

**Nayar Index**

1NC .....	2
New Beginnings Link.....	5
Politics of Inclusion Link .....	6
Order Impact .....	7
Criticism First.....	8
Alternative Solves .....	9
AT: Global Good.....	10
AFF ANSWERS	
Work with the Global.....	11

INC

A. Link -- The dissent of the 1AC is a façade for the continuation of a violent politics of order – calling the USFG out on its violations of civil liberties still concedes to the systems of violence which prop up the ideology

Nayar, School of Law at the University of Warwick, 1999  
(Jayan, Transnational Law & Contemporary Problems, Fall page lexis)

The power of world-ordering to self-sustain, I suggest, lies precisely in this, its ability to order the "voices" and the "voicing" of dissent. From this perspective, the fact of dissent or critique is not, in itself, the significant indicator of resistance that we might consider it to be. The point, I argue, is not *that* dissent is registered, but rather, how, where and in what form that dissent is expressed. Voices of dissent that are absorbed into the channels of voicing as provided by the structures of order, in my view, have themselves been ordered. Rather than providing energies for imagination, they are drained of them, sustaining instead the orders against which they purport to stand. In the struggle to find a voice we, therefore, comply with the orders of voicing; the best of times being when our voice is "heard," tolerated, sometimes even congratulated and rewarded, the worst of times being when it is appropriated and transformed into further legitimizations of violence, and most commonly, when it is simply ignored. To sustain "us," therefore, self-referential communities of voice are founded, established and propagated, quoting back and forth the same voices, repetition being equated with significance and impact. While we keep busy being heard, "achieving" lots by way of giving volume to (our) voice, little is changed in the order-ing of worlds. How much of the continuing violence within the disorderings of the world has followed from this experience?

B. Impact – The affirmatives ordering rhetoric props up the violence of colonialism this process of brutalization is legitimized by the structures they engage – it turns the case

Nayar, School of Law at the University of Warwick, 1999  
(Jayan, Transnational Law & Contemporary Problems, Fall page lexis)

Although historical colonialism as a formal structure of politico-legal ordering of humanity has come and gone, the violence of colonization is very much a persistent reality. A striking feature of historical world-orderings was the confidence with which the "new world" was projected upon human imagination. Colonialism was not a tentative process. The "right" of colonization, both as a right of the colonizer and as a right thing to do by the colonizer, was passionately believed and confidently asserted. Thus, for the most part, this "right" was uncontested, this confidence unchallenged. "World-order" today is similarly asserted with confidence and rectitude.

Contemporary world-orderings, consistent with those of the past, are implemented using a range of civilizational legitimization. With the advent of an ideology of "humanity," a "post-colonial" concession to human dignity demanded by the previously colonized, new languages of the civilizational project had to be conceived of and projected. "Freed" from the brutalities of the order of historical colonialism, the "ordered" now are subjected to the colonizing force of the "post-colonial," and increasingly, globalization-inspired ideologies of development and security. Visible, still, is the legitimization of "order" as coercive command through the rhetoric of "order" as evolutionary structure.

1NC

C. The Alternative – We believe you should – reject the affirmative – in favor of an engagement as localized participants in the ordered world – the affirmatives interventionism is meaningless if we are not first willing to intervene into our personal worlds of violence

Nayar, School of Law at the University of Warwick, 1999  
(Jayan, Transnational Law & Contemporary Problems, Fall page lexis)

"We" are participants in ordered worlds, not merely observers. The choice is whether we wish to recognize our own locations of ordered violence and participate in the struggle to resist their orderings, or whether we wish merely to observe violence in far-off worlds in order that our interventionary participation "out there" never destabilizes the ground upon which we stand. I suggest that we betray the spirit of transformatory struggle, despite all our expressions of support and even actions of professionalized expertise, if our own locations, within which are ordered and from which we ourselves order, remain unscrutinized.

**Human Rights / Dignity Link**

Concept of human rights pre-supposes there is a central identity in being human – this assumption is based on colonial concepts for civilization which naturalizes the violence of political institutions

**Nayar**, School of Law at the University of Warwick, **1999**  
(Jayan, Transnational Law & Contemporary Problems, Fall page lexis)

Through "colonialism" was reshaped the material basis of exchange that determined human relationships. Put differently, the very idea of what is "human" was recast by the imposed value-systems of the "civilizing" process that was colonialism. To be human, to live, and to relate to others, thus, both lost and gained meaning. Lost were many pre-colonial and indigenous conceptions of human dignity, of subsistence, production, consumption, wealth and poverty. Gained was the advent of the human "self" as an objective "economic" agent and, with it, the universals of commodification as the basis for human relations.

Following this transformation of the material political-economy of the colonized, or "ordered," colonialism entrenched the "state" as the symbolic "political" institution of "public" social relations. The effect of this "colonization of the mind" was that the "political-economic" form of social organization--the state--was universalized as common, if not "natural," resulting in a homogenization of "political" imagination and language. Thus, diversity was unified, while at the same time, unity was diversified. The particularities and inconveniences of human diversity--culture and tradition--were subordinated to the "civilized" discourse of secular myths (to which the "rule of law" is central), while concurrently, humanity was formally segregated into artificial "states," enclosures of mythic solidarities and common destinies.

The intent of the affirmative is not relevant – appeals to human rights and welfare appeal to the larger systems of order which replicate the violence of colonialism

**Nayar**, School of Law at the University of Warwick, **1999**  
(Jayan, Transnational Law & Contemporary Problems, Fall page lexis)

I am not suggesting that all "new beginnings" of world-order, past and present, were envisioned with cynical intent. Quite the opposite is the reason for the point I wish to make. The persistent realities of violence within "ordered" worlds are all the more glaring when we acknowledge that they arise in the name of human aspirations that were mostly articulated by progressive forces, in the wake of real struggles, to contribute to the transformation of the inequities and violence of the then existing "orders." Yet more and more talk of universal human welfare, transformed world-orders, new beginnings and the like have only given us more and more occasion to lament the resulting dashed hopes.

My questioning is not of intent, or of commitment, or of the sincerity of those who advocate world-order transformations. Rather, my questionings relate to a perspective on "implications." Here, there is a very different, and more subtle, sort of globalized world-order that we need to consider--the globalization of violence, wherein human relationships become disconnected from the personal and are instead conjoined into distant and distanced chains of violence, an alienation of human and human. And by the nature of this new world-ordering, as the web of implication in relational violence is increasingly extended, so too, the vision of violence itself becomes blurred and the voice, muted. Through this implication into violence, therefore, the order(ing) of emancipatory imagination is reinforced. What we cannot see, after all, we cannot speak; what we refuse to see, we dare not speak.

### New Beginnings Link

The allure of the affirmative comes in its call for a new beginning – this ideology may sound promising however it is simply an extension of the workings of ordered systems

Nayar, School of Law at the University of Warwick, 1999  
(Jayan, Transnational Law & Contemporary Problems. Fall page lexis)

The promise of "new beginnings" has been a constant feature in the rhetoric of post-colonial world-orders, for, after all, new beginnings have a certain captivating allure. "Liberation" from the old has found utterance in a myriad of slogans--independence, peace, security, nation-building, democracy, development, prosperity--made during Party Annual General Meetings, with launches of National Development Plans, or at the lavish settings of the United Nations and international Conferences. With the passing of the blemished age of colonialism, the powerful--national governments, the UN, the World Bank and IMF, and even those countries who individually and severally brutalized and pillaged the formerly "uncivilized"--are now willing, it would seem, to get into the act of creating the "new age" of welfare for all. New beginnings, and more new beginnings, the (once) new United Nations, 18 the (now dead) New International Economic [\*609] Order, the (still-born) new "sustainable development," the (old) New World-Order, each grand promise of tomorrow ushered in, tired and haggard, but accompanied with much frenzied trumpeting.

Politics of Inclusion Link

Politics of inclusion do nothing to change the culture of violence that justifies exclusion – they only allow those in positions of power to wash their hands clean of the violence of colonialism

Nayar, School of Law at the University of Warwick, 1999  
(Jayan, Transnational Law & Contemporary Problems, Fall page lexis)

Others among us, without the comforts of such complacencies and with the best of intentions, may seek to extend and apply the benefits of the world that we know, that is "our" truth, to those who we identify as being "excluded." The politics of inclusion then dominates our attention--inclusion of the poor in "development," inclusion of the terrorized in the framework of "security," inclusion of all those thus far marginalized into the "world." 50 The keyword for this new politics of inclusion, we often hear, is "participation." So we might struggle to bring the excluded within the fora of national, international and transnational organizations, articulate their interests and demand service to their cause. And yet, so much inclusion has done little to change the culture of violence. However sympathetic, even empathetic, we may be to the cause of the "subaltern," however sophisticated and often self-complicating our exposition of violence, one thing is difficult for us to face: when all is said and done, most of us engaged in these transformatory endeavors are far removed from the existential realities of "subaltern" [\*627] suffering. For "them," what is the difference, I wonder, between the violence of new orders and that of the old, what is the difference between the new articulations of violence and those of the old, when violence itself is a continuing reality? But we push on, keeping ourselves busy. What else can we do but suggest new beginnings?

## Order Impact

The ideology of order guarantees the perpetuation of colonizing violence

Nayar, School of Law at the University of Warwick, 1999  
(Jayan, Transnational Law & Contemporary Problems, Fall page lexis)

The discussion above was intended to provide a perspective of world-order as an historical process of ordering which, contrary to the benign symbolism of universalism evoked by notions such as "one world" and "global village," is constructed out of the violent destruction of diverse socialities. World-order, when re-viewed, therefore, may be understood as follows:

. As a concept that seeks to articulate the civilizational project of humanity, it is at best nonsense, and at worst a fraudulent ideology of legitimization for the perpetuation of colonizing violence--"world-order" as symbolic violence.

. As a material reality of violent social relations, it is a conscious and systematized design for the control of resources through the disciplining of minds and bodies--"world-order" as embodied violence.

## Criticism First

We must fully criticize our perspective before we can engage in questions of what to do next

Nayar, School of Law at the University of Warwick, 1999  
(Jayan, Transnational Law & Contemporary Problems, Fall page lexis)

Rightly, we are concerned with the question of what can be done to alleviate the sufferings that prevail. But there are necessary prerequisites to answering the "what do we do?" question. We must first ask the intimately connected questions of "about what?" and "toward what end?" These questions, obviously, impinge on our vision and judgment. When we attempt to imagine transformations toward preferred human futures, we engage in the difficult task of judging the present. This is difficult not because we are oblivious to violence or that we are numb to the resulting suffering, but because, outrage with "events" of violence aside, processes of violence embroil and implicate our familiarities in ways that defy the simplicities of straightforward imputability. Despite our best efforts at categorizing violence into convenient compartments--into "disciplines" of study and analysis such as "development" and "security" (health, environment, population, being other examples of such compartmentalization)--the encroachments of order(ing) function at more pervasive levels. And without doubt, the perspectives of the observer, commentator, and actor become crucial determinants. It is necessary, I believe, to question this, "our," perspective, to reflect upon a perspective of violence which not only locates violence as a happening "out there" while we stand as detached observers and critics, but is also one in which we are ourselves implicated in the violence of ordered worlds where we stand very much as participants. For this purpose of a critique of critique, it is necessary to consider the "technologies" of ordering.

## Alternative Selves

We cannot simply denounce larger systems of power – the only path to liberation lies in criticizing and dissenting in localized relationships of power

Navar, School of Law at the University of Warwick, 1999

(Jayan, Transnational Law & Contemporary Problems, Fall page lexis)

It is often that we think that to change the world it is necessary to change the way power is exercised in the world; so we go about the business of exposing and denouncing the many power configurations that dominate. Power indeed does lie at the core of human misery, yet we blind ourselves if we regard this power as the power out there. Power, when all the complex networks of its reach are untangled, is personal; power does not exist out there. [\*630] it only exists in relationship. To say the word. power, is to describe relationship, to acknowledge power, is to acknowledge our subservience in that relationship. There can exist no power if the subservient relationship is refused--then power can only achieve its ambitions through its naked form, as violence.

Changing the world therefore is a misnomer for in truth it is relationships that are to be changed. And the only relationships that we can change for sure are our own. And the constant in our relationships is ourselves--the "I" of all of us. And so, to change our relationships, we must change the "I" that is each of us. Transformations of "structures" will soon follow. This is, perhaps, the beginning of all emancipations. This is, perhaps, the essential message of Mahatmas.

AT: Global Good

Even if they win that the end result of criticism should be global we'll win that the global is a dangerous starting point for discussion – their methodology only replicates the dominations of the status quo

Nayar, School of Law at the University of Warwick, 1999  
(Jayan, Transnational Law & Contemporary Problems, Fall page lexis)

Located within a site of privilege, and charged to reflect upon the grand questions of world-order and the human condition as the third Christian Millennium dawns, we are tempted to turn the mind to the task of abstract imaginings of "what could be" of our "world," and "how should we organize" our "humanity." Perhaps such contemplations are a necessary antidote to cynicism and skepticism regarding any possibility of human betterment. a necessary revitalization of critical and creative energies to check the complacencies of the state of things as they are. However, imagining [\*601] possibilities of abstractions--"world-order," "international society," "the global village," "the family of humankind," etc.--does carry with it a risk. The "total" view that is the take-off point for discourses on preferred "world-order" futures risks deflection as the abstracted projections it provokes might entail little consequence for the faces and the names of the humanity on whose behalf we might speak. So, what do we do?

Global activism is short sighted because it engages in an act of distancing which leaves us unable to process the implications of structural violence

Nayar, School of Law at the University of Warwick, 1999  
(Jayan, Transnational Law & Contemporary Problems. Fall page lexis)

We are today bombarded by images of our "one world." We speak of the world as "shrinking" into a "global village." We are not all fooled by the implicit benign-ness of this image of "time-space" contracted--so we also speak of "global pillage." This astuteness of our perceptions, however, does not prevent us from our delusion of the "global;" the image of the "global" world persists even for many activists amongst us who struggle to "change" the world.

This is recent delusion. It is a delusion which anesthetizes us from the only world which we can ever locate ourselves in and know--the worlds of "I"-in relationships.

The "I" is seldom present in "emancipatory" projects to change the world. This is because the "relational I"-world and the "global"-world are negations of one another; the former negates the concept of the latter whilst the latter negates the life of the former. And concepts are more amenable to scrutiny than life.

The advance in technologies of image-ing enables a distanciation of scrutiny, from the "I"-world of relationships to the "global"-world of abstractions. As we become fixated with the distant, as we consume the images of "world" as other than here and now, as we project ourselves through technological time-space into worlds apart from our here and now, as we become "global," we are relieved of the gravity of our present. We, thus, cease the activism of self (being) and take on the mantle of the "activist" (doing). This is a significant displacement.

That there is suffering all over the world has indeed been made more visible by the technologies of image-ing. Yet for all its consequent fostering of "networks," images of "global" suffering have also served to disempower. By this, we mean not merely that we are filled with the sense that the forces against which the struggle for emancipations from injustice and exploitation are waged are pervasive and, therefore, often impenetrable, but, more importantly, that it diverts our gaze away from the only true power that is in our disposal--the power of self-change in relationships of solidarities.

## Work with the Global

Our IAC offers an opportunity to break free of the normalization of domination – only working within the system allows us to create the changes which break down structural oppression

Philpott, University of Notre Dame, 2003

(Daniel, Ethics and International Affairs, page proquest gjm)

Ethical ideas effect change through their very prescriptive force. Crawford asserts. Not only are they irreducible to structures of economics and power, but they operate independently of them through their intrinsic appeal, via persuasive communication, by changing minds, in short, through argument. Her extensive theoretical account of how argument works offers international relations scholars a veritable education in the philosophy of discourse and a set of concepts they can transport to other political settings.

Her core argument is that "normative beliefs"-tenets about what is right and good-shape "behavioral norms," practices that become dominant (pp. 86-89). The first opponents of dominant practices-slavery, colonialism, absolute sovereignty-may well speak as voices in the wilderness, their critique eliciting little consensus and still less actual change. But their arguments persist as a deposit of criticism, one that others remember and take up, even centuries later. When the critique persuades enough hearers, the dominant practices become contested, or, in Crawford's terms, "denormalized."

Eventually, the critique "reconstructs" new practices that bring positive change. How does this reconstruction occur? In part, ethical argument succeeds by appealing to elements of prevailing beliefs rather than seeking their wholesale overthrow (p. 114). Early modern critics of Spanish slavery in the New World, for instance, appealed to tenets of Christianity, the dominant belief in Europe, in order to delegitimize what Christian rulers and merchants practiced. Ethical argument also succeeds by swaying actors who have strategic-economic, political, military-power at their disposal, thus fortifying ideas with new capabilities (pp. 103-105). Most powerfully, arguments will succeed by becoming "institutionalized," that is, adopted by societies and political organizations as rules, laws, regulations, and standard operating procedures, and enforced through sanctions (pp. 105-109). In the unfolding of argument, one thing often leads to another as an argument's victory in becoming a practice begets further change by its very logic. The end of slavery led people to ask why any forced labor was practiced; humanitarian arguments for reforming colonialism, why colonialism even existed.

Even when it runs counter to the criticism state action is necessary to maintain an arena for activism

Chomsky, Professor of Linguistics at MIT, 1997

(Noam, Canadian Dimension, May, page proquest gjm)

I share that vision, though it runs directly counter to my goals. My short - term goals are to defend and even strengthen elements of state authority which, though illegitimate in fundamental ways, are critically necessary right now to impede the dedicated efforts to 'roll back' the progress that has been achieved in extending democracy and human rights. State authority is now under severe attack in the more democratic societies, but not because it conflicts with the libertarian vision. Rather the opposite: because it offers (weak) protection to some aspects of that vision.

In today's world, I think, the goals of a committed anarchist should be to defend some state institutions from the attack against them, while trying at the same time to pry them open to more meaningful public participation - and ultimately, to dismantle them in a much more free society; if the appropriate circumstances can be achieved.