# Round 3 vs Houston AB

## 1NC

### Off-1

#### Interpretation- “Introducing United States Armed Forces into hostilities” refers to human members of the Armed Forces- we have the best reading of the War Powers Resolution, the only place where this phrase is defined and used

Lorber 2013 (Eric, J.D. Candidate, University of Pennsylvania Law School, Ph.D Candidate, Duke University Department of Political Science, EXECUTIVE WARMAKING AUTHORITY AND OFFENSIVE CYBER OPERATIONS: CAN EXISTING LEGISLATION SUCCESSFULLY CONSTRAIN PRESIDENTIAL POWER?, 15 U. Pa. J. Const. L. 961 2012-2013)

C. The War Powers Resolution as Applied to Offensive Cyber Operations¶ As discussed above, critical to the application of the War Powers¶ Resolution-especially in the context of an offensive cyber operation-are¶ the definitions of key terms, particularly "armed forces," as the relevant¶ provisions of the Act are only triggered if the President "introduc[es armed¶ forces] into hostilities or into situations [of] imminent . .. hostilities," or if¶ such forces are introduced "into the territory, airspace, or waters of a foreign¶ nation, while equipped for combat, except for deployments which relate¶ solely to supply, replacement, repair, or training of such forces."17 The¶ requirements may also be triggered if the United States deploys armed¶ forces "in numbers which substantially enlarge United States Armed Forces¶ equipped for combat already located in a foreign nation." 74 As is evident,¶ the definition of "armed forces" is crucial to deciphering whether the WPR¶ applies in a particular circumstance to provide congressional leverage over¶ executive actions. The definition of "hostilities," which has garnered the¶ majority of scholarly and political attention, 75 particularly in the recent¶ Libyan conflict,76 will be dealt with secondarily here because it only becomes¶ important if "armed forces" exist in the situation.¶ As is evident from a textual analysis, an examination of the legislative¶ history, and the broad policy purposes behind the creation of the Act, 79 "armed forces" refers to U.S. soldiers and members of the armed forces, not¶ weapon systems or capabilities such as offensive cyber weapons. Section¶ 1547 does not specifically define "armed forces," but it states that "the term¶ 'introduction of United States Armed Forces' includes the assignment of¶ members of such armed forces to command, coordinate, participate in the¶ movement of, or accompany the regular or irregular military forces of any¶ foreign country or government."' While this definition pertains to the¶ broader phrase "introduction of armed forces," the clear implication is that¶ only members of the armed forces count for the purposes of the definition¶ under the WPR. Though not dispositive, the term "member" connotes a¶ human individual who is part of an organization."" Thus, it appears that the¶ term "armed forces" means human members of the United States armed¶ forces. However, there exist two potential complications with this reading.¶ First, the language of the statute states that "the term 'introduction of¶ United States Armed Forces' includes the assignment of members of such¶ armed forces."12 By using inclusionary-as opposed to exclusionarylanguage,¶ one might argue that the term "armed forces" could include more¶ than members. This argument is unconvincing however, given that a core¶ principle of statutory interpretation, expressio unius, suggests that expression¶ of one thing (i.e., members) implies the exclusion of others (such as nonmembers¶ constituting armed forces) . Second, the term "member" does¶ not explicitly reference "humans," and so could arguably refer to individual¶ units and beings that are part of a larger whole (e.g., wolves can be members¶ of a pack). As a result, though a textual analysis suggests that "armed forces"¶ refers to human members of the armed forces, such a conclusion is not¶ determinative.¶ An examination of the legislative history also suggests that Congress¶ clearly conceptualized "armed forces" as human members of the armed¶ forces. For example, disputes over the term "armed forces" revolved around¶ who could be considered members of the armed forces, not what constituted¶ a member. Senator Thomas Eagleton, one of the Resolution's architects,¶ proposed an amendment during the process providing that the Resolution¶ cover military officers on loan to a civilian agency (such as the Central Intelligence Agency) . This amendment was dropped after encountering¶ pushback, but the debate revolved around whether those military¶ individuals on loan to the civilian agency were still members of the armed¶ forces for the purposes of the WPR, suggesting that Congress considered the¶ term to apply only to soldiers in the armed forces. Further, during the¶ congressional hearings, the question of deployment of "armed forces"¶ 186 centered primarily on past U.S. deployment of troops to combat zones,¶ suggesting that Congress conceptualized "armed forces" to mean U.S.¶ combat troops.¶ The broad purpose of the Resolution aimed to prevent the large-scale¶ but unauthorized deployments of U.S. troops into hostilities.' While¶ examining the broad purpose of a legislative act is increasingly relied upon¶ only after examining the text and legislative history, here it provides further¶ support for those two alternate interpretive sources." As one scholar has¶ noted, "[t]he War Powers Resolution, for example, is concerned with¶ sending U.S. troops into harm's way." 5 The historical context of the War¶ Powers Resolution is also important in determining its broad purpose; as the¶ resolutions submitted during the Vietnam War and in the lead-up to the¶ passage of the WPR suggest, Congress was concerned about its ability to¶ effectively regulate the President's deployments of large numbers of U.S.¶ troops to Southeast Asia,'oo as well as prevent the President from authorizing¶ troop incursions into countries in that region.'"' The WPR was a reaction to¶ the President's continued deployments of these troops into combat zones,¶ and as such suggests that Congress's broad purpose was to prevent the¶ unconstrained deployment of U.S. personnel, not weapons, into hostilities.¶ This analysis suggests that, when defining the term "armed forces,"¶ Congress meant members of the armed forces who would be placed in harm's way (i.e., into hostilities or imminent hostilities). Applied to¶ offensive cyber operations, such a definition leads to the conclusion that the¶ War Powers Resolution likely does not cover such activities. Worms, viruses,¶ and kill switches are clearly not U.S. troops. Therefore, the key question¶ regarding whether the WPR can govern cyber operations is not whether the¶ operation is conducted independently or as part of a kinetic military¶ operation. Rather, the key question is the delivery mechanism. For¶ example, if military forces were deployed to launch the cyberattack, such an¶ activity, if it were related to imminent hostilities with a foreign country,¶ could trigger the WPR. This seems unlikely, however, for two reasons. First,¶ it is unclear whether small-scale deployments where the soldiers are not¶ participating or under threat of harm constitute the introduction of armed¶ forces into hostilities under the War Powers Resolution. Thus, individual¶ operators deployed to plant viruses in particular enemy systems may not¶ constitute armed forces introduced into hostilities or imminent hostilities.¶ Second, such a tactical approach seems unlikely. If the target system is¶ remote access, the military can attack it without placing personnel in harm's¶ way. 1 If it is close access, there exist many other effective ways to target¶ such systems.194 As a result, unless U.S. troops are introduced into hostilities¶ or imminent hostilities while deploying offensive cyber capabilities-which is¶ highly unlikely-such operations will not trigger the War Powers Resolution.

#### Violation- they restrict something other than the introduction of members of the Armed Forces

#### Reasons to vote-

#### Limits- they allow the aff to restrict literally anything controlled by the military- leads to nuke affs, space weapon affs, experimental weapon affs- the list goes on- they force the neg to defend the use of literally every military-ish device in existence which is an impossible burden

#### Precision- in the context of war powers the whole phrase “introduction of United States Armed Forces into hostilities” refers to activities covered by the War Powers Resolution- our evidence gives the best legal analysis of what that means- that’s the most predictable basis on which to define the topic

### Off-2

#### 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.

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

**Critical praxis outweighs policy making- voting affirmative guarantees error replication. Only a radical break from dominant paradigms can avoid becoming a self fulfilling prophecy**

Cheeseman & Bruce 1996 (Graeme, Senior Lecturer at the University of New South Wales, and Robert, Associate Professor in social sciences at Curtin university, “Discourses of Danger & Dread Frontiers”, p. 5-8, MT)

This goal is pursued in ways which are still unconventional in the intellectual milieu of international relations in Australia, even though they are gaining influence worldwide as traditional modes of theory and practice are rendered inadequate by global trends that defy comprehension, let alone policy. The inability to give meaning to global changes reflects partly the enclosed, elitist world of professional security analysts and bureaucratic experts, where entry is gained by learning and accepting to speak a particular, exclusionary language. The contributors to this book are familiar with the discourse, but accord no privileged place to its ‘knowledge form as reality’ in debates on defence and security. Indeed, they believe that debate will be furthered only through a long overdue critical re-evaluation of elite perspectives. Pluralistic, democratically-oriented perspectives on Australia’s identity are both required and essential if Australia’s thinking on defence and security is to be invigorated. This is not a conventional policy book; nor should it be, in the sense of offering policy-makers and their academic counterparts sets of neat alternative solutions, in familiar language and format, to problems they pose. **This expectation is in itself a considerable part of the problem** to be analysed. It is, however, a book about policy, one that **questions how problems are framed by policy-makers**. It challenges the proposition that irreducible bodies of real knowledge on defence and security exist independently of their ‘context in the world’, and it demonstrates how security policy is articulated authoritatively by the elite keepers of that knowledge, experts trained to recognize enduring, universal wisdom. All others, from this perspective, must accept such wisdom or remain outside the expert domain, tainted by their inability to comply with the ‘rightness’ of the official line. But it is precisely the official line, or at least its image of the world, that needs to be problematised. If the critic responds directly to the demand for policy alternatives, without addressing this image, he or she is tacitly endorsing it. **Before engaging in the policy debate the critics need to reframe the basic terms of reference**. This book, then, reflects and underlines the importance of Antonio Gramsci and Edward Said’s ‘critical intellectuals’.15 The demand, tacit or otherwise, that the policy-maker’s frame of reference be accepted as the only basis for discussion and analysis ignores a three thousand year old tradition commonly associated with Socrates and purportedly integral to the Western tradition of democratic dialogue. More immediately, it ignores post-seventeenth century democratic traditions which insist that a good society must have within it some way of critically assessing its knowledge and the decisions based upon that knowledge which impact upon citizens of such a society. This is a tradition with a slightly different connotation in contemporary liberal democracies which, during the Cold War, were proclaimed different and superior to the totalitarian enemy precisely because there were institutional checks and balances upon power. In short, one of the major differences between ‘open societies’ and their (closed) counterparts behind the Iron Curtain was that the former encouraged the critical testing of the knowledge and decisions of the powerful and assessing them against liberal democratic principles. The latter tolerated criticism only on rare and limited occasions. For some, this represented the triumph of rational-scientific methods of inquiry and techniques of falsification. For others, especially since positivism and rationalism have lost much of their allure, it meant that for society to become open and liberal, sectors of the population must be independent of the state and free to question its knowledge and power. Though we do not expect this position to be accepted by every reader, contributors to this book believe that critical dialogue is long overdue in Australia and needs to be listened to. For all its liberal democratic trappings, Australia’s security community continues to invoke closed monological narratives on defence and security. This book also questions the distinctions between policy practice and academic theory that inform conventional accounts of Australian security. One of its major concerns, particularly in chapters 1 and 2, is to illustrate how theory is integral to the practice of security analysis and policy prescription. The book also calls on policy-makers, academics and students of defence and security to think critically about what they are reading, writing and saying; to begin to ask, of their work and study, difficult and searching questions raised in other disciplines; to recognise, no matter how uncomfortable it feels, that what is involved in theory and practice is not the ability to identify a replacement for failed models, but a realisation that terms and concepts – state sovereignty, balance of power, security, and so on – are contested and problematic, and that the world is indeterminate, **always becoming what is written about it.** Critical analysis which shows how particular kinds of theoretical presumptions can effectively exclude vital areas of political life from analysis **has direct practical implications for policy-makers**, academics and citizens who face the daunting task of steering Australia through some potentially choppy international waters over the next few years. There is also much of interest in the chapters for those struggling to give meaning to a world where so much that has long been taken for granted now demands imaginative, incisive reappraisal. The contributors, too, have struggled to find meaning, often despairing at the terrible human costs of international violence. This is why readers will find no single, fully formed panacea for the world’s ills in general, or Australia’s security in particular. There are none. Every chapter, however, in its own way, offers something more than is found in orthodox literature, often by exposing ritualistic Cold War defence and security mind-sets that are dressed up as new thinking. Chapters 7 and 9, for example, present alternative ways of engaging in security and defence practice. Others (chapters 3, 4, 5, 6 and 8) seek to alert policy-makers, academics and students to alternative theoretical possibilities which might better serve an Australian community pursuing security and prosperity in an uncertain world. All chapters confront the policy community and its counterparts in the academy with a deep awareness of the intellectual and material constraints imposed by dominant traditions of realism, but they avoid dismissive and exclusionary terms which often in the past characterized exchanges between policy-makers and their critics. This is because, as noted earlier, attention needs to be paid to the words and the thought processes of those being criticized. A close reading of this kind draws attention to underlying assumptions, showing they need to be recognized and questioned. A sense of doubt (in place of confident certainty) is a necessary prelude to a genuine search for alternative policies. First comes an awareness of the need for new perspectives, **then specific policies may follow.** As Jim George argues in the following chapter, we need to look not so much at **contending policies** as they are made for us **but at challenging ‘the discursive process which gives** [favoured **interpretations of “reality”] their meaning and which direct** [Australia’s] **policy**/analytical/**military responses**’. This process is not restricted to the small, official defence and security establishment huddled around the US-Australian War Memorial in Canberra. It also encompasses much of Australia’s academic defence and security community located primarily though not exclusively within the Australian National University and the University College of the University of New South Wales. These discursive processes are examined in detail in subsequent chapters as authors attempt to make sense of a politics of exclusion and closure which exercises disciplinary power over Australia’s security community. They also question the discourse of ‘regional security’, ‘security cooperation’, ‘peacekeeping’ and ‘alliance politics’ that are central to Australia’s official and academic security agenda in the 1990s. This is seen as an important task especially when, as is revealed, the disciplines of International Relations and Strategic Studies are under challenge from critical and theoretical debates ranging across the social sciences and humanities; debates that are nowhere to be found in Australian defence and security studies. The chapters graphically illustrate how Australia’s public policies on defence and security are informed, underpinned and legitimised by a narrowly-based intellectual enterprise which draws strength from contested concepts of realism and liberalism, which in turn seek legitimacy through policy-making processes. Contributors ask whether Australia’s policy-makers and their academic advisors are unaware of broader intellectual debates, or resistant to them, or choose not to understand them, and why?

### 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.”

#### The limits or excess of Obama’s executive power will establish presidential norms

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.19-20)

“There is a very real danger that the Obama administration will enshrine permanently within the law policies and practices that were widely considered extreme and unlawful during the bush administration,” warned the American Civil Liberties Union in a July 2010 report. Acknowledging the Obama changes on interrogation and black sites, the ACLU nonetheless concluded that “there is a real danger…that the Obama administration will preside over the creation of a “new normal”.”” This is basically what has happened. On the issues of whether terrorism is to be confronted as a war or as a crime, the legal basis for military detention, the discretionary approach to trials and detention, habeas corpus, the legal basis for rendition, state secrets and surveillance, Obama’s position is basically the same as the one that prevailed at the end of the Bush administration. Obama made small reforms to the military commissions and he raised detention standards in Afghanistan. He also pulled back from late Bush administration practices on interrogation (though bush himself had pulled back on this quite a lot from the 2002-2004 period). Finally, Obama has ramped up targeted killing, and if anything the NSA seems more active in the homeland under Obama than under the late Bush administration.

#### 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.

### Off-4

#### Text: The Executive Branch of the United States federal government should exhibit executive restraint to introduce nuclear weapons into hostilities.

#### The CP is the only way to solve- the President will refuse to follow restrictions from Congress

Delahunty and Yoo 2013 (Robert and John, Associate Professor of Law, University of St. Thomas School of Law, Minneapolis; Professor of Law, University of California Berkeley School of Law and a Visiting Scholar at the American Enterprise Institute; Dream On: The Obama Administration's Nonenforcement of Immigration Laws, the DREAM Act, and the Take Care Clause, Texas Law Review91.4 (2013): 781-857, proquest)

A. Unconstitutional Statutes¶ Presidents have refused to enforce or defend acts of Congress that they maintain are unconstitutional.362 The unconstitutionality of an act of Congress can serve as a defense to a charge of nonexecution in two ways. First, the President can argue that his duty is to enforce the "law." An unconstitutional act of Congress is void, and thus not "law." There is no duty to enforce it, and no breach of duty in not enforcing it. Alternatively, the President can argue that the Constitution is itself a "law" that he has a duty to enforce. If he is also obligated to enforce an unconstitutional statute, his duties will conflict. In that conflict, he must discharge the higher and more important duty, which is to the Constitution.¶ We have argued in other work that the President is not duty bound to enforce an unconstitutional law.363 Of course, legal scholars and practitioners may disagree over whether a particular statute is, or is not, unconstitutional. During the Clinton Administration, there was a controversy over the constitutionality of a statute that would have required the Defense Department to identify military personnel who were HIV-positive and to discharge them if they tested positive.364 Likewise, during that Administration there was also a controversy over a bill that would have precluded the President from placing U.S. military personnel under the command of foreign military officers.365 In both cases, the Clinton Administration concluded that these measures would infringe on the President's prerogatives as Commander in Chief.366 We ourselves have argued that congressional efforts to control the initiation of hostilities through the War Powers Resolution would violate the President's Chief Executive and Commander in Chief powers.367 Such constitutional objections could serve as a valid defense to the charge that nonenforcement was a breach of constitutional duty.

### Threats

#### The affirmative’s literal depictions of the bomb ignore the symbolic nature of representation. We must first acknowledge the symbolic reality that bridges literalism and fantasy before we can engage true in real movements away from the bomb

Chernus, 86 (Ira Chernus. professor of religious studies university of Colorado at boulder.

University of South Caroline 1986 “Dr. Strangegod.” Page 153-156//ts) NG

Moreover, even if we could imagine the reality of nuclear war in purely literal terms, there is good reason to believe that we should not follow this path. **Literal thinking and literal language impose a particular mode of thought and feeling, one that is intimately linked with the Bomb and its symbolism.** Literalism insists that in every situation there is one single meaning and one single truth to be found. Thus it divides the world into true and false, right and wrong, good and evil, with no middle ground allowed. It is the characteristic language of a culture bent on an apocalyptic crusade to wipe out all evil. It allows no ground for a unified vision of good and evil or life and death together. At the same time, literalism underscores our psychic numbing. With its statistics, computer projections, and abstract theoretical models, the literal approach reduces the world to a set of finite means and ends, each with a single simple meaning. It fails to grasp the complexities of human reality and human response. It creates a dehumanized world, amenable to manipulation and control, in which we learn to see other people and ultimately ourselves as mere inert objects. It is the characteristic language of a technological culture that has made a death-machine its deity. The inert words of literalism create an inert world, in which every thing is just the thing it is and can be nothing else. In this one-dimensional world it is increasingly difficult to give possible realities and imagined realities any meaningful place. So we are prevented by our mode of speaking and thinking from exploring genuine alternatives to the existing situation. We are also prevented from recognizing the reality and power of our symbolisms and fantasies. Since we define literal truth as the only valid form of truth. we deny that our unconscious processes have any valid truth at all So literalism becomes part of the process of psychological repression. This is especially dangerous in the nuclear age, when the difference between literal reality and fantasy is so hard to find. With fantasy images affecting us so powerfully, we must exert ever more powerful processes of repression. One way to achieve this is simply to intensify our numbing-to refuse to feel at all. Another way is to project our inner thoughts and feelings onto external objects-to make the Enemy responsible for all the anger and hatred and dark feeling that wells up inside us. As numbing reinforces our commitment to dehumanizing technology, projection reinforces our commitment to the apocalyptic crusade against the Enemy. So **literalism again ties together both our ways of thinking about the Bomb and our efforts to avoid thinking about it. Yet even the most ardent literalism cannot banish the symbolic dimensions of our minds and our symbolic responses to the Bomb. Indeed, our conviction that literal truth is the only truth paradoxically strengthens the grip of symbolic meanings. The more literalism starves our supply of symbolic thinking and feeling, the more it feeds our hunger, and the more intensively we cling to our symbols**. **Since we are convinced that these nuclear symbols are actually literal realities, they take even deeper root in our psyches**. When warnings of the dire reality of nuclear war are cast in purely literal terms, they are received on the symbolic level (even if we consciously deny this) and their threatening aspect is largely nullified. Perhaps this explains, in part, the relatively limited success of the nuclear disarmament movement. The movement has tried to move us from the level of numbing to the level of awareness by urging us to imagine the literal horrors of nuclear war. Yet its alarms have fallen largely on deaf ears. The movement itself has explained this deafness by pointing to the conflict between the first two levels of awareness and numbing. But in its commitment to literal thinking it has ignored the third level of symbolic meaning. This literalism is just part of a larger picture-the disarmament movement's roots in the liberal humanism of the eighteenth-century Enlightenment. This rationalistic humanism strips the issue of its religious and psychological complexities and sees it as a purely ethical matter: humanism and life against global death, one value against another. It assumes that ethical problems must be resolved by literal factual analysis and clear logical analysis alone. It assumes, furthermore, that all people are rational and can be shown the convergence of morality and self-interest. Therefore the movement puts all its energies into education based solely on facts and logical arguments. Yet it is clear that the nuclear issue goes beyond ethical considerations, and it is equally clear that the antinuclear campaign cannot succeed merely by stressing the irrationality of nuclear armament, for the Bomb's nonrational symbolic meanings lie at the heart of its appeal. Moreover, the Enlightenment tradition still links its faith in rationality to a belief in "progress," which means the triumph of the forces of life over the forces of death. Yet all these Enlightenment values are the very values held just as fervently by nuclear policymakers, strategists, and political and military leaders. We have seen ample evidence that they too put their faith in logical analysis and the triumph of life over death, always holding the opposites apart. And proponents of nuclear armament have always couched their arguments in the most literal terms. The media have largely accepted this literal treatment and passed it along to the general public. Media presentations of the issue have been saturated with symbolic meanings that have gone unrecognized as symbolism because we have assumed that all truth must be literal truth. So the disarmament movement's own roots are closely intertwined with the roots of the very tree it hopes to fell. As long as it fails to recognize the role of symbolism and the irrational in the psyche, it will fail to grasp the fascinating, appealing qualities of the Bomb. If we are to "imagine the real," the first step is to understand that the reality we must imagine is largely a symbolic reality that crosses the line between literalism and fantasy.

#### This fascination with the bomb becomes a worship of all destructive technology, and constantly pushes us to raise the stakes to keep death interesting. All of us become cogs in a grand nuclear machine that rewards us for our devotion only by grinding us to death

Chernus, 86 (Ira Chernus. professor of religious studies university of Colorado at boulder.

University of South Caroline 1986 “Dr. Strangegod.” Page 136-140//ts) NG

The similarities between the Bomb and other religious realities tell us part of what we need to know. But we must also ask how our new God differs from all previous gods, for only then can we see clearly how it affects us in unprecedented ways. One point, which has been implicit in our previous discussion, must now be brought out explicitly: this God is a machine, a technological device invented by human beings. Yet the machine, being infinitely more powerful than the humans who invented it, has become a Frankenstein's Monster, independent of its creators and capable of turning violently upon them. And "them" is now, of course, all of us. We have the choice of either cooperating or resisting when the machine acts; because of its many appealing symbolic qualities, we generally cooperate. We become partners in the machine's actions and thus, in a very real sense, parts of the machine. We are all soldiers in the front-line trenches, but the Bomb is our commander and we do its bidding. This is especially clear in the concept of MAD; the citizens of all superpowers become linked together in a single machine, which demands more and more sacrifices; the actions of one side must (according to this theory) necessarily evoke corresponding actions from the other side. The way in which we prepare for war reflects and foreshadows the way we shall wage war: "In a push-button war involving nuclear missiles, there will be no direct contact between adversaries. The techniques of war are fast becoming as impersonal and mechanized as pulling a lever to start a production chainbelt. In such a setting, the best soldier is not the 'hero' but the 'automaton.'''1 We voluntarily become automatons, mere parts of a machine, in part because of our age-old mythic dream of being heroes and our mythic desire to embody in ourselves the power inherent in the divine machine. What Moss says of the Strategic Air Command bomber pilot may be true for all of us: "He is equally remote from the human will that makes a decision on using or not using the bomb, and the human suffering that its use would cause. He sees himself as part of a complex instrument, an agent between someone else's will and its effect, a living button. His pride is to function in this role perfectly. He has a sense of importance."2 Ultimately, though, in our symbolic perception, it may very well be the Bomb itself whose will we obey, for how can any human will dare to interfere with that of the divine? Even the greatest national leaders are merely parts of the machine. And, as we have seen, our importance becomes not merely social or political, but in fact sacred and cosmic in scope. At the same time, psychic numbing reinforces the pattern effected by symbolic meaning. For if we are in fact "dead in life," already suffused with the death taint of the Bomb, then it is that much easier to see ourselves as machines and to take pride in being perfectly functioning machines. Of course, this sense of the mechanization of human life was hardly created by the nuclear age. Here, as in so many other instances, the Bomb is both a reflection and a shaper of our relationship with reality. But the elevation of a machine to a central place in our symbolic world-the deification of a machine-surely makes it much more likely that we shall see ourselves as automatons. Moreover, the technologically induced problem offers itself as a solution. As this machine God intensifies our psychic numbing, we seek to escape that numbing by finding meaning in a symbolic form of immortality that is itself technological, as Lifton suggests: "Everyone in this age participates in a sense of immortality derived from the interlocking human projects we call science and technology."3 Thus, as technology absorbs those provinces of life that were previously considered spiritual, it may be fair to say that technology has become the soul of the body of humanity. Yet we cannot be totally content with being machines. In fact, as we saw previously, the existentialist movement may be said to have started with Dostoevski's revolt against being a mere piano key, a part of a machine. The sense of dehumanization and the sheer boredom-the flatness of life-which afflicts automatons can be challenged only in situations of great intensity. Russian roulette may easily become, as in the film *The Deer Hunter,* a primary symbol for the modern world's escape from the dehumanization of a technological God. The intensity of risk is combined with the joy of being entertained in a theater of life-and-death. But for the ultimate "kick," the stakes must be ultimately high. Thus **the machine deity leads us to give ourselves over to it in a game of global Russian roulette in which we all hold the pistol. And apparently we do so willingly. Machines must inevitably see all the world as a machine: "The more a man acts on the basis of a self-image that assumes he is powerless, an impotent cog in a huge machine, t**

**he more likely he is to drift into a pattern of dehumanized thinking and action toward others**."5 "We have become masters of the impersonal and the inanimate. Our energy and even our emotions have gone into things; the things serve us but come between us, changing the relationship of man to man. And the things take on an authority that men accept without protest. The impersonality is epidemic. It is almost as though we feared direct contact, almost as though the soul of man had become septic."6 Thus we find our identity not by relating to other individuals as individuals, but by seeing ourselves merely as a part of "the crowd" or "the nation," whose emblem and savior is the Bomb, the ultimate machine. We lose the subtleties and nuances of human complexity and see the world in absolutes, "us versus them." We view human relationships in terms of the mythic, apocalyptic vision, a vision whose ultimate promise is the annihilation of "their" machine and unlimited license for "our" machine to do whatever it wants. In fact, **the ultimate goal of machine people is always to have total dominance, unlimited autonomy to manipulate the environment-both human and natural-in endless technological ways. Thus the machine God also shapes our relationship with our physical and material environment, leading us to the environmental crisis that we now face.** Again, **the fouling of the air, water, and land was hardly begun in the nuclear age, but the symbolism of the Bomb makes it much more difficult to escape from this predicament too.** Behind our callousness toward the natural realm there is not only a desire for quick and easy profit, but a more fundamental view of ourselves as radically separated from nature. In the battle of the machines to dominate the elements, we are clearly on the side of the machines-we are the machines--and this battle is seen in radically dualistic, even apocalyptic, terms. Thus. having no meaningful relationship with nature, we are free, perhaps even compelled, to manipulate it endlessly. The transformation of raw materials into manufactured goods thus becomes our primary goal and value; if the Bomb is God, then the GNP is chief of the angels. Yet our commitment to material goods as highest good may have a more complex significance. It is fostered not only by the symbol of the Bomb as divine controller, manipulator, and dominator, but also by the psychic numbing that the Bomb creates. If we dare not think about the true reality of our lives-the sword of Damocles that constantly threatens total extinction at a moment's notice­ then we must divert ourselves, making the other, numbed level so complex and interesting that we shall not have time to think about the truth. And **we** must **make ourselves so comfortable that we shall not care to deal with the danger.** Thus the Bomb and the economy are interlocked not only from a strictly economic point of view (though most people do believe that more bombs are good for the economy, despite the doubts raised by economists), but also from the psychological and symbolic standpoints. The Bomb, the economy, and our lives all form parts of one interlocking machine, offering us enough satisfactions that we refuse to ask about the deeper meaning of the machine's life. When this question threatens to arise, the diversions of life as theater of the absurd and global Russian roulette are there to entertain us and soothe our doubts. Thus we desperately desire the security that we hope to gain from total domination and manipulation of our world, but we simultaneously demand the insecurity that will make life interesting and entertaining. And we certainly get this insecurity, for we have based our hopes of security on a God that, as we have seen, cannot provide it. We hope to dominate the Enemy with a weapon that by its very nature cannot offer the freedom that we seek through domination. We are caught in a vicious circle in which the quest for security can only breed the anxiety of insecurity. But machines can't feel anxiety, so it may be easier, for this reason too, to live as a machine. Finally, then, we come to treat not only the natural world and our fellow human beings as machines, but ourselves as well. We offer ourselves, our thoughts and feelings, to the machine and the nation that embodies it, and we perceive those feelings and thoughts as parts of the unreality that surrounds us: "Faced with the prospect of the destruction of mankind, we feel neither violent nor guilty, as though we were all involved in a gigantic delusion of negation of the external as well as of our internal reality."7 We allow ourselves to be numbed, finding it the easiest way to cope with an impossible situation, and thus we commit "partial suicide," which in turn allows us to continue preparing for total suicide on a global scale. **We commit ourselves to a machine that is infinitely violent and must wreak its violence on us if it is to be used on others. Therefore, as much as we fear the Enemy, we must fear ourselves in equal measure, and this fear of ourselves reinforces the numbing**.

### China

#### No China modernization

CEWCES 12 10-9; Bond University Center for East-East Cultural and Economic Studies, “Nuclear complexity in the Third Nuclear Age” <http://cewces.wordpress.com/2012/10/09/nuclear-complexity-in-the-third-nuclear-age/>

So when you examine China’s nuclear forces, with a low number of nuclear warheads in comparison to the United States and Russia, and older delivery systems, the Chinese nuclear weapons capability and posture is not that threatening. This is reinforced by China’s nuclear posture, which remains minimum deterrence and no-first-use. The modernization described above will ensure that it remains a credible deterrent, as well as give China the potential to move from a basis of minimum deterrent / no first use, to a more robust nuclear posture in the future. The key question to consider is why would it choose to make such a change? A number of factors are emerging which could promote significant changes in both the size and role of China’s nuclear forces, and will demand greater attention by Western policy makers. Of key significance to China is ensuring the survivability and maintaining the credibility of their nuclear deterrent in the face of a range of looming challenges. Looking from the perspective from Beijing, China faces the United States, which although currently de-emphasizing the role of nuclear forces and seeking to significantly reduce the number of nuclear weapons in its arsenal under the Obama Administration, is also maintaining a commitment to sustaining its own credible nuclear deterrent for the foreseeable future. This means that the aging nuclear delivery systems, as well as infrastructure to sustain the US nuclear weapons complex, will need to be modernized sooner rather than later to avoid undermining the credibility of the US nuclear deterrent.

#### Tons of alt causes to Chinese modernization

Blumenthal and Mazza 1AC Author 11(Dan Blumenthal, M.A., School of Advanced International Studies, Johns Hopkins University, director of Asian Studies at the American Enterprise Institute, and Michael Mazza, M.A., international relations (strategic studies and international economics), Paul H. Nitze School of Advanced International Studies (SAIS), Johns Hopkins University, program manager for AEI's annual Executive Program on National Security Policy and Strategy, “China's Strategic Forces in the 21st Century: The PLA's Changing Nuclear Doctrine and Force Posture,” 4/6/11) <http://www.npolicy.org/article_file/Chinas_Strategic_Forces.pdf>

When it comes to its development and deployment of nuclear weapons-China first tested a weapon in 1964-China maintains a narrative in which it holds the moral high ground. According to the Chinese Communist Party line, China detests nuclear weapons, which are inhumane. But because the U.S. and the Soviet Union were both building large nuclear arsenals during the Cold War and because (China thought) they used those weapons to coerce non-nuclear states, China had no choice but to pursue those weapons itself. China, the narrative goes, would prefer to see nuclear weapons abolished rather than maintain its own arsenal, but reality requires that China arm itself. Whatever legitimacy this narrative may have once had, it has become less credible. Given China's complicity in the Pakistani and Iranian nuclear programs-for example, China delivered fissile material to A.Q. Kahn-it appears that China sees a use for these weapons other than simple self-defense. Though China appears to have halted its proliferation activities, those activities suggest a more casual attitude towards nuclear weapons than one of abhorrence. Indeed, actions speak louder than words. That Beijing proliferated nuclear technology, materials, and know-how-and to relatively unstable regimes that may be less cautious about using nuclear weapons-is worrying. Considered in this context, China's movement towards an increased reliance on nuclear weapons and shifts in its nuclear doctrine are both unsurprising and of potentially great concern. While China has been growing its nuclear arsenal and fielding new ballistic missiles and ballistic missile submarines, Chinese strategists have been engaged in doctrinal debates over how those weapons should be used. As a younger generation of military thinkers has come to the fore, the long-held tenets of China's nuclear doctrine as originally set forth under Mao-namely, the "no first use" policy and minimum deterrence-are increasingly coming under scrutiny. Indeed, some strategists argue that the People's Republic should cast these policies aside and adopt a new nuclear doctrine that will grant strategic forces a more prominent role in the country's defense. External and internal factors are driving changes in China's nuclear policy and force structure and will continue to do so in the future. Concerns over what the Chinese see as a U.S. threat lead some to call for a greater reliance on nuclear weapons for deterring Washington. Should South Korea or Japan ever "go nuclear"-and there are growing worries that they might-that would similarly impact China's nuclear force posture and doctrine. Internally, economic and demographic challenges will make it more difficult for China to maintain a large standing army in the coming decades and may very well lead Beijing to increasingly rely on nuclear forces for its national defense.

#### No impact to modernization

Zhou 11 – associate professor at Hobart and William Smith Colleges in New York [Jinghao, “US-China rivalry still a mismatch”, April 14, http://www.atimes.com/atimes/China/MD14Ad01.html]

Policy of defense Ever since the Great Wall was built more than 2,000 years ago, China's military policy has largely revolved around defense. So much so that Western powers had to use gun ships to knock out the doors of the Middle Kingdom in the mid-19th century. Yet Washington is concerned about the development of China's military. The 2010 Report to Congress of the US-China Economic and Security Review Commission pointed out that China has accelerated military modernization, including foreign purchases and indigenous production of high-technology equipment. No doubt, China's military budget has rapidly grown. In 2010, the defense budget was 532.115 billion yuan (US$81.3 billion), while this year it is expected to hit 601 billion yuan. Western governments are wondering why China has accelerated its military modernization since it faces no obvious threat. After visiting China in 2010, US Defense Secretary Robert Gates concluded that China's military development will challenge US military power in Asia and may challenge the US military operation worldwide. That China has sped up its military modernization is a fact. But this does not prove China has any intention of challenging US dominance. This kind of thinking displays a Cold War mentality, as if simply owning a strong military is a threat, then the US is the biggest threat to every country in the world. China spends one-eighth of the US's military budget, if one accepts the official figures. The US has the largest defense budget in the world, accounting for 47% of the world's total military spending. There are about 154 countries with a US military presence and 63 countries with US military bases and troops. By contrast, China does not have a single military base in any foreign country. Even now, the Chinese military lags far behind the US and European countries. Although China has nuclear-weapons capability, the Chinese army is ill-equipped. China does not have a large navy or a single aircraft carrier. China's air force does not have any long-range bombers. Chinese Defense Minister Liang Guanglie told Gates that China is not an advanced military country and poses no threat to the rest of the world. This said, China needs to increase transparency of its military expansion, to let the world including the US know its military strategic intent, so as to assure the world that its rise is really "peaceful". China's military expansion will inevitably upset the existing balance of global forces with US in dominance. It is common sense that a nation's strength must be supported by military power. China needs a stronger military to protect its growing global interests. Dispatching naval warships to escort Chinese commercial ships off Somalia and help evacuate Chinese nationals in Libya is a good example. China could not have taken such actions 20 or 30 years ago when its military was rather weak. Another major reason for China to modernize its military force is to protect its territorial integrity, especially to prevent Taiwan from actually separating from China. If Washington sees this as a potential threat to US, then it has to gain a better understanding of Chinese people's feelings. The majority of the Chinese people clearly remember that China was bullied and humiliated by Western powers for a century.

### Prolif

#### US won’t exert leadership

Cleary 12 Richard Cleary, American Enterprise Institute Research Assistant, 8/13/12, Richard Cleary: Persuading Countries to Forgo Nuclear Fuel-Making, npolicy.org/article.php?aid=1192&tid=30

The cases above offer a common lesson: The U.S., though constrained or empowered by circumstance, can exert considerable sway in nonproliferation matters, **but** often elects not to apply the most powerful tools at its disposal for fear of jeopardizing other objectives. The persistent dilemma of how much to emphasize nonproliferation goals, and at what cost, has contributed to cases of nonproliferation failure. The **inconsistent** or incomplete **application** of U.S. power in nonproliferation cases is most harmful when it gives the impression to a nation that either sharing sensitive technology or developing it is, or will become, acceptable to Washington. **U.S. reticence** historically, with some exceptions, to prioritize nonproliferation—and in so doing reduce the chance of success in these cases—**does not leave room for** great **optimism about future U.S. efforts at persuading countries to forgo nuclear fuel-making**

#### The NPT isn’t enforeced

Salik 12 [Naeem Ahmad Salik Before his retirement from Pakistan's military, Brigadier Salik served as director of arms control and disarmament affairs in the Strategic Plans Division, the secretariat of Pakistan's National Command Authority. He has taught at National Defense University in Islamabad and has been a visiting scholar at Johns Hopkins University and the Brookings Institution. He is currently pursuing a doctorate in political science and international relations at the Center for Muslim States and Societies at the University of Western Australia 14 JUNE 2012 “A Tale of Two Treaties?” Bulletin of Atomic Scientists http://www.thebulletin.org/web-edition/roundtables/tale-of-two-treaties#]

This is not quite correct. I do recognize, however, that the NPT lacks an organization dedicated to its effective implementation, along the lines of the Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons and the Preparatory Commission for the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Organization. Because the IAEA's founding predated the NPT, and because the agency's primary purpose was to support US President Dwight Eisenhower's "Atoms for Peace" program, overseeing the treaty is a task that was not originally foreseen and for which the agency is inadequately equipped.¶ Still, those who argue for strengthening the treaty's institutional support and oversight system should remember that, precisely because such structures were not part of the treaty regime as it was approved by signatories, these structures cannot easily be added now. Adding them would require an amendment to the treaty, and such an amendment would not necessarily be accepted by member states. After all, a majority of IAEA members have not ratified the 2005 amendment to the Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material, despite the passage of seven years.

## 2NC

### Threats

#### 2-Their “safe bomb” fantasy, in which arms control is the route to stability reduces the nuclear problem to a series of literalist technical problems, perpetuating the numbing and self-defeating schizoid strategy

CHERNUS 1991 (Ira, Associate Professor of Religious Studies at the University of Colorado Boulder, Nuclear Madness, p 90, NG)

Denying the uncontrollable complexities of imagination, literalism also cuts the mind off from its innate sense of possibility. It creates a static world, in which the possible is confined to the given of present perception, as if it were complete and unalterable. Literalizing others along with itself, the ego binds the others too; it forgets that all are acting out shared fantasies. All become stuck, as if in the mud, in their superficial materialism, unable to figure out what is really the matter. Without distance from the immediacy of experience, the mind cannot imagine historical depth or future alternatives. With its reality frozen in literalized images, it cannot help becoming numb. Certainly there is change in our world. But if there can be no experience of the whole there can be no change in the whole. All change must be confined to the realm that literalism defines as real: the smallest possible units of incremental change. And since the possible is equated with the given, all change must take place within that given; i.e., within the limits of the consensually validated fantasy that we call "progress." Indeed, everything can be allowed to change because the structure within which these changes occur appears to be safely immutable. The numbing effects of literalism are most vividly evident in the popular images of the disarmament process and the "safe Bomb." A nearly universal consensus insists that only the gradual step-by-step process of arms control and environmental reform can reduce the weapons' threat. There is an endless stream of new projects and proposals to make progress in averting the nuclear threat; hyperactivity is one good way to avoid facing our inner psychological depths. But all these innovations only act out new variations on the same old tragic dramas. All reduce the nuclear dilemma to a discrete series of technical problems, requiring that other nations be reduced to a discrete series of technical problems as well. The Bomb and all those who might wield it become as inert as the matter from which the weapons are made. Only this literalizing approach fits the dominant canons of "realism," so it alone can be accepted as really real. Yet if Hillman is right, this is a narrow perspective whose ultimate result is to validate the very worldview that created the nuclear threat in the first place. As long as our nuclear images are all held purely literally, we are bound to perpetuate our numbing, and therefore perpetuate the threat, no matter what particular images or policies hold sway. We will be unable to imagine genuinely new possibilities because we are unable to imagine very much at all. Literalism's crusade against imagination is endless, because the fantasies generated by the open psyche are our fundamental reality and will not go away. The more we deny the reality of fantasy, the more we starve ourselves of our personal reality and lock ourselves in to the self-defeating spiral of the schizoid strategy. Literalism thus exacerbates our ontological insecurity and drives us to replace our own waning reality with the apparent reality of the communal fantasy. We feel compelled to insist that this fantasy world, and only this world, is "really real," and that our worldview is a literally accurate representation of all reality. In a world that defines truth solely as literal truth, every new reality including the Bomb and our efforts to control it must be apprehended literally and thus intensify psychic numbing. This separation from our own reality and the world's reality is the psychological essence of the process that we call "being realistic."

### ov

**A) Error Replication – Hegemony’s goal is to make the nation secure but this recreates the conditions that caused China to be perceived as a threat in the first place and triggers a cycle where all actions strive to create security but simply escalate – that’s Jaeger**

**And, the gap of insecurity can never be crossed – their discourse results in destructive international relationships**

**Lifton 3** (Robert J. Lifton, *Superpower Syndrome: America’s Apocalyptic Confrontation with the World*, New York: Nation Books, pg 128-130; MCLOON)

Ironically, superpower syndrome projects the problem of American vulnerability onto the world stage. **A super­power is perceived as possessing more than natural power. (In this sense it comes closer to resembling the comic-strip hero Superman than the Nietzschean Superman)**For a nation, its leaders, or even its ordinary citizens **to enter into the superpower syndrome is to lay claim to omnipo­tence, to power that is unlimited, which is ultimately power over death. At the heart of the superpower syndrome then is the need to eliminate a vulnerability that, as the antithesis of omnipo­tence, contains the basic contradiction of the syndrome. For vulnerability can never be eliminated, either by a nation or an individual. In seeking its elimination, the superpower finds itself on a psychological treadmill. The idea of vul­nerability is intolerable, the fact of it irrefutable. One solu­tion is to maintain an illusion of invulnerability. But the superpower then runs the danger of taking increasingly draconian actions to sustain that illusion. For to do oth­erwise would be to surrender the cherished status of superpower. Other nations have experiences in the world that render them and their citizens all too aware of the essen­tial vulnerability of life on earth.** They also may be influ­enced by religious and cultural traditions (far weaker in the United States) that emphasize vulnerability as an aspect of human mortality. No such reality can be accepted by those clinging to a sense of omnipotence. **At issue is the experience of death anxiety, which is the strongest manifestation of vulnerability.** Such a deep-seated sense of vulnerability can sometimes be acknowl­edged by the ordinary citizens of a superpower, or even at times by its leaders, who may admit, for instance, that there is no guaranteed defense against terrorist acts. But those **leaders** nonetheless **remain committed to elimi­nating** precisely that **vulnerability**—committed, that is, to the illusory goal of invulnerability. **When that goal is** repeatedly **undermined**—whether by large-scale terrorist acts like 9/11, or as at present by militant resistance to American hegemony in Iraq and elsewhere in the Middle East—**both the superpower and the world it acts upon may become dangerously destabilized.**

**B) Makes extinction Inevitable - relying on traditional patterns of interpreting actions as a product of national identity that we otherize to create friend-enemy distinctions will only guarantee extinction in the era of nuclear weapons – Mack**

**All of this is proven by their hegemony advantage**

**Hoggett 4**—prof of politics and co-dir. of Center for Psycho-Social Studies, U West England. Degree in social psychology, U Sussex—AND—Dr. Simon Clarke—prof of psycho-social studies and co-dir. of the center. (The Empire of Fear: The American Political Psyche and the Culture of Paranoia, http://www.btinternet.com/~psycho\_social/Vol5/JPSS5-PHSC1.htm)

The image of Prometheus has often been used as a metaphor to describe the conjoining of capitalist and technological development, something which has unleashed processes of modernisation, the like of which have never been seen before (Landes 1969). The metaphor of `Prometheus Unbound’, once used by Shelley as descriptor for the Industrial Revolution in the 19th Century, now seems an apt image for American economic, military and cultural power at the beginning of the new century. Prometheus represents humanity’s freedom to rebel against the God’s, a rage against the arbitrary finality of mortality. But whilst Prometheus is noble hubris and grandiosity also mark his stance – the creations of his imagination will displace the divine. Therefore, like other less clamorous and dynamic narcissants, the Promethean is one also contemptuous of limits and incapable of (inter)relations. Alone in a world of his own creation. In her classic paper on narcissism Joan Riviere (1936) insists `we should not be deceived by the positive aspects of narcissism but should look deeper, for the depression that will be found to underlie it’ (p.368). Fear is now an abiding, pervasive and dominant affect in American life and has been since the Second World War. However this relates to a paradox that the ancient Greeks knew so well. Lying at the very heart of the hubris of an individual or nation that believes in its omniscience lies fear, fear of its own capacity for self-annihilation. Speaking of the narcissistic character, Rivierre noted that ultimately this individual lives in `fear of his own suicide or madness’; this is the essence of what she calls his depressive anxiety. It is necessary therefore to focus upon this dark side of the new Promethean for this is a figure wracked by guilt and anxiety concerning the destructive consequences of his creative powers. First there is internal destruction. In a recent bestseller, The Culture of Fear: Why Americans are Afraid of the Wrong Things, Barry Glassner (1999) investigates a range of social anxieties which have beset the American psyche, from panics about smack and gunslinging black teenagers to scares about satanic abuse and internet addiction. The book is a rich description of some of the fears that haunt the contemporary American psyche but it is ultimately disappointing for it offers little insight into the deeper cultural anxieties that the American media so cleverly exploits. What Glassner highlights, without ever examining, is the internal destruction consequent upon the American mode of development. The USA is a grossly unequal society and one in which structural inequality remains steadfastly mapped onto questions of race and class. Right at the end of his book Glassner briefly examines the source of the moral panics he has described, suggesting that they are `oblique expressions of concern about problems Americans know to be pernicious but have not taken decisive action to quash – problems such as hunger, dilapidated schools, gun proliferation, and deficient health care for much of the US population’ (Glassner p.209). No more vivid expression of this social divisiveness can be found than in statistics regarding prison populations. According to recent Home Office (2000) figures, Britain, the worst offender in Europe, has a prison population of 72,000, equivalent to 139 per 100,000 people (Norway has 59). But the US tops the table with 686 per 100,000 (compared to China’s 111 and Brazil’s 133). The US prison population currently stands at 1.96 million people, an astronomical figure, the overwhelming proportion of whom are black men, and the US government spends more on imprisonment than on higher education! Contrary to the belief that the US exemplifies an effective multicultural society what we see is a severely restricted multiculturalism in which racial divisions, focusing upon the exclusion of African-Americans and Latinos, are more entrenched than ever. This has led some commentators to suggest that the US’s failure to understand global inequality and its incomprehension at the rage that many peoples feel towards it is an expression of its own inability to understand the sharpness of its own internal differences (Shapiro 2003). But social disintegration in the US is not just mapped along racial lines. As the effects of decades of neo-Liberal social and fiscal policies accumulate it is increasingly clear that in the US the concept of a `safety net’, central to the post-war settlement in western type democracies, has all but disappeared. As a consequence, and this has been glimpsed in some of Richard Sennett’s (1998) recent work, failure can now have catastrophic psychological and material effects even upon the American middle classes. The result seems to be a form of `moral isolationism', which is spreading through American society, a feeling that there is no-one and no-thing to rely upon. And whilst associationism, despite Putnam’s (2000) gloomy prognostications, still seems to be a strong feature of civic culture in the USA, with a few exceptions, such as strong faith communities, this offers little consolation when the chips are really down. In the absence of collective solutions to shared risk Americans fall back upon themselves. But this is not healthy individualism but social anomie, an isolationism fueled by those survival anxieties which were first glimpsed by Christopher Lasch (1985). There exists a second reservoir of guilt and anxiety, which is intimately connected to the destructive creativity of the American Prometheus. This can be traced back to the hideous and monstrous child that America, more than any other, nurtured from conception through to realisation. A monstrous child, Little Boy by name, which was unleashed upon the ordinary civilians of Hiroshima. The first of countless thousands of such children which, along with consequences of other monstrous biological and chemical conceptions, now constitute the exterminating logic of modernity. Let us not forget who unleashed the first Weapon of Mass Destruction and the imprint that this act must have left upon the collective psyche of the perpetrator. Within a few years a whole genre of sci-fi American B movies, paperbacks and comics was flourishing in which the theme of mutation was a constant motif (Jancovich 1996). This was the return of the repressed, or, rather, the annihilated. A whole culture of paranoia was developing; partly fueled by the Cold War, a culture that remains a potent dimension of the American psyche to this day. Richard Hofstadter (1979) described how this culture of paranoia infused American politics. Describing the paranoid style of the American politician, Hofstadter argues that whilst retaining some of the characteristics of the clinical paranoiac - overheated, oversuspicious, overaggressive, grandiose, and apocalyptic in expression – this character does not perceive that the hostile and conspiratorial world is necessarily directed at him. Rather he sees all that is bad and evil directed at his nation, his culture and his way of life (Hofstadter, p.4). This has been typical of new right politics for many years and, for example, has resulted in persecutory immigration policies designed to protect ways of life that are often fictitious and based in phantasy. In a recent essay, Jason Cowley (2001) argues that this culture, despite its religiosity, `is essentially an entertainment culture, addicted to narratives of catastrophe’ in everything from film right through to computer games. Sat astride the pinnacle of this culture is Tom Clancy, the best-selling, Reagan-adoring writer of fiction such as the Sum of all Fears which presciently described the hijacking by Arab militants of civilian planes which were then used as weapons against the American people. Fiction becomes fact. America looks into the mirror of the world and sees an enemy, an enemy which if not contained will spread. Thus the `domino theory’, given vivid expression by Harry.S. Truman who succeeded Roosevelt as US President in 1944, a `theory’ which justified American intervention in Greece, Turkey and countless Latin American countries during the Cold War, inspired the Vietnam tragedy and now `the War on Terror’ in which a febrile Islam is imagined to be spreading rhizome-like around the edges of the `free world’. But who is this enemy if not Thanatos, Little Boy and all his heirs, the dark echoes of the idealisation of the American way of life - a variety and quantity of weapons of mass destruction which are now, like China’s citizens, almost beyond enumeration? In 2000 American defence expenditure stood at $295bn, this exceeded the combined expenditure of the rest of the world by almost $30bn. This year, 2003, it is set to rise by a further 14%, the biggest leap in over two decades, as a new generation of tactical nuclear weaponry, outlined in Rumsfeld’s `nuclear posture review’ of the previous year, is actively contemplated by the National Nuclear Security Agency (Guardian 2003). Despite the caution of John Quincy Adams, America’s sixth president, not to go `in search of monsters to destroy’, Rumsfeld and Co. are clearly bent on fostering the conditions that will keep this species sustainable for decades to come (and the US defence industry by the way). Such an overwhelming degree of military superiority betrays not just the extent of American ambitions for global hegemony but also the extent of America’s fear. Returning to Riviere, she notes how depressive anxiety gives rise to its own special defence, the manic defence. In place of vulnerability there is omnipotence and specifically an attitude of contempt and depreciation for the relationships upon which the narcissist depends. Listening to Richard Perle and other architects of the Project for the New American Century this contempt – for the United Nations, `Old Europe’ and countries which cannot or will not embrace the neo-conservative brand of modernisation – is explicit and worn with smirking pride. Contemplating the demise of the UN after the war on Iraq, Perle notes that `whilst the chatterbox on the Hudson will continue to bleat’ what will die `is the fantasy of the UN as the foundation of the new world order’ (Perle 2003). He then unleashes an apparently clinical demolition of the repeated failure of the Security Council to act against breaches of international law without providing even the faintest of hints that in truth it has been the US which has most consistently used its veto on the Security Council – nine times in all since 1990 against the four vetos cast by the other four members combined during the same period. And whilst we’re on the subject of inaction in the face of breaches of international law we’d do well to remember that over the last thirty years the USA has vetoed 34 UN resolutions on Israel and has consistently supported Israel’s routine violations of UN resolution 242 to which the US is a signatory. What we have here is both cold cunning – there is no room for the UN as a countervailing source of authority in `the Project’ – and a paranoia about the world which has become so routine that it is not even aware of itself. Allusions to `threat’ and `security’ run like a thread throughout the brief manifesto of the Project, that is, its `Statement of Principles’. But what makes this paranoia, instead of a rational fear response to the real threats that exist to American hegemony around the world? The massive overkill, the self-fulfilling nature of so many American interventions, the uncanny knack that American foreign policy has displayed of making its worst fears come true, the classic paranoid conviction that one is the misunderstood victim and never the perpetrator, the complete inability to perceive how ones own `defensive actions’ are experienced by the other as provocation and threat – wherever we look, the `arms race’ with the Soviet Union, the run-up to the Cuban Missile Crisis, fear of communist contagion in S.E Asia and Latin America, the current `war on terrorism’ and `containment’ of N.Korea we see the same mixture of provocation, ineptness and misunderstanding. In his recent book on paranoia, David Bell (2003) notes how the fears that the paranoid is subject to are the echo of what has become alien(ated). In this way Melanie Klein adds a twist to our understanding of alienation by insisting that what we project into the world forever threatens to return and haunt us. Bell notes how films such as Alien and The Conversation vividly depict this. Indeed Klein argues that through projective identification the other can become subject to control by self, in subtle ways becoming nudged and coerced into enacting what is put into them. In this way paranoia can become self-fulfilling and it really does seem as if the world is out to get you. God’s chosen people Estimates suggest that well over 60% of the citizens of the USA engage in religious worship on a regular basis – in Britain the figure is more like 7%. Christian fundamentalism has become particularly powerful in the USA since the late 1960’s, perhaps as the backlash towards 60’s `godlessness’. But these fundamentalist movements seem to be simply the tip of the iceberg that is modern American religiosity. Indeed, as Karen Armstrong (2001) noted, the concept of `fundamentalism’ was first coined to characterise the emergence of charismatic religious movements in N.America at the beginning of the twentieth century. In fact God and America have walked hand in hand ever since the Founding Fathers. This has found a powerful and consistent expression in the politics of the United States, and particularly in its foreign policy, where analysts have coined the phrase `American exceptionalism’ to describe the belief that `the United States is an extraordinary nation with a special role to play in human history’ (McCrisken 2001). Almost from the beginning of the occupation by European settlers N.America has been construed as a promised land and its citizens a chosen people. The New World was, in this sense contrasted with the Old, a world of famine, war and intolerance from which many of these settlers had fled. McCrisken provides countless indications of this exceptionalist belief system from George Washington to Bill Clinton but all are characterised by certain common suppositions – that America is the land of the free, that its intentions are inherently benevolent, that inside every non-American there is an American struggling to get out and, perhaps most importantly given the War on Terror and the occupation of Iraq, that the US is the embodiment of universal human values based on the rights of all mankind – freedom, democracy and justice. Weinberg (1935) described this in terms of the belief in `manifest destiny’ which gave successive administrations in the nineteenth century the sense of America’s special mission to bring freedom to the peoples of the world, as in the Mexican War or the Spanish-American War which led to the `liberation’ of Cuba. Today the sense of manifest destiny is no less strong but now it is garbed in the cloak of `modernisation’ – the belief that all societies pass through certain stages of development (from traditional to modern) and that the West, and particularly the United States, is the common endpoint towards which all peoples must irresistibly move. Of course, this is Fukuyama’s `end of history’ and it is perhaps no surprise to find him to be (along with Rumsfeld, Wolfowitz & Co.) one of the 25 signatories to the Statement of Principles (written in June 1997) of the Project for the New American Century – the neo-Conservative manifesto which now directs American and British foreign policy. The point about all this is that this very idealisation of America by Americans, its self-identification with virtue, contributes enormously both to its innocence and to its arrogance. There is often a real generosity of spirit and a friendly naivete which strikes the non-American (at least the English ones) when encountering an American citizen. One thinks of the countless jokes about the American as an `innocent abroad’ captured in the image of the gawping American tourist. But there is also the arrogance added to this, an arrogance which leads even hard nosed strategists to assume that invading troops need know nothing about the peoples that they are about to `liberate’, a mistake which had tragic consequences in Somalia and is now being repeated in Iraq. Moreover this is an arrogance which leaves Americans with such a strong sense that they have virtue on their side, and it is this that has provided the fertile ground for the splitting and paranoia which has been such a feature of the American view of the world since the Second World War. Again, if we return to Hofstadter's ideas about American politics we can see this paranoid belief in a vast and sinister conspiracy which is set out to undermine and destroy a way of life. Indeed for Hofstadter, `the paranoid spokesman sees the fate of this conspiracy in apocalyptic terms - he traffics in the birth and death of whole worlds, whole political orders, whole systems of human values. He is always manning the barricades of civilization’ (Hofstadter 1979, p.29). Three decades on and this still sounds very familiar. One thinks of the `fighting talk’ of George Bush in the war on Iraq, in the fight against the Axis of Evil, and the struggle against global terrorism - fighting terror with terror, the talion morality of the paranoid schizoid position, destroying and re-creating political systems, acting as the purveyor of civilization to the world. This then, is a world in which American society has been called upon to resist the spreading evils, first of communism, now of militant Islam. Moreover, it has been this splitting of good and evil which fueled the rise of McCarthyism in the 1950’s and which is threatening American civil liberties today. Injured narcissism In 'Notes on Some Schizoid Mechanisms' Melanie Klein (1946) describes the destructive and controlling nature of the narcissistic state of mind. A typical feature of paranoid object relations is their narcissistic nature, for in reality the objects to which the paranoid individual or group relates are representations of their alienated selves. Moreover the narcissistic relationship has strong obsessional features, and in particular the need to control others, to remain omnipotent and all powerful. David Bell develops this theme in his commentary on Mike Davis’s recent NLR article (Davis 2001) in which he notes that the resort, following September 11th, to increasingly pervasive forms of security and control within the USA actually contributes the very anxiety these measures seek to address. Bell argues, `the grandiose demand for complete security creates ever more, in our minds, enemies endowed with our own omnipotence who are imagined as seeking to control us’ (Bell, p.37). But what happens when this narcissism is injured, omnipotence punctured? In the real world, as opposed to the world of the imaginary, this attitude of omnipotence is repeatedly subject to disconfirmation. McCrisken (2003) refers to the `Vietnam syndrome’ as a defining element of American foreign policy since the 1970’s, something which formed the backdrop to the first Gulf War through which it reached a partial and incomplete resolution. Vietnam was a trauma for the USA in two ways. The American claim to have a monopoly on virtue was destroyed by successive scandals, atrocities and outrages, in fact they were revealed to be as savage as any other occupying power. Jean-Paul Sartre (1968) famously argued that the war waged by America on Vietnam was implicitly genocidal. Indeed for Sartre, the war in Vietnam signified a new stage in the development of imperialism - 'it is the greatest power on earth against a poor peasant people. Those who fight it are living out the only possible relationship between an over-industrialized country and an under-developed country, that is to say, a genocidal relationship implemented through racism' (p.42). Worse still, they lost the war, against one of the most economically backward societies imaginable the might of American military power came to nought. The impact of Vietnam was such that the USA virtually avoided direct military involvement for twenty five years, preferring indirect involvement (encouraging and equipping Iraq versus Iran, Afghanistan versus the Soviet Union) or direct engagement in situations such as tiny Grenada where they could hardly lose. The Vietnam Syndrome also encouraged the development of an approach to warfare which gave maximum emphasis to the use of air power and the avoidance of ground troops, something exemplified by the intervention in Kosovo and, later, Afghanistan. We can also understand the Vietnam Syndrome in terms of Freud’s work on trauma and his notions of repetition and working through. Trauma (whether loss of limb or sexual abuse) is an attack upon the narcissistic organisation of the psyche/body, it is experienced as loss which is irreparable. But loss can be managed sufficiently for a life to move on, and for this to occur a place in the psyche/culture needs to be found in which some of the shock, rage, horror and grief can be addressed symbolically. And for a while in the 1970’s elements of the liberal American intelligentsia were able to initiate such a process through critical self-analysis, literature, film and music. But a quite different response, based upon a manic form of denial, was waiting in the wings. Freud notes how a child may engage in the repetition of traumatic experience in an attempt to magically overcome it by reversing the subject/object relationship, by becoming master rather than victim. But this is a `working through’ by enactment, an attempt to `act upon’ reality rather than understand it. Thus the `action movie’ and the `action hero’ of the Hollywood movies which began in the 1970’s featuring Schwarzenegger, Jean Claude Van Damme, and, later, Bruce Willis. But, more seriously, we can also see the same process of `working through’ in terms of the search to re-enact in reverse the humiliation of Vietnam but this time with the US as master. The first Gulf War only partially accomplishes this, Saddam remains unfinished business for many of the neo-conservatives gathering with Rumsfeld and Wolfowitz in the late 1990’s. It is in this context that we can understand September 11th . For September 11th was a second huge narcissistic injury for the USA and the current war on Iraq is a further attempt at `working through’. As by now is absolutely clear (and openly admitted by Wolfowitz) the existence of Weapons of Mass Destruction in Iraq was the pretext for an intervention which had quite different motives. These motives were partly strategic (oil, the need to find an alternative to Saudi Arabia as a forward base for US forces in the region) but they were also partly simply about the reassertion of American power against a more fulfilling target than the Taliban in Afghanistan. They set about `finishing the job’ begun by Bush Snr and achieving `closure’, closing the narcissistic wound opened up by Vietnam and never properly healed. Psychotic Anxieties, Splitting and September 11th If we think psychoanalytically about the events leading up to the war on Iraq, then the starting point is the twin towers - September 11th . Its not easy to forget the horror of that day. There was no absence of bodies then. Horrific scenes of people jumping out of windows, running for life, mangled and dismembered corpses. On September 11th we witnessed true annihilation, not a film, just annihilation. As Cowley (2001) acutely observed, `Islamic terrorists appropriated the destructive impulses of American entertainment culture, making of a nation’s apocalyptic fantasies a terrifying actuality, as if they were attempting to speak to the Americans in their own language’. This was a massive attack on the security of the American nation. As Hanna Segal (2002) noted, the trauma of the terrorist attack had an added dynamic 'the crushing realisation that there is somebody out there who actually hates you to the point of annihilation'. It is now commonplace to say that the USA lost its innocence on September 11th. But what it really lost was its embrace of the imaginary. Until that day the American psyche had been consumed by a helpless fascination with a fictional threat, or rather a series of fictional threats; on September 11th they received the shock of the real. `Welcome to the world’ some people said. Suddenly Americans became as vulnerable as the rest of us. The immediate response to September 11th was bewilderment and incredulity. Again, as Segal noted, the question on most American lips was `why’? It is a common reaction for people in trauma situations to think that people are out to get them, ‘in the case of the terrorist attacks it is actually a true fact. One’s worst nightmares come true’. Segal added another dimension - the symbolism of the twin towers and the Pentagon. This is very important if we are to try and understand the meanings and motivations behind the war on Iraq. So, the symbolism equates to ‘we are all-powerful, with our weapons, finance, high tech - we can dominate you completely’. The suicide bombers destroyed this omnipotence. As Segal noted: we were pushed into a world of terror versus terror, disintegration and confusion. The shock was followed by mourning and barely contained anxiety. The president of the United States of America appeared on global television networks as `the child adult’, a little boy lost. At first he seemed quite inadequate to the part that was being demanded of him. It almost looked like he wanted to run – asking, `why me’? For weeks the USA was gripped by a wave of panics about anthrax and other impending attacks. But traces of American triumphalism were being quickly reasserted. The flags which, from Maine to Arizona, first hung from poles and windows in grief quickly transmuted into a sign of strength and resolution, and later, to bellicosity. This other mood could also be discerned in homage to the courage of fire crews and emergency service personnel and to the passengers who overcame the hi-jackers on the fourth plane (`let’s roll’). But rage took time to gather. Many liberals and leftists in Europe anticipated an outpouring of vengeful rhetoric from the Republicans, but it did not come. Rather, the response was surprisingly measured and multilateral. And whilst many opposed the war of the `coalition against terror’ against Afghanistan, at least the connection with September 11th seemed obvious – Al Quaeda was clearly being protected by the Taliban regime. It was only when this phyric victory had been swiftly achieved that a shift, symbolised by the `Axis of Evil’ speech in January 2002, into a more paranoid and in-your-face triumphalist discourse began. The question of weapons of mass destruction became central to the moral and ethical charge for war. Was there any proof of their existence? The weapons inspectors could find none, yet we were told time after time that clear evidence existed, even though the documents cited had very little credibility. Again, as Hofstadter noted, the typical procedure of higher paranoid scholarship is to start by accumalating facts, or what appear to be facts to establish 'proof' that a conspiracy exists - the paranoid mentality seeks a coherence that reality cannot provide. Indeed for Hofstadter, `what distinguishes the paranoid style is not, then, the absence of verifiable facts (though it is occasionally true that in his extravagant passion for facts the paranoid occasionally manufactures them), but rather the curious leap in imagination that is always made at some critical point in the recital of events.’ (Hofstadter 1979, p.39). The deployment of reason and strategic cunning becomes unpinned by the apocalyptic vision of paranoid politics. Destroying the Bad Object Classically, in a paranoid schizoid state, manic defenses are called into play. The splitting of good and bad, processes of idealisation and denigration, as we have seen, lead us to perceive the world in dichotomous relationships between good and bad. The bad object/other becomes the fixation point of our anger, fear, rage and paranoia. Excessive projection leaves the individual in mortal fear of an attack from the bad object. Thus we try and destroy this object, lest it comes back to destroy us. The question arises though, as to what happens when these destructive forces are unable to find a satisfactory object. Despite the measured and multi-lateral nature of the intervention there was still something murderous and retaliatory about the attack on the people of Afghanistan. An attack based in the talion morality of the paranoid schizoid position - an eye for an eye. The problem with the war in Afghanistan against the Taliban was there was no sense of gratification and the lust to get equal was never satisfied. There are several reasons for this. First, the bombing of Afghanistan simply wasn’t enough to either exact revenge, or to demonstrate the power of the Apocalypse - you cannot bomb the stone age back into the stone age even though, as Sartre (1968, p.40) had noted over thirty years earlier, this had already been attempted in Vietnam with disastrous effects. Second, Bin Laden disappeared, vaporised - there was no bad object to destroy. Finally, the exercise of military might, of unadulterated power had nothing to be powerful over - power only exists if people are the objects of that power. Instead we seemed to have an increasingly paranoid American population and its government on the one hand and disappearing enemy bodies on the other. And then came the `Axis of Evil’ speech and a further ratcheting up of the spiral of splitting, projection, paranoid phantasy, and defensive offence. White House rhetoric began providing florid depictions of a world divided between good and evil in which there was no `in between’, `you are either with us or you are against us’. Fakhry Davids (2002) notes that the events of September 11th were brought home vividly to us by the wall to wall media coverage - the shocking images of the planes crashing into the twin towers of the World Trade Centre, and then its collapse. Psychically unbearable events, argues Davids, call into play powerful defences whose aim is to protect us from perceived danger. For Davids, the extent to which the event has been reframed in stereotyped racist terms is apparent everywhere, ‘the problem has now been reduced to a conflict between the enlightened, civilised, tolerant, freedom loving, clean living democrat versus the bearded, robed, Kalashnikov bearing bigoted, intolerant, glint in the eye fundamentalist fanatic, or viewed from the other side, the humble believer with God on his side versus the infidel armed with all the worldly might of the devil’ (Davids 2002, p.362). For Davids, it is difficult for us to find neutral ground - you are either with us, or against us - which side are you on? This reduction of a complex situation into black and white, good and bad is a paranoid solution to intense anxiety which reinforces the self-idealisation which we have seen lies at the heart of American exceptionalism. As Davids notes, such a world view makes us feel that we know who we are, and may justify actions that make us feel better. The problem is that we don’t face the problem. There have been many arguments about why America and Britain decided to wage war on Iraq. All quite plausible in their own right - Saddam the evil dictator, Saddam the murderer of his own people, then there are the economic, the oil, the money to be made from reconstructing the country, the geo-political, securing the middle east - stopping a snowball of violence, and of course harbouring the terrorist. Then of course there are the weapons of mass destruction, yet to be found, despite the documentation of the paranoid conspirators. All these explanations contribute to a fuller picture, but as David Hare (2003) recently wrote, the main motivation behind this war was a simply assertion of American power, `the feral pleasure of the flex’. Uppity Saddam had dared to piss on the boots of Uncle Sam. A lesson in respect was due. An annihilatory lesson aimed at the global (and not just Islamic) psyche. But we’ve been here before. This is Sartre (1968, p.42) again on Vietnam, `when a peasant falls in his rice paddy, mowed down by a machine gun, everyone of us is hit…. The group which the United States wants to intimidate and terrorize by way of the Vietnamese nation is the human group in its entirety’. Not just an attack but an annihilatory one aimed at the Iraqi body, its government, its history and its country – an attempt at vaporisation - an apocalyptic vision - such is the style of paranoid politics. And for a while the world did look on in shock and awe. Empty Boots, Empty Tanks, Empty Buildings According to Baudrillard (1994), `Coppola makes his films like the Americans make war… with the same immoderation, the same excess of means, the same monstrous candour… and the same success. The war as entrenchment, as technological and psychedelic fantasy, the war as a succession of special effects, the war becomes film even before being filmed… a test site, a gigantic territory in which to test their arms, their methods, their power.’ America had a choice after September 11th. It could have joined much of the rest of the world in its shared sense of vulnerability and interdependence. But, once more, America chose denial and magic. Denial of the real and a manic reassertion of omnipotence. The war on Iraq was a demonstration of pure and total power. It became sanitised as a film of all the elements that might obstruct or resist power. There were no bodies, just empty tanks, boots and buildings that were endlessly pounded as a demonstration of shock andawe. The Iraqi bodies disappeared, the presidential guard disappeared and then Saddam disappeared, as did the mighty Republican Guard and, oh yes, it seems so have the weapons of mass destruction. Peter Preston (2003) commented along similar lines, `the missing link, for those of us watching far away is death: the bodies of the men and women who have died’. Preston argued that the televised war turned away from the reality of the situation. Nobody wanted to see dead bodies, wounded soldiers or civilians suffering. We can watch the bombs falling, but not see the effect - ‘the dead become undead for photographic purposes’. In Britain, the first time we saw blood and bodies, despite the apocalyptic first night of the cruise missiles, was a report by John Simpson two weeks into the war. Simpson (2003) was with a convey of Kurdish fighters and American special forces when they came under attack from American warplanes: "This is just a scene from hell here. All the vehicles on fire. There are bodies burning around me, there are bodies lying around, there are bits of bodies on the ground. This is a really bad own goal by the Americans" . The very graphic images were even worse, broadcast on BBC television - blood dripping down the windscreen of a vehicle while the reporter sat inside. The cameraman wiping blood from the lens of the camera with his fingers. It was as if the full horror of war had suddenly hit the world. We could at last see the very symbolic and sickening images of a real, as opposed to a hyperreal war. It is paradoxical that there has been more emphasis on casualties since the end of the war. Some conclusions The destruction of the world trade centre was a terrible event in world history, a terrible shock to the American psyche and brought terrible traumas to the ordinary citizens of New York. For the USA as the only world power, the bubble was burst. Coppolla wasn’t there, or even Bruce Willis to protect the ordinary person in the street - the terrorists struck at the very heart of America. The tables, however, were turned and the Middle East temporarily succumbed to the (film) show of power (with no casualties), the show that should have protected the twin towers but didn’t. The problem is we cannot have war without bodies - and there cannot be power without being in relation to the other. Despite the fact the neo-Conservatives were itching to take on Saddam before Bush even got into office, despite the fact that for some of these strategists September 11th was therefore both a shock and an opportunity sent from heaven, despite the long period of military preparation and the diplomatic side-show conducted by that naïve Mr Blair that accompanied it, despite all this the occupation of Iraq looks like being a piece of inept foreign policy making in the best traditions of American irrationalism. Little thought appears to have been given to what happens once the military occupation was achieved, to the problem of law and order or to reviving the basic infrastructure. Little thought appears to have been given to the possibility that armed Saddam loyalists might `melt’ into the night in order to fight a sustained campaign of sabotage and guerilla warfare or that the repressed Shias might quickly fill the power vacuum left by the collapse of the Baathists and look to their theocratic Shia neighbours in Iran as guide and model. Little thought seems to have been given to an exit strategy and, as the situation deteriorates, the obvious solution – call for the UN to pick up the pieces – can only be reached for if an enormous chunk of humble pie is swallowed. Besides, the Project for the New American Century is not concerned to restore any legitimacy to this `Old World’ institution. To return to more or less where we began, it is impossible to stress enough the narcissistic and fearful character of contemporary American power. This is a power based in a paranoid syle of politics and expressed from a seemingly omnipotent position. Five decades of a growing ascendancy have encouraged the fantasy that there really are no limits, a delusional belief system has become corroborated by reality. Well almost. God’s chosen people really have acquired a technical, military and economic superiority, which seems to make interdependence unnecessary. But this is the problem of the narcissant, the attack upon relatedness. That America can destroy (like in Afghanistan) there can be no doubt, but it has little or no capacity to build or create beyond that which can be included within a commodified mode of relatedness – it has lost the capacity to rebuild states or civil societies (witness the continued degradation of the former Soviet Bloc). America, the Empire of Fear, now stands as the major threat to global society.

**Now, The alternative resolves the case and our links – their advantages parrot the security logic of the state – We reject this and propose political language without rhetorical vacuousity. Security politics are anti-politics destroying all they claim to solve, and marginalizing real solutions, the only way to engage in a form of emancipatory politics is to eschew the logic of security in it’s entirety by refusing to use the language of security and strive for a new political language**

**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

### A2 floyd

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

Mack 1988 (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.

Modern war is all about defending identity – the Cold War was founded on the need to show the world what our country was made of. This makes nuclear war inevitable – the paradox of risking individual death for the sake of the collective ensures the war will always be the logical choice

Campbell 1998 (David, Professor of International Politics University of Newcastle, “Writing Security: United States Foreign Policy and the Politics of Identity” p. 254-255, MT)

The theory of police, as an instance of the rationality behind the art of government, had therefore the constitution, production, and maintenance of identity as its major effect. Likewise, the conduct of war is linked to identity. As Foucault argues, "Wars are no longer waged in the name of a sovereign who must be defended; they are waged on behalf of the existence of everyone; entire populations are mobilized for the purpose of slaughter in the name of life necessity." In other words, countries go to war, not for the purpose of defending their rulers, but for the purpose of defending "the nation," ensuring the state's security, or upholding the interests and values of the people. Moreover, in an era that has seen the development of a global system for the fighting of a nuclear war (the infrastructure of which remains intact despite the "end of the cold war"), the paradox of risking individual death for the sake of collective life has been pushed to its logical extreme. Indeed, "the atomic situation is now at the end of this process: the power to expose a whole population to death is the underside of the power to guarantee an individual's continued existence." 29 The common effect of the theory of police and the waging of war in constituting the identity in whose name they operate highlights the way in which foreign policy/Foreign Policy establishes the general preconditions for a "coherent policy of order," particularly as it gives rise to a geography of evil. 30 Indeed, the preoccupation of the texts of Foreign Policy with the prospects for order, and the concern of a range of cultural spokespersons in America with the dangers to order, manifest how this problematic is articulated in a variety of sites distinctive of the United States. Most important, though, it is at the intersection of the "microphysics" and "macrophysics" of power in the problematic of order that we can locate the concept of security. Security in this formulation is neither just an essential precondition of power nor its goal; security is a specific principle of political method and practice directed explicitly to "the ensemble of the population." 31 This is not to suggest that "the population" exists in a prediscursive domain; on the contrary, "one of the great innovations in the techniques of power in the eighteenth century was the emergence of 'population' as an economic and political problem."

### AT: Nuclear threats real

**Both of these cards assume a realist framework where if there are no checks on nuclear weapons countries will start throughing them around without any regard to anything –this is obviously ridiculous and proves the vacuisity of their analysis – make them prove that their specific scenarios are true**

**And, the ideological apparatus of realism acts as a force multiplier escalating all problems into global disaster- their world view is structurally incapable of responding to global problems- this outweighs and turns the case.**

Der Derian 2005 (James, is Director of the Global Security Program and Research Professor of International Studies at the Watson Institute for International Studies at Brown University  An Accident Waiting to Happen by James Der Derian Predicting the Present, Vol. 27 (3) - Fall 2005 Issue <http://hir.harvard.edu/index.php?page=article&id=1430>, MT)

It often takes a catastrophe to reveal the illusory beliefs we continue to harbor in national and homeland security. To keep us safe, we place our faith in national borders and guards, bureaucracies and experts, technologies and armies. These and other instruments of national security are empowered and legitimated by the assumption that it falls upon the sovereign country to protect us from the turbulent state of nature and anarchy that permanently lies in wait offshore and over the horizon for the unprepared and inadequately defended. But this parochial fear, posing as a realistic worldview, has recently taken some very hard knocks. Prior to September 11, 2001, national borders were thought to be necessary and sufficient to keep our enemies at bay; upon entry to Baghdad, a virtuous triumphalism and a revolution in military affairs were touted as the best means to bring peace and democracy to the Middle East; and before Hurricane Katrina, emergency preparedness and an intricate system of levees were supposed to keep New Orleans safe and dry. The intractability of disaster, especially its unexpected, unplanned, unprecedented nature, erodes not only the very distinction of the local, national, and global, but, assisted and amplified by an unblinking global media, reveals the contingent and highly interconnected character of life in general. Yet when it comes to dealing with natural and unnatural disasters, we continue to expect (and, in the absence of a credible alternative, understandably so) if not certainty and total safety at least a high level of probability and competence from our national and homeland security experts However, between the mixed metaphors and behind the metaphysical concepts given voice by US Homeland Security Director Michael Chertoff early into the Katrina crisis, there lurks an uneasy recognition that this administration—and perhaps no national government—is up to the task of managing incidents that so rapidly cascade into global events. Indeed, they suggest that our national plans and preparations for the “big one”—a force-five hurricane, terrorist attack, pandemic disease—have become part of the problem, not the solution. His use of hyberbolic terms like “ultra-catastrophe” and “fall-out” is telling: such events exceed not only local and national capabilities, but the capacity of conventional language itself. An easy deflection would be to lay the blame on the neoconservative faithful of the first term of US President George W. Bush, who, viewing through an inverted Wilsonian prism the world as they would wish it to be, have now been forced by natural and unnatural disasters to face the world as it really is—and not even the most sophisticated public affairs machine of dissimulations, distortions, and lies can close this gap. However, the discourse of the second Bush term has increasingly returned to the dominant worldview of national security, realism. And if language is, as Nietzsche claimed, a prisonhouse, realism is its supermax penitentiary. Based on linear notions of causality, a correspondence theory of truth, and the materiality of power, how can realism possibly account—let alone prepare or provide remedies—for complex catastrophes, like the toppling of the World Trade Center and attack on the Pentagon by a handful of jihadists armed with box-cutters and a few months of flight-training? A force-five hurricane that might well have begun with the flapping of a butterfly’s wings? A northeast electrical blackout that started with a falling tree limb in Ohio? A possible pandemic triggered by the mutation of an avian virus? How, for instance, are we to measure the immaterial power of the CNN-effect on the first Gulf War, the Al-Jazeera-effect on the Iraq War, or the Nokia-effect on the London terrorist bombings? For events of such complex, non-linear origins and with such tightly-coupled, quantum effects, the national security discourse of realism is simply not up to the task. Worse, what if the “failure of imagination” identified by the 9/11 Commission is built into our national and homeland security systems? What if the reliance onplanning for the catastrophe that never came reduced our capability to flexibly respond and improvise for the “ultra-catastrophe” that did? What if worse-case scenarios, simulation training, and disaster exercises—as well as border guards, concrete barriers and earthen levees—not only prove inadequate but might well act as force-multipliers—what organizational theorists identify as “negative synergy” and “cascading effects” —that produce the automated bungling (think Federal Emergency Management Agency) that transform isolated events and singular attacks into global disasters? Just as “normal accidents” are built into new technologies—from the Titanic sinking to the Chernobyl meltdown to the Challenger explosion—we must ask whether “ultra-catastrophes” are no longer the exception but now part and parcel of densely networked systems that defy national management; in other words, “planned disasters.” What, then, is to be done? A first step is to move beyond the wheel-spinning debates that perennially keep security discourse always one step behind the global event. It might well be uni-, bi-, or multi-polar, but it is time to recognize that the power configuration of the states-system is rapidly being subsumed by a heteropolar matrix, in which a wide range of different actors and technological drivers are producing profound global effects through interconnectivity. Varying in identity, interests, and strength, these new actors and drivers gain advantage through the broad bandwidth of information technology, for networked communication systems provide the means to traverse political, economic, religious, and cultural boundaries, changing not only how we interpret events, but making it ever more difficult to maintain the very distinction of intended from accidental events. According to the legal philosopher of Nazi Germany, Carl Schmitt, when the state is unable to deliver on its traditional promissory notes of safety, security, and well-being through legal, democratic means, it will necessarily exercise the sovereign “exception:” declaring a state of emergency, defining friend from foe, and, if necessary, eradicating the threat to the state. But what if the state, facing the global event, cannot discern the accidental from the intentional? An external attack from an internal auto-immune response? The natural as opposed to the “planned disaster”? The enemy within from the enemy without?   We can, as the United States has done since September 11, continue to treat catastrophic threats as issues of national rather than global security, and go it alone. However, once declared, bureaucratically installed, and repetitively gamed, national states of emergency grow recalcitrant and become prone to even worse disasters. As Paul Virilio, master theorist of the war machine and the integral accident once told me: “The full-scale accident is now the prolongation of total war by other means.”

The attempt to make peace through security results in more nuclear insecurities –turns the case.

Sandy & Perkins 2001 (Leo R., co-founder of Peace Studies at Plymouth State College and Ray, teacher of philosophy at Plymouth State College, The Nature of Peace and Its Implications for Peace Education Online Journal of Peace and Conflict Resolutions, 4.2, MT)

In its most myopic and limited definition, peace is the mere absence of war. O'Kane (1992) sees this definition as a "vacuous, passive, simplistic, and unresponsive escape mechanism too often resorted to in the past - without success." This definition also commits a serious oversight: it ignores the residual feelings of mistrust and suspicion that the winners and losers of a war harbor toward each other. The subsequent suppression of mutual hostile feelings is not taken into account by those who define peace so simply. Their stance is that as long as people are not actively engaged in overt, mutual, violent, physical, and destructive activity, then peace exists. This, of course, is just another way of defining cold war. In other words, this simplistic definition is too broad because it allows us to attribute the term "peace" to states of affairs that are not truly peaceful (Copi and Cohen, p. 194). Unfortunately, this definition of peace appears to be the prevailing one in the world. It is the kind of peace maintained by a "peace through strength" posture that has led to the arms race, stockpiles of nuclear weapons, and the ultimate threat of mutually assured destruction. This version of peace was defended by the "peacekeeper" - a name that actually adorns some U.S. nuclear weapons deployed since 1986. Also, versions of this name appear on entrances to some military bases. Keeping "peace" in this manner evokes the theme in Peggy Lee's old song, "Is That All There is?" What this really comes down to is the idea of massive and indiscriminate killing for peace, which represents a morally dubious notion if not a fault of logic. The point here is that a "peace" that depends upon the threat and intention to kill vast numbers of human beings is hardly a stable or justifiable peace worthy of the name. Those in charge of waging war know that killing is a questionable activity. Otherwise, they would not use such euphemisms as "collateral damage" and "smart bombs" to obfuscate it

Securitization constructs peace as the absence of war – militarizing inter-state competition makes war inevitable.

Tavares 2007 (Rodrigo, IR Prof @ Gothenburg University, Belgium “How Do Peace and Security Cluster Regionally?” <http://85.10.198.45/fileadmin/template-unucris1/articles_and_book_chapters/RTGARNETworking_paper.pdf>, MT)

The concepts of peace and security are characterized by complex subtleties. In the arena of international relations, where the *lingua franca* is often marked by buzz words and capturing messages, both concepts are sometimes used interchangeably without proper investigation on their adequate meaning. Even the UN Charter, probably inspired by the Preamble of the Covenant of the League of Nations Charter, uses these terms almost synonymously, as a unified formula, without pausing for reflection on their substantive conceptual value. However, no matter how symbiotically linked they may be, they reflect a basic distinction. Security is primarily about the management of threats6, whereas peace is about the management of violence7. The first is associated to a statement of intention, a menace. It involves a cognitive and subjective interpretation derived from a latent and potential action. Peace, on the other hand deals with the absence of structural and physical violence, i.e. it presupposes absence of real damage or adversely effect. Whereas a threat is related to the expression of an *intention*, violence is the *observable materialization* of that threat. A fundamental characteristic of peace and security is the fact that both terms are relational in the sense that they are not conceptually self-sufficient. They are derivative concepts; meaningless in themselves. To have any meaning security and peace necessarily presuppose something to be secured or to be in peace, as a realm of study they cannot be self-referential (Krause and Williams, 1997: ix). Moreover, although they are used to characterize an object, they reflect a *relationship* between, at least, two objects (Buzan and Wæver, 2003:43). To be secure involves freeing ourselves from the threats that could emanate from an outside object. By the same token, in a globalized world where processes and agents are tightly interconnected, to be at peace presupposes that violence (physical or structural) would not be inflicted on ‘the other’. To Johan Galtung this relational ingredient of peace is fundamental. According to him, in the West, peace is seen as “something pertaining to relations within the in-group, and war is something referring to relations between in-group and out-group” (1981:184). This possibly derives from the Greek concept of *eirene*, which reflects and may be translated by ‘in-group harmony’. Drawing from the relational nature of peace and security, two key dimensions should be considered: the reactive and proactive component of peace and security, and the dependency between both concepts. Reactive and Proactive Components of Peace and Security Peace, as early as in the Roman Empire, was initially conceived as absence of direct violence (negative peace). It had, therefore, a *reactive* component, something whose existence was contingent on the non-existence of something else. In the Renaissance, even though peace was still interpreted as lack of violence, it enlarged its scope. Violence was not only related to the infliction of physical harm but also encompassed a structural component. In this wake, peace and social wellbeing could only be attained when the forces that administered economic, political and social injury were successfully transformed (positive peace). With this background peace research has concentrated, since its formation, on classical situations of war and conflict between states, on disarmament, balance of power, détente, arms race, causes of war (Bönisch, 1981:167; Wiberg, 1981: 115-129; Buzan, 1984:120), with a fixation on the North and the activities of the superpowers (Scherrer, 2001:10). This idiosyncrasy has possibly led, in the mid-1970s, Georg Picht to declare that although the science of war had reached its culmination, the science of peace was still non-existent (1975:45). Kacowicz has also argued that, “most of the academic research addresses the classical questions on the causes of war and the conditions for peace. However, it does not cope with the related issue of how peace is preserved or even ‘deepened’ once it is established” (1998:33). In 1981, Håkan Wiberg remarked that if peace research was to be limited to the empirical study of peace and peaceful societies, the amount of articles and research communications, published in the *Journal of Peace Research* since its first edition (1964), was a *single one* (p.113. See also Fabbro, 1978). Notwithstanding, it could be argued that the concept is now gradually surpassing its initial reactive component. Beyond a state that is achieved when violence (direct and structural) is no longer inflicted, peace is increasingly gaining a *proactive* orientation and a life of its own. Peace can therefore be interpreted as enabling, as making something happening. By being at peace one is bestowed with the capacity to amplify and project our wellbeing. Peace research is, in fact, progressively comprehending this enlarged interpretation of peace. As Vinthagen pertinently affirms, “peace studies should be related to the study of peace, not violence” (2005:15/429). A similar route seems to be taken by security. Since its earliest usage, security was regarded as a negation, as a state permitted by the absence of threats. As Arnold Wolfers saw it, “security after all is nothing but the absence of the evil of insecurity, a negative value, so to speak” (1962:153). During the ‘golden age’ of security (Walt, 1991:213), the field was driven by Cold War fears and narrowly equated with military power and nuclear deterrence. Ironically, the study of security put more attention into investigating insecurity, the use of military force, and management of threats (Herz, 1950; Waltz, 1979; Gilpin, 1981; Walt, 1991), rather than focusing on the positive element inherent to security. Traditionally, it has been anchored on theoretical investigations over the use and control of military force (Walt, 1991:212) and interpreted as “the absence of threats to acquired values” (Wolfers, 1952:485). As Buzan puts it, “the basic problem which underlines almost all interest in international relations is insecurity (...) when the interactions among these organizations [states] are competitive, then the problem of insecurity is compounded” (1984:111). The growing concern with insecurity is also related to the surplus capacity for destruction, which the mechanical and nuclear revolutions introduced into warfare and the increasing tendency towards the transnationalization of violence. Also alerting us for the lack of *security* within security studies, Baldwin points out that “security has been a banner to be flown, a label to be applied, but not a concept to be used by most security studies”. He adds that, “military force, not security, has been the central concern of security studies” (1997:9). When security is regarded through these lenses, it is normally interpreted as a zero-sum concept in the sense that more security for one actor entails less security for another. This leads to situations in which a state’s efforts to increase its security reduce the security of other states (‘security dilemma’) transforming the regional environment where these competitive security relations are played into a distrustful and potentially violent one (Herz, 1950; Mearsheimer, 1992).

## 1NR

### Framework

#### Whoops you forgot to read framework—that means you only evaluate representations. No new 1ar arguments on this question. At best they have a blippy one liner about discourse and reality but that is not responsive to our argument

#### 1. Democracy DA - Ignoring underlying assumptions in favor of focusing on policy outcomes denies democratic dialogue because we refuse to investigate our assumptions - this guarantees more Iraq’s - That’s Cheeseman & Bruce.

#### 2. Our interpretation - The Neg has the right to critique representations integral to affirmative justifications, assumptions must be evaluated before the policy because they provide the conceptual founding of policy.

#### 3. 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**.

#### 5. Their framework arguments make violence inevitable by isolating the K by being outside the acceptable realm of political discourse.

DuRand 2003 (Dr. Cliff DuRand is Professor Emeritus of Philosophy at Morgan State University in Baltimore, Maryland.  This paper was presented February 14, 2003 in a public lecture series sponsored by Biblioteca Publica in San Miguel de Allende, Mexico. <http://www.ocf.berkeley.edu/~marto/aip/future.htm>, MT)

The main point I want to make about that era is that the climate of fear was deliberately induced by our political elite in order to mobilize a frightened population into supporting its anti-communist crusade. Republicans and Democrats, conservatives and liberals alike sought to purge Leftists from the political life of the nation so there could be no dissenting voices from a Cold War to  protect capitalism and ensure U.S. hegemony in the world. Never mind that a nuclear arms race made us less secure, that in the name of anti-communism our government sought to crush every progressive movement that emerged anywhere in the world, and that the scope of political discourse at home was limited to a narrow range. A fearful population was willing to accept all this and  more. Fear induced an unquestioning, childlike trust in a political elite that promised to protect us from harm. As the 17th century philosopher Thomas Hobbes well understood, those with sufficient fear for their lives, liberties and property will be willing to turn all that over to an all powerful Leviathan in hopes of finding security. The politics of fear has governed our national life ever since. With the end of the Cold War up until 911, there was a hiatus.  Without a communist bogeyman to scare us with anymore, the national security state was faced with a legitimization crisis. How could it justify its interventions  against Third World countries? How could it justify continued high levels of military expenditures? How could it sustain the powers of an imperial presidency? Without  an enemy, without a threat to fear, how could the political elite mobilize public support? Through the 1990s you could see it grasping for a new enemy for us to fear. A  war on drugs was offered as cover for interventions in the Andean countries and in Panama, even though the problem of drugs had its roots here at home. We were  told to fear crime (at a time when crime rates were actually decreasing) so we would support draconian police and sentencing practices that have given us the  highest prison population in the industrial world. But the most ludicrous of all was the propaganda campaign launched by the Pentagon to try to convince us that we  were threatened by a possible asteroid that could crash into the earth, destroying all life. To protect against that, we needed to develop space laser weapons that  could destroy an oncoming asteroid first. Thus did the military-industrial complex seek to frighten us into supporting the development of star wars weaponry.  But  none of that could quite do what the political elite needed. Finally, in 2001 on September 11 a spectacular mass terrorist crime gave them a new threat for us to fear.  Quickly interpreting it as an act of war rather than a crime, the most reactionary sector of the elite declared war on an undefined enemy - a war without end. They  offered us something new to fear so we would need the protection they claimed to offer. And they have played the politics of fear masterfully. With frequent alerts,  high visibility security measures, constant reminders of vulnerabilities, an atmosphere of fear has been maintained even in the absence of further real attacks. In his  January 29 State of the Union address, George W. Bush fed our fear with these words: "Imagine those 19 hijackers with other weapons and other plans, this time  armed by Saddam Hussein. It would take one vial, one canister, one crate slipped into this country to bring a day of horror like none we have ever known." The  operative word here is 'imagine.' By fueling a fevered imagination, he promotes a "servile fearfulness", to use Shakespeare's phrase.   This has enabled this reactionary sector of the elite to not only win acceptance of unprecedented regressive policies domestically, with passive acceptance by the rest of the elite, but now push through a war against a country that didn't even have anything to do with terrorism.  Again, we can see how fear can be a potent political force in the hands of skilled political leaders.

#### 6. 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)

#### 8. Floating PIKs are justified—no new 1ar arguments on this question

#### 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

### Permutation

#### Wæver’s approach is state-centric, ignores the interpretive element of security and attempts to fix the object of the speech act.

Jones 1999 (Richard Wyn, Lecturer in the Department of International Politics at the University of Wales, Aberystwyth and Director of the University’s Wales Governance Centre, “Security, Strategy, and Critical Theory”, Chapter 4, MT)

**State–centrism is the point at issue in the next section. Suffice it to say here that in his initial formulation of the speech act theory of security, Wæver attempted to yoke his insights concerning securitization to a thoroughgoing state–centrism (Wæver 1994, 1995). As we have seen, he was interested only in how states securitized issues in order to justify extraordinary measures by states:** Wæver viewed **the grammar of** security as inherently statist**. In doing so** he actually undermined much of the usefulness of the speech act approach. **Its (potential) great strength is that it encourages analysts to interrogate the politics of how particular threats are securitized in order to mobilize and legitimate particular responses to them. States, or even state elites, are not the only actors who use the grammar of security in this way. All kinds of social groups, at both sub– and supra–state levels, attempt to securitize many different types of issues, often with far–reaching sociocultural, political, and economic implications. Consider, for example, how the peace movement of the 1980s identified nuclearism as a threat to security (e.g., Falk and Lifton 1982; E. Thompson 1982b) and generated massive public support for its cause despite bitter opposition from governments. Or the way in which some Welsh–language activists have identified the flow of substantial numbers of so–called lifestyle migrants from England to rural Wales as a threat to the survival of the language and thus, in their view, to Welsh nationhood. Adopting a speech act approach to the politics of security as practiced by groups other than the state is a fruitful avenue for exploration. Yet** Wæver’s state–centrism initially led him to attempt to delegitimate any effort in this direction. **Significantly, however, this position has now been reversed. In his collaborative study Security: A New Framework for Analysis, Wæver and his co–authors, Buzan and de Wilde, have decoupled the speech act approach from state–centrism, correctly acknowledging the distinction between “a state–centric approach and a state–dominated field [of study]” (Buzan, Wæver, and de Wilde 1998: 37). 1 It is arguable, however, that** a more fundamental problem remains in Wæver’s particular understanding of speech act theory itself. Wæver seems to regard the content of security as fixed**; that is, he believes that the implications of** calling an issue a “security problem” cannot be challenged**, only the objects to which that label is applied. In the earlier, avowedly state–centric version of speech act theory, Wæver viewed the consequences of securitization as inherently conservative:“The language game of security is... a jus necessitatis for threatened elites, and this it must remain” (Wæver 1995: 56). This broad thrust has been retained (including the state–centrism?) in the latest formulation of the theory, which argues that to securitize an issue is to render it “so important that it should not be exposed to the normal haggling of politics but should be dealt with decisively by top leaders prior to other issues” (Buzan, Wæver, and de Wilde 1998: 29). But the notion that the implications of securitization—the meaning of security—are fixed can be challenged at both the empirical level and at the level of the theory of language. Empirically, there can be no doubt that the theory and practice of traditional security have come under unprecedented scrutiny over the past twenty or so years. In particular,notions of “common security” have been advanced based on the argument that there can be no long–term resolution of threats through unilateral, militarized, zero–sum action. Rather, it is only a holistic and empathetic approach to security that can hope to ameliorate threats (the emergence of such an approach can be traced through the following independent, international commissions: the Commission on International Development Issues [1980]; the Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues [1982]; the Commission on Global Governance [1995]). Moreover, the experience of the end of the Cold War demonstrates that such a conception of security can become influential(a point returned to and developed further in Chapter 6). This suggests that** contrary to the opinions of Wæver **or indeed Deudney,** the meaning of security is not necessarily fixed but is open to argumentation and dispute**. Theoretically, this criticism of Wæver is buttressed by a Habermasian understanding of speech acts. Habermas’s “universal pragmatics,” which forms the general framework for his understanding of speech acts, was outlined in Chapter 3. His specific views on speech acts are summarized by Outhwaite: Contra conceptions of language as just a factual representation of states of affairs, or their negative counterpart in which it is seen as mere rhetoric, [in Habermas’s approach] the three validity–claims of truth, normative rightness and expressive truthfulness or sincerity are given equal importance. (Outhwaite 1994: 131) This understanding of speech acts has major implications for alternative approaches to the theory and practice of security. It suggests that when the label “security” is attached to particular issues, it generates validity–claims that are open to redemption or refutation through argumentation. Thus, for example, if a state treats the continued existence of a minority language within its borders as a threat to national security (as is the case with Turkey and Kurdish, and as was the case until recently with the United Kingdom and Irish), this behavior is susceptible to critique on the grounds of truth, rightness, and sincerity. In this case, the truth of the claim that a minority language is a threat to the state may be questioned. The normative rightness of persecuting a minority culture in the name of national security may also be called into doubt, as well the sincerity of those advocating this policy (whose interests are really being served by such a claim?). Another example of how validity–claims are brought into play through the use of the term “security” is a decision by a government to base another state’s nuclear weapons on its territory to counter a threat that it perceives as emanating from a third country (as was the case with the deployment of U.S. cruise missiles in the United Kingdom in the early 1980s). In this case the questions that might arise during the process of redeeming the validity–claims implicit in this scenario would include: Does the third country really pose a threat to the state deciding to host nuclear weapons? What is the evidence concerning both material capabilities and intentions? Could not nuclear weapons and nuclearism pose a greater threat to security than any putative aggressor? Is it right to threaten death and destruction to millions of innocents in the name of national security? Should a state be privileged in this way? Is the decision to deploy nuclear weapons a sincere response to a perceived threat, or is it a result of intra–alliance politics? Or does it reflect pressure from a self–interested military–industrial–academic complex? As these examples demonstrate, once security discourse is viewed in terms of a series of validity–claims subject to redemption through argumentation rather than a take–it–or–leave–it package of militarized assumptions and responses, a more fluid picture emerges than the one presented by Wæver or Deudney. Understood in Habermasian terms, the speech act of security cannot simply be narrowed by prior definition to exclude all threats other than those that are military in nature—rather, the breadth of the concept is subject to debate. Similarly, the meaning—the implications—of securitizing a particular issue cannot be regarded as fixed. However, I am not arguing that it is easy to challenge the traditions that are attached to a particular concept. Simply to talk about something differently does not necessarily lead to different forms of behavior: Practice cannot simply be reduced to theory. But** argumentation **and disputation can have—and** have **had—**profound effects even on the practice of security **(a theme pursued in Chapter 6). When anchored in Habermasian pragmatics, the speech act approach to security supports arguments for broadening the understanding of the concept and certainly undermines attempts at closure as a result of prior definition rather than argumentation and discussion. More generally, the focus on how arguments concerning truth, rightness, and sincerity are brought into play by security discourse provides powerful theoretical support for the project of critical security studies.**

#### Risk of a link means the permutation doesn’t solve

#### Contemporary proliferation rhetoric that focuses on the security implications shapes our responses to it by promoting militarized responses focused on security.

**Mutimer** 20**02** (David, Associate Professor, Political Science, Deputy Director, Centre for International and Security Studies, Coordinator, Graduate Diploma in International and Security Studies. “Critical Security Studies: Concepts and Cases” edited by Michael and Keith. Copywrited in 1997, this edition was published in 2002. p. 188-193, MT)

The Cold War security environment was thought of in terms of bipolarity and of Cold War. This image defined and ordered security problems—indeed, much of the new thinking in international security is a reaction against the exclusion and marginalization of other concerns by this image. In large part **the tasks of definition and ordering are performed by the metaphorical content of the security images. Images comprise a series of metaphors, which** shape our understanding of policy problems and thereby inform the solutions that are, and are not, attempted. In this chapter 1 consider one of **the central images that is emerging from the rethinking of international security, the image of proliferation.** I will show how this image **is being constructed in the discourse and practice of (particularly Western) states.** I will also examine **the metaphors that are contained in the image and show how they are** informing a particular, and flawed, policy response.REIMAGINING INTERNATIONAL SECURITY One noted and useful example of the rethinking of international security was provided by Charles Krauthammer, in the journal of record of the U.S. foreign policy elite, Foreign Affairs, in early 1991. He was responding directly to the collapse of the bipolar image of the Cold War: “Ever since it became clear that an exhausted Soviet Union was calling off the Cold War, the quest has been on for a new American role in the world. **Roles,** however**, are not invented in the abstract; they are a response to a perceived world structure.”**1 The structure Krauthammer perceived following bipolarity was a “unipolar moment.” In addition to redefining international security in terms of unipolarity, Krauthammer also gave an early statement **of** the proliferation problem **as it would come to be** understood**:** The post-Cold War era is thus perhaps better called the era of weapons of mass destruction. The proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery will constitutethe greatest single threat to world securityfor the rest of our lives. That is what makes a new international order not an imperial dream or a Wilsonian fantasy but a matter of the sheerest prudence. It is slowly dawning on the West that there is a need to establish some new regime to police these weapons and those who brandish them.2 Krauthammer’s article appeared as a United States-led coalition was using Iraq as a test range for its assortment of weapons of all kinds of destruction. The aftermath of this war in the Gulf saw the West pick up the pace of their realization that longer-term action was needed to address the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. In addition, the massive conventional army that Iraq deployed (admittedly to little effect) was seen to tie conventional weapons to this new security agenda**. Proliferation thus came to be seen as a wide-ranging problem, encompassing not only the spread of nuclear weapons, but of chemical and biological weapons,** as well as the diffusion of conventional arms. Not only did Krauthammer sound the warning on proliferation, but he also foresaw the elements of **a response to this new threat, a response that would be developed by the West in the years following the Gulf War:** Any solution **will have to include three elements: denying, disarming, and defending.** First, we will have to develop a new regime, similar to COCOM (Coordinating Committee on Export Controls) **to deny** yet more **high technology to such states. Second, those states that acquire such weapons anyway will have to submit to strict outside control or risk being physically disarmed. A final element must be the development of antiballistic missile and air defense systems to defend against those weapons that do escape Western control or preemption.3**

Over the next four years, Western states have paid increasing attention to the various problems of proliferation and developed response strategies that can be well characterized as “denying, disarming, and defending.” The first line of attack is a regime based on technology denial. The COCOM was formally dissolved in March 1994, and its members have now joined with most of the states of former Eastern Europe in a new export-control regime for conventional weapons and related technologies. Preliminary agreement was reached in September 1995 among twenty-eight states, and what is being called the Wassenaar Arrangement was formally created in April 1996.4 More generally, regimes of technology denial are the foundation of the nonproliferation effort. Consider the communique of the North Atlantic Council, announcing an “Alliance Policy Framework on Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction” (9 June 1994): 3. Current international efforts focus on the prevention of WMD and missile proliferation through a range of international treaties and regimes....5 4. The aforementioned treaties are complemented on the supply side by the Nuclear Suppliers Group, the Zangger Committee, the Australia Group and the Missile Technology Control Regime. These regimes should be reinforced through the broadest possible adherence to them and enhancement of their effectiveness.6 The creation of the Wassenaar Arrangement means that there are in place technology-denial regimes for the three weapons of mass destruction (nuclear, chemical, and biological), missile-delivery systems, and conventional arms. With the exception of missile systems, there will also be some form of international mechanism addressing the spread of each of these technologies as well, as the United Nations has created a Register of Conventional Arms. Technology denial is the backbone of the response to proliferation. At least in the case of Iraq, however, attempts have also been made to respond to proliferation through enforced disarmament. On 9 April 1991 the UN Security Council passed Resolution 687, which outlined the forcible disarmament of Iraq. It mandated a Special Commission (UNSCOM) that, together with the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), would oversee the declaration and destruction of the Iraqi chemical, biological, and nuclear weapons holdings and production capabilities, as well as their missile technology.7 Similarly, through May and June of 1994, North Korea was threatened with international sanction, and possible military conflict with South Korea and the United States, if it did not allow international inspection of its nuclear facilities**. The final element, particularly in the United States, of a security policy to counter proliferation has been the development of military capabilities to defend against what has come to be called the post— proliferation environment. The** recent U.S. threats of violence **in the case of North Korea are one** example of such a military response forming part of the reaction to the problem of proliferation**.** A second is found in the NATO declaration from which I quoted above: 12. Recent events in Iraq and North Korea have demonstrated that WMD proliferation can occur despite international non- proliferation norms and agreements. As a defensive Alliance, NATO must therefore address the military capabilities needed to discourage WMD proliferation and use, and if necessary, to protect NATO territory, populations and forces. 13. NATO will therefore...seek, if necessary, to improve defense capabilities of NATO and its members to protect NATO territory, populations and forces against WMD use, based on assessments of threats (including non-State actors), Allied military doctrine and planning, and Allied military capabilities.8 It would seem, then, that it has dawned on the West that proliferation is a serious security problem. Indeed, in January 1992, an unprecedented summit meeting of the UN Security Council declared proliferation—in its new, comprehensive guise—a threat to international peace and security, opening the way for multilateral military action to respond to proliferation, under the terms of the United Nations’ Charter: The members of the Council underline the need for all member states to fulfil their obligations in relation to arms control and disarmament; to prevent the proliferation in all its aspects of all weapons of mass destruction; to avoid excessive and destabilizing accumulations and transfers of arms, and to resolve peacefully in accordance with the Charter any problems concerning these matters threatening or disrupting the maintenance of regional and global stability.... The proliferation of all weapons of mass destruction constitutes a threat to international peace and security. The members of the Council commit themselves to working to prevent the spread of technology related to the research for or production of such weapons and to take appropriate action to that end.9 This statement contains all of the key elements of the new image of proliferation in international security: a problem of all forms of weapons of mass destruction and of “excessive and destabilizing” accumulations of conventional arms. This image has been deepened and developed in the pronouncements and practices of (particularly Western) policy makers since the end of the Gulf War.10 The importance of this new image is reflected in the academic literature on foreign and security problems. I conducted a review of the issues between 1985 and 1994 in five of the leading U.S. foreign policy journals, journals that reflect and inform the policy debate within the United States. This review bears out the contention advanced here that proliferation is a problem enunciated to fill the gap left by the Cold War and catalyzed by the experience in the Gulf. There were only seven articles on the problem between 1985 and the fall of the Berlin Wall, of which five were concerned with nuclear proliferation. There were nine articles in the year between 1989 and the Gulf War. In the three years following the end of the Gulf War, there were fifty—six articles in these journals that were concerned with proliferation.11In addition to the new image, there is also a clear pattern to the strategy being employed in response. It is a three—tiered strategy, anchored at the global level by formal multilateral nonproliferation arrangements. At present there are four such arrangements: the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), the Chemical Weapons Convention (cwc), the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention (BTWC), and the UN Register of Conventional Arms. This leaves only missile technology (of the identified concerns), without a global arrangement but only a supplier—control regime, the Missile Technology Control Regime (MTCR).12 The second tier of the control strategy is a collection of supplier—control regimes. The MTCR is joined by the Australia Group, which controls chemical and biological technology, the Nuclear Suppliers Group (NSG) and the Zangger Committee, which controls nuclear technology, and the Wassenaar Arrangement, which is to control conventional and dual-use technology. Finally, these supplier controls are implemented nationally by export-control systems**. The international security environment is thus being reimagined. The image that guided international security policy and scholarship during the Cold War has given way to a new image centered on proliferation. This image is informing both policy and academic debate and is found reflected in the instruments and institutions of international arms control and security,** as well as in the written record of the academy. What are the implications of this image? How can we understand the way in which this image informs policy, reshaping instruments, institutions, and even interests**?** The images of security comprise a number of metaphors that shape our thinking about problems and solutions; in the present case, the key metaphors are “proliferation,” **“stability,” and its related metaphor “balance**.” In order to consider the role that image plays in international security, it is necessary to appreciate the way in whichmetaphors constitute our understandingsand **thereby** inform **the conception we hold of a policy problem, and** the solutions **we develop to address that problem.**

#### China threat discourse is derived from a discursive construction of otherness that is based on a pursuit of absolute security that inevitably leads to a policy of containment that makes war and arms race more likely.

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)

I have argued above that the "China threat" argument in mainstream U.S. IR literature is derived, primarily, from a discursive construction of otherness. This construction is predicated on a particular narcissistic understanding of the U.S. self and on a positivist-based realism, concerned with absolute certainty and security, a concern central to the dominant U.S. self-imaginary. Within these frameworks, it seems imperative that China be treated as a threatening, absolute other since it is unable to fit neatly into the U.S.-led evolutionary scheme or guarantee absolute security for the United States, so that U.S. power preponderance in the post-Cold War world can still be legitimated. Not only does this reductionist representation come at the expense of understanding China as a dynamic, multifaceted country but it leads inevitably to a policy of containment that, in turn, tends to enhance the influence of realpolitik thinking, nationalist extremism, and hard-line stance in today's China. Even a small dose of the containment strategy is likely to have a highly dramatic impact on U.S.-China relations, as the 1995-1996 missile crisis and the 2001 spy-plane incident have vividly attested. In this respect, Chalmers Johnson is right when he suggests that "a policy of containment toward China implies the possibility of war, just as it did during the Cold War vis-a-vis the former Soviet Union. The balance of terror prevented war between the United States and the Soviet Union, but this may not work in the case of China." (93) For instance, as the United States presses ahead with a missile-defence shield to "guarantee" its invulnerability from rather unlikely sources of missile attacks, it would be almost certain to intensify China's sense of vulnerability and compel it to expand its current small nuclear arsenal so as to maintain the efficiency of its limited deterrence. In consequence, it is not impossible that the two countries, and possibly the whole region, might be dragged into an escalating arms race that would eventually make war more likely. Neither the United States nor China is likely to be keen on fighting the other. But as has been demonstrated, the "China threat" argument, for all its alleged desire for peace and security, tends to make war preparedness the most "realistic" option for both sides. At this juncture, worthy of note is an interesting comment made by Charlie Neuhauser, a leading CIA China specialist, on the Vietnam War, a war fought by the United States to contain the then-Communist "other." Neuhauser says, "Nobody wants it. We don't want it, Ho Chi Minh doesn't want it; it's simply a question of annoying the other side." (94) And, as we know, in an unwanted war some fifty-eight thousand young people from the United States and an estimated two million Vietnamese men, women, and children lost their lives. Therefore, to call for a halt to the vicious circle of theory as practice associated with the "China threat" literature, tinkering with the current positivist-dominated U.S. IR scholarship on China is no longer adequate. Rather, what is needed is to question this un-self-reflective scholarship itself, particularly its connections with the dominant way in which the United States and the West in general represent themselves and others via their positivist epistemology, so that alternative, more nuanced, and less dangerous ways of interpreting and debating China might become possible.