

LOVE K

fear of death 1nc.....	2
fear of death 1nc.....	3
fear of death 1nc.....	4
alternative solves.....	5
alternative solves: racism/sexism/classism.....	6
alternative: Know one's self.....	7
Alternative: Forgiveness.....	8
alternative: Rethink.....	9
alternative: Rethink.....	10
Love solves all evils.....	11
Love solves fear.....	12
love solves fear.....	13
at: permutation.....	14
at: permutation.....	15
link: representations of death as the negation of life.....	16
link: spectacles of death.....	17
link: fear of the other fuels the death drive.....	18
links: genocide.....	19
links: genocide.....	20
impact: death drive.....	21
impact: fear of death fuels the death drive.....	22
Impact: Identity.....	23
no reason to fear death.....	24
death good.....	25
no value to life.....	26
must change society.....	27
ontology.....	28
preventing nuke war key.....	29
fear of death solves value to life.....	30
fear of nuke war good.....	31
representations of violence good.....	32
love fails.....	33
loving kids leads to violence.....	34
romantic love can't solve.....	35
empty love can't solve.....	36
promiscuous love can't solve.....	37
indiscriminant love fails.....	38
brotherly love fails.....	39

P - GRIP

FEAR OF DEATH INC

The 1ac's representation of death is a symptom of their fear of dying – depicting the world in this way makes us try to overcome our fear of death by accepting it –we love death in lieu of loving life

bell hooks, 2000 (All About Love, p. 191-192)

LOVE MAKES us feel more alive. Living in a state of lovelessness we feel we might as well be dead; everything within us is silent and still. We are unmoved. "Soul murder" is the term psychoanalysts use to describe this state of living death. It echoes the biblical declaration that "anyone who does not know love is still in death." Cultures of domination court death. Hence the ongoing fascination with violence, the false insistence that it is natural for the strong to prey upon the weak, for the more powerful to prey upon the powerless. In our culture the worship of death is so intense it stands in the way of love. On his deathbed Erich Fromm asked a beloved friend why we prefer love of death to love of life, why "the human race prefers necrophilia to biophilia." Coming from Fromm this question was merely rhetorical, as he had spent his life explaining our cultural failure to fully embrace the reality that love gives life meaning. Unlike love, death will touch us all at some point in our lives. We will witness the death of others or we will witness our own dying, even if it's just in that brief instance when life is fading away. Living with lovelessness is not a problem we openly and readily complain about. Yet the reality that we will all die generates tremendous concern, fear, and worry. It may very well be that the worship of death, indicated by the constant spectacles of dying we watch on television screens daily, is one way our culture tries to still that fear, to conquer it, to make us comfortable. Writing about the meaning of death in contemporary culture Thomas Merton explains: "Psychoanalysis has taught us something about the death wish that pervades the modern world. We discover our affluent society to be profoundly addicted to the love of death.... In such a society, though much may officially be said about human values, whenever there is, in fact, a choice between the living and the dead, between men and money; or men and power, or men and bombs, the choice will always be for death, for death is the end or the goal of life." Our cultural obsession with death consumes energy that could be given to the art of loving.

Images of death displace our fear instead of reducing it--to the other, the stranger, who we begin to view as a messenger of death

bell hooks, 2000 (All About Love, p. 193-4)

Ironically, the worship of death as a strategy for coping with our underlying fear of death's power does not truly give us solace. It is deeply anxiety producing. The more we watch spectacles of meaningless death, of random violence and cruelty, the more afraid we become in our daily lives. We cannot embrace the stranger with love for we fear the stranger. We believe the stranger is a messenger of death who wants our life. This irrational fear is an expression of madness if we think of madness as meaning we are out of touch with reality. Even though we are more likely to be hurt by someone we know than a stranger, our fear is directed toward the unknown and the unfamiliar. That fear brings with it intense paranoia and a constant obsession with safety. The growing number of gated communities in our nation is but one example of the obsession with safety. With guards at the gate, individuals still have bars and elaborate internal security systems. Americans spend more than thirty billion dollars a year on security. When I have stayed with friends in these communities and inquired as to whether all the security is in response to an actual danger I am told "not really," that it is the fear of threat rather than a real threat that is the catalyst for an obsession with safety that borders on madness.

FEAR OF DEATH INC

The notion that the state can protect us from death gives it the ability to kill in order to save – this is the root cause of wars and genocide

Beres, Professor of International Law in the Department of Political Science at Purdue University, 1994 (Louis Rene, Arizona Journal of International and Comparative Law, Spring, 1994, p. 13-14)

The State requires its members to be serviceable instruments, suppressing every glimmer of creativity and imagination in the interest of a plastic mediocrity. Even political liberty within particular States does nothing to encourage opposition to war or to genocide in other States. Since "patriotic self-sacrifice" is demanded even of "free" peoples, the expectations of inter-State competition may include war and the mass killing of other peoples. In the final analysis, war and genocide are made possible by the surrender of Self to the State. Given that the claims of international law are rendered impotent by Realpolitik, this commitment to so-called power politics is itself an expression of control by the herd. Without such control, individuals could discover authentic bases of personal value inside themselves, depriving the State of its capacity to make corpses of others.

FEAR OF DEATH INC

The alternative is to refuse the affirmative's images of death and demand representations based upon love instead of fear as the basis for political action.

This act can transform our culture of death and domination—rejecting the consumption of the 1ac's representations is empowering in the way we think and act.

bell hooks, 2000 (All About Love, p. 93-100)

Cultures of domination rely on the cultivation of fear as a way to ensure obedience. In our society we make much of love and say little about fear. Yet we are all terribly afraid most of the time. As a culture we are obsessed with the notion of safety. Yet we do not question why we live in states of extreme anxiety and dread. Fear is the primary force upholding structures of domination. It promotes the desire for separation, the desire not to be known. When we are taught that safety lies always with sameness, then difference, of any kind, will appear as a threat. When we choose to love we choose to move against fear-against alienation and separation. The choice to love is a choice to connect-to find ourselves in the other. Since so many of us are imprisoned by fear, we can move toward a love ethic only by the process of conversion. Philosopher Cornel West states that "a politics of conversion" restores our sense of hope. Calling attention to the pervasive nihilism in our society he reminds us: "Nihilism is not overcome by arguments or analyses, it is tamed by love and care. Any disease of the soul must be conquered by a turning of one's soul. This turning is done through one's own affirmation of one's worth an affirmation fueled by the concern of others." In an attempt to ward off life-threatening despair, more and more individuals are turning toward a love ethic. Signs that this conversion is taking place abound in our culture. It's reassuring when masses of people read literature like Thomas Moore's *Care of the Soul*, a work that invites us to reevaluate the values that undergird our lives and make choices that affirm our interconnectedness with others. Embracing a love ethic means that we utilize all the dimensions of love-care, commitment, trust, responsibility, respect, and knowledge"-in our everyday lives. We can successfully do this only by cultivating awareness. Being aware enables us to critically examine our actions to see what is needed so that we can give care, be responsible, show respect, and indicate a willingness to learn. Understanding knowledge as an essential element of love is vital because we are daily bombarded with messages that tell us love is about mystery, about that which cannot be known. We see movies in which people are represented as being in love who never talk with one another, who fall into bed without ever discussing their bodies, their sexual needs, their likes and dislikes. Indeed, the message received from the mass media is that knowledge makes love less compelling; that it is ignorance that gives love its erotic and transgressive edge. These messages are often brought to us by profiteering producers who have no clue about the art of loving, who substitute their mystified visions because they do not really know how to genuinely portray loving interaction. Were we, collectively, to demand that our mass media portray images that reflect love's reality; it would happen. This change would radically alter our culture. The mass media dwells on and perpetuates an ethic of domination and violence because our image makers have more intimate knowledge of these realities than they have with the realities of love. We all know what violence looks like. All scholarship in the field of cultural studies focusing on a critical analysis of the mass media, whether pro or con, indicates that images of violence, particularly those that involve action and gore, capture the attention of viewers more than still, peaceful images. The small groups of people who produce most of the images we see in this culture have heretofore shown no interest in learning how to represent images of love in ways that will capture and stir our cultural imagination and hold our attention. If the work they did was informed by a love ethic, they would consider it important to think critically about the images they create. And that would mean thinking about the impact of these images, the ways they shape culture and inform how we think and act in everyday life. If unfamiliar with love's terrain, they would hire consultants who would provide the necessary insight. Even though some individual scholars try to tell us there is no direct connection between images of violence and the violence confronting us in our lives, the commonsense truth remains- we are all affected by the images we consume and by the state of mind we are in when watching them. If consumers want to be entertained, and the images shown us as entertaining are images of violent dehumanization, it makes sense that these acts become more acceptable in our daily lives and that we become less likely to respond to them with moral outrage or concern. Were we all seeing more images of loving human interaction, it would undoubtedly have a positive impact on our lives. We cannot talk about changing the types of images offered us in the mass media without acknowledging the extent to which the vast majority of the images we see are created from a patriarchal standpoint. These images will not change until patriarchal thinking and perspectives change. Individual women and men who do not see themselves as victims of patriarchal power find it difficult to take seriously the need to challenge and change patriarchal thinking. But reeducation is always possible. Masses of people are negatively affected by patriarchal institutions and, most specifically, by male domination. Since individuals committed to advancing patriarchy are producing most of the images we see, they have an investment in providing us with representations that reflect their values and the social institutions they wish to uphold. Patriarchy, like any system of domination (for example, racism), relies on socializing everyone to believe that in all human relations there is an inferior and a superior party, one person is strong, the other weak, and that it is therefore natural for the powerful to rule over the powerless. To those who support patriarchal thinking, maintaining power and control is acceptable by whatever means. Naturally, anyone socialized to think this way would be more interested in and stimulated by scenes of domination and violence rather than by scenes of love and care. Yet they need a consumer audience to whom they can sell their product. Therein lies our power to demand change. While the contemporary feminist movement has done much to intervene with this kind of thinking, challenging and changing it, and by so doing offering women and men a chance to lead more fulfilling lives, patriarchal thinking is still the norm for those in power. This does not mean we do not have the right to demand change. We have power as consumers. We can exercise that power all the time by not choosing to invest time, energy, or funds to support the production and dissemination of mass media images that do not reflect life-enhancing values, that undermine a love ethic. This is not meant to be an argument for censorship. Most of the evils in our world are not created by the mass media. For example, clearly, the mass media does not create violence in the home. Domestic violence was widespread even when there was no television. But everyone knows that all forms of violence are glamorized and made to appear interesting and seductive by the mass media. The producers of these images could just as easily use the mass media to challenge and change violence. When images we see condone violence, whether they lead any of us to be "more" violent or not, they do affirm the notion that violence is an acceptable means of social control, that it is fine for one individual or group to dominate another individual or group. Domination cannot exist in any social situation where a love ethic prevails. Jung's insight, that if the will to power is paramount love will be lacking, is important to remember. When love is present the desire to dominate and exercise power cannot rule the day. All the great social movements for freedom and justice in our society have promoted a love ethic. Concern for the collective good of our nation, city, or neighbor rooted in the values of love makes us all seek to nurture and protect that good. If all public policy was created in the spirit of love, we would not have to worry about unemployment, homelessness, schools failing to teach children, or addiction. Were a love ethic informing all public policy in cities and towns, individuals would come together and map out programs that would affect the good of everyone. Melody Chavis's wonderful book *Altars in the Street: A Neighborhood Fights to Survive* tells a story of real people coming together across differences of race and class to improve their living environment. She speaks from the perspective of a white woman who moves with her family into a predominately black community. As someone who embraces a love ethic, Melody joins her neighbors to create peace and love in their environment. Their work succeeds but is undermined by the failure of support from public policy and city government. Concurrently, she also works to help prisoners on death row. Loving community in all its diversity, Melody states: "Sometimes I think that I've been trying, on death row and in my neighborhood, to gain some control over the violence in my life. As a child I was - completely helpless in the face of violence." Her book shows the changes a love ethic can make even in the most troubled community. It also documents the tragic consequences to human life when terror and violence become the accepted norm. When small communities organize their lives around a love ethic, every aspect of daily life can be affirming for everyone.

ALTERNATIVE SOLVES

Representing love instead of death creates space that will rupture the spectacles of violence created by the 1ac

Banash, University of Iowa, 2002 (David, Reconstruction, Winter,
<http://www.reconstruction.ws/021/Activist.htm>)

<32> In Adorno's sense, *Memoires* is political to the extent that it breaks up the monolithic discourse of the spectacle and its powers of identic thought. However, this is not politics in the activist sense we have come to value through our fear of anything that might be labeled, however speciously, quietist. As Adorno explains in his essay "Commitment,"

it is not the office of art to spotlight alternatives, but to resist by its form alone the course of the world, which permanently puts a pistol to men's heads. In fact, as soon as committed works of art do instigate decisions at their own level, the decisions themselves become interchangeable . . . the work of art becomes an appeal to subjects, because it is itself nothing other than a deceleration by a subject of his own choice or failure to choose (304).

Like Adorno's committed work of art, *Memoires* resists an easy translation into a practical choice. Rather, its form gestures at an alternative engagement with the materials of the spectacle. In this it does rupture the discourse of the spectacle, but it does so by creating the sense of a future that has not been realized, that, as Marcus points out, forces one to think from the perspective of a Situationist world that does not exist. In short, this is a project that exists only as theory. How, exactly, would one translate this sense into an activist practice? Neither *Memoires* nor later Situationist writings or practices answer this question. However, this fact should not tempt us to label this a quietist work. To push Adorno's metaphor, the space created by a book like *Memoires* allows us to take the gun from our heads, if only for a moment. Yet, within that moment, there is the chance to imagine a world otherwise, and that possibility surely plays a role in developing the desire necessary to someday realize such a world. or, at the least, it creates a critical difference which questions the one-dimensional sense that coordinates our spectacular lives. The relative neglect of *Memoires* underscores the difficulty cultural critics have when the concepts of a work cannot be readily aligned with a political project. If critics invoke the Debord of 1968 as an example of heroic activism, they all but suppress the moment of *Memoires* where theory is the only expression possible.

<33> The final page of *Memoires* is composed of one fragment and a simple series of Jom's painted lines. The fragment reads "I wanted to speak the beautiful language of my century." This fragment, rife with irony, marks an alterian desire. The beautiful language of traditional art, the endless discourse of the spectacle, all that is certainly invoked in this statement. But, more than that, to make it beautiful in Debord's sense requires that this statement shudder at the spectacle. Underneath this fragment, in red, the color associated with the most intense collages of the text, the curving lines invoke motions culminating in an amorphous shape, perhaps the desires of the text itself centrifugally creating a kind of critical mass. If *Memoires* is more than a history, it is less than a political program, and this is precisely its success. What is a practical political program, even an oppositional program, but an intelligible choice already available to the extent that it is articulate? *Memoires* lives on because it is inarticulate, its power and potential indexed by the silence of the critics.

ALTERNATIVE SOLVES: RACISM/SEXISM/CLASSISM

Embracing an ethic of love can solve their case-it's a more politically effective way of addressing oppression and would change public policy

bell hooks, 2000 (All About Love, p. 89-90)

TESTIMONY IN NEW AGE writing affirms the way in which embracing a love ethic transforms life for the good. Yet a lot of this information only reaches those of us who have class privilege. And often, individuals whose lives are rich in spiritual and material well-being, who have diverse friends from all walks of life who nurture their personal integrity, tell the rest of the world these things are impossible to come by. I am talking here about the many prophets of doom who tell us that racism will never end, sexism is here to stay, the rich will never share their resources. We would all be surprised if we could enter their lives for a day. Much of what they are telling us cannot be had, they have. But in keeping with a capitalist-based notion of well-being, they really believe there is not enough to go around, that the good life can be had only by a few.

Talking to a university audience recently I expressed my faith in the power of white people to speak out against racism, challenging and changing prejudice-emphatically stating that I definitely believe we can all change our minds and our actions. I stressed that this faith was not rooted in a utopian longing but, rather, that I believed this because of our nation's history of the many individuals who have offered their lives in the service of justice and freedom. When challenged by folks who claimed that these individuals were exceptions, I agreed. But I then talked about the necessity of changing our thinking so that we see ourselves as being like the one who does change rather than among the among who refuse to change. What made these individuals exceptional was not that they were any smarter or kinder than their neighbors but that they were willing to live the truth of their values. Here is another example. If you go door to door in our nation and talk to citizens about domestic violence, almost everyone will insist that they do not support male violence against women, that they believe it to be morally and ethically wrong. However, if you then explain that we can only end male violence against women by challenging patriarchy, and that means no longer accepting the notion that men should have more rights and privileges than women because of biological difference or that men should have the power to rule over women, that is when the agreement stops. There is a gap between the values they claim to hold and their willingness to do the work of connecting thought and action, theory and practice to realize these values and thus create a more just society. Sadly, many of our nation's citizens are proud to live in one of the most democratic countries in the world even as they are afraid to stand up for individuals who live under repressive and fascist governments. They are afraid to act on what they believe because it would mean challenging the conservative status quo. Refusal to stand up for what you believe in weakens individual morality and ethics as well as those of the culture. No wonder then that we are a nation of people, the majority of whom, across race, class, and gender, claim to be religious, claim to believe in the divine power of love, and yet collectively remain unable to embrace a love ethic and allow it to guide behavior, especially if doing so would mean supporting radical change. Fear of radical changes leads many citizens of our nation to betray their minds and hearts. Yet we are all subjected to radical changes every day. We face them by moving through fear. These changes are usually imposed by the status quo. For example, revolutionary new technologies have led us all to accept computers. Our willingness to embrace this "unknown" shows that we are all capable of confronting fears of radical change, that we can cope. Obviously, it is not in the interest of the conservative status quo to encourage us to confront our collective fear of love. An overall cultural embrace of a love ethic would mean that we would all oppose much of the public policy conservatives condone and support.

ALTERNATIVE: KNOW ONE'S SELF

Fear of death is rather fear of knowing one's real self

Knapp, 2000 (Stephen Knapp, Stephen Knapp is internationally renowned for large-scale works of art in public, corporate and private collections, in such diverse mediums as kiln formed, dichroic, and cast glass; metal, stone, mosaic and ceramic. He frequently writes and lectures on architectural art glass, the collaborative process, and the integration of art and architecture. Mr. Knapp's work has appeared in countless international publications including Art & Antiques, Architectural Record, Honoho Geijutsu, Identity, Interior Design, Interiors, Nikkei Architecture, Progressive Architecture, The New York Times and many more. "Dispelling the Fear of Death" http://www.stephen-knapp.com/dispelling_the_fear_of_death.htm, January 1, 2000)

Actually, to fear death reveals one's misunderstanding of life. It is a fear of knowing one's real self, which is beyond the bodily identification. It is that with which some people hesitate to acquaint themselves. Thus, if a person has known nothing else but one's bodily identity, losing the body can put one into fear. Yet, how can one ever think he was the body when it is plain to see that he came into this temporary world through birth and must leave it through death? All of our possessions, relationships, even our talents and skills are all temporary. So how can our body be anything more? Being afraid of death is like being afraid to give up an old and worn-out garment.

Solves
Forgiveness Alternative

Forgiveness is a key step in the process of replacing fear with love
Jampolsky, 2005 (Gerald G. Jampolsky, Love is Letting Go of Fear, Bantam Books,
Published: 1979)

Our first step in mind retraining is to establish peace of mind as our single goal. This means thinking of ourselves first in terms of self-fullness, not selfishness. The second step is forgiveness.

Many of us become frustrated when we make the mistake of trying to love others as the first step. In light of our past distorted values and experiences, some people simply seem unlovable; because of our faulty perception of their behavior it is difficult to love them.

When we have peace of mind as a single goal, we can then take the second step, forgiveness, and choose to see others as extending Love, or being fearful and calling for help in the form of Love. With this new perception, it becomes easier to give both total Love and acceptance to the other person and therefore to experience inner peace at the same time.

Inner peace can only be reached when we practice forgiveness
Jampolsky, 2005 (Gerald G. Jampolsky, Love is Letting Go of Fear, Bantam Books,
Published: 1979)

Inner peace can be reached only when we practice forgiveness. Forgiveness is the vehicle for changing our perceptions and letting go of our fears, condemning judgments and grievances.

We need to remind ourselves constantly that Love is the only reality there is. Anything we perceive that does not mirror Love is a misperception. Forgiveness, then, becomes the means for correcting our misperceptions; it allows us to see only the Love in others and ourselves, and nothing else.

Through selective forgetting, through taking off the tinted glasses that superimpose the fearful past upon the present, we can begin to know that the truth of Love is forever present and that by perceiving only Love we can experience happiness. Forgiveness then becomes a process of letting go and overlooking whatever we thought other people may have done to us, or whatever we may think we have done to them.

Re-think Alternative

We have to re-think the way we look at the world in order to change it
Jampolsky, 2005 (Gerald G. Jampolsky, Love is Letting Go of Fear, Bantam Books,
Published: 1979)

Many of us feel at times that we are hopelessly trapped in the world we see. Try as we may, we just can't seem to change the world and escape from its seeming confines.

If we remember that it is our thoughts that make up the world, then we can change them. We change the world we see by changing our thoughts about it. By changing our thoughts, we are actually changing the cause. Then the world we see, the effect, will change automatically.

A changed thought system can reverse cause-and-effect as we have known it. For most of us, this is a very difficult concept to accept, because of our resistance to relinquishing the predictability of our past belief system and to assuming responsibility for our thoughts, feelings and reactions. Since we always look within before looking out, we can perceive attack outside us only when we have first accepted attack as real within.

Distancing ourselves and thinking about Death allows us to beat the Fear of Death

Langer 2002 (Thomas, Retired school of public health and Department of Psychiatry Columbia University, Choices for Living: Coping with Fear of Dying, p. 63-4)

"Philosophy is the practise or rehearsal of death," said Plato (White, 1988; on p. 165, White quotes from the *Phaedo*). Death is the central issue of both philosophy and religion. Cosmology and ethics take second place. I've shown how much a part it plays in the creative arts. The distancing of intellectualization allows us some perspective. It takes away some of the sting, and reduces the

threat. In later life people often have an epiphany, in which their whole life falls into perspective. This is a part of the religious experience too. It is a type of conversion. Younger people are also converts, but their conversions of course are usually not concerned with their own imminent death. (The "foxhole religious conversion" during war comes to mind. The ghetto youth as well as the soldier in combat is constantly concerned with imminent death.) There may be a family crisis, a sexual problem, ostracism by peers, or other events that bring on such conversions—both religious and philosophical. These events are experienced as mini-deaths, with severe depression, and in some cases they are relieved by the conversion. This is the "death and rebirth" phenomenon. There is much talk now of reinventing the self. Conservatives see this as changing color too often to match the background—as spinelessness—as a lack of values. Liberals see it as freedom to change and grow. The exaggerated version of this view is that any trauma, such as a death of a loved one or a divorce, is an opportunity for psychological growth, and should be welcomed. This is surely the age of the "sweet lemon," which has been preached by religions for centuries, and by watered-down, popularized psychoanalysis for the latter part of this century. The weight of evidence from research, including my own, would indicate that the cumulative effect of negative life events is mounting mental illness, especially depression and antisocial behavior. I think the "sweet-lemon" rigid optimists deserve the same fate as the philosopher Pangloss in Voltaire's *Candide*, who said "All is for the best in this best of all possible worlds." He repeated this maxim, and when he was thrown into the ocean, they threw a boot at him. He drowned, still repeating his silly mantra.

In sum, while intellectualization has its deficits, it is one of the best devices for defusing the fear of death and dying. It appears in many forms, such as religion, philosophy, and science. It is a mechanism and a coping mode that has produced some of the greatest works of mankind.

SM

10

LOVE SOLVES ALL EVILS

Universal love is to regard others as one's self, and solves all the world's evils.

Mohler, '75. (James A, S.J. Professor of Religious History at John Carrol University. Dimensions of Love: East and West. Doubleday & Company, Inc. Garden City, New York. P. 5-6)

What is universal love?

It is to regard the state of others as one's own, the houses of others as one's own, the persons of others as one's self. When feudal lords love one another, there will be no more war. When heads of houses love one another, there will be no more mutual usurpation. When individuals love one another, there will be no more mutual injury. When ruler and ruled love each other, they will be gracious and loyal. When father and son love each other, they will be affectionate and filial. When elder and younger brothers love each other, they will be harmonious. When all the people in the world love one another, then the strong will not overpower the weak, the many will not oppress the few, the wealthy will not milk the poor, the honored will not disdain the humble, and the cunning will not deceive the simple. This is all due to mutual love that calamities, strifes, complaints, and hatred are prevented from arising. Therefore, the benevolent exalt it. . . . Whoever loves others is loved by others; whoever benefits from others is benefited by others; whoever hates others is hated by others; whoever injured others is injured by them.

LOVE SOLVES FEAR

Love is the greatest weapon we as individuals have against fear.

Parham, 02. (Betty. The Atlanta Journal-Constitution. "Media with a Message: Love is the greatest weapon here is against fear." LexisNexis)

We can fight the "war on terrorism"; we can spend billions on defense; we can put metal detectors in every public building in the country. But if we are still afraid to leave the house in the morning, we won't have achieved anything.

If you think about it, one reason so many of us are afraid is because of the lack of love in our lives. We're lonely; we don't know our next-door neighbor; we're not sure we can trust the guy at the local gas station. Basically, we're afraid of everyone we don't know. And the only way we're going to solve this miserable situation is by risking something: by overcoming our suspicions and reaching out beyond our "comfort zone," and learning to see everyone we meet as a fellow member of the same human family.

That's why love is so important. It transcends religion, ethnic background, race, and status. And every deed of love --- every act of kindness or mercy, every encouraging or uplifting word leaves a mark before rippling on to touch someone else. That's why I believe that on a personal level, love is the greatest weapon there is against fear --- the enemy within. It's the best way to disarm and conquer it.

Reciprocated love is key to defeating Fear of Death

Langer 2002 (Thomas, Retired school of public health and Department of Psychiatry Columbia University, Choices for Living: Coping with Fear of Dying, p. 27-8)

LOVE IN GENERAL

There are some aspects of love in general that may offer a bit of protection against fear of death and dying. Becker, as usual, has seen the link between love and self-esteem, which is so crucial in the fight against fear.

If one is loved for what he is, as a unique existential object, then the crucial awareness dawns. He would not be loved if he were anything else. ... A primary endeavor of

28

CHAPTER 4

psychotherapy is thus accomplished by love; the individual accepts his past and his uniqueness as irrevocable, as necessarily and desirably so. (Becker, 1964, p. 242)

If the splendid existential (love) object is so real, and so much a part of the world that includes me, then I too am an irrevocable part of a meaningful world ... then life itself must be of value. (Becker, 1964, p. 246)

In other words, love, especially reciprocated love, is life affirming. Perhaps this is what is meant by the old platitude, "Love's what makes the world go 'round." Becker, like Goldberg, warns that the love object promises much, but "may give little or nothing." Reciprocation of love, then, is one key to lessening the fear of dying.

We all know about the virtues of love, which have been expressed in many ways. Yet, if I were to ask you just what advantages love adds to life, you might be hard pressed to give an answer. Here is one simple expression of love's advantages.

When we truly love, we are willing to change and we do often change. We lose weight, start exercising, forgive our enemies, accept others, love ourselves, feel alive, believe that life is worthwhile. (Bradshaw, 1992, p. 181)

If there is any advantage to being "in love," being loved, or bestowing love on someone, it is that life seems worth living. That is the first line of defense against fear of dying.

SM

B

AT: PERMUTATION

1. They are in a double bind – EITHER the permutation still does the 1ac—which links because it embraces the fear of death OR they server their representations which is a voting issues because it destroys negative disad and CP ground.
2. Our alternative is mutually exclusive—extend our bell hooks alternative; she says that images of death undermine attempts to achieve a love ethic
3. Tradeoff disad—extend the first two cards from the 1nc—spectacles of dying consume the energy we have available to love the other
4. Affirmative attempts to combine an ethic of love with their representations of fear are impossible. The transformative power of love requires us to fully surrender to the fear of death instead of invoking it

bell hooks, 2000 (All About Love, p. 219-221)

I began thinking and writing about love when I heard cynicism instead of hope in the voices of young and old. Cynicism is the greatest barrier to love. It is rooted in doubt and despair. Fear intensifies our doubt. It paralyzes. Faith and hope allow us to let fear go. Fear stands in the way of love. When we take to heart the biblical insistence that "there is no fear in love," we understand the necessity of choosing courageous thought and action. This scripture encourages us to find comfort in knowing that "perfect love casts our fear." This is our reminder that even if fear exists it can be released by the experience of perfect love. The alchemy of perfect love is such that it offers to us all a love that is able to vanquish fear. That which is rendered separate or strange through fear is made whole through perfect love. It is this perfect love that is redemptive—that can, like the intense heat of alchemical fire, burn away impurities and leave the soul free. Significantly, we are told in biblical scripture that it is crucial that love casts out fear "because fear hath torment." These words speak directly to the presence of anguish in our lives when we are driven by fear. The practice of loving is the healing force that brings sustained peace. It is the practice of love that transforms. As one gives and receives love, fear is let go. As we live the understanding that "there is no fear in love" our anguish diminishes and we garner the strength to enter more deeply into love's paradise. When we are able to accept that giving ourselves over to love completely restores the soul, we are made perfect in love. The transformative power of love is not fully embraced in our society because we often wrongly believe that torment and anguish are our "natural" condition. This assumption seems to be affirmed by the ongoing tragedy that prevails in modern society. In a world anguished by rampant destruction, fear prevails. When we love, we no longer allow our hearts to be held captive by fear. The desire to be powerful is rooted in the intensity of fear. Power gives us the illusion of having triumphed over fear, over our need for love. To return to love, to know perfect love, we surrender the will to power. It is this revelation that makes the scriptures on perfect love so prophetic and revolutionary for our times. We cannot know love if we remain unable to surrender our attachment to power, if any feeling of vulnerability strikes terror in our hearts. Lovelessness torments.

AT: PERMUTATION

5. Its mutually exclusive--rooting our obsession with death in fear prevents us from achieving a true ethic of love for life

bell hooks, 2000 (All About Love, p. 195-6)

All the worship of death we see on our television screens, all the death we witness daily, does not prepare us in any way to face dying with awareness, clarity, or, peace of mind. When worship of death is rooted in fear it does not enable us to live fully or well. Merton contends: "If we become obsessed with the idea of death hiding and waiting for us in ambush, we are not making death more real but life less real. Our life is divided against itself. It becomes a tug of war between the love and the fear of itself. Death then operates in the midst of life, not as the end of life, but rather, as the fear of life." To live fully we would need to let go of our fear of dying. That fear can only be addressed by the love of living. We have a long history in this nation of believing that to be too celebratory is dangerous, that being optimistic is foolhardy, hence our difficulty in celebrating life, in teaching our children and ourselves how to love life

LINK: REPRESENTATIONS OF DEATH AS THE NEGATION OF LIFE

The 1ac's depiction of death as solely the negation of life fuels a cultural fear of death. This obsession will fuel a death drive

Butterfield, Dept. of English at the University of Wisconsin, 2002 (Bradley, Postmodern Culture 13.1, projectmuse)

Modern Western cultures have largely ceased to exchange with the dead collectively, partly because we no longer believe in their continued existence, and partly because we no longer value that which cannot be accumulated or consumed. The dead have no value

by our measurements. We give them nothing and expect nothing from them in return, and yet they remain with us, in our memories, obligating our recognition and response. How do we respond to the symbolic challenge of death and the dead, the challenge they pose to our conscious experience? This is the question of 9/11. The primitives, Baudrillard maintains, responded to this challenge collectively through symbolic exchanges with their dead and deities. Their belief in the sign's transparency, its symbolic singularity, can be seen in animistic practices such as voodoo, where the enemy's hair is thought to contain his or her spirit. If the dead are only humans of a different nature, and if the sign is what it stands for, then a symbolic sacrifice to a dead person is every bit as binding as a gift to a living person. The obligation to return is placed upon the dead, and they reciprocate by somehow honoring or benefiting the living. Most Christians believe in and employ this same mechanism when they pray to the resurrected Christ, but even they do not believe that their symbolic gestures are anything but metaphors. We no longer believe in the one to one correspondence of signifier and signified, and we know the loved one is not really contained in the lock of hair. Americans will doubtless commemorate the deaths of those killed on 9/11 as long as our nation exists, but we know that our gifts to the dead are only symbolic, which for us means imaginary. Baudrillard's postmodern-primitive symbolic, on the other hand, aimed to obliterate the difference in value between the imaginary and the real, the signifier and the signified, and to expose the metaphysical prejudice at the heart of all such valuations. His wager was that this would be done through aesthetic violence and not real violence, but having erased the difference between the two, there was never any guarantee that others wouldn't take such theoretical "violence" to its literal ends. Graffiti art, scarification and tattooing are just the benign counterparts of true terrorism, which takes ritual sacrifice and initiation to their extremes. Literalists and extremists, fundamentalists of all sorts, find their logic foretold in Baudrillard's references to the primitives. What the terrorists enacted on 9/11 was what Baudrillard would call a symbolic event of the first order, and they were undeniably primitive in their belief that God, the dead, and the living would somehow honor and benefit them in the afterlife. Unable to defeat the U.S. in economic or military terms, they employ the rule of prestation in symbolic exchange with the gift of their own deaths. But Americans are not "primitives"--

we do not value death symbolically, but rather only as a subtraction from life. Capitalism's implicit promise, in every ad campaign and marketing strategy, is that to consume is to live. We score up life against death as gain against loss, as if through accumulation we achieve mastery over the qualitative presence of death that haunts life. Our official holidays honoring the dead serve no other function than to encourage consumption. When it comes to actually dealing with death and the dead, even in public, we do so in private. As Baudrillard points out, "This entails a considerable difference in enjoyment: we trade with our dead in a kind of melancholy, while the primitives live with their dead under the auspices of the ritual and the feast" (134-35). Because we devalue death and thereby the dead, we view them only as a dreaded caste of unfortunates, and not as continuing partners in exchange. Ultimately, however, it is not so much the dead but our own deaths, our negative doubles, that we insult by denying their value. When we posit death as the negation of life, we bifurcate our identities and begin a process of mourning over our own eventual deaths, a process which lasts our whole lives. The more we devalue our death-imagines, that is, the greater they become, until they haunt our every moment, as in Don DeLillo's darkest comedy, *White Noise*. This leads us, according to Baudrillard, to an obsession with death that can be felt in the media fascination with catastrophes like 9/11. Death "becomes the object of a perverse desire. Desire invests the very separation of life and death" (147). Political economy's inability to absorb the rupturing energy of death is thus compensated by the symbolic yield of the media catastrophe. In these events we experience an artificial death which fascinates us, bored as we are by the routine order of the system and the "natural" death it prescribes for us.

LINK: SPECTACLES OF DEATH

Spectacles of death feed our fear of it, creating a death drive for the corpses of others

Butterfield, Dept. of English at the University of Wisconsin, 2002 (Bradley, Postmodern Culture 13.1, projectmuse)

As for death, it is still un-American. We live mostly, as Ernest Becker claimed, in denial of death, which our marketing specialists have yet to fully package. We live in ignorance of the death and misery caused by our military and its industry. No one knows how many lives, or anything about the individuals killed. We see only TV spectacles. We do not see the real, or know the real, but we are a culture fascinated by its simulacrum. Approximately 3,000 more people joined the ranks of the dead on 9/11 and for most of us they were only abstractions, but the fascination we felt, the release, is something everyone is now anticipating, every false alarm a tease. Whether we see it in Baudrillardian or Freudian terms, this is the death drive. The most recent Gallup poll shows 53% of Americans in favor of the U.S. invading Iraq alone. Toward the end of *Symbolic Exchange and Death*, Baudrillard states what he believes is on all of our minds:

Death itself demands to be experienced immediately, in total blindness and total ambivalence. But is it revolutionary? If political economy is the most rigorous attempt to put an end to death, it is clear that only death can put an end to political economy. (86-87)

Forget waiting for it, let's have another spectacle; let's demand death now! Is Baudrillard being sinister when he tempts us with our desire for more death? Is he death's seducer? Not if we allow for his caveat about the term "death" found in the book's second footnote: "death ought never to be understood as the real event that affects a subject or a body, but as a *form* in which the determinacy of the subject and of value is lost" (5, n. 2). Baudrillard uses the term *death* to signify "the real event" throughout *Symbolic Exchange and Death*, and only sometimes uses it as a conceptual figure like this, but if he is not talking here about *real* death, where some subject and some value are certainly lost, what is he talking about? Death, in Baudrillard's specialized sense, signifies the end of "bound energies in stable oppositions," but since the system itself is also capable of imposing such deaths, he clarifies that the death of the system can only be achieved by way of its strategic reversal: For the system is master: like God it can bind or unbind energies; what it is incapable of (and what it can no longer avoid) is reversibility. Reversibility alone therefore, rather than unbinding or drifting, is fatal to it. This is exactly what the term symbolic "exchange" means.

LINK: FEAR OF THE OTHER FUELS THE DEATH DRIVE

Fear of the other is a form of collective psychosis which endangers everyone

Gleisner, psychiatrist, 1983 (John, new internationalist 121, March, <http://www.newint.org/issue121/enemy.htm>)

Many were shocked to hear British people chant 'nuke the Argies' and to see how the Ministry of Defense and the media portrayed Argentina as a nation of international gangsters. It was a shock, but it should not have been. After all, governments and media throughout the world have perfected a psychological war machine which is highly efficient in fostering fear and hatred of 'the enemy'. True, for us in the West the enemy these days is usually portrayed as toting a red flag and a fistful of nuclear missiles, but the fear and hatred are free-floating and can be attached, by skilful manoeuvring, to any object. Softened by centuries of insecurity, our minds are malleable clay for the psychological war machine. There have often been good grounds in the past for fearing the enemy, and the distinction between 'them' and 'us' was once necessary for survival. But nuclear weapons have changed everything. Today that ancient them us distinction threatens the survival of them and us. As Einstein once said: 'The unleashed power of the atom has changed everything except our way of thinking. . . we need an essentially new way of thinking if mankind is to survive.' The old them-us thinking is dangerous because it leads us to accept the unacceptable. And the reasoning goes something like this: 'The Russians are basically different from us. They are wicked bullies who intend to take over the world. We can stop them only by threatening them because bullies only respond to threats. And because they are basically different from us it is alright to destroy them if necessary. Nuclear weapons are terrible but it may be that the Russians cannot be stopped by any other means. Although nuclear war would be horrible, we have a reasonable chance of surviving. And anyway life under Russian rule would be far worse than death.' If any individual spoke about another using logic like this they would be diagnosed as paranoid. And, indeed, them-us thinking is a time-honoured symptom of psychosis (a psychotic being someone who can no longer distinguish between events in the world and events taking place in their imagination), characterised by what psychologists call 'denial' and 'projection'. 'Denial' is refusing to acknowledge one's own unpleasant motives. 'Projection' is attaching these unacknowledged motives onto someone else and then rejecting them. It is the perfect way of having your cake and eating it too: of indulging your own bad motives and criticising them at the same time. Our media and governments depict the Russians as aggressive expansionists bent on our destruction. A powerful perception of threat is created to soften up the public for yet more 'defence' spending, And in the Soviet Union precisely the same tricks are used to persuade Soviet citizens to make the necessary 'sacrifices' for protection against us. Most of us have never met a Russian. Yet there are few of us without opinions about how dangerous they are. We tend to see our own country as conciliatory, just, trustworthy, rational, legitimate. Theirs is aggressive, unjust, untrustworthy, irrational and illegitimate. Yet anyone travelling in the Soviet Union is soon struck not only by the Soviets' strong belief in their own peacefulness, but also by their surprise and puzzlement at the fact that foreigners do not view them in the same light. They fear us — for precisely the same reasons that we fear them.

The reliance on the loss that is involved with death is what pushes interest in activities of all kinds, in order to curb the anxiety, or fear, that death brings.

Willmott, '00 (Hugh, Former appointments at Aston Business School and also at the Manchester School of Management, UMIST, where he was Professor of Organizational Analysis. The Sociological Review. "Death. So what? Sociology and Sequestration." P. 656. LexisNexis)

From this perspective, what makes the anticipation of death so bewildering is not the experience of physical death, of which we can know nothing before it occurs, but the projected loss of what we (commonsensically) know, or believe, ourselves to be: the socially constructed sense of self-identity that arises simultaneously with participation in modern social institutions. It is awareness of the precariousness and projected loss and projected loss of the emotional and cognitive knowledge upon which we depend for our sense of self-identity that is so deeply, existentially, troubling. It is this 'trouble' that can inspire or fuel an interest in activities — from love relationships through fitness projects to authoring academic papers — that enable 'unconscious tensions' to be 'curbed'. It is when these projects lose their meaning or appeal — what Trungpa (1975: 1-2) describes as a mundane 'bardo' experience (to be discussed below) — that we become more conscious of the relative, precarious, and insignificant status of our projects and our related sense of self-identity (*sic*). In modern societies, the anxiety or "onomic terror" identified by Berger and Luckmann is, I suggest, as much, and more, aroused by the threat of symbolic death than it is provoked by a revelation of the chaos alleged to lurk beneath institutional forms of order.

LINKS: GENOCIDE

The fear of death is the root cause of genocide—invoking the spectacle of dying will make their harm self-fulfilling

Beres, professor of international relations at Purdue University, 1996 (Louis, 10 Temple International & Comparative Law Journal 281, lexis)

The "love of death" described by the suicidal terrorist n189 is the ironic consequence of an all-consuming wish to avoid death. The objective to "remain standing" n190 can be realized by this terrorist only when its enemy has become the dead man lying down. n191 A civilized and decent human being watching the evening news about the latest suicide bombing may ask incredulously: "Why do they do this?" The answer to this question is that they do this out of desire for the ultimate form of power - the greater the number of enemy corpses, the more powerful they feel. Real power, as a zero-sum commodity, is to gain in aliveness through the **death** of despised enemies. Furthermore, it is important to note that a terrorist cannot possibly kill as many enemies as his passion for survival may demand. Consequently, he may seek to induce or direct others to meet this passion. As a practical and jurisprudential matter, this could lead to an undeniable impulse for genocide or genocide-like crimes, an impulse that could be actualized by future resort to higher-order forms of terrorism (chemical/biological/nuclear) and/or unconventional forms of war. It is a mistake for students of international law to believe that reason governs the world. n192 The true source of effective law is power and power is ultimately the conquest of **death**. n193 This conquest is a more or less universal effort. On this matter, consider the remark made by Eugene Ionesco in his journal in 1966. Describing killing as an affirmation of one's own survival, Ionesco says: [*308] I must kill my visible enemy, the one who is determined to take my life, to prevent him from killing me. Killing gives me a feeling of relief, because I am dimly aware that in killing him, I have killed death. My enemy's **death** cannot be held against me, it is no longer a source of anguish, if I killed him with the approval of society; that is the purpose of war. Killing is a way of relieving one's feelings, of warding off one's own **death**. n194 Genocide is a collective response to the individual terror of mortality. In this manner, a "herd" of human beings sets upon a particular class of victims to distance its own members from personal death. Aware of the fearful claims of membership, Nietzsche declared with remarkable prescience: "To lure many away from the herd, for that I have come. The people and the herd shall be angry with me. Zarathustra wants to be called a robber by the shepherds." n195 The danger of genocide stems from the gathering of individuals into herds. Not every herd is genocidal, but genocide cannot take place in the absence of herds. The pertinent dynamic is that individuals seek safety from mortality in herds, n196 and that some of these herds, in turn, discover the immortality benefits of slaughtering others. According to Carl Jung: If people crowd together and form a mob, then the dynamics of the collective man are set free - beasts or demons which lie dormant in every person till he [sic] is part of a mob. Man in the crowd is unconsciously lowered to an inferior moral and intellectual level, to that level which is always there, below the threshold of consciousness, ready to break forth as soon as it is stimulated through the formation of a crowd. n197 We have seen that it is anxiety over one's own **death** that may lead to the formation of herds and to the commission of genocide. Whether we like it or not, the essential remedies to genocide now depend less on progress toward more centralized arrangements of global power (e.g., collective security or world government) n198 than upon appropriate transformations of human anxiety. These transformations, inter alia, will require individuals to come to [*309] terms with the primacy of personal death fears and with the grave genocidal harms that are the product of such fears.

LINKS: GENOCIDE

Individual transformations of their fear of death is critical to addressing genocide—fear of the other must be replaced by love of the other

Beres, professor of international relations at Purdue University, 1996 (Louis, 10 Temple International & Comparative Law Journal 281, lexis)

First, to prevent genocide and genocide-like crimes, herds - especially States - must be shorn of their special capacity to bestow meaning to people who have lost their individual identities in a crowd. Before this can happen, however, individuals must first discover private sources of belonging. n208 A principal cause of crimes against humanity is the continuing incapacity of individual persons to draw meaning from within themselves. Therefore, by reducing group, or herd, identity, we may eliminate the impetus for genocide or genocide-like crime. At its very heart, the problem of genocide and genocide-like crimes is largely one of individual meaning. Ever anxious of drawing such meaning from their own inwardness, human beings draw closer and closer to the herd. Sometimes the unity arises from the Class, sometimes from the Tribe, Church, Race, and State. But whatever the claims of the particular moment, the herd spawns hatreds and excesses that make genocide possible. Fostering an incessant refrain of "us" versus "them," it prevents each person from becoming empathetically fully human and encourages each person to celebrate the death of "outsiders." Today, the dominant herd is the State. The individual in world politics, who supports the omnivorous appetites of the State, does so largely out of anxiety. He does not want to be alone, on the outside. To this end he may find the existence of domestic "parasites" and foreign "enemies" absolutely necessary. Small matter that the victim population, wherever it may exist, is constructed of flesh and blood itself. As the individual has chosen to renounce Self, he or she is impervious to reason, responding only to the strong emotional advantages of belonging.

IMPACT: DEATH DRIVE

Demands based upon representations of fear can't solve—the state itself is nothing more than a collective manifestation of that fear. The state is prepared to invoke the apocalypse to respond to fears of the apocalypse—it will go to war as a salve for our collective fears about war

Beres, professor of international law at Purdue University, 1994 (Louis, 27 Vand. J. Transnat'l L. 161, March, lexis)

For the future, students of international law must team up with psychologists, sociologists, and child development scholars to find a means of reducing international criminal conduct. To a considerable extent, the State is the human individual writ large, a corporate manifestation of will, fear, and anxiety that commands institutional misdeeds because of its component human misfortunes. A vehicle designed not merely to protect persons, but also to assuage doubts about "belonging" and immortality, n16 the State is always preparing to accept the Apocalypse as liberation. Granted, these preparations are hardly ever openly acknowledged, especially in the "secular," scientific West, but they operate nonetheless.

The dominant orthodoxy among students of international law is that world politics consists of a struggle for power. This thinking is certainly correct, but also trivial. The struggle for power in the world legal order is always epiphenomenal. What

[*169] underlies this struggle, what animates competition between states and human rights violations within states, represents the problem of international crimes. What underlies the struggle is the individual's private apprehensions, needs, and terrors, including the all-consuming fear of death and the overriding search for immortality.

Dreading, perhaps more than anything else, animality, decomposition, and decay, humankind ironically perceives salvation in world politics. As this salvation requires an endless commitment to holy wars (however much they might be disguised as natural competition between states), world politics only ensures the very harms that it has been invented to dispel. While interstate wars, as well as intrastate excursions into barbarism, are designed to express personal potency and overcome intolerable earthly limitations, they inevitably make human rights n17 and a decent world order impossible. Whether visible or not, ideology in world politics largely has become theology, and opposition to particular policies of states represents not dissent, but blasphemy.

Fear of death empowers the state to butcher millions to protect us

Beres, professor of international law at Purdue University, 1994 (Louis, 11 Arizona Journal of International & Comparative Law 1, Spring, lexis)

Rationalist philosophy derived the idea of national sovereignty from the notion of individual liberty, but cast in its modern, post-seventeenth century expression, the idea has normally prohibited intervention n62 and acted to oppose human dignity and human rights. n63 Left to develop on its continuous flight from reason, the legacy of unrestrained nationalism can only be endless loathing and slaughter. Ultimately, as Lewis Mumford has observed, all human energies will [*21] be placed at the disposal of a murderous "megamachine" with whose advent we will all be drawn unsparingly into a "dreadful ceremony" of worldwide sacrifice. n64

The State that commits itself to mass butchery does not intend to do evil. Rather, according to Hegel's description in the *Philosophy of Right*, "the State is the actuality of the ethical Idea." It commits itself to death for the sake of life, prodding killing with conviction and pure heart. A sanctified killer, the State that accepts Realpolitik generates an incessant search for victims. Though mired in blood, the search is tranquil and self-assured, born of the knowledge that the State's deeds are neither infamous nor shameful, but *heroic*. n65

With Hegel's characterization of the State as "the march of God in the world," John Locke's notion of a Social Contract -- the notion upon which the United States was founded n66 -- is fully disposed of, relegated to the ash heap of history. While the purpose of the State, for Locke, is to provide protection that is otherwise unavailable to individuals -- the "preservation of their lives, liberties and States" -- for Hegel, the State stands above any private interests. It is the spirit of the State, *Volkgeist*, rather than of individuals, that is the presumed creator of advanced civilization. And it is in war, rather than in peace, that a State is judged to demonstrate its true worth and potential.

[*22] How easily humankind still gives itself to the new gods. Promised relief from the most terrifying of possibilities -- death and disappearance -- our species regularly surrenders itself to formal structures of power and immunity. Ironically, such surrender brings about an enlargement of the very terrors that created the new gods in the first place, but we surrender nonetheless. In the words of William Reich, we lay waste to ourselves by embracing the "political plague-mongers," a necrophilous partnership that promises purity and vitality through the killing of "outsiders."

Fear of death, to summarize, not only cripples life, it also creates entire fields of premature corpses. But how can we be reminded of our mortality in a productive way, a way that would point to a new and dignified polity of private selves and, significantly, to fewer untimely deaths? One answer lies in the ethics of Epicurus, an enlightened creed whose prescriptions for disciplined will are essential for international stability.

IMPACT: FEAR OF DEATH FUELS THE DEATH DRIVE

The focus on survival reinforces a fixation with necropolitics—it paradoxically increases our motives to enact death upon the other and transforms us into the living dead

Mbembe, senior researcher at the Institute of Social and Economic Research at the University of the Witwatersrand, 2003 (Achille, *Public Culture*, 15.1, *projectmuse*)

Let us return to the example of Palestine where two apparently irreconcilable logics are confronting each other: the *logic of martyrdom* and the *logic of survival*. In examining these two logics, I would like to reflect on the twin issues of death and terror on the one hand and terror and freedom on the other. In the confrontation between these two logics, terror is not on one side and [End Page 35] death on the other. Terror and death are at the heart of each. As Elias Canetti reminds us, the survivor is the one who, having stood in the path of death, knowing of many deaths and standing in the midst of the fallen, is still alive. Or, more precisely, the survivor is the one

who has taken on a whole pack of enemies and managed not only to escape alive, but to kill his or her attackers. This is why, to a large extent, the lowest form of survival is killing. Canetti

points out that in the logic of survival, "each man is the enemy of every other." Even more radically, in the logic of survival one's horror at the sight of death turns into satisfaction that it is someone else who is dead. It is the death of the other, his or her physical

presence as a corpse, that makes the survivor feel unique. And each enemy killed makes the survivor feel more secure.⁷⁴ The logic of martyrdom

proceeds along different lines. It is epitomized by the figure of the "suicide bomber," which itself raises a number of questions. What intrinsic difference is there between killing with a missile helicopter or a tank and killing with one's own body? Does the distinction between the arms used to inflict death prevent the establishment of a system of general exchange between the manner of killing and the manner of dying? The "suicide bomber" wears no ordinary soldier's uniform and displays no weapon. The candidate for martyrdom chooses his or her targets; the enemy is a prey for whom a trap is set. Significant in this respect is the location of the ambush laid: the bus stop, the café, the discotheque, the marketplace, the checkpoint, the road—in sum, the spaces of everyday life. The trapping of the body is added to the ambush location. The candidate for martyrdom transforms his or her body into a mask that hides the soon-to-be-detonated weapon. Unlike the tank or the missile that is clearly visible, the weapon carried in the shape of the body is invisible. Thus concealed, it forms part of the body. It is so intimately part of the body that at the time of detonation it annihilates the body of its bearer, who carries with it the bodies of others when it does not reduce them to pieces. The body does not simply conceal a weapon. The body is transformed into a weapon, not in a metaphorical sense but in the truly ballistic sense. In this instance, my death goes hand in hand with the death of the Other. Homicide and suicide are accomplished in the same act. And to a large extent, resistance and self-destruction are synonymous. To deal out death is therefore to reduce the other and oneself to the status of pieces of inert flesh, scattered everywhere, [End Page 36] and assembled with difficulty before the burial. In this case, war is the war of body on body (*guerre au corps-à-corps*). To kill, one has to come as close as possible to the body of the enemy. To detonate the bomb necessitates resolving the question of distance, through the work of proximity and concealment. How are we to interpret this manner of spilling blood in which death is not simply that which is *my own*, but always goes hand in hand with the death of the other?⁷⁵ How does it differ from death inflicted by a tank or a missile, in a context in which the cost of my survival is calculated in terms of my capacity and readiness to kill someone else? In the logic of "martyrdom," the will to die is fused with the willingness to take the enemy with you, that is, with closing the door on the possibility of life for everyone. This logic seems contrary to another one, which consists in wishing to impose death on others while preserving one's own life. Canetti describes this moment of survival as a moment of power. In such a case, triumph develops precisely from the possibility of being there when the others (in this case the enemy) are no longer there. Such is the logic of heroism as classically understood: to execute others while holding one's own death at a distance. In the logic of martyrdom, a new semiosis of killing emerges. It is not necessarily based on a relationship between form and matter. As I have already indicated, the body here becomes the very uniform of the martyr. But the body as such is not only an object to protect against danger and death. The body in itself has neither power nor value. The power and value of the body result from a process of abstraction based on the desire for eternity. In that sense, the martyr, having established a moment of supremacy in which the subject overcomes his own mortality, can be seen as laboring under the sign of the future. In other words, in death the future is collapsed into the present. In its desire for eternity, the besieged body passes through two stages. First, it is transformed into a mere thing, malleable matter. Second, the manner in which it is put to death—suicide—affords it its ultimate signification. The matter of the body, or again the matter which is the body, is invested with properties that cannot be deduced from its character as a thing, but from a transcendental *nomos* outside it. The besieged body becomes a piece of metal whose function is, through sacrifice, to bring eternal life into being. The body duplicates itself and, in death, literally and metaphorically escapes the state of siege and occupation. Let me explore, in conclusion, the relation between terror, freedom, and sacrifice. Martin Heidegger argues that the human's "being toward death" is the decisive [End Page 37] condition of all true human freedom.⁷⁶ In other words, one is free to live one's own life only because one is free to die one's own death. Whereas Heidegger grants an existential status to being-toward-death and considers it an event of freedom, Bataille suggests that "sacrifice in reality reveals nothing." It is not simply the absolute manifestation of negativity. It is also a comedy. For Bataille, death reveals the human subject's animal side, which he refers to moreover as the subject's "natural being." "For man to reveal himself in the end, he has to die, but he will have to do so while alive—by looking at himself ceasing to exist," he adds. In other words, the human subject has to be fully alive at the very moment of dying, to be aware of his or her death, to live with the impression of actually dying. Death itself must become awareness of the self at the very time that it does away with the conscious being. "In a sense, this is what happens (what at least is on the point of taking place, or what takes place in an elusive, fugitive manner), by means of a subterfuge in the sacrifice. In the sacrifice, the sacrificed identifies himself with the animal on the point of death. Thus he dies seeing himself die, and even, in some sense, through his own will, at one with the weapon of sacrifice. But this is play!" And for Bataille, play is more or less the means by which the human subject "voluntarily tricks himself."⁷⁷ How does the notion of play and trickery relate to the "suicide bomber"? There is no doubt that in the case of the suicide bomber the sacrifice consists of the spectacular putting to death of the self, of becoming his or her own victim (self-sacrifice). The self-sacrificed proceeds to take power over his or her death and to approach it head-on. This power may be derived from the belief that the destruction of one's own body does not affect the continuity of the being. The idea is that the being exists outside us. The self-sacrifice consists, here, in the removal of a twofold prohibition: that of self-inmolation (suicide) and that of murder. Unlike primitive sacrifices, however, there is no animal to serve as a substitute victim. Death here achieves the character of a transgression. But unlike crucifixion, it has no expiatory dimension. It is not related to the Hegelian paradigms of prestige or recognition. Indeed, a dead person cannot recognize his or her killer, who is also dead. Does this imply that death occurs here as pure annihilation and nothingness, excess and scandal? Whether read from the perspective of slavery or of colonial occupation, death and freedom are irreducibly intertwined. As we have seen, terror is a defining feature of both slave and late-modern colonial regimes. Both regimes are also [End Page 38] specific instances and experiences of unfreedom. To live under late modern occupation is to experience a permanent condition of "being in pain": fortified structures, military posts, and roadblocks everywhere; buildings that bring back painful memories of humiliation, interrogations, and beatings; curfews that imprison hundreds of thousands in their cramped homes every night from dusk to daybreak; soldiers patrolling the unlit streets, frightened by their own shadows; children blinded by rubber bullets; parents shamed and beaten in front of their families; soldiers urinating on fences, shooting at the rooftop water tanks just for fun, chanting loud offensive slogans, pounding on fragile tin doors to frighten the children, confiscating papers, or dumping garbage in the middle of a residential neighborhood; border guards kicking over a vegetable stand or closing borders at whim; bones broken; shootings and fatalities—a certain kind of madness.⁷⁸ In such circumstances, the discipline of life and the necessities of hardship (trial by death) are marked by excess. What connects terror, death, and freedom is an *ecstatic* notion of temporality and politics. The future, here, can be authentically anticipated, but not in the present. The present itself is but a moment of vision—vision of the freedom not yet come. Death in the present is the mediator of redemption. Far from being an encounter with a limit, boundary, or barrier, it is experienced as "a release from terror and bondage."⁷⁹ As Gilroy notes, this preference for death over continued servitude is a commentary on the nature of freedom itself (or the lack thereof). If this lack is the very nature of what it means for the slave or the colonized to exist, the same lack is also precisely the way in which he or she takes account of his or her mortality. Referring to the practice of individual or mass suicide by slaves cornered by the slave catchers, Gilroy suggests that death, in this case, can be represented as agency. For death is precisely that from and over which I have power. But it is also that space where freedom and negation operate.

Conclusion In this essay I have argued that contemporary forms of subjugation of life to the power of death (necropolitics) profoundly reconfigure the relations among resistance, sacrifice, and terror. I have demonstrated that the notion of biopower is insufficient to account for contemporary forms of subjugation of life to the power [End Page 39] of death. Moreover I have put forward the notion of necropolitics and necropower to account for the various ways in which, in our contemporary world, weapons are deployed in the interest of maximum destruction of persons and the creation of death-worlds, new and unique forms of social existence in which vast populations are subjected to conditions of life conferring upon them the status of living dead. The essay has also outlined some of the repressed topographies of cruelty (the plantation and the colony in particular) and has suggested that under conditions of necropower, the lines between resistance and suicide, sacrifice and redemption, martyrdom and freedom are blurred.

IMPACT: IDENTITY

The anxiety that is derived from the minimization of the risk of the fear of death is pushed further by the worry that more situations will come up that risk destroying self-identity.

Willmott, '00 (Hugh, Former appointments at Aston Business School and also at the Manchester School of Management, UMIST, where he was Professor of Organizational Analysis. The Sociological Review. "Death. So what? Sociology and Sequestration." P. 658. LexisNexis)

By becoming immersed in and dependent on routines, human beings contrive to defy the precarious, fictional quality of self-identity, and to minimize the risk of symbolic death experienced most commonly as ontological insecurity or 'paranoia'. Yet, precisely because social institutions and routines are precarious, the business of sustaining a solid, independent sense of self-identity is accompanied by pervasive and recurrent anxiety that situations will arise in which the constructed quality of self-identity will be exposed by an inability to sustain normal appearances. In the theatre, it is called 'corpsing'. Any academic who has despaired of gaining clarity or communicating ideas effectively will be able to identify with such everyday 'bardo' experiences of self-doubt and symbolic death. I will now illustrate this argument by brief reference to Castaneda's 'factional' accounts of his relationship to don Juan, a Yaqui sorcerer (eg, Castaneda, 1969: 1974

NO REASON TO FEAR DEATH

Death is merely a transition between two planes of being; we have no reason to fear it

Knapp, 2000 (Stephen Knapp, Stephen Knapp is internationally renowned for large-scale works of art in public, corporate and private collections, in such diverse mediums as kiln formed, dichroic, and cast glass; metal, stone, mosaic and ceramic. He frequently writes and lectures on architectural art glass, the collaborative process, and the integration of art and architecture. Mr. Knapp's work has appeared in countless international publications including Art & Antiques, Architectural Record, Honoho Geijutsu, Identity, Interior Design, Interiors, Nikkei Architecture, Progressive Architecture, The New York Times and many more. "Dispelling the Fear of Death" http://www.stephen-knapp.com/dispelling_the_fear_of_death.htm, January 1, 2000)

It is natural to feel fear of the unknown. In regard to death, this fear may be of what might happen during the process of dying, such as the pain of a terminal illness, nausea, vomiting, or even fearing abandonment by those around you. The fear of death may also be perpetuated by the sadness of the family around the dying person, or the hopelessness of the doctor, or the nurses who feel they may have failed to keep the person alive. However, it is through death that the dying person can be released from the great burden of the diseased body.

Death is not an enemy, it is a natural fact of life, a stage of our existence, and a transition or doorway between planes of reality. Death has its own harmony with nature just as a tree loses its leaves every fall. We don't feel that it is unjust or that the tree failed to stay fully alive when it goes dormant through the winter. It is natural. Neither should doctors and nurses feel they have failed if after every endeavor a patient dies. Actually, it may be better to let a person take the opportunity to die peacefully rather than trying to force him or her to remain alive in a suffering body. In other words, it can be better to make peace with death than try to conquer it.

The process of dying can be rough, but it is temporary. The best thing to do is to focus our consciousness as much as we can in a way that will help us reach the highest realm possible after death. Of course, it always may be a little sad to leave our home and loved ones, but if we are going to a bigger and more beautiful home, then what is there to be sorry about? It is joyful to be going to a better place. This sort of joy will also help divert our attention from any pain we may be feeling.

We do not need to fear death because, through death we find renewal and immortality

Knapp, 2000 (Stephen Knapp, Stephen Knapp is internationally renowned for large-scale works of art in public, corporate and private collections, in such diverse mediums as kiln formed, dichroic, and cast glass; metal, stone, mosaic and ceramic. He frequently writes and lectures on architectural art glass, the collaborative process, and the integration of art and architecture. Mr. Knapp's work has appeared in countless international publications including Art & Antiques, Architectural Record, Honoho Geijutsu, Identity, Interior Design, Interiors, Nikkei Architecture, Progressive Architecture, The New York Times and many more. "Dispelling the Fear of Death" http://www.stephen-knapp.com/dispelling_the_fear_of_death.htm, January 1, 2000)

In this regard, the mind is the root cause of fear and suffering. However, this fear and anguish can be a gift because it shows where the mind gets caught in the desired model of thinking how things should be. It projects its own level of reality out on the world and its perception of things. When things are not the way we want them to be, or think they should be, the mind has difficulty accepting it and we suffer. We then often get angry, anxious, confused, or fall into fear. To enjoy freedom from suffering, we have to grow beyond our attachments, ego, and desires. Thus, the awareness of our approaching death plays an important role in helping us transcend our temporary worldly attachments, and to increase our development and qualities that are offered through our existence in different bodies or different planes of consciousness.

So an important point is that we do not have to be afraid of death, for we are all immortal. When we look around us, this is plain to see. Every winter the trees, plants and grass go dormant and practically die, yet they return to life and display their blooms in the spring. Even if a tree dies and becomes soil, we can see that out of it new life rises from the remnants of its decay. Even if the water of a pond disappears, it forms the steam from which clouds are created, which rain down the potential for new life. We witness many forms of transition of the same energy. It is an endless cycle in which we all participate. In the same way, our physical body is shed at death, but our life persists on another level. Thus, through death we also find renewal.

DEATH GOOD

Death is an opportunity to become free of restraints and limitations

Knapp, 2000 (Stephen Knapp, Stephen Knapp is internationally renowned for large-scale works of art in public, corporate and private collections, in such diverse mediums as kiln formed, dichroic, and cast glass; metal, stone, mosaic and ceramic. He frequently writes and lectures on architectural art glass, the collaborative process, and the integration of art and architecture. Mr. Knapp's work has appeared in countless international publications including Art & Antiques, Architectural Record, Honoho Geijutsu, Identity, Interior Design, Interiors, Nikkei Architecture, Progressive Architecture, The New York Times and many more. "Dispelling the Fear of Death" http://www.stephen-knapp.com/dispelling_the_fear_of_death.htm, January 1, 2000)

In the end, there comes a time when we need to let ourselves, or the person dear to us, leave the body, just as when a person needs to rest. It can be wrong to resist the process of death, whether it be yours or that of another. So we should not begrudge another of his death. We should not be unwilling to let him or her go. It is his opportunity to become free of his present restraints and limitations. It is his chance to enter a better realm to continue with his progress. He is not leaving us, he is simply going on before us.

Death is not an enemy, it can be like the friend who cuts the chain that holds the anchor which prevents one from sailing to greater horizons. This is the way we become closer to attaining freedom from this earthly plane, and from the dictates of the senses, the service of the body, and the impressions in the mind.

Death shows us what is not important and allows us to understand our spiritual identity

Knapp, 2000 (Stephen Knapp, Stephen Knapp is internationally renowned for large-scale works of art in public, corporate and private collections, in such diverse mediums as kiln formed, dichroic, and cast glass; metal, stone, mosaic and ceramic. He frequently writes and lectures on architectural art glass, the collaborative process, and the integration of art and architecture. Mr. Knapp's work has appeared in countless international publications including Art & Antiques, Architectural Record, Honoho Geijutsu, Identity, Interior Design, Interiors, Nikkei Architecture, Progressive Architecture, The New York Times and many more. "Dispelling the Fear of Death" http://www.stephen-knapp.com/dispelling_the_fear_of_death.htm, January 1, 2000)

Furthermore, "The soul can never be cut into pieces by any weapon, nor can he be burned by fire, nor moistened by the wind. This individual soul is unbreakable and insoluble, and can be neither burned nor dried. He is everlasting, all-pervading, unchangeable, immovable and eternally the same. It is said the soul is invisible, inconceivable, immutable, and unchangeable. Knowing this, you should not grieve for the body." (Bg.2.23-25) Thus, we can understand the soul accepts forms for its experience in the material worlds, but can never be killed nor does it die, but it goes on after such bodies are no longer useful.

While we live in this material world, death helps alleviate and release us from our accumulated attachments, positions, and superficial desires. Death shows us what is not important, and makes us give up those things which can no longer help, or which keeps us from understanding who we really are. Even though we are here to experience the innumerable aspects of material existence, if we are too caught up in it, we will never understand our spiritual identity. Thus, death is an assistant which forces us to come to grips with what is temporary, and to give it up. It is another step in the learning process, to come closer to what we really are.

NO VALUE TO LIFE

Fear of death can be connected or attributed to the loss of the value of life's routine meanings and attitudes.

Willmott, '00 (Hugh, Former appointments at Aston Business School and also at the Manchester School of Management, UMIST, where he was Professor of Organizational Analysis. The Sociological Review. "Death. So what? Sociology and Sequestration." P. 651. LexisNexis)

Second, death has a symbolic significance that is not necessarily directly connected to the pain and uncertainty attributed to the death of others but with the (loss of) meanings invested in life-projects. The significance of human mortality resides in its capacity to 'threaten the basic assumptions upon which society is organized, as well as open up the individual to the dread of personal meaninglessness. Death radically questions the taken-for-granted 'business as usual' attitude which is usually adopted in everyday life' (Shilling, 1993: 178-9 paraphrasing Berger, 1967, emphasis added). It is not (just) that death defies the modernist impulse to control threats and uncertainty in ways that can be profoundly frustrating and disturbing. It is (also) that the prospect of mortality and the certainty of death can radically disrupt the meaning with which everyday practices are routinely endowed. As Mellor and Shilling (1993) observe, albeit somewhat in passing, individuals' 'reflexively constructed sense of what is real and meaningful starts to vanish' when they 'realize that they are dying' (428, emphasis added). This realization may occur when a person is diagnosed as terminally ill or believe themselves to have a lifethreatening (sic) disease. But it can also be induced by awareness that every breath brings us closer to death, and that the next breath could be out least. When mortal knowledge is realized in this way (instead of being abstractly known and routinely disregarded), meanings that previously had seemed solid, unshakeable, or at least significant, can become drained of their meaning and value. What is the point of struggling to pursue the current life-project? What difference can my life make? Who will remember me in 50 years let alone 500 years time?

MUST CHANGE SOCIETY

Social institutions are not unnecessary, but neither is relying on them to save us from the fear of death. It is possible to develop social institutions where self-identity—in life—is acknowledged as good, and the effort to secure it is more playful than a serious focus of life.

Willmott, '00 (Hugh, Former appointments at Aston Business School and also at the Manchester School of Management, UMIST, where he was Professor of Organizational Analysis. The Sociological Review. "Death. So what? Sociology, sequestration." P. 661-2. LexisNexis)

To be clear, this understanding of death's significance as an absent presence involves no nihilistic rejection of social institutions as 'mere' constructions. Social institutions are a necessary feature of social life. But dependence upon them for a sense of ontological security is not. When reframed in this way, awareness of mortality and the anticipation of death renders life futile only when a yearning to restore the meaning and value ascribed to past achievements overrides its linking of 'the individual lifespan to broad issues of morality and finitude' (Giddens, 1991: 8). Awareness and study of morality is significant precisely because it disrupts and problematizes a tendency to assume and reinforce the importance and seriousness of the projects of self-identity. It is important sociologically insofar as human conduct is conditioned and guided by an urge to suppress or circumvent this awareness. It is also important politically because it suggests the emancipatory relevance of mortality as an 'advisor' that enables us to assess the existential and transpersonal value of life-projects. Critical reflection upon mundane reasoning about death points to the (postmodern) possibility of developing social institutions in which the functional value of self-identity is acknowledged, its precariousness is appreciated, and (self-defeating) efforts to secure self-identity become a source of playfulness and humour rather than a serious focus of human endeavour. This is an understanding that the discipline of sociology has ducked or denied rather than directly addressed. A contemporary challenge for sociologists is to reverse their discipline's collusion in the sequestration of death.

Society's exclusion of death has not neutralized its impact, but left many without support when dealing with death.

Willmott, '00 (Hugh, Former appointments at Aston Business School and also at the Manchester School of Management, UMIST, where he was Professor of Organizational Analysis. The Sociological Review. "Death. So what? Sociology and Sequestration." P. 652. LexisNexis)

Modernity's sequestration of experience is paradoxical. The 'transpersonal, existential' significance (Mellor and Shelling, 1993: 423) of death is excluded or distanced from interpersonal interaction, communication and processes of mutual understanding. In the guise of medical discourse, scientific knowledge mediates everyday encounters with potentially life-threatening accidents, disease, and illness. Death is represented in terms of its causes (eg, concussion, lung cancer, heart failure) so that we no longer hear or think of people 'dying of mortality' (Bauman, 1992: 5, cited in Mellor and Shilling: 425). The 'cumulative effect' of this sequestration of death, is not to resolve the problem of death by neutralising its impact threat to self-identity but, ironically, 'to leave many people uncertain, socially unsupported when it comes to dealing with death' as a transpersonal, existential phenomenon (Shilling, 1993: 189) This may begin to account for why, as Walter (1991: 306-7) contends, in modern societies the *societal* taboo about death diminishes but, 'along with [greater] societal acceptance of death goes the most intense personal pain' (ibid: 306) accompanying bereavement. Walter's favoured framework for analysing the meaning of death in modern societies 'points to death being highly problematic for modern society - hence the lack of ritual surrounding it today' (307). In other words, Walter contends that taboos surrounding the public discussion and viewing (albeit simulated) of **death** are weakening, as indicated by the decline of elaborate codes and conventions for dealing with death, but that the anticipation of death remains a major existential issue and concern for modern individuals.

ONTOLOGY

In modern times, any instance that threatens our view of ourselves as independent individuals will be perceived as a threat to 'ontological security,' or security from the fear of death.

Willmott, '00 (Hugh, Former appointments at Aston Business School and also at the Manchester School of Management, UMIST, where he was Professor of Organizational Analysis. *The Sociological Review*. "Death. So what? Sociology and Sequestration." P. 657. LexisNexis)

Earlier, when commenting upon the cultural constitution of individuals, it was noted how, in modernity, we are increasingly thrown back upon ourselves, and thus are more 'prone to reality-threatening ontological and existential anxieties' (Mellor and Shilling, 1993: 429). I now want to argue that these anxieties are not universal, or endemic, to the human condition but, instead, are expressions of the socially organized privileging of a separation between wo/man and world. As this separation occurs, the sense of self as an independent entity becomes institutionalized and largely taken-for-granted (by self as well as by others). Any event or 'fateful moment' that problematizes this 'solid' sense of self as an independent, sovereign entity tends, as both Berger and Luckmann and Giddens recognize, to be experienced as a threat to ontological security rather than an occasion to dis-close and debunk the basis of this understanding. Why is this?

PREVENTING NUKE WAR KEY

Preventing nuclear war is the absolute prerequisite to any structural change

Folk, Professor of Religious and Peace Studies at Bethany College, 1978 [Jerry, "Peace Educations – Peace Studies : Towards an Integrated Approach," *Peace & Change*, volume V, number 1, Spring, p. 58]

Those proponents of the positive peace approach who reject out of hand the work of researchers and educators coming to the field from the perspective of negative peace too easily forget that the prevention of a nuclear confrontation of global dimensions is the prerequisite for all other peace research, education, and action. Unless such a confrontation can be avoided there will be no world left in which to build positive peace. Moreover, the blanket condemnation of all such negative peace oriented research, education or action as a reactionary attempt to support and reinforce the status quo is doctrinaire.

Conflict theory and resolution, disarmament studies, studies of the international system and of international organizations, and integration studies are in themselves neutral. They do not intrinsically support either the status quo or revolutionary efforts to change or overthrow it. Rather they offer a body of knowledge which can be used for either purpose or for some purpose in between. It is much more logical for those who understand peace as positive peace to integrate this knowledge into their own framework and to utilize it in achieving their own purposes. A balanced peace studies program should therefore offer the student exposure to the questions and concerns which occupy those who view the field essentially from the point of view of negative peace.

FEAR OF DEATH SOLVES VALUE TO LIFE

A fear of death is critical to recognize a value to life

Kelsang, internationally renowned teacher of Buddhism, 99 (Geshe, <http://www.tharpa.com/background/fear-of-death.htm>)

A healthy fear of death would be the fear of dying unprepared, as this is a fear we can do something about, a danger we can avert. If we have this realistic fear, this sense of danger, we are encouraged to prepare for a peaceful and successful death and are also inspired to make the most of our very precious human life instead of wasting it.

This "sense of danger" inspires us to make preparations so that we are no longer in the danger we are in now, for example by practicing moral discipline, purifying our negative karma, and accumulating as much merit, or good karma, as possible.

We put on a seat belt out of a sense of danger of the unseen dangers of traffic on the road, and that seat belt protects us from going through the windshield. We can do nothing about other traffic, but we can do something about whether or not we go through the windscreen if someone crashes into us.

Dying with regrets is not at all unusual. To avoid a sad and meaningless end to our life we need to remember continually that we too must die. Contemplating our own death will inspire us to use our life wisely by developing the inner refuge of spiritual realizations; otherwise we shall have no ability to protect ourself from the sufferings of death and what lies beyond.

FEAR OF NUKE WAR GOOD

Fear of nuclear war is good—it is key to stop the use of nuclear weapons as well as lead to a more peaceful society in general

Futtermann, nuclear physicist, 1994

[J.A.H. "Mediations on the Bomb", <http://www.dogchurch.org/indexfrm.html>]

I could say that if I didn't do it, someone else would, but that answer was rejected at Nuremberg. (It's also a better reason to leave the weapons program than to stay.) I continue to support the nuclear weapons business with my effort for many reasons, which I discuss throughout this piece. But mostly, I do it because the fear of nuclear holocaust is the only authority my own country or any other has respected so far when it comes to nationalistic urges to make unlimited war. As William L. Shirer states in his preface to *The Rise and Fall of the Third Reich* (Touchstone Books, New York, 1990),

"Adolf Hitler is probably the last of the great adventurer-conquerors in the tradition of Alexander, Caesar, and Napoleon, and the Third Reich the last of the empires which set out on the path taken earlier by France, Rome and Macedonia. The curtain was rung down on that phase of history, at least, by the sudden invention of the hydrogen bomb, of the ballistic missile, and of rockets which can be aimed to hit the moon."

Now this contrasts with the argument of those who would "reinvent government" by putting up bureaucratic roadblocks to maintaining the reliability of the US nuclear arsenal through research and testing. They reason that if the reliability of everyone's nuclear arsenals declines, everyone will be less likely to try using them. The problem is that some "adventurer-conqueror" may arise and use everyone's doubt about their arsenals to risk massive conventional war instead. An expansionist dictatorship might even risk nuclear war with weapons that are simpler, cruder, less powerful, much riskier (in terms of the possibility of accidental detonation) but much more reliable than our own may eventually become without adequate "stockpile stewardship." [14]

But the inhibitory effect of reliable nuclear weapons goes deeper than Shirer's deterrence of adventurer-conquerors. It changes the way we think individually and culturally, preparing us for a future we cannot now imagine. Jungian psychiatrist Anthony J. Stevens states, [15]

"History would indicate that people cannot rise above their narrow sectarian concerns without some overwhelming paroxysm.

It took the War of Independence and the Civil War to forge the United States, World War I to create the League of Nations, World War II to create the United Nations Organization and the European Economic Community. Only catastrophe, it seems, forces people to take the wider view.

Or what about fear? Can the horror which we all experience when we contemplate the possibility of nuclear extinction mobilize in us sufficient libidinal energy to resist the archetypes of war? Certainly, the moment we become blasé about the possibility of holocaust we are lost. As long as horror of nuclear exchange remains uppermost we can recognize that nothing is worth it. War becomes the impossible option. Perhaps horror, the experience of horror, the consciousness of horror, is our only hope. Perhaps horror alone will enable us to overcome the otherwise invincible attraction of war."

Thus I also continue engaging in nuclear weapons work to help fire that world-historical warning shot I mentioned above, namely, that as our beneficial technologies become more powerful, so will our weapons technologies, unless genuine peace precludes it. We must build a future more peaceful than our past, if we are to have a future at all, with or without nuclear weapons — a fact we had better learn before worse things than nuclear weapons are invented. If you're a philosopher, this means that I regard the nature of humankind as mutable rather than fixed, but that I think most people welcome change in their personalities and cultures with all the enthusiasm that they welcome death — thus, the fear of nuclear annihilation of ourselves and all our values may be what we require in order to become peaceful enough to survive our future technological breakthroughs. [16]

In other words, when the peace movement tells the world that we need to treat each other more kindly, I and my colleagues stand behind it (like Malcolm X stood behind Martin Luther King, Jr.) saying, "Or else." We provide the peace movement with a needed sense of urgency that it might otherwise lack.

REPRESENTATIONS OF VIOLENCE GOOD

Representations of violence and catastrophe create the political will to change the system. Realist descriptions are necessary to get people's attention

Tuathail, Associate Professor of Political Geography at Virginia Tech, 2000 [Gearoid O., Geopolitics @ Millennium, Paranoid Fantasies and Technological Fundamentalism Amidst the Contradictions of Contemporary Modernity, p. online]

History indicates that the everyday practice of geopolitics is often motivated and given meaning by paranoid fantasies of various sorts. In the twentieth century the paranoid fantasies that informed geopolitics were state-centric and nationalist territorial visions of world domination and control. There is no shortage of paranoid visions of the future at the opening of the twenty first century. Rather than dismiss all paranoid fantasies as irrational, it is may be worthwhile in the coming century to distinguish between counter-modern ones (usually based on religious and/or nationalist romantic visions) that attempt to impose certitude upon modernity, classic modern fantasies about limitless progress and growth that recycle already bankrupt myths to serve particularistic interests, and reflexively modern visions that sometimes throw the contradictions of the contemporary geopolitical condition into stark relief. The paranoid visions of environmentalists and peace activists today are part of the struggle to imagine and transform the future of modernity. Though these visions sometimes appear fantastic they are far from being crazy. Unlike the paranoid power fantasies and conspiracies that gave meaning to international politics for much of the twentieth century, visions of increasing planetary temperatures and rising ocean levels, unfolding global pandemics and irreversible technoscientific manipulations, proliferating weapons of destruction and deepening vulnerability to potentially catastrophic accidents, can be empirically documented and supported in great scientific detail. As Athansiou remarks about those studying the rising levels toxicity in the environment, 'the paranoids, it happens, do not have a bad record at all.

LOVE FAILS

Let's face it, love's not all flowers and poetry—it can also be destructive

Derrida, a smart human being, 1997 [Jacques, *Politics of Friendship*, p. 64-65]

[This 'disappropriation' [déappropriation] would undoubtedly beckon to this other 'love' whose true name, says Nietzsche in conclusion, whose just name is friendship. *Ihr rechter Name ist Freundschaft*).¹⁶ This friendship is a species of love, but of a love more loving than love. All the names would have to change for the sake of coherence. Without being able to devote to it the careful reading it deserves, let us recall that this little two-page treatise on love denounces, in sum, the right to property. This property right is the claim [revendication] of love (at least, of what is thus named). The vindictive claim of this right can be deciphered throughout all the

appropriative manoeuvres of the strategy which this 'love' deploys. It is the appropriating drive (*Trieb*) par excellence. Love wants to possess. It wants the possessing. It is the possessing – cupidity itself (*Habsucht*); it always hopes for new property; and even the very Christian 'love of one's neighbour' – charity, perhaps – would reveal only a new lust in this fundamental drive: 'Our love of our neighbour – is it not a lust for new possessions? (*Unsere Nächstenliebe – ist sie nicht ein Drang nach neuem Eigentum?*)'

This question is doubly important. In contesting the Christian revolution of love as much as the Greek philosophical concept of friendship – and just as much the norms of justice that depend on them – its target is the very value of proximity, the neighbour's proximity as the ruse of the proper and of appropriation. The gesture confirms the warning accompanying the discourse on 'good friendship': not to give in to proximity or identification, to the fusion or the permutation of you and me. But, rather to place, maintain or keep an infinite distance within 'good friendship'. The very thing that love – that which is thus named, 'love between the sexes', egotism itself, jealousy which tends only towards possession (*Besitzen*) – is incapable of doing.

Is this to say that friendship, rightly named, will carry itself beyond Eros? Beyond Eros in general? Or beyond love between two sexes?

Nietzsche does not unfold these questions in this form. But let us not conceal their radicality, which can become disquieting, particularly given the motive of the 'new' or of the 'future' that we perhaps too often trust as if it were univocal, simply opposed to the form of repetition and the work of the arch-ancient. For Nietzsche sees this drive of appropriation, this form always pushing for 'new property', at work everywhere, including where love loves in view of knowledge, of truth, of the novelty of the new, of all new reality in general: 'Our love of our neighbour – is it not a lust for new possessions? And likewise our love of knowledge, of truth, and altogether any lust for what is new? (*und überhaupt all jener Drang nach Neuigkeiten?*)' 64-65

Loving ones children will not stop wars

Langer 2002 (Thomas, Retired school of public health and Department of Psychiatry Columbia University, Choices for Living: Coping with Fear of Dying, p. 32)

Love for their children has not succeeded in keeping parents from supporting wars. In fact, a frequent rationale for starting a war is the defense of their children, or securing the future of their children. Love of country and love of God seem to take precedence over love of children, and these two "loves" are the major excuses for starting wars. Often war is really based on the search for power by political groups who do not represent parents in general. The fact that acceptance of war belies our professed love for our children does not diminish the importance of everyday love, caring, and support given by so many parents to their children. The frequent betrayals, abandonments, or assaults on children by their caretakers and the resulting depressions and antisocial behavior are mounting evidence of the importance of parental love in preventing fear of dying and its equivalents. (Antisocial behavior, especially in preadolescent children, is a way of expression depression, and depression is often based on anger.)

SM

Romantic love's illusory nature causer it to fail

Langer 2002 (Thomas, Retired school of public health and Department of Psychiatry Columbia University, Choices for Living: Coping with Fear of Dying, p. 37)

An opposing view is held by Goldberg. Because it is based on illusion, she sees it as fragile (and for our purposes thus less helpful in dealing with death fear).

Romantic love is blind because it thrives on fantasy and illusion: it looks inwardly at one's own hopes and desires rather than at the reality of who the other person is ... But such an imaginative love is fragile ... When we discover the complete, unvarnished truth about our beloved—their imperfections and their all-too-human traits ... we feel betrayed by both our lover and our love. (Goldberg, 1993, p. 177)

SM

Empty love makes the fear of death worse

Langer 2002 (Thomas, Retired school of public health and Department of Psychiatry Columbia University, Choices for Living: Coping with Fear of Dying, p. 38-9)

Love That Fosters Death Fear

Empty Love This is commitment without intimacy or passion, the "Pragma" of Lee's classification. It is the pragmatic compatible love, the arranged marriage. It is difficult to find examples of this type of love, since we are so accustomed to some intimacy or passion in our relationships. If you know of a woman or man who is just "hanging in there," trapped in a relationship she or he doesn't really like, this may be "empty love." It does not act to reduce death fear; in fact it may exacerbate it. Arranged marriages are rare in our current society, but all

over the world there are millions of child brides who are committed by their parents to what we would consider a loveless life. The royal marriages of the past are of this type. They were arranged for purely political purposes. Stefan Zweig described the unhappiness of Marie Antoinette upon being wed to Louis XVI. For years she was unable to become pregnant because Louis had phimosis, a constriction of the foreskin, which interfered with erection and ejaculation. After he was operated on, she became pregnant, but had already taken a lover. This might be called "involuntary commitment," since most members of royal families, until recently, went along with the choices their parents and ministers made for them.

SM

Promiscuous individuals "love" does not protect them from Fear of Death

Langer 2002 (Thomas, Retired school of public health and Department of Psychiatry Columbia University, Choices for Living: Coping with Fear of Dying, p.40)

┌ The promiscuous man (or woman) is not protected against death fear to the degree that the romantic or the companionate lover is. The more extreme the behavior, the greater the suffering of the roving lover.

... the wives, mothers and girlfriends of compulsive Casanovas are not the only victims of these entanglements. Despite the admiring notion of the man who ... 'gets plenty' as super-macho ... there is a mass of evidence to show that in illicit amours, whether they go right or wrong, men bleed too. The problem with adultery is that it is inherently a self-punishing self-defeating exercise, says Dr. Gessler. ... 'adultery is a fantasy flight to find the real mother, the woman who will offer him unconditional all-embracing love, who will provide the nourishment he desires, who will serve his bodily needs as instantly, adoringly, as he dreams she must have done in his primal heyday.' (Miles, 1991, p. 191)

SM

Indiscriminant love fails to solve Fear of Death

Langer 2002 (Thomas, Retired school of public health and Department of Psychiatry Columbia University, *Choices for Living: Coping with Fear of Dying*, p. 43)

The same criticism of Fromm's idea of love as universal is articulated by Nathaniel Branden: Again he seems to be talking about Romantic love (for that is the subject of his book), while Fromm is promoting Brotherly love.

Love by its very nature entails a process of selection, of discrimination. Love is our response to that which represents our highest values. Love is a response to distinctive characteristics possessed by some human beings, but not all. Otherwise, what would be the tribute of love? (Branden, 1981, p. 214)

Ridiculing Fromm's idea that since we are all part of mankind, love of one is equal to love of all, Branden says:

If we were to ask our lover why he or she cared for us, consider what our reaction would be if told 'Who shouldn't I love you? All human beings are identical. Therefore, it doesn't make any difference whom I love. So it might as well be you.' (Branden, 1981, p. 215)

Other than the issue of universal versus particular criteria for choosing a lover, an even more basic criticism of Brotherly love (as love of the highest order) is that human beings, by their nature, are just not capable of such a pure and perfect love. Schaar, talking of the mystery of love, says that few can ever attain it.

Most men never truly love another nor are they truly loved by another on this earth. We can accept that sadness or we can with Fromm try to conceal it by equating sympathy with love. (Schaar, 1961, p. 129)

Long before Fromm had written about love, Freud inveighed against the idea of brotherly love and love of mankind. In discussing how society binds the members of a community to each other, he says that restrictions on sexual life produce "aim-inhibited libido," which fosters the development of friendship. He examines the commandment "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," and considers it unnatural, and an obligation which involves a sacrifice. (*This is the very point that Albert Schweitzer is trying to make—Christian love does involve self-sacrifice.*)

Freud first raises the issue of particular (rather than universal) criteria for choosing to love someone.

If I love someone, he must be worthy of it in some way or other... But if he is a stranger to me and cannot attract me by any value he has in himself or any significance he may have already acquired in my emotional life, it will be hard for me to love him. I shall even be doing wrong if I do, for my love is valued as a privilege by all those belonging to me; it is an injustice to them if I put a stranger on a level with them. [Freud, 1929, in *Civilization, War and Death*, edited by John Rickman, *Psychanalytical Epitomes*, No. 4, The Hogarth Press, New Enlarged Edition, 1953 (orig. 1939), p. 50]

SM

Brotherly love for all of society fails

Langer 2002 (Thomas, Retired school of public health and Department of Psychiatry Columbia University, Choices for Living: Coping with Fear of Dying, p. 43-4)

He then launches into the more basic question of whether humans are even capable of such an exalted type of love. Here his view of man as having aggressive

and sexual drives that he can barely control leads him to believe that one cannot love one's neighbor, much less one's enemy.

And there is a second commandment that seems to me even more incomprehensible, and arouses still stronger opposition in me. It is 'Love thine enemies' ... (The truth is) that men are not gentle, friendly creatures wishing for love, who simply defend themselves if they are attacked, but that a powerful measure of desire for aggression has to be reckoned as part of their instinctual endowment. The result is that their neighbor is to them not only a possible helper or sexual object, but also a temptation to them to gratify their aggressiveness on him, to exploit his capacity for work without recompense, to use him sexually without his consent, to seize his possessions, to humiliate him, to cause him pain, to torture and to kill him. *Homo homine lupus* [Man is a wolf to man] (derived from Plautus, *Asinaria* II, iv, 88) ... This cruelty ... reveals men as savage beasts to whom the thought of sparing their own kind is alien ... (Freud, 1929, op., cit. pp. 50-51)

Finally, Freud sums up his view of Brotherly love (loving neighbors, enemies, and strangers) as a reaction-formation (a behavioral tendency developed in direct opposition to a repressed impulse—that is, the impulse to kill, rape, etc.). Love of the neighbor or of mankind is looked on as "aim inhibited." In aim inhibition, the natural object is considered to be someone of the opposite sex, but societal prohibitions and commandments inhibit this sexual drive, and channel it into a more generalized kind of love, one that is asexual.

Culture has to call up every possible reinforcement in order to erect barriers against the aggressive instincts of men and hold their manifestations in check by reaction-formations in men's minds. Hence its system of methods by which mankind is to be driven to identifications and aim-inhibited love relationships; hence the restrictions on sexual life; and hence, too, an ideal command to love one's neighbor as oneself, which is really justified by the fact that nothing is so completely at variance with original human nature as this. (Freud, 1929, op. cit., p. 51)

SM