

Nayar Index

INC Shell.....	p.2-4
Link extension: Disorder.....	p.5
Link extension: Security.....	p.6-7
Link extension: Environmentalism.....	p.8
Link extension: Silencing.....	p.9
Link extension: National service.....	p.10
Impact extension: Violence.....	p.11
Impact extensions: Genocide.....	p.12
Alternative solvency.....	p.13-14
AT: Perm.....	p.15-17

Aff

State/global thinking good.....	p.18
Perm solvency.....	p.19-22

Nayar 1NC

A. The Link

The affirmative engages in "world speak" They attempt to move towards one global view of world "order"

Nayar, School of Law @ University of Warwick, 1999

(Jayan, "Orders of Inhumanity," Transnational Law & Contemporary Problems, Fall 99, p. Lexis)

It has become a convenience , even an imperative, it seems, to speak in terms of a "global," world. The proliferation of world-order rhetoric is a noticeable feature of contemporary politico-legal, economic and socio-cultural discourse. In politico-legal terms, languages of the "harmonization" and "integration" of polities have gained prominence since the early [*603] experimentations of the League of Nations and, later, the United Nations. Gradually, it seems, we have moved from a world organized through the isolationism of "coexisting" states, to one co-ordinated by the UN-led interactions of "co-operating" states which have seen the emergence of "internationalism" and "regionalism." Most recently we see a world characterized by a shift, slowly but surely, toward ever greater "interdependence," as reflected through the contemporary mantra of "global governance." In economic and socio-cultural terms, imaginations of a "global village (market-place)" or a "Global Neighborhood," n4 encapsulate this evolution, the final stage toward realizing the aspiration of a "We the Peoples," as contained in the UN Charter, n5 ostensibly to be "connected" through the "world-wide web" of the internet through its many "dot-coms." n6 Driving this movement toward ever greater globality are the new realities of economic and social exchange in human relationships. There appears to be no escaping the bombardment of "globalization-speak." All this, we are told, is in the name of "inclusion" into "one world." n7 Ultimately, what we are witnessing is a nascent "global culture" emerging as an historic movement. The coming together of the peoples of the world is the great challenge of the twenty-first century civilizational project. n8

[*604] Indeed, much of what provides the descriptive content of world-order narratives appears to be happening. Increased interaction at the global, let alone international, level is taking place. Leisurely meanderings through the streets of any major city, or even minor town, anywhere, provide ample sensory evidence of a globalization-led rise in homogeneity of social experience and aspiration. From advertising hoardings to cinema posters, restaurants to cyber-cafes, shopping malls to banks, hotels to discotheques, muzak to top-tens, fashion of the chic to that of the executive, monocultures prevail. Everywhere, local flavors provide an exotic touch of difference to the otherwise comfortable familiarity of the global. Of course, such leisurely meanderings are limited to those who have the resources by which to make such a comparative study, to those with the mobility to "be anywhere"--the professional, the corporate player, the "global activist," the footloose academic. For these, narratives of a "global world" find appeal.

Thus, a "globalized" world-order has come to fit snugly within the common parlance of these "global citizens" (politicians, lawyers, corporate actors, professional NGOists, academics), and world-order possibilities have infused their imaginations. The struggle ahead, from such vantage points, lies in determining what the image of order might be, what the structures of a global order might look like. The rush to capture the symbolic and futuristic landscape of world-order provides us with the rich exhortations of "new beginnings," open to the intellectual expertise of both "right" and "left" politico-economic orientations. These range from the "ordering" inclinations of U.S. State officials asserting the right of "benign imperialism," n9 to the "reordering" demands of progressive internationalists calling for "humane governance" n10 and "neighborhood" perspectives. n11 Regardless of political and ideological orientations, the underlying message of the rhetoric of world-order, however conceptualized, is one of increased human welfare, freed now [*605] from the ideological constraints of an outdated, geo-politically based state system . A new order for these exciting times is the order of the day.

Nayar 1NC

B. The Implication

In participating in this world speak the affirmative cause us to "forget" those who have different views of the world. This process is inherently violent and dehumanizing.

Nayar, School of Law @ University of Warwick, 1999

(Jayan, "Orders of Inhumanity," Transnational Law & Contemporary Problems, Fall 99, p. Lexis)

All this expression of angst and hope is, of course, nothing new. Like a social ritual played out with consistent regularity, we have become familiar with these gatherings of "developmentalists," at which they administer healthy measures of both admonishments for past failures and [*610] encouragements for future hope. And like in all rituals, processes of "remembering," which are the public face of proceedings, are accompanied by the equally important processes of "forgetting." Repeated and remembered are the "failures," the commitments to "humanity," the conditions of suffering that are deemed "intolerable," and the articulations of hope in future "action." Ignored and forgotten are the violence of the failures, the fraudulence of the commitments, the processes of inflicted suffering deemed necessary, and the articulations of despair about past actions. Still, the ritual performs a regenerative purpose. It recasts anew the project of development with all its civilizational importance and reassures its practitioners of their historic mission to "order" society.

But what is the message given to the "victims" of development--those who, although intended as the beneficiaries of this universal project, have had to suffer the "many failures and too few successes" as these rituals are enacted? n20 To them is made a plea for patience and a rearticulation of a vision for tomorrow. For them, however, perhaps a different experience of developmental (mis)orderings persists, one which bears a striking resemblance to the earlier phase of colonial ordering.

While once colonialism was blatant in its dehumanizing of social relationships, notwithstanding the claims of the "civilizing mission," now that same dehumanization takes place under the acceptable, if not desirable, guise of globalized development. The "poor" has come to replace the "savage/native;" the "expert consultant," the "missionary;" "training seminars," mass "baptizing;" the handphone in the pocket, the cross on the altar. But some things--the foreigner's degree, attire, consumer items, etc.--don't change. And what of the "comprador elites," that band of minority mercenaries who symbolized to the colonialist all that was good about what it meant to be the servile "civilized," who served as the faithful mouthpieces of the master? Today, many go by the names of "government functionaries" and "entrepreneurs." Regenerated by these contemporary ideological weapons of the desired human condition, the processes of ordering, of creating orders of inhumanity, carry on with violence intact.

Nayar 1NC

C. The Alternative

Reject the affirmative's notions of a totalized world, and embrace a mentality of local thinking and resistance

Esteva and Prakash, 1998

(Gustavo and Madhu Suri, "Grassroots Post-modernism: Remaking the Soil of Cultures," New York: Zed Books, p. 23-24)

With the traditional humility of Gandhi, Ivan Illich, Leopold Kohr, Fritz Schumacher, and others of their ilk, Berry warns of the many harmful consequences of "Thinking Big": pushing all human enterprises beyond the human scale. Appreciating the genuine limits of human intelligence and capacities, Berry celebrates the age-old wisdom of "thinking little" or small: on the proportion and scale that humans can really understand, know and assume responsibility for the consequences of their actions and decisions upon others.

Afraid that local thinking weakens and isolates people, localizing them into parochialism, the "alternative" global thinkers⁸ forget that Goliath did in fact meet his match in David. Forgetting this biblical moral insight, they place their faith in the countervailing force of a competing or "alternative" Goliath of their own, whose global thinking encompasses the supra-morality of "planetary consciousness." Assuming that "Global Man" (the grown-ups' version of Superman) has more or less conquered every space on Earth (and is now moving beyond, into the extra-terrestrial), they think he is now advancing towards a collective conscience: one conscience, one transcultural consciousness, one humanity – the great human family. "It is the planetary conscience that takes us to a 'world society' with a 'planetary citizenship,'" says Leonardo Boff, the Brazilian theologian,⁹ describing a hope now shared by a wide variety of "globalists." Hunger in Ethiopia, bloody civil wars in Somalia or Yugoslavia, human rights violations in Mexico thus become the personal responsibilities of all good, non-parochial citizens of Main Street; supposedly complementing their local involvement in reducing garbage, homelessness or junk food in their own neighborhoods. Global Samaritans may fail to see that when their local actions are informed, shaped and determined by a "global frame of mind,"¹⁰ they become as uprooted as those of the globalists they explicitly criticize.

L/ Extension – Disorder Link

The affirmative attempts to make truth claims in an attempt to justify bringing "order" to the world. They perceive "disorder" and attempt to destroy it.

Nayar, School of Law @ University of Warwick, 1999

(Jayan, "Orders of Inhumanity," Transnational Law & Contemporary Problems, Fall 99, p. Lexis)

Truth, as the ground from which "humanity" springs, represents that fundamental exposition of the human condition from which all social relationships gain meaning. The notion of order as "structure" pertains precisely to this laying of the truth of humanity. "Order," in this respect, is premised on the existence of the undesired "other" condition of "disorder," from which structure is to be created. From the previous discussion on the ideologies of "development" and "security" we see this clearly. n40 The "order" of "development" is presented as the humanizing process of creating structure and movement from the truth of the undesirable "disorder" of "underdevelopment" or "poverty," the "order" of "security," from that of "insecurity" and "anarchy." These suppositions of the truths of the human condition, therefore, serve to authenticate and legitimize the constructed institutions and structures of order as part of the progressive civilizational movement out of the preceding, pre-civilizational, non-humanity. Before the "ordered" world, the argument would go, there was the word of "order;" before the Word of order, there was nothingness.

Yet, this proclaimed "truth" is a lie. The "other" of civil-izational order was never, and is not, nothingness. Rather, the other of order may be seen, alternatively, as diversity. Seen in this light, the universalism of order is but the negation of diversity, to validate the "truth" of the one "order" is to invalidate the truths of diverse orders. This other truth of humanity, however, is the unspeakable of order; that which does not conform to the "civilized" vision of order, is deemed invisible, non-existent, despicable, and if nothing else, unworkable, irrelevant, unrealistic. From the violence of colonialism, through to the current orderings of the present-day "uncivilized," this negation of other orders has served to legitimize the violence perpetuated in the name of human betterment and progress.

L/ Extension – Security Link

Threats of security are simply distractions away from the ordering and destruction of worlds.

Nayar, School of Law @ University of Warwick, 1999

(Jayan, "Orders of Inhumanity," Transnational Law & Contemporary Problems, Fall 99, p. Lexis)

"Security" is another bulwark of the "new world-order." This is not surprising, for "development" requires the creation of conditions that facilitate its implementation and that ensure the obedience, if not the subservience, of those to be "developed." Security, as a motive for ordering, has been a useful distraction for this purpose, as is demonstrated by its transformation from a precept of coexistence to a common cause of globalization.

From its very conception, the current framework of international order, constructed through the United Nations Charter, had as its fundamental rationale the creation of conditions of security. Born out of the expressed aspirations of the Atlantic Charter n26 amid the early phases of the Second World War, the postwar UN Charter begins with words that were intended to resonate generations down the line: "We the Peoples of the United Nations Determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind. . ." n27

[*613] With these visions of an order freed from the madness of states in conflict, there was created a basis for collective responsibility in the preservation of peace--the collective security regime under the supervision of the Security Council, and particularly, its "Permanent Members," as stipulated in Chapter VII of the UN Charter. n28 Many further refinements to these high ideals have since been made as the post-UN Charter world-order evolves. With the end of formal colonialism, attention was transferred in the 1960s and 1970s to the perceived importance of elaborating on principles of non-aggression and non-intervention. The 1980s and 1990s have seen a reversal of enthusiasms, however, as interest is being increasingly expressed, especially within "Western" states, for a more "collective" undertaking of responsibility in matters of security. This includes the forwarding of arguments in favor of "humanitarian intervention" in cases of "internal" conflicts. n29 These trends in the changing outlook on "security" and its relationship to "sovereignty" have continued, and have recently resulted in the formation of a permanent International Criminal Court to bring to justice perpetrators of "genocide," "war crimes" and "crimes against humanity." n30 Ever so gradually, it seems, the "new world-order" is moving away from the statist pillars of sovereignty and domestic jurisdiction to a globalist notion of collective rights and responsibilities. Yet, as the following two observations on the nature of the global "security" landscape demonstrate, the realities of ordering that have flowed from reiterations of the commitment to non-violence have failed to establish a legacy of security for the majority of the global population:

L/ Extension – Security Link

Threats of security are used as justification for ordering others and violence. Enemies are created to legitimize the "one true world"
Nayar, School of Law @ University of Warwick, 1999

(Jayan, "Orders of Inhumanity," Transnational Law & Contemporary Problems, Fall 99, p. Lexis)

Once again, from the perspective of the ordered, the order of security has proved to be the ideological weapon for the systematic infliction of violence. It is not so much the order of security that is of interest here, but rather, the ordering which takes place in its guise.

And with the passing of history, so has the legitimizing claim for the necessity of violent ordering for "security" purposes --fascism, colonialism, communism, capitalism (depending on the ideological orientation of the claimant), terrorism (particularly of the Islamic bent). There is always an enemy, sometimes internal, sometimes external, threatening the well-being of the people. The languages of nationalism and sovereignty, of peace and collective security, constructed to suit whichever threat happens to be in fashion, are passionately employed; the anarchy that is a Hobbesian state of nature is always the prophesied consequence of the lack of order that is impending. And the price that the "ordered" has to pay for all this "security" in the post-colonial, new world-order?: the freedom of those who order to be violent!

From a "nationalist" standpoint, the rhetoric would insist that the security of the state is paramount, all else flowing from it. By this perspective, the state, that prize which was (re)gained from the colonial epoch, that jewel to be protected by the international order of "collective security," becomes the expression of the dignity of the "people," no questions asked. n33 From the anti-colonial struggle, from independence, the reasoning flows naturally, it seems, that the State is to be preserved from any challenge. The police, the military, and the secret service, purportedly given sight and hearing by the eyes and the ears of "the people," are the trophies of "independence." Overnight, the term "freedom fighter" is banished from the vocabulary of the state, the notion of the "terrorist" becomes its replacement. Overnight, the revolution is terminated, with "counter-revolution" becoming [*615] the label for any attempt to challenge the new status quo. Overnight, supposedly, the basic structures for freedom from violence are achieved--the condition of "security" that must be preserved is attained.

L/ Extension – Environmentalism Link

Environmentalism is a totalizing world view

Esteva and Prakash, 1998

(Gustavo and Madhu Suri, "Grassroots Post-modernism: Remaking the Soil of Cultures,"
New York: Zed Books, p. 22-23)

Once environmental "problems"⁷ are reduced to the ozone layer or to global warming, to planetary "sources" and "sinks," faith in the futility of local efforts is fed by global experts; while their conferences, campaigns and institutions present the fabulous apparition of solutions "scientifically" pulled out of the "global hat." Both a global consciousness and a global government (such as the Global Environmental Facility "master-minded" at the Earth Summit) appear as badly needed to manage the planet's "scarce resources" and "the masses" irresponsibly chopping "green sinks" for their daily tortillas or chappatis, threatening the "experts" planetary designs for eco-development. The "ozone layer" or "global warming" are abstract hypotheses, offered by some scientists as an explanation of recent phenomena. Even in that condition, they could prove to be very useful for fostering critical awareness of the folly of the "social minorities." But they are promoted as "a fact," reality itself; and all the socio-political and ecological dangers inherent in the illusion of the "Global Management" of planet Earth are hidden from "the people." Excluded, for example, from critical scrutiny is the reflection that in order for "global thinking" to be feasible, we should be able to "think" from within every culture on Earth and come away from this excursion single-minded – clearly a logical and practical impossibility, once it is critically de-mythologized. For it requires the supra-cultural criteria of "thinking" – implying the dissolution of the subject who "thinks"; or assuming that it is possible to "think" outside of the culture in which every man and woman on Earth is immersed. The human condition does not allow such operations. We celebrate the hopefulness of common men and women, saved from the hubris of "scientific man," unchastened by all his failures at playing God.

L/ Extension – Silencing Link

The affirmatives harms are premised on the silencing of the voices of dissent. This is not only violent, but proves that their harms cannot be "solved" for.

Nayar, School of Law @ University of Warwick, 1999

(Jayan, "Orders of Inhumanity," Transnational Law & Contemporary Problems, Fall 99, p. 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 misorderings of the world has followed from this experience?

L/ Extension – National Service Link

National service programs are used for people to spread their ideas of truth and further dominate those that fall outside that realm of truth.

Nayar, School of Law @ University of Warwick, 1999

(Jayan, "Orders of Inhumanity," Transnational Law & Contemporary Problems, Fall 99, p. 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." n50 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?

ix Extension – Violence Extension

This violence stems into more violence and leads to a world of invisible, globalized violence

Nayar, School of Law @ University of Warwick, 1999

(Jayan, "Orders of Inhumanity," Transnational Law & Contemporary Problems, Fall 99, p. Lexis)

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.

The affirmative assertion of one world inevitably destroys the world of others. This destruction is inherently violent

Nayar, School of Law @ University of Warwick, 1999

(Jayan, "Orders of Inhumanity," Transnational Law & Contemporary Problems, Fall 99, p. Lexis)

This brief remembering of colonialism as an historic process, provides us with the most explicit lessons on the violence of the "ordering" of "worlds." From its history we see that an important feature of ordering prevails. The world of those who "order" is the **destruction** of the "worlds" of those ordered. So many ideologies of negation and (re)creation served to justify this "beginning"--*terra nullius*, the "savage" native, the "civilizing mission." n17 The [*608] "world," after all, had to be created out of all this "unworldly" miasma, all for the common good of the universal society of humankind.

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.

ix Extension – Genocide Extension

This idea of "world speak" and that there can only be "one world" causes the destruction of all other worlds. This act is "justifiable" genocide and colonization.

Nayar, School of Law @ University of Warwick, 1999

(Jayan, "Orders of Inhumanity," Transnational Law & Contemporary Problems, Fall 99, p. Lexis)

Despite the vision of world-order founded on a notion of a universal society of humankind aspiring toward a universal common good, (first given meaning within a conceptual political-legal framework through the birth of the so-called "Westphalian" state system n14), the materialities of "ordering" were of a different complexion altogether. Contrary to the disembodied rhetoric of world-order as bloodless evolution, the new images of the world and languages of "globality" did not evolve out of a sense of "hospitality" n15 to the "other," the "stranger." Rather, the history of the creation of the post-Westphalian "world" as one world, can be seen to be most intimately connected with the rise of an expansionist and colonizing world-view and practice. Voyages of "discovery" provided the necessary reconnaissance to image this "new world." Bit by bit, piece by piece, the jigsaw of the globe was completed. With the advance of the "discoverer," the "colonizer," the "invader," the "new" territories were given meaning within the hermeneutic construct that was the new "world."

[*607] The significance of this evolution of the world does not, however, lie merely in its acquiring meaning. It is not simply the "idea" of the world that was brought to prominence through acts of colonization. The construction of the "stage" of the world has also occurred, albeit amid the performance of a violent drama upon it. The idea of a single world in need of order was followed by a succession of chained and brutalized bodies of the "other." The embodied world that has been in creation from the "colonial" times to the present could not, and does not, accommodate plurality. The very idea of "one world" contains the necessary impetus for the absorption, assimilation, if not destruction, of existing worlds and the genocide of existing socialities. This violence of "order-ing" within the historical epoch of colonialism is now plainly visible.

Alt Solvency Extension

Local resistance can solve globalization and the violence inherent within it

Prakash & Esteva, Prof. of education of Philosophy @ Pennsylvania State Univ. and grassroots activist, 1998

(Madhu Suri & Esteva, "Grassroots Postmodernism: Remaking the soil of culture," p.26-7)

The time has come to recognize with the late Leopold Kohr that the true problem of the modern age lies in the inhuman size or scale of many contemporary institutions and technologies. Instead of trying to counteract such inherently unstable and damaging global forces through government or civic controls that match their disproportionate and destructive scale, the time has come "to reduce the size of the body politic which gives them their devastating scale, until they become once again a match for the limited talent available to the ordinary mortals of which even the most majestic governments are composed" (Kohr, 1992, p. 10). In other words, said Kohr,

instead of centralization or unification, let us have economic cantonization. Let us replace the oceanic dimension of integrated big powers and common markets by a dike system of inter-connected but highly self-sufficient local markets and small states in which economic fluctuations can be controlled not because national or international leaders have Oxford or Yale degrees, but because the ripples of a pond, however animated, can never assume the scale of the huge swells passing through the united water masses of the open seas. (Kohr, 1992, p. 11)

This is sound advice not only for dealing with the WTO, the European Union, NAFTA or the World Bank in the political arena; that is, to put public pressure on governments with regards to the reorientation of their policies. It applies equally to every local struggle. Kohr's alternatives cannot be constructed from the top down, creating gigantic dikes to stop such oceanic waves or struggling to "seize" such powers in order to give them a different orientation or to dismantle them. In the struggle against global forces, there is a need to keep all political bodies at a human scale.

This is exemplified by the *Zapatistas*. On January 1, 1994, a few thousand poorly armed Indians started a rebellion in the south of Mexico. We elaborate on this *Zapatista* movement in different parts of this book.¹¹ We explain both how it has precipitated the end of the old authoritarian regime¹² of a country of 90 million, and how it continues to articulate the struggles of many local groups. No other call of the *Zapatista* movement was more successful than "*Basta!*" ("Enough!"). Millions of Mexicans were activated by it, shaping their generalized discontent and their multiple affirmations into a common, dignified rejection. The movement was able to encapsulate new aspirations in ways that affirm and regenerate their local spaces. They show no interest in seizing power in order to impose their own regime on everyone. Their struggle for a radically democratic governance attempts to take some of the political procedures of formal democracies, while combining these with those prevailing in their own traditions, in their communities. In their commons, the *Zapatistas* and other Mexicans are trying to govern themselves autonomously, well rooted in the spaces to which they belong and that belong to them. While affirming their dignity and their hope of flourishing and enduring according to their own cultural patterns and their own practices of the art of living and dying, they are joining in solidarity with all those liberating themselves from the parochial

Alt Solvency Extension

Local resistance is key to solving- Ghandi proves local resistance works
Prakash & Esteva, Prof. of education of Philosophy @ Pennsylvania State Univ. and
grassroots activist, 1998

(Madhu Suri & Esteva, "Grassroots Postmodernism: Remaking the soil of culture," p.28-9)

Two million French workers in the streets and several weeks of massive strikes did not stop the "neoliberal" design for France. A million farmers of India demonstrating against GATT did nothing to stop the threat the latter is posing to their lives. In contrast, Gandhi's Salt March, the simple decision of the oppressed to make their own salt in their streets and neighborhoods, could be considered decisive in ending the global British Empire. The rebellion of a few hundred Indians, poorly armed, could begin the end of the nation-state of Mexico. All these cases help us to understand the nature of modern power. However, they illustrate two distinct modes of power struggles: those that clothe the Emperor in contrast with others that disrobe him. Examining the reasons for their differential outcomes may help to see how real men and women can successfully exercise their power to pursue their own purposes; or, alternatively, be highly counterproductive in their confrontations with the "global forces" threatening them.

AT: Perm

Perm can't solve- Working with the state only reifies its power to control

Prakash & Esteva, Prof. of education of Philosophy @ Pennsylvania State Univ. and grassroots activist, 1998

(Madhu Suri & Esteva, "Grassroots Postmodernism: Remaking the soil of culture," p.29-30)

The French workers will probably succeed in their struggle to slow down the actual materialization of a plan depriving them of their "rights" to jobs, pension plans or personal security. But even if they kill the Juppé plan, and even though they have helped to throw Juppé himself out of office, they will only get more or less of the same from the machinery of the state to which they are presenting their "rights" or demands. By claiming from the state what the state has (or does not have), they are strengthening it; further feeding the myth of its centrality, its importance to their lives. Following its logic, the government will negotiate with the unions and a "good" agreement will finally be reached: a compromise between what the workers want to protect and what the government needs to dismantle. But the very basic "issue," the evil threatening people's lives in France and everywhere else, will remain untouched.

"What resists, supports," once observed an old Mexican politician, taking his metaphor from engineering: resistance of materials makes for sound construction. By strongly *opposing* Juppé's plan, French workers are, at the same time, legitimizing its authors; revealing how much they need them; engaged in a power dispute in which "the people" remain the weaker party. Gandhi's radicalism lay in the philosophy and praxis of simply *ignoring* British "power" – its laws, its technology, its industry. Turning away from political structures that weaken "the people," he moved the struggle for power to spaces where they can exercise their capacities for self-rule; governance that renders redundant rulers "on top." Affirming the liberation of "the people" from their rulers, he was underscoring the opposite: the dependency of the "rulers" upon the "ruled" for maintaining the myth that the former possess power, or that power is concentrated at the top of pyramidal structures.

AT: Perm

True Global Thinking is Impossible

Esteva and Prakash, 1998

(Gustavo and Madhu Suri, "Grassroots Post-modernism: Remaking the Soil of Cultures,"
New York: Zed Books, p. 22)

The modern "gaze" (Illich, 1994b, p. 3) can distinguish less and less between reality and the image broadcast on the TV screen.⁴ It has shrunk the earth into a little blue bauble, a mere Christmas tree ornament, all too often viewed on a TV set. Forgetting its mystery, immensity and grandeur, modern men and women succumb to the arrogance of "thinking globally" to manage planet Earth (Berry, 1991a, 1991b).

We can only think wisely about what we actually know well. And no person, however sophisticated, intelligent and overloaded with the information age state-of-the-art technologies, can ever "know" the Earth — except by reducing it statistically, as all modern institutions tend to do today, supported by reductionist scientists.⁵ Since none of us can ever really know more than a minuscule part of the earth, "global thinking" is at its best only an illusion, and at its worst the grounds for the kinds of destructive and dangerous actions perpetrated by global "think tanks" like the World Bank, or their more benign counterparts — the watchdogs in the global environmental and human rights movements.

AT: Perm

Global thinking is parochial, turning ALL benign intentions of case
Prakash & Esteva, Prof. of education of Philosophy @ Pennsylvania State Univ. and
grassroots activist, 1998

(Madhu Suri & Esteva, "Grassroots Postmodernism: Remaking the soil of culture," p.27)

Global proposals are necessarily parochial: they inevitably express the specific vision and interests of a small group of people, even when they are supposedly formulated in the interest of humanity (Shiva 1993). In contrast, if they are conceived by communities well rooted in specific places, local proposals reflect the unique "cosmovision" that defines, differentiates and distinguishes every culture: an awareness of the place and responsibilities of humans in the cosmos.¹³ Those who think locally do not twist the humble satisfaction of belonging to the cosmos into the arrogance of pretending to know what is good for everyone and to attempt to control the world.

Aff: State/global thinking good

A strong state is key to projecting power

Rotberg, director of the Kennedy School's Program on Intrastate Conflict and president of the World Peace Foundation, 2002

(Robert, "The new nature of Nation-State failure," Washington Quarterly, Vol. 25, issue 3, p.87)

Nation-states exist to deliver political goods—security, education, health services, economic opportunity, environmental surveillance, a legal framework of order and a judicial system to administer it, and fundamental infrastructural requirements such as roads and communications facilities—to their citizens. Failed states honor these obligations in the breach. They increasingly forfeit their function as providers of political goods to warlords and other nonstate actors. In other words, a failed state is no longer able or willing to perform the job of a nation-state in the modern world.

Failed states are unable to provide security—the most central and foremost political good—across the whole of their domains. Citizens depend on states and central governments to secure their persons and free them from fear. Because a failing state is unable to establish an atmosphere of security nationwide and is often barely able to assert any kind of state power beyond a capital city, the failure of the state becomes obvious even before rebel groups and other contenders threaten the residents of central cities and overwhelm demoralized government contingents, as in contemporary Liberia and recent Sierra Leone.

Aff: Perm

Perm solves- Both micro and macro-politics are key to social change

Best and Kellner, Associate Prof. of Philosophy & Humanities @ University of Texas and Prof. of Social Sciences @ Graduate School of Education Information Studies, 2001

(Steven & Douglas, "Dawns, Twilights, and Transitions: Postmodern Theories, Politics, and Challenges," Democracy & Nature The International Journal Of Inclusive Democracy, Vol. 7, Number 1,
http://www.democracynature.org/dn/vol7/best_kellner_postmodernism.htm)

Yet we would insist that it is not a question of micro vs macropolitics, as if it were an either/or proposition, but rather both dimensions are important for the struggles of the present and future.[xi] Likewise, we would argue that we need to combine the most affirmative and negative perspectives, embodying Marcuse's declaration that critical social theory should be both more negative and utopian in reference to the status quo.[xii] There are certainly many things to be depressed about in the negative and cynical postmodernism of a Baudrillard, yet without a positive political vision merely citing the negative might lead to apathy and depression that only benefits the existing order. For a dialectical politics, however, positive vision of what could be is articulated in conjunction with critical analysis of what is in a multiperspectivist approach that focuses on the forces of domination as well as possibilities of emancipation.

But it is also a mistake, we believe, to ground one's politics in either modern or postmodern theory alone. Against one-sided positions, we advocate a version of reconstructive postmodernism that we call a politics of alliance and solidarity that builds on both modern and postmodern traditions. Unlike Laclau and Mouffe who believe that postmodern theory basically provides a basis for a new politics, and who tend to reject the Enlightenment per se, we believe that the Enlightenment continues to provide resources for political struggle today and are skeptical whether postmodern theory alone can provide sufficient assets for an emancipatory new politics. Yet the Enlightenment has its blindspots and dark sides (such as its relentless pursuit of the domination of nature, and naive belief in "progress," so we believe that aspects of the postmodern critique of Enlightenment are valid and force us to rethink and reconstruct Enlightenment philosophy for the present age. And while we agree with Habermas that a reconstruction of the Enlightenment and modernity are in order, unlike Habermas we believe that postmodern theory has important contributions to make to this project.

Aff: Perm

Doing both would solve global issues without risking a link to the kritik

Best and Kellner, Associate Prof. of Philosophy & Humanities @ University of Texas and Prof. of Social Sciences @ Graduate School of Education Information Studies, 2001

(Steven & Douglas, "Dawns, Twilights, and Transitions: Postmodern Theories, Politics, and Challenges," Democracy & Nature The International Journal Of Inclusive Democracy, Vol. 7, Number 1,
http://www.democracynature.org/dn/vol7/best_kellner_postmodernism.htm)

Rethinking politics in the present conflicted and complex configurations of both novel and established relations of power and domination thus requires thinking through the complex ways in which the global and the local are interconnected. Theorizing the configurations of the global and the local also requires developing new multidimensional strategies ranging from the macro to the micro, the national to the local, in order to intervene in a wide range of contemporary and emerging problems and struggles. To the slogan, "Think globally, act locally," we may thus add the slogan, "Think locally, act globally." From this perspective, problems concerning global environmental problems, the development of a global information superhighway, and the need for new global forums for discussing and resolving the seemingly intransigent problems of war and peace, poverty and inequality, and overcoming divisions between the haves and the have-nots may produce new conceptions of global citizenship and new challenges for global intellectuals and activists.

Yet it is impossible to predict what forms a future postmodern politics will take. Such a politics is open and evolving, and will itself develop in response to changing and perhaps surprising conditions. Thus, it is impossible to sketch out the full parameters of a postmodern politics as the project is relatively new and open to further and unpredictable developments. In this novel and challenging conjuncture, the old modern and new postmodern politics both seem one-sided. Power resides in macro and micro institutions; it is more complex than ever with new configurations of global, national, regional, and more properly local forces and relations of power, generating new conflicts and sites of struggle, ranging from debates over "the new world order" -- or disorder as it may appear to many -- to struggles over local control of schools or the environment. This situation thus requires fresh thinking and politics as we move into the new millennium.

Aff: Perm

Mixing both modern and postmodern philosophies solves the fragmentation of movements

Best and Kellner, Associate Prof. of Philosophy & Humanities @ University of Texas and Prof. of Social Sciences @ Graduate School of Education Information Studies, 2001

(Steven & Douglas, "Dawns, Twilights, and Transitions: Postmodern Theories, Politics, and Challenges," Democracy & Nature The International Journal Of Inclusive Democracy, Vol. 7, Number 1, http://www.democracynature.org/dn/vol7/best_kellner_postmodernism.htm)

Indeed, both modern and postmodern positions have strengths and limitations, and we should seek a creative combination of the best elements of each. Thus, we should combine modern notions of solidarity, alliances, consensus, universal rights, macropolitics and institutional struggle with postmodern notions of difference, plurality, multiperspectivalism, identity, and micropolitics. The task today is to construct what Hegel called a "differentiated unity," where the various threads of historical development come together in a rich and mediated way. The abstract unity of the Enlightenment, as expressed in the discourse of rights or human nature, produced a false unity that masked and suppressed differences and privileged certain groups at the expense of others. The postmodern turn, conversely, has produced in its extreme forms warring fragments of difference, exploding any possible context for human community. This was perhaps a necessary development in order to construct needed differences, but it is now equally necessary to reconstruct a new social whole, a progressive community in consensus over basic values and goals, a solidarity that is richly mediated with differences that are articulated without being annulled.

Aff: Perm

Doing both would allow the opening up of new politics which would allow us to solve both kritik and case simultaneously

Best and Kellner, Associate Prof. of Philosophy & Humanities @ University of Texas and Prof. of Social Sciences @ Graduate School of Education Information Studies, 2001

(Steven & Douglas, "Dawns, Twilights, and Transitions: Postmodern Theories, Politics, and Challenges," Democracy & Nature The International Journal Of Inclusive Democracy, Vol. 7, Number 1,
http://www.democracynature.org/dn/vol7/best_kellner_postmodernism.htm)

Thus, we should avoid both the characteristic deficiencies of a modern politics that is grounded in an excessively universalizing political discourse that occludes differences and imposes a general dogmatic political schema which is held to be a foundational and not-to-be questioned arbitrator of political values and decisions. In addition, we should reject a postmodern identity politics that renounces the normative project of modern politics, that refuses common and general interests as intrinsically repressive, and that thus abandons a politics of alliance and solidarity in favor of the advocacy of one's own special interest group. Instead, a new politics would mediate the differences between the traditions, creating new syntheses that would strive for a higher ground based on common interests, general philosophical principles, and a renunciation of dogmatism and authoritarianism of whatever sort.

A new postmodern politics would also overcome the Eurocentrism of modern politics and valorize a diversity of local political projects and struggles. Although globalization is creating a more homogenized and shared world, it is doing so unevenly, thus proliferating difference and heterogeneity at the same time it produces resemblance and homogeneity. New syntheses of the global and the local, new hybridities, and an increased diaspora of many peoples and cultures is creating a novel situation in which modernization processes are reaching the far corners of the world and a postmodern global culture is found everywhere at the same time that new syntheses of the modern, postmodern, and premodern are generating differences and heterogeneity.^{i[xvii]} Thus, to the extent that modernization processes now include postmodernization processes, such that NAFTA, GATT, and the World Bank are bringing the cultures and technologies of developed postindustrial societies to developing societies, these societies must confront not only rapacious capital, repressive state control, and the exploitation of labor, but also mass media, cultural spectacles, computer technologies, new cultural identities, and so on.

In this situation, a postmodern politics must learn to be at once local, national, and global, depending on specific territorial conditions and problems. While sometimes only local struggles are viable, a new politics must also learn how to go beyond the local to the national and even global levels, requiring new forms of struggle and alliance against the growing power of transnational capitalism, the superstates that remain the dominant political forces, and the rapidly expanding culture industries of contemporary technocapitalism. Such new struggles and alliances are emerging already, as evident in the dramatic Seattle upheavals in December, 1999.
