, the less likely such status competition is. Unipolarity thus generates far fewer incentives than either bipolarity or multipolarity for direct great power positional competition over status. Elites in the other major powers continue to prefer higher status, but in a unipolar system they face comparatively weak incentives to translate that preference into costly action. And the absence of such incentives matters because social status is a positional good—something whose value depends on how much one has in relation to others.7 “If everyone has high status,” Randall Schweller notes, “no one does.”8 While one actor might increase its status, all cannot simultaneously do so. High status is thus inherently scarce, and competitions for status tend to be zero sum.9

**Collapse of hegemony causes transition wars**

**Brzezinski 12** - Former US National Security Advisor, (Zbigniew, January/February, “After America” Foreign Policy, http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/01/03/after\_america)

Not so long ago, a high-ranking Chinese official, who obviously had concluded that America's decline and China's rise were both inevitable, noted in a burst of candor to a senior U.S. official: "But, please, let America not decline too quickly." Although the inevitability of the Chinese leader's expectation is still far from certain, he was right to be cautious when looking forward to America's demise.¶ For if America falters, the world is unlikely to be dominated by a single preeminent successor -- not even China. International uncertainty, increased tension among global competitors, and even outright chaos would be far more likely outcomes.¶ While a sudden, massive crisis of the American system -- for instance, another financial crisis -- would produce a fast-moving chain reaction leading to global political and economic disorder, a steady drift by America into increasingly pervasive decay or endlessly widening warfare with Islam would be unlikely to produce, even by 2025, an effective global successor. No single power will be ready by then to exercise the role that the world, upon the fall of the Soviet Union in 1991, expected the United States to play: the leader of a new, globally cooperative world order. More probable would be a protracted phase of rather inconclusive realignments of both global and regional power, with no grand winners and many more losers, in a setting of international uncertainty and even of potentially fatal risks to global well-being. Rather than a world where dreams of democracy flourish, a Hobbesian world of enhanced national security based on varying fusions of authoritarianism, nationalism, and religion could ensue.¶ The leaders of the world's second-rank powers, among them India, Japan, Russia, and some European countries, are already assessing the potential impact of U.S. decline on their respective national interests. The Japanese, fearful of an assertive China dominating the Asian mainland, may be thinking of closer links with Europe. Leaders in India and Japan may be considering closer political and even military cooperation in case America falters and China rises. Russia, while perhaps engaging in wishful thinking (even schadenfreude) about America's uncertain prospects, will almost certainly have its eye on the independent states of the former Soviet Union. Europe, not yet cohesive, would likely be pulled in several directions: Germany and Italy toward Russia because of commercial interests, France and insecure Central Europe in favor of a politically tighter European Union, and Britain toward manipulating a balance within the EU while preserving its special relationship with a declining United States. Others may move more rapidly to carve out their own regional spheres: Turkey in the area of the old Ottoman Empire, Brazil in the Southern Hemisphere, and so forth. None of these countries, however, will have the requisite combination of economic, financial, technological, and military power even to consider inheriting America's leading role.¶

**History proves hegemony solves war**

**Drezner 05** [Daniel, Gregg Easterbrook, Associate Professor of International Politics at the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy at Tufts University, “War, and the dangers of extrapolation,” may 25]

Daily explosions in Iraq, massacres in Sudan, the Koreas smakestaring at each other through artillery barrels, a Hobbesian war of all against all in eastern Congo--combat plagues human society as it has, perhaps, since our distant forebears realized that a tree limb could be used as a club. But here is something you would never guess from watching the news: War has entered a cycle of decline. Combat in Iraq and in a few other places is an exception to a significant global trend that has gone nearly unnoticed--namely that, for about 15 years, there have been steadily fewer armed conflicts worldwide. In fact, it is possible that a person's chance of dying because of war has, in the last decade or more, become the lowest in human history. Is Easterbrook right? He has a few more paragraphs on the numbers: The University of Maryland studies find the number of wars and armed conflicts worldwide peaked in 1991 at 51, which may represent the most wars happening simultaneously at any point in history. Since 1991, the number has fallen steadily. There were 26 armed conflicts in 2000 and 25 in 2002, even after the Al Qaeda attack on the United States and the U.S. counterattack against Afghanistan. By 2004, Marshall and Gurr's latest study shows, the number of armed conflicts in the world had declined to 20, even after the invasion of Iraq. All told, there were less than half as many wars in 2004 as there were in 1991. Marshall and Gurr also have a second ranking, gauging the magnitude of fighting. This section of the report is more subjective. Everyone agrees that the worst moment for human conflict was World War II; but how to rank, say, the current separatist fighting in Indonesia versus, say, the Algerian war of independence is more speculative. Nevertheless, the Peace and Conflict studies name 1991 as the peak post-World War II year for totality of global fighting, giving that year a ranking of 179 on a scale that rates the extent and destructiveness of combat. By 2000, in spite of war in the Balkans and genocide in Rwanda, the number had fallen to 97; by 2002 to 81; and, at the end of 2004, it stood at 65. This suggests the extent andintensity of global combat is now less than half what it was 15 years ago. Easterbrook spends the rest of the essay postulating the causes of this -- the decline in great power war, the spread of democracies, the growth of economic interdependence, and even the peacekeeping capabilities of the United Nations. Easterbrook makes a lot of good points -- most people are genuinely shocked when they are told that even in a post-9/11 climate, there has been a steady and persistent decline in wars and deaths from wars. That said, what bothers me in the piece is what Easterbrook leaves out. First, he neglects to mention the biggest reason for why war is on the decline -- there's a global hegemon called the United States right now. Easterbrook acknowledges that "the most powerful factor must be the end of the cold war" but he doesn't understand why it's the most powerful factor. Elsewhere in the piece he talks about the growing comity among the great powers, without discussing the elephant in the room: the reason the "great powers" get along is that the United States is much, much more powerful than anyone else. If you quantify power only by relative military capabilities, the U.S. is a great power, there are maybe ten or so middle powers, and then there are a lot of mosquitoes.[If the U.S. is so powerful, why can't it subdue the Iraqi insurgency?--ed. Power is a relative measure -- the U.S. might be having difficulties, but no other country in the world would have fewer problems.] Joshua Goldstein, who knows a thing or two about this phenomenon, made this clear in a Christian Science Monitor op-ed three years ago: We probably owe this lull to the end of the cold war, and to a unipolar world order with a single superpower to impose its will in places like Kuwait, Serbia, and Afghanistan. The emerging world order is not exactly benign – Sept. 11 comes to mind – and Pax Americana delivers neither justice nor harmony to the corners of the earth. But a unipolar world is inherently more peaceful than the bipolar one where two superpowers fueled rival armies around the world. The long-delayed "peace dividend" has arrived, like a tax refund check long lost in the mail. The difference in language between Goldstein and Easterbrook highlights my second problem with "The End of War?" Goldstein rightly refers to the past fifteen years as a "lull" -- a temporary reduction in war and war-related death. The flip side of U.S. hegemony being responsible for the reduction of armed conflict is what would happen if U.S. hegemony were to ever fade away. Easterbrook focuses on the trends that suggest an ever-decreasing amount of armed conflict -- and I hope he's right. But I'm enough of a realist to know that if the U.S. should find its primacy challenged by, say, a really populous non-democratic country on the other side of the Pacific Ocean, all best about the utility of economic interdependence, U.N. peacekeeping, and the spread of democracy are right out the window. UPDATE: To respond to a few thoughts posted by the commenters: 1) To spell things out a bit more clearly -- U.S. hegemony important to the reduction of conflict in two ways. First, U.S. power can act as a powerful if imperfect constraint on pairs of enduring rivals (Greece-Turkey, India-Pakistan) that contemplate war on a regular basis. It can't stop every conflict, but it can blunt a lot of them. Second, and more important to Easterbrook's thesis, U.S. supremacy in conventional military affairs prevents other middle-range states -- China, Russia, India, Great Britain, France, etc. -- from challenging the U.S. or each other in a war. It would be suicide for anyone to fight a war with the U.S., and if any of these countries waged a war with each other, the prospect of U.S. intervention would be equally daunting. 2) Many commenters think what's important is the number of casualties, not the number of wars. This is tricky, however, because of the changing nature of warfighting and medical science. Compared to, say, World War II, wars now have far less of an effect on civilian populations. Furthermore, more people survive combat injuries because of improvements in medicine. These are both salutory trends, but I dunno if that means that war as a tool of statecraft is over -- if anything, it makes the use of force potentially more attractive, because of the minimization of spillover effects.

**History proves hegemony is better for global peace**

**Gobry 11** [Pascal—Emmanuel Gobry, *Paris based entrepreneur with a degree in political science,* August 23, 2011, “Hey Ron Paul Fans: hope you know that if America stopped being the world’s leader, America’s economy would collapse”, <http://www.businessinsider.com/america-world-police-2011-8>]

Well, maybe no one country can replace the United States, but maybe everyone could chip in: Europe and the U.S. would ensure the security of the Atlantic, India of South Asia, China that of East Asia (which will certainly go down well in Taiwan and Japan) and so forth. Except that history teaches us that these "multipolar" zones of influences lead to one thing: war. In the 17th century, Britain, France and Spain fought endlessly for naval superiority. Only when Britain became most powerful did peace arrive and global trade begin in earnest. Same thing with the Punic Wars between Rome and Carthage. And so on. But let's imagine an ideal libertarian scenario. Let's imagine that instead of a specific country, or even set of countries, global security is provided by private actors through some combination of mercenaries and insurance. By definition this would still raise the cost of global trade dramatically. Those mercenaries and insurance providers would still have to be paid, and those costs would still be reflected in the price of shipping. So it would still amount to a huge global tariff. All but the most hardcore libertarians realize that government has a role in providing for the public good, things that benefit everyone but that it doesn't make sense for any individual actor to pay for. Like it or not, global American military hegemony is a public good. The fact that the U.S. military is so much more powerful than anyone else (indeed, everyone else combined) means that global trade is safer, and thereby cheaper, than it's ever been before, which benefits the global economy and the U.S. directly and tremendously.

**Primacy fills in for powerless institutions—key to solve genocide and mass violence globally**

**Lieber 05** – PhD from Harvard, Professor of Government and International Affairs at Georgetown, former consultant to the State Department and for National Intelligence Estimates (Robert, “The American Era”, pages 51-52, WEA)

The United States possesses the military and economic means to act assertively on a global basis, but should it do so, and if so, how? In short, if the United States conducts itself in this way, will the world be safer and more stable, and is such a role in America’s national interest? Here, the anarchy problem is especially pertinent. The capacity of the United Nations to act, especially in coping with the most urgent and deadly problems, is severely limited, and in this sense, the demand for “global governance” far exceeds the supply. Since its inception in 1945, there have only been two occasions (Korea in 1950 and Kuwait in 1991) when the U.N. Security Council authorized the use of force, and in both instances the bulk of the forces were provided by the United States. In the most serious cases, especially those involving international terrorism, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, ethnic cleansing, civil war, and mass murder, if America does not take the lead, no other country or organization is willing or able to respond effectively. The deadly cases of Bosnia (1991–95) and Rwanda (1994) make this clear. In their own way, so did the demonstrations by the people of Liberia calling for American intervention to save them from the ravages of predatory militias in a failed state. And the **weakness of the international reaction to ethnic cleansing, rape, and widespread killing** in the Darfur region of Western Sudan provides a more recent example.

### AT Epistimology of Hegemonic Calculation

#### Definitionally, their form of politics alters truth claims

Collins Dictionary, No Date [http://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english/opaque-context]

(philosophy, logic) an expression in which the replacement of a term by another with the same reference may change the truth-value of the whole. John believes that Cicero was a Roman is opaque, since even though Cicero and Tully are the same person John may know that the given statement is true but not that Tully was a Roman Compare [transparent context](http://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english/transparent-context#transparent-context_1) See also [intensional](http://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english/intensional#intensional_1), [Electra paradox](http://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english/electra-paradox#electra-paradox_1)

The criticism of the limit of rationalism, universalism and objecitvity encourages epistemological pluralism – this is seized on by conservatives to justify and project their radical ideologies**.**

Sherry 96 – Professor of Civil Rights and Civil Liberties Law and the University of Minnesota (Suzanna, Georgetown Law Journal, “The Sleep of Reason,” February 1996, 84 Geo. L.J. 453

We all know the Enlightenment story, but this article recounts -- and criticizes -- the rather surprising ending that is currently in vogue. Once upon a time, reason replaced faith as the guiding epistemology. In response, religion became largely rational itself, questioning the sharp distinction between faith and reason. [n6](http://www.lexisnexis.com.ezproxy.lib.ou.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1285602121837&returnToKey=20_T10208434889&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.466563.51045007084" \l "n6) Despite occasional upsurges, religiosity of the traditional, pre-Enlightenment, antirational kind gradually diminished in the Western world. Originally pure and acontextual, reason eventually came to encompass pragmatism or practical reason. [n7](http://www.lexisnexis.com.ezproxy.lib.ou.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1285602121837&returnToKey=20_T10208434889&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.466563.51045007084" \l "n7) For good or ill, the reason and empiricism of the Enlightenment -- modified and expanded by later thinkers -- reigned supreme. Occasional critics were discounted as primitive, naive, or uneducated, and rarely gained a foothold in universities. [n8](http://www.lexisnexis.com.ezproxy.lib.ou.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1285602121837&returnToKey=20_T10208434889&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.466563.51045007084" \l "n8)The first ripple in this once uncontroversial ending came from French postmodernists, whose ideas were quickly adopted in the 1980s by legal academics on the left. Critical legal scholars, radical feminists, critical race theorists, and gay and lesbian theorists [n9](http://www.lexisnexis.com.ezproxy.lib.ou.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1285602121837&returnToKey=20_T10208434889&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.466563.51045007084" \l "n9) began to attribute the Enlightenment epistemology to powerful straight white men, to suggest that others might have different and equally valid epistemologies, and to argue for a sort of epistemological pluralism. This approach has more recently been adopted by conservative scholars arguing that we ought to afford religion a more central place in our politics and culture. Enlightenment reason, they suggest, is just one of a number of alternative epistemologies, and there is no justification for privileging it over religious ways of knowing such as faith and revelation.Nor is this all merely abstract philosophical speculation: both the radicals and  [\*455]  the religionists use their critique of the Enlightenment to advocate very real legal change. Questions of epistemology are thus made central to issues of public policy, and the question becomes what sort of epistemology we should use in governance. After first describing the surprising congruence between the left and the right, I will suggest in this article that our history, the basic structure of our government, and serious practical considerations all point to Enlightenment epistemology as the one best suited for public governance.

Enlightenment reason is necessary to prevent a new wave of domestic conflicts. Epistemological pluralism leads to power as the only legitimate means for resolving disputes. The affirmative cedes the political sphere to those in power.

Sherry 96 – Professor of Civil Rights and Civil Liberties Law and the University of Minnesota (Suzanna, Georgetown Law Journal, “The Sleep of Reason,” February 1996, 84 Geo. L.J. 453

Some, however, have suggested that the historical era of the Enlightenment was unique, and that epistemological pluralism would, in the modern world, create little danger of internecine warfare. [n139](http://www.lexisnexis.com.ezproxy.lib.ou.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1285602121837&returnToKey=20_T10208434889&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.466563.51045007084" \l "n139) This optimism overlooks one of the fundamental differences between rational and antirational epistemologies:  [\*479]  because the latter rest on faith rather than reason, they are likely to be impervious to persuasion and resistant to compromise. [n140](http://www.lexisnexis.com.ezproxy.lib.ou.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1285602121837&returnToKey=20_T10208434889&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.466563.51045007084" \l "n140) Moreover, without the skeptical cast of mind fostered by Enlightenment epistemology, antirational epistemologies -- especially religion, with its extrahuman source of authority -- are likely to be conducive to particularly deep conviction. Deep conviction, in turn, is a breeding ground for exactly the religious wars of previous centuries:In Abrams v. United States, Justice Holmes argued that a logical result of deep conviction is intolerance. As Dean Bollinger has added, failing to attempt to silence what one believes to be false might be seen as a sign of weak conviction. . . . To the zealous adherent, intolerance and persecution become, in a sense, the measure of her commitment to her religious beliefs. [n141](http://www.lexisnexis.com.ezproxy.lib.ou.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1285602121837&returnToKey=20_T10208434889&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.466563.51045007084" \l "n141)Even in the United States, where religion has largely been domesticated (as Michael Perry puts it), [n142](http://www.lexisnexis.com.ezproxy.lib.ou.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1285602121837&returnToKey=20_T10208434889&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.466563.51045007084" \l "n142) we have not been spared all of the violence associated with pre-Enlightenment religious wars. Although, as Perry points out, "we are not the former Yugoslavia or India," [n143](http://www.lexisnexis.com.ezproxy.lib.ou.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1285602121837&returnToKey=20_T10208434889&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.466563.51045007084" \l "n143) the Branch Davidians, the World Trade Center bombers, the abortion clinic killings, and the growth of various organizations -- on the left and the right, not all of them religious -- that use irrational arguments to reject and resist the authority of government, by violence if necessary, should give us pause before abandoning the fruits of the Enlightenment. [n144](http://www.lexisnexis.com.ezproxy.lib.ou.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1285602121837&returnToKey=20_T10208434889&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.466563.51045007084" \l "n144) Indeed, as one historian has pointed out: If we have now entered an era in which those on the right have been joined by some on the left in assailing reason as faulty because it does not correspond to the essential and incontestable truths they have come to know emotionally, or by virtue of their membership in particular groups, the prospects for deliberative democracy are bleak indeed. . . . If truth resides in difference and emotion, then war rather than persuasion is the only possible consequence of speaking such a truth to power. [n145](http://www.lexisnexis.com.ezproxy.lib.ou.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1285602121837&returnToKey=20_T10208434889&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.466563.51045007084" \l "n145) Even where violence is unlikely, the practical implications of epistemological pluralism are not likely to please the pluralists. For example, Gertrude Himmelfarb points out that different perspectives on history will inevitably conflict: "If the feminist historian can and should write history from her perspective . . . why should the black historian not do the same -- even if such a history might 'marginalize' women? And why not the working-class historian, who might marginalize both women and blacks?" [n146](http://www.lexisnexis.com.ezproxy.lib.ou.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1285602121837&returnToKey=20_T10208434889&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.466563.51045007084" \l "n146) Currently popular antirationalisms  [\*480]  seem indeed to have little in common except their rejection of the Enlightenment. Try to imagine a public school curriculum designed jointly by Bob and Alice Mozert (the religious parents who objected to a standard public school curriculum as secular humanism) [n147](http://www.lexisnexis.com.ezproxy.lib.ou.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1285602121837&returnToKey=20_T10208434889&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.466563.51045007084" \l "n147) and Stanley Fish, Duncan Kennedy, or William Eskridge. Find a single point of agreement -- other than that the Enlightenment was a failure -- between Michael McConnell and Catharine MacKinnon. Even allies within the multiculturalist wing of epistemological pluralism are on the brink of war: women are complaining about sexism within the NAACP, [n148](http://www.lexisnexis.com.ezproxy.lib.ou.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1285602121837&returnToKey=20_T10208434889&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.466563.51045007084" \l "n148) federal laws requiring equality for women in college athletics are viewed as hurting black male athletes, [n149](http://www.lexisnexis.com.ezproxy.lib.ou.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1285602121837&returnToKey=20_T10208434889&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.466563.51045007084" \l "n149) and feminists are themselves divided over whether to accord respect to non-Western cultures that practice female circumcision, a mutilation of female genitalia. [n150](http://www.lexisnexis.com.ezproxy.lib.ou.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1285602121837&returnToKey=20_T10208434889&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.466563.51045007084" \l "n150)The more radical of the social constructivists accept -- and even embrace -- the inevitable consequence of their theory that there is no knowledge, just power. [n151](http://www.lexisnexis.com.ezproxy.lib.ou.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1285602121837&returnToKey=20_T10208434889&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.466563.51045007084" \l "n151) Their project is to expose and alter the hidden power relations. A few even remain epistemologically faithful by refusing to use reason in their scholarship at all, relying instead on "narratives" to communicate what are necessarily private and personal truths. Just as religious conversion cannot be prompted by reason (pace Pascal), this use of narratives is a nonrational attempt to transform beliefs. [n152](http://www.lexisnexis.com.ezproxy.lib.ou.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1285602121837&returnToKey=20_T10208434889&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.466563.51045007084" \l "n152) But whether or not all epistemological pluralists explicitly recognize that their position leaves power as the only means of resolving disputes, it is an inevitable consequence of granting alternative epistemologies equal status.None of the epistemological pluralists seem willing to confront the practical  [\*481]  implications of this reduction of knowledge to power. [n153](http://www.lexisnexis.com.ezproxy.lib.ou.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1285602121837&returnToKey=20_T10208434889&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.466563.51045007084" \l "n153) Stephen Carter, for example, notes that the problem with creationism is not its epistemological pedigree but that, like the proposition that the earth is flat, it is "factually in error." [n154](http://www.lexisnexis.com.ezproxy.lib.ou.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1285602121837&returnToKey=20_T10208434889&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.466563.51045007084" \l "n154) According to both religious and radical social constructivists, however, one cannot make the claim that any proposition is "factually in error" except from within a particular epistemological system. Thus, an epistemological pluralist like Carter should not be making such a statement at all, since he maintains that the rationalism and empiricism on which such "factual" claims are based are no more valid than an epistemology of faith and revelation that might lead to opposite conclusions. Similarly, many of the religious epistemological pluralists castigate Justice Scalia's opinion in Employment Division, Department of Human Resources v. Smith. [n155](http://www.lexisnexis.com.ezproxy.lib.ou.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1285602121837&returnToKey=20_T10208434889&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.466563.51045007084" \l "n155) But Scalia's position instantiates the notion that only power can mediate between different epistemological systems: he is comfortable in "leaving accommodation to the political process" even though that will "place at a relative disadvantage those religious practices that are not widely engaged in." [n156](http://www.lexisnexis.com.ezproxy.lib.ou.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1285602121837&returnToKey=20_T10208434889&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.466563.51045007084" \l "n156) The radical cris de coeur pleading for progressive changes in the law are similarly unpersuasive in the face of the current stolid conservatism of the American people: unless moved emotionally by the academic appeals -- an unlikely scenario -- there is no reason for either citizens or politicians to change their views. "For if ideas are mere reflections of the exercise of power, it becomes difficult to find a basis for criticizing social arrangements." [n157](http://www.lexisnexis.com.ezproxy.lib.ou.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1285602121837&returnToKey=20_T10208434889&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.466563.51045007084" \l "n157) And if reason is not a universal epistemology that can mediate between the different beliefs, but only the belief system favored by the powerful, then whoever is in power will reify his own epistemology. That is the nature of the social constructivist critique.One rather prosaic example may illustrate, close to home, the dangers of abandoning epistemological objectivity in favor of structures of power. Most academic journals use a blind reviewing system, in order to minimize institutional authority and maximize intellectual authority. They rely, in other words, as much as possible on objective standards rather than on hierarchies of power within academia. [n158](http://www.lexisnexis.com.ezproxy.lib.ou.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1285602121837&returnToKey=20_T10208434889&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.466563.51045007084" \l "n158) Law reviews are an exception; those who select articles are fully aware of the identity, past scholarly achievements, and institutional affiliation  [\*482]  of the authors who submit manuscripts. Because law reviews are therefore able to rely more heavily on these indicia of institutional authority, they provide us with a concrete example of the results when epistemological objectivity gives way to power. Those results are not encouraging, especially to those who would challenge the status quo. Unsurprisingly, prestigious law reviews disproportionately publish well-known authors, authors at well-known institutions, and authors at their own institutions. [n159](http://www.lexisnexis.com.ezproxy.lib.ou.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1285602121837&returnToKey=20_T10208434889&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.466563.51045007084" \l "n159) If epistemological pluralists expect that abandoning reason and empiricism will favor their political agendas over those currently in favor, they are likely to be sorely disappointed.

### 2AC Sustainable

#### Heg won’t collapse – it’s sustainable

Susman 12, US Ambassador to the UK (Louis, “America: Still the Indispensable Power?” Chatham House, http://www.chathamhouse.org/sites/default/files/public/Meetings/Meeting%20Transcripts/260612susman.pdf)

Because an argument is being made by some academics, commentators and journalists that America is now in permanent decline. The argument goes that a gradual but irreversible erosion of economic strength, the so-called ‘rise of the rest’, and the effects of two gruelling wars is stripping the United States of its power, influence and authority. Now, there’s no doubt – as President Obama acknowledged in his speech to Parliament last year – that the international order is being reshaped and that as we adapt to it, we face undeniable and significant challenges. But we have overcome similar circumstances before. In the 1950s and 60s the fear was we were falling behind the Soviet Union in technology and ambition. The 1970s brought recession and unemployment to America; combined with a loss of faith in our system after Vietnam and Watergate. At the same time, Japan’s economy was taking off. Then in the 1980s and 90s the tiger economies of East Asia produced an economic miracle of rapid growth unparalleled in modern history. Each time America’s standing was questioned. Each time America rose to the particular challenges it faced. Time and again the doom mongers and the defeatists were proven wrong. And I am confident that they will be again. There are many reasons for my conclusion but three factors stand out. First, the strength of our economy. Second, our military prowess. Third, the power and scope of our international partnerships. Let me start with the strength and resilience of the United States economy. Despite being damaged by the most severe recession in more than 70 years, America is still – by far – the world’s largest economy. Today the United States is responsible for one quarter of all global economic output, just as we have been for more than four decades. Our economy is growing – with the IMF, Federal Reserve and others projecting growth of somewhere between two and three per cent this year. And the trend lines of the important economic factors continue to be strong. Unemployment nationally is at 8.2% – down from a peak of 10% in October 2010. More than four million private sector jobs have been created in the past two years. There is a renewed consumer confidence - essential to a selfsustaining recovery – where people are no longer paying off their credit cards but out spending again. The Troubled Asset Relief Program – known as TARP – has ensured that our banks are stable and well capitalized. TARP authorized the Treasury to use up to $700 billion to stabilize banks and other financial institutions. Ultimately, only $410 billion was disbursed – including $245 billion to recapitalize the banks. The Treasury is now confident that overall TARP will cost less than $50 billion – in fact, the financial assistance we provided banks will actually result in taxpayer gains of approximately $20 billion. The stronger position of banks is helping to support broader economic recovery, including a 30% increase in private investment in equipment and software. Lending to companies is also rising by over 10% a year. And America is still the No. 1 choice for foreign investment. US exports increased almost 16% last year to $2.1 trillion. That is well on track to achieving America’s ambitious goal of doubling exports by 2015 under the National Export Initiative. Our manufacturing sector is making a strong comeback for the first time since the 1990s. The United States has added nearly half a million manufacturing jobs since the beginning of 2010. The revival is evidenced by General Electric bringing back manufacturing operations from China and opening new plants in America. The French company Michelin is investing $750 million in a new plant and factory expansion in South Carolina. And there is no better example of the recovery in American manufacturing than the United States automobile industry. In 2008, 400,000 jobs across the car-making industry were lost. Two of the big three manufacturers were on the brink of administration. Today, GM is the No. 1 car-maker in the world, Chrysler is growing faster in America than any other car company, and Ford is posting record profits. So while always guarding against complacency, the American economy is on the right path to a return to full health. But one of our greatest and most enduring strengths comes from the fundamentals of our economic approach. Our philosophy is built on the whole-hearted belief in free trade. While other nations – including some of the fast-growing emerging economies – still trade behind barriers, the United States continues to embrace market-based principles. Free trade means every country, every business, and even every individual, has a chance to compete. That in turn creates the very jobs and wealth that lift people and communities out of poverty – both at home and abroad. America has firmly rejected protectionist policies; reaffirming our commitment to open markets with a number of new international free trade agreements. We are also open to immigration. Our ethnically diverse society and a culture of opportunity continues to draw talent from around the world. The latest OECD records show that more than 1.1 million foreigners came to live permanently in America in 2009. A survey by Gallup published in April once again put the United States as the most desirable destination for immigrants. Another distinct advantage America enjoys is the entrepreneurial spirit embedded in our DNA. Equally, our faith in free enterprise and freedom of thought and speech helps stimulate creativity and innovation. Today our companies – many of them small start-ups – are at the forefront of the highgrowth, R&D-based industries of the future. It is also worth noting that America is blessed with an abundance of natural resources. From the most arable land of any country on Earth to a diverse range of energy sources that will leave us increasingly energy independent. Current crude oil production is the highest since 2003, we have been the world’s largest producer of natural gas since 2009, we have vast shale oil deposits, and use of renewables such as wind and solar has doubled since 2008. All these underlying strengths make me confident that the United States will continue to be a vibrant and vital global economic power. And a strong economy, of course, underwrites our second enduring strength: the capability and reach of our military. Clearly, we are in a period of transition; turning the page on a decade of war and at the same time dealing with our budget deficit. But despite what some might say, America is not dismantling its defences. The truth is that in the wake of 9/11 and our response to it, our defence budget grew at an extraordinary pace. In 2001 – the year of the attacks – annual defense spending was $319 billion. By 2011 it had more than doubled to $691 billion a year. So we are taking the difficult step of reducing our planned defence spending by around $45 billion a year over a period of 10 years. But this adjustment is in no way going to undermine America as the foremost military power on earth. Our defense budget was – and still is – larger than roughly the next 10 countries combined. The new approach combines the need for deficit reduction with a recognition of the changing nature of the security threats we face. Today our policy encompasses a more agile, flexible, rapidly deployable and technologically advanced military – complemented with strong international alliances and multilateral cooperation. Which brings me to America’s third core strength, which is the power of our partnerships. Partnerships are essential in the 21st century. Today’s challenges are too many, too immense and too complex for one country to go it alone. This administration is intent on expanding and intensifying US engagement with other nations and with international institutions. As a result, the United States now has a range of formidable alliances on every continent. We don’t see ourselves as a super-power believing unilateral action can solve everything. A more direct, confrontational approach advocated by some in previous decades is clearly no longer appropriate – nor, I should add, would it be effective. The complexity of today's challenges demand a different style of American leadership. That's why today we see ourselves as a super-partner applying Secretary Clinton’s focus on ‘smart power’. In Libya, for example, we used an effective range of tools – including diplomatic, economic, military, and humanitarian – in the multilateral alliance against Colonel Gaddafi. And we will continue to play a central role within the United Nations and NATO – and also inside the G8, G20, the World Bank, and the IMF. At the same time, we are forging new relationships across Asia-Pacific, which is fast-becoming a strategic and economic center of gravity. This is what the Pacific pivot is all about. As a truly global power, we have widespread, enduring interests in the region – and they demand our widespread, enduring presence. But turning our face towards Asia-Pacific does not mean turning our back on Europe. We are constantly reinforcing ties with our oldest and strongest allies, including our special relationship with the United Kingdom. Building and maintaining strong, mutually beneficial partnerships, however, does not come from government alone. Successful and enduring alliances are not simply born from the President signing a treaty, a trade agreement or military pact. They are entrenched and sustained by a range of additional assets that are hard to quantify but nonetheless highly significant: our values, our customs and culture, our institutions and organizations. In effect, what the United States represents to the world. Take the timeless appeal of the values we embrace. Values of freedom, democracy, human rights, tolerance, opportunity and the rule of law. These are the values we promote on the international stage. And one way others learn what we stand for, and who we are, and what aspirations we share comes from the power of our example. America’s standing and influence is not only built on economic and military authority. Consider how the US was one of the first countries to send a message to the corporate world on transparency and bribery. We passed the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act because it was the right thing to do – even though it possibly put American companies at a disadvantage. America was also among the first to take humanitarian action following the devastating earthquake and tsunami in Japan last year. We sent relief supplies, elite search and rescue teams, and disaster response experts - while the American Red Cross provided shelter for some of those made homeless. The exceptional work of American NGOs and foundations around the world also provides US leadership on a number of global causes. In 2011 alone, American individuals, corporations and foundations donated almost $300 billion to charities. But it is not just the immense resources our NGOs bring to their efforts, it is also the boldness of their vision. The Carter Center – the organization founded by former President Jimmy Carter – is close to eradicating Guinea worm disease. It is also promoting democracy through monitoring elections across Africa, Latin America, and Asia. And look at Bill and Melinda Gates. How easy it would have been for them to slip into comfortable early retirement, using their wealth to hide from the world’s troubles. Instead, they were determined to use their personal fortune to help confront and overcome some of the world’s toughest health problems. This enlightened approach to public service and social responsibility is an explicit demonstration of America’s ‘hidden’ role as a global leader. Another source of international influence comes from our educational institutions. The excellence of our universities helps us to cultivate some of the world’s best and brightest minds. Indeed, America remains the No. 1 destination for foreign students – attracted by a system that gives them the opportunity to pursue and achieve their ambitions. According to the QS World University Rankings, 11 of the top 15 universities in the world are located in the United States. Perhaps that is why the US can also claim more Nobel Prizes than any other country. This widespread appeal of America is part of what makes us strong because it means our alliances are built on conviction not convenience. We do not stand alone in the world. We face our challenges in partnership with others. And yes, of course, America has enormous challenges. So nothing I have said this evening is intended to sound either boastful or complacent. We recognize that we constantly have to work, and that there is still a lot to do to maintain our leadership in a turbulent world undergoing significant transformation. But I do believe strongly that our continued leadership is more important than ever. And America is not perfect, we know that. Unemployment is still too high; the need for deficit reduction is essential and must be addressed; there remain issues around equality in our society; and aggressive partisanship is causing dysfunction in our government and cannot be ignored. In these and many other areas, we know our country needs to do more: to heal wounds, take courageous decisions, and adapt to new circumstances. But the lesson from history is that America has always shown the capacity to overcome its difficulties. In the past decade, we’ve endured the deadliest terrorist attacks in modern history; two conflicts that have lasted longer than both world wars; and a global financial crisis on scale unprecedented in a generation. Through it all, America has retained its global leadership. And, as I have outlined this evening, the sources of our influence are many and they are durable. Our economic strengths are unequaled. Our military power unrivaled. And our international partnerships unsurpassed. I believe that our weaknesses pale in comparison to our resilience and our strengths. This is why I can say with confidence that ultimately America will remain the indispensable global power.

**Heg is durable – in depth studies of major factors in international relations**

Michael **Beckley** **12 -** PhD student at Columbia University and a predoctoral fellow at Harvard’s Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs (The Unipolar Era: Why American Power Persists and China’s Rise Is Limited, Columbia University)

The conventional wisdom in U.S. foreign policy debates is that the United States is in relative decline to China and that much of this decline is the result of globalization and the hegemonic burdens the United States bears to sustain globalization. These ideas frame the public discussion of U.S. foreign policy, influence intelligence assessments that inform decision making in the U.S. government, and shape the development of international relations theory and scholarly research agendas. The results presented in this study, however, suggest that the conventional wisdom is mistaken. Over the last 20 years, globalization and U.S. hegemonic burdens have expanded, yet the United States has risen relative to China. The United States’ hegemonic presence abroad appears to be much cheaper than past hegemonic systems and, in fact, may be net‐profitable. And globalization seems to cause wealth and innovation to cluster in areas that are already wealthy and innovative and, in particular, in the United States. Many factors, both foreign and domestic, will shape the evolution of the international balance of power, and there is no guarantee that the trends highlighted in this study will persist. At the very least, however, these trends suggest unipolarity is more durable, and will likely last longer, than is typically assumed. This conclusion has important implications for international relationship scholarship and policy.

**The decline their evidence is talking about is small – our decline destroys hegemony**

Carla **Norrlof 10** (an Associate Professor in the Department of Political Science at the University of Toronto) 2010 “America’s Global Advantage US Hegemony and International Cooperation” 51-3

In today’s debate on American decline redux, scholars continue to assume a substitute relation between economic and political power. Bacevich, for instance, sees the United States as a global enforcer that uses new advanced means to practice old-style gunboat diplomacy, a development he laments and sees as more or less irreversible.48 Ferguson the mores and practices in other countries is seen as especially devastating for its dominance. While Mann too sees the United States as a “military giant,” he does not think military power is of much use, and disparagingly calls it an economic “backseat driver.”50 Mann clearly sees the United States as a power in decline. In two books, Chalmers Johnson describes the proliferation of American bases around the world, the resentment they create, and how it might provoke decline.51 The French analyst Emmanuel Todd indicts the United States for outright banditry, “the mugging of Europeans by Wall Street,” but does not believe the United States has the military wherewithal to ensure that it can continue to reap disproportionate economic benefits, or that it is capable of the kind of political (non-discriminatory) rule that attracts dependable followers.52 Not everyone has been convinced that the United States has declined in any meaningful way. As several authors have pointed out, the relative ascendancy of Europe and Japan was not only to be expected, but an explicit aim of American policy after the war.53 Critics charged that those who believed that the United States had declined in significant ways had failed to grasp important changes in the international economy and the prominent role played by multi-national corporations. 54 To appreciate the full extent of America’s reach one had to take into account the functioning of the world economy, the vitality of the American economy, the diversity of its population, and its military preponderance. Samuel Huntington was particularly prescient in identifying what kept America on top and in spelling out challenges to its lead position. He saw the country’s multi-dimensional power base as difficult for others to replicate and understood that the dynamism of the American economy would take a blow if consumer overstretch got out of hand, even though he believed that the most serious challenge to American power would come from a coalition of European states.55 While Huntington correctly perceived that America’s preeminence is anchored across a wide range of issue-areas, he did not connect these different sources of power. In elaborating an alternative way of thinking about the hegemon’s power arc, I show how various forms of power mutually reinforce one another as the hegemon travels up and down the power ladder. As I have already suggested, the consequences of relative decline are potentially favorable to the hegemon and can in some circumstances activate power

### Realism

#### [ ] Uncertainty is not a product of discourse—it’s a part of the human condition

#### Copeland 6, Associate Professor and Director Dept. of Government and Foreign Affairs @ University of Virginia, 2006 (Dale, “The Constructivist Challenge to Structural Realism: A Review Essay”, Constructivism and International Relations, Alexander Wendt and His Critics)

Social Theory of International Politics provides an important starting point for further debate and constructivist empirical analysis, but only a starting point. Wendt has not shown that anarchy tied to changing distributions of power has no logic, only that constructivist variables can perhaps, under certain conditions, moderate actors’ level of uncertainty about others’ intentions. Yet constructivism is inherently an argument about how the past shapes the way actors understand their present situation. By its very nature—its focus on historical process—constructivism has trouble analyzing how rational, prudent leaders deal with the pernicious problem of future uncertainty. And this uncertainty is given by the human condition. **Human beings are not born with the ability to read the minds of other actors, and they have only limited means for foreseeing the future**. Moreover, human beings, as constructivists emphasize, are **mutable**—they can be changed through interaction. Yet if much of this interaction takes place at the domestic level and is independent of diplomatic interaction, then prudent states must be worried. They know that the other may become aggressive despite all diplomatic efforts to instantiate other-regarding values and to communicate their own non-aggressive intentions. The material distribution of power then becomes critical to their calculations. It represents the other’s potential to do harm in the future. Hence, if power trends are negative, a declining state must worry that the other will turn aggressive after it achieves preponderance, even if it seems peaceful right now.

#### [ ] Discourse doesn’t shape all policy - future uncertainty and the presence of the other establishes the anarchical nature of state interaction that makes a focus on realism crucial

#### Copeland 6, Associate Professor and Director Dept. of Government and Foreign Affairs @ University of Virginia, 2006 (Dale, “The Constructivist Challenge to Structural Realism: A Review Essay”, Constructivism and International Relations, Alexander Wendt and His Critics)

The distinction between Wendt’s focus on structure as the coaction (interaction) of units, and a realist focus on structure as the potential for coaction, is neither semantic nor trivial. It reflects a fundamentally different conception of the role of time in international politics. For Wendt and other constructivists, it is the past that matters—how interactions and gestures in the historical process have socialized actors toward certain conceptions of self and other. Realists certainly do not dismiss the ways that past interaction shape current beliefs.33 Most fundamentally, however, realism is a forward-looking theory. States are rational maximizers of their security over the foreseeable future. Hence they remain constantly vigilant for any changes in their external situation that might damage their chances for survival later. Reduced to five words, then, the divide between constructivism and systemic realism is all about **past socialization versus future uncertainty.**34 This analysis has a straightforward implication: there is no need for any interaction in the present or past for a constraining structure to exist. **Power structures**—the relative distribution of material resources—are **not generated by social practices** (even if practices can sometimes change the distribution over time). Structures exist by the **mere presence of the other**, and its potential to do harm in the future—its potential to ‘coact’ by invading, if you will. Hence, in anarchy, even when a state has no relations with the other, even if the other does not know that the state exists, the state is forced by the situation to **contemplate future scenarios in which the other could do it harm**. When scouts returned to ancient Assyria with the first reports on the Egyptian empire and its phenomenal resources, Assyrian leaders would have been imprudent not to have at least considered the possibility of an Egyptian invasion. No interaction was required for Egypt’s relative power to have a constraining effect on Assyria’s behavior.35

### Util

#### b. Alternative frameworks leads to moral tunnel vision

Isaac 2 (Jeffrey, Professor of PoliSci @ Indiana-Bloomington, Director of the Center for the Study of Democracy and Public Life, PhD Yale, “Ends, Means, and Politics,” Dissent Magazine Vol 49 Issue 2)

As a result, the most important political questions are simply not asked. It is assumed that U.S. military intervention is an act of "aggression," but no consideration is given to the aggression to which intervention is a response. The status quo ante in Afghanistan is not, as peace activists would have it, peace, but rather terrorist violence abetted by a regime--the Taliban--that rose to power through brutality and repression. This requires us to ask a question that most "peace" activists would prefer not to ask: What should be done to respond to the violence of a Saddam Hussein, or a Milosevic, or a Taliban regime? What means are likely to stop violence and bring criminals to justice? Calls for diplomacy and international law are well intended and important; they implicate a decent and civilized ethic of global order. But they are also vague and empty, because they are not accompanied by any account of how diplomacy or international law [it] can work effectively to address the problem at hand. The campus left offers no such account. To do so would require it to contemplate tragic choices in which moral goodness is of limited utility. Here what matters is not purity of intention but the intelligent exercise of power. Power is not a dirty word or an unfortunate feature of the world. It is the core of politics. Power is the ability to effect outcomes in the world. Politics, in large part, involves contests over the distribution and use of power. To accomplish anything in the political world, one must attend to the means that are necessary to bring it about. And to develop such means is to develop, and to exercise, power. To say this is not to say that power is beyond morality. It is to say that power is not reducible to morality. As writers such as Niccolo Machiavelli, Max Weber, Reinhold Niebuhr, and Hannah Arendt have taught, an unyielding concern with moral goodness undercuts political responsibility. The concern may be morally laudable, reflecting a kind of personal integrity, but it suffers from three fatal flaws: (1) It fails to see that the purity of one's intention does not ensure the achievement of what one intends. Abjuring violence or refusing to make common cause with morally compromised parties may seem like the right thing; but if such tactics entail impotence, then it is hard to view them as serving any moral good beyond the clean conscience of their supporters; (2) it fails to see that in a world of real violence and injustice, moral purity is not simply a form of powerlessness; it is often a form of complicity in injustice. This is why, from the standpoint of politics--as opposed to religion--pacifism is always a potentially immoral stand. In categorically repudiating violence, it refuses in principle to oppose certain violent injustices with any effect; and (3) it fails to see that politics is as much about unintended consequences as it is about intentions; it is the effects of action, rather than the motives of action, that is most significant. J

ust as the alignment with "good" may engender impotence, it is often the pursuit of "good" that generates evil. This is the lesson of communism in the twentieth century: it is not enough that one's goals be sincere or idealistic; it is equally important, always, to ask about the effects of pursuing these goals and to judge these effects in pragmatic and historically contextualized ways. Moral absolutism inhibits this judgment. It alienates those who are not true believers. It promotes arrogance. And it undermines political effectiveness.

#### a. Util accommodates rights

Shaw 99 (William H, Professor of Philosophy @ San Jose State, Contemporary Ethics, p.185-186)

One of the most widespread criticisms of utilitarianism is that it cannot take rights seriously enough. Generally speaking, rights take precedence over considerations of immediate utility. They limit or restrict direct appeals to welfare maximization. For example, to have a right to free speech means that one is free to speak one's mind even if doing so will fail to maximize happiness because others will dislike hearing what one has to say. The right not to be compelled to incriminate oneself entails that it would be wrong to force a criminal defendant to testify against himself even if the results of doing so would be good. If rights are moral claims that trump straightforward appeals to utility," then utilitarianism, the critics argue, cannot meaningfully respect rights because their theory subordinates them to the promotion of welfare. However, the criticism that utilitarianism cannot do right by rights ignores the extent to which utilitarianism can, as discussed in Chapter 5, accommodate the moral rules, principles, and norms other than welfare maximization that appear to constitute the warp and woof of our moral lives. To be sure, utilitarians look at rights in a different light than do . moral theorists who see them as self-evident or as having an independent deontic status grounded on non-utilitarian considerations. For utilitarians, it is not rights, but the promotion of welfare, that lies at the heart of morality. Bentham was consistently hostile to the idea of natural rights, in large measure because he believed that invoking natural rights was only a way of dressing up appeals to intuition in fancy rhetoric. In a similar vein, many utilitarians today believe that in both popular and philosophical discourse people are too quick to declare themselves possessors of all sorts of putative rights and that all too frequently these competing claims of rights only obscure the important, underlying moral issues.

#### b. All lives are infinitely valuable

Cummisky 96 (David, professor of philosophy at Bates, Kantian Consequentialism, p. 131)

Finally, even if one grants that saving two persons with dignity cannot outweigh and compensate for killing one—because dignity cannot be added and summed in this way—this point still does not justify deontologieal constraints. On the extreme interpretation, why would not killing one person be a stronger obligation than saving two persons? If I am concerned with the priceless dignity of each, it would seem that 1 may still saw two; it is just that my reason cannot be that the two compensate for the loss of the one. Consider Hills example of a priceless object: If I can save two of three priceless statutes only by destroying one. Then 1 cannot claim that saving two makes up for the loss of the one. But Similarly, the loss of the two is not outweighed by the one that was not destroyed. Indeed, even if dignity cannot be simply summed up. How is the extreme interpretation inconsistent with the idea that I should save as many priceless objects as possible? Even if two do not simply outweigh and thus compensate for the lass of the one, each is priceless: thus, I have good reason to save as many as I can. In short, it is not clear how the extreme interpretation justifies the ordinary killing'letting-die distinction or even how it conflicts with the conclusion that the more persons with dignity who are saved, the better.\*

#### Refusing the counter-plan is a refusal of ethics—Choices must be made on a case-by-case basis

Derrida 5 (Jacques, Directeur d’Etudes at the Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales in Paris, Rogues: Two Essays On Reason, p. 84-85)

In the second place, then, the responsibility of what remains to be de­cided or done (in actuality) cannot consist in following, applying, or car­rying out a norm or rule. Wherever I have at my disposal a determinable rule, I know what must be done, and as soon as such knowledge dictates the law, action follows knowledge as a calculable consequence: one knows what path to take, one no longer hesitates. The decision then no longer decides anything but is made in advance and is thus in advance annulled. It is simply deployed, without delay, presently, with the automatism at­tributed to machines. There is no longer any place for justice or responsi­bility (whether juridical, political, or ethical).

#### There’s no reason their stance can benefit the other—What’s good for the other must be determined by the way in which we choose to act for the other—CP is key

Balkin 94 (J. M, Professor of Law at the University of Texas, March, Michigan Law Review, 92 Mich. L. Rev. 1131, p. 1137-1138)

Like Derrida, I am also concerned with deconstruction's possible relationship to justice. In this essay, I offer an extended critique of Derrida's views in order to make two basic points about the relationship between justice and deconstruction. First, Derrida offers deconstructive arguments that cut both ways: Although one can use deconstructive arguments to further what Derrida believes is just, one can also deconstruct in a different way to reach conclusions he would probably find very unjust. One can also question his careful choice of targets of deconstruction: One could just as easily have chosen different targets and, by deconstructing them, reach conclusions that he would find abhorrent. Thus, in each case, what makes Derrida's deconstructive argument an argument for justice is not its use of deconstruction, but the selection of the particular text or concept to deconstruct and the way in which the particular deconstructive argument is wielded. I shall argue that Derrida's encounter with justice really shows that deconstructive argument is a species of rhetoric, which can be used for different purposes depending upon the moral and political commitments of the deconstructor.

## 1NR

### Case

#### Refusing the counter-plan is a refusal of ethics—Choices must be made on a case-by-case basis

Derrida 5 (Jacques, Directeur d’Etudes at the Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales in Paris, Rogues: Two Essays On Reason, p. 84-85)

In the second place, then, the responsibility of what remains to be de­cided or done (in actuality) cannot consist in following, applying, or car­rying out a norm or rule. Wherever I have at my disposal a determinable rule, I know what must be done, and as soon as such knowledge dictates the law, action follows knowledge as a calculable consequence: one knows what path to take, one no longer hesitates. The decision then no longer decides anything but is made in advance and is thus in advance annulled. It is simply deployed, without delay, presently, with the automatism at­tributed to machines. There is no longer any place for justice or responsi­bility (whether juridical,

### Impact

Turns case—Macro politics is crucial to solve coercion and imperialism

Bohman‘99 (John, Professor, St. Louis University, Monist, April, 1999, Vol. 82, No. 2, p. 235-52)

The interaction between the state and the public sphere raises questions about the status of institutions and the norms that constitute them and that are required to structure and constrain the interaction that goes on within them. In the absence of institutions and their normative structures, it is unclear that consensus on issues of moral conflict could ever be reached. In her analysis of the catastrophic events of this century, Arendt takes the lack of any normative status of "stateless people" to be paradigmatic of the real failures of modern politics (Arendt 1953, ch. 9). Such people are reduced to their bare humanity and lack not only basic rights, but "the right to have rights," the right to participate in and shape a common world where one's speech and actions have meaning and significance. Thus, the return to politics, especially a non-coercive kind, requires rethinking basic modern institutions and building up an immanent critique of their underlying conceptions of citizenship, decision-making mechanisms, and basic norms. As carried out by thinkers as diverse as Arendt, Habermas and Lefort, this immanent critique pushes liberal institutions in the direction of a more participatory and deliberative form of democracy that goes beyond the aggregative voting and mere self-interest of most liberal interpretations of democracy and its representative institutions. All of these philosophers argue that the public space for politics permits disagreement as well as agreement, contestation as well as consensus.As opposed to Marx and Heidegger, Gramsci, Habermas, Arendt, Lefort and others have developed a conception of democracy that serves as a corrective to the coercive character of modern society. Civil society, the public sphere and democratic institutions all open up the possibility of a form of politics that is governed neither by the invisible hand of market forces nor by the visible hand of sovereign state power. To the extent that these arguments are sound, they provide the basis for an immanent critique of modern reason, discovering in political practices a foothold for the unifying and reconciling power of reason in uncoerced consensus, democratic contestation of power and domination, and intersubjective structures of mutual recognition.

Prefer it—it’s a net turn for *their* objectives -- the anti-politics vacuum is filled by the right, not the left

Boggs ’97

(CARL BOGGS – Professor and Ph.D. Political Science, National University, Los Angeles -- Theory and Society 26: 741-780)

Both mall culture and mass media symbolize the prevailing mood of anti-politics: they reproduce to a deeply-atomized, commodified social life-world which corresponds to the mode of consciousness described by Richard Sennett in The Fall of Public Man, where citizen involvement in a republic is effaced ``by the belief that social meanings are generated by the feelings of individual human beings,'' so that the common terrain of power relations and social space is obliterated.15 Sheldon Wolin refers to this development as a ``crisis of citizenship,'' re£ected in the carving up of the public sphere by local, privatized interests.16 The point has been reached where most Americans can no longer imagine a system truly open to citizen participation, where the ordinary person might have influence. Viewed in this way, modernity is two-sided: it coincides with the spread of technology, knowledge, and expertise but also reinforces widespread feelings of alienation and powerlessness. Individuals feel engulfed by forces beyond their control ^ bureaucracy, government, huge corporations, the global economy. Under these conditions psychological retreat from the public sphere may seem normal enough. The problem, however, is that such firmly entrenched bastions of power will not vanish simply because they are denigrated or ignored; on the contrary, their hegemony will simply go unchallenged.

### Link

### A2 – We’re Boggs!

#### Their criticism of historical origins cedes the political to the right—Discussion of difference on the local level destroys the idea of citizenship—Only a macro political structure can solve

Boggs ’97

(CARL BOGGS – Professor and Ph.D. Political Science, National University, Los Angeles -- Theory and Society 26: 741-780)

While multiple sites of power and resistance need to be more clearly theorized than in the past, and while Marxian fixation on class struggle, the primacy of capital-labor relations, and social totality has lost its rationale, the extreme postmodern assault on macro institutions severs the connection between critique and action. Moreover, to the extent that postmodernism embraces a notion of subjectivity that is decentered and fragmented, the very idea of citizenship gets obscured. As Philip Wexler argues, the social, legal, and political requirements of citizen- ship were *historically founded* upon universal norms of democracy, freedom, and equality, but postmodernism, which blurs everything and dissolves politics into the sphere of culture and everyday life, destroys this foundation. Once the subject melts into a murky cultural diffuse- ness, into a world of images and spectacles, the elements of citizenship simply evaporate.56 Various democratic ideals may be kept alive within the official ideology, mainly to legitimate the electoral ritual, but they fail to resonate with the times. AsWexler concludes: ``For now, citizen- ship will remain the appropriate sign of post-modernism and semiotic society ^ a restored sign artifact that may be recycled and used so long as it does not disturb contemporary society's profound need for super- ¢ciality.''57In the splintered, discontinuous world inhabited by Baurdrillard, Fou- cault, and kindred theorists, social bonds are weakened and the link between personal life and the public sphere is fractured. Where truth, language, and ideology are perpetually contested, nothing is settled or taken for granted. While this ethos corresponds well to an era in which emphasis is placed on local knowledge and identity movements, it is a depoliticizing ethos insofar as it blurs or dismisses macro forms of economic and political power. Where the state is either ignored or broken down into a mosaic of localized and partial entities, politics too winds up obliterated. Symbols and images become far more im- portant than concrete struggles involving rival claims to power, eco- nomic interests, and visions of a better society.58

#### Their historical focus on war powers accomplishes nothing—This was established in CX

Todd Gitlin formerly served as professor of sociology and director of the mass communications program at the University of California, Berkeley, and then a professor of culture, journalism and sociology at New York University. He is now a professor of journalism and sociology and chair of the Ph.D. program in Communications at Columbia University. He was a long-time political activist( from the Left). From the Book: The Intellectuals and the Flag – 2005 – available via CIAO Books – date accessed 7/17/10 – http://www.ciaonet.org.proxy1.cl.msu.edu/book/git01/git01\_05.pdf

Indeed, the United States does not have clean hands. We are living in tragedy, not melodrama. Recognizing the complex chains of cause and effect that produce a catastrophe is defensible, indeed necessary—up to a point. If only history could be restarted at one pivotal juncture or another! That would be excellent. But the past is what it is, and the killers are who they are. Moral responsibility can never be denied the ones who pull the triggers, wield the knives, push the buttons. And now that fanatical Islamists are at work in real time, whatever causes spurred them, the question remains: what should the United States do about thousands of actual and potential present-day killers who set no limits to what and whom they would destroy? The question is stark and unblinkable. When a cause produces effects and the effects are lethal, the effects have to be stopped—the citizens have a right to expect that of their government. To say, as did many who opposed an invasion of Afghanistan, that the terror attacks should be considered crimes, not acts of war, yet without proposing an effective means of punishing and preventing such crimes, is useless—and tantamount to washing one’s hands of the matter. But for taking security seriously in the here and now, and thinking about how to defeat the jihadists, the fundamentalist left had little time, little interest, little hard-headed curiosity—as little as the all-or-nothing theology that justified war against any “evildoers” decreed to be such by the forces of good.

#### Link alone turns the case—Even *if* deployed effectively in this instance, the willingness to appropriate history for an external objective will ultimately be manipulated to prop-up dominant systems of power

**Alanís** 200**6** (Jaime Alanís, doctoral student in educational policy studies at the University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, “How Much are You Willing to Risk? How Far are You Willing to Go”? Cultural Studies <=> Critical Methodologies, 2006; 6; 166, http://csc.sagepub.com)

As Patti Lather (1998) notes, from the perspective of feminist pedagogies, tensions and contradictions were ever present with critical pedagogy since its inception. However, it was Elizabeth Ellsworth (1989) who articulated the first formidable critique of critical pedagogy. Ellsworth argues that critical pedagogy suffers from a number of “repressive myths” that are operative in the daily classroom practices of critical pedagogues that if left unexamined, **will unintentionally** produce (and reproduce) relations of **domination**. One of the key criticisms Ellsworth (1989) accentuates is that “educational researchers who invoke concepts of critical pedagogy **consistently strip discussions** of classroom practices **of historical context** and political position” (p. 300). Ellsworth notes that oftentimes, the language used by critical pedagogues remains too highly abstract, which she believes caters to more philosophical debates rather than addressing actual classroom practices. Another shortcoming of critical pedagogues, Ellsworth tells us, is that they have a tendency of masking their true political agendas behind the rubric of critical pedagogy. Here, Ellsworth observes that both professors and students should be held accountable for explicitly naming the particular political and ethical agenda they have when they enter the classroom. Another such myth goes back to the Enlightenment projects’ aim of using the power of reason for emancipatory goals. It is precisely the very notion of reason in its various forms or “rationalist” assumptions with which Ellsworth takes issue. Ellsworth contends that if reason is the foundation of classroom interaction, then it will remain self-evident as an act against forms of domination. Yet Ellsworth finds this quite problematic because “the myths of the ideal rational person and the ‘universality’ of propositions have been oppressive to those who are not European, White, male, middle-class, Christian, able-bodied, thin, and heterosexual” (p. 304). She goes on to state that “while poststructuralism, like rationalism, is a tool that can be used to dominate, it has also facilitated a devastating critique of the violence of rationalism against its Others” (p. 304). Therefore, according to Ellsworth, one of the strengths of poststructural feminism is that it “is not bound to reason” (p. 304) but rather to discourse, which in turn, is recognized by its advocates as always partial, provisional, and contingent, as knowledge and reality is made sense of from a specific standpoint or location. Indeed, along with Ellsworth, Wendy Kohli (1998), Patti Lather (1998), and Jennifer Gore (2003) contend that the “masculinist voice” of abstraction and “universalization” is very problematic because it is usually constructed and presented by critical pedagogues who assume the “correct” position of “the one who knows.” The difficulty with many critical pedagogues who assume this position is that (in the name of an empowering education) they may nonetheless “not know” and so they may in fact “get it wrong.” As Ellsworth (1989) notes, I am similarly suspicious of the desire by mostly White, middle-class men who write the literature on critical pedagogy to elicit ‘full expression’ of student voices. Such a relation between teacher/student becomes voyeuristic when the voice of the pedagogue himself goes unexamined. (p. 312) Hence, postructural feminists observe that a deep self-criticality and reflexivity (beyond mere rhetoric), one that comes to terms with ambiguity, contradiction, and uncertainty, in the context of specific practices, is oftentimes missing from advocates of critical pedagogy. Another major critique articulated by feminist poststructuralists is the unproblematic (implicit or explicit) manner that either/or dichotomies (e.g., oppressors and oppressed, Us and Them, victim and victimizer) are used by many critical pedagogues.5 At issue here, poststructural feminists posit, is the unexplored dimensions of the ways that the oppressed can also be oppressors, that victims can also be victimizers or the ways in whichUs/Them ways of sense making separate us from acknowledging that we are all interconnected in the life world. Poststructural feminists alert us to the sensibilities of recognizing the limits of totalizing as well as dualistic analysis by illuminating the complexities and ambiguities of multiple subject positions located within ever-shifting specific power relations. In the end, poststructural feminists insist that if critical pedagogy is to be instructive (as a theory and practice), for both educators and students, it will have to assume tentative, partial, and thus less dogmatic approaches. Moreover, to avoid abstract generalizations, poststructural feminists point to the necessity of attention to local specificity and historical context in the arsenal of analytical tools. Last, for poststructural feminists, a simplistic trust in reason and rationality is conceived as a substantial flaw because it tends to overdetermine the power of human reason and dialogue, “to loosen deep-seated, self-interested investments in unjust relations of . . . gender, ethnicity, and sexual orientation” (Ellsworth, 1989, p. 312). Hence, poststructural feminists suggest that if critical pedagogues refuse to engage in substantial self-criticality and reflexivity, they will end up actually silencing diversity in the name of liberatory pedagogy.

Empire K is ineffective and cedes politics to the Right. Their perm answers are wrong.
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From the late New Left point of view, then, patriotism meant obscuring the whole grisly truth of the United States**.** It couldn’t help spilling over into what Orwell thought was the harsh, dangerous, and distinct phenomenon of nationalism, with its aggressive edge and its implication of superiority. Scrub up patriotism as you will, and nationalism, as Schaar put it, remained “patriotism’s bloody brother.”3 Was Orwell’s distinction not, in the end, a distinction without a difference? Didn’t his patriotism, while refusing aggressiveness, still insist that the nation he affirmed was “the best in the world”? What if there was more than one feature of the American way of life that you did not believe to be “the best in the world”—the national bravado, the overreach of the marketplace. Patriotism might well be the door through which you marched with the rest of the conformists to the beat of the national anthem. Facing these realities, all the left could do was criticize empire and, on the positive side, unearth and cultivate righteous traditions. The much-mocked “political correctness” of the next academic generations was a consolation prize. We might have lost politics but we won a lot of the textbooks. The tragedy of the left is that, having achieved an unprecedented victory in helping stop an appalling war, it then proceeded to commit suicide. The left helped force the United States out of Vietnam, where the country had no constructive work to do—either for Vietnam or for itself—but did so at the cost of disconnecting itself from the nation. Most U.S. intellectuals substituted the pleasures of condemnation for the pursuit of improvement. The orthodoxy was that “the system” precluded reform—never mind that the antiwar movement had already demonstrated that reform was possible. Human rights, feminism, environmentalism— these worldwide initiatives, American in their inception, flowing not from the American Establishment but from our own American movements, were noises off, not center stage. They were outsider tastes, the stuff of protest, not national features, the real stuff. Thus when, in the nineties, the Clinton administra tion finally mobilized armed force in behalf of Bosnia and then Kosovo against Milosevic’s genocidal Serbia, the hard left only could smell imperial motives, maintaining that democratic, antigenocidal intentions added up to a paper-thin mask. In short, if the United States seemed fundamentally trapped in militarist imperialism, its opposition was trapped in the mirror- image opposite. By the seventies the outsider stance had become second nature. Even those who had entered the sixties in diapers came to maturity thinking patriotism a threat or a bad joke. But anti-Americanism was, and remains, a mood and a metaphysics more than a politics. It cannot help but see practical politics as an illusion, entangled as it is and must be with a system fatally flawed by original sin. Viewing the ongoing politics of the Americans as contemptibly shallow and compromised, the demonological attitude naturally rules out patriotic attachment to those very Americans. Marooned (often self-marooned) on university campuses, exiled in left-wing media and other cultural outposts—all told, an archipelago of bitterness—what sealed itself off in the postsixties decades was what Richard Rorty has called “a spectatorial, disgusted, mocking Left rather than a Left which dreams of achieving our country.”4

### A2 – Sequencing

Their sequencing arg is wrong. Insisting they are “political” is a distraction. Micro-politics *won’t* spill-into Macro-politics. This also K’s their co-optation args.
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Consolation: here is an explanation for the rise of academic cultural studies during precisely the years when the right has held political and economic power longer and more consistently than at any other time in more than a half century. Now, in effect, "the cultural is political," and more, it is regarded as central to the control of political and economic resources. The control of popular culture is held to have become decisive in the fate of contemporary societies--or at least it is the sphere in which opposition can find footing, find breathing space, rally the powerless, defy the grip of the dominant ideas, isolate the powers that be, and prepare for a "war of position" against their dwindling ramparts. On this view, to dwell on the centrality of popular culture is more than an academic's way of filling her hours; it is a useful certification of the people and their projects. To put it more neutrally, the political aura of cultural studies is supported by something like a "false consciousness" premise: the analytical assumption that what holds the ruling groups in power is their capacity to muffle, deform, paralyze, or destroy contrary tendencies of an emotional or ideological nature. By the same token, if there is to be a significant "opposition," it must *first* find a base in popular culture--and first also turns out to be second, third, and fourth, since popular culture is so much more accessible, so much more porous, so much more changeable than the economic and political order. With time, what began as compensation hardened--became institutionalized--into a tradition. Younger scholars gravitated to cultural studies because it was to them incontestable that culture was politics. To do cultural studies, especially in connection with identity politics, was the politics they knew. The contrast with the rest of the West is illuminating. In varying degrees, left-wing intellectuals in France, Italy, Scandinavia, Germany, Spain and elsewhere retain energizing attachments to Social Democratic, Green, and other left-wing parties. There, the association of culture with excellence and traditional elites remains strong. But in the Anglo-American world, including Australia, these conditions scarcely obtain. Here, in a discouraging time, popular culture emerges as a consolation prize. (The same happened in Latin America, with the decline of left-wing hopes.) The sting fades from the fragmentation of the organized left, the metastasis of murderous nationalism, the twilight of socialist dreams virtually everywhere. Class inequality may have soared, ruthless individualism may have intensified, the conditions of life for the poor may have worsened, racial tensions may have mounted, unions and social democratic parties may have weakened or reached an impasse, but never mind. Attend to popular culture, study it with sympathy, and one need not dwell on unpleasant realities. One need not be unduly vexed by electoral defeats. One need not be preoccupied by the ways in which the political culture's center of gravity has moved rightward--or rather, one can put this down to the iron grip of the established media institutions. One need not even be rigorous about what one opposes and what one proposes in its place. Is capitalism the trouble? Is it the particular form of capitalism practiced by multinational corporations in a deregulatory era? Is it patriarchy (and is that the proper term for a society that has seen an upheaval in relations between women and men in the course of a half-century)? Racism? Antidemocracy? Practitioners of cultural studies, like the rest of the academic left, are frequently elusive. Speaking cavalierly of "opposition" and "resistance" permits--rather, cultivates--a certain sloppiness of thinking, making it possible to remain "left" without having to face the most difficult questions of political self-definition. The situation of cultural studies conforms to the contours of our political moment. It confirms--and reinforces--the current paralysis: the incapacity of social movements and dissonant sensibilities to imagine effective forms of public engagement. It substitutes an obsession with popular culture for coherent economic-political thought or a connection with mobilizable populations outside the academy and across identity lines. One must underscore that this is not simply because of cultural studies' default. The default is an effect more than a cause. It has its reasons. The odds are indeed stacked against serious forward motion in conventional politics. Political power is not only beyond reach, but functional majorities disdain it, finding the government and all its works contemptible. Few of the central problems of contemporary civilization are seriously contested within the narrow band of conventional discourse. Unconventional politics, such as it is, is mostly fragmented and self-contained along lines of racial, gender, and sexual identities. One cannot say that cultural studies diverts energy from a vigorous politics that is already in force. Still, insofar as cultural studies makes claims for itself as an insurgent politics, the field is presumptuous and misleading. Its attempt to legitimize the ecstasies of the moment confirms the collective withdrawal from democratic hope. Seeking to find political energies in audiences who function as audiences, rather than in citizens functioning as citizens, the dominant current in cultural studies is pressed willy-nilly toward an uncritical celebration of technological progress. It offers no resistance to the primacy of visual and nonlinear culture over the literary and linear. To the contrary: it embraces technological innovation as soon as the latest developments prove popular. It embraces the sufficiency of markets; its main idea of the intellect's democratic commitment is to flatter the audience. Is there a chance of a modest redemption? Perhaps, if we imagine a harder headed, less wishful cultural studies, free of the burden of imagining itself to be a political practice. A chastened, realistic cultural studies would divest itself of political pretensions. It would not claim to be politics. It would not mistake the academy for the larger society. It would be less romantic about the world--and about itself. Rigorous practitioners of cultural studies should be more curious about the world that remains to be researched--and changed. We would learn more about politics, economy, and society, and in the process, appreciate better what culture, and cultural study, do not accomplish. If we wish to do politics, let us organize groups, coalitions, demonstrations, lobbies, whatever; **let us do politics. Let us not think that our academic work is already that**