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### Off-1

**Security speech acts define difference as threatening otherness, to secure state identity, which causes a self-fulfilling prophecy based on false regimes of truth.**

**Jæger** 20**00** (Øyvind @ Norwegian Institute of International Affairs and the Copenhagen Peace Research Institute. *Peace and Conflict Studies* 7.2 “Securitizing Russia: Discoursive Practice of the Baltic States” shss.nova.edu/pcs/journalsPDF/V7N2.pdf”, MT)

Security is a field of practice into which subject matters can be inserted as well as exempted. Security is a code for going about a particular business in very particular ways. By labeling an issue a security issue, that is, a threat to security, one legitimises the employment of extraordinary measures to counter the threat, because it threatens security. In other words, security is a self-referential practice that carries its own legitimisation and justification. Security issues are allotted priority above everything else because everything else is irrelevant if sovereignty is lost, the state loses independence and ceases to exist. This makes for the point that it is not security as an objective or a state of affairs that is the crux of understanding security, but rather the typical operations and modalities by which security comes into play, Wæver (1995) notes.15 The typical operations are speech-acts and the modality threat-defence sequences. That is, perceiving and conveying threats and calling upon defence hold back the alleged threat. This is also a self-referential practice with the dynamic of a security dilemma: Defensive measures taken with reference to a perceived threat cause increased sense of insecurity and new calls for defence, and so forth. Wæver’s argument is that this logic is at work also in other fields than those busying themselves with military defence of sovereignty. Moreover, viewing security as a speech act not only makes it possible to include different sectors in a study of security, and thus open up the concept. It also clears the way for resolving security concerns by desecuritising issues which through securitisation have raised the concern in the first place. Knowing the logic of securitisation and pinning it down when it is at work carries the possibility of reversing the process by advocating other modalities for dealing with a given issue unluckily cast as a matter of security. What is perceived as a threat and therefore invoking defence, triggering the spiral, might be perceived of otherwise, namely as a matter of political discord to be resolved by means of ordinary political conduct, (i.e. not by rallying in defence of sovereignty). A call for more security will not eliminate threats and dangers. It is a call for more insecurity as it will reproduce threats and perpetuate a security problem. As Wæver (1994:8)16 puts it:"Transcending a security problem, politicizing a problem can therefore not happen through thematization in terms of security, only away from it." That is what de-securitisation is about. David Campbell (1992) has taken the discursive approach to security one step further. He demonstrates that security is pretty much the business of (state) identity. His argument is developed from the claim that foreign policy is a discourse of danger that came to replace Christianity’s evangelism of fear in the wake of the Westphalian peace. But the effects of a "evangelism of fear" and a discourse of danger are similar – namely to produce a certitude of identity by depicting difference as otherness. As the Peace of Westphalia signified the replacement of church by state, faith by reason, religion by science, intuition by experience and tradition by modernity, the religious identity of salvation by othering evil ("think continually about death in order to avoid sin, because sin plus death will land you in hell"17 –so better beware of Jews, heretics, witches and temptations of the flesh) was replaced by a hidden ambiguity of the state. Since modernity’s privileging of reason erased the possibility of grounding social organisation in faith, it had to be propped up by reason and the sovereign state as a anthropomorphic representation of sovereign Man was offered as a resolution. But state identity cannot easily be produced by reason alone. The problem was, however, that once the "death of God" had been proclaimed, the link between the world, "man" and certitude had been broken (Campbell 1992: 53). Thus ambiguity prevailed in the modernist imperative that every presumption grounded in faith be revealed by reason, and on the other hand, that the privileging of modernity, the state, and reason itself is not possible without an element of faith. In Campbell’s (1992: 54) words: In this context of incipient ambiguity brought upon by an insistence that can no longer be grounded, securing identity in the form of the state requires an emphasis on the unfinished and endangered nature of the world. In other words, discourses of "danger" are central to the discourses of the "state" and the discourses of "man". In place of the spiritual certitude that provided the vertical intensity to support the horizontal extenciveness of Christendom, the state requires discourses of "danger" to provide a new theology of truth about who and what "we" are by highlighting who and what "we" are not, and what "we" have to fear. The mode through which the Campbellian discourse of danger is employed in foreign (and security) policy, can then be seen as practices of Wæverian securitisation. Securitisation is the mode of discourse and the discourse is a "discourse of danger" identifying and naming threats, thereby delineating Self from Other and thus making it clear what it is "we" are protecting, (i.e. what is "us", what is our identity and therefore – as representation – what is state identity). This is done by pointing out danger, threats and enemies, internal and external alike, and – by linking the two (Campbell 1992: 239): For the state, identity can be understood as the outcome of exclusionary practices in which resistant elements to a secure identity on the "inside" are linked through a discourse of danger (such as Foreign Policy) with threats identified and located on the "outside". To speak security is then to employ a discourse of danger inter-subjectively depicting that which is different from Self as an existential threat – and therefore as Other to Self. Securitisation is about the identity of that which is securitised on behalf of, a discursive practice to (re)produce the identity of the state. Securitising implies "othering" difference – making difference the Other in a binary opposition constituting Self (Neumann 1996b: 167). Turning to the Baltic Sea Region, one cannot help noting the rather loose fitting between the undeniable – indeed underscored – state focus in the works of both David Campbell and the Copenhagen School on the one hand, and the somewhat wishful speculations of regionality beyond the state – transcending sovereignty – on the other. Coupling the two is not necessarily an analytical problem. It only makes a rather weak case for regionality. But exactly that becomes a theoretical problem in undermining the very theoretical substance, and by implication – empirical viability – of regionality. There are of course indications that the role of states are relativised in late modern (or post- modern) politics. And there is reason to expect current developments in the security problematique of the Baltic states – firmly connected to the dynamic of NATO’s enlargement – to exert an impact on regional co-operation in the Baltic Sea Region, possibly even on regionality. NATO moving east, engaging Russia and carrying elements of the post-modernist security agenda with it in the process, is likely to narrow the gap between the two agendas. Moreover, since the Baltic states are not included in a first round of expansion, they might in this very fact (failure, some would say) find an incentive for shifting focus from international to regional levels. Involving Poland and engaging Russia, the enlargement of NATO will in fact bring the Alliance as such (not only individual NATO countries as the case has been) to bear increasingly on the regional setting as well as on regional activity. That might add significance to the regional level. It does not, however, necessarily imply that the state as actor and state centric approaches will succumb to regionality. Neither does it do away with the state as the prime referent for, and producer of, collective identity, so central to the approaches of both Wæver and Campbell. But it might spur a parallel to sovereignty. A way out of this theoretical impasse would then be not to stress the either or of regionality/sovereignty, but to see the two as organising principles at work side by side, complementing each other in parallelity rather than excluding one another in contrariety. The Discourse of Danger: The Russian war on Chechnya is one event that was widely interpreted in the Baltic as a ominous sign of what Russia has in store for the Baltic states (see Rebas 1996: 27; Nekrasas 1996: 58; Tarand 1996: 24; cf. Haab 1997). The constitutional ban in all three states on any kind of association with post-Soviet political structures is indicative of a threat perception that confuses Soviet and post- Soviet, conflating Russia with the USSR and casting everything Russian as a threat through what Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe (1985) call a discursive "chain of equivalence". In this the value of one side in a binary opposition is reiterated in other denotations of the same binary opposition. Thus, the value "Russia" in a Russia/Europe-opposition is also denoted by "instability", "Asia", "invasion", "chaos", "incitement of ethnic minorities", "unpredictability", "imperialism", "slander campaign", "migration", and so forth. The opposite value of these markers ("stability", "Europe", "defence", "order", and so on) would then denote the Self and thus conjure up an identity. When identity is precarious, this discursive practice intensifies by shifting onto a security mode, treating the oppositions as if they were questions of political existence, sovereignty, and survival. Identity is (re)produced more effectively when the oppositions are employed in a discourse of in-security and danger, that is, made into questions of national security and thus securitised in the Wæverian sense. In the Baltic cases, especially the Lithuanian National Security Concept is knitting a chain of equivalence in a ferocious discourse of danger. Not only does it establish "[t]hat the defence of Lithuania is total and unconditional," and that "[s]hould there be no higher command, self-controlled combat actions of armed units and citizens shall be considered legal." (National Security Concept, Lithuania, Ch. 7, Sc. 1, 2) It also posits that [t]he power of civic resistance is constituted of the Nation’s Will and self-determination to fight for own freedom, of everyone citizen’s resolution to resist to [an] assailant or invader by all possible ways, despite citizen’s age and [or] profession, of taking part in Lithuania’s defence (National Security Concept, Lithuania, Ch. 7, Sc. 4). When this is added to the identifying of the objects of national security as "human and citizen rights, fundamental freedoms and personal security; state sovereignty; rights of the nation, prerequisites for a free development; the state independence; the constitutional order; state territory and its integrity, and; cultural heritage," and the subjects as "the state, the armed forces and other institutions thereof; the citizens and their associations, and; non governmental organisations,"(National Security Concept, Lithuania, Ch. 2, Sc. 1, 2) one approaches a conception of security in which the distinction between state and nation has disappeared in all-encompassing securitisation. Everyone is expected to defend everything with every possible means.

Enmity motivated by security will cause extinction, the threats they name aren’t real but are invented by leaders manipulating us.

Mack 1990 (John E., M.D. an American psychiatrist, writer, and professor at Harvard Medical School. He was a Pulitzer Prize-winning biographer. “The Enemy System” 1988. <http://www.johnemackinstitute.org/passport/enemysystem.html>, MT)

The threat of nuclear annihilation has stimulated us to try to understand what it is about mankind that has led to such self-destroying behavior. Central to this inquiry is an exploration of the adversarial relationships between ethnic or national groups. It is out of such enmities that war, including nuclear war should it occur, has always arisen. Enmity between groups of people stems from the interaction of psychological, economic, and cultural elements. These include fear and hostility (which are often closely related), competition over perceived scarce resources,[3] the need for individuals to identify with a large group or cause,[4] a tendency to disclaim and assign elsewhere responsibility for unwelcome impulses and intentions, and a peculiar susceptibility to emotional manipulation by leaders who play upon our more savage inclinations in the name of national security or the national interest. A full understanding of the "enemy system"[3] requires insights from many specialities, including psychology, anthropology, history, political science, and the humanities. In their statement on violence[5] twenty social and behavioral scientists, who met in Seville, Spain, to examine the roots of war, declared that there was no scientific basis for regarding man as an innately aggressive animal, inevitably committed to war. The Seville statement implies that we have real choices. It also points to a hopeful paradox of the nuclear age: threat of nuclear war may have provoked our capacity for fear-driven polarization but at the same time it has inspired unprecedented efforts towards cooperation and settlement of differences without violence. The Real and the Created Enemy: Attempts to explore the psychological roots of enmity are frequently met with responses on the following lines: "I can accept psychological explanations of things, but my enemy is real. The Russians [or Germans, Arabs, Israelis, Americans] are armed, threaten us, and intend us harm. Furthermore, there are real differences between us and our national interests, such as competition over oil, land, or other scarce resources, and genuine conflicts of values between our two nations. It is essential that we be strong and maintain a balance or superiority of military and political power, lest the other side take advantage of our weakness". This argument does not address the distinction between the enemy threat and one's own contribution to that threat-by distortions of perception, provocative words, and actions. In short, the enemy is real, but we have not learned to understand how we have created that enemy, or how the threatening image we hold of the enemy relates to its actual intentions. "We never see our enemy's motives and we never labor to assess his will, with anything approaching objectivity".[6] Individuals may have little to do with the choice of national enemies. Most Americans, for example, know only what has been reported in the mass media about the Soviet Union. We are largely unaware of the forces that operate within our institutions, affecting the thinking of our leaders and ourselves, and which determine how the Soviet Union will be represented to us. Ill-will and a desire for revenge are transmitted from one generation to another, and we are not taught to think critically about how our assigned enemies are selected for us. In the relations between potential adversarial nations there will have been, inevitably, real grievances that are grounds for enmity. But the attitude of one people towards another is usually determined by leaders who manipulate the minds of citizens for domestic political reasons which are generally unknown to the public. As Israeli sociologist Alouph Haveran has said, in times of conflict between nations historical accuracy is the first victim.[8] The Image of the Enemy and How We Sustain It: Vietnam veteran William Broyles wrote: "War begins in the mind, with the idea of the enemy."[9] But to sustain that idea in war and peacetime a nation's leaders must maintain public support for the massive expenditures that are required. Studies of enmity have revealed susceptibilities, though not necessarily recognized as such by the governing elites that provide raw material upon which the leaders may draw to sustain the image of an enemy.[7,10] Freud[11] in his examination of mass psychology identified the proclivity of individuals to surrender personal responsibility to the leaders of large groups. This surrender takes place in both totalitarian and democratic societies, and without coercion. Leaders can therefore designate outside enemies and take actions against them with little opposition. Much further research is needed to understand the psychological mechanisms that impel individuals to kill or allow killing in their name, often with little questioning of the morality or consequences of such actions. Philosopher and psychologist Sam Keen asks why it is that in virtually every war "The enemy is seen as less than human? He's faceless. He's an animal"." Keen tries to answer his question: "The image of the enemy is not only the soldier's most powerful weapon; it is society's most powerful weapon. It enables people en masse to participate in acts of violence they would never consider doing as individuals".[12] National leaders become skilled in presenting the adversary in dehumanized images. The mass media, taking their cues from the leadership, contribute powerfully to the process. The image of the enemy as less than human may be hard to dislodge. For example, a teacher in the Boston area reported that during a high school class on the Soviet Union a student protested: "You're trying to get us to see them as people". Stephen Cohen and other Soviet experts have noted how difficult it is to change the American perception of the Soviet Union, despite the vast amount of new information contradicting old stereotypes." Bernard Shaw in his preface to *Heartbreak House*, written at the end of World War I, observed ironically: "Truth telling is not compatible with the defense of the realm". Nations are usually created out of the violent defeat of the former inhabitants of a piece of land or of outside enemies, and national leaders become adept at keeping their people's attention focused on the threat of an outside enemy.[14] Leaders also provide what psychiatrist Vamik Volkan called "suitable targets of externalization"[10] – i.e., outside enemies upon whom both leaders and citizens can relieve their burdens of private defeat, personal hurt, and humiliation.[15] All-embracing ideas, such as political ideologies and fixed religious beliefs act as psychological or cultural amplifiers. Such ideologies can embrace whole economic systems, such as socialism or capitalism, or draw on beliefs that imply that a collectivity owes its existence to some higher power in the universe. It was not Stalin as an individual whom Nadezhda Mandelstam blamed for the political murder of her poet husband Osip and millions of other citizens but the "craving for an all-embracing idea which would explain everything in the world and bring about universal harmony at one go”.[16] Every nation, no matter how bloody and cruel its beginnings, sees its origins in a glorious era of heroes who vanquished less worthy foes. One's own race, people, country, or political system is felt to be superior to the adversary's, blessed by a less worthy god. The nuclear age has spawned a new kind of myth. This is best exemplified by the United States' strategic defense initiative. This celestial fantasy offers protection from attack by nuclear warheads, faith here being invested not in a god but in an anti-nuclear technology of lasers, satellites, mirrors, and so on in the heavens.Individual Group Linkages and Lessons in Childhood: To find out the source of hatred or antagonism we need to understand the complex relationship between the psychology of the individual, and the national group.[17] We can start by examining how enmity develops in childhood. In the first year of life a child begins to have a sense of self,[18] which includes the ability to distinguish between familiar people with whom he or she feels comfortable and those who are strangers or are felt to be alien. The small child's ability to distinguish between friends and strangers[19] is accompanied by thought patterns that tend to divide people and things into good and bad, safe and unsafe. It is out of such primitive thinking that the structures of enmity later grow. In the second year the child learns that ill-will directed towards those upon whom he is dependent is dangerous to his own well-being. He develops, therefore, mechanisms such as displacement and externalization which allow him to disown such negative impulses. Grandparents and parents may pass on to their children stories of the designated enemy groups' evil actions so that chosen displacements persist from one generation to another. From the drawings and comments of children in Germany, the United States, Central America, and Samoa, Hesse showed that by age five a child understands the idea of an enemy, which he or she will depict as whatever in the culture seems most immediately fearful or threatening-a monster, wild animal, or bad man.[20] By age eight a child understands that "the idea of the enemy" has to do with an unfriendly relationship. But this idea does not usually become cast in political terms until age ten to twelve. It is noteworthy that Hesse's research children, including the older ones, tend not to see their own country as bad or responsible for bad actions. The small child's sense of helplessness is accompanied by a feeling of vulnerability and awareness of dependence on others. The formation of relationships or alliances with other individuals and groups, beginning with family members and extending to the neighborhood, classroom, school playground, and teenage youth group, is an important strategy for gaining a sense of power. Such alliances are the prototype for later political relationships. All of these primitive, or child-like, mechanisms provide fertile soil for political leaders in real life interethnic or international conflicts. Nationalistic slogans and media manipulation focus the child's mind (or the child-mind of the adult) on the peoples or system he is supposed to hate or fear (Jews, Arabs, capitalists, or communists). In the United States patriotic recruitment is accompanied by commercial profiteering-for example, robotic war toys designed to kill communists.[21] The extraordinary dimensions of the nuclear threat have also spawned examples of apocalyptic thinking, in which the world is divided into forces of good and evil, and the belief that, in the event of a nuclear holocaust, the good would be saved and the evil would perish. In such thinking the primitive, polarizing tendencies of the child's mind are all too evident. Creating a Safer World: Hesse's finding that even older children do not perceive their own country's responsibility for states of enmity is in accord with those of psychologists and social scientists - that there is no self-awareness or self-responsibility at the political level which corresponds to the awareness of personal responsibility with which we are familiar in a clinical setting." In political life, the assignment of blame, disclaiming of responsibility, and the denial of one's own nation's contribution to tensions and enmity are the norm.[23] The first task, therefore, is to apply the insights of the behavioral sciences to create a new expectation of political self-responsibility. Nuclear weapons have connected all the peoples of the earth. Not only the nuclear superpowers but also all peoples are now interdependent and mutually vulnerable. Nations may have conflicting values but they cannot afford to have enemies. Education in elementary and secondary schools that reflects this new reality should be our highest priority. Instead of constant blaming of the other side, we need to give new attention to the adversary's culture and history, to his real intentions as well as his hopes, dreams, and values. To understand is not to forgive, but awareness and knowledge could lead to a more realistic appreciation of who has contributed what to the problems and tensions that exist in the world. Young people should be taught in their homes and schools how to identify and resist ideological propaganda. In the nuclear age we need to redefine hackneyed ideas such as national security or the national interest. just as we can no longer afford enemies, there is no longer such a notion as national security. The security of each depends on the other, and the communication of this reality must become a major focus of our educational system.

Political reality only comes into being after we describe the world. Thus we have to deal with how the Affirmative represents the world before we can move on to any other question

#### Blieker 2000 (Roland, Professor of IR at University of Queensland, “Contending Images of World Politics”, p. 227-228, MT)

While the conceptual contours of the postmodern will always remain elusive, the substantial issues that this image of world politics has brought to the forefront have clear and important implications. Critical engagements with modernity have emerged from a dissatisfaction with what Lyotard famously described as a long modern tendency to ground and legitimize knowledge in reference to a grand narrative, that is, a universalizing framework which seeks to emancipate the individual by **mastering the conditions** of life (Lyotard, 1979, pp. 7-9). Even when such a master narrative seems unquestionably desirable, it inevitably **legitimizes and objectivizes** certain interpretations and political agendas, thereby excluding everything that does not fit into its corresponding view of life. Authors who are said to represent a postmodern image of the world politics grapple with the implications that emerge from the prevalence of master narratives in world politics. They challenge the way in which scientific discourses that have emerged from the Cartesian separation of the object and subject mask the constituted dimensions of life. They engage prevalent thinking patterns so that we can see the world from more that one perspective, and that marginalized voices can be brought into the realm of dialogue. This search for epistemological tolerance and inclusion is as much political as it is philosophical. And its practical applicability is – needless to say – virtually unlimited. It is in this sense that, for instance, all feminisms can be thought of as a postmodern’ (Sylvester, 1994, p. 16). The purpose of this essay is not to summarize the great variety of postmodern approaches to the world politics. Several authors have already done so (see for instance, Brown, 1994; Devetak, 1996). The main effort of this essay thus revolves around demonstrating how something termed postmodernism may work. From such a perspective the ‘how’ is as important as the ‘is’. In fact, the ‘how’ becomes the ‘is’ insofar as the nature of something is identified primarily as the process through which it works. The prime task of such an approach consists not of looking at modernity or postmodernity as metaphors of contemporary world politics, but of understanding – and acting upon – the more fundamental recognition that all forms of thought are metaphorical in nature. They cannot be anything else, for language itself is a series of metaphors through which we make sense of the world that surrounds us. And since we need language not only to communicate, but also to form our opinions of social phenomena, we inevitably think, live and politicize through a series of metaphors – that is, through forms of conceptualizing that contain **inevitable gaps** between a representation of an event and the event itself. Various implications follow from an approach that acknowledges the metaphorical nature of our understanding of world politics. At the beginning is perhaps the simple recognition that representation is an essential aspect of the political process. Political reality, F.R. Ankersmit stresses, ‘is’ not first given to us and subsequently represented; **political reality only comes into being after and due to representations’** (1996, pg. 47). What this means for an analysis of world politics is that **before being able to move to any other question, one has to deal with how the representation has structured the object it seeks to represent**.

Our alternative is to reject the security fetishism of the 1AC, their flawed methodology and discourse to eschew the logic of security.

The alternative solves - breaking out of our obsession with security allows alternative relationships to the future - their predictions are ideologically loaded and suspect.

**Neocleous** 20**08** (Mark is a Professor at Brunel University, Critique of Political Economy; Head of Department of Politics & History, he joined Brunel University in the Department of Government in 1994. Since then he has published numerous books and articles. His most recent work has been towards the development of a critique of security. “CRITIQUE OF SECURITY” 2008. Pg. 185-186, MT)

The only way out of such a dilemma, **to escape the fetish**, is perhaps to **eschew the logic of security** altogether – to **reject it as so ideologically loaded** in favour of the state that any real political thought other than the authoritarian and reactionary should be pressed to give it up. That is clearly something that can not be achieved within the limits of bourgeois thought and thus could never even begin to be imagined by the security intellectual. It is also something that the **constant iteration** of the refrain ‘**this is an insecure world**’ and reiteration of one **fear**, anxiety and insecurity after another **will** also make it hard to do. But it is something that the critique of security suggests we may have to consider if we want a political way out of the impasse of security. This impasse exists because security has now become so all-encompassing that **it marginalises all else,** most notably the constructive conflicts, **debates and discussions** that **animate political life**. The constant prioritising of a mythical security as a political end – as the political end – constitutes a **rejection of politics** in any **meaningful sense** of the term. That is, as a mode of action in which differences can be articulated, in which the conflicts and struggles that arise from such differences can be fought for and negotiated, in which people might come to believe that **another world is possible** – that they might transform the world and in turn be transformed. Security politics simply removes this; worse, it removes it while purportedly addressing it. In so doing it suppresses all issues of power and turns political questions into debates about the most efficient way to achieve ‘security’, despite the fact that we are never quite told – never could be told – what might count as having achieved it. Security politics is, in this sense, an **anti-politics**,141 dominating political discourse in much the same manner as the security state tries to dominate human beings, reinforcing security fetishism and the monopolistic character of security on the political imagination. We therefore need to get beyond security politics, **not add yet more ‘sectors’ to it** in a way that simply expands the scope of the state and legitimises state intervention in yet more and more areas of our lives. Simon Dalby reports a personal communication with Michael Williams, co-editor of the important text Critical Security Studies, in which the latter asks: if you take away security, what do you put in the hole that’s left behind? But I’m inclined to agree with Dalby: **maybe there is no hole.**142 The mistake has been to think that there is a hole and that this hole needs to be filled with a new vision or revision of security in which it is re-mapped or civilised or gendered or humanised or expanded or whatever. All of these ultimately remain within the statist political imaginary, and consequently end up re- affirming the state as the terrain of modern politics, the grounds of security. The real task is not to fill the supposed hole with yet another vision of security, but to fight for **an alternative political language** which takes us beyond the narrow horizon of bourgeois security and which therefore does not constantly throw us into the arms of the state. That’s the point of critical politics: to develop a **new political language** more adequate to the kind of society we want. Thus while much of what I have said here has been of a negative order, part of the tradition of critical theory is that the **negative may be as significant** as the positive in setting thought on new paths. For if security really is the supreme concept of bourgeois society and the fundamental thematic of liberalism, then to keep harping on about insecurity and to keep demanding ‘more security’ (while meekly hoping that this increased security doesn’t damage our liberty) **is to blind ourselves** to the possibility of building real alternatives to the authoritarian tendencies in contemporary politics. To **situate ourselves against security** politics would allow us to circumvent the debilitating effect achieved through the constant securitising of social and political issues, debilitating in the sense that ‘security’ helps consolidate the power of the existing **forms of social domination** and justifies the short-circuiting of even the most democratic forms. It would also allow us to forge another kind of politics centred on a **different conception of the good.** We need a new way of thinking and talking about social being and politics that moves us beyond security. This would perhaps **be emancipatory in the true sense of the word.** What this might mean, precisely, must be open to debate. But it certainly requires recognising that security is an illusion that has forgotten it is an illusion; it requires recognising that security is not the same as solidarity; it requires accepting that insecurity is part of the human condition, and thus giving up the search for the certainty of security and instead learning to tolerate the uncertainties, ambiguities and ‘insecurities’ that come with being human; it requires accepting that ‘securitizing’ an issue does **not mean dealing with it politically, but bracketing it** out and handing it to the state; **it requires us to be brave enough to return the gift.**143

### Off-2

#### Text: The President of the United States should exhibit executive restraint in regards to drone strikes in Yemen

#### Executive actors solve restrictions and oversight, enable independent review, and are the only way to avoid leaking intel

Radsan and Murphy 2011 (Afsheen and Richard, Professor of Law, William Mitchell College of Law; AT&T Professor of Law, Texas Tech University School of Law, MEASURE TWICE, SHOOT ONCE:¶ HIGHER CARE FOR¶ CIA-TARGETED KILLING, http://illinoislawreview.org/wp-content/ilr-content/articles/2011/4/Murphy.pdf)

There are other candidates to conduct independent review. Executive¶ officials, to be sure, are not as independent as federal judges. These¶ officials have a natural impulse to avoid embarrassing the administration¶ they work for. Moreover, if the media are correct that CIA Director¶ Leon Panetta approves drone strikes,181 then this review goes toward the¶ most senior officials in the intelligence community. Despite these challenges,¶ there is at least one official with a measure of independence for¶ meaningful review of CIA drone strikes. The CIA’s Inspector General (IG) is charged with investigating the¶ legality of CIA actions.182 He or she is experienced with protecting classified¶ information. His or her independence is protected by a statute that¶ permits only the president to remove the IG.183 And he or she has a dual¶ reporting line to the CIA Director and to the congressional oversight¶ committees.184 The CIA’s IG is thus our preferred candidate.¶ The CIA’s IG should review all the CIA’s targeted killings for reasoned¶ decision making. Based on this review, an IG could recommend¶ internal discipline, compensation to unwarranted victims of a strike, or,¶ in an extreme case of abuse, referral to the Department of Justice for¶ criminal proceedings. The IG should also be involved in reviewing the¶ CIA’s internal procedures on target selection and execution of attacks.¶ IG’s due process, so to speak, substitutes for what otherwise might come¶ from the courts. To enhance accountability, the IG could prepare public¶ reports detailing as much information on strikes as reasonably consonant¶ with national security. Such reports would need to balance the interests¶ of accountability against the CIA’s need to enable foreign governments¶ to keep their role in assisting U.S. intelligence a secret. They would also¶ need to avoid excessive revelations of sensitive sources and methods.¶ Given the limited number of CIA strikes, the dangers this program¶ poses to peaceful civilians now and in the future, and the extensive data¶ concerning each strike, it is feasible for the IG to conduct an investigation¶ of all CIA drone strikes. These investigations will not guarantee¶ perfection. Nothing can. But they will help ensure the accuracy and the¶ legality of strikes, curb abuses, and provide a modicum of accountability¶ for a shadow war. Because they are feasible under the laws of war, IHL¶ requires them.

#### Judicial review of drone strikes fails and leaks key intelligence- causes terrorism

Radsan and Murphy 2011 (Afsheen and Richard, Professor of Law, William Mitchell College of Law; AT&T Professor of Law, Texas Tech University School of Law, MEASURE TWICE, SHOOT ONCE:¶ HIGHER CARE FOR¶ CIA-TARGETED KILLING, http://illinoislawreview.org/wp-content/ilr-content/articles/2011/4/Murphy.pdf)

Determining an appropriate scope of review still leaves open who¶ should conduct that review of CIA drone strikes. The Israelis rely on a¶ mix of executive and judicial actors. In the United States, federal judges¶ have great independence because of lifetime tenure and protections of¶ their salaries. They are obvious candidates. But using federal courts to¶ review CIA targeted killing raises a host of problems. Few judges are¶ military and intelligence experts, and the transparency of civilian courts¶ goes against the secrecy necessary for some military and intelligence operations.¶ As a compromise, one might try a national security court to¶ keep intelligence sources and methods from unauthorized disclosure.179¶ But, putting aside academic debates, Congress does not seem interested¶ in a new court. Another problem with regular courts is the “standing”¶ requirement of a plaintiff who is ready and able to bring suit. The targets¶ of attacks, even if they survive, are unlikely to travel from Afghanistan or¶ Pakistan to file suit, and it is not clear who else could be a proper plaintiff.¶ 180

Nuclear war

Speice, J.D. Candidate at Marshall-Wythe School of Law at William & Marry, 6 (Patrick, “NEGLIGENCE AND NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION: ELIMINATING THE CURRENT LIABILITY BARRIER TO BILATERAL U.S.-RUSSIAN NONPROLIFERATION ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS,” William & Marry Law Review, February, 47 Wm and Mary L. Rev. 1427)

Organizations such as the Russian military and Minatom are now operating in circumstances of great stress. Money is in short supply, paychecks are irregular, living conditions unpleasant ... [D]isorder within Russia and the resulting strains within the military could easily cause a lapse or a breakdown in the Russian military's guardianship of nuclear weapons. 38 Accordingly, there is a significant and ever-present risk that terrorists could acquire a nuclear device or fissile material from Russia as a result of the confluence of Russian economic decline and the end of stringent Soviet-era nuclear security measures. 39 Terrorist groups could acquire a nuclear weapon by a number of methods, including "steal[ing] one intact from the stockpile of a country possessing such weapons, or ... [being] sold or given one by [\*1438] such a country, or [buying or stealing] one from another subnational group that had obtained it in one of these ways." 40 Equally threatening, however, is the risk that terrorists will steal or purchase fissile material and construct a nuclear device on their own. Very little material is necessary to construct a highly destructive nuclear weapon. 41 Although nuclear devices are extraordinarily complex, the technical barriers to constructing a workable weapon are not significant. 42 Moreover, the sheer number of methods that could be used to deliver a nuclear device into the United States makes it incredibly likely that terrorists could successfully employ a nuclear weapon once it was built. 43 Accordingly, supply-side controls that are aimed at preventing terrorists from acquiring nuclear material in the first place are the most effective means of countering the risk of nuclear terrorism. 44 Moreover, the end of the Cold War eliminated the rationale for maintaining a large military-industrial complex in Russia, and the nuclear cities were closed. 45 This resulted in at least 35,000 nuclear scientists becoming unemployed in an economy that was collapsing. 46 Although the economy has stabilized somewhat, there [\*1439] are still at least 20,000 former scientists who are unemployed or underpaid and who are too young to retire, 47 raising the chilling prospect that these scientists will be tempted to sell their nuclear knowledge, or steal nuclear material to sell, to states or terrorist organizations with nuclear ambitions. 48 The potential consequences of the unchecked spread of nuclear knowledge and material to terrorist groups that seek to cause mass destruction in the United States are truly horrifying. A terrorist attack with a nuclear weapon would be devastating in terms of immediate human and economic losses. 49 Moreover, there would be immense political pressure in the United States to discover the perpetrators and retaliate with nuclear weapons, massively increasing the number of casualties and potentially triggering a full-scale nuclear conflict.

Third

### Off-3

#### Obamas foreign policy presidential powers are high but he will show strategic restraint if they decline

Joseph S. Nye Jr. is University Distinguished Service Professor at Harvard University and is the former Dean of the Kennedy School. 5-31-13 (“The Cult of Transformational Leadership”, the diplomat)

In contrast to Bush, the crisis that Obama faced was economic rather than security related, but Obama’s temperament was different as well. While Obama had expounded a transformational vision in his campaign, his crisis responses were those of a pragmatist. Temperamentally, he was noted for his coolness in analysis under pressure, a term sometimes summed up by the phrase “no drama Obama.” For example, his reaction to success in the highly risky cross- border raid that killed Bin Laden in 2011 but could have destroyed his presidency “was self-contained to the extreme: ‘we got him,’ was all he said.” Political scientist George Edwards criticizes Obama as a man who presented himself as a “transformational leader who would fundamentally change the policy and politics of America” and then overreached by thinking his ability to communicate and educate the public could change more than he could. But this criticism is more telling in regard to Obama’s domestic program than in regard to his foreign policy.¶ Obama’s rhetoric both in the 2008 campaign and during the first months of his presidency was both inspirational in style and transformational in objective. As several experts describe the campaign, “This image of a new domestic agenda, a new global architecture, and a transformed world was crucial to his ultimate success as a candidate.” Of course, campaign rhetoric always sounds more transformational as challengers criticize the incumbents, but Obama continued the transformational rhetoric with a series of speeches in the first year of his presidency, including his inaugural address; a speech at Prague proclaiming the goal of a nuclear-free world; a speech in Cairo promising a new approach to the Muslim world; and his Nobel Peace Prize speech promising to “bend history in the direction of justice.” In part this series of speeches was tactical. Obama needed to meet his promise to set a new direction in foreign policy while simultaneously managing to juggle the legacy of issues left to him by Bush, any of which, if dropped, could cause a crisis for his presidency. Nonetheless, there is no reason to believe that Obama was being disingenuous about his objectives.¶ Obama had an “activist vision of his role in history,” intending to “refurbish America’s image abroad, especially in the Muslim world; end its involvement in two wars; offer an outstretched hand to Iran; reset relations with Russia as a step toward ridding the world of nuclear weapons; develop significant cooperation with China on both regional and global issues; and make peace in the Middle East.” As Martin S. Indyk, Kenneth G. Lieberthal, and Michael E. O'Hanlon have observed, his record of achievement on these issues in his first term was mixed. “Seemingly intractable circumstances turned him from the would-be architect of a new global order into a leader focused more on repairing relationships and reacting to crises—most notably global economic crisis.”¶

#### Targeted killings results in elimination of legal and necessary targeted killings

Jack Goldsmith, 2012, (Jack Goldsmith is a Harvard Law professor and former legal adviser to the General Counsel of the Department of Defense, *Power and Constraint*, W.W. Norton Publishing, p.199-200)

These sorts of institutional ripples were what the ACLU and the CCR were aiming at more broadly. These organizations did not bring the al-Aulaqi lawsuit only (or even mainly) to win the court. They also sued to promote media attention to the issue, to get the government to disclose more information about its practices, and to pressure the government to adopt tighter international controls. On these scores the lawsuit was something of a victory. The public already new a bit about the supposedly secret operations in Yemen against al-Aulaqi. But the lawsuit caused new details to spill out and brought greater attention to the targeted killing issue. In response to an ACLU Freedom of Information requires, the government released documents that explained its targeting decision-making practices. Beyond that, information about the care with which terrorists are placed on high-value target lists, about the National Security Councils oversight of the program, about the legal analysis supporting the targeting and about the actual operations in Yemen and elsewhere leaked to the press through the ecology of transparency, both before and, in much greater detail, after al–Aulaqi was killed in October 2011. In addition, the controversy sparked by the lawsuit was the predicate for state department legal advisor Harold Kohs speech, providing new legal details , by president Obamas chief counterterrorism advisor, John Brennan, in September 2011. All of this information allows congress and the American people (who are the ultimate checks on the presidency) to analyze what the government is doing in their name in secret and push back if they deem the operations unwarranted. Thus far – and in contrast to, say, bush-era interrogation practices they have largely sided with the government, even when it killed an American Citizen. For the GTMO Bar and its cousin NGOs and activists, how-ever the al-aulaqi lawsuit, like other lawsuits on different issues, was merely an early battle in a long war over the legitimacy of U.S. targeting practices – a war that will take place not just in the United States, but in other countries as well. When the CCR failed to achieve what it viewed as adequate accountability for Bush administration officials in the United States in connection with interrogation and detention practices, it started pursuing, and continues to pursue, lawsuits and prosecutions against U.S. officials in Spain, Germany, and other European counties. “you look for every niche you can when you can take on the issues that you think are important,” said Michael Ratner, explaining the CCR’s strategy for pursuing lawsuits in Europe. Clive Stafford Smith, a former CCR attorney who was instrumental in its early GTMO victories and who now leads the British advocacy organization Reprieve, is using this strategy in the targeted killing context. “There are endless ways in which the courts in Britain, the courts in America, the international courts and Pakistani courts can get involved” in scrutinizing U.S. targeting killing practices, he argues. “Its going to be the next “Guantanamo Bay issue.” Working in global network of NGO activists, Stafford Smith has begun a process in Pakistan to seek the arrest of former CIA lawyer John Rizzo in connection with drone strikes in Pakistan, and he is planning more lawsuits in the United States and elsewhere against drone operators. “The crucial court here is the court of public opinion,” he said, explaining why the lawsuits are important even if he loses. His efforts are backed by a growing web of proclamations in the United Nations , foreign capitals, the press, and the academy that U.S. drone practices are unlawful. What American University law professor Ken Anderson has described as the “international legal-media-academic-NGO-international organization- global opinion complex” is hard at work to stigmatize drones and those who support and operate them. This strategy is having an impact. The slew of lawsuits in the United States and threatened prosecutions in Europe against Bush administration officials imposes reputational, emotional and financial costs on them that help to promote the human rights groups ideological goals, even if courts never actually rule against the officials. By design, these suits also give pause to current officials who are considering controversial actions for fear that the same thing might later happen to them. This effect is starting to be felt with drones. Several Obama administration officials have told that they worry targeted killings will be seen in the future (as Stafford smith predicts) as their administrations GTMO. The attempted judicial action against RIZZO, the earlier lawsuits against top CIA officials in Pakistan and elsewhere, and the louder and louder proclamations of illegality around the world – all of which have gained momentum after al-Aulaqis killing – are also having an impact. These actions are rallying cries for protest and political pushback in the countries where the done strikes take place. And they lead CIA operators to worry about legal exposure before becoming involved in the Agency’s drone program. We don’t know yet whether these forces have affected actual targeting practices and related tactics. But they induce the officials involved to take more caution. And it is only a matter of time, if it has not happened already, before they lead the US government to forgo lawful targeted killing actions otherwise deemed to be in the interest of U.S. national security.

#### That destroys US leadership and flips all of their terminal impacts

Gonzalez, founder of NationandState.org an open-source foreign policy think tank, 7 (Nathan, Engaging Iran: The Rise of a Middle East Powerhouse and America’s Strategic Choice, p. 112)

In today’s unipolar world—one that has not yet been directly challenged by rival powers such as China or the European Union—America is allowed the comfort of not fearing its total destruction. No scenario, even the most pessimistic, such as a group of nuclear-armed terrorists attacking the American homeland, could result in the total destruction of the American state. Presently, of highest concern to this superpower is not the Armageddon-style conflict between two titanic rivals, but the continuing erosion of American power over the long term, forcing the United States to retreat—militarily, economically, or otherwise—from parts of the world previously under its support and influence. This casual chipping away at supremacy could allow rival powers to step up their efforts and gain a wider reach in the world. Not only China, but also the European Union and other “benign” powers could play the role of America’s geostrategic rival, given a large enough vacuum of influence or political presence left by today’s superpower in the twenty-first century. Historically, such systemic changes in the world have been associated with chaos and carnage. Most recently, such a power struggle was played out in World War II between the rising powers of Japan, Germany, the United States, and the Soviet Union, amidst the backdrop of Britain’s and France’s declining global reach. In today’s unipolar world, the United States must revisit the notion of how it commits itself to military and diplomatic hot zones. Overreaching could be disastrous, as it would invite the kind of bold rivalry associated with a global power vacuum. If the war in Iraq does not itself prove the damage that can be done by trying to overemphasize the effectiveness of purely military means, one need only imagine another war front opening tomorrow. Could America sustain another protracted, troop-intensive military endeavor, given the fact that it must operate under real economic and political constraints? How many more troops can America commit to conflicts that are not essential to its survival? If the United States needs to maintain an active presence in the world and keep other potential rivals from rising to the occasion of a power vacuum, then it must be poised to better manage world conflicts within its budget of current resources and political capital. The United States must be resourceful in order remain strong.

### Yemen

#### Multiple alt causes to Yemen instability

Mneimneh, 13 [Suzane, contributor to Geopoliticalmonitor.com, “Yemen: The Forgotten Front,” <http://www.geopoliticalmonitor.com/yemen-the-forgotten-front-4841/>, ALB]

The struggle against al-Qaeda in Yemen stands as an unheralded though critical front in the global war against terrorism. This fight has taken the form of violent hit-and-run operations against the Yemen Army, itself backed by U.S. drones, and the establishment of territorial bases that are often in flux. Most recently the battle has shifted to Hadramaut province, which was already largely controlled by al-Qaeda, after the Yemen Army managed to regain control of Abyan province and expel Ansar al-Sharia. Despite these ostensible gains, al-Qaeda forces have proven adept at moving in to fill gaps in central authority and capitalizing on endemic instability, poverty, unemployment, and political division in Yemen- the very factors that provide the most fertile ground for spreading the group’s extremist beliefs.

### Terrorism

No motivation for nuclear terror

Francis J. Gavin 10, Professor of International Affairs and Director of the Robert S. Strauss Center for International Security and Law, Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs, University of Texas at Austin, “Same As It Ever Was,” International Security, Vol. 34, No. 3 (Winter 2009/10), pp. 7–37

A recent study contends that al-Qaida’s interest in acquiring and using nuclear weapons may be overstated. Anne Stenersen, a terrorism expert, claims that “looking at statements and activities at various levels within the al-Qaida network, it becomes clear that the network’s interest in using unconventional means is in fact much lower than commonly thought.”55 She further states that “CBRN [chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear] weapons do not play a central part in al-Qaida’s strategy.”56 In the 1990s, members of al-Qaida debated whether to obtain a nuclear device. Those in favor sought the weapons primarily to deter a U.S. attack on al-Qaida’s bases in Afghanistan. This assessment reveals an organization at odds with that laid out by nuclear alarmists of terrorists obsessed with using nuclear weapons against the United States regardless of the consequences. Stenersen asserts, “Although there have been various reports stating that al-Qaida attempted to buy nuclear material in the nineties, and possibly recruited skilled scientists, it appears that al-Qaida central have not dedicated a lot of time or effort to developing a high-end CBRN capability. . . . Al-Qaida central never had a coherent strategy to obtain CBRN: instead, its members were divided on the issue, and there was an awareness that militarily effective weapons were extremely difficult to obtain.” 57 Most terrorist groups “assess nuclear terrorism through the lens of their political goals and may judge that it does not advance their interests.”58 As Frost has written, “The risk of nuclear terrorism, especially true nuclear terrorism employing bombs powered by nuclear fission, is overstated, and that popular wisdom on the topic is significantly flawed.”59

#### Multiple alt causes to AQAP and Yemen instability

Mneimneh, 13 [Suzane, contributor to Geopoliticalmonitor.com, “Yemen: The Forgotten Front,” <http://www.geopoliticalmonitor.com/yemen-the-forgotten-front-4841/>, ALB]

Political Instability: The Islamists are taking advantage of post-revolution political turmoil. Currently, the armed forces are preoccupied with internal stability and domestic political power struggles; the Yemen Army is seeking to maximize its influence and presence in several cities, especially in the southern provinces. In fact, there are political parties and power blocs that are invested in al-Qaeda’s activities because they lost out in the process of political transition in Yemen. Many opposition groups and tribes have thus facilitated al-Qaeda’s activities as a way to weaken the incipient central government. For example, some tribes have allowed terrorists to establish safe havens for training and recruitment.¶ Arms: In addition to the fact that Yemen has the second highest rate of gun ownership in the world, al-Qaeda-allied groups have been able to seize large quantities of weapons, equipment, and ammunition from Yemeni army sites captured in the south and southeast of Yemen.¶ These factors have enhanced al-Qaeda’s ability to become President Hadi’s biggest challenge in moving the country from dictatorship to democracy. After the Arab Spring, the new leadership inherited a fragmented security and military apparatus that must contend with an organized terrorist structure with a strong grip on many of the important cities and regions in the southern part of the country. Given the circumstances, the new government is faced with a very difficult task. On the one hand, it must fulfill the political responsibilities entrusted to it in the transitional phase, particularly the responsibility to push for a national dialogue and political settlement. On the other hand, Hadi’s government has to eliminate all sources (economic, political, and security) that al-Qaeda is drawing on to strengthen its grip on the southern areas. It also needs to understand that the continued escalation of al-Qaeda activity will doubtlessly overshadow the overall situation in Yemen, making any political settlement vulnerable to further shocks. The war against Islamist militants is draining the state's resources, all at the expense of other political and economic development goals. In addition, security agencies have often botched operations in dealing with militants, thus prolonging the duration of the fight and encouraging al-Qaeda to carry out more daring attacks against top Yemeni leaders.¶ The inability of the new government to resolve the battle with al-Qaeda will affect the democratic transition negatively. It’s only a matter of time until Yemeni citizens lose confidence in the transitional government which has promised to fight terrorism and ease their economic hardship. This may push some people to engage in other local or regional political projects, or even fall into the arms of terrorist groups. Moreover, the continuation of these groups’ activities in Yemen will encourage dissatisfied young people on the regional and international level to come to Yemen and support the terrorist cause.¶ In the end, the geostrategic blessing of Yemen’s location - its proximity to oil wells of the Gulf and supervision of the Strait of Bab-el-Mandeb - is turning into a geostrategic curse. At present, these characteristics merely expose the country to more external pressure and interference, turning it into an open battleground against terrorism.

Drones are key to global counter-terrorism operations

Byman Professor of Security Studies at Georgetown and Senior Fellow at the Saban Center for Middle East Policy at Brookings August 2013 (Daniel, “Why Drones Work,” *Foreign Affairs 92*(4), Lexis, Mike)

The Case for Washington's Weapon of Choice

Despite President Barack Obama's recent call to reduce the United States' reliance on drones, they will likely remain his administration's weapon of choice. Whereas President George W. Bush oversaw fewer than 50 drone strikes during his tenure, Obama has signed off on over 400 of them in the last four years, making the program the centerpiece of U.S. counterterrorism strategy. The drones have done their job remarkably well: by killing key leaders and denying terrorists sanctuaries in Pakistan, Yemen, and, to a lesser degree, Somalia, drones have devastated al Qaeda and associated anti-American militant groups. And they have done so at little financial cost, at no risk to U.S. forces, and with fewer civilian casualties than many alternative methods would have caused.

Critics, however, remain skeptical. They claim that drones kill thousands of innocent civilians, alienate allied governments, anger foreign publics, illegally target Americans, and set a dangerous precedent that irresponsible governments will abuse. Some of these criticisms are valid; others, less so. In the end, drone strikes remain a necessary instrument of counterterrorism. The United States simply cannot tolerate terrorist safe havens in remote parts of Pakistan and elsewhere, and drones offer a comparatively low-risk way of targeting these areas while minimizing collateral damage.

So drone warfare is here to stay, and it is likely to expand in the years to come as other countries' capabilities catch up with those of the United States. But Washington must continue to improve its drone policy, spelling out clearer rules for extrajudicial and extraterritorial killings so that tyrannical regimes will have a harder time pointing to the U.S. drone program to justify attacks against political opponents. At the same time, even as it solidifies the drone program, Washington must remain mindful of the built-in limits of low-cost, unmanned interventions, since the very convenience of drone warfare risks dragging the United States into conflicts it could otherwise avoid.

NOBODY DOES IT BETTER

The Obama administration relies on drones for one simple reason: they work. According to data compiled by the New America Foundation, since Obama has been in the White House, U.S. drones have killed an estimated 3,300 al Qaeda, Taliban, and other jihadist operatives in Pakistan and Yemen. That number includes over 50 senior leaders of al Qaeda and the Taliban -- top figures who are not easily replaced. In 2010, Osama bin Laden warned his chief aide, Atiyah Abd al-Rahman, who was later killed by a drone strike in the Waziristan region of Pakistan in 2011, that when experienced leaders are eliminated, the result is "the rise of lower leaders who are not as experienced as the former leaders" and who are prone to errors and miscalculations. And drones also hurt terrorist organizations when they eliminate operatives who are lower down on the food chain but who boast special skills: passport forgers, bomb makers, recruiters, and fundraisers.

### Solvency

Congressional action fails-MOST conclusive evidence

Alston, 11 [Philip, Pomeroy Professor of Law, New York University School of Law, was UN Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary, or arbitrary executions from 2004 until 2012, “The CIA and Targeted Killings Beyond Borders,” 2 Harv. Nat’l Sec. J. 283, pg. lexis, ALB]

Much has been written about the type of reforms that might have enhanced congressional oversight of the intelligence community. The most striking aspect is the extent to which they are predicated upon a belief that the situation can be radically improved through adjustments to the institutional design of the oversight arrangements. But various authors have exposed the fallacy of this approach, and it is difficult to disagree with Johnson who has consistently made the point that structural or design factors are less important

than the motivations of those who are asked to conduct the oversight. It should be added that examples from other jurisdictions are more encouraging, but hardly inspiring, in this regard. The difference, however, between those other jurisdictions and the United States is that in the case of the latter the stakes are much higher, especially in human rights terms, since what is in need of oversight is a rapidly expanding global program of state-directed killings.

## 2NC

### Overview

**We will never be able to entirely eradicate ‘evil’ from the world – however, their condemnation of terrorism blocks structural analysis of why terrorism exists and locks is into infinite violence.**

**Zulaika** 20**03** (Joesba, Director of the Center for Basque Studies at University of Nevada, Reno. “Reflections and Reports: The Self-Fulfilling Prophecies of Counterterrorism,” Radical History Review 85 (2003) 191-199, Muse, MT)

This is primarily a discourse that substitutes the spectacle of a constant "waiting [End Page 192] for terror" for actual historical temporality. Begoña Aretxaga describes it in the following way: "In contrast to historical time, the structure of this timeless war is characterized by the temporality of waiting, waiting for the next attack. Waiting for the spread of a virus, waiting for the killing of terrorists, waiting . . . as a prolonged moment of suspension and anxiety, of terror transformed into spectacle, of terror that is also a thrill, of terror that focuses and binds into a new sense of patriotic affect." 6 If the Beckettian theater of waiting is so intensely ominous ("it is not if, but when"), if the political manipulations of collective fantasies about nuclearism and savagery can prove so effective, it is hard not to assume that terrorism foretold must become prophecy fulfilled at some point. The army of public officials, experts, journalists, and academics who orchestrate the doom of terrorist futurology are thus vindicated. The events of September 11 are not immune to the possibility that counterterrorism is complicit in creating the very thing it abominates. We mentioned earlier that Sheik Omar, condemned to a New York prison for the rest of his life as the mastermind of the 1993 attack on the WTC, was directly a product of the CIA that recruited him for Reagan's anti-Soviet crusade in Afghanistan and gave him visas to come to the United States. The same pattern fits Osama bin Laden and the Taliban. The United States initially trained and armed them. When the Taliban became a pariah regime, the United States' main ally in the Arab world, Saudi Arabia, gave them primary support. But the blame game leads us at once into what Slavoj Zizek has labeled "the temptation of a double blackmail." 21 Namely, either the unconditional condemnation of Third World evil that appears to endorse the ideological position of American innocence, or drawing attention to the deeper sociopolitical causes of Arab extremism, which ends up blaming the victim. Each of the two positions prove one-sided and false. Pointing to the limits of moral reasoning, Zizek resorts to the dialectical category of totality to argue that "from the moral standpoint, the victims are innocent, the act was an abominable crime; however, this very innocence is not innocent—to adopt such an 'innocent' position in today's global capitalist universe is in itself a false abstraction." 22 This does not entail a compromised notion of shared guilt by terrorists and victims; "the point is, rather, that the two sides are not really opposed, that they belong to the same field. In short, the position to adopt is to accept the necessity of the fight against terrorism, BUT to redefine and expand its terms so that it will include also (some) American and other Western powers' acts." 23 As widely reported at the time, the Reagan administration, led by Alexander Haig, would self-servingly "confuse terrorism with communism." 24 As the cold war was coming to an end, terrorism became the easy substitute for communism in Reagan's black-and-white world. Still, when Haig would voice his belief that Moscow controlled the worldwide terrorist network, the State Department's bureau of intelligence chief Ronald Spiers would react by thinking that "he was kidding." 25 By the 1990s, the Soviet Union no longer constituted the terrorist enemy and only days after the Oklahoma City bombing, Russian president Yeltsin hosted President Clinton in Moscow who equated the recent massacres in Chechnya with Oklahoma City as domestic conflicts. We should be concerned as to what this new Good-versus-Evil war on terror substitutes for. Its consequences in legitimizing the repression of minorities in India, Russia, Turkey, and other countries are all too obvious. [End Page 197] But the ultimate catastrophe is that such a categorically ill-defined, perpetually deferred, simpleminded Good-versus-Evil war echoes and re-creates the very absolutist mentality and exceptionalist tactics of the insurgent terrorists. By formally adopting the terrorists' own game—one that by definition lacks rules of engagement, definite endings, clear alignments between enemies and friends, or formal arrangements of any sort, military, political, legal, or ethical—the inevitable danger lies in **reproducing it endlessly**. One only has to look at the Palestinian-Israeli or the Basque-Spanish conflicts to see how self-defeating the alleged "victories" against terrorism can be in the absence of addressing the causes of the violence. "A war against terrorism, then, mirrors the state of exception characteristic of insurgent violence, and in so doing it reproduces it ad infinitum. The question remains: What politics might be involved in this state of alert as normal state? Would this possible scenario of competing (and mutually constituting) terror signify the end of politics as we know it?" 27 It is either politics or once again the self-fulfilling prophecy of fundamentalist crusaders who will **never be able to entirely eradicate evil from the world.** Our choice cannot be between Bush and bin Laden, nor is our struggle one of "us" versus "them." Such a split leads us into the ethical catastrophe of not feeling full solidarity with the victims of either side—since the value of each life is absolute, "the only appropriate stance is the unconditional solidarity with ALL victims." 28 We must question our own involvement with the phantasmatic reality of terrorism discourse, for "now even the USA and its citizens can be regulated by terrorist discourse. . . . Now the North American territory has become the most global and central place in the new history that terrorist ideology inaugurates." 29 Resisting the temptation of innocence regarding the barbarian other implies an awareness of a point Hegel made and that applies to the contemporary and increasingly globalized world more than ever: evil, he claims, resides also in the innocent gaze itself, perceiving as it does evil all around itself. Derrida equally holds this position. In reference to the events of September 11, he said: "My unconditional compassion, addressed to the victims of September 11, does not prevent me from saying it loudly: with regard to this crime, I do not believe that anyone is politically guiltless." 30 In brief, we are all included in the picture, and these tragic events must make us problematize our own innocence while questioning our own political and libidinal investment in the global terrorism discourse.

### 2NC Framework

2. And, you are not a policy-maker—pretending you are causes absolving of individual responsibility—ensures the aff’s impacts are inevitable and link turns their cede the political arguments.

Kappeler 1995 (Susanne, Associate Professor at the School of Humanities and Social Sciences, Al Akhawayn University, “The Will to Violence”, p. 10-11, MT)

We are the war' does not mean that the responsibility for a war is shared collectively and diffusely by an entire society which would be equivalent to exonerating warlords and politicians and profiteers or, as Ulrich Beck says, upholding the notion of `collective irresponsibility', where people are no longer held responsible for their actions, and where the conception of universal responsibility becomes the equival ent of a universal acquittal.' On the contrary, the object is precisely to analyse the specific and differential responsibility of everyone in their diverse situations. Decisions to unleash a war are indeed taken at particular levels of power by those in a position to make them and to command such collective action. We need to hold them clearly responsible for their decisions and actions without lessening theirs by any collective `assumption' of responsibility. Yet our habit of focusing on the stage where the major dramas of power take place tends to obscure our sight in relation to our own sphere of competence, our own power and our own responsibility leading to the well-known illusion of our apparent `powerlessness’ and its accompanying phe nomenon, our so-called political disillusionment. Single citizens even more so those of other nations have come to feel secure in their obvious non-responsibility for such large-scale political events as, say, the wars in Croatia and Bosnia-Hercegovina or Somalia since the decisions for such events are always made elsewhere. Yet our insight that indeed we are not responsible for the decisions of a Serbian general or a Croatian president tends to mislead us into thinking that therefore we have no responsibility at all, not even for forming our own judgement, and thus into underrating the responsibility we do have within our own sphere of action. In particular, it seems to absolve us from having to try to see any relation between our own actions and those events, or to recognize the connections between those political decisions and our own personal decisions. It not only shows that we participate in what Beck calls `organized irresponsibility', upholding the apparent lack of connection between bureaucratically, institutionally, nationally and also individually or ganized separate competences. It also proves the phenomenal and unquestioned alliance of our personal thinking with the thinking of the major powermongers: For we tend to think that we cannot `do' anything, say, about a war, because we deem ourselves to be in the wrong situation; because we are not where the major decisions are made. Which is why many of those not yet entirely disillusioned with politics tend to engage in a form of mental deputy politics, in the style of `What would I do if I were the general, the prime minister, the president, the foreign minister or the minister of defence?' Since we seem to regard their mega spheres of action as the only worthwhile and truly effective ones, and since our political analyses tend to dwell there first of all, any question of what I would do if I were indeed myself tends to peter out in the comparative insignificance of having what is perceived as `virtually no possibilities': what I could do seems petty and futile. For my own action I obviously desire the range of action of a general, a prime minister, or a General Secretary of the UN finding expression in ever more prevalent formulations like `I want to stop this war', `I want military intervention', `I want to stop this backlash', or `I want a moral revolution." 'We are this war', however, even if we do not command the troops or participate in so-called peace talks, namely as Drakulic says, in our `non-comprehension’: our willed refusal to feel responsible for our own thinking and for working out our own understanding, preferring innocently to drift along the ideological current of prefabricated arguments or less than innocently taking advantage of the advantages these offer. And we `are' the war in our `unconscious cruelty towards you', our tolerance of the `fact that you have a yellow form for refugees and I don't' our readiness, in other words, to build ident ities, one for ourselves and one for refugees, one of our own and one for the `others'. We share in the responsibility for this war and its violence in the way we let them grow inside us, that is, in the way we shape `our feelings, our relationships, our values' according to the structures and the values of war and violence. “destining” of revealing insofar as it “pushes” us in a certain direction. Heidegger does not regard destining as determination (he says it is not a “fate which compels”), but rather as the implicit project within the field of modern practices to subject all aspects of reality to the principles of order and efficiency, and to pursue reality down to the finest detail. Thus, insofar as modern technology aims to order and render calculable, the objectification of reality tends to take the form of an increasing classification, differentiation, and fragmentation of reality. The possibilities for how things appear are increasingly reduced to those that enhance calculative activities.  Heidegger perceives the real danger in the modern age to be that human beings will continue to regard technology as a mere instrument and fail to inquire into its essence. He fears that all revealing will become calculative and all relations technical, that the unthought horizon of revealing, namely the “concealed” background practices that make technological thinking possible, will be forgotten. He remarks:  The coming to presence of technology threatens revealing, threatens it with the possibility that all revealing will be consumed in ordering and that everything will present itself only in the unconcealedness of standing-reserve. *(QT,* 33) [10](http://www.questiaschool.com/read/108740194)  Therefore, it is not technology, or science, but rather the essence of technology as a way of revealing that constitutes the danger; for the essence of technology is existential*,* not technological. [11](http://www.questiaschool.com/read/108740194) It is a matter of how human beings are fundamentally oriented toward their world vis a vis their practices, skills, habits, customs, and so forth. Humanism contributes to this danger insofar as it fosters the illusion that technology is the result of a collective human choice and therefore subject to human control. [12](http://www.questiaschool.com/read/108740194)

### Perm

Cloaking DA - The reasons for pursuing a policy are central to understanding it, we must reject liberal reforms that mask the security apparatus by shifting the frame of debate because they effectively kill critique and sustain security logic.

Burke 2007 (Anthony, Senior Lecturer @ School of Politics & IR @ Univ. of New South Wales, 2007, *Beyond Security, Ethics and Violence*, p. 1-4, MT)

Working between international relations, philosophy, and political and cultural theory, and with those whose daily suffering is most shocking and unbearable in mind, this book thus brings sustained critical attention to the promises and practices of security, ethics and violence as they manifest themselves in the statecraft, foreign policy, diplomacy, terrorism, war-making, geopolitics and strategy of the last few decades. This book does so to sound a warning: that not only are global patterns of insecurity, violence and conflict getting ever more destructive and out of hand, but that the dominant conceptual and policy frameworks we use to understand and respond to them are deeply inadequate and dangerous. Given this danger, the book insists upon a ‘critical’ approach: one that refuses to accept the representations of the world most available to us and apparently most credible, but instead questions the very categories we have used to understand and shape our modernity and its relation to power, violence and existence. Hence none of these things – ethics, violence, security or war – are taken for granted, as if we know what they are and how they fit together. Rather this is a book that asks about the kind of violence that war is, that we think and allow it to be; that asks about the kind of ethics that relates to security and violence, that by turns condemns, demands or exonerates killing; that asks about the violence that we think enables, defends or threatens security; and that asks about the security that conjures violence from its soul, which pushes kindness or cruelty or murder through its veins like a life-giving fluid. It asks if violence is really as rational, ethical and controllable as we believe; if a security that hinges upon violence is tenable or meaningful, and if it can be refigured; and it asks if ethics can offer us a path beyond violence or is in danger of becoming reduced to it. While a concern with ethics, as both a source of hope and danger, is a central theme of the book, it is not based on an approach that brings ‘ethics’, as a fully formed and systematic body of principles, to something that lies outside it: ‘security’, ‘war’ or ‘international relations’. Rather it interrogates the very practical and conceptual structure of these processes, along with ethical 4 reasoning itself, in order to understand the ethical outcomes of various approaches to security and violence even when they claim to be governed by the demands of ethics. Nor are ethics, security and violence the limit of this book’s concerns. It puts significant related ideas under scrutiny: sovereignty, freedom, identity and power. These frameworks are interrogated at the level both of their theoretical conceptualisation and their practice: in their influence and implementation in specific policy contexts and conflicts in East and Central Asia, the Middle East and the 'war on terror', where their meaning and impact take on greater clarity. This approach is based on a conviction that the meaning of powerful political concepts cannot be abstract or easily universalised: they all have histories, often complex and conflictual; their forms and meanings change over time; and they are developed, refined and deployed in concrete struggles over power, wealth and societal form. While this should not preclude normative debate over how political or ethical concepts should be defined and used, and thus be beneficial or destructive to humanity, it embodies a caution that the meaning of concepts can never be stabilised or unproblematic in practice. Their normative potential must always be considered in relation to their utilisation in systems of political, social and economic power and their consequent worldly effects. Hence this book embodies a caution by Michel Foucault, who warned us about the 'politics of truth . . the battle about the status of truth and the economic and political role it plays', and it is inspired by his call to 'detach the power of truth from the forms of hegemony, social, economic and cultural, within which it operates at the present time'. It is clear that traditionally coercive and violent approaches to security and strategy are both still culturally dominant, and politically and ethically suspect. However, the reasons for pursuing a critical analysis relate not only to the most destructive or controversial approaches, such as the war in Iraq, but also to their available (and generally preferable) alternatives. There is a necessity to question not merely extremist versions such as the Bush doctrine, Indonesian militarism or Israeli expansionism, but also their mainstream critiques - whether they take the form of liberal policy approaches in international relations (IR), just war theory, US realism, optimistic accounts of globalisation, rhetorics of sensitivity to cultural difference, or centrist Israeli security discourses based on territorial compromise with the Palestinians. The surface appearance of lively (and often significant) debate masks a deeper agreement about major concepts, forms of political identity and the imperative to secure them. Debates about when and how it may be effective and legitimate to use military force in tandem with other policy options, for example, mask a more fundamental discursive consensus about the meaning of security, the effectiveness of strategic power, the nature of progress, the value of freedom or the promises of national and cultural identity.  As a result, political and intellectual debate about insecurity, violent conflict and global injustice can become hostage to a claustrophic structure of political and ethical possibility that systematically wards off critique.

a. The justification for an action it itself an action—this means it’s textually and functionally competitive, it’s not a theoretical question it’s a evidentiary question.

Risman 2004 (Barbara J. Risman is Associate Professor of Sociology and Found Director of Women 's Studies at North Carolina State University, “Gender as a Social Structure: Theory Wrestling with Activism” Gender and Society, Vol. 18, No. 4 (Aug., 2004), pp. 429-450 Jstor)

Giddens's (1984) structuration theory adds considerably more depth to this  analysis of gender as a social structure  with his emphasis on the recursive  relation ship between social structure  and individuals.  That is, social structures  shape individuals, but simultaneously, individuals shape the social structure. Giddens  embraced  the transformative  power of human action. He insisted that  any structural theory must be concerned with reflexivity and actors' interpretations of their own  lives. Social structures  not only act on people; people act on social structures.  Indeed,  social structures  are created  not by mysterious  forces but by human action.  When people act on structure, they do so for their  own reasons.  We must, therefore,  be concerned with why actors choose their acts. Giddens insisted that  concern with meaning must go beyond the verbal justification easily available from actors because so much of social life is routine and so taken for granted that actors will not articulate, or even consider, why they act. This nonreflexive habituated  action is what I refer to as the cultural component  of the social structure:  The taken  for granted  or cognitive image rules that  belong to  the situational  context (not only or necessarily to the actor's personality).  The cul tural  component of the social structure  includes the interactional expectations  that  each of us meet in every social encounter.  My aims are to bring women and men  back into a structural theory where gender is the structure  under analysis and to  identify when behavior is habit (an enactment of taken for granted  gendered cul tural norms) and when we do gender consciously, with intent, rebellion, or even  with irony. When are we doing gender and re-creating inequality without intent?  And what happens to interactional dynamics and male-dominated institutions  when we rebel?  Can we refuse to do gender or is rebellion simply doing gender  dif ferently, forging alternative masculinities and femininities?  Connell (1987) applied Giddens's (1984) concern with social structure  as both  constraint  and created by action in his treatise on gender and power (see particu larly chapter  5). In his analysis, structure  constrains action,  yet "since human  action  involves free invention  ... and is reflexive, practice  can be turned  against  what con strains it; so structure  can deliberately  be the object of practice"  (Connell 1987, 95).  Action may turn against structure  but can never escape it. We must pay attention both to how structure shapes individual choice and social interaction  and to how  human agency creates, sustains, and modifies current  structure.  Action itself may change the immediate or future  context. A theory of gender as a social structure  must integrate  this notion of causality as  recursive with attention to gender  consequences at multiple  levels of analysis. Gen der is deeply embedded  as a basis for stratification  not just in our personalities,  our  cultural  rules, or institutions  but in all these, and in complicated ways. The gender  structure  differentiates  opportunities  and constraints based on sex category and  thus has consequences on three dimensions: (1) At the individual level, for the  development  of gendered  selves; (2) during  interaction  as men and women face dif ferent cultural  expectations even when they fill the identical structural  positions;  and (3) in institutional domains where explicit regulations regarding resource  distribution  and material  goods are gender specific.

**b. And changing security assumptions radically alters policy and how it is interpreted in the context of political debates - prove’s we’re competitive.**

**Dalby** 20**02** (Simon, Ph.D., Professor, Department of Geography and Environmental Studies at Carleton University. “Critical Security Studies: Concepts and Cases” edited by Michael and Keith. Copywrited in 1997, this edition was published in 2002. p. 11-12, MT)

It is interesting to note that, like many other contributions, Edward Kolodziej’s meditations on the end of the Cold War occlude this whole theme of shifting Soviet priorities by simply arguing that the Soviet Union was a political and security failure.38 The significance of not paying attention to the changing social constitution of Soviet security policy is that it supports Western triumphalist scriptings of the end of the Cold War. This in turn suggests that “we won” because of the superiority of “our” social institutions and the appropriateness of “our” security policy. This script of the end of the Cold War, as a Western triumph rather than as a result of the Soviet decision to end the military confrontation, adds to the ideological support for maintaining the institutions of the Cold War and modeling future policies on this apparently successful formulation. Read as a consequence of changing security priorities by a superpower, the events of the end of the Cold War suggest very different interpretations, ones that undermine the self-confidence in Western institutions and call into question the presuppositions of security premised on geopolitics and technological violence. This point about changing official assumptions about security having dramatic political implications is unavoidable for any serious attempt to rethink the security problematique. It is precisely what makes the political and policy debates about how to reformulate security (in what Ronald Steel so pointedly calls the “doctrine gap”) after the Cold War so important.39

### Links

The United States attempts to define itself as the indispensable nation through achieving an impossible absolute security which defines uncertainty and instability as ‘threats’ that must be combatted against - however this construction is essential to the construction of a dichotomous identity of us and them than causes a self-fulfilling prophecy.

Pan 2004 ([Chengxi](http://findarticles.com/p/search/?qa=Chengxin%20Pan)n, Professor of Political Science at Australia National University, “China Threat In American Self-Imagination” Alternatives Volume 29, number 3, p. 305-331, MT)

The (neo)realist emphasis on survival and security in international relations dovetails perfectly with the U.S. self-imagination, because for the United States to define itself as the indispensable nation in a world of anarchy is often to demand absolute security. As James Chace and Caleb Carr note, "for over two centuries the aspiration toward an eventual condition of absolute security has been viewed as central to an effective American foreign policy." (50) And this self-identification in turn leads to the definition of not only "tangible" foreign powers but global contingency and uncertainty per se as threats. For example, former U.S. President George H. W. Bush repeatedly said that "the enemy [of America] is unpredictability. The enemy is instability." (51) Similarly, arguing for the continuation of U.S. Cold War alliances, a high-ranking Pentagon official asked, "if we pull out, who knows what nervousness will result?" (52) Thus understood, by its very uncertain character, China would now automatically constitute a threat to the United States. For example, Bernstein and Munro believe that "China's political unpredictability, the always-present possibility that it will fall into a state of domestic disunion and factional fighting," constitutes a source of danger. (53) In like manner, Richard Betts and Thomas Christensen write: If the PLA [People's Liberation Army] remains second-rate, should the world breathe a sigh of relief? Not entirely.... Drawing China into the web of global interdependence may do more to encourage peace than war, but it cannot guarantee that the pursuit of heartfelt political interests will be blocked by a fear of economic consequences.... U.S. efforts to create a stable balance across the Taiwan Strait might deter the use of force under certain circumstances, but certainly not all. (54) The upshot, therefore, is that since China displays no absolute certainty for peace, it must be, by definition, an uncertainty, and hence, a threat. In the same way, a multitude of other unpredictable factors (such as ethnic rivalry, local insurgencies, overpopulation, drug trafficking, environmental degradation, rogue states, the spread of weapons of mass destruction, and international terrorism) have also been labeled as "threats" to U.S. security. Yet, it seems that in the post-Cold War environment, China represents a kind of uncertainty par excellence. "Whatever the prospects for a more peaceful, more democratic, and more just world order, nothing seems more uncertain today than the future of post-Deng China," (55) argues Samuel Kim. And such an archetypical uncertainty is crucial to the enterprise of U.S. self-construction, because it seems that only an uncertainty with potentially global consequences such as China could justify U.S. indispensability or its continued world dominance. In this sense, Bruce Cumings aptly suggested in 1996 that China (as a threat) was basically "a metaphor for an enormously expensive Pentagon that has lost its bearings and that requires a formidable 'renegade state' to define its mission (Islam is rather vague, and Iran lacks necessary weights)." (56) It is mainly on the basis of this self-fashioning that many U.S. scholars have for long claimed their "expertise" on China. For example, from his observation (presumably on Western TV networks) of the Chinese protest against the U.S. bombing of their embassy in Belgrade in May 1999, Robert Kagan is confident enough to speak on behalf of the whole Chinese people, claiming that he knows "the fact" of "what [China] really thinks about the United States." That is, "they consider the United States an enemy--or, more precisely, the enemy.... How else can one interpret the Chinese government's response to the bombing?" he asks, rhetorically. (57) For Kagan, because the Chinese "have no other information" than their government's propaganda, the protesters cannot rationally "know" the whole event as "we" do. Thus, their anger must have been orchestrated, unreal, and hence need not be taken seriously. (58) Given that Kagan heads the U.S. Leadership Project at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace and is very much at the heart of redefining the United States as the benevolent global hegemon, his confidence in speaking for the Chinese "other" is perhaps not surprising. In a similar vein, without producing in-depth analysis, Bernstein and Munro invoke with great ease such all-encompassing notions as "the Chinese tradition" and its "entire three-thousand-year history." (59) In particular, they repeatedly speak of what China's "real" goal is: "China is an unsatisfied and ambitious power whose goal is to dominate Asia.... China aims at achieving a kind of hegemony.... China is so big and so naturally powerful that [we know] it will tend to dominate its region even if it does not intend to do so as a matter of national policy." (60) Likewise, with the goal of absolute security for the United States in mind, Richard Betts and Thomas Christensen argue: The truth is that China can pose a grave problem even if it does not become a military power on the American model, does not intend to commit aggression, integrates into a global economy, and liberalizes politically. Similarly, the United States could face a dangerous conflict over Taiwan even if it turns out that Beijing lacks the capacity to conquer the island.... This is true because of geography; because of America's reliance on alliances to project power; and because of China's capacity to harm U.S. forces, U.S. regional allies, and the American homeland, even while losing a war in the technical, military sense. (61) By now, it seems clear that neither China's capabilities nor intentions really matter. Rather, almost by its mere geographical existence, China has been qualified as an absolute strategic "other," a discursive construct from which it cannot escape. Because of this, "China" in U.S. IR discourse has been objectified and deprived of its own subjectivity and exists mainly in and for the U.S. self. Little wonder that for many U.S. China specialists, China becomes merely a "national security concern" for the United States, with the "severe disproportion between the keen attention to China as a security concern and the intractable neglect of China's [own] security concerns in the current debate." (62) At this point, at issue here is no longer whether the "China threat" argument is true or false, but is rather its reflection of a shared positivist mentality among mainstream China experts that they know China better than do the Chinese themselves. (63) "We" alone can know for sure that they consider "us" their enemy and thus pose a menace to "us." Such an account of China, in many ways, strongly seems to resemble Orientalists' problematic distinction between the West and the Orient. Like orientalism, the U.S. construction of the Chinese "other" does not require that China acknowledge the validity of that dichotomous construction. Indeed, as Edward Said point out, "It is enough for 'us' to set up these distinctions in our own minds; [and] 'they' become 'they' accordingly." (64)

#### The protection of oil through securitized techniques will serve as the greatest geopolitical struggle of the 21st century ultimately culminating in the destruction of humanity and the biosphere.

Heinberg 2003 (Richard, Professor New College, recipient of M.K. Hubbert Award for Energy Excellence Education & Senior Fellow at Post-Carbon Institute, “The Party’s Over: Oil, War, and the Fate of Industrial Societies”, 2003, p. 230, MT)

Today the average US citizen uses five times as much energy as the world average. Even citizens of nations that export oil — such as Venezuela and Iran — use only a small fraction of the energy US citizens use per capita. The Carter Doctrine, declared in 1980, made it plain that US military might would be applied to the project of dominating the world’s oil wealth: henceforth, any hostile effort to impede the flow of Persian Gulf oil would be regarded as an “assault on the vital interests of the United States” and would be “repelled by any means necessary, including military force.”23 In the past 60 years, the US military and intelligence services have grown to become bureaucracies of unrivaled scope, power, and durability. While the US has not declared war on any nation since 1945, it has nevertheless bombed or invaded a total of 19 countries and stationed troops, or engaged in direct or indirect military action, in dozens of others.24 During the Cold War, the US military apparatus grew exponentially, ostensibly in response to the threat posed by an archrival: the Soviet Union. But after the end of the Cold War the American military and intelligence establishments did not shrink in scale to any appreciable degree. Rather, their implicit agenda — the protection of global resource interests — emerged as the semi-explicit justification for their continued existence. With resource hegemony came challenges from nations or sub-national groups opposing that hegemony. But the immensity of US military might ensured that such challenges would be overwhelmingly asymmetrical. US strategists labeled such challenges “terrorism” — a term with a definition malleable enough to be applicable to any threat from any potential enemy, foreign or domestic, while never referring to any violent action on the part of the US, its agents, or its allies. This policy puts the US on a collision course with the rest of the world. If all-out competition is pursued with the available weapons of awesome power, the result could be the destruction not just of industrial civilization, but of humanity and most of the biosphere.

### Realism

#### The idea that realism is inevitable is a fantasy that presumes there’s a neutral and universal standpoint from which we can shoehorn all explanations of the world---our links prove their args are wrong

Grondin 4 David, master of pol sci and PHD of political studies @ U of Ottowa “(Re)Writing the “National Security State”: How and Why Realists (Re)Built the(ir) Cold War,” http://www.er.uqam.ca/nobel/ieim/IMG/pdf/rewriting\_national\_security\_state.pdf

In explaining national security conduct, realist discourses serve the violent purposes of the state, as well as legitimizing its actions and reinforcing its hegemony. This is why we must historicize the practice of the analyst and question the “regimes of truth” constructed by realist discourses**.** When studying a given discourse, one must also study the socio-historical conditions in which it was produced. Realist analysts are part of the subfield of Strategic Studies associated with the Cold War era. Even though it faced numerous criticisms after the Cold War, especially since it proved irrelevant in predicting its end, this subfield retains a significant influence in International Relations – as evidenced, for instance, by the vitality of the journal International Security. Theoretically speaking, Strategic Studies is the field par excellence of realist analyses: it is a way of interpreting the world, which is inscribed in the language of violence, organized in strategy, in military planning, in a military order, and which seek to shape and preserve world order (Klein, 1994: 14). Since they are interested in issues of international order, realist discourses study the balancing and bandwagoning behavior of great powers. Realist analysts believe they can separate object from subject: on this view, it would be possible to abstract oneself from the world in which one lives and studies and to use value-free discourse to produce a non-normative analysis. As Stephen Brooks and William Wohlforth assert, “[s]uch arguments [about American moderation and inter- national benevolence that stress the constraints on American power] are unpersuasive, however, because they fail to acknowledge the true nature of the current international system” (Brooks and Wohlforth, 2002: 31). Thus it would seem that Brooks and Wohlforth have the ability to “know” essential “truths”, as they “know” the “true” nature of the international system. From this vantage point it would even be possible “to set aside one’s own subjective biases and values and to confront the world on its own terms, with the hope of gaining mastery of that world through a clear understanding that transcends the limits of such personal determinants as one’s own values, class, gender, race, or emotions” (Klein, 1994: 16). However, it is impossible to speak or write from a neutral or transcendental ground: “there are only interpretations – some stronger and some weaker, to be sure – based on argument and evidence, which seems from the standpoint of the interpreter and his or her interlocutor to be ‘right’ or ‘accurate’ or ‘useful’ at the moment of interpretation” (Medhurst, 2000: 10). It is in such realist discourse that Strategic Studies become a technocratic approach determining the foundations of security policies that are disguised as an academic approach above all critical reflection (Klein, 1994: 27-28). Committed to an explanatory logic, realist analysts are less interested in the constitutive processes of states and state systems than in their functional existence, which they take as given. They are more attentive to regulation, through the military uses of force and strategic practices that establish the internal and external boundaries of the states system. Their main argument is that matters of security are the immutable driving forces of global politics. Indeed, most realists see some strategic lessons as being eternal, such as balance of power politics and the quest for national security. For Brooks and Wohlforth, balance of power politics (which was synonymous with Cold War politics in realist discourses) is the norm: “The result — balancing that is rhetorically grand but substan- tively weak — is politics as usual in a unipolar world” (Brooks and Wohlforth, 2002: 29). National security discourses constitute the “observed realities” that are the grist of neorealist and neoclassical realist theories. These theories rely upon U.S. material power (the perception of U.S. relative material power for neoclassical realists), balance of power, and the global distribution of power to explain and legitimate American national security conduct. Their argument is circular since they depict a reality that is constituted by their own discourse, in addition to legitimizing American strategic behavior. Realists often disagree about the use of force – on military restraint versus military intervention, for example – but the differences pertain to strategies of power, that is, means as opposed to ends. Realist discourses will not challenge the United States’ position as a prominent military power. As Barry Posen maintains, “[o]ne pillar of U.S. hegemony is the vast military power of the United States. […] Observers of the actual capabilities that this effort produces can focus on a favorite aspect of U.S. superiority to make the point that the United States sits comfortably atop the military food chain, and is likely to remain there” (Posen, 2003: 7). Realist analysts “observe” that the U.S. is theworld hegemonic power and that no other state can balance that power. In their analyses, they seek to explain how the United States was able to build and lead coalitions in Afghanistan and Iraq with no other power capable of offering military resistance. Barry Posen “neutrally” explains this by em- phasizing the United States’ permanent preparation for war: I argue that the United States enjoys command of the commons—command of the sea, space, and air. I discuss how command of the commons supports a hegemonic grand strategy. […] Command means that the United States gets vastly more military use out of the sea, space, and air than do others; that it can credibly threaten to deny their use to others; and that others would lose a military contest for the commons if they attempted to deny them to the United States. Command of the commons is the key military enabler of the U.S. global power position. It allows the United States to exploit more fully other sources of power, including its own economic and military might as well as the economic and military might of its allies. Command of the commons has permitted the United States to wage war on short notice even where it has had little permanent military presence. This was true of the 1991 Persian Gulf War, the 1993 intervention in Somalia, and the 2001 action in Afghanistan (Posen, 2003: 7-9). Moreover, in realist theoretical discourses, transnational non-state actors such as terrorist networks are not yet taken into account. According to Brooks and Wohlforth, they need not be: “Today there is one pole in a system in which the population has trebled to nearly 200” (Brooks and Wohlforth, 2002: 29). In their system, only states are relevant. And what of the Al-Qaida terrorist network? At best, realist discourses accommodate an interstate framework, a “reality” depicted in their writings as an oversimplification of the complex world in which we now live (Kratochwil, 2000).7 In their theoretical constructs, these analysts do not address national or state identity in any substantive way. Moreover, they do not pay attention to the security culture in which they as individuals are embedded8. They rarely if ever acknowledge their subjectivity as analysts, and they proceed as if they were able to separate themselves from their cultural environment. From a poststructuralist perspective, however, it is impossible to recognize all the ways in which we have been shaped by the culture and environment in which we were raised. We can only think or experience the world through a cultural prism: it is impossible to abstract oneself from one’s interpretive cultural context and experience and describe “the world as it is”. There is always an interpretive dimension to knowledge, an inevitable mediation between the “real world” and its representation. This is why American realist analysts have trouble shedding the Cold War mentality in which they were immersed. Yet some scholars, like Brooks and Wohlforth, consciously want to perpetuate it: “Today the costs and dangers of the Cold War have faded into history, but they need to be kept in mind in order to assess unipolarity accurately” (Brooks and Wohlforth, 2002: 30).

#### Realism creates aggression by focusing myopically on threats and ignoring their role in creating aggression - this paranoid misperception can be overridden by empathy..

**Inan** 20**03** (Annette, Professor, Department of Political Science at the University of Amsterdam as well as the Amsterdam School for Social Science Research. PhD in IR, “What Moves Man: The Realist Theory of International Relations and Its Judgment of Human Nature”, p. 134-141, MT)

134 Richard Ned Lebow as well as Lebow and Janice Gross Stein have examined the risks posed by motivational and unmotivational biases for deterrence and nuclear crisis management/' Their findings support those of Holsti, suggesting that the fact that the world was spared a direct superpower confrontation during the Cold War is hardly attributable to the ingenuity of deterrence strategies.1" According to Lebow, the realist strategy of deterrence "fails to address what may be the most common cause of aggression: . . . the perceived need to pursue a confrontational foreign policy because of weakness at home or abroad."'1"1 White discusses as the three conventional elements of deterrence theory the "Good Guys—Bad Guys" schema, the doctrine of flexible response, and the principle of mutual assured destruction. He confirms that a basic limitation of all three of those components is that most who defend and rely on them "give little attention to the motives for aggression that their deterrence is designed to counteract."11\* This is surprising, considering the fact that in order to successfully deter an actor from a particular course of action, it seems necessary to know the reasons why that actor might or might not take such an action in the first place. In other words, it is necessary to know which motives a potential opponent might have to engage in conflict, and which motives he might have not to. According to White, "|0|n the negative, war-preventing side are the motives the dcterrer hopes to create in his opponent: fear of war and fear of defeat in war. On the positive, war-promoting side ... both historical evidence and psychological evidence suggest that two motives stand out as frequent driving forces toward aggression: an exaggerated, misconceived, 'paranoid' form of fear and a macho type of pride." White's argument at this point is highly reminiscent of Hobbes, who, as we have seen, also emphasizes the destructive potential of pride and the distinction between "realistic war-preventing fear and unrealistic war-promoting fear."104 As White points our, this distinction also parallels the Freudian distinction between "objective" and "neurotic" anxiety. 1 In a completely different context and with entirely different straregies in mind, then, White proceeds to propose a solution that is nonetheless essentially Hobbesian: First, "to keep the peace we should encourage realistic fear on both sides and discourage exaggerated fear on both sides."10\* Second, we should also discourage what White calls "macho pride" and defines as "undue satisfaction from, or an undue craving for, an image of oneself or one's own group as powerful, prestigious, tough, and courageous, usually with a strong underlying assumption that those are masculine attributes."107 In comparison with Hobbes, it is necessary to note that White distinguishes between macho pride and what might be called "healthy" kinds of pride, involving the cultivation of self-confidence or self-respect. White's case study suggests that realism may support "paranoia" in international politics. Psychiatrists commonly define paranoia in terms of two types of delusions: "delusions of persecution, usually regarded as primary, and delusions of grandeur—which often occur together."1'\* Delusions of persecution can be seen to be motivated by exaggerated fear, and delusions of grandeur by macho pride. As Ross Stagner, for example, has pointed out, paranoia is also characterized by so-called possibilistic behavior: the "jumping" from suspicion to certainty. Such behavior involves severe motivated misperception, which functions to confirm the actor's initial suspicions. It can lead the actor to make erroneous judgments to convince himself that his suspicions were correct. Stagner discusses as an example of paranoia realist U.S. policy makers' attitudes toward the likelihood of success of moratoria on nuclear tests. He suggests that by functioning as self-fulfilling prophesies, the images and motivated biases that were involved in such attitudes obtained an even stronger impact, further reducing decision-making rationality.109 Drawing on Jervis, White distinguishes between two types of errors of judgment. He defines motivated misperceptions as those that can "readily be attributed to subconscious emotional or motivational factors such as macho pride or ego defense."110 Among those, **the image an actor has of an actual or potential enemy is especially important, since it plays a great role in his perception of that enemy's** character and **actions**. According to White, "at a minimum we need to recognize the great perception-determining importance of a long-term, deeply ingrained diabolical image of a national enemy" (1 37). Such an image "powerfully and directly influences the specific perceptions that directly mobilize the motives and cause the actions that cause war" (ibid.). The psychological reasons for holding such an image may include exaggerated fear, worst-case thinking, guilt projection, and defensively motivated aggression. However, White holds that those explanations "seem tenuous when compared with the anxiety we create for ourselves by picturing human opponents, who are probably as frightened of us as we are of them, as villains or monsters" (HO). He finds that at least two more reasons need to be considered: the appeal of "macho melodrama" and the satisfaction achieved by "grim realism" (142). The first motive consists in the human fascination with stories of the "Rambo" type, in which good fights evil and in which "macho pride, glorified by an intense sense of righteousness, [operates on a semi-fantasy level" (141). The second motive suggested by White is particularly relevant for a critique of the realist paradigm. The problem here lies not with being "realistic" in the literal sense of the word, but rather with being "grim" about it: "There is nothing wrong or conducive to misperception in getting satisfaction from feeling realistic. That is an appropriate reward and reinforcement for being realistic. There is often something conducive to misperception though (and akin to macho pride) in feeling more grimly realistic than other people" (ibid.). White draws attention to the fact that "realism actually calls for nothing but great respect for evidence and for orderly, honest thinking on the basis of evidence" (ibid.). He observes that for some reason, though, many people apparently assume that there is something hard, virile, and automatically realistic about condemning an outgroup that their own group condemns and putting the worst possible interpretation on anything it does. . . Perhaps the line of association is that seeing an outgroup as diabolical connotes readiness for violent conflict, and readiness for violent conflict connotes virility. It is a fighting stance. In any case an association between a diabolical enemy-image and a macho self-image does seem to exist, and to distort realistic judgment. (142) The chief process through which such images actually produce mis perceptions of reality is through selective inattention: "Subconscious motives such as anxiety and macho pride influence a person's 'reality world' chiefly by first influencing what he thinks about—that is, what he pays attention to—moment by moment" (1 54-1 55). **The main corrective for** all forms of **war-promoting misperceptions**, according to White, is "realistic empathy." Such empathy, while clearly distinguished from sympathy, "is more than the cold, calculating chess-player's type of empathy" required for successful strategic interaction (160). Instead, it implies understanding or at least genuinely **trying to understand the feelings of other people**. ... It means being the other person, at least for a while, and postponing\* skeptical analysis until later. It means trying to understand the other from the inside looking out, not merely from the outside looking in. Most of all, it means trying to look at one's own group's behavior honestly, as it might appear when seen through the other's eyes. . .. An honest look at the other implies an honest look at oneself. (161) Robert McCalla has analyzed five U.S.-Soviet crises.

He finds that realist statesmen consistently exhibit tendencies to believe that their threats will be accurately perceived by the adversary and to interpret the actions of the adversary as hostile or evil, and that they are generally led astray by lack of information and the power of their preconceived images and beliefs."1 White's call for "realistic empathy" is supported by McCalla's finding that crises tend to end when adversaries come to see their situation in a similar way. **Realistic empathy counteracts exaggerated fear that is based on the diabolical enemy-image**, "since **it** immediately **humanizes the** image of the **enemy and makes it possible to recognize**, for instance, the **possible defensive motives behind** his most **aggressive behavior.**""3 It also counteracts "the process of selective inattention, because absence of realistic empathy is probably the most inclusive, the most predictable, and the most war-promoting of all the forms of selective inattention. What is or may be in the mind of an opponent is one of the most important things to think about if we want peace, but also one of the easiest to push out of our minds."111 According to White, three kinds of lack of empathy have been "pervasive on both sides of the East-West conflict, and perhaps on both sides of every acute international conflict:"114 "not seeing an opponent's longing for peace," "not seeing an opponent’s fear of being attacked,” and “not seeing an opponent’s understandable anger.”115 Additional problems may be caused by the operation of the assumption of self-interested rationality. Psychologists have shown that selfish motivation is commonly regarded with some degree of hostility. For example, Steven Fein and James Hilton argue that “perceivers evaluate social actors more negatively when suspicion about ulterior motives is present, even when those perceivers do not have strong evidence that those ulterior motives in fact influenced their behavior.”116 Dale Miller and Rebecca Ratner have recently drawn together the findings of five separate empirical analyses which strongly suggest that human beings generally overestimate the inf luence of rational self-interest on both the attitudes and the behavior of others.117 If this is the case, the realist emphasis on rational self-interest serves to make the judgment of foreign policy makers rather less than more realistic. In addition, there seems to be a certain amount of risk that an assumption of the essential selfishness of all human beings could lead to paranoia about other actors’ intentions, especially under the added pressure of a political crisis.118 A second type of misperception are those of a “cognitive” nature, meaning simply that they cannot be as readily attributed to underlying emotional or motivational inclinations as the above. Prevalent among these are the effects of preexisting beliefs, such as images or stereotypes, on present perception. During a process of “assimilation of information to pre-existing beliefs,”119 all evidence that is “dissonant”120 or “out of balance”121 with such images or stereotypes is disregarded. According to White, “the most conflict-promoting form” of such an image “is an established Good Guys–Bad Guys picture of the political world.”122 He eloquently describes the establishment of such an image: The origin of that world-picture (apart from the considerable elements of realism that it typically contains) is probably mainly subconsciously motivated. Over a period of many years it can be gradually built up—a little motivated exaggeration of the opponent’s wickedness here, and a little motivated selective inattention to one’s own wickedness there, but almost always in those same two directions. It can be likened to a great f lywheel, too heavy to be set in rapid motion all at once by any ordinary amount of force but having much momentum once it is well started. It creates confident expectations that whatever the diabolical enemy does will have evil motives and harmful effects, while whatever the good self does will have good motives and good effects. Those expectations, in turn, influence the perception of any new situation, especially if that new situation is at all ambiguous—open to varying interpretations— as most new situations are. That process is mainly cognitive, since there is a vast amount of evidence, in everyday experience as well as experimental psychology, that expectations inf luence perception. Expecting evil, human minds tend to put the worst possible interpretation on whatever the enemy does; expecting good, they tend to put the best possible interpretation on whatever their own group does. It is even possible that the whole effect of subconscious motives on present perception is the result of this two-stage process. They affect expectations, and expectations, by a process that is perhaps purely cognitive, inf luence perceptions of a present situation and behavior in it.123 138 Two processes that attribution theor y has found to play a major role in this context are the “injured-innocence mechanism” and the human tendency to universalize one’s own perceptions. The first has to do with the fact that the judgment of another’s actions is strongly affected by the context in which that action occurs. For example, “[B]ecause each nation believes it is obviously innocent of any aggressive intention, it tends to infer that any strenuous arming by its opponents must have an aggressive purpose.”126 Such a way of thinking presupposes that the opponent knows of the actor’s “innocence” or lack of aggressive intentions, which is obviously rarely the case. The second process may reinforce this error by leading an actor to assume that what is obvious to him is equally obvious to the opponent. According to White, “[E]mpathy with the perceptions of others, when their perceptions differ from one’s own, is an acquired art, calling for some mental effort as well as sophistication.”127 He comes to the conclusion that “in the business of preventing war the most vital kind of learning is to see the world in a more and more differentiated way, with more and clearer distinctions between its various parts and aspects.”128 As studies such as White’s can show, **realist motivational assumptions** may **introduce error into** the **foreign policy**–making process by **supporting** both motivational and cognitive t ypes of **misperception**. As Vertzberger points out, “[W]hen motivational biases affect decision makers’ behavior, the observer cannot easily predict the state’s behavior because such obvious causal factors as the situation, state interests, or past behavior are modified by psychological needs and personalit y traits, which are difficult to observe directly or infer indirectly and about which information is almost impossible to validate.”129What this means, of course, is also that hypotheses linking motivational biases to behavior are extremely difficult to test.130

The realist psychology and logic of argument and the evidence that does exist, however, suggest that the bias introduced into policy making as a result of the dominant status 139 of the realist paradigm can be expected to be divisive and competitive and, thus, potentially harmful in its real-world effects. Contemporary realism assumes the empirical validit y of self-interested rationalit y and the primacy of the motive of power. By assuming the essential selfishness of all human beings, realism creates a reliance on distrust, which favors negative interpretations of others’ intentions and restricts the range of rational reactions for realist policy makers in ways that favor competition and conf lict. Realist policy makers consistently fail to acknowledge that opponents may be motivated by fear or that they may not be inherently aggressive, even though they understand their own competitive and aggressive moves to be motivated by the need for self-defense and by rational self-interest. They also fail to acknowledge that opponents may be motivated by collectivist forms of pride, since such “social” motives are supposed to be irrelevant in international politics. It may well be expected that this particular failure of “realistic empathy” could cause major problems for Western policy makers in their interactions with less individualistic societies, such as those of the Islamic world. If it is obvious that other actors are motivated by some kind of pride, that pride is interpreted after the Hobbesian fashion as inherently irrational and destructive. Realists deny that they themselves may be motivated by any kind of pride, or by irrational fear, yet, as studies such as White’s show, this is far from true. Perhaps the psychological appeal of “grim realism” operates hand in hand with the incentives created by the status of realist theory to reinforce the kinds of misperceptions discussed by White. Whereas prescriptive realism would of course suggest that policy makers should try to avoid such misperceptions, since they lead them to act less than rationally, based on an unrealistic assessment of their situations, such misperceptions might in fact be direct consequences of the assumptions about human nature that underlie the realist paradigm. In addition to studying the possible psychological effects of realist motivational assumptions on foreign policy decision making, it is useful to observe the political effects of the operation of the realist paradigm. If the above suspicions are supportable, we should be able to identify particular patterns in international interaction that are associated with realist policies. According to Margaret Hermann and Joe Hagan, “[T]he view that the world is anarchic . . . **leads to a focus on threats** and securit y, a sense of distrust, and a perceived need for carefully managing the balance of power. Leaders with this view must always remain alert to challenges to their states’ power and position in the international system.”131 John Vasquez has even argued that “the rise to power of militant hardliners who view the world in such realpolitik terms is a crucial prerequisite for war.”132 The work of Jack Snyder is interesting in this context, as he has made some headway in the study of the role played by strategic concepts in the formation of national policy. Attempting to explain “the recurrent problem of self-defeating aggression among great powers,” he finds it largely attributable to the “myth of security through expansion.”133 This myth, which is the core of realist strategic advice, is found to affect the domestic process of policy development through functioning effectively as a 140 foreign policy ideology. Snyder cites as an example of overexpansion U.S. global containment strategy during the Cold War and shows how this strategy was encouraged through the use of the “domino theory” and other arguments related to the “securit y through expansion” myth. Ernst-Otto Czempiel has discussed the effects of the dominance of realism in Europe, during and after the Cold War. He begins by observing that **realist balance-of power** politics has **always failed to actually prevent war** here. In fact, between 1815 and 1945, seventy-one wars were fought in Europe, among them the two world wars. Between 1945 and 1962, twelve actual wars were fought, while “the greater east–west conf lict . . . continually threatened to lead to nuclear cataclysm.”134 Czempiel quips that “realism has after all been successful. Only it has produced war, not peace.”135 The familiar claim that realist strategic policies have prevented the outbreak of nuclear war is, of course, impossible to either prove or disprove. What is undoubtedly true is that the perception of the danger of war, both conventional and nuclear, remained extremely high in Europe throughout the Cold War decades. Czempiel’s judgment is clear: “To believe that the security dilemma can be ameliorated by a strategy of strategic balancing is to fool oneself.”136 Czempiel suggests that the conception of a securit y dilemma, if it ever was appropriate, is dangerously anachronistic in the world of modern industrialized nations. 137 This is a world characterized by a high degree of interdependence, in which states, along with a large variet y of other important actors, pursue a variet y of goals, among them many that require international coordination and cooperation. It is a world in which national foreign policies are only partly determined by military securit y requirements and largely depend on varying constellations of societal interests. Czempiel echoes early-twentieth-century idealist writers, who already held that “industrial modernization rendered [political realism] . . . increasingly anachronistic and dangerous.”138 Andreas Osiander observes that, while twentieth-century realists t ypically charged idealists with a naiveté that they were sure histor y would invalidate, “from a post-1989 perspective the picture seems reversed. It would now appear that it was the early twentieth-century IR Idealists who had the correct longterm prognosis, while the adoption of the rival realist paradigm by academic IR since the late 1930s was based on a shortsighted interpretation of events at that time.”139 Osiander answers Hedley Bull’s accusation that idealists are guilt y of an “unlearning of old lessons”140 with the suggestion that it may be that “the most serious shortcoming of Realism is . . . its refusal or inabilit y to learn the lessons of modernit y.”141 Steven Forde, as well, finds that “classical realists take the worst moments of crisis and war as epitomes of the international climate, something non-realists regard as tendentious. Under normal conditions, they argue, the costs or risks involved in moral action are not nearly as great as the realists claim, and the benefits of moral consensus and cooperation greater.”142Nonrealists generally argue that mutually beneficial cooperation among nations is more common than realists contend, and that 141 the realm of international politics is not “sufficiently lawless to be fairly depicted as a latent ‘state of war.’”143 Overall, non-realists would contend that few states are as aggressive and dangerous as Machiavelli would have them be and few exhibit the paranoid reactions to anarchy that Hobbes and other realists describe. Under actual conditions it is misleading to say that states are “compelled” to abandon all restraints to protect themselves. It is usually appropriate at most to speak of certain risks states run in acting ethically, and the traditions of moral thought would hold that such risks are ordinarily small enough that states have a moral dut y to take them.144 According to many of its critics, realism overlooks that the pervasive insecurit y concerning the motives and considerations of other actors which characterizes the securit y dilemma does not truly exist among at least the developed nations of today’s world. Its outlook is not only anachronistic but dangerous, because, by assuming such insecurity and preparing the appropriate defenses, realist policies can create a security dilemma that is the more dangerous because it has been established in this way. The reason is that a potential opponent who observes defensive postures that are evidently not necessary has all the more reason to interpret them to be offensive preparations. Thus, “realism, through its policies, creates a threatening situation, which confirms these policies ex post facto. If it chose a different strategy, the threat would never occur.”145

## 1NR

### CP

#### This is the core educational question of the topic- The CP has an advocate, and is *an explicit alternative to other branches*

Radsan and Murphy 2010 (Afsheen and Richard, Professor of Law, William Mitchell College of Law; AT&T Professor of Law, Texas Tech University School of Law, DUE PROCESS AND TARGETED KILLING OF¶ TERRORISTS, 31 Cardozo L. Rev. 405 2009-2010)

Yet as a practical matter, the judicial role just identified is¶ vanishingly small. Justice Thomas is surely correct that the executive¶ must dominate decisions about who lives and dies in war. This makes¶ executive self-control all the more important-and leads to our second¶ claim. Due process is everywhere. For a century, debate has bubbled¶ over the extra-territorial reach of the Constitution. 30 The logic of¶ Boumediene's five-justice majority opinion is that the Due Process¶ Clause binds the executive worldwide-from Alaska to Zimbabwe. 31¶ This duty exists even for matters that cannot or should not be subject to¶ significant judicial control; the executive must obey the Constitution¶ even if no court is in a position to say so. Honoring this obligation¶ requires the executive to adopt procedures that maximize the accuracy¶ and propriety of the CIA's targeted killing without unacceptably¶ harming national security. 32 Following the lead of cases from the¶ European Court of Human Rights and the Supreme Court of Israel,33 we¶ submit that as one integral element of these procedures, executive¶ authorities should conduct independent, impartial, post-hoc review of¶ the legality of any targeted killing by the CIA and that this review¶ should be as public as national security permits. 34

### Terrorism

#### Terrorists view nukes as counterproductive

Moodie 2**—**headed the Chemical and Biological Arms Control Institute and served as assistant director for multilateral affairs at the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency**.** president of the Chemical and Biological Arms Control Institute (Brad Roberts and Michael Moodie, Biological Weapons: Toward a Threat Reduction Strategy, http://www.ndu.edu/inss/DefHor/DH15/DH15.htm)  
The argument about terrorist motivation is also important. Terrorists generally have not killed as many as they have been capable of killing. This restraint seems to derive from an understanding of mass casualty attacks as both unnecessary and counterproductive. They are unnecessary because terrorists, by and large, have succeeded by conventional means. Also, they are counterproductive because they might alienate key constituencies, whether among the public, state sponsors, or the terrorist leadership group. In Brian Jenkins' famous words, terrorists want a lot of people watching, not a lot of people dead. Others have argued that the lack of mass casualty terrorism and effective exploitation of BW has been more a matter of accident and good fortune than capability or intent. Adherents of this view, including former Secretary of Defense William Cohen, argue that "it's not a matter of if but when." The attacks of September 11 would seem to settle the debate about whether terrorists have both the motivation and sophistication to exploit weapons of mass destruction for their full lethal effect. After all, those were terrorist attacks of unprecedented sophistication that seemed clearly aimed at achieving mass casualties--had the World Trade Center towers collapsed as the 1993 bombers had intended, perhaps as many as 150,000 would have died. Moreover, Osama bin Laden's constituency would appear to be not the "Arab street" or some other political entity but his god. And terrorists answerable only to their deity have proven historically to be among the most lethal. But this debate cannot be considered settled. Bin Laden and his followers could have killed many more on September 11 if killing as many as possible had been their primary objective. They now face the core dilemma of asymmetric warfare: how to escalate without creating new interests for the stronger power and thus the incentive to exploit its power potential more fully. Asymmetric adversaries want their stronger enemies fearful, not fully engaged--militarily or otherwise. They seek to win by preventing the stronger partner from exploiting its full potential. To kill millions in America with biological or other weapons would only commit the United States--and much of the rest of the international community--to the annihilation of the perpetrators.

#### Any supposed historical interest in nuclear weapons is bullshit – they will stick to conventional attacks

Mueller 10—Professor of Political Science and International Relations @ Ohio State. Widely-recognized expert on terrorism threats in foreign policy. AB from U Chicago, MA in pol sci from UCLA and PhD in pol sci from UCLA (John, “Calming Our Nuclear Jitters”, Issues in Science & Technology, 07485492, Winter 2010, Vol. 26, Issue 2, EBSCO)

The al Qaeda factor The degree to which al Qaeda, the only terrorist group that seems to want to target the United States, has pursued or even has much interest in a nuclear weapon may have been exaggerated. The 9/11 Commission stated that "al Qaeda has tried to acquire or make nuclear weapons for at least ten years," but the only substantial evidence it supplies comes from an episode that is supposed to have taken place about 1993 in Sudan, when al Qaeda members may have sought to purchase some uranium that turned out to be bogus. Information about this supposed venture apparently comes entirely from Jamal al Fadl, who defected from al Qaeda in 1996 after being caught stealing $110,000 from the organization. Others, including the man who allegedly purchased the uranium, assert that although there were various other scams taking place at the time that may have served as grist for Fadl, the uranium episode never happened. As a key indication of al Qaeda's desire to obtain atomic weapons, many have focused on a set of conversations in Afghanistan in August 2001 that two Pakistani nuclear scientists reportedly had with Osama bin Laden and three other al Qaeda officials. Pakistani intelligence officers characterize the discussions as "academic" in nature. It seems that the discussion was wide-ranging and rudimentary and that the scientists provided no material or specific plans. Moreover, the scientists probably were incapable of providing truly helpful information because their expertise was not in bomb design but in the processing of fissile material, which is almost certainly beyond the capacities of a nonstate group. Kalid Sheikh Mohammed, the apparent planner of the 9/11 attacks, reportedly says that al Qaeda's bomb efforts never went beyond searching the Internet. After the fall of the Taliban in 2001, technical experts from the CIA and the Department of Energy examined documents and other information that were uncovered by intelligence agencies and the media in Afghanistan. They uncovered no credible information that al Qaeda had obtained fissile material or acquired a nuclear weapon. Moreover, they found no evidence of any radioactive material suitable for weapons. They did uncover, however, a "nuclear-related" document discussing "openly available concepts about the nuclear fuel cycle and some weapons-related issues." Just a day or two before al Qaeda was to flee from Afghanistan in 2001, bin Laden supposedly told a Pakistani journalist, "If the United States uses chemical or nuclear weapons against us, we might respond with chemical and nuclear weapons. We possess these weapons as a deterrent." Given the military pressure that they were then under and taking into account the evidence of the primitive or more probably nonexistent nature of al Qaedas nuclear program, the reported assertions, although unsettling, appear at best to be a desperate bluff. Bin Laden has made statements about nuclear weapons a few other times. Some of these pronouncements can be seen to be threatening, but they are rather coy and indirect, indicating perhaps something of an interest, but not acknowledging a capability. And as terrorism specialist Louise Richardson observes, "Statements claiming a right to possess nuclear weapons have been misinterpreted as expressing a determination to use them. This in turn has fed the exaggeration of the threat we face." Norwegian researcher Anne Stenersen concluded after an exhaustive study of available materials that, although "it is likely that al Qaeda central has considered the option of using non-conventional weapons," there is "little evidence that such ideas ever developed into actual plans, or that they were given any kind of priority at the expense of more traditional types of terrorist attacks." She also notes that information on an al Qaeda computer left behind in Afghanistan in 2001 indicates that only $2,000 to $4,000 was earmarked for weapons of mass destruction research and that the money was mainly for very crude work on chemical weapons. Today, the key portions of al Qaeda central may well total only a few hundred people, apparently assisting the Taliban's distinctly separate, far larger, and very troublesome insurgency in Afghanistan. Beyond this tiny band, there are thousands of sympathizers and would-be jihadists spread around the globe. They mainly connect in Internet chat rooms, engage in radicalizing conversations, and variously dare each other to actually do something. Any "threat," particularly to the West, appears, then, principally to derive from self-selected people, often isolated from each other, who fantasize about performing dire deeds. From time to time some of these people, or ones closer to al Qaeda central, actually manage to do some harm. And occasionally, they may even be able to pull off something large, such as 9/11. But in most cases, their capacities and schemes, or alleged schemes, seem to be far less dangerous than initial press reports vividly, even hysterically, suggest. Most important for present purposes, however, is that any notion that al Qaeda has the capacity to acquire nuclear weapons, even if it wanted to, looks farfetched in the extreme. It is also noteworthy that, although there have been plenty of terrorist attacks in the world since 2001, all have relied on conventional destructive methods. For the most part, terrorists seem to be heeding the advice found in a memo on an al Qaeda laptop seized in Pakistan in 2004: "Make use of that which is available … rather than waste valuable time becoming despondent over that which is not within your reach." In fact, history consistently demonstrates that terrorists prefer weapons that they know and understand, not new, exotic ones.

#### No Correlation Between Drones and Recruitment

By Kimi Tsuruta | August 16, 2012 Aid instead of drones may hold key to hindering AQAP http://nationalsecurityzone.org/site/aid-instead-of-drones-may-hold-key-to-hindering-aqap/

However, whether the U.S. drone attacks and their collateral damage have directly led to civilians joining the AQAP out of revenge and anti-American sentiments remains in dispute.¶ “The sense of resentment based on my research does not transfer into more recruiting for al-Qaeda,” said Christopher Swift, a fellow at the University of Virginia Law School’s Center for National Security Law who has directly interviewed tribal leaders and Islamist politicians from 14 of Yemen’s 21 provinces.¶ There is no evidence of a correlation between the increased drone attacks and the tripling of the AQAP membership in the last three years, and instead the economic condition in Yemen plays the biggest factor in civilians joining the organization, according to Swift. He, however, acknowledges the validity of conflicting claims made by others, like Yemeni youth activist Ibrahim Mothana.

#### No blowback – systematic first person interviews disprove – their evidence makes racist and unjustified assumptions.

**Swift 12** – (7/1, Christopher, fellow at the University of Virginia's Center for National Security Law, “The Drone Blowback Fallacy,” Foreign Affairs, http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/137760/christopher-swift/the-drone-blowback-fallacy?page=show)

Critics argue that drone strikes create new adversaries and drive al Qaeda's recruiting. As the Yemeni youth activist Ibrahim Mothana recently wrote in The New York Times, "Drone strikes are causing more and more Yemenis to hate America and join radical militants; they are not driven by ideology but rather by a sense of revenge and despair." The Washington Post concurs. In May, it reported that the "escalating campaign of U.S. drone strikes [in Yemen] is stirring increasing sympathy for al Qaeda-linked militants and driving tribesmen to join a network linked to terrorist plots against the United States." The ranks of al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula (AQAP) have tripled to 1,000 in the last three years, and the link between its burgeoning membership, U.S. drone strikes, and local resentment seems obvious.

Last month, I traveled to Yemen to study how AQAP operates and whether the conventional understanding of the relationship between drones and recruitment is correct. While there, I conducted 40 interviews with tribal leaders, Islamist politicians, Salafist clerics, and other sources. These subjects came from 14 of Yemen's 21 provinces, most from rural regions. Many faced insurgent infiltration in their own districts. Some of them were actively fighting AQAP. Two had recently visited terrorist strongholds in Jaar and Zinjibar as guests. I conducted each of these in-depth interviews using structured questions and a skilled interpreter. I have withheld my subjects' names to protect their safety -- a necessity occasioned by the fact that some of them had survived assassination attempts and that others had recently received death threats.

These men had little in common with the Yemeni youth activists who capture headlines and inspire international acclaim. As a group, they were older, more conservative, and more skeptical of U.S. motives. They were less urban, less wealthy, and substantially less secular. But to my astonishment, **none of the individuals I interviewed drew a causal relationship between U.S. drone strikes and al Qaeda recruiting**. Indeed, of the 40 men in this cohort, only five believed that U.S. drone strikes were helping al Qaeda more than they were hurting it.

#### Civilian casualties don’t incite more terrorism – Safety concerns outweigh revenge

Johnston and Sarbahi, Ph.Ds in Political Science 1/3/13 (\*Patrick, associate political scientist at the Rand Corporation, Ph.D in Political Science, Northwestern University, \*Anoop, received his PhD in political science from the University of California, Los Angeles in 2011. His research interests include civil wars, counter insurgency, post-conflict transition and state rebuilding, electoral dynamics and political violence, democratization and democratic processes, and political economy of inter-group and inter-regional disparities, “The Impact of US Drone Strikes on Terrorism in Pakistan and Afghanistan” patrickjohnston.info/materials/drones.pdf)

The observed dampening effect of drone strikes on militant violence would also cast doubt on certain conventionally held views regarding how civilians respond to violence. Specifically, to the extent that Muslims, especially Pashtuns, living in the region have a strong disdain for the drones' persistent surveillance and periodic destruction, they either have less agency to mobilize as mujahideen fighters or less interest in doing so than both academic theories of emotion and violence (revenge, in particular) and military doctrine that emphasizes the importance of “hearts and minds" would predict. If this were true, it would suggest either that the militant organization in particular, the networks through which militants operate is their center-of-gravity rather than the population. Alternatively, it could mean that the population behaves more rationally than many would expect based on the narratives about popular anger stemming from drone strikes. This would imply that as angry and spiteful as parts of the population might feel as a result of drone strikes, emotions ultimately take a backseat to individuals' primary interest in their own safety, which is much higher as a civilian than as a fighter who associates with other possible targets of the drones, thus risking becoming a target himself.

### Yemen

#### Alt cause to Yemen instability-Land disputes

Murray, 13 [Rebecca, writes for Al Jazeera, “Land disputes threaten south Yemen stability,”<http://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/features/2013/04/2013412103741772293.html>, ALB]

Increasing discontent¶ Unresolved land disputes are contributing to increasing discontent in the south.¶ This month, UN special envoy Jamal Benomar warned the Security Council: "A civil disobedience movement is now attracting large numbers to the streets. The calls for secession have grown.¶ "After nearly two decades of discrimination, repression, and unaddressed legitimate grievances, the people in the south are weary and skeptical of promises of reform."¶ But resolving land disputes in the region is highly complicated, explains April Alley, a researcher with the International Crisis Group (ICG). ¶ "Patterns of land ownership have dramatically changed several times over the past 50 years," she told Al Jazeera. "There are usually multiple claims on the same property."¶ Land seizures after the demise of the south's socialist rule are the most controversial. ¶ "Following unification in 1990, state properties were sold, often at undervalued rates, to individuals - both northern and southern - many of whom had connections with the Saleh regime," Alley said. "Military commanders in particular were notorious for corrupt land grabs."¶ The popularity of those seeking a separate state has swelled since initial calls in 2007 to address injustices were ignored by Saleh's government. ¶ In the National Dialogue, groups under the popular southern movement umbrella, al-Hirak al-Janoubi, are allotted 85 seats of a 565 seat chamber. Saleh's ruling General People's Congress (GPC) claims the most slots with 112.¶ But pro-secessionist leaders such as Hassan Baoum and exiled former South Yemeni president Ali Salem Al-Beid are boycotting National Dialogue talks, demanding discussions between the north and south instead.¶ Khalid Wahed Noman, an independent participant from Aden, disagreed. He said he believes in an autonomous greater Aden within a Yemeni federation. ¶ "Why is Hirak here?" he asked rhetorically. "Because the regime destroyed southern establishments. They destroyed everything."¶ Human Rights Minister Hooria Mashhour said that power in the country must be decentralised. "Now is the time to raise our issues, address them and settle this," he said. "There are two real solutions: federalism or secession. High centralisation is not accepted now."¶ In the months leading up to the National Dialogue, tens of thousands of secessionists held rallies across the south, rallies which were marred by arrests and civilians killed by the security forces.¶ Aden's governor, Waheed Ali Rasheed, a member of the Islamic Islah party, remains unsympathetic. He blames the street violence on protesters who shut down services.¶ "Aden's parties and people complain about the situation but they won't find a solution here," he said. "The National Dialogue is the only way."

#### Yemen instability inevitable –insurgencies prove --- Makes democratic efforts impossible.

Wolff 1/24 (Stefan - Professor of International Security at the University of Birmingham. He is a specialist in contemporary security challenges and has written extensively on international conflict management and state-building. Reuters, January 24, 2012, "Yemen needs an insurgent democracy," -blogs.reuters.com/great-debate/2012/01/24/yemen-needs-an-insurgent-democracy/)

Yemen, though, is different. Its crisis goes much deeper than socioeconomic and political dissatisfaction. It has insurgencies to worry about. There are two: the al-Houthi uprising in the north since 2004 and the increasingly secessionist rebellion in the south that, while tracing its origins back to the brief 1994 north-south civil war, has gained violent momentum from 2007 onwards. Both insurgencies are reactions to political marginalization and economic neglect by Sana’a. But these insurgencies have telling differences. The situation in the north has been destabilized by past military operations against a Shi’ite rebellion that allegedly received support from Iran (doubtful as it may be in its significance). For years on-and-off fighting had seen little gain for either side until the government launched operation “Scorched Earth” in 2009. That push involved Saudi forces, but the insurgency, although reduced in strength, continued. To date, a number of ceasefire agreements have been signed, and broken, most recently in 2010. In the south, meanwhile, a battle with secessionist forces is complicated by the significant and growing presence of al-Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula (AQAP). This fight has garnered significant international attention, not least because of two failed international terrorist plots that originated in Yemen — the attempt to bring down airplanes with explosives hidden in printer toner cartridges in October 2010 and the Christmas Day bombing plot in 2009. The alliance between AQAP and the southern secessionists, however, is one of convenience above all else. The southern movement is deeply divided among different factions and has limited military capabilities. It thus relies to an extent on AQAP to challenge the regime without sharing the terrorist network’s religious fundamentalism or anti-Western agenda. For the regime, southern secession is unacceptable given that most of Yemen’s dwindling oil resources are located there. Internationally, too, there is broad support for Yemen’s unity and a fear that instability in the south will further enable and embolden AQAP. Even without Saleh, these insurgencies will continue — and so will all of Yemen’s other ills. Economically, the country has struggled for years with declining oil reserves and serious water shortages, high unemployment, and the consequences of immigration, emigration, and transmigration. Social tensions between different segments of Yemen’s society overlap and cut across existing political, religious, geographical, tribal, and cultural divides, and are unlikely to decrease amid further political instability and economic decline.

One also shouldn’t dismiss the danger that an already volatile security situation will escalate. Fears of an imminent civil war may be overstated, but the multiple threats from northern and southern insurgents and from AQAP must not be underestimated. You try reaching an agreement on a new constitution with all that swirling around.